

METAPHORS AND PROBLEMS OF THEIR CLASSIFICATION IN MODERN WORLD LINGUISTICS

Husniyya Tanriverdiyeva

Azerbaijan University of Languages PhD in philology, senior teacher

E-mail: husniyya.tanriverdiyeva@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3365-8787>

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14212593>

Abstract: Metaphors are an artistic-linguistic tool that creates imagery in literary texts. In our daily life we use these tools inevitably enough. Metaphor is based on complex thought operations with an associative character. This problem was studied with great interest by Aristotle and Theophrastus in Ancient Greece under the name of tropes, and by Cicero, Hermogenes and others in Rome. When they talked about metaphors (tropes) they considered their poetic effect and their influence on the semantics of words. When talking about tropes Aristotle approached metaphors logically and saw them as manifestations of syllogisms and logical figures. The logical approach to metaphors is related to the period when rhetoric was inseparable from logic and philosophy. Ancient philosophers described the manifestations of this phenomenon which decorates speech on the basis of ancient Sanskrit poetic texts. The study of metaphors declines for a long time after the Greek and Roman phase. Approaching this issue from a purely linguistic point of view reappears as a part of poetics.

Keywords: metaphor, metamorphosis, metonymy, synecdoche, allegory

МЕТАФОРЫ И ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИХ КЛАССИФИКАЦИИ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ МИРОВОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ

Аннотация: Метафоры являются художественно-лингвистическим инструментом, создающим образы в литературных текстах. В нашей повседневной жизни мы достаточно неизбежно используем эти инструменты. Метафора основана на сложных мыслительных операциях, имеющих ассоциативный характер. Эту проблему с большим интересом изучали Аристотель и Теофраст в Древней Греции под названием тропов, а также Цицерон, Гермоген и другие в Риме. Когда они говорили о метафорах (тропах), они рассматривали их поэтический эффект и их влияние на семантику слов. Говоря о тропях, Аристотель подходил к метафорам логически и видел в них проявления силлогизмов и логических фигур. Логический подход к метафорам связан с периодом, когда риторика была неотделима от логики и философии. Древние философы описывали проявления этого явления, украшающего речь, на основе древних санскритских поэтических текстов. Изучение метафор долгое время приходит в упадок после греческой и римской фазы. Подход к этому вопросу с чисто лингвистической точки зрения вновь появляется как часть поэтики.

Ключевые слова: метафора, метаморфоза, метонимия, синекдоха, аллегория

INTRODUCTION

The history of the study of metaphors in rhetoric begins with Greek and Roman linguistics: in the poetic records of Aristotle, Demetrius, Quintilian, Cicero, and others, metaphors were given under the name of tropes, and they expressed many valuable ideas about it. Aristotle was the first to distinguish artistic language from ordinary language and studied other metaphors under the name of metaphor, that is, when he said metaphor, he mainly meant metaphors. Among the ancient rhetoricians, Demetrius called comparisons extended metaphors, and Quintilian called metaphors reduced comparisons. We would like to add that despite the fact that this idea has caused some controversy in modern rhetoric, it is still generally accepted [1]. Those ideas have not lost their

scientific value even in our modern times, and have been a serious stimulus for the creation of fundamental research works related to rhetoric. Sometimes European rhetoricians suggest that the strong rhetorical tradition of the Romantic era prevented the development of style.

The influence of rhetorical views and rhetorical tradition on stylistics is not controversial, because their objects of study, the approach to poetic text are close to each other, in rhetoric, metaphors have a speech-decorating function during the expression of the idea of a literary text, as a result, the speech has vitality, and its effect rises to a high level. On the stylistic side of the issue, the choice of words for the creation of metaphors becomes the main focus.

Metaphor is essentially based on the principles of transfer and substitution. The mentioned concepts are determined depending on the content and essence of the idea to be given. In the lexical system of the language, this event is a creative event: at its core are signs, events, ideas, quantities and other features. Metaphors have a unique nature, the meaning of one subject is transferred to others, it is a product of subjective thinking, it is an expression of the content actualized in that situation, it is a concrete means of expression of a broad meaning, it is an effective means of expression and it has an evaluative feature [2].

However, the new features acquired by transfer and replacement in different contextual conditions have led to the distinction of tropes down to the smallest detail, which has led to differences of opinion in its classification in modern rhetoric. For example, the distinction between metaphors and metamorphoses in rhetoric is a vivid example of this. In both of them, the transfer operation is essentially the same, and transfer is based on the sign in both of them, but there are certain differences in the way they are expressed, which is also related to the predicative nature of metamorphoses. Among rhetoricians, there is also an opinion that metamorphosis occupies a common position between metaphor and comparison, that is, it has both metaphor and comparison.

Despite the fact that the study of metaphors and metonymies has a history of two millennia, the interest in their study has not decreased even now. Metaphors and metonyms as a research object in the field of cognitive linguistics, on the one hand, are suitable, on the other hand, they represent a rather mysterious object due to their special status, more precisely, their proximity to the field of human consciousness and thinking.

