MINISTY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION

SAMARKAND STATE INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

CHAIR OF ENGLISH LEXICS AND STYLISTICS

Shomurodova Sh.J. Abdullaeva L.T.

STYLISTICS AND TEXT INTERPRETATION

Collected lectures

Samarkand-2014

CONTENTS

LECTURE I

1. GENERAL NOTES ON STYLE AND STYLISTICS

1.1. General notes on style and stylistics.
1.2. Expressive means and stylistic devices.
1.3. General notes on functional styles of language.
1.4. The English literary language.
1.5. Varieties of language.

Stylistics sometimes called ***linguo-stylistics*** is a branch of general linguistics. It has now been more or less definitely outlined. It deals mainly with two interdependent tasks: a) the investigation of the inventory of special language media which by their ontological features secure the desirable effect of the utterance and b) certain types of texts (discourse) which due to the choice and arrangement of language means are distinguished by the pragmatic aspect of the communication. The two objectives of stylistics are clearly discernible as two separate fields of investigation. The inventory of special language -media, can be analysed and their ontological features revealed if presented in a system in which the co-relation between the media becomes evident.

The types of texts can be analyzed if their linguistic components are presented in their interaction, thus revealing the unbreakable unity and transparency of constructions of a given type. The types of texts that are distinguished by the pragmatic, aspect of the communication are called *fu fictional styles of language (FS)\ * the special media of language which secure the desirable effect of the utterance are called *stylistic devices (SD)* and *expressive means (EM).*

The first field of investigation, i.e. SDs and EMs, necessarily touches upon such general language problems as the aesthetic function of language, synonymous ways of rendering one and the-same idea, emotional colouring in language, the interrelation between language and thought, the individual manner of an author in making use of language and a number of other issues.

The second field, i.e. functional styles, cannot avoid discussion of such most general linguistic issues as oral and written varieties of language, the notion of the literary (standard) language, the constituents of texts larger than the sentence, the generative aspect of literary texts, and some others.

In dealing with the objectives of stylistics, certain pronouncements of adjacent disciplines such as theory of information, literature, psychology, logic and to some extent statistics must be touched upon. This is indispensable; for nowadays no science is entirely isolated from other domains of human knowledge; and linguistics particularly its branch stylistics, cannot avoid references to the above mentioned disciplines because it is confronted with certain overlapping issues.

2. EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYLISTIC DEVICES

The expressive means of a language are: 1) phonetic, 2) lexical and 3) syntactical. They are poly-functional. One and the same expressive means may be used for different purposes: e.g. repetition of a word or a group of words may be used for emphases, clarity, rhythm. The expressive means are facts of the language. They are studied respectively in manuals of phonetics, grammar, Lexicology.

"A stylistic device is a conscious and intentional literary use of some of the facts of the language for further intensification of the emotional or logical emphasis contained in the expressive means."(I- R- Galperin "Stylistics", p. 26)

In comparison with the expressive means of the language, stylistic devices carry a greater account of information as they show the attitude of the speaker or of the author towards what he is speaking about. Stylistic devices are always emotionally charged.

Sound combinations, intonation, pitch are phonetic expressive means. They are facts of the language, but there are certain sound arrangements which produce a desired effect: e.g. alliteration, onomatopoeia are used for euphony. Words, phraseological units are facts of the language, but used not in the dictionary but contextual meanings, they become stylistic devices: metaphor, metonymy, irony, epithets, etc. In syntax paragraph, sentence patterns and other syntactical expressive means can serve to build syntactical stylistic devices: parallel constructions, climax, rhetoric questions, litotes and many other stylistic devices.

3. GENERAL NOTES ON FUNCTIONAL STYLES OF LANGUAGE

Literary English is used in different spheres of communication that determine the choice of words, the peculiarities of syntax and the phonetic arrangements of speech. Each style fulfils a particular function, hence the term "functional". According to the function and the peculiar choice of language means dependent on the aim of communication we may distinguish the following styles within the English Literary Language(according to Prof. Galperin):

1) the belles-letters style which falls into three varieties: a)the language style of poetry; b)the language style of emotive prose; c) the language style of drama.

2) the publicistic style comprises the following sub-styles: a) the language style of oratory;b) the language style of essays; c) the language style of feature articles in newspapers and journals.

3) the newspaper style falls into: a) the language style of brief news items and communiques; b) the language style of newspaper headlines and c) the language style of notices and advertisements; d) the language style of editorials.

4) the scientific prose style also has three divisions: a) the language style of humanitarian sciences; b) the language style of "exact" sciences; c) the language style of popular scientific prose.

5) the style of official documents can be divided into four varieties: a) the language style of diplomatic documents; b) the language style of business documents; c) the language style of legal documents; d)the language style of military documents.

The classification presented here is by no means arbitrary, it is the result of long and minute observations of factual material in which not only peculiarities of language usage were taken into account but also extralinguistic data, in particular the purport of the communication. However, we admit that this classification is not proof against criticism. Other schemes may possibly be elaborated and highlighted by different approaches to the problem of functional styles. The classification of FSs is not a simple matter and any discussion of it is bound to reflect more than one angle of vision. Thus, for example, some stylicists consider "that newspaper articles (including feature articles) should be classed under the functional style of newspaper language, not under the language of publicistic literature. Others insist on including the language of every-day-life discourse into the system of functional styles. Prof. Budagov singles out only two main functional styles: the language of science and that of emotive literature.

It is inevitable, of course, that any classification should lead to some kind of simplification of the facts classified, because items are considered in isolation. Moreover, sub-styles assume, as it were, the aspect of closed systems. But no classification, useful though it may be from the theoretical point of view, should be allowed to blind us as to the conventionality of classification in general. When analysing concrete texts, we discover that the boundaries between them sometimes become less an<dless discernible. Thus, for instance, the signs of difference are sometimes almost imperceptible between poetry and emotive prose, between newspaper FS and publicistic FS, between a popular scientific article and a scientific treatise;

between an essay and a scientific article. But this extremes are apparent from the ways language units are used both structurally and semantically. Language serves a variety of needs and these needs have given birth to the principles on which Galperin's classification is based and which in their turn presuppose the choice and combination of language means.

The term "stylistics" originated from the greek "stylos", which means "a pen". In the course of time it developed several meanings, each one applied to a specific study of language elements and their use in speech.

It is no news that any propositional content-any "idea"- can be verbalized in several different ways. So, "May I offer you a chair?", "Sit down" - have the same proposition (subject-matter but differ in the manner of expression, which, in its turn, depends upon the situational conditions of the communications act.

70 percent of our lifetime is spent in various forms of communication activities – oral (speaking, listening) or written (reading, writing) so it is self evident how important it is for a philologist to know the mechanics of relations between the non-verbal, extralinguistic denotational essence of the communicative act and its verbal, linguistic presentation. It is no surprise, then that many linguists follow their famous French colleague Charles Bally, claiming that stylistics is primarily the study of synonymic language resources.

Representatives of the not less well-known Prague school – V.Mathesius, T.Vachek, J.Havranek and others focused their attention on the priority of the situational appropriateness in the choice of languages varieties for their adequate functioning. Thus, *functional stylistics*, which became and remains an international, very important trend in style study, deals with sets, "paradigms" of language units of all levels of language hierarchy serving to accommodate the needs of certain typified communicative situations. These paradigms are known as *functional styles* of the language. Proceeding from the famous definition of the style of a language offered by V.V.Vinogradov more than three decades ago, we shall follow the understanding of a functional style formulated by I.R.Galperin as "a system of coordinated, interrelated and interconditioned language means intended to fulfil a specific function of communication and aiming at a definite effect."

All scholars agree that a well developed language, such as English or Russian, is streamed into several functional styles. Their classifications, though, coincide only partially: most style theoreticians do not argue about the number of functional styles being five, but disagree about their nomenclature. This manual offers on of the rather widely accepted classifications which single out of the following functional styles:

1. *official style*, represented in all kinds of official documents and papers;
2. *scientific style*, found in articles, brochures, monographs and other scientific, academic publications;
3. *publicist style*, covering such genres as essay, feature article, most writings of "new journalism", public speeches, etc.;
4. *newspaper style*, observed in the majority of material printed in newspapers;
5. *belles-lettres*, embracing numerous and versatile genres of creative writing.

It is only the first three that are invariably recognized in all stylistic treatises. As to newspaper style, it is often regarded as part of the publicist domain and is not always treated individually. But the biggest controversy is flaming around *belles-lettres style*. The unlimited possibilities of creative writing, which covers the whole of the universe and makes use of all language resources, led some scholars to the conviction that because of the liability of its contours it can be hardly qualified as a functional style. Still others claim that, regardless of its versatility, the *belles-lettres style*, in each of its concrete representations, fulfils the aesthetic function, which fact singles this style out of others and gives grounds to recognise its systematic

uniqueness, i.e. charges it with the status if an autonomous functional style.

Each of the enumerated styles is exercised in two forms – *written* and *oral;* an article and a lecture are examples of the two forms of the scientific style, news broadcast, on the radio and TV or newspaper information materials – of the newspaper style; an essay and public speech – of the publicist style, etc.

The number of functional styles and principles of their differentiation change with time and reflect the state of the functioning language at a given period. So, only recently, most style classifications had also included the so called *poetic style* which dealt with verbal forms specific for poetry. But poetry, within the last decades, lost its isolated linguistic position, makes use of all the vocabulary and grammar offered by the language at large and there is hardly sense in singling out a special poetic style for the contemporary linguistic situation, though its relevance for the language of the seventeenth, eighteenth and even the biggest part of the nineteenth centuries cannot be argued.

Something similar can be said about the *oratoric style*, which, in Ancient Greece, was instrumental in the creation of "Rhetoric", where Aristotle, its author, elaborated the basics of style study, still relevant today. The oratoric skill though has lost its position in social and political life. Nowadays speeches are mostly written first, and so contain all the characteristic features of publicist writing, which made it unnecessary to specify oratoric style within the contemporary functional stratification of the language.

All the above-mentioned styles are specified within the *literary type* of the language. Their functioning is characterized by the international approach of the speaker towards the choice of language means suitable for a particular communicative situation and the official, formal, preplanned nature of the latter.

The *colloquial type* of the language, on the contrary, is characterized by the inofficiality, spontaneity, informality of the communicative situation. Sometimes the colloquial type of speech is labelled "the colloquial style" and entered into the classification of functional styles of the language, regardless of the situational and linguistic differences between the literary and colloquial communication, and despite the fact that a style of speech manifests a conscious, mindful effort in choosing and preferring certain means of expression for the given communicative circumstances, while colloquial speech is shaped by the immediacy, spontaneity, unpremeditativeness of the communicative situation. Alongside this consideration there exists a strong tendency to treat colloquial speech as an individual language system with its independent set of language units and rules of their connection.

Functional stylistics, dealing in fact with all the subdivisions of the language and all its possible usages, is the most all-embracing "global" trend in style study, and such specified stylistics as the scientific prose study, or newspaper style study, or the like may be considered elaborations of certain fields of functional stylistics.

A special place here is occupied by the study of creative writing of the belles-lettres style, because in it, above all, we deal with *stylistic use of language resources*, i.e. with such a handling of language elements that enables them to carry not only the basic, logical, but also additional information of various types. So the *stylistic of artistic speech*, or belles-lettres style study, was shaped.

Functional stylistics at large and its specified directions proceed from the situationally stipulated language "paradigms" and concentrate primarily on the analysis of the latter. It is possible to say that the attention of functional stylistics is focused on the message in its correlation with the communicative situation.

The message is common ground for communications in an act of communications, an indispensable element in the exchange of information between two participants of the

communicative act – the addresser (the supplier of information, the speaker, the writer) and the addressee (the receiver of the information, the listener, the reader).

Problems, concerning the choice of the most appropriate languages means and their organization into a message, from the viewpoint of the addresser, are centre of attention of the *individual style study*, which puts particular emphasis on the study of an individual author's style, looking for correlation between the creative concepts of the author and the language of his works.

In terms of information theory the author's stylistics may be named the *stylistics of the encoder*: the language being viewed as the code to shape the information, respectively, as the encoder. The addressee in this case plays the part of the decoder of the information contained in the message, and the problems connected with adequate reception of the message without any informational losses or deformations, i.e., with adequate decoding, are the concern of *decoding stylistics*.

And, finally, the stylistics, proceeding from the norms of language usage at a given period and teaching these norms to language speakers, especially the ones, dealing with the language professionally (editors, publishers, writers, journalists, teachers, etc.) is called *practical stylistics*.

Thus, depending on the approach and the final aim there can be observed several trends in style study. Common to all of them is the necessity to learn what the language can offer to serve the innumerable communicative tasks and purposes of language users; how various elements of the language participate in storing and transferring information, which of them carries which type of information, etc.

The best way to find answers to most of these and similar questions is to investigate informational values and possibilities of language units, following the structural hierarchy of language levels, suggested by well-known Belgian linguist E.Benveniste more than four decades ago – at the IX International Congress of Linguists in 1962, accepted by most scholars today if not in its entirety, then at least as the basis for further elaboration and development.

E.Benveniste's scheme of analysis proceeds from the level of the phoneme – through the levels of the morpheme and the word to that sentence.

The resources of each language level become evident in action, i.e. in speech, so the attention of the learners is drawn to the behaviour of each language element in functioning, to its aptitude to convey various kinds of information.

The ability of a verbal element to obtain extra significance, to say more in a definite context was called by Prague linguists *foregrounding*: indeed, when a word (affix, sentence), automatized by the long use in speech, through context developments, obtains some new, additional features, the act resembles a background phenomenon moving into the front line - foregrounding.

A contextually foregrounded element carries more information than when taken in isolation, so it is possible to say that in context it is loaded with basic information inherently belonging to it, plus the acquired, adherent, additional information. It is this latter that is mainly responsible for the well known fact that a sentence means always more than the sum total of the meanings of its component-words, or a text means more than the sum of its sentences. So, stylistic analysis involves rather subtle procedures of finding foregrounded element and indicating the chemistry of its contextual changes, brought about by the intentional, planned operations of the addresser, i.e. effected by the conscious stylistic use of the language.

For foreign language students stylistic analysis holds particular difficulties: linguistic intuition of a native speaker, which is very helpful in all philological activities, does not work in the case of foreign learners. Besides, difficulties may arise because of the inadequate language command and the ensuing gaps in grasping the basic, denotational information. Starting

stylistic analysis, thus one should bear in mind that the understanding of each separate component of the message is an indispensable condition of satisfactory work with the message as a whole, of getting down to the core and essence of its meaning.

Stylistic analysis not only broadens the theoretical horizons of a language learner but also teaches the latter the skill of a competent reading, on the one hand, and proprieties of situational language usage, on the other.

4. THE ENGLISH LITERARY LANGUAGE

The literary language is a historical category. It exists as a variety of the national language. The literary language is that variety of the national language which imposes definite morphological, phonetic, syntactical, lexical, phraseological and stylistic norms. The norm usage is established by the language community at every given period in the development of the language. At every period the norm is in a state of fluctuation. There are two conflicting tendencies in the process of establishing the norm: 1) preservation of the already existing norm; 2) introduction of new norms not yet firmly established. Much of what was considered a violation of the norm in one period becomes acknowledged and is regarded as perfectly normal in another period.

There is no hard division between the literary and non-literary language. They are *independent. The literary language consistently enriches its vocabulary at the expense of the* non-literary language.

The English literary language was particularly regulated during the 17-th and 18-th centuries.

This turn the literary language greatly influences the non-literary language. Many words, onstructions and particularly phonetic improvements have been introduced through it into he English colloquial language. This influence had its greatest effect in the 19-th century with the spread of general education, and in the present century with the introduction of radio aid television into daily lives of the people.

Literary English is almost synonymous with the term Standard English, though the latter is an abstraction, an ideal. This ideal helps to establish more or less strict norms for all aspects of he language no matter how difficult it may be.

5. VARIETIES OF LANGUAGE

We distinguish between two varieties of the language: the spoken and the written. The spoken variety differs from the written language phonetically (in its written representation), morphologically, lexically and syntactically, e.g. he'd, she's instead of "he had", "she is" in the written variety. Some of these violations are recognised as being legitimated forms of colloquial English. The most striking difference between the spoken and written language is the vocabulary used. There are words and phrases typically colloquial and typically bookish.

The spoken language makes ample use of intensifying words: interjections, swear words, oaths. Ellipses or omissions of parts of the utterance is also characteristic of the spoken variety, e.g. "Had a good, Nora?" (instead of "Have you had a good day, Nora?"). In the spoken language it is very natural to have a string of sentences without any connections, e.g. "Came home late. Had supper and went to bed. Couldn't sleep, of course. The evening had been too much of a strain."

In the written variety the utterance becomes more exact, as the situation must be made clear by the context. The relation between the parts of the utterances must be more precise. Hence the abundance of conjunctions and other kinds of connectives characteristic only of the written variety is the use of complicated sentence-units. The monologue character of the written

language demands logical coherence of the idea expressed and the breaking of the utterances into spans; hence units like the syntactical whole of the paragraph.

Key words: Style and stylistics, expressive means and stylistic devices, functional styles of language, official style, scientific style, publicist style, newspaper style, belles-lettres, literary language, varieties of language.

Assignments for Self-Control

1. What are the main trends in style study?
2. What forms and types of speech do you know?
3. What is a functional style and what functional styles do you know?
4. What do you know of the studies in the domain of the style of artistic speech?
5. What do you know about individual style study? What authors most often attract the attention of style theoreticians?
6. What is foregrounding and how does it operate in the text?
7. What levels of linguistic analysis do you know and which of them are relevant for stylistic analysis?
8. What is decoding stylistics?
9. What is the main concern of practical stylistics?
10. What is the ultimate goal of stylistic analysis of a speech product?
11. What types of language communication do you know?
12. What are the main characteristics of oral speech?
13. Enumerate functional styles of contemporary English.
14. What do you know about the scientific style?
15. Characterize the official style.
16. Discuss the peculiarities of the newspaper style.
17. What are the main features of the publicist style?
18. What is the status of belles-lettres style among other functional styles?
19. What dichotomies between the types and the forms of language communication do you know? Do they correlate?
20. Can you think of any intermediate styles, boasting of qualities of two or even more "regular" styles?

LECTURE II.
STYLISTIC CLASSIFICATION OF THE ENGLISH VOCABULARY

2.1. General considerations.
2.2. Neutral, common literary and common colloquial vocabulary.
2.3. Special literary vocabulary:
a) Terms
b) Poetic and Highly Literary Words
c) Archaic, Obsolescent and Obsolete Words
d) Barbarisms and Foreignisms
e) Literary Coinages (Including Nonce-Words)

2.1. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Like any linguistic issue the classification of the vocabulary here suggested is for purely stylistic purposes. This is important for the course inasmuch as some SDs are based on the interplay of different stylistic aspects of word. It follows then that a discussion of the ways the English vocabulary can be classified from a stylistic point of view should be given proper attention.

In order to get a more or less clear idea of the word-stock of any language, it must be presented as a system, the elements of which are interconnected, interrelated and yet independent. Some linguists, who clearly see the systematic character of language as a whole, deny, however, the possibility of systematically classifying the vocabulary. They say that the word-stock of any language is so large and so heterogeneous that it is impossible to formalise it and therefore present it in any system. The words of a language are thought of as a chaotic body whether viewed from their origin and development or from their present state.

Indeed, the coinage of new lexical units, the development of meaning, the differentiation of words according to their stylistic evaluation and their spheres of usage, the correlation between meaning and concept and other problems connected with vocabulary are so multifarious and varied that it is difficult to grasp the systematic character of the word-stock of a language, though it co-exists with the systems of other levels phonetics, morphology and syntax.

To deny the systematic character of the word-stock of a language amounts to denying the systematic character of language as a whole, words being elements in the general system of language.

The word-stock of a language may be represented as a definite system in which different aspects of words may be singled out as interdependent. A special branch of linguistic science Lexicology has done much to classify vocabulary. A glance at the contents of any book on Lexicology will suffice to ascertain the outline of the system of the word-stock of the given language.

For our purpose, i. e. for linguistic stylistics, a special type of classification, viz. stylistic classification, is most important.

In accordance with the already-mentioned division of language into literary and colloquial, we may represent the whole of the word-stock of the English language as being divided into three main layers: the *literary layer*, the *neutral layer* and the *colloquial layer*. The literary and the colloquial layers contain a number of subgroups, each of which has a property it shares with all the subgroups within the layer. This common property, which unites the different groups of words within the layer, may be called its aspect. The aspect of the literary layer is its markedly bookish character. It is this that makes the layer more or less stable. The aspect of the colloquial layer of words is its lively spoken character. It is this that makes it unstable, fleeting.

The aspect of the neutral layer is its universal character. That means it is unrestricted in its use. It can be employed in all styles of language and in all spheres of human activity. It is this that makes the layer the most stable of all.

The literary layer of words consists of groups accepted as legitimate members of the English vocabulary. They have no local or dialectal character.

The colloquial layer of words as qualified in most English or American dictionaries is not infrequently limited to a definite language community or confined to a special locality where it circulates.

The literary vocabulary consists of the following groups of words:
1. common literary, 2. terms and learned words, 3. poetic words, 4. archaic words, 5. barbarisms and foreign words, 6. literary coinages including nonce-words.

The colloquial vocabulary falls into the following groups: 1. common colloquial words; 2. slang; 3. jargonisms; 4. professional words; 5. dialectal words, 6. vulgar words; 7. colloquial coinages.

The common literary, neutral and common colloquial words are grouped under the term *standard English vocabulary*. Other groups in the literary layer are regarded as special literary

vocabulary and those in the colloquial layer are regarded as special colloquial (non-literary) vocabulary.

2.2. NEUTRAL, COMMON LITERARY AND COMMON COLLOQUIAL VOCABULARY

Neutral words, which form the bulk of the English vocabulary, are used in both literary and colloquial language. Neutral words are the main source of synonymy and polysemy. It is the neutral stock of words that is so prolific in the production of new meanings.

The wealth of the neutral stratum of words is often overlooked. This is due to their inconspicuous character. But their faculty for assuming new meanings and generating new stylistic variants is often quite amazing.' This generative power of the neutral words in the English language is multiplied by the very nature of the language itself. It has been estimated that most neutral English words are of monosyllabic character, as, in the process of development from Old English to Modem English, most of the parts of speech lost their distinguishing suffixes. This phenomenon has led to the development of conversion as the most productive means of word-building. Word compounding is not so productive as conversion or word derivation, where a new word is because of a shift in the part of speech in the first case and by the edition of an affix in the second. Unlike all other groups, the neutral group of words cannot be considered as having a special stylistic colouring, whereas both literary and colloquial words have a definite stylistic colouring.

