

An Analysis of the Means Expressing the Pragmatic Properties of Metaphor in English and Uzbek Novels

RUZIYEVA NIGORA SAPAR QIZI

Denov Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article examines the linguistic means through which the pragmatic properties of metaphor are expressed in English and Uzbek novels. Although metaphor has been described in detail as a conceptual and a stylistic phenomenon, far less attention has been paid to the concrete formal devices by which novelists make metaphorical expressions perform speech-act-like work: evaluating, persuading, mitigating, characterising and guiding the reader along a particular inferential path. Drawing on a manually annotated corpus of approximately 240,000 running words sampled from six English and six Uzbek novels of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, the study identifies five groups of means: lexico-semantic, morphological, syntactic, phraseological-cultural, and metadiscursive. The analysis combines a modified version of the MIPVU identification procedure with a functional-pragmatic annotation scheme derived from relevance theory, speech act theory and politeness theory. The results show that the two languages converge in the range of pragmatic functions that metaphor performs but diverge substantially in the means that encode them. English novels rely more heavily on syntactic and metadiscursive framing, whereas Uzbek novels concentrate pragmatic force in morphological resources, above all the comparative affixes -day/-dek, -simon and -namo, and in phraseological units with dense cultural coding. The findings have implications for contrastive stylistics, literary translation and the teaching of interpretation.

Keywords: Metaphor, pragmatics, novel, implicature, relevance theory, evaluative meaning, metaphor signalling, contrastive stylistics, English, Uzbek

INTRODUCTION

Metaphor is no longer treated as a decorative supplement to literal speech. Since the publication of *Metaphors We Live By* (Lakoff & Johnson 1980), the dominant view has been that metaphor is a property of thought that happens to surface in language, and that the systematic mappings between conceptual domains which underlie ordinary talk also underlie the most elaborate figures of literary art (Lakoff & Turner 1989). This cognitive reorientation has produced an impressive body of descriptive work, including a substantial body of work on Uzbek material. What it has not produced, however, is an equally detailed account of what metaphor does to the addressee at the moment of reading, and of which formal resources a given language makes available for doing it.

The gap is a pragmatic one. A conceptual mapping such as “Anger is fire” is an abstraction over many possible utterances; it does not tell us why a novelist chose to describe a character’s rage as a slow fire rather than an explosion, why the description was hedged with a sort of, or why the same mapping is realised in Uzbek through a single suffixed form. These choices concern the speaker’s commitment to the proposition, the strength of the evaluation, the face-threat it carries, and the inferential labour the reader is invited to perform. Steen (2008) named this the paradox of metaphor: metaphor may be conceptual in structure, yet it is always deployed in communication, and it is the deployment that produces the rhetorical effect.

The present study addresses that gap by asking a deliberately formal question. If metaphor in the novel performs pragmatic work, by what means is that work encoded? The question is worth asking comparatively, because English and Uzbek are typologically distant. English is a predominantly analytic, subject-verb-object language with a limited derivational apparatus for comparison and evaluation but a rich inventory of

syntactic and metadiscursive framing devices. Uzbek is agglutinative and subject-object-verb, with a highly productive system of comparative, diminutive and evaluative affixes and a clause-final predicate that places the metaphorical element in communicative focus by default. One would therefore expect the same functions to be distributed across different formal channels.

Three research questions guide the analysis.

1. First, which formal means express the pragmatic properties of metaphor in English and Uzbek novels, and how may they be classified?
2. Second, how are those means distributed quantitatively across the two subcorpora?
3. Third, to what extent do differences in the distribution of means correlate with differences in the pragmatic functions actually realised, and to what extent do they merely reflect typological differences in the encoding of the same functions?

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

The classical rhetorical tradition treated metaphor as a transfer of a name from one thing to another and as an ornament that could in principle be paraphrased away. Black (1962) undermined the paraphrase assumption with the interaction view, according to which the vehicle organises the reader's perception of the topic in a way that no literal restatement reproduces. Lakoff & Johnson (1980) argued that the transfer occurs between conceptual domains rather than between words, and Kövecses (2010, 2015) refined the model by adding scope, range and contextual pressure, showing that the metaphors actually produced depend as much on immediate situational factors as on entrenched mappings.

Applied to literature, this framework yielded the insight that poetic metaphor is typically a creative extension, elaboration or combination of conventional mappings rather than an invention *ex nihilo* (Lakoff & Turner 1989). Semino & Steen (2008) showed that literary metaphor differs from everyday metaphor in density, novelty and patterning rather than in kind, while corpus work has demonstrated that conventional metaphorical senses are

grammatically and collocationally constrained (Deignan 2005) and that persuasive weight depends on linguistic form (Charteris-Black 2004).

Searle (1979) approached metaphor as a divergence between sentence meaning and speaker meaning, arguing that the hearer must first register the inadequacy of the literal reading and then compute what the speaker intended. Grice (1975) had located the mechanism in the flouting of the first maxim of Quality. Both are two-stage models, and both have been criticised on psycholinguistic grounds by Gibbs (1994), who showed that conventional metaphors are understood as quickly as their literal counterparts.

Relevance theory offers a one-stage alternative. Sperber & Wilson (1995, 2008) treat metaphor as a case of loose use lying on a continuum with hyperbole and approximation: the hearer constructs an ad hoc concept by broadening or narrowing the encoded concept until the utterance yields adequate cognitive effects for the processing effort expended. Carston (2002) developed the account in detail and Wilson (2011) compared it with the cognitive-linguistic model. The consequence for the present study is that linguistic form determines processing effort and therefore determines which effects are worth deriving: a hedged metaphor licenses weaker implicatures than an unhedged one, and a metaphor in predicate position licenses a stronger commitment than the same metaphor in an appositive.

Two further strands complete the picture. Leech (1983) and Brown & Levinson (1987) showed that indirectness is a resource for managing face, and metaphor is a canonical off-record strategy: an unfavourable evaluation delivered metaphorically can be retracted in a way that a literal insult cannot. Goatly (2011) catalogued the markers that accompany metaphors in English, Cameron (2003) introduced the notion of tuning devices, and Semino (2008) and Musolff (2016) extended the analysis to ideological framing.

Uzbek scholarship approached metaphor first through stylistics and lingvopoetics. Qo'chqortoyev (1977) analysed figurative transfer as a component of artistic speech style, and

Mukarramov (1976) produced a detailed monographic treatment of comparison, including the affixal means that distinguish Uzbek from Indo-European languages. Yo'ldoshev (2008) established lingvopoetics as a systematic discipline for the study of the artistic text and devoted particular attention to the way individual authors, notably Qodiriy and Cho'lpon, exploit the resources of the language for evaluative purposes.

The pragmatic turn came later. Safarov (2008) introduced pragmalinguistics to Uzbek philology as a coherent discipline covering speech acts, deixis, presupposition and implicature, and his earlier work on cognitive linguistics (Safarov 2006) supplied the conceptual vocabulary for metaphor analysis. Hakimov (2013) elaborated the foundations of Uzbek pragmalinguistics with a focus on the interaction of grammatical form and communicative intention, and Xudoyberganova (2013) developed an anthropocentric approach in which figurative units are read as traces of the speaking subject. Mahmudov (2013) argued for an integrated description in which formal, cognitive and pragmatic levels are treated together. Comparative English-Uzbek work goes back to Bo'ronov (1973) but has concentrated on grammatical rather than pragmatic categories. Three observations follow. First, the pragmatic literature on metaphor is overwhelmingly based on English and on non-literary genres such as political and journalistic discourse. Second, the Uzbek literature is rich in stylistic and lingvopoetic description but has not systematically inventoried the formal means by which pragmatic force is encoded. Third, no contrastive study known to the present author has quantified, on a comparable corpus, how the same pragmatic functions are distributed across different formal channels in the two languages.

The corpus was designed to be balanced in size, comparable in period, and representative of the mainstream novelistic tradition of each literature. Twelve novels were selected, six in English and six in Uzbek. From each novel a continuous sample of approximately 20,000 running words was extracted, beginning at the opening of a chapter located in the middle third of the book in order to avoid the atypical density of figurative language that often characterises openings and closings. The resulting corpus

contains approximately 240,000 running words, evenly divided between the two languages. Table 1 sets out the composition.

Table 1. *Composition of the research corpus*

Author	Novel	Year	Sample (words)
English subcorpus	6 novels	1925-2001	120,000
V. Woolf	<i>Mrs Dalloway</i>	1925	20,100
F. S. Fitzgerald	<i>The Great Gatsby</i>	1925	19,900
W. Golding	<i>Lord of the Flies</i>	1954	20,050
G. Greene	<i>The Quiet American</i>	1955	19,950
K. Ishiguro	<i>The Remains of the Day</i>	1989	20,000
I. McEwan	<i>Atonement</i>	2001	20,000
Uzbek subcorpus	6 novels	1926-2011	120,000
A. Qodiriy	<i>O'tkan kunlar</i>	1926	20,050
Cho'lpon	<i>Kecha va kunduz</i>	1936	19,900
O. Yoqubov	<i>Ulug'bek xazinasi</i>	1974	20,000
O'. Hoshimov	<i>Ikki eshik orasi</i>	1986	20,100
T. Murod	<i>Otamdan qolgan dalalar</i>	1994	19,950
I. Sulton	<i>Boqiy darbadar</i>	2011	20,000
Total	12 novels	1925-2011	240,000

The selection is deliberately conservative: all twelve works are canonical and available in reliable editions, which reduces the risk that idiosyncratic authorial practice is mistaken for a language-level tendency. The chronological spread is comparable across the two subcorpora.

Metaphorically used lexical units were identified by a modified version of the MIPVU procedure (Steen et al. 2010), itself an elaboration of MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007). For each lexical unit the analyst established the contextual meaning, checked whether a more basic contemporary meaning existed in a reference dictionary, and, if so, decided whether the contextual meaning could be understood by comparison with the basic one. Units meeting the last condition were marked as metaphor-related words.

Two modifications were necessary for the Uzbek subcorpus. First, the Uzbek explanatory dictionary was used as the primary

reference for basic senses, with cross-checking against a second dictionary in doubtful cases. Second, because Uzbek encodes comparison affixally rather than by a separate function word, the procedure was extended so that a stem carrying *-day*, *-dek*, *-simon* or *-namo* counts as a single metaphor-related unit rather than as a marker plus a stem. Without this extension the two subcorpora would not have been comparable.

Inter-annotator agreement was checked on a randomly selected ten per cent of the corpus, annotated independently by the author and a second trained analyst. Agreement on metaphor identification reached a Cohen's kappa of .82, which is consistent with values reported for MIPVU in the literature. Disagreements were resolved by discussion.

Each identified item was annotated on two independent dimensions. The first records the formal means through which the pragmatic property is expressed; the five categories, developed inductively during a pilot analysis of 20,000 words, are lexico-semantic, morphological, syntactic, phraseological-cultural, and metadiscursive. Where more than one means was present, the item was assigned to the category carrying the dominant pragmatic load.

The second dimension records the dominant pragmatic function. Six functions were distinguished: evaluative-axiological, characterising, emotive-expressive, persuasive-argumentative, mitigating-euphemistic, and text-organising. The taxonomy derives from the speech-act and politeness literature (Searle 1979; Leech 1983; Brown & Levinson 1987) and from Semino (2008) and Charteris-Black (2004). Assignment was based on a co-text of at least three sentences. Frequencies were normalised per 10,000 running words.

A total of 3,818 metaphor-related items were identified, 1,842 in the English subcorpus and 1,976 in the Uzbek subcorpus. Normalised to 10,000 running words this yields 153.5 items for English and 164.7 for Uzbek. The difference of roughly seven per cent is modest and does not support any claim that one literature is intrinsically more figurative than the other. The interesting differences lie not in density but in distribution, which Table 2 summarises.

Table 2. *Distribution of the means expressing pragmatic properties of metaphor*

Group of means	English (n)	English (%)	Uzbek (n)	Uzbek (%)
Lexico-semantic	968	52.6	842	42.6
Morphological	121	6.6	517	26.2
Syntactic	402	21.8	268	13.6
Phraseological-cultural	208	11.3	279	14.1
Metadiscursive	143	7.7	70	3.5
Total	1,842	100.0	1,976	100.0

Note: Normalised frequencies per 10,000 running words: English 153.5; Uzbek 164.7.

Lexico-semantic means are the default channel in both languages, accounting for slightly more than half of the English data and slightly more than two fifths of the Uzbek data. This category covers metaphorically used verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs whose pragmatic force resides in the semantic distance between vehicle and topic and in the evaluative charge that the vehicle carries independently of any additional marking.

Within this category the two languages differ in the part of speech that bears the load. English shows a marked preference for the verb: 44.1 per cent of English lexico-semantic items are verbal, against 31.6 per cent in Uzbek. Verbs such as *crush*, *drift*, *seep* and *harden* carry the evaluation into the predicate, where it is least available for negotiation, since a predicate is asserted rather than presupposed. Uzbek distributes the load more evenly, with a higher proportion of nominal metaphors, 38.4 per cent against 27.2 per cent. Nominal metaphors such as *umr dovoni*, the mountain pass of life, or *ko'ngil ko'zgusi*, the mirror of the heart, package the evaluation as a referring expression and thereby present it as given rather than asserted.

The rhetorical consequence is demonstrable. Assertion invites disagreement; presupposition does not. When an Uzbek narrator refers to a character's ambition as a fire that has already been lit, the existence of the fire is presupposed by the referring expression and the reader is manoeuvred into accepting the frame before any propositional content is evaluated.

A second contrast concerns preferred source domains. English shows a heavy concentration of mechanical, nautical and meteorological vehicles; Uzbek a corresponding concentration of somatic, equine, agricultural and luminous ones. The somatic group is particularly productive: the nouns *ko'ngil*, *yurak*, *jigar* and *bag'ir* generate large families of metaphorical predicates whose evaluative polarity is fixed by convention. English possesses the heart-based family but not the liver-based one, and translators are obliged either to neutralise the vehicle or to substitute a different organ, with a loss of evaluative precision.

The most striking quantitative asymmetry in the data concerns morphological means, which account for 26.2 per cent of the Uzbek items but only 6.6 per cent of the English items, a fourfold difference. This is a typological consequence rather than a stylistic one, but it has substantial pragmatic implications.

Uzbek possesses a set of highly productive affixes that convert a nominal stem into a comparative predicate or modifier. The pair *-day* and *-dek* is the most frequent, producing *toshdek*, like a stone, *o'qdek*, like an arrow, and *muzdek*, like ice; *-simon* derives a shape-based resemblance, as in *ilonsimon*, serpentine; and *-namo* derives a resemblance carrying a pejorative or ironic overtone, as in *olimnamo*, would-be scholar. The crucial pragmatic point is that these forms are morphologically integrated: because the comparison is fused into a single word, the reader is not offered the interpretive pause that an analytic marker such as English *like* provides, and the evaluation is processed as a single act.

Uzbek also uses evaluative affixes to modulate the strength of a metaphor. The diminutive *-cha*, the affective *-gina* and the endearing *-jon* can attach to a metaphorical vehicle and adjust its force, so that a vehicle harsh in its bare form becomes tolerable when suffixed. This is a morphological realisation of what Cameron (2003) called tuning and of the face-saving work that Brown & Levinson (1987) attributed to off-record strategies. English has no equivalent resource and must resort to separate hedging words.

The English morphological inventory is comparatively thin but not empty. Derivational suffixes such as “-like,” “-ish” and “-

y” produce forms of the type “birdlike,” “wolfish” and “stony”; compounding produces evaluative modifiers such as iron-grey and razor-thin; and conversion produces verbs from concrete nouns, as in he shouldered his way through the crowd, where the metaphor is carried by the category shift itself. These devices are productive but lack systematic evaluative gradation.

A further Uzbek resource, and one that is easily overlooked, is the compound verb formed from a lexical verb plus an auxiliary. Forms such as *yonib ketdi*, roughly burst into flame, and *so'nib bordi*, gradually faded, encode not only the metaphorical event but also its aspectual profile and, through the auxiliary, the narrator's stance towards its abruptness or gradualness. The auxiliary is thus doing pragmatic work of a kind that English distributes across adverbials and aspectual periphrasis.

Syntactic means account for 21.8 per cent of the English data against 13.6 per cent of the Uzbek data. Four constructions dominate the English figures.

The copular identification of the type X is Y asserts the metaphorical identity directly and commits the narrator to it; because it is assertive, it is the most face-threatening option and is reserved for moments of narrative climax. The appositive of the type Y, a Z, presents the characterisation as a parenthetical aside, a weaker commitment that can convey an unfavourable evaluation while formally treating it as incidental, and appositives are correspondingly frequent in ironic narration.

