Xususan, *Nayzavor*, *Qaqnustalabli* hamda *tomug‘dam* okkazionalizmlarida tovushlarning shiddatli artikulyatsiyasi jismoniy va botiniy qiynoqlarning emotsional quvvatini eng yuqori darajaga olib chiqib, matnda kuchli dramatik taranglikni ta’minlaydi.

Aksincha, o‘tkinchi umr, kuzgi sokinlik, yomg‘irli havo va tun manzaralarini tasvirlashda mayin sonor hamda sirg‘aluvchi tovushlar (“sh”, “b”, “d”, “l”, “m”, “y”) vositasida mayin fonetik oqim va lirik musiqiylik qaror topadi. *Shabbodalik*, *yomg‘irparast*, *tunlikka* hamda *orollashganim* kabi lisoniy yasalmalarda fonosemantik to‘lqin matnning lirik ohangdorligini kuchaytirib, kitobxon qalbida chuqur estetik rezonans va mayin hissiy kechinma uyg‘otadi.

Ushbu jarayonlarning barchasi Usmon Azim she’riyatida okkazionalizmlar tasodifiy nutqiy hodisa emas, balki tilning fonetik, morfologik va semantik sathlarini o‘zaro uzviy harakatga keltiruvchi mukammal kognitiv-badiiy tizim ekanligini ko‘rsatadi. Shoir o‘zbek adabiy tilining boy tovush tizimi imkoniyatlarini yangi derivatsion modellar bilan uyg‘unlashtirib, milliy badiiy tafakkurning lisoniy ufqlarini sezilarli darajada kengaytiradi.

Xulosa qilib aytganda, Usmon Azim ijodida fonosemantik vositalar va poetik tovush uyg‘unligi she’riy nutqning ichki harakatlantiruvchi kuchidir. Shoir yaratgan okkazional birliklar tovush va ma’no mutanosibligining yuksak namunasi bo‘lib, o‘zbek tilshunosligida badiiy matn fonetikasi, lingvopoetika hamda poetik so‘z ijodkorligi qonuniyatlarini tadqiq etishda fundamental ilmiy manba bo‘lib xizmat qiladi.

Adabiyotlar ro‘yxati

1. Воронин С. В. Основы фоносемантики. – Л.: Изд-во ЛГУ, 1982. – С. 15; Якобсон Р. Звуковой облик языка. – М.: Прогресс, 1987. – С. 205.
2. Журавлёв А.П. Звук и смысл. – М.: Просвещение, 1991. – С. 56; Йўлдошев М. Бадиий матннинг лингвопоэтик тадқиқи. – Т.: Фан, 2008. – Б. 72
3. Соссюр Ф. де. Труды по языкознанию. – М.: Прогресс, 1977. – С. 101.
4. Усмон Азим. Сайланма. – Тошкент: Шарқ, 1995. – Б. 65.

THE FORMATION AND CONTEMPORARY INTERPRETATION OF METAPHOR THEORY

Ma’ripov Jalolxon Kamoliddin o‘g‘li
Assistant-teacher, Jizzakh Branch of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Abstract. This article examines the historical formation and contemporary interpretation of metaphor theory, tracing its development from classical rhetoric to semantic, interactional, cognitive, cultural, and discourse-oriented approaches. Particular attention is paid to the transition from viewing metaphor as an ornamental linguistic device to understanding it as a fundamental mechanism of conceptualization. The study discusses Aristotle’s classical account, the contributions of I. A. Richards and Max Black, Conceptual metaphor theory developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, and later approaches emphasizing

embodiment, context, cultural variation, and discourse. The analysis shows that contemporary metaphor studies integrate linguistic form, cognition, communicative context, and culture.

Keywords: metaphor, metaphor theory, conceptual metaphor, cognition, interaction theory, cognitive linguistics, culture, discourse.

Metaphor is one of the oldest objects of inquiry in the study of language and remains one of the most productive concepts in contemporary linguistics. Its theoretical history is significant because the understanding of metaphor has changed considerably across intellectual traditions. What was initially treated mainly as a rhetorical technique gradually became an object of semantic, philosophical, psychological, cognitive, pragmatic, and cultural investigation. The development of metaphor theory therefore represents not merely a succession of definitions, but a fundamental transformation in scholarly assumptions about the relationship between language, thought, experience, and culture.

The foundations of systematic metaphor theory are traditionally associated with Aristotle. In Poetics and Rhetoric, metaphor was considered within the broader framework of poetic and rhetorical language. Aristotle defined metaphor in terms of the transfer of a name from one entity to another through relations such as genus, species, and analogy [1]. This account established transfer as a central principle in the subsequent history of metaphor studies. For centuries, metaphor was consequently classified as a trope and discussed alongside other figures of speech. The focus remained primarily on its stylistic and expressive functions, while literal language was generally treated as the ordinary mode of communication.

The traditional view was substantially reconsidered in the twentieth century. I. A. Richards argued against reducing metaphor to the substitution of one word for another. In The Philosophy of Rhetoric, he proposed that metaphorical meaning arises through the interaction of two components, which he called the tenor and the vehicle [2]. The tenor is the underlying subject, whereas the vehicle is the expression through which that subject is understood. Richards's approach shifted attention from isolated figurative words to relations between semantic elements. Metaphorical meaning could therefore no longer be explained adequately by replacing a figurative expression with a supposedly equivalent literal one.

