

METAPHOR AS ONE OF THE MAIN STYLISTIC DEVICES

Maxmudova Kumushoy Najmiddin qizi

Samarkand State institute of foreign languages

Student 2nd of course of master department

Abstract : A metaphor is a stylistic device that consists in transferring a name from one object or phenomenon to objects , phenomena of another type due to similar secondary features or a hidden comparison . Metaphor is one of the most expressive and expressive tools of speech , reflecting not only lexical meaning , but also giving emotional coloring to a word or expression . Metaphor can often be seen in works of art , where the author , with its help , sets the right atmosphere , in written and even colloquial speech , in which one can trace both long- established metaphorical transfers and situational ones , when the speaker uses them intentionally in his speech , thereby improving your linguistic level.

Key words :conceptual form , figurative language , cognitive linguistics , specific – level , generic – level , textual , emotiveness , expressiveness.

Аннотация: Метафора — это стилистический прием, заключающийся в переносе наименования с одного предмета или явления на предметы, явления другого вида за счет схожих второстепенных признаков или скрытого сравнения. Метафора является одним из самых выразительных и экспрессивных инструментов речи, отражающее не только лексическое значение, но и придающее эмоциональную окраску слову или выражению. Метафору часто можно видеть в художественных произведениях, где автор с ее помощью задает нужную атмосферу, в письменной и даже в разговорной речи, в которой можно проследить как давно устоявшиеся метафорические переносы, так и ситуационные, когда говорящий употребляет их в своей речи намеренно, тем самым повышая свой лингвистический уровень.

Ключевые слова: понятийная форма, образный язык, когнитивная лингвистика, видовой уровень, родовой уровень, текстовая , эмотивность, экспрессивность.

Annotatsiya: Metafora - bu nomni bir obyekt yoki hodisadan obyektlarga, boshqa turdagi hodisalarga o'xshash ikkilamchi xususiyatlar yoki yashirin taqqoslash tufayli o'tkazishdan iborat stilistik vosita. Metafora nutqning eng ifodali vositalaridan biri bo'lib, nafaqat leksik ma'noni aks ettiradi, balki so'z yoki iboraga hissiy rang beradi. Metaforani ko'pincha badiiy asarlarda ko'rish mumkin, bu yerda muallif uning yordami bilan to'g'ri muhitni o'rnatadi, yozma va hatto so'zlashuv nutqida, unda ma'ruzachi ulardan foydalanganda uzoq vaqtdan beri mavjud bo'lgan metafora va vaziyatni kuzatish mumkin, o'z nutqida qasddan, shu bilan lingvistik darajangizni yaxshilaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: konseptual shakl , ko'chma til , kognitiv lingvistika , o'ziga xos daraja , umumiy daraja , matn, emotivlik, ekspressivlik

Since the publication of Lakoff and Johnson's seminal work on conceptual metaphor, *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), there has been a rapid increase of interest in metaphor studies, principally in the fields of psychology and cognitive science. Lakoff and Johnson revealed, through theoretical argument supported by empirical investigation, the centrality of metaphor to thought exemplified in the ubiquity of metaphorical forms in everyday, conventional language. Accordingly, we talk about things the way we conceive of them, and this is fashioned through and grounded in experience and culture: our basic conceptual system "is fundamentally metaphoric in nature". In practical terms, this theory of cognition and language provides for two levels of metaphor: conceptual metaphor and linguistic metaphor. The former are super-ordinate, epistemic and semantic mappings that take the form of target domain is/as source domain. linguistic metaphors are motivated by conceptual metaphors and are the realisations that appear in everyday written and spoken forms. For example, the conceptual metaphor life (target) is a journey (source) motivates

common linguistic metaphors such as *we're on the right (wrong) track (path)*, *we've come too far down this road to turn back now*, *he's looking for a change of direction*, and a great many more typical everyday expressions as well as more elaborate extensions that occur in poetic language. It is from these linguistic instances that we are able to hypothesise the existence of a wide range of conceptual forms. All the above expressions use different words and if metaphor were no more than a linguistic device it would not be possible to talk about them as essentially the same metaphor; by locating metaphor at the conceptual level we can identify it as a conceptual structure.

For Lakoff and Johnson, metaphor is in essence “understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” ; it is a matter of thought rather than language. Traditionally, figurative language, especially in literary contexts, is regarded as something used for effect or for ornament and contrasts with “literal” language; cognitive metaphor challenges the very basis of that notion. We are aware that in traditional rhetoric there are subtle differences between figures of speech - between metaphor and metonymy, for instance. Cognitive linguistics recognises this difference. Whereas metaphor treats one thing, in culturally determined and cognitively recognisable ways, as another for the purpose of understanding, a metonymic utterance takes one entity to stand for another. If in the pub I request “a Guinness, please”, I use a typical, everyday metonymic form by substituting the name of the producer for the product. But more is implied: it is also a reference to my attitude to the product, its status among alcoholic beverages and my preferences as a beer drinker. Like metaphors, metonymic concepts structure and reflect more than just our use of language. In this paper, as I subscribe to the conceptual nature of so much language use, metaphor will be used a generic term to cover all aspects of figurative language.

Firstly, some aspects of theory of conceptual metaphor are considered and their usefulness in terms of language understanding and pedagogy.

Lakoff's 1993 paper "The contemporary theory of metaphor" sets out more concisely how the theory of conceptual metaphor works. He distinguishes between two types of basic conventional, conceptual metaphors: generic-level metaphors and specific-level metaphors. The former are those which have become a routine and unconscious part of our everyday conceptualisation - for example, more is up/less is down. These metaphors are likely to occur across cultures and be the most intuitively recognisable to L2 learners with cross-linguistic correspondences which can be elicited and discussed in the learning context. Specific-level metaphors are also fully established but less pervasive and likely to be more culturally specific - the love/journey mappings referred to earlier are examples. The "invariance principle" holds that the image-schema structure of the source domain must be consistent with the inherent structure of the target domain. This represents a constraint on possible mappings and ensures consistency; invariably, the target domain takes precedence and limits the forms of linguistic expression which the metaphor may motivate. In the conceptual metaphor actions are transfers, actions are conceptualised as objects transferred from agent to agent. If I say *I will give Lakoff a kick*, the source domain allows us to think that as the recipient of the kick the receiver may then possess it. But the target domain overrides this because we know that actions do not continue to exist after they occur; hence, the common, everyday metaphor of giving somebody or something a physical action but without the corollary of them keeping it.

Another important feature of the contemporary theory is that there is an inherited hierarchical structure among metaphors. Among the most common forms in everyday thought, reasoning and speech are event-structure metaphors: aspects of events such as states, changes, processes, actions, causes and purposes are understood in terms of space, motion and force. A state, for example, is a bounded region we may be 'in' or 'out of', 'entering' or 'leaving' (*in a hurry, out of patience, etc*) in accordance with the conceptual metaphor states are locations. In English, spatial prepositions are used in a wide variety of metaphorical senses. There are

numerous cross-linguistic correspondences but this conceptual basis for language is almost entirely unavailable to L2 learners in many course-book and reference materials. The “inheritance hierarchy” maintains that basic event-structure metaphors pass on their structures to specific-level metaphors further down the hierarchy - for example, long-term purposeful activities are journeys (generic level - event structure), a purposeful life is a journey (specific level), love is a journey/a career is a journey (specific level).

The contemporary theory challenges the views of traditional linguistics, which is the basis of formal semantics. The traditional view maintains a distinction between literal and figurative language. It sees the workings and interpretation of metaphor to be in the field of pragmatics where metaphorical meaning is derived algorithmically from ‘literal’ language according to the application of cumbersome principles and the influence of context. Cognitive linguistics rejects the notion that metaphor is separate and understood differently from literal or conventional language. The category of expressiveness is often the focus of attention of linguists. In its etymological comprehension expressiveness may be described as a way of intensification of an assertion or of an element of it depending on the disposition in the utterance of the means that disclose the category and what these means are . Emotiveness, and appropriately the emotive items of language, is what reveals the emotions of orators and writers. However these elements are not forthright manifestations of the feelings, they are the reverberation of real emotions which have experienced some mental recasting. They are made to activate co-experience in the intellect of the reader. Expressiveness is a more extensive notion than emotiveness which occupies a prevalent position in the category of expressiveness.

The direction which studies the category of textual expressiveness is stylistics. It focuses on the expressive features of linguistic units, their interaction in expressing ideas in a certain text or communicative context. Stylistics explains the difference or clash between a denotative meaning of a word and its contextual meaning. It creates images, reflects on the surroundings by naming, qualifying them.

Thereby, stylistics is engaged in the study of connotative meanings. All units of a language can be divided into two groups:

Those which possess a connotation along with their denotative meanings, carry some additional information and are called stylistically marked units.

Those which do not have a connotative meaning are stylistically neutral units. The linguistic units of phonetic, lexical, morphological, syntactical language levels which enter the first group are called expressive means: phonetic expressive means (EM) include melody, tones, stresses and intonation in general. The use of emphatic intonation enables the speaker to increase emotions and logic of the utterance, to convey additional meanings that are not expressed by special words.

Morphological expressive means are means of using grammatical meanings that display a kind of emphasis. For example we can call the use of stylistically marked forms of the Present and Past Simple Tense the use of the emphatic verb 'do': He did come (in comparison with stylistically neutral - He came).

Lexical expressive means include congenerous stylistically coloured words (poetic, bookish, vulgar). They are words that usually stand in opposition to their neutral synonyms. The main aim of expressive means of language is to affect a reader or listener in a desired way.

In linguistics there are various terms to denote particular means by which a writer obtains the desired effect: expressive means, stylistic means, and stylistic devices. For our purpose, it is important to make a distinction between stylistic devices and expressive means. These terms have a lot in common but they are not completely synonyms. "All stylistic means of a language can be divided into the so called expressive means, which are used in a peculiar way, and special devices known as stylistic devices". The expressive means are those phonetic means, lexical, and syntactical forms, all of which function in the language for emotional or logical intensification of the statement. These intensifying forms of the language have been put in dictionaries and grammars. Many of them are normalized and good dictionaries define them as intensifiers. In other cases they have neutral synonyms.

All stylistic devices belong to expressive means but not allepressive means can be stylistic devices. Therefore, phonetic phenomena such as pauses, vocal pitch or staccato pronunciation are all expressive means without being stylistic devices .

Some linguists consider stylistic devices (figures of speech, tropes) as non-language phenomena unlike expressive means . These linguists point out that stylistic devices are formed in speech and many of them do not exist outside their context. According to this information, SDs are grouped into phonetic, lexico-semantic and syntactic types. Essentially, stylistic devises are the effect of reevaluation of neutral words and syntactic structures. Reevaluation forces language units to receive connotations of stylistic value.

A stylistic device, which combines some general semantic meaning with a certain linguistic form resulting in a stylistic effect, is the subject matter of stylistic semasiology. From ancient times to the present, stylistic devices have been largely employed by writers and orators to strengthen and embellish there style in speech and writing. Within the composition of the present research project expressive means and stylistic devices will be observed on the phonetic, lexical and syntactical levels with special attention paid to metaphor as a device used.

It follows from what has just been said that expressive means may be found on different levels of linguistic analysis: phonetic, lexical, stylistic. Since the focus of our attention is the device of metaphor, we have to make reference to lexical and stylistic expressive means in greater detail. We would bear in mind, though, that phonetic means may appear to be adding to the expressive functionality of the device chosen for analysis.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Метафора и дискурс // Теория метафоры.
2. Гуревич В.В. Стилистика английского языка: Учеб. пособие. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2007. – 72 с.
3. Знаменская Т.А. Стилистика английского языка. Основы курса. – М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2004. – 343

4. Ильф И., Петров Е. Двенадцать стульев. – СПб.: Азбука, 2014. – 344 с.
5. Караваева Н.А. Стилистика английского языка: Учебно-методический комплекс / Н.А. Караваева – Казань: Юниверсум, 2009. – 102 с.
6. Кухаренко В.А. Практикум по стилистике английского языка: Учеб. пособие. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2009. – 184 с.
7. Схиархимандрит И. Святитель Тихон Задонский и его учение о спасении: Статьи разных лет. – М.: Самшит, 1995. – 508 с.
8. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242