The of-genitive of the type the storm of his anger nominalises the metaphorical relation and presupposes rather than asserts it. This is the principal English functional equivalent of the Uzbek nominal metaphor discussed above, and its frequency goes some way towards explaining why English needs fewer nominal metaphors. Extended metaphor, finally, distributes a single mapping over a stretch of text and thereby converts the metaphor into a cohesive device as well as an evaluative one; extended metaphors are the principal locus of the text-organising function in the English data.

Uzbek makes less use of these constructions, but possesses a syntactic resource that English lacks: the obligatory clause-final

position of the predicate. Because Uzbek is verb-final, a metaphorical predicate automatically occupies the position of end focus, which carries the highest communicative dynamism. The metaphor is thus foregrounded by default, without additional marking, whereas English must use clefting, fronting or postposition to achieve comparable prominence. A lower frequency of syntactic means therefore does not indicate a weaker syntactic contribution; the contribution is built into the unmarked order and is invisible to a procedure that registers only marked constructions.

Both languages use parallelism, but differently. English parallelism tends to be binary and antithetical, whereas Uzbek parallelism frequently follows the tripartite rhythm of the oral tradition, in which a metaphorical predicate is repeated with three vehicles of increasing intensity. The device is inherited from the folk epic and carries an audience-directed, quasi-oral pragmatics with no direct English counterpart in the novel.

Phraseological means account for 14.1 per cent of the Uzbek data and 11.3 percent of the English data. The difference is smaller than one might expect, but the internal composition of the two sets differs sharply.

The English phraseological metaphors in the corpus are drawn predominantly from seafaring, mechanical engineering, sport and gardening. Their pragmatic value lies chiefly in their conventionality: because they are recognised instantly, they impose minimal processing cost and are used where the narrator wishes to evaluate without drawing attention to the act of evaluating.

The Uzbek phraseological metaphors cluster around somatic vehicles, hospitality and commensality, “the horse” and “the road,” “light and fire,” and the vocabulary of classical Islamic tradition. Their pragmatic value is different in kind. Because many carry an explicit moral charge inherited from a shared didactic tradition, their use invokes not merely an evaluation but a community of evaluators: when a narrator characterises a betrayal through an expression drawn from the ethics of bread and salt, the reader is addressed as a member of a moral community that already knows what such a betrayal is worth.

This is an effect of solidarity, in Leech's terms an appeal to the agreement maxim.

The translational consequences are severe. A culturally coded phraseological metaphor cannot be rendered by a semantic equivalent without stripping away the solidarity effect, nor by a functional equivalent from the target culture without importing a foreign moral community into the text. The present data show how frequent the problem is: nearly a seventh of all Uzbek metaphorical items present it in some form.

Metadiscursive means are the smallest category in both subcorpora but they are the most explicitly pragmatic, since their sole function is to comment on the metaphorical act itself. They account for 7.7 percent of the English data and 3.5 per cent of the Uzbek data. Table 3 sets out the inventory.

Table 3. *Metadiscursive signalling and tuning devices*

Type of device	English exponents	n	Uzbek exponents	n
Approximating quantifiers	a kind of, a sort of	44	<i>bir turli, qandaydir</i>	13
Perception/seeming verbs	seemed, appeared, felt like	52	<i>go'yo, go'yoki</i>	27
Explicit metaphor signals	as it were, so to speak, if you will	21	<i>xuddi, bamisoli</i>	14
Intensity qualifiers	almost, practically, virtually	26	<i>deyarli, nechog'lik</i>	9
Metatextual comment	-	0	<i>aytish mumkinki</i>	7
Total		143		70

The English devices fall into four groups. 1) Approximating quantifiers such as a kind of instruct the reader to broaden the encoded concept rather than apply it strictly. 2) Perception and seeming verbs attribute the construal to an experiencing consciousness rather than to the narrator, which localises the evaluation and protects the narrator from commitment to it. 3) Explicit signals such as as it were flag the utterance as deliberate metaphor in Steen's sense. 4) Intensity qualifiers such as almost position the utterance on the boundary between metaphor and

literal statement, and are used where a narrator wishes to make a strong claim while retaining deniability.

The Uzbek devices are fewer and are dominated by *go'yo* and its variants, which cover much of the ground occupied in English by both seeming verbs and explicit signals. The relative scarcity of Uzbek metadiscursive marking should not be read as a lack of pragmatic subtlety. It follows directly from the morphological findings because Uzbek can tune a metaphor by affixation, it does not need a separate hedging word to do the same work. The two categories are in complementary distribution, and taken together, morphological and metadiscursive means account for 29.7 percent of Uzbek items and 14.3 percent of English items. The remaining difference is absorbed by the higher English figures for syntactic means.

Table 4 reports the distribution of the six pragmatic functions across the two subcorpora.

Table 4. *Distribution of the dominant pragmatic functions of metaphor*

Pragmatic function	English (n)	English (%)	Uzbek (n)	Uzbek (%)
Evaluative-axiological	486	26.4	604	30.6
Characterising	512	27.8	528	26.7
Emotive-expressive	331	18.0	402	20.3
Persuasive-argumentative	244	13.2	176	8.9
Mitigating-euphemistic	152	8.3	148	7.5
Text-organising	117	6.3	118	6.0
Total	1,842	100.0	1,976	100.0

The overall profiles are similar, and this similarity is itself a finding. The four largest categories are the same in both languages and in almost the same order, which supports the view that the pragmatic work performed by metaphor in the novel is a genre property rather than a language-specific one. Two differences are nonetheless worth comment.

The evaluative-axiological function is more prominent in Uzbek, 30.6 per cent against 26.4 per cent. This is consistent with the phraseological findings: a literature whose figurative stock carries an inherited moral charge produces a higher proportion of items whose dominant purpose is to place the referent on a scale of value. It also reflects narrative convention, since an overt evaluating narrator is more readily tolerated in the Uzbek novel than in the post-Jamesian English tradition, where evaluative comment is displaced into free indirect discourse.

The persuasive-argumentative function is correspondingly more prominent in English, 13.2 per cent against 8.9 per cent. Persuasive metaphor is concentrated in passages of reported reasoning, and the higher English figure correlates with the higher frequency of extended metaphor, since an argument delivered figuratively generally requires the mapping to be sustained across several sentences.

Three general conclusions emerge.

1. **The first is a principle of functional constancy:** the set of pragmatic tasks that metaphor performs in the novel is stable across the two literatures, and the differences in proportion are matters of emphasis rather than of inventory. This supports a genre-based rather than a language-based account of literary metaphor function.
2. **The second is a principle of formal redistribution:** Where a language possesses a productive morphological resource it will use it in preference to an analytic one, and the analytic resource will be correspondingly less frequent without any loss of expressive power. The complementary distribution of Uzbek affixal tuning and English metadiscursive hedging is the clearest instance, but the same relation holds between Uzbek verb-final focus and English marked syntactic prominence.
3. **The third is a principle of cultural weighting:** The two literatures differ not in whether metaphor evaluates but in the source of the evaluative authority to which it appeals. English literary metaphor tends to derive its authority from the perceptual vividness of the vehicle; Uzbek literary

metaphor frequently derives it from a shared moral tradition. This difference does not appear in the distribution of functions, since both cases are coded as evaluative, but it appears clearly in the distribution of means.

For contrastive stylistics, the findings suggest that comparisons of figurative density between typologically distant languages are of limited value unless the counting procedure is adjusted for the morphological encoding of comparison. Had this study counted only analytic comparison markers, the Uzbek subcorpus would have appeared substantially less figurative than the English, and the conclusion would have been an artefact of the method.

For literary translation, two systematic pressure points emerge: affixal tuning, which must be redistributed onto English hedging expressions with a shift in the location of the pragmatic marking within the clause, and culturally coded phraseology, where no strategy fully preserves the solidarity effect. For teaching, the findings support an approach in which students are asked not only what a metaphor means but what it does and by what means; Uzbek learners working on English texts systematically underinterpret metadiscursive hedging because their first language marks the same function morphologically.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to identify the linguistic means by which the pragmatic properties of metaphor are expressed in English and Uzbek novels, and to establish how those means are distributed. On a balanced corpus of approximately 240,000 running words drawn from twelve canonical novels, 3,818 metaphor-related items were identified and annotated for formal means and pragmatic function.

The answer to the first research question is a five-part classification: lexico-semantic, morphological, syntactic, phraseological-cultural, and metadiscursive means. The classification was developed inductively but proved applicable to both languages without modification, which suggests that it may be usable for other language pairs.

The answer to the second question is that the distribution differs substantially. Uzbek concentrates pragmatic marking in morphology, with 26.2 per cent of items against 6.6 per cent in English, and in culturally coded phraseology. English concentrates it in syntax, with 21.8 per cent against 13.6 per cent, and in metadiscursive signalling, with 7.7 per cent against 3.5 per cent. Lexico-semantic means predominate in both, but with a different part-of-speech profile: English favours the metaphorical verb, Uzbek the metaphorical noun.

The answer to the third question is that differences in means do not correspond to differences in function. The six pragmatic functions are distributed similarly in the two subcorpora, with only two differences exceeding four percentage points. The evidence supports a model in which pragmatic functions are relatively constant across the novelistic genre while the formal channels that carry them are determined by the typological profile of the language and by the cultural resources of the literary tradition.

Three limitations should be acknowledged. The corpus is small by the standards of corpus linguistics, and the sampling of continuous extracts means that whole-novel patterns of metaphorical development are not captured. The functional annotation assigns a single dominant function to each item, which simplifies cases of genuine multifunctionality. And the findings should not be extrapolated to poetry or drama, where the conditions of reception differ.

Further work should enlarge the corpus and make it available for replication, extend the analysis to translated texts so that the strategies actually adopted by translators can be compared with the pressure points identified here, and test the classification on a third language with a different typological profile in order to establish whether the principle of formal redistribution holds more generally.

REFERENCES

- Black, M. 1962. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Bo'ronov, J. 1973. *Ingliz va o'zbek tillarining qiyosiy grammatikasi* [A comparative grammar of English and Uzbek]. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, L. 2003. *Metaphor in Educational Discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Carston, R. 2002. *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2004. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deignan, A. 2005. *Metaphor and Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gibbs, R. W. 1994. *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . (Ed.) 2008. *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goatly, A. 2011. *The Language of Metaphors*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Hakimov, M. 2013. *O'zbek pragmalolingvistikasi asoslari* [Foundations of Uzbek pragmalinguistics]. Toshkent: Akademnashr.
- Kövecses, Z. 2010. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2015. *Where Metaphors come from: Reconsidering Context in Metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . & Turner, M. 1989. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Leech, G. N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Mahmudov, N. 2013. Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo'llarini izlab [In search of ways towards a comprehensive study of language]. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 5, 3-16.
- Mukarramov, M. 1976. *O'zbek tilida o'xshatish* [Comparison in the Uzbek language]. Toshkent: Fan.
- Musolff, A. 2016. *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Pragglejaz Group. 2007. MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22/1, 1-39.

- Qo'chqortoyev, I. 1977. *Badiiy nutq stilistikasi* [The stylistics of artistic speech]. Toshkent: TDU nashriyoti.
- Safarov, Sh. 2006. *Kognitiv tilshunoslik* [Cognitive linguistics]. Jizzax: Sangzor.
- . 2008. *Pragmalingvistika* [Pragmalinguistics]. Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
- Searle, J. R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Semino, E. 2008. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . & Steen, G. 2008. Metaphor in literature. In R. W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 232-246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . & Wilson, D. 2008. A deflationary account of metaphors. In R. W. Gibbs (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (pp. 84-105). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steen, G. J. 2008. The paradox of metaphor: Why we need a three-dimensional model of metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 23/4, 213-241.
- , Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T. & Pasma, T. 2010. *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Verschueren, J. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Wilson, D. 2011. Parallels and differences in the treatment of metaphor in relevance theory and cognitive linguistics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 8/2, 177-196.
- Xudoyberganova, D. 2013. *Matnning Antroposentrik Tadqiqi* [An anthropocentric study of the text]. Toshkent: Fan.
- Yo'ldoshev, M. 2008. *Badiiy Matn Lingvopoetikasi* [The lingvopoetics of the artistic text]. Toshkent: Fan.

RUZIYEVA NIGORA SAPAR QIZI

INDEPENDENT RESEARCHER,

DENOV INSTITUTE OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP

AND PEDAGOGY, DENOV, UZBEKISTAN.

ORCID: 0009-0003-3727-5809

E-MAIL: <NIGORA.RUZIYEVA.88@INBOX.RU>