Max Black further developed this direction through interaction theory. He maintained that metaphor does not simply report a similarity that already exists between two objects. Instead, one subject is understood through a system of implications associated with another [3]. Metaphor may thus highlight, organize, or even create perceived similarities. This was an important theoretical step because the central problem changed from identifying what a metaphor replaces to explaining how metaphor produces meaning. The interactional account thereby prepared the ground for later approaches in which metaphor became connected with conceptual organization rather than with verbal ornament alone.

The most influential transformation occurred with the emergence of cognitive linguistics and Conceptual metaphor theory. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, in Metaphors We Live By, rejected the assumption that metaphor belongs primarily to

poetic or extraordinary language. They argued that metaphor is deeply embedded in ordinary thought and that the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured to a considerable degree [4]. This position relocated metaphor from the periphery of language to the center of cognition. Everyday expressions were treated as evidence of systematic conceptual correspondences rather than as isolated stylistic deviations.

Conceptual metaphor theory distinguishes between conceptual metaphors and their linguistic manifestations. A conceptual metaphor establishes systematic correspondences between a source domain and a target domain. The source domain generally provides a more concrete or experientially accessible structure, while the target domain is understood through it. The well-known ARGUMENT IS WAR pattern, for example, is reflected in expressions concerning attacking a position, defending an argument, winning a dispute, or changing a strategy [4]. The importance of such examples lies in their systematicity: speakers do not create a new poetic comparison each time, but draw on an established conceptual mapping.

Embodiment became another major component of contemporary metaphor theory. Cognitive approaches emphasize that conceptual structures are connected with recurring bodily, perceptual, and sensorimotor experience. Abstract domains such as time, emotion, quantity, morality, and social relationships can therefore be understood partly through spatial and physical experience. This view explains why metaphorical conceptualization is not regarded as an arbitrary linguistic association. At the same time, contemporary research increasingly recognizes that bodily experience alone cannot account for the full diversity of metaphorical meaning. Context, communicative purpose, genre, cultural knowledge, and social environment also influence metaphor selection and interpretation.

Zoltán Kövecses has made an important contribution to the cultural dimension of metaphor theory. His research demonstrates that conceptual metaphors may show both cross-cultural similarity and significant variation [6]. Certain broad metaphorical patterns can have an experiential basis shared by different communities, while their specific elaborations may depend on cultural models, values, historical experience, and conventional ways of speaking. This observation is especially important for comparative and linguocultural studies. Different languages may use different source domains for similar target concepts or may develop culturally distinctive versions of a broadly shared conceptual metaphor.

Contemporary metaphor studies also emphasize discourse and context. A metaphor does not function independently of the communicative environment in which it appears. Its interpretation can depend on the speaker’s purpose, surrounding discourse, genre conventions, social relations, historical circumstances, and shared cultural knowledge. For this reason, current research often combines cognitive analysis with pragmatic and discourse-oriented methods. The focus is increasingly placed not only on stable conceptual mappings but also on how particular metaphors are selected, negotiated, extended, and evaluated in actual communication.

From a contemporary perspective, metaphor can therefore be treated simultaneously as a linguistic, conceptual, pragmatic, and cultural phenomenon. Linguistically, it is realized through words, phrases, constructions, and larger textual

patterns. Cognitively, it enables one domain of experience to be structured partly in terms of another. Pragmatically, it performs context-sensitive communicative functions. Culturally, it can encode shared models, values, and conventional interpretations of experience. Restricting metaphor to any one of these dimensions would reduce the complexity of metaphorical meaning and overlook the interaction among language, cognition, context, and culture.

In conclusion, the formation of metaphor theory can be described as a movement from a predominantly rhetorical interpretation toward an integrated cognitive and cultural understanding. Aristotle established the classical foundation by explaining metaphor through transferred naming and analogy. Richards and Black challenged substitution-based accounts and emphasized semantic interaction. Lakoff and Johnson radically broadened the scope of metaphor by demonstrating its systematic role in ordinary conceptualization, while later researchers such as Kövecses showed that metaphorical thought is shaped by the interaction of embodiment and culture. Contemporary metaphor theory thus regards metaphor not merely as an expressive ornament but as a dynamic mechanism connecting language, cognition, experience, discourse, and culture. This multidimensional interpretation provides a productive theoretical basis for further comparative research across languages and literary traditions.

REFERENCES

1. Aristotle. Poetics. Translated by Malcolm Heath. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

2. Richards, I. A. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936.

3. Black, M. "Metaphor." Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, New Series, Vol. 55, 1954–1955, pp. 273–294.

4. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

5. Ortony, A. (ed.). Metaphor and Thought. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

6. Kövecses, Z. Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

THE ROLE OF VOCABULARY ENHANCEMENT IN DEVELOPING ADVANCED EFL READING SKILLS

Mirzo Ulug'bek nomidagi
O'zbekiston Milliy universiteti
Xorijiy filologiya fakulteti
Ingliz tilshunosligi kafedrasi PhD, o'qituvchisi
Mavlanova Oybarchin Sheraliyevna

Abstract. This article examines the role of vocabulary enhancement in developing advanced EFL learners' reading skills. It focuses on the relationship between vocabulary knowledge and learners' ability to understand, interpret, and