

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**EQUIVALENCE AND NON-EQUIVALENCE OF ZOOMORPHIC METAPHORS
(a comparative study of English -Uzbek dictionaries)****Jaloliddin Choriyev***Master's student, Department of English Linguistics**Karshi State University**Email: choriyevjaloliddin405@gmail.com**Karshi, Uzbekistan***Nargiza Suyarova***Associate Professor, PhD, Department of English Linguistics**Karshi State University**Karshi, Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: zoomorphic metaphors; equivalence; non-equivalence; bilingual lexicography; dictionary analysis; figurative meaning; semantic representation.

Received: 01.05.26

Accepted: 02.05.26

Published: 03.05.26

Abstract: In this article, the equivalence and non-equivalence of zoomorphic metaphors are studied through a comparative analysis of their representation in the Cambridge Dictionary and English-Uzbek bilingual dictionaries. Zoomorphic metaphors, which describe human characteristics through animal imagery, play an important role in expressing evaluation and cultural meaning in both languages. The research adopts a qualitative comparative approach and focuses on the microstructure of dictionary entries, including the presentation of figurative meanings, usage labels, and examples. Selected metaphors such as fox, snake, and lion are analyzed to identify different types of equivalence. The findings reveal that metaphorical meanings are present in both languages but differ in their lexicographic representation. Three types of equivalence are identified: full, partial, and non-equivalence. The results show that learner dictionaries provide more detailed and structured explanations, while bilingual dictionaries tend to simplify or omit figurative meanings. The study concludes that equivalence

is influenced not only by linguistic and cultural factors but also by the way meanings are represented in dictionary entries. It suggests that improving bilingual dictionaries requires clearer definitions, usage labels, and examples to better reflect metaphorical meaning.

Introduction. Zoomorphic metaphors, which describe people through animal names, are commonly used in both English and Uzbek. They help express opinions, attitudes, and personal qualities in a vivid way. However, even though these metaphors are widely used in real communication, they are not always clearly shown in dictionaries. Studies in cognitive linguistics, especially by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, explain that metaphors are part of how people think, not just how they speak. Still, most research focuses on meaning and culture, and less attention is given to how these meanings are presented in dictionaries.

In English – Uzbek bilingual dictionaries, zoomorphic metaphors are often translated directly, without clearly explaining their figurative meaning. Sometimes the metaphor is not shown at all, or it is hidden inside the literal meaning. Because of this, dictionary users may not fully understand how the word is actually used.

On the other hand, learner dictionaries such as the Cambridge Dictionary usually show figurative meanings more clearly. They separate meanings, give labels, and provide examples. This shows that the problem is not only about language differences, but also about how dictionaries are designed.

Therefore, this study looks at zoomorphic metaphors from a dictionary perspective. It compares how these metaphors are presented in the Cambridge Dictionary and in English – Uzbek bilingual dictionaries, and tries to show what problems exist and how they affect meaning.

Literature review. The concept of equivalence plays an important role in translation studies and is generally understood as the relationship between meanings in different languages. However, equivalence is not always exact and can vary depending on context and usage. Some scholars argue that translation should focus on meaning and communicative effect rather than form [Nida, 1964]. Others explain that equivalence operates at different levels, including semantic and pragmatic dimensions [Baker, 1992]. This becomes especially important when dealing with metaphorical language.

In modern linguistics, metaphor is viewed as part of human thinking rather than only a stylistic feature. It helps people understand abstract ideas through more familiar concepts

[Lakoff & Johnson, 1980]. Zoomorphic metaphors, which describe human qualities using animal names, are a clear example of this. However, the meaning of such metaphors often depends on culture. Different societies may associate different characteristics with the same animal, which leads to variation across languages [Kövecses, 2010].

The cultural aspect of language has also been emphasized in studies of meaning and interpretation. Researchers show that language reflects cultural values and social attitudes, which influence how words and expressions are understood [Newmark, 1988; Wierzbicka, 1992]. Because of this, metaphorical expressions are often difficult to translate directly.

In lexicography, attention is given to how meanings are presented in dictionaries. A well-structured dictionary entry usually includes not only literal meanings but also figurative uses, labels, and examples [Atkins & Rundell, 2008]. These elements are important for helping users understand how a word is used in real communication. Learner dictionaries are especially known for providing clear explanations and examples.

