Published Date: - 31-12-2025

Page No: - 90-93


# Cognitive And Metaphorical Functions Of Construction And Architectural Linguistic Units In English And Uzbek

**Burxonov Baxodirjon**
Senior Teacher at the Department of Foreign Language Philology at ASU, Uzbekistan

## ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the role of construction and architectural linguistic units as cognitive-metaphorical resources in English and Uzbek. Building-related words like foundation, framework, structure, pillar, blueprint, and scaffold in English and poydevor, asos, tuzilma, ustun, loyiha, and qurmoq in Uzbek are often used in academic, political, and everyday conversation to organize abstract thinking. Utilizing Conceptual Metaphor Theory and associated cognitive-semantic frameworks, the research contends that construction–architecture terminology constitutes a significant source domain, as it provides spatial stability, part–whole relationships, and a culturally shared experience of "making" that facilitates inferences regarding complex phenomena. The analysis demonstrates that in both languages, these units (a) condense causal explanations into spatial representations, (b) govern evaluation by distinguishing stability from fragility, and (c) amplify persuasive impact by attributing design, responsibility, and expertise to non-material realms such as ideology, knowledge, identity, and institutions. Cross-linguistic comparison shows that the conceptual mappings are mostly the same, but there are language-specific preferences in collocational patterns and rhetorical style. These preferences are shaped by discourse traditions and the status of key lexemes in the language.

**KEYWORDS:** Cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphor, construction metaphor, architectural lexicon, English, Uzbek, discourse, terminology.

## INTRODUCTION

Metaphor is a key conceptualization tool in cognitive linguistics, connecting embodied experience to abstract ideas. Due to their visual prominence, sequential nature, and social conventions, construction and architecture are ideal metaphorical domains. Early learning teaches that stable objects need bases, arrangements need structures, and designs need plans. An argument can be "well-built," a policy "rest on a weak foundation," and a scientific model can need "reconstruction." Uzbek discourse uses poydevor and asos to evaluate institutions and ideas, and tuzilma and qurmoq to realize abstract organization.

Despite their universality, "building metaphors" operate differently in different languages. English contains several permanent metaphorical collocations, such as "build a case," "lay the groundwork," and "architectural design of a system" from its institutional and academic genres. Due to its unique rhetorical norms and sociopolitical lexicon, Uzbek often emphasizes the moral and evaluative aspects of stability and responsibility, especially through terms like "mustahkam poydevor" (firm foundation) and "qurish" (to build/create"). The cognitive and rhetorical roles of these components in both languages may be examined methodically to improve bilingual

terminology, translation accuracy, and discourse analysis in academic and public communication.

This study examines the cognitive-metaphorical roles of construction and architectural language units in English and Uzbek, as well as their conceptual mappings and communicative impacts.

The study uses discourse sampling and qualitative cognitive-semantic analysis. (1) dictionary-derived inventories of construction–architecture lexemes in both languages, (2) contextual examples from academic prose, media commentary, and institutional texts, and (3) parallel observations from translation practice where metaphorical equivalence is negotiated. Traditional cognitive-linguistic methods are used to identify metaphorical terms, distinguish basic and contextual meanings, and recreate conceptual frameworks. Dual-language metaphor identification is done with the Metaphor Identification Procedure (MIP) and its enhancements. Metaphorical lexical units have a context-specific meaning that is different from their construction-related fundamental meaning yet may be grasped through resemblance or correspondence. Source-target domain linkages and inferential frameworks describe the conceptual level.

Comparisons focus on (a) common mappings (e.g., IDEAS/ARGUMENTS AS BUILDINGS), (b) language-specific collocational preferences, and (c) pragmatic discourse functions including legitimization, simplification, and assessment. Descriptive rather than statistical methods yield recurrent patterns with representative contextual interpretations rather than frequency statements.

The first major finding is that both English and Uzbek use construction and architecture vocabulary to create "epistemic solidity," which means that an abstract claim seems to have material support. English phrases like "the foundation of the theory," "the framework of analysis," and "a solid structure of evidence" do more than just name parts of an argument; they also suggest that the claim is stable, coherent, and hard to criticize. Uzbek achieves a similar cognitive function through nazariyaning asosi (“the basis of the theory”), tahlilning ramkasi (commonly translated as “frame”), and particularly mustahkam poydevor (“firm foundation”), which possesses an evaluative force challenging to replicate with a purely neutral equivalent. In both languages, "foundation" metaphors condense multi-step justification into a single spatial relationship: the superstructure is presumed to be properly supported by the foundation.

