



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF METAPHORS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERARY WORKS

Author: Berdiyeva Zilola ¹

Affiliation: Nordic International University, Master's student ¹

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19651943>

ABSTRACT

The research shows metaphor not only as an artistic decoration, but also as a cognitive mechanism. The article analyzes examples from Harper Lee's "To Kill a Mockingbird" in English, as well as metaphorical units of an artistic and phraseological nature in the Uzbek language. The results of the analysis showed that in English literature expression of a social or mental state through body parts while in Uzbek literature, metaphors expressing emotional tension, suffering, the power of social influence.

Keywords: metaphor, cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, embodied thinking, image-scheme, English literature, Uzbek literature, comparative analysis.

INTRODUCTION

For a long time, metaphor was interpreted mainly as a stylistic or poetic phenomenon. However, with the emergence of cognitive linguistics, the attitude towards metaphor has fundamentally changed. According to this approach, language is a mirror of human thinking, and the study of language means the study of conceptualization processes. Language reflects human experience and the structure of thought; therefore, metaphor is not an external ornament of the word, but a conceptual mechanism that allows one to understand abstract concepts based on concrete experience. One of the central principles of cognitive semantics is that the conceptual structure is embodied, and the semantic structure is inextricably linked with the conceptual structure. Moreover, meaning does not end with lexical boundaries; it has an encyclopedic nature and is built in context. Therefore, to understand metaphor, it is necessary to refer not only to the words in the text, but also to a person's physical experience, knowledge about the world, and cultural experience. Conceptual metaphor theory interprets metaphor as mapping between the source domain and the target domain. Usually, an abstract concept is constructed with the help of relatively concrete, sensory experience. For example, time can be understood through movement, quantity through height, emotional proximity through spatial proximity. In the text of Evans and Green, the construction of abstract domains with concrete experience is also shown through such examples as "Christmas is fast approaching," "The number of shares has gone up," "a very close friendship."

The relevance of this article lies in the fact that the analysis of metaphors in English and Uzbek literature from a comparative-cognitive point of view serves to reveal the commonalities and differences in the methods of conceptualization of the

world of the two languages and two cultures. Especially in the language of the literary text, metaphor is the point of intersection of the cognitive model and the aesthetic goal. In this regard, this research is aimed at illuminating the relationship between literary text, language thinking, and culture. The purpose of this article is to conduct a comparative analysis of metaphorical units found in English and Uzbek literature based on cognitive linguistics, to reveal their conceptual basis, and to show the connection of these metaphors with embodied experience, image-schemes, and cultural conceptualization.

METHODS

This study was conducted qualitatively and used methods of comparative-semantic and cognitive-conceptual analysis. The following principles of cognitive linguistics were taken as a theoretical basis: language reflects patterns of thinking; semantic structure is related to conceptual structure; meaning has an encyclopedic character; meaning is built in context; metaphor structures the abstract purpose domain through a specific source domain; and image-schemes form the experimental basis of such mapping.

