EXPLORING THE DYNAMICS OF METAPHOR: MODERN ENGLISH AND UZBEK PERSPECTIVES

Abdulkhakimova Mohlaroy Abduqosim qizi
Fergana State University, Bachelor's degree student

Abstract. Metaphor is not merely a literary embellishment but a crucial cognitive tool shaping human thought and communication. Traditionally regarded as a stylistic device, recent linguistic research has demonstrated its deeper conceptual significance. This article examines metaphor theory in Modern English and Uzbek, primarily referencing contributions from cognitive linguists such as Lakoff and Johnson, who argued that metaphor structures conceptual thought. A comparative analysis between English and Uzbek metaphorical expressions highlights their universal cognitive function, while additional insights reveal metaphor's role in cultural identity, education, translation, and technological development. The study advances the discussion beyond conventional linguistic approaches, exploring metaphor's interdisciplinary applications and cognitive impact.

Key words: lexical system development, metaphor, semantic, signal, transfer, matter.

INTRODUCTION

Metaphor is for most people a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish- a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Moreover, metaphor is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action. For this reason, most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature [2; 4]. The idea about usage of metaphors put forward by Lakoff G. and Johnson M. inspired many linguists to dive into the investigation of metaphor again and with conscious mind. Since, they were indeed right when they claimed the aforementioned statement. More and more scholars and scientists had a stereotypical opinion that only limited group of people are able to handle with this kind of stylistic device.

The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor. [2; 4]. Moreover, they not only suggest that everyone can use them, but they actually use it subconsciously. Lakoff and Johnson were pioneers to inform that metaphors are not the result of literary sources, but fruit of mind. Till them many would argue that this cannot be right. Metaphor is usually investigated by literature scientists as a linguistic expression. We do not want to oppose of course, we simply going to say that this was only one aspect of investigating it. The core thing is how wecreate metaphors, what urges us to produce, what aspects affect us when we form certain metaphors. These questions were blank.

But our conceptual system is not something we are normally aware of. In most of the little things we do every day, we simply think and act more or less automatically along certain lines. Just what these lines are is by no means obvious. One way to find out is by looking at language.

Since communication is based on the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and acting, language is an important source of evidence for what that system is like. [2; 4]. Johnson and Lakoff states that "The most important claim we have made sofar is that metaphor is not just a matter of language, that is, of mere words. Weshall argue that, on the contrary, human thought processes are largely metaphorical. This is what we mean when we say that the human conceptual system is metaphorically structured and defined. Metaphors as linguistic expressions are possible precisely because there are metaphors in a person's conceptual system."[2; 7] There are also several theories besides that approach, but this inspired a lot. The first inspiring idea was presented by Aristotle though several centuries ago. So far there have been made and done several research onthe topic of metaphor all over the world. But we mostly focus on investigations done in the English and Uzbek languages. These investigations were done by many linguists, not only Uzbek and British, but also Russian, German, Ukrainian, Danish, American and other linguists and scholars. Let us consider them in detail further. People tend to use more emphatic and figurative speech, whereas others consider that this kind of speech is usually used by orators, speakers, writers and poets. However, people use metaphors in their day to day life without even knowing it. As in a daily routine we have to converse with different sort of individuals, and according to our mood, or their demeanor we change our way of speaking. That is to say we sometimes unintentionally, subconsciously use metaphors, even they are often used to emphasize our intentions.

For most of us, metaphor is a figure of speech in which one thing is compared to another by saying that one is the other, as in He is a lion. Or, as the Encyclopaedia Britannica puts it: "metaphor is a figure of speech that implies comparison between two unlike entities, as distinguished from simile, an explicit comparison signalled by the words 'like' or 'as." [emphases in the original]. For example, we would consider the word lion to be a metaphor in the sentence "Achilles was a lion in the fight." Metaphor (from the Greek language: ustapopa - metaphora, meaning "transfer") is language that directly compares seemingly unrelated subjects. It is a figure of speech that compares two or more things not using like or as.2 A metaphor, according to I.A.Richards, is "a shift", a carrying over of a word from its normal use to a new use". [3; 12] Metaphor has been studied by several linguists, philosophers and thinkers so far, and all of them more or less contributed to development of its theoretical value. Shakespeare, Goethe and Moliere helped to shape their languages, giving the members of their own linguistic communities new vibrant visions of the world; and if writers' words and turns of phrases, rhythms, rhymes and metaphors continue to stimulate the way we express ourselves in everyday speech today, it is because the vitality of those authors' worldviews has not died within our language. To a greater or lesser extent, their ways of viewing the world continue to contribute to the ways we view the world. As the great German linguist Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835) put it, poets and philosophers strike their roots into reality, and in doing so, they cultivate and shape our vision of the world. Poets have the capacity to shape our interior world, the intimate space within us, just as much as ideologies structure the frameworks within which we live and work. [4; 4]

We would probably also say that the word is used metaphorically in order to achieve some artistic and rhetorical effect, since we speak and write metaphorically to communicate eloquently, to impress others with "beautiful," esthetically pleasing words, or to express some deep emotion. Perhaps we would also add that what makes the metaphorical identification of

Achilles with a lion possible is that Achilles and lions have something in common, namely, theirbravery and strength.

