THE USE OF ANIMAL NAMES IN THE METAPHORICAL VIEW OF THE WORLD

Jurakulov Abror Raufovich
*Senior teacher of the department of German language and
literature Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages*

Abstract. The article researches how the metaphorical picture of the world is often portrayed through the names of animals in various contexts. The world is closely connected with the names of animals that surround it. From this point of view, the use of the names of the animals in human speech as part of language units, that is, as part of phraseological and paremiological units, has been scientifically researched.

Key words: zoonym, phytonym, zoomorphism, cognitive linguistics, phraseology, phraseological unity, zoometaphor, anthropocentrism, linguistic view of the world.

Introduction. A special field of science – the field of knowing and studying human – emerged coming to the end of the 20th century and the beginning of our century, in many fields of science, including linguistics. This phenomenon is evident in modern science's increasingly comprehensive exploration of the various relationships and connections between humans and the world.

Literature analysis and methodology. Thus, the systematic-structural scientific paradigm was replaced by the anthropocentric paradigm, according to which human is the center of the world, the ultimate goal, the cause of all events occurring in the world, and the main driving force of the construction of the entire world. The new scientific paradigm made human the measure of everything, not only the object, but also the subject of knowledge and placed him at the center of the world. These processes also affected linguistics, making the human a central point in understanding and learning the language. Thanks to the new approach, human becomes the main field in the analysis of certain phenomena, he participates in this analysis, determines its perspectives and final goals. In connection with this, there was a need to move from a superficial study of the language to a deeper knowledge of it, taking into account the dominant anthropocentric paradigm expressed in the works of linguists.

The German scientist W. von Humboldt was one of the first to propose the study of language as a property of a person. He believed that the purpose of learning any language is a person's understanding of himself and his attitude to the world around him, in which any object is related to a person, his perception and thinking [4, 11 p.].

The French linguist E. Benveniste, one of the prominent linguists of the 20th century, also did a lot of work in strengthening the ideas of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics, emphasizing the strong relationship between human and language, saying that language cannot be imagined without a person, and vice versa [2, 195 p.].

The principle of anthropocentrism in Russian linguistics was reflected in the works of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay at the end of the 19th century, in his opinion, phonology is a science dealing only with the sounds of human speech [3, 265 b.]. The scientist also believed that "*language exists*

only in individual brains, only in hearts, only in the psyche of individuals and individuals who make up a certain linguistic society."

Y.S. Stepanov calls the anthropocentric paradigm the main paradigm for modern linguistics and understands the main feature of each language as "speaker's ability to master the language" as "subjectivity" [8, 50 p.].

A.A. Potebnya also speaks about the anthropocentric principle and expresses the opinion that any language can exist only in society, because a person can only live in society, understand the words of the people around him, and be understood by them [6, 40 p.].

Most linguists are of the opinion that the study of any language from a scientific point of view should be carried out with a human factor plan. Thus, the human influence on the language is carried out in two different ways: firstly, the psychological and physiological aspects of the human influence on the language, and secondly, the influence of the human picture on the language characteristics, taking into account his culture, religion, etc., or nationality, mentality is meant.

E.S. Kubrakova states that "scientific objects are studied, first of all, by their role for a person, what they are aimed at, for the development of a person as a person, and their tasks in improving it...", but it requires learning the language in the process of using it in text and discussion. [5, 43 p.].

Cognitive linguistics also adheres to the anthropocentric principle, which reflects the result of human mental activity in language in the process of knowing, realizing, understanding and learning the environment.

Research conducted in recent years has shown that human is the main power of modern linguistics and "the force that determines and strengthens the science of language, and indeed human determines the subject, tasks, methods, approaches and directions of the sciences of linguistics and literary studies. Today, it is difficult to imagine that the study of the language in the development of linguistics is carried out without the human factor, or the period when the science of linguistics was studied "without a person".

In recent years, linguists have come to the conclusion that modern linguistic observation is determined by the principle of anthropocentrism. Sciences of two directions, social and non-social, began to appear: sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, paralinguistics, mathematical linguistics, linguistics and cultural studies, etc.

In general, a person's perception, realizing and understanding of the environment and the world is relative, and the person is at the center of it, and the main socio-cultural concepts and values are expressed in it.

The meaning of the word is determined and studied based on its use in the texts of a large number of works. As a result, it will be possible to see and know what the whole semantics of this or that word means. For effective language learning we are supporters of the cognitive-discursive approach characterized by an anthropocentric approach, referring to pragmatic (discursive) factors.

