筑紫女学園大学リポジト

Movies, Metaphor and Meaning

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 公開日: 2015-05-29 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: WOOD, David John, WOOD, David John メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://chikushi-u.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/433

Movies, Metaphor and Meaning

David John Wood

Films can communicate their stories through the metaphors that they contain. Once you understand a movie's use of metaphor, you can often begin to understand the movie more deeply. Most movies can be taken at face value alone, but by determining what the vehicle (the thing that affects) and tenor (the thing that is affected) are, we can sometimes discover a story's various levels of meaning. In nearly every form of expression or communication, there is both a container as well as that which is contained. The container shapes the contained material, giving it new meaning. Depending on the level of complexity or dexterity, container and contained can interact fundamentally even to the extent of interchanging their nature. In a work of art, we are presented with a finished product, meaning that we have to work backwards to decode and distinguish the container and what it is that is being contained by it. The process is not necessarily reversible. We cannot always rewind from the final formation, or even see what has taken place clearly. This indescribable uncertainty is itself one definition of the artistic process. If there were only a single or simple formula that led to the result, everybody would be an artist. Art seeks more insightful expression than what preceded it, and almost inevitably involves an ambiguity in its ultimate shape. This invites different reactions and interpretations from all who partake of it. It is a kind of synergy where 1 (the container) plus 1 (the contained) equals more than 2, the excess being the actual creation that consumes our interest. This definition is an organic metaphor itself, as there is a sense in which the tenor is the male element and the vehicle the female, though this definition by itself is not enough to explain the process.

In everything we think, say and write, we tend to house our expression in imagery which gives those receiving it (even ourselves) glimpses into our deeper intents. In the same way, the artist reveals an inner core of meaning in his or her creation through the use of the images therein. In a novel or purely verbal form, we only need to think about language, but in the case of plays, for example, the language is much more deeply dimensioned by the subtle shades of tone, the speed of delivery and, to varying extents,

the visual and extra-linguistic aspects that accompany them. In conventional drama, at least, the visual impact may be quite limited because we do not see things in close up, the stage is too fixed and vast for us to capture all it contains, and everything exists completely in the moment. Even if a play is recorded on film, the result will still be the single take of time in which it was enacted. If it is re-shot again and again in a similar way to a movie, then it will be simply be a rudimentary form of film, or a pre-film.

In a movie, we are presented with the elements of control and visual detail not possible in other forms of expression, and as we can watch and re-watch in the form of digital recording, there is no limit to the depth of analysis possible. Therefore, this medium of expression exceeds most other forms of expression, and is ideal for a close analysis of both the linguistic and paralinguistic features that it contains. The metaphors used in this form, verbal and audiovisual, can reveal the essence of expression and allow viewers to establish the precise nature and importance of any artistry. To determine what a metaphor is, we can begin by considering the poet Shelley's comment that metaphor "marks the before unapprehended relations of things and perpetuates their apprehension." Murray defines metaphor as "the means by which the less familiar is assimilated to the more familiar, the unknown to the known." Whittock describes metaphor as the "presentation of one idea in terms of another, belonging to a different category, so that either our understanding of the first idea is transformed, or so that from the fusion of the two ideas a new one is created."

The Greek word *metaphora* literally means to carry over, but even Aristotle had begun to refine and qualify the concept nearly two and half thousand years ago thus "(We) derive metaphors from objects which are closely related to the thing itself, but which are not immediately obvious." The historical potency of the concept was well illustrated in seventeenth century England when Parliament even considered banning its use. Metaphor survived quite comfortably, and in the 1930s became rigorously delineated by the likes of the English literary critic Richards in America. Thus the original idea became known as the tenor, the second idea use to transform it the vehicle, and the conceptual momentum that would generate their interaction, tension.

Metaphor was distinguished from mere analogy or juxtaposition, which in literal modes would only result in simple comparison without any mutual transformation. When analogy becomes metaphor, the comparison will be figurative and transformation ensues. Metaphor is thus one process to grasp new concepts or experience in terms of preexisting ones. When such a process becomes fully assimilated to the point where tension disappears, the result is referred to as dead metaphor. Objections to misuse of

metaphor often involve the criticism that connections may be arbitrary or even false, but the process frees us from proscribed thinking, and without it any original conceptualization may be difficult if not impossible. New ways of thinking require emotionally expressive tropes, releasing us from normative rhetorical schematization.

In terms of film, as indicated above, the use of metaphor potentially far exceeds that of literature. However, this assertion is not without its critics. The tendency is to reduce the concept to a strictly verbal use such as in novels. Crisscrossing subdivisions of the amorphous concept of metaphor merely fail to see the bigger picture. Rather than clutching at would-be metaphors on an in-vacuo basis, a holistic approach is necessary to avoid seeing isolated meanings that may not even be there. Movies tend to frame their metaphors in a similar way to their structure. There is no significance to their critical use if it only intends their subordination in order to demonstrate a theory which will die long before the memory of the film does.

Even Whittock is reduced to citing predominantly linguistic examples in his explanation of film metaphor, and no matter how scientifically sound the definitions of synechdoche, metonymy, anaphor, diaphor and all their attendant sub-categories may seem, they tend to restrict the subtlety, complexity and overall evaluation of movie metaphor. In fact, the boundaries between the linguistic and non-linguistic are blurred because they can spill over into each other. Literary snobbishness seems to be the cause of much criticism. Twentieth century literary critics like Stanford defied the existence of metaphor in film altogether, because they insisted that non-verbal imagery can only be symbolism. But such an approach denies the obvious fact that we actually perceive non-verbal imagery in linguistic terms, just as we may perceive the verbal in a purely sensory way. Metaphors existed long before there were literary critics, and they can not account for all those that exist now, let alone all those that will exist in the future. Movies are still in a developing stage, unlike the novel which was forced to attempt to rediscover itself since the advent of movie just a century or so ago. It is impossible to separate rigidly the linguistic and paralinguistic, and in any case, the latter accounts for the vast majority of our communication.

The existence of what we might call audiovisual imagery is as old as film itself, and the concept of metaphor existed for thousand of years before the first novels ever came into existence, like the comparatively naive Daniel Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, so it would be more than inane to claim that their province must be limited strictly to the constrained conception of one elitist school of criticism. Nonetheless, many people may still tend to think that literature has to be a written form of expression. But of course, it

began in the form of spoken, acted and musical performances. Literature started as an oral tradition of storytelling often involving music. Shakespeare's plays are some of the best examples of literature, but they were not even meant to be read. Novels have only existed for a handful of centuries, but literature is as old as human time itself. The newest form of literature in the last century was film. Computers may create newer forms from now on. Movies have used novels as their source and have already equaled them in volume and creativity. As a result, novels have had to recreate themselves as a unique form to survive, just as painting did after photography began. Many novels now tell stories that can't easily be made into movies. And while fewer people read novels, every new one is considered for movie production as demand only grows.

Any form of expression may borrow from another for ideas. Movies have used stories from novels as their starting points because they could use a similar structure. There are exceptions like Rain Man which came from an original shooting script. But even when a movie uses a novel as its inspiration, it does not have to attempt to keep exactly to the original. There are three kinds of film that can result from using a novel: one that does try to remain faithful to the original story, one that creates an almost completely different story, and one that keeps some of the spirit of the original but at the same time is an independent form of expression. The first is nearly always judged to be inferior, while the second is not relevant. Only the final form is interesting enough to be studied as an independent literary form. One approach to a deeper understanding of literature and metaphor is to compare a film and a novel which tell basically the same stories but have their own unique and valuable interpretations. These interpretations should use their respective medium to its fullest potential, which is another reason why attempts at completely faithful adaptations of novels into films may miss the point. At the same time, it is very difficult to find truly great novels becoming truly great films, or great films that have come from great novels. The aim therefore should be to find the few examples of great books that have become great films.

A film could express its story through writing, but even without this, the dialogue, sounds, music and picture give a film more potential than a novel. The demand for movies may mean that they have to be produced more quickly than novels, but the huge budget that they have means they can hire the greatest talent, while technology only continues to make production faster, without any necessary loss of quality. At the same time, to make money, films often change the story and are less genre-specific to create wider audience appeal. While time is more limited in a movie, more can be done in less time and a film's structure and content are usually clearer, and therefore more powerful.

A film's viewpoint is the camera not the "I" of a novel, making it more objective and creating more possible interpretations. This is also the result of having so many people make a movie, while a book is usually written by only one person. Films can only exist in the present tense because of their immediate sound and picture, while novels can never escape the past tense of the story teller, even if they are about the future. Their spoken language is far more expressive than the written word, just as the sounds and music are richer. But the most important point in comparing a film and novel of the same story is to determine which has the more powerful and better focused imagery.

To assess the power and potential of metaphor, let's look at the movie Rain Man to examine how its main metaphors move the movie forward towards its essential meaning. By taking autism as the vehicle and Charlie's change as the tenor, we can begin to get the story's meaning the right way around. As if to confirm the fact, Tom Cruise has commented that Charlie learns to live life again through his brother, Raymond, who is autistic, and that Charlie is an "emotional autistic" . Most films' appeal is a character with strong emotions who can change. Although Charlie changes, Ray is not emotional and does not change. But it was Dustin Hoffman who won the Oscar for Best Actor for his role as Ray, and not Cruise for Charlie, and it was Hoffman himself who suggested that Ray be autistic for the final shooting script. The subject is Charlie's change, which we measure by Ray's lack of one. The main metaphor is autism, more than the car or even the journey. Ray's immutability is the yardstick that allows us to savor all the more Charlie's transformation into a feeling human being. The final word on this must go to Hoffman as he made the movie such a major part of himself and vice versa. He spells out his own heart by explaining that, when we meet people whose lives are touched by autism, we can not help but to be affected by them. And we hope that if we could somehow just give them enough love they might even be released from their condition. The movie wanted the audience to be able to feel the same way. Charlie has to travel the breadth of America to learn that, though that is impossible, trying to do so can help us to heal ourselves. And finally, to elucidate another often overlooked facet of the movie, we must always be aware of the background which perfects the movie's meaning with its dazzling array of visual metaphor. From the puff of sand when Charlie u-turns at the news of his father's death, through the dead roses, dried up pool, then the rain that weeps like tears, the background along with Charlie's heart transmogrifies as the sky expands in ever deeper shades of blue, love blooming in the gorgeous greening, and the high point, the fountains shooting high into the sky outside the casino hotel after Charlie's new family, Ray, Susanna and himself, are all reunited.

The car is a major focal point and even the location of major elements of the film's action and momentum. It is like a metaphorical leitmotif, providing the story with much of its structure and flow. The movie begins with the background of a smoggy sky, suggesting Charlie's life is similarly blinded by his inability to see himself or his reality. A sleek red Italian sports car floats down from the sky on a crane. It lands next to several others. Their garish colors are like a limited rainbow. They are Charlie's dream of a brighter future and his dream to be rich.

The scene switches to a small and dirty room where his girlfriend and secretary, Susanna, speaks Italian over the phone. Lenny, who also works for Charlie, speaks on another, and Charlie uses a phone headset. The office also shows how sad Charlie's life is - absent of any sincere or empathetic communication with those who are closest to him. Lenny is losing some of their customers, and Susanna is being threatened by Charlie's loan agent. Charlie is aggressive and will tell any lie to succeed. Instead of exchanging ideas or feelings, he dominates the others like puppets in a world with only one living creature, himself. He forces Lenny and Susanna to mouth his lies for him.

The scene shows that Charlie cannot communicate happily or honestly, as does the one which immediately follows. Charlie and Susanna are driving for a weekend away together, but Susanna is upset. Charlie does not speak to her. When she insists, he is not kind. Lenny calls to tell Charlie that his father is dead. Lenny tries to be sympathetic, but Charlie cuts him off and shows no reaction to the news. Even though Charlie says he will go alone, Susanna insists on coming along with him. The background looks like a desert, and when Charlie u-turns to drive to the funeral, the car wheels send up a cloud of sand. The huge wind power fans viciously slice the sky, as it were. This background shows love will not grow in Charlie's heart, with more than a hint of menace and cruelty.

Charlie arrives in the middle of the funeral. The lawyer gives him the keys to his father's house. Charlie tells Susanna that the lawyer will read the will to him at night and then they can leave immediately. Susanna is again surprised that Charlie can be so cold hearted. Charlie did not react to his father's death, and now just wants to leave as quickly as he can. Above all, it seems that he does not want to appear to care for or love his father.

At his father's house, Charlie sees a vintage car, which is in stark contrast to the gaudy Lamborghinis that he is staking his entire future on. Susanna says that the roses are dying. She says his father must have loved him as he was an only child, born when Mr. Babitt Senior was already 45. Charlie is angry that she is holding a photo of them

as his hidden memory of their relationship is so excruciating for him. But the real reason that he gets angry and lies is because he cannot communicate happily or honestly.

Then he explains why he hates his father. He says that the car and the roses were his father's baby, not him, because he believed that his father loved them more than Charlie. He explains that his father would not let him use the car even when he did very well at school. So, he took his father's car without his permission, because he was jealous of it like a rival brother who is his parent's favorite. Charlie was seeking attention because he wanted more than anything else to feel loved by his father. His father told the police that someone had stolen his car. Charlie had to stay in jail for two days. He says that he was scared, and then he left home, doomed never to see his father again. Charlie's reaction is understandable, but he misunderstood his father's strictness for cruelty - Mr. Babbit Senior had only done what he thought was best to teach his son to be an honest and decent human being.

Susanna is shocked to hear this after already having known Charlie for a year. Charlie says that when he was scared, an imaginary friend called the Rain Man sang to him. The lawyer reads the will. His father blames Charlie for never contacting him, and thus leaving him without a son. Ironically, his father gives Charlie the car that ended their relationship. Charlie is shocked, and wants to know who will get his father's $3,000,000, but the lawyer will not say. Charlie says that his father is laughing at him from Hell because this posthumous attempt to teach his son the important things in life again backfires. Later, he tells Susanna nihilistically that he got what he expected. He is standing in an empty pool into which the rain had been falling like tears of broken glass into his heart, again echoing the sadness at his core. This is a rain that cannot help anything grow as the empty concrete swimming pool in which Charlie is standing is covered with dead leaves and rose petals. This shows that Charlie's heart is sad and his ability to love anyone is as good as extinct. Charlie's ability to love seems dead because he is surrounded by death.

As with other metaphors in the movie, the car's metaphorical effect is cumulative. Other imagery motifs include the background swing from east to west coasts with its transformation from overcast death to fertile life, and the dysfunctional emotions, relationships and communication, all symptoms of Charlie's emotional autism. But central to all these is that of Ray's autism which highlights Charlie's condition. The opening scenes have vividly depicted his uncompromising coldness. When he visits the facility in search of the mysterious recipient of his father's fortune, an unresponsive patient on the driveway is an important foreshadowing of this tension. Charlie often stays silent with his

girlfriend when it would only be normal for a couple who are supposedly close to share their feelings with each other, while his inability to be self-reflective makes it impossible for him to understand when anyone else is unresponsive to his demands.

When he meets the brother he never knew he had, his own communication problem is frequently mirrored. In fact, the number of things which they have in common just grows and grows. The connection is caught in a perfect visual metaphor. We see Charlie's face reflected in the window as he looks outside. When Ray appears in the same shot approaching their father's car outside, Charlie sees nothing. Here, the word "see" has both a visual as well as an emotionally conceptual implication - Charlie neither sees nor understands anything outside of himself. Charlie's emotional vision is impaired, so whenever he looks at images of himself, he does so without actually seeing anything. He is incapable of self-reflection. Ray's autism means that he was born with a clinical defect in his ability to feel and communicate. Charlie's inability to feel and communicate stems from a misreading of his experiences with his only other family member, his father. Now the discovery of his new family, his older brother, is a second chance for him. Even though he may never have met his older brother, however, the common denominators continue to build, and their significance ripples outwards, imbuing the whole movie with their import.

The two brothers know exactly the same things about the car, which continues to be a focal point for either the making or breaking of relationships, as well as for future insights and self revelations. Charlie had thought that he was an only child, and thus underprivileged emotionally compared with those who have siblings. However, the discovery of his own sibling does little to soften his heart - he just becomes the more aggressive and cunning, even suggesting a deal with Ray's doctor (in the form of a kick back) in exchange for releasing control of his father's estate to him. The very fact that Charlie learns they are brothers only when ironically Ray communicates this to him merely serves to underscore the extremity of Charlie's inability to convey anything worthwhile or meaningful in life. To Charlie, the only ironic thing is that Ray, somebody who cannot even understand the concept of money, has just inherited the three million dollars, the very fortune that Charlie had so firmly set his blinkered sights on. But what is even more ironic is Charlie's disdain for Ray's apparent weaknesses when his own flaws are all the more evident. He is so proud of his pursuit of happiness through the illusion of the profit that he hopes to make from his car business, but paradoxically it was a car that had burnt his heart to ashes in the first place. No matter how seductive the sports cars may seem, they are all just substitutes for the old Buick in the final analysis. It is

nothing but an illusory dream that has no true human value. In other words, all Charlie needs has always been within his grasp, but by turning his back on his father, he had shunned the very solution that he should have been urgently seeking. In a way, Ray's sudden emergence is God's way of giving humankind the extra opportunity we always need to appreciate what it is that we already have - each other. Neither Ray nor Charlie has been able to understand the importance of other people. The journey which they now set out on is the chance for at least one of them, Charlie, to open his eyes and heart to the person sitting next to him in the passenger seat, his long lost brother Ray.

At first, Charlie dehumanizes Ray as merely a means of getting rich quick. To Charlie, Ray is an encumbrance, not an older brother at all. Charlie is annoyed by Ray's limitations, and cynically dismisses his amazing memory as a trivial party trick. But Susanna has had enough of forgiving Charlie's inhumanity, and she leaves after he finally admits his true motive, forcing Ray's doctor to concede half of their father's huge inheritance to Charlie. Ray's condition conspires to extending the brothers' journey as he can neither fly nor use a fast road. To aggravate things even further, he will not travel in rainy weather, which is both a recall of the tear-like rain that pierced Charlie's heart just before he stood in the bottom of his father's leaf strewn pool, and a premonition of the forgotten nickname that Charlie had given Ray so many unremembered years before. When they can finally continue, Ray increases Charlie's discomfort by suddenly grabbing the wheel and nearly causing the car to crash. But Charlie's exasperation here is finally a more human response than he would normally allow himself, and it is also an important seed of change for him. His pride will not allow Charlie to accept that Ray is beyond access to him, and Charlie thus seeks out a small town doctor for advice. This is major for Charlie, as until now he could not have admitted to himself that he cared a thing about anyone else other than himself, his family included. Of course, it may seem to be just a desperate attempt to achieve more practical control over his brother, but it is more likely a clear indication that, no matter how reluctantly, he is at last getting to know his brother better than almost anyone else in his life. He says he thinks Ray is hiding inside himself, and adds that he's going crazy: "You can't tell me you're not in there somewhere!" But this is more a stage of self realization, as Charlie is the one deeply hidden inside himself, like a nearby reflection that keeps maddeningly just out of sight.

Then there is the brief flashback to the Wallbrook scene when Charlie's face was reflected in the window as Ray approached the car outside. This time, we see Ray reflected in the phone booth from which Charlie is calling the doctor as Ray exits the car and

wanders off. The scene where the doctor gives Charlie advice on how to deal with Ray is also a poignant reminder of Ray's predicament, as we see both his genius and weakness when he cannot distinguish between the price of a candy bar and compact car (both of which he estimates to be about a hundred dollars) another extension of the car leitmotif. When Ray will not certify himself as autistic, the pang of tragedy is all the more biting.

It is only at the very nadir of his fortunes that Charlie is able to make the discovery that leads to his recovery. He overcomes his emotional communication gap when he understands that his imaginary childhood friend, the Rain Man, was in fact only his immature mispronunciation of Raymond's name. His brother is no longer just a stranger or a mere bank account waiting for him to figure out how it can be broken into. Ray is the family that he had always wanted to love and be loved by. To bring this home in a physical manifestation, Ray pulls out an old photograph of them together. Then his brother's heart-wrenching tragedy is played out both literally and metaphorically in front of his very eyes as the motel bath being filled forces Ray to suddenly relive the horror of the accidental scalding he had caused, which resulted in his confinement in Wallbrook. The shocking end to their previous relationship is figuratively re-enacted when the photo drops and drowns as it were in the steaming tub. Through Ray's unspoiled innocence, Charlie can finally believe that it is possible to recover his own, something that he has not been able to believe in since his mother died, his childhood friend disappeared and all his father's best efforts had turned to poisoned dust. Charlie assures the panicked Ray that he is back and that everything is okay. Just as Ray had once cared for his kid brother, their lives come full circle, and Charlie puts him to bed with all the tender care befitting a true brother.

He can finally achieve the necessary self-reflection to phone Susanna and remorsefully express himself as he has never been able to before. Charlie sees himself for what he really is - he can now look out of the window of life with eyes wide open, and see in the figure that looks back what a fool he has been. He is thus able to resolve to rebuild the relationships in his life which are worth more than dollars or cars. The disaster that was his life's work, the seized Lamborghinis, is no longer a problem - Charlie sees the gift that Ray has as their salvation. Images of clearer weather and lush growth loom in the background and music score, and Charlie's new hope is borne aloft in the deck of cards that fly up towards the blue sky from on top of the bonnet of the Buick as they speed away to the casinos of Las Vegas. All the images are interlocked, and combine to build the momentum of the movie to its magical climax. Charlie's change of

heart is almost complete.

The motor car metaphor is extended through Charlie's promise to Ray (who always says he likes driving slowly on the driveway) that he can drive wherever he wants if they win. And win they do, but more than money, Charlie wins a heart, his own. The impact on Ray is also positive as the latter finds a new purpose in Charlie's company, and a will to learn of the life that he has been denied by his incarceration. Charlie too is learning to be more human in fits and starts. On the one hand, he can apologize to Ray for being impatient at him after a glitch in Ray's concentration had led to an unexpected, albeit inconsequential loss in the casino. However, Charlie still has some way to go because he expects Ray to respond to this somehow even though his autism would prevent it. He also forgets that it is hard for Ray to accept physical contact, and he is very disappointed when Ray recoils as Charlie attempts a brotherly hug in celebration at their success at the gambling tables, enough to rid Charlie of his debts and let him start his life afresh.

But Charlie has learnt enough to begin to understand, and feels no resentment at Ray's inability to respond. It teaches him that he is not the center of the world and must compromise with those close to him, and as if to drive the point home, the knock on the door that immediately follows this belongs to none other than Susanna, who has also come to give Charlie a second chance. His heartfelt greeting - "I'm glad to see you" - demonstrates that Charlie can at last show his real affection for her. Far from being bad news, Susanna's announcement that she is out of a job as Charlie's company is bust means that they are both free of his misguided dream of achieving happiness through wealth at the expense of forming dignified human relationships. Susanna's return is also necessary to complete Ray's education in the domain of relationships after Charlie had taught him how to dance. Even though Ray's date stands him up, Susanna is the perfect stand in because she can give him a Platonic kiss that both gives Ray the tenderness that he needs, as well as preserving her relationship with Charlie.

The perfect metaphor for Charlie's return from his inhumanity, even more magical than the dancing sequence between the brothers, is the true victory drive around the hotel fountain. Since Charlie's nightmare drive to prison as a teenager, his father's Buick had haunted him. That bad dream transforms into a total recovery as his new family, a brother and a girlfriend whom he can both love and respect, enjoys the cascading surge of revival. The car is still the focal point, and has finally fulfilled its fate - to renew Charlie's faith in the value of compassion. The background now is imbued with sunlight and lush foliage, a world away from the aridity of the opening scenes, and this

continues all the way to Charlie's LA home.

The true expression of Charlie's heart is achieved in the closing scenes of the movie, and it is perfectly communicated by his borrowing of many of his older brother's linguistic mannerisms. Lost is the brash uncompromising cockiness, and in its place a hesitant self doubting. His conversations are laced with the "I don't knows" that had first so frustrated Charlie about Ray's responses to his own mercenary probing. Charlie is no longer an arrogant know it all. Instead, he can admit that he was a bad son, and is able to see himself through his father's eyes. His rejection of a pay off from Ray's doctor in exchange for him to simply disappear from his brother's life shows how he has overcome the false dream of getting rich quick, and attests to the fact that he is seeking the true value of life, relating happily to other people.

Although they cannot live together as Charlie would like, he can also accept that Ray's peace of mind is the most important thing. Ray too has changed in many ways (for example, both in his taste of clothes and manner of expression) under Charlie's influence. Even though the car does not appear in the last shot, this is only because its work has been completed. The brothers will remain united through its presence, and it will remain as a perpetual part of their relationship, like the parent that neither of them was able to cherish together. They are truly brothers and a family at last.

This explication of selected uses of metaphor in Rain Man is limited by the length of this publication to only a cursory glimpse. It would be easy to extend it to book length. Nonetheless, even such a brief overview of a single film indicates that an unwieldy critical apparatus would be obstructive, insufficient and inadequate as regards decoding the metaphorical meaning of a movie shot by shot. Many metaphors just have to be felt and intuited. Their overall impact is better grasped through impression and verified through their film-length sustainment. There are many many movies, but few stand up to the rigorous artistic demands of creating the kind of metaphorical magic of a movie like Rain Man. Its true value is best measured by its inception and effect.

The current writer has developed an approach to the study of metaphor in film and its relation to other forms of expression like novels in two forms called Film Communication and Visual Literature. Visual Literature compares a film to the novel that it is based on. Film Communication compares a film to a shooting script it is based on. A shooting script is a version of a film before a director makes it a film. Novels start as shooting scripts, but an original script is the original story. There is an academy award for both the Best Adaptation from a Novel, and a different one for Best Original Script. After a film has been shown, the final dialog can be published as a

screen play.

Rain Man is an example of a film that is based on a shooting script. Film Communication studies character, structure, technique and theme. The most important things to study are verbal and audiovisual metaphors. A metaphor describes one thing as something else that is quite different. For example, in Rain Man, Charlie says that his father's car was his baby. A car is not a baby, but his father loved it more than he loved Charlie. Films communicate their stories through the metaphors they contain. As stated earlier, once you can understand these metaphors, you can understand the movie.

Rain Man cost $25 million to make. It made $40 million in the space of a few days, and $100 million in its first months. It has made much more since then, first as a video, and then as a DVD. It was so successful that a new commemorative DVD was made. It won four Oscars, including Best Picture. Few films have ever done this. The film is entertainment, not a documentary. It is very informative because it tries to be real. Its importance meant it became a new word, and many articles have appeared about it on the Internet for twenty years.

Both Hoffman and Cruise prepared for years to complete Rain Man. Many directors like Spielberg gave up the project long before it reached the level of maturity that Barry Levinson was able to achieve. As stated before, most films' appeal is a character with strong emotions who changes. Although Charlie changes, Ray is not emotional and does not change. As Hoffman (Ray) won the Oscar for Best Actor, the final word must be his: "To be authentic, Ray cannot have the dramatic range all actors want. Instead of acting the part of a full character, I acted the role of a haiku." The subjects are Charlie's change which we measure by Ray's lack of it, and their new relationship. As this study has attempted to show, the metaphors of Rain Man are clearly autism, the car and the brothers' journey, simultaneously back to the past and forward to the future together.

Selected References

Aristotle, The Poetics, in Bywater, I. Introduction to Aristotle. Random House, 1947.

Levinson, B. Rain Man. MGM/United Artists, 1988.

Levinson, B. Rain Man (Special Edition). MGM/UA, 2006.

Murry, J. Selected Criticism. Oxford University Press, 1960.

Ortony, A. Metaphor and Thought. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Richards, I. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. Oxford University Press, 1936.

Stanford, W. Greek Metaphor. 1936.

Whittock, T. Metaphor and Film. Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Wood, D. Film Communication. Mellen, 1995.

Wood, D. Mixed Metaphors, Rain Man review. Amazon.com, 2007.

Wood, D. Shooting Script to Silver Screen. Chikushi University International Research, 2002.

（デヴィッド・ジョン・ウッド：英語学科　教授）