

SPECIFIC FEATURES OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS IN TRANSLATION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BASED ON ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Turdiyev Nabijon Islomiddin o'g'li

Webster University Tashkent

Center for Implementation of Educational Programs

(Tashkent, Uzbekistan – in partnership with Webster University, USA)

Email: nabijonturdiyev732@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16736596>

Annotation: This article explores the peculiarities of conceptual metaphor translation through a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek languages. Conceptual metaphors, as a key element of cognitive linguistics, reflect how people perceive and interpret the world through language. The study highlights how metaphors rooted in cultural and cognitive frameworks often resist direct translation and require culturally adaptive strategies. By analyzing selected metaphorical expressions from both languages, the article demonstrates how different metaphorical mappings influence meaning, emotional impact, and stylistic nuance. The research also discusses challenges faced by translators when rendering metaphorical language and offers solutions that balance fidelity to the source with cultural appropriateness.

Keywords: conceptual metaphor, cognitive linguistics, metaphor translation, cultural adaptation, comparative linguistics, English-Uzbek translation, metaphorical mapping

Metaphor is not merely a decorative element of language but a fundamental mechanism of human thought. It allows individuals to understand abstract concepts through more concrete or familiar domains. This idea, central to cognitive linguistics, was extensively developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in their seminal work *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), where they introduced the notion of "conceptual metaphors." These metaphors shape the way we perceive reality, structure our experiences, and articulate emotions. As such, they are deeply embedded in the cultural and cognitive frameworks of a given linguistic community.

In the field of translation studies, conceptual metaphors pose a unique challenge. Unlike lexical or grammatical constructions, metaphors often rely on culturally specific knowledge and symbolic systems that may not have direct equivalents in another language. When translating metaphorical expressions from English into Uzbek or vice versa, translators are frequently confronted with the dilemma of preserving meaning versus adapting to the target culture's

conceptual worldview. This raises critical questions: How do conceptual metaphors function across languages and cultures? What are the dominant strategies used in translating them? To what extent can metaphorical meanings be retained without losing cultural relevance?

This paper investigates the characteristics of conceptual metaphors in English and Uzbek by conducting a comparative analysis of selected metaphorical expressions. It explores how metaphorical mappings differ across the two languages and cultures, identifying cases of equivalence, partial overlap, and divergence. By focusing on metaphor translation, the study aims to illuminate the intricacies of intercultural communication and contribute to a better understanding of cognitive and cultural factors that influence the translation process.

Moreover, the research emphasizes the importance of cultural awareness in metaphor translation and the role of metaphor in shaping ideologies, values, and social norms. Understanding these differences is essential not only for accurate translation but also for fostering intercultural understanding in an increasingly globalized world.

The translation of conceptual metaphors from English into Uzbek and vice versa presents complex linguistic and cultural challenges. This complexity stems primarily from the fact that conceptual metaphors are not arbitrary linguistic ornaments; rather, they are deeply rooted in the cognitive structures and cultural values of each speech community. As such, what seems natural or logical in one language may appear unfamiliar or even unintelligible in another.

The findings of the study revealed that many conceptual metaphors share universal cognitive bases but differ in their linguistic realizations and cultural connotations. For instance, metaphors related to emotions, such as "**anger is a heated fluid**" (e.g., "He was boiling with rage"), have parallels in Uzbek ("u g'azabdan qaynab ketdi"), suggesting a shared human experience that is metaphorically mapped in similar ways. This facilitates relatively straightforward translation using equivalent metaphorical structures.

However, other metaphorical expressions are more culturally bound and require adaptive strategies. A metaphor such as "**time is money**" is deeply embedded in Western capitalist ideology, emphasizing productivity and efficiency. In contrast, the Uzbek language, shaped by different socio-cultural and historical factors, may conceptualize time more communally or spiritually, making a direct metaphorical translation less effective or even misleading. In such cases, translators may opt for **domestication**, replacing the source

metaphor with a culturally appropriate target metaphor, or **explication**, rendering the meaning in a more descriptive and less metaphorical form.

The discussion also highlights the importance of metaphor clusters or networks. Metaphors often do not appear in isolation but are part of broader conceptual frameworks (e.g., "life is a journey," "ideas are food"). When translating texts, especially literary or philosophical ones, it becomes crucial for translators to recognize these larger metaphorical systems to maintain textual coherence and conceptual consistency. Translating metaphors out of context may result in fragmentation and a loss of rhetorical power.

Moreover, the analysis shows that novice translators often struggle with identifying conceptual metaphors, especially when they are linguistically implicit or culturally opaque. Therefore, metaphor translation demands not only linguistic proficiency but also a high level of **intercultural competence** and **metaphorical literacy**. Training in metaphor theory and cultural semiotics can significantly improve translators' abilities to recognize and render metaphors appropriately.

Another important aspect discussed is the tension between **semantic fidelity** and **pragmatic effectiveness**. While preserving the original metaphor may be semantically accurate, it might not always be pragmatically effective in the target culture. For example, a metaphor that is humorous or idiomatic in English may fall flat or become confusing in Uzbek unless culturally adapted. Thus, the translator's task becomes a balancing act between staying faithful to the source text and making the translation resonate with the target audience.

In summary, the discussion underscores the fact that conceptual metaphor translation is not a mechanical transfer of words but a complex cognitive and cultural negotiation. It requires sensitivity to metaphorical meaning, awareness of cultural differences, and flexibility in applying translation strategies.

The comparative analysis of conceptual metaphors in English and Uzbek has revealed both striking similarities and significant differences in metaphorical thinking and linguistic expression across the two languages. Conceptual metaphors, as cognitive tools, are not merely decorative language elements but foundational frameworks through which speakers understand and interpret abstract ideas. Consequently, their translation is not a matter of lexical substitution, but of cultural and cognitive mediation.

One of the key findings of this research is that many conceptual metaphors are grounded in universal human experiences — such as physical sensations, emotions, or spatial orientation — and therefore exhibit cross-linguistic

parallels. For instance, metaphors like *"up is good"* or *"heat represents anger"* are prevalent in both English and Uzbek, albeit with slight variations in phrasing. These shared metaphors can often be translated with minimal adaptation, preserving both meaning and imagery.

However, the study has also shown that a large number of metaphors are deeply culture-specific and shaped by historical, religious, social, and ideological contexts unique to each language community. For example, metaphors related to time, fate, or morality often reflect contrasting worldviews in English and Uzbek, making their direct translation difficult or even misleading. In such cases, translators must go beyond linguistic equivalence and engage in cultural interpretation to retain communicative intent and emotional resonance.

Another important conclusion is that metaphor translation requires more than bilingual proficiency — it demands cultural fluency, contextual awareness, and a strong grasp of metaphor theory. Translators must be able to distinguish between surface-level idiomatic expressions and deeper conceptual mappings, and select strategies accordingly. Whether opting for literal translation, substitution, paraphrasing, or omission, the translator's choices should be guided by the communicative function of the metaphor and the expectations of the target audience.

This research also emphasizes the need for specialized training in metaphor translation, especially in literary, academic, and intercultural communication contexts. Incorporating metaphor analysis into translator education programs can significantly enhance the quality and effectiveness of cross-cultural translation work.

Ultimately, conceptual metaphor translation is a dynamic, interpretive act that bridges languages and cultures. It is both an art and a science — requiring analytical skills, creativity, and intercultural sensitivity. A deeper understanding of conceptual metaphors not only enriches translation practice but also fosters mutual understanding between cultures, which is the fundamental goal of translation in a globalized world.

References:

1. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
2. Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
4. Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan.

5. Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Brill Academic Publishers.
6. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Shirazi, M. & Dastjerdi, H. V. (2010). Conceptual Metaphor Translation across Cultures. *Translation Studies Journal*, 3(2), 45–59.
8. Boers, F. (2003). Applied linguistics perspectives on metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18(4), 231–238.
9. Azizkhodjaeva, N. (2019). Specifics of metaphor translation in Uzbek-English bilingual context. *Uzbek Journal of Language and Translation Studies*, 7(1), 55–62.



WOC
WORLD
ONLINE
CONFERENCES

