



Literature

Elixir Literature 75 (2014) 27583-27587

Elixir
ISSN: 2229-712X

Studying the allegorical metaphor and the course of its historical evolution from the perspective of rhetoricians

Kiamars Shahvali and Mohamad Janatifar

Department of Arabic Literature, Qom branch, Islamic azad university, Qom, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 17 August 2014;

Received in revised form:

20 September 2014;

Accepted: 6 October 2014;

Keywords

Allegorical metaphor,
Sakkaki, Qazvini,
Taftazani.

ABSTRACT

Allegorical metaphor is a kind of explicit metaphor in which the elliptic tenor as an abstract form of multiple grounds is compared to an explicit vehicle which is an abstract form of multiple grounds either. This figure of speech is a verbal masterpiece of human being and soaring beyond the heaven of the poetic images which has always had many controversies regarding its quality and quantity during its historical course. This descriptive article using content analysis attempts to study and compare the various and different opinions of the scholars of the art of the scheme from commencing of this term to the art of Arabic and Persian rhetoric up to present time to provide the interested readers of the art of the scheme and device of metaphor with a thorough understanding of the historical course and evolution of that figure.

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

Allegorical metaphor, or metaphorical synthetic trope, or allegory on the basis of metaphor, or allegory which once called Momasetat (analogy) had a place in the art of schemes (Badi') and some referred to it as metonymy. It has always been a common way of indirect expression of meanings and concepts among the sons of Adam and the living languages around the globe are replete with this kind of diction.

The heart of the matter is that "Allegorical metaphor is a kind of explicit metaphor in which the elliptic tenor as an abstract form of multiple grounds is compared to an explicit vehicle which is an abstract form of multiple things either and mostly from the common parables, while in order to exaggeration it claims the entering of the tenor into the matter of the vehicle and also has a synthetic ground of analogy and its presumption is always circumstantial. As an instance if we use the parable of "أب در هاون کوبیدن" – to beat the air – for someone who is engaging with a fruitless endeavor, we compared that engaging person (tenor) to someone who is pestling the water in a mortar – beating the air – (vehicle) and the ground of analogy would be the fruitless endeavor.

Precursors' views

For the first time Jāhīz has referred to this kind of metaphor in his book "al-Hayawān", however, without calling it as allegorical metaphor. He quoted the following verse from ibn-Mayādeh:

وأخري يصيب المجرمين سعيرها ناره: نار نار كل مدقع

Meaning: "He hath two fires, one which warmeth the destitute and one which burneth the criminal by its flame".

He said that his purpose is a fire on the basis of parable not truth (Jāhīz, 1996: vol, 5; p. 133). Undoubtedly, his reference to "on the basis of parable" is an indicative that his purpose is this kind of metaphor.

Abu-Hilal Askari named this kind of metaphor as Momasetat (analogy), although in his view the concept of this term includes the comparative allegory. Therefore, he defines that in this way:

موضوعه تكون بلفظة فيأتي معني، عن العبارة المتكلم يريد أن «المماثلة: أراده» (عسكري، 1995: الذي المعني أوردته عن إذا ينبئ أنه إلا آخر، لمعني (238).

Meaning: "Momasetat (analogy) is something that the speaker is willing to refer to a meaning, but he bring forth a word which is denoted for another meaning and when presenting that phrase comes with a context which evokes the connotational meaning".

Abd-Al-Ghafer explicitly referred to the metaphorical allegory and with an example explained that in this way:

«و أما التمثيل الذي يكون مجازاً لمجيبك به علي حد الاستعارة، فمثاله قوله للرجل يتردد في الشيء بين فعله و تركه: "أراك تُقَدِّمُ رَجُلًا و تُؤَخِّرُ أخري"» (1992: 68).

Meaning: "as for the allegory which is a trope, to the point that fact that you bring it forth to the degree of a metaphor it is like the saying to someone who is hesitant to do a job or not: I see you taking a step forward and then backwards". His purpose in this example is that the "أراك في ترددك كمن تُقَدِّمُ رَجُلًا و تُؤَخِّرُ" and tenor is omitted and the vehicle is explicit and because the tenor, vehicle, and grounds of analogy are extracted from multiple things and are synthetic, he termed it as metaphorical allegory.

Ibn-Athir accounted allegory as a kind of metonymy and regarded it as a simile on the basis of metonymy. Although he didn't mention the comparative allegory and allegorical metaphor in this kind of metonymy, the examples he presented some of them are metonymy, some comparative allegory, and some others allegorical metaphor. His definition in this part is close to the definition of allegorical metaphor because he says:

«التمثيل: و هو التشبيه علي سبيل الكناية، و ذلك أن تراد الإشارة إلي معني، فتوضع ألفاظ تدل علي معني آخر و تكون تلك الألفاظ و ذلك المعني مثالاً للمعني الذي قصدت الإشارة إليه» (ابن اثير، 1375: 157).

Meaning: "allegory is a simile on the basis of metonymy and defined as referring to the connotational meaning, therefore, the words which have connotative meaning are used and those used words are examples of referring to the intended meaning". One of the examples which is definitely an allegorical metaphor and ibn-Athir expressed it following this definition is the verse

{أَجِبُّ أَحَدَكُمْ أَنْ يَأْكُلَ لَحْمَ أَخِيهِ مَيْتًا فَكَرِهْنَاهُ وَ اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ تَوَّابٌ رَحِيمٌ} (الحجرات/12).

Sakkaki's view

Sakkaki didn't explain much about the allegorical metaphor and in the end of the discussion about the definite actual explicit metaphor (the first type of his five-fold division of metaphor) mentioned it in a form of example and this is raised a doubt that Sakkaki regarded the allegorical metaphor as a type of singular trope. What is concluded from this explanation of Sakkaki is that the allegorical metaphor is the comparison of an abstraction form of multiple things to other abstraction forms and omitting the tenor and assertion of the entering of the tenor into the matter of vehicle. However, Sakkaki represents the allegorical metaphor in this way:

«و من الأمثلة استعارة وصف إحدى صورتين منتزعتين من أمور لوصف الأخرى، مثل أن تجد إنساناً استفتي في مسألة، فيهم تارة بإطلاق اللسان ليجيب، و لايهم أخرى، فتأخذ صورة تردده هذا، فتشبهها بصورة تردد إنسان قام ليذهب في أمر، فتارة يريد الذهاب فيقدم رجلاً و تارة لا يريد فيؤخر أخرى، ثم تدخل صورة المشبه في جنس صورة المشبه به روماً للمبالغة في التشبيه، فكسوها وصف المشبه به من غير تغيير فيه بوجه من الوجوه على سبيل الاستعارة، قائلاً: أراك أيها المفتي تقدم رجلاً وتؤخر أخرى، وهذا نسيمه التمثيل على سبيل الاستعارة، و لكون الأمثال كلها تمثيلات على سبيل الاستعارة لا يجد التغيير إليها سبيلاً» (سكاكي، 1987: 376).

Meaning: "... and from the examples of metaphor. Metaphor is one of the two descriptive abstract forms of multiple grounds to other things like when you find a man who has been asked a question, then at a time he is willing to talk and answer the question and somwhen he is not willing so. Therefore, you compare this form of doubt to the form of a human kind of doubt who is hesitating to do a job, so he is sometimes willing to go and take a step forward and sometimes not willing and take a step backwards. In this case you enter the form of tenor into the matter of vehicle for exaggeration and enter the description of the vehicle into the tenor on the basis of metaphor as the form of expression that: you the person who were been asked, I see that you take a step forward and then a step backwards; this is what we call as allegory on the basis of metaphor and all the examples are allegory to metaphor".

Qazvini's view

Qazvini stated the allegorical metaphor with the name of synthetic trope, although in the middle of his discussion he mentioned it as allegory on the basis of metaphor. He even said that allegory was named as an absolute form (without any condition). He delved into the discussion with an objection to Sakkaki for including the allegorical metaphor under the rubric of the definite actual explicit metaphor and then he gives his definition by pruning the mentioned inappropriateness of Sakkaki's view back.

