

Verbalization of the Concept “Soul/Ruwx” in Shakespeare’s and Ajiniyaz’s Poetic Picture of the World: An Archaism and Conceptual Metaphor Analysis (CMT)

MUKHAMMADIYAROV AYDOS JOLDASBAEVICH
Nukus State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the verbalization of the concept of "Soul/Ruwx" through the lens of archaisms in the poetry of William Shakespeare and Ajiniyaz. By analyzing obsolete words and their historical significance, we explore how these terms contribute to the thematic richness of both poets' works. The findings highlight the cultural and linguistic parallels between English and Karakalpak literature, emphasizing the role of historical context in shaping poetic expression. In addition, the investigation explores the verbalization of the concept of "Soul/Ruwx" through metaphors in the lyro-epic poems of Ajiniyaz's 'Bozataw' and Shakespeare's Henry V and some pronouns in their poems and sonnets. By analyzing metaphorical and archaic images and their historical significance, we investigate how these terms enhance the thematic depth and emotional resonance of both works. The findings reveal that the metaphors of the concept «soul» serve as crucial linguistic tools that connect the poets' explorations of identity, heroism, and spirituality. Furthermore, this comparative analysis highlights cultural parallels between English and Karakalpak literature, emphasizing how historical context shapes poetic expression and enriches our understanding of universal human experiences.

Keywords: Verbalization, love poetry, conceptual analysis, archaism, pronoun, conceptual metaphor, comparison

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of "Soul/Ruwx" has been a focal point in literature across cultures, embodying complex ideas about identity, existence, and spirituality. This paper aims to analyze how obsolete words – specifically archaisms – convey this concept in the poetry of William Shakespeare and Ajiniyaz. By examining historical linguistics alongside thematic exploration, we reveal how language evolution reflects deeper cultural narratives. The research paper aims also to find the similarities and differences of different representatives with diverse backgrounds by comparing their poetic context, particularly in poems and lyrical lines based on the analysis of some archaisms (pronouns) and metaphoric language.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Ferdinand de Saussure, a foundational figure in modern linguistics, introduced several key concepts that are relevant to the analysis of pronouns and archaisms. His theory emphasizes the distinction between "langue" (the abstract system of language) and "parole" (the concrete use of language in speech). In this framework, pronouns serve as critical linguistic elements that embody social relations and identity. Saussure posited that language is a system of signs where meaning arises from the relationships between signs rather than from the signs themselves.

Pronouns, such as "thy," "thee," "thyself," and "thine" in early modern English, or "ani," "ana," "andin," and "sendin" in Karakalpak, exemplify this relational aspect. These terms not only denote individuals but also convey social status, intimacy, and cultural context. The use of archaic pronoun in literary works like Shakespeare's sonnets and Ajiniyaz's love poetry enriches the text by invoking historical and cultural nuances that resonate with the reader's understanding of identity and relational dynamics.

2. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson: Conceptual metaphor. In their seminal work, *Metaphors We Live By* (1980), George Lakoff and Mark Johnson explore how metaphors shape our

understanding of reality. They argue that metaphor is not merely a linguistic feature but a fundamental part of human thought. This perspective is particularly relevant when examining archaisms in literature, as these obsolete terms often carry metaphorical weight that transcends their literal meanings. Lakoff and Johnson assert that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, influencing how we perceive experiences and communicate them. For instance, in 'Bozataw,' the use of terms like *búlbil* (nightingale) can be seen as embodying deeper metaphors related to selfhood and relationality within the context of Karakalpak culture. Similarly, Shakespeare's use of light or fire in "Henry V" not only serves a grammatical function but also evokes a sense of intimacy, loyalty, and historical continuity.

The relationship between pronouns and metaphors is crucial in understanding how a language functions within these texts. The kind of forms reflect not only linguistic choices but also cultural values and social hierarchies. By employing these terms, both Ajiniyaz and Shakespeare tap into a reservoir of meaning that enhances their exploration of themes such as identity, heroism, and community.

3. In analyzing Ajiniyaz's 'Bozataw' and Shakespeare's *Henry V*, it becomes evident that archaisms serve as a bridge between language, culture, and metaphorical understanding. The pronouns used by both poets are steeped in historical significance, inviting readers to engage with the texts on multiple levels.

