LEGE ARTIS

Language yesterday, today, tomorrow

Vol. V. No 1 2020

VERBAL SOURCES OF CINEMATIC METAPHORS: FROM CINEMATIC PERFORMATIVITY TO LINGUISTIC CREATIVITY*

Irina Zykova

Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

Abstract: The paper develops a methodology for analyzing multimodal strategies involved in the creation of cinematic metaphors based on verbal units. Special attention is paid to the typology of verbal means that underlie cinematic metaphors emerging in comedy films. The research offers an integrated approach to the study of cinematic performativity and linguistic creativity and gives insights into their interrelatedness in constructing cinematic figurativeness.

Key words: cinematic discourse, cinematic performativity, cinematic metaphor, linguistic creativity, phraseological unit, multimodal strategy, comedy film.

1. Introduction: Revisiting the issue of the word in cinematic art

Among the top-ranking research areas in the modern theory of film semantics is the issue of nature, sources, and functions of the cinematic, or filmic, metaphor. Our research is aimed at studying verbal (or language) sources of cinematic metaphors, the discussion of which was triggered at the beginning of the 20th century by the active search for the cinema-specific means of artistic expression inaccessible to other arts.

As is well-known, the development of the "pure cinema" (or "true cinema", "absolute film") conception once divided film specialists into opposing camps taking different positions with regard to the role of the word in the film-making process. As Christie claims, there was genuine fear that "sound would in some way destroy the 'essence' of film art". The researcher also adds that "most aesthetic discussions of sound in the 1930s come down to the <…> assertion that, since film is essentially visual and therefore silent, sound will inevitably distract from its artistry" (1991: 177). Therefore, according to Fischer, it was believed that "sound would ruin the poetic art of cinema developed in the silent era – reducing all film to banal talking heads or ringing phones" (1999: 78).

Despite the fact that the role of the word was frequently downplayed at the different periods of the evolution of cinematic art, its validity as a peculiar artistic means in constructing films' conceptual medium as well as its peculiar diegetic world have been highly appreciated by many outstanding film figures and cinema theorists both in the past and at present. For instance, Italian Futurists regarded language and, more specifically, its figurative means as one of the crucial points in creating the film narrative. In 1916, they published a manifesto in which they claimed that cinema was able to embody most of the tropes, or figures of speech, known in literature (Marinetti et al. 1916). Making a reference to Philippon, Deleuze mentions that one of the principal aims of cinema's reason for being is to film speech (1989). Carroll writes that "cinema is not a language"; nevertheless, "language plays an intimate role in several of the symbolic structures used in cinema" (1996: 187).

It is worth special mention that, as is usually recognized, it was Sergei Eisenstein (1898–1948) – "one of the giants of world cinema" (Gillespie 2000: 57) who exerted the strongest influence on developing a certain attitude to the word in the historical development of cinema and to the word's adaptation to this technologically new and multimodal medium. Eisenstein's experimentation in the field of filmmaking revealed the true value of the word in the film's inner structure as well as the significance of

figurative language means in elaborating the semantic or conceptual architecture of a film. Besides, his approach to the cinematic word-based imagery contributed much to the development of the theory of cinematic performativity as well as to disclosing its essence and how it can be embodied in films.

First of all, as a pioneer in a specific use of film editing (alongside other representatives of the Russian cinematic school, such as Lev Kuleshov, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Dziga Vertov, and others), Eisenstein was one of the founders of the cinematic metaphor theory. He introduced a certain type of cinematic metaphors – montage metaphors defined as moving, or movement, images that are impressive, laden with multidimensional senses and easy to memorize. Elaborating principles of creating and using montage and visual metaphors, Eisenstein, as is usually asserted, was among those film directors who shaped film imaging for the years to come. One of his best-known images is the massacre on the Odessa Steps in the film "Броненосец Потемкин" ("Battleship Potemkin"), released in 1926. As Gillespie points out, the massacre sequence demonstrates "a magnificent awareness of the possibilities of moving image" (2000: 44). The researcher describes the intricate imagery (or figurativeness) of the episode in question in the following way:

"We never get to see the faces of the other Cossacks – they are merely faceless murderers or, in the scene when the mother of the wounded boy confronts them, ominous, giant shadows looming over her. When the pram totters then rolls down the steps, it is a synecdoche of the enormous brutality of the regime. It then becomes transformed into an unmistakable visual metaphor for the Revolution itself, amassing its own momentum as it moves relentlessly on, bearing a traditional Russian cultural symbol of the New World: a baby. The whole episode also features dynamic cross-cuts and stylistic flourishes, and there is a great visceral power to the images of violence" (Gillespie 2000: 43-44).

Also remarkably, Eisenstein was one of the first to use literary tropes and phraseology as a kind of basis for his montage and visual imagery experiments. For example, depicting the scene "Separator" in the film "Генеральная линия" ("The general line", released in 1929 and co-directed with Grigori Aleksandrov), Eisenstein emphasizes that one of its core conceptual constituents is the cinematic metaphor of "milk fountains", which was derived from such figurative folklore phrases as *молочные реки*

(lit. *milk rivers*) and *кисельные берега* (lit. *kissel' (~ sweet jelly-like) riverbanks*), symbolizing material prosperity in the Russian culture (Эйзенштейн 1964: 85). In his paper, Caroll recalls how Eisenstein cuts from images of Kerensky in the film "Октябрь" ("October", released in 1927) to a mechanical peacock and emphasizes that to understand "this interpolation, one must remember the Russian saying *proud as a peacock*" (1996: 413). Christie (1991: 178) mentions Eikhenbaum's claim that "film metaphor is entirely dependent on verbal metaphor" was "of prime importance to Eisenstein in the development of his conception of 'intellectual cinema' and many of the montage 'tropes' " created in his films. The researcher concludes that "what was at stake in the sound revolution, for the montage school, was nothing less than the underlying principle of montage itself, the poetic interplay of inner speech and montage figures, the participation of the spectator as actor" (op. cit.).

So, in his filmmaking work and theoretical writings, Eisenstein developed the "metaphor principle" whose origin can be traced back to the language and to the literary usage. He paid special attention to the metaphor's structure, its psychological affectivity, "regularity of its emergence and presence at a certain level of a thematically required impression" (Эйзенштейн 1964: 200). Eisenstein's experiments with movement (or moving) images and with staging verbal tropes on the screen were aimed at both creating the maximum psychological impact and provoking or receiving the greatest emotional response. Being such, they are closely related to the notion of cinematic performativity, which is part and parcel of the modern cinema theory. Eisenstein shared his belief in the future of the sound cinema with numerous other outstanding film specialists. From his point of view, sound as a new technical invention was "an organic exit from many blind alleys rather than an occasional moment in the history of cinema" (Эйзенштейн et al. 1964: 315-316). In accordance with Eisenstein, sound (and I would add the speech sound) treated as a new montage element and as an independent constituent alongside the visual image inevitably brings a new means of enormous power to the cinematic expressivity and performativity.

