the rapid influence of globalization and digital communication has made English naming practices highly dynamic and constantly changing.

Furthermore, globalization has begun to reduce the sharp differences between naming systems. English names are becoming more diverse due to migration and cultural exchange, while Uzbek naming practices are gradually incorporating modern and international elements. This interaction leads to the emergence of hybrid naming patterns that combine traditional and modern features. [7, 220-238 p]

Overall, the study confirms that naming motives are shaped by a combination of linguistic, cultural, historical, and social factors. Understanding these motives provides deeper insight into how societies preserve identity while adapting to global changes. The comparative approach also highlights that while English and Uzbek naming traditions differ in structure and motivation, they share a common function: expressing human identity, values, and cultural continuity across generations.

References:

(1). Alford R.D. Naming and Identity: A Cross-Cultural Study. New Haven, HRAF Press, 1988, p. 112–130.

(2). Hanks P., Hardcastle K., Hodges F. A Dictionary of First Names. Oxford University Press, 2006, p. 5–18.

(3). Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge University Press, 2010, p. 340–356.

(4). Superanskaya A.V. General Theory of Proper Names. Moscow, "Nauka", 2009, p. 78–95.

(5). Nafisa T. Uzbek Anthroponymy and Cultural Traditions. Tashkent State University Press, 2015, p. 54–72.

(6). Karimov A. Linguocultural Aspects of Uzbek Naming System. Tashkent: Fan Publishing, 2018, p. 101–118.

(7). Finch G. Linguistic Terms and Concepts. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p. 220–238.

Gulomjonova Nozigul Dilshodbek qizi (PhD student of Department of English Linguistics, The National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek; E-mail: gnusa44@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0009-0001-5965-2391)

THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO THE CONCEPTUAL-SEMANTIC AND LINGUOCOGNITIVE STUDY OF ECOLOGICAL DISCOURSE METAPHORS

Annotation. *This article examines the main theoretical approaches to the conceptual-semantic and linguocognitive study of ecological discourse metaphors. The study is based on the assumption that metaphor should be understood not only as a stylistic device, but also as a cognitive mechanism of conceptualizing, semantically modeling, and interpreting reality. Particular attention is paid to the development of metaphor theory from traditional semantic interpretations to modern cognitive and discourse-oriented approaches. The article discusses such key notions as literal and figurative meaning, source domain, target domain, conceptual model, frame, slot, and metaphorical network. The findings demonstrate that these approaches can be effectively applied to the analysis of ecological discourse, cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, and comparative metaphor research.*

Keywords: *metaphor, ecological discourse, conceptual-semantic analysis, linguocognitive analysis, literal meaning, figurative meaning, source domain, target domain, conceptual model, frame, slot, metaphorical network.*

Gulomjonova Nozigul Dilshodbek qizi (O'zbekiston Milliy universiteti "Ingliz tilshunosligi" kafedrasi tayanch doktoranti (PhD); E-mail: gnusa44@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0009-0001-5965-2391)

EKOLOGIK DISKURS METAFORALARINI KONSEPTUAL-SEMANTIK VA LINGVOKOGNITIV O'RGANISHNING NAZARIY YONDASHUVLARI

Annotatsiya. *Mazkur maqolada ekologik diskurs metaforalarini konseptual-semantik va lingvokognitiv jihatdan o'rganishning asosiy nazariy yondashuvlari tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot metaforaning nafaqat uslubiy vosita, balki borliqni konseptuallashtirish, semantik jihatdan modellashtirish va talqin qilishga xizmat qiluvchi kognitiv mexanizm ekanligi haqidagi qarashga asoslanadi. Maqolada metafora nazariyasining an'anaviy semantik talqinlardan kognitiv va diskursiv yondashuvlargacha bo'lgan taraqqiyot bosqichlari yoritiladi. Literal va ko'chma ma'no, manba soha, nishon soha, konseptual model, freym, slot va metaforik tarmoq kabi tayanch tushunchalarning nazariy mohiyati ochib beriladi. Tadqiqot natijalari metaforani ekologik diskursni tahlil qilish, kognitiv tilshunoslik, diskurs tahlili va qiyosiy tadqiqotlarda samarali qo'llash mumkinligini ko'rsatadi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *metafora, ekologik diskurs, konseptual-semantik tahlil, lingvokognitiv tahlil, literal ma'no, ko'chma ma'no, manba soha, nishon soha, konseptual model, freym, slot metaforik tarmoq.*