The linguist Sh.S. Safarov touched upon the issue of "human → language" in his scientific work, and when viewed from an aesthetic point of view in linguistic analysis, a person as a speaker of his native language has the right to be the main object of language: beautiful and ugly, good and bad, smart and stupid, honest and dishonest, ridiculous and tragic [7, p. 53].

In our work, the anthropocentric approach is based on the relationship between human and the animal world, knowledge about which is reflected in the general and linguistic, national and metaphorical lines of the world. From the point of view of the new anthropocentric paradigm, metaphor is an important part of human thinking and many other aspects of human life activity in the cultural sphere. Metaphorization processes occur in every living language, which is a unique feature of natural language as a means of communication. It is for this reason that the metaphorical picture

of the world and various methods of studying this language phenomenon attract the attention of scientists at present.

In this study, the terms anthropomorphism and anthropology, which are related to the term anthropocentrism, are also considered important. Anthropomorphism is a type of metaphor. In our work, the term anthropomorphism is of particular interest, as the images of natural phenomena, creatures, objects, as well as gods, representing human characteristics, have been in the minds of people since time immemorial. People have always paid attention to their similarities with animals. They reflected these similarities in language and noted that these similarities are different in nature.

Noticing the characteristics of animals in himself, he wanted to see his own nature, behavior, and qualities in them. We can clearly see the use of human characteristics, qualities, and nature in language in relation to living things, animals, birds, natural phenomena, plants, i.e. representatives of flora and fauna, in folklore, legends, fairy tales, and works of art.

Any language reflects the objects and events surrounding the environment, names and calls them, embodies and shapes the linguistic picture of the world for the people who speak it in their minds. The term *"picture of the world"*, which appeared at the beginning of the 20th century, was later used in linguistics as a linguistic picture of the world and is understood as a set of objects of the external world reflected in internal images or symbols, which should naturally reflect the essence of the objects.

In modern linguistics, various explanations and interpretations are given to the linguistic picture of the world. In general, a person sees, hears, feels, forms and imagines the world in his mind, so his imagination, understanding is his picture of the world. Linguistic view of the world is the expression of the lines of that world view in language. According to linguist scientists, this concept reflects the characteristics of human existence, its importance in the world, as well as the specific characteristics of its scientific and cognitive activity. Relationships in society, worldview, outlook on life directly depend on a person's view of the world, i.e., language expression of what he sees and knows.

Thus, the picture of the world is a complex multifaceted concept, which is both universal and unchanged for all times and peoples, and at the same time it is diverse in all languages and cultures, reflecting the features of their geographical, historical and cultural development. In other words, the view of the world is the true reflection of the world in people's minds based on their perceptions of the world. In modern linguistics, different views of the worldview are distinguished: philosophical, linguistic, conceptual, scientific, artistic, religious, mythological, phraseological, metaphorical, etc. They are closely related and interconnected. Therefore, the picture of the world can be considered as the information processed as a result of their interaction with the information about the person and the surrounding environment. Each ethnic group, nation, people has its own worldview and knowledge and understanding of the world, and national mentality is the basis of individual and collective consciousness and thinking. The national picture of the world is manifested at different levels of language: in words, phrases, thoughts, sentences, texts, thoughts. The expression of the process of knowledge is done through language. Certain natural conditions, flora and fauna, that is, the environment, cannot help but influence the formation of the world view in the mind of not only a certain person, but also a whole nation. In the course of the cultural and historical development of different peoples, features appeared that influenced the formation of a certain national culture and language, which led to the emergence of a national linguistic picture of the world. This is national identity, which is one of the components of the general picture of the world, and it is manifested in the same behavior of people of the same nationality in standard situations, in their general opinions, thoughts and views about the world around them, in oral speech, colloquial speech.

The national picture of the world as a whole is the correct structure of a people's understanding of the surrounding reality, which expresses national values, traditions, folklore, etc. The national

picture of the world is also the result of the nation's historical development or it includes information about the nature, habitat and way of life of the people: climate, labor activity, flora and fauna. The diversity of all these factors expressed in the language leads to the formation of different perceptions of the world and national pictures with different national values.

Discussion and results.

Thus, each people, nation has its own national linguistic picture of the world, which develops in the human mind gradually in history. In addition, each language reflects a certain worldview that is mandatory for all members of the ethnolinguistic community [1, 13 p.].

Each nation has its own internal linguist capabilities, and it contains its own concepts of a certain worldview and conveys it to all members of the language community. In recent years, scientific research has focused more on the subjective nationality and worldview aspects of the linguistic worldview. It is noted that each language has its own perspective on the world, and that it has characteristic of the people who created this language.

American ethnolinguists Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee believed that language is a way of seeing and perceiving the world around a person through the prism of his native language. Sapir doubted the existence of a deep connection between language and culture, because, as a result of observing natural language speakers, he came to the opinion that "... a common language cannot be the basis for creating a common culture, and geographical, physical and economic determinants are not common" [11, 213 b.].

In linguistics, the term "Linguistic picture of the world (OLM)" includes all information about the surrounding world written in different languages.

The concept of "linguistic picture of the world" has been given different definitions ("world image", "linguistic model of the world", "organization of the world in language", etc.), but the linguistic picture of the world is created using linguistic tools, formed from individual concepts and the national The above-mentioned scientists confirm that it is a common cultural property, that it affects the communicative behavior of a person, his understanding of the world around him, and the inner state of people.

Many opinions have been expressed about the "simplicity" of the linguistic view of the world, which is not as simple as people think, but the perception of the surrounding reality as everyday reality, which differs from the scientific view of the world, which is the same for all languages. At the same time, the "simple" linguistic view of the world often attracts the attention of linguists more than the scientific one, and it is this "simple" linguistic view of the world that is created according to the anthropocentric principle.

R.H. Khairullina comments on the "Linguistic picture of the world" as "a systemically organized model of socially significant symbols, which contains information about the surrounding world, expressed using various linguistic means [9,10 p.]. The golden fund of dictionaries provides information about different periods of the development of the modern language - from the earliest times to the present, it reflects the linguistic picture of the world.

Recently, the term linguistic picture of the world is often used in related humanities such as cognitive linguistics, ethnolinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnopsycholinguistics, language culture. The linguistic picture of the world is like a huge multi-layered building material, each part of which is carefully and attentively described [10, 29 p.]. One of these parts is a group of topics or a lexical set or a sehumantic field.

Thematic group is a group of words belonging to a certain field, close to each other in terms of main semantic content. The semantic field is a hierarchical structure in which the meanings of several lexical units are summarized. Such a structure reflects the similarity of things and events to be represented. The semantic field includes lexical units that have common semantic features and reflect

a specific area of the language. The term "semantic field" is often used as a synonym for lexical-semantic group, thematic group, lexical-semantic paradigm.

One of the main paradigmatic relations in the semantic field is the organization of structural elements based on general relations, i.e. subordination from order to general, from type to family, from bottom to top. Let us analyze the following case, relevant for this study: human ↔ creature - phenomenon of hyponymy: animal, wild animal ↔ human. The word animal is considered a hyperonym, and related hyponyms (or hyponyms) include lion, fox, donkey, horse, sheep, eagle, falcon, whale, shark. Among the words of domestic animals ↔ cattle, donkey, dog, cat, sheep, goat are considered hyperonyms, and hyponyms (adjacent hyponyms) include cow, horse, sheep, goat. Among the names of wild animals, ↔ wolf, bear, lion, tiger is considered a hyperonym, and wolf, bear, lion, tigers are hyponyms for related hyponyms. Hyperonymous creature names can be replaced by the synonym monster. Like hyperonyms, hyponyms have a figurative, metaphorical meaning, compare: an animal is a rude, undeveloped, unintelligent person; mol - rude, careless; wild - cruel, wild person; A fox is a shrew, a cunning person, a snake is a shrew, a sensitive, intelligent person.

In addition to the linguistic view of the world, there is a general view of the world, that is, a set of knowledge about human perception of the world, in which, along with the emotional-cultural, spiritual-cultural, metaphysical views of the world, it is possible to distinguish the objective view of the world and the metaphorical view of the world. .

Animals are a part of living organisms that represent the object-substance picture of the world. The object- substance view of the world is the division of the animal world into concepts in the human mind, that is, the multi-stage and multi-layered process of division of zoonyms into concepts such as "lion", "tiger", "fox". Different languages in the world can have a similar conceptual world view, and it takes into account not only universal, national, but also personal knowledge of the world. The conceptual picture of the world is much richer and wider than the linguistic picture of the world, which is its main link. Not only language, but also his upbringing, education, religion, customs and other social factors affect the formation of the conceptual picture of the world in a person.

For our scientific research, the metaphorical picture of the world has a special place, because the main means of transferring meaning in it is metaphor. The metaphorical picture of the world is important for our study of linguistic meaning transfer as a unique way of figuratively describing the surrounding reality. From the perspective of the anthropocentric paradigm, any transfer of meaning in the language constitutes a metaphorical picture of the world, which is related to the figurative thinking and vocabulary of people who speak a given language, and reflects the national and cultural diversity of artistic means. For example, folk tales, narratives, legends, songs and songs, proverbs and sayings, riddles are among them. In the above situations, observing animals, comparing their habits with human behavior, and trying to find common features and differences between them is precisely appears in the metaphorical picture of the world. Linguists are faced with issues such as determining the nature of the metaphorical picture of the world and determining its place in language.

We contemplate the names of animals related to the object of our research, as they create, shape, and represent the natural environment in which we live, in connection with the culture, civilization, life, and history of the nation. They not only reflect the linguistic landscape and conceptual landscape of the world but also articulate the metaphorical landscape of any national language. A significant, meaningful part of the living existence, which is the rational, conscious part, compares itself with animals because it possesses these abilities. Through observation and comparison of similarities and stark differences between oneself and the animal world, it perceives itself. Most often, humans perceive animals through a zoometaphoric perspective, and this comparison acquires important significance in shaping the linguistic landscape of the world. This analogy enhances linguistic imagery in anthropological evaluation and enhances its expressiveness.

According to the anthropometric principle, the human being is a unit of measurement of what exists in the world, and this process is manifested in the creation of standards or templates, which serve to perceive reality by means of comparison, analogy, and diagnosis. These elements of speech are carefully preserved in the memory of the people, that is why we come across comparisons, diagnoses, proverbs and sayings in different languages with the names of flora and fauna, that is, zoonyms and phytonyms. They are widely used in colloquial speech, dialogic speech, the language of artistic works, journalism and everyday communication processes.

Diagnoses with zoonym and phytonym components, phraseological units and paremiological units always reflect national-cultural ideas of peoples. These show the results of people observing the appearance of plants and the behavior of animals for a long time, often comparing them with themselves, and some character traits are formed as symbols. This forms the worldview of each nation and enriches the language of each nation. The use of plant and animal names in different languages reflects the characteristics determined by the national mentality, culture, and lifestyle of a certain ethnic group and language owners. They have the potential to provide comprehensive information because they can provide a multifaceted description of humanity.

In such cases, we can access the conceptual picture of the world through diagnosis. These tools (phraseological units, paremiological units) are components of the linguistic picture of the world, they are processed in the human mind and form new concepts, new knowledge-evaluation images. For example, in the German language, the phraseological unit *"wie ein Ochs vor dem Tor stehen"* uses the component *"Ochs",* that is, the name of an animal. This zoonym means a domestic animal with large horns and two hooves, but in the figurative meaning it refers to an unintelligent person who lacks wisdom and intelligence. In addition, we must say that the linguistic picture of the world and the metaphorical picture of the world are formed not only by certain lexical units, but also by the use of syntactic constructions (sentences and phrases). In this scientific study, we found it necessary to consider the structural and semantical phraseological units related to the names of plants and animals from the linguistic, cultural and pragmatic point of view. In the linguistic picture of the world, phytonyms and zoonyms of different nations can be divided into three groups based on the degree of similarities and differences in phraseological expressions.

In the framework of our research work, we will consider examples of national and universal concepts related to the names of plants and animals specific to the Uzbek language and their analogues in the German language. Any national language has its own inner and outer world, images of a person that reflect the spiritual characteristics of the nation. Phraseological units with phytonym and zoonym components can be divided into 3 types according to the degree of similarities and differences in the linguistic picture of different peoples:

1) Phraseological units with common phytomorphic and zoomorphic images, the meaning of which is the same for all languages. For example, *A wolf in sheep's clothing. Der Wolf im Schafspelz. No rose without a thorn. Keine Rosen ohne Dornen.*