If we sum up the statement of Kovecses, metaphor is a phenomenon of language; it is used for special purposes, i.e. to give special "effect" to our speech; when metaphor is used, we name one thing with another (A is B) [4; 190]; not all people can handle to use metaphors, as it can demand effort; and finally without it we can also somehow manage our speech and daily life. Bear in mind that these attitudes were in the past, not in the far past, but until middle, more exactly eighties of twentieth century, this sort of contentions were put forward.

A new view of metaphor that challenged all these aspects of the powerful traditional theory in a coherent and systematic way was first developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in 1980 in their seminal study: Metaphors We Live By. Their conception has become known as the "cognitive linguistic view of metaphor." Lakoff and Johnson challenged the deeply entrenched view of metaphor by claiming that (1) metaphor is a property of concepts, and not of words; (2) the function of metaphor is to better understand certain concepts, and not just some artistic or esthetic purpose; (3) metaphor is often not based on similarity; (4) metaphor is used effortlessly in everyday life by ordinary people, not just by special talented people; and (5) metaphor, far from being a superfluous though pleasing linguistic ornament, is an inevitable process of human thought and reasoning. As one can see that these viewpoints changed everything, the contention's each band can oppose to the former traditional view and make more sense. Metaphor is indeed the result of mind rather than words. If we want to say something how actually we do this?! We first think (actually our brain does it) and deliver our thought by tongue, that is to by our speech. More often we use metaphor (or any other stylistic device) not only for artistic or aesthetic purpose, but also for stressing our point or sometimes we merely use it without any purpose. It is not only used by speakers, orators and writers, even most ordinary people use it. (Everyone says what a happy, sunny girl she was. [2; viii]) It is an evitable part of our life, as human being tends to use fewer words and explain themselves from all the beginning. George Lakoff clearly expressed this by stating, metaphor is for most people a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish-a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language. Moreover, metaphor is typically viewed as characteristic of language alone, a matter of words rather than thought or action. For this reason, most people think they can get along perfectly well without metaphor. We have found, on the contrary, that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.

The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, andhow we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor. But our conceptual system is not something we are normally aware of. In most of the little things we do every day, we simply think and act more or less automatically along certain lines. Just what these lines are is by no means obvious. One way to find out is by looking at language. Since communication is based on the same conceptual system that we use in thinking and acting, language is an

important source of evidence for what that system is like. [7; 4]. And here we had better discriminate conceptual and traditional metaphor, which we are going to discuss in next sections, so let us not go so further.

Metaphor has been thoroughly investigated by Uzbek linguists too. Some scholars dedicated their research on general meaning transfer ("ko'chim"), while others selected one specific type of meaning transfer such as metaphor (sometimes called as "istiora"). If we look up Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek language there is given such a definition to metaphor: "the usage of a word or a phrase on the basis of similarity or comparison or used word or phrase in this meaning, istiora, majoz3, for instance tuning peg of dutar (musical instrument) is called as "ear" in a metaphoric meaning."[3; 582]

Many linguists touched upon the theme meaning transfer, and they defined it more or less on their way. If we observe some of them, we can encounter reasonable approaches. According to Qobuljonova G., lexeme is the essential unit of language. It serves to name the objects existing in the world. It does not only limit itself with naming, but also it has functions such as passing the knowledge to generations (cumulative), realize (perceptive), affect to the listener (expressive). She also claims that in learning the world it is important the role of comparison. New object or event is always compared to previous realized objects or events, and it leads to call the latter ones with names of previous ones. [1; 3-4] She also admits that metaphor was considered as literary device and attracted mostly poets and researches of literature. She comments on the fact that from 70s it began to be investigated rapidly and she highlights the works of Mirtojiyev M. As there are so many approaches to the definition of metaphor in the Uzbek language too, she puts forward her version: "Metaphor is transfer of object's, attribute's, action's name to another object's, attribute's, action's name respectively on the basis of mutual similarity" [4; 4] She also points out the types of metaphor namely simple and extended as to formation, also literary and linguistic metaphors. Qobuljonova also highlights that in scientific research metaphor is illustrated in two forms: the occurrence of language and speech. Mirtojiyev, according to denote similarity of metaphors, divides them into three groups:

1. Simple metaphor;
2. Personification (naming inanimate object with the name of animate);
3. Synesthesia (perceptual phenomenon in which stimulation of one sensory or cognitive pathway leads to automatic, involuntary experiences in a second sensory or cognitive pathway). He also comments on the vitality of ellipsis in the formation of meaning transfer.