Гуломджонова Нозигуль Дилшодбек кизи (PhD-докторант кафедры английского языкознания Национального университета Узбекистана имени Мирзо Улугбека; E-mail: gnusa44@gmail.com; RCID ID: 0009-0001-5965-2391)

ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ПОДХОДЫ К КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКОМУ И ЛИНГВОКОГНИТИВНОМУ ИЗУЧЕНИЮ МЕТАФОР ЭКОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА

Аннотация. *В данной статье рассматриваются основные теоретические подходы к концептуально-семантическому и лингвокогнитивному изучению метафор экологического дискурса. Исследование основывается на положении о том, что метафора представляет собой не только стилистическое средство, но и когнитивный механизм концептуализации, семантического моделирования и интерпретации действительности. В статье освещаются этапы развития теории метафоры от традиционных семантических трактовок до современных когнитивных и дискурсивных подходов. Раскрывается теоретическая сущность таких ключевых понятий, как буквальное и переносное значение, исходная сфера, целевая сфера, концептуальная модель, фрейм, слот и метафорическая сеть. Результаты исследования показывают, что данные подходы могут эффективно применяться при анализе экологического дискурса, в когнитивной лингвистике, дискурс-анализе и сопоставительных исследованиях.*

Ключевые слова: *метафора, экологический дискурс, концептуально-семантический анализ, лингвокогнитивный анализ, буквальное значение, переносное значение, исходная сфера, целевая сфера, концептуальная модель, фрейм, слот, метафорическая сеть.*

Introduction. In contemporary linguistics, metaphor is no longer viewed as a marginal stylistic embellishment restricted to literary texts. Modern linguistic scholarship treats metaphor as one of the central mechanisms through which people conceptualize reality, organize knowledge, and interpret abstract or complex phenomena. This theoretical reorientation is especially significant for the study of ecological discourse, where environmental processes, climate change, biodiversity loss, and ecological crisis are often represented through figurative language. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson formulate this shift in a highly influential way when they state that metaphor is "not just in language but in thought and action" [1;3-p.].

The relevance of the present article is determined by the growing importance of ecological discourse in modern communication and by the need to clarify the theoretical approaches that make its metaphorical structure analyzable. Ecological discourse is not limited to the literal description of environmental facts. It also includes metaphorical models through which the environment is understood as a living organism, the planet as a body or home, and ecological crisis as illness, danger, or conflict. Therefore, a consistent theoretical discussion of conceptual-semantic and linguocognitive approaches to metaphor is necessary.

The aim of the article is to systematize the main theoretical approaches to the conceptual-semantic and linguocognitive study of ecological discourse metaphors. To achieve this aim, the article addresses the following tasks: first, to outline the main stages in the development of metaphor studies; second, to explain the difference and correlation between conceptual-semantic and linguocognitive analysis; third, to clarify the notions of literal and figurative meaning, source domain, target domain, conceptual model, frame, slot, and metaphorical network; and fourth, to show how these categories may be applied to the study of ecological discourse.

Literature Review. The modern theory of metaphor developed gradually from classical rhetoric to contemporary cognitive and discourse-oriented paradigms. In traditional stylistics and semantics, metaphor was mainly interpreted as a trope based on similarity. Within that perspective, metaphor was treated as a decorative linguistic device that replaced a direct name with an indirect one. Although this interpretation remains useful for describing individual figurative expressions, it cannot explain why metaphor occurs systematically in scientific, political, journalistic, and ecological discourse.

A major turning point in metaphor studies came with the emergence of conceptual metaphor theory. Lakoff and Johnson argue that metaphor is not merely a feature of language but a feature of thought itself, and that people "understand and experience one kind of thing in terms of another" [1;5-p]. This proposition is fundamental because it demonstrates that metaphor functions as a cognitive instrument rather than only as a rhetorical figure. Zoltán Kövecses further develops this approach by emphasizing the importance of source domain and target domain**.** According to him, conceptual metaphors consist of "a source domain and a target domain" [2;32 p.]. The source domain is the more concrete and experientially grounded conceptual sphere, whereas the target domain is the more abstract sphere that is interpreted through the source. In ecological discourse, this distinction becomes especially productive, since abstract and large-

scale environmental phenomena are frequently conceptualized through more familiar domains such as health, war, home, or the body.

The linguocognitive dimension of metaphor analysis is strengthened by the work of Russian scholars. N. D. Arutyunova underlines the formative role of language in conceptual thinking and notes that language "forms concepts and judgments" [3;1 p.] This observation is important because it supports the view that metaphor is not external to cognition but is directly involved in the formation of conceptual categories.

Another significant contribution comes from A.P.Chudinov, whose studies emphasize the systematic nature of metaphorical models and their internal organization. His work demonstrates that metaphors can be grouped into larger conceptual systems and analyzed through their frame structure [4; 41-p]. This methodological principle is particularly useful for ecological discourse, where individual expressions usually belong to broader metaphorical networks. The ecolinguistic perspective also plays an important role. Einar Haugen introduced the ecological view of language by defining language ecology as "the study of the interactions between any given language and its environment" [5;325 p.]. Later, Arran Stibbe extended this perspective and argued that ecolinguistics investigates the "stories we live by" [6;2 p]. These works are relevant because ecological discourse metaphors are not isolated linguistic units; they are embedded in broader cultural and ideological narratives about nature, crisis, responsibility, and survival. Thus, the review of literature shows that modern metaphor studies are based on the convergence of semantic, cognitive, discourse-oriented, and ecolinguistic approaches. This convergence provides the theoretical foundation for the study of ecological discourse metaphors.

Research Methodology. The present study is based on a qualitative-descriptive approach. Since the article is theoretical in character, the main research material consists of major works in cognitive linguistics, semantics, discourse analysis, and ecolinguistics. The methodological basis of the study includes the following methods: First, conceptual-semantic analysis is used to explain how literal meaning is transformed into figurative meaning and how metaphorical transfer is organized semantically. This method is especially important for distinguishing between the denotative and figurative aspects of ecological discourse metaphors.

Second, linguocognitive analysis is applied to reveal the conceptual models underlying metaphorical expressions. Within this framework, particular attention is paid to source and target domains, conceptual structures, and the role of embodied and cultural knowledge in metaphor formation. Third, comparative interpretation of theoretical sources is used in order to systematize the views of different scholars and reveal convergences and divergences between semantic and cognitive approaches.

The analytical procedure is organized around several key categories: literal meaning, figurative meaning, source domain, target domain, conceptual model, frame, slot, and metaphorical network. These categories are treated as complementary analytical tools. The combination of these methods makes it possible to present a coherent account of the theoretical approaches to ecological discourse metaphors.

Analysis and Results. The analysis of theoretical sources demonstrates that the conceptual-semantic and linguocognitive approaches to metaphor are closely related, yet they focus on different aspects of the same phenomenon. From the conceptual-semantic perspective, metaphor is primarily treated as a process of meaning transfer. The central question here is how a lexical unit moves from literal to figurative meaning. Literal meaning is the direct, dictionary-based meaning of a word, whereas figurative meaning appears when the same lexical unit is projected onto another conceptual sphere. For example, in the expression *the Earth is sick*, the adjective *sick* retains its semantic association with bodily illness, but in discourse it acquires a figurative meaning related to the ecological condition of the planet. The conceptual-semantic approach therefore focuses on the structure of meaning, semantic reorganization, and the logic of transfer.

The analysis also shows that the concepts of source domain and target domain are central to conceptual-semantic interpretation. The source domain provides the semantic material for metaphorical transfer, while the target domain receives that structure. Thus, in ecological discourse, a model such as CLIMATE CHANGE IS WAR relies on the source domain of war and the target domain of climate change. Similarly, NATURE IS A LIVING ORGANISM relies on the source domain of bodily life and the target domain of nature. These relations confirm that metaphorical meaning is structured rather than arbitrary.From the linguocognitive perspective, metaphor is interpreted as a cognitive mechanism that organizes experience. Here the focus shifts from the surface meaning of an individual expression to the deeper conceptual model that generates a series of metaphorical realizations. The analysis shows that metaphors in ecological discourse tend to cluster around recurrent models, such as NATURE IS A LIVING ORGANISM, THE EARTH IS HOME, THE PLANET IS A BODY, and CLIMATE CHANGE IS WAR.

These models are not isolated verbal formulas; they function as stable patterns of ecological conceptualization. A particularly important result of the analysis concerns the role of frames and slots. Within the linguocognitive approach, a conceptual model is internally organized into smaller cognitive units. For instance, the model ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM IS DISEASE can be analyzed through the frame illness, which contains slots such as cause, symptom, diagnosis, treatment, and recovery. In the same way, the model CLIMATE CHANGE IS WAR can be analyzed through the frame conflict, with slots such as enemy, threat, defense, strategy, and victory. This means that metaphors do not operate as loose figurative expressions; they are structured according to cognitive scenarios.

Another important finding concerns the notion of metaphorical network. The analysis confirms that metaphors in ecological discourse often appear not singly, but in clusters. A dominant conceptual model may generate multiple related expressions. For example, the model NATURE IS A LIVING ORGANISM may produce expressions such as *the planet is sick*, *nature is recovering*, *ecosystems are dying*, and *the ocean is choking*. Such clusters form metaphorical networks and reveal the internal coherence of ecological discourse.The study also shows that ecolinguistics strengthens metaphor analysis by connecting linguistic structures with cultural and ecological worldviews. Haugen's ecological approach to language and Stibbe's idea of "stories we live by" indicate that metaphor is not only a semantic and cognitive mechanism but also a means of shaping ecological awareness. In this respect, ecological discourse metaphors perform a mediating function between scientific knowledge, public understanding, and cultural values.

Overall, the results demonstrate that the conceptual-semantic approach reveals how metaphorical meaning is formed, while the linguocognitive approach explains how that meaning is embedded in broader conceptual systems. The two approaches are therefore not contradictory; rather, they complement one another and together provide a fuller model for analyzing ecological discourse metaphors.

Conclusion and Recommendations. The study has shown that metaphor should be approached as a multidimensional phenomenon situated at the intersection of semantics, cognition, discourse, and culture. The conceptual-semantic approach is primarily concerned with the transformation of literal meaning into figurative meaning and with the semantic relations that make such transfer possible. The linguocognitive approach, by contrast, explains metaphor as a mechanism of conceptualization that reveals stable models of human thought.

The theoretical review confirms that Lakoff and Johnson, Kövecses, Arutyunova, Chudinov, Haugen, and Stibbe have each made a significant contribution to the understanding of metaphor as more than a stylistic ornament. Their ideas demonstrate that ecological discourse metaphors can and should be studied through a combination of semantic and cognitive methods.The article also makes it clear that ecological discourse is a particularly productive field for metaphor research because it relies heavily on source domains such as body, illness, home, war, and system in order to conceptualize complex environmental realities. This creates dominant conceptual models and metaphorical networks that shape ecological understanding.

As a recommendation, further studies should move from purely theoretical discussion to corpus-based analysis of ecological discourse in specific languages, including comparative research between English and Uzbek. Future work may also focus on the productivity of particular conceptual models, the role of metaphor in ecological awareness, and the linguistic representation of environmental crises in different discourse types.

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. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002, 285 p.

(3). Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. Москва, Языки русской культуры, 1999, 896 с.

(4). Чудинов А.П. Метафорическая мозаика в современной политической коммуникации. Екатеринбург, Урал. гос. пед. ун-т, 2003, 248 с.

(5). Haugen E. The Ecology of Language. The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen, ed. by A.S.Dil. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1972, p. 325–339.

(6). Stibbe A. Ecolinguistics: Language, Ecology and the Stories We Live By. London, Routledge, 2015, 210 p.