

Metaphoric and Metonymic Conceptualization of *na:k* (Nose) in Hindi

Dr. Neelam Yadav,
Department of Linguistics,
K.M.I., Dr. B.R. Ambedkar University,
Agra, UP., India
Email-id: dr.neelam2012.yadav@gmail.com

Abstract:

This paper examines the metaphorical and metonymic structure of the “nose” in Hindi, India. The study is done within the framework of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory propounded by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). The aim is to analyze the ways in which the body part ‘nose’ is used in Hindi to express human experiences in day to day life. The data reveal the metaphorical and metonymic conceptualization of ‘nose’ in relation to the locus of emotion. The nose is conceptualized variously in Hindi language and also reflects the culture of Hindi speaking community.

Key Word: Metaphor, Metonymy, Emotion, Nose, Conceptualization.

Introduction and Theoretical Background

Recent years have witnessed a good number of studies which focus on the conceptualization of external body organs in many languages. The metaphoric and metonymic conceptualization of body parts such as the head, heart, hand, eye have recently drawn the interest of scholars (e.g., Wolters 2011; Moshenrose 2012; Blechmen 2005; Fan 2017; Dzokoto et al. 2016). Moreover, there has been substantial development in the discussion of the nose in the Hebrew Bible. Recent contributions have been made by Amzallag (2017, 2018), Kotzé (2005), and Wrenn (2020). In Hindi, conceptualization of ‘nose’ expresses and stands for various emotions like respect and disrespect, hate, anger, honor etc.

In the present study, two cognitive mechanisms, metaphor and metonymy, are mainly important in conceptualization. The metaphorical expression cannot be inferred only from literal senses of the word; hence, it required comprehending both the literal and the conceptual meanings (Agyekum 2004). Metaphor is no longer understood as a mere stylistic decoration or an ornamental figure of speech. In its place, a cognitive approach promotes construction of meaning and understanding to the conceptual system, it takes human perception, experience, body parts, and understanding of the world as the basis for the structure of human language (Gyekye 1987; Yu 2004, 664). According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 5), metaphors are grounded in physical and mental experience (Lee 2005, 6). Metaphor is about the conceptualization of one domain in terms of another (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 6). Kövecses (2010, 4) defines metaphor as “understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain”.

This is something close to our bodily, embodied experience (e.g., TIME IS MONEY). This is a sign that cross-domains mappings sustenance the importance of metaphorical reasoning over the linguistic

comprehensions (Lakoff and Johnson 1999, 116). The Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) has gone through several updates and revisions (Gibbs 2017). Barcelona (2003, 4) notes that metonymy is basic to language and also cognition. According to Gibbs (1994, 321), metonymy is a process by which “people take one well-understood or easily perceived aspect of something to represent or stand for the thing as a whole.” Metonymy is a conceptual projection whereby one domain is partly understood in terms of another included in the same experiential domain (Barcelona 2000). Thus metaphor is different from metonymy. Metaphor is based on likeness between two domains of experience, while metonymy is founded on nearness that is PART FOR THE WHOLE model. For example “Delhi” for “India”) is more common than the reverse, WHOLE FOR PART metonymy (e.g., “America” for “USA”). It’s not easy to draw a clear difference between metaphor and metonymy. However, some scholars interpret metaphor and metonymy as a continuum of associated process (Kövecses and Radden 1998; Goosens 2002; Peirsman and Geeraerts 2006). Some opines that all metaphors are basically metonymically-based (Kövecses and Radden 1999; Niemeier 2000; Barcelona 2000). Radden (2000, 93) defines a metonymy-based metaphor as “a mapping involving two conceptual domains which are grounded in, or can be tracked to, one conceptual domain.” Kövecses and Radden (1998, 61) posit that, “it may not be unreasonable to suggest that many conceptual metaphors derive from conceptual metonymies.”

