DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS OF DERIVED METONYMIE

[1]Shodikulova Aziza Zikiryaevna

[1]*Assistant of the Department of Languages, Samarkand State Medical Institute, Uzbekistan,*
azizashodikulova87@gmail.com

Abstract

The article is based on the scientific and classification of the quality, linguistic research of media texts. The study of functional methods of speech, the identification of their linguistic features, the discovery of the functional properties of linguistic units and their separation based on linguistic facts is one of the tasks awaiting the Solution of modern linguistics. Text linguistics, which deals with the creation of text, the modeling of its structure, and the study of the process of such activity, is of interest to journalists today as a science. This is due to the fact, that linguists describe the current state of living language on the basis of various factors, based on a wide range of linguistic and verbal traditions. Along with communicative means of persuasion and persuasion, the main character of a journalist's text remains its evaluation. The communicative integrity of a text is ensured by the relationship between the author's communicative structure and the main idea of the text and its linguistic expressions, as well as the goal setting and choice of the type of functional semantic speech.

Keywords: media text, information, media, mass media, culture, discursive, sociolinguistic, non-linguistic analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Metonymy is one of the means of changing the meaning of a word. The development of the meaning of lexical units has different forms. The scope of the expression of meaning can expand or narrow, become abstract or acquire a clear appearance. In this case, the change of the existing value, the appearance of derived values are of particular importance [12, 115]. Traditionally, metonymy is considered as one of the manifestations of the semantic development of the environment. Let 's compare the following definitions in special dictionaries:

"Metonymy – a term used in semantics and stylistics, referring to a figure of speech in which the name of an attribute of an entity is used in place of the entity itself" [2, 303].

Metonymy is the substitution of a word for another based on the connection of their meanings by contiguity: "the audience applauded" instead of "the audience applauded" [9, 196].

In all the above definitions, the sign of associative similarity is presented as a general indicator, and it is emphasized that the migration of metonymic meaning is the main guideline. These features are repeated almost in the works of other researchers.

In our opinion, the concept of "associative similarity" should be understood in a broad sense. Because here "similarity" is taken in the context of the interaction of things-events in certain relationships. The migration of meaning occurs only when the relations of real objects are based on mutual similarity, proximity. According to V.N. Telia, "a name formed in a metonymic way will be aimed at highlighting the reported information regarding the nature of its formation" [18, 212].

The well-known lexicologist N.N. Amasova once noted the peculiarity of metonymic migrations, the occurrence of which is associated not only with "a simple nominative movement, but also with the need to describe things and events" [7, 114]. A closer opinion was recently expressed by an Uzbek linguist, A. Rakhimov is also noted. According to him, "the sequence of the formation of language derivatives is provided by similar forms that accumulate in human memory" and, consequently, "social speech activity is important not only for the formation of words, but also for the future as a whole, in order to provide the necessary opportunities for communication and ensure the development of language in the modern world" [15, 22].

Moreover, metonymy, unlike other types of semantic changes, serves to save speech more than to increase expressiveness in expression.

Metonymic migration based on associative similarity manifests itself in several forms. The German linguist G. Paul once mentioned that names move in the context of space, time and reason [14,102].

Linguists who follow this classification have tried to distinguish between attributive and synecdochic types in addition to spatial, temporal and causal types of metonymic migration. We believe that all these types of metonymic migrations are equally worthy of attention [10, 62].

Thus, although it has been repeatedly noted in the linguistic literature that metonymy is a phenomenon based on the interdependence of generative and derived meanings, little is known about how and why this connection arises, little has been studied. The solution to this problem draws attention to the idea of involving the method of differential semantic analysis in the search. For example, the word "apron" has the lexical meaning of "clothes", "below the waist", "part". He also added the semantic "an object held below the waist". Since what these semantics mean is interrelated, the formation of a derived meaning is a metonymy [13, 100].

Metonymy is divided into different groups according to the content of the relationship between the derivative and the derived meaning of the referents and the number of groups recorded in the scientific literature varies.

Modern explanatory dictionaries do not always serve as a completely reliable source of information about metonymy. Linguists drew attention to the inconsistent nature of the fixation of metonymy, as well as the lack of unification of interpretations. Direct and figurative values may not be differentiated. Sometimes they are united by a common formulation, however, from the examples of usage, it can be concluded that there is a metonymic meaning. Thus, there is no metonymic meaning in the words vain, arrogant, although the presence of metonymy in them is obvious, as evidenced by the illustrations in dictionary entries: vain thoughts, an arrogant look.

There are differences in the qualification of metonymic meanings: in some cases, metonymy is presented as a separate independent meaning, in others - as a shade of the basic meaning.

Some formulations do not reflect the derivative nature of the metonymic meaning. In such cases, the transfer is not explicated and the metonymic value looks like an autonomous one from the original one. So, for the adjective noble, the initial meaning of "possessing high moral qualities, immaculately honest, generous" (noble person) and its shade are formulated "exalted, sanctified by a high purpose" (noble impulse), which does not give an idea of the metonymic transfer noble person → noble impulse.

When interpreting the values formed by of the same metonymic model, heterogeneous formulations with different predicates are often used.

M. Mirtozhiev it is desirable that we base the classification of metonymy on the property of the meaning that it forms. Accordingly, metonymies are divided into two types: metonymy based on a generalized lexical meaning and metonymy based on a specific

lexical meaning. In the first type of metonymy, the generative and derived values are separated from each other by a different semaphore and are interconnected with a common semaphore. For example, the metonymic meaning of the title meaning "the front of the road" is based on its generalized lexical meaning [13, 101-102].

Metonyms based on generalized lexical meaning are the most common type [17, 25]. Metonyms based on certain lexical meanings are formed as a result of the proper name switching to a common noun. Some linguists consider the appearance of this type of referent to be a separate form of relativity [6, 14; 17, 27]. Its distinctive feature is that the value of the derivative depends on the value of the derivative as a whole. The word "Chinese" in the sentence "I made it from a sheet of Chinese production" has a derivative meaning and means a thin sheet of paper. His creative meaning is a big country – China [13, 103].

Another type of metonymy is associated with the phenomenon of synecdoche. When forming this type of metonymy, it is taken into account that one of the referents of the generative and derived values is a whole, and the other is a part of it. For example, the word "hook" has a special meaning. In the case of a "metal object with a hook", its use in the sense of a "hunting weapon" activates "the entire additional semaphore, including the front side of the object" [13, 104].

There is a widespread tradition of dividing metonymy into different groups based on origin. In particular, in the Russian scientific literature there are such terms as "metonymy of a sign", "contextual metonymy", "objective metonymy", "metonymy of perception" [8; 11; 16].

Let's focus on the interpretation of the concept of "discursive metonymy", which is important for our research. According to researchers, discursive metonymy "unlike lexical metonymy acts only in the text and does not exist outside of it" [18, 50].

The discourse conveys some important ideas about the phenomenon of metonymy. The researcher, studying the use of words in the category of adjectives in the metonymic derived sense, found that lexical metonymy is already ready in the language system and its occurrence is not a "living process", and discursive metonymy, on the contrary, emphasizes that it is formed directly in the process of the speaker's speech activity. This type of metonymy is a moving dynamic phenomenon that occurs in discourse, and therefore it should be considered as an event of an unusual nature. According to the scientist, "as a result of the usual metonymic migration, any lexical unit acquires the value of a secondary product, and this value is then included in the dictionary. Discursive metonymy does not create semantic derivatives: it should think about the use of a word, and not about a new meaning" [16, 106].

An unusual combination of parts of speech, which is a means of discursive metonymy, gives way to expressive expression. An unusual combination of parts of speech, which is a means of discursive metonymy, gives way to expressive expression. After metonymy became the object of cognitive linguistics, the main attention was paid to the definition of its cognitive essence and the corresponding classification. In the context of cognitive linguistics, this phenomenon has been interpreted as the result of processes such as internal migration, expansion or narrowing of the meaning of referential attitudes. Some linguists emphasize that the migration of meanings in the formation of metonymy occurs within the framework of a cognitive model. One category in the model replaces another category belonging to this model. In it, the main function of a metonymic phrase is to activate one category by referring to another category [5, 128]. Let's compare the following statements [1, 350]:

a) We need a couple of strong bodies for our team;

b) There are a lot of good heads in the university;

c) We need some new faces around here.

In all three cases, the referent is a person, but in each case a separate aspect of the personality is

chosen. In the first sentence of PHYSICAL STRENGTH, the "physical strength" model of the BODY occurred through a category. When it comes to university, Nead Referent INTELLIGENCE is an alternative to the conceptual model. According to the observations of R. Lendecker, the relations of control points underlying metonymy, by their nature, move from within, but have no original content. That is why the ordinary referent in the metonymic structure leads to the perception of reality. For example, taken from the newspaper Vietnam marked a turning point in American history in the sentence Vietnam, the element does not refer to the country, but to the war that took place there [3, 504].

In this war, G. Redden and Z. Kovech should recall the description of the phenomenon of metonymy: Metonymy is a cognitive process in which one conceptual entity, the vehicle, provides mental access to another conceptual entity the target, with in the same idealized cognitive model [4, 21]. To simplify the definition, it is clear that the source unit (vehicle) shifts the focus to the target unit. The definition of metonymy also serves as a reference point for achieving the goal. The mental assess concept mentioned here demonstrates the cognitive nature of metonymy.

A characteristic feature of the reflected metonymy is the complexity of the differentiation of meanings. Usually there is a diffusivity of the original and metonymic values. In a phrase with the same noun, an adjective can express two different relations: to the object that the motivating word calls in the direct meaning, and to the object that the motivating word calls in the metonymic meaning. Thus, an adjective is able to express two meanings at the same time - the original and metonymic, and phrases of this kind allow for a dual understanding: packaging paper as "such as serves, is intended for packaging" (relation to action) and "such as packaging consists of" (relation to the means of action) [16, 108].

So, we accept a broad interpretation of the term "metonymy" and within the framework of this concept we advocate the unification of events related to metonymic thinking, such as synecdoche, metaphtonia, into a single category.

References

[1] Croff W The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies//Cognitive linguistics, 1993. vol.4. – P. 335-370.

[2] Crystal D. A Dictionary of linguistics and Phonetics. – L.: Blackwell Publishing, 2008. –529 p.

[3] Langacker R. Cognitive Grammar. A basic introduction. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. – 562 p.

[4] Radden G., Kovecses Z. Towards a theory of metonymy // Metonymy in Language and Thought. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. – P. 17-59.

[5] Ungerer F., Shmid A. An introduction to cognitive linguistics. – Edinburg: Pearson education. 1996.

[6] Аликулов Т. Метономия ва полисемия //Тилшунослик ва адабиётшуносликка оид тадқиқотлар. – Т.: Фан, 1965. – Б. 24-26.

[7] Амасова Н.Н. К вопросу о лексическом значении слова// Вестник ЛГУ. Серия история языке и лит-ре. Вып.1. 1967. №2.

[8] Бирих А.К. Метонимия прилагательных в современном русском языке вестник. ЛГУ. Серия.2. Вып.1., 1987. – С. 62-74.

[9] Жеребило Т.В. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – Назрань: Пилиграм, 2009. – 486 p.

[10] Маслова – Лашанская С.С. Лексикология шведского языка. – М: Высшая школа, 1973.

[11] Мерзлякова А.Х. Типы семантического варьирования прилагательных в поле "Восприятие": на материал английского, русского и французского языков. Дисс…докт. филол. наук. – Уфа, 2003. – 359 б.

[12] Миртожиев М. Переносные значения: их манифестация, в узбекском языке. Автореф дисс… док. филол наук. – Т., 1989.

[13] Миртожиев М. Семасиология. –Т.: Мумтоз сўз, 2010. – 288 б.

[14] Пауль Г. Принципа история языка. – М: Изд-во инсттранный литература, 1962.

[15] Рахимов А. Лексик ва семантик деривация муаммолари. – Т. Навруз, 2011. – 170 б.

[16] Сандакова М.В. О механизмах дискурсной метонимия прилагательного // Филологические науки, 2004. №3. – С. 106-112.

[17] Суванова Р. Ўзбек тилида метономия. – Т; Халқ мероси 2003. – Б. 36-75.

[18] Телия В.Н Вторичная номинация и её виды// Языковая номинация. – М: Наука, 1977. – С. 74.

[19] Қуронов Д., Мамажонов З., Шералиева М. Адабиётшунослик терминлари луғати. – Т. Академ нашр, 2013. – 408 б.