

**FROM NAMING TO PERSUASION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE  
NOMINATIVE, EVALUATIVE, EXPRESSIVE, AND ARGUMENTATIVE FUNCTIONS  
OF METAPHOR IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK**

**Hazratkulova Muborak**

University of Economics and Pedagogy

Email: [hzzratkulovamuborak@gmail.com](mailto:hzzratkulovamuborak@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** The article compares four major functions of metaphor in English and Uzbek: nominative, evaluative, expressive, and argumentative. It shows that metaphor in both languages helps speakers conceptualize abstract experience, express attitudes, intensify emotion, and guide interpretation.

**Keywords:** metaphor, nominative function, evaluative function, expressive function, argumentative function, English, Uzbek.

**NOMLASHDAN ISHONTIRISHGACHA: INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA  
METAFORANING NOMINATIV, BAHOLOVCHI, EKSPRESSIV VA  
ARGUMENTATIV FUNKSIYALARINING QIYOSIY TAHLILI**

**Annotatsiya.** Maqolada metaforaning nominativ, baholovchi, ekspressiv va argumentativ funksiyalari ingliz va o‘zbek tillari misolida qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi. Metafora har ikki tilda abstrakt tushunchalarni nomlash, baho berish, hissiy ta‘sirni kuchaytirish va fikrni yo‘naltirish uchun xizmat qilishi ko‘rsatiladi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** metafora, nominativ funksiya, baholovchi funksiya, ekspressiv funksiya, argumentativ funksiya, ingliz tili, o‘zbek tili.

**ОТ НОМИНАЦИИ К УБЕЖДЕНИЮ: СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ  
НОМИНАТИВНОЙ, ОЦЕНОЧНОЙ, ЭКСПРЕССИВНОЙ И АРГУМЕНТАТИВНОЙ  
ФУНКЦИЙ МЕТАФОРЫ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ**

**Аннотация.** В статье сопоставляются номинативная, оценочная, экспрессивная и аргументативная функции метафоры в английском и узбекском языках. Показано, что метафора в обоих языках участвует в концептуализации, оценке, эмоциональном воздействии и формировании интерпретации.

**Ключевые слова:** метафора, номинативная функция, оценочная функция, экспрессивная функция, аргументативная функция, английский язык, узбекский язык.

**Introduction**

Modern linguistics no longer treats metaphor as a mere ornament of poetic language. Cognitive metaphor theory established that metaphor is a basic mechanism of thought through which people understand abstract domains in terms of more concrete experience [1]. This view changed the direction of metaphor studies by showing that metaphor is present in everyday language, not only in literature. Subsequent research expanded this insight. Kövecses explains that metaphor is central to ordinary conceptualization and especially important in the language of emotion [2]. Semino shows that metaphor is common across discourse types and may perform different communicative functions depending on context [3]. Accordingly, metaphor can be studied as a functional resource rather than only as a stylistic figure. The present article focuses on four functions that are especially useful for comparative analysis: nominative, evaluative, expressive, and argumentative. English and Uzbek share many embodied metaphorical patterns, yet their discourse traditions are not identical. The article therefore aims to show both common cognitive tendencies and language-specific rhetorical preferences.

### **Literature Review**

Lakoff and Johnson argue that metaphor structures everyday thought and action because abstract concepts are regularly understood through source domains grounded in bodily and social experience [1]. Kövecses further demonstrates that metaphor is closely connected with culture and emotion; similar conceptual mappings may therefore be realized differently across languages [2].

Discourse-centered studies are equally important for the present topic. Semino emphasizes that metaphor is versatile in function and can explain, simplify, evaluate, or emotionally intensify communication [3]. Charteris-Black adds that metaphor is often persuasive and ideologically effective because it combines cognitive plausibility with affective appeal [4]. Research on framing in discourse likewise shows that metaphor choices can influence the interpretation of social reality and support particular inferences [5; 6].

### **Research Methodology**

This study applies a qualitative comparative method. The analysis is based on theoretical literature and on illustrative metaphorical examples from English and Uzbek discourse. The aim is not statistical measurement but functional interpretation: each metaphorical expression is examined according to its dominant communicative role in context. The procedure consists of three steps. First, expressions are grouped according to the function they mainly perform. Second, parallels and contrasts between English and Uzbek are identified. Third, the observations are interpreted in the light of cognitive and discourse-oriented metaphor scholarship [3; 4]. This method makes it possible to describe how metaphor operates as a resource for naming, evaluation, emotional expression, and persuasion.

