

Cognitive Features of Metaphoric Euphemisms used by the Uzbeks**Linguistics**

Keywords: metaphor, cognitive metaphor, euphemism, cognitive linguistics, mental environment, concept, semantic phenomenon, semantic concept, gnosiology, verbalization, artistic intention.

Rustamova Dilrabokhon Abdurahimova

Teacher of the Andizhan State University, Uzbekistan.

Abstract

The article is about lingua-cognitive research of metaphoric euphemisms. Here the author asserts that metaphors are lingua-cognitive means of expressing and perceiving the reality. He also shows giving some examples that perceiving the meaning of metaphoric euphemisms as well as play of words created by the help of euphemistic means is connected with the environment the personality belongs to and thought. The article gives scientific substantiation for creation of complex lingua-cognitive and logical mixture of objective metaphoric legality in subjective relation and speech condition.

Introduction

On the one hand, it seems illogic to differentiate all types of metaphors into cognitive or in-cognitive according to their role of knowledge formation or knowledge expression. But on the other hand, metaphor is considered to be as a phenomenon unifying the paradigms of linguistics formed in the last quarter of the XX century and as a foundation stone for all types of cognitive researches. There are different conclusions, so, there are different ideas and attitudes are contradictory. This fact proves the idea that the object of the research is dialectically many-sided phenomenon.

Metaphoric researches, which began in the times of Aristotle, including the concept of mutual semantic impact, could not go out of the traditional framework of the issue of attitude towards metaphor. It is clear that serious difference between the ancient comparative metaphoric concept and the concept of semantic impact. All of them analyze metaphor from the point of view of linguistics, and were discussed as a semantic phenomenon.

We can say that only E. Mac Cormac's "Cognitive Theory of Metaphor" made a turning point in the field. Only he walked along the path of analyzing metaphor in connection with the process of man's knowing. In spite of this, he also went on the footprints of his predecessors and used comparative concept as a methodological basis. Earl Mac Cormac thinks that comparing external not corresponding semantic concepts in rational process is the main basis for emergence of metaphors.

Dialectics of similarity and dissimilarity comprises the foundation of metaphoric process. The listener has to understand the metaphor in some respect in order to perceive it. For this reason, the metaphor must have signs of the old, and it must have some aspects the new as the listener must get a new meaning and content from it. This two-sided proneness to conflict is regarded to be the stem root of the metaphor. And this gives an evidence that conflict and opposition are the forms and contents of existence of the metaphor as well as all language phenomena [7, pp. 358-386].

Euphemistic type of the metaphor in majority of cases has gnoseologic function. Using a metaphor, the speaker opens ever more new aspects of the objects in comparison, and these aspects are evaluated, analyzed, on the basis and by means of existing semantic phenomena on the one hand and on the other widens, deepens, multiplies branches of semantic genealogical trees. In general, secondary nominative units, secondary predicates, secondary qualifying are formed on the basis of the process of comparison that on the basis of all of them there is the system and results of cognitive processes.

Cognitive metaphoric euphemisms create semantic niceties when compared to their traditional alternatives. On the one hand they create delicate differences between euphemistic expressions and traditional expressions, on the other they bring them close to each other. In other words they verbalize cohesion and relatedness of externally entirely different phenomena on the basis of above mentioned principles of similarities and dissimilarities. For example, the idea of “dying” can be expressed by the following metaphoric euphemisms in Uzbek: *қулоғи остида қолди* – *he has been left under ears*, *ризқи қийилди* – *his portion has been cut*, *қуни битди* – *his days have come to the end*, *умр битиғизга нуқта қўйди* – *a full stop has been put to his life*, *кўпга қўшилди* – *he has joined the majority etc.*

All of these expressions are formed on metaphoric basis. They demonstrate themselves as peculiar semantic concepts. Here we don't see any internal proximity to the idea of “dying”. Internal connection comes into existence only as a result of cognitive activity of external likeness. Perception of the very euphemistic expressions forms not figurative imagination but none-figurative event. We do not reject figurativeness, it seeps out through subconsciousness and our deliberate cognitive activity do not pay “intentional attention” to it.

Ordinary interpretations in the form of transforming a feature of one object to the other cannot show the cognitive essence of Metaphoric euphemisms. Externally, in such understood euphemisms a feature of an object is compared to an event, process, condition, thought, idea, theory and concept; serves as a basis of resemblance to so many obstruct ideas, and this forms even more new logical predicates in thought as organicity and continuance, duration and succession, conventionality and conditionality, targetness and intendedness.

Let us have a look at a text analyzed by linguists with special attention:

*“There should be a **meaning** in speech,” said Gulshan, “so much giggling for nothing; it is better to go to sleep.”*

*“Can you tell us what **meaning** is, Gulshanopa?”*

*“Don't ask the meaning of **meaning**, Tuhfa,” said Qumri, “Let Gulshanopa answer, if there is any **meaning** in being imprisoned in this “QirqQiz?”*

*“Leave her,” said one of the girls, “Gulshanopa has left her husband alone and she is now **ameaningless** among us – other **meaninglesses**; is there any **meaning** in this?”*

“May your voices go down.”

“There is, there is,” said someone, “She will bring some companions for us.”

“Is there any meaning if she brings some companions for us?”

*“Why there shouldn’t be a **meaning**, there will be more such **meaninglesses** as we are.”*

*“May all of you go to hell! I won’t multiply **meaninglesses** anymore, go to sleep peacefully.”*

*“Well done,” said Nozick, “now you have some **meaning**” [10, p. 73].*

Analyzing the text a linguist H. Kodirova, though he has not any cognitive based attitude towards the matter, tries to bring light upon these features of euphemisms.

At the beginning of the text the word *маъни* is used with the meaning of “meaning, content” and performs the function of nominative in its proper meaning. But, at the same time it performs contextual function, i.e. it serves as a fulfillment key of performing the author’s intention. Further in the text it might perform the role of a shade of meaning of ironical hint and other cognitive meanings. It may be just a question of a young girl asked as a result of being playful, or it may be a hint to another thing of a girl who is “very shrewd” or “frivolous.” This must be got by the reader as well. It may also be a rhetoric question as the researcher says. After all, “rhetoric questions deliver conclusions as well as occurrences which are difficult to mention in “hidden”, “closed” poetic style” [8, p. 55]. The very expression which according to the researcher shows that the girls lead meaningless life and they are bored demonstrates its euphemistic coloring. The third sentence of the play of words beginning with: *“Can you tell us what meaning is, Gulshanopa?”* uses the word **meaning** three times. Here this word plays the role of poetic rhyme and makes bigger the impact of the play of words: *“Don’t ask the meaning of meaning...”* [5:86-87]

The word **meaningless** in *“Gulshanopa has left her husband alone and she is now a meaningless among us – other meaningless...”* conveys a euphemistic meaning of “without husband”, “manless”. H. Kodirova evaluates it as a euphemic expression of a meaning of “being insulted, outraged, being a toy before the eyes of others” not of a meaning of “like us whose dreams were outraged”. [5:86-87]. This serves as a stronger euphemic dress for the meaning we supposed. One more meaning of the word “meaningless” is “prostitute” or “a beautiful girl”. This can be reconstituted on the basis of cognitive meaning of the profession of Gulshanopa: *“there will be more such meaningless as we are.”; “I won’t multiply meaningless any more.”*

If one pays attention, the euphemism of *meaningful* is to be with a proper man appropriate by Islam and *meaningless* formed on the basis of metaphoric meaning of being free from such essence. Generally, as a result of the word play of *meaning* and *meaningful* has a new cognitive function on the basis of paronymic relation. One can understand this cognitive meaning in the text. It is also clear that there is some inner hint at the importance of *meaningful* life.

It is evident that perception of word plays on the basis of metaphoric euphemisms as well as euphemistic means is connected with mental environment of a personality and thinking activity. And this is connected with metaphor's basis of knowing the reality. Why, the metaphor is lingua-cognitive means of expressing and perception of the reality. In the 70s and 80s of the last century this problem was learned by A.Hilly, R.Harris, A.Ortony, R.Reynolde and others on the basis of English material. It is not for nothing that J.Lakoff and M. Jonson looked at metaphor as a conception of the way of knowing [6: 387-415]. They regarded it as the third conceptual sphere appeared in the intersection of two different conceptual areas [6, pp. 387-415].

In general euphemization conveys a cognitive function as a many sided phenomenon. This can especially be seen in metaphoric euphemisms more clearly.

Metaphor, namely euphemic metaphor is one of the main means of development of the language. Euphemic metaphors or metaphoric euphemes constantly enrich language vocabulary – synonym ring, multi meaning words, colorful words. The role of euphemic metaphors is invaluable especially in verbalizing the inner feelings of man. N.D.Arutyunova says “Without metaphor the vocabulary of “invisible worlds” (Inner World Life of Man) [2; 5].

