

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ЗАПОРІЗЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ**

**ФАКУЛЬТЕТ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ
КАФЕДРА АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ**

**Кваліфікаційна робота
магістра**

**на тему КРОС-КУЛЬТУРНИЙ АНАЛІЗ КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНИХ
МЕТАФОР-УОСОБЛЕНЬ В ПОЕТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ**

Виконав: студент 2 курсу,
групи 8.0358-а
спеціальності 035 Філологія
спеціалізації 035.041 Германські мови та
літератури (переклад включно)
освітньо-професійної програми
Мова і література (англійська)
Ель АсріМунсеф

Керівник: д.ф.н., доц. Козлова Т.О.

Рецензент: д.ф.н., проф. Єнікєєва С. М.

Запоріжжя – 2020

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE
ZAPORIZHZHIA NATIONAL UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY OF FOREIGN PHILOLOGY
ENGLISH PHILOLOGY DEPARTMENT**

Thesis

for the Degree of Master of Arts

**Title: CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONCEPTUAL
METAPHOR OF PERSONIFICATION IN POETIC DISCOURSE**

Fulfilled by: the student of M.A. second year,
group 8.0358-a

specialty 035 Philology

specialisation 035.041 Germanic Languages
and literature (translation included),

first language — English

educational programme

Language and literature (English)

El Asri Mouncef

Adviser :D.Sc., Assoc. Prof. Kozlova T. O.

Reviewer: D.Sc., Prof. Yenkokeyeva S.M.

Zaporizhzhia– 2020

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ЗАПОРІЗЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ**

Факультет іноземної філології

Кафедра англійської філології

Освітній рівень магістр

Спеціальність 035 Філологія

Спеціалізація 035.041 Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно),
перша – англійська

Освітньо-професійна програма Мова і література (англійська)

ЗАТВЕРДЖУЮ

Завідувач кафедри _____

« _____ » _____ 2020 року

**З А В Д А Н Н Я
НА КВАЛІФІКАЦІЙНУ РОБОТУ МАГІСТРА
ЕЛЬ АСРІ МУНСЕФУ**

(прізвище, ім'я, по батькові)

1. Тема кваліфікаційної роботи магістра (проекту) _____ «Крос-культурний
аналіз метафор-уособлень в поетичному дискурсі»

Керівник кваліфікаційної роботи (проекту) _____ Козлова Тетяна
Олегівна, д.ф.н.,
доцент

(прізвище, ім'я, по батькові, , науковий ступінь, вчене звання)

затверджені наказом ЗНУ від «22» квітня 2019 року № 597-с

2. Строк подання студентом кваліфікаційної роботи (проекту) _____
10 січня 2020 р.

3. Вихідні дані до кваліфікаційної роботи (проекту)
теорія _____ метафори; _____ персоніфікація; _____ поетичний
дискурс

4. Зміст розрахунково-пояснювальної записки (перелік питань, які потрібно розробити):

1) здійснити огляд теоретичних джерел; 2) розглянути традиційні та сучасні
підходи до тлумачення метафори; 3) виявити спільні та відмінні ознаки
персоніфікації в англійських, французьких, арабських та російських
поетичних творах XIX-XX ст.

5. Консультанти розділів кваліфікаційної роботи (проекту)

Розділ	Прізвище, ініціали та посада консультанта	Підпис, дата	
		Завданнявидав	Завданняприйняв
Вступ	Козлова Т. О., д.ф.н., проф.	22.04.2019	22.04.2019
Розділ 1	Козлова Т. О., д.ф.н., проф.	15.05.2019	15.05.2019
Розділ 2	Козлова Т. О., д.ф.н., проф.	10.06.2019	10.06.2019
Розділ 3	Козлова Т. О., д.ф.н., проф.	20.09.2019	20.09.2019
Висновки	Козлова Т. О., д.ф.н., проф.	17.11.2019	17.11.2019

6. Дата видачі завдання 22.04.2019**КАЛЕНДАРНИЙ ПЛАН**

№ з/п	Назва етапів кваліфікаційної роботи Магістра	Строк виконання етапів роботи (проекту)	Примітка
1.	Пошук наукових джерел з теми дослідження, їх аналіз	жовтень 2018	Виконано
2.	Добір фактичного матеріалу	листопад 2018	Виконано
3.	Написання вступу	квітень 2019	Виконано
4.	Написання теоретичного розділу	травень 2019	Виконано
5.	Написання практичного розділу	грудень 2019	Виконано
6.	Формулювання висновків	грудень 2019	Виконано
7.	Проходження нормоконтролю	грудень 2019	Виконано
8.	Одержання відгуку та рецензії	січень 2020	Виконано
9.	Захист	січень 2020	Виконано

Автор роботи несе персональну відповідальність за відсутність в роботі несанкціонованих текстових запозичень (академічного плагіату)

Магістрант

(підпис)

М. Ель Асрі

(ініціали та прізвище)

Керівник роботи

(підпис)

Т. О. Козлова

(ініціали та прізвище)

Нормоконтроль пройдено

Нормоконтролер

(підпис)

М. В. Залужна

(ініціали та прізвище)

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	6
INTRODUCTION.....	8
CHAPTER 1 THE THEORY OF METAPHOR: PREMISES AND MODERN STATE	12
1.1 Traditional approaches to understanding metaphor	12
1.2 Metaphor from a cognitive perspective	15
1.3 Metaphors in poetic discourse	23
1.3.1 The concept of discourse	23
1.3.2. The role of metaphor in poetic discourse	25
1.4 Personification as a distinctive type of metaphor	28
CHAPTER 2 PERSONIFICATION IN THE 19TH— 20TH C.POETRY FROM CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE.....	32
2.1 Degrees of personification as they are actualized in poetic images	32
2.2. The comparative analysis of the target of personification.....	34
2.3 Productive personifications and their structure	35
2.4. The comparative analysis of the source of personification.....	41
CONCLUSIONS.....	49
REFERENCES	51
APPENDIX.....	58

ABSTRACT

M.A. Thesis—75 pages.72 sources.

The object of the research focuses on common and specific features of personification in the English, French, Russian, and Arabic poetry of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The purpose of the study is to compare and contrast personifications realised in poetic discourse relating to typologically different and geographically distant cultures of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Theoretical and methodological premises: theory of conceptual metaphor(G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, M. Turner, Z. Kövesces), the role of metaphors in poetic discourse (J. Johnson, T. Davidson).

Results: The analysis of the poems shows trivial results with regard to our hypothesis as the elements of personification have appeared to be varied with unbalanced degrees of similarity between languages, and no collective pattern of similarity has been detected. Personification is just one of the figures of speech that make up language and these figures happen to be not evenly distributed as it has been shown about Arabic in which the use of metaphor generally and personification specifically exceeds considerably the other languages selected for this project. I assume that other languages make up for that by virtue of other figures of speech or these languages simply can be just fine without it. Personification is a fundamental aspect in every language whether defined as a stylistic device or as language property. The frequency of its use though appears to vary from one language to another. This assumption is a potential solid ground for a future comparative analysis together with the concentrated use of special element in precise languages like it is the case with the element rock in Arabic.

Keywords: *cognitive metaphor, personification, cross-cultural analysis, source of metaphorisation, target of metaphorisation, poetic discourse*

The conceptual approach of metaphor introduced by Lakoff and Johnson 1980 has revolutionized the linguistic and philosophical history of metaphorical studies. It is based on the assumption that the use of metaphor is not only a linguistic phenomenon but rather conceptual process i.e. we think and conceive of things metaphorically by means of mapping attributes of source domains to target domain. Different studies have been conducted to account for the universals of metaphorical mappings. This being my starting point, the purpose of this study research is to inspect aspects of similarity between instances of personification in different languages.

INTRODUCTION

Studies of metaphor have existed along with the oldest disciplines in the history of humanity that we know. Personification is a relatively new subject of linguistic and philosophical studies. Very little is found about this metaphorical concept specifically.

W. Melion and B. Ramakers [Melion, Ramakers2016] stated that a discussion about personification and about allegory is one and the same, as texts and images considered to be allegories are very often cases of personifications, and allegories come to existence there where personification is used. In their research, they went even to employing the word allegory as synonymous to personification.

The uniformity or universality of metaphorical constructions cross-linguistically is approached either as a surface, or purely linguistic, phenomenon or as deep, conceptual, i.e. anthropological, one. In the surface, linguistic approach, a universal metaphor happens to be a metaphorical borrowing or an instance of pure coincidence with occasional cultural and historical connections between speakers of different languages. From conceptual perspective, universal metaphors are approached as a natural way of conceiving things as is initiated by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson [Lakoff, Johnson 1980] within the cognitive linguistic framework.

Z. Kövecses [2010] argues that the shared understandings of concepts through metaphors are suggested by anthropologists to constitute a large part of the definition of culture. Although many studies have investigated metaphor generally and personification specifically, very little can be found about cross-linguistic accounts for personification in the literature.

The purpose of the study is to compare and contrast personifications realized in poetic discourse relating to typologically different and geographically distant cultures of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The objectives of the study include:

- discussing the key issues of the theory of metaphor related to its definition, types, functions, traditional and modern interpretations;
- establishing differences for rhetorical, linguistic, and cognitive understanding of metaphors;
- outlining the characteristic features of discourse, particularly poetic discourse;
- discovering the role of metaphor in poetic discourse;
- considering personification as a distinctive type of ontological metaphor;
- revealing degrees of personification as they are actualized in poetic images expressed by means of the English, French, Russian, and Arabic languages;
- discovering productive personifications and their structure;
- comparing sources of personification in poetic discourses in question;
- comparing targets of personification in poetic discourses in question;
- comparing cognitive mechanisms and linguistic means of poetic images created through personifications by English, French, Russian, and Arabic poets of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The subject of the research embraces personified images in the English, French, Russian, and Arabic poetry of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The object of the research focuses on common and specific features of personification in the English, French, Russian, and Arabic poetry of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The material for the analysis comprises selecting 20 poems from the most popular ones in English, French, Arabic, and Russian literature of the time span in question.

The preference to these languages was given as they represent typologically different cultures and languages belonging to different language groups.

The methods employed in this study include *method of contextual analysis* for the selection and identification of personified images; descriptive method for the interpretation of metaphors; conceptual analysis for detecting the source and the target domains of metaphorising,

It is hypothesized that being determined by historical and geographic components as key factors, poetic personified images cross-culturally exhibit common features rather than culture-specific ones.

Theoretical justification. The results of the present research contribute into the general theory of metaphor and other issues of cognitive linguistics, language and culture studies, comparative linguistics, and ethnography of speaking.

Practical value and application. The results of the present study can be introduced in theoretical and applied courses in General Linguistics (“Language and Culture”, “Language and Society”), Comparative and Historical Linguistics (“Semantic Change”, “Language Universals”, “Synchronic and Diachronic Variation”, “Regular Semantic Changes”), Cognitive Linguistics (“Conceptual Metaphor”), Discourse Studies (“Cognitive Poetics”), Intercultural Communication (“Conceptual and Language Worldview”) and other related cross- and interdisciplinary subjects.

Conferences and publications. Uniformity of metaphorical Formations from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective. *The 1st Young Researcher`s International Web Conference “Communication in the Expanding Intellectual Space”*. *Book of Abstracts*. Tetyana Kozlova, Oksana Babelyuk, Andrzej Kryński (Eds.). Czestochowa, 2019. P. 68—69.

The structure of the research paper. The research consists of Introduction, two Chapters, Conclusions, and References.

Introduction contains a brief description of the topic, the purpose, research objectives and the hypothesis, methods, theoretical justification and practical value, approbation information.

Chapter 1 deals with the premises and modern state of the theory of metaphor, compares traditional and cognitive approaches to understanding metaphor, discusses key features of poetic discourse and the role of metaphor.

Chapter 2 focuses on cross-cultural analysis of personification in English, French, Arabic, and Russian poetry of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In **Conclusions**, key theoretical statements and practical results are summarized.

The full volume of the research paper — 72 pages, the main body volume — 50 pages. The list of references includes 70 references cited, 3 dictionaries, 5 sources.

CHAPTER 1

THE THEORY OF METAPHOR: PREMISES AND MODERN STATE

1.1 Traditional approaches to understanding metaphor

For a usual person, the word metaphor is no more than a figure of speech. For most people, it is usually just a vague thing that has something to do with conveying meaning in a way other than the direct one. In fact metaphor is a hardly defined concept. I choose to call it “concept” instead of word as it is a way bigger thing than to be called just a “word”.

It is necessary to do a research through which the following questions can be answered: ‘Is there any cross-cultural uniformity of metaphorical formations?’, ‘How is this uniformity articulated in various languages?’, ‘Does the conceptual uniformity stimulate linguistic uniformity or conform with cultural, historical, social, etc. variables?’.

Following Lakoff (Lakoff & Johnsen 1980), modern scientists (Zhang 2009) treat “metaphor” as a property of concepts, not words, i.e., we don’t simply use metaphor to describe one thing in terms of another, we use it to understand a thing in terms of another.

As language, cognition and culture cannot be parted, the formations of metaphorical expressions in any language are, then, no exception.

In his book “The Philosophy of Rhetoric” [Richards 1936], the author asserts that the essence of metaphor lies in an Interaction between a metaphorical expression and the context in which it is used. The Interaction Theory arises from a correct observation in that as for a conventional metaphor which links a source domain and a target domain, speaking about the source domain alone may bring to mind the target domain.

It is obvious that various languages tend to employ different metaphors or rather construct metaphorical utterances within different mappings between the source domains and the target domains. However, the cases of similar metaphorical imagery expressed in genetically and / geographically distant languages, are not rare. In numerous studies on conceptual metaphors, such similarities are interpreted as metaphorical borrowings and cultural transfers, or explained by the genetic transmittance from a parent-language to cognate daughter-languages.

There can be no doubt that speakers of different languages rely upon similar cognitive mechanisms in the process of conceptualization, they also share perception principles and some ways of conceiving things. However, “universal experiences do not necessarily lead to universal metaphors” [Kövecses 2005, p. 4].

There are plenty of examples from the everyday language in which a metaphorical mapping is used and it is the same universally. Conceiving of time as a valuable commodity (money) is one good example crosslinguistically.

In French; *Gacher du temps / waste time. Donnez moi une minute! / give me one minute.*

In English: *you waste my precious time and I spend time.*

In Russian: *Ты потратила мое время / you wasted my time*

In Arabic : *انفقت الكثير من الوقت /anfqtu alkatira mina lwaqt/ Ispent a lot of time*

In many cases, it is not history or social identity of the speakers that determines source and target domains of metaphorisation in two or more different languages. Due to bodily and emotional experience, the perception of heart as a place within a person where feelings and emotions are considered to come from, it is possible, for example, to refer to emotional suffering in terms of physical destruction employing various and similar linguistic structures. Cf.: E. *break one's heart*; Ger. *jemandem das Herzbrechen*; Fr. *déchirer le cœur à quequ'un, briser le cœur de qqn*; Sp. *romperle el corazón a alguien*; Pol. *złamać komuś serce*; Ukr. *vstromyty nozha v sertse*; Indones. *patah hati* “broken heart”, lit. broken liver’ (although in Indonesian the primary meaning of *hati* is ‘liver’, the word is also used to refer to ‘heart’ and ‘mind’) [Siahaan 2008, p. 46];

As a literary figure of speech or as a linguistic phenomenon it has been the subject of attention since ancient times. We talk about Aristotle's view of metaphor that defines metaphor as an advanced rhetorical tool for comparison, and up to the modern conceptual approach of metaphor introduced by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson [Lakoff, Johnson 1980 p.20].

As per the cognitive/conceptual theory, metaphors are rooted in a mental process of conceiving things rather than being just a linguistic tool that is used only on the surface of the human discourse. This chapter is going to cover the preliminaries to our study of metaphor in discourse generally and personification in poetic discourse specifically.

What is a metaphor? Metaphor as a figure of speech is a word or phrase which is used for special effect, and which does not have its natural meaning. In a metaphor, no function words are used. Instead something is described by stating another thing with which it can be compared.”

The word *metaphor* was originated from the Greek word *metaphere*, in which *meta* means “exceeding” and *pherein* means “carrying”.

From the late 15th century, *methaphoris* (plural), from Middle French *metaphore* (Old French *metafore*, 13 century) and directly from Latin *metaphora*, from Greek *metaphora* “a transfer”, “especially of the sense of one word to a different word, literally “a carrying over”, from *metapherein* “to transfer, carry over; change, alter; to use a word in a strange sense”, from *meta* “over, across” (see *meta-*) + *pherein* “to carry, bear”, from PIE root **bher-* “to carry”, also “to bear children” [Etymonline].

The Cambridge dictionary [dictionary.cambridge.org] defines metaphor as an expression which is often found in literature and that describes a person or object by referring to something that is considered to have similar characteristics to that person or object.

When talking about metaphor in its general, most common signification we talk about it as synonymous to the following terms:

- idiom — a word, sentence or phrase that is commonly used not in a proper sense;
- allegory — a phrase that has an actual proper sense but it also implies a certain target that is hidden behind the direct sense;
- allusion — an expression designed to call something to mind without mentioning it explicitly; an indirect or passing reference;
- anthropomorphism — the attribution of human characteristics or behavior to a divine being, animal, or object;
- figure of speech — a stylistic device that operates by deviating the proper meaning of an expression;
- imagery — synonymous to figure of speech;
- irony — saying something and intending the opposite;
- metonymy — the substitution of the name of an attribute or adjunct for that of the concept meant, for example a name of a city referring to its inhabitance;
- symbol — as a figure of speech, it is the use of a thing that stands for something else like the use of fox to highlight the cunning character of a person by saying “that girl is a real fox”.

As seen by the previous definitions, metaphor in the English literature-like any other language- plays a major part in every written piece of work so far as it is considered to be a figure of speech that is used explicitly for stylistic purposes. Either as a stylistic device or as a conceptual process metaphor is a fundamental element in all types of discourse, and no discourse can get along well without it.

1.2. Metaphor in cognitive perspective

Cognitive metaphor is pretty the same fundamental principle of creating links between different concepts / words /things, but it is argued to be grounded in a deeper level of the human consciousness, and this one is not used for stylistic reasons more

than for fundamental communicational reasons, for a speaker subconsciously makes use of a source domain as a resource of expressing a target domain. This is basically exhibited in every type of discourse.

So far as literature is concerned, the term metaphor is generally only used in the sense of the stylistic device that has many subtypes as illustrated in the summary of R. Nordquist's outline that follows:

- absolute metaphor — a metaphor in which one of the terms can't be readily distinguished from the other;
 - complex metaphor — a metaphor in which the literal meaning is expressed through more than one figurative term in a combination of primary metaphors;
 - conceptual metaphor — metaphor in which one idea (or conceptual domain) is understood in terms of another;
 - conventional metaphor – a commonplace comparison that is not made notice to as a figure of speech;
 - creative metaphor — an original comparative reference which is intentionally used as a figure of speech;
 - extended metaphor — a comparison between two elements that occurs repeatedly throughout a series of utterances or lines in a text;
 - mixed metaphor — a succession of irrational or satiric comparisons;
 - primary metaphor — a fundamental metaphor such as KNOWING IS SEEING or TIME IS MONEY that calls to intuitive understanding and which may be put together with other primary metaphors to come up with complex ones;
 - root metaphor — related to a specific culture, an individual, or perception of life.
 - submerged metaphor — a type of metaphor in which one of the domains (either the source or the target) is highlighted instead of stated explicitly;
 - therapeutic metaphor — a metaphor used by a therapist to support a patient throughout the process of personal improvement;
 - implied metaphor — this kind of metaphor is often found in songs and poetry.
- In a famous example from Shakespeare's poetry Romeo compares Juliet to the sun

over several lines: *but soft! what light through yonder window breaks? it is the east, and Juliet is the sun! arise, fair sun, and kill the envious moon, who is already sick and pale with grief;*

- dead metaphor — a cliché that has become so familiar that the imagery has lost its power and becomes granted e.g. *raining cats and dogs* and *behind the wheel*. An example of a dead metaphor would be the use of the word ‘ruin’ in ‘she ruined my life’. Ruins are literally collapsed buildings. A life cannot be reduced to smashed blocks as life is an abstract concept that has no physical realization. So, ‘ruined my life is true only in the metaphorical sense. Yet we use this expression so often that we do not recognize it as unusual and we might not normally conceive of it as a metaphor. [Nordquist R.]

Studies of metaphor trace back to more than 2000 years ago. Though, in the history of metaphor studies, the year 1980 is commonly regarded as a time-marker. Scholars before that regarded metaphor as a figure of speech. Starting from the year 1980, a notion of thinking / conceiving became the main interpretation of metaphor.

Ever since Aristotle asserted that "the greatest thing is to be a master of metaphor", scholars have been attracted to this concept. The majority of the scholars focused on the concept of metaphor as a special use of language and the employing of a variety of rhetorical techniques.

Nevertheless, in the modern times some scholars have started to approach the concept of metaphor differently, assuming that metaphor is indeed not simply a way of speaking, but rather a way of thinking that is rooted epistemologically in the human being.

A metaphor study is an infant branch of linguistics that has been a great attraction to scholars ever since the ancient times. Naturally, a great diversity of views have come to existence, mainly falling into two schools, namely traditional metaphor and modern metaphor, which interpret metaphor in the scope of rhetoric and cognition respectively” [Zhang 2009, p. 1].

“Preceding points of view interests in metaphor date back to the late 1970s. It would though be wrong to think that metaphor attracted less attention before this. Metaphor became part of the necessary elements that deal with how we use language to express thought and emotion almost at the moment that the enquiry emerged. Aristotle is generally stated to be the originator of the comparative theory of metaphor, holding that a metaphor is a comparison between two things that is made in order to explore the nature of one.

Thus, stating love as being a rose is to attribute obviously the physical properties of the source domain ‘rose’ to the target ‘love’. Presumably, love is then beautiful, but it has got its harmful part ‘thorns’. One could culturally have a different conception or symbolization of the source domain and then the interpretation would follow.

In fact, Aristotle also dwells on the capacity of metaphor to name what is not named or to serve the ‘human urge’ ‘to articulate what is as yet unarticulated’. He discusses how the sun ‘casting forth its rays’ has no name, unlike ‘casting forth of seed’ which is called sowing; hence we may come to speak of the sun ‘sowing its flames’. Aristotle identified two key attributes of metaphor. The first attribute is the conventional meaning transformation through the comparison between two things. The second attribute is representing a phenomenon by means of a transformed meaning in which case the phenomenon may not be named otherwise.

Aristotle also expressed the interest of classical rhetoricians in metaphor as a device that persuades and moves an audience”. [HOLME, 2004]

Three main views of metaphor can be found in classical theories: The comparison, the substitution and the interaction view. The comparison view is attributed to Aristotle. The latter viewed metaphor as an implicit comparison between a literal phrase and a metaphorical expression that is grounded on underlying resemblance between two concepts. The substitution holds that metaphorical expressions are used as a replacement of an existing equivalent literal expression. The interaction view is that a metaphorical meaning is a result of an interaction between the metaphorical expression and its surrounding literal frame.

The three views have in common that they regard metaphor as a linguistic phenomenon and they distinguish the literal from the figurative senses [Yu 1998, p. 10].

Different models that describe the phenomenon of metaphor have been presented. The classical one is usually referred to as Aristotle's. It is called the poetic and rhetoric or the comparison theory of metaphor. This model approaches metaphor as in elliptical versions of comparison and Simile i.e. the form "A is B" is just an elliptical alternative of "A is like B". This view has been argued against and claimed wrong by many scholars. One of the main issues of this view is that it assumes that metaphors describe similarities but can't create them. The second issue of the comparison theory is "how do we process the metaphorical use of language [Tendahl 2009, p. 1].

1.2 Metaphor from a Cognitive Perspective

Alternative views to conceptual metaphor theory have been suggested by different scholars [Ortony 1993; Barnden2006; Wilson 2006; 2008; Vega2007; Gibbs 2008]. Particular approaches include the conceptual metaphor, the categorization theory of metaphor, the standard theory of metaphor, the blending theory, and the relevance theory.

The standard theory of metaphor is the jargon name given to Lakoff's conceptual metaphor as aspects of it are developed by others scholars based on the conceptual mapping principle.

Unlike the direct mapping or correspondence between source and target domains in the standard theory, the blending theory [Fauconnier 1994] suggests that new metaphors can be made up by means of blending the source and target domains. That is to say if we want to evoke the meaning of 'attack' in an argument we shall

combine features of argument together with war. the result of the blending is the construction of the blended concept. [Mengying Xi 2019 p.24]

The categorization theory of metaphor [Glucksberg, 2001, Glucksberg & Keysar, 1990] argues that we understand metaphors by assuming that the target concept is one that belongs to the environment to which the source domain belongs. For example saying 'red voice' is a mapping between the symbolic use of red which is widely known as a sign danger blood and the target domain 'voice', which is supposed to mean that someone's voice is alerting or unpleasant to hear with allusion to calls of alerts. Thus, the categorization theory is a mapping that is based on placing the target domain in the same case where the source domain is conventionally placed.

The relevance theory of metaphor evokes a principal element of communication that is crucial for understanding, which is the context. According to this theory, there are no unique figurative language processing implicatures. It is primarily founded on the seemingly vague process of utterance and interpretation. It suggests a comprehensive approach of a model of communication and cognition that sets forward a complete account for utterance and interpretation. [Tendahl 2009 p. 68]

Z. Kovecses [2010] presented these various theories through the analysis of one metaphorical sentence: This surgeon is a butcher...

The categorization theory views metaphor as the case in which an entity is assigned to a category that stands as a typical example for it or typical of another entity also belonging to that category... saying "this surgeon is a butcher" means that a certain metaphoric property is attributed to a particular surgeon.

Kovecses [2010] refers to the "standard" conceptual metaphor theory [Lakoff, Johnson 1980; Kovecses 2002; 2010], the source and target domains are targeted by the words butcher and surgeon respectively. This yields in this case the conceptual metaphor: surgery is butchery.

The blending theory rejects the proposition that butchers are presumably incompetent [Grady et al., 1999] and that we need to be able to explain how butchers get the meaning of being considered incompetent.

He refers to Lakoff's extended theory of metaphor [Lakoff, Johnson 1980; 1999] in which G. Lakoff, using the same example, refers to the surgeon as a person who performs actions with certain characteristics.

The “main-meaning” conceptual theory in [Kövecses2000, p.82] in which central knowledge about the source domain is crucial.

[Francisco González-García, María Sandra Peña Cervel, Lorena Pérez Hernández, 2013, pp. 11 – 19]

Ch. Peirce defines metaphor as "an icon which represents the representative character of a representament by representing a parallelism in something else" [C. Peirce 1667]. The classical theory by Aristotle, Quintilian and others is presented within six assertions. First, metaphors are one kind of trope among others. Second, a metaphor is the outcome of a naming extension by deviation from the literal sense of the words through the recognition of similarity between concepts. Third, the resemblance sets the replacement of the literal meaning by the figurative one. Fourth, the meaning that is replaced does not count any semantic innovation. Fifth, metaphors are decorative by their function. Sixth, metaphors do not intend novel information about their proposition [Ricoeur 1975, p. 75-78]. These definitions fail in front of Peirce's definition. The last definition mentioned fails first, because second-language acquirers quickly realize that the growth of language is a huge resource of dead metaphors.

Ch. Peirce states that in order for a logician to create a new language he would need prepositions for the expression of relations in time (before, after) and for spatial relations (touching, containing) and for motion (into, out of). The rest can be managed with metaphors [Colapietro, Olshewsky 2011, p. 229].

Since the idea of metaphor has become a point of focus for researchers, metaphor in the classical sense has become a victim of research. The term is used for "true" metaphors only in a few cases. The terms image and metaphor are in fact

too general with respect to their respective supposedly described phenomena. Furthermore, the two terms are often employed by speakers to refer to a variety of figures of thought and all kinds of figurative discourse without exception... Epistemologically, there is probably no considerable difference between the process of understanding a word figuratively in a specific context and the interpretation of a text figuratively for a specific situation according to the interpreter. The only nuance is that the former is regarded to be passive while the later is considered to be an active quest for the intended meaning of the text [Kessler, 2013, p. 24].

Kövecses [2010] wrote: “Can there be any cases of conceptual metaphor that can be found in all languages and cultures? Such a question is a very difficult one to ask and even harder to answer, knowing that that there exist more than four thousand languages that are spoken on this planet. The best we can do to account for such a question is to have a look at some cases of conceptual metaphors that are found in many languages and verify if we can find their equivalents in languages of different families and typologies. In case the result is positive i.e. they do exist we shall say that this hypothesis is a valid one and conceptual metaphors are universal. With more research we can eventually approve or falsify their universality” [Kövecses 2010, p. 188].

Z. Kövecses [2010] drew a comparison between conceptual metaphors in three different languages that are far different from one another, namely English, Chinese and Hungarian. He provided several examples:

Happy is UP illustrated in expressions such as ‘He is very high-spirited/happy.’
HAPPINESS IS LIGHT with the example ‘They’re all in great delight.’

HAPPINESS IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER with the example ‘His heart is filled with happiness.’

The result of the comparison showed evidence that though the language are very distinct, the mapping of conceptual metaphors shows identical.

The question that arises is “How is it possible for such different languages and cultures to conceptualize happiness metaphorically in such similar ways?”

Z. Kövecses gives three possible answers: (1) it took place accidentally; (2) these are metaphorical borrowings; and (3) there shall be a universal motivation resulting into such a similarity. He as a supporter of the conceptual metaphor chose the third answer, though -he asserted- the other factors cannot be completely disapproved, either. [Kövecses 2010, p. 249—254]

Metaphor is not the only “figure of speech” that plays an important role in our cognitive activities. Another equally significant trope is metonymy. The latter and metaphor, though distinct, are similar in many interesting aspects. In metonymy we use one entity, or thing to indicate, or to provide mental access to another entity... Instead of mentioning the second entity directly, we provide mental access to it through another entity...” Metonymy contrasts with metaphor in that it is based on the relationship of contiguity instead of similarity [Kövecses 2010, p.162—166].

1.3 Metaphors in poetic discourse

1.3.1 The concept of discourse.

Any kind of linguistic realization is an instance of discourse i.e. an utterance, an interjection, a set of random incoherent words or phrases, a written paragraph, or a hieroglyph is indeed a discourse. Discoursal studies have exist ever since humans became aware of the fact that they can actually combine sounds to compose words and sentences to make a linguistic utterance. The use of language is obviously a crucial aspect in whether or not the speaker is successful in reaching their aims or not. Thus the human interest in how we invest our linguistic resources in getting as much as we can.

As defined by the Cambridge dictionary, discourse is communication in speech or writing. There are countless different classifications of

the types of discourse ever existing due to the infinity of possible utterances as a natural result of the very property of recursiveness of language in addition to the infinity of possible speech-situation. Discursial studies are concerned with the illocutionary act performed by every single instance of discourse and the linguistic tools mobilized for realizing an intended Impact worked out by given discourse makers. Thus, often when there is a mention of discourse in the modern times, it is tightly connected to the charismatic political leaders and religious preachers building a typical influence on the receivers / hearers / readers; mainly speakers who somehow managed to have good command of spoken language and are taking advantage of it. Basically, discourse is either spoken or written.

There are 4 main types of discourse:

- narrative — an author tells a story fact or fiction;
- descriptive — an appeal for the five senses to draw an image for the receiver providing physical details to project a picture with the help of the receiver's imagination;
- persuasive — discourse that exhibits the opinion of the speaker/writer and attempts to influence the receiver;
- expository — discourse whose purpose is mainly informative.

Defining poetic discourse, as opposed to discourse generally or rhetoric discourse precisely is a literary matter that has been controversial for centuries.

A poetic discourse is not necessarily one that was written by a brilliant poet and stored on shelves of street-corner libraries or museums to be consulted by poetry addicts and passionate readers of everything and anything.

Humans obviously spoke before they wrote and poetic discourse doesn't exclude any of the types of discourse. Hence, poetic discourse refers to a written material or a spoken one which focuses on the expression of feelings-appealing themes and topics through specific rhymes and rhythms together with all kinds of formal grooming of words.

The Oxford dictionary defines poetic discourse as the literary communication in which special intensity is given to the expression of feelings, thoughts, ideas or

description of places or events by the use of distinctive diction, rhythm, style and imagination.[Oxford, 2001, p. 1430]

R. G. G. Coleman states that poetic discourse is “...of course an occasional mode of communication, and it is not the way poets talk or write all the time but the product of a consciously creative process that is activated on particular occasions...” [Coleman, 1999, p. 26] so now it is clear that the poetic use of the trope differs from the conceptual one in that the former is a result of intentional elaboration with a pure stylistic purpose, while the conceptual metaphor is rather a spontaneous process that serves a rather fundamental purpose.

Coleman also says that the metrically useful forms distinguish poetic discourse from literary prose usage, which sometimes distanced itself from the colloquial use more sharply than poetic usage felt the need to consistently do.

1.3.2 The role of metaphor in poetic discourse.

Most scholars who investigate metaphor in real discourse would argue that a principal function of metaphor in discourse is the provision of coherence. The coherence metaphors are classified into two types; intertextual and intratextual. Thus, metaphors can make different texts coherent or can lend coherence to one single piece of discourse. Intertextual coherence is fulfilled by inheriting and employing a particular conceptual metaphor at different historical periods, while for the intratextual metaphor, the same conceptual metaphor can lend coherence to one and the same text. The metaphor that sets coherence in the discourse does not necessarily have to be a deeply rooted conventional conceptual one. It can be a “metaphorical analogy” of any kind. [Zoltán, 2010, pp. 261-263]

With our scientific, yet vague definition of metaphor, it comes near to opening a Pandora’s Box if we attempt to approach metaphor in poetic discourse from the conceptual theory perspective.

As far as this subsection is concerned, we are concerned only with the traditional definition of metaphor which is a comparison without a tool of comparison.

The Online Glossary of Poetic Terms defines metaphor as a “comparison that is made directly (for example, John Keats’s “Beauty is truth, truth beauty” or less directly e.g. Shakespeare’s “marriage of two minds”, but in any case without pointing out a similarity by using words such as “like,” “as,” or “than.”

“Metaphor's peculiar effect is demonstrated in the way apparently unrelated items are linked. A great deal of meaning may be compressed into a single metaphor. The quality of a poet is to be able to combine unconnected ideas creatively’ [Metaphor: A Bibliography of post-1970 publications, 1985]

Now we have gone far enough in the investigation about our subject of study to be precise with our employing of the term “metaphor” within a narrow scope.

‘...Dictionaries give illustrative examples of how the term metaphor can vary in its intended signification. The two major senses are captured in the Oxford English Dictionary [1996]. The first sense labels metaphor as a type of language "A figure of speech in which a name or descriptive word or phrase is transferred to an object or action different from, but analogous to, that it is literally applicable to; an example of this is a metaphorical expression."The second sense identifies metaphor as a form of conceptual representation: "A thing is considered as representative of some other usually abstract thing: A symbol. A particular instance of metaphorical use of language can illustrate both of the two senses simultaneously is when crime is referred to as a disease e.g. Crime in our city has become an epidemic...’ [Glucksberg, 2001, p. 4]. In this example it is clear to the hearer that the phenomenon of crime is expanding. The mapping of crime of a target domain and disease as a source domain is instantly effective without the smallest misunderstanding. The linguistic level suggests that crime, which is an abstract concept, is growing in a fast rate but the growing in mass or volume is in no way applicable to it in the tangible world. That is why we call for our physical knowledge of the concrete objects to

grasp an understanding of the abstract. The conceptual approach is scoring a winning goal at this point.

How does the cognitive linguist differentiate the linguistic and the conceptual metaphor? Is there a process for determining the conceptual metaphor when metaphorical language is encountered? Gerard Steen addresses these two questions in an attempt to come up with a basic procedure for differentiating the conceptual and the linguistic metaphors. This procedure's purpose is to set the constraints that guide the relationship between the conceptual and the linguistic metaphor. There are plenty of clear instances and cases where the name of a particular domain is directly and overtly employed in a linguistic expression, as is demonstrated by the classic list of references by G. Lakoff and M. Johnson [Lakoff, Johnson 1980; Lakoff 1987; 1993; Turner 1987; Lakoff, Turner 1989].

The mapping of love (relationships) as a journey:

The lovers are the travelers. The relationship is the vehicle. The problems of relationships are difficulties encountered in a travel. The lovers' goals are the destinations [Raymond, Gibbs 1999, p. 57] so the conceptual metaphor is not only about how we conceive of one very mapping. It is far beyond that. It is rather about the whole set of thought. It operates synergistically with the other conceptual component to make up the whole image. Thus metaphorical expressions in different languages are formed differently about love for example, but there is big evidence to show that it is basically understood as a journey. Abstract notions need metaphor by nature to get understood and since love is a concept that takes time, it a common thing that time is mapped into space distance for the sake of reference to pace and period.

1.3 Personification as a distinctive type of metaphor

The initial problem with metaphor as I have shown is that metaphor as a linguistic phenomenon obviously defies all definitions. Giving a definition to conceptual metaphor presupposes that we already have a notion of what metaphor is. Thus, I will simply adopt Lakoff's definition of conceptual metaphor, which is the correspondence between two conceptual domains, with the target domain borrowing properties of the source domain. Metaphor in this case is beyond the linguistic level and it is a mapping that reflects a mutual correspondence between physical and abstract concepts. Lakoff and Johnson said "...Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature...".

Lakoff and Johnson highlight the systematicity of conceptual metaphors as that it appears spontaneously in linguistic expressions within the same fashion of correspondence between the source domain and the target domain. It is illustrated in the examples of talking about arguing as though we talk about a fight or war i.e. the arguers are the opponents, the arguments used are the weapons and the topic of the argument is the battle field or the subject of conflict. Another example is the understanding of time as an abstract entity by means of money as a concrete one as when someone says "give me some time"; "don't waste my time"; "investing time"....

According to Lakoff and Johnson, this mapping systematicity allows us to grasp the meaning of something by means of another through highlighting one or many relevant aspects of the source domain that correspond with the target domain, and hiding the irrelevant aspects. The example of comprehending an argument as a war entails that while we passionately argue in defense of our point of view we highlight the properties of a war and disregard the aspect of conversation coordination and the listening to each other which is not the case in a real war. Thus,

in this very example we systematically highlight the relevant aspects and tend to deny what is not compatible for our metaphorical mapping.

“Time is money” is a stylistic overt metaphor or a poetic device that is consciously used and that is grounded on the understanding of the fact that the more time you spend working, the more money you would make. On the other hand, the sentence “investing time” is a subconscious exhibition of how we subconsciously conceive our notion of this abstract entity. [Lakoff and Johnson, 2003, p. 10]

Personification is a commonly poetic figure of speech which operates by attributing human-specific properties to an object or an abstract concept. This type of comparison itself is basically motivated by the same principle of metaphorical utterances which makes it a metaphor par excellence. Personification is one of the most, if not the most, common type of metaphor encountered in the poetic discourse. For instance “the hand of the morning”, “the night told me’ or ‘I hear death whispering’ these are all attribution of human specific qualities to things. This figure can take place in speech in a variety of ways. Sometimes it is easily recognizable while some other times it could sound so natural that one may not pay attention to it being an instance of personification.

Personification aka prosopopoeia is a figure of speech by means of which a human identity or ‘face’ is given to something (that is not animate). This rhetorical device is readily identified, but the cognitive form and function and its rhetorical and pictorial effects are rarely attracting the interest of scholars.

It is hard to make a distinction between personification and other related tropes that may sometimes be used in discourse as a synonym of personification such as allegory, anthropomorphism, and prosopopoeia. These tropes are confused because their definitions with relation to metaphor overlap. For example a metaphor can consist of personification, and an extended personification is an allegory.

Anthropomorphism is a phenomenon that some scholars consider to be a trope, precisely a personification because it attributes human physical and moral qualities a divine being. I personally prefer not to consider it as a trope because different cultures conceive of the metaphysical power differently. Even if I don’t believe in

any of that, the way I used to conceive of god was exactly the same as for a human being. Thus, to me it is no trope but rather a literal attribution.

Allegory is either taken for granted or it is dismissed as a case of mere convention. Literary and pictorial genres like festival plays and royal entries that are meant for large audiences, very often make use of allegorical personification, and this shows that the allegory-personified figure was seen to attract a wide range of tastes and expectations. Personification functions in several registers and it occurs in facts, opinions, and beliefs. The interest in personification has emerged due to the appearing of several trends in the last ten years in studies of culture and history, where art is being tackled from perspectives of body, performance, and conception. Approached accordingly, personification lays forward a great deal research questions.

Why is personification hardly studied?

For answering this question we should investigate the history of allegory studies. Scrutinizing this background will evoke the strong links and the mutual dependence between textual and visual approaches to allegory and personification. A great deal of content has been written on allegory, while not really much on personification.

Talking about personification and about allegory is one and the same, for texts and images considered to be allegories are very often cases of personifications, and allegories come to existence there where personification is used. Historians of art and literature use the term ‘personification allegory’ to refer to the procedure of creating allegory through personification and the result of it. Some go even to using the terms allegory and personification as equally interchangeable synonyms [Melion, Ramakers 2016, p. 1-4].

It is indeed significant to draw this conclusion about the very closeness of personification and allegory because they happen to have an identical principle of building a sense. At the end of the day, both employ a source domain to refer to a target domain, I assume though that allegory is made use of not because it is a fundamental way of expressing meaning but rather because there is a facultative

reason for which the speaker prefers to employ a metaphor instead of a direct meaning. Mainly allegory is used for stylistic purposes which is not the basic thing for the conceptual metaphor principle. I believe that allegory and personification differ from one another in that allegory is an optional variant of referring to things with adding some vagueness while personification is rather spontaneous.

Personification being considered as a type of metaphor can be then approached from the stylistic perspective or the conceptual one. A pure stylistic approach to personification though seems unfair because the grounds on which similarity is built can have allegorical symbolizations and even without any conventional association in meaning among the speakers of a language, it would have literally no significance if it was no different use than using a proper sense.

Trying to distinguish the literary, tropic definition of metaphor from the conceptual approach of metaphor is indeed not necessary for this study, though it is a supportive step to grasp a better understanding of the conceptual metaphor.

Here are definitions of tropes that overlap in their definition with personification:

Personification is the attribution of human traits to an inanimate object or an abstract idea.

Allegory is an extended personification that refers to something by a conventionally symbolizing object like the use of lion as a symbol for a king.

prosopopeia is addressing the audience by giving voice to another person separate from the author.

Hypostasys is figure which lays in the middle position between a personification and an in dependant being.

Having defined Personification and projected the conceptual approach on it we are now ready to speak the same language during the analysis of personification elements in the poetic discourse cross-linguistically.

CHAPTER 2

PERSONIFICATION IN THE 19TH— 20TH C. POETRY FROM CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

2.1 Degrees of personification as they are actualized in poetic images

Among tropes in the literature of verse and prose all together with the various scientific approaches to figures of speech, there are a lot of typologies and nominations. This is very natural as it corresponds to the property of recursiveness in language. The human brain develops and language too. Defining a trope can actually be such a burden as metaphorical constructions are not standard and simple. Instead every metaphorical expression is by definition a construct of complex thoughts that the brain of the speaker has no problem to encode and decode provided that the addresser and addressee speak the same language and belong to the same culture.

Metaphor as a figure that has subsidiaries is very hardly defined and its subtype personification is also not piece of cake. There are plenty of subtypes of metaphor as presented in the first chapter of this paper. Many of the subtypes of metaphor are confused with personification and alternatively used as a synonym to it. The cause of the similarity and the confusion is that every trope happens to be a construct of several parts and these parts happen to be partially in common with personification.

Let's take the example of metonymy. "The city is not breathing fresh air because of the pollution from the metal fabrics".

The word city is used as a substitution for its inhabitation. If we break down this metaphorical mapping into parts, we have a source domain 'inhabitation' and a target domain 'city'. If we say "the lungs of the city" with reference to a forest located in the center of the city, here it is an instance of personification and not metonymy. The source domain in this case is 'human' instead of the 'inhabitation'.

Thus, the source domain being in such a similar parameter is no surprise if it leads to confusion.

There are many other commonly confused tropes with personification such as anthropomorphism, allegory, prosopopoeia and Hypostasis.

J. Johnson [1812] praises personification particularly and says that it is a figure of speech that sometimes by effort and sometimes by a simple play of the imagination makes sense and dynamic, sympathy and passion, to inanimate things. It could sound ridiculous and contradictory, but it in fact has a most beautiful and most natural impact, because it reaches not only the top of poetry, but it nourishes the most modest types of prose and mingles in the most normal, usual conversation...[Johnson, 1812, p. 149]

J. Davidson [1822] stated that there exist three distinguishable levels of personification; the first level is when the specificities of living species are attributed to non-living things. The second level is when non-living things are said to act as though they are alive. The third level is when naturally things that don't have life are demonstrated as having a conversational correspondence by listening, talking or both... a minimal case of personification which is practically giving to inanimate objects one quality -or more- of living creatures promotes the expression style enough that it is unarguably demonstrated by any kind of written or spoken discourse. Thus examples such as a raging storm, a deceitful disease and a cruel disaster are recognizable expressions. In fact, this is an obscure case of personification, as some wouldn't approach as being a personification for it may naturally not catch our attention. [J. Davidson, 1822, p. 84 – 86]

A suggested terminology for the three degrees of personification is (1) animate feature carrier, (2) animate entity, and (3) interlocutor. The “feature carrier” personification is when animate features from the source are attributed to an inanimate target.

2.2 The comparative analysis of the target of personification

On the basis of the source domain and target domain principle of conceptual metaphor, the analyzed data has shown to include various target elements of personification in the different languages. The list of targets is included in the appendix by each language. (See table 2 in the appendix)

The fact that the amount is far not balanced equally between the languages raises anthropological questions related to the speakers of the language in question. Arabic stood out with an incredibly larger amount of elements of personification that more than doubles the other languages which makes this language again a distinctive one, which adds to the obvious graphic difference in the system of signs in which it writes all together with its geographic span and the language family it belongs to. The nature of the elements that have been covered in the selected data on the other hand is not greatly distinctive, but the amount factor opens more room of variation for Arabic over the other languages. In order to account for this question, a greater dedication, time and savoir ought to be mobilized.

Looking into my collection of elements, it appears that the personification itself has different subtypes that can have different classes as the attribution of animate features to inanimate objects or abstract things takes place within various forms. Sometimes the source feature is simply carried by the target as it is the case in *парус одинокой* which means the lonely vale. In other instances the target is not only carrying a feature, but performing an action like in the example *إلى أن ينام القمر /ila an yanama alqamar/* until the moon sleeps. The difference may seem farfetched but with further examples from every language it becomes clear that the correspondence between the source and target domain takes place within three main regular patterns. The third pattern is the one in which the target domain is an interlocutor who speaks or listens to someone or both. For example in the Arabic selection *سلي الصبح إذ يبكي /ssali assubha id yabki:/* ask the morn as he cries, the morn is personified as an interlocutor that would answer a question.

A considerable remark that I drew from the Arabic selection is that Arabic appears to favor combinations of different levels of personification, which I call reinforced personification like in the previous example and in the following ones.

وتحرق النبع السخي الى معانقة الجرار /wa taharaqna nnabaaao ssakhiyo ila: moanaqati ljjirari/ The generous spring of water is longing to hug the jars. In this case the spring of water at the same time gets a feature carrier personification which is being generous, and then comes again to the performance personification by longing to hug the jars. Another example is سلي الصبح إذ يبكي / ssali ssobha id yabki / ask the morn when he cries. Here a different combination of personification types is made. The morn is an interlocutor as he receives the question and at the same time a performer of an action as he cries.

The difference between metaphor and personification is that a metaphor presents a person with reference to something else while a personification invokes another character. For example the phrase "King Richards is a lion, roaring before his pride" is an instance of metaphor. An instance of personification with the same source and target domains is the sentence "The lion reached for his sword, calling forth his crusaders". So, personification is legitimately a metaphor but the reverse is not applicable. [Joseph R. 2008 p 34]. Joseph also introduces allegory as a personification and says that it is a personification gone too far, which means that a given instance of allegory was in fact initiated as a personification but it didn't stay there and rather proceeded further to settle down as an allegory.

2.3 Productive personifications and their structure

In the definition of metaphor -both classical and conceptual- there is generally the principle of correspondence between two domains as is referred to as the source and target domains. For personification, the source is an animate being i.e. human

or animal and the target is an inanimate object or abstract concept. This being said, let's have a look at the elements personified in the languages in question.

The target domains are the elements of personification that can be objects or abstract concepts. The personification of death is one common case cross-linguistically.

In the Arabic selection I have come across the personification of death in Ali Alhasri Alqairawani's poem. He says "the death of the generous is a life in their homelands"

وما أرى الموت إلا باسطاً يده من قبل أن يُمكنَ المأسور إفلاتاً

/wa ma ara al mawta illa bassitan yadaho min qabli an yomkina alma'asour aiflato/

It means "and I don't see death unless it is extending its hand before it is possible for the detainee to escape".

Death in this case is personified as the minion who will finish the life of the dead.

Let us have a look at other different examples:

In Arabic "كانت لسمع صخرة صماء"/kanat limasmai sakhratin samma'i/ which means "the hearing of a deaf rock". In this case the rock carries the feature of hearing. The poet comes again and in a spectacular way ascribes the same feature to the same target in the negative sense by means of oxymoron when he says hearing of a deaf rock, which I name a double personification instead of extended or reinforced because in this case the same level of personification is applied.

It is different in its kind than what I call reinforced personification because the latter double confirms the disguise of the target domain as a human not only by one type of personification but by using personifications of different levels. In the previous example 'the hearing' and 'deaf' are both attributes of the same level, Which is a feature-carrier personification.

In John Davidson's "the Last Rose", he says "the pale rose" which personifies a rose as it carries the feature of being pale for some kind of shock or fear that a human being exhibits in a case of alert.

In the Russian selection a good example of this level of metaphor is “парус одинокий” which means “the lonely sail” where the loneliness feature is carried by the inanimate object “sail”.

From the French selection, a very telling expression that I took from Victor Hugo’s “Cent mille hommes” is a good example “la fière et blanche Liberté” which means “the proud, white freedom” Freedom is an abstract concept that carries the feature of pride.

It is indeed a low level personification because it sounds so spontaneous and natural that it could easily skip the attention of a reader or hearer as an instance of personification. This is actually among the challenges that could expose an analytical study of metaphor to harsh criticism and falsification as there are cases of personification that could be so common in a culture that the feature borrowed from the source domain becomes naturally attributed to the target domain without conceiving of it as an instance of personification. For example in Arabic the use of rock to mean inactivity and silence is very typical which make the expression ‘deaf rock sound so usual and empty from any abnormal attribution.

The second type that I decided to call “animate entity” personification is when the target, inanimate entity is acting as an animate one. At this level, the personification becomes more noticeable as it is not only a feature being carried but rather the target domain moves to action using the feature as we shall see in the examples.

Let’s again look at examples cross-linguistically:

In the Arabic selection we give the same verse presented earlier in this chapter. “وما أرى الموت إلا باسطاً يده” /ara almawta bassitan yadah/ “I see death only straightening its hand”. Here the death is straightening its hand with the signification of welcoming a comer. So, it is not only mentioning the hand of death and moving along. The death is described as having a hand and it is using it in the action of welcoming, from where I drew the name animate entity to this very type of metaphor.

