

THE EXPRESSION OF THE WRITER'S INTENTION THROUGH METAPHORIC SIMILES

ABSTRACT

The subject matter of the present article is the study of metaphoric simile as an embodiment of the writer's intention in verbal art. The study of verbal art in very general lines brings us closer to the central question of the paper. The problem of simile as a figure of speech is discussed and the attention is focused on its realization in verbal art. "Metaphoric similes" are closely connected with the global purport of the work and the intention of the writer. The study of the material confirms that the category of literary simile as a stylistic figure very widely used in verbal art is constituted by two categorial forms: "metaphoric simile" and "metonymic simile" which are opposed to each other.

Key words: *Similes, verbal art, literature, metaphoric similes, metonymic simile.*

РЕЗЮМЕ

МЕТАФОРИЧЕСКОЕ СРАВНЕНИЕ КАК ВЫРАЖЕНИЕ ЗАМЫСЛА ПИСАТЕЛЯ

Предметом данной статьи является исследование метафорического сравнения как выражение замысла писателя. Изучение словесного искусства в общих чертах приближает нас к главному вопросу статьи. Анализируется проблема сравнения как фигуры речи и акцентируется внимание на ее реализации в словесном искусстве. «Метафорические сравнения» тесно связаны с глобальным смыслом произведения и замыслом писателя. Изучение материала подтверждает, что категория литературного сравнения как стилистического образа, очень широко используемого в словесном искусстве, образована двумя противопоставленными друг другу категориальными формами: «метафорическое сравнение» и «метонимическое сравнение».

Ключевые слова: *сравнения, словесное искусство, литература, метафорическое сравнение, метонимическое сравнение.*

ԱՄՓՈՓՈՒՄ

ՓՈԽԱԲԵՐԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՄԵՄԱՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ՈՐՊԵՍ ՀԵՂԻՆԱԿԻ ՄՏԱԴՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԴՐՍԵՎՈՐՈՒՄ

Սույն հոդվածում ուսումնասիրվում է «Փոխաբերական համեմատությունը որպես հեղինակի մտադրության դրսևորում» թեման: Խոսքային արվեստի ուսումնասիրությունն ընդհանուր առմամբ մեզ մոտեցնում է հոդվածի հիմնական խնդրին: Քննարկվում է համեմատության խնդիրը՝ որպես խոսքի մաս, և ուշադրությունը կենտրոնանում է խոսքային արվեստում դրա իրականացման վրա: «Փոխաբերական համեմատությունները» սերտորեն կապված են ստեղծագործության գլոբալ իմաստի և գրողի մտադրության հետ: Նյութի ուսումնասիրությունը հաստատում է, որ գրական համեմատության կատեգորիան՝ որպես ոճական կերպար, որը շատ լայնորեն օգտագործվում է խոսքային արվեստում, կազմված է երկու հակադիր ձևերից՝ «փոխաբերական համեմատություն» և «մետոնիմիկ համեմատություն»:

***Բանալի բառեր՝** համեմատություն, խոսքային արվեստ, գրականություն, փոխաբերական համեմատություն, մետոնիմիկ համեմատություն:*

It has long been established that verbal art is an art, which explores what is meant to be human from the inside. It is the reflection of the inner world of the writer and the characters. It is a million and snapshots of the human heart in all its mystery and perfection, and imperfection.

The word “literature” has various meanings depending on who uses it and in what context. It could be applied broadly to mean any symbolic record, covering everything from images and sculptures to letters. In a more narrow sense the term could only mean a text composed of letters, or other examples of symbolic written language. An even more narrow interpretation is that text has a physical form, such as on paper or some other portable form, to exclusion of inscriptions or digital media. One of the Muslim scientists and philosophers defined Literature as the garment which one puts on what he says or writes so that it may appear more attractive.

Furthermore, people may perceive a difference between “literature” and some popular forms of written work. We can add that literature has different

forms: **Poetry, drama, essays, and prose fiction.**¹ The terms “literary fiction” and “literary merit” often serve to distinguish between individual works. For example, almost all literate people perceive the works of Charles Dickens as “Literature”, whereas critics look down on the works of Jeffrey Archer as unworthy of inclusion under the general heading of “English literature”. Critics may include works from the classification of “literature”, for example, on the grounds of a poor standard of grammar and syntax, of an unbelievable or disjointed story-line, or of inconsistent or unconvincing characters. Genre fiction (for example: romance, crime or science fiction) may also become excluded from consideration as “literature” (<https://nordan.daynal.org/wiki/Literature>).

