METAPHORICAL STUDIES AND ITS TYPES

Azim Abdurakhmanovich Yuldashev
PhD, Department of Foreign Languages
Chirchik State Pedagogical Institute, Tashkent region
azimupsi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

There are many studies that touch on the cultural metaphor and the research is categorized into seven aspects, namely the Traditional Metaphorical Study, the Comprehensive Metaphorical Study, the Special Metaphorical Study, the Non-Special Metaphorical Study, the Cross-Cultural Metaphorical Study, the Animal Metaphorical Study and the Uzbek Metaphorical Study. Each of these categories will be elaborated in detail in the next section to identify what problems arise from these studies to be the basis of this study.

Keywords: Traditional, Complex, Comprehensive, Specific, Non-specific, Cross-cultural, Animal, and Uzbek metaphorical studies.

TRADITIONAL METAPHORICAL STUDIES

Traditional Metaphorical Study focuses on metaphorical descriptions from the classic rhetorical point of view. Among the researchers are Aristotle (1475), Glucksberg and MgGlone (2011), Fontaniar (1821), Richards (1936), Mooij (1976), Fogelin (1988), Leezenberg (2011), Eunbanks (1999). All of these researchers describe the question of how metaphorical mapping takes place in the philosophy of human thought. At this time, metaphorical studies are regarded as artistic, that is, humans cultivate metaphors in the form of beautiful poems to illustrate the value of a person's sense of taste and mind. The creation of this beautiful poem is the greatness of talent possessed by poets and someone who speaks fluently. The metaphor is also used to describe literary aspects, but it is still understandable. Therefore, the metaphor presented in the classic language is an abstract concept and not a comparative metaphor. Nevertheless, the whole study states that metaphor is a feature of art that can be the best medium for delivering thought. However, once observed, the metaphorical conceptions are still at an arbitrary stage of creation, which is purely literary philosophy, and no mapping element occurs in the resulting metaphor.

COMPLEX METAPHORICAL STUDY

Complex Metaphorical Studies means a study that looks at the metaphorical mapping based on the strategies used either theoretically or psychologically.

Complex metaphorical studies are categorized into several subtopics, namely the Cultural Metaphorical Study and the Proverb Metaphorical Studies. The Cultural Metaphorical Study is defined as a study that looks at metaphorical strategies that prioritize cultural aspects. Therefore, this study examines research related to all cultural metaphors as found in the study of Black (1979), Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Johnson (1987), Lakoff and Tuner (1989), Lakoff (1993), Gibbs (1994), Kovecses (2002), Croft and Cruse (2004), Evans and Green (2006), Gibbs and Colston (1995).

The researchers have analyzed metaphors not only as mapping but also as source domain mappings to targets that include generalizations related to their respective cultures. Nevertheless, these studies still do not explicitly explain how conceptual thinking is happening as well as being a one-way and two-way mapping. In addition, the question of how the resource mapping process to the target is not stated in detail, instead it just states directly as if human minds like "machines". This led to the metaphorical observation performed in terms of diversity of concepts but did not include the cultural mapping process involved in the concept. For example, the Machines Are People metaphorically mapped only as a machine's philosophy in that culture. However, the reason for selecting machine vocabulary versus other words is not specified. This cluster is to be drawn up in this study to improve the description of the cultural metaphor mapping.

Complex Metaphorical studies also involve proverbs. In the study of proverbs, a rather complex metaphor mapping is seen from the uniqueness of the creator or society in highlighting their thoughts through proverbs. Among the researchers included in this study are Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Fontecha and Catalan (2003), Azam Estaji and Fakhteh Nakhavali (2011), Nilufer Can (2011), Wen Zhao (2012), Jianwen Lui (2013) Ahmed Omran Othman (2013), Wan Norasikin Wan Ismail, Abdul Latif Samian and Nazri Muslim (2016). All of these researcher state that metaphors are important components that exist in society to reflect certain values such as cultural symbolism, life philosophy, beliefs, lifestyles and aesthetics. Metaphors in this study are translated from micro level to macro level, where each concept is associated with specific cultural aspects. Therefore, the metaphor is no longer mapped by strategy-oriented solely, but also the diversity of concepts. The question of metaphor as to why the concept exists can be answered with confidence. Nevertheless, the clutter of this study is that this study cannot describe the orderly orientation of the stage regarding the concept of the metaphor.

SPECIFIC METAPHORICAL STUDY

Specific metaphorical study is defined as a study that illustrates the metaphorical aspects of science such as chemistry (Brown, 2003), physics (Drewer, 2003; Pulaczewska, 1999), neurosciences (Goschler, 2008), biology (Keller, 1995, 2000; Maasen, Mendelsohn (1997), Richardt, 2005; Salager-Meyer, 1990) and psychotherapy (Tay, 2011), the study of environmental (Larson, 2011). Metaphorical studies were also studied in more detail in the field of Social Science and Humanities as well as philosophical examples in the study of Black (1962), Jakel (1997), Johnson (2010) and Hoffman (1985), historiography and philosophical history in the study of Ankersmit (1994), Demandt (1978), White (1978) and Topitsch (1979), studies in sociology, for example by Rigney (2001), Levine (1995) and Maasen et al, (1995), in administrative science by Cornelissen, Oswick, Phillips (2008), Grant & Oswick (1996), Morgan (1986). Furthermore, for example, Smith (2007) and Winter (2001), economics such as Charteris-Black (2004), Crawford Camiciottoli (2006), Lindstromberg (1991), Skorszynska (2010), Skorczynska & Deignan (2006) White (2003), Henderson (1986, 2000) and studies in education such as Aubusson, Harrison, & Ritchie (2006), Cameron (2003), Cameron & Low (2004), Charteris (2000), Darian (2003) (2008), Hoffman (1980), Littlemore (2001, 2003, 2008, 2011), Littlemore & Low (2006) and Low, (2009, 2010).
All of these field exhibit the metaphor of blended in the perspective of other knowledge, not only in the field of language and further add to the metaphorical documentation. In this category, metaphors are created practically through the dimensions of knowledge presented using a distinctive approach by field practitioners. There is also a naturally created metaphor. Although there are theories of knowledge in these fields that are used to categorize the metaphor, however, the visualized conceptual metaphors do not develop the deeply motivated aspects of the terms they use.

NON-SPECIFIC METAPHORICAL STUDY

Non-Specific Metaphorical research is not specifically defined on the basis of metaphorical creations that encompass various fields, which include the fields of emotion, plants and women. Researchers in emotional areas such as Goddard (1996), Muhammad Haji Salleh (2007), Imran Ho and Sabariah (2007), Rozaimah Rashidin and Nor Hashimah Jalaluddin (2013), Kovecses (1986, 1988, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2010) Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999), Tendahl (2008), Stover (2010), Hassan (2003), Rozaimah Rashidin and Nor Hashimah Jalaluddin (2013b), Tendahl (2009) and Stover (2010).

Furthermore, researchers in the field of plants are Sylwia Felipezuk-Rozinska (2016), Krzeszowski (1997), Kovecses (2002) and Zhang Yangyang (2012) while in the women's field are Mari Takada, Kazuko Shinohara, Fumi Morizumi, Michiko Sato (2000).

In the field of emotion, a metaphor is seen as a transformation where the metaphor is translated by transferring emotion to another mind. The formation of metaphors applies ad hoc and creates certain inference. This means that the resulting metaphor is perceived only through conceptual conjugation followed by approaches or theories such as Cognitive Theory, Relevant Theory, and Hybrid Theory. Nevertheless, all aspects of the concept of reflection are reflected through linguistic proof and this is what gives rise to the question to the researcher, which is the extent to which evidence needs to be manifested to highlight the metaphor. Furthermore, every individual in a culture is unlimited in his thinking when conveying the metaphor.

In the metaphorical study of plants, the metaphor is constructed using a set of deep experience mapping. This can be seen through plant metaphors in Poland by Krzeszowki (1997) study that states that "bud" and "weed" are not plants that are commonly used but are applied in metaphors that carry meaning not satisfied. This demonstrates that the metaphor generated requires a deep experience of the environment. Hence, to what extent metaphorical concepts can be understood through limited domain boundaries.

Next, the metaphor in the women's domain presents the non-free metaphorical expression but adheres to the social-cultural setting. This shows that the metaphorical representation is not transparent, but rather a template. This means there are similarities between sources and targets in the cultural aspects of society. This study is more authoritative if the metaphor is explained from the compositional cultural typology.

CROSS-CULTURAL METAPHORICAL STUDY

A cross-cultural metaphorical study is a study that looks at some similarities and differences between different countries or cultures. Researchers involved in this category are Xiuzhi Li (2010), Chen (2010), Liu and Zhao (2013), Mashak, Pazhakh and Hayati (2012), Berendt and Tanita (2011), Byram (1997, 2008), Porter 2010), Kramsch (1993, 1998), Esmail Faghih (2001), Maisarah M. Almirabi (2015), Regina Guterrez Perez (2008), Lakoff and Johnson (1980), Lakoff (1993), Lakoff and Johnson (1980) Kovecses (2002), Zahra Khajeh and imron-Ho-Abdullah (2012), Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1999), Ahrens (2002).

In this study, the metaphor is seen as a universal cultural concept between the source domain to the target domain. The universal concept is intended as a metaphor expressed through geographical, personal, thought-style values and views of the world. It concludes that the expression of the metaphor is done literally, for example, "walking on the clouds" translated as Happiness Is Up. Metaphorical mapping is done by associating meaning in relation to an in-depth concept. Therefore, it is clear that researchers see the conceptions of metaphors not rationalizing the views and minds by using cultural entities as a starting point for their fundamental aspects, but only through the surface-framing of related aspects of displaying similarities and the differences of metaphors that exist in two cultures.

ANIMALS METAPHORICAL STUDY

Animal metaphorical studies are defined on the basis of metaphorical discussions described based on animal domains. This study is categorized for the purpose of identifying the extent of the animal metaphorical assessment and is ultimately the core of this study. Researchers involved in this animal metaphor include Krikmann (2007), Lakoff and Turner (1989), Imran Ho-Abdullah (2011), Wei Lixia (2012), Covecses (2002, 2005, 2010), Noviana Laurencia (2012) Rolex (2011), Thorntorn (1999), Kieltyka and Kleparski (2007), Holes and Abu Athera (2009), Peled-Shapira (2009), Qlateji (2005), Rodriguez (2009), Kleparski (2002), Kieltyka and Kleparski (2007), Thornton (1989), Nurul Nadia Muhammad and Sabariah Md Rashid (2013), Merry Lapasau and Arbak Othman (2010), Henrieta Hatalova (2007), Sangji Zhaxi (1998), John M. Kobia Ching-yu Hsieh (2008), Kovecses (2000), Halliday (1985), Adesola Olateju (2005), Jiang Feng and Wen Xu (2014) and Di Feng (2006).

This study translates comparative metaphor between animals and their relation to culture. In general, animal metaphorical studies are described through analogy principles. Although each study describes animal metaphors using different theories, however, each of these researchers does not explain why the properties or characteristics of these animals are so significant in the perspective of a culture. In addition, the metaphor of the animal is not scientifically and congruently related to the concepts that appear in the understanding of the animal metaphor.

UZBEK METAPHORICAL STUDY

The Uzbek Metaphorical study is defined on the basis of this study to illustrate metaphors in Uzbek culture itself. The researcher included Yaqub Siddiqovich Saidov (2016) and Obidjon Karimov Yakubdjanovich (2013). Both of these

researchers expressed Uzbek metaphor for the translation of the poet's views on his world. However, the resulting metaphor is very artistic so researchers can not explain the metaphorical correlation with the creator's thinking. This may be because there are not many researchers who are exposed to language theoretical knowledge. Reflecting on all the weaknesses or clumps of these past studies, further study of metaphorical studies needs to be done specifically to identify the fundamental nuances of causality in the metaphorical concepts, in particular, cross-cultural animals metaphorical, between Malay culture and Uzbek culture. This study will focus on five aspects: the relationship between metaphor and culture, the perspective of theoretical perspective, metaphorical orientation in the cross-domain perspective, metaphorical orientation in cross-cultural perspective and repetition of metaphors based on holistic generalization.

However, there is still no comparative study between Malay and Uzbek culture. The Malays and Uzbek nations embrace the same religion, so researchers believe that Malays and Uzbek share the same culture. The study was conducted to investigate the use of animal metaphors in Malay and Uzbek culture from semantic aspects based on the Concept Metaphorical Theory.

CONCLUSION

As we can identify need to be study more on usage of metaphorical types in any language to enrich its vocabulary in an artistic way. There are plenty of studies carried out on above mentioned studies. However, still demands to develop the mentioned metaphorical types in studies to chain among culture and language.

REFERENCES

1. Kövecses, Z. (2017). Conceptual metaphor theory. *The Routledge handbook of metaphor and language*, 13-27.
2. Fauconnier, G., & Lakoff, G. (2009). On metaphor and blending. *Cognitive Semiotics*, *5*(1-2), 393-399.
3. Ho-Abdullah, I. (2011). Analisis kognitif semantik peribahasa Melayu bersumberkan anjing (canis familiaris). *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, *11*(1).
4. Yuldashev, A. A. (2020). Animal metaphor proverbs in Uzbek and Malay cross–culture. *Science and Education*, *1*(Special Issue 2).
5. Yuldashev, A. A. (2020). Dog Conception and Construction Metaphor in Malay and Uzbek Culture. *Academic Research in Educational Sciences, 1* (3), 1294-1299.