## **Results and Their Analysis**

### **1. The Nominative Function**

The nominative function appears when metaphor supplies a name for an abstract, complex, or newly conceptualized phenomenon. In such cases, metaphor supports understanding rather than emotional effect. This function follows directly from conceptual metaphor theory, according to which abstract domains are structured through more concrete source domains [1]. In English, expressions such as foundation of a theory, bottleneck in the system, flood of information, and backbone of the economy show how metaphor turns abstraction into manageable concepts. Uzbek displays parallel patterns in taraqqiyot yo'li, bilim manbai, jamiyat poydevori, and fikr oqimi. In both languages, movement, structure, source, and force domains are productive because they facilitate conceptual access. A difference can nevertheless be observed. English nominative metaphors are often highly conventionalized and may sound almost technical. Uzbek nominative metaphors, while also conventional, often remain more semantically vivid and can preserve stronger cultural resonance. Thus, both languages use metaphor for naming, but the degree of felt imagery may differ.

### **2. The Evaluative Function**

The evaluative function is activated when metaphor communicates judgment. Here metaphor does not merely refer to reality; it marks a phenomenon as positive, negative, stable, dangerous, admirable, or corrupt. Semino's discourse approach and Charteris-Black's critical metaphor analysis are especially helpful for understanding this function [3; 4]. English discourse offers many examples: toxic atmosphere, broken system, fragile peace, unhealthy obsession, rotten policy. These metaphors encode evaluation through the source domains of illness, damage, weakness, and decay. Uzbek uses comparable metaphorical judgments in chirigan tizim, sog'lom muhit, xalqning og'rig'i, and ma'naviy tanazzul. In both languages, health and bodily well-being serve as powerful standards for judging institutions and social conditions. The comparison suggests that Uzbek evaluative metaphor often carries a more openly ethical and communal tone, especially in discourse about education, society, or morality. English also uses strongly evaluative metaphors, but in formal registers it frequently presents them in a more compressed and institutionally neutral style. The evaluative function is therefore common to both languages, though its rhetorical intensity may vary.

### **3. The Expressive Function**

The expressive function becomes central when metaphor intensifies emotion and makes discourse vivid. Kövecses shows that emotional experience is often conceptualized through force,

pressure, heat, movement, and containment [2]. This is why metaphor is so productive in emotionally charged discourse.

In English, expressions such as anger erupted, hope faded, words cut deeply, and the news hit like a storm dramatize inner experience through physical events. Uzbek offers equally expressive forms: qalbi ezildi, ich-ichidan yondi, ko'ngli tog'dek ko'tarildi, dardini ichiga yutdi. Such examples show that both languages rely on embodied imagery to render emotion tangible. At the same time, stylistic preferences differ. English expressive metaphor often foregrounds sudden motion or impact, whereas Uzbek frequently highlights inward endurance, the heart, and the culturally familiar imagery of suffering and resilience. This gives Uzbek metaphor a particularly intimate affective tone, while English often sounds more event-centered.

#### **4. The Argumentative Function**

The argumentative function is one of the most consequential because metaphor can shape reasoning itself. A metaphor frames an issue so that some conclusions appear more natural than others. Studies on framing in discourse show that metaphor influences interpretation, while Musolff demonstrates that metaphor scenarios structure public argumentation [5; 6]. English examples such as education is an investment, politics is a battlefield, reform is a journey, and the economy is a machine each promote different ways of reasoning. If education is framed as investment, efficiency and return become salient; if politics is framed as war, conflict and victory become central. Uzbek discourse uses the same logic in expressions such as islohot yo'li, kelajak poydevori, jamiyat tanasi, and taraqqiyotning lokomotivi. In each case, the metaphor offers a scenario with roles, aims, obstacles, and expected solutions. This function is closely tied to persuasion. Charteris-Black argues that metaphor is persuasive because it links cognition with emotion [4]. Consequently, calling a problem a disease invites cure, calling it a burden invites relief, and calling it an opportunity invites investment. The argumentative function therefore reveals metaphor as a tool of framing, legitimation, and ideological influence in both English and Uzbek.

#### **Conclusion**

The analysis confirms that metaphor in English and Uzbek performs important nominative, evaluative, expressive, and argumentative functions. Through these functions, metaphor names abstract phenomena, conveys judgment, intensifies feeling, and guides interpretation. In real discourse, these functions often overlap, but distinguishing the dominant one makes comparative analysis clearer.

The study also suggests that English often favors compact and highly conventionalized metaphorical formulations, while Uzbek more frequently preserves stronger emotional, moral, and

culturally resonant coloring. These differences do not contradict the universal cognitive basis of metaphor; rather, they show how shared embodied patterns interact with different discourse traditions. For this reason, functional comparison of metaphor remains valuable for cognitive linguistics, discourse studies, translation, and intercultural communication.

### **References**

1. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.
2. Kövecses, Z. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
3. Semino, E. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
4. Charteris-Black, J. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
5. Semino, E., Demjén, Z. *Metaphor, Metonymy and Framing in Discourse*. In: *The Cambridge Handbook of Discourse Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. P. 213-234.
6. Musolff, A. *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.