

analyzed. The features of (post)realism as one of the stylistic parameters of post-postmodernism are found out. A complex of social problems and motives, which find a critical understanding in English post-postmodernistic novel, has been spotlighted.

Key words: post-postmodernism, contemporary English novel, social science fiction, (post)realism, post-truth, dystopia, mystery, carnival.

УДКС 811.161 + 81.111

Roman Dudok., Olviya Vysotska

PSYCHOLOGICAL ROLE OF METAPHORS IN THE BELLES-LETTRES DISCOURSE

The article is devoted to the analysis and the role of the term “metaphor” in modern scientific fields: philosophy, linguistics, psychology and literary criticism. The phenomenon of metaphor is analysed as a complex of multifunctional discursive category, as an interdisciplinary term. The article unifies approaches to the interpretation of the metaphor and existing interpretations, describes the ways and means of creating metaphors in belles-lettres discourse. The metaphor is analyzed as an important form of penetration into the inner nature and essence of things in the belles-lettres style, psychological discourses, realized in the language through symbolic concepts that function at the level of nuclear (archetypical) metaphors. It is proved that base (archetypical) metaphors form figurative constants, which pass through all the writer's work. The article focuses on the formation of a new direction – *linguistic metaphorology*, which enables the unification of diversity in the system of metaphor's interpretation, describes the ways and sources of the metaphors' creation, both in the language communication practice, and in the belles-lettres text. It is concluded that at the present stage, the term “metaphor” is not a simple transfer, by similarity or analogy, but a complex multifunctional discursive category with a tendency to be isolated into an independent scientific interdisciplinary term.

Key words: metaphor, sense, psychological metaphorization, psychological discourse, discourse category, belles-lettres text, linguometaphorology.

Formulation of the problem. The metaphor problem was of interest to many of the most prominent thinkers from Aristotle to E. Cosseriu, H. Ortega y Gasset, J. Miller, J. Searle, P. Ricker, and many others. Studying the foundations and origins of human cognitive activity, scientists (A. Kuhn, M. Müller and others) came to the conclusion that in order to master all the diversity of the environment, to know and understand the world around us is possible only through the creation of basic metaphors. Thus, Ortega y Gasset noted that metaphor is, perhaps, the only way to fix and meaningfully identify objects of a high degree abstraction. “It turns out,” he wrote, “that all the huge building of the universe, full of life, relies on the tiny and ethereal body of the metaphor” [8, p. 68–81]. In modern linguopsychological studios, we came across the use of metaphor fall into a variety of discourses, as a means of describing and explaining any phenomena in many other branches of scientific knowledge. The researcher P. Rieker describes the living process of metaphorization as the fluent unity of cognition, imagination, perception, and, in particular, F. G. Lorca, calls the metaphor a real daughter of an imagination, without which it would not be possible “to immerse his hands in the burning fever of alogism and negligence, where it is generated free and nothing to be screwed up with inspiration” [10, p. 229–242].

Thus, figuratively speaking, a metaphor is a means of instantaneous “enlightenment” of the latent meaning of things and events on the one hand. On the other hand, it simultaneously operates in the field of expressive sensory mastery of the world. That is, the process of metaphorization is a fruitful synthesis of cognitive-search and myth-poetic human activity. It should be added that the act of metaphorical creation itself is at the basis of many semantic processes (the search for synonymous means, the emergence of new meanings, the development of expressive-emotional vocabulary, etc.), and hence acts as an effective mechanism of the individual process of the sense-forming. According to researchers, the metaphor teaches “to transform the world of objects into the world of meanings” [7, p. 41–45]. We note here that we used the notion of metaphor in the above and in the broad sense, namely, as a manifestation of a certain general way of indirect and sense figurative embodiment in any belles-lettres context.

Analysis of recent research and publications. In modern linguistic science, we observe the tendency to use the metaphor in different directions: semiotics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, structural linguistics and, of course, stylistics. Attempts for the psychological interpretation of the metaphor are found in the works: Z. Freud, G. Bloom, V. Rotenberg, I. Vachkov, D. Gordon, A. Vaganov and others. The study of the linguistic metaphor was carried out in the works: Yu. Levin, B. Plotnikov, S. Kurash, N. Arutyunova, V. Grigoriev, V. Gak, N. Cherkasova, I. Arnold, G. Sklyarevskaya, I. Tolochina, B. Borisova, R. Jakobson, J. Lakoff, M. Johnson and others. The researchers of the metaphor phenomenon proposed a number of constructive approaches to its understanding. In particular, they include: an interpretative model (H.-G. Gadamer, S. Averintsev, E. Dobrenko, O. Staroselets, N. Kryukova, K. Tomashevskaya and others), hermeneutic model (G. Gadamer, I. Solovyov, P. Riecker), lingua-axiological interpretation of the metaphor (R. Rozov, L. Alberti, A. Baranov, V. Karasik, I. Dubrovina, D. Davidson), interpretation of metaphors in linguodidactics and translation theory (N. Zhinkin, E. Vereshchagin, V. Kostomarov, A. Averina, Yu. Karaulov, Z. Ladmiraal, T. Borisova), lexicographic approach (W. Weinreich, F. Rustler, G. Sklyarevskaya, Yu. Apresyan), etc.

The purpose of the article is to unify the diversity of approaches in the metaphor's interpretation system and to systematise existing interpre(ta)tive approaches, to describe the ways and sources of the metaphors' creation, both in language communication practice and in the belles-lettres discourse.

The body of the article. Numerous scientific works on metaphor, especially in recent decades, are related to the awareness of its role in the process of thinking in the belles-lettres discourse. Particular attention in this area is given by metaphors' philosophers, linguists, psychologists. The problem of linguophilosophical interpretation of the metaphor is analysed in the works: H. Ortega y Gasset, P. Ricker, O. Losiev, O. Freidenberg, E. Solovyov and others. This is guided by Yu. Tymoshenko's opinion, "within the philosophical discourse the metaphor, for the most part, is considered in the context of cognition problems and language" [12, p. 29–35]. As for comprehension of the metaphor in the linguistic representation, the roots of the paths in the structure of the language and their tendency to create the portability of the values are emphasised. Researchers postulate that human experience has a pronounced linguistic (symbolic) character and, precisely, this symbolic function is mostly represented in a metaphor.

According to N. Owen, the stories are "magical metaphors", the meaning of which is that they are "capable of changing or shaking the rooted view, the usual map of the world, and pushing us out of a limited space of stereotypes, to bring about a new understanding and new discoveries" [9]. So, in our understanding, the metaphor is a powerful stylistic means for the actual production of senses.

On the understanding of the metaphor as a "tool of thought, a form of scientific thinking", emphasises H. Ortega y Gasset, where the metaphor, in his opinion, serves as a linguistic tool by which the writer of a belles-lettres work manages to reach the most remote parts of our conceptual field, that is, "metaphor expands the boundaries of thinking" [cit. work 8]. In his turn, O. Freidenberg argues that metaphor is a kind of transitional link between the image and the concept; it "transmits concreteness in such a way that it turns to its own foreign-language, that is, to such specificity, which turns out to be abstract and generalised by a new meaning" [14]. It seems to us to be original, O. Losiev's statement, namely, "the metaphor does not point to any object other than itself, because it is self-sufficient and deep enough to be considered and thoughtful of it for a long time, not passing to other objects" [5].

Thus, in the psychological filling of the belles-lettres text, the metaphor is interpreted as an important form of penetration into the inner nature and essence of things. It directly reflects the structure of comprehension, the human experience embodied in the metaphor, in a symbolic form. Consequently, the metaphor in belles-lettres and psychological discourses is understood as a specific feature of thinking, which is realised in the language through symbolic concepts, which often function at the level of nuclear (archetypal) metaphors.

It should be noted that the system of knowledge about the metaphor is deeply ingrained both in psychology and in linguistics. In particular, S. Freud linked it with the sphere of the unconscious, with wit, as a kind of mental activity, aimed at obtaining pleasure, which follows from the saving of mental

energy [13, p. 5–87]. In linguistics, traditionally, a metaphor transmits the similarity between dissimilar concepts. Similarly, we encounter the psychological concept of metaphorism when the metaphor seeks to become a reality, to become one step with the concept or even surpasses it in the ability to reflect the surrounding reality [1, p. 40–50].

In view of the above, let us give some of our own arguments. First of all, we can say, without exaggeration, that no psychotherapeutic direction can be done without the use of metaphors. After all, the metaphor is the embodiment of hidden meanings, because the language of metaphors is a symbolic language of human communication and one of the important means in artistic discourse, it is this connecting link between different semantic spaces (in the cognitive aspect). The metaphor, practically, introduces hidden mechanisms of the unconscious, using archetypical elements [11]. Therefore, it is extremely important to engage a metaphor for the purpose of psychological influence on the reader (recipient).

For the cognitive direction of modern linguistic science, the characteristic understanding of the metaphor is essential not only as a linguistic one, but also as a mental fact that conceptualises our picture of the world [2, p. 5–18]. The approach to the metaphor, of a particular interest in this aspect, was proposed by J. Lacoff and M. Johnson in their famous monograph “The Metaphors We Live in” (1990). It received the title of the conceptual analysis. The basic principles of this approach are that the metaphor does not refer to the level of language technology, but to the level of thinking and activity, and, actually human experience, serves as the basis for the creation of metaphorical concepts.

According to our observations, in the field of linguists' view, along with routine (linguistic) and individual (belles-lettres) metaphors, there are the so-called nuclear (root, basic, fundamental, archetypical) metaphors, which are split by analogy and associations between different groups of concepts, forming smaller metaphors and their varieties [4]. Continuing our considerations, we will add that the basic (archetypical) metaphors form stable figurative constants, which pass through time and creativity of the artist and become the symbolic foundation of the belles-lettres world.

As it is known, namely the linguists first conducted a terminological distinction between the linguistic and belles-lettres metaphors, the essence of which is that the language of fiction, in addition to the real and logical contents, has also an aesthetic object of research. In addition, we note that metaphor in linguistic works is considered as an effective cognitive model. It is able to cover and obscure various aspects of the object, it is complex and multifaceted, it helps to identify not only universal but also national peculiarities of thinking.

We can argue that such a great deal of research suggests the formation of a new direction – linguometaphorology, which makes it possible to unify the diversity in the metaphor's interpretation system and systematise existing interpre(ta)tive approaches, to describe the ways and sources of metaphors' creation, both in language communication practice and in artistic text. A researcher V. Vovk emphasises the importance of understanding the metaphor in a particular context. She believes that metaphor is one of the main means of expression in communicative and belles-lettres discourses and shares, in particular, the metaphor in belles-lettres speech on the individual-author, metaphor-symbol and phraseological metaphor [3].

According to the researchers, “metaphorization is perceived as a linguistic means only in the presence of some formal indicators, when it goes beyond the word, extends to the whole sentence, to the whole passage, etc., that is, ceases to be a purely linguistic phenomenon” [6]. As we can see, such an understanding of the metaphor fits into the system of traditional understanding theory the path as a substitution, that is, by replacing the word, name, concept, or whole system of values with others that define another experience. So, coming to the conclusion, we can assert that the metaphor in the belles-lettres text accumulates a large charge of subjective perception, an individual's attitude, a personal system of the belles-lettres values etc.

Conclusions and perspectives of further research. Consequently, our scientific search gives reason to believe that a number of researches, connected, one way or another, with a metaphor, is constantly increasing. In fact, the phenomenon of metaphor affects almost all spheres of human

experience. If we consider metaphor in the terminological sense, then it is in two main meanings – a metaphor in the context of thinking (thought) and in the plane of language (belles-lettres word). We arrive at the key point that at the present stage the term “metaphor” is far from simple transfer by similarity or analogy, and a complex multifunctional discursive category with a tendency to separate as an independent scientific interdisciplinary term, which requires a further fundamental and in-depth analysis.

References

1. Alekseyev, K. 2002. “Metaphor in the scientific discourse”. *Psychological studies of discourse*. Moscow. 40–50.
2. Arutyunova, N. D. 1990. *Metaphor and Discourse*. Theory of Metaphors. Moscow. 5–18.
3. Vovk, V. 1986. *Linguistic metaphor in the belles-lettres speech*. Kyiv.
4. Ivanyuk, B. 1988. *Metaphor and literary work*. Chernivtsi.
5. Losiev, A. F. 1990. *The Philosophy of the Name*. Moscow: Moscow State University.
6. Maillah, B. 1958. “Metaphor as an element of the belles-lettres system”. *Questions of literature and aesthetics*. Lviv.
7. Mikesheva, L., and Openkov, M. 1998. *The Metaphor of culturology*. *XX century Encyclopedia: in 2 volumes*. St. Petersburg. 41–45.
8. Ortega, y Gasset H. 1990. “Two great metaphors”. *Theory of metaphors*. Moscow. 68–81.
9. Owen, N. 2002. *Magic Metaphors*. Moscow: Press.
10. Ricker, P. 1996. “Conflict of Interpretations”. *Word. Sign. Discourse Anthology of the World Literary-Critical Thinking of the XX Century*. Lviv. 229–242.
11. *Theory of metaphors: Collection: translated from English, French, German, Spanish, Polish*. Moscow: Progress.
12. Tymoshenko, Yu. 2001. “The phenomenon of metaphor: the problem of ancient and today”. *Word and time*. 29–35.
13. Freud, S. 1998. “Wit and its attitude to the unconscious”. *Wit and its relation to the unconscious: Fear; Totem and taboo*. Munich. 5–87.
14. Freidenberg, O. M. 1988. *Myth and the literature of antiquity*. Moscow.

Дудок Роман, Висоцька Ольвія. Психологічна роль метафори в художньому дискурсі. Статтю присвячено аналізу терміна «метафора» та його ролі в сучасних науках: філософії, мовознавстві, психології, літературознавстві. Феномен метафори проаналізовано як складну багатофункційну дискурсивну категорію, як між науковий термін. Уніфіковано підходи до тлумачення метафори та наявні інтерпретації, описано способи і джерела творення метафор у художньому дискурсі. Метафору проаналізовано як важливу форму проникнення у внутрішню природу й суть речей у художньому та психологічному дискурсах, що реалізується в мові через символічні концепти, які функціують на рівні ядерних (архетипних) метафор. Доведено, що базові (архетипні) метафори утворюють сталі образні константи, які проходять через всю творчість письменника. Акцентовано увагу на формуванні нового напрямку – *лінгвометафорології*, яка уможливує уніфікацію різноманітності в системі тлумачень метафори, описує способи і джерела творення метафор і в мовній практиці спілкування, і в художньому тексті. Зроблено висновок, що на сучасному етапі термін «метафора» – це не просте перенесення за подібністю чи аналогією, а складна багатофункційна дискурсивна категорія з тенденцією до виокремлення в самостійний науково-міждисциплінарний термін.

Ключові слова: метафора, смисл, психологічна метафоризація, психологічний дискурс, дискурсивна категорія, художній текст, лінгвометафорологія.

Дудок Роман, Высоцкая Ольвия. Психологическая роль метафоры в художественном дискурсе. Статья посвящена анализу термина «метафора» и её роли в современных науках: философии, языкознании, психологии и литературоведении. Феномен метафоры проанализирован как сложная многофункциональная дискурсивная категория, как междисциплинарный термин. Унифицированы подходы к толкованию метафоры и существующие интерпретации, описаны способы и источники создания метафор в художественном дискурсе. Метафора проанализирована как важная форма проникновения во внутреннюю природу и сущность вещей в художественном, психологическом дискурсе, который реализуется в речи путем символических концептов, функционирующих на уровне ядерных (архетипных) метафор. Доказано, что базовые (архетипные) метафоры образуют образные константы, которые проходят через всё творчество писателя. Акцентируется внимание на формировании нового направления – *лингвометафорологии*, которая унифицирует разнообразия в системе толкований метафоры, осуществляет описание способов и источников создания метафор, как в языковой практике общения, так и в художественном тексте. Сделан вывод, что на современном этапе термин «метафора» – это не просто перенос по сходству или аналогии, а сложная многофункциональная дискурсивная категория с тенденцией к выделению в самостоятельный научно-междисциплинарный термин.

Ключевые слова: метафора, смысл, психологическая метафоризация, психологический дискурс, дискурсивная категория, художественный текст, лінгвометафорологія.