

*Sharafutdinova Dilrabo*

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

*Group: Linguistic 5*

**Research advisor:** Safarova Zarina Giyosovna

*Comparative analysis of metaphor in the english and uzbek languages*

**Annotation:** This article is about the problems of lexicology and stylistics in linguistics, which studies the metaphor that is one of the important devices of the language. It finds out unique and universal features of the metaphor in English and Uzbek languages.

**Key words:** metaphor, metonymy, stylistic device, cumulative, expressive, perceptive, English and Uzbek languages.

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. 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. Johnson and Lakoff states that “The most important claim we have made so far is that metaphor is not just a matter of language, that is, of mere words. We shall 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.” Up until most recently, metaphor has been primarily studied by philosophers, rhetoricians, literary critics, psychologists, and linguists, such as Aristotle, Hume,

Locke, Vico, Herder, Cassirer, Buhler, I. A. Richards, Whorf, Goodman, Max Black, to mention just a few names from the thousands of people who have done work on metaphor over the past two thousand years. Today, an increasing number of cognitive scientists, including cognitive linguists, engage in the research on metaphor. The reason is that metaphor plays a role in human thought, understanding, and reasoning and, beyond that, in the creation of our social, cultural, and psychological reality. Trying to understand metaphor, then, means attempting to understand a vital part of who we are and what kind of world we live in. 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, majoz, for instance tuning peg of dutar (musical instrument) is called as “ear” in a metaphoric meaning. As one can observe metaphoric word or phrase in one language cannot commensurate with the same meaning transfer in another one. Like in above mentioned example, we say “ear” of dutar, rubab and things like that, whereas in the English language they call it tuning peg, in its turn there is also metaphor, as they call hook, usually something to hang on it, as a peg.

As mentioned 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. [41; 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 Mirtojijev 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”. Qobuljonova also highlights that in scientific research metaphor is illustrated in two forms: the occurrence of language and speech. Mirtojijev , according to denotate 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.”<sup>4</sup> . 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. 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.

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

1. Arnold I.V. (1986). The English Word. Moskva: Visshaya shkola.
2. Ayvor A. Richards. (1990). Metafora [Metaphor]. Teoriya metafora [Theory of Metaphor]: Sbornik: Per. s.ang.,fr., isp., pols., yaz. / Vstup. St. i sost. N.D.Artyunovoy; Obsh. red. N.D.Artyunovoy i M.A.Jurniskiy. Moskva: Progress.
3. Bally Ch. (1961). Fransuskaya stilistika [French stylistics]. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Innostranniye Literaturi.
4. Croft W., D.Alan Cruse. (2004). Cognitive Linguistics. New York by Cambridge University Press. 85 2019 Vol. 29 No. 2. Series: LINGUISTICS
5. Friedrich Ungerer, Hans-JorgSchmid. (2006). An introduction to cognitive linguistics. Second edition. Great Britain: PEARSON LONGMAN.
6. Glaser, R. (1988). The grading of Idiomaticity as a Presupposition for a Taxonomy of Idioms, in Hullen, W. and Schulze, R. (Eds.). Understanding the Lexicon: Meaning, Sense and World Knowledge in Lexical Semantics. Tubinger: Niemeyer, 264-279.
7. Goossens L. (1990). Metaphonymy: The Interaction of metaphor and metonymy in figurative expressions for linguistic action. // Cognitive Linguistics. – Berlin; New-York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1 (3), 323-340.