Thus, revising the fundamental issue of the word relevance in the cinematic art foregrounds another fundamental issue of cinematic performativity. Eisenstein's conception of the sound and the word as the acting forces of creative filmmaking gives an initial impetus to the awareness that they are closely related to the phenomenon of cinematic performativity, which is characterized nowadays by an intensive research interest on the part of many contemporary disciplines and interdisciplines.

2. Theoretical framework: Integrating cinematic performativity with linguistic creativity

The notion of "cinematic performativity" has acquired a wide range of interpretations in the course of its development from the silent cinema epoch to the modern cinema production based on digital technologies. Nowadays, its understanding is characterized by the blend of a number of well-known theories as well as approaches that serve as theoretical groundings for modern film studies and are further elaborated in various interdisciplinary perspectives.

The analysis of modern film literature has shown that the most influential approaches and theories ensuring the development of the cinematic performativity theory are as follows: Austin – Searle speech act theory with the key tenet of equating words with deeds (see, e.g., the approach to cinematic verbal images as illocutionary acts (Carroll 1996); Chomsky's conception of linguistic performance and linguistic creativity (Chomsky 1964; 1966); Butler's theory of gender performativity (Butler 1990); Iser's conceptions of the fictive and the imaginary, his ideas of the text as a living event, performance, or a staged play (Iser 1993); Sobchak's neo-phenomenological approach to cinema with the central idea of the [film] narrative produced by spectators in their embodied experiences of film-viewing (Sobchak 1992; 2004); Deleuze's views on cinema, his concepts of "the movement-image" and "the time-image", of "the cinema of the body" as opposed to "the cinema of the brain", of speech as a dimension of the visual image (Deleuze 1989); the theory of metaphoric performativity in different arts

(including the cinematic art) and science, e.g., gene-technological experiments (Hallensleben 2003; Cinematic metaphor 2018); the theory of the comic performativity or the performative theory of humour (Velten 2009).

Generalization of numerous contemporary film studies makes it possible to conclude that cinematic performativity is conceived in terms of a number of correlated notions, such as "action", "gesture", "event", "a staged play/game", "staging", "doing", "acting". Resting on these modern interpretations, I elaborate **a new approach to cinematic performativity connecting it with the notion of linguistic creativity** (see also Зыкова 2019).

In my research, cinematic performativity is understood as "staging" (or "performing", "acting") various verbal means (e.g., words, wide-spread literary tropes, free word-combinations, phraseological units) in the film medium. In cinematic discourse, this staging aims to achieve particular artistic purposes and results in the emergence of different cinematic (or film) images, cinematic (or film) tropes, including cinematic (or film) metaphors in particular. Verbal or verbally based cinematic metaphors affect the verbal expressions that underlay their formation in a creative way. Within the framework of cinematic metaphors, the initial verbal unit may undergo structural, semantic, grammatical, and pragmatic changes that shape a new (original, unusual, extraordinary) verbal form.

To give an insight into what the approach that is based on the integration of the notions of "cinematic performativity" and "linguistic creativity" seeks to show, I cite the following example, which is taken from the script of the film "Как поживаете?" ("How is your life?"), written in 1926 by Vladimir Mayakovsky (1893–1930), a leading figure of the Russian avant-garde Futurist movement. Though the film has never been staged, from my point of view, it proves to be a good example of how cinematic metaphors can arise owing to verbal expressions and influence the latter in a linguistically creative way.

In one of the scenes of the film script in part four, Mayakovsky (1958: 144) proceeds from the popular Russian idiom *на крыльях любви* (*on the wings of love*) and creates a movement image of a young man (Mayakovsky himself) and a young girl who fly up the stairs, with aeroplane wings growing behind their shoulders:

(Сцена) ***На крыльях любви***

70-72. У девушки и Маяковского появляются аэропланные крылья.

73-74. Девушка и человек вспархивают по лестнице.

(Scene) **On the wings of love**

70-72. The aeroplane wings start growing behind the shoulders of the young girl and Mayakovsky.

73-74. The young girl and the man fly up the stairs. /translated by the author/

The given example illustrates the following:

- it reveals the author's idea of creating a cinematic metaphor by means of a visual representation, and more specifically, by peculiar animation effects and the actors' (kinesthetic) performance of the expression *on the wings of love*;

- this presupposed visual-kinesthetic performance results in the radical linguistic transformation of the original verbal expression *on the wings of love* into a rather extended expression *to fly up the stairs with aeroplane wings of love suddenly growing behind a man's/woman's shoulders*;

- this linguistic transformation is a creative modification of the verbal unit under consideration, stemming from a newly created metaphorical image, which is rather comic;

- the new metaphorical image affects the original phraseological unit in the following way: a) its five-component composition changes into the fifteen-component composition; b) its adverbial structure transforms into the verbal one with the verb *to fly* as a pivotal structural element); c) its semantics acquires multiple additional senses, e.g., the beginning of love relations, getting away from

reality, striving to be modern and to be not like everybody else, etc; and d) its pragmatic function changes, as it is used to produce a humorous rather than dramatic effect.

Thus, creating a cinematic metaphor implies in this particular case the cinematic performance or cinematic staging of a certain verbal item (*on the wings of love*) that underlies this cinematic metaphor. As a result, a new, unique (unusual, extraordinary) verbal form emerges – a fact that exposes the cause-effect connection between such two fundamental phenomena as cinematic performativity and linguistic creativity. The interrelation described above is far more intricate than it might seem at first sight. In an attempt to explore it comprehensively, I proceed to special methodology that should be applied to the fiction film material to get an insight into how the underlying blending mechanism works.

3. Material and methodology

The research was conducted on the basis of a specific type of fiction films – comedy films. I selected and analyzed eight popular comedy films directed by famous Soviet film directors and released in the 1960s and the early 1970s. These years are known as the period of "The Thaw" and the time of a new wave of artistic experimentation in the Soviet cinema art:

- "Полосатый рейс" ("Striped trip", directed by Aleksandr Sery; released in 1961);
- "Семь нянек" ("Seven nannies", directed by Rolan Bykov; released in 1962);
- "Три плюс два" ("Three plus two", directed by Genrikh Oganisyan; released in 1963);
- "Добро пожаловать, или Посторонним вход воспрещен" ("Welcome, or no trespassing", directed by Elem Klimov; released in 1964);
- "Дайте жалобную книгу!" ("Give me a book of complaints!", directed by Eldar Ryazanov; released in 1965);

- "Бриллиантовая рука" ("The diamond arm", directed by Leonid Gaidai; released in 1968);
- "Джентльмены удачи" ("Gentlemen of fortune", directed by Aleksandr Sery; released in 1971);
- "Невероятные приключения итальянцев в России" ("Unbelievable adventures of Italians in Russia", directed by Eldar Ryazanov and Franco Prosperi; released in 1973).

