COGNITIVE-DISCURSIVE ASPECTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF METONYMY IN A MEDIA

Shodikulova Aziza Zikiryayevna
Teacher, Samarkand State Medical Institute, Department of Foreign Languages
azizashodikulova87@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
To provide a context for the essays published here, this introduction to the special issue on metonymy highlights a number of aspects of the cognitive-linguistic discussion of metonymy of the past twenty-five years. It briefly sketches the development of metonymy studies in poetics, linguistics, and philosophy, emphasizing that the cognitive-linguistic approach to metonymy of the past decades represents a return to the semantic views of metonymy advocated in structuralist semantics.

Keywords: cognitive linguistic, metonymy studies, implementation of metonymy.

INTRODUCTION
This development was triggered by the extensive study of metaphor, but metonymy has now emancipated itself as an autonomous field of study that displays complex and unresolved relations with metaphor. This introduction also attends to the new insights added by cognitive linguistics to such a semantic approach to metonymy, suggesting that metonymy has indeed gone cognitive linguistic. Throughout the history of linguistic stylistics, starting from the moment of its formation and development as one of the disciplines of linguistics, the stylistic resources of the language - ". Special language aids capable. Carry additional aesthetic information"- always remain in its problematic field. The study of these means has its origins in ancient rhetoric. The concepts formed in the era of antiquity and the taxonomies developed during this period have remained the basis of stylistic observations for many centuries. A qualitative change in the study of stylistic means as linguistic categories is carried out within the framework of linguistic stylistics, where stylistic means acquire ontological significance and for the first time are seriously developed from linguistic positions. In the XX century. Stylistic resources are beginning to be explored along the lines of linguistic traditions and expectations. Studying stylistic resources in the XX century. Focuses within several interrelated and complementary approaches, the most prominent among which are structural-semantic, pragmatic and cognitive.

These approaches prompted stylists to explore new problem areas, and also made it possible to return to already studied phenomena, but from a different point of view. Such studied phenomena include stylistic devices that make up a significant part of the stylistic resources of the language. New principles and techniques allow us to reveal those aspects of them that until that moment were felt intuitively and did not receive a scientific explanation.

Thus, the relevance of the dissertation research is determined by the need to find and implement adequate ways to describe the ontological nature of stylistic techniques, the study of which is one of the fundamental tasks of linguistic stylistics. In this dissertation, the study of the stylistic technique of metonymy is carried out with the involvement of a whole complex of parameters: structural-semantic, functional, pragmatic, socio-cultural, cognitive.

Particular emphasis is placed on the currently emerging cognitive-discursive aspect, which is a special integration of the two leading paradigms of our time - cognitive and communicative, their rational synthesis. Research within the framework of the cognitive-discursive paradigm clarifies the important parameters of the stylistic method of metonymy, without which its integral picture cannot be formed: the polyphonic nature of the stylistic method of metonymy, functioning in discourse, national-cultural conditioning, its meaning-forming function. A similar development, away from an exclusive focus on semantics, took place in linguistics. The problem of metaphorical interpretation was first resolved by means of a proposal of semantic feature transfer, which was linked to the grammatical notion of selection restrictions (Weinreich). This led to a discussion of mechanisms of grammatical feature projection versus cancellation (e.g., Cohen; Levin). Then the whole semantic idea was abandoned and a move to handling figuration by pragmatic interpretation was advocated by philosophers of language Paul Grice and John Searle.

A third philosopher of language who had a stake in this debate, Donald Davidson, also took figuration out of semantics and proposed an account of its function in terms of psychological effects rather than meaning, since meaning could only be literal. By the mid 1970s, the pragmatic account of metaphor and metonymy seemed to hold the best cards in poetics, linguistics, and philosophy.

When analyzing my myth, you need to pay attention to its functions as it is expressed in the literary text. A phraseological myth is a name expressed in phraseological units, and most of it is a specific noun, whose functions are similar, and the functions usually assigned to the corresponding noun are common in works of art. It should be noted here that the identification of a common noun (i.e., the names of peoples) included in a noun performs the same functions as a noun.

