



**JOURNAL OF ADVANCED
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**

ISSN: 0976-9595

Editorial Team

Editorial Board Members

Dr. Hazim Jabbar Shah Ali

Country: University of Baghdad , Abu-Ghraib , Iraq.

Specialization: Avian Physiology and Reproduction.

Dr. Khalid Nabih Zaki Rashed

Country: Dokki, Egypt.

Specialization: Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries.

Dr. Manzoor Khan Afridi

Country: Islamabad, Pakistan.

Specialization: Politics and International Relations.

Seyyed Mahdi Javazadeh

Country: Mashhad Iran.

Specialization: Agricultural Sciences.

Dr. Turapova Nargiza Ahmedovna

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Specialization: Art and Humanities, Education

Dr. Muataz A. Majeed

Country: INDIA

Specialization: Atomic Physics.

Dr Zakaria Fouad Fawzy Hassan

Country: Egypt

Specialization: Agriculture and Biological

Dr. Subha Ganguly

Country: India

Specialization: Microbiology and Veterinary Sciences.

Dr. KANDURI VENKATA LAKSHMI NARASIMHACHARYULU

Country: India.

Specialization: Mathematics.

Dr. Mohammad Ebrahim

Country: Iran

Specialization: Structural Engineering

Dr. Malihe Moeini

Country: IRAN

Specialization: Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology

Dr. I. Anand shaker

Country: India.

Specialization: Clinical Biochemistry

Dr. Magdy Shayboub

Country: Taif University, Egypt

Specialization: Artificial Intelligence

Kozikhodjayev Jumakhodja Hamdamkhodjayevich

Country: Uzbekistan

Senior Lecturer, Namangan State University

Dr. Ramachandran Guruprasad

Country: National Aerospace Laboratories, Bangalore, India.

Specialization: Library and Information Science.

Dr. Alaa Kareem Niamah

Country: Iraq.

Specialization: Biotechnology and Microbiology.

Dr. Abdul Aziz

Country: Pakistan

Specialization: General Pharmacology and Applied Pharmacology.

Dr. Khalmurzaeva Nadira - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Japanese Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Mirzakhmedova Hulkan - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Iranian-Afghan Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Dilip Kumar Behara

Country: India

Specialization: Chemical Engineering, Nanotechnology, Material Science and Solar Energy.

Dr. Neda Nozari

Country: Iran

Specialization: Obesity, Gastrointestinal Diseases.

Bazarov Furkhat Odilovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Tashkent institute of finance

Shavkatjon Joraboyev Tursunqulovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Namangan State University

C/O Advanced Scientific Research,

8/21 Thamostraran Street,

Arisipalayam, Salem

DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE CONCEPTS OF METAPHOR AND SIMILE AND THEIR USE IN LANGUAGE

Nurmuratova Xilola Yashinovna

Teacher, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

Abstract: This article provides an overview of the different uses of the word, the difference between simile and metaphor, and the basic meanings of words that express certain concepts and subtle meanings that express other aspects of the word, figurative meanings and figurative uses of words.

Keywords: comparison, metaphor, florionym, equivalent, metonymy, comparison, semantics, speech, language units, phrases

INTRODUCTION

Comparison means different things: the study of two objects to see their similarities and differences, that is, comparison is to pay attention to the similarity of objects and the expressive characteristics of one object to another one. This idea was put forward by Dj. Jakof and M. Johnson.

There are different opinions about comparison, for example, according to Whatley, it can be considered as a phenomenon that differs only in form from metaphor. For example, comparison emphasizes similarities, while metaphors suggest. J.B. Black says that a metaphor is a comparison, which means that the comparison is supported by words.

For example, "Jane is a rose" is metaphorically translated as "Jane is beautiful", which is roughly equivalent to that meaning, i.e. "Jane is like a rose" (in being beautiful). Jane is being compared to a rose in her beauty, and both examples are using metaphorical emphasis rather than literal equivalence. But from the point of view of comparison, this requires a complete paraphrase, since the emphasis is on both Jane and the rose. Comparison again compares objects, concepts only separately, that is, in a situation. Thus, only one defining meaning can be indicated in a metaphor. For example, "He is a real nut" means "he is a real nut". In the comparison of the defining quality of the florionim, the basis on which the

comparison is made, that is, the precise meaning of the sign, becomes important. For example, "You are as fair as a lily" - "Сен нилуфар гулидек беғуборсан." As can be seen here, there are two types of semantic components.

In metonymization, for example, the relationship between the part and the whole is indicated. «...She was flower-faced...».

Thus, in our work for metaphor, we have shown similarities that create a general impression: depending on the form, age, characteristic sign, metonymy, which manifests the phenomenon of transferable meanings, the relationship between the whole and the part is determined by the transfer of meaning, cause, result, and situation. Comparison, on the one hand, the more convincing and clear its figurative basis is, on the other hand, the more precise the comparison is, the greater its impact power, the more effective and clear the casual comparison is in relation to the existence of a real basis.

There is also a semantic difference between language and speech designations, in general florionyms, that is, it is manifested in the simple sign of language metaphor. For example, "kisel": a) sticky mass; b) an indecisive, weak person; "nut": a) plant, fruit; b) short-sighted and stupid person, etc.

In the case of an artistic metaphor, things that are completely different from each other are brought closer in terms of meaning, and this action does not give the metaphor the character of imagery, that is, here the metaphor does not perform the communicative function, but defines its artistic-aesthetic function. The interrelationship of categories of figurative meaning (metaphor, metonymy and comparison) of the analyzed materials in different languages can be given in the form of a table.

Languages	Types of contextual meaning			
			Compa	Tot
English	2000	280	720	300
Uzbek	1000	180	820	200
Total	3000	460	1540	500

According to the above table, the difference between florionyms in terms of semantic structure and metaphorical units is not great. According to this table, it is possible to determine the level of occurrence or use of florionyms in one or another nomination of figurative meaning.

It is known that language has general, universal meanings. These general meanings are given in a similar way in different languages, but at the same time, expressing general meanings, they are divided into functions related to the degree of isomorphism with national-cultural characteristics.

Semantics considered as a special level of language.

The modern theory and practice of structural linguistics is based on the principle of isomorphism of language levels.

Professor J. According to Boranov, the problem of universalization of language signs is one of the important issues of contemporary comparative typology, and it is unlikely that this problem will be completely solved in the near future.

This problem applies to both areal and genetic typology, but the former is limited to a specific geographical area, while the latter deals with genetically related languages.

For example, while analyzing the semantic structure of the florionyms "calabash" and "pumpkin", we can determine the presence of similar differential schemes. "Calabash" in English has the following meanings, that is, "short understanding", "pumpkin head"; In the Uzbek language, "pumpkin" has the same meanings as in the English language, and this phenomenon can be observed not only in these words, but also in other words.

It can also be said that, as mentioned above, the similarity of the semantic structure of florionyms is observed not only in related languages, but also in apparently unrelated languages. But florionyms and differential symbols that represent human characteristics do not always match. We tried to show the compatibility or inconsistency of florionyms characterizing a person in different languages in the form of a table (see Chapter II), where microgroups of florionyms

are defined by specific patterns that distinguish them from florionyms that are combined within certain groups.

Of course, the development of such a table for practical use is a complicated process, but despite this, we tried to show that florionyms in each language can be different, and this difference means a nationally specific view of knowing the world in them. This means that different peoples may use the names of different florionyms to describe human nature or activities.

For example, in Great Britain and America, the use of different types of flowers and their names, i.e. "rose", "lily", "daisy", "violet", etc., to describe a person, or rather a woman, is typical of this area, and this is the vocabulary of that language. indicates the richness of its composition.

Or, for example, "bean", "nut", "potato" etc. in the English language have differential meanings such as "fool", "crazy mind", but such florionyms in the Uzbek language do not have such meanings, and they occupy a peripheral position, the above mentioned meanings and in the Uzbek language it is represented by other florionyms.

CONCLUSION

As can be seen from the above examples, comparative analysis is required to reveal isomorphism and national-cultural characteristics. In order to reveal similar national-cultural features, we tried to use not only explanatory dictionaries of famous authors of the two languages, but also dictionaries based on their dialectal words.

References:

1. Jakoff. G, Johnson. M. Metaphors we live by Chicago. University of Chicago press. 1980
2. Black JB, Turner NJ, Bower JH. Point of view in negative comprehension, memory and production-journal of verbal learning and verbal "behaviour". 1879
3. Buranov Dj. Sravnitel'naya typology of English and Turkish languages. Izd. High school. Moscow, 1983