The cinematic material under consideration encompasses different subtypes of film comedy: romantic, social, adventure, criminal, screwball (eccentric). It is worth special mention that in modern investigations of performativity attention to the comic or the ludic becomes a central concern insofar as, according to Sherzer (2002), it contains a high level of metadiscourse and social critique (see also Marina (2018), in which the category of the paradoxical is analyzed). Due to their special pragmatic essence, comedy films prove to be especially prolific in the study of cinematic performativity. Comedy films are deliberately designed to entertain, "to amuse and provoke laughter by exaggerating the situation, the language, action, relationships, and characters" (Filmsite.org). Horton (1991: 5) writes that:

"A work that is identified in any way as comic automatically predisposes its audience to enter a state of liminality where the everyday is turned upside down and where cause and effect can be triumphed over and manipulated. Comedy thus can be partially described as a playful realm of consecrated freedom".

It is emphasized that "comedy is a form of 'play' that embraces fantasy and festivity" (A companion to film comedy 2012: 3). King (2002: 5) also notes:

"Comedy tends to involve departures of a particular type – or particular kinds – from what are considered to be the 'normal' routines of life of the social group in question. In order to be marked out as comic, the events represented – or the mode of representation – tend to be different in characteristic ways from what is usually expected in the non-comic world. <…> Comedy can result from a sense of things being out of place, mixed up or not quite right, in various ways".

Additionally, from the linguistic point of view, it is remarkable that comedies are "always attentive to the mechanisms of popular language" (Viganò 1995: 15), which is full of witty and easily recognizable words and phrases, paremiological and idiomatic units that can be chosen for staging on the screen in order to achieve a strong emotional reaction (mainly laughter) on the part of the viewer.

The methodology developed in my research involves several analytical stages based on the application of particular research methods. These stages are as follows: (I) recognizing (or reconstructing) cinematic metaphors in films, (II) analyzing the cinematic performativity of the verbal unit that underlies a cinematic metaphor, and (III) measuring the linguistically creative potential of the cinematic metaphor that manifests itself in the extent of transformations (or modifications) of the verbal unit that gave rise to this cinematic metaphor.

Stage I – Recognizing (or reconstructing) cinematic metaphors in films.

One of the key challenges in studying cinematic and multimodal metaphors is their recognizability in the cinematic material. In modern film literature, this issue is approached from many different perspectives and with the application of different methods, such as, e.g., cognitive methods based on the conceptual metaphor theory and image-schemas (Eggertsson & Forceville 2009; Forceville 2017); the method of identifying waking metaphors (multimodal and monomodal) as opposed to sleeping metaphors (Müller 2008; Müller & Ladewig 2013); the method of transcribing multimodal discourses including cinematic or multimodal images as their immediate constituents (Baldry 2004).

Of particular interest is the conception of cinematic metaphor recognizability offered by Carroll (1996). The researcher establishes the following properties that help recognize a cinematic metaphor or qualify some film figure as a cinematic metaphor: *superimposition* (providing a selective mapping of the target domain with the source domain); *homospatiality* (implying that disparate elements are visually incorporated

into one spatially bounded homogeneous entity, inhabit the same space-time coordinates); *physical noncompossibility* (meaning that the physically noncompossible elements must be literally co-present in the same object or state of affairs); *falsity* or *apparent falsity* (indicating that cinematic metaphors are intentionally made to represent something non-existent in reality, which opposes them to what physically possible entities represent in a fantastic world); *symbolization* (meaning the need for symbolic interpretation); *visual salience* (implying that all relevant elements composing a cinematic metaphor must be salient, i.e. they must stand out); *heuristic value* (suggesting that cinematic metaphors facilitate the spectator's apprehension of the putative relation, comparison, or fact, and let the spectator make some discoveries in the process of exploring the image); *language dependence* (meaning a degree of relatedness of cinematic metaphors to particular language means, i.e. words, phrases, or expressions).

According to Carroll (1996), composite figures that have these properties or meet these requirements can be successfully identified as film metaphors. The author puts special emphasis on the link of cinematic metaphors to language and elaborates the notion of (cinematic) verbal images. This link can manifest itself either directly, when corresponding language units accompany the unfolding of film metaphors or give a cue to their interpretation, or indirectly. However, as Carroll notes, even if there is no accompanying text, the spectator can supply it, or, in other words, can "find the words through the pictures" or elicit the words from the pictures (ibid., 187).

In my research, I deal with cinematic metaphors that are derived from verbal units. Therefore, the process of recognizing such cinematic metaphors consists in the search of the cases of cinematic acting (or staging, performing) language items of different structural-semantic types (e.g., special words or terms, familiar literary tropes, phraseological units). One of the factors of recognizing verbally based cinematic metaphors is the oral or written form of representation of the verbal units underlying these cinematic metaphors in the analyzed comedy films. Another factor is deciphering

the initial verbal source through the analysis of the specifics of constructing a cinematic metaphor in the comedy films, taking into account the various aspects, constituents, and devices involved in its composition.

Thus, as a point of departure in the process of recognizing cinematic metaphors, the verbal structure of the comedy films under consideration is explored, particularly the possible ways of staging or performing their verbal elements on the screen.

Stage II – Analyzing the cinematic performativity of the verbal unit that underlies a cinematic metaphor

At this stage of the analysis, the main objectives are not only to study how a verbal unit is staged in the comedy films under consideration, giving rise to a certain cinematic metaphor, but also to establish what modalities are involved in the process of translating this verbal unit into a rather complex multimodal form – a cinematic metaphor as a new perceptual whole. Since a cinematic metaphor is a type of multimodal metaphors, one of the questions that has to be considered first is what the term 'modality', or 'mode', means.

From Forceville's point of view (2009), when studying multimodal metaphors, 'modalities' or 'modes' should not be linked to the five senses (sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch), since such an approach allows arriving at a rather "crude" categorization of modes that can be presented in the following way: 1) the pictorial or visual mode; 2) the aural or sonic mode; 3) the olfactory mode; 4) the gustatory mode; and 5) the tactile mode. The main drawback of this perspective is that it is impossible to clearly distinguish between modalities or modes as, e.g., "the sonic mode under this description lumps together spoken language, music, and non-verbal sound" (ibid., 22). In his turn, the researcher claims that the list of modalities or modes should include, at least, the following ones: 1) pictorial signs; 2) written signs; 3) spoken signs; 4) gestures; 5) sounds; 6) music; 7) smells; 8) tastes; and 9) touch.

According to contemporary studies of multimodal metaphors, the relevance of these modalities may differ depending on the media environment. For example, Eggertsson and Forceville (2009: 430) state that "in film, the list of modes includes at least: visuals, written language, spoken language, sound, and music". Rohdin (2009: 404) also points out that the creation of multimodal metaphors in fiction films is based on the modalities or modes that include five different signs: pictorial signs, written signs, spoken signs, non-verbal sounds, and music. Carroll defines cinematic metaphors as composite figures constructed by a number of techniques. Analyzing cinematic verbal images as well as film metaphors, the researcher claims that they "can be propounded by every channel of articulation available to the medium including blocking, lighting, set design, camera placement, movement, and angulation as well as editing, special effects, and overall narrative organization" (1996: 189). Besides, video-image processing, costuming, and computer-generated imaging can also be added. The researcher regards the camera movement as one of the unique means for projecting verbal images in film. In particular, Carroll notes that "the variables of speed, direction and shape in camera movement can each be exploited to produce verbal images; Ophuls' circular movement in *Lola Motes*, for example, are 'encirclements' in the sense of entrapments" (ibid., 191).

