



## DSCOURSIVE APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF METAPHOR

*Mukhammadiyah Umida Faxriddin qizi*

*Student of MA Uzbekistan State World Languages University*

**Annotation:** This article is devoted to the basis of the organization of an artificial environment is a metaphor that creates the structure of the text in an artistic way, a mythical symbol. Therefore, logic and linguistics are increasingly focused not on the description of linguistic structures by themselves, but on identifying the ways in which these structures influence. And the problem of metaphorical statements plays an important role in such searches.

**Keywords:** Discourse, approach, metaphor, linguistics.

The study of metaphor in written discourse is carried out on the basis of discursive analysis, the main task of which is to understand the intent of the text, ideas with the help of which the author explains the surrounding reality. In the discursive theory, a metaphor is considered from the point of view of cognitive, functional, communicative directions, not only such a feature of human thinking as metaphoricalness is taken into account, but also the functionality of the metaphor and the intention of the author.

The term "discourse" attracts the attention of researchers of various sciences (linguistics, literary criticism, philosophy, sociology, psychology, logic, etc.), their individual areas (pragmalinguistics, pragmatilistics, linguistic semantics, communication theory, grammatical stylistics, text linguistics, text grammar), interdisciplinary sciences (psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, etc.). The very wide scope of the concept of discourse has led to the polysemy of this terminological unit both in different sciences and at different levels of linguistics proper. The problem of the study of discourse and discursive analysis is relevant both in modern world linguistics and in Russian, in which it has been actively developed for only 20-25 years and has not yet received a generally recognized status. The study of the problem of the essence, structure, functioning and typology of discourse is one of the main areas of world linguistics.

The term "discourse" is most often identified with the language in use and serves to describe the text in a direct communicative context. It is precisely for this reason that discourse plays an important role both in individual sciences and in various areas of linguistics, for example: in text linguistics - to describe the method of combining sentences into a single, coherent linguistic whole, there is more than a grammatical sentence; in system linguistics - to link the linguistic organization of discourse with individual system components of situational types; in psycholinguistics - to determine the communicative strategies that speakers use when communicating.

The meaning of discourse can vary from a narrow linguistic description, according to which discourse is defined as "a coherent speech statement, more than a sentence (written or oral; belongs to one speaker or several)", [1] in macroconcepts, in which an attempt is made to theoretically define ideological clusters - discursive formations, systematize knowledge and experience.

Some linguists identify the concept of discourse with text. Other researchers identify the meanings of these terms from a methodological perspective: text is a material product, discourse is a communicative process. According to the opinion of the French linguist R Robert De Beaugrande,

*“text and discourse have the same temporal extent in the sense that they come from the same author.”*

The researcher proposes seven standards of textuality, the presence of which is mandatory for the transformation of a text into a communicative process, that is, a discourse. The main criteria are cohesion (connectivity) and coherence (integrity). These characteristics are connected, first of all, with grammatical forms, which denote the relationship between sentences in the text, and conceptual connections, which are presented in the form of certain grammatical forms. Auxiliary criteria are intention, assumption, information content, situationality and intertextuality. These seven standards of textuality form the basis of communication. It is important to realize that the meaning of discourse lies outside of grammatical forms, and recipients must construct meanings based on conclusions.

D. Crystal believes that the interest of researchers in analyzing how sentences interact in a certain sequence to create coherent passages of speech develops in two directions. The scientist singles out, on the one hand, discourse analysis, focuses on the structure of natural oral speech, which manifests itself in such discourses as conversation, interview, commentary, language, and, on the other hand, text analysis, which studies the structure of written speech, which can be found in such texts as essays, notes, road signs, sections. This division is not final and generally accepted. The awareness of communicating rule by which the speech exercise is performed and the plan of their own action program is formed. When forming speaking , it is also necessary to take into account the correct distribution over time. [2]