From the fact that Sakkaki put the allegorical metaphor under the rubric of the definite actual explicit metaphor Qazvini construes that he regarded it as a singular trope, therefore, he raise an objection to this and says:

«و فسر التحقيقية بما مرّ، و عدّ التمثيل على سبيل الاستعارة منها و فيه نظر، لأنّ التمثيل على سبيل الاستعارة لا يكون إلا مركباً كما سبق، فكيف يكون قسماً من المجاز المفرد؟ و لو لم يقيد الاستعارة بالإفراد. و عرفها بالمجاز الذي أريد به ما شبه بمعناه الأصلي مبالغة في التشبيه» (قزويني، 2011: 306).

Meaning: "He [Sakkaki] described the metaphor as it mentioned and accounted the allegory on the basis of the metaphor of that kind, while there is inappropriateness in it because as it was mentioned the allegory on the basis of metaphor does not happen synthetically. So, how can it be a part of the singular trope? Although he didn't confined the metaphor to the individuals and considered it as a trope by which a

meaning other than its denotational meaning has been inferred because of the exaggeration in tenor".

Qazvini after resolving his objection to Sakkaki's view describes his definition of the allegorical metaphor in this way:

«و أما المجاز المركب فهو اللفظ المركب المستعمل فيما شُبه بمعناه الأصلي تشبيه التمثيل للمبالغة في التشبيه، أي تشبيه إحدى صورتين منتزعتين من أمرين أو أمور بالأخرى، ثم تدخل المشبهة في جنس المشبه بها مبالغة في التشبيه، فتذكر بلفظها من غير تغيير بوجه من الوجوه» (قزويني، 2011: 297).

Meaning: "However, the synthetic trope is a word that is used in a meaning similar to its denotational meaning as a form of comparative allegory for exaggeration in simile, that is, simile is an abstraction form of two or more (of multiple) grounds to another, then the tenor is entered into the matter of the vehicle for exaggeration, thus the vehicle is stated without any change".

Taftazani's view

On the contrary to Qazvini, Taftazani divided the synthetic trope like singular trope into two types, synthetic trope on the basis of metaphor and non-metaphoric synthetic trope (free synthetic trope). In a condition that there is a ground of analogy between the two modes of abstraction that would be on the basis of metaphor and if the shared ground is non-analogical that would be named as non-metaphorical synthetic trope (Taftazani, 2004; p. 604) and said that it is a metaphor because the vehicle is stated and the tenor is completely omitted (Taftazani, 2004; p. 604).

The other point that Taftazani expressed in this regard is that because the use of the synthetic trope on the basis of metaphor is prevalent that was termed as parable. That is, he considers parable as an allegory which has become widely used on the basis of metaphor and conventionally termed as Kasir-alestema (widely used). He said that metaphor sometimes is called as allegoric and sometimes allegory; the reason he proposes for calling this kind of trope as allegory is that its grounds of analogy has been taken from multiple grounds and for listener/reader to differentiate between the allegory and comparative analogy he expresses that the difference between the two is that the comparative analogy is always bound to an allegory or an allegorical provision (his purpose is that in comparative analogy the word of analogy is certainly an allegory or allegorical provision), therefore, it will not be mistaken with the meaning of the allegorical metaphor (ibid).

After stating the definition of synthetic trope from the perspective of Qazvini and describing it, Taftazani, came to this conclusion from the discussion of the allegorical metaphor:

"The conclusion of the discussion of the metaphorical synthetic trope is that it is the comparison of one of the two abstraction forms of multiple forms to another one, then it can be claimed that the form of the tenor is of the matter of the vehicle; therefore, the word which is created for the form of vehicle as corresponding implication is attributed to the form of tenor (Taftazani, 2004; p. 604). After this conclusion he quotes the same sentence of Valid-ibn-Yazid as an example which has been described earlier.

