

THE ROLE OF BINARY METAPHORICAL OPPOSITIONS IN A POETIC TEXT

Kamienieva Iryna

PhD in Philology, Dr.,

ORCID ID: - 0000-0002-5013-3210

Wyższa Szkoła Turystyki i Języków Obcych,
Aleja Prymasa Tysiąclecia 38, 00-999 Warszawa

Abstract. *The article is devoted to the study of the universal binary oppositions which are part of the primary classifications, forming the basis of any mythological picture of the world. It has been also considered metaphorical binary oppositions in literature and the peculiarities of their use which helps to understand the peculiarities of the worldview. Analysis of the romantic concept of the universe made it possible to reveal how actively their dualistic thinking manifests itself in the artistic cosmology of the poetic texts. It has been established that in the spatial, temporal and value aspects, authors create entire systems of interconnected oppositions in their theoretical constructions.*

Keywords: *binary opposition, worldview, sign system, binary symbols, metaphorical pairs.*

Introduction. Today the method of analyzing binary oppositions is actively used, which have begun to claim the status of a universal means of understanding the world. The role of binary oppositions, realized in the 20th century, knows no boundaries: they are used in the range from poetic rhyme to biological rhythms of day and night, as well as cultural rhythms: ideal culture – material culture. According to many authoritative researchers, such as N. Bohr, W. Heisenberg, Yu.M. Lotman, binary oppositions, being universal in nature, are the basis of the description of any picture of the world, both archaic and modern.

Aim. The aim is to identify and describe binary oppositions and characterize the main ways of figuratively embodying the romantics' ideas about the unity of nature and man.

Materials and methods. The materials of the research are binary oppositions as the key symbols of the romantics' worldview. The following linguistic research methods were used in the work: the method of selecting binary oppositions, the method of linguistic modeling to identify key oppositions using interpretation techniques, and the analysis of dictionary definitions to clarify concepts.

Results and discussions. The idea of understanding the world through binary oppositions continues in the structuralism of C. Levi-Strauss. Having the world as the whole as an object of knowledge, traditional society described this whole through its particular manifestations.

The fact that the bearers of mythological consciousness perceived the world as one is evidenced by the fact that they built a space-time model using a limited set of binary oppositions. Fundamental cultural oppositions, such as «life–death», «reality–illusion», «lie–truth», are neutralized in the mythological consciousness: «Myth is actualized where the rationalistic worldview either does not occupy a dominant position or, for some reason, loses it» [5, 3].

One of the ways to study a person's evaluative activity and his subjective perception of the world is to study the metaphorical use of opposing concepts that

create a binary opposition in language. Such oppositions are considered as a universal means of understanding reality, which lies in the description of any picture of the world [9, 48-49]. Researchers distinguish that such opposites were characteristic of mythological consciousness, since they were «consciously essential for rituals and myths in archaic societies».

V.V. Ivanov notes that «binary structures, similar to those that are identified in natural language, are also found in the sign systems of myth and ritual... Mythological and ritual systems of binary symbols, correlated with the dual organization of the collective, are usually characterized by further divisions, due to which (as in language systems), with the help of the composition of binary relations, ternary and even more complex structures are built» [3, 259]. Since binary contrast is a powerful organizing principle in perception and cognitive activity, it can serve as a very effective tool in the language of literature.

In modern linguistic science oppositions are considered as the foundation of linguistic reality. The Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary gives the following definition of linguistic opposition: «A linguistically significant (performing a semiological function) difference between units of the expression plan, which corresponds to the difference between units of the content plan, and vice versa» [6, 395].

V.N. Komissarov presents the following semantic features of opposition: a) opposition as an element of the meaning of a word, independent of the specific context, that is, as a phenomenon of language, not speech; b) regular contrast of words with opposite meanings in speech; c) the same sphere of contextual compatibility [4, 6].

In modern language, there are spatial (top–bottom, right–left, front–back, straight–crooked, close–far), parametric (large–small, wide–narrow), colour (white–black, bright–dark), temporary (spring–autumn, day–night, morning–evening) and other metaphorical antonymic pairs that help a person organize, make the diverse world around him more understandable and logical, making it easier to navigate in it.

Universal binary oppositions are part of the primary classifications, forming the basis of any mythological picture of the world and the essence of «systems emerging in archaic cosmology». These «oppositional pairs form the boundaries of the field of cultural meanings» [7, 25].

In modern linguistic consciousness, the interaction of components of metaphorical binary oppositions continues to determine human speech and mental activity. It is no coincidence that poets operate with opposing concepts that allow them to actualize deep ontological connections and evaluate different spheres of human life.

Metaphorical oppositions, showing a reflection of the sensory perception of the picture of the world, create a multi-layered structure, each level of which is represented by various opposition associations, while maintaining the «leitmotif of concreteness» [10].

Identifying general patterns in the work of metaphorical oppositions will help to understand the complex process of comprehending reality and take a fresh look at traditional semantic phenomena.

Entering into relationships with various linguistic units, lexemes that name opposition form around themselves a system of linguistic means of expression – associates that underlie the semantic space of opposition.

Metaphorical binary oppositions are based on the antonymic relations of the components and are formed, in most cases, on logical contrast, creating a dialectical unity, which manifests itself in the dependence of the components on each other, in their «mutual conditionality» [2, 20]. The formation of associates is greatly influenced by the phenomenon of polysemy, synonymous and syntagmatic relations of units, pragmatic factors.

Researchers of antonymy note that one of the members of an antonymous pair appears in analysis as positive, and the other as negative. A. Vezhbitskaya considers antonymic relations as asymmetrical, where the negative member of the opposition turns out to be semantically more important and complex. But «the linguistic interpretation of one of the antonyms using negation», according to L.A. Novikov, does not mean that the very content of this word (its meaning, conceptual content) is negative in nature» [8, 90].

Metaphorical oppositions interact with each other in complex ways. One metaphorical opposition can simultaneously describe several spheres in a language. And in one sphere several oppositions can coexist, each of which, expressing the individual author's meaning, introduces its own figurative touch and emphasizes its own nuances of meaning.

The study of metaphorical binary oppositions in literature and the peculiarities of their use helps to understand the peculiarities of the worldview. The main function of oppositions is to serve as a universal, the most «general classification framework» [10, 11], which describes the world from a general perspective.

Analysis of the romantic concept of the universe allows us to reveal how actively their dualistic thinking manifests itself in the artistic cosmology of the romantics. Observing and comprehending the universe in its spatial, temporal and value aspects, romantics, in search of true knowledge about the universe, create entire systems of interconnected oppositions in their theoretical constructions. These dualistic systems are used by them as a necessary means for reproducing a holistic image of the world in artistic creativity.

The spatial image of the romantic universe in theoretical texts arises from a complex of such antinomies as «whole–part», «uniformity–diversity», «unity–multiplicity», «flatness–volume», «here–there», «earth–sky», «closedness–openness» [3]. Depending on the creative task of the author, these oppositions act as a tool for the artistic modeling of romantic space.

The antitheses «flatness–volumetricity» «horizontal–vertical» find their consistent embodiment in the opposition «earth–sky», which always appears axiologically colored. «Earth» and «sky», being the key symbols of the romantics' worldview, represent universal characteristics of the romantic space, always focused on absolute values and ideals of the highest order.

Key oppositions permeate the romantic concept of the universe and link particular antitheses into a living hierarchical system. Such key oppositions, uniting the three most important aspects of the romantic cosmos (spatial, temporal, value),

are the antitheses «space–chaos», «finite–infinite». The originality of the romantic interpretation of these oppositions, universal for any artistic picture of the world, is most obvious against the background of the philosophical and artistic tradition.

The romantic opposition «chaos–space», which has ancient origins, is associated primarily with the ancient interpretation of the universe. Thus, chaos in ancient mythology acts as one of the principles from which the existence of all things arises.

Rethinking the ancient tradition, romantics come to the conclusion that the opposition «chaos–space» has many new meanings presented in the ancient consciousness. Comprehension of the multi-level and multi-component nature of the universe, the romantics reject the very possibility of its final definiteness, both spatially and axiologically. As a result, the cosmos «in the ancient manner» is rethought by the romantics into relative value, a state of temporary orderliness of the universe, always potentially ready to turn into chaos.

The oppositions «chaos–space», «finite–infinite» universal for the romantic picture of the world, intersect and closely interact in the artistic thinking of the romantics.

Variants of the idea of dual worlds, expressing the ideas of the romantics about the ambiguity of the universe in spatial, temporal and value relations, are endless in literary texts. They can be distinguished only conditionally, highlighting the key oppositions; At the same time, it is necessary to keep in mind those systems of antitheses that organize the dominants, their development in the course of the plot movement and their axiological meaning. Only under this condition does the phenomenon of romantic dual worlds appear not as a simplified image of an objectively multifaceted universe.

The dualistic opposition «world–man» appears among the romantics as the dominant of a whole system of interconnected oppositions, the dialectical content of which reflects the structure of the emerging universal theoretical and figurative knowledge of the world and man.

The dualistic vision of reality leads the romantics to a consistent dualization of artistic space and time. This is expressed in the development of different models of dual worlds and the use of the artistic device of narrative duality due to the intersection different time plans.

Many researchers of poetry (both linguists and literary critics) pay attention to the abundance of antinomies: «space–chaos», «nature–man», «night–day», «sound–silence». Understanding the peculiarities of the use of these oppositions is directly related with studying metaphor because it has the ability to reconcile incompatible concepts, find similarities and unite objects.

One of the distinctive features of poetry is the creation of poetic metaphors, which we understand as the construction of a metaphorical model based on an already existing, regularly repeated image. This is a kind of «double» metaphor. Dual structure is one of the properties of metaphor, which lies in the fact that two sets of associations, associated simultaneously with direct and figurative meaning, generate an image. A metaphorical image is created by comparing two phenomena, in which associations link ideas about two realities.

Conclusion. Semantic and aesthetic transformation of metaphorical models, purposeful change and merging of the meanings of linguistic units leads to the fact that these models acquire various semantic shades. Associatively associated linguistic means, which create the basis for the correlation of all components, form the semantics of the poet's metaphorical models. Such interaction is created by associates of a poetic text. Metaphorical models represent a synthesis of different meanings.

So, during the research, it has been revealed the originality of romantic concepts and characterized the main ways of figuratively embodying the romantics' ideas about the unity of nature and man. The dualism of the worldview, the essence of which is understood through the analysis of the oppositions «chaos–space», «day–night», «life–death» and the system of interrelated antitheses.

References:

1. Vezhbitskaya A. Comparison – gradation – metaphor. *Metaphor theory*. M.: Progress, 1990. P. 133–152.
2. Vvedenskaya L.A. Problems of lexical antonymy and principles of compiling a dictionary of antonyms. M. 1972.
3. Ivanov V. V., Toporov V.N. Research in the field of Slavic antiquities: Lexical and phraseological issues of text reconstruction. M.: Publishing house «Nauka», 1974.
4. Komissarov V.N. The problem of defining an antonym (on the relationship between logical and linguistic in semasiology). *Question Linguistics*. No. 2. 1957. P. 6–7.
5. Levi-Strauss K. Structural anthropology. M. 1985. P. 321.
6. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. V. N. Yartseva. M.: Encyclopedia, 1990. 685 p.
7. Melnikova A.A. Language and national character. The relationship between the structure of language and mentality. St. Petersburg: Rech, 2003. 320 p.
8. Novikov L.A. Semantic analysis of opposites in vocabulary. M., 1973. 155 p.
9. Rudnev V.P. Encyclopedic Dictionary of 20th Century Culture: Key Concepts and Texts. M.: Agraf, 2009. P. 48–49.
10. Tsivyan T.V. Model of the world and its linguistic foundations. M. 2005.