

The Concept of Food as a Part of the Linguistic Landscape of the World “Based on Uzbek and English Language Materials”

Yuldasheva Yulduz Komilovna.

Termiz University of Economics and Service Faculty of "Foreign language and literature".

Bakirov Poyon Urolivich

TerDu. PHD Lecturer

Abstract: The article provides extensive information about the concept of food as a part of the linguistic landscape of the world "on the basis of Uzbek and English language materials".

Key Word: extensive, information, food, scholars, metaphorical, linguistic.

The linguistic conceptualization of food implies the presence of cultural and linguocultural competence as a cognitive construct that generalizes knowledge. It contributes to a deep understanding of the nature of the cultural meaning assigned to a certain linguistic sign, as well as all the cultural attitudes and traditions of the people [20]. The concept of "Food" is a complex mental formation in which certain constitutive features can be identified, partially coinciding and intersecting in the Uzbek and English linguocultures.

Modern linguistic approaches have opened new horizons for contrastive analysis. More precisely, cognitive linguistics, pragmatics and corpus linguistics have all offered precious new theoretical frameworks and methodology that have been incorporated into recent contrastive studies [1]. The cultural awareness has become at the heart of intercultural communication. It has to do with language behavior, pragmatics, beliefs and values (Kurtes, 2006). This claim is supported by Hua (2007) who employed the cognitive approach in translating Chinese and English proverbs from cultural model perspectives. He emphasizes the role of the cultural aspect of a language in the construction of metaphorical models in that language. This role affects the mapping pattern of the source domain onto the target domains. He stresses the importance of incorporating the cognitive model in current contrastive studies. [8]

Main Part: Most scholars agree that metaphor is conceptual and that a major part of our thinking is dominated by metaphorical conceptions. The Conceptual Metaphor Theory proposed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) involves a two-domain model to conceptualize metaphors. The basic contexts and situations based on cultural experiences are called 'source domains'. These domains are clear, simple in structure and concrete. The more abstract and complex contexts, to which the words are applied, are called target domains. This previous systematic identification of "source" and "target" domains suggested by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) is called metaphorical mapping. It links two different domains, thus structuring our experience, reasoning and everyday language. They state that such mapping arises more or less automatically and unconsciously which affects the way we experience, think and

interact within our environment. [4.5] They believe that conceptual metaphors are mental categories which are not necessarily expressed in a language; the use of capital letters when referring to the domains means this. All metaphorical expressions, however, are written in lower-case letters.

Review Of Literature: Several studies have sought out cross-cultural linguistic differences in metaphor use, often focusing on domains thought likely to differ because of known cultural differences. Kurodom and Suzaki (1989) conducted a cross cultural study on Japanese, English and Arabic languages. They observed that a questionnaire written in one language cannot easily be translated into another without substantial variances from the original of the source language. [2.3] In their study, they discovered how respondents' answers to certain queries were framed depending on the language used and on whether the respondents were native speakers or secondary users of the language. Accordingly, they recognized that different cultures might have different ways of generating and processing metaphors. Deignan (2003) used corpus linguistics to compare the relative degrees of productivity of a number of source domains of metaphor across various languages. [6.9] Although each corpus data suggested that there was a variation in metaphor usage across the different languages, she states that this should not automatically be taken as evidence of the presence of cultural differences. A lot of metaphorical expressions may merely be reliquaries of a community's past culture.

Methodology: The data collection procedures in this study revolved around the identification of similarities and differences between the English languages in food conceptual metaphor, i.e. the metaphor that uses food items as a source domain in order to conceptualize certain target domains. In order to achieve the goal of the study, the researcher adopted the corpus-based approach suggested by Deignan (1995). This approach is considered useful in the studies of conceptual metaphors relating to a particular source domain; the one that all metaphorical expressions have in common is that they contain lexical items from their respective source domain. By this approach, Deignan suggests that every researcher can simply choose the expressions that contain individual lexical items or sets of lexical items. [7] Then, the results can be sorted into metaphorical and non-metaphorical uses and the metaphorical uses can be described exhaustively.

Findings Of The Study: For the purpose of this study, the researcher regrouped the collected expressions according to the target domains onto which the metaphorical expressions are mapped. The collected expressions were of two sorts: simple literal expressions and idioms that fit the metaphor and are part of the normal everyday way of talking about the subject. The metaphorical expressions in the English linguistic corpus showed that many aspects of social and cultural life are talked about and experienced in terms of food. The comparison between English in terms of food occurs easily because of the systematic organization of food and food habits within each culture.

References

1. Hornby. A.S. (1948). Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (First edition). Oxford: Oxford University

2. Press. Hua, T (2007). A Cognitive Contrastive Study of Chinese and English Proverbs from a Cultural Model Perspective. *Journal of Sichuan International Studies*,2, 150-198.
3. Koveceses, Z. (2000). *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture and Body in Human Feeling*.
4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Koveceses, Z. (2006), *Embodiment, Experiential Focus, and Diachronic Change in Metaphor*. In R.W. McConchie. (Ed.) *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium on New Approaches in English*
5. *Historical Lexis (HEL-LEX)*, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. Kurtes, S. (2006). "Contrastive analysis". In *An Encyclopedia of the Arts*. Lagos, Nigeria: Lagos State
6. University, 831-840. Kurodom Y. & Suzuki, T.(1989). *Language and Attitude: A Study in Arabic, English, and Japanese on the Role of Language*. In Crowell, D. Kobayashi, D and Topping, D. *Thinking Across Cultures*.
7. Lakoff, G.& Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
8. Steen, G. (2002). *Identifying Metaphor in Language: A Cognitive Approach*. *Style*, 36, (3).
9. Tang, Ch. (2007). *A Comparative Study of English and Chinese Idioms with Food Names*. *University System of Taiwan Working Papers in Linguistics*, 5, 83-93. Dictionaries: