COGNITIVE MODELS AND METAPHORICAL EXTENSIONS OF MOTION LEXEMES IN ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK

Sarsenbayev H.A
Toshkent Kimyo-texnologiya Instituti

Abstract: This thesis examines cognitive models underlying motion expressions in English and Karakalpak. It focuses on categorization, construal, frame semantics, image schemas and metaphorical extension. The analysis shows how comparable spatial experiences can be represented through different distributions of manner, path and destination. Context activates a particular meaning, while recurrent spatial patterns support the interpretation of abstract events.

Keywords: motion event, categorization, construal, frame semantics, image schema, conceptual metaphor.

A motion expression does more than report displacement. It presents an event from a selected perspective, giving prominence to a participant, route, manner or result. Cognitive linguistics connects these choices with human perception, experience and conceptual activity. Sh. Safarov's treatment of cognitive linguistics provides the general theoretical orientation for relating language to cognition.[1]

The purpose of this thesis is to explain how motion events are conceptually organized and how their components are expressed in English and Karakalpak. The analysis draws on the theoretical discussion and illustrative examples in the supplied article. It considers shared conceptual patterns while preserving differences between lexical and grammatical expression. It does not claim that illustrative correspondences alone establish a complete typological profile of either language.

The distinction between conceptual content and construal is central. Two descriptions can refer to a comparable situation while highlighting different features. R. Langacker's cognitive approach makes the perspective adopted by an expression part of its interpretation.[2] Accordingly, the analysis asks both what event is described and how the expression directs attention within that event. This allows motion vocabulary to be examined as a means of organizing experience, rather than only as a list of names for physical actions.

Categorization groups different occurrences according to shared features. People recognize walking despite variation in speed, destination and personal intention. More specialized descriptions distinguish strolling, marching, limping or wandering. Such distinctions connect an ordinary reference pattern with additional properties, including pace, coordination, bodily condition and route selection. Prototype-based accounts explain why some members can function as more typical examples of a category without imposing completely rigid boundaries.[3]

Prototype status depends on the category under consideration. Walk may serve as a reference point for ordinary pedestrian motion, while run can be central within rapid human locomotion. It would therefore be misleading to identify a single verb as the prototype of every kind of movement. Karakalpak жүриў and жуўырыў likewise require evaluation relative to a specified category and selected lexical

[1]Сафаров Ш. Когнитив тилшунослик. Жиззах: Сангзор, 2006.
[2]Langacker R. W. Discourse in Cognitive Grammar. Cognitive Linguistics, 2001, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 143–188.
[3]Croft W., Cruse D. A. Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

sense. This qualification prevents typicality from being confused with general frequency or universal conceptual priority.

Construal concerns the prominence assigned to event features. The boy went into the house mainly presents displacement toward an interior; The boy ran into the house additionally profiles manner. In Karakalpak, Бала үйге кирди emphasizes entry, whereas Бала үйге жуўырып кирди explicitly adds running. The situation remains broadly comparable, but its verbal presentation becomes more specific. These contrasts are consistent with an interpretation of meaning that includes the speaker's way of viewing the event.[4]

Attention to construal also clarifies why context matters. A narrative may foreground hurried movement to develop tension or slow movement to portray hesitation. However, an interpretation of urgency, fear or confidence must be supported by the expression and its surroundings. The physical action alone does not prove the character's emotional state. Cognitive analysis should distinguish the features linguistically encoded from those inferred through the broader discourse.

A frame organizes knowledge about a recognizable situation and its participants. In a motion frame, relevant elements include a moving entity, an initial location, a path and a destination. Manner, medium, purpose and outcome may supply further detail. Fillmore's frame-semantic approach relates lexical meaning to this background structure of knowledge.[5] A motion verb can activate the frame while making only some of its elements explicit.

In The traveller reached the village and Жолаўшы аўылға жетти, arrival at a destination is prominent. The expression does not state the earlier route, pace or means of travel. Those components remain open rather than fully determined. Depart profiles an initial stage, walk highlights a process of locomotion, and arrive foregrounds arrival. Their different profiles show how related verbs direct attention to different portions of a broader event.

A scenario adds temporal sequencing. He left the house, walked along the street and arrived at the station presents departure, intermediate movement and arrival as successive stages. Ол үйден шықты, көше бойлап жүрди ҳәм вокзалға жетип келди likewise organizes a sequence through coordinated predicates. More complex discourse may introduce an obstacle, a changed route, a pause or a return. A scenario should therefore be reconstructed from textual evidence rather than imposed on every motion expression.

This distinction is particularly useful in literary analysis. An individual verb may describe a local action, while a sequence of clauses establishes the character's route and developing purpose. The frame identifies participant roles and spatial relations; the scenario explains their unfolding over time. For each documented passage, analysis should record which roles are expressed, which are recoverable from context and which remain unspecified. This makes cognitive interpretation explicit and limits unsupported assumptions about the event.

Image schemas are recurring patterns grounded in bodily and spatial experience. The source-path-goal pattern connects departure, movement along a route and arrival. She walked from the house through the garden to the gate explicitly realizes these stages. Ол үйден бағ иши менен дәрўазаға дейин жүрди presents a comparable spatial organization. The schema offers a way of relating event components without requiring identical wording in both languages.

---

[4]Langacker R. W. Discourse in Cognitive Grammar. Cognitive Linguistics, 2001, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 143–188.

[5]Fillmore C. J. Frame Semantics. Linguistics in the Morning Calm. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing, 1982, pp. 111–137.

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

The container pattern organizes the distinction between interior, boundary and exterior. Enter and кириў describe movement into an interior, while exit and шығыў describe movement outward. Vertical and front–back relations supply further patterns. Their interpretation depends on the relevant ground and point of reference: upward movement need not imply achievement in a literal description, and movement backward need not express failure. Such evaluative readings require an abstract domain or contextual support.

L. Talmy's motion-event account distinguishes **Figure, Ground, Motion, Path** and **Manner**, among other components.[6] In The child ran out of the room, the child is the moving entity, the room supplies the spatial ground, ran presents manner, and out of the room specifies an outward relation and path. In Бала бөлмеден жуўырып шықты, manner is expressed by жуўырып, while бөлмеден and шықты contribute source and outward movement.

The comparison concerns the distribution of conceptual components across expressions. English can combine a manner verb with a path expression; Karakalpak can combine a converb with a directional verb. These examples are informative but do not establish that every construction follows one pattern. A broader typological claim would require a systematically selected range of motion descriptions. At this stage, the relevant finding is that shared spatial content may be encoded by different combinations of lexical and grammatical resources.

Spatial experience supplies structures for interpreting abstract domains. The conceptual models life is a journey, a goal is a destination and progress is forward motion connect a familiar physical domain with less directly perceptible experiences. G. Lakoff and Johnson explain conceptual metaphor as a systematic relation between domains.[7] Expressions such as choose one's path, reach a goal and move forward, together with өз жолын табыў, мақсетке жетиў and алға қәдәм таслаў, illustrate these connections.

Arrival can structure the attainment of an intellectual result, as in come to a conclusion and жуўмаққа келиў. Boundary crossing can describe release from a difficult state in get out of trouble and қыйын жағдайдан шығыў. Verticality also supports expressions of status and change, but the relevant mapping must be established for the particular phrase. Shared spatial motivation does not guarantee identical idiomatic usage or cultural evaluation across languages.

Context differentiates literal motion from extended meanings. Fall describes bodily displacement in The child fell, a quantitative decrease in The temperature fell and an emotional development in She fell in love. Karakalpak түсиў participates in constructions such as текшеден түсиў, температура түсти and қыйын жағдайға түсиў. These examples belong to related spatial or extended patterns, yet each construction has a distinct interpretation that must be examined individually.

Categorization explains relationships among motion descriptions; construal identifies the features made prominent; frames organize participants and spatial roles; scenarios establish temporal order. Image schemas and metaphor account for connections between physical motion and abstract experience. A comparative analysis should combine these perspectives while distinguishing encoded meaning from inference. Further literary analysis requires documented passages and attention to the surrounding text, so that cognitive models remain grounded in actual linguistic evidence.

[6]Talmy L. Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol. II: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.
[7]Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

References:

1. Сафаров Ш. Когнитив тилшунослик. Жиззах: Сангзор, 2006.
2. Langacker R. W. Discourse in Cognitive Grammar. Cognitive Linguistics, Vol. 12, No. 2. 2001. – P. 143-188.
3. Croft W., Cruse D. A., Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
4. Fillmore C. J. Frame Semantics. Linguistics in the Morning Calm. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing, 1982. – P.111–137.
5. Talmy L. Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol. II: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000.
6. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.