ISSN:3030-332X
Impact factor: 9,493
International journal of scientific researchers

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GENDERED METAPHORICAL MODELS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: A COGNITIVE AND CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Khayitova Madina Bakhtiyorovna
Master student
Asia International University, Bukhara, Uzbekistan
Email: madinabaxtiyorovna88@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21426336

Abstract. This study explores the cognitive and cross-cultural dimensions of gendered metaphorical models in English and Uzbek linguistic cultures, using textual evidence from classical and modern literature. Operating within the framework of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) pioneered by Lakoff and Johnson, the research examines how gender roles, traits, and hierarchies are mentally structured and linguistically manifested in both genetically and structurally distinct languages. By analyzing literary corpora—including works by William Shakespeare, Charlotte Brontë, Abdulla Qodiriy, and Abdulhamid Cho‘lpon—the paper uncovers both universal cognitive baselines and culturally specific deviations. The findings reveal that while English literary metaphors increasingly reflect egalitarian shifts and individualistic values, Uzbek metaphorical models remain deeply rooted in patriarchal structures, kinship dynamics, and Islamic cultural ethics. This comparative analysis sheds light on the interplay between language, literature, cognition, and societal evolution.
Keywords: Conceptual Metaphor Theory, Gendered Metaphors, Cognitive Linguistics, Cross-Cultural Linguistics, Anglo-Saxon Literature, Uzbek Literature, Abdulla Qodiriy.

Introduction Language does not merely reflect reality; it actively structures human experience. Within cognitive linguistics, metaphors are viewed as fundamental cognitive mechanisms through which humans map abstract concepts onto concrete domains[1].Literature serves as the primary repository for these mappings, preserving the psychological archetypes of a nation across generations.

Comparing English (an Indo-European, Germanic, analytic language) and Uzbek (a Turkic, agglutinative language) through the lens of literary discourse offers a rich ground for cross-cultural investigation. The relevance of this study lies in understanding how two distinct socio-historical trajectories shape the cognitive framing of masculinity and femininity. While Western literary landscapes have transitioned from rigid Victorian archetypes to feminist linguistic deconstructions, Uzbek literature preserves a dense, culturally unique layer of traditional, collective, and family-centric metaphorical models. This paper aims to isolate, categorize, and compare the dominant gendered metaphorical models in English and Uzbek classical literature to understand the underlying cultural worldviews (*Weltanschauung*).

Theoretical Framework and Methodology

The theoretical foundation of this research relies on Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT). We utilize the classic A IS B mapping model, where the target domain (*Gender/Man/Woman*) is structured by a concrete source domain (*Nature, Architecture, Commodity, War*).

The methodology employed is qualitative and comparative:

— Corpus Selection: Metaphorical expressions extracted from classic English novels (e.g., Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre*, William Shakespeare's plays) and seminal Uzbek literature (e.g., Abdulla Qodiriy’s *O‘tkan kunlar*, Cho‘lpon’s *Kecha va kunduz*).

— Component Analysis: Identifying the vehicle, tenor, and ground of each literary metaphor.

— Cross-Cultural Mapping: Comparing structural matches and conceptual gaps (*lacunae*) between the two metaphorical systems.

[1] Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press.1980. pp. 10–25, pp. 46–52

Structural and Cognitive Analysis of Metaphorical Models

In both cultures, women are historically mapped as objects, but the cognitive valuation differs fundamentally.English Literary Context: The metaphor often manifests in terms of economic transaction, ownership, or surface aesthetic value. In Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*, Petruchio conceptualizes his wife, Katherina, strictly through the domain of property:

I will be master of what is mine own. She is my goods, my chattels; she is my house, my household stuff, my field, my barn…

The cognitive focus here is individualistic possession and legal mastery.Uzbek Literary Context: In Uzbek literature, the objectification is framed through kinship, family honor, and transitional trust. In Abdulla Qodiriy's historical novel *O'tkan kunlar* (*Days Gone By*), Otabek's mother, Zaynab's mother, and societal elders view a young bride as a delicate asset transferred between clans. When Kumush is forced into a secondary role, her social state is mapped onto a fragile object of duty. However, the most profound manifestation is seen in Cho'lpon's *Kecha va kunduz* (*Night and Day*), where Zebiniso is treated as a financial and social ladder for her father, Razzoq sofi. Her identity is mapped onto an unassertive, transactional entity (*"birovning hazonasi"* - someone else's treasure), highlighting a collective patriarchal framework where a woman's agency is subsumed by familial honor.

Domain Mapping	Literary Context & Focus	Key Examples
Source Domain: Object / Property ⬇ (Mapping) ⬇ Target Domain: Woman	English Literature: Focus on Legal Ownership & Personal Goods	Shakespeare's Petruchio (*The Taming of the Shrew*)
	Uzbek Literature: Focus on Collective Honor & Inter-clan Asset	Cho'lpon's Zebiniso (*Kecha va kunduz*)

English Literary Context: English literature frequently utilizes botanical mappings focusing on short-lived aesthetic peak, fragility, or emotional isolation. In Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, Jane resists being mapped onto a fragile botanical ornament by Rochester, who views her as a delicate flower to be shielded:*I am no bird; and no net ensnares me; I am a free human being with an independent will.* Traditional Victorian discourse, however, heavily relied on the *"shrinking violet"* or *"fading rose"* models to enforce submissiveness.

Uzbek Literary Context: The botanical model carries a high degree of domestic functionality, moral purity, and endurance. In *O'tkan kunlar*, Kumush is consistently mapped onto the domain of a pure, blooming flower (*"ra'no gul"*, *"g'uncha"*), but this mapping goes beyond aesthetics. It represents her structural position as a newly rooted life-giver within a new household. Qodiriy writes:

"Kumushbibi erining yonida bir uyatchan g'uncha kabi tovlanardi." (Kumushbibi shimmered beside her husband like a shy flower bud).

The cognitive focus here is on natural purity, reserve (*andoza*), and the quiet flourishing of family continuity.

Masculinity in both cultures is conceptualized through stability, but the scale and social expectations of the source domain vary.

English Literary Context: Mapped through individual strength, emotional stoicism, and isolation. In classic Anglo-Saxon narratives and Victorian literature, a man is often an unyielding physical feature. For instance, in Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights*, Heathcliff is described through architectural and geological metaphors:*He's a fierce, pitiless, wolfish man... an arid wilderness of furze and whinstone.* The strength is self-contained, aggressive, and often detached from social duties.

Uzbek Literary Context: Mapped through massive architectural constants that support an entire micro-society (the family and the community). In *O'tkan kunlar*, Otabek is conceptualized by his father, Yusufbek hoji, and his wives as the pillar of the lineage (*"oila ustuni"*). Yusufbek hoji himself represents the ultimate architectural metaphor for the state and the family—a fortress (*qal'a*). The male is

cognitively framed not as an independent agent pursuing personal desires, but as a foundational infrastructure. If the man cracks, the entire social unit collapses. Qodiriy beautifully illustrates this when Otabek struggles between his personal love for Kumush and his duty as a son: his masculinity is a structural weight he must bear for the collective survival of the house.

English Literary Context: Modern and post-industrial English literature translates the medieval warrior archetype into corporate, legal, or individualistic competition (e.g., the *"corporate warrior"* or *"lone wolf"* of London's financial landscapes).Uzbek Literary Context: Relies on historical, hunting, or zoological domains emphasizing tribal honor (*g'urur*), justice, and devotion to the homeland (*el-yurt*). In the epic poem *Alpomish* or the works of Oybek, the male protagonist is mapped onto the domain of a lion (*"arslon"*) or a falcon (*"lochin"*). Their aggression is never individualistic; it is sanctioned by the community to protect the collective boundary.

Table.2
Quantitative and Qualitative Comparison of Literary Textures

Conceptual Model	English Literary Source & Focus	Uzbek Literary Source & Focus	Cognitive Overlap
WOMAN IS OBJECT	*The Taming of the Shrew* (Individual ownership, legal property)	*Kecha va kunduz* (Family commodity, transactional honor)	Deep objectification; restriction of female agency.
WOMAN IS NATURE	*Jane Eyre* (Fragility to be conquered or resisted)	*O'tkan kunlar* (Modesty, moral purity, domestic rooting)	Association with organic growth, beauty, and vulnerability.
MAN IS STRUCTURE	*Wuthering Heights* (Arid stone, emotional isolation, autonomy)	*O'tkan kunlar* (Family pillar, fortress of collective security)	Requirement of unyielding strength and stoicism.
MAN IS WARRIOR	*Macbeth / Modern Fiction* (Ambition, personal status, rivalry)	*Alpomish / Historical Novels* (National defense, clan protection)	High external agency; justification of constructive violence.

Autonomy vs. Relationality: English literary metaphors prioritize the individual's psychological and emotional state. A man can be a *"lone wolf"* and a woman can be an *"independent island."* In contrast, Uzbek literary metaphors are strictly relational; a character is rarely conceptualized outside the matrix of family or community roles (*ota, ona, kelin, mard yigit*).

The Metaphor of the House: In Uzbek literature, the domestic sphere is metaphorically elevated to a sacred space governed by the woman's light (*"Ayol – uyning chirog'i"*). To extinguish the light is to destroy the family. In Western literature, particularly from the late 19th century onward (e.g., Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House*, which heavily influenced English feminist literary thought), the house is often metaphorically framed as a prison or a cage from which the female protagonist must escape to achieve personhood.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of gendered metaphorical models in English and Uzbek literature reveals that conceptual mappings are deeply bound to cultural worldviews.

English literary discourse displays a distinct evolutionary transition: old patriarchal layers have been systematically deconstructed by modern, egalitarian, and individualized professional metaphors where gender boundaries are blurred. Conversely, Uzbek literary discourse exhibits a high degree of cognitive stability. It reflects enduring traditional values, Islamic ethics, and a collectivist social structure where gender roles—though sharply delineated—are viewed as complementary and structurally interdependent.

For the field of cognitive linguistics, this literary comparison proves that while the basic cognitive architecture of metaphor mapping is universal (A IS B), the specific source domains selected are strictly dictated by cultural history, geography, and changing social values.

References

1. Brontë, C. (1847). *Jane Eyre*. Smith, Elder & Co.
2. Cho‘lpon, A. (1936). *Kecha va kunduz*. Toshkent.
3. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
4. Qodiriy, A. (1925). *O‘tkan kunlar*. Toshkent.
5. Shakespeare, W. (1590-1592). *The Taming of the Shrew*. First Folio.