In 'Bozataw,' Ajiniyaz's use of pronouns reflects the individual's connection to the collective spirit of the Karakalpak people. The archaic forms like "anı" and "sendin" evoke a sense of belonging while also emphasizing personal identity within a communal context. This aligns with Lakoff and Johnson's assertion that our conceptual frameworks shape our experiences; thus, the pronouns become metaphors for the interplay between self and society.

4. In both Ajiniyaz's 'Bozataw' and Shakespeare's *Henry V*, metaphors serve as powerful vehicles for expressing complex ideas about the soul, identity, and human experience. By

analyzing metaphors such as soul-light/fire, soul-water/river, soul-bird, soul-earth/soil, soul-sword/rifle, soul-wind/storm, soul-shadow, soul-poem/song, soul-gold/wealth, and soul-time, we can see how these literary devices align with George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor Theory. This theory posits that our understanding of abstract concepts is largely shaped by metaphorical mappings from more concrete experiences.

5. This study employs a qualitative approach, utilizing comparative literary analysis to examine selected works from both poets. The classification of obsolete words into historicisms and archaisms, as outlined by E. Berdimuratov, serves as a framework for the analysis. Additionally, conceptual analysis techniques are applied to explore the thematic representation of "Soul/Ruwx."

3. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a multi-faceted methodological approach to analyze the use of language, particularly focusing on archaisms in their sonnets and poems and metaphors in Ajiniyaz's 'Bozataw' and Shakespeare's *Henry V*. The methodology consists of four primary analytical methods: comparative analysis, contrastive analysis, interpretation analysis, and classification analysis. Each method serves a distinct purpose in uncovering the nuanced relationships between the two texts.

1. *Comparative Analysis*

Comparative analysis involves examining both 'Bozataw' and *Henry V* side by side to identify similarities in themes, motifs, and linguistic features. This method allows for an exploration of how both authors address universal concepts such as identity, honor, and the human experience through their respective cultural lenses. Key aspects of this analysis include:

- **Theme identification:** Identifying central themes in both texts, such as the nature of leadership, the role of fate, and the quest for identity.

- **Linguistic features:** Analyzing specific linguistic choices, including syntax, diction, and figurative language, to understand how they contribute to the overall message of each work.

2. *Contrastive analysis*

Contrastive analysis focuses on the differences between the two texts, highlighting how distinct cultural contexts influence language use and thematic development. This method emphasizes:

- **Cultural context:** Examining how the historical and cultural backgrounds of the Karakalpak people in 'Bozataw' and the English society during Shakespeare's time shape the portrayal of characters and events.
- **Linguistic variations:** Identifying differences in archaisms and metaphorical language that reflect the unique stylistic choices of each author, revealing how these choices affect reader interpretation.

3. *Interpretation analysis*

Interpretation analysis delves into the meanings behind specific linguistic elements, particularly focusing on archaisms in both texts. This method involves:

- **Contextual interpretation:** Analyzing how archaisms function within their respective texts, considering their historical significance and emotional resonance.
- **Reader response:** Exploring how contemporary readers might interpret these archaisms differently based on their own cultural backgrounds and experiences.

4. *Classification*

Classification analysis categorizes various linguistic features, particularly archaisms, within both Shakespearean sonnets and Ajiniyazian love poems." This method includes:

- Archaism categorization: Classifying identified archaisms into thematic or functional groups (e.g., terms related to warfare, nature, societal roles) to better understand their usage and significance.
- Functional analysis: Assessing how these archaisms contribute to character development, plot progression, and thematic depth in each text.

5. *Conceptual metaphor analysis*

Conceptual metaphor analysis examines the underlying metaphorical frameworks present in both texts. This method focuses on:

- **Metaphor identification:** Identifying key metaphors related to the soul and human experience in both 'Bozataw' and *Henry V*.
- **Mapping conceptual frameworks:** Analyzing how these metaphors shape character motivations and thematic development, using George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's framework to understand how concrete experiences inform abstract concepts.

By employing comparative analysis, contrastive analysis, interpretation analysis, classification analysis, and conceptual metaphor analysis, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the linguistic and thematic connections between Ajiniyaz's 'Bozataw' and Shakespeare's *Henry V*. This multi-method approach enables a nuanced exploration of how archaisms and metaphors function within each text, enriching our understanding of cultural identity and human experience as expressed through literature.

4. RESULTS

- **Historicisms: English:** Squire, bodkin, cuirass, goat, caravel, cavalier, samovar
- **Karakalpak:** садақ, мәки, қанжар, жәллат, пристав, шахзада, ханзада, қаршын, қырқағары, тулымшақ.

- **Archaisms: English:** hark (listen), fain (gladly), betwixt (between), hither (to this place), methinks (it seems to me)
- **Karakalpak:** жасаўыл (hamir - order), үгит (agitation), жар (decree), печать (seal)

In the poetry of William Shakespeare, a prominent figure in English literature from 1564-1616 and a founder of the English written language, obsolete words such as "thou," "thee," "thy," "thine," and "thyself" appear frequently. For example:

When **thou** impresses, what are precepts worth
Of stale example? When **thou** wilt inflame... 24 p.
In **thee** hath neither sting, knot, nor confine,
For **thou** art all, and all things else are thine. 24 p.
...**Thy** tooth is not so keen,
Because **thou** art not seen,
Although **thy** breath be rude. 32 p.
...But from **thine** eyes my knowledge I derive,
And, constant stars, in them I read such art... 55 p.
...Making a famine where abundance lies,
Thyselfthy foe, to **thy** sweet self too cruel... 69 p.

According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, the archaisms "thou," "thee," "thy," "thine," and "thyself" were first used before the 12th century. We consider them pronouns, and currently, they have the following forms in English:

- Thou – you
- Thee – you
- Thine – yours
- Thy – your
- Thyself – yourself
- Thence – there, here

These words underwent significant formal changes from the Old English period to the Modern English period."

Old English			Modern English
Case	Singular	Plural	Singular/plural
Subject pronoun	thou	ye	you
Object pronoun	thee	you	you
Possessive adjective	thy	your	your
Possessive pronoun	thine	yours	your
Reflexive	thyself	yourselves	yourself/yourselfs

We also frequently encounter them in Shakespeare's works. Shakespeare primarily used these pronouns in his sonnets to represent the "Soul" in love. For example: "I take thee at thy word..."

Looking closely at Karakalpak literature, the equivalents of "thou," "thee," "thy," "thine," and "thyself" in the forms of *sán*, *sańa*, *sendin*, *sán óziń* are frequently used in the works of Kunkhoja, Ajiniyaz, and Berdak, who lived and created in the 19th century and are considered true pioneers of Karakalpak literature.

Old Karakalpak			Modern Karakalpak
Parts of speech	Бирлик	Көплик	Бирлик/көплик
Атаў сеплик	сен/сән	сизлер	сен/сизлер
Табыс/барыс	сәна/саған	сизлерди, сизлерге, сенлерге	саған/ сизге,сизлерге
Ийелик	сәниң/сениң	сизлердиң	сениң/сизлердиң
Меншиклестириў	сәники/сеники	сизлердики	сеники/сизлердики
Өзлик алмасық	сән өзиң/сен өзиң	сизлердиң өзлериңиз	сениң өзиң/сизлердиң өзлериңиз
Шығыс сеплик	сендин/сеннен	сизлерден	сеннен/сизлерден

For example: Тәрийпиң дийейин хан Ханымбийке, Дүньяныңмахбубысендинсадаға.

If we look at the discourse of Ajiniyaz's love poetry, unlike Shakespeare, in addition to the *sán* (you) pronoun substitution

(addressing someone directly), the *anı* (she/her) pronoun substitution is also frequently used in relation to the beloved, to convey her description. It is formed in the following way:

Ески қарақалпақ тили			Хәзирги қарақалпақ тили
Сөз шақабы	Бирлик	Көплек	Бирлик/көплек
Атаў сеплик	ол	олар	Ол/олар
Табыс/барыс	аны, аңа	оларды/оларға	оған/оларға
Ийелик	аның	олардың	оның/олардың
Меншиклестириў	аники	олардики	Оники/олардики
Өзлик алмасық	аның өзи	олардың өзлери	оның өзи/олардың өзлери
Шығыс сеплик	аннан	олардан	оннан/олардан

Тынбас кеше-күндиз көзим гиряны,
 Болыппан мен *аның* бағры биряны...
 Хәр ким айтур *аңа* хәмдам болсам деп,
 Йолында жанымды пидә қылсам деп...
 Ашық Зийўар *аны* көрген заманы,
 Арақ сәйлан етиб ақты да кетти.

In the Karakalpak language, the reasons for the emergence of such forms were studied by B. Ubaydullaev. According to his opinion, in the Orkhon-Yenisei written monuments, they were used in the forms *maña* (to me), *saña* (to you), and *aña* (to him/her). Therefore, the forms *maña*, *saña*, *aña* in the accusative case of the personal pronouns used in the language of classical poets have historical roots, that is, they are influenced by the old written Chagatai language, which was common to the Central Asian peoples widely spread at that time.

At the time Shakespeare lived, these had possibly become archaic words in the English language lexicon. However, in Ajiniyaz's time, these are traditionally prominent in the creativity of poets. This is because in the literature of Turkic-speaking peoples, whose literature the poet used as a guide, they are also frequently used in the poetry of Navoi, Fizuli, Mashrab, Magtymguly, Kemine. The fact that the poet studied at an Arabic

madrasah and learned Arabic also has a significant impact on his skillful use of them, and a direct influence of the Arabic language is felt.

In the poetry of Shakespeare and Ajiniyaz, especially in sonnets and love lyrics, these archaisms are mainly used when longing for a desired one, waiting, yearning; in short, they are used in relation to the beloved, and both convey it with their own rhythm and intonation, which still adds beauty to their poetry. However, Kunhoja and Berdak did not use them only in relation to the beloved in their poems, but also generally used them for people, nature, phenomena, actions, and things:

Талап ислеп тап дуньяны,
Сүттен ақдур билсен аны.
Көп етсең өзиң гүнаны,
Жаман атлы боладурсаң.
«Қашан рәхатланадурсаң» by Berdakh

Here, the poet refers to the *dúnya* in the preceding line as "anı" Of course, these are not just included to rhyme the lines of the poem; with this, the poet's word becomes more beautiful and its impact increases.

By calling his desired beloved *anı* Ajiniyaz also expresses his respect for her. The reason Shakespeare used them so much may be that he said "I love you" to his beloved in that way, or that they expressed the endless love of two hearts. They are particularly noticeable in Shakespeare's sonnets 10, 11, 134, 100, 109, and in Ajiniyaz's poems such as 'A Beauty,' 'A Fairy,' 'Wrong,' and 'Sacrifice.'

In conclusion, the occurrence of such a similar phenomenon in the works of these two poets who lived at distant intervals is not accidental. Thou can be considered equivalent as thou – *аны*, *сән*, thee – *аңа*, *сәңа*, thy – *аның*, *сәниң*. However, grammatically, only "thou" is close to the pronoun "you." It would not be in vain if the younger generation could read and learn from these two sensitive, loving poets a great respect for love in their own right.

We will examine our conceptual analysis of the metaphorical lines (with examples in English) of the "Soul/Ruwx" concept in Shakespeare's *Henry V* and Ajiniyaz's 'Bozataw' poems. Based on these works, we have created 10 metaphorical columns.

1. *Soul – light/fire*

Henry V: O for a Muse of **fire**, that would ascend
The brightest heaven of invention! (Prologue, 1-2)
Now all the youth of England are **on fire**,
And silken dalliance in the wardrobe lies... (Act 2, Scene 1)

Бозатаў: Кимсениң қыз-уғлы, арзыўлы яры,
Кимсениң қашы кара, **көзи хунқары**...
Кимсе **көзи қунқарыдын** айрылды,
Башына қыямет түшти, Бозатаў.

Comparison: In Shakespeare, the soul appears on the battlefield as a "muse" fighting for justice, while in Ajiniyaz, the soul appears as "an eternal struggle" for the people, seeking enlightenment.

2. *Soul – water/river*

Henry V: There is some soul of goodness in things evil,
Would men observingly distil it out. (Act 4, Scene 1)
All the water in Wye cannot wash your Majesty's Welsh
blood out of your body, I can tell you that. (Act 4, Scene 7)

Бозатаў: **Көзим яшлы**, мен кетәрмән шарам йоқ,
Бир қудадан басқа пушты-панам йоқ... Тағыда:
Зийўарың хошласар қәдириңни билип,
Көзини яшартып, бағрыны тилип...