VD Bondaletov studies the characteristic, aesthetic and symbolic functions of nominative, ideological, myphonyms, previously unfamiliar to the reader, and says that phraseological mythonyms are portable [Bondaletov 1983]. Yu AA Karpenko, in turn, describes it as follows: mifonyms have both methodological and nominative features in terms of functions and are not repeated [Karpenko 1986]. S. Vlakhov and S. Florin note that in the work "Inaccessible in translation" the correct name has a definite connotative meaning, what determines its ability to convey a certain aesthetic, defines the features of the work [Vlakhov Florin 1980]. That is, the meaning of the myth has a positive effect on your emotional, expressive, and evaluative component.

By summarizing the views of linguists, the following functions can be distinguished. phraseological mythonym:

1) Like any noun, a mythonym performs a nominative function.It should be noted here that it is a denotation for a phraseological mythonym. An imaginary image created by the author's imagination, behind this image he corrects the individual name (or common name).

2) The methodological function has the following types:

 - Informational and methodological aspects: "Information about the name is transmitted and a logical, conceptual form is created and it can be easily described in words. " In addition, this information can ideologically describe other parameters.

 - Emotional and stylistic: the main means of its expression is, as a rule, the phonetic form of the myth. The action of this is based on what the functions evoke in the mythological reader, the particular emotion and the way he or she relates to himself or herself. It can also be achieved due to the effect, the aspect of word formation, for example, the inconsistency between the name and the image is obvious. Often a separate expressive function is also included in this element.

Let's take a closer look at my phraseological myth and look at the various classifications that will help us to systematically analyze the corpus of examples collected later.

Usually, the meaning of a phraseological unit is the same as the meaning of a lexeme. However, they are never equal. Because if a phraseological unit and lexeme had the same meaning, the phraseological unit would be redundant. As an example, compare the meanings of the phrase to be depressed with the phrase to be depressed, or to be depressed with the phrase to be depressed. While this Uzbek phraseological unit is "overwhelmed by something unexpected, incomprehensible, or eventful," the lexeme of wonder is "affected by something unexpected or incomprehensible." Also, the English phraseological unit means "to be overly depressed by an unexpected event", while the lexeme to feel depressed means "to feel overwhelmed by a simple event". In each case, they have seized it, despite obstacles we can scarcely imagine. "However, the phraseological unit differs from the lexeme of "wonder" in that it has the meanings of "extreme" and "colloquial, colorful." This means that the expressive semantics of the phraseological unit are often figurative and colorful. Apparently, phraseological units and lexemes are sharply differentiated by the colors of expression, even if they refer to something or an event.

Before moving on to the definition of a mythonym, it should be noted that it is part of the non-equivalent vocabulary layer of the language. That is, it refers to such non-partial words and phrases, and there are no complete equivalents in other languages. As to questions of definition, as well as areas such as the translation of myths and names analyzed by scientists such as A. Karpenko, T.A. Kazakova, V. Superanskaya, V. D. Bondaletov. My phraseological myth is a name, so the study of my myth is a branch of onomastics that deals with science, and mainly includes things that the eye can see and hear. Mythological onomastics includes the names of two personal names, surnames, nicknames, and geographical objects:

mountains, rivers, settlements, streets, as well as the names of peoples, etc., which interpreted in a mythological way. It should be noted that mythological onomastics deals with both mythonyms, nouns and mythonyms, representing common nouns, i.e. definition, and does not fully reflect the field covered by science. In the dictionary, N.V. Podolskaya refers to the terms of mythological onomastics as "the art of naming", which includes the process of nomination and nomination, but does not refer only to specific names. It also includes the following descriptions of the myth, and common names (names of peoples), which must thus be studied by the science of onomastics. So far, a new direction has been formed - literary onomastics, with which the intersection of onomastics has increased its connection with such disciplines as stylistics, poetics, lexical semantics and linguistics. It is also possible to study the peculiarities of the use of the text and its features, as well as the names in the works of art. This direction explores the functioning of the elements, both imaginary and real mythological onomastics, which is based on how it is applied in creation and is a separate artistic text. To date, a general definition of the myth has not yet been obtained, but, in our view, the existing definitions are largely unified

REFERENCES
1) FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1995): Media Discourse, London, Edward Arnold.
2) FASS, D. (1997): Processing Metonymy and Metaphor, Greenwich – London, Ablex Publishing Corporation.
3) GIBBS, R. W. (1994): The Poetics of Mind, Cambridge, CUP
4) HIRAGA, M. K. (2005): Metaphor and Iconicity, Houndmills – New York, Palgrave Macmillan
5) Ermolovich D.I. Proper names at the junction of languages   and cultures - M .: R.Valent, 2001 .-- 200 p.