Another shared mapping is about structure—organization and systemic linkages. The abstract term "structure" is used often in English to refer to architecture and general organization (social, narrative, market). Uzbek tuzilma links technical and social words like "state structure" and "market structure." These words help part–whole reasoning by viewing elements as parts that must fit, align, or be restructured. Complex things become understandable as assemblages, bolstering explanatory discourse. Metaphors describe and propose actions. Structures can be altered, reconstructed, or strengthened. Uzbek words like qayta qurish ("rebuild/reconstruct") and mustahkamlash ("strengthen") typically signify technical and moral-political rejuvenation.

The third pattern uses design and intentionality. English utilizes "blueprint," "design," and "architecture" to describe social process planning ("policy blueprint," "system architecture," and "institutional design"). Uzbek loyiha ("project/design") and arxitektura (in modern administrative and IT language) are increasingly used to depict changes as planned solutions,

making them appear controllable and expert-supervised. This rhetorical strategy legitimizes judgments by depicting them as the outcome of meticulous forethought rather than impulsive bargaining. Cognitively, "blueprint" metaphors indicate a master plan before action and that faults may be corrected by returning to the plan.

Metaphorical fragility and risk assessment is a fourth discovery. Buildings symbolize vulnerability in both languages: English has a weak basis, systemic flaws, and a broken paradigm. Uzbek has poydevori bo'sh ("weak foundation"), tizimda yoriqlar ("system cracks"), and qulash ("collapse"). These sentences are diagnostic tools that reveal problems and future outcomes. "Collapse" signifies catastrophic failure, while "cracks" indicate latent issues that endanger integrity, which affects how we feel. These metaphors work because they employ lived knowledge of structural failure to illustrate abstract critique.

Language differences largely affect collocational conventionalization and stylistic dispersion. English uses "build," "build an argument," "build consensus," and "build capacity." These verb patterns signify "to add to something little by little." Qurmoq ("to build/create") is widely used in Uzbek speech to emphasize endurance (barqaror, "stable"; mustahkam, "firm") and morality. Direct replacement isn't always adequate when translating. In academic settings, "English framework" may translate to "Uzbek ramka," but when the target material is about norms rather than structural images, "Uzbek asos" or "tamoyil" (meaning "principle") may be better. In contrast, Uzbek poydevor is more axiological than English. Depending on genre, adjectives (solid, firm, basic) may be needed to maintain this impact.Another significant difference has to do with the noun architecture itself. In English, architecture has become a useful metaphor in computer science and organizational studies. It is often used in a neutral way (security architecture, governance architecture). Uzbek has incorporated "arxitektura" in analogous contexts; however, its metaphorical application may be more pronounced in conventional humanities literature, where indigenous terms (tuzilma, asos) prevail. This indicates that lexical borrowing influences metaphor conventionalization: borrowed terms typically coalesce in technical-administrative registers, whereas native building lexicon facilitates more expansive evaluative rhetoric.

The evidence suggests that construction-architecture metaphors in both languages help us understand complex ideas, make causality into spatial relations, and manage evaluation and persuasion. These functions demonstrate the domain's genre stability and cross-linguistic importance.

English and Uzbek construction and architectural language units are powerful cognitive-metaphorical tools that turn abstract domains into spatially organized “objects.” Shared mappings—FOUNDATION, STRUCTURE, DESIGN, and FAILURE—use embodied experience and culturally recognized building processes to explain, evaluate, and persuade. Cross-linguistic diversity is more noticeable in mapping packing than in mappings. English has a typical network of collocations and register-neutral abstraction, while Uzbek utilizes strong evaluative modifiers and native lexemes outside technical-administrative registers. The findings affect translation and bilingual academic writing, because metaphorical equivalency requires denotation, inferential, and axiological considerations. Further corpus-driven quantification and genre-specific analysis of metaphorical density in educational, legal, and media speech may improve the existing methods.

## References

1. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. — 242 p.
2. Kövecses Z. Metaphor: A Practical Introduction. — 2nd ed. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. — 396 p.
3. Fauconnier G., Turner M. The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities. — New York: Basic Books, 2002. — 440 p.
4. Langacker R. W. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites. — Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987. — 516 p.
5. Fillmore C. J. Frame Semantics // Linguistics in the Morning Calm. — Seoul: Hanshin, 1982. — P. 111–137.
6. Halliday M. A. K., Matthiessen C. M. I. M. Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar. — 4th ed. — London: Routledge, 2014. — 808 p.