From English I give the example from John Davidson's "The Last Rose" where wrote "Till the night was undone in her fight with the sun". The night and the sun are fighting like two people can do and thus they are presented as acting like humans. Attributing gender to an object in English -like in this case by referring to the night as "her"- is enough to personify an object. In addition to the cultural significance of feminine and masculine, English together with other gender neutral languages have got it in their benefit at this very literary aspect.

An example of "animate entity" personification from our Russian selection is "Играют волны".

The meaning of it is the waves are playing. The waves are presented as playful animate creatures in order to describe the waves in the middle of the sea rushing randomly. Such a case of personification can be easily accused of not being a personification indeed, because playing is very commonly used to refer to some random movement of an object to the extent that it loses its metaphorical allusion and sounds as a natural naming to a concrete phenomenon. I decide to still approach this as a personification simply because by adopting the conceptual approach of metaphor this can only be a personification.

From French I give the example from my selected poem "Far Niente" by Théophile Gautier. The verse says "Au murmure de l'eau qu'un caillou fait gémir" meaning "The whisper of water that can be made groan by a pebble". Here the water is performing the action of speaking quietly which is unarguably specific to humans. The pebble makes the water groan is hardly a case of personification for we don't know if this is an allusion to an intimate intercourse between the pebble and the flowing water. So the water is definitely personified as it whispers and groans while the pebble thing is subject to individual interpretation.

I decided to call the upper level of personification "interlocutor" personification. It is when an inanimate object is listening or speaking or both to another entity. For example, "...complaining to the sea my pain, and it answers me with outraged winds..." this example is one that doesn't figure in my selection. It is

from Khalil Matran's "دَاءٌ أَلَمَ فَحَلْتُ فِيهِ شَفَائِي" "A disease came and I thought it contains my cure".

Here are examples of interlocutor personifications:

From English we take this verse from Thomas Hardy's "I Said to Love" where he addresses a poem to love saying "I said to Love, "It is not now as in old days when men adored thee and thy ways". Here love does not reply but he is listening. The poet comes again to give love the animate male personal pronoun 'him' and says "I said to him, we now know more of thee than then".

From the Arabic selection we have encountered a remarkably bigger amount of this very type of personification compared to the other types which may be just an instance of luck, but may also be a statistically proved phenomenon. Most examples are in a form of addressing a question to different inanimate elements of nature.

Let's have a look at these examples.

سلي زهرات الروض /Salizaharatirawd/ Ask the flowers of the garden

سلي نسيمات الصبح /Salinassamatisobh/ Ask the breeze of the morning

سلي جاريات الماء عما تذيعه /Salijariyatilma'laama:todioho/

عن الترب أو ماذا يقول لها الترب /aaniturbi aw madayaqululahaturbu/

Ask the running water about what it delivers to the soil and what the soil tells him.

سلي زاخرات الموج /Salizakhiratilmawji/ Ask the boastful waves

سلي ساطعات النجم /Salisatiaatinajmi/ Ask the shining stars

سلي الصخر /Salissakhra/ Ask the rocks

فيجتو سعيداً زاهياً فوقه العشب /fayajthussaidanfawqaholaaushbu/ The grass grows happy on top of it

سلي الشمس إذ تأوي إلى البحر زوجها /Salishamsa id ta'wiilalbahrizawjiha/ Ask the sun as it takes shelter with her husband sea

سلي الليل /Salilayla/ Ask the night

سلي الصبح إذ يبكي /Salissobha id yabki/ Ask the morning as he cries

سلي الأفق باسماء /Salil'ofaqabasiman/ Ask the smiling horizon

سلي النور /Salinnoura/ Ask the light

سلي قلبك المصغي إليّ وروحك التي هي أخت القلب /Saliqalbakilmosghiilayawa rou7aki
lati hiya okhtolqalbi/ Ask your heart that is listening to me and your soul who is
the sister of the heart

In the Russian selection of poems we have the example from poem “Do Russians Want War?” by Evgenii Evtushenko that says “Хотят ли русские войны? Спросите вы у тишины”. It means do the “Russians want war? Go ask the silence”. Here silence is personified as the potential interlocutor who is supposed to answer a question.

This kind of metaphor is especially far enough from being doubted as being an instance of personification.

An example from the French selection is from the poem “Cent millehomes” by the icon of the French literature Victor Hugowhere he says “l'âme a le droit d'aller dire à Dieu” which means “The soul has the right to go and say goodbye”. Here the soul is first personified by means of the feature carrier metaphor by the attribution of the possession of rights which is human-specific. Second, the soul is personified by means of the interlocutor personification as a speaker.

Such a case that combines two levels of personification in one instance gives a strong impact to the target domains. The target element gains a stronger incarnation in the imagination of the reader who is then able to place the target element more concretely in the role of a human being carrying human features and acting like a human. I call this combination of different levels of personification a reinforced personification as it reiterates the mapping which reinforces the idea that the object personified is a thinking being. Some scholars would refer to such instance as the extended personification. Especially when the personified target is re-personified throughout the same text, poem or spoken discourse several times as a feature-carrier, animate entity and interlocutor.

2.4. The comparative analysis of the source of personification.

As a preliminary step to my analysis I did a first comparison of the use of personification generally in the most popular poems in different languages regardless to the period in which they were written. The reason why I did this selection is that different cultures had different times of flourishing in literature and the canonic works standing for their respective language and culture came to existence in different eras. I also did not focus on one precise type of metaphor and just did with all the kinds I could approach as metaphor. This analysis opened my eye on the incredibly big challenge I am about to take. It didn't take me much to realize that narrowing the scope is the only way of making a comparative cross-linguistic study possible. Nevertheless, the analysis led to interesting general remarks about general lingo-cultural big differences between the three selected languages French English and Arabic. The scope of the study is then narrowed at the level of the two variables time and trope. On the one hand, I target poetry of the 19th and 20th century. On the other hand, the type of metaphor to be targeted, as had been decided beforehand, is personification.

The first table in the appendix shows the results of the first comparative analysis. (see table 1 in the appendix)

My general remarks about the metaphor scan of the selected poems are the following:

It is clear that the frequency of personification is way more frequent in the Arabic selected poems compared to the English and French ones.

The nature of the elements used in personification are considerably similar in the three languages according to the samples selected, but we can depict more similarity between French and English than between the two languages and Arabic at the level of the frequency of recurrence and the semantic symbolization of the words employed as target domains. The Arabic selection is obviously distinct especially with regard to the elements of nature used in making metaphors and the frequency of metaphors that considerably rank higher than the other languages.

Having arrived at the main part of the analysis, I have selected twenty poems from the period of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and I have made a

comparative analysis of the instances of personification between four selected languages, namely English, French, Russian and Arabic.

The selection gave me some concern with respect to the fairness of the analysis, so I tried to be as fair as possible with the criteria. I did not want to select the theme of the poem because this violates the historical part that is a major variable. I then managed to pick up a list of the most popular writers of the nineteenth and twentieth century. I randomly selected ten poets from the nineteenth century and ten from the twentieth. Then, I picked up one of their most popular poems based on the number of the views on the websites.

Identifying a case of personification is a subjective process that depends purely on the individual reader, for the cultural background of the person affects whether they will consider a dead metaphor as a metaphor or rather as a proper sense. With personification it is easier to decide but there are still cases in which the linguistic background betrays the reader. That is why I took time to close read every single line of the poems. For example, ‘the waves playing in the ocean’ can be seen as a mapping between the human as the source domain and the wave as the target domain departing from the assumption that playing is a human-specific activity while another person would claim that ‘play’ is a verb that refers to an irregular movement of some object without it being a human-specific behavior.

Table number in the appendix contains all the elements of personification encountered in the selected data sorted by language. (see table 2 in the appendix)

By observing the data presented in table number two I have made the following remarks:

The personification of heart was encountered in Arabic, English and Russian once per each.

The element “Wave” was found once in Russian and once in Arabic.

The element “Breeze” was found once in both Arabic and French.

The element “Rock” was found three times in Arabic only.

The element “Night” was found six times in Arabic and once in English. I can attribute the night being favored by the Arabic poets to the hot climate that makes

the Arabs long for meeting the night so they can feel better with the freshness of the air. Personifying the night six times is a high number for such a selection and the assumption is gaining credibility thanks to the frequency variable.

The element “Earth” was found twice in English, once in Russian and once in Arabic.

The element “Death” was encountered in English Arabic and French once per each.

The element “Flower” was found once in English and in Russian, and in Arabic twice.

The element “Love” was found twice in English and once in Russian.

The element “Sun” was encountered twice in English and three times in French while only once in Arabic and not even once in Russian.

The element “Spring” was found once in English and French.

The element “Soul” was found once in French and once in Arabic.

The element “Time” was found in Russian French and Arabic once per each.

The element “Water” was found twice in French and twice in Arabic.

The element “Sea” was found once in French and once in Arabic.

The element “Eye” was found twice in Arabic and once in both French and Russian

The element “Wind” was found in Arabic and French.

The element “Moon” was found three times in Arabic and once in Russian.

The element “Life” was found once in Russian and Arabic.

It is fairly obvious that we cannot draw generalizations only based on the result of such a limited amount of selected data. Indeed it would also be the case with a much larger amount. Thus I will focus only on what attracts attention and what could be a starting point to a potential future analytical study.

The most important remarks among what I have come up to are the following:

The element “rock” was found three times in Arabic only. According to my long experience as an Arabic speaker, I assert that rocks have an important value in the culture. I even met people whose name is صخر /sakhr/ which means rock.

The fact that the element “night” was found six times in Arabic and once in English is an interesting thing that evokes the semantic allusions that the night can have, and leads to the question about how the Arab culture conceives of the night.

Death was encountered in English Arabic and French once per each but not in Russian which I interpret to be very significant according to the Russian mentality and non-acceptance of defeat which is a visible thing historically and in the present time Russian patriotism and longing for triumph, which has been visible to me as an objective reader of the Russian poetry of the past and the present.

The element “sun” was encountered twice in English and three times in French, while surprisingly only once in Arabic and not at all in Russian.

The moon was found three times in Arabic and once in Russian.

The fact that the elements “life”, “moon” and “wave” have been encountered only in Russian and Arabic is an indication that this lexical field which is one of adventure and sailing is a common one in the modern Russian and Arabic poetry. Combining this similarity with the terminology that has been picked up in every separate language makes the assumption of the closeness more plausible (see next table).

Out of the elements of personification found in the selected data, there are elements that were found in all languages while others were found in one language without the others. That is why I refer to them in the present analysis as language specific elements of personification. The analysis is not an exhaustive one, which cannot be the case by any means. That is why an approach to the lexical field is what I decided to adopt. In “table 3”, I collected and sorted the elements that have been found in every language without fissuring in any of the other languages.

The specific 19th-20th-century lexical fields exhibited in personification in the poetic discourse are as follows:

Among the languages I estimate the most unified and specific lexical field with respect to the elements used in personification is the Russian language one par excellence. It contains the words sail, mast (of the ship), forest, claws, horses,

country, wings, silence, New York, Paris, dreams, land, city, trees and separation. The set of words is one that fits perfectly in the lexical field of travel and adventure.

The Arabic elements show very numerous and it has taken me some time to decide upon the lexical field that all the elements shall be part of. The allusion to travel is definitely the dominant idea that can be taken from the list of the elements, but the fact that it contains elements of despair and struggle like Doom, Tears, Despair, Emotions, Depression, Anxiety, Ulcers, Sadness, Darkness and Grizzly Hair simply demonstrates and tells that the Arab world during the period in question were having bigger issues. I would say that in comparison with Russian, Arabic is distinctive with melancholy and despair.

Talking to a rock is a very frequent figure in Arabic that is used to express getting no response from one's interlocutor or from a supposed audience. The number of times it has been repeated in the limited selection of Arabic data it supporting my claim. سأل الصخر/Sali ssakhra/ Ask the rocks

سألت الصخور / sa'alto ssokhor / I asked the rocks

كانت لمسمع صخرة صماء /kanat limasmai sakhratin samma'i/ It was for the hearing of a deaf rock

The French Elements are interestingly very much of what we know about the present time France. Thus the Elements are fitting in the general lexical field of the French style of life. The elements are freedom, truth, violin, memory, belief, duty, perfume, melancholy, winter and sky.

The English Elements of personification are December, orb, sunset, rose, letters, verandah, twilight, garden, drink, eternity, nails (metal), mountains, light, spring, cells, fingers, and caves. This set of Elements though small, it is particularly varied. The lexical field that can include these elements is nature and simple life which is in fact a very close allusion to the British civilization.

The table number one comprehends the instances of personification found in the selected data. Only by looking at the distribution of its fields it is clear that Arabic takes the king's share when it comes to the frequency of recurrence of personification –precisely-, which was also the case with metaphor generally. In the

second place comes English with almost half the score of Arabic. Russian English and French show a very close quantitative result with a trivial difference of three items. Ps: items are repeated in the table on purpose in order to account for the frequency of personification in poems in every language.