Commonly, the texts that make up literature cross over these limits. Illustrated stories, hypertexts, cave paintings and inscribed monuments have all at one time or another pushed the limits of “literature”.

“Literature” can mention to anything written. The kind of literature as “imaginative literature” or “creative writing” is not “real” and that kind of literature can be defined as verbal art. It is verbal, and it is an art. The implications of that definition are twofold: first, we acknowledge that we are dealing with art, which implies that an artist has constructed this thing, this final product, which is now accessible to its audience, and is meant to strike that audience as strongly beautiful, or meaningful, or both.

The problem that basically arises here is: Is art in general (i.e. painting, sculpture, film, book, etc.) something visual or verbal? And what is literature if observed from this point of view? These questions can probably be answered in the following way. All varieties of art are meant to make an influence on their addresses, often this influence is not only intellectual but also aesthetic ,i. e. we do not only think of what we see or read but also feel it, because it moves us.

It is important to know the verbal aspect of the art of literature, because words are the literary artist’s only instrument. The short story writer uses character, plot, and narrative point of view, description, and dialogue in

interesting , provocative ways; poets use figures of speech, predetermined structures, and other devices to make words sound remarkable together; dramatists use dialogue and sets, and the talents of life actors and actresses to give their works its punch. And what makes a good poem might not make a good drama, or what makes a good drama might make a boring poem, etc. But what is common to fiction, poetry, and drama is that the writer has this unique, profound, beautiful vision to somehow express in words. And if those words add up to something neither unique, nor profound, nor beautiful, nor in some way useful, then it is perhaps not good art (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simile).

Nations can have literatures, as can corporations, philosophical schools or historical periods. Popular belief commonly holds that the literature of a nation, for example, comprises the collection of texts, which make it a whole nation. The Hebrew Bible, Persian Shahnama, the Indian Mahabrahata, the Iliad and the Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Constitution of the United States, all fall within this definition of a kind of literature.

People study literature because it enriches them; it is repository of the wisdom of the ages; it is entertaining; it is beautiful and moving. The best of it can deepen our experience of being alive, taking us beneath the superficial surface of people, into their inner caverns. As a discipline, the study of literature is an excellent way to sharpen our close reading skills, assemble excellent critical thinking apparatus, and refine our general sense of appreciation. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Literature)

The study of language of verbal art and the appointment of the methods of its stylistic analysis is a problem to which numerous articles and investigations are devoted. The investigations of the language of verbal art are connected with problems of investigating the language of literature and its styles, also the language of this or that writer. In the sphere of linguistic studies of a work of literature the basic categories are confessed as understanding individual styles. In the writer's style, according to his

conceptions, the investigations of all the linguistic means, used by the artist, are aesthetically justified.

The language of the same author in different works of verbal art may have indispensable variances. According to L.V. Sherba the main aim and the task of studying the language of verbal art is to show such linguistic means with the help of which ideological and emotional content connected with it is expressed in literature.

A work of verbal art can and ought to be studied, from many points. Its investigation as a process of embodiment and settling the ideological conception of the author is of paramount importance. The study of the language of a work of verbal art is usually accompanied by the research of public life, appropriate period of the development of the people, of the culture, the literature and the art of that epoch.

In the language of a literary work socially bound expressivity of speech within the environment is used in diverse functions. Usually the studies of the expression plane, i.e. the form of speech refer to the sphere of stylistics. They point to the necessity of differentiating the forms of individual and collective expressivity. Expressive colors are easily mixed with one another. Expressive forms of speech not only reflect the subjective-characteristic, but also express the style of a person; a social group and they are easily translatable in the language.

In the structure of verbal art emotional-characteristic, aesthetic transformation of the means of public language is taking place. All the means of language are expressive, only one should use it skillfully.

As has been pointed out, the study and deep analysis of the language of verbal art is impossible without knowledge of the language of culture and social-historical context, characteristics of the epoch. But these literary-linguistic norms, in the aspect of which the elements of the style of verbal art are evaluated, are parts of the context.

They study of the imaginative means of language is exceptionally important. The rules of the artistic creative work of public reflecting in the

development of its language are defining the character of speech creation by the writer, system of images, and structure of expressive colors used in literature. The language of literature is multifarious. Thus, it is not by chance that within the language of verbal art, we can come across the combination of different styles of literary language.

Certain styles of language get mixed in this or that piece of literature, this mixture is always predetermined by the general purport of the work and the intention of the author. In the structure of verbal art are dependent on its ideological content, on the spheres of the imaginative reality and on the author's creative method various styles of language can conjoin and enter into interaction.

The language of verbal art is based on the perception, understanding and evaluating it from the point of view of the correlation of the public and national languages. It is impossible to understand the language of verbal art without knowing the literary language of the period, the period when it was created. The language of verbal art streaming into the development of language is viewed as a monument and stream of the history of that language. But the language of that monument represents only a little part of the system of literature, which the author uses for formulating and expressing his creative thoughts. Accordingly, investigations devoted to the analysis of the grammatical constructions or lexics and phraseology of this or that work, are quite correct. In the language of verbal art we can first of all differentiate two sides to which two different methods of analysis correspond. On the one hand, comes forward the discovery of the system of speech means, which the author has selected from the public linguistic treasury. In the individual creative style, there may arise difficulties connected with its speech means of jargons and various professional and social dialects. The investigations of the characters and the inner motives of combining all these linguistic means into one system of verbal expression needs further study. Therefore, while studying the language of a literary work, we shall start from the question of

understanding which is closely connected with many different minor questions.

The writer's artistic creativity is, on the one hand, guided and regulated by the established language standards and, on the other hand, the writer's creative mind itself influences the development and regulation of language standards.

The process of creating a work of verbal art is a complicated one, for it presupposes the adequate reflection of the writer's perception of the objective reality in the work he creates, as well as his careful attitude to language material. In other words, the choice of the linguistic elements the writer makes and the way they are arranged in a work of literature predetermine, to a great extent, the writer's individual style, personal manner of viewing the world.

Thus, understanding a piece of verbal art in every particular case presupposes the bringing out of "the general spirit" of the work through the study of its elements.

In other words, the study of the general is achieved through the study of the single. However, it should be borne in mind that the single can be adequately perceived and cognized only when it is viewed through the prism the general spirit of the work. Hence the vital importance of the dialectical correlation of analytical and synthetical methods, can be explained by the correlation and organic connection between part and whole in a work of verbal art.

It becomes clear from what has been said above that in the study of verbal art special emphasis should be laid on the analysis of its language material and particularly the vocabulary, for it is words that matter first and foremost. Words never appear at random in a work of verbal creativity. Moreover, their choice and sometimes very specific arrangements are closely connected with a global purport of the work and the intention of the writer.

Investigations have shown that the meaning of the word in verbal art is never confined to its direct nominative meaning. The word in a literary

context always displays its inclination to enrich its semantic contents, to realize all its semantic and stylistic potentialities to become much wider and deeper semantically, in fact to become a semantic global whole in which all its meanings, shades of meanings, connotations and associations are condensed. (Vinogradov, 1959)

In capacity of literary word has been described by prof. Gasparyan as the polyphony of the word. She has also shown that polyphony is one of the important characteristic features of verbal art at large. Thus, it is natural to believe that the polyphonic nature of literary work, let alone the polyphonic behavior of literary words in a work of verbal art, is something that requires a lot of attention, especially when what we deal with is the problem of understanding verbal art.

In his article “Experience and Verbal Art” Hugo Reoffers intended to present a philosophical account of what is commonly called verbal or literary art.

It is a common assumption that there is an art, which can be defined, as literary or verbal. Yet, definition relies mainly on linguistic criteria. Can literary art also be accounted for philosophically? In his paper the author intends to offer such an account.

Starting from the Hegelian conception of language and of the aesthetic experience, he argues that literary and more specifically poetic, discourse can be defined as the verbal completion of an aesthetic experience, and that this distinctive feature marks off literary discourse from other types of discourse, such as scientific and philosophical discourse. In his phenomenological description of the growth of the subject’s identity, Hegel situates the birth of language in the transition from consciousness (Verstand) to self-consciousness (Vernunft). In his Philosophy of Fine Art, this transition also marks the locus philosophicus of the artistic experience. (<https://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Aest/AestRoef.htm>)

Hugo started his exposition from the assumption that we call literature and poetic discourse can best be defined with recourse to the aesthetic

experience. The four moments of this experience could be illustrated by concomitant artistic and mainly literary expressions.

This may already suggest that the link between aesthetic experience and verbal art is all but accidental. The sensuous appearance of meaning seems to manifest itself primarily in verbal art. The medium of language appears to be more appropriate to embody and accomplish this experience than any other artistic medium. In literary and poetic art language figures are a medium that strikes a fair balance between duration and transience, sense and sensibility, signification and sensuous presentation. In this respect the verbal medium, the linguistic sign to the extent it correlates the signifier and the signified, i.e. sensuous presentation and meaning corresponds most closely to the parity between sensuous embodiment and meaning which is the very characteristic of the aesthetic experience. On the basis of this inherent correspondence one can distinguish the poetic use of language from the scientific discourse, on the one hand, and the philosophical, on the other hand. In the former signifier is promoted at the expense of the signified. Scientific language reduces the sign to a univocal denotation by restricting the field of connotations of the signified. This restriction reflects the categorizing and objectifying activity of the intellect (*Verstand*), which tries to unify the disparate phenomena under some common denominators. The meaning of the concept can longer be grasped by appeal to any of the senses; its apprehension may require a deliberate suppression of analogies of visual and muscular experience. Philosophical language reflects the conceptualizing function of reason (*Vernunft*). Poetic language can be distinguished from both scientific and philosophical language in that restores the balance between signifier and signified objectification and conceptualization, sensuous presentation and meaning. The locus philosophicus of poetic language is the transient moment of harmony between objectification and conceptualization, understanding and reasoning in the growth of the subject's comprehension of reality. This harmony reveals itself in the aesthetic moment. Thus the question arises how

the poetic function of language performs the articulation of the aesthetic moment in a verbal presentation. (<https://text.ru/rd/>)

Literature is an artistic experience that realizes itself in the medium of language. This experience does not precede verbal expression. It does not merely dress our thoughts but it shapes and articulates them. The writer does not clothe his experience in words. He is a maker who works up his experience to a verbal creation: 'He has something germinating in him for which he must find words, but he cannot know what words he wants until he has found the words; he cannot identify this embryo until it has been transformed into an arrangement of the right words in the right order' (T.S. Eliot, 1971).

What Eliot calls 'an arrangement of the right words in the right order' may be conceived as the poetic function of language. The question then arises how the poetic use of language enables the completion and actualization of an embryonic aesthetic experience in a verbal work of art. Roman Jakobson ascribes the capacity to the poetic function of language because it 'promotes the palpability of signs', i.e. because it foregrounds the material nature of words. In a piece of verbal art the referential function of language is suspended in favor of the self-reflective function and consequently the sensuous presence of the linguistic sign is made explicit. More technically speaking, the poetic function turns the signs of language into symbols. Whereas, in the verbal sign the material aspect (signifier) is subordinated to its meaning (signified, referent) and mainly serves as a vehicle to carry meaning, in the verbal symbol the signifier is foregrounded and is the anchorage of meaning. In the verbal sign, the signifier is transparent in that it directly points to the signified; in the verbal symbol the signifier, apart from referring to the signified, functions also in its own right. (T.S. Eliot, 1971).

Literary language used in a work of verbal art brings to light the open-ended production of meaning whereas verbal discourse offers as the conventionally sealed product of signification. In literature the production of meaning is open-ended because the poem creates its own context of

signification, a context that is a-referential. This does not mean that a piece of literature does not refer to reality. In that it is an act of verbal communication it cannot dispense with this reference. Yet, the referent in a piece of verbal art is not a historically or geographically definable world, but a quasi-world, a potentially real world, a world that may well exist but the existence of which is as yet not testified. To illustrate the fictional reality of the world of a poem we may compare it with a landscape painting. Also this painting may not represent an existing a landscape it may well be recognized by the spectator as a picture of a real, i.e. possibly existing, landscape. Any landscape painting will indeed contain features of a real landscape, and precisely these features attribute to it a pseudo-reality. While being an imitation (mimesis) and not a copy of a landscape, it moreover exhibits an existence of its own apart from the reference to an existent landscape.

Similarly by imitating natural language use, poetic language is anchored in reality while simultaneously it creates its own verbal reality. ([web.bu.edu./AestRoef.htm](http://web.bu.edu/AestRoef.htm))

Continuing the theme of verbal art we can notice that it may be full of various stylistic devices, tropes and figures of speech.² and in this connection it is appropriate to mention that, besides in our everyday speech we meet similes in the works of verbal art. In this case the use of simile is premeditated as the author uses simile in his work of verbal art for making an aesthetic impact on the readers. Conclusively, our investigations have led us to the following basic deductions:

1. The thorough study of our material confirms once again that the category of literary simile as a stylistic figure very widely used in verbal art is constituted by two categorial forms: "metaphoric simile" and "metonymic simile" which are opposed to each other.

2. With the help of metonymic simile objects, phenomena and situations are described in a way as to clarify and reinforce the author's thought. Here objects are brought together and compared on the basis of some peculiar physical features common for both the objects. Metonymic similes are not

directly connected with the meta-content of the work and do not need a special interpretation. They are of local importance and stylistic value in different narrow contexts.

3. Metonymic similes, they are based on similarity but the transfer of meaning is of a different nature, in this case we cannot be confined to the criterion of "physical" resemblances, here in the first place is the problem of the aesthetic impact. Metaphoric similes are conditioned by the ideological-artistic content of the work and require a deep philological interpretation.

4. "Metaphoric similes" are closely connected with the global purport of the work and the intention of the writer. In creating the figure of simile in the structure of a work of verbal art, the author due to his artistic visions notices such characteristic features in the objects compared, that can be thought as common only within the scope of his creative imagination. Simile based on the comparison of objects from very different spheres of the objective world brings out certain moods and associations, which bring the remote concepts of the diverse world of reality close to one another. Simile, in the context of verbal art, depending on the author's intention, his individual creative conceptions, is created on the basis of special kinds of inner "elusive" connections between its parts and represents a very complicated stylistic method of creativity.

REFERENCES

1. **Виноградов В.В.** (1959), О языке художественной литературы.
2. **Гаспарян С.К.** (2000), Фигура Сравнения в Функциональном Освещении. Ереван,
3. **Хоффман Р., Кассирер Э., Якобсон Р., Ричарде А., Блэк М., Лакофф Дж., Ортонидр А.** (1990), - Теория Метафоры. - Москва. Прогресс.
4. **Black M.** (1962), Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy. - N.Y.: Ithaca.
5. **Croft W.** (1997), The role of domains in the interpretation of metaphors and metonymies. Cognitive Linguistics.

6. **Dirven R.** (1996), Conversion as a Conceptual Metonymy of Basic Event Schemata. Fass, Dan. Processing Metonymy and Metaphor.
7. **Earl R.** (1985), MacCormac. A Cognitive Theory of Metaphor. MIT Press, Cambridge (Mass.)-London,
8. **Eliot T.S.** (1971), The Three Voices of Poetry, London
9. **Frank M.** (2004), Exploring Literature 2nd.ed. by Pearson Education, Inc. 2004
10. **Galperin I.R.** (1977), Stylistics. -2nd. - M., 1977
11. **Gasparyan S.K.** (2004), The Linguostylistic and Linguopoetic Analysis in Action. // Գիտելիք Երեւան-Էջ 38-45
12. **Gibbs, R.** (1994), The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding. New York: Cambridge University Press.
13. **Glucksberg, S., and Keysar B.** (1990), Understanding Metaphorical Comparisons: Beyond Similarity. Psychological Review
14. **Glucksberg, S.** (2001), Understanding Figurative Language. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
15. **John Searle.** (1979), "Metaphor", in A. Ortony ed. Metaphor & Thought.
16. **Lakoff, G.** (1980), Johnson M. Metaphors We Live by. - Chicago, London,
17. **Lakor T, G.** (1993), The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor, ed. A. Ortony, 1993
18. **Lawrence D.** (1961), "Mountolive" New York
19. **Miller, G.** (1979), Images and models, similes and metaphors, ed. A. Ortony, 1993
20. **Richards I.A.** (1936), Metaphor. - hi: I.A. Richards. The philosophy of rhetoric. London, Oxford Univ. Press,
21. **Ricoeur P.** (1978), The Rule of Metaphor. - London - Henley,
22. **Stanford W.B.** (1936), Greek Metaphor. - Oxford,
24. **Tirrell L.** (1991), Reductive and nonreductive simile theories of Metaphor. The Journal of Philosophy.

Internet Sources

25. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Literature)
26. (web.bu.edu/./AestRoefjitm)
27. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Metaphor)

28. (1efconnec1.иnп1^и/~18rae1/18rae1&...)
29. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simile)
30. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lawrence _Durrell).
31. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mountolive)
32. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Authorial int...)

Հայրապետյան Լիլիթ – դասախոս, ԵՊՀ եվրոպական լեզուների և հաղորդակցության ֆակուլտետ, անգլերենի թիվ 1 ամբիոն, էլ. փոստ՝ hayrapetyan_l@yahoo.com:

Ներկայացվել է խմբագրություն՝ 30.06.21, տրվել է գրախոսության՝ 07.07.21 - 14.11.21, երաշխավորվել է ԵՊՀ եվրոպական լեզուների և հաղորդակցության ֆակուլտետի անգլերենի թիվ 1 ամբիոնի կողմից, ընդունվել է տպագրության՝ 18.12.21: