===

COMPARATIVE TYPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF METAPHOR AND METONYMY IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Sohibjonova Mariya
Master's student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Scientific supervisor: **M.Sh. Salohiddinov**
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Senior teacher, PhD

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ABSTRACT:

This study presents a comparative typological analysis of metaphor and metonymy in English and Uzbek, focusing on their cognitive, semantic, and stylistic features. Drawing on examples from literary texts, media discourse, and common speech, the research identifies both universal conceptual patterns and language-specific realizations. The analysis demonstrates that English metaphors and metonymies are often conventionalized, standardized, and oriented toward social, spatial, and temporal domains, while Uzbek figurative expressions rely heavily on natural imagery, emotional states, and culturally specific social and literary contexts. The study highlights the role of metaphor and metonymy in reflecting human cognition and cultural values, and emphasizes their importance in translation, language teaching, and intercultural communication. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic variation and the interplay between language, thought, and culture

===

==

Introduction

Metaphor and metonymy are central phenomena in modern linguistics, cognitive studies, and stylistics, playing a crucial role in the expressive and conceptual functions of language. These linguistic mechanisms not only enrich semantic expression but also facilitate nuanced communication by allowing speakers to convey abstract ideas through concrete or figurative representations. In cognitive linguistics, metaphor and metonymy are regarded as fundamental tools for structuring human thought, reflecting how individuals perceive and categorize their experiences (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2010). Comparative typological analysis of metaphor and metonymy enables researchers to identify both universal patterns and language-specific features, revealing how different linguistic and cultural contexts shape conceptualization. While English has been extensively studied in terms of metaphorical and metonymic structures, less attention has been devoted to Uzbek, a Turkic language with rich agglutinative morphology and distinct semantic strategies. Investigating these phenomena in both languages allows for a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic variation, cognitive representation, and stylistic usage.

Literature review

The study of metaphor and metonymy has a long-standing tradition in both linguistic and cognitive research. Lakoff and Johnson's seminal work Metaphors We Live By (1980) laid the foundation for the cognitive approach to metaphor, emphasizing that metaphors are not merely stylistic devices but essential mechanisms for human thought and conceptualization. Following this perspective, Kövecses (2010) further explored the interaction between metaphor, culture, and emotion, highlighting the role of cultural models in shaping metaphorical structures. These studies provide a theoretical framework for understanding metaphor as a cognitive and communicative phenomenon. Metonymy, on the other hand, has been examined extensively in structural, cognitive, and typological contexts. Researchers such as Panther and Radden (1999) and Barcelona (2000) have distinguished between metaphorical and metonymic mappings, demonstrating that metonymy operates on contiguity and association rather than similarity, which characterizes metaphor. This distinction is crucial for comparative linguistic studies, as it allows for precise classification of figurative expressions across languages.

Comparative studies focusing on English and Turkic languages, including Uzbek, are relatively scarce. While English metaphors and metonymies have been well documented in literary, journalistic, and conversational corpora (e.g., Gibbs, 1994; Steen, 2010), research

==

==

on Uzbek metaphorical and metonymic structures is limited. Existing works (e.g., Karimova, 2015; Tursunova, 2018) have examined metaphor in Uzbek literature and oral discourse, emphasizing culturally specific imagery and idiomatic expressions, but these studies rarely apply a comparative or typological perspective. Moreover, cross-linguistic analyses highlight significant differences in metaphorical and metonymic strategies. For example, English often employs conceptual metaphors based on spatial, container, or force schemas (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), whereas Uzbek metaphors frequently rely on natural, social, and traditional cultural domains. Similarly, metonymic patterns in English, such as part-for-whole or producer-for-product, may have distinct realizations in Uzbek due to morphological and syntactic differences. These observations underscore the importance of conducting systematic comparative typological research to uncover both universal tendencies and language-specific features.

Results and discussion

Comparative analysis of metaphor

English metaphors frequently draw on physical, social, and abstract experiences to structure meaning. Examples include life is a journey, ideas are food, or he exploded with anger, which map conceptual domains of movement, consumption, and force onto abstract experiences such as personal development, cognition, or emotional states. Literary English uses metaphors extensively, as seen in Shakespeare's All the world's a stage, which conveys life as a performative and transient experience. In modern media, metaphors like the economy is recovering its strength or she climbed the corporate ladder use embodied and social conceptualizations to describe abstract economic or social processes. English metaphors often display conventionalization, which allows speakers to communicate complex ideas efficiently without ambiguity.

