REPRESENTATION AND METONYMY AS THE MOST IMPLY OF THE CONCEPT OF TWOFOLD ASSIGNMENT

Amanova Nodirabegim Furkatovna

Independent researcher

Abstract: *In present day cognitive science, representation is considered as the most component for conceptualizing information. As a result, it appears vital to stay on the hypothesis of allegory in more detail. The conventional see goes back to Aristotle, who considered representation an property of talk and verse and caught on it as a covered up comparison coming about from the similitude between the concepts included in allegorical reinterpretation.*

Keywords: *representation an property, similitude, metonymy, characterize allegory.*

The concept of allegory is exceptionally wide, since it is nearly continuously conceivable to decide the similitude of signs between any signifier and sign. In expansion, Lapshin emphasizes that it is inconceivable to talk of a common include, since this include is as it were suggested. The inverse approach, utilizing the sentence as an illustration, considers representation to be an peculiarity, noticing the coherent contradiction of the signifier and the meant. The originators of interactionist hypothesis, A. Richards and M. Dark, characterize allegory as the interaction of its constituent components (i.e., two compared objects) and forms (i.e., mental reflection that inspires acquainted- metaphorical pictures presented into a unused concept). The allegorical handle is depicted by them as the interaction of two types of referents: the most person/subject and the assistant person/subject, which are decided within the handle of representation, not as it were title the assigned one, but too serve as the premise for understanding it, recognizing critical viewpoints of the question assigned by the representation and presenting it into a unused meaning.

R. Sternberg, K. Jolls, E. McCormack developed this theory from the point of view of cognitive research, emphasizing that metaphor is not only a new representation of two different objects, but also the interaction of two conceptual fields . The domains to which these objects belong.[18] Accordingly, M. Black's classic metaphor "People are wolves" is considered not only as an isolation of wolf traits that may be characteristic of humans (aggression, anger, etc.) , but also as an interaction between conceptual concepts. Social the relational domain and the conceptual domain of the animal kingdom. Thus, the metaphor changes the way we look at two areas anthropocentric factor that directly determines the choice of one auxiliary tool from the many available for metaphor .Metaphor is, by its very nature, an emotional evaluator . It affects the sphere of expression of the lexical meaning of a word, that is, its connotations, which include not so much logical ideas about an object or phenomenon of the real world , but rather ideas and associations that arise among

representatives of a particular linguistic and cultural community . They In connection with this, representatives of the cognitive direction , based on the position that the structure of thinking reflects the structure of human activity , put forward the following position : thinking, the entire conceptual system of a person, and therefore linguistic semantics, has its own specific features. J. Lakoff and M. Johnson emphasize: " Metaphor enters our everyday life, not only into language, but also into thought and action. Our usual conceptual system, by which we think and act, is metaphorical in nature " .

Using the metaphor "Argument is war" as an example, J. Lakoff and M. Johnson define language metaphor as a collective two-way categorization based on the psychological reality of prototype models .[19] The collective two-way categorization expressed in the metaphorical structure of reality differs in different languages due to the different material, physical, intellectual, and spiritual experiences of speakers of different languages. Cultural differences affect the entire language system, including the processes of bimodal nomination . Language is universal in its essence, but national in its methods of expression. A metaphor that appears in one cultural and linguistic field contains a certain associative mechanism for comparing two conceptual fields of representatives of this field and in most cases claims its uniqueness, since the most basic cultural values are consistent with the metaphor.Thus, linguistic categorization depends not only on the naming of various concepts that exist in the world , but also on the metaphorical structure of the perception of the world cognitive linguistics, metaphor is viewed as the conceptualization of abstract and imprecise experience in terms of familiarity and concreteness. Thus, metaphor is motivated by the search for understanding. It emerges as a result of significant, natural , and similar processes in the context of category boundary violations and is therefore characterized by the conceptualization of one cognitive domain using component terms that are often and usually associated with another cognitive domain conceptualization of abstract categories can be based on three main experiments that provide these categories with a truly clear structure:more complex categories , including event-specific features, activity categories i (action categories i);objects, organisms and general classes of persons (object/person/organism categories);" image schemes ") used for the spatial concept of abstract categories N.D. Arutyunova considers the linguistic essence of metaphor formation taking into account two main functions that affect the formation of the categorical lexical meaning of a word , namely the functions of identification and predication . As a method of conveying the specificity of an object, metaphor uniquely combines both functions: this case is closely related to the definition of the dictionary, is characterized by great opportunities for descriptiveness, individualization of objects and phenomena, but belongs to the sectional position, since the main goal of the metaphor is to actualize certain features that correspond to the object and are included in the meaning of the metaphor itself. To create a classical metaphor, the definition is transferred to the field of dictionaries. In this case, a categorical error occurs when the correspondence between the lexical type (metaphor individualizes the object) and the syntactic function (metaphor refers to the object as a class to which it does not belong) is violated. In order not to contradict the laws of semantic

correspondence, the metaphor thus characterizes the real denotation and at the same time corresponds to the figurative denotation of the section. This is a mechanism for transforming the metaphor into an image that can only be used in a certain category .

Comparison of As a result of the contrast, the main features of the metaphor become clear. Comparison changes the syntactic structure of the sentence and, accordingly, determines for the metaphor a range of features that are only characteristic of it. Descriptiveness emphasizes the constant features of the metaphorized concept , revealing its essence and not affecting its individual characteristics. Metaphor is static, because it expresses not the impression of the concept at a certain time, but its true essence, stable similarity. The semantic richness of the metaphor does not indicate its accuracy. These features of the metaphor determine the property of the metaphor to be a constant figurative name of a separate conceptual category .

According to the mechanism of emergence, the following types of linguistic metaphors can be distinguished: 1) nominative metaphor, which replaces one descriptive meaning with another and serves as a source of homonymy; the development of figurative meanings , synonymous means of the language, 3) cognitive metaphor resulting from the shift of the harmony of words (meaning transfer) and the creation of polysemy, 4) generalizing metaphor (as the final result of cognitive metaphor), erasing the boundaries between them , encouraging the emergence of logical orders in the lexical meaning of the word and logical polysemy.

Nominative and generalizing metaphors exclude semantic duality, which leads to their instability. Figurative metaphor is distinguished by a degree of stability. It " gives a concise description of a certain object, often penetrating into its essence ."[20]Figurative metaphor is expressed through specific names or objects that are well known to speakers of the language , evoking various images, feelings and ideas in people . This leads to variability in understanding, but does not affect the success of the communication process are distinguished , as well as " dead " (erased, traditional, lexicalized) metaphors. The cognitive approach to metaphor does not take this classification into account, since it does not accept the concept of " dead metaphor " , which denotes a unity that indicates the convention (fixation) of the figurative meaning of a word in society and its frequent association with a certain language form , and can be included in the lexicon as one of the meanings of a word . From a cognitive point of view, the metaphorical power of a word cannot be inactive, since a metaphor contains not only the characteristics of individual categories, but also its role in the structure of the entire cognitive model. Thus, a metaphor expresses the structure, internal relations or logic of a cognitive model . Analyzing individual metaphors as " ready-made " semantic formations, M.N. Lapshin, allows us to identify a number of regular associations of the same type, the generalization of which leads to the formation of prototype metaphors, which are stable semantic paradigms. Prototype metaphors are effective idealized conceptual structures that allow us to create a new image of a given concept by comparing two conceptual fields in each case .

The animal world and the human world are fundamental in the conceptual system of man due to their constant initial proximity. Due to the diversity of the objective world , there are a great many prototype object metaphors of their own kind. Accordingly, in the prototype paradigm " object - person " the first element may belong to the conceptual sphere of the world (sun, moon, pearls) or to the sphere of objects (artifacts) created in the process of labor activity. Other paradigms of the subject metaphor are " body part - profession, character or nationality " , " gastronomic product - person " .

To himself Despite its specificity, metaphor still refers not to individual objects or events, but to complex conceptual fields , mental spaces. Combining multifaceted cognitive models in a unique and appropriate way, metaphor reflects the world , interprets it. With the help of metaphor , it is possible to include various conceptual areas into a single mental field , into the general conceptual system of a certain language community.

Like metaphor, metonymy is an effective cognitive tool for conveying information and supplementing knowledge about the relationships between objects . Like metaphorical concepts , metonymic concepts are an integral part of human thinking.

Metonymy can be conditional or conceptual in nature, a means of expanding language resources, and can also be interpreted as a method of conceptualization . The main difference is that metaphor involves different cognitive models in the process of conceptualization , while conceptualization using metonymy is carried out within the framework of the same model, that is, one category in the model is considered as a substitute for another category in the same model .

Metonymy does not imply a difference in characteristics, therefore, it occupies a subjective position, which allows the metonymic meaning to " acquire a certain reference (belonging to a certain object known to the speaker), " emphasizing the individualizing nature of a particular object .[21] "Metonymy in the subject, although it is intended to define the "whole" by indicating a specific feature , usually accepts defining definitions that apply to this detail, but not to the whole . At the same time, definitions derived from a part and a part denote a specific whole, i.e. to the referent of metonymy .

Metonymic concepts structure human daily activities in various ways. F. Ungerer and H.-J. Schmid identify the following typical examples: part - whole, whole - part, container - content, material - object, producer - product, place - institution, place - event, controlled - controlling, cause - effect to activate a particular cognitive category by referring it to another category within the same model . In metonymy The set of features is limited, but there are still several objects to choose from semanticization of signs through metaphor and metonymy is based on the principle of recategorization, the interaction between the systemic meaning of a word and its functional concept . This principle involves "reconsideration of a word as a result of its association with another category due to the realization of the properties of another category or concept . "[22] This occurs as a result of the neutralization of the prototypical signs of the language unit and, accordingly, allows it to be used in an unusual

systematic sense of conceptualization and categorization in the cognitive system of knowledge and ideas of social importance for culture and society . Metaphorical and metonymic models structure reality in different ways, using different mechanisms for this. Metaphor and metonymy provide more figurativeness of binary nominations . They form complex networks of interacting and interconnected conceptual relations within the language unit and mainly determine the features of thinking . This allows us to consider these mechanisms of semantic transfer as an important cognitive tool.

In different types of metaphors, various elements of its internal structure are explained. Thus, the class of the metaphorical auxiliary subject is not determined, it is expressed by an indicative word. In a figurative metaphor, on the contrary, the term of comparison (auxiliary subject) is determined, and its features that serve as the basis of the metaphorical meaning remain unexplained. According to F. Ungerer and H. Schmid , the essence of the metaphor is realized in the interaction of the metaphorical expression and the context of its application . In this way, the context makes it possible to explain the different types of objects implied by the metaphor.

R. Sternberg, K. Jolls, E. McCormack developed this theory from the point of view of cognitive research, emphasizing that metaphor is not only a new representation of two different objects, but also the interaction of two conceptual fields . The domains to which these objects belong. Accordingly, M. Black's classic metaphor "People are wolves" is considered not only as an isolation of wolf traits that may be characteristic of humans (aggression, anger, etc.) , but also as an interaction between conceptual concepts. Social the relational domain and the conceptual domain of the animal kingdom. Thus, the metaphor changes the way we look at two areas anthropocentric factor that directly determines the choice of one auxiliary tool from the many available for metaphor .

Metaphor is, by its very nature, an emotional evaluator . It affects the sphere of expression of the lexical meaning of a word, that is, its connotations, which include not so much logical ideas about an object or phenomenon of the real world , but rather ideas and associations that arise among representatives of a particular linguistic and cultural community . They In connection with this, representatives of the cognitive direction , based on the position that the structure of thinking reflects the structure of human activity , put forward the following position : thinking, the entire conceptual system of a person, and therefore linguistic semantics, has its own specific features. J. Lakoff and M. Johnson emphasize: " Metaphor enters our everyday life, not only into language, but also into thought and action. Our usual conceptual system, by which we think and act, is metaphorical in nature " .

Using the metaphor "Argument is war" as an example, J. Lakoff and M. Johnson define language metaphor as a collective two-way categorization based on the psychological reality of prototype models . The collective two-way categorization expressed in the metaphorical structure of reality differs in different languages due to the different material, physical, intellectual, and spiritual experiences of speakers of different languages. Cultural differences affect the entire language system, including the processes of bimodal nomination . Language is universal in its essence, but national in its methods of expression. A metaphor that appears in one cultural and linguistic field contains a certain associative mechanism for comparing

two conceptual fields of representatives of this field and in most cases claims its uniqueness, since the most basic cultural values are consistent with the metaphor.

Thus, linguistic categorization depends not only on the naming of various concepts that exist in the world , but also on the metaphorical structure of the perception of the world .cognitive linguistics, metaphor is viewed as the conceptualization of abstract and imprecise experience in terms of familiarity and concreteness. Thus, metaphor is motivated by the search for understanding. It emerges as a result of significant, natural , and similar processes in the context of category boundary violations and is therefore characterized by the conceptualization of one cognitive domain using component terms that are often and usually associated with another cognitive domain conceptualization of abstract categories can be based on three main experiments that provide these categories with a truly clear structure:more complex categories , including event-specific features, activity categories i used for the spatial concept of abstract categories .

N.D. Arutyunova considers the linguistic essence of metaphor formation taking into account two main functions that affect the formation of the categorical lexical meaning of a word , namely the functions of identification and predication . As a method of conveying the specificity of an object, metaphor uniquely combines both functions: this case is closely related to the definition of the dictionary, is characterized by great opportunities for descriptiveness, individualization of objects and phenomena, but belongs to the sectional position, since the main goal of the metaphor is to actualize certain features that correspond to the object and are included in the meaning of the metaphor itself. To create a classical metaphor, the definition is transferred to the field of dictionaries. In this case, a categorical error occurs when the correspondence between the lexical type (metaphor individualizes the object) and the syntactic function (metaphor refers to the object as a class to which it does not belong) is violated. In order not to contradict the laws of semantic correspondence, the metaphor thus characterizes the real denotation and at the same time corresponds to the figurative denotation of the section. This is a mechanism for transforming the metaphor into an image that can only be used in a certain category .

Comparison of As a result of the contrast, the main features of the metaphor become clear. Comparison changes the syntactic structure of the sentence and, accordingly, determines for the metaphor a range of features that are only characteristic of it. Descriptiveness emphasizes the constant features of the metaphorized concept , revealing its essence and not affecting its individual characteristics. Metaphor is static, because it expresses not the impression of the concept at a certain time, but its true essence, stable similarity. The semantic richness of the metaphor does not indicate its accuracy. These features of the metaphor determine the property of the metaphor to be a constant figurative name of a separate conceptual category .

According to the mechanism of emergence, the following types of linguistic metaphors can be distinguished: 1) nominative metaphor, which replaces one descriptive meaning with another and serves as a source of homonymy; the development of figurative meanings , synonymous means of the language, 3) cognitive metaphor resulting from the shift of the harmony of words (meaning transfer) and the creation of polysemy, 4) generalizing metaphor (as the final result of cognitive metaphor), erasing the boundaries between them ,

encouraging the emergence of logical orders in the lexical meaning of the word and logical polysemy.

Nominative and generalizing metaphors exclude semantic duality, which leads to their instability. Figurative metaphor is distinguished by a degree of stability. It " gives a concise description of a certain object, often penetrating into its essence ." Figurative metaphor is expressed through specific names or objects that are well known to speakers of the language , evoking various images, feelings and ideas in people . This leads to variability in understanding, but does not affect the success of the communication process are distinguished , as well as " dead " (erased, traditional, lexicalized) metaphors. The cognitive approach to metaphor does not take this classification into account, since it does not accept the concept of " dead metaphor " , which denotes a unity that indicates the convention (fixation) of the figurative meaning of a word in society and its frequent association with a certain language form , and can be included in the lexicon as one of the meanings of a word . From a cognitive point of view, the metaphorical power of a word cannot be inactive, since a metaphor contains not only the characteristics of individual categories, but also its role in the structure of the entire cognitive model. Thus, a metaphor expresses the structure, internal relations or logic of a cognitive model .

Analyzing individual metaphors as " ready-made " semantic formations, M.N. Lapshin, allows us to identify a number of regular associations of the same type, the generalization of which leads to the formation of prototype metaphors, which are stable semantic paradigms. Prototype metaphors are effective idealized conceptual structures that allow us to create a new image of a given concept by comparing two conceptual fields in each case .

The animal world and the human world are fundamental in the conceptual system of man due to their constant initial proximity. Due to the diversity of the objective world , there are a great many prototype object metaphors of their own kind. Accordingly, in the prototype paradigm " object - person " the first element may belong to the conceptual sphere of the world (sun, moon, pearls) or to the sphere of objects (artifacts) created in the process of labor activity. Other paradigms of the subject metaphor are " body part - profession, character or nationality " , " gastronomic product - person " .

To himself Despite its specificity, metaphor still refers not to individual objects or events, but to complex conceptual fields , mental spaces. Combining multifaceted cognitive models in a unique and appropriate way, metaphor reflects the world , interprets it. With the help of metaphor , it is possible to include various conceptual areas into a single mental field , into the general conceptual system of a certain language community.

Like metaphor, metonymy is an effective cognitive tool for conveying information and supplementing knowledge about the relationships between objects . Like metaphorical concepts , metonymic concepts are an integral part of human thinking.

Metonymy can be conditional or conceptual in nature, a means of expanding language resources, and can also be interpreted as a method of conceptualization . The main difference is that metaphor involves different cognitive models in the process of conceptualization , while conceptualization using metonymy is carried out within the framework of the same

model, that is, one category in the model is considered as a substitute for another category in the same model .

Metonymy does not imply a difference in characteristics, therefore, it occupies a subjective position, which allows the metonymic meaning to " acquire a certain reference (belonging to a certain object known to the speaker), " emphasizing the individualizing nature of a particular object . "Metonymy in the subject, although it is intended to define the "whole" by indicating a specific feature , usually accepts defining definitions that apply to this detail, but not to the whole . At the same time, definitions derived from a part and a part denote a specific whole, i.e. to the referent of metonymy .

Metonymic concepts structure human daily activities in various ways. F. Ungerer and H.-J. Schmid identify the following typical examples: part - whole, whole - part, container - content, material - object, producer - product, place - institution, place - event, controlled - controlling, cause - effect .

to activate a particular cognitive category by referring it to another category within the same model . In metonymy The set of features is limited, but there are still several objects to choose from .

In this study, metaphor and metonymy are considered as the main cognitive tools of perception , they are the result of " secondary semanticization of signs " at the level of linguistic expression , " signs with secondary meaning according to the models of semantic derivation " semanticization of signs through metaphor and metonymy is based on the principle of recategorization, the interaction between the systemic meaning of a word and its functional concept . This principle involves "reconsideration of a word as a result of its association with another category due to the realization of the properties of another category or concept . " This occurs as a result of the neutralization of the prototypical signs of the language unit and, accordingly, allows it to be used in an unusual systematic sense of conceptualization and categorization in the cognitive system of knowledge and ideas of social importance for culture and society . Metaphorical and metonymic models structure reality in different ways, using different mechanisms for this. Metaphor and metonymy provide more figurativeness of binary nominations . They form complex networks of interacting and interconnected conceptual relations within the language unit and mainly determine the features of thinking . This allows us to consider these mechanisms of semantic transfer as an important cognitive tool.

Literature:

1. Arutyunova N.D. - M.: "Languages of russian culture", 1999.-896 p .

2. Boldyrev N.N. Functional categorization of English verbs: Dis. ... Dr. Philol. science - Spb., 1995. - 445 p.

3. Lapshina M.N. Semantic evolution of English language - Spb.: Izd-vo S.-Peterburg, 1998. - 159 p.

4. Aristotle. Art poetry. - M., 1957. - 183 p.

5. Chomsky N. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory //The Structure of Language / Ed. by J. Fodor, J. Katz. - Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall, 1964. - 119 p.

6. Black M. Models and Metaphors. Studies in Language and Philosophy. -N.-Y.: Ithaca, 1962.-267 p.

7. Telia V.N. Types of linguistic meanings: The associated meaning of a word in a language.- M.: Nauka, 1981. - 272 p .

8. Lakoff G. Classifiers as a Reflection of Mind //Cognitive Science Report. - No. 19. - Berkeley, 1984. - 52 p.