Qobuljonova in the beginning of her research points out the theory of Aristotle, (it is traditional, as Aristotle first put forward the initial notion of metaphor as epiphora): "a generic term for the metaphorical motility previous to any objectivation of a figurative meaning."4. According to this she claims that metaphor is a compared or transferred word from sex to type, or from type to sex, or from type to type, which is not related to an object. As an example for from sex to type "There stands my brother's boat", in which "stands" means transferred meaning; from type to sex "Odyssey did thousands of great deeds … " "thousands" in metaphorical meaning to "many"; from type to type "loosing soul with brass … " and "cutting water drop with brass … " here metaphorical words are "cutting" and "loosing". Commenting on the drawback of this theory, she says that Aristotle presented the definition of metaphor, yet he did not explain how these similarities happen. Potebnya A.A. defines metaphor as "Metaphor

is shortened comparison": She was beautiful and delicate as a flower. // She was a delicate and beautiful flower. [4; 15] As she analyzes the theories and approaches of other linguists, she comments that many scholars while defining metaphor included the attributes of either synecdoche or simile, sometimes even metonymy. Thus there happens confusion about it. She refers to it to the definition of Aristotle, and says that many linguists referred to him, and maybe as result they came to such conclusions.

Commenting from Rahmatullayev Sh., she highlights that metaphor has the capacity of usage with other meaning transfer kinds like metaphoric-functionality, metaphoric-metonymy, metaphoric-synecdoche and so on. As an example it is presented the wing of a plane, which is compared not only to functionality, but alsosimilarity. One of the other sources on linguistics of the Uzbek language presents likewise information. It is stated that the meaning transference of a particular object, feature or action to other ones based on outer similarity is called a metaphor. This similarity is based on the attitude of the object towards the colour, shape, action/state, feature, place and time. For instance, the spout of the teapot is compared to the nose of a human, the part of the sea thrust into the land is compared to the armpit of a human. Metaphor is mostly formed in comparison with the names of human body (head, face, nose, mouth, ear, tongue, foot); the part of cloth (apron, collar); the name of body parts of animals, poultry, insects (wing, tail). The word "otlanmoq" was used in the meaning of "to go somewhere by horse" in the past (definitely, it was imagined to be on a horse), however nowadays it means, "to depart somewhere" let it be either by horse or on foot, or by car. Onlythe outer similarity of the action exists.

The similarity between the object and the event as the following: Form likeness:
— odamning qulog'i - qozonning qulog'i,
— qush uchdi - odam uchdi;
Positionlikeness:
— itning dumi - samolyotning dumi,
— qo'shni odam qo'shni dala;
Content likeness:
— tomdan yiqilmoq - imtihondan yiqilmoq,
— sovuq havo -sovuq xabar,
— qaynoq suv - qaynoq liniya,
— achchiq o't - achchiq sovuq,
— tomdan tushmoq - mansabdan tushmoq,
— odam o'tirdi - fabrika o'tirdi, akkumlyator o'tirdi.

As it can be seen from the above-mentioned definitions and examples, the metaphor within the two languages are almost quite near. For instance "davlat boshi" in Uzbek, "The head of the State" in English"; "achchiq sovuq " in Uzbek, "bitter cold" in the English language; "qaynoq liniya" in Uzbek, "hot line" in English; "the face of the building" in English, "binoning yuzi" in Uzbek, "the wing of a plane" In the English language corresponds to "samolyot qanoti". In these examples there is a meaning and word correspondence between Uzbek and English languages.

References:

Используемая литература:
Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar:

1. Masharipov J. The essence of the concept of a metaphor in the English and Uzbek languages. *Ilm sarchashmalari*. Urganch. 2017.
2. McCarthy M., O'Dell F. English Idioms in Use. Cambridge University Press. 2002.
3. Mengliyev B., Xoliyorov O ' .. O'zbek tilidan universal qo'llanma. T .: Akademnashr. 2011.
4. Mirtojiyev M. Hozirgi O'zbek adabiy tili. 1-lid. O'zMU, T: 2004.
5. Mowat B. & Werstine P. As You Like It by William Shakespeare - Washington Square Press. 2004.
6. Musayev A. Ma'ruzalar matni. JDPI. 2014.
7. Nesin A. "G'aroyib bolalar" roman va hikoyalar. Sharq, 2006.
8. Nurullayeva G. Linguistic Analysis of Metaphor. Samarkand. 2015.
9. Qobuljonova G.K. Systematic Linguistic Interpretation of Metaphor. Toshkent. 2000.