RESULTS

As a result of the analysis, several main conceptual types of metaphors in English and Uzbek literature were identified. In metaphors of English literature, the concept of animation and action is strong. In the unit "the ceiling danced with metallic light," a movement characteristic of a human or living being is imposed on the ceiling. Here, the inanimate object is depicted as a moving subject. The cognitive basis of the metaphor is that visual vibration, the flickering of light, and dynamism in space are conceptualized in the human mind through a "dance" scheme. Thus, in this unit, the mapping of VISUAL DYNAMICS occurs. In the example "I saw a muscle jump in his skinny jaw," the "jump" of the muscle represents a real physiological micro shaking through an enhanced motor model. Here, internal psychological tension appears as an external bodily movement. So, the EMOTIONAL TENSION - UNEXPECTED ACTION model works. This is based on cognitively embodied experience, because a person experiences emotional strain. In English examples, metonymy and metaphor intersect. In the example of "Walter Cunningham's face told everybody...," the word "face" becomes the entry point representing the entire internal, social, and health state of a person. On the one hand, this is a metonymic structure: YUZ - SHAXS/HOLAT. On the other hand, through the expression "told everybody," the body part is interpreted as a communicating subject, that is, personification is also activated. So, here metaphor and metonymy are interconnected. Cognitive linguistics views metonymy as an access mechanism within one domain, and metaphor as an interdomain mapping; this unit is precisely the point of intersection of these two mechanisms. In Uzbek literature, emotional state is more expressed through substance, filling, and trauma. The unit "o'pkasi to'ldi" is one of the strongest emotional metaphors in the Uzbek language. In this unity, inner feeling, grief, resentment, or anger are structured through the filling of the physical vessel. Here, the main conceptual model manifests itself in the form of FEELING - SUBSTANCE IN A VESSEL, more precisely, BODY - VESSEL, EMOTION - INTERNAL FILLING SUBSTANCE. From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, such a structure goes back to the CONTAINER image-scheme. A person experiences their

body as a limited space; therefore, abstract states such as love, anxiety, anger, grief are expressed through physical experience, such as "being inside," "filling," "exiting." In the unit "you will make your heart bleed," emotional pain has an artistic model, enhanced by the injury of the internal organ and its transformation into blood. The MODEL OF PSYCHOLOGICAL TORMENT - PHYSICAL INJURY works here. The bleeding of the heart is not literal, but conceptualizes spiritual suffering with the experience of physical trauma. This model is strongly connected with embodied experience, since physical pain is one of the most accurate, tangible experiences for a person. In Uzbek metaphors, social influence is expressed through spatial or physical expansion. In the unit "qo'li uzun," social influence, opportunity, and power are expressed by the spatial extension of the body part. Here is the POWER/ORTIMANITY - LONG-RUN MODEL. In this case, the "hand" is not only a physical organ, but also a means of influence. The metaphor expresses social possibility through the experience of spatial reach. This unit has strong social semantics as a cultural-conceptual model in the Uzbek language. In the example of "their requests would not be ignored," the non-acceptance of the request is expressed through "being ignored." So, here we observe the model "UNACCEPTED APPEAL - WHAT REMAINS BELOW." In this case, vertical space is important: climbing up means a positive result, while staying on the ground means non-fulfillment or rejection. This corresponds to the VERTICALITY scheme in cognitive semantics; the abstract social result is conceptualized by a spatial state. The English and Uzbek languages have a common cognitive basis. In the material of both languages, the understanding of abstract situations with the help of physical experience manifested itself as a general law. This confirms the view of cognitive linguistics that "abstract concepts are structured based on concrete experience." Abstract domains such as time, emotion, social status, mental strain, and evaluation are expressed through movement, vessel, altitude, body part, and spatial directions. Difference: in English examples, observational visuality is stronger, in Uzbek examples, internal-emotional density is stronger. In English examples, the focus is mainly on visual observation, the animation of an external sign, and signals on the surface of the body, while in Uzbek examples, internal experiences, psychological trauma, social influence, and relationships are expressed more through internal-organic or spatial metaphors. This difference can also be related to cultural-pragmatic priority: in English artistic expression, the external scene and the observed detail are stronger; in Uzbek expression, emotional inner depth, social connection, and phraseological density are stronger.

DISCUSSION

Analysis shows that metaphor in English and Uzbek literature serves not only as an aesthetic tool, but also as a conceptual mechanism of thinking. This result coincides with the main claims of cognitive linguistics: language reflects the patterns of human thinking; meaning is built in the word not in a ready-made form, but in the process of conceptualization; and metaphorical meaning is the result of interdomain mapping.

