Paraphrasing and Related Concepts: Exploring Similarities and Variations

Ikhtiyar E. Umirov ᵃ, Farkhad K. Yuldashev ᵇ, Farogat F. Yuldasheva ᶜ, Dilnoza M. Kholikova ᵈ,
Salomat F. Yuldasheva ᵉ and Malokhat S. Sharipova ᶠ

Uzbek State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Keywords: Trope, Metaphor, Linguistic Metaphor, Artistic Metaphor, Paraphrase, Epithet, Euphemism, Phraseological Unit, Fixed Conjunction, Figurative Expression, Figurative Device.

Abstract: Until now, paraphrases have not been the primary focus of scientific research, nor have they been extensively studied in Uzbek linguistics or Turkology. Despite their active use in both oral and written forms as a means of artistic expression, paraphrases significantly contribute to the richness and semantic diversity of our language. They enhance clarity, logic, and uniqueness in speech. Although some articles acknowledge the unique characteristics of paraphrases within artistic representation, comprehensive studies are lacking. This article addresses this gap by scientifically and theoretically distinguishing paraphrases from related linguistic phenomena such as euphemism, phraseologism, synonymy, epithet, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and functional transfer. It also provides preliminary insights into the creation of paraphrases and serves as a theoretical resource for their study and analysis. This research enriches current understanding in stylistics and contributes to solving aspects of the relationship between language and speech.

1 INTRODUCTION

Paraphrases and metaphors, though related, function differently in language and literature. Metaphor, derived from the Greek word for "transfer," involves using words figuratively based on similarities between objects or events, changing the word's meaning but not the underlying concept. For instance, "tip" can refer to both the end of a belt and the top of a poplar tree, showing how one term can have multiple metaphorical meanings. In literary studies, metaphors differ by focusing on resemblance in attributes like colour and characteristics, enhancing expressiveness and emotional impact. Examples include phrases like "the dark forces" and "wolves" symbolising enemies, which are not literal but evoke vivid imagery. Artistic metaphors, as described by Prof. S. Usmanov and linguist B. Umurkulov, provide stylistic richness and are integral to the writer's craft, unlike linguistic metaphors that serve nominative functions. These artistic metaphors are categorised into various types, such as lexical and compound, reflecting their structural diversity.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Prof. R. Kongurov, metaphors in poetry are categorised into two types: simple and extended. A simple metaphor consists of a single word, whereas an extended metaphor includes two or more words. For instance, "dome" (sky), "snake" (cold person), "lion" and "falcon" (strong person), and "fox" (cunning person) are examples of simple metaphors. Extended metaphors include "steel horse" (car), "blue ship" (cotton-picking machine), "white gold"

ᵃ https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0494-2698
ᵇ https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4980-3591
ᶜ https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7533-4883
ᵈ https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1890-8911
ᵉ https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7377-5347
ᶠ https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4692-8001

(cotton), "blue fire" (gas), and "steel bird" (plane). R. Kongurov, E. Begmatov, and Y. Tojiev explain this classification, although it diverges from the views of S. Usmanov and B. Umurkulov. These scholars argue that artistic metaphors are simple, while paraphrases (figurative expressions) should be considered extended metaphors.

Paraphrases, such as "queen of the field" for corn, are semantically tied to their referents, requiring a clear image of the object to transfer meaning. Linguist A. Shomaksudov emphasises the importance of understanding lexical development to use words effectively and contextually. Unlike metaphors, which directly transfer the name of one object to another (e.g., "the eye of a tree" or "a ring"), paraphrases describe objects or events through detailed metaphorical imagery. This method enhances expressiveness, variety, and vividness in language. For example, "Islamic culture" refers to Tashkent, "green wealth" to nature, and "green field" to a stadium.

Paraphrases are formed through metaphorical meaning transfer, using symbolic associations. For instance, in "The Key to Knowledge" (book) and "The Silver Thread" (cocoon), the terms "key" and "silver" are metaphorically linked to their referents. These metaphors and paraphrases enrich the language, making abstract or complex ideas more accessible and vivid, thus increasing the expressive value of words through metaphorical and symbolic methods.

3 DISCUSSIONS

Paraphrases: Object Clarity and Convincing Expression
Clear Object Requirement: Paraphrases need a clear object to describe. Without this clarity, the visual expressions created are unconvincing.
Comparison with Metaphors: Metaphors do not require this clarity, differentiating them from paraphrases.

- **Paraphrase and Metonymy**
  Definition: Metonymy, from Greek, means renaming based on the interdependence of things and events, without similarity.
  Example: "Tablecloth" representing "treats" due to their direct connection.
  Differences from Paraphrases:
    o **Nature of Naming**: Metonymy uses one object's name for another, while paraphrases provide a deeper, more descriptive name.
    o **Relationship of Objects**: Metonymy involves related objects, whereas paraphrases use unrelated objects to describe existing ones differently.
    o **Naming Process**: Metonymy transfers names directly; paraphrases describe and explain before naming.
    o **Ellipsis Feature**: Metonymy often omits words for brevity; this feature is not observed in paraphrases.
    o **Structural Focus**: Metonymy involves two related members; paraphrases emphasize descriptive expression.
- **Paraphrase Formation via Metonymy**: Paraphrases can be created using metonymy, e.g., "dancing queen" for Mukarrama Turgunboeva.
  Meaning in Context: Metonymy clarifies meaning within text, while paraphrases enhance understanding through context.
- **Paraphrase and Euphemism**
  Definition: Euphemism softens harsh or blunt terms, often seen in polite expressions.
  Comparison:
    o **Similarity**: Both rename concepts, enhancing expression.
    o **Differences**:
        ▪ **Softening Effect**: Euphemisms replace rude terms with gentler ones, unlike paraphrases.
        ▪ **Figurativeness**: Paraphrases are more figurative and expressive.
        ▪ **Opposite Concepts**: Euphemisms have dysphemism (opposite harsh terms); paraphrases maintain a positive, expressive tone.
  Examples:
    o **Euphemisms**: "He died" as "the soul came out," "closed its eyes."
    o **Paraphrases**: "The spring of life" for youth, emphasizing positive imagery.
- **Paraphrase and Phraseology**
  Similarity: Both involve multiple-word expressions replacing a single term, but differ fundamentally.

Differences:
- o **Nature of Representation**: Paraphrases descriptively represent subjects/events; phraseological idioms denote state/action.
- o **Formation Methods**: Paraphrases use metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and functional transfer; idioms primarily use metaphor.
- o **Single Word Formation**: Paraphrases can be a single descriptive word; idioms cannot.
- o **Semantic Closeness**: Paraphrases maintain semantic closeness with described words; idioms do not.

Examples:
- o **Paraphrases**: "Book" as "the lamp of the mind," "spring" as "the season of awakening."
- o **Idioms**: "To cheat" as "to fill one's stomach with nuts."

- **Paraphrase and Epithet**
  Definition: Epithets are poetic qualifiers, emphasizing a feature of a subject.
  Comparison:
  - o **Similarity**: Both describe important characteristics, enhancing speech.
  - o **Differences**:
    - ▪ **Descriptive Method**: Paraphrases omit the described word, using figurative names; epithets directly modify the word.
    - ▪ **Function**: Paraphrases act as figurative names; epithets are artistic tools highlighting important traits.

Examples:
- o **Paraphrases**: "The bride of the seasons" for spring, "white gold" for cotton.
- o **Epithets**: "Silver winter," "emerald spring," emphasizing autumn's beauty.

Distinctive Features: Paraphrases, metonymy, euphemism, phraseology, and epithet each have unique roles in enhancing language expressiveness.

Functional Differences: Understanding their distinctions helps in appreciating the richness and diversity of linguistic expression.

Paraphrases, metonymy, euphemism, phraseology, and epithets are fundamental elements of linguistic creativity, each contributing uniquely to the expressiveness of language. Paraphrases demand a clear object for effective communication, providing a vivid and descriptive alternative name, unlike metaphors that can be abstract. Metonymy involves renaming based on the interdependence of concepts, making it distinct from paraphrases, which do not rely on such connections. For instance, referring to a "dancing queen" for a talented dancer like Mukarrama Turgunboeva is a metonymic paraphrase, highlighting her prowess without directly naming her.

Euphemisms, which soften harsh or blunt terms, differ from paraphrases through their lack of vivid figurative language. While both can rename concepts, euphemisms focus on gentler expression. Phraseological idioms, though multi-word units, do not maintain the same direct semantic relationship with their subjects as paraphrases do. For example, "mother's milk has not left her mouth" describes inexperience but is not directly connected to the subject as a paraphrase would be.

Epithets, serving as poetic qualifiers, enhance the description of nouns but differ from paraphrases by explicitly modifying the terms they describe. Unlike paraphrases, epithets do not omit the word they modify but emphasize its attributes. Understanding these distinctions enriches our appreciation of linguistic tools, revealing how language can be precisely tailored for clarity, emotional impact, and stylistic flourish. This knowledge is invaluable for linguists, writers, and communicators who seek to master the art of effective and evocative expression.

4 CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, paraphrases, metonymy, euphemism, phraseology, and epithets each play distinct yet interconnected roles in the realm of linguistic expression. Paraphrases require a clear object for effective communication, distinguishing them from metaphors which do not necessitate such clarity.

Metonymy, though similar to paraphrases in renaming concepts, differs fundamentally in its reliance on the interdependence of objects, whereas paraphrases use unrelated objects to convey deeper meanings. Euphemisms soften blunt terms, differing from paraphrases in their lack of strong figurative expression, while phraseological idioms, despite their multi-word structure, do not maintain the same semantic closeness with their subjects as paraphrases do. Epithets, acting as poetic qualifiers, enhance the descriptive quality of language but differ from paraphrases by directly modifying the words they describe.

The exploration of these linguistic phenomena underscores the richness and diversity inherent in language. Paraphrases stand out for their ability to convey intricate and vivid imagery, enhancing both written and spoken communication. Understanding the nuances between these elements not only aids in appreciating their individual contributions but also highlights their collective impact on stylistic expression. This nuanced comprehension is vital for linguists, writers, and anyone interested in the art of effective communication, as it reveals the sophisticated mechanisms through which language can be manipulated to achieve clarity, expressiveness, and emotional resonance.

REFERENCES

An explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language. (1981). Moscow, Russia.

Begmatov, E., & Tojiev, Yo. (1992). Speech culture and methodological foundations. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

Dolinin, K. A. (1978). Stylistics in the French language. Leningrad, Russia.

Ismatullaev, N. (1996). Euphemisms in the Uzbek language and their classification. EXCESSIVE.

Golub, I. B. (1976). Stylistics of the contemporary Russian language. Moscow, Russia.

Kongurov, R. (1977). Pictorial means of the Uzbek language. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

Lapasov, J. (1995). Epithet: A work of art and linguistic analysis. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

Usmanov, S. (1964). A metaphor. UTA.

Utkina, V. P. (1959). Periphrastic circulation in Russian godly literature. Izvestia Krymskogo pedagogi-cheskogo instituta, 33(1), Simferopol, Ukraine.

Umurkulov, B. (1980). Poetic metaphor and its importance in poetic speech.

Shamsiddinov, Kh. (1993). About the periphrasis: Some conclusions. UTA.

Shomaksudov, A., Rasulov, I., Kongurov, R., & Rustamov, H. (1981). Stylistics of the Uzbek language. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.