The last point that Taftazani wrote about the allegorical metaphor is rejecting the objection of Qazvini against Sakkaki, because from the viewpoint of Qazvini, Sakkaki regarded the synthetic trope as singular for he dealt with that in the discussion about the actual explicit metaphor. Taftazani propounds two reasons for rejecting the objection of Qazvini: his first reason is that Sakkaki put the allegory as an absolute part of the actual metaphor (which includes the singular and synthetic) not a metaphor which is a singular trope. Thus he has said:

«و الجواب أنه عدّ التمثيل قسماً من مطلق الاستعارة التصريحية التحقيقية لا تا: ج 109/2). من الاستعارة التي هي مجاز مفرد» (تافتازاني، بي

And the second reason is that the case of division in Sakkaki's view was not singular trope, but it includes both singular and synthetic because he stated it in this way:

«إنَّ المجاز عند السلف قسمان: لغوي و عقلي، و اللغوي قسمان راجع إلى معني الكلمة و راجع إلى حكم الكلمة، و الراجع إلى المعني قسمان: خالٍ عن الفائدة و متضمن لها، و المتضمن للفائدة قسمان: استعارة و غير استعارة، و ظاهر أن المجاز العقلي و الراجع إلى حكم الكلمة خارجان عن المجاز بالمعني المذكور؛ فيجب أن يريد بالراجع إلى معني الكلمة اعمّ من المفرد و المركب ليصحّ الحصر في تا: ج 2/109). القسمين». (تفتازاني، بي

Meaning: "the trope from the view of precursors was two kinds: lexical and mental, and lexical is two types: one is about the meaning of the word and the other is about the sentence proposition (the purpose is mental and predicative tropes), and the trope regarding the meaning of the word is of two types: without benefit and beneficial, the beneficial one has two types: metaphor and non-metaphor, and the apparent sense of this discussion is that the mental trope regarding the sentence proposition outside of the tropical meaning have the explicit meaning, therefore it is necessary that "regarding the meaning of the word" be considered as both singular and synthetic, accordingly, the delimitation of the mentioned divisions remain true".

Exegetes' views

Tayyebi in the book "al-bayan va al-tabyin" explains the subject of the allegorical metaphor and analyze it by giving an example. His definition has no apparent difference from Qazvini's definition except in the matter that from his view the subject of the allegorical metaphor goes back to the aggregation between the Mostaar (borrowed word) and Mostaar Lah (tenor), but he considers that aggregation as a single representation. Therefore, he says on that matter:

«و هو أن يكون الجامع في حكم الواحد، و ذلك بأن تأخذ وصف إحدى الصورتين المنتزعة من أمور فتشبهه بوصف صورة أخرى يشابهه، ثم تُدخِل صورة به مبالغة» (طبيبي، 2011: 193). المشبه في جنس صورة المشبه

Meaning: "and that (metaphorical allegory) is a metaphor that its aggregation has a single representation and it is in this way that you take one of the multiple forms of abstraction and compare it to another form which shares grounds of analogy then enter the form of tenor into the matter of the form of vehicle". The other point that Tayyebi (2011) has referred to is the difference between the parable and allegory. In his view if in this kind of metaphor the Mostaar (borrowed word) is a common and widespread speech it is a parable and if it is other than this it would be an allegory. Therefore he says:

«فالمستعار إذا كان قولاً سائراً يشبه مضرته بمورده سُميَ متلاً، و إلا سُميَ تمثيلاً» (Tayyebi, 2011, p. 194).

Subki has not a special new thing about the allegorical metaphor and he confined himself to describe the Qazvini's view and just confirmed the Qazvini's view related to the position of allegorical metaphor and the objection of Sakkaki to that issue and defended it. Thus he first introduces the Khatibi's view on disconfirming the Qazvini's objection and then reject it with its own reasoning and says:

«و أجاب الخطيبي: بأنَّ المركب قد يطلق عليه كلمة، فتكون مراده بالكلمة في حدّ المجاز ما هو اعمّ من المفرد و المركب» (سبكي، 2009: 193).

Meaning: "and Khatibi in response to Qazvini said: sometimes the word is also attributed synthetically, so his (Sakkaki's) purpose of the word was in the realm of trope which

encompasses both singular and synthetic". Following this he raises an objection to Khatibi's view with the rationale that attribution of the word to synthetic and sentence is a trope and also requires the synthetic to have a denotational meaning. Thus he stated:

«و فيه نظر، لأنَّ إطلاق الكلمة على الكلام مجاز، و ايضاً فإنّه يستلزم أن يكون المركب موضوعاً» (سبكي، 2009: 193)

Eeji has briefly defined the allegorical metaphor in this way that it is a metaphor which is accounted as parable, but it is not an allegory:

«فلاستعارة التمثيلية هي التي تُعدّ مثلاً و ليس تشبيه التمثيل» (الإيجي، 1991: 90).

Contemporaries' views

Almaraghi considers the allegorical metaphor as a kind of metaphor in which exist a ground of analogy between the abstraction form of tenor and the abstraction form of vehicle, and on the other hand, these forms are extracted from multiple grounds. Thus he says:

«ما كانت علاقته المشابهة بين الهيئة المستعار منها و الهيئة المستعار لها، بأن تشبه إحدى صورتين منتزعتين من أمرين أو أمور بالأخرى، ثم يدعي أن الصورة المشبه من جنس الصورة المشبهة بها، فيطلق على الصورة المشبهة اللفظ الدالّ بالمطابقة على الصورة المشبه بها مبالغة في التشبيه» (المراغي، 1993: 287).

Meaning: "allegorical metaphor is a kind of metaphor that its relation between the form of Mostaar and the form of Mostaar menh (vehicle) is a ground of analogy, that is, one of the abstraction forms from two or more is compared to another one then argue that the form of tenor is of the matter of the form of the vehicle, therefore, the word which is created for the form of tenor as an attributive implication attributed to the form of tenor for exaggeration in comparison". He continues: this kind of metaphor is termed as allegorical metaphor, metaphor on the basis of allegory, or allegory without any provision. The criterion to distinguish it from the synthetic simile is that the synthetic simile is known as comparative allegory or allegorical (Al-Maraghi, 1993; p. 287). It should be mentioned that he considers this kind of metaphor as the most exaggerative of singular and synthetic metaphors (Al-Maraghi, 1993; p. 288).

From the view of Al-Maraghi the parable is an allegorical metaphor, but has reputation and widespread use and always comes in the same form, whether for singular or masculine or its other derivatives. He said in this respect:

«و إذا اشتهرت الاستعارة التمثيلية و كثر استعمالها سُميت مثلاً، و لا يغير مطلقاً محافظة على الاستعارة، فيخاطب به المفرد و المذكر و فرعهما بطريقة واحدة، كقولهم: أحشأ و سوء كيلة²» (المراغي، 1993: 287).

Meaning: "whenever the allegorical metaphor takes reputation and widely used, it is called parable and never changes for keeping the metaphor then by means of it, singular and masculine forms and other derivatives of the both are addressed with the same way like this Arabic speech: you both give me the stale date and the bad bushel (you are stinting)".

Habankeh in his brief definition considered the metaphor in synthesis as allegorical metaphor. He says:

«و أنّ الاستعارة في المركب تسمي "الاستعارة التمثيلية" (حبنكه، 1996: 265).

After this brief explanation he described it and states: "it is a metaphor in which the borrowed word is a synthetic one and this synthetic word has been used in a sense other than its

1 the meaning of "case" is the original form in which the speech (Mostaar or a structure which is quoted in the speech), and the meaning of "Mazrab" is a form that the word has been compared to or a form which is the purpose of the speaker (Mostaar Lah, tenor) (Al-Tahawoni, 1996; vol, 2; p. 1449).

² In this phrase: Mostaar la (tenor) is a person who has been damaged from two sides. Mostaar menh (vehicle) is the synthetic form and Vajh shabah (Jame, shared ground) is the damage received from multiple affairs, and the mentioned sentence is the lexical Mostaar (borrowed words).

denotational meaning, discursively speaking, because of the existence of the grounds of analogy between the denotational and connotational meaning along with a context that restrain it from the denotational meaning (Habankheh, 1996; p. 265)

Qalqileh delineated the allegorical metaphor in other way that although it has the concept of all the other views, but it is important because of its manner of expression. This is his saying in this respect:

«و الاستعارة التمثيلية ضرب من الاستعارة التصريحية؛ ففيها نصرح بالمشبه به المنكور في مكان المشبه، و لافرق بين استعارتين: التصريحية و التمثيلية إلا أنّ واحدة منهما تجري في المفرد و الأخرى تجري في المركب. نقول للقائد العائد منتصراً: عاد السيف إلى غرابه» (قليله، 1992: 62).

Meaning: “allegorical metaphor is a kind of explicit metaphor in which the vehicle is explicit and placed in the position of the tenor. There is no difference between the explicit and allegorical metaphors except in that one of them is realized singularly and the other synthetically. For example, we say to a commander who came back victoriously to home: He came back to home with his sword sheathed”. The point that the others didn't mention it and Qalqileh drew attention to it is that the context of allegorical metaphor because of not changing in all the modes is always circumstantial but not lexical or textual. Thus he says:

«و لا تكون قرينة التمثيلية إلا حالية» (قليله، 1992: 63).

Shamisa considers the synthetic metaphorical trope as a metaphor that its vehicle is a sentence which can be understood through rational contemplation that it was not used in its [literal] meaning, but with a ground of analogy conveys another meaning, like pestling water in the mortar which its meaning by comparison of the ground of analogy is the fruitless endeavor (1374, p. 177). The important point that he proposes is that he says:

“However, it had better use the allegorical metaphor for the cases that the synthetic metaphor has the characteristic of the *ersālolmasal* (adage) or proverb. So, as it mentioned before the allegorical metaphor is a synthetic vehicle which is realized as a *Masāl*” (1374, p. 177). There are two important points in this expression. One is that Shamisa has said that the use of allegorical metaphor is in the cases that synthetic metaphor has the characteristic of *ersālolmasal* or proverb, while is the using of the *Masāl* (parable) itself in the speech and it does not signify the *Masāl* as Jorjani in defining it stated that *ersālolmasal* is that the speaker inserts a famous parable in his speech (Jorjani, 1377, p. 40). The other point is that he argued that the allegorical metaphor is a synthetic vehicle which represents the *Masāl* which is the same as *Masāl* in his view.

Shafiee Kadkani categorizes the metaphor into two types in the respect that whether it is in the word or in the sentence, and holds that synthetic metaphor encompasses most of the proverbs and also the cases that tenor and vehicle are assumed from multiple grounds. Thus he argues:

Metaphor has been categorized into synthetic or allegorical metaphor and singular metaphor. Altogether most of the proverbs are included in the subject of synthetic or allegorical metaphor and also wherever a set of affairs to be considered, that is, transferring a collection of the meaning of a sentence which literally have special concept to something other than its literal concept (1375: p. 116).

Hashemi in the book “*Javaher al-Balaghah*” introduces the allegorical metaphor in this way:

«المجاز المركب بالاستعارة التمثيلية: هو تركيب استعمل في غير ما وضع له، لعلاقة المشابهة، مع قرينة مانعة من إرادة معناه الوضعي، بحيث يكون كل من المشبه و المشبه به هيئة منتزعة من متعدد - و ذلك بأن تشبه إحدى صورتين

منزعتين من أمرين، أو أمور بأخرى؛ ثم تدخل المشبه في الصورة المشبه بها مبالغة في التشبيه - و يسمى بالاستعارة التمثيلية» (هاشمي، 1367: 346).

Meaning: “synthetic trope to allegorical metaphor: that is a synthesis which is used as something other than its denotational meaning by means of a ground of analogy, and along with a context that refrains the assuming of its denotational meaning. It is in this way that one of the two forms extracted from the two or more affairs be compared to another thing then the tenor be represented in the form of vehicle for exaggeration. That is called the allegorical metaphor”.

Hashemi considers four cases of the differences between the comparative analogy and allegorical metaphor which consisted of: 1. in comparative analogy the tenor and particles of comparison are mentioned, while in allegorical metaphor just the explicit tenor is mentioned and the tenor and the particles of comparison are omitted. 2. It is permissible that comparative analogy be between to singular form, while the allegorical metaphor is just between two abstraction syntheses. 3. Comparative analogy does not need a context to refrain the realization of the denotational meaning. 4. Comparative analogy is a kind of truth, while the allegorical metaphor is a trope; therefore it is more exaggerative than the comparative analogy (Hashemi, 1376; p. 350).

Conclusion

There is no existential controversy regarding this metaphor, however, there has been controversies regarding its nomenclature and where it should be discussed. Qazvini assumed that Sakkaki placed it in the lexical singular metaphor because he [Sakkaki] mentioned it under the rubric of the discussion of the actual explicit metaphor, while it was not the case, and as Taftazani and others quoted the purpose of Sakkaki was not that, but he considered the allegory as a an absolute part of the actual metaphor which includes both the singular and synthetic not a metaphor which is a singular trope. However in this respect that some called it as *Masāl* (parable) , it should be said that a parable is called allegorical metaphor which in the manner of a common metaphor be prevalent and widely used.

The most simple and perfect definition can be stated in this way: allegorical metaphor is a synthesis which is used in a non-literal meaning other than its literal denotation because of the existence of the grounds of analogy and along with a context that refrain it from the realization of the connotational meaning of the speech. That is, the tenor which is an abstraction form of multiple grounds is compared to the vehicle which is also an abstraction form of multiple grounds either. As an instance if we use the parable “pestling the water in the mortar” for a person who is engaging a fruitless endeavor, the person who is engaging a fruitless endeavor (tenor) is compared to a person who is pestling the water in the mortar (vehicle); and the ground of analogy is that fruitless endeavor.

References

- Askari, A. H. (1995). *Industries*, a research by Muhammad Tahir Gablawy. Egypt: The Family Library.
- Eiji, A. (1991). *The benefits of Distress*, a research by Asheq Hussein. Beirut: The Lebanese Science Books.
- Gerjani, A. (1992). *Signs of Miracles*, a research by Mahmoud Mohamed Shaker. Jeddah: School of City.
- Gorgani, M. H. (1997). *Creating Innovations*, with the cooperation of Hussein Jafari (1st ed.). Tabriz: Ehrar Publication.
- Habannake, A. R. H. (1996). *Arabic Rhetoric and the Arts and Sciences* (Vol. 2). Damascus: School of Pen.
- Hashemi, A. (2005). *Jewels of Rhetoric in the Statement and the Meanings and Innovation* (1st ed.). Mostafavi Publication.

- Ibn Asir, Z. (1995). *The Great Knowledge in the Prose and Poetry*. Academy Press.
- Jahez, O. (1966). *Animal*, A research by Abdul Salam Mohammed Haroun. Cairo: the Matte Company of Al Babi and Sons.
- Maraghi, A. M. (1993). *Science and Rhetoric statement Meanings and Innovation* (Vol. 2). Beirut: School of Scientific Books.
- Qalqiliya, A. A. (1992). *Idiomatic Rhetoric* (2nd ed.). Cairo: School of Thought.
- Qazwini, J. (2011). *Clarification of Science in Rhetoric, achieving Mohammed Abdul Qader al-Fadhli*. Beirut: Modern Library.
- Sabaki, B. (2009). *Al Afrah bride in Describing the summary of the key* (Vol. 2), Researching Hameed Hindawi. Modern library.
- Sakaki, Y. (1987). *Science Key. Researching Naeem Zerzour* (Vol. 2). Beirut: School of Scientific Books.
- Shafie Kadkani, M. R. (1995). *Imagery in the Persian Poetry* (6th ed.). Tehran: the Agah Institute.
- Shamisa, S. (1994). *Expression* (5th ed.). Tehran: Ferdowsi.
- Taftazani, S. (2004). *Lengthy Explanation to Summarize the Key*. Beirut: The School for Reviving Arab Heritage.
- Taftazani, S. (ND). *Concise Description*. Qom: Dar Alhekma Publications.
- Tayeb, A. (1998). *The Best of Qur'an in the Interpretation of Qur'an*. Tehran: Islam Publication.
- Tayebi, H. (2011). *Clarification of the Semantics and the Magnificent Statement, Researching Hadi Attia Matar*. Beirut: The Science Books.