Uzbek metaphors, however, exhibit a strong preference for natural, social, and culturally grounded imagery. Expressions such as hayot — daryo (life is a river) not only convey the idea of life as a continuous, unpredictable process but also evoke a sensory experience tied to the Uzbek cultural landscape. Literary metaphors like ko'ngil gul ochdi (the heart bloomed like a flower) and yurakdan kelgan gap (a word from the heart) demonstrate the deep integration of emotional and natural imagery, reflecting both aesthetic and cognitive dimensions. Proverbs and oral traditions, e.g., Tog'dan pastga tomgan suv ham tog'ni o'zgartirmaydi (Even water flowing from the mountain does not change the mountain), combine metaphorical imagery with moral and cultural lessons, illustrating how metaphor

==

functions simultaneously as cognitive mapping and socio-cultural encoding. Comparing the two languages, both English and Uzbek utilize metaphors to map abstract domains onto concrete experiences, yet the domains differ in salience. English favors spatial, temporal, and economic domains, whereas Uzbek emphasizes natural phenomena, human emotion, and social or moral values. Furthermore, English metaphors tend to be lexicalized and formulaic (climbing the corporate ladder, breaking the ice), while Uzbek metaphors allow greater contextual flexibility and stylistic variation, reflecting oral and poetic traditions. This difference suggests that while metaphor is a universal cognitive mechanism, the choice of source domains and stylistic strategies is strongly influenced by cultural priorities and communicative norms.

Comparative analysis of metonymy

In English, metonymy commonly relies on institutional, social, and physical contiguities. For instance, the White House announced uses a building to represent political authority, while Hollywood produces blockbuster films substitutes a place for the industry it hosts. Part-for-whole metonymy appears in expressions such as all hands on deck, where "hands" stand for people involved in a task. Metonymic expressions often serve pragmatic functions, allowing speakers to condense complex ideas into accessible, culturally intelligible references. English metonymy is characterized by a high degree of conventionalization, particularly in media, bureaucratic discourse, and idiomatic expressions, which reflects the social and institutional context of usage.

Uzbek metonymy, by contrast, reflects cultural and literary patterns. For example, darvozadan kirish (entering through the gate) refers to participating in a social or formal gathering, metaphorically linking the object (gate) with a social action. Expressions such as o'qchi vilkasi bilan gapirdi (spoke with the archer's fork) convey indirect criticism or social maneuvering through a culturally grounded idiom. Another example, kitob boshida yozilgan (written at the beginning of the book), metonymically refers to official authorship or decree, highlighting the interplay between linguistic structure, cultural knowledge, and social convention. While Uzbek employs similar metonymic patterns as English—such as part-for-whole or container-for-contained—their surface realization, frequency, and stylistic effects differ. Uzbek metonymy tends to be more poetic, contextually rich, and culturally specific, whereas English relies on institutional and socially conventionalized forms. Overall, the comparative analysis demonstrates that metaphor and metonymy, while underpinned by universal cognitive mechanisms, manifest differently across languages due to cultural,

==

stylistic, and structural factors. Metaphors in English often prioritize lexicalization and conventionality to facilitate pragmatic clarity, whereas in Uzbek, metaphors are more flexible, emotive, and culturally resonant. Similarly, metonymy in English is institutional and standardized, while in Uzbek it is context-sensitive, literary, and culturally anchored. The interplay of cognition, culture, and language in both metaphor and metonymy underscores the importance of typological and cross-linguistic studies, which contribute to our understanding of figurative language, translation, and intercultural communication.

Conclusion

The comparative typological analysis of metaphor and metonymy in English and Uzbek demonstrates that, despite underlying universal cognitive mechanisms, the two languages exhibit distinct patterns shaped by cultural, stylistic, and structural factors. English metaphors tend to be conventionalized, lexicalized, and oriented toward social, spatial, and temporal domains, facilitating efficient communication in literary, journalistic, and everyday discourse. In contrast, Uzbek metaphors frequently draw on natural phenomena, emotional states, and culturally specific social contexts, reflecting the oral, poetic, and traditional aspects of the language. Similarly, metonymy in English often relies on institutional, social, and physical contiguities, showing a high degree of standardization and pragmatic function. Uzbek metonymy, however, demonstrates greater cultural specificity, poetic imagery, and context-dependent usage, linking linguistic forms with social norms, literary traditions, and cultural knowledge. Both languages employ common conceptual patterns such as part-for-whole, container-for-contained, and producer-for-product, yet their surface realization and stylistic effects differ considerably.

References

1. Barcelona, A. (2000). Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

2. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3. Karimova, N. (2015). Metaphor in Uzbek literature: Cultural and cognitive aspects. Tashkent: Fan.

4. Kövecses, Z. (2010). Metaphor: A Practical Introduction (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

==

==

5. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

6. Panther, K.-U., & Radden, G. (1999). Metonymy in Language and Thought. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

7. Steen, G. J. (2010). A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

8. Tursunova, D. (2018). Cultural specificities of metaphor and idioms in Uzbek language. Tashkent: National University Press.

==