# PHRASEOLOGISMS AS METAPHORICAL MEANS IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

**Adzheminova Elvina Rifatovna**
Ferghana state university teacher of the department of russian philology
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7670183

# ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЗМЫ КАК МЕТАФОРИЧЕСКИЕ СРЕДСТВА В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ

**Аджеминова Эльвина Рифатовна**
Ферганский государственный университет преподаватель кафедры русской филологии

# FRAZEOLOGIK BIRLIKLAR METAFORIK VOSITA OLARAK ZAMONAVIY TILISLIKDA

**Adjeminova Elvina Rifatovna**
Farg'ona davlat universiteti rus filologiyasi kafedrasi o‘qituvchisi

**Annotation.** This article considers phraseological units as metaphorical means of modern linguistics, in particular, metaphorical models of their formation. An analysis of the literature devoted to the role of metaphorical means of language in the creation of a nationally and culturally colored linguistic picture of the world was carried out. Attention is drawn to the fact that metaphorization of meaning is the main way to create a secondary language image.

**Key words:** metaphor, metaphorical images, language differences; stereotypes; system of cultural values., theoretical and methodological arsenal, semantic duality.

**Аннотация.** В данной статье рассматриваются фразеологизмы как метафорические средства современной лингвистики, в частности, метафорические модели их образования. Проведен анализ литературы, посвященной роли метафорических средств языка в создании национально и культурно окрашенной языковой картины мира. Обращается внимание на то, что метафоризация смысла является основным способом создания вторичного языкового образа.

**Ключевые слова:** метафора, метафорические образы, языковые различия; стереотипы; система культурных ценностей., теоретико-методологический арсенал, смысловая двойственность.

**Izoh.** Ushbu maqolada zamonaviy tilshunoslikning metaforik vositasi sifatida frazeologik birliklar, xususan, ularning shakllanishining metaforik modellari muhokama qilinadi. Dunyoning milliy va madaniy rangdagi lingvistik rasmini yaratishda tilning metaforik vositalarining roliga bag'ishlangan adabiyotlar tahlili o'tkazildi. Ma'noni metaforalashtirish ikkinchi darajali til obrazini yaratishning asosiy usuli ekanligiga e'tibor qaratiladi.

**Tayanch so`zlar:** metafora, metafora obrazlari, til farqlari; stereotiplar; madaniy qadriyatlar tizimi., nazariy va uslubiy arsenal, semantik ikkilik.

It is easy to see that in modern speech - in newspaper, colloquial, popular science and other types of discourse - in the widest and most diverse areas of communication, images of food and cuisine are actively used. In extensive text arrays, analogies are found between cooking and political life, social activity, economic processes, the experience of emotions, and interpersonal relationships [5].

The metaphors taste, tasty, tasty, yummy, goodies are often used for figurative characteristics of visual and colorful visual images (tasty interior detail, tasty shades, tasty design solution); a lifestyle associated with pleasures (tasty to enjoy the delights of being, to live tasty and enthusiastically); expressive manner of speech (speak very tasty, tasty folk name)

The most common areas of application of these metaphors are economic activity (delicious part of the nuclear industry, division of delicious coastal pieces of land, regional piece of pie - the most delicious) and verbal creativity (delicious book, delicious topic, delicious quote, finish the chapter with something delicious, television cooked a lot of delicious food.

We express interest in life by analogy with appetite and thirst, an attractive appearance with appetizing and tasty food. The metaphorical model of the life of society as a kitchen in which dishes are prepared according to well-known or completely new recipes is repeatedly broadcast in modern oral and written speech, changing and varying in different texts, but maintaining its conceptual stability [1].

Choosing a culinary metaphor as an object of study, we will try to answer three key questions:

1. Why is the culinary metaphor so in demand in speech?
2. What are the origins of the symbolic rethinking of gastronomic images?
3. Is it possible to detect linguistic patterns of their linguistic and textual existence?

The theoretical and methodological arsenal of modern linguistics provides an opportunity to give detailed and convincing answers to these questions [3]. Their consistent consideration will form the main content of this book, and now, in the

introduction, we will put forward key theses that characterize the main provisions, material and methods of our research.