Language, Data and Analysis

Language: Hindi (Devnagari) or **Modern Standard Hindi** is an Indo-Aryan language spoken chiefly in the Hindi Belt region encompassing parts of northern, central, eastern, and western India. Hindi has been described as a standardized and Sanskritized register of the Hindustani language, which itself is based primarily on the Khariboli dialect of Delhi and neighboring areas of India. Hindi is one of the two official languages of the Government of India, along with English. It is an official language in nine states and three union territories and an additional official language in three other states. Hindi is also one of the 22 scheduled languages of the Republic of India.

The data were gathered from the Hindi proverbs and idioms’ dictionaries available in on and offline mode like Hindi Sahitya Darpan(online), Hindi Muhaaware aur lokokti kosha(2015) by Badrinath Kapoor, kahaawat ki kahaaniyaan (2007) by Radha Kant bharti etc.

The data elicited from the Hindi proverbs and idioms’ dictionaries were gathered by using the source-domain-oriented approach. A group of items related to the source domains such as CONTAINER, OBJECT, MATERIAL, and PERSON are selected and then grouped into their major metaphorical and metonymical mappings for the analysis.

Conceptualization of the Nose in Hindi

Nose Metaphors and Metonymies in Hindi

In Hindi the term *na:k* (*nose*) is referring not only to the nose, but also seen as the locus of emotions such as anger, honour, respect etc. Here, we shall see through the various metaphorical and metonymic conceptualizations of nose that how emotional changes can be reflected through physiological movements and reactions.

1. THE NOSE IS AN OBJECT/MATERIAL

The metaphoric conceptualization, THE NOSE IS AN OBJECT, may be classified into the following sub-metaphors:

A. THE NOSE IS A LONG OBJECT/ HIGH OBJECT

a. *usaki na:k bahot ã:tfi: hæ*

(His nose is very high)

b. *bahot ã:tfi: na:k hæ uski: wah nahi: ma:nega:*

(His nose is very high, he will not accept)

Hindi conceptualizes the nose as a high object or a long object. Here, the above mentioned linguistic expressions are motivated by the cognitive vehicle of metaphor as well as metonymy. Cognitively HEIGHT OR LENGTH stands for greatness in various contexts. Thus the linguistic expressions are motivated by the conceptual metaphor THE NOSE IS A LONG OBJECT/ HIGH OBJECT. When the nose “lengthens,” it carries positive connotations, but when it “shortened,” it carries negative connotations. Thus, “short” is conceptualized as negative whilst “long” is conceptualized as positive, similarly with “high” and “low”. So, in Hindi culture a person with *unchi naak* (long nose) or *lambi naak* (long nose) is, sometimes, sarcastically considered a very highly esteemed person. Moreover, semantically, it gives the shade of sarcasm also. The cognitive vehicles are the motivator of various expressions. The meaning of the above constructions can be understood with the conceptual metonymy as well, such as HEIGHT OR LENGTH STANDS FOR GREATNESS thus LONG OR HIGH NOSE STANDS FOR ESTEEMED PERSON.

B. THE NOSE IS A RUBBING OBJECT

a. *usane apne ma:lk ke sa:mane bahot na:k ragari: lekñ koi sonwa:1 nahi: hui:*
(He rubbed his nose before his owner but he was not listened.)

b. *usane na:k ragar da:li: lekñ usaka: ka:m nahi: hua:*
(He rubbed his nose but his work was not done)

Here, nose is conceptualized as an object to rub. The conceptual metaphor THE NOSE IS A RUBBING OBJECT triggers the meaning of the above expression as when we correlate it with our experience of rubbing something against some place or object there we find that it takes lots of efforts and friction to get the output, thus, rubbing nose imparts the meaning of doing rigorous efforts to get some work done or in doing by own.

Metonymically RUBBING NOSE STANDS FOR RIGOROUS EFFORTS.

C. THE NOSE IS AN OBJECT TO KEEP

a. *a:dz sabke bi:tf usne meri: na:k rak^h li:*

(Today he kept my nose amongst everybody)

b. a:ʒ sabke bi:f meri: na:k rah gai:
(Today my nose is kept amongst everybody)

In the above linguistic expression the metaphorical conceptualization of nose is THE NOSE IS AN OBJECT TO KEEP. Here the linguistic expression, grounded in our daily experience, denotes the expression that when we keep something with us means it has some value and if we reject or throw out, it denotes the uselessness of the object.

Thus, KEEPING NOSE gives the sense to respect or to give honour somebody.

Metonymically KEEPING NOSE STANDS FOR KEEPING RESPECT/MAINTAINING DIGNITY.

D. THE NOSE IS AN INFLATABLE OBJECT

a. wah na:k p^hola: kar id^har od^har g^hu:m rahi: hæ
(Inflating her nose, she is moving here and there.)

b. na:k mat p^hola:o
(Don't inflate nose.)

A resentful or offended person is conceptualized as an inflated nose. The above linguistic expression seems to be partly metonymically motivated such as THE INFLATED NOSE STANDS FOR OFFENDED PERSON. Metaphorically the meaning of THE NOSE IS AN INFLATABLE OBJECT is stimulated and corresponds with our experience with balloon or any inflatable objects like a balloon expands or inflates with the gas filled in and it can burst if filled beyond its capacity similarly a person burst into anger if filled with resentment beyond the capacity of tolerance. Here BALLOON can be mapped with PERSON/NOSE, and metonymically NOSE STANDS FOR PERSON, GAS can be mapped with ANGER, BURST of balloon can be mapped with the person burst in anger.

2. NOSE IS A SEAT

It is our experience with life that motivates the cognitive vehicles to turn the wheel of thoughts to create such expressions. Here, nose is conceptualized as a seat where one cannot allow even a housefly to sit, this linguistic expression gives the sense that one doesn't allow anybody to interfere into one's matter and keep oneself away from interference. Nose is a dominating part of the face, so any positive or negative expressions related to nose indicate the honorific part.

A. NOSE IS A LOCUS OF ANGER/ SEAT FOR ANGER

a. gussa: uske na:k par bæst^ha: rahta: hæ
(anger sits at his/her nose)
 har g^harī wah na:k par gussa: līje p^hirṭa: hæ
(He carries anger at his nose every time.)

In the above expression nose is conceptualized as the place for anger. This conceptual metaphor is stimulated by the experience of being placed at a pointed and very less spacious place where one can hold on just for a while. Similarly, since nose is the locus of anger in Hindi it cannot stay or sit for long but falls down means such person gets angry frequently.

Metonymically, in Hindi, ANGER AT NOSE STANDS FOR SHORT TEMPERED PERSON.

3. NOSE IS A CONTAINER

usne na:k mē dam kar rak^ha: hæ

(He kept on creating a steam-pressure in the nose)

is for fara:be ne mere na:k me dam kar rak^ha: hæ

(This noise has kept on creating a steam-pressure in the nose)

The metaphor THE NOSE IS A CONTAINER is based on CONTAINER image schema. The container may be filled or emptied. The prepositions “in” and “out of” are markers of the CONTAINER image schema. . In the CONTAINER schema, the nose is conceptualized as a confined space with its outside and inside, where content is stored. In this section, our focus is more on the content of a container than the mere container. The above expression indicate that, in the Hindi , the nose expression is used with reference to the steam-pressure in the nose, filling the nose of the human being with steam-pressure substantiate the metaphor THE NOSE IS THE CONTAINER OF STEAM-PRESSURE. The expression suggest that the nose is the locus of vivacity and if it is filled with steam-pressure, the person may suffocate and die, thus it implies the sense of causing great annoyance to somebody or to torment greatly to somebody that is very throttling. Here, the steam-pressure can be mapped with the distress and annoyance and the nose is mapped with the container. Metonymically A STEAM-PRESSURED NOSE STANDS FOR A BOTHERED PERSON.

Conclusion

The paper focused the conceptual metaphors and metonymies with reference to NOSE in Hindi. The nose is conceptualized variously in Hindi language and also reflects the culture of Hindi speaking community. Metaphorically Nose is conceptualized as an object of different shape and size that is metonymically stands for Respect and Esteem of a person, such as THE NOSE IS A LONG OBJECT/ HIGH OBJECT. When the nose “lengthens,” it carries positive connotations, but when it “shortened,” it carries negative connotations. Thus, “short” is conceptualized as negative whilst “long” is conceptualized as positive. So, in Hindi culture a person with *unchi naak* (long nose) or *lambi naak* (long nose) is sometimes sarcastically considered a very highly esteemed person. Moreover, semantically, it gives the shade of sarcasm also. On one hand AN INFLATED NOSE STANDS FOR ANNOYED PERSON while on other it is conceptualized as SEAT or LOCUS of ANGER. The Nose is also a CONTAINER in Hindi based on CONTAINER image schema where steam-pressure can be

filled, steam-pressure mapped with the distress and annoyance caused and the nose is mapped with the container. Metonymically such nose STANDS FOR A BOTHERED PERSON. The NOSE in Hindi is also conceptualized as a SEAT where not even a housefly is allowed to sit,gives the sense that one doesn’t allow anybody to interfere into ones matter and keep oneself away from interference. Nose is a dominating part of the face, so any positive or negative expressions related to nose indicate the honorific part.

Reference

- Afreh, Esther Serwaah. 2015. "The metonymic and metaphorical conceptualizations of the heart in Akan and English." *Legon Journal of Humanities* 26(1):38–57.
- Berendt, Erich A. and Keiko Tanita. 2011. "The 'heart' of things: a conceptual metaphoric analysis of heart and related body parts in Thai, Japanese and English." *International Association Intercultural Communication Studies* 20(1):65–78.
- Blechmen, Robert K. 2005. "The heart of the matter: an exploration of the persistence of core beliefs." *Proceedings of the Media Ecology Association* 5:1–16.
- Dzokoto, Vivian and Sumie Okazaki. 2006. "Happiness in the eye and heart: somatic referencing in West African emotion lexica." *Journal of Black Psychology* 32(2):117–140.
- Evans, Vyvyan. 2010. "Figurative language understanding in LCCM theory." *Cognitive Linguistics* 21(4):601–662.
- Fan, Hui. 2017. "A Study of 'hand' metaphors in English and Chinese: cognitive and cultural perspective." *Advances in Literary Study* 5(4):84– 93.
- Gyekye, Kwame. 1987. *An Essay on African Philosophical Thought: The Akan Conceptual Scheme*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Johnson, Mark. 1987. *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Reason and Imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kövecses, Zoltan. 1986. *Metaphors of Anger, Pride and Love*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kövecses, Zoltan and Günter Radden. 1998. "Metonymy: Developing a Cognitive Linguistic View." *Cognitive Linguistics* 9(1):37–78.
- Kövecses, Zoltan and Günter Radden. 1999. "Towards a Theory of Metonymy." In *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, edited by Klaus Uwe Panther and Günter Radden, 17–59. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Image Metaphor*. *Metaphor and Symbolic* 2(3):219– 222.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, David. 2005. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Swan, Toril. 2009. "Metaphors of body and mind in the history of English." *English Studies* 90(4):460–475.
- Sweeter, E. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The Lexham Hebrew Bible. 2012. Bellingham. Lexham Press.
- Vainik, Ene. 2011. "Dynamic body parts in Estonian figurative description of emotion." In *Embodiment via Body Parts*, edited by Z. Maalej and N. Yu, 41–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Yu, Ning. 2004. "The eyes for sight and mind." *Journal of Pragmatics* 36:663– 686