Table 3 shows the elements of personification that were mentioned only in one language without others. (See appendix table 3)

The Russian set denotes travelling through the lexical field of the personifications with the words Sail, Mast, Forest, Horses, Country, Wings, New York, Paris, Dreams, Land, City, and Separation.

By looking at these elements that have been personified in the selected poems, I guess that if a lexical field can encompass all these elements, it can definitely be travel.

The going back to nature is the lexical field par excellence that encompasses the elements found in the English poetry personification elements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The words December, orb, sunset, rose, letters, verandah, twilight, garden, drink, eternity, nails (metal), mountain, forms, sun's, light, spring, cells, fingers, caves are the fruit of the English selected poems.

It is not surprising at all that perfume is a French element of personification. The lexical field I can attribute to the French part is my present idea about the French culture, music and literature. It's simply France with such words: freedom, truth, violin, memory, belief, duty, perfume, melancholy, winter and sky.

My overall remark about the data analysis is a realization that a cross linguistic study requires a greater degree of dedication and preliminary knowledge in linguistics together with a good understanding of the languages that fall under the scope, as every language comes to existence with a whole construct of cultural impacts that are necessary to be understood and felt through a great deal of interaction with each language and correspondence with its speakers in order to acquire an identical understanding of the proper sense of the words and the metaphorical and symbolic allusions that every word can carry along.

Stating that there exists such a phenomenon as universality or standard cross-linguistic formation of metaphor does not presuppose that all instances of metaphors definitely fit into this assumption.

Zoltan Koves [2005] talks about what he calls “Primary” universal metaphors that he defines as being attributed to the bodily experience giving the example of conceiving of affection as warmth because the bodies of the people who give us affection transmit a pleasing warmth that highly marks the affective relationship. This metaphorical mapping happens to be a universal one as exhibited by examples in every language. Attempting such an account with such a specific subtype of metaphor such as personification would be like accelerating while driving into a dead end street as narrowing the scope in this case enlarges the field of the targeted data as a linguistic analysis of data in one language is already a big deal. A cross-linguistic analysis of this kind is plausibly doable but I am confident that it would require would require lifetimes.

There is a great deal of metaphorical mappings out there in different languages that somehow don't have their equivalents in other languages. Nevertheless, the metaphorical constructions differ in wording but they also often correspond in terms of the conceptual mapping link. This variation can be attributed to the morphological properties of the every language. The example of moon being personified in Arabic and Russian as a ‘participant’ cannot have a significant indication as it does not mean that it the moon is not personified at all in other languages or that it is personified only within other levels of personification. Nevertheless this can be a valid starting point for a cross-linguistic comparative study of the elements of nature and their levels of personification.

Variation in metaphorical source-target correspondences and universality appear to be equally important and common in all the languages falling under the scope of the present analysis. The personification types that I have called ‘Feature carrier’ ‘participant’ and ‘interlocutor’ personifications which refer to the first, second and third levels respectively, appear to figure in all of these languages though in different rates of distribution and with various source domain elements. I deduce

that the syntactic features of personification or the deep level constructions are confirmed standard as the three levels of personification appear in the four languages that have been analyzed in this research, while the thematic part is clearly distinct according to the cultural, geographical and historical factors that alter the source domains preferences of the speakers.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the poems shows trivial results with regard to our hypothesis as the elements of personification have appeared to be varied with unbalanced degrees of similarity between languages, and no collective pattern of similarity has been detected.

This comparative study's biggest challenges were to deal with the selection of the data and to define the precise intended notion of metaphor that swings between the literary jargon, as a stylistic device and the anthropological feature of the human's understanding of the world as part of a conceptual bilateral mapping. This study has allowed me to gain a closer understanding of language universals and how close and far two languages can appear to be within the different levels that constitute this fascinating tool of communication. Though languages can greatly vary syntactically and morphophonologically, it is impressive that the conceptual level can show that languages have very tightly close -and sometimes identical- properties. Mappings of metaphors are a good example of this case. The analysis of personification in the poems shows trivial results with this regard as the elements of personification have appeared to be various with unbalanced degrees of similarity and without any notable collective pattern of similarity between the four languages.

There have been interesting elements that I have found common among some languages but not shared with other ones within a non-systematic pattern which reflects that languages in fact all have similarities semantically speaking, but the patterns of similarity are hardly observable and farfetched to grasp.

Personification is just one of the figures of speech that make up language and these figures happen to be not evenly distributed as it has been shown about Arabic in which the use of metaphor generally and personification specifically exceeds considerably the other languages selected for this project. I assume that other languages make up for that by virtue of other figures of speech or these languages

simply can be just fine without it. Personification is a fundamental aspect in every language whether defined as a stylistic device or as language property. The frequency of its use though appears to vary from one language to another. This assumption is a potential solid ground for a future comparative analysis together with the concentrated use of special element in precise languages like it is the case with the element rock in Arabic.

REFERENCES

LITERATURE CITED

1. Abdikalyka K. S., Otarbekova Z. K., Kaidarova D. K. Concept as the Main Research Object of Cognitive Linguistics. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, 2016. Volume 11/10. P. 3167- 3178.
2. *Acquiring Metaphorical Expressions in a Second Language: Performance by Chinese Learners of English*, 2019, 232 p.
3. Adamson, T, Johnson G., Rohrer T., and Howard L. *Metaphors we ought not live by: Rush Limbaugh in the age of cognitive science*. Metaphor Center Online. University of Oregon, Philosophy Department. 1996
4. Aitchison J. *Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon* Oxford: Blackwell. 1987, 327p.
5. Allbritton, D. W.. *When metaphors function as schemas: Some cognitive effects of conceptual metaphors*. *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 1995 p.33–46.
6. Andrew O. *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge University Press, 1993, 678 p.
7. Angeliki A. E. Tabakowska, *Speaking of Emotions Conceptualisation and Expression* Mouton de Gruyter Berlin · New York 1998, 466 p.
8. Barcelona A. *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, Walter de Gruyter, 2012, 368 p.
9. Benjamins J. *Metaphor: A Bibliography of Post-1970 Publications* 1985, 497 p.
10. Benjamins J. *Metonymy in cognitive linguistics: An analysis and a few modest proposals*. 2003
11. Brill A. *Avicenna's Commentary on the Poetics of Aristotle: A Critical Study with an Annotated Translation of the Text* Brill Archive 1974, 126 p.

12. Brugman C. *Metaphor in the Elaboration of Grammatical Categories in Mixtec*; Unpublished manuscript, Cambridge University Press, 1979.
13. Noppen J. P, Hols E., *Metaphor II: A Classified Bibliography of Publications from 1985 to 1990* John Benjamins Publishing, 1990, 350 p.
14. Carston R, Seiji Uchida *Relevance Theory: Applications and Implications* 1998, 299 p.
15. *Cognitive Linguistic; Approaches to Teaching Vocabulary and Phraseology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 2008, 406 p.
16. Colapietro V. M, Olszewsky T. M. In *Peirce's Doctrine of Signs: Theory, Applications, and Connections* 2011, 473 p.
17. Coleman, R. G. (1999). *Poetic Diction, Poetic Discourse*. p.12-93
18. Cuyckens H, Klaus-Uwe P, and Berg T, *Motivation in Language: Studies in Honor of Günter Radden*, Amsterdam 2003, P. 223–255
19. Davidson T, *Essays W. Essays on Rhetoric: abridged chiefly from Dr. Blair's Lectures on that science*, F.C. and J. Rivington, 1822, 241 p.
20. Dirk G. *Theories of Lexical Semantics*, Oxford University Press, 2010, 341 p.
21. Dodson J. R. *The 'Powers' of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the 'Book of Wisdom' and the Letter to the Romans*, Walter de Gruyter, 2008, 276 p.
22. Easthope A. *Poetry as Discourse*. New York, Routledge, 2003 178p.
23. Farzad S., René D., Ning Y., Susanne N., *Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages*, Walter de Gruyter, 2008 - p. 395-428
24. G. J. Raymond W. Gibbs. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics* . John Benjamins Publishing, 1999 225.p
25. Geeraerts D., Cuyckens H. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics Couverture*, Oxford University Press, 2010, 1368 p.
26. Geiger R. A, Rudzka-Ostyn B. *Conceptualizations and Mental Processing in Language* Walter de Gruyter, 2011, 839 p.
27. Geoffrey N. Leech, Geoffrey Leech, *Mick Short Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* Pearson Education, 2007, 404 p.

28. Glucksberg, D. S. Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphor to Idioms . In Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphor to Idioms, 2001, 144 p.
29. González-García F, Cervel M. S., Hernánde L. P. Metaphor and Metonymy revisited beyond the Contemporary Theory of Metaphor: Recent developments and applications, John Benjamins Publishing, 2013, 318 p.
30. Handl S. The Conventionality of Figurative Language: A Usage-based Study BoD – Books on Demand, 2011, 371 p.
31. Holland D., and Quinn N., Cultural Models in Language and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 700 p.
32. Holme R. Metaphor and Language Teaching, Springer, 2004. 242p.
33. Johnson M. Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor. U of Minnesota Press, 1981, 361 p.
34. Johnson M. The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Reason and Imagination. University of Chicago Press, 1987, 272 p.
35. Johnson, J. Poetics: Or a Series of Poems and Disquisitions on Poetry. 1812
36. Johnson-Laird P. N., Wason P. C. Thinking: Readings in Cognitive Science CUP Archive, 1977, 615 p.
37. Kemal S. The Philosophical Poetics of Alfarabi, Avicenna and Averroes: The Aristotelian Reception Routledge, 2012 - 368 pages
38. Kessler, S. Theories of Metaphor Revised. In Theories of Metaphor Revised, 2013, p 24
39. Kiczenski K. "The War as it Should Have Been": Metaphor and Mental Spaces in David Jones' In Parenthesis. Keely Kiczenski, 45 p.
40. Kirby T. Aristotle on Metaphor John, The American Journal of Philology Vol. 118, No. 4, 1997, p. 517-554
41. Kövecses Z. Metaphor: A Practical Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. 890 p.
42. Krzeszowski T. P. The Axiological Parameter in Preconceptual Image Schemata. Linguistic Agency Univ, 1989 37 p.

43. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live By*, University of Chicago Press, 2008, 256 p.
44. Lakoff, G. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor." *Metaphor and Thought*. Ed. A. Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 202–251.
45. Lakoff, G. "The Invariance Hypothesis." *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.1, 1990.
46. Lakoff, G. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987, 632 p
47. Lakoff, G., M. Johnson. *Metaphors We Live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
48. Lakoff, G., Turner M. *More than Cool Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989, 237 p.
49. M. Tendahl *A Hybrid Theory of Metaphor: Relevance Theory and Cognitive Linguistics* 2009 - 282 p.
50. Maalej, Z. *The heart and cultural embodiment in Tunisian Arabic*. In Farzad from *Conceptualizations of internal body organs across cultures and languages*, Mouton de Gruyter, p.395-428
51. Melion W. and Ramakers B. *Personification: Embodying Meaning and Emotion*. BRILL, 2016, 788 p
52. *Metaphorical Concepts from the Source Domain ORGAN in English and in Indonesian*. Retrieved from *Conceptualizations of internal body organs across cultures and languages*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, New York 2008, 45-74
53. Mikhail Gronas *Cognitive Poetics and Cultural Memory: Russian Literary Mnemonics*, Routledge, 2010, 188 p.
54. Minsky M. *Frame theory. Thinking: Readings in Cognitive Science*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1977, p. 355 – 376.
55. Navarro I. F. *Current Approaches to Metaphor Analysis in Discourse* Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2019, 387 p.
56. Nietzsche, Friedrich 'Rhétorique et Langage' texts translated, edited and Ortony, Andrew, ed. *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge:

57. Osgood C. E. *The Nature and Measurement of Meaning*, Bobbs-Merrill, 1974, 41 p.
58. Paxson J. *The Poetics of Personification*, Cambridge University Press, 1994, 210 p.
59. Piquer-Píriz A.M and Alejo-González R. *Applying Cognitive Linguistics Identifying some current research foci (figurative language in use, constructions and typology)* 2016, p. 1 - 20
60. Prandi M. *Conceptual Conflicts in Metaphors and Figurative Language* Routledge, 2017, 336 p.
61. Reddy, Michael. *The Conduit Metaphor in Metaphor and Thought*. Edited by Andrew Ortony. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
62. Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York; London, Oxford: 2001 - 94 p.
63. Ricoeur P. *The Rule of Metaphor: The Creation of Meaning in Language* Routledge, 2004, 392 p.
64. Semino E, Culpeper J, *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis*, John Benjamins Publishing, 2002, 333 p.
65. Siahaan, P. *Did he break your heart or your liver? A contrastive study on concepts from the source domain ORGAN in English and in Indonesian*. 2008, 73 p.
66. Steen G. *Finding Metaphor in Grammar and Usage: A Methodological Analysis of Theory and Research* John Benjamins Publishing, 2007, 430 p.
67. Tendahl M. *A Hybrid Theory of Metaphor: Relevance Theory and Cognitive Linguistics*. Springer, 2009, 282 p.
68. Ungerer F., Schmid H. J. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. New York, Routledge, 2013, 383 p.
69. Vosniadou S, Kayser D, Protopapas A. *Proceedings of the European Cognitive Science Conference*, Taylor & Francis, 2007, 976 p.
70. Yu, N. *The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor: A Perspective from Chinese*, John Benjamins Publishing, 1998, 278 p.

71. Zhang, F. A Study of Metaphor and its Application in Language: Learning and Teaching, International Education Studies, Canadian Center of Science and Education 2009 p. 77-81

72. Zhang, F. A Study of Metaphor and its Application in Language. In A Study of Metaphor and its Application in Language. Foreign Languages School, Ludong University, China. 2009

DICTIONARIES

Oxford English Dictionary 2001 URL: <https://www.oed.com>

Your Dictionary online URL: www.examples.yourdictionary.com

The Cambridge Dictionary URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/fr/>

Harper D. Online Etymology Dictionary. 2001. URL :<https://www.etymonline.com>

SOURCES

بوابة الشعراء The gate of poets: <https://www.poetsgate.com/>

Moysan, Poètes, poèmes et poésie du XIX ème siècle. URL: www.eternels-eclairs.fr:

Best Russian Poems. URL : www.100bestpoems.ru

Famous poets and poems. URL: http://famouspoetsandpoems.com/country-6/England/19th_century_English_poets.html

Thoughtco. URL: <https://www.thoughtco.com/metaphor-figure-of-speech-and-thought-1691385>

Appendix

Table 1 Elements of metaphor in English French and Arabic

Language	English	French		Arabic	
			Translation		translation
The elements used in personification	<i>heaven</i> <i>Death</i> <i>stars</i> <i>cloud</i> <i>daffodils</i> <i>the waves</i>	<i>Le cœur</i> <i>L'azur</i> <i>le beau</i> <i>temps</i> <i>l'Espérance</i> <i>cerveau.</i> <i>les pastels</i>	<i>the heart</i> <i>the sky</i> <i>weather</i> <i>hope</i> <i>brain</i> <i>pastels</i>	الحُفْر حُرْن الظَّلام العَابُ البحر صخر الأفق الليث الخيل الليل الببداء السيف الرمح القرطاس القلم القور الأكم الكائنات الرِّيحُ الأَرْضُ الحَجَرُ الكون	<i>holes,</i> <i>tombs</i> <i>sadness</i> <i>the</i> <i>darkness</i> <i>the forest</i> <i>the sea</i> <i>rocks</i> <i>the horizon</i> <i>the lion</i> <i>the horse</i> <i>the night</i> <i>the desert</i> <i>the Sword</i> <i>the spear,</i> <i>lance</i> <i>bullets</i> <i>the pencil</i> <i>dunes</i> <i>mountains</i> <i>the species</i> <i>the wind</i> <i>earth</i> <i>stones</i> <i>the</i> <i>universe</i>

Table 2: Elements of personification in English, French, Russian and Arabic

English	French	Russian	Arabic		
Pain	Freedom	Sail	Heart	Water Spring	Birds
World	Soul	Wave	Nights	Eyes	Breeze
Earth	Breeze	Mast (Of The Ship)	Rock	Eye	Darkness
Flowers	Truth	Time	Feeling	Moon	Night
Heart	Time	Love	Eye	Nights	Depression
December	Water	Earth	Moon	Morning	The Species
Love	Albatross (Bird)	Forest	Tears	Road	Stars
Night	Violin	Spring	Doom	Emotions	Desert
Orb	Memory	Morning	Dawn	Flowers	Dawn
Sunset	Belief	Moon	Expectation	Walking	Warms
Rose	Sea	Claws	Moon	Water	Genius (Noun)
Rose	Duty	Eye	Wind	Waves	Storm
Death	Sun	Life	Earth	Stars	Night
Letters	Perfume	Horses	Ships	Rocks	Day
Verandah	Eye	Country	Death	The Grass	Tent
Sun	Wind	Wings	Tree	Sun	Desert
Twilight	Heart	Cranes (Birds)	Skies	Sea	Flowers
Garden	Melancholy	Silence	Night	Morning	Soil
The Drink	Water	New York And Paris	Life	Horizon	Clouds
Eternity	Sun	Dreams	Age	Light	Breeze
Nails (Metal)	Death	Land	Sadness	Heart And Soul	
Earth	Ant	Eagle	Despair	Religion And Life	
Mountain Forms	Winter	City	Stars	Night And Stars	
Sun's Light	Sun	Trees	Ages	Flutes	
Spring	Sky	Separation	Anxiety	Rocks	
Cells		Flowers	Bed	Birds	
Fingers			Rhymes	Eagles	
Caves			Rhetoric	The Branch	
Love			Ambitions	Gray Hair	

Sun			Ulcers	Grizzly Hair	
			Time	Water	

Table 3 : elements of personification in languages

English	French	Russian	Arabic
December, Orb, Sunset, Rose, Letters, Verandah, Twilight, Garden, Drink, Eternity, Nails (Metal), Mountain, Forms, Sun's, Light, Spring, Cells, Fingers, Caves,	Freedom, Truth, Violin, Memory, Belief, Duty, Perfume, Melancholy, Winter, Sky	Sail, Mast (Of The Ship), Forest, Claws, Horses, Country, Wings, Silence, New York Paris, Dreams, Land, City, Trees, Separation	Feeling, Tears, Doom, Dawn, Expectation, Ships, Tree, Skies, Age, Sadness, Despair, Stars, Ages, Anxiety, Bed, Rhymes, Rhetoric, Ambitions, Ulcers, Worms, Genius (Noun), Storm, Day, Morning, Road, Emotions, Walking, Stars, The, Grass, Morning, Horizon, Light, Heart, Religion, Stars, Flutes Eagles, The Branch, Grizzly Hair, Clouds, Darkness, Depression, The Species, Stars, Desert, Dawn, Tent, Desert, Soil

Table 4 : The elements of personification in English

English personification	Elements
wearry pain	Pain
To hear the world applaud the hollow ghost	World
Come, thrust your hands in the warm earth And feel <u>her strength</u> through all your veins; Breathe <u>her full odors</u> , taste her <u>mouth</u> ,	Earth
flowers which daily blow and die	Flowers
Heart, fear nothing, for, heart, thou shalt find her	Heart
That when December blights thy brow He may still leave thy garland green.	December
I said to Love I said to him	Love
Till the night Was undone In her fight with the sun.	Night and sun
The brave orb in state rose	Orb
But at sunset reborn	Sunset
Then the pale rose of noonday	Rose
The snow rose, the last rose Congeal'd in its breath,	Rose
The traitor was death	Death
Its letters, although naturally lying	Letters
And cool the verandah that welcomes us in	Verandah
And westering, questioning settles the sun,	Sun
Oh! Surry twilight! importunate band!	Twilight
When the gardener has gone this garden Looks wistful and seems waiting an event.	Garden
The drink gone dead, without showing how	The drink
And arrogant eternity.	Eternity
among keys to abandoned houses, nails waiting to be needed and hammered into some wall.	Nails (metal)
the face that the earth turns to me	Earth

The mountain forms that rest against the sky	Mountain forms
the sun's light sees me	Sun's light
the bad blood of spring	Spring
Shall it be male or female? say the cells	Cells
Shall it be male or female? say the fingers	Fingers
the mouths of caves	Caves
Such a morning it is when love leans through geranium windows and calls with a cockerel's tongue.	Love
Such a morning it is when mice run whispering from the church,	Mice

Table 5: The elements of personification in Arabic

Arabic personification	English translation	Elements
يا داء قلبي في الهوى ودوائي	You are The disease of my heart in love and my cure	Heart
ما لليالي إن نظرن فضائلي	The nights that are staring at my virtues	Nights
كانت لسمع صخرة صماء	It was for the hearing of a deaf rock	Rock
وأجيب سائل مهجتي عن دائها	I reply to those who ask my feelings about their disease	feeling
نظرت إلي بمقلة عمياء	She looked at me with a blind eye	Eye
أأنت الليلة البدر	Are you the moon	Moon
دمع العين مكتئب	The tears of the eye are depressed	Tears
غرض للدهر يرشقه	A purpose of the doom	Doom
فجر منقوب	A dawn veiling itself	Dawn
عاد ظني عليلاً بعد صحته	My expectation turned ill after it was healthy	expectation
عنا بليل النوى والبدر يحتجب	The moon is hiding himself	Moon
الريح لو أهدت تحيتها	The wind offers its salute	Wind
بكتني الأرض فيها والسموات	The earth and the skies cried for me	Earth and skies
وأسأل السفن	I ask the ships	Ships

وما أرى الموت إلا باسطاً يده	I see death straightening its hand	Death
يا ثمرا يملأ أغصاني	The fruits filling up my branches	Tree
فأشواقىوصلت لحدود الهذيان	My nostalgia reached the state of raving	
وَبَصْدِرِ اللَّيْلِ	The chest of the night	Night
يحارب الرّجل الدنيا فيخضعها	The man fights life and makes her obey	Life
و يفزع الدهر مذعورا	The age gets frightened	Age
الحزن في عينيك مرتجف	The sadness in your eyes trembles	Sadness
والياس في شفقتك يضطرب	The despair is disturbed on your lips	Sespair
فتكاد تنتثر النجوم أسى	The stars almost explode out of sadness	Stars
إلا السنين تدب في جسد	The ages crawling inside the body	Ages
وَسَطًا عَلَى جَنبَيْكَ هَمٌّ مُفْلِقٌ	a worrying anxiety burgled your surroundings	Anxiety
حارّ الفراش	The bed got confused	Bed
ما للقوافي أنكرتك	Why did the rhymes deny you?	Rhymes
ما للبيان بغير بابك واقفايكي	Why is rhetoric standing and crying at your door?	Rhetoric
عزائميلولا كما فوق السماك تحلق.	My ambitions without you would fly above the skies	Ambitions
تجري القرائح	The ulcers are running	Ulcers
الزمان لما يقول مصدق	The time believes what he said	Time
فلا شذى يروى رواقك الظلمات ولا زهر	No breeze and no flowers are telling your visions	breeze and flowers
برد المقابر تحت حكم الدود	The cold of the cemeteries under the ruling of the warms.	Warms
العبقرية كئيبة	The genius is depressed	Genius (noun)
صرخة الاعصار في الافق المديد	The scream of the storm in the horizon	Storm
وتشوق الليل العميق الى ملاقاته النهار	The night's impatience to meet the day	Night and day

وتحرق النبع السخي الى معانقة الجرار	The generous spring of water is longing to hug the jars	Water spring
أتعلم عيناك	Do your eyes know ?	Eyes
فعين تنام لتصحو عين.. تبكي على أختها ،	An eye sleeps for the other eye to wake and cry for her sister	Eye
إلى أن ينام القمر	Until the moon sleeps	Moon
طعام ليالي الغزل	The food of the compliments nights	Nights
الصباح ينادي خطاي لكي تستمرّ	The morning is calling my walking steps to keep on	Morning and walking
لماذا نسائل هذا الطريق .. لأي مصير	Why are we interrogating this road to which destiny?	Road
عواطفٌ منوعة الأجناس	Emotions of different nationalities	Emotions
سلي زهرات الروض	Ask the flowers of the garden	Flowers
سلي نسيمات الصبح	Ask the breeze of the morning	
سلي جاريات الماء عما تذيّعه عن التراب أو ماذا يقول لها التراب	Ask the running water about what it delivers to the soil and what the soil tells him.	Water and soil
سلي زاخرات الموج	Ask the boastful waves	Waves
سلي ساطعات النجم	Ask the shining stars	Stars
سلي الصخر	Ask the rocks	Rocks
فيجتو سعيداً زاهياً فوقه العشب	The grass grows happy on top of it	The grass
سلي الشمس إذ تأوي إلى البحر زوجها	Ask the sun as it takes shelter with her husband sea	Sun and sea
سلي الليل	Ask the night	
سلي الصبح إذ يبكي	Ask the morning as it cries	Morning
سلي الأفق باسمأ	Ask the smiling horizon	Horizon
سلي النور	Ask the light	Light
سلي قلبك المصغي إليّ وروحك التي هي أخت القلب	Ask your heart that is listening to me and your soul who is the sister of the heart	Heart and soul

سلي الدين والدنيا	Ask the religion and the life	Religion and life
كم يتعذب الليل ليلد النجمات	The night is suffering to give birth to stars	Night and stars
كم يحترق النغم في شجن النايات	The melodies are burning in the screams of the flutes	Flutes
سألت الصخور	I asked the rocks	Rocks
وَالْغِصْنِ فِي بستانِهِ يَزْهُو إِذَا رَطَّبَ الْهَوَا	The branch in the orchard feels joy if the air gets moisturized	The branch
ضحكاتُ الشيبِ	The laughters of the gray hair	Gray hair
يا بياضَ الشيبِ ما صنع يَدُكَ الْعِسرَاءِ	Hey there witness of the grizzly hair! What made your left hand	Grizzly hair
إذا داعبَ الماءُ	If The water caresses	Water
وغازلتِ السُّحُبُ	The clouds flirted	Clouds
النسيمُ يُقَبِّلُ كلَّ شراعٍ	The breeze kissing the sails	Breeze
كأنَّ الظلامَ بها ما شعرَ	As if the darkness didn't feel her	Darkness
إلى أنْ يَمَلَّ الدجى وحشتي	Until the night is bored of my nostalgia	Night
وتشكو الكأبةُ	The depression is complaining	Depression
وتعجبُ من حيرتي الكائناتُ	The species wonder about my confusion	The species
وتُشْفِقُ مِنِّي نجومُ السَّحَرِ	The stars feel pity for me	Stars
في دم الصحراءِ	The blood of the desert	Desert
وبؤسِ الفجرِ	The dawn's misery	Dawn
جوانحِ الخيمه	The wings of the tent	Tent
فتظمأ الصحراءُ	The desert gets thirsty	Desert

Table 6 : The elements of personification in Russian

Russian personification	English translation	Elements
Парус одинокий	The lonely sail	Sail
Играют волны	The waves played	Wave
А время торопит	The time hurries up	Time
Две вечных подруги - любовь и разлука	Two eternal – love and separation	Love and separation
Спит земля	The earth sleeps	Earth
лес проснулся	The forest woke up	Forest
весенней полон жаждой	spring is full of thirst	Spring
Утро дышит	The morning breathes	Morning
играла луна	The moon plays	Moon
Смерти в когти	Death in claws	Claws
Буйство глаз	Riot of eyes	Eye
кони мне попались привередливые	horses were caught finicky	Horses
Вставай, страна	Wake up country	Country
Не смеют крылья	Don't dare wings	Wings
Спросите вы у тишины	Go ask the silence	Silence
ты спишь, Нью-Йорк, ты спишь, Париж	You sleep, New York, you sleep, Paris	New York and Paris
Пусть вам ответят ваши сны	Let your dreams answer you	Dreams
землю грустную	The sad land	Land
Сердцегорода	The heart of the city	City
обнимают деревья, цветы	The trees hug the flowers	Trees and flowers

Table 7: The elements of personification in French

French personification	English translation	Elements
D'où prend son vol la fière et blanche Liberté	From where flies the proud, white freedom	Freedom
l'âme a le droit d'aller dire à Dieu	The soul has the right to go and say goodbye	Soul
Sur l'aile du zéphyr	On the wing of the breeze	Breeze
Quand j'ai connu la vérité, J'ai cru que c'était une amie	When I knew the truth I thought we were friends	Truth
Là, pour tuer le temps, j'observe la fourmi. Qui, pensant au retour de l'hiver ennemi	Here, to kill the time, I observe the ant who thinks about the coming back of winter the enemy	Time winter
Au murmure de l'eau qu'un caillou fait gémir	The whisper of water that can be made groan by a pebble	Water
Les sanglots longs des violons	Sobs of the violins	Violin
Dans ta mémoire immortelle	In your immortal memory	Memory
La foi qui doit nous sauver	The belief that must save us	Belief
C'est la mer allée Avec le soleil	It's the sea who went with the sun	Sea and sun
Le Devoir s'exhale	The duty exhales	Duty
le pâle soleil	The pale sun	Sun
Je suis le parfum Vivant et défunt	I am the alive and dead perfume	Perfume
On ne voit, d'un œil désolé Que le ciel sombre de son âme	We see with a sorry eye nothing but the sky dark in its soul.	Eye sky
Le vent gémit	The wind groans	Wind
Mon cœur impatient s'émeut	My impatient heart loves	Heart
où dort la mélancolie	Where the melancholy sleeps	Melancholy
les déités des eaux vives laissent couler leurs longs cheveux	the divinities of the bright waters let their long hair run	Water

Sous le soleil montant Qui ne sait que grandir	Under the rising sun who knows nothing but growing	Sun
La mort, indifférente à telles circonstances. Car ce n'est pas la mort elle-même qui tue. Elle a ses assassins.	The indifferent death has got such circumstances. As it's not death itself who kills. It's got its assassins.	Death

List of Poems

French poems

Victor Hugo (1802-1885) Cent mille hommes

Alphonse de Lamartine (1790-1869) Le Papillon

Alfred de Musset (1810-1857) Tristesse

Théophile Gautier (1811-1872) Far Niente

Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867) L'Albatros

Paul Verlaine (1844-1896) Chanson d'automne

Nérée Beauchemin (1850-1931) À celle que j'aime

Arthur Rimbaud (1854-1891) L'Éternité

Alphonse Allais (1854-1905) Complainte amoureuse

Jean Moréas (1856-1910) Quand reviendra l'automne

Paul Valéry (1871-1945) Le Sylphe

Rainer Maria Rilke (1875-1926) Été : être pour quelques jours

Albert Lozeau (1878-1924) Douleur

Albert Lozeau (1878-1924) J'attends ...

Guillaume Apollinaire (1880-1918) Clotilde

Jules Supervielle (1884-1960) Encore frissonnant

Paul Géraudy (1885-1983) Absence

Paul Géraudy (1885-1983) Âmes, Modes

Jean Cocteau (1889-1963) Hélas ! vais-je à présent me plaindre

Paul Eluard (1895-1952) L'Avis

English Poems

Growing Old by Matthew Arnold (1822 - 1888)

Goodbye! by Richard Aldington (1892 - 1962)

Love In A Life by Robert Browning (1812 - 1889)

Tears by Elizabeth Barrett Browning (1809 - 1861)

Love and Friendship by Emily Bronte (1818 - 1848)

The Broken Heart by William Barnes (1801 - 1886)

I Said To Love by Thomas Hardy (1840 - 1928)

The Last Rose by John Davidson(1857 - 1909)

Sweet Endings Come and Go, Love by George Eliot (1819 - 1880)

A Valentine by Edgar Allan Poe 1809-1849,

A Subaltern's Love Song by John Betjeman (1906 - 1984)

Leaving and Leaving You by Sophie Hannah (1917 - present)

In a Garden by Elizabeth Jennings (1926 - 2001)

Love Again by Philip Larkin (1922 - 1985)

Wedding-Ring by Denise Levertov (1923 - 1997)

Love Poem by John Frederick Nims (1913 - 1999)

Love Poem by Kathleen Raine (1908 - 2003)

If I Were Tickled By the Rub of Love by Dylan Thomas (1914 - 1953)

The Knife by Keith Douglas (1920 - 1944)

Day of These Days by Laurie Lee (1914 - 1997)

Russian Poems

- Михаил Лермонтов — Бородино 1837
- Александр Пушкин — Я вас любил: любовь еще, быть может... 1829
- Булат Окуджава — Любовь и разлука 1982
- Михаил Лермонтов — Выхожу один я на дорогу 1841
- Афанасий Фет — Я пришел к тебе с приветом... 1843
- Иван Суриков — Что шумишь, качаясь, Тонкая рябина... 1864
- Афанасий Фет — На заре ты её не буди... 1842
- Фёдор Тютчев — Умом Россию не понять... 1866
- Владимир Чуевский — Гори, гори, моя звезда 1868
- Денис Давыдов — Я люблю кровавый бой!.. 1815
- Сергей Есенин — Не жалею, не зову, не плачу 1921
- Владимир Высоцкий — Кони привередливые 1972
- Василий Лебедев-Кумач — Священная война 1941
- Расул Гамзатов — Журавли 1965
- Евгений Евтушенко — Хотят ли русские войны? 1961
- Михаил Исаковский — Каким ты был 1949
- Арсений Тарковский — Вот и лето прошло 1983
- Валерий Тихонов — Осенняя рапсодия 1993
- Андрей Дементьев — Ни о чем не жалейте 1977
- Марина Цветаева — Мне нравится, что вы больны не мной 1915

ArabicPoems

عبد الغفار الأخرس : أتراك تعرف عِلَّتِي وَشَفَائِي
 عباس محمود العقاد : شذى زهرُ ولا زهرُ
 محمود سامي البارودي: لِكُلِّ دَمْعٍ مِنْ مُقْلَةٍ سَبَبُ
 موتُ الكرامِ حَيَاةٌ فِي مِوَاطِنِهِمْ .. علي الحصري القيرواني
 أحبك .. أحبك .. نزار قباني
 أَعْطِنِي النَّايَ وَغَنِّ .. جبران خليل جبران
 الرجل و المرأة .. إيليا أبو ماضي
 لن نفترق .. بدر شاكر السياب
 سَكَنَ الظَّلَامُ وَبَاتَ قَلْبُكَ يَخْفِقُ .. حافظ إبراهيم
 دعوة إلى الحياة .. نازك الملائكة
 أجمل حب .. محمود درويش
 تراتيل المساء .. ردينة الفيلاي
 من أغاني افريقيا .. محمد الفيتوري
 سألت الصخور .. إبراهيم أبو زيد
 اعتذار عن خطبة قصيرة .. عبد الوهاب البياتي
 وَلرُبَّ عودٍ كان عُصْناً .. خليل ناصيف اليازجي
 ضحكاتُ الشيبِ في الشعر .. مصطفى لطفى المنفلوطي
 أغنية ريفية .. علي محمود طه
 القدس .. أحمد المجاطي

SUMMARY

M.A. Thesis 77 pages – 70 sources.

The object of the research focuses on common and specific features of personification in the English, French, Russian, and Arabic poetry of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The purpose of the study is to compare and contrast personifications realised in poetic discourse relating to typologically different and geographically distant cultures of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Theoretical and methodological premises: theory of conceptual metaphor (G. Lakoff, M. Johnson, M. Turner, Z. Kövesces), the role of metaphors in poetic discourse (J. Johnson, T. Davidson).

Results: The analysis of the poems shows trivial results with regard to our hypothesis as the elements of personification have appeared to be varied with unbalanced degrees of similarity between languages, and no collective pattern of similarity has been detected. On the other hand, Personification is one of the figures of speech that make up language and these figures happen to be not evenly distributed as it has been shown about Arabic in which the use of metaphor generally and personification specifically exceeds considerably the other languages selected for this project. I assume that other languages make up for that by virtue of other figures of speech or these languages simply can be just fine without it. Personification is a fundamental aspect in every language whether defined as a stylistic device or as language property. The frequency of its use though appears to vary from one language to another. This assumption is a potential solid ground for a future comparative analysis together with the concentrated use of special element in precise languages like it is the case with the element rock in Arabic.

Keywords: *cognitive metaphor, personification, cross-cultural analysis, source of metaphorisation, target of metaphorisation, poetic discourse*

РЕЗЮМЕ

Дослідження присвячено актуальним питанням сучасної лінгвістики, зокрема формування та функціонування концептуальних метафор в поетичному дискурсі.

Об'єктом дослідження обрано спільні та культурно-специфічні ознаки концептуальних метафор-уособлень в англійському, французькому, арабському та російському поетичних дискурсах 19—20 ст. становить

Мета дослідження полягає у здійсненні крос-культурного аналізу такого виду концептуальних метафор, як персоніфікації. Реалізація цієї мети передбачає розв'язання таких завдань:

- розглянути головні положення теорії метафори;
- порівняти традиційні інтерпретації метафори як риторичної фігури (факту мовлення) та як механізму розвитку лексичного значення (факту мови) з сучасним когнітивним тлумаченням метафори як способу мислення, організації знань;
- окреслити характерні ознаки поетичного дискурсу;
- систематизувати відомості про роль метафори в поетичному мовленні;
- розглянути персоніфікацію як вид концептуальної (онтологічної) метафори;
- проаналізувати та зіставити джерела та цілі персоніфікації в англійських, французьких, арабській, російській поетичних текстах 19-20 ст.

Результати дослідження підтвердили гіпотезу про перевагу спільних, універсальних, ознак персоніфікації над культурно-специфічними ознаками в аналізованих типах дискурсу.

Key-words: когнітивна метафора, персоніфікація, крос-культурний аналіз, джерело метафоризації, ціль метафоризації, поетичний дискурс.

**Декларація
академічної доброчесності
здобувача ступеня вищої освіти ЗНУ**

Я, Ель АсріМунсеф, студент 2 курсу, форми навчання денної, факультету іноземної філології, спеціальність 035 Філологія, освітньо-професійна програма мова і література (англійська), адреса електронної пошти moncef6hlf@gmail.com,

- підтверджую, що написана мною кваліфікаційна робота на тему «Крос-культурний аналіз метафор-уособлень в поетичному дискурсі» відповідає вимогам академічної доброчесності та не містить порушень, що визначені у ст. 42 Закону України «Про освіту», зі змістом яких ознайомлений/ознайомлена;

- заявляю, що надана мною для перевірки електронна версія роботи є ідентичною її друкованій версії;

- згоден/згодна на перевірку моєї роботи на відповідність критеріям академічної доброчесності у будь-який спосіб, у тому числі за допомогою Інтернет-системи, а також на архівування моєї роботи в базі даних цієї системи.

Дата _____ Підпис _____ ПІБ (студент) _____