Metaphorization occurs at the level of semantics as a linguistic phenomenon. Metaphorization is related to the thinking ability of an individual and it should be considered as a symbolic operation consisting of replacing one sign (object) with another sign (object). Metaphor and metonymy can be evaluated as two main types of deviation from the basic normative level of the language system, more precisely, the naming system. As a result of the expansion of the original meaning, metaphor becomes metonymy. Both of them actively participate in the process of conceptualization of important knowledge from a linguistic and cultural point of view. Metaphor not only reflects the thinking skills of a person, but also develops and strengthens the thinking ability of a person.

In modern rhetoric, they pay more attention to metonymies. This is related to the enrichment of people's knowledge about the surrounding world and the way they approach it. Undoubtedly, this is a manifestation of the anthropocentric approach to language phenomena in linguistics. In Russian linguistics, this issue was not interpreted unambiguously, and their view of the issue differed by its uniqueness. Let's review them. Although the study of this issue in classical Russian linguistics is associated with the name of M.V. Lomonosov, its strong and comprehensive study dates back to the 20th century. Especially in the second half of this century, valuable studies are emerging from each other. For example, Y.M. Skrebnev uses metaphors based on the classification in Roman and Greek linguistics as follows:

- 1) quality metaphors (metaphor, metonymy and irony);
- 2) quantification metaphors (hyperbola and meiosis) [3, p.121].

The point that attracts attention here is that the principle of classification is carried out according to the principle of substitution and transfer, on the other hand, metaphors are sharply distinguished from rhetorical figures. The distinguishing criterion is to take into account the quantitative factor along with the general principle of metaphors. Contrary to these ideas, E. N. Zaretskaya takes a different position regarding metaphors in general. According to the author, "the concept of metaphor does not exist at all, there is only the context in which the meaning of the word is realized, and they are manifested in a concrete communication situation in the form of words and utterances" [4, p. 79]. The author considers "metaphorism" to be an unsuccessful name in relation to the essence of language signs. In this work, the author attributes the following to the system of metaphors in the modern sense:

"1) metaphor; 2) metonymy; 3) hyperbole and finally, 4) meiosis" [4, p. 79].

In addition, in her research, E.N.Zaretskaya considers synecdoche as a type of metonymy, and also includes oxymoron, allegory, and animation in this line [4, p. 79].

Allegory, animation included in this division are included in metaphors in other rhetorical studies, synecdoche is also studied as part of metonymy, and comparisons are also attributed to tropes. In essence, the mentioned approach is rational in nature, it is more based on logic in content. The classification of metaphors in the Russian school of rhetoric revolves around this volume. We see this quite clearly in relatively recent studies. L.A. Vedenskaya, L.G. Pavlova are somewhat indifferent to the issue: they include "metaphor, metonymy, comparison and epithets as metaphors" [5, pp. 128-134].

Contrary to the above distinctions, the grouping of metaphors into larger classes is evident in recent studies. This feature is also observed in the researches of O.V.Petrov. Based on Y.M. Skrebnev's classification, the author classifies metaphors as follows:

- "1) metaphors expressing quality (metaphor, metonymy);
- 2) metaphors expressing quantity (hyperbola and meiosis);
- 3) contrastive naming (irony)" [6, p. 93].

In this classification, synecdoche and metalepsis are mentioned as types of metonymy, and allegory is a type of metaphor, and comparisons are discussed in the background of metaphor. Therefore, this classification fully agrees with Y.M. Skrebnev's classification. In the relatively later studies conducted in this direction, details (crushing) are observed in large groups of classification, for example, antonomasia are mentioned as a special type of metonymy. Periphrasis is also mentioned separately in the researches of recent years [7, p. 109].

Human thinking is metaphorical by nature, and metaphors (metonymies) in language are their outward manifestation in language. The metaphorical process is deeply rooted in the structure of language itself. Metaphorization, as a cognitive phenomenon and structure, permeates our daily life, not only our spoken language, but also our thinking and practical activity. Metaphors are an important and perhaps the only linguistic tool for understanding difficult, inaccessible subjects, things and objects. They (metaphors, metonymies) are included in the system of human concepts and therefore are expressed in concrete copies in human language. Metaphors have creative power because they not only describe the world around them, but also create new realities.

The Azerbaijani school of rhetoric is relatively poorly developed compared to other fields of linguistics, on the other hand, the unresolved points in this field in Russian linguistics are also reflected in it. While classifying metaphors, we present the following division based on Y.M. Skrebnev's ideas:

- 1) qualitative metaphors (metaphor and metonymy):
 - a) metaphor, allegory, metamorphosis and revitalization can also be included;
 - b) metonymy includes synecdoche and metalepsis;
- 2) quantitative metaphors (hyperbola and meiosis);

3) irony [3].

There are linguists who do not include irony in metaphors, but irony also has a transfer operation. This is essentially a more complex operation, and irony, sharp humor is transferred to the transmitted idea. As a result, the opposite of the given idea is understood. Hence, in irony, as in hyperbole and meiosis, the transfer operation is connected with the whole idea.

