



IMAGERY IS A COMPONENT OF THE CONNOTATION OF THE NOMINATIVE UNIT

N.A.Nematova,

Navoi State Pedagogical Institute

Article history:	Abstract:
Received: 3 rd April 2023 Accepted: 6 th May 2023 Published: 6 th June 2023	This article focuses on the importance of nominative units found in the speech of the hero in fiction. The national connotativeness of the images used in the speech is discussed in the translated work. The theories of our scientists who conducted scientific research in this regard have been thoroughly studied.
Keywords: proverbs, phraseological units, nominative units, expression, feelings, translated works, linguistic.	

The language that man uses not only fixes the world, but also explains what is fixed. In his speech, he conveys his thoughts to others through nominative units, that is, through proverbs, and phraseological units. In the process of such interpretation, a person includes an emotional component. Phraseological units occupy a special place among the means of verbal expression of feelings. Phraseologisms are fixed, inseparable phrases. In the general theory of phraseology, the works of certain scientists, including V. V. Vinogradov, B. A. Larin, V. N. Teliya, N. N. Amosova, A. V. Kunin and others, occupy an important place. In Uzbek linguistics, this problem is reflected in the scientific works of Sh. Rahmatullaev and Z. Uraksin. But even today, it is observed that the emotionality of current Uzbek phraseological units has not been sufficiently studied in translated works. The method of component analysis and description methods are used in the study of word semantics, the study is supplemented by the stylistic method and the method of psychological analysis. Image is the basis of many phraseological units. Hayduk defines imagery as "vitality, clarity, brightness of the image, an integral feature of any art, a form of understanding the surrounding reality from the point of view of a certain aesthetic ideal." As you can see from the definition, the concept of "image" is not only used in linguistics. The scientist understands imagery as "a semantic component that actualizes figurative representations, representations associated with a certain word and through it a phenomenon called this word with a certain object." As can be seen from the definition, representations have a specific nominative character and are based on it. Therefore, figurativeness as a semantic phenomenon occurs as a direct meaning of a word, as a previous meaning of a word, as a figurative meaning of a word. The idea of imagery, as well as other components of connotation, is not well established in modern linguistics. The controversy of this category is mainly due to the fact that it is fundamental to psychology, philosophy, literary

criticism and art studies. In each discipline, the term "image" interacts with a number of other special concepts, which, on the one hand, help to get into the essence of this multifaceted phenomenon, and on the other hand, make it difficult to understand.

There are two concepts of imageness in linguistics. The first is that the image as a feature of the artistic speech primarily related to the use of visual means was developed by T.G. Vinokur, A.D. Grigoryeva, L.I. Ibraev, I.S. Kurakhtanova, S.M. Mezenin interprets metaphors, epithets, comparisons, paraphrases. Imagery through expressions such as "beauty of language", "richness of language", "variety of speech", "brightness of presentation", "accuracy, accuracy of word usage", and figurative speech is "bright". It is explained by features such as "colorful", "visual", "descriptive", "colorful", "expressive". With this approach, the feature of imagery for language units is usually not recognized. In particular, S.M. Mezenin understands the literary image as a specific and at the same time generalized image of human life with an aesthetic meaning [1].

According to the author, language units - morphemes, words, phrases do not have an image, they are only a means of embodying a literary image.

The second concept is related to the attempt to understand imagery as a linguistic phenomenon. At the same time, from a number of linguists, Blinova O.I. 1983, Zagorovskaya O.V. 1983, Kruglikova L.E. 1988, Chijik-Poleiko A.I. 1962 believe that all important words in the language are image and consider them to be of lesser degree of imageness.

In semantics, a narrow approach to the study of language imagery is widespread, according to which the range of language figurative units can be limited. Usually figurative and non-figurative words and phraseological units are distinguished (the latter may occasionally express figurativeness in the context). In addition, their differentiation is based on the understanding of a particular image.



On the one hand, the image is a metaphor in the narrow sense, which consists in using a unit denoting a certain class of objects to describe and name another object that is similar to data from any point of view, Arutyunova N.D., Glukhov V.M., Korolova A.L., Nazaryan A.G., Solodub Y.P. Cherdantseva T.Z. is interpreted. Such imagery is based on the semantic duality of meaning: the obligatory interaction of the main and auxiliary subjects of the metaphor. Therefore, the word eagle, which is the name of a bird, can be used as a characteristic of a person who traditionally has the qualities of an eagle (courage, vigilance, etc.). The interaction between the main subject (man) and the auxiliary (birds) creates its semantic duality. The two images are combined to create an image.

On the other hand, imageness is related to the presence of an internal form in linguistic units Potebnya A.A., Alefirenko N.F., Kunin A.V. Teliya V.N.; Kharchenko V. K. the most promising approach in modern linguistics is to approach the internal form as a link between onomasiological and semasiological signs of nominative units.

The internal form is understood as the morpho-semantic structure of a word or phraseological unit (considered at the synchronic level), which shows the logic of the connection of its meaning with the sound shell on the basis of one root and one interdependence of structural units. defines. Words with a metaphorical internal form (phraseologisms), in which the semantic duality of the metaphor is realized.

Consequently, the interpretation of the image as an internal form is broader and includes the previous approach, because the auxiliary subject of the metaphor is understood as one of the types of internal form - lexical motivation. This understanding of the image is very convincing and is generally accepted in our work. So, imageness, in our understanding, is a component of connotation, which expresses a general integrated, visual image of a certain real object, event, characteristic attached to a language unit using an internal form accepted by native speakers. At the same time, the perception of the usual imagery in the sentence, as noted by V. N. Teliya, is reduced to a certain extent: "For example, when a person is called a donkey, the speaker concentrates, and the listener does not perceive a natural object as himself.

REFERENCE

1. Mezenin S.M. 1983, стр. 50, 56

2. Аверьянова И.Е. Прагматика и типология коммуникативных единиц русского языка о прагматическом значении перевода / Под ред. А. Я. Алексеева. - Днепропетровск: Днепропетровское изд-во. университет_1989. - С. 116-119. л
3. Адлер Э. Внутренняя форма слова УУЛЛингвистический энциклопедический словарь УТТ под ред. В. Н. Ярцева. - М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1990. -Стр. 85-86.
4. Азнаурова Е.С. Коммуникативно-прагматический аспект лексического значения слова УУ Коммуникативный аспект значения слова УУ, изд. В. И. Шаховский. - Волгоград: Волгоградское издательство. пед. вуз 1990. - С.23-29.
5. Азнаурова Е.С. Прагматика художественного слова. - Ташкент: Издательство «Наука» Узбекской ССР, 1988. - 119 с. 4
6. Виноградов В.А. Диглоссия // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / Под ред.
7. В. Н. Ярцева—М.: Сов. Энциклопедия, 1990. - С.136.
8. Виноградов В.В. Русский язык (грамматическое обучение Слову). - М.: Высш. шк., 1986. - 639 с.
9. Винокур Г.О. Избранные произведения по русскому языку. — М.: Учпедгиз, 1959. — 492 с.
10. Винокур Т.Г. Спикер и слушатель. Варианты речевого поведения. - М.: Наука, 1993. - 172 с.
11. Нокур Т.Г./ Закономерности стилистического употребления языковых единиц. - М.: Наука, 1980. - 238 с.
12. Винокур Т.Г. О содержании некоторых стилистических понятий // Стилистические исследования (на материале современного русского языка) / Под ред. В.Д. Левин. - М.: Наука, 1972, - С. 7-106.
13. Винокур Т.Г. Использование языка как основной предмет стилистики // Стилистика русского языка: Жанрово-коммуникативный аспект стилистики текста / Под ред. А. Н. Кожина. - М.: Наука, 1987. - С.5-39.