Another approach to this problem is proposed by the British scientist Guy Cook. He states that there are two different kinds of speech. One of them is a certain abstraction that is created for the teaching of language, as well as for the study of the functioning of language rules; the other is used to convey some information and is perceived as connected (it may or may not correspond to the correct sentence or set of correct sentences). This last kind of speech - speech in use, speech for communication - is, according to G. Cook, style, and the search for what adds coherence to discourse is discursive analysis. [3] The author considers it important to note that the difference between these two types of speech (artificially created and communicative) quickly comes down to the problem of our perception or use of a particular segment of speech than to what this segment actually is. It is worth noting that Guy Cooke claims that everything can be considered discourse: starting with a cry or exclamation, a short conversation or marginal notes, and ending with a novel or a big court case. When developing automatic indexing of homonyms revealed what great difficulties are associated with the formal distinction of the meanings of words such as device, installation.[4] The scientist also notes that discourse requires the presence of three contexts: textual, social and psychological. Since clear definitions are always difficult to find, the British researcher suggests distinguishing between oral discourse and written text [3]. In the humanities, discourse is viewed as a multi-valued phenomenon, for the analysis of which various approaches are used: pragmatic, ethnographic, cognitive, critical discursive analysis, naratological and functional. Let’s consider them in more detail:

**Pragmatic Approach.**

This approach is based on the assertion that language is used not only to describe the world, but also to perform certain actions. A pragmatic approach to the study of discourse is based on the principles of the general theory of correlation between language use and sociocultural contexts and on the study of speech communication as a social and cultural phenomenon [5];

**Ethnographic Approach.**

With the help of an ethnographic approach, verbal and non-verbal elements are studied as components of culture. The key concept of this approach is communicative competence as knowledge about the rules of communication in a particular speech community. This term combines both linguistic and cultural competence. Language competence includes knowledge of the syntagmatic and paradigmatic properties of linguistic elements, the rules for deploying the text and the embodiment of communicative and interactive plans in it, knowledge of the rules for

	interpreting the text, the principles of speech communication, the relationship between different types of social and communicative context.
<b>Cognitive approach.</b>	Discourse is a complex cognitive formation. It involves the study of discourse based on the analysis of the representation of knowledge in discourse in the form of models of situations or frames;[7]
<b>Critical-discursive analysis.</b>	The study of social and applied aspects of discourse has gained considerable popularity in connection with the requirements of modernity. Political and ideological discourse have a direct impact on nations, peoples, countries and relations between them. The study of the influence of ideology, power, social relations and status occurs within the limits of critical discursive analysis. With the help of this approach, it is determined how discourse is formed through the relationship of power and ideologies.

It is believed that ideology is at the level of pragmatics, and communication occurs due to the same understanding of the types of texts by the participants in the discourse and their indexing. It is important to know the latest approaches of , special teaching techniques in order optimally choose one or another instruction method in accordance with the level of knowledge, needs and interests. Any text is a reflection of a fragment of the real world, directly or indirectly related to politics. Power, knowledge and truth concern the configuration of discourse. In addition, certain discursive practices can influence the formation of public opinion [8].

#### REFERENCE:

1. Ogienko I.S. Discourse and approaches to its analysis // Scientific Notes. Series “Philological”, 2012. - S. 98–102.
2. Khamidova N. N. Speech exercises as a necessary component of the formation of the communicative personality of students in teaching foreign languages”. Английский язык в сфере профессиональной Коммуникации vii всероссийская молодежная научная конференция Kazan. 2021
3. Galperin, I.R. Text as an object of linguistic research I.R. Galperin.-M .: URSS, 2006.-137 p  
Datsishin, H. Morphological and syntactic principle of the structural classification of metaphors in political discourse [Text] / H. Datsishin // Bism. Lviv. un-tu.-Ser. Journalism. 2001.-Vip. 21.-S. 506-509.
4. Khamidova N. N. “The Development of a Semiotic Point of View in Structural Linguistics”. European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science 4, p. 545-547, 2022
5. Lakoff D., Johnson M. “Metaphors by which we live” / D. Lakoff, M. Johnson. - M, 2004. - P.78.
6. Khamidova N. N. Features of phraseological units in linguoculture. Современные проблемы филологии, педагогики и методики преподавания языков. Сборник научных трудов по итогам всероссийской научно-практической конференции. Kazan. 2020
7. The theory of metaphor: Collection: Per. from English, French, German, Spanish, Polish. language / Entry. Art. and comp. N. D. Arutyunova; Common ed. N. D. Arutyunova and M.A. Zhurinskaya. -M .: Progress, 1990.-512 p.\
8. Khamidova N. N. “Effectively engaging text as a basic unit of communication in efl in learner centered classroom”. Английский язык в сфере профессиональной коммуникации. Сборник тезисов докладов VII Всероссийской молодежной научной конференции. Казань, 2021