Common literary words are chiefly used in writing and polished speech. One can always tell a literary word from a colloquial word. The reason for this lies in certain objective features of

the literary layer of words. What these objective features are, is difficult to say be-cause as yet no objective criteria have been worked out. But one of them undoubtedly is that literary units stand in opposition to colloquial units. This is especially apparent when pairs of synonyms, literary and colloquial, can be formed which stand in contrasting relation.

The following synonyms illustrate the relations that exist between the neutral, literary and colloquial words in the English language.

Colloquial	*Neutral*	*Literary*
kid	child	infant
daddy	father	parent
chap	fellow	associate
get out	go away	retire
goon	continue	proceed
teenager	boy (girl)	youth (maiden)
flapper	young girl	maiden
go ahead	begin	commence

It goes without saying that these synonyms are not only stylistic but ideographic as well, i. e. there is a definite, though slight, semantic difference between the words. But this is almost always the case with synonyms. There are very few absolute synonyms in English just as there are in any language. The main distinction between synonyms remains stylistic. But stylistic difference may be of various kinds: it may lie in the emotional tension connoted in a word, or in the sphere of application, or in the degree of the quality denoted. Colloquial words , are always more emotionally coloured than literary ones. The neutral stratum of words, as the term itself implies, has no degree of emotiveness, nor have they any distinctions in the sphere of usage.

Both literary and colloquial words have their upper and lower ranges. The lower range of literary words approaches the neutral layer and has a markedly obvious tendency to pass

into that layer. The same may be said of the upper range of the colloquial layer: it can very easily pass into the neutral layer. The lines of demarcation between common colloquial and neutral, on the one hand, and common literary and neutral, on the other, are blurred. It is here that the process of inter-penetration of the stylistic strata becomes most apparent.

In the diagram, *common colloquial vocabulary* is represented as overlapping into the standard English vocabulary and is therefore to be considered part of it. It borders both on the neutral vocabulary and on the special colloquial vocabulary which, as we shall see later, falls out of standard English altogether. Just as common literary words lack homogeneity so do common colloquial words and set expressions. Some of the lexical items belonging to this stratum are close to the non-standard colloquial groups such as jargonisms, professionalisms, etc. These are on the border-line between the common, colloquial vocabulary and the special colloquial or non-standard vocabulary. Other words approach the neutral bulk of the English vocabulary. Thus, the words *teenager* (a young girl or young man) and *hippie (hippy)* (a young person who leads an unordered and unconventional life) are colloquial words passing into the neutral vocabulary. They are gradually losing their non-standard character and becoming widely recognized. However, they have not lost their colloquial association and therefore still remain in the colloquial stratum of the English vocabulary. So also are the following words and expressions: *take* (in "as I take it"= as I understand); *to go for* (to be attracted by, like very much, as in "You think she still goes for the guy?"); *guy* (young man); *to be gone on* (= to be madly in love with); *pro* (= a professional, e.g. a professional boxer, tennis-player, etc.).

The spoken language abounds in set expressions which are colloquial in character, e.g. *all sorts of things, just a bit, How is life treating you?, so-so, What time do you make it?, to hobnob* (= to be very friendly with, to drink together), *so much the better, to be sick and tired of, to be up to something*.

The stylistic function of the different strata of the English vocabulary depends not so much on the inner qualities of each of the groups, as on their interaction when they are opposed to one another. However, the qualities themselves are not unaffected by the function of the words, inasmuch as these qualities have been acquired in certain environments. It is interesting to note that anything written assumes a greater degree of significance than what is only spoken. If the spoken takes the place of the written or *vice versa*, it means that we are faced with a stylistic device.

Certain set expressions have been coined within literary English and their use in ordinary speech will inevitably make the utterance sound bookish. In other words, it will become literary. The following are examples of set expressions which can be considered literary: *in accordance with, with regard to, by virtue of, to speak at great length, to lend assistance, to draw a lesson, responsibility rests*.

Assignments for Self-Control

1. What can you say about the meaning of a word and its relation to the concept of an entity?
2. What types of lexical meaning do you know and what stipulates their existence and differentiation?
3. What connotational meanings do you know? Dwell on each of them, providing your own examples.
4. What is the role of the context in meaning actualization?
5. What registers of communication are reflected in the stylistic differentiation of the vocabulary?
6. Speak about general literary words illustrating your elaboration with examples from nineteenth- and twentieth-century prose.
7. What are the main subgroups of special literary words?

8. hat do you know of terms, their structure, meaning, functions?

Lecture 3.
SPECIAL LITERARY VOCABULARY
a) TERMS

"All scientists are linguists to some extent. They are responsible for devising a consistent terminology, a skeleton language to talk about their subject-matter. Philologists and philosophers of speech are in the peculiar position of having to evolve a special language to talk about language itself."

This quotation makes clear one of the essential characteristics of a term *viz.* its highly conventional character. A term is generally very easily coined and easily accepted, and new icoinages as easily replace out-dated ones.

This sensitivity to alteration is mainly due to the necessity of reflecting in language the cognitive process maintained by scholars in analysing different concepts and phenomena. One of the most characteristic features of a term is its direct relevance to the system or set of terms used in a particular science, discipline or art, i. e. to its nomenclature.

When a term is used our mind immediately associates it with a certain nomenclature. A term is directly connected with the concept it denotes. A term, unlike other words, directs the mind to the essential quality of the thing, phenomenon or action as seen by the scientist in the light of his own conceptualisation.

Terms are mostly and predominantly used in special works dealing with the notions of some branch of science. Therefore it may be said that they belong to the style of language of science. But their use is not confined to this style. They may as well appear in other styles - in newspaper style, in publicistic and practically in all other existing styles of language. But their function in this case changes. They do not always fulfil their basic function, that of bearing exact reference to a given concept. When used in the belles-lettres style, for instance, a term may acquire a stylistic function and consequently become a SD.

The following is an example where a term is used as an SD.

"What a fool Rawdon Crawley has been," Clump replied, "to go and marry a governess There was something about the girl too."

"Green eyes, fair skin, pretty figure, *famous frontal development*" Squill remarked. (W. M. Thackeray)

The combination "frontal development" is terminological in character (used sometimes in anatomy). But being preceded by the word "famous" used in the sense indicated by the Shorter Oxford Dictionary as "a strong expression of approval (chiefly colloquial); excellent, capital" the whole expression assumes a specific stylistic function due to the fact that "frontal development" is used both in its terminological aspect and in its logical meaning "the breast of a woman".

Whenever the terms used in the belles-lettres style set the reader at odds with the text, we can register a stylistic effect caused either by a specific use of terms in their proper meanings or by a simultaneous realisation of two meanings.

b) POETIC AND HIGHLY LITERARY WORDS

Poetic words form a rather insignificant layer of the special literary vocabulary. They are mostly archaic or very rarely used highly literary words which aim at producing an elevated effect. They have a marked tendency to detach themselves from the common literary word-stock and gradually assume the quality of terms denoting certain definite notions and calling forth poetic diction.

Poetic words and expressions are called upon to sustain the special elevated atmosphere

of poetry. This may be said to be the main function of poetic words.

V. V. Vinogradov gives the following properties of poetic words:

"... the cobweb of poetic words and images veils the reality, stylising it according to the established literary norms and canons. A word is torn away from its referent. Being drawn into the system of literary styles, the words are selected and arranged in groups of definite images, in phraseological series, which grow standardised and stale and are becoming conventional symbols of definite phenomena or characters or of definite ideas or impressions."

Poetical tradition has kept alive such archaic words and forms *as yclept* (p. p. of the old verb *clipian* – to call, name), *eftsoons* (*eftsona*, - again, soon after), which are used even by modern ballad-mongers. Let us note in passing that archaic words are here to be understood as units that have either entirely gone out of use, or as words some of whose meanings have grown archaic, e. g. *hall* in the following line from Byron's Childe Harold's Pilgrimage: Deserted is my own good *hall*, its hearth is desolate.

It must be remembered though, that not all English poetry makes use of "poeticisms or poetical terms", as they might be named. In the history of English literature there were periods, as there were in many countries, which were characterised by protests against the use of such conventional symbols. The literary trends known as classicism and romanticism were particularly rich in fresh poetic terms.

Poetical words in an ordinary environment may also have a satirical function, as seen in this passage from Byron.

But Adeline was not indifferent: for
(Now for a common-place!) beneath the snow, **As** a **volcano holds the lava** more
Within - et cetera. Shall I go on? **- No, I hate to hunt down** *a tired metaphor,*
So let the often-used volcano go. Poor thing: How frequently, by me and others, It hath been stirred up till its smoke quite smothers?
("Don Juan")

The satirical function of poetic words and conventional poetic devices is well revealed in this stanza. The "tired metaphor" and the "often-used volcano" are typical of Byron's estimate of the value of conventional metaphors and stereotyped poetical expressions.

The striving for the unusual - the characteristic feature of some kinds of poetry - is akin to the sensational and is therefore to be found not only in poetry, but in many other styles.

A modern English literary critic has remarked that in journalese a policeman never *goes* to an appointed spot; he *proceeds* to it. The picturesque reporter seldom talks of a *horse*, it is a *steed* or a *charger*. The *sky* is the *welkin*; the *valley* is the *vale*; *fire* is the *devouring element*...

Poetical words and word-combinations can be likened to terms in that they do not easily yield to polysemy. They are said to evoke emotive meanings. They colour the utterance with a certain air of loftiness, but generally fail to produce a genuine feeling of delight: they are too hackneyed for the purpose, too stale. And that is the reason that the excessive use of poeticisms at present calls forth protest and derision towards those who favour this conventional device.

The very secret of a truly poetic quality of a word does not lie in conventionality of usage. On the contrary, a poeticism through constant repetition gradually becomes hackneyed. Like anything that lacks freshness it fails to evoke a genuinely aesthetic effect and eventually call forth protest on the part of those who are sensitive to real beauty.

As far back as in 1800 Wordsworth raised the question of the conventional use of words and phrases, which to his mind should be avoided. There was (and still persists) a notion called "poetic diction" which still means the collection of epithets, periphrases, archaisms, etc., which were common property to most poets of the 18th century.

However, the term has now acquired a broader meaning. Thus Owen Barfield says:

"When words are selected and arranged in such a way that their meaning either arouses or is obviously intended to arouse aesthetic imagination, the result may be described as poetic diction."

Poetical words and set expressions make the utterance understandable only to a limited number of readers. It is mainly due to poeticism that poetical language is sometimes called poetical jargon.

c) ARCHAIC, OBSOLESCENT AND OBSOLETE WORDS

The word-stock of a language is in an increasing state of change. Words change their meaning and sometimes drop out of the language together. New words spring up and replace the old ones. **Some** words stay in the language a very long time and do not lose their **faculty of** gaining **new** meanings and becoming richer and richer polysemantically. Other words live **but** a short time and are like bubbles on the surface of water - they disappear leaving no trace of their existence.

In registering these processes the role of dictionaries can hardly be over-estimated. Dictionaries serve to retain this or that word in a language either as a relic of ancient times, where it lived and circulated, or as a still living unit of the system, though it may have lost some of its meanings. They may also preserve certain nonce-creations which were never intended for general use.

