

Problems of Representation of Conceptual Concepts of Metonymy

Erdanova Sevara Anvarovna

Senior teacher, Tashkent Institute of Finance Foreign languages department

ANNOTATION

The article analyzes the concept of cognitive metonymy and cognitive aspects of the use of metonymy. Appeal to the intended problem is explained by the following factors. On the one hand, these are the urgent needs of modern science in general. She achieved significant success in mastering the reality surrounding a person, but at the same time she learned very little about his inner world. This is noted by many researchers, arguing that "in fact, the most relevant and even urgently needed at the present time is the study of the internal space of a person.

KEYWORDS: *Metonymy, Philosophical.*

The cognitive approach is today the key to solving those issues, the study of which previously remained fruitless without any recourse to the analysis of cognitive processes. Sometimes people talk not about the cognitive approach, but about cognitive science, which is defined in the New Philosophical Encyclopedia as "a complex of sciences that study consciousness and higher thought processes based on the application of information-theoretic models."

However, in the last two decades, cognitive research has expanded its problematic field so much that it is now more correct to speak of the cognitive approach: we mean research on a variety of subjects, including the solution of problems traditional for a particular science, but using methods that take into account cognitive aspects, in which the processes of perception, thinking, cognition, understanding and explanation are included.

In the history of linguistics, metonymy has been considered in various interrelated aspects: as a language device, tropes; as a way to expand the semantic structure of a word, a regular mechanism for the formation of new meanings of one word and subsequently new lexical units; as a way of language economy; as a tool of pragmatic influence; as a property of any sign system; as the result of mental processes.

In modern linguistics, metonymy is primarily recognized as "a cognitive mechanism for the representation of knowledge, both as a result of their reflection in the systemic meanings of language units, and in the course of constructing an utterance" [3, p. 11]; in linguistic works the term "conceptual metonymy" is widely used.

The cognitive mechanism of metonymy lies in the fact that within a particular conceptual domain (conceptual domain) one concept (concept-means - vehicle / trigger concept) can represent its other concept (concept-goal - target concept) or replace the entire area as a whole ([3; 10-15], etc.). The substitution is due to the contiguity of the phenomena being comprehended in reality - the presence of some real (temporal, spatial, causal, etc.) connection between them. Metonymic transfer, of course, is not a simple mental projection of one phenomenon onto another, ontologically related to it, but involves a number of mental operations: profiling one or another element of the conceptualized area (concept-means), focusing attention on it and deprofiling other, insignificant elements, selection of actualizable features, etc. In this sense, the use of the term "conceptual metonymy" to refer to a

complex of mental operations, accompanying the actual replacement of one concept by another, is in itself metonymic.

Implementations of the mechanism of metonymy are found at different language levels, in the language system and in the process of speech.

Numerous linguistic works explore the manifestations of metonymy at the level of vocabulary. The mechanism of metonymy explains the formation of new meanings of a known word, both subsequently fixed in the dictionary, and purely occasional. The concept of metonymy is used in the study of word-formation models and the semantics of derivative words, lexical units with indicative semantics and attributive combinations [6; eight]. The metonymic models of phraseological semantics are studied [4]. The mechanism of metonymy explains the ability of one lexical unit (in particular, a verb) to designate several interrelated processes at the same time (see: [3]).

A number of studies consider the implementation of the mechanism of metonymy at the level of morphology, cases of secondary representation of verbalized knowledge by morphological forms of the word (for example, the lexicalized form of the plural of nouns) [2]. As a consequence of the metonymic transfer, it is also interpreted the transition of words from one grammatical class to another [1, p. 136-138].

In linguistic works, the manifestation of the mechanism of metonymy at the level of a sentence-utterance was studied. Thus, the action of metonymic transfer explains the incomplete linguistic reflection of the proposition, caused by the need to shift the focus of attention from some participants in the event to others (instead of Somebody opened the door — The door opened). As a case of metonymy, we consider the representation in the statement of a complex event through the designation of its part (He sneezed the napkin off the table - He sneezed + The napkin was off the table) [5].

The implementation of metonymy at the level of the text, ways of its construction, and in discourse, where the interaction of statements, linguistic forms (words, phrases, sentences) acquire new meanings, are also studied (for more details on discursive metonymy, see: [9]).

In this article, on the material of the modern English language, the manifestations of conceptual metonymy are considered at the level of the syntactic structure of a holistic statement.

The structure of an utterance is expressed in the use of a certain type of syntactic model to report a situation, which is a sign of another typical situation. So, for example, answering the question about the location of someone or something (Where is he? - Where is he?), You can build a statement not according to the model with an adverbial predicate, denoting a static relationship between an object and a spatial landmark (He is in bed - He is in bed), but according to some other model, for example, according to a syntactic model with a verbal predicate, designed to report on the activity of the subject (He is sleeping. - He is sleeping). However, the question will be answered.

In terms of content, one type of relationship is replaced by another. So, in the example considered above, instead of the relation “an object and its place in space”, the relation “an object and its activity” is actualized. Location of the subject (concept-goal) is represented as its location (concept-means): one element of the general conceptual area, one frame (“dream”) metonymically replaces another. The basis for the transfer is the relationship of real adjacency between the designated situations: a certain activity is usually carried out in a certain place (for example, they usually sleep in a bed), and vice versa, one or another place is associated in the minds of the speakers with one or another type of activity.

The metonymic designation of a fragment of reality allows you to focus on some of its components and leave others “in the background”. In the example above, the speaker's focus is on the subject and

its state, while the place where the subject is located "remains in the background" and is not indicated by a separate element in the structure of the utterance. Obviously, in this case, for the speaker, the specific location of the subject is not of fundamental importance. Nevertheless, information about the location of the subject in the utterance is expressed. In this case, however, the meaning of the statement can have several potential interpretations. Understanding the utterance in each case depends on a number of factors, primarily on the specific background knowledge of the speaker and listener. Thus, if the listener knows that the person referred to in the statement He is sleeping usually sleeps in a certain place, for example, in the bedroom on the second floor of his house, he will receive the corresponding information about the whereabouts of this person. For other communicants, the same statement may have a different meaning.

As a result of metonymic transfer, a sort of expansion of the scope of the meaning of the syntactic model of the sentence occurs due to the formation of a figurative meaning in it. The syntactic model acquires the ability to express a different proposition in specific usages in speech, and subsequently - a regular system meaning. As a consequence, metonymic propositional models of the conceptualization of reality are found in the language.

The conclusion that the syntactic model expresses content that was originally unusual for it can be made on the basis of an analysis of the context of the use of the statement; as an indicator, one can take a context in which an utterance of one structural type serves as an answer to a question constructed according to a different syntactic model. In order to distinguish between the metonymic functioning of an utterance of an "uncharacteristic" structural type and the occurrence of such an utterance in speech due to other reasons (such as a conscious or unconscious violation of the content and structural adequacy of speech, a violation of the pragmatic principles of communication), it is necessary to identify the basis for metonymic transfer - the relation of contiguity between situations denoted by a statement-question and a statement-answer.

Reference

1. Berestnev G.I. Semantics of the Russian language in the cognitive aspect: textbook. allowance. Kaliningrad, 2002.
2. Besedina N.A. Morphologically transmitted concepts. M.; Tambov; Belgorod, 2006.
3. Boldyrev N.N. Conceptual metonymy at different levels of language: system and implementation // Form, meaning and functions of units of language and speech: mater. report International scientific conf. Minsk, 2002, part 1, pp. 11-14.
4. Voloshkina I.A. Metonymy as a cognitive categorization mechanism knowledge about the world: the experience of modeling the semantics of phrases // Cognitive Language Studies. 2016. No. 27. pp. 142-150.
5. Kozlova E.A. Metonymy as a conceptual basis for the functional categorization of the verb: author. dis. ... cand. philol. Sciences. Tambov, 2011.
6. Kubryakova E.S. On new ways of studying meaning (iceberg theory) // Problems of semantic description of units of language and speech. Minsk, 1998, pp. 38-39.
7. Novikov A.L. From the history of the study of metonymy // Vestnik RUDN University. Ser.:Linguistics. 2005. No. 7. pp. 135-142.