



UDC 811.111

METAPHORS IN MODERN LINGUISTIC THEORIES

Yeschanova Raya Mukhiyatdinovna

*Assistant of the Interlingual Department of Foreign Languages, Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh
Republic of Karakalpakstan*

ANNOTATION

The article is devoted to metaphors in modern linguistic theories. Metaphor is studied as a certain type of tropes in poetics, as a source of new meanings of words - in lexicology, as a special type of speech use - in pragmatics, as an associative mechanism and an object of interpretation and perception of speech - in psycholinguistics, as a way of thinking and cognition - in logic and philosophy.

KEY WORDS: *metaphor, status, theory, comparisons, principle, directions, conflict.*

Metaphor is studied as a certain type of tropes in poetics, as a source of new meanings of words - in lexicology, as a special type of speech use - in pragmatics, as an associative mechanism and object of interpretation and perception of speech - in psycholinguistics, as a way of thinking and cognition - in logic and philosophy. . All this determines the existence of a number of certain approaches to the study of metaphor. Thus, in Western linguistic directions one can single out substitutive, comparative, interactionist and cognitive theories of metaphor.

The substitutive approach is based on the fact that any metaphorical expression is used instead of an equivalent literal expression and can be replaced by it. This view is rooted in Aristotle's definition above: a metaphor gives a thing a name that actually belongs to something else. The cognitive content of a metaphor can simply be considered its literal equivalent.

The theory of substitution gives metaphor the status of a simple ornamental means: the author prefers metaphor to its literal equivalent only because of stylization and embellishment of speech. No other significance, except to make speech more attractive, is given to the metaphor.

The traditional theory of substitution for the most part served as the basis for the development of a comparative theory, the beginnings of which can be found in Aristotle's Rhetoric and in M.F. Quintilian. The comparative approach assumes that the meaning of any metaphorical expression can still be expressed by a literal equivalent, since a literal expression is one of the forms of explicit comparison. This theory limits metaphor to verbal use, because metaphor here expresses only comparison. Metaphor is in constant interaction with comparison. Many authors defend the assumption that a metaphor is a concise comparison, while others refute this point of view. Actually, metaphor is based on comparison, but still metaphor is not just comparison. The concepts of "comparison" and "metaphor", from our point of view, are close, but not identical.

The interactionist theory, developed in the works of A. Richards and M. Black, is rightfully considered the leading direction in analytics in terms of explication of the essence of metaphor. M. Black is based on the idea of A. Richards, according to which a metaphor is two thoughts that relate to different objects, but act together and are contained in one word or one phrase, whose meaning is the result of their interaction. In other words, the thought itself is metaphorical, which, developing through comparison, generates a metaphor. The metaphorical use of an expression consists in its use in a sense that is different from its usual or direct sense, and in a context that helps to reveal this indirect or non-standard sense. The focus of a metaphor (that is, a clearly metaphorical word or expression inserted into the frame of the direct meanings of words) serves to convey a meaning that, in principle, could be expressed literally.

Thus, M. Black uses the concept of a system of generally accepted associations or associated implications. Its essence is that two systems of concepts interact: a system of associated implications associated with an auxiliary subject is attached to the main subject, and as a result a new meaning is formed that is not reducible to the sum of the components, and the interpretation of each subject also changes. In other words, a distinctive feature of metaphor in the theory of interaction is its semantic duality - the interaction of the main and auxiliary subjects, the play of direct and figurative meanings.

Believing that metaphor is not an isolated use of words, interactionists rely on the concepts of focus to denote the actual metaphorical structure and frame to denote the rest of the sentence, which includes the metaphor as a constituent element. The focus of metaphor serves to convey a meaning that could in principle be expressed literally. Metaphor is the result of the interaction of these two objects, during which there is an expansion, a shift in meaning.

The theory of M. Black had a great influence on further studies of metaphor within the framework of the interactionist



direction (M. Hesse, M. Arbib, E. Kitty, E.K. Way, S.S. Gusev, etc.). Interactionists (A. Richards, M. Black, E. McCormack) can also be considered the initiators of the modern cognitive approach to the analysis of metaphor. According to their interpretation, the semantics of metaphor is an interactive mechanism that connects the surface of the language with the field of knowledge. A metaphor is the result of a cognitive process that juxtaposes two or more referents that are not normally related, resulting in a semantic conceptual anomaly.

M. Beardsley's theory of conflict was also developed on the basis of the interactionist-semantic approach. According to M. Beardsley, metaphor is based on conflict, verbal opposition, which is contained in the very semantic structure of a metaphorical language unit. According to M. Beardsley, the main subject of a metaphor has two main groups of properties: those that are defining or central, and those that are considered marginal and are called connotations. The first properties serve as a necessary condition for the correct use of a given subject in a certain sense, and the second properties are accidental.

Within the framework of the conflict theory, on the basis of the interactionist theory, the anomaly theory was also formed, which is a generalization of several later versions of the conflict theory. All of them hold the view that conflicts and anomalies are inherent in metaphor and determine its identification and understanding. At the same time, the very nature of the anomaly is defined differently by different adherents of this view, but everyone is unanimous that this is something like a semantic category error. Semantic categories describe the general kinds of objects in the world, and conflict occurs when an object or its properties are attributed to its antipode.

Defenders of the anomaly theory believe that such a violation of the rules of the semantic category provides an opportunity to identify metaphorical expressions as non-literal; on the very interpretation of such expressions, their paths diverge.

Metaphors make us see some things instead of others, which act in their direct meaning as auxiliary structures and give the key to their understanding. Metaphor is a source, not a guide. Its successful interpretation depends not only on the structure of the metaphorical image (which remains the same both in the case of metaphorical and in the case of direct use), but also on the ability of the addressee to comprehend the meaning encoded by the author. The personality of the interpreter determines the metaphorical meaning, and not the meaning inherent in the metaphorical image a priori. The mysterious nature of metaphorical transfer in the interpretation of D. Davidson receives the highest form of its expression.

The considered approaches to the analysis of metaphor make it possible to single out three main views on the linguistic nature of metaphor: as a way of existence of the meaning of a word (a lexical phenomenon - a metaphor is realized in the structure of the linguistic meaning of a word); as a phenomenon of syntactic semantics (considered at the level of syntactic compatibility of words); as a way of conveying meaning in a communicative act (a functional-communicative phenomenon that is realized in a statement / in a text).

Along with the analysis of structural-semantic and functional features, recently not only in the West, but also in Russia, interest has increased in issues related to the mechanisms for generating metaphorical structures, with their cognitive activity, with the transformation of mental categories into linguistic ones in the process of metaphorical reflection of reality.

So, in modern Russian linguistics, the lexicological approach involves the study of metaphor as a method of nomination and makes the object of study the lexical meaning of the word. Representatives of the lexicological approach are G.N. Sklyarevskaya, V.G. Gak, V.N. Teliya, V.N. Vovk.

G.N. Sklyarevskaya in her monograph "Metaphor in the Language System" interprets the lexical meaning of a word as a complex redundant structure consisting of denotative content, including the core and periphery, and the connotative environment. A component of semantics that directly links the metaphorical meaning of the lexeme with the denotative one, G.N. Sklyarevskaya designates it as a "symbol of metaphor". In metaphorical transfer, the "symbol of metaphor", "which in its original nominative meaning belongs to the sphere of connotation", acts as an independent concept, "is included in the denotative content as nuclear (differential) semes and serves as the basis for semantic transformations in the process of metaphorization"

Against the background of the theories presented above, there is another tradition - to consider metaphor as a phenomenon of syntactic semantics. This position is most clearly reflected in the works of N.D. Arutyunova, who is close to the views of M. Black and the main provisions of his interactionist theory. This approach allows obtaining interesting information about the influence of the semantic compatibility of words on the process of metaphorization. Proponents of the semantic-syntactic approach see a categorical shift as the basis for the mechanism of metaphor formation. The essence of metaphor is the transposition of identifying (descriptive and semantically diffuse) vocabulary, intended to indicate the subject of speech, into the sphere of predicates, intended to indicate its features and properties.

The semantic-syntactic approach provides a lot for understanding the nature of metaphor. Its main value is that it reveals the mechanism of metaphorical meaning formation on the basis of categorical characterization. Thus, it is recognized that the metaphor is created by predication to the main subject of the metaphor of the signs of the auxiliary subject.

Thus, summing up all the theories presented by us, we can say that metaphor is considered from different points of view and positions, however, all authors in their works recognize metaphor as one of the most interesting and important topics for research.

LITERATURE

1. Arutyunova, N.D. *Metaphor in the language of feelings* / N.D. Arutyunova - Moscow: 2013. - 385 p.
2. Vovk, V.N. *Language metaphor in artistic speech (the nature of the secondary nomination): monograph* / V.N. Vovk. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1986. - 140 p.
3. Black M. *More about metaphor // Metaphor and thought.* - Cambridge etc., 1979. - P. 19-45.



4. *Beardsley M. The Metaphorical Twist // Philosophy and Phenomenological Research. 1962. No. 22. P. 293–307.*
5. *Black M. Models and metaphors: Studies in lang. a. philosophy. - Ithaca, 1962. - 267 p.*
6. *Gak, VG Functional-semantic field of localization predicates / Theory of functional grammar. Locativity. Beingness. Possession. Conditionality // Ed. A. V. Bondarko. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1996. S. 6-26.*
7. *Richards A. Philosophy of rhetoric// Theory of metaphor. M., 1990.*
8. *Sklyarevskaya, G. N. Language metaphor in the dictionary / G. N. Sklyarevskaya - VYa, 1987. No. 2, P. 34-65*
9. *Sklyarevskaya, G.N. Metaphor in the language system / G.N. Sklyarevskaya - St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1993. - 152 p.*
10. *Teliya, V.N; Metaphor as a model of meaning production and its . expressive-evaluative function / V.N. Telia // Metaphor in language and text: Sat. scientific: works.-M.: Nauka, 1988. - S. 26-52:*