In every period in the development of a literary language one can find words which will show more or less apparent changes in their meaning or usage, from full vigour, through a moribund state, to death, i. e. complete disappearance of the unit from the language.

We shall distinguish three stages in the aging process of words.

The beginning of the aging process when the word becomes rarely used. Such words are called *obsolescent*, i.e. they are in the stage of gradually passing out of general use. To this category first of all belong morphological forms belonging to the earlier stages in the development of the language. In the English language these are the pronouns *thou* and its forms *thee, thy* and *thine*, the corresponding verbal ending *-est* and the verb-forms *art, wilt (thou makest, thou wilt)*, the ending *-(e)th* instead of *-(e)s (he maketh)* and the pronounce.

To the category of obsolescent words belong many French borrowings which have been kept in the literary language as a means of preserving the spirit of earlier periods, e.g. *& pallet* (= a straw mattress), a *palfrey* (= a small horse), *garniture* (= furniture), *to emplume* (= to adorn with feathers or plumes).

The second group of archaic words are those that have already gone completely out of use but are still recognised by the English-speaking community: e.g. *methinks* (= it seems to me), *nay* (= no). These words are called *obsolete*.

The third group, which may be called *archaic proper*, are words which are no longer recognisable in modern English, words that were in use in Old English and which have either dropped out of the language entirely or have changed in their appearance so much that they have become unrecognisable, e. g. *troth* (= faith), *a losel* (= a worthless, lazy fellow).

The border lines between the groups are not distinct. In fact they interpenetrate. It is specially difficult to distinguish between obsolete and obsolescent words. But the difference is important when we come to deal with the stylistic aspect of an utterance in which the given word serves a certain stylistic purpose. Obsolete and obsolescent words have separate functions.

There is still another class of words which is classed as historical words. They can be called historical terms referring to definite stages in the development of society and can not be neglected though the things and phenomena to which they refer no longer exist. Historical

words have no synonyms as compared to archaic words which are replaced by modern synonyms. "Yeoman", "goblet", baldric", "mace" - are historical words.

The words of all 4 groups are used by writers for stylistic purposes: they serve to create a realistic background to historical novels.

Archaic words and phrases can be found in official documents, e.g. "aforesaid, therewith, herein, aternamed", etc. They are also used in poetry to create an elevated effect.

d) BARBARISMS AND FOREIGNISMS

In the vocabulary of the English language there is a considerable layer of words called *barbarisms*. These are words of foreign origin which have not entirely been assimilated into the English language. They bear the appearance of a borrowing and are felt as something alien to the native tongue. The role foreign borrowings played in the development of the English literary language is well known, and the great majority of these borrowed words now form part of the rank and file of the English vocabulary. It is the science of linguistics, in particular its branch etymology, that reveals the foreign nature of this or that word. But most of what were formerly foreign borrowings are now, from a purely stylistic position, not regarded as foreign. But still there are some words which retain their foreign appearance to a greater or lesser degree. These words, which are called barbarisms, are, like archaisms, also considered to be on the outskirts of the literary language.

Most of them have corresponding English synonyms, e. g. *chic* (= stylish); *bon mot* (= a clever witty saying); *en passant* (= in passing); *ad infinitum* (= to infinity) and many other words and phrases.

It is very important for purely stylistic purposes to distinguish between barbarisms and foreign words proper. Barbarisms are words which have already become facts of the English language. They are, as it were, part and parcel of the English word-stock, though they remain on the outskirts of the literary vocabulary. Foreign words, though used for certain stylistic purposes, do not belong to the English vocabulary. They are not registered by English dictionaries, except in a kind of addenda which gives the meanings of the foreign words most frequently used in literary English. Barbarisms are generally given in the body of the dictionary.

In printed works foreign words and phrases are generally italicised to indicate their alien nature or their stylistic value. Barbarisms, on the contrary, are not made conspicuous in the text unless they bear a special load of stylistic information.

There are foreign words in the English vocabulary which fulfil a terminological function. Therefore, though they still retain their foreign appearance, they should not be regarded as barbarisms.

Barbarisms are a historical category. Many foreign words and phrases which were once just foreign words used in Literary English to express a concept non-existent in English reality, have little by little entered the class of words called barbarisms and many of these barbarisms have gradually lost their foreign peculiarities become more or less naturalised and have mixed with the native word stock. With the passing of time they have become common English literary words. The words *scientific, methodical, penetrate, function, figurative* and many others were once barbarisms but now they are lawful members of the common literary word-stock. Both foreign words and barbarisms are widely used in various styles of language to supply local colour.

e) LITERARY COINAGES (INCLUDING NONCE-WORDS)

There is a term in linguistics, which by its very nature is ambiguous, and that is the term *neologism*. In dictionaries it is generally defined as "a new word -or a new meaning for an established word". Everything in this definition is vague. How long should words or their meanings be regarded as new? Which words of those that appear as new in the language, say

during the life-time of one generation, can be regarded as established? It is suggestive that the latest editions of certain dictionaries avoid the use of the stylistic notation "neologism" apparently because of its ambiguous character. If a word is fixed in a dictionary and provided that the dictionary is reliable, it ceases to be a neologism. If a new meaning is recognised as an element in the semantic structure of a lexical unit, it ceases to be new. However, if we wish to divide the word-stock of a language into chronological periods, we can conventionally mark off a period, which might be called new.

Every period in the development of a language produces an enormous number of new words or new meanings of established words. Most of them do not live long. They are not meant to live long. They are, as it were, coined for use at the moment of speech, and therefore possess a peculiar property - that of temporariness. The given word or meaning holds only in the given context and is meant only to "serve the occasion."

However, such is the power of the written language that a word or a meaning used only to serve the occasion, when once *fixed* in writing, may become part and parcel of the general vocabulary irrespective of the quality of the word. That's why the introduction of new words by men-of-letters is pregnant with unforeseen consequences: their new coinages may replace old words and become established in the language as synonyms and later as substitutes for the old words.

The coining of new words generally arises first of all with the need to designate new concepts resulting from the development of science and also with the need to express nuances of meaning called forth by a deeper understanding of the nature of the phenomenon in question. It may also be the result of a search for a more economical, brief and compact form of utterance, which proves to be a more expressive means of communicating the idea. The first type of newly coined words, i. e. Those, which designate new-born concepts, may be named *terminological coinages*. The second type, i. e. words coined because their creators seek expressive utterance may be named *stylistic coinages*.

New words are mainly coined according to the productive models for word-building in the given language. But the new words of the literary-bookish type we are dealing with may sometimes be built with the help of affixes and by other means which have gone out of use or which are in the process of dying out. In this case the stylistic effect produced by the means of word-building chosen becomes more apparent, and the stylistic function of the device can be felt more acutely.

Among new coinages of a literary-bookish type must be mentioned a considerable layer of words appearing in the publicistic style, mainly in newspaper articles and magazines and also in the newspaper style – mostly in newspaper headlines. To these belongs the word *Blimp* - a name coined by Low, the well-known English cartoonist. The name was coined to designate an English colonel famous for his conceit, brutality, ultra- conservatism. This word gave birth to a derivative, *viz. Blimpish*.

Another type of neologism is the *nonce- word*, i.e. a word coined to suit one particular occasion. They rarely pass into the language as legitimate units of the vocabulary; *cousined, wived, mother - in - lawed*. They are not registered in dictionaries.

Key words. General considerations, neutral, common literary, common colloquial vocabulary, special literary vocabulary, terms, poetic and highly literary words, archaic, obsolescent, obsolete words, barbarisms and foreignisms, literary coinages, nonce-words.

Assignments for Self-Control

9. What are the fields of application of archaic words and forms?
10. What do you know about the common literary vocabulary?
11. What do you know about the common colloquial vocabulary?

12. What do you know about the neutral words?
13. What can you say about the meaning of a word and its relation to the concept of an entity?
14. What types of lexical meaning do you know and what stipulates their existance and differentiation?

LECTURE 4
SPECIAL COLLOQUIAL VOCABULARY

3.1 Slang
3.2 Jargonisms
3.3 Professionalisms
3.4 Dialectal Words
3.5 Vulgar words or vulgarisms.
3.6 Colloquial coinages (words and meanings).

3.1 SLANG

There is hardly any other term that is as ambiguous and obscure as the term *slang*. Slang seems to mean everything that is below the standard of usage of present-day English.

Much has been said and written about it. This is probably due to the uncertainty of the concept itself. No one has yet given a more or less satisfactory definition of the term. Nor has it been specified by any linguist who deals with the problem of the English vocabulary.

The first thing that strikes the scholar is the fact that no other European language has singled out a special layer of vocabulary and named it slang, though all of them distinguish such groups of words as jargon, cant, and the like. The distinctions between slang and other groups of unconventional English, though perhaps subtle and sometimes difficult to grasp, should nevertheless be subjected to a more detailed linguistic specification.

Webster's "Third New International Dictionary" gives the following meanings of the term: slang *[origin unknown]* 1: language peculiar to a particular group: as a: the special and often secret vocabulary used by a class (as thieves, beggars) and usu. felt to be vulgar or inferior: argot; b: the jargon used by or associated with a particular trade, profession, or field of activity; 2: a non-standard vocabulary composed of words and senses characterised primarily by connotations of extreme informality and usu. a currency not limited to a particular region and composed typically of coinages or arbitrarily changed words, clipped or shortened forms, extravagant, forced or facetious figures of speech, or verbal novelties usu. experiencing quick popularity and relatively rapid decline into disuse.

The New Oxford English Dictionary defines slang as follows:

a) the special vocabulary used by any set of persons of a low or disreputable character; language of a low and vulgar type. (Now merged in c. *[cant]*); b) the *cant* or *jargon* of a certain class or period; c) language of a highly colloquial type considered as below the level of standard educated speech, and consisting either of new words or of current words employed in some special sense.

As is seen from these quotations slang is represented both as a special vocabulary and as a **special language**. This is the first thing that causes confusion. If this is a certain lexical layer, then why **should** it **be** given the rank of language? If, on the other hand, slang is a certain language **or a** dialect or even a patois, then it should be characterised not only by its peculiar **use of words but** also by phonetic, morphological and syntactical peculiarities. **J. B. Greenough and** C. L. Kitteridge define slang in **these words:** -

"**Slang**... is **a** peculiar kind of vagabond language, always hanging on the outskirts of **legitimate** speech but continually straying or forcing its way into the most respectable **company**."

Another definition of slang is one made by Eric Partridge, the eminent student of the non-**literary language:**

"**Slang** is much rather a spoken than a literary language. It originates, nearly always, in speech. To coin a term on a written page is almost inevitably to brand it as **a** neologism **which** will either be accepted or become **a** nonce-word (or phrase), but, except in the **rarest** instances, that term will not be slang"

In most of **the** dictionaries *si* (slang) is used as convenient stylistic notation for a word or a phrase that cannot be specified more exactly. The obscure etymology of the term itself affects its use as **a** stylistic notation. Whenever the notation appears in a dictionary it may serve as an indication that the unit presented is non-literary, but not pinpointed. That is the reason why the various dictionaries disagree in the use of this term when applied as a stylistic notation.

