

CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF METAPHOR AND SIMILE IN ENGLISH
AND UZBEK ECONOMICAL TERMS

National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek
Faculty of foreign philosophy
Department of English Linguistics
student of Master's degree
Ernazarova Madinakhon Bakhtiyor kizi

Annotation: This article is dedicated to contrastive study of Metaphor and simile in English and Uzbek economic terms. Metaphor and simile are very common stylistic devices in linguistics, and their examples in Uzbek and English are analyzed in the article.

Key words: stylistic devices, notion, cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, cohesive system, cultural dominants, metaphorical model, associations, economic criticism.

There are different terms to denote particular means by which utterances are made more conspicuous, more effective and therefore imparting some additional information in linguistics. They are named expressive means, stylistic means, stylistic markers, stylistic devices, tropes, figures of speech and other names. All these terms are used indiscriminately and they are set against neutral. However, Galperin and some scholars described the notion of expressive means and stylistic devices. Now, we are going to define two of them : *Metaphor and Simile*.

Scientists of many spheres have interested the topic of Metaphors. The latest develop of cognitive linguistics gave life to a new approach to metaphors, inquiring them from different angles. Thus, from anthropocentric viewpoint, where human factor plays an important role in the formation and development of any kind



of linguistic and cognitive units, metaphors have been studied. The work deals with the conceptual metaphor theory along with cognitive metaphor universals have been analyzed in the case of the English and Uzbek languages. It is impossible to develop a theory of conceptual metaphor without taking into consideration the issue of the relationship between metaphor and culture[1]. Famous cognitive linguists, widely regarded as the founders of cognitive linguistics, J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, defined that the values that exist in a society are represented in the metaphorical system of a particular linguistic community. At the same time, cultural values should not be considered in isolation from one another, but rather as part of a cohesive system that includes metaphorical conceptions that describe the environment in which we live. The system of value attitudes of the topic of speech is, thus, governed by cultural dominants, meanings that are the most significant for the national culture, which is kept in its whole as its uniqueness, and that are reflected in the language. The phenomena of cultural dominants becoming fixed in a language is referred to as "linguoculture," and the conceptual metaphors that underpin it are at its heart.

A important metaphorical term may describe a fragment of a particular conceptual sphere, but a collection of different metaphors produces a conceptual metaphor that reflects society's conceptual metaphorical system and cultural dominants. A vector (or method) comparative study of a metaphorical model begins with a study of the verbalized components of individual conceptual mappings, regardless of whether an evaluative component is present in an individual concept or whether this content is culturally specific, but conclusions are drawn about the universal and culturally specific in national concept spheres based on the study's findings[2]. As a result, in the study of conceptual metaphors, the interaction of individual and culturally unique conceptual material is inextricably linked.



A word or [phrase](#) that is used in a non-literal way to create an effect is called a figure of speech. This effect may be rhetorical as in the deliberate arrangement of words to achieve something poetic, or [imagery](#) as in the use of language to suggest a visual picture or make an idea more vivid. Generally, [figures of speech](#) function as [literary devices](#) because they serve as expressive use of language. Words are used in other ways than their literal meanings or typical manner of application. Similes are an important tool that make language more creative, descriptive, and entertaining. The mind thinks in images and associations, so similes are used to make stronger and more effective descriptions than if only adjectives or literal descriptions were used; they can stir up associated emotions, create new connections in the mind, and emphasize certain characteristics[3]. One of the most important figure of speech which almost essential to creative expression from everyday speech to poetry. We utilize similes and metaphors to compare two different types of things. Unlike simile, though, metaphor makes a direct comparison without using “like” or “as.” For example, consider the following descriptions:

Metaphor:

He's a wolf.

Here, the metaphor made the comparison which a person *is equal* to a wolf, not like a wolf. Since this cannot be literal, we know that it must mean that he is like a wolf in some way, probably that he is predatory, wild, or hungry. In order to express the same idea, simile is slightly different:

Simile:

He's like a wolf. Or

He's as hungry as a wolf.

As you can see, both metaphors and similes make the same kinds of vivid comparisons, just in different words. Which one you use may just depend on what kind of wording sounds or feels best in context.



Formal linguistics has treated metaphor as a device of the poetic imagination found mainly in “high” literature but hardly present in everyday language. However, there was an exception to this rule, one important theory of metaphor, known as Interaction or Tension which did not regard it as a simple use of words, however linguist I. A. Richards highlighted that “two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction.” [4] Over the past two decades, linguists’ view of metaphor has changed fundamentally. Modern metaphor theory refutes the idea that metaphors are merely poetic devices rather than part of everyday speech, characteristic of human thought processes, enabling us to make sense of the world and deal with our experiences on it. Willie Henderson opened the discussion of metaphor in economics, pointing to the scarcity of analyses of metaphor in economics, in spite of the “wide and deliberate use of metaphor in economic texts” in 1982. After a year, Deidre McCloskey noted that metaphor should be investigated in the frame of an economic criticism whose objective should be finding out “how arguments sought to convince the reader.” It was defined by McCloskey how in the eighties a few economists realized that such facts as “the character of the audience”, “the style of the customary medium”, “the practical purpose to be achieved from the communication” do influence scientific communication while not necessarily distorting it; he suggests that, in order to account for such factors, economists need rhetoric, which is not an ornament, “or what is left after logic and evidence have done their work.”

Rhetoric in its wide description is the art of argument. It covers logic, one corner of the rhetoric tetrad (which also includes, for McCloskey, metaphor, story and fact). Merely linguistic ornaments are not scientific metaphors, in the opposite, they are essential to the conception, development and maintenance of scientific theories in a variety of ways: they provide the linguistic context in which the models that constitute the basis for scientific explanation are suggested and



described; they supply new terms for the theoretical vocabulary, especially when there is a gap in the lexicon; and they direct scientists towards new paths of inquiry, by suggesting new hypothetical entities and mechanism. Through metaphors scientists draw upon existing cognitive resources to provide both the model and the vocabulary in terms of which the unknown mechanisms can be conceived and so investigated. Metaphors thereby perform a cognitive role in scientific theorizing[5].

Since economists too tell stories, use metaphors, also twentieth-century economic literature as a whole has a style, and this style is scientific. Style in the writing of economics followed a path parallel to that of the modern novel: the suppression of the authorial “I” in the latter corresponds to the suppression of the “I” in science, yielding “represented reality.” The suggested author of economic literature, once the Philosopher or the Historian, has become the Scientist. The scientific paper depends on a theory of writing – the dominant one being based on “strange commonplaces” such as that style may be separated from content, or that invention is a self-standing and all-encompassing process, supposedly independent from the metaphors and stories through which the economists’ world is created, and the style and arrangement in which their arguments are couched.

To sum up it should be noted that language of business is extremely metaphorical and sometimes clusters of metaphors result in rather elaborated images. Very often this is metaphorical elaboration of an everyday word, otherwise completely familiar. Metaphors are utilized to reflect intentions of the writer. It is believed that from a speech act theory perspective, that they have strong illocutionary force. For example, saying that something is “a pillar of stability” has a strong effect due to the fact that pillars are important for buildings, and the idea of a reliable building is very important to everyone. Therefore, the reason for which a metaphor is used, the intentionality of the writer behind the metaphor may



give useful insights for a true understanding of the text where the metaphor has been used.

REFERENCES:

1. Fayziyeva Aziza Anvarovna. CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR UNIVERSALS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK. JournalNX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal VOLUME 8, ISSUE 4, Apr. -2022
2. <https://literarydevices.net/simile/>
3. MIHAELA VASILOAIA. Metaphors Business Linguistic Culture Lives By. Economy Transdisciplinarity Cognition Vol. XIV, Issue 1/2011
4. .Richards, I.A. (1965). Philosophy of Rhetoric, Oxford University Press, p.93.
5. Henderson, Willie (1982). Metaphor in Economics in “Journal of Socio-Economics”, 21(4), winter 1982, pp. 363-377.