Table 1.

| Nº | Feature of metaphor | English | Uzbek | Cognitive Model | Explanation |
|----|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | Personification | <i>the ceiling danced</i> | | Human action | A non-living object is described as acting like a human |
| 2 | Motion-based | <i>muscle jumped</i> | | Motion | Inner feelings are shown through movement |
| 3 | Metaphor Metonymy interaction | <i>face told everybody</i> | | metonymy + metaphor | Feelings are understood as something filling the body |
| 4 | Container metaphor | | <i>o'pkasi to'ldi</i> | Substance in container | Feelings are understood as something filling the body |
| 5 | Physical injury metaphor | | <i>yuragini qon qilmoq</i> | Emotional pain Physical damage | Emotional suffering is described as physical harm |
| 6 | Power as reach | | <i>qo'li uzun</i> | Physical reach | Influence is understood as the ability to reach far |

The first important aspect is that the metaphors of both languages are based on embodied experience. Uzbek units such as "*o'pkasi to'ldi*," "*yuragini qon qilmoq*," "*qo'li uzun*," "*iltimosi yerda qolmoq*," and English units such as "*ceiling danced*," "*muscle jump*" transfer experiences about sensation, movement, body, space, and tension to an abstract spiritual or social content. This clearly shows the role of image-schemes - in particular, such schemes as CONTAINER, MOTION, FORCE, VERTICALITY - in literary thinking. The second aspect is that the cultural features of metaphors are preserved. Cognitive linguistics, on the one hand, recognizes the ability of universal human conceptualization, and on the other hand, does not deny interlingual variation. The theoretical source you uploaded also emphasizes that cognitive linguistics predicts significant interlingual differences along with general patterns. So, although there are common cognitive foundations of metaphorical thinking in English and Uzbek, it is natural that which domains are artistically activated differ depending on the culture. The third aspect is the interconnection of metaphor and metonymy in some compounds. The example of "*Face told everybody*" is a vivid example of this. Such situations complicate the semantic layer of the literary text and force the reader to interpret it more based on encyclopedic knowledge, social experience, and context. This means that cognitive semantics "meaning is encyclopedic" and "meaning construction depends on context."

The fourth aspect is that metaphorical units in the Uzbek language appear to be largely phraseologized and fixed in cultural memory. Units such as "*qöli uzun*," "*öpkasi töldi*," "*iltimosi yerda qoldi*" function not only in a single text, but also as ready-made conceptual models of the language community. In English examples, some metaphors are closer to contextual poetic novelty, that is, the power of the author's image is more dominant. This difference is connected with the peculiarity of the literary style and phraseological tradition.

CONCLUSION

The research results showed that metaphor in English and Uzbek literature manifests itself as a deep conceptual mechanism of human thinking. From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, metaphor is a universal means of thinking that allows

one to understand abstract content through concrete, physical, and experiential domains. This approach helps to move metaphor from the level of a simple poetic decoration and interpret it as a central semantic phenomenon at the intersection of thought, experience, and culture. A comparative analysis of the English and Uzbek material gave two important conclusions. Firstly, metaphorical conceptualization in both languages reflects common human cognitive mechanisms based on embodied experience. Secondly, the concrete realization of metaphors is determined by cultural, linguistic, and stylistic features. In English examples, figurative personification and semantic activation of the external sign are more noticeable, while in Uzbek examples, emotional inner state, mental anguish.

REFERENCES

1. Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
2. Lee, H. *To Kill a Mockingbird*.
3. A. Qahhor. (2013, p-44). *Asror bobo*. Davlat ilmiy nashriyoti.
4. O'. Hoshimov, 2019; 4). *Daftar hoshiyasidagi bitiklar*. G'afur G'ulom Nashriyoti.
5. *Philology Matters / ISSN: Berdiyeva, Z. A comparative analysis of metaphor in english and uzbek literary work*. 2025 y.
6. Berdiyeva, Z. (2025). A comparative study of English and Uzbek body metaphors. *Tilshunoslikning nazariy va amaliy masalalari*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15166751>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15166751>