3.2 JARGONISMS

In the non-literary vocabulary of the English language there is a group of words that are called *jargonisms. Jargon* is a recognised term for a group of words that exists in almost every language and whose aim is to preserve secrecy within one or another social group. Jargonisms are generally old words with entirely new meanings imposed on them. The traditional meaning of the words is immaterial, only the new, improvised meaning is of importance. Most of the jargonisms of any language, and of the English language too, are absolutely incomprehensible to those outside the social group, which has invented them. They may be defined as a code within a code, that is special meanings of words that are imposed on the recognised code - the dictionary meaning of the words.

Thus the word *grease* means "money"; *loaf* means "head"; *a tiger hunter* is "a gambler"; *a lexer* is "a student preparing for a law course"

Jargonisms are social in character. They are not regional. In Britain and in the US almost any social group of people has its own jargon. The following jargons are well known in the English language: the jargon of thieves and vagabonds, generally known as cant; the jargon of jazz people; the jargon of the army, known as military slang; the jargon of sportsmen, and many others.

The various jargons (which in fact are nothing but a definite group of words) remain a foreign language to the outsiders of any particular social group.

3.3 PROFESSIONALISMS

Professionalisms, as the term itself signifies, are the words used in a definite trade, profession or calling by people connected by common interests both at work and at home. They commonly designate some working process or implement of labour. Professionalisms are correlated to terms. Terms, as has already been indicated, coined to nominate new concepts that appear in the process of, and as a result of, technical progress and the development of science.

Professional words name anew already-existing concepts, tools or instruments, and have the typical properties of a special code. The main feature of a professionalism is its technicality. Professionalisms are special words in the non-literary layer of the English vocabulary, whereas terms are a specialised group belonging to the literary layer of words. Terms, if they are connected with a field or branch of science or technique well-known to ordinary people, are easily decoded and enter the neutral stratum of the vocabulary. Professionalisms generally remain in circulation within a definite community, as they are linked to a common occupation and common social interests. The semantic structure of the term is usually transparent and is therefore easily understood. The semantic structure of a professionalism is often dimmed by the image on which the meaning of the professionalism is based, particularly when the features of the object in question reflect the process of the work, metaphorically or metonymically. Like

terms, professionalisms do not allow any polysemy, they are monosemantic.

Here are some professionalisms used in different trades: *tin-fish* (= submarine), *block-buster* (= a bomb especially designed to destroy blocks of big buildings).

3.4 DIALECTAL WORDS

This group of words is obviously opposed to the other groups of the non-literary English vocabulary and therefore its stylistic functions can be more or less clearly defined. *Dialectal words* are those, which in the process of integration of the English national language remained beyond its literary boundaries, and their use is generally confined to a definite locality.

With reference to this group there is a confusion of terms, particularly between the terms *dialectal, slang* and *vernacular*. In order to ascertain the true value *and* the stylistic functions of dialectal words it is necessary to look into their nature. For this purpose a quotation from Cecil Wyld's "A History of Modern Colloquial English" will be to the point.

"The history of a very large part of the vocabulary of the present day English dialects is still very obscure, and it is doubtful whether much of it is of any antiquity. So far very little attempt has been made to sift the chaff from the grain in that very vast receptacle of the English Dialect Dictionary, and to decide which elements are really genuine "corruptions" of words which the yokel has heard from educated speakers, or read, misheard, or misread, and ignorantly altered, and adopted, often with a slightly twisted significance. Probably many hundreds of 'dialect' words are of this origin, and have no historical value whatever, except inasmuch as they illustrate a general principle in the modification of speech. Such words are not, as a rule, characteristic of any Regional Dialect, although they may be ascribed to one of these, simply because some collector of dialect forms has happened to hear them in a particular area. They belong rather to the category of "mistakes" which any ignorant speaker may make, and which such persons do make, again and again, in every part of the country."

We are not concerned, here with the historical aspect of dialectal words. For our purpose it will suffice to note that there is a definite similarity of functions in the use of slang, cockney and any other form of non-literary English and that of dialectal words. All these groups when used in emotive prose are meant to characterise the speaker as a person of a certain locality, breeding, education, etc.

There is sometimes a difficulty in distinguishing dialectal words from colloquial words. Some dialectal words have become so familiar in good colloquial or standard colloquial English that they are universally accepted as recognised units of the standard colloquial English. To these words belong *lass*, meaning "a girl or a beloved girl" and the corresponding *lad*, "a boy or a young man", *daft* from the Scottish and the northern dialect, meaning "of unsound mind, silly".

3.5 VULGAR WORDS OR VULGARISMS

Vulgarisms are coarse words and expressions with strong emotional meaning which denote the speaker's attitude towards the object in question. There are different degrees of vulgar words, some of them - obscene ones - should not even be fixed in common dictionaries ("four-letter" words); words like "damn, bloody, son of a bitch, to hell" belong to vulgarisms of a lesser degree.

Coarse words denoting parts of the body and physiological acts that are not spoken of in public except in euphemistic form are called *dysphemisms*.

The function of expletives is almost the same as that of interjections, that is to express strong emotions, mainly annoyance, anger, vexation and the like. They are not to be found in any functional style of language except emotive prose, and here only in the direct speech of the characters.

The language of the underworld is rich in coarse words and expressions. But not every expression which may be considered coarse should regarded as a vulgarism. Coarseness of expression may result from improper grammar, non-standard pronunciation, from the misuse of certain literary words and expressions, from a deliberate distortion of words. These are improprieties of speech but not vulgarisms. Needless to say the label *coarse* is very frequently used merely to designate an expression which lacks refinement. But vulgarisms, besides being coarse properly, are also rude and emotionally strongly charged and, like any manifestation of excess of feelings, are not very discernible as to their logical meaning.

3.6. COLLOQUIAL COINAGES (WORDS AND MEANINGS)

Colloquial coinages (nonce-words), unlike those of a literary-bookish character, are spontaneous and elusive. This proceeds from the very nature of the colloquial words as such. Not all of the colloquial nonce-words are fixed in dictionaries or even in writing and therefore most of them disappear from the language leaving no trace in it whatsoever.

Unlike literary-bookish coinages, nonce-words of a colloquial nature are not usually built by means of affixes but are based on certain semantic changes in words that are almost imperceptible to the linguistic observer until the word finds its way into print.

It is only **a** careful stylistic analysis of the utterance as a whole that will reveal a new shade of meaning inserted into the semantic structure of a given word or word-combination.

Writers often show that they are conscious of the specific character of the nonce-word they use by various means. The following are illustrations of the deliberate use of a new word that either was already established in the language or was in process of being established as such: •

"... besides, there is *a tact* -
(That modern phrase appears to me sad stuff.
But it will serve to keep my verse compact).
(Byron, "Don Juan")

According to the Oxford Dictionary the meaning of the word *tact* as used in these lines appeared in the English language in 1804. Byron, who keenly felt any innovation introduced into the literary language of his time, accepts it unwillingly

Key words. Slang, jargonisms, professionalisms, dialectal words, vulgar words or vulgarisms, colloquial coinages (words and meanings).

Assignments for Self-Control

1. What can you say about the meaning of a word and its relation to the concept of an entity?
2. What types of lexical meaning do you know and what stipulates their existence and differentiation?
3. What are the main subgroups of special colloquial words?
4. Can you recognize general colloquial words in a literary text? Where do they mainly occur?
5. What are the main characteristics of slang?
6. What do you know of professional and social Jargonisms?
7. What connects the stock of vulgarisms and social history?
8. What is the place and the role of dialectal words in the national language? in the literary text?
9. To provide answers to the above questions find words belonging to different stylistic groups and subgroups:

a) in the dictionary, specifying its stylistic mark ("label"); b) in your reading material, specifying the type of discourse, where you found it-authorial speech (dialogue, narration), description,

etc.

LECTURE V

Phonetic expressive means and stylistic devices.

4.1. Onomatopoeia
4.2. Alliteration
4.3. Rhyme
4.4. Rhythm

PHONETIC EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYLISTIC DEVICES

The stylistic approach to the utterance is not confined to its structure and sense. There is another thing to be taken into account which, in a certain type of communication, viz. belles - lettres, plays an important role. This is the way a word, a phrase or a sentence sounds. The sound of most words taken separately will have little or no aesthetic value. It is in combination with other words that a word may acquire a certain euphonic impression, but this is the matter of individual perception and feeling and therefor subjective.

An interesting statement in this regard is made by a Hungarian linguist, Ivan Fonagy:

"The great semantic entropy (a term from theory of communication denoting the measure of the unknown, I.G.) of poetic language stands in contrast to the predictability of its sounds. Of course, not even in the case of poetry can we determine the sound of a word on the basis of its meaning. Nevertheless in the larger units of line and stanza, a certain relationship can be found between sounds and content."

The Russian poet B. Pasternak says that he has "... always thought that the music of words is not an acoustic phenomenon and does not consist of the euphony of vowels and consonants taken separately. It results from the correlation of the meaning of the utterance with its sound."

The theory of sound symbolism is based on the assumption that separate sounds due to their articulatory and acoustic properties may awake certain ideas, perceptions, feelings, images, vague though they might be. Recent investigations have shown that "it is rash to deny the existence of universal, or widespread, types of sound symbolism." In poetry we cannot help feeling that the arrangement of sounds carries a definite aesthetic function. Poetry is not entirely divorced from music. Such notions as harmony, euphony, rhythm and other sound phenomena undoubtedly are not indifferent to the general effect produced by a verbal chain. Poetry, unlike prose, is meant to be read out loud and any oral performance of a message inevitably involves definite musical (in the broad sense of the word) interpretation.

4.1 ONOMOTOPOEIA

Onomatopoeia is a combination of speech-sounds which aims at imitating sounds produced in nature (wind, sea, thunder, etc), by things (machines or tools, etc), by people (sighing, laughter, patter of feet, etc) and by animals. Combinations of speech sounds of this type will inevitably be associated with whatever produces the natural sound. Therefore the relation between onomatopoeia and the phenomenon it is supposed to represent is one of metonymy.

There are two varieties of onomatopoeia, direct and indirect. *Direct onomatopoeia* is contained in words that imitate natural sounds, as *ding-dong, buzz, bang, cuckoo, tintinabulation, mew, ping-pong, roar* and the like.

Indirect onomatopoeia is a combination of sounds aim of which is to make the sound of the utterance an echo of its sense. It is sometimes called "echo-writing". An example is:

"And the silken, sad, uncertain rustling of each purple curtain" (E. A. Poe), where the repetition of the sound [s] actually produces the sound of the rustling of the curtain.

Indirect onomatopoeia, unlike alliteration, demands some mention of what makes the sound, as *rustling* (of curtains) in the line above.

Indirect onomatopoeia is sometimes very effectively used by repeating words which themselves are not onomatopoetic, as in Poe's poem "The Bells" where the words *tinkle* and *bells* are distributed in the following manner:

"Silver bells... how they tinkle, tinkle, tinkle"

4.2 ALLITERATION

Alliteration is a phonetic stylistic device which aims at imparting a melodic effect to the utterance. The essence of this device lies in the repetition of similar sounds, in particular consonant sounds, in close succession, particularly at the beginning of successive words:

"The possessive instinct never stands still. Through florescence and feud, frosts and fires it follows the laws of progression." (Galsworthy)

Alliteration, like most phonetic expressive means, does not bear any lexical or other meaning unless we agree that a sound meaning exists as such. But even so we may not be able to specify clearly the character of this meaning, and the term will merely suggest that a certain amount of information is contained in the repetition of sounds, as is the case with the repetition of lexical units.