In the book "Cinematic metaphor", the "CinMet procedure" is elaborated to study cinematic metaphors that are interpreted in terms of temporal gestalts. According to the conception presented in the book, "film images develop as movement patterns, combining different staging tools like sound composition, montage rhythm, camera movements, and acting into one temporal gestalt" (Cinematic metaphor 2018: 131). The authors claim that CinMet addresses temporal structures on the macro, meso, and micro levels and is applicable, in particular, to the analysis of cinematic metaphors arising in films. Of special significance for my research is the micro level since it intends to spell out the metaphoricity emerging in the film as well as the functioning of verbal metaphorical expressions. To analyze the specifics of cinematic metaphors emerging in the film medium, the book suggests the following core aspects of aesthetic expressive movement units which may be taken into account: camera; montage; sound;

acting; mise-en-scène; choreography; image composition; dialogue and written words (Cinematic metaphor 2018: 236).

Resting on the approaches described above, I single out the following six parameters to explore the specifics of the cinematic staging of the verbal units that "trigger" cinematic metaphors in the comedy films under consideration:

1. The form of presenting the verbal unit in a comedy film: spoken or written; spoken and written; neither spoken, nor written.

2. The duration of staging the verbal unit that underlies a particular cinematic metaphor as well as its location in the temporal structure of the comedy film.

3. Verbal sequence: all the verbal means involved in staging the target verbal unit and forming the whole verbal structure of the cinematic metaphor; type of this verbal structure, e.g., dialogue, description, etc.).

4. Visuals construction: the description of mise-en-scène (time and place of action, characters (performers), set design, costumes and make-up, props and accessories), camera position and moves, montage, shot transitions, shooting angle, light values, contrast and color distribution, etc.

5. Sound design: music, sounds and noises, acoustic effects, sound volume and tempo.

6. Kinetics (or kinesthetic sequences): a wide range of exteroceptive and proprioceptive modalities characterizing the actors' playing, such as their movement and position in space, gestures, body movements, facial expressions, etc.

The study of these cinematic parameters discloses how different modalities interact in the process of the cinematic staging of verbal means and helps to understand which modalities are more relevant in this process. Thus, this study establishes **the multimodal strategy of creating cinematic metaphors in the comedy films** in question and their linguistically creative potential manifested in various linguistic transformations that the verbal units undergo while generating the cinematic metaphors and when serving as their core elements in the film medium.

Stage III – Measuring the linguistically creative potential of the cinematic metaphor.
This or that multimodal strategy determines a certain extent of transformation of the verbal unit in the cinematic metaphor it underlies. Therefore, this stage of the analysis focuses on the specifics of this transformation, which is analyzed in accordance with the following aspects: a) structural changes in the verbal unit; b) grammatical changes in the verbal unit; c) semantic changes in the verbal unit; and e) pragmatic changes in the use of the verbal unit that are evoked by the implementation of the comic through the transformations it underwent as part of a cinematic metaphor.

To sum up, the whole research procedure comprises three consecutive stages of analysis that reveal how verbal means of different structural-semantic types are staged (performed) in the comedy films under consideration, giving birth to the cinematic metaphors in which these verbal means change their initial linguistic properties and acquire novel, original features in order to produce a peculiar pragmatic and aesthetic effect in the comedy films in question.

4. Results and discussion: Multimodal strategies of cinematic performativity and linguistically creative potential of cinematic metaphors

The analysis has shown that cinematic metaphors in the comedy films under consideration may originate in the verbal units that can be grouped into the following two main classes:

1. **Non-figurative verbal units**, i.e. words, free word-combinations, and sentences. For example, in the comedy film "Семь нянек" ("Seven nannies"), the utterance of the word *выдох* (*exhalation* – 'the action of sending air out of one's lungs') is synchronized with the image of the city embankment in its foreground and a few houses and factory buildings in its background. The factory chimney stacks emitting steam and smoke stage figuratively the idea of the city's "*exhalation*", which gives rise to the cinematic metaphor of the city's vital activity, dependent (like any human being's vital activity) on the ability to breathe (see Fig. 1).

Выдох (Exhalation)
Figure 1. The cinematic metaphor based on the word *выдох (exhalation)*

2. Figurative verbal units, i.e. figurative lexis, widely-spread literary or verbal tropes, various phraseological and paremiological units. For example, in the comedy film "Полосатый рейс" ("Striped trip") Gleb Shuleikin (interpreted by Evgeniy Leonov) in his conversation with the cook (interpreted by Arkadiy Trusov) characterizes the chief mate Oleg Petrovich (interpreted by Ivan Dmitriev), saying that the latter is *серьезный товарищ, капитан-то против него пожиже будет* (*a serious guy, the captain is going to be "thinner" against him* /translated by the author/). This phase is being uttered at the moment when Shuleikin is stirring the simmering soup with a spoon and pouring the soup from the spoon into the pot, thus testing its thickness (cf., *thin soup*) (see Fig. 2, images 1 and 2).

(1) [Oleg Petrovich is] *A serious guy…*   (2) *The captain is going to **be "thinner" against him**.*

Figure 2. The cinematic metaphor based on the word combination *быть пожиже кого-либо* (fig. be "thinner" against someone else)

In the Russian language, the word *жидкий* is used to metaphorically denote a person who is 'not of a firm character or strong will', who is indecisive. The cinematic staging of the metaphorical phrase *быть пожиже кого-либо* (lit. *to be more "liquid" than someone else*; ~ *to be "thinner" against someone else*) provides the emergence of a cinematic metaphor in which the protagonist's main traits of character, his essence, or human qualities as a personality are conceived in terms of the nutritional value of soup, of soup quality defined through its thickness.

Since the majority of verbally based cinematic metaphors are derived from phraseological and paremiological units, the elaborated research procedure and the results obtained in my work are further demonstrated on the basis of the second class of verbal units. The cinematic metaphors generated by the phraseological units *яблоку негде упасть* (lit. *there is no place for an apple to fall down* /translated by the author/) and *спустить кого-либо с лестницы* (lit. *to fling someone down the staircase* /translated by the author/) will serve as examples.