However, bilingual dictionaries often follow a different approach. They usually focus on direct translation equivalents, which can lead to the omission or simplification of metaphorical meanings [Hartmann, 2001]. As a result, important aspects such as connotation and usage may not be clearly shown.

Although metaphor, equivalence, and lexicography have all been widely studied, there is still limited research on how these areas are connected, especially in the English – Uzbek context. Previous studies have not fully explored how zoomorphic metaphors are represented in bilingual dictionaries and how this affects equivalence. This study aims to address this gap by focusing on dictionary analysis and examining how metaphorical meanings are presented.

Methodology. This study uses a qualitative comparative approach to analyze zoomorphic metaphors in two types of dictionaries. The research is based on a comparison between the Cambridge Dictionary and English – Uzbek bilingual dictionaries (Wisdom online dictionary mainly). The data consist of selected zoomorphic metaphors such as fox, snake, pig, wolf, and donkey. These examples were chosen because they are commonly used in everyday language and are found in both English and Uzbek. The analysis focuses on how each metaphor is presented in the two dictionaries. Special attention is given to the structure of dictionary entries (microstructure). The following aspects were examined:

- whether figurative meanings are clearly shown
- whether literal and figurative meanings are separated
- whether usage labels (e.g., informal, offensive) are included

- whether example sentences are provided
- whether meaning and usage are clearly explained

Each entry from the Cambridge Dictionary was compared with its equivalent in the English – Uzbek bilingual dictionary. Based on this comparison, the metaphors were classified into three types:

- full equivalence
- partial equivalence
- non-equivalence

The results of the comparison were used to identify differences in dictionary representation and to determine how these differences affect the understanding of metaphorical meaning.

Results. The analysis of zoomorphic metaphors in the Cambridge Dictionary and English–Uzbek bilingual dictionaries shows clear differences in how metaphorical meanings are presented.

The entry of fox in the Cambridge Dictionary demonstrates a clear and structured representation of metaphorical meaning. The figurative sense is presented as a separate entry under “fox (clever person)”, accompanied by a precise definition (someone who is clever and good at deceiving people), a usage label, and an example sentence. In addition, another figurative meaning (a sexually attractive woman) is included and marked as informal, which shows that the dictionary systematically distinguishes different metaphorical uses.

In the English – Uzbek dictionary (mobile application), the entry also includes both literal and figurative meanings, such as tulki (literal), ayyor odam (figurative), and maftunkor ayol (informal). However, these meanings are presented mainly as direct translations without detailed explanation. The figurative senses are not clearly defined or separated as independent semantic units, and there is little information about usage or connotation.

This comparison shows that metaphorical meanings are present in both dictionaries, but they are represented differently. While the Cambridge Dictionary provides a detailed and structured explanation, the English–Uzbek dictionary offers a simplified, translation-based representation. Therefore, the type of equivalence can be defined as partial equivalence, since the meaning exists in both languages but differs in the way it is lexicographically presented.

The entry of snake in the Cambridge Dictionary shows a clear representation of metaphorical meaning through the expression “a snake (in the grass)”. The figurative sense is explicitly defined as “an unpleasant person who cannot be trusted”, which highlights both the

negative evaluation and the idea of hidden danger. This meaning is supported by an example sentence (“I don’t trust him – he’s a snake in the grass”), which helps users understand how the metaphor is used in context. This structure demonstrates that the dictionary does not treat the metaphor as a simple extension of the literal meaning, but as a separate and meaningful unit with its own definition and usage.

In contrast, in the English – Uzbek online dictionary (mobile application), the entry is typically given as *ilon*, which represents only the literal meaning. The figurative sense (a dishonest or untrustworthy person) is not clearly defined or separated. There is also no example or explanation of how the metaphor is used.

This comparison shows that the metaphorical meaning is fully developed and explicitly presented in the Cambridge Dictionary, while it is either absent or not clearly encoded in the bilingual dictionary. Therefore, this case can be classified as non-equivalence, since the figurative meaning is not adequately represented in the English – Uzbek dictionary.

The entry of *lion* in the Cambridge Dictionary includes both literal and figurative meanings. In addition to its basic meaning as a large wild animal, the figurative sense refers to a brave, strong, or important person. This meaning reflects positive qualities such as courage and strength and is commonly used in both everyday and literary contexts.

In the English – Uzbek dictionary, the word is translated as *sher*, which also carries similar metaphorical meanings. In Uzbek, *sher* is widely used to describe a brave and strong person, especially in heroic or poetic contexts. The metaphor is culturally shared and easily understood in both languages. This similarity can also be observed in literary usage. For example, in *The Chronicles of Narnia*, the character Aslan, who is a lion, symbolizes strength, courage, and leadership. The equivalence of the metaphor can also be observed in literary usage. In Uzbek literary context, expressions such as “*sheryurak*” are used to describe a brave and courageous person, for example: “Agar u zolim holdida, sheryurak, jasur ham bo’lganda edi...” [Mallayev, 1974, p. 163]. This shows that the metaphorical meaning of lion as a symbol of bravery is shared in both languages. This comparison shows that both dictionaries reflect similar metaphorical meanings, and the concept is culturally and semantically aligned. This example clearly shows that the metaphorical meaning of lion as a symbol of bravery and courage is also present in Uzbek. The use of the expression “*sheryurak*” in literary context confirms that the association between a lion and positive human qualities is culturally shared. Unlike previous examples, the metaphor is not only present in both dictionaries but is also actively used in real texts with the same meaning and function. This indicates that there is no

significant semantic or cultural difference between the two languages in this case. Therefore, this example can be classified as full equivalence, since both languages share the same metaphorical meaning, usage, and connotation.

Discussion. The findings of this study highlight that the main issue in translating zoomorphic metaphors is not the absence of meaning, but the difference in how meanings are represented in dictionaries. Even when a metaphor exists in both languages, its interpretation depends on the level of detail provided in the dictionary entry.

The comparison shows that learner dictionaries follow an explanatory approach, where meanings are clearly defined, labeled, and supported by examples. In contrast, English – Uzbek bilingual dictionaries often rely on direct translation, which may not fully reflect figurative meaning, connotation, or usage. As a result, users may not fully understand how metaphorical expressions function in real communication.

The analysis also confirms that zoomorphic metaphors are culturally grounded but not entirely different across languages. Some metaphors, such as lion, show strong cross-cultural similarity, while others vary in meaning or usage. This indicates that equivalence should be seen as a gradual concept rather than a fixed category.

Therefore, the study suggests that improving bilingual dictionaries requires more detailed representation of metaphorical meanings, including definitions, labels, and examples. Such improvements would help users better understand both the meaning and the function of metaphors in different languages.

Conclusion. This study has examined the equivalence and non-equivalence of zoomorphic metaphors through a comparative analysis of their representation in the Cambridge Dictionary and English – Uzbek bilingual dictionaries. The findings show that while metaphorical meanings are present in both languages, their lexicographic representation differs significantly.

The analysis identified three types of equivalence: full, partial, and non-equivalence. The example of lion demonstrated full equivalence, as the metaphorical meaning and usage are shared across both languages and supported by literary evidence. In contrast, fox showed partial equivalence due to differences in the level of explanation and structure, while snake represented non-equivalence, as the figurative meaning was not clearly encoded in the bilingual dictionary.

The study confirms that equivalence is not determined solely by linguistic similarity but is strongly influenced by how meanings are structured and presented in dictionary entries. In

this regard, the main challenge lies not in the absence of metaphorical meaning, but in its incomplete or simplified representation in bilingual lexicography.

Therefore, it is recommended that English – Uzbek dictionaries adopt a more detailed and explanatory approach to metaphor, including clear definitions, usage labels, and examples. Such improvements would enhance users' understanding of metaphorical language and contribute to more accurate cross-linguistic communication. Future research may expand the range of data and explore other types of metaphor to further develop the study of equivalence in lexicography.

References:

- [1]. Atkins, B. T. S., & Rundell, M. (2008). *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [2]. Baker, M. (1992). In *Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- [3]. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [4]. Hartmann, R. R. K. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Lexicography*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- [5]. Jackson, H. (2002). *Lexicography: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- [6]. Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [7]. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [8]. Mallayev, N. (1974). *Alisher Navoiy va xalq ijodiyoti*. Toshkent.
- [9]. Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- [10]. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- [11]. Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [12]. Cambridge Dictionary. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org>
- [13] Oxford Advanced learners dictionary.