Therefore alliteration is generally regarded as a musical accompaniment of the author's idea, supporting it with some vague emotional atmosphere which each reader interprets for himself. Thus the repetition of the sound [d] in the lines: "Doubting, dreaming dreams no mortals ever dared to dream before", quoted from Poe's poem "The Raven" prompts the feeling of anxiety, fear, horror, anguish or all these feelings simultaneously.

Alliteration in the English language is deeply rooted in the traditions of English folklore. The laws of phonetic arrangement in Anglo-Saxon poetry differed greatly from those of present-day English poetry» In Old English poetry alliteration was one of the basic principles of verse and considered, along with rhythm, to be its main characteristic.

The traditions of folklore are exceptionally stable and alliteration as a structural device of Old English poems and songs has shown remarkable continuity. It is frequently used as a well-tested means not only in verse but in emotive prose, in newspaper headlines, in the titles of books, in proverbs and sayings, as, for example, in the following:

Tit for tat; blind as a bat, betwixt and between; It is neck or nothing; to rob Peter to pay Paul; or in the titles of books.

4.3 RHYME

Rhyme is the repetition of identical or similar terminal sound combinations of words.

Rhyming words are generally placed at a regular distance from each other. In verse they are usually placed at the end of the corresponding lines.

We distinguish between *full rhymes* and *incomplete rhymes*. The full rhyme presupposes identity of the vowel sound and the following consonant sounds in a stressed syllable, as in *night, right; needless, heedless*.

Incomplete rhymes present a greater variety. They can be divided into two main groups: *vowel rhymes* and *consonant rhymes*. In vowel rhymes the vowels of the syllables in corresponding words are identical, but the consonants may be different, as in : *flesh – fresh – press*.

Consonant rhymes, on the contrary, show concordance in consonants and disparity in vowels, as in : *worth -forth; tale – tool - Treble - trouble; flung - long*.

According to the way the rhymes are arranged within the stanza, certain models have crystallised, for instance:

1. couplets - when the last word of two successive lines are rhymed. This is commonly marked *aa*.
2. triple rhymes - *aaa*.
3. cross rhymes - *abab*.
4. framing or ring rhymes - *abba*.

There is still another variety of rhyme which is called *internal rhyme*. The rhyming words are placed not at the ends of the lines but within the line, as in:

"I bring fresh *showers* for the thirsting *flowers*," (Shelley)

4.4 RHYTHM

Rhythm exists in all spheres of human activity and assumes multifarious forms. It is a mighty weapon in stirring up emotions whatever its nature or origin, whether it is musical, mechanical, or symmetrical, as in architecture.

Rhythm is the main factor which brings order into the utterance. Rhythm is not a mere addition to verse or emotive prose, which also has its rhythm, and it must not be regarded as possessing «phonetic autonomy amounting to an 'irrelevant texture', but has a meaning.» This point of view is now gaining ground. Many attempts have been made to ascribe meaning to rhythm and even to specify different meanings to different types of metre. This is important, inasmuch as it contributes to the now-prevailing idea that any form must make some contribution to the general sense. Rhythm intensifies the emotions. It also specifies emotions. Some students of rhythm go so far as to declare that "...one obvious agency for the expression of his (a poet's) attitude is surety metre" and that "... the poet's attitude toward his reader is reflected in his manipulation—sometimes his disregard—of metre."

Rhythm in verse as an SD is defined as a combination of the ideal metrical scheme and the variations of it, variations which are governed by the standard.

Prose rhythm, unlike verse rhythm, lacks consistency, as it follows various principles. But nevertheless a trained ear will always detect a kind of alternation of syntactical units. The task is then to find these units and to ascertain the manner of alternation. This is not an easy task because, as has already been pointed out, rhythm is not an essential property of prose, whereas it is essential in verse. Prose is the opposite of verse and this opposition is primarily structural, in this case, rhythmical structure versus arhythmical structure. The incursion of se into poetry is a deliberate device to break away from its strict rhythm.

Key words. Phonetic expressive means, onamotopoeia, alliteration, sound-instrumenting, phono-graphical, graphon, rhyme, couplets, triple rhymes,cross rhymes ,framing or ring rhymes.

Assignments for Self-Control

1. What is sound-instrumenting?
2. What cases of sound-instrumenting do you know?
3. What is graphon?
4. What types and functions of graphon do you know?
5. What is achieved by the graphical changes of writing-its type, the spacing of graphemes and lines?
6. Which phono-graphical means are predominantly used in piose and which ones in poetry?

LECTURE 6.
LEXICAL EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYLISTIC DEVICES

Plan

5.1. Interaction of different types of lexical meaning
5.2. Interaction of primary dictionary and contextually imposed meanings.
5.2.1. Metonymy
5.2.2. Metaphor
5.2.3. Irony

5.1. INTERACTION OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF LEXICAL MEANING

Words in context may acquire additional lexical meanings not fixed in dictionaries, what we have called *contextual meanings*. The latter may sometimes deviate from the dictionary meaning to such a degree that the new meaning even becomes the opposite of the primary meaning. This is especially the case when we deal with transferred meanings.

What is known in linguistics as *transferred meaning* is practically the interrelation between two types of lexical meaning: dictionary and contextual. The contextual meaning will always depend on the dictionary (logical) meaning to a greater or lesser extent. When the deviation from the acknowledged meaning is carried to a degree that it causes an unexpected turn in the recognised logical meanings, we register a stylistic device.

The transferred meaning of a word may be fixed in dictionaries as a result of long and frequent use of the word other than in its primary learning. In this case we register a derivative meaning of the word. The term 'transferred' points to the process of formation of the derivative meaning. Hence the term 'transferred' should be used, to our mind, as a lexicographical term signifying diachronically the development of the semantic structure of the word. In this case we do not perceive two meanings.

When, however, we perceive two meanings of a word simultaneously, we are confronted with a stylistic device in which the two meanings interact.

5.2. INTERACTION OF PRIMARY DICTIONARY AND CONTEXTUALLY IMPOSED MEANINGS

The interaction or interplay between the primary dictionary meaning (the meaning which is registered in the language code as an easily recognised sign for an abstract notion designating a certain phenomenon or object) and a meaning which is imposed on the word by a micro-context may be maintained along different lines. One line is when the author identifies two objects which have nothing in common, but in which he subjectively sees a function, or a property, or a feature, or a quality that may make the reader perceive these two objects as identical. Another line is when the author finds it possible to substitute one object for another on the grounds that there is some kind of interdependence or interrelation between the two corresponding objects. A third line is when a certain property or quality of an object is used in an opposite or contradictory sense.

The stylistic device based on the principle of identification of two objects is called a *metaphor*. The SD based on the principle of institution of one object for another is called *metonymy* and the SD based on contrary concepts is called *irony*.

Metonymy used in language-in-action, i.e. *contextual metonymy*, is genuine metonymy and reveals a quite unexpected substitution of one word for another, or one concept for another, on the ground of some strong impression produced by a chance feature of the thing, for sample: "Miss Tox's hand trembled as she slipped it through Mr. Dombe's arm, and felt herself escorted up the steps, *preceded by a cocked hat and a Babylonian collar*." (Dickens)

Metonymy and metaphor differ also in the way they are deciphered. In the process of disclosing the meaning implied in a metaphor, one image excludes the other, that is, the metaphor *'lamp'* in the "The sky lamp of the night", when deciphered, means the moon, and though there is a definite interplay of meanings, we perceive only one object, *the moon*. This is not the case with metonymy. Metonymy, while presenting one object to our mind, does not exclude the other. In the example: "Then they came in. Two of them, a man with long fair moustaches and a silent dark man... Definitely, *the moustache* and I had nothing in common."(Doris Lessing, "Retreat to Innocence") *the moustache* and *the man himself are* both perceived by the mind.

5.2.1. METONYMY

Many attempts have been made to pin- point the types of relation which metonymy is based on. Among them the following are most common:

1. A concrete thing used instead of an abstract notion. In this case the thing becomes a symbol of the notion, as in:

"*The camp, the pulpit* and the law For rich men's sons are free." (Shelley)

2. The container instead of the thing contained:

3. *he hall* applauded.

4. The relation of proximity, as in:

"The round *game table* was boisterous and happy." (Dickens)

The material instead of the thing made of it, as in: "*The marble* spoke."

The instrument which the doer uses in performing the action in- ..ad of the action or the doer himself, as in:

"As *the sword* is the worst argument that can be used, so b.iould it be the last." (Byron).

The list is in no way complete. There are many other types of relations, which may serve as a basis for metonymy.

You know by now that among multiple functions of the word the main one is to denote, denotational meaning being the major semantic characteristic of the word. In this paragraph we shall deal with the foregrounding of this particular function, i. e. with such types of denoting phenomena that create additional expressive, evaluative, subjective connotations. We shall deal in fact with the substitution of the existing names approved by long usage and fixed in dictionaries by new, occasional, individual ones, prompted by the speaker's subjective original view and evaluation of things. This act of name-exchange, of substitution is traditionally referred to as *transference*, for, indeed, the name of one object is transferred onto another, proceeding from their similarity (of shape, colour, function, etc.), or closeness (of material existence, cause/effect, instrument/result, part/whole relations, etc.).

5.2.2 METAPHOR

Each type of intended substitution results in a *stylistic device (SD)*[1] called also a *trope*. The most frequently used, well known and elaborated among them is a *metaphor* -transference of names based on the associated likeness between two objects, as in the "pancake", or "ball", or "volcano" for the "sun"; "silver dust", "sequins" for "stars"; "vault", "blanket", "veil" for the "sky".

From previous study you know that nomination-the process of naming reality by means of the language-proceeds from choosing one of the features characteristic of the object which is being named for the representative of the object. The connection between the chose-n feature, representing the object, and the word is especially vivid in cases of transparent "inner form" when the name of the object can be easily traced to the name of one of its characteristics. Cf.:

---

[1] For the elaboration of SDs see. *Galperin I. R.* Stylistics. M., 1971, esp. pp. 24-30 and part IV (pp. 132-190).

"railway", "chairman", "waxen". Thus the semantic structure of a word reflects, to a certain extent, characteristic features of the piece of reality which it denotes (names). So it is only natural that similarity between real objects or phenomena finds its reflection in the semantic structures of words denoting them: both words possess at least one common semantic component. In the above examples with the "sun" this common semantic component is "hot" (hence-"volcano", "pancake" which are also "hot"), or "round" ("ball", "pancake" which are also of round shape).

The expressiveness of the metaphor is promoted by the implicit simultaneous presence of images of both objects-the one which is actually named and the one which supplies its own "legal" name. So that formally we deal with the name transference based on the similarity of one feature common to two different entities, while in fact each one enters a phrase in the complexity of its other characteristics. The wider is the gap between the associated objects the more striking and unexpected-the more expressive-is the metaphor.

If a metaphor involves likeness between inanimate and animate objects, we deal with *personification*, as in "the face of London", or "the pain of the ocean".

Metaphor, as all other SDs, is *fresh, original, genuine,* when first used, and *trite, hackneyed, stale* when often repeated. In the latter case it gradually loses its expressiveness becoming just another entry in the dictionary, as in the *"leg* of a table" or the *"sunrise"*, thus serving a very important source of enriching the vocabulary of the language.

Metaphor can be expressed by all notional parts of speech, and functions in the sentence as any of its members.