Metaphorical associations between objects in metaphor are free, at any time based on the richness of the reader's (listener's) background knowledge, this mechanism is activated and manifests itself in new metaphorical expressions in the conceptual system. In this process, not a separate culture, but historical events, incidents, mythological knowledge, symbols belonging to different peoples of different cultures can be used in metaphorization. In such a case, the referenced linguistic and cultural materials become internationalized and enter the cultural, more precisely, conceptual sphere of other nations.

Another point is the placement of the text within the text, that is, the creation of intertext. This is a linguistic and cultural event in which an existing event or concept is reinterpreted at the level of social consciousness, or rather, it enters another social environment.

As a result of the interaction of two conceptual fields, namely the source field and the goal field, conceptual metaphors serve to understand and understand the essence of one type in the essence of another type. Conceptual fields - the source field and the target field are non-equivalent only in the sense of the direction of metaphorization. When the source field has a more concrete character, that is, when there is a precise knowledge acquired by a person in the process of interacting with non-linguistic realities, the target (goal) field is relatively clear, relatively definite knowledge. As J. Lakoff writes, "metaphor makes it possible to understand highly abstract or inherently unstructured entities in more concrete or, at least, relatively structured terms" [8, p. 27].

Since the second half of the last century, the approach to metaphors in American linguistics has been fundamentally changing, and this is primarily due to the emergence of anthropocentric linguistics in linguistics. In fact, with the emergence of structural linguistics and textual syntax, there was a revival in the study of this issue in rhetoric. Therefore, the change in the point of view of the issue revealed the aspects of metaphors that were not visible in previous times. In this respect, the research conducted by P. Shofer and D. Rice can be specially mentioned [9, p. 21].

They looked at metaphors as a semantic transposition of existing signs and explained the real nature of the mentioned issue as follows: new semantic nuances in a language sign are related to a set of semantic signs, semantic breadth is not limited to micro or macrottexts, motivated referent connection is understood as the main feature of a linguistic unit, microcontext of a metaphor is a place of being. According to the theory of metaphor in the modern sense, metaphor has a systematic character, its elements have systematicity. Metaphors in natural languages are linguistic phenomena expressed by linguistic facts. The deep rooting of metaphors in the language structure is related to the expression and content plan of language units. In this context, the asymmetry of language signs is manifested in relation to the semantic plan. The semantic asymmetry observed in language signs is the accompanying of the illogical with the logical. Metaphor, which has extremely complex characteristics, is the verbal expression of the real and unreal in language, that is, in the process of metaphor, human consciousness provides an organic connection between reality and unreality, and as a result, the potential possibilities of language are realized.

Metaphor is based on the expression of deep emotional meaning with few words and is regulated by the principle of economy in the language system. It is related to the structure of language, because in language, units are units with corresponding structures. Metaphor, metonymy, hyperbole, etc. included in the metaphor system. language is characterized by unique structural units, one does not repeat the other. Speaking about the structural features of metaphors

and metonymies in this aspect, metaphors are the replacement of semantically different signs in semantically similar syntactic situations, and metonymies are the change of the syntactic position itself.

Metaphor as a means of artistic expressiveness can be found in any type of text: from poetic texts to spoken language, and it enlivens the text, gives color, expressiveness, individuality. Metaphor, as a semantic operation, is related to the transfer of only part of the signs from the source area to the target area. He attributes these signs to the latter (target source) and describes it based on them. Combining the signs of one concept with another in a single entity determines the vertical character and paradigmatic nature of this sign. Such a combination is arbitrary, which does not exist in reality, which determines the hypothetical character of the metaphor.

CONCLUSION

Metaphor is actively used as a technical method of renaming the object, event and all concepts in the whole activity of human activity. A person separates and selects the objects of the surrounding reality, names them by noting their similarities with previously marked and perceived objects. Metaphor becomes a necessity due to the fact that our ideas pass from concrete objects of the surrounding world to abstract concepts. Complex abstract concepts are often used in their similarity to concrete objects for their characterization. Metaphor is the transfer of one or more signs from one object or event to another. Metaphorization is essentially a hidden comparison. Unlike the usual simile, which has two members, the metaphor has only the second member.

References

1. <http://www.philol.msu.ru/>
2. <http://ayr.ru/library/ritorika-osnovnoy-teori//5327>
3. Скребнев, Ю.М. Очерк теории стилистики - Горький: 1975. 175 с.
4. Зарецкая, Е.Н. Риторика. Теория и практика речевой коммуникации – Москва: Дело, 2002. 480 с.
5. Введенская, Л.А. Риторика для юристов. Учебное пособие. – 7-е изд. Ростов-на-Дону: Феникс, 2008. 568 с.
6. Петров, О.В. Риторика: Учеб. – Москва: ТК Велби; Изд-во Проспект, 2007. 423 с.
7. Голуб, И.Б. Риторика – Москва Изд-во “Омега-Л”, 2009. 405 с.
8. Lakoff, G. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. Metaphor and Thought/ ed. by A. Ortony. – Cambridge University Press, 1993. 696 p.
9. Scofer, P.P. Metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche. “Semiotica”. 1977.