The phraseological unit *яблоку негде упасть* (lit. *there is no place for an apple to fall down*) means 'a place is so full of people or things that there is no free space at all'. It is used in the comedy film "Три плюс два" ("Three plus two"), which is about a holiday romance between two young men (interpreted by Evgeniy Zharikov and Andrey Mironov) and two young women (interpreted by Natalya Kustinskaya and Natalya Fateeva), respectively. In search of a place to spend their holidays far from overcrowded resorts, three young men (interpreted by Evgeniy Zharikov, Andrey Mironov, and Gennadiy Nilov) and two young women (interpreted by Natalya Kustinskaya and Natalya Fateeva) (these men and women did not previously know each other) happen to come to one and the same deserted beach on the coast of the Black Sea. Since the young people sought to flee overcrowded beaches, the film starts with a metaphorical presentation of what they tried to escape that is based on the cinematic staging of the phraseological unit *яблоку негде упасть*. It should be specially noted that this unit is not presented verbally in the film (either in oral or

written form). The specifics of its staging are presented in Figure 3 by a series of movement images (images 1-7) that can be described in the following way:

(image 1): The staging begins by introducing an overcrowded resort beach.

(images 2 and 3): While a young man with a hat full of apples in his arm is going along the beach, one of the apples falls out of his hat.

(images 4-6): The apple is flying around, making several attempts to fall down.

(image 7): With nowhere to land on the ground, the green apple comes back into the young man's hat.

Figure 3. The cinematic metaphor based on the phraseological unit *яблоку негде упасть* (lit. *there is no place for an apple to fall down*)

The analysis of this phraseological unit's cinematic performance leads to the establishment of an appropriate multimodal strategy used to transfer this verbal item into a certain cinematic metaphor. The results of the analysis conducted in accordance with the six parameters (or aspects) singled out in my research are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Specifics of the cinematic staging of the phraseological unit *яблоку негде упасть*
(lit. *there is no place for an apple to fall down*)

Parameters	*яблоку негде упасть* (lit. *there is no place for an apple to fall down*)
1. The form of presenting the verbal unit in the comedy film (spoken or written; spoken and written; neither spoken, nor written)	Neither spoken, nor written. The phraseological unit is performed by audio-visual means.
2. The duration of staging the verbal unit that underlies the cinematic metaphor and **its location in the temporal structure** of the comedy film	The duration of the staging is 31 seconds. The performance period lasts from 02 min. 47 sec. to 03 min. 18 sec.
3. Verbal sequence (all the verbal means involved in performing the target verbal unit and constituting the whole verbal structure of the cinematic metaphor; type of the verbal structure, e.g., dialogue, description, etc.)	*[none]*
4. Visuals construction (the description of mise-en-scène (time and place of the action, characters (performers), set design, costumes and make-up, props and accessories), camera position and moves, montage, shot transitions, shooting angle, light values, contrast and colour distribution, etc.)	The action takes place in summer on one of the beaches of the seacoast in the daytime. The characters (performers): extra actors and one main actor. At the beginning, several shots with extras; a few quick shot transitions giving different perspectives of the place of action – an overcrowded beach. The medium shots of the actor going along the beach with the hatful of apples in his right arm. The full shots of the green apple floating in search of the place to land on the ground. The movement of the camera, which focuses on the apple, is synchronized both with the movement of the apple flying in the air at some distance ahead of the man and with the occasional short stops the apple makes (tracking shot). The set design: outdoor location shooting with a picturesque scenery of the sea and the sea coast with some beach facilities on it, and (in the background) the images of the mountains and the typical flora of the place – all accentuate the important plot point of the film. The bright natural sunlight creates a rather cheerful, playful, and careless atmosphere.

5. Sound design (music, sounds and noises, acoustic effects, sound volume and tempo)	The cinematic staging of the phraseological unit as well as the unfolding of the cinematic metaphor it underlies are accompanied by lively music.
6. Kinetics (kinesthetic sequence) (a wide range of proprioceptive and exteroceptive modalities characterizing the acting, such as movement and position in space, gestures, body movements, facial expressions, etc.)	Extras represent numerous holidaymakers, engaged in different types of recreational activities on the beach, and, as opposed to them, one main actor – a vacationer, walking along the beach in search of a free space and carrying a hat full of apples in one arm. The man is walking rather slowly, stepping over the people sitting or lying everywhere on the beach; he is watching carefully his every step and the way his apple is flying; he has an intense facial expression. People on the beach are preoccupied with their own affairs (playing different games, reading, chatting, sleeping, sunbathing, eating, smoking, etc.) without paying attention to the young man who is trying to find some free space to join the holidaymakers. The green apple is flying smoothly through the air, making several attempts to land on the ground in different places, but fails and returns into the young man's hat.

The study of the cinematic staging of the phraseological unit *яблоку негде упасть* (lit. *there is no place for an apple to fall down*) has resulted in establishing particular cinematic techniques employed to synthesize the following three modalities (or modes) into a new complex perceptual whole: 1) the visual sequence, in which the camera movements, the shot transitions, the natural scenery, and the visual effects of the flying apple gain particular relevance; 2) the cheerful, lively music; 3) the kinesthetic sequence, in which the focus is on the young man walking along the beach, which is hampered by a large number of people sitting and lying all over on his way. All these cinematic techniques are indicative of **a specific multimodal strategy** that is applied for creating and unfolding the cinematic metaphor of "an overcrowded place (resort)" based on the phraseological unit *яблоку негде упасть*. Also noteworthy is the time when this cinematic metaphor emerges in the temporal structure of the comedy film "Three plus two". Emerging at the very beginning of the film, it depicts the motif that predetermines the casual acquaintance of the three young men and two young women, previously unacquainted, on one of the deserted spots of the seacoast and, therefore, serves as a core element in its storyline formation.

Of special interest further on is the linguistically creative potential of the analyzed cinematic metaphor that manifests itself in the ways and extent of modifications of its target verbal unit.

It should be specially noted that, within the framework of the cinematic metaphor, the phraseological unit *яблоку негде упасть* (lit. *there is no place for an apple to fall down*) undergoes particular structural, semantic, and pragmatic transformations. As a result of the cinematic staging, the apple acquires colouring (green) and is personified, i.e. it can fly, estimating the possibility of falling down in this or that place on the beach. This means that the base form of the phraseological unit changes from the three-component structure to the eight-component one: *яблоку негде упасть > зеленому летающему яблоку негде упасть на курортном пляже* (lit. *there is no place on the resort beach for the green flying apple to fall down*). The new extended structure of the phraseological unit is rather comic and intends to provoke laughter on the part of the film viewer. Its comic character is intensified by a specific type of sounding music accompanying the unfolding of the cinematic metaphor as well as by the behaviour of the holidaymakers, who seem to ignore a strange thing – the green apple flying in search of a place to land on the ground. Moreover, new semantic elements arise in the meaning of the phraseological unit in the process of its transformation into a new multimodal form – the cinematic metaphor. In this cinematic metaphor, *the green apple*, on the one hand, obtains the symbolic senses of temptation or a budding romantic relationship, and, on the other hand, becomes a symbol of discord between the three young men and the two young women who first took an oath of loyalty to their respective male and female friendship, but eventually broke it, giving way to the feeling of love that dawned on them.

As yet another example, it is worth considering the verbally based cinematic metaphor derived from the phraseological unit *спустить кого-либо с лестницы* (lit. *to fling someone down the staircase*) that denotes 'to force someone to leave one's house with disgrace by showing that (s)he is considered a dishonest and unworthy person'.

This phraseological unit is used in the criminal comedy film "Джентльмены удачи" ("Gentlemen of fortune") narrating a story about a group of criminals who steal the priceless helmet of Alexander the Great during an archaeological expedition. In order to find out where they hide the helmet, the police ask an amiable, good-hearted kindergarten principal named Evgeniy Ivanovich Troshkin (interpreted by Evgeniy Leonov), who looks exactly like the cruel gang leader nicknamed Docent[1], to perform the undercover role of his "twin". Troshkin, disguised as Docent, comes home to one of Docent's accomplices (interpreted by Aleksey Vanin) to get the information about the helmet. The accomplice, however, no longer wants to have anything to do with Docent and flings him down the staircase. As a result of the cinematic staging of the phraseological unit *спустить кого-либо с лестницы* (lit. *to fling someone down the staircase*), the cinematic metaphor of "breaking off from crime" emerges. The way it unfolds in the comedy film under analysis is presented in Figure 4 (images 1-12) by a series of movement images that can be described as follows:

(image 1): The kindergarten principal Troshkin, disguised as Docent, goes up the stairs of a block of flats and rings the doorbell of the flat of one of Docent's former accomplices.

(image 2): The former accomplice opens the door and comes out onto the stairwell.

(images 3-9): The former accomplice and Docent have a tough talk in which the former accomplice behaves rather aggressively.

(images 10-12): The talk ends in the former accomplice taking the "gang leader" by the collar of his coat and pushing him down the staircase into the street.

(3) The former accomplice: *Listen, Docent, did I tell you I'm done? Did I?*
(4) Docent: *Mmm…you did.*

(5) The former accomplice: *Did I say you better not come? Did I?*
(6) Docent: *Mmm... you did.*

(7) The former accomplice: *Did I tell you I'**d fling you down the staircase**? Did I?*
(8) Docent: *You did say THAT?*
The former accomplice: *Yes, I did.*

(9) The former accomplice: *Then, no offence!*

Figure 4. Cinematic metaphor based on the phraseological unit *спустить с лестницы*

The next step in my research is the establishment of those cinematic techniques and devices that are employed to transform the phraseological unit *спустить кого-либо с лестницы* (lit. *to fling someone down the staircase*) into a new multimodal form in order to create the cinematic metaphor of "breaking off from crime". The data obtained are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Specifics of the cinematic staging of the phraseological unit *спустить с лестницы* (lit. *to fling someone down the staircase*)

Parameters	*спустить с лестницы* (lit. *to fling someone down the staircase*)
1. The form of presenting the verbal unit in the comedy film (spoken or written; spoken and written; neither spoken, nor written)	The phraseological unit is spoken.
2. The duration of staging the verbal unit that underlies the cinematic metaphor and **its location in the temporal structure** of the comedy film	The duration of the staging is 61 seconds. The performance period lasts from 44 min. 37 sec. to 45 min. 38 sec. The phraseological unit is pronounced on the 45th min. 28-29th sec.
3. Verbal sequence (all the verbal means involved in performing the target verbal unit and constituting the whole verbal structure of the cinematic metaphor; type of the verbal structure, e.g., dialogue, description, etc.)	The phraseological unit is used in a dialogue containing a number of prosodic, lexical, syntactical, and stylistic devices: expressive-emotive intonation modulations, a cluster of parallel syntactical constructions, elliptical sentences, lexical repetitions, the syntactical figures of anaphora and gradation, emotive use of interjections.
4. Visuals construction (the description of mise-en-scène (time and place of the action, characters (performers), set design, costumes and make-up, props and accessories), camera position and moves, montage, shot transitions, shooting angle, light	The action takes place in winter, in the evening, on the stairwell of a block of flats in the city. The characters (performers): the good-hearted kindergarten principal named Evgeniy Ivanovich Troshkin, disguised as the cruel gang leader nicknamed Docent (interpreted by Evgeniy Leonov), and one of Docent's former accomplices (interpreted by Aleksey Vanin).

values, contrast and color distribution, etc.	The camera movement is synchronized with the characters' movements (tracking shooting): the camera moves from the left to the right when Troshkin goes from the staircase to the former accomplice's flat and the camera moves in the "reverse" direction, i.e. from the right to the left, when the characters go from the accomplice's flat to the place at the stairwell where the accomplice flings Troshkin down the staircase and out into the snow.
	The alteration of the medium, full, and extreme long shots creates the multifocal perspective of perceiving the unfolding event.
	The shooting angle: (mainly) the two-shot (both protagonists in profile) with the stairwell in the background.
	The set design: indoor location shooting – a block of flats, the stairwell.
	The artificial light effects together with the medium shots render the atmosphere of intensifying tension between the two protagonists produced by the aggression on the part of the former gang member and the growing sense of fear on the part of "the gang leader" Docent.
5. Sound design (music, sounds and noises, acoustic effects, sound volume and tempo)	The cinematic staging of the phraseological unit and the compositional deployment of the cinematic metaphor it underlies are accompanied by staccato music with a slightly accelerating tempo that ends with one abrupt high-pitch sound to accentuate the moment when Docent "flies out" of the block of flats into the street.
	Voice contrast: a confident, firm voice of the former gang member is opposed to a halting voice of the gang leader (produces a humorous effect).
6. Kinetics (kinesthetic sequence) (a wide range of proprioceptive and exteroceptive modalities characterizing the acting, such as movement and position in space, gestures, body movements, facial expressions, etc.)	The main technique is a kinesthetic contrast.
	The former accomplice, a tall athletic young man is opposed to "the gang leader" – Docent, a short stout middle-aged man.
	The face-to-face confrontation positions of the protagonists.
	The slow offensive ("attacking") movement of the former accomplice is opposed to the slow retreating ("defending") movement of "the gang leader".
	The confident gaze of the former accomplice at the "gang leader" is opposed to the frightened, indecisive look of the "gang leader".
	The active gesturing of the former accomplice (various head movements, hand gestures, touches, and grabs) is opposed to the almost non-gesticulating "gang leader's" behaviour (few gestures, barely noticeable nods of the head).
	The pronunciation of the phraseological unit *to fling you down the stairs* (see image 7) is synchronized with the right-hand gesture made by the former accomplice to indicate the stairs from which the kindergarten principal Troshkin, disguised as the gang leader, will be roughly thrown down in a few seconds.

As the analysis has shown, the cinematic staging of the phraseological unit *спустить кого-либо с лестницы* (lit. *to fling someone down the staircase*) involves the application of certain cinematic techniques and devices, which results in synthesizing the following modalities (or modes) as a new perceptual whole: 1) the verbal sequence whose nucleus is the phraseological unit in question; 2) the visuals in which the place of action (the stairwell of a block of flats) and the camera movements are meant to highlight the focal aspects of the staging; 3) the staccato music sounds; 4) the kinesthetic sequence constructed on the contrast of the characters' movements and gesturing and on the employment of the hand gesture that points to the staircase and accompanies the speech presentation of the phraseological unit *спустить кого-либо с лестницы* (lit. *to fling someone down the staircase*). All these cinematic devices are integrated into **one multimodal strategy** used to create and unfold the cinematic metaphor of "completely breaking off from crime" in the comedy film "Gentlemen of fortune".

Of special interest is the linguistically creative potential of the cinematic metaphor under consideration. The multimodal strategy applied in its emergence modifies the phraseological unit that underlies this cinematic metaphor. Its two-component composition extends significantly by means of incorporating several new components, cf., *спустить кого-либо с лестницы* (lit. *to fling someone down the staircase*) > *спустить заведующего детского сада в роли уголовника-рецидивиста с лестницы жилого многоэтажного дома на улицу* (lit. *to fling the kindergarten principal disguised as a recidivist down the staircase of a block of flats into the street*). The structural modification evokes semantic transformations. The meaning 'to force someone to leave one's house with disgrace by showing that (s)he is considered a dishonest and unworthy person' acquires new semantic elements and changes into 'to force an exceptionally decent, honest, respectable person to leave one's house with great disgrace by showing that he is considered an extremely dishonest and unworthy person'. Besides, this man is not just thrown down the staircase. He has to "fly" through several flights of stairs until he reaches the ground floor, ending up outside. Arising

within the framework of semantics, the paradoxical contradiction between 'the man's high moral qualities and his being treated in an extremely disgraceful manner' solves concrete pragmatic tasks – it produces a comic effect and triggers the viewer's laughter. The former accomplice's attempt of "completely breaking off from crime", personified in this situation by the "false" criminal boss, is illusive and, therefore, absurd, ridiculous, and amusing.

Thus, deploying the cinematic metaphor in the process of film viewing affects the phraseological unit underlying it in that it makes the latter change (to a certain extent) structurally, semantically, and pragmatically. This fact testifies to the linguistically creative possibilities of this cinematic metaphor. In general, my experience shows that cinematic figurativeness related to phraseological imagery is among the most stable and productive in cinematic comedy discourse.

5. Conclusion

In the present paper, the research focus was on the exploration of the verbal means that underlie cinematic metaphors as the pivotal constructive elements of the artistic medium of the cinematic discourse and, more specifically, of the Soviet comedy films released in the 1960s and the early 1970s.

According to the analysis conducted, cinematic metaphors have a long-standing research record. The paper traced the way of their historical development back to the theoretical writings of Sergey Eisenstein – a world-famous film director and theorist who was one of the founders of the cinematic metaphor theory. His works highlight a high relevance of the word as such and of language figurativeness in creating cinematic metaphors, particularly montage and visual metaphors that are presented in the film to achieve maximum psychological impact. As was shown, Eisenstein's approach opens up new areas for the exploration of cinematic performativity, which forms part and parcel of the modern film theory.

Taking into account the classical and contemporary works in the field explored, I attempted to elaborate a new approach to cinematic performativity, connecting it with the notion of linguistic creativity. In my research, cinematic performativity is understood as "staging" (or "performing", "acting") various verbal means in the film medium, which results in the emergence of cinematic metaphors that, in their turn, affect the verbal units that underlie their formation in a creative way.

The complex methodology developed in my research includes three consecutive stages of analysis based on the application of particular research methods: (I) recognizing (or reconstructing) cinematic metaphors in films; (II) analyzing the cinematic performativity of the verbal unit that underlies a cinematic metaphor; and (III) measuring the linguistically creative potential of the cinematic metaphor that manifests itself in the extent of transformations (or modifications) of the verbal unit that gave rise to this cinematic metaphor.

The application of this methodology to the analysis of popular Soviet comedy films let me draw the following main deductions.

The verbal units underlying the cinematic metaphors in the comedy films under consideration can be of two kinds: 1) non-figurative verbal units, i.e. words, free word-combinations, and sentences; 2) figurative verbal units, i.e. figurative lexis, widespread literary tropes, various phraseological and paremiological units. In accordance with the research findings, the figurative verbal units prove to be more productive in constructing cinematic metaphors than the non-figurative ones.

Staging the verbal sources of both kinds involves the employment of certain multimodal strategies that provide their transfer into the new – filmic – medium. These multimodal strategies consist in blending different modalities (or modes), in forming their peculiar combinations to create new intricately structured perceptual wholes – cinematic metaphors. As was confirmed, the rather frequent multimodal strategies,

described in detail in the paper, are based on the synthesis of the following three or four modalities, correspondingly: 1) 'visual sequence – music – kinesthetic sequence' (the case study of the cinematic metaphor of "a overcrowded place (resort)" generated by the phraseological unit *яблоку негде упасть*); 2) 'verbal sequence – visual sequence – music – kinesthetic sequence' (the case study of the cinematic metaphor of "completely breaking off from crime" rooted in the phraseological unit *спустить с лестницы*). The research findings (presented in Tables 1-2) show that each modality consists of a number of sub-modalities whose relevance and prominence differs with regard to particular cinematic metaphors. For instance, the comparison of the kinesthetic sequences reveals a high degree of salience and significance of the protagonist's walking movement in making up the first cinematic metaphor under consideration and the use of the kinesthetic contrast in the second one.

The creation of cinematic metaphors evokes certain structural, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic changes of the underlying phraseological units that can be regarded as manifestations of the linguistically creative power of these cinematic metaphors. New (original, unusual, extraordinary) forms of verbal units **serve the purpose of expressing in a (rather or very) creative way the ludic** and **the comic** as the fundamental ethical and aesthetic categories of cinematic art.

Notes

1. In Russian, the word *docent* is used to denote 'a member of the teaching staff in higher school immediately below professorial rank'. In the film, this word used as a nickname (*Docent*) implies the gang leader's special traits of character.
2. All the examples and titles in the text have been translated by the author.

References

Baldry, A. (2004). Phase and transition, type and instance: Patterns in media texts as seen through a multimodal concordance. In *Multimodal discourse analysis: Systemic functional perspectives*. O'Halloran, K. (ed.). London – New York: Continuum, p. 83-108.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.

Carroll, N. (1996). *Theorizing the moving image*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1964). *Current issues in linguistic theory*. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, N. (1966). *Topics in the theory of generative grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.

Christie, I. (1991). Making sense of early Soviet sound. In *Inside the film factory new approaches to Russian and Soviet cinema*. Taylor, R. & Christie, I. (eds.). London – New York: Routledge, p.175-192.

Cinematic metaphor: Experience – affectivity – temporality. Müller, C. & Kappelhoff, H. (2018). (eds.). Berlin: DeGruyter.

A companion to film comedy. (2012). Horton, A. & Rapf, J. (eds.). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Deleuze, G. (1989). *Cinema-2. The Time-image*. Translated by Tomlinson, H. & Galeta, R. London: The Athlone Press.

Eggertsson, G.Th. & Forceville, Ch. (2009). Multimodal expressions of the HUMAN VICTIM IS ANIMAL metaphor in horror films. In *Multimodal metaphor*. Forceville, Ch. & Urios-Aparisi, E. (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 429-449.

Eisenstein, S. (1964). *Selected works*. Moscow: Iskusstvo. Vol. 3. / Ejzenshtejn, S. *Izbrannyye proizvedeniya*. Moskva: Iskusstvo. T. 3. / Эйзенштейн, С. *Избранные произведения*. Москва: Искусство. Т. 3.

Eisenstein, S., Pudovkin, V. & Alexandrov, G. (1964). The future of sound films. Application (1928). In *Sergey Eisenstein. Selected works*. Moscow: Iskusstvo. Vol. 2, p. 315-316. / Ejzenshtejn S., Pudovkin V., Aleksandrov G. Budushcheye zvukovoj fil'my. Zayavka (1928). In *Sergej Ejzenshtejn. Izbrannyye proizvedeniya*. Moskva: Iskusstvo. Tom 2, s. 315-316. / Эйзенштейн С., Пудовкин В., Александров Г. Будущее звуковой фильмы. Заявка (1928). In *Сергей Эйзенштейн. Избранные произведения*. Москва: Искусство. Том 2, с. 315-316.

Filmsite.org. Available at: http://www.filmsite.org/genres.html

Fischer, L. (1999). Film editing. In *A companion to film theory*. Miller, T. & Stam, R. Oxford: Blackwell, p. 64-83.

Forceville, Ch. (2009). Non-verbal and multimodal metaphor in a cognitivist framework: Agendas for research. In *Multimodal metaphor*. Forceville, Ch. & Urios-Aparisi, E. (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 19-42.

Forceville, Ch. (2017). From image schema to metaphor in discourse. The FORCE schemas in animation films. In *Metaphor. Embodied cognition and discourse.* Hampe, B. (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 239-256.

Gillespie, D. (2000). *Early Soviet cinema: Innovation, ideology and propaganda*. London: Wallflower.

Hallensleben, M. (2003). Performance of metaphor: The body as text-text implantation of body images. In *Performance and performativity in German cultural studies*. Duttlinger, C., Ruprecht, L. & Webber, A. (eds.). Oxford – Bern – Berlin: Peter Lang, p. 241-256.

Horton, A. (1991). Introduction. In *Comedy, cinema, theory*. Horton, A. (ed.). Berckley: University of California Press.

Iser, W. (1993). *The fictive and the imaginary: Charting literary anthropology*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

King, G. (2002). *Film comedy*. Chippenham: Antony Rowe.

Marina, O. (2018). Cognitive and semiotic dimensions of paradoxicality in contemporary American poetic discourse. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, III (1), June 2018, p. 179-222. DOI: 10.2478/lart-2018-0006

Marinetti, F.T., Corra, B., Settimelli, E., Ginna, A., Balla, G. & Chiti, R. (1916). La cinematografia futurista. In *L'Italia futurista*, 10. Available at:

https://www.futurismo.org/futurismo/manifests/la-cinematografia-futurista/

Mayakovsky, V. (1958). *Complete collection of works*. Moscow: Artistic literature. Vol. 11: Screenplays and plays 1926–1930. / Mayakovskij V. *Polnoye sobraniye sochinenij*. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaya literatura. T. 11: Kinostsenarii i p'yesy 1926–

1930. / Маяковский В. *Полное собрание сочинений.* Москва: Художественная литература. Т. 11: Киносценарии и пьесы 1926–1930.

Müller, C. (2008). *Metaphors dead and alive, sleeping and waking. A dynamic view*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Müller, C. & Ladewig, S.H. (2013). Metaphors for sensorimotor experience. Gestures as embodied and dynamic conceptualizations of balance in dance lessons. In *Language and the creative mind*. Borkent, M., Dancygier, B. & Hinnel, J. (eds.). Standford: Standford University Press, p. 295-324.

Rohdin, M. (2009). Multimodal metaphor in classical film theory from the 1920s to the 1950s. In *Multimodal metaphor*. Forceville, Ch. & Urios-Aparisi, E. (eds.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, p. 403-428.

Sherzer, J. (2002). *Speech play and verbal art*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Sobchak, V. (2004). *Carnal thoughts. Embodiment and moving image culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sobchak, V. (1992). *The address of the eye. A phenomenology of film experience*. Princeton: Princeton University.

Velten, H.R. (2009). Laughing at the body: Approaches to a performative theory of humor. In *Journal of literary theory*, 3 (2), p. 253-374.

Viganò, A. (1995). *Storia del cinema. Commedia italiana in cento film*. Genova: Le Mani.

Zykova, I. (2019). Language play in construal of poetics of comedy film discourse. In *Proceedings of V.V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute*, 19, p. 205-214. / Zykova I. (2019). Yazykovaya igra v konstruirovanii poetiki komedijnogo kinodiskursa. In *Trudy Instituta russkogo yazyka im. V.V. Vinogradova*, 19, s. 205-214. / Зыкова И. (2019). Языковая игра в конструировании поэтики комедийного кинодискурса. In *Труды Института русского языка им. В.В. Виноградова*, 19, с. 205-214.

Contact data		**Fields of interest**
Irina Zykova DrSc. (Philology), Professor Leading Researcher at the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 125009, Bolshoj Kislovskij lane, 1/1, Russian Federation, e-mail: zykova_iv@mail.ru		Theoretical linguistics, cognitive linguistics, lexicography, semiotics, linguo-cultural studies, film studies, poetics of cinematic discourse, idiomatics of the avant- garde.

Résumé

The paper addresses one of the central problems in the interdisciplinary field of film and language studies that concerns the role of language in constructing and construing the cinematic figurativeness explored here in terms of the notions of "cinematic performativity" and "linguistic creativity". As a starting point, the issue of the word in the cinematic art is revisited. Special attention is paid to Eisenstein's contribution to the development of a trend which views language and language figurativeness as one of the crucial driving forces in creating cinematic metaphors (moving or movement images aimed at eliciting the viewer's strongest emotional reactions). Eisenstein's conception introduces the idea of cinematic performativity being rooted in speech sound. Following the classical as well as contemporary works in the field explored, the present research sets out to elaborate the theory of the integrative study of cinematic performativity and linguistic creativity that gives insights into their interrelatedness in constructing cinematic imagery. This theory is developed and tested on the basis of a certain type of fiction films – popular Soviet comedy films of the 1960s and the early 1970s. The films are explored by means of a complex methodology that comprises three consecutive stages of analysis: (I) identifying cinematic metaphors in the comedy films under study; (II) analyzing the cinematic performativity of the verbal units that underlie the identified cinematic metaphors; and (III) measuring the linguistically creative potential of the given cinematic metaphors. The research results in establishing two types of verbal units that underlie the cinematic metaphors of the comedy: non-

figurative verbal units and figurative verbal units. The present paper demonstrates that both types of verbal units become part of the performance in the analyzed comedy films by means of particular multimodal strategies that account for their creative modifications giving rise to particular cinematic metaphors and construing the comic as a key ethical and aesthetic category of cinematic art.