

## Metaphonymy as the Main Cognitive Mechanism in the Formation of Idiomatic Compound Words



### Linguistics

**Keywords:** metaphonymy, conceptual metaphor, conceptual metonymy, cognitive domain, idiomatic compound word, linguistic world view.

Akmal Gulamjanovich Yuldashev

Uzbekistan State University of World Languages, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

### Abstract

The article discusses a metaphor and a metonymy, functioning as cognitive tools for expression of an imagery element not as the main stylistic devices. The main purpose and the novelty of the present article are in undertaking the detail analysis of a Metaphonymy with the idiomatic compound words in the English and Uzbek languages. Moreover, as a Metaphonymy is a new notion appeared as a result of the mutual harmony of a conceptual metaphor and a conceptual metonymy in contemporary linguistics, the definitions of a conceptual metaphor, a conceptual metonymy and a Metaphonymy are briefly discussed. The use of a Metaphonymy in a language is analyzed with the examples of idiomatic compound words in the English and Uzbek languages.

### Introduction

A metaphor and a metonymy have been investigated as the main stylistic devices expressing imagery in the international and Uzbek linguistics L.A. Bulakhovsky (1954), L. Bloomfield (1968), I.R. Galperin (1977), A. Shomaksudov, I. Rasulov (1983), I.V. Arnold (1990), R.A. Suvonova (2003), S. Sultonsaidova, U. Sharipova (2009), M. Mirtojiev (2010)

A lot of ideas were suggested about the semantic change of words by means of a metaphorical and metonymic transference in the structural-functional stage of linguistics. American linguist L. Bloomfield, when dealing with the problem of semantic change (transference) of words, states: *“The formation of resultant words is realized in different stages, i.e. formation of new words based on semantic changes, narrowing of meaning (specialization), widening of meaning (generalization) metaphor, metonymy, synechdoche, hyperbole, litotes, pejoration, ...* (L. Bloomfield, 1968, pp. 466-467). It is common knowledge that a metaphor is the most productive way of formation of resultant meaning. To prove this idea Uzbek linguist M. Mirtojiev writes: *...Metaphor is based on formation of resultant meaning and on the similarity of resultant meaning referents with each other* (M. Mirtojiev, 2010, p. 94).

V.N. Teliya states that a metaphor, which is a universal way of enriching a language word stock, is widely used in secondary nomination processes including compound nouns. (V.N. Teliya, 1988, p. 181). She also writes: *“there is common link between metonymic meaning and the word formed by means of metonymy and semantic transference in that word happens smoothly”*.

The definition to the term “metonymy” given by A. Shomaksudov and I. Rasulov is attractive *“...a thing or an event is inter-connected with the expression of interrelated notions with one another”* (A. Shomaksudov, I. Rasulov, 1983, p. 237). Based on this definition, it can obviously be seen that being a language unit (phenomenon) a metonymy can appear as a result of certain knowledge where cognition and communication come across each other.

The development of cognitive linguistics is characterized with the increased attention to the anthropocentric paradigm development, cognitive-semantic and linguo-cultural disciplines. Hence, types of word meaning transference – a metaphor and a metonymy have become one of the most topical problems. Thus, cognitive approach to a metaphor and a metonymy – the types of semantic transference has become one of the most topical problems of contemporary linguistics.

At the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the theory of *conceptual metaphor* emerged in general linguistics with the book *Metaphors We Live by* published by G. Lakoff, M. Johnson [Lakoff, G., Johnson, 1980, 2003]. The novelty of this theory was that the authors have disclosed new features of a metaphor's nature stating its importance of having a conceptual linguistic status not only being a simple stylistic expression unit. According to the authors, a metaphor is not just a language expression unit, but also a phenomenon connected with mind (cognition) and "...as metaphors are fixed in human conceptual system they exist in language expression unit. In other words, metaphor is specific for thought, and linguistic metaphors are external expressions of only this phenomenon" (T.G. Skrepsova, 2011, p. 49).