We can see that our linguistic activity would not exist without metaphor. It covers the expression of idea and the idea itself. There is no any area of thought without participation of metaphor. The main means of understanding, evaluating, explaining, characterizing the reality is metaphor. Even the means of differentiating feature of the man from artificial intellect is metaphor. That is why metaphor came to the linguistic from other fields of science became an object of investigation of linguistics and other sciences as well as a result of development of linguistics in the new century. As a result lingua-cognitology which is a paradigm in the section of different sciences also began learning peculiarities of many sided metaphor and there appeared a new notion – *cognitive metaphor*. [3: 385-402]. As Yu. S. Stepanov said, “The metaphor – fundamental characteristics of language... by means of metaphor the speaker singles out from an intimate circle, adjacent to his body and coinciding with the moment of speech, other worlds” [11, p. 228]. And this circumstance requires deeper learning of the role of metaphor.

The quality of creative and figurative thought, oral and written expression of the product of thought in accordance with the speech condition is maintained by the degree of metaphoric thinking. A creator of euphemic metaphor, as all creators of metaphor, relying on his logical and linguistic experience, looks for coincidence and similarities between logically not related objects, finds them, connects the objects in his mind, constructs logical bridge between them and as a result founds a euphemic metaphor. He chooses linguistic dress for image in thought and brings it to life in compliance with pragmatic situation in speech. “In general, psychologists consider the language to be a display of cognitive processes. It reflects thought, perception, memory, stronger than other types of behavior of the man” [4, pp. 184-193].

Degree of cognition and intellectual facilities of a language owner find their reflection in metaphoric euphemisms. The cooperation of linguistic knowledge, gumption and speech

qualification plays a significant role in creating especially provisional metaphoric euphemisms. The importance of paradigmatic associative connections is bigger than those of syntagmatic relations in maintaining the meaning of metaphor of speech phenomenon (sentence, phrase, text). Semiccontent of permanent and provisional units of the single system of paradigmatic relations gets clearer and it can be seen that expression semes of euphemes on metaphoric basis are more noticeable. In general, coming into being and perception of a metaphoric euphemistic meaning, though, on syntagmatic basis and its essence are realized in connection of associative thought peculiarities of cognition degree and personal qualities (ability and ethnic origin) of the addressee. Units used in coding take part in decoding too. The level of these units in the end, serve for improving the quality of communication. Let us try to analyze the euphemism of *correspondence* used in “Past Days” by Abdulla Qodiriy:

1. “I think there is no more delicate business than getting married,” said Rahmat and looked at Otabek. “When getting married its very good if your wife corresponds to your tastes; otherwise, there is no a more difficult situation.” 2. “No doubt that you are telling the truth,” he said, “but I must also tell you that as the wife should *correspond* to the tastes of her future husband, the husband also should *correspond* to his future wife’s requirements.” 3. “Corresponding and not corresponding to wife is not so important,” said Homid objecting a little, “for women only the word husband itself is enough... as my nephew said the wife should correspond to the tastes of her husband.” 4. For example I got married to the girl who was to the liking of my parents... but though my wife corresponds to the tastes of my parents, she does not correspond to my tastes, perhaps, as you told, I don’t correspond to my wife’s tastes either. 5. “My nephew,” said Homid looking at Rahmat, “at the beginning you got married in accordance with your parents will, of course, and it is not good to take offence at them for it. If your wife does not correspond to your tastes, get married to a corresponding one and have two wives. If it is not all right with her either get married to the third one. It is not good for a man to remain in grief if his wife does not correspond to his tastes” [9, p. 3-4].

In this point we think it is necessary to bring the definition of the word of *мувофиқ*–corresponding, given in the dictionary of the Uzbek language:

МУВОФИҚ [Arabic – approver, corresponding, convenient, suitable]

1. Corresponding, suitable, worthy, fit. *To find a suitable job. They wanted to send a messenger, Hasanali was chosen as a suitable (мувофиқ) person for this mission. (Past days. A. Qodiriy)*

The man who chose the nickname “Titmouse” for Nabigul found a very suitable (мувофиқ) one. (A Wingless Titmouse. A. Qahhor)

2. Typical, fit, deserving. *A deserving (мувофиқ) reply*

3. In accordance with, on the basis, according to. *In accordance with law regulations. According to traditions. On the basis of the decree. According to their mutual commotion new lands, waters*

taken up will transfer to Teshaboy for nothing. (Fergana Beforethe Dawn. M. Ismoiliy) [12, p. 615].

In the above given extract some of the three ideas were used with euphemistic purposes. Namely, in the first phrase the euphemism of *correspondence (muvofiq)* serves to express the meaning of “to be to one’s liking” on euphemistic basis. So, when Rahmat uses *corresponding to taste* as “to be to one’s liking”, he is based on associative closeness of *corresponding* with the verb “to be to one’s liking” of the linguistic intellect of the Uzbeks. Besides, this inter-words associative connection is understood by addressees and a range of cognitive transactions are carried on. On the basis of the word “*muvofiq*” Otabek draws our attention to under some of “two sidedness”: “*No doubt that you are telling the truth,*” he said, “*but I must also tell you that as the wife should correspond to the tastes of her future husband, the husband also should correspond to his future wife’s requirements.*” In Homid’s thought “*muvofiq*” is one sided phenomenon and the very expression of none family – husband-wife relations of “objective two sidedness” prevails in his understanding: “*Corresponding and not corresponding to wife is not so important,*” said Homid objecting a little, “*for women only the word husband itself is enough... as my nephew said the wife should correspond to the tastes of her husband.*” Main informative content is about relations of husband and wife. The word “*muvofiq*”, expressing different approaches to this relation, with its euphemistic meaning plays the role of curtaining the speakers’ views. On the basis of the polemics one can notice the choice of accepting or not accepting the methodological power of Uzbekish saying “Тенг тенги билан, тезак қопи билан” (everybody has his equal). A linguist H. Kodirova contends that “those who carry on polemics do not speak openly; everybody looks upon “*muvofiq*” in his own way, understands in his own way and interprets in his own way. This word Only expresses such meaning as finding a way to one’s heart”, “serving him”, “not to contradict him”, “serving for necessary demands” which are not permitted to speak about openly in some extend. Though Homid is given the status of a negative hero by the writer, he speaks only curtained words, he is also not deprived of national feeling of shame and politeness, is not shown to the reader in a rude manner. Here we can be witnesses of the author’s high valuing national shame and delicateness. The author achieves his goal by using the word “*muvofiq*” which means “corresponding” or “fit” in designed and sensible manner. This euphemism like other euphemisms is used in order to fulfill the task of leaving positive impression and not using dislikable words” [5, p. 81].

If we pay attention, colorful aspects of outlook of those having the polemics as well as their life experience serve as basis for the opposition in thoughts. Otabek does not have enough experience in family – husband-wife relations. And when because of lack of experience he stresses such meanings as “to like” and “to dislike” of the word “*muvofiq*”, in Homid’s using of the words prevails euphemistic meaning of “one sided correspondence” as a result of his limitation in personal nature. As H. Kodirova says, “one sided correspondence” can be seen in general meanings of “being subordinate, dependant, limiting personal freedoms” in Homid’s each sentence. “In using connotative character in the function of nominative the meaning of ascribed to him predicative signs can vary according to language situation and to individual peculiarities of

the subject of speech. The existence of connotation in a system of language often goes in the framework of functional meanings” [1, p. 245]. Here the metaphoric euphemism of “*muvoʻfiq*” in connection with speech intention of subjects forms colorful euphemistic features in different situations. So we can say that objective metaphoric regularity in cognitive metaphoric euphemisms form complex lingua-cognitive and logical mixture with subjective relation and in speech condition.

References

- Arutyunova N.D. Tipyyazykovyhnacheniy: Otsenka. Sobytiya. Fakt. M.: Nauka, 1988.
 Arutyunova N.D. Metafora i diskurs. Teoriya metafory. M., 1990. S. 5-51.
- Arutyunova N. D. Metafora v yazyke chuvstv. Arutyunova N. D. Yazyk i mir cheloveka. M., 1999. S. 385-402.
- Baranov A.N. Ocherkkognitivnoyeteorii metafory. Russkayapoliticheskayametafora (materialy k slovaryu). M.: IRYA RAN, 1991. S.184-193
- Kadirova Kh.B. Abdulla Qodiriyning evfemizm va disfemizmlardan foydalanish mahorati: Filologiya fanlari nomzodi ...diss. Toshkent, 2009.
- Lakoff D., Djonson M. Metafory, kotorymi my jivem. Teoriyametafory. M., 1990. S. 387-415
- Makkormak E. Kognitivnayateoriyametafory. Teoriya Metafory / pod red. N.D. Arutyunovoy i M.A. Jurinskoy. M.: Progress, 1990. C. 358-386.
- Omonturdiyev A.J. Professional nutqevfemikasi. T.: Fan, 2006.
- Qodiriy A. Oʻtkankunlar. T.: Oʻqituvchi, 1985.
- Qodiriy A. Mehrobdanchayon. Toshkent. Adabiyotvasanʼat, 1994.
- Stepanov Yu.S. V trehmernomprostranstveyazyka (Semioticheskieproblemylingvistiki, filosofii i iskusstva). M.: Nauka, 1985.
- Oʻzbektiliningizohlilugʻati. 5-jildli. Ikkinchichijild. – Toshkent: Oʻzbekistonmilliyensiklopediyasi, 2006.