

Available online at: <https://miopap.aspu.am/index.php/miopap>

## GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE PECULIARITIES OF V. SIRADEGHYAN'S PROSE LANGUAGE AND VISUALIZATION TOOLS

DOI: 10.24234/miopap.v21i1.429

*Hovhannes Hovakimyan, MA in Armenian language and literature*

*Chair of Modern Armenian literature*

*Yerevan State University, Republic of Armenia*

*E-mail: [hovhanneshovakimian.hh@gmail.com](mailto:hovhanneshovakimian.hh@gmail.com)*

### **ABSTRACT**

*The work analyzes the peculiarities of Vano Siradeghyan, who is one of the most outstanding prose writers of modern Armenian literature. This analysis utilizes the viewpoint of stylistic vocabulary. In addition, the opinions from other scholars are considered regarding the author.*

*Furthermore, the author's use of lexicon and grammar, multilayered language are also discussed in this analysis. Lastly, a detailed study of Vano Siradeghyan's prose is considered, the means of illustration used by him, the various methods by which the author received the literary text, the use of certain grammar and literary structure, and also the author's sophisticated word choices.*

**Key words:** *Vano Siradeghyan, modern Armenian literature, vocabulary, lexicon, prose, visualization tools, literary structure.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Siradeghyan's entry as a writer into the field of Armenian literature was long-awaited, as the readers were already familiar with him from his stories published in the literary press of the 70s - magazines "Spring", "Literary Gazette", "Soviet Literature". His first book, the collection "Sunday", was published in 1983 and aroused great interest among the readers. The reaction of literary critics was also interesting, which, it seems, had already become accustomed to the use of a simple, as well as experimental literary language after Hrant Matevosyan's entry in the field. In fact, there was no appeal to the prose language of Vano Siradeghyan. The language problems had already been discussed around Matevosyan's prose, and everyone had realized that literature was already moving in a different direction both in terms of content and language. Of course, very little was said about the language of his work in those few literary articles and it was

all very careless and superficial.

Siradeghyan's second book was published only in 1987, bearing the title "Heavy light" and containing twenty-seven stories: These stories definitively outlined the prose writer Vano Siradegyan, his special place in Armenian literature with his peculiar style, thematic and content preferences and his ability to present all this: "Heavy Light" already forced to take a closer look, and made it possible for both the ordinary reader and thinkers around literature to reflect more deeply. And this is the reason why Siradeghyan's next small collection "A fair blessing" had two prefaces written by Hrant Matevosyan, in which the great novelist expressed his admiration for Siradeghyan:

*«The behavior of Siradeghyan's characters' efforts towards the morality of being distinguishes a blind, restless, instinctive, one could say not approximate, but purely bodily, almost unbearable effort, as if they do not yet exist and want to shape themselves, as if they have not yet been created and strive to create themselves. In this stubborn, blind, endless striving, they fail and throw themselves into new activities under new names, in order to be beaten again and keep striving from nothingness to existence, from cattle to man» (Siradeghyan V., 1993):*

Years later, Vano Siradegyan's third book was published - the collection "Take off your hand from the pain", which, one might say, was a collection of Siradegyan's prose, consisting of thirty-six short stories (the collection included the stories of all previous books, making up a collection of the general work). The preface was again Hrant Matevosyan, where the great novelist was referring to the preface of Siradegyan's previous book written by him, but this time with more tangible and more accurate comments. In this little speech of Matevosyan, there is a lot of regret, sadness, a sense of unforgiveness towards himself:

«In 1988, the pen was laid down some kind of tickle and an unmistakable hand, what an imperious face of true despair departed from literature, with what a look of grief he broke away from our crowd of children and animals, old people and youngsters, women and men, that we, as loving and forgiving as we are, in such an understanding look, no matter how much we lose ourselves, no matter how much we beg and distort, we will never be published as a crowd, because we are mothers - his mother, brothers - his brother, we are the kids - his childhood, the Motherland - the only place for his life, residence, peace. And how on point was the political thought twelve years ago, choosing from the hundreds and thousands of our past someone who can overthrow falsification, whether it is a weighting reality or a literary reality capable of not rocking itself with an inexhaustible condition in literary reality («Դեբանս Է՝ զրոնցումենք էլի») and not with the

convincing presence of the reality of life («Դեկանը է՝ ենթարկվում ենք, էլի»), but also keeps itself in a long march between repression and reality. » (Siradeghyan V., 2000).