According to G. Lakoff and M. Johnson: "*that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature.*" (Lakoff G., Johnson M, 2003, p. 4). So, a conceptual metaphor is not just a resultant (derived) meaning which is the result of a simple semantic transference, but it is a result of complex process happening in human mind. The reason of this idea is that human-beings rely on their knowledge in creating a new word. Linguistic investigations devoted to this issue prove that a conceptual metaphor is the most productive way of building new words formed as a result of acquiring new knowledge.

G. Lakoff and M. Johnson suggest: "*In a metaphor: there are two domains: the target domain, which is constituted by the immediate subject matter, and source domain, in which important metaphorical reasoning takes place and provides the source concepts used in that reasoning. Metaphorical language has literal meaning in the source domain. In addition, a metaphoric mapping is multiple, that is, two or more elements are mapped to two or more other elements. Image-schema structure is preserved in the mapping – interiors of containers map to interiors, exteriors map to exteriors; sources of motion to sources, goals to goals, and so on*" (Lakoff, G., Johnson, 1980, 2003).

According to E.S. Kubryakova "*There are two required processes in the formation of derived word meaning, in our case in compound words as well the first is cognition and the second is communication; each newly formed word undergoes narrowing process of knowledge.*" (E.S. Kubryakova, 2004, pp. 407-408). From the cognitive point of view a set of knowledge of ready language units in compound words is realized by means of re-understanding the world with the aid of new word building models.

Above mentioned ideas were investigated by F. Ungerer, H. Schmid: 1997, T. Clausner, W. Croft :2004; they also tried to determine the differences between resultant meanings appeared as a result of a conceptual metaphor and a conceptual metonymy taking this cognitive domains into account. Later Laira A. Janda: 2004, J. Svanlund: 2007 deeply investigated cognitive domains in the formation of a conceptual metaphor.

The first linguist who studied a conceptual metaphor in Uzbek D. Khudoyberganova gives the following definition to this term: "*cognitive metaphor is characteristic feature of person's cognitive activity which categorizes a notion or subordination based on the knowledge structure about another notion or subordination.*" (D. Xudoyberganova, 2013, p. 49). Besides analyzing a conceptual metaphor in text semantics she suggests that conceptual metaphors should be studied by dividing them into the following groups: a) metaphors in word-form; b) metaphors in the form of word combination; c) metaphors in the form of sentence; d) metaphors in the form of micro text (D. Xudoyberganova, 2013, p. 50).

A cognitive metaphor is considered to be a necessary mechanism in the formation of idiomatic compound words.

G. Lakoff and M. Johnson are recognized as the founders of the conceptual metonymy theory. They think that conceptual metonymies are fed with the knowledge acquired by a human being, they are more obvious than cognitive metaphors; a metonymy usually has exact physiological or associative indicators. (G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, 2003, p. 38].

W. Croft and D. Cruse state that a conceptual metonymy consists of two cognitive domains, i.e. a vehicle domain and a target domain. They believe that the function of the vehicle domain is only to indicate the target domain structure. W. Croft, D. Cruse (2004). Differing from a conceptual metaphor, the reason of the formation of a metonymy from a vehicle domain is that it is found in a cognitive domain of a certain concept, e.g. "WHOLE – PART, PART – WHOLE".

As has been mentioned above, a metaphor and a metonymy are not only language phenomena, but a resultant meaning arises as a result of a complex cognitive process. The reasons why these phenomena own the status of a conceptual metaphor and a conceptual metonymy have been proved by a number of linguists.

Theories about the integration of a conceptual metaphor and a conceptual metonymy began to appear in the following stage of the development of cognitive linguistics.

Based on the analysis of the material collected about idiomatic compound words it is possible to deduce that idiomatic compound words can be formed by means of not only a conceptual metaphor or a conceptual metonymy, but they can also be formed with the help of the integration of both conceptual language devices. Our research is based on the definition given by A. I. Smirnitsky: "the general meaning of the idiomatic compound word does not derive from a set of the meanings of its components" (A. I. Smirnitsky, 1956, p. 117). Now, we want to say a few words about the term *metaphonymy* used in contemporary cognitive linguistics. This term has first been used by L. Goossens in linguistics. This scholar first observed the connection process of a metaphor and a metonymy and called it a *metaphonymy* (Goossens L, 2002, pp. 349-378). According to this linguist there exists a complex mechanism possessing the features of both a metaphor and a metonymy. A metaphonymy has become one of the main cognitive mechanisms serving for the conceptualization of world events and phenomena at present time.

There are two main types of *metaphonymy*:

1) a metonymy within a metaphor. The main idea of this process is that a semantic transference happens in the boundary of source-domain, then a metonymy becomes an element of the whole source domain being metaphorically discussed. L. Goossens analyzes this theory by means of conventional phrases: *bite one's tongue off* – "be sorry for what one has just said" (*tilinitis lamoq, aytgangapigapushaymonbo`lmoq*). The whole and simile express a state or situation by means of the word *tongue* – a speech organ (a part of human body in general). The general meaning of the given example is produced by a metonymy within a metaphor.

2) a metaphor from a metonymy. The main idea of this phenomenon is inserting the object used metonymically in metaphorical language unit or phrase<sup>1</sup>. "Oh dear", she giggled, "I'd quite forgotten" – (a metonymy within a metaphor).

A metaphonymy is used as one of the cognitive mechanisms serving for the formation of idiomatic compound words during the investigation of the given problem. We have revealed that one of the two

<sup>1</sup> Goossens L. The Interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action // Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast. – Berlin; New-York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002. pp. 349 – 378.

components of the idiomatic compound word, the material under consideration, is formed by means of a metaphor and the other by a metonymy, or vice versa. In the conceptual analysis of idiomatic compound words the harmony (concord) of two conceptual phenomena in one cognitive domain is observed. For instance: the Uzbek word *ayiqtovon* (*buttercup*) – *herbaceous plant with bright yellow cup-shaped flowers, which is common in grassland and as a garden weed* belongs to the conceptual field of PLANT [ЎПЎЖИ: 136]. This idiomatic compound word is formed by the cognitive model ANIMAL+ PART OF THE BODY= PLANT. The reason why it is called a cognitive model is that the word *ayiq* (bear) belongs to the cognitive domain of the concept ANIMAL, *tovon* (heel) belongs to the cognitive domain of the concept BODY. In the formation of this idiomatic compound word the component *ayiq* (bear) matches metaphorically, the component *tovon* (heel) arises metonymically, i.e. WHOLE – PART. The general lexical meaning of the present idiomatic compound word is a result of a metaphorical transference of a simile, i.e. the shape of this flower looks like a heel of the bear. The reason why this plant is called a *buttercup* in English is that the colour of the flower is yellow as the colour of butter and the shape of the flower is similar to a cup. So, in both languages the idiomatic compound words are considered to be isomorphemic. Another example: the Uzbek word *laylaktumshuq* (*laylak* – stork, *tumshuq* – beak. Filerie) [BQIL, 1990: 31] – a flower, which is similar to the beak of the stork in shape, is called so because of its similarity to the beak of the stork. The first component of this word *laylak* belongs to the cognitive domain of the concept BIRD and designates the similarity between BIRD and PLANT. The second component *tumshuq* means the part of a bird's body, so this is formed by PART – WHOLE structure. The whole general lexical meaning of the idiomatic compound word is formed by a metaphor from a metonymy. This plant is called *Filerie* which is a simple word. This case exemplifies the process of homomorphism in compared languages.

The following compound words are formed by means of this cognitive model: *bo'rikalla* (*bo'ri* – wolf, *kalla* – head – a type of melon) [O`TIL I, 2006: 417], *itburun* (*it* – dog, *burun* – nose – a dog nose) [O`TIL II, 2006: 241], *tuyatish* (*tuya* – camel, *tish* – tooth. Coarse-grained) [O`TIL III, 2007: 224], *tuyatovon* (*tuya* – camel, *tovon* – heel. Bean-shaped) [ЎПЎЖИ 1973: 175], *tuyaqorin* (*tuya* – camel, *qorin* – stomach. Heliotrope downy-fruited) [ЎПЎЖИ 1973: 53], *otquloq* (*ot* – horse, *quloq* – ear. Sorrel) [ЎПЎЖИ 1973: 306], *ho'kiztili* (*ho'kiz* – ox, *tili* – tongue. ....) [BQIL, 1990: 27-28].

Idiomatic compound words formed by this model can frequently be found in English as well: *cattail* – a tall, reedlike marsh plant with straplike leaves and a dark brown, velvety cylindrical head of numerous tiny flowers [ABBY Lingvo]; the first component of the idiomatic compound word belongs to the cognitive domain of the concept ANIMAL whereas the second component belongs to the cognitive domain of the concept BODY. The first component is formed by a conceptual metaphor; the second component is formed by a conceptual metonymy, i.e. PART – WHOLE. *Foxtail* – a common meadow grass that has soft brush-like flowering spikes [ABBY Lingvo], *foxglove* – a tall Eurasian plant with erect spikes of pinkish-purple (or white) flowers shaped like the fingers of gloves. It is a source of the drug digitalis [OALD 2010: 615].

Now, it is important to analyze some idiomatic compound words belonging to the cognitive domain of the concept BIRD in Uzbek. The first model may have the following structure: COLOUR + PART of BODY = BIRD, e.g. *qiziloyoq* – (*qizil* – red, *oyoq* – foot, leg. Oyster catcher, pied oyster) [ZEqushlar, 1957: 52], [O`TIL V 2008: 278]. The first component of this idiomatic compound word *qizil* has experienced the metaphorical transference. This component is projected by the cognitive domain of the concept COLOUR as the colour of this bird's leg is red. The second component is projected from the cognitive domain of the concept BODY, the structure PART – WHOLE, i.e. the whole is called with a bird's leg. The name of the bird – *qiziloyoq* formed as a result of the integration of two concepts with the cognitive model COLOUR + PART OF THE BODY = BIRD by means of metaphonymy.

The following idiomatic compound words are formed by means of this cognitive model (COLOUR +PART OF THE BODY = BIRD): qoratomoq – (*qora – black, tomoq – throat*. Wagtail) [O`TIL V, 2008: 340], ko`kbel – (*ko`k – black, bel – waist*. Dunbird) [O`TIL V, 2008: 277], qizilishton – (*qizil – red, ishton – trousers*. Woodpecker) [O`TIL V, 2008: 277].

The following English idiomatic compound words can be examples for this model: *yellowtail* – a marine fish that has yellow coloration on the fins, esp. a number of species prized as food fish. [OALD 2010: 34], *buttercup* – noun, a wild plant with small shiny yellow flowers that shaped like cups [OALD 2010: 202]

As a logical continuation of our work the formation of idiomatic compound words expressing people's physical and social status which is formed by means of metaphonymy analyzed below. One of the most frequently found cognitive models is COLOUR+ PART OF BODY= HUMAN. *Oqsoqol* – (*oq – white, soqol – beard*) an honored person of a village civil council [O`TIL III, 2007:182] can be an example for this model. This idiomatic compound word meant *old man* some centuries ago, but now it implies a head of municipal authority and this post is occupied not only by a male person, but also a female one. If it comes to the formation of this idiomatic compound word it should be stated that the first component of this word *oq*(white) belongs to cognitive domain of the concept COLOUR which is formed by means of conceptual metaphor whereas the second component of this word *soqol*(beard) is projected from the cognitive domain of the concept PART OF THE BODY – PART+ WHOLE, i.e. a conceptual metonymy. Consequently, by means of the integration of the two conceptual domains there formed a resultant meaning expressing HUMAN. The word *oqsoch*(*oq – white, soch – hair*. Housemaid) has been formed by means of this model. [O`TIL III, 2007: 182].

The English idiomatic compound word *greybeard* – an old man [OALD 2010: 682] has been formed by the cognitive model COLOUR+ PART OF THE BODY = HUMAN.

It is possible to draw a conclusion that idiomatic compound words in the English and Uzbek languages can frequently be formed by means of a metaphonymy model. While investigating the given problem three types of idiomatic compound words formed by means of the cognitive models ANIMAL+ PART OF THE BODY = PLANT, COLOUR + PART OF THE BODY = BIRD, COLOUR + PART OF THE BODY = HUMAN have been revealed.

The research of the idiomatic compound words by using conceptual analysis can widely reveal the chosen problem. Determination of the formation of lexical units based on the metonymy within a metaphor arisen from investigated examples, defining compound words with separating them into components and determining the components belonging to a cognitive domain of a certain concept and their projection, and the formation of words as a result of integration of a conceptual metaphor and metonymy prove the theory of a metaphonymy as correct among linguistic theories.

Idiomatic compound words are formed by means of cognitive mechanisms of a conceptual metaphor, a conceptual metonymy and a metaphonymy. We assume that in the process of the formation of idiomatic compound words having central and rather fixed characteristics of concepts corresponding to the words with denotational meaning which need interpretation and as a result of above mentioned mechanisms new concepts representing idiomatic compound words are formed.

## References

1. Arnold I.V. Stilistikasovremennogoangliyskogoyazika. Moskva, Prosvesheniye1990. p.300.
2. Bloomfield L. Yazik. Moskva, Progress, 1968, 607 s.
3. Bulaxovskiy L.A. Vvedeniye yazikoznaniya. Chast II, Moskva, Gosuchpedgiz, 1954. p.177.
4. Kubryakova E.S. Yazik i znaniye. Na putipolucheniyaznaniy o yazike: chastirechi s kognitivnoytochkizreniya. Rolyazika v poznaniimira.Moskva, Yazikislavyanskoykulturi. 2004. p.560.
5. Mirtojdiyev M. O`zbektilisemasiologiyasi. Toshkent. Mumtozsoz. 2010. 288 b.
6. Skrebsova T. G. Kognitivnayalingvistika. St. Petersburg. Filologicheskifakultet. 2011. p.254.
7. Smirniskiy A.I. Leksikologiyaangliyskogoyazika. Moskva. Literaturanainnostrannixyazikax. 1956. p.256.
8. Suvonova R.A. O`zbektilidametoniimiya. Toshkent. A. QodiriyXalqmerosi. 2003. 108 b.
9. Teliya V.N. Metaforizasiya i yeyo rol v sformirovanii yazikovoy kartini mira // Rol chelovecheskogo faktora v yazikovoy kartini mira. Yazik i kartina mira.Moskva, Nauka, 1988. pp.173-204
10. Xudayberganova D. Matnningantroposentriktadqiqi. Toshkent. Fan. 2013, 136 b.
11. Shomaqsudov A., Rasulov I. O`zbektilistilistikasi. Toshkent. O`qituvchi. 1983. 248 b.
12. Clausner, T.C., Croft, W. Domains and image schemas. Cognitive Linguistics, 1999. – Vol. 10. - № 1. pp. 1-3.
13. Croft W., D.Alan Cruse. Cognitive Linguistics. Published in USA, New York by Cambridge University Press. 2004. p.195. p.374.
14. Galperin. I.R. Stylistics. Moskva. Higher School, 1977. p.332.
15. GoossensL.the Interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action // Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast. – Berlin; New-York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002. pp.349–378.
16. Lakoff G. and Mark Johnson. Metaphors we live by. London: The university of Chicago press. 2003. p.38.
17. Laura A. Janda. A metaphor in search of source domain: The categories of Slavic aspect. Cognitive Linguistics, 2004. – Vol. 15. - № 4. pp.471–527.
18. Jan Svanlund. Metaphor and convention. Cognitive Linguistics, 2007. – Vol. 18. - № 1. pp.47–89.
19. Sultondaidova S., Sharipova O`. O`zbek tili stilistikasi. Toshkent, YURIST-MEDIA MARKAZI. 2009. p.112
20. Ungerer, F., Schmid, H.-J. An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics. – L., N.Y.: Longman, 1997. p.305.
21. O`zbektiliningizohlilug`ati. 5 jildlik. – Toshkent, O`zME, I jilt 2006 – 680b. II jilt 2006. – 672b. III jilt 2007. 688b. IV jilt2008 – 608b. Vjilt 2008 – 592b.
22. Zoxidov T.Z. Zoologiyaensiklopediyasi. Qushlar. – Toshkent: Fan, 1957. 127 b.
23. Qosimov A.I., Nabiyeu M.M. Botanikadan qisqacha izohli lug`at. – Toshkent, O`qituvchi, 1990. 80 b.
24. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary – Typeset by Oxford University Press. Printed in India, 2010. p.1796.