When the speaker (writer) in his desire to present an elaborated image does not limit its creation to a single meta-phor hut offers a group of them, each supplying another feature of the described phenomenon, this cluster creates a *sustained (prolonged)* metaphor.

5.2.3. IRONY

Irony is a stylistic device also based on the simultaneous realisation of two logical meanings -dictionary and contextual, but the two meanings stand in opposition to each other. For example:

"It must be *delightful to* find oneself in a foreign country without a penny in one's pocket."

Irony must not be confused with humour, although they have very much in common. Humour always causes laughter. What is funny must come as a sudden clash of the positive and the negative. In this respect irony can be likened to humour. But the function of irony is not confined to producing a humorous effect. In a sentence like "How clever of you!" where, due to the intonation pattern, the word 'clever' conveys a sense opposite to its literal signification, the irony does not cause a ludicrous effect. It rather expresses a feeling of irritation, displeasure, pity or regret.

Irony is generally used to convey a negative meaning. Therefor only positive concepts may be used in their logical dictionary meanings. The contextual meaning always conveys the negation of the positive concepts embodied in the dictionary meaning.

The essence of this SD consists in the foregrounding not of the logical but of the evaluative meaning. The context is arranged so that the qualifying word in irony reverses the direction of the evaluation, and the word positively charged is understood as a negative qualification and (much-much rarer) vice versa. Irony thus is a stylistic device in which the contextual evaluative meaning of a word is directly opposite to its dictionary meaning. So, like all other SDs irony does not exist outside the context, which varies from the minimal – a word combination, as in J. Steinbeck's "She turned with the sweet smile of an alligator,"-to the context of a whole book, as in Ch. Dickens, where one of the remarks of Mr. Micawber, known for his

complex, highly bookish and elaborate style of speaking about the most trivial things, is introduced by the author's words "...Mr. Micawber said in his usual plain manner".

In both examples the words "sweet" and "plain" reverse their positive meaning into the negative one due to the context, micro- in the first, macro- in the second case.

In the stylistic device of irony it is always possible to indicate the exact word whose contextual meaning diametrically opposes its dictionary meaning. This is why this type of irony is called *verbal* irony. There are very many cases, though, which we regard as irony, intuitively feeling the reversal of the evaluation, but unable to put our finger on the exact word in whose meaning we can trace the contradiction between the said and the implied. The effect of irony in such cases is created by a number of statements, by the whole of the text. This type of irony is called *sustained*, and it is formed by the contradiction of the speaker's (writer's) considerations and the generally accepted moral and ethical codes. Many examples of sustained irony are supplied by D. Defoe, J. Swift, by such contemporary writers as S. Lewis, K. Vonnegut, E. Waugh and others.

Key words.

Lexical meaning, logical (denotational) meaning , contextual meaning, original, hackneyed, a metaphor, semantic, morphological, syntactical, structural, functional peculiarity, a metonymy, detailed ,description, device.

Assignments for Self-Control

1. What lexical meanings of a word can you name?
2. Which of them, in most cases, is the most important one?
3. What SDs are based on the use of the logical (denotational) meaning of a word?
4. What is a contextual meaning? How is it used in a SD?
5. What is the difference between the original and the hackneyed SDs?
6. What is a metaphor? What are its semantic, morphological, syntactical, structural, functional peculiarities?
7. What is a metonymy? Give a detailed description of the device?

LECTURE 7
INTERACTION OF PRIMARY AND DERIVATIVE LOGICAL MEANING

Plan

6.1. The problem of polysemy
6.2. Zeugma
6.3. The Pun
6.4. The Epithet
6.5. Oxymoron

6.1. The problem of polysemy

The problem of polysemy is one of the vexed questions of Lexicology. It is sometimes impossible to draw a line of demarcation between a derivative meaning of a polysemantic word and a separate word, i.e. a word that has broken its semantic ties with the head word and has become a homonym to the word it was derived from.

Polysemy is a category of Lexicology and as such belongs to language - as - system. In actual everyday speech polysemy vanishes unless it is deliberately retained for certain stylistic purposes. A context that does not seek to produce any particular stylistic effect generally materialises but one definite meaning.

However, when a word begins to manifest an interplay between the primary and one of

the derivative meanings we are again confronted with.

6.2. ZEUGMA

Zeugma is the use of a word in the same grammatical but different semantic relations to two adjacent words in the context, the semantic relations being, on the one hand, literal, on the other, transferred.

"Dora, *plunging* at once *into privileged intimacy* and *into the middle of the room."* (B.Shaw)

This stylistic device is particularly favoured in English emotive prose and poetry.

Zeugma is a strong and effective device to maintain the purity of the primary meaning when the two meanings clash. By making the two meanings conspicuous in this particular way, each of them stands out clearly.

"... And May's mother *always stood on her gentility,* and Dot's mother *never stood on anything but her active little feet."* (Dickens)

6.3 THE PUN

The pun is another stylistic device based on the interaction of two well-known meanings of a word or phrase. It is difficult do draw a hard and fast distinction between zeugma and the pun. The only reliable distinguishing feature is a structural one: zeugma is the realisation of two meanings with the help of a verb, which is made to refer to different subjects or objects (direct or indirect). The pun is more independent. There need not necessarily be a word in the sentence to which the pun-word refers. This does not mean, however, that the pun is entirely free. Like any other stylistic device, it must depend on a context. But the context may be of a more expanded character, sometimes even as large as a whole work of emotive prose. Thus the title of one of Oscar Wilde's plays, "The Importance of Being *Earnest"* has a pun in it, inasmuch as the name of the hero and the adjective meaning 'seriously-minded' are both **present** in **our mind.**

Puns are often **used** in riddles and jokes, for example, in this riddle: What is the difference between a schoolmaster and an engine-driver? (One trains the mind and the other minds the train.)

Devices of simultaneously realising the various meanings of words, which are of a more subtle character than those embodied in puns and zeugma, are to be found in poetry and poetical descriptions and in speculations in emotive prose. Men-of-letters are especially sensitive to the nuances of meaning embodied in almost every common word, and to make these words live with their multifarious semantic aspects is the task of a good writer. Those who can do it easily are said to have talent.

Pun is a play on words:

"Bow to the board, said Bumble. Oliver brushed away two or three tears that were **lingering in** his eyes, and *seeing no board but the table,* fortunately *bowed to that".*

6.4 THE EPITHET

The *epithet* is a stylistic device based on the interplay of emotive and logical meaning in an attributive word, phrase or even sentence used to characterise an object and pointing out to the reader, and frequently imposing on him, some of the properties or features of the object with the aim of giving an individual perception and evaluation of these features or properties. The epithet is markedly subjective and evaluative. The logical attribute is purely objective, non-evaluating. It is descriptive and indicates an inherent or prominent feature of the thing or phenomenon in question.

The epithet makes a strong impact on the reader, so much so, that unwittingly begins to see and evaluate things as the writer wants him to.

Epithets may be classified from different standpoints: *semantic* and *structural.* Semantically, epithets may be divided into two groups: those *associated* with the noun following

and those *unassociated* with it.

Associated epithets are those, which point to a feature which is essential to the objects they describe: the idea expressed in the epithet is to a certain extent inherent in the concept of the object. The associated epithet immediately refers the mind to the concept in question due to some actual quality of the object it is attached to, for instance, 'dark *forest*', 'dreary *midnight*', 'careful *attention*', 'unwearying *research*', 'indefatigable *assiduity*', 'fantastic *terrors*', etc.

Unassociated epithets are attributes used to characterise the object by adding a feature not inherent in it, i.e. a feature which may be so unexpected as to strike the reader by its novelty, as, for instance, *'heartburning* smile', *'bootless* cries', *'sullen* earth', *'voiceless* sands, etc. The adjectives here do not indicate any property inherent in the objects in question. They impose, as it were, a property on them which is fitting only in the given circumstances. It may seem strange, unusual, or even accidental.

The function of epithets of this kind remains basically the same: to show the evaluating, subjective attitude of the writer towards the thing described. But for this purpose the author does not create his own, new, unexpected epithets; he uses ones that have become traditional, and may be termed "language epithets" as they belong to the language-as-a-system. Thus epithets may be divided into *language epithets* and *speech epithets*. Examples of speech epithets are: *'slavish knees'*, *'sleepless* bay'.

From the point of view of their *compositional* structure epithets may be divided into *simple, compound, phrase* and *sentence epithets*. Simple epithets are ordinary adjectives. Compound epithets are built like compound adjectives. Examples are: *heart-burning* sigh, *sylph-like* figures, *cloud-shapen* giant.

The tendency to cram into one language unit as much information as possible has led to new compositional models for epithets which we shall call *phrase epithets*. A phrase and even a whole sentence may become an epithet if the main formal requirement of the epithet is maintained, *viz.* its attributive use. But unlike simple and compound epithets, which may have pre- or post-position, phrase epithets are always placed before the nouns they refer to. Another structural variety of the epithet is the one which we shall term *reversed(inverted)*. The reversed epithet is composed of two nouns linked in an of-phrase. The subjective, evaluating, emotional element is embodied not in the noun attribute but in the noun structurally described, for example: "the *shadow* of a smile"; "a *devil* of a job" (Maugham); "...he smiled brightly, neatly, efficiently, a *military abbreviation* of a smile" (Graham Green); "A *devil* of a sea rolls in that bay" (Byron); "A *little Flying Dutchman* of a cab" (Galsworthy); "a *dog* of a fellow" (Dickens).

The epithet is a direct and straightforward way of showing the author's attitude towards the things described, whereas other stylistic devices, even image-bearing ones, will reveal the author's evaluation of the object only indirectly.

6.5. OXYMORON

Oxymoron is a combination of two words (mostly an adjective and a noun or an adverb with an adjective) in which the meanings of the two clash, being opposite in sense, for example: *'low* skyscraper', *'sweet* sorrow', *'nice* rascal', *'pleasantly* ugly face', *'horribly* beautiful', *'a deafening* silence'.

The essence of oxymoron consists in the capacity of the primary meaning of the adjective or adverb to resist for some time the overwhelming power of semantic change which words undergo in combination. The forcible combination of non-combinative words seems to develop what may be called a kind of centrifugal force which keeps them apart, in contrast to ordinary word-combinations where centripetal force is in action.

Oxymoron has one main structural model: *adjective+noun*. It is in this structural model that the resistance of the two component parts to fusion into one unit manifests itself most

strongly. In the *adverb + adjective* model the change of meaning in the first element, the adverb, is more rapid, resistance to the unifying process not being so strong.

Oxymoron reveals the contradictory sides of one and the same phenomena: one of its components discloses some objectively existing feature or quality, while the other serves to conceal the author's personal attitude towards the same. In Shakespearian definitions of love, much quoted from his *Romeo and Juliet*, perfectly correct syntactically, attributive combinations present a strong semantic discrepancy between their members. Cf.: "O brawling love! O loving hate! O heavy lightness! Serious vanity! Feather of lead, bright smoke, cold fire, sick health!" As is clearly seen from this string of oxymorons, each one of them is a combination of two semantically contradictory notions, that help to emphasize contradictory qualities as a dialectal unity simultaneously existing in the described phenomenon. As a rule, one of the two members of oxymoron illuminates the feature which is universally observed and acknowledged while the other one offers a purely subjective individual perception of the object. Thus in an oxymoron we also deal with the foregrounding of emotive meaning, only of a different type than the one observed in previously discussed SDs. The most widely known structure of oxymoron is attributive, so it is easy to believe that the subjective part of the oxymoron is embodied in the attribute-epithet, especially because the latter also proceeds from the foregrounding of the emotive meaning. But there are also others, in which verbs are employed. Such verbal structures as "to shout mutely" (I. Sh.) or "to cry silently" (M. W.) seem to strengthen the idea, which leads to the conclusion that oxymoron is a specific type of epithet. But the peculiarity of an oxymoron lies in the fact that the speaker's (writer's) subjective view can be expressed through either of the members of the word combination.