Comparison: In Shakespeare, the soul floats in the river of fate, full of thousands of thoughts, while in Ajiniyaz, the soul resembles a drop falling one by one from the eye.

3. *Soul – bird*

Henry V: And those that leave their valiant bones in France,
Dying like men, though buried in your dunghills,
They shall be famed; for there the sun shall greet them,
And draw their honours reeking up to heaven. (Act 4, Scene 3)

Бозатаў: Сен бағ едиң , бүлбил ушты зағ қалды,
Пүткил сийнем жанды иште дағ қалды.

Comparison: In Shakespeare, the soul is like a spirit striving for the sky, resembling the flight of a bird seeking heights, while in Ajiniyaz, the soul is a symbol of freedom and suffering.

4. *Soul – earth/soil*

Henry V: 1. This story shall the good man teach his son;
And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
From this day to the ending of the world,
But we in it shall be rememberèd." (Act 4, Scene 3)

2. Which **Salic land** the French unjustly gloze...
That **the land** Salic is in Germany...
Was not devisèd for the realm of France,
Nor did the French possess **the Salic land.**
(Act 1, Scene 2)

Бозатаў: 1. **Жер хәм ел** биләндур, ел **хәм жер** билән,
Жерсиз елдиң күни дәрба-дәр билән...

Also, place names such as Kyik Porkan, Bozatav, Atirek, Gurgun, Khajar Asti, Sham, Iraq, Gurd, Tehran, the Balkans, and Kungrad help to illustrate this metaphorical pillar.

Comparison: Although in both works the soul is depicted in connection with the homeland, in Shakespeare, the patriotic feeling is dominant, while in Ajiniyaz, national honor and spirit are dominant.

5. *Soul – sword/rifle*

Henry V: Whose blood is fet from fathers of war-proof,
Fathers that, like so many Alexanders,
Have in these parts from morn till even fought,
And **sheathed their swords for lack of argument.**
(Act 3, Scene 2)

Бозатаў: Сәхәр ўақта **қырлы дүпең атылды,**
Бенде болып түштим, колым шатылды...
Қала бузып түркмен бағрым дағлады,
Кимсени **дүпеңлеп,** кимди бағлады...

Comparison: In Shakespeare, the soul is a sword ready to engage in battle for honor, while in Ajiniyaz, the soul is the image of a person weary of searching for justice.

6. *Soul – wind, storm*

Henry V: And you, good yeomen,
Whose limbs were made in England,
show us here The mettle of your pasture; let us swear
That you are worth your breeding; which I doubt not;
For there is none of you so mean and base,
That hath not noble lustre in your eyes. (Act 3, Scene 1)

Бозатаў: **Елатың үстиндин серпилип көшти,**
Хош аман бол, бизден қалдың, Бозатаў.

Comparison: In Shakespeare, the soul is a wind seeking freedom, while in Ajiniyaz, the soul is a relentless storm; it constantly migrates and drives everything along with it. Here, the connotation of wind and storm has an explicit connection.

7. *Soul – shadow*

Henry V: Патша Генри патшалықтың тәшўишлери туўралы
ойлы ҳалатта:
What infinite heart's-ease
Must kings neglect, that private men enjoy?
And what have kings, that privates have not too,
Save ceremony, save general ceremony? (Act 4, Scene 1)

Бозатаў: **Ер йигит башына мүшкил ис түшти,**
Жүрек бағрым ғамның отына пишти...

Comparison: In Shakespeare, the soul is the uncertain shadow of fate, while in Ajiniyaz, the soul appears as a cloudy shadow that has settled upon hardship. Shakespeare compares the inner human world with glory and wealth. Glory is reflected here as a shadow falling on a person's head, while in Ajiniyaz, sorrow casts a dark gloom upon a person's head. Both are in a metaphorical sense.

8. *Soul – poem/song*

Henry V: Генрих өз жауынгерлерин руўхландырыў ушын төмендеги қатарларды айтқан.

Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot,

But he'll remember, with advantages,

What feats he did that day.

(Act 4, Scene 3)

Бозатаў: Өмири өтер жүректеги шер билән,
Қәдириң сениң бизге өтти, Бозатаў.

Comparison: In Shakespeare, the soul is a divinely beautiful belief, while in Ajiniyaz, the soul is a song of national spirit. Shakespeare says that all deeds will be forgotten, but the deeds they have done will be sung again like a song, while in Ajiniyaz, the word *sher* (poem/song) has two different meanings: one is human concern, the other is the endless song of human life. This can be viewed from two sides in the poem. Poem/song is used metaphorically in English, and in Karakalpak, it is used both metaphorically and literally.

9. *Soul – gold/wealth*

Henry V: By Jove, I am not covetous for gold,

Nor care I who doth feed upon my cost;

It yearns me not if men my garments wear;

Such outward things dwell not in my desires:

But if it be a sin to covet honour,

I am the most offending soul alive. (Act 4, Scene 3)

Бозатаў: Мәмбетмурат дийўанбеги кул болды,
Жан-ийманы, мүддахасы **пул болды...**

Comparison: In Shakespeare, the soul is gold purified through trial, while in Ajiniyaz, the soul is the inexhaustible wealth of the people.

10. *Soul – time*

Henry V: **We are in God's hand, brother, not in theirs.**

March to the bridge. **It now draws toward night.**

Beyond the river we'll encamp ourselves,

And **on tomorrow** bid them march away. (Act 3, Scene 6)

Бозатаў: Өмири өтер жүректеги шер билән,
Қәдириң сениң бизге өтти, Бозатаў.

Comparison: In Shakespeare, the soul is fleeting, while in Ajiniyaz, the soul is an eternal concept.

5. DISCUSSION

The exploration of personal pronouns in the poetry of Ajiniyaz and Shakespeare reveals a fascinating interplay between language, culture, and emotion, underscoring the enduring nature of love across different literary traditions. B. Ubaydullaev's study of the Karakalpak language highlights the historical roots of forms such as *maña* (to me), *saña* (to you), and *aña* (to him/her) in the Orkhon-Yenisei written monuments. These forms, which have been carried into the accusative case in classical poetry, reflect a linguistic heritage that connects contemporary Turkic languages to the old written Chagatai language prevalent among Central Asian peoples.

In contrast, during Shakespeare's era, these pronouns may have already begun to fade from common usage, potentially rendering them archaic within the English lexicon. Nevertheless, their presence in the works of Ajiniyaz illustrates a rich tradition where such forms are integral to poetic expression. The poet's education in an Arabic madrasah undoubtedly influenced his adept use of these pronouns, highlighting the significant impact of Arabic on Turkic poetic language.

Both poets utilize these archaisms within the context of longing and desire, particularly in sonnets and love lyrics. This shared thematic concern illustrates how deeply personal emotions can transcend cultural and temporal boundaries. The rhythmic and intonational qualities brought forth by these pronouns enhance the beauty of their poetry, allowing for a profound expression of yearning and affection.

Moreover, while Kunhoja and Berdak employed these forms broadly – addressing not only beloved individuals but also nature, phenomena, and objects – Ajiniyaz's use of *ani* to refer to his beloved signifies a nuanced respect and admiration. This linguistic choice enriches the emotional landscape of his poetry, much like Shakespeare's use of "thou" and its variants, which convey intimacy and depth in relationships.

The parallels drawn between the works of Ajiniyaz and Shakespeare reveal that such linguistic phenomena are not merely coincidental but rather indicative of a shared human experience. The equivalents found in their respective languages – “thou” as “ańa” or “sńn,” “thee” as “sańa” or “am,” and “thy” as “ańń” or “sńni” – demonstrate an intrinsic connection in how love is articulated across cultures.

As for the metaphorical analysis, the exploration of the metaphors surrounding the concept of "soul" in both Shakespeare's *Henry V* and Ajiniyaz's 'Bozataw' provides a rich tapestry of emotional and cultural significance. Each poet utilizes various metaphors to convey the complexities of human experience, honor, and identity, reflecting their respective societal contexts.

The exploration of the concept of "soul" in both Shakespeare's *Henry V* and Ajiniyaz's 'Bozataw' reveals a rich tapestry of metaphors that reflect the complexities of human experience, identity, and cultural values. In these works, the soul serves as a central motif through which the poets articulate their understanding of honor, struggle, and aspiration, each shaped by their respective societal contexts. In Shakespeare's portrayal, the soul often emerges as a source of light and fire, symbolizing inspiration and the drive for glory. This imagery underscores the noble aspirations that propel characters toward greatness, suggesting that the soul's purpose is intricately linked to the pursuit of honor. The metaphor of the soul as a river further illustrates this journey, emphasizing the fluidity of moral choices amidst life's challenges. Here, the river represents both the potential for growth and the inevitable struggles faced along the way. Conversely, Ajiniyaz offers a more intimate perspective on the soul, depicting it as a struggle for enlightenment and truth. His use of tears as a metaphor for personal sorrow highlights an emotional connection to the soul's journey, emphasizing the weight of individual experiences. This contrast between Shakespeare's valorization of glory and Ajiniyaz's focus on personal suffering illustrates how different cultures interpret the soul's navigation through hardship. Moreover, both poets utilize the imagery of birds to signify aspiration and freedom. In "Henry

V," the soul as a bird embodies the valor and honor that characters strive to achieve, soaring towards lofty ideals. In contrast, Ajiniyaz portrays the soul as one burdened by suffering yet yearning for liberation. This duality captures a universal desire for freedom while acknowledging the pain that often accompanies such aspirations.

The metaphor of earth and soil further underscores the connection between the soul and national identity. Shakespeare emphasizes duty to one's homeland, reflecting a society that values legacy and collective honor. Similarly, Ajiniyaz's references to land and honor reinforce how deeply rooted cultural values shape one's understanding of self and community. Both poets illustrate how the soul is intertwined with notions of heritage and belonging.

Additionally, the imagery of weapons in both texts signifies readiness for battle and sacrifice for a greater cause. In *Henry V*, the soul as a sword symbolizes valor and commitment to honor through conflict. Ajiniyaz, however, presents a more nuanced perspective on struggle, suggesting that the fight for justice is not solely external but also internal, reflecting personal and societal conflicts.

6. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the enduring relevance of these pronouns serves as a reminder of the universal nature of love and respect within poetic traditions. As we encourage younger generations to engage with the works of these two sensitive poets, we foster an appreciation for the profound ways in which language shapes our understanding of love and relationships. By learning from Ajiniyaz and Shakespeare, readers can cultivate a deeper respect for the emotional richness that poetry offers, transcending time and cultural boundaries. In addition, through these metaphorical representations, both Shakespeare and Ajiniyaz offer profound insights into the human condition. Their works reflect not only individual struggles but also broader themes related to honor, identity, and emotional depth within their respective cultural contexts. By examining these metaphors, we gain a deeper

understanding of how different societies articulate the essence of the human experience through poetry. The exploration reveals that while cultural expressions may differ, the fundamental questions about existence, purpose, and connection remain universal across time and space.

REFERENCES

1. Ájiniyaz Tañlamalı shıǵarmaları. 2022. Nókis: «Bilim».
2. Өжинияз. Баспағатаярлаўшылар: Қ. Байниязов, А. Альниязов, Т. Байниязова. 2014. ӨзРИАҚарақалпақстанбөлими, қарақалпақгуманитарилімлер-изертлеўинституты. Нөкис: «Илим».
3. Бердақ. 1977. Таңдамалы шығармаларының жыйнағы. Нөкис.: «Қарақалпақстан».
4. Бердимуратов, Е. & Давлетов, А. 1979. Ҳазирги қарақалпақ тили Нөкис.: «Karakalpakstan».
5. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
6. Saussure, F. 1959. *Course in General Linguistics*. Ed. Charles Bally & Albert Sechehaye. Trans. Wade Baskin. McGraw-Hill.
7. Shakespeare, W. 2012. Poems. PoemHunter.Com - The World's Poetry Archive.
8. Shakespeare, W. *The Life of King Henry V*. Ed. Barbara A. Mowat & Paul Werstine. Folger Shakespeare Library. Available online: <shakespeare.folger.edu>.

MUKHAMMADIYAROV AYDOS JOLDASBAEVICH
PHD STUDENT,
NUKUS STATE PEDAGOGICAL INSTITUTE, UZBEKISTAN
E-MAIL: <AYDMUXAM@MAIL.RU>