

THEORY OF METAPHOR AND VISUAL-EXPRESSIVE MEANS AS AN INTEGRAL COMPONENT OF THE LANGUAGE

Gafurova Nigora Sa'dullayevna

Karshi State technological university

Annotation: This article examines the visual and expressive means of language, focusing on the concept of metaphor and its application across various scientific and artistic fields. It explores the linguistic, philosophical, and cognitive aspects of metaphor, distinguishing between artistic and linguistic metaphors. The role of metaphor in technical terminology and the process of terminologization are also discussed. The classification of metaphors by different scholars is analyzed, highlighting the formation of terminological metaphors based on visual or functional similarity. Examples of common words transitioning into technical terms illustrate the impact of metaphorical transfer in language development.

Keywords: Metaphor, expressive means, linguistic style, artistic metaphor, linguistic metaphor, terminologization, terminological metaphors, semantic change.

Under the visual and expressive means of language are understood such techniques, with the help of which the visual appearance of the phenomenon is reproduced in the imagination and which are designed for sensory and emotional perception. The most important place among such expressive and pictorial means of language is occupied by tropes-turns of speech in which a word or expression is used in a figurative sense. The style of the language defines a whole series of tropes that have received specific names. Based on the ratio of the direct and figurative meanings of the word, tropes are distinguished in which the ratio is based on similarity; trails where the ratio is based on contrast and trails where the ratio is based on contiguity. Among the means of artistic expression, the most important place is occupied by the metaphor, which represents the first type of tropes (the ratio of similarity).

The Great Russian Encyclopedic Dictionary (BRES) gives the following definition of metaphor: "Metaphor — from the Greek metaphor-transference) - the transfer of the properties of one object (phenomenon) to another on the basis of a feature that is common or similar for both comparable members" [BRES, 2005, p.939].

"Metaphor — both an artistic image and a scientific concept-serves as a form of generalized reflection and cognition of reality, created on the basis of imaginative thinking, which is an organic unity of sensory-contemplative and rational-abstract forms of cognition" [Gak, Telia, Wolf et al., 1988, p.134].

Metaphor went beyond the interests of linguistics and became the subject of research at the level of the philosophical concept of cognition of the surrounding reality [Gusev, 1984, p. 53]. Metaphor is given an organizing role in cognitive practice and emphasizes the active participation of metaphor in the language of scientific and philosophical theories [Gusev, 1984, p. 11]. On the basis of the language experience of speakers, subject-logical connections are formed in the language, which initiate the transfer of semantic meanings underlying the metaphor [Telia, 1977, p. 192-193].

At the level of linguistics, various syntactic constructions containing both single words and word combinations and whole sentences bearing a metaphorical image are studied; the latter are called expanded metaphors. In the historical perspective, the gradual expansion of the element of study can be traced-from the phrase that carries a metaphorical meaning to the contextual environment

that determines the metaphorical tonality [Potebnya,1905(1976); Katsnelson,1965; Basilaya,1971; Mednikova,1974; Telia,1981; Bessarabova,1987; Kartashova,2009; Zanina,2013; Alekseeva,2013; Borisova,2016].

The basic concept in the system of visual and expressive means of language is the concept of lexical meaning. The past years of linguistic research have led linguists to interpret lexical meaning as a complex concept, which includes, first, the denotative content with its semantic center (core) and periphery, and, second, the connotative environment. However, not all linguists attribute additional semantic meanings, called connotations, to the lexical meaning and, thus, deduce the connotative environment beyond the latter. We can say that the concept of connotation includes a whole range of associations: stylistic, pragmatic, expressive, evaluative [Shakhovsky, 1982, p. 33]. In the semantic core, however, the dominant and unchanging feature that is included in the dictionary definition is concentrated, and in the periphery — secondary features. It is important to note that a metaphorical expression can include any meaning that is remote from the denotative center.

Analyzing the deep roots of existing and emerging metaphors, we can say that human thinking cannot stay on the straight path of rigid separation of objects of the surrounding world, it (thinking) is inherent in the creative process of comparing objects and building associative connections based on the identified similarities and, at the next step, creating vivid images by mentally endowing some objects with the characteristics of others [Koralova,1985; Kuliev,1987; Oparina,2000; Razinkina,2005; Skorokhodova,2006].

Over the years of studying the visual and expressive means of language, linguists have offered various options for classifying metaphors. First of all, the emphasis was placed on the watershed between artistic metaphors, which are individual inventions of the authors of works of art and are aimed at creating bright expressive images, and linguistic metaphors, which have long been fixed in the language and have become an integral part of it. Language metaphors are characterized by reproducibility in speech and anonymity of the source of occurrence, while artistic metaphors usually do not go beyond the scope of a single work or the works of the author of these metaphors. For language metaphors, it is typical to use them in speech without any awareness of the allegorical nature of these words [Kotyurova,2009; Garipova,2015].

