SEMANTIC MODELING OF METAPHOR IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Hazratqulova Muborak Rajabovna,

Assistant teacher

Iqtisodiyot va Pedagogika Universiteti, Qarshi City,

e-mail: hzratkulovamuborak@Gmail.com

+998994239778

ANNOTATION

In this scientific paper, the semantic modeling of linguistic metaphor units is thoroughly studied in English and Uzbek. Metaphors have been described based on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory and a Kövecses (2005) cognitive semantic model through mapping between the source and target domain, conceptual structuring/structure, semantic extension mechanisms, and cultural aspects. The study takes the reader into extremely deep research into the commonalities, differences and culturally based peculiarities of metaphors that represent emotion, time, intellect, social relations and human character in English and Uzbek languages to a greater extent.

Keywords:metaphor, semantic modeling, conceptual metaphor, cognitive semantics, cultural specificity.

ANNOTATION

This work conducts in-depth semantic modeling of metaphor in English and Uzbek. Utilizing Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) and Kövecses's cross-linguistic framework (2005), the research investigates the construction of the mapping between source and target domain, the internal conceptual model of

metaphors, the semantic extension mechanisms, and the relevance of cultural knowledge as factors of metaphorical interpretation. The study mainly concerns metaphorical representational patterns of emotion, cognition, time, social status and human character in both languages by examining cross-linguistic models in both languages, demonstrating universal patterns, with an emphasis on body representations and cultural models in metaphoric selection and semantic fine distinctions.

Key words: metaphor, semantic modeling, conceptual domain, cross-linguistic metaphor, cultural cognition.

ANNOTATION

The article provides in-depth analysis on semantic models of metaphor modeling in English and Uzbek languages. Based on the conceptual metaphor theory of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Kövecses (2005) and cross language model of them, the researchers demonstrate the mapping process between source and target, inner framework of metaphors, semantic extrapolation, as well as the impact of cultural factors on the construction of metaphorical meanings. The conceptual metaphors of experience, perception, life, time, social order, and human nature are examined, and reveal general and culturally conditioned differences.

Keywords: metaphor, semantic modeling, concept-based domain, cross-cultural semantics, cognitive metaphor.

Introduction

Metaphor has been described for years as one of the most potent tools for human thought and human communication. Metaphors, far from serving as mere decorative decorations, are considered a basic cognitive process by which people form a structure for their world-based experience. Based on the cognitive linguistic paradigm, metaphor is conceived not as an aberration but as a recurrent and prevalent structuring of thought that emerges from human embodiment. In this regard, metaphors are a key way in which abstract, immaterial, or emotionally ambiguous concepts can be made real by connecting them to real-world (sensory) experience. Here, we consider the semantic model approach to metaphors in English and Uzbek to uncover both patterns of generalisation and localized mapping methods. In this sense, semantic modeling is the method through which conceptual domains are systematically identified and relations, semantic components, and cultural motivations for forming metaphors are mapped. Using metaphors linking emotions, cognition, time, social relations and character traits, the present research aims to identify the manner in which English and Uzbek speakers construct meaning through metaphor and the ways these models mirror cognitive and cultural worlds.

Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) developed by Lakoff and Johnson maintains that metaphors are constituted by embodied experience and result from frequent mappings of source-to-target categories. For example, the physical sensation of rising temperature as anger occurs, underlies the metaphor ANGER IS HEAT universally. Semantic modeling in the framework includes finding (1) the source domain, (2) the target domain, (3) the kind of mapping, and (4) the context (cultural or experiential background) to the mapping [1, 45]. Kövecses builds on this hypothesis, showing that although a great number of metaphors are universally applicable because of analogous human physiology, great cross-linguistic variation comes from cultural preference, local ecological knowledge, and divergent symbolic relationships [3, 74]. For two languages, in other words there is a conceptual metaphor which can be the

same, while different lexical realizations, semantic intensity, or culturally specific implications can mean a different thing. One of these is that although English and Uzbek both view anger as heat, they have different lexical choices, and they may at times add cultural meanings to these expressions. Semantic modeling also investigates the phenomena of semantic extension related to metaphor use, including generalization, specialization, and associative transfer. This is the kind of thing that makes the metaphorical connotation expand, contract or shift with cultural adoption and communicative requirements. It is such theoretical principles which direct a comparative framework described in this study.

Both English and Uzbek depict a plethora of emotion metaphors corresponding to the universal body experience. The ubiquitous use of heat metaphors for anger illustrates how the human physiology underlies metaphor. Expressions such as He is boiling with anger and U jahldan qaynab ketdi also show parallel mappings, where increasing internal heat suggests rising emotional intensity. Similarly, sadness is represented in heaviness in our minds: a heavy heart in English corresponds to og'ir dard in Uzbek. It is this mutual perception of emotional suffering as a weight too that gives rise to shared emotional patterns both in culture and for our own thoughts. Semantic modeling, however, indicates that universal metaphors can sometimes turn out to have different shades of meaning. Depression in English is usually treated metaphorically as a downward movement (feeling down) and in Uzbek more metaphors are used to describe emotions including the dark (ko'ngli qorong'i), reflecting the preferences that exist between people in various cultures.

Both languages depict time as a moving entity, though subtle differences exist. English often renders time as something in flux towards the speaker (The deadline is approaching), but Uzbek could conceivably express it as something in flux that the speaker moves through or things advance with as much rhythm as they occur (vaqt yaqinlashyapti). Also, the metaphor TIME IS MONEY, which underpins

conceptualization in English, has diminished application in Uzbek. English expressions used in our English translations— save time, spend time, and waste time—are all heavily economy focused, yet more in Uzbek culture, which has long been devoid of economic conceptualization of time, even though more and more modern usage uses them.

Uzbek individuals focus on interpersonal communication, hierarchical roles, respect for elders, and the importance of interpersonal relationships. These cultural values are expressed in metaphors like ko'pni ko'rgan odam ("a person who has seen much"), which defines wisdom as accumulating life experience through accumulated wisdom. kattalarning gapiga quloq solmoq ("to listen to elders") is of the equivalent style as an embedded metaphor, with a deep cultural context that binds obedience to a listening (or, for many, listening as perceived) with some form of auditory comprehension. English, on the other hand, emphasizes individuality and personal agency that produce metaphors such as, "stand on your own feet" or "take responsibility," which emphasize self-reliance instead of hierarchical deference.

More specifically, animal metaphors are another salient area within which cultural differences influence semantic modeling. The metaphors found in English: "lone wolf," "black sheep," "as proud as a peacock", are rooted in the Western symbolic association of animals. Uzbek metaphors often make reference to creatures that are native to local ecosystems and communities such as "ilonning yog'ini yalagan" ("cunning as a snake") or "qo'ydek yuvosh" ("gentle as a sheep"). Although each language employs animal metaphors to explain the character of an individual's personality traits, the animals selected and the levels of judgment in favor of a specific subject group signal separate cultural storylines and group images. Metaphors in the two languages develop through the processes of semantic extension, meaning which is transformed, or modified within cultural, social, and stylistic situations. One is generalization, in which a metaphor describing the emotions or

UZDJTU TARJIMONLIK FAKULTETI
INGLIZ TILI AMALIY TARJIMA KAFEDRASI
TRANSLATION FACULTY
1992
O'ZBEKISTON DAVLAT JAHON TILLARI UNIVERSITETI
ENGLISH APPLIED TRANSLATION DEPARTMENT

situations associated with a particular emotion or situation becomes a generalized category. Or in English, such as the cold person (which initially represented emotional distance but now connotes formality and professionalism). Uzbek shows an equivalent way in "sovuq munosabat," the word that once referred to emotional indifference, but now evokes social distance or the non-hospitality of a society. The second mechanism is associative transfer, by which the metaphorical connotation takes place not from physical similarity but from culture-specific symbols. A case in point might be the fox ("tulki") in Uzbek, which represents cunning in folk tales when compared to English, a fox commonly associated with attractiveness or cleverness. These discrepancies in associative networks demonstrate that cultural factors influence semantic models that are culturally biased.

Cognition is very visualized in English. Words like "I see your point," "a clear idea" and "a bright mind" demonstrate how much the English system conceptualizes understanding through eyesight. Uzbek, however, very often employs metaphors of hearing and internalization, and includes "gapni uqdi" ("he absorbed the meaning") or "quloq solmoq" ("to pay close attention"), indicating that understanding is interpreted in terms of internal cognitive resonance rather than visual clarity. Both languages conceptualize life as movement through space, but with unique cultural attitudes inscribed. English metaphors such as "moving forward in life" stress a story of linear progress and of the individual's accomplishment. Metaphors common in Uzbek culture, including, "yo'ldan adashmoq" ("to lose the path") speak to something of moral, social or communal depth to life's way. Semantic modeling indicates that while it is the case that universalizable, the mapping "LIFE IS A JOURNEY" places more emphasis on moral, social and personal dimensions.

This semantic modeling of metaphors in English and Uzbek demonstrates a play between universal cognitive constructs and culture-specific constructions in the same context. Yet, both languages are grounded in physical experiences that draw heavily

on the body to construct metaphors of emotion, time and cognition, but cultural norms, historical traditions and symbolic connotations have led to divergent methods of utilizing metaphors and processing the underlying semantics. English metaphors tend to include individual agency, visual cognition and economic perception of time, whereas Uzbek metaphors focus on social relations, audio perception and cultural iconography based within the historical and ecological framework of the region. Insights into these patterns not only indicate the structures of language but also, how to construct a context for understanding the conceptual worlds of speakers of both English and Uzbek. This study is part of a larger inter-linguistic examination of metaphor and emphasizes the importance of semantic modeling for comprehending cultural cognition, intercultural communication and translation activities.

REFERENCES:

1. Lakoff G., Johnson M. "Metaphors We Live By." Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p.

2. Kövecses Z. "Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. – 314 p.

3. Kövecses Z. "Metaphor: A Practical Introduction." Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

4. Barcelona A. "The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy." Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. – 365 p.

5. Mardonova D. M. Comparative analysis of metaphorical structures in English and Uzbek. Tashkent, 2017. – 212 b.