ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

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

Author: **Sokhibjonova Mariya Sur'atovna**

Address: Samarkand, St. Bogdad, 17

Telephone: +998 90 618 15 43

E-mail: mariyasokhibjonova@gmail.com

Affiliation: Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Scientific supervisor: **Shamuradova Naima Muhtarovna**

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23375352

Abstract: This article presents a comparative typological analysis of metaphor and metonymy in Uzbek and English. The study examines these figures of speech not only as stylistic devices but also as important mechanisms of conceptualization, semantic extension, and communication. Particular attention is given to the structural and semantic principles underlying metaphorical transfer and metonymic association, including similarity, contiguity, part-whole relations, container-content relations, place-institution relations, and the use of human experience as a source of figurative meaning. The comparison demonstrates that both Uzbek and English frequently develop figurative meanings from bodily experience, nature, social relations, and everyday objects, although culturally specific associations may lead to different lexical realizations. The article also considers the difficulties involved in translating figurative expressions between the two languages. The findings indicate that successful translation requires recognition of the conceptual relation behind an expression rather than mechanical substitution of individual words. The study contributes to comparative linguistics, cognitive semantics, translation studies, and foreign language teaching.

Keywords: metaphor, metonymy, comparative typology, Uzbek, English, cognitive semantics, figurative language, translation

Introduction

Figurative language is an essential component of natural communication because speakers regularly use familiar concrete experiences to describe abstract concepts, emotions, social relations, and intellectual activities. Among the most productive mechanisms of figurative meaning are metaphor and metonymy. Although both may result in semantic extension, they are based on different principles. Metaphor generally involves understanding one conceptual domain through another on the basis of perceived similarity or analogy, whereas metonymy establishes a relationship between concepts that are closely associated within the same experiential or conceptual domain.

The comparison of Uzbek and English is especially valuable because the two languages belong to different linguistic and cultural traditions. English, as a Germanic language with a highly productive modern vocabulary, contains numerous conventional metaphors that have become part

of ordinary lexical usage. Uzbek, as a Turkic language, also demonstrates extensive metaphorical and metonymic productivity, frequently drawing on bodily experience, family relations, agriculture, nature, traditional objects, and social practices. The existence of similar human experiences does not, however, guarantee identical figurative expressions. A concept may be conceptualized through different source domains in the two languages.

The purpose of this study is to identify major similarities and differences in metaphorical and metonymic meaning formation in Uzbek and English. The research addresses four questions: what conceptual relations motivate figurative meanings in each language; which metaphorical and metonymic patterns are shared; where cultural differences become visible; and what strategies can be used when translating figurative expressions between Uzbek and English.

Literature Review

The modern study of metaphor was strongly influenced by the cognitive approach developed by Lakoff and Johnson, who demonstrated that metaphor is not restricted to literary decoration but is deeply involved in everyday thought and language. Their analysis of conceptual metaphors such as ARGUMENT IS WAR and TIME IS MONEY showed that recurring linguistic expressions may reflect systematic mappings between conceptual domains. This approach made it possible to study metaphor as a cognitive phenomenon rather than simply as a rhetorical figure.

Metonymy has also received extensive attention in cognitive linguistics. Unlike metaphor, which normally connects different conceptual domains, metonymy operates through conceptual contiguity. Common patterns include PART FOR WHOLE, WHOLE FOR PART, PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT, PLACE FOR INSTITUTION, and CONTAINER FOR CONTENT. Such relations are particularly productive because speakers can identify one entity through another entity that is closely associated with it.

Studies of figurative language in Turkic languages indicate that metaphorical meaning is frequently motivated by physical experience and culturally familiar objects. Uzbek expressions associated with the heart, head, eye, hand, road, light, darkness, and natural phenomena demonstrate how concrete vocabulary can acquire abstract meanings. English shows comparable tendencies, although the conventional combinations and lexical choices are not always equivalent. This difference is particularly significant for translators and language learners.

Despite the substantial literature on metaphor and metonymy, a combined comparative analysis of their structural, cognitive, cultural, and translation-related properties in Uzbek and English remains useful for language pedagogy. The present study therefore treats metaphor and metonymy as interconnected mechanisms of semantic organization while maintaining the distinction between similarity-based and contiguity-based mappings.

Methodology

The study applies a qualitative comparative-typological approach. Representative figurative expressions in English and Uzbek are examined according to four parameters: semantic motivation, conceptual relation, degree of conventionalization, and possible translation equivalent. The analysis distinguishes between expressions whose figurative meaning is relatively transparent and conventionalized expressions whose original motivation may no longer be immediately noticeable to speakers.

The examples are used to demonstrate recurring patterns rather than to establish quantitative frequency. Metaphorical expressions are analysed in terms of source and target domains, while

metonymic expressions are classified according to the type of association connecting the two concepts. Translation examples are evaluated according to semantic equivalence and naturalness rather than formal similarity.

Metaphor in English and Uzbek

Metaphor allows speakers to understand an abstract or less familiar concept through a more concrete experiential domain. A common example in English is the expression “a warm welcome”. The adjective warm, originally associated with physical temperature, is mapped onto a social experience and expresses friendliness. Uzbek likewise uses temperature and physical sensation vocabulary metaphorically, including expressions in which warmth is associated with kindness and emotional closeness. The shared conceptual motivation reflects a common human experience, although the exact collocations may differ.

Body-part vocabulary provides another productive source domain. English uses expressions such as “the head of the department”, “the heart of the city”, and “the eye of the storm”. Uzbek also extends the meanings of words for body parts to social, spatial, and abstract concepts. For instance, bosh can refer not only to the physical head but also to the beginning, top, or leader of an organized group. This illustrates how bodily experience provides a highly productive conceptual basis for lexical polysemy.

Spatial experience is another major source of metaphor. English speakers describe improvement as “going up” and decline as “going down”, as in “prices went up” or “the temperature fell”. Uzbek similarly uses vertical and spatial concepts to describe changes in quantity, status, and condition. Such parallels suggest that certain conceptual metaphors may have a strong experiential basis and therefore recur across unrelated languages.

Nevertheless, not all metaphors are universal. Cultural experience influences the choice of source domain and the emotional evaluation attached to it. Historical traditions, occupations, food, clothing, landscapes, social institutions, and folklore can create metaphorical associations that are particularly recognizable to members of one speech community. Consequently, a metaphor that is conventional in Uzbek may require explanation or a different metaphor when translated into English.

Metonymy in English and Uzbek

Metonymy differs from metaphor because the relationship between the literal and figurative meanings is based primarily on association rather than cross-domain similarity. One of the most productive patterns is PLACE FOR INSTITUTION. In English, “Washington announced a new policy” does not normally refer to the physical city as the speaking agent; Washington metonymically represents the relevant political administration. Similar uses occur with institutional places in Uzbek, although the conventional names and contexts of such expressions may differ.

Another productive pattern is PRODUCER FOR PRODUCT. English uses expressions such as “I bought a Picasso” to refer to a work produced by Picasso. Uzbek can also identify an object through its maker, author, or associated person, especially in contexts involving literature, art, food, and manufactured products. The interpretation depends on shared contextual knowledge between speaker and listener.

PART FOR WHOLE is equally important. English expressions such as “we need more hands” use a body part to refer to workers or people. Uzbek also makes extensive use of body-part terms in

expressions describing people, actions, and social roles. Such patterns demonstrate that metonymy is closely connected with the human tendency to use salient features of an entity as a means of identifying the whole entity.

Container-content metonymy provides another example. In English, “The whole classroom was laughing” can refer to the students in the classroom rather than to the physical room. Uzbek permits comparable contextual shifts, where a place, container, or collective location can stand for the people or objects associated with it. These examples demonstrate that metonymy frequently depends on contextual interpretation and pragmatic knowledge.

Comparative Analysis of Metaphor and Metonymy

The comparison reveals three major areas of similarity. First, both languages use concrete everyday experience as a basis for expanding lexical meaning. Body parts, movement, spatial orientation, temperature, nature, and objects are productive sources of figurative expressions. Second, both languages contain conventionalized figurative meanings that speakers may perceive as ordinary vocabulary rather than deliberate stylistic devices. Third, context is essential for distinguishing literal from figurative interpretation.

The principal difference lies in the type of conceptual relationship. Metaphor generally creates a mapping between two domains, for example from physical movement to intellectual progress. Metonymy instead links elements within a conceptual frame, such as a place and an institution, a producer and a product, or a part and a whole. In actual discourse, however, the two mechanisms can interact. A conventional expression may contain both metaphorical and metonymic motivation, which makes rigid classification difficult in some cases.

Another difference concerns cultural conventionalization. A conceptual pattern may be shared by Uzbek and English but realized through different lexical items. Conversely, an expression can have an apparently similar form in both languages but carry different pragmatic or cultural associations. Therefore, comparative analysis should consider not only whether an expression has a figurative counterpart but also whether the counterpart produces the same cognitive and emotional effect.

Translation and Cross-Cultural Problems

Figurative expressions represent a particular challenge for translation because their meaning is often greater than the sum of their lexical components. A literal translation can preserve individual words while losing the conceptual association that makes the original expression meaningful. For this reason, translators commonly use four strategies: retaining an equivalent metaphor; replacing it with a culturally appropriate metaphor; using a non-figurative paraphrase; or explaining the figurative meaning when cultural knowledge is essential.

For example, an English metaphor based on sports may be understandable to Uzbek readers but may not have an equally conventional expression. A translator can search for an Uzbek metaphor with the same communicative function rather than reproduce the sports vocabulary. Conversely, Uzbek expressions rooted in traditional culture, family relations, food, or folklore may require a different English image or a short explanatory translation.

Metonymy creates a related problem. Because metonymic expressions depend on culturally shared associations, the same place, institution, object, or social symbol may not activate the same meaning for readers of another language. Successful translation therefore requires identification of the intended referent and the relation between the literal expression and that referent.

Cultural and Cognitive Aspects

The comparative evidence supports the view that figurative language reflects both universal human experience and culture-specific conceptualization. Physical embodiment creates recurring patterns: people experience vertical movement, temperature, physical proximity, bodily sensations, and spatial boundaries. These experiences can motivate similar metaphors in languages that are historically unrelated. At the same time, culture determines which experiences become especially salient and which associations become conventional.

In Uzbek, figurative meaning is frequently connected with social relationships, respect, family structure, traditional occupations, natural surroundings, and culturally established concepts of character and behaviour. English also contains culturally specific figurative systems, but the dominant conventional expressions reflect the historical development of English-speaking societies and their institutions. Comparative study therefore offers insight not only into vocabulary but also into the conceptual organization of cultural experience.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings have important implications for teaching English to Uzbek-speaking learners. Figurative expressions should not be taught exclusively as lists of idioms. Students need to recognize the conceptual relation that motivates an expression. Teachers can begin with transparent metaphors based on body parts, movement, space, and physical sensation, and then progress to conventional and culturally specific expressions.

A useful classroom technique is to present English and Uzbek expressions in pairs and ask learners to identify whether the relationship is based on similarity or association. Students can then identify the source and target domains of metaphors or the two associated entities in metonymies. Translation tasks can require learners to choose between literal translation, equivalent figurative expression, and paraphrase. Such activities develop semantic awareness and reduce word-for-word translation.

Teaching figurative language through context is particularly important because many expressions have multiple interpretations. Learners should analyse surrounding words, register, speaker intention, and cultural background. This approach can improve reading comprehension, academic writing, translation competence, and communicative fluency.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis demonstrates that metaphor and metonymy are productive mechanisms of semantic extension in both Uzbek and English. Both languages rely extensively on bodily experience, spatial relations, nature, objects, and social experience to develop figurative meanings. These similarities reflect common aspects of human cognition. At the same time, the lexical realization of figurative concepts is influenced by culture, history, social practices, and conventional patterns of each language.

The central distinction is that metaphor is primarily based on a conceptual mapping between domains, while metonymy is based on association or contiguity within a conceptual frame. Recognizing this distinction helps explain why certain expressions have close equivalents across languages while others require substitution or paraphrase. It also demonstrates that figurative meaning cannot be adequately analysed at the level of individual words alone.

For translation and language teaching, the main implication is that figurative competence requires more than vocabulary knowledge. Learners and translators must understand the conceptual and

cultural motivation of an expression and determine how that meaning is conventionally communicated in the target language. Further research could use parallel corpora to compare the frequency of metaphorical and metonymic patterns across literary, journalistic, academic, and conversational Uzbek and English, providing additional evidence for cross-linguistic and cross-cultural semantic analysis.

References

1. Barcelona, A. (Ed.). (2000). Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective. Mouton de Gruyter.
2. Cruse, D. A. (2004). Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.
3. Goossens, L. (1990). Metaphtonymy: The interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action. Cognitive Linguistics, 1(3), 323–340.
4. Kövecses, Z. (2010). Metaphor: A Practical Introduction (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
5. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press.
6. Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor. University of Chicago Press.
7. Radden, G., & Kövecses, Z. (1999). Towards a theory of metonymy. In K.-U. Panther & G. Radden (Eds.), Metonymy in Language and Thought. John Benjamins.
8. Ullmann, S. (1962). Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. Basil Blackwell.