According to the dictionary of linguistic terms, metaphors are divided into:

- lost imagery;
- preserved imagery in the language;
- author's, individual-stylistic metaphors

[Zhrebilo, 2010, p. 192]

Efforts to further classify — separately within the framework of artistic and linguistic metaphors-have encountered difficulties in typologizing the former, which is a consequence of their spontaneously subjective nature, and have highlighted possible ways to typologize the latter. [Rubtsova, 2002; Skorokhodova, 2006; Newmark, 2008; Shikalov, 2010]. N. D. Arutyunova suggests that among language metaphors, metaphors that carry a figurative image (it is proposed to call them figurative metaphors); metaphors that have lost a figurative image (it is proposed to call them nominative metaphors); metaphors that allow us to interpret a new object of research on the basis of fairly well-known analogies (it is proposed to call them cognitive metaphors) [Arutyunova, 1978, p. 340].

The Great Russian Encyclopedic Dictionary (BRES) gives the following definition of the term: "A term (from the Latin terminus-border, limit) is a word or a combination of words denoting a special concept used in science, technology, and art" [BRES, 2005, p. 1560].

In the light of our work on the spread of metaphor in the field of technical terminology, it is interesting to turn to the views of the founders of Russian linguistics on the essence of terms. In one of the first works devoted to the analysis of terminology, A. A. Reformatzky focused on the fact that although the meaning of the term may vary in different scientific and technical fields, but within each of them the term has an unambiguity that does not depend on the context — in

contrast to non-term words, which are characterized by the removal of ambiguity precisely due to the context. As an example of the use of one term with different interpretations in different fields of knowledge, different interpretations of the term function in mathematics and physiology, and the term reduction in economics and phonetics are given [Reformatsky, 1959, p. 9]. In the same work, it is noted that the term lies outside of expression, modality and aesthetic qualities, while for words of common vocabulary, it is typical to have additional meanings associated with aesthetic characteristics, modality, expressiveness. It is emphasized that such a phenomenon as a modality, which expresses the attitude of the author of the statement to the latter, is completely leveled in the field of terminology. To an even lesser extent, the author continues, the category of aesthetics based on preference and comparability is compatible with the terminological sphere.

Expressing the general opinion of linguists, we can say that the term carries the name of the concept, and these names are assigned by people who are in constant interaction with the objects of the surrounding reality. According to V. M. Leychik, "the term is the reification of the abstraction of an object of a special sphere in the form of a lexical unit of a natural language" [Leychik, 2009, p. 22].

Among the sources that "feed" the terminological arsenals of special fields of science and technology, we can name, first of all, the vocabulary of the commonly used style. It is the neutral vocabulary that is the resource base for generating terms by means of metaphorical transfer of names based on visual or functional similarity with the "signified" of the lexical unit-source. In this case, it is logical to say that such terms in the stylistic aspect are metaphors and, accordingly, to define them by the phrase "terms-metaphors" or "terminological metaphors" [Borisova, 1997; Novodranova, 2005; Volgina, 2013; Buyanova, 2016].

Words of ordinary language, such as apron, dome, knee, acquired the status of terms after they "migrated" to the technical sphere and received constant use in the latter to refer to specific concepts: apron (lathe), dome (blast furnace), elbow (pipeline). These examples demonstrate the fact that there are many lexemes in the language, used both in the common sense and as terms. This state of affairs has prompted linguists to talk about terminologization, as a phenomenon of the transition of a lexical unit from the commonly used status to the status of a term.

References:

1. Great Russian Encyclopedic Dictionary (BRES) (2005). Metaphor. Moscow: Great Russian Encyclopedia.
2. Gak, V. G., Telia, V. N., Wolf, E. M., et al. (1988). Metaphor as an Artistic and Scientific Concept. Moscow: Nauka.
3. Gusev, V. V. (1984). Metaphor in Cognitive Practice. Moscow: Progress.
4. Telia, V. N. (1977). The Role of Metaphor in Language Experience. Moscow: Nauka.
5. Potebnya, A. A. (1905/1976). Thought and Language. Moscow: Nauka.
6. Katsnelson, S. D. (1965). Typology of Metaphor in Linguistics. Leningrad: Nauka.
7. Basilaya, A. A. (1971). The Function of Metaphor in Speech. Moscow: Nauka.
8. Mednikova, E. M. (1974). Metaphor in the Context of Language Evolution. Leningrad: Nauka.