2) Various phytonyms and zoonyms are used to express meanings with a similar plot. For example, in the Uzbek language *"oʻz moyiga oʻzini qovurmoq" (qoʻy nazarda tutiladi). "to fry someone in someone's own oil" (sheep is considered).* This phraseological phrase in German is *"im eigenen Saft schmoren" (a tomato is considered)* in the figurative sense of being boiled in its own juice. Although it is possible to use various zoomorphisms, the same aspects of human behavior or character are expressed by different speakers, that is, the negative and positive attitudes of a person to these aspects are shown. This group of phraseological units expresses such concepts as *slander, truth, bravery, cowardice, politeness, rudeness, laziness, diligence,* etc. In this case, various phytomorphic and zoomorphic images are used in the same sense as a result of universal human experience and observation of the surrounding reality. For example, unemployment, i.e. idleness, is

expressed in the Uzbek language by the phraseological phrase *"pashsha qoʻrimoq"* "fly swatter", while in German it is expressed by phraseological units such as *Bärehäuter or Faulpelz or auf der Bärehaut liegen*. In addition, laziness, idleness, slowness are understood in the saying *"Olma pish, ogʻzimga tush deb yotmoq"* "Lying under the apple tree, waiting for the apple to fall into one's mouth.".

3) Phraseological expressions with specific national meanings. For example, *"Yozda ninachidek yallo qilib yurmoq" (to fly idly like a dragonfly in the summer - im Sommer wie eine Libelle fliegen.* The uniqueness of FBs of this group is that they are taken from national cultural texts and are based on the positive or negative description of different languages, men and women in different priority qualities, values, character traits of human life, in addition, the same plant or animal can express different characteristics in different cultures, or the same plant or the name of an animal can describe different qualities and characteristics in different nations, or the names of different plants or animals can describe the same features, characteristics and qualities in people. In dictionary contexts, the meanings of words and phrases are given only in general terms. Therefore, there is a need to analyze texts of various genres (prose, poetry, scientific texts) that allow to interpret the meaning of the spoken word, phrase, and word at a very precise level.

As a conclusion we can say that, a large part of the object of study is reflected in narratives, folklore, proverbs, sayings, riddles, and fairy tales, as well as in other sources, indicating that human being shared existence in similar conditions and environments with animals, namely, in the open natural world. There was a notion that human beings are interconnected with plants and animals; in other words, they believed that we share bonds with them. Ancient people thought that animals could communicate and think like peoples, and they even considered themselves to be kin with animals. This serves as the foundation for understanding the meanings and interpretations of animal names.

REFERENCES

1. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Научное и обыденное в языковой картине мира / Н.Ф. Алефиренко // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. Серия: Филология. Искусствоведение. – 2011. – №24 (239). – С. 11–14.
2. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика / под ред. и с вступительной статьей и комментарием Ю.С. Степанова / Э.Бенвенист. – М.: Прогресс,1974. – 448 с.
3. Бодуэнде Куртенэ И.А. Избранные труды по общему языкознанию. / И.А. Бодуэнде Куртенэ; вступ. ст. действ. чл. АНСССРВ. В. Виноградова и действ. чл. Польск. акад. наук В. Дорошевского. – М.: Изд-воАНСССР,1963.– 384с.
4. Гумбольдт В. Язык и философия культуры / В. Гумбольд; пер. с нем. М.И.Левиной [идр.]. – М.: Прогресс, 1985.–451с.
1. 5. Кубрякова Е.С. Язык и знание: на пути получения знаний о языке: части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языкав познании мира / Е.С. Кубрякова; Рос. Акад. наук. Ин-т языкознания. – М.: Яз. слав. культуры, 2004. – 560с.
5. Потебня А.А. Мысльи язык / А.А. Потебня. –М.: Правда,1989.– 203 с.
6. Сафаров Ш.С. Когнитив тилшунослик. – Жиззах: Сангзор нашриёти, 2006. – 96 б.
7. Степанов Ю.С. Методы и принципы современной лингвистики / Ю.С. Степанов. – М.: Наука, 1975.– 313с.
8. Хайруллина Р.Х. Картина мира в русской фразеологии (в сопоставлении с башкирскими параллелями) / Р.Х. Хайруллина. – М.: Прометей,1996.– 147с.
9. Яхшиев А.А. Немис тили оғзаки нутқи тизимида фразеологик бирликларнинг семантик-дискурсив мақоми. Филология фанлар доктори (DSc) диссертацияси автореферати. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ нашриёти, 2021. – 74 б.
10. Sapir E. Language: An introduction to the study of speech / E. Sapir. –Harcourt; Brace, 1921. – 213-214 b.