From these words of Matevosyan, we can understand how popular Siradeghyan's stories are and how close they are to the people, that if "we are mothers - his mother, brothers - his brother, younger ones - his childhood, homeland - the only place for his life, affirmation, peace. "All this, of course, says something. If these stories are truly so close and relatable to the people, if they really describe the life of this period, then they simply have to be rich in demographic words, stylistics and structures inherent in the people's dialect. We will come back to this later.

In another article, Hrant Matevosyan also touched a little on the language of Vano Siradeghyan, his phrases and, so to speak, caution and parsimony of words.

*«A boy came into the land of prose, and told truthful stories more precisely than all his predecessors, had no approximate words, as if he wanted to put them on quartzine, was stingy and critical, did not have a single wrong word, his words and objects found each other at the same moment. The superficial, instantaneous, elusive, and unnamed turned out to have already found his word, already having obtained an image and a name.... And these images and characters delighted and pleased everyone with their liveliness and multitude, and so did their creator with his choice of the only one among many. He was the right writer, and it was true prose» (Matosyan H., 2012, February 4).*

Summarizing this introductory part of the work, we can state that Siradeghyan left quite a big mark in the history of Armenian literature of the last century, consolidating his place and role, the importance of his works, which is due to their popularity, wide dissemination and manifestation of love on the part of the reader. If we try to understand why, we will notice the following: One common feature clearly outlined in Siradeghyan's stories is the perception of the psychology of a rural person, the reformation of this psychology in urban reality, the creation of a literature of memory. And if we take into account that it was in the nineties of the last century that Yerevan was significantly settled by young people from villages, then it will also become clear why these stories enjoyed love and touched the reader's heart. After all, the reader's love becomes accessible to the reader, when their emotions and related topics are involved.

Visualization tools are the most important components of the stylization of a work of art. Even by just checking the term, we can understand that these are tools for creating images with which the author styles and types both scenes and characters. Thanks to figurative and expressive means, the author gets the opportunity to better present his work to the reader, kindle the reader's imagination with different images, characterizing

these images and phenomena in figurative and non-figurative senses, emotional and objective views.

In this regard, Vano Siradeghyan used almost all kinds of visualization tools - epithets, comparisons, metaphors, etc. This is also explained by Siradeghyan's thematic preferences, since the characters who find themselves in the folk and rural space are largely aimed at exaggerations and metaphors. And if we take into account that the language of Siradeghyan's narratives is quite poetic and expresses the feelings and sensuality of the writer, then it can be considered logical and natural.

Epithet is likely the most used way of illustration by Vano Siradeghyan. Siradeghyan brought the use of epithets to another level. Their diversity, and flexibility of being expressed in different parts of speech further contributed to the Siradeghyan's stylistic specificity. Thanks to these epithets, Siradeghyan's word acquired a figurative character, made it possible to express sensitivity and emotionality.

While the most remarkable epithets in the Armenian literature are expressed in an adjective, Siradeghyan's epithets are expressed in all the existing parts of speech and in such an order that the author reaches the peak of defining the image and the subject, and it seems impossible to give a better characterization.

We are well aware of the use of epithets in fiction, and every knowledgeable reader can give such examples. To characterize any subject, the writers used one or two epithets, but in Siradeghyan's edition we find bundles consisting of up to three or four epithets, which we consider an incredible phenomenon both in the last century and in Armenian literature as a whole. The use of these epithets is also interesting in the sense that for a long time their inscription is along the lines, which from Siradeghyan's side resembles a hint that they are the same characteristics of the subject as, say, «The cold appearance of a beautiful woman lies in the fact that at any time when she wants, she has no problems with reflection, she will always find luxurious unpretentious and sycophantic glass, but she will also remain a mirror loving crookedness, loyal to the dressing table, the bag, the sleeve, which is looked at only at night by the soul and eclipsed with a light breath when wanted, wiped from breathing when wanted, but still left in the dark».

In this one sentence only you can find several examples of epithets: You can even ignore the epithet "cold appearance", because Siradeghyan is so generous and accurate in the use of epithets that a single-word one should not distract us from more interesting structures. Just look at how the word "glass" is characterized in a peculiar way: **"luxuriously-unpretentious-sycophantic"**.

Let's touch on another kind of stylistic and linguistic implementation that has found a place in this sentence: «**loyal to the dressing table, the bag, stored in the sleeve, loving crookedness**», all these characteristics refer to the mirror: This characteristic is seasoned with another way of illustration-repetition, which is expressed by the word "loyal".

It was with such generosity that Siradeghyan took advantage of the many opportunities provided by the Armenian language, showing that our language is capable of being more flexible and imaginative than we think. Through these epithets, metaphors, repetitions and comparisons, Siradeghyan's fine art has reached a height to which the Armenian reader has not yet become accustomed.

Let us give examples of other uses of epithets as well: «I was late to realize that **living-giving birth-working** people are neither surprised by their coming to the world, nor do they attribute terrible meaning to death ...» (270), «He was sure that a person's fate was their will, and even his life, **lived-failed** by his limited will did not teach him anything» (274), «And if I were to fail, he would not be comforted by me sharing his fate, but would become a doubly **stricken-invincible** fighter against a huge injustice ...» (278), «May I take from life **the late-darkening-quickly-glowing** days» (261), «In the blink of an eye, they would have been smeared like a **drop smeared-thrown** on a front glass» (137), «It slowly collapses after the sunset, and around midnight, **newly-made-childlike voices** are born from hellish deafness...» (131), «The husband looks at the Gohar with a **forgiving-mocking-encouraging face** like a drunkard looks at a young man drinking his first cup» (123), «The day Sona entered the building, the unfamiliar local **shameless-prying** looks were what terrified her» (105), «In these whispers and susurrations, in the **skeptically-zealously-respected looks**, she had to behave as if she neither saw nor heard it all, and did not even want to...» (111), «In the alleys, a **walking crowd**, a sea of **white-foam outfits**, a silvery path of musical instruments in the light of **weak lanterns**, a **dignified march** of chariots on an autumn street stretching on the **white lanes** of winter, the opening-closing of front doors around **slippery smokes** of silence, and men in **immaculate white jackets**, wands inverted around elbows, friendly and polite, flirting without waiting, knowing how to kiss **pale fingers**, and sending flowers together with notes to their beloved women (244), etc.».

Such an application of epithets can be found in almost all of Siradeghyan's stories, since such implementations of language have become an integral part of his literary style, image-building, and literary techniques.

Now let us turn to another way of illustration – comparison. Going through epithets

we have already met comparisons, but it must be stated that there are many examples of both epithets and comparisons in Siradeghyan's stories: This contributed to the generalization of the picture, the improvement of descriptions, thanks to which Siradeghyan characterized and emphasized both the nature and mentality of different characters, created images, combining them with various phenomena and things that are put in comparison: «They came back from the war **like lunatics**» (263), «His life now seems to be a **burden given for a moment** that he must conscientiously bring to the end, and the path being short or long does not matter.» (263), «Have you never passed running around a cripple, eaten an ice-cream in the presence of a child with a bandaged throat, run into the room of a patient **like a racehorse?** ...» (247), «Now then, the one bringing those two together, that close nature is a virtuous mother, and at the same time a knowledgeable procuress who took the blame on herself, she was filled, and **discharged like a cloud**» (246), «An enamored, an inexperienced traveler is different **like a patient**» (208), «There was some kind of rarity on the street, which made the soul ache like **a pain in the lungs**» (192), «The naive voice of the typist reached the ear **like a slap**» (188), «...You will wander until you find the second one's handle and you will enter like a **sheep opening the paddock's door with its head**" (188), etc. These comparisons contributed to a more accurate definition of actions and characters.

The metaphors used by Siradeghyan which are also visualization tools are interesting too. The author has used metaphors in interesting stylizations as well. Those metaphorical structures are again distinguished by an inscription characteristic of the author, which does not obey any spelling, but belongs to the author's style: «If I have the strength to not regret the past, not abandon the life I have lived, if I can admit that it is not death that is **absurd-unjust-cruel**, but it is my birth that is an accidental happiness - if I have so much strength, I will die magnanimously» (266), «He lived with impulses, and the attitude to the smallest excitement was **childishly direct**» (267), «He walked towards this experience as if through a shoulder with a slide, and his smile was **white, bitter and humble**» (277), «If I succeeded in something, firstly, the talent of our tribe was proved, therefore, he remained an immaculate victim of injustice and ate his bread **suffocating gradually-stubbornly-demonstratively**" (278), etc.

With the help of these examples, we can see how specific Siradeghyan's vocabulary is even when using metaphors: These structures resemble the epithets used and created by the author, but they now characterize not the subject, but the action, often taking on the position of a predicative. This proves only one thing. No matter which line Siradeghyan dealt with, the writer's style is so original that the words found their own role and position

in this speech that is as imaginative as it gets.

It can be stated that this peculiar application and the author's inscriptions contributed to the shortest and most accurate word. In the last example given, "bread was eaten **gradually-stubbornly-demonstratively**", any other writer would try to connect the words characterizing the eating process with different primitive words or choose another line that would affect the sound of speech, accuracy and compression: But as a result of the language experiment, Siradeghyan found a possible method and a way to make the speech more concise, but at the same time very imaginative. This is what makes Vano Siradeghyan stand out in Armenian literature, his originality, precise choice of words, precision of thought.

Siradeghyan's prose is very apt and imaginative. To substantiate this statement of ours once again and for the last time, let's give an example of one sentence in which you can find all the figurative and expressive means: «Then the woman stood up like grass shaken off by the rain, stretched out like a waking tree, turned over like a heifer that forgot her love partner at once, soon found her way to the village and for the first time that day she heard that the forest was full of chickens, saw that the trees were rotting upwards, the branches were growing obliquely, felt that the forest was not just a mass of trees, but that all species had their name, and as she stepped next to each tree, stood on each grass, bypassed each flower, the names shouted out to their owners from within» (246): This sentence alone contains both an epithet (**grass shaken off by a gust of rain**) and a comparison (**like grass shaken off by the rain, like a waking tree, a heifer forgetting the love partner right away**), or a character (**names shouted out to their owners**), or an exaggeration (**the forest is full of chickens**), or a metaphor (**a gust of rain**), and even an unattractive reduction to prose (**as she stepped, stood, bypassed**): We can say this with confidence: it is difficult to find such a feature of the word, originality, imagery in Armenian prose (if, of course, there ever was such a thing) (Yezekyan L. K., 1990).

At the beginning of the work, we mentioned the story "Անանձրև հուլիս", to some extent highlighting this story in Siradeghyan's work: Now we would like to touch this story and explain why we consider it as a separate unit. The story «Անանձրև հուլիս» can be considered a work that includes both linguistic, and meaningful, and emotional, and stylistic nuances of all other stories. This is a sample of compressed emotions and images, which is extremely interesting from both the linguistic and literary viewpoints.

In this story there are dialect structures that have become the subject of our research (... may the spoon not **make a noise** off of a cup, they day goes by like **a donkey's burden**), folk speech (**half-asleep half-awake**, will drink whatever it is **լ. lay waste to**

**everything**), epithets (**slandering from idleness, vulgarizing from idleness, lewd atmosphere from idleness**), comparisons (getting shattered **like an ox**) and any other linguistic reality: This story is a set of means of illustration, and is seasoned with some manifestations of the poetic rhythm characteristic of Siradeghyan's prose, smooth structures, various classical components and the implementation of various phrases.

## CONCLUSION

Completing the work, we want to recall the tasks set before us, the goals of the analysis: The purpose of the work was to study the peculiarities of illustration of one of the most outstanding prose writers of the last generation of modern Armenian literature - Vano Siradeghyan, going through various methods of word stylization, the use of illustration tools.

As a result of the research, we found that Siradeghyan used these means in order to make his speech more figurative and expressive, more descriptive and emotional, which, we state, was received very well.

It is interesting that Siradeghyan seems to have violated the classical use of visualization tools, bringing into action such linguistic possibilities that are rarely found in Armenian literature. It can be stated that Siradeghyan raised fine art to a higher level with a new application of language structures and a peculiar approach to them:

## REFERENCE LIST

- Matosyan H. (2012, February 4).** Twshgrit bar'erov twshmarit patmowt'yownner (True stories with accurate words). Granish Literary Community, Memoir. Retrieved April 12, 2022, from <https://granish.org/true-stories-by-true-words/>
- Siradeghyan V. (1993).** Shat chhamarvi (Not to be considered too much). Yerevan.
- Siradeghyan V. (2000).** D'er'qd et tar cavi vrayic (Put your hand back in pain). Yerevan.
- Yezekyan L. K. (1990).** Grakan ashxarhabary' & ar&elahay patmavepi lezown (The literary world language and the language of the Eastern Armenian historical novel). YSU Publishing House.

*Copyright © 2022 Published by Khachatur Abovyan Armenian State Pedagogical University & the Authors*

*The article submitted and sent to review: 15/12/2021*

*Accepted for publication: 20/03/2022*