In modern linguistics, the role of metaphorical means of language in the creation of a nationally and culturally colored linguistic picture of the world is actively studied. The methodology for studying typical images of national culture is based on the provisions of the theory of linguistic metaphor, cognitive metaphor, imagery as a linguistic and mental category (N. D. Arutyunova, O. I. Blinova, A. N. Baranov, J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, N. A. Ilyukhina, G. N. Sklyarevskaya, and others). There are significant developments in the field of linguoculturological and cognitive studies of key concepts of national consciousness, linguistic conceptualization of reality and fragments of the linguistic picture of the world (N. F. Alefirenko, Yu. D. Apresyan, A. Vezhbitskaya, S. G. Vorkachev, V. I. Karasik , E. S. Kubryakova, V. A. Maslova, G. G. Slyshkin and others).

Observations of language from the standpoint of anthropological and culturological linguistics, presented in these works, convince us that the sensory-figurative expression of ideas in language serves not only to decorate speech, but is one of the main ways of human thinking. The modern cognitive theory of metaphor convincingly develops the thesis of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson that metaphorical modeling is one of the main cognitive processes in human mental activity [4]. We learn something new by analogy with what is already known, comprehend something abstract in the image and likeness of sensual and visible phenomena. Not only basic metaphorical models are universal and are present in all languages of the world. There are also many particular stable analogies between metaphorically likened phenomena.For example, the shape of a culinary product is the shape of a part of the human body (Russian kalach 'hair gathered in a bun and twisted into a ring in a woman's hairstyle'; Italian spaghetti 'long straight hair'; Kazakh baursak 'about plump cheeks, reminiscent of the lush round product of the same name from test'); property of a food product - character traits of a person (Russian cracker 'an indifferent, unemotional person, as if hard, like a cracker'; Italian ricotta 'about a spineless, weak-willed person resembling soft cheese'; Kazakh. bal (honey) 'about a sweet, beloved child as sweet as honey').

Metaphorical models are rooted in the minds of native speakers and are regularly reproduced in speech, thanks to the use of both stable figurative language tools (metaphors, figurative words and expressions, idioms, sayings), and author's figurative turns of speech [6]. Metaphorization of meaning is the main way to create a secondary language image that has a semantic duality.

Figurative vocabulary and phraseology make up a significant part of the vocabulary of the language, broadcast typical images of national culture, built on various metaphorical models [2]. In contrast to the universality of metaphorical

models, language images have a much greater national specificity, forming the "national face" of the language picture of the world.

Metaphorical images are expressive, visible, plastic, therefore they serve the tasks of characterizing and evaluating the named phenomena. This determines the expressive, emotive, evaluative and characterizing functions of the figurative means of language in speech. Metaphor has always been considered the most striking means of speech expressiveness. Therefore, in the author's texts, metaphors often become a key way of expressing an idea, they are played out, unfolded, figuratively representing entire situations.

**List of used literature:**

**1.** Аджеминова, Э. Р. Перевод и двуязычие при обучении русскому языку. *ББК 81.2-5 Т 307*, 221.

**2.** Adjeminova, E. R. (2022, October). TRANSLATION AND BILINGUALISM IN TEACHING RUSSIAN. In *INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES* (Vol. 1, No. 8, pp. 123-127).

**3.** Adzheminova, E. R. (2022). Phraseological Units of Culinary Vocabulary. *Miasto Przyszłości*, *29*, 82-83.

**4.** Аджеминова, Э., & Давлятова, Г. (2021). PHRASEOLOGICAL UNIT IN THE SYSTEM OF LANGUAGE SIGNS. *Herald pedagogiki. Nauka i Praktyka*, *1*(1).

**5.** Аджеминова, Э. Р. (2021). Семантика фразеологических единиц как средства образности культурных ценностей.«.

**6.** Аджеминова, Э. Р. (2022). ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЗМЫ С УНИКАЛЬНОЙ ВНУТРЕННЕЙ ФОРМОЙ В РУССКИХ И ФРАНЦУЗСКИХ ГОВОРАХ. *Talqin va tadqiqotlar ilmiy-uslubiy jurnali*, *1*(1A), 173-175.

7. Rifatovna, A. E. (2022). Anthropocentrism of Phraseology. *Web of Scholars: Multidimensional Research Journal*, *1*(5), 198-200.