Originality and specificity of oxymoron becomes especially evident in non-attributive structures which also, not infrequently, are used to express semantic contradiction, as in "the street damaged by improvements" (O. H.) or "silence was louder than thunder" (U.).

Oxymorons rarely become trite, for their components, linked forcibly, repulse each other and oppose repeated use. There are few colloquial oxymorons, all of them showing a high degree of the speaker's emotional involvement in the situation, as in "damn nice", "awfully pretty".*[2]

Key words. Interaction , primary , derivative, logical meanings polysemy, Zeugma, The Pun, play on words, epithets, foregrounded, trite oxymoron, semantically false chain, nonsense of non-sequence..

Assignments for Self-Control.

1. What is included into a group of SDs known as "play on words"? Which ones of them are the most frequently used? What levels of language hierarchy are involved into their formation?
2. Describe the difference between pun and zeugma, zeugma and a semantically false chain, semantically false chain and nonsense of non-sequence.
3. What meanings of a word participate in the violation of a phraseological unit?
4. What is the basic effect achieved by the play on words?
5. What lexical meaning is instrumental in the formation of epithets?
6. What semantic types of epithets do you know?
7. What structural types of epithets do you know?
8. What parts of speech are predominantly used as epithets and why?
9. When reading a book pay attention to the type and distribution of epithets there. Give your considerations as to what defines the quantity and the quality of epithets in a literary work.

---

[2] Some often repeated Russian titles form a group of trite oxymorons as in «Живой труп», «Песня без слов», «Оптимистическая трагедия».

10. What is an oxymoron and what meanings are foregrounded in its formation?
11. Why are there comparatively few trite oxymorons and where are they mainly used?
12. Give some examples of trite oxymor

LECTURE 8
INTERACTION OF LOGICAL AND NOMINAL MEANINGS

Plan

7.1. Antonomasia
7.2. Simile
7.3. Periphrasis
7.4. Euphemisms
7.5. Hyperbole

7. 1. ANTONOMASIA

Antonomasia is a lexical SD in which a proper name is used instead of a common noun or vice versa, i.e. a SD, in which the nominal meaning of a proper name is suppressed by its logical meaning or the logical meaning acquires the new-nominal-component. Logical meaning, as you know, serves to denote concepts and thus to classify individual objects into groups (classes). Nominal meaning has no classifying power for it applies to one single individual object with the aim not of classifying it as just another of a number of objects constituting a definite group, but, on the contrary, with the aim of singling it out of the group of similar objects, of individualizing one particular object. Indeed, the word "Mary" does not indicate whether the denoted object refers to the class of women, girls, boats, cats, etc., for it singles out without denotational classification. But in Th. Dreiser we read: "He took little satisfaction in telling each Mary, shortly after she arrived, something..." The attribute "each", used with the name, turns it into a common noun denoting any woman. Here we deal with a case of antonomasia of the first type.

Another type of antonomasia we meet when a common noun serves as an individualizing name, as in D. Cusack: "There are three doctors in an illness like yours. I don't mean only myself, my partner and the radiologist who does your X-rays, the three I'm referring to are Dr. Rest, Dr. Diet and Dr. Fresh Air."

Still another type of antonomasia is presented by the so-called "speaking names"-names whose origin from common nouns is still clearly perceived. So, in such popular English surnames as Mr. Smith or Mr. Brown the etymology can be restored but no speaker of English today has it in his mind that the first one used to mean occupation and the second one-color. While such names from Sheridan's *School for Scandal* as Lady Teazle or Mr. Surface immediately raise associations with certain human qualities due to the denotational meaning of the words "to tease" and "surface". The double role of the speaking names, both to name and to quality, is sometimes preserved in translation. Cf. the list of names from another of Sheridan's plays, *The Rivals*: Miss Languish – Мисс Томпэн; Mr. Backbite – М-р Клеветаун; Mr. Credulous – М-р Доверч; Mr. Snake – М-р Гад, etc. Or from F. Cooper: Lord Chatterino – Лорд Балаболо, John Jaw – Джон Брех; Island Leap-High – Остров Высокопрыгия.

Antonomasia is created mainly by nouns, more seldom by attributive combinations (as in "Dr. Fresh Air") or phrases (as in "Mr. What's-his name"). Common nouns used in the second type of antonomasia are in most cases abstract, though there are instances of concrete ones being used too.

7. 2. SIMILE

The intensification of some one feature of the concept in question is realised in a device called *simile*. Ordinary comparison and simile must not be confused. They represent two diverse processes. Comparison means weighing two objects belonging to one class of things with the purpose of establishing the degree of their sameness or difference. To use a simile is to characterise one object by bringing it into contact with another object belonging to an entirely different class of things^ Comparison takes into consideration all the properties of the two objects, stressing the one that is compared. Simile excludes all the properties of the two objects except one which is made common to them. For example, *'The boy* seems to be *as clever as his mother'* is ordinary comparison. 'Boy' and 'mother' belong to the same class of objects - human beings - so this is not a simile but ordinary comparison.

But in the sentence: *"Maidens, like moths,* are ever caught by glare" (Byron), we have a simile. 'Maidens' and 'moths' belong to heterogeneous classes of objects.

Similes forcibly set one object against another regardless of the fact that they may be completely alien to each other. And without our being rare of it, the simile gives rise to a new understanding of the object characterising as well as of the object characterized.

The properties of an object may be viewed from different angles, lor sample, its state, actions, manners, etc. Accordingly, similes may be based on adjective-attributes, adverb-modifiers, verb-predicates, etc.

Similes have formal elements in their structure, connective words such as *like, as, such as, as if, seem.* Here are some examples of similes taken from various sources and illustrating the variety of structural designs of this stylistic device.

"His mind was restless, but it worked perversely and *thoughts jerked* through his brain *like the misfirings of a defective carburettor"* (Maugham)

"It was that moment of the year when *the countryside seems to faint* from its own loveliness, from the intoxication of its scents and sounds." (J. Galsworthy.)

A simile, often repeated, becomes trite and adds to the stock of language phraseology. Most of trite similes have the foundation mentioned and conjunctions "as", "as...as" used as connectives. Cf.: "as brisk as a bee", "as strong as a horse", "as live as a bird" and many many more.

Similes in which the link between the tenor and the vehicle is expressed by notional verbs such as "to resemble" "to seem", "to recollect", "to remember", "to look like" "to appear", etc. are called *disguised,* because the realization comparison is somewhat suspended, as likeness between the objects seems less evident. Cf.: "His strangely taut, full-width grin made his large teeth resemble a dazzling miniature piano keyboard in the green light." (J) Or: "The ball appeared to the batter to be a slow spinning planet looming toward the earth." (B. M.)

7. 3. PERIPHRASIS

Periphrasis is a very peculiar stylistic device which basically consists of using a roundabout form of expression instead of a simpler one, i.e. of using a more or less complicated syntactical structure instead of a word. Depending on the mechanism of this substitution, periphrases are classified into figurative (metonymic and metaphoric), and logical. The first group is made, in fact, of phrase-metonymies and phrase-metaphors, as you may well see from the following example: "The hospital was crowded with, the surgically interesting products of the fighting in Africa" (I. Sh.) where the extended metonymy stands for "the wounded".

Logical periphrases are phrases synonymic with the words which were substituted by periphrases: "Mr. Du Pont was dressed in the conventional disguise with, which Brooks Brothers cover the shame of American millionaires." (M. St.) "the conventional disguise" stands

here for "the suit" and "the shame of American millionaires" – for "the paunch (the belly)". Because the direct nomination of the not too elegant feature of appearance was substituted by a roundabout description this periphrasis may be also considered euphemistic, as it offers a more polite qualification instead of a coarser one.

The main function of periphrases is to convey a purely individual perception of the described object. To achieve it the generally accepted nomination of the object is replaced by the description of one of its features or qualities, which seems to the author most important for the characteristic of the object, and which thus becomes foregrounded.

The often repeated periphrases become trite and serve as universally accepted periphrastic synonyms: "the gentle (soft, weak) sex" (women); "my better half" (my spouse); "minions of Law" (police), etc.

7.4. EUPHEMISMS

There is a variety of periphrasis which we shall call euphemistic.

E u p h e m i s m, as is known, is a word or phrase used to replace an unpleasant word or expression by a conventionally more acceptable one, for example, the word 'to die' has bred the following euphemisms: *'to pass away, to expire, to be no more, to depart, to join the majority, to be gone,* and the more facetious ones: *to kick the bucket, to give up the ghost, to go west.* So euphemisms are synonyms which aim at producing a deliberately mild effect.

The origin of the term 'euphemism' discloses the aim of the device very clearly, i.e. speaking well (from Greek – *eu* = well + *-pheme* = speaking). In the vocabulary of any language, synonyms can be found that soften an otherwise coarse or unpleasant idea. Euphemism is some times figuratively called "a whitewashing device". The linguistic peculiarity of euphemism lies in the fact that every euphemism must call up a definite synonym in the mind of the reader or listener. This synonym, or dominant in a group of synonyms, as it is often called, must follow the euphemism like a shadow, as 'to possess a vivid imagination', or 'to tell stories' in the proper context will call up the unpleasant verb *to lie*. The euphemistic synonyms given above are part of the language-as-a- system. They have not been freshly invented. They are expressive means of the language and are to be found in all good dictionaries. They cannot be regarded as stylistic devices because they do not call to mind the keyword or dominant of the group, in other words, they refer the mind to the concept directly, not through the medium of another word. Compare these euphemisms with the following from Dickens's "Pickwick Papers":

"They think we *have come by this horse in some dishonest manner,"*

The italicized parts call forth the word 'steal' (have stolen it).

Euphemisms may be divided into several groups according to their spheres of application. The most recognized are the following: 1) religious, 2) moral, 3) medical and 4) parliamentary.

The life of euphemisms is short. They very soon become closely associated with the referent (the object named) and give way to a newly-coined word or combination of words, which, being the sign of a sign. Throws another veil over an unpleasant or indelicate concept. Here is an interesting excerpt from an article on this subject.

"The evolution over the years of a civilized mental health service has been marked by periodic changes in terminology. The *mad-house* became the *lunatic asylum*; the asylum made way for the *mental hospital* – even if the building remained the same. *Idiots, imbeciles* and *the feeble-minded* became *low, medium* and *high-grade mental defectives*. All are now to be lumped together as *patients of severely subnormal personality*. *The insane* became *persons of unsound mind*, and are now to be *mentally-ill patients*. As each phrase develops the stigmata of popular prejudice, it is

abandoned in favour of another, sometimes less precise than the old. Unimportant in themselves, these changes of name are the signposts of progress."[1]

Albert C. Baugh gives another instance of such changes:

"...the common word for a woman's undergarment down to the eighteenth century was 'smock'. It was then replaced by the more delicate word 'shift'. In the nineteