

## Semantic and Structural Features of Figurative Agentive Paradigmatic Rows

*Andrey Viktorovich Kazakov, Olga Vladimirovna Baykova  
and Vladimir Alexandrovich Banin*

Vyatka State University of Humanities, Krasnoarmeyskaya  
Street, 26, 610002, Kirov, Russia

---

**Abstract:** The article deals with the study of a new type of paradigmatic rows- figurative paradigmatic rows. The material of this investigation allows the author to single out the images at the following 5 the level of morphemes, words, the level between a word and a sentence, the level of a sentence, the level one or a few sentences levels. The images may be created at levels above the phonemic one.

**Key words:** Figurative Paradigmatic Rows • Imagery Paradigms • Variant • Invariant • Semantic Orientation • Comparison

---

### INTRODUCTION

The term paradigm is widely used in the linguistic literature. It occurs in linguistic studies devoted to the consideration of different levels of language: phonemic, morphonemic, lexemic, denotemic, proposemic and dictemic [1, 2].

In the field of phonetics paradigmatic rows are built as oppositions of sounds based on different features: vowel-consonant, voiced-voiceless, fricative-plosive, long-short, etc. In the area of the vocabulary these rows are based on the relationship of synonyms and antonyms, hyponymy and hyperonymy, relations of different thematic connection, various derivational dependence. In grammar series of correlative forms build categories of number and case, person and tense, voice, mood, sets of coordinative and subordinative models of sentences, etc.

The imagery paradigm is understood as "the invariant itself, as well as a set of images, in which it is realized" [3], [4]. At the same time the image invariant is understood as "a complex notion of  $X \rightarrow Y$ ; where X and Y are concepts that are in contradictory relations and the arrow shows the direction of identifying the X and Y. In this case, X and Y are invariants of the lexical rows, X is the thing being identified and Y-the object with which comparison takes place" [3]. What is being identified (X), is termed the left part of the paradigm (the referent) and the object with

which the identification takes place (Y), the right part of the paradigm (agent). For example, in the paradigms "*water* → *a living creature*," "*water*" is the left component of the paradigm, *a living being*-the right one. Thus, in a linguistic unit, which belongs to some figurative paradigm, there are two components of meaning: a common component, unifying the paradigmatic row and a differential, exposing its own, unique character of the unit in the paradigmatic row.

S. M. Mezenin stresses the importance of semantic direction between the object and the agent: "If we transform the phrase «Aaron is as cunning as a serpent» into the statement «the serpent is as cunning as Aaron», the latter would be perceived as a deviation from the usual method of constructing the comparison, as it is customary to juxtapose man with animals, but not vice versa" [5]. The author emphasizes the fact that the rearrangement of the referent and agent entails a significant change in the semantic and stylistic characteristics of the expression.

In our study, we investigate a new type of paradigmatic rows-figurative paradigmatic rows. Figurative meaning is created at all levels of the language except for the level of phonemes, as phonemes by themselves have no semantic content and image is created by the interaction of notions. The material of our study allowed us to single out the images at the following levels:

- Morphonemic. In this context, scientists deal with the inner form of the word, when the images of tongue-fire, head-bubble arise from the interaction of the morphemes *fire* and *tongue* in the word *fire-tongued*, *bubble* and *head* in the word *a bubblehead*.
- lexemic: The basket is heaped with human *eyes* [6]. The word *eyes* refers to geranium flowers. In this case, the image of the eyes-geraniums is created on the level of one lexeme *eyes*.
- Denotemic (the level between a word and a sentence): *cavernous mouths*, *golden hair*, *alabaster skin*. The following images *mouth-cave*, *hair-gold*, *skin-alabaster* are created by a combination of individual lexemes.
- Proposemic (the level of a sentence): *Their eyes were moons* [7].
- Dictemic (the level one or a few sentences): *It was the most frightening house Pongo and Missis had ever seen. Many of the windows in its large, flat face had been bricked up and those that were left looked like eyes and nose, with the front door for a mouth. Only there were too many eyes and the nose and the mouth were not quite in the right place, so that the whole face looked distorted* [8]. In this example, all the above-mentioned sentences are united around a single theme, a single image *home* → *face*.

N.V. Pavlovich distinguishes 4 types of imagery paradigms, depending on the nature of elements X and Y. First, there is a paradigm of the type «substantive» → «substantive», the elements of which constitute the "essence" or "nouns" [3]. Cf: «eye» → «light».

Second, the scientist distinguishes paradigm «property» → «property». For example: *alive* → *dead*, *real* → *unreal*.

The third type of paradigms is built according to the scheme «action» → «action». For example, the cheeks bloom like roses (*Roses bloom upon thy cheek* [7]); man bows his head as the storm-battered flower bends down its bud (*I hang the head As flowers with frost or grass beat down with storms* [7]). In our opinion, it is not justifiable to single out this type of paradigms, as the examples cited by the author, do not illustrate the identification of one activity to another, but rather clarify the model of «substantive» → «substantive».

The fourth type constitutes the paradigm «situation» → «situation», where X and Y are invariants of situations. An example of such a paradigm is a model of the type «tears on her cheeks» → «raindrops on the trees»: *the standers-by had wet their cheeks Like trees bedash'd with rain* [7].

In our work we focus on the paradigmatic rows «substantive» → «substantive» as the most common type of identification. Other types of paradigmatic rows are not as frequent and rather complete this type of imagery paradigmatic rows.

An image can be characterized by its complexity. A strong image may be defined as an image, which is the most remote from the paradigm, but-justified, that is understandable. The paradigm needs to be hidden as much as possible, but be recognizable. The true art of a poet is to keep within limits and create images that would be justified.

The complexity of the image is determined by the number of features. They are:

- High capacity. The greater the number of paradigms the image belongs to, the more complex it is, that is, several paradigms may be realized using only one pair of lexemes. For example, the capacity of the image *my eye shall be the stream* [7] allows a single pair of lexemes «eyes» → «stream» to realize several paradigms «eyes» → «water», «eyes» → «the elements». In addition, the capacity of the image is increased by the use of «rare words, ambiguous words, or neologisms," "lexical choice within one nest," "the sound similarity of X and Y»;
- The lexical embodiment of the paradigm (kernel or marginalia). The kernel embodiment of the paradigm is simpler than the marginal one. The farther the real lexemes of the image are from the invariant of the paradigm and from its nucleus, the more difficult the image is. For example, «eyes» → «water» (*eyes Like water in a lonely place* [9]) is the core of the paradigm and «eyes» → «dew» (*Girl of the dew eye* [9]) is marginalia;
- Method of identification: explicit-implicit, consistent-mixed. "Implicit identification is more complex than explicit one. In this way only strong, consistent paradigms can be hidden. Otherwise, they will simply not be perceived. For example, in the image *summer lets down her hair* [10] we can easily recognize paradigm «hair» → «light»;
- Amplification. The concepts of X and Y may be repeated in a few lexemes of the image, thus increasing and complicating it. Nf.: *Hath thy fiery heart so parch'd thine entrails That not a tear can fall for Rutland's death* → [7]; *cold hearts freeze* [7]. In the first example, the idea of heat is repeated twice, the second-the idea of cold.

The concept of imagery paradigm is important to take into account when describing the individual styles of poets and writers. This allows, first, to establish continuous paradigmatic rows in the works of any author and, secondly, to show the dynamics of their usage and, therefore, to identify the main trends of evolution of individual style and finally, to determine ways of refreshing consistent images.

Thus, paradigmatic rows are of great theoretical and practical importance. The images may be created at levels above the phonemic one. Paradigmatic rows of images enable us to generalize the real figurative means that operate in specific texts and to identify certain patterns in the development of poetic language, to trace the evolution of artistic speech, to show how it combines tradition and innovation.

#### REFERENCES

1. Blokh, M.Y., 2002. Theoretical Grammar of the English Language. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
2. Blokh, M.Y., T.N. Semenova and S.V. Timofeeva, 2010. Practical Course on Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
3. Pavlovich, N.V., 1995. Language of images: Paradigms of Images in the Russian Poetic Language. Moscow: URSS, pp: 62.
4. Pavlovich, N.V., 2007. Dictionary of Poetic Images. Moscow: URSS.
5. Mezenin, S.M., 1984. Imagery Means of the Language. Moscow: MGPI, pp: 30.
6. The Home Book of Verse, American and English; with an Appendix Containing a Few Well-Known Poems in Other Languages, 1949. New York: Holt.
7. Complete Works of William Shakespeare, 1994. Barnes & Noble.
8. Smith, D., 1989. The Hundred and One Dalmatians. Puffin.
9. Lawrence, D.H., 2010. Sons and Lovers. Harper Press.
10. Fitzgerald, F.S., 1991. This Side of Paradise. Garland.