

## EXPRESSION OF METAPHOR IN DIFFERENT SYSTEM LANGUAGES

**Yusupova Sabohatxon A'zamjonovna**

Senior teacher, Ferghana state university

[nihonnobara@gmail.com](mailto:nihonnobara@gmail.com)

**To'ychieva Zilolaxon Nabijon qizi**

Master, Ferghana state university

[nurmatovazilola815@gmail.com](mailto:nurmatovazilola815@gmail.com)

**Yo'ldasheva Shaxlo Shavkatjonovna**

Master, Ferghana state university

[sshavkatjonovna571@gmail.com](mailto:sshavkatjonovna571@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

The term 'metaphor' has been adopted by Uzbek stylists relatively recently. Another term 'metaphor' was used in this concern. It should be noted, however, that the metaphor basically corresponds to 'metaphor', which is a type of 'metaphor' and involves the comparison of two things that have a similar feature. This article discusses the nature of metaphors in different systematic languages.

**Keywords:** cognitive correction, metaphorical image, metaphor, social intelligence, animation.

### INTRODUCTION

Metaphor is a product of the cognitive work of thought, a means of knowing and reflecting the reality that surrounds a person. The use of metaphorical imagery as a logical model for the perception of semantic meanings that do not have other forms of symbolism at the level of consciousness indicates a high potential for the development of social intelligence. Man does not limit himself to the frames of his own free will, but strives to understand the whole diversity of the world around him, all the richness of the semantic meanings it contains. [7]

On the one hand, we can say that the metaphor has an international character. The relevance of the metaphorical transition to the realm of thought predetermines the existence of the same connotative images in the languages of different systems to convey certain indicative information. Metaphors, on the other hand, are structures that are deeply national in their content because they are based on a system of spiritual,

moral, and ethical values developed by the collective consciousness in the process of social development.

Metaphorical transmission is not limited to language barriers and can take place not only verbally but also on an associative-figurative level. Although metaphorical structures are a promising tool for analytical comprehension by artificial intelligence systems, adequate translation and repetition of metaphorical meanings at the level of machine translation is a task for the near future. Stable twists of speech and the interpretation of traditional metaphorical translations are not difficult even today, and the discovery of the subjective-author's associative-figurative connections can now only be made at the level of human consciousness.

### LITERATURE ANALYSIS AND METHODOLOGY

Metaphor is the most common form of speech. In contrast to metaphor, metaphor (from the Greek: meaning "to move") is a language that directly compares seemingly unrelated topics. . It is a form of speech that compares two or more things without using similar or similar. In the simplest case, it takes the form [1]. Metaphors, says N. Fyodorova [3], can be based on very different types of similarities, for example, the similarity of form: cabbage head, saw teeth. This similarity of form can be supported by the similarity of the function. The meaning conveyed is easily recognized from the context.

In Uzbek stylistics we find the following classification of metaphors. For example, according to I. Arnold [2], metaphors can be divided into "traditional metaphor" (traditional metaphor) and "creative metaphor" ("creative metaphor"). Sh. Shomahsudov also uses the terms "language metaphor" ("language metaphor") and "artistic metaphor" ("literary metaphor"). I think this is the same classification given in different terms. Here are some examples of trite metaphors in Uzbek: the fire of separation, burning in the fire of love, the hearth of knowledge.

Comparing the structural classifications of metaphors in English and Uzbek stylistics, it is worth noting that Uzbek scholars have given different definitions and understandings of metaphors. As for the simple metaphor, its definition fits in both languages.

### RESULTS

Although metaphor has long played a secondary role in the best case scenario, it has taken a strong place in the language and speech system, filling gaps in the mechanisms of word formation and interpretation of reality events. There was no place at all in the system of linguistic means by which a rhetorical person was able to reflect the real knowledge of the world from a philosophical point of view and, worst of all,

from a philosophical point of view, aimed at enhancing the psychological impact on the listener.

Most of the animation of the metaphor identified in English (77.9%) is horses. Makes up verbs - 11.6%; qualities - 9.4%. Attachments are represented by individual examples. This is in line with general trends inherent in the development of the English lexico-semantic system. In terms of structural and semantic features, the English substantive metaphor can be divided into two major groups. [4]

The first group consists of lexical-semantic variants, i.e., complete metaphors, formed on the basis of existing words in the language. These units are represented by one- and two-syllable words that correspond to the analytical and synthetic structure of the entire English language.

The second group is replaced by substantive stable compounds, consisting mainly of compound words consisting of two stems and possibly affixes and affixoids, formed by the addition or combination of stem parts. This method of derivation also reflects the general trends in the development of the modern English lexical-semantic system.

## DISCUSSION

In terms of form, Russian metaphors, as in English, are represented by new individual lexemes (see scraper, rudder) and stable, phraseological expressions as a metaphorical revision or combination of individual components. The morphological structure of Russian metaphors is mainly English: horse metaphors predominate and account for 66.6% of the total number of units; verbs make up 24.9%. [5]

The substantive metaphor names events in all key areas the same way: "Objective world" (mostly names of artifacts), "Non-objective world" (mainly names of political, economic processes, and legal relations), "Man as a mental entity" and social being" (mainly personal names according to their professional, intellectual, emotional, and moral characteristics).

In general, a substantive metaphor is characterized by the transparency of motivation for the meaning of animation and, for example, a unambiguous assessment compared to a verbal metaphor.

Modern Russian literary language (including speech and journalistic speech) makes very active use of metaphors (especially from young people, computer jargon) that appear in non-literary layers. The main function of this type of debt is expressive. This dictionary mainly describes a person's physical, mental (intellectual and emotional) condition, as well as his or her social status (see Swelling, wedge knocking, load). Very active modern literary language (especially colloquial speech, less journalistic style) is complemented by metaphor-argotisms.

In modern English (English version) such facts are hardly reflected. Of course, the English political correctness we mentioned above plays a very big role in this regard. In the United Kingdom, for example, an employee of a company was sued and fired for calling a Muslim towel (lit .: towel + head) "discriminatory." [6]

## CONCLUSION

Thus, the feature of Russian metaphor animation is also determined by the structural and typological features of English, on the one hand, the main function of animation (predominance of substantive metaphor), on the other hand, grammatical specificity.

## REFERENCES

1. Aznaurova E.S. Essays on the style of the word. Tashkent. 1973.
2. Arnold I.V. The style of modern English. Leningrad, 1981.
3. Fedorova N.V. The figurative structure of the literary text on the material of metaphorical paths. Tashkent, 1994.
4. Kongurov R., Shomaksudov Sh. Stylistics of the Uzbek language. Tashkent, 1964
5. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. Pearson Education Limited, 2005.
6. S.A. Yusupova [ИНГЛИЗ ВА ЎЗБЕК ТИЛЛАРИДА ХУРМАТ КАТЕГОРИЯСИНИНГ ИФОДАЛАНИШИ \(EXPRESSION OF HONOR CATEGORY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK\)](#)  
[https://scholar.google.com/citations?view\\_op=view\\_citation&hl=en&user=ujxay18AAAAJ&citation\\_for\\_view=ujxay18AAAAJ:ZeXyd9-uunAC](https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=ujxay18AAAAJ&citation_for_view=ujxay18AAAAJ:ZeXyd9-uunAC)
7. [https://studopedia.ru/21\\_10582\\_obraznie-metaforicheskie-strukturi-v-sisteme-yazika-i-rechi.html](https://studopedia.ru/21_10582_obraznie-metaforicheskie-strukturi-v-sisteme-yazika-i-rechi.html)
8. <https://uz.warbletoncouncil.org/metafora-ejemplos-3279>
9. A. Mamadaliyev, Z. To'ychiyeva "Turli tizimli tillarda metaforaning jonlantirish xususiyatlari". "Zamonaviy tilshunoslikning dolzarb muammolari va xorijiy tillarni o'qitishda innovatsion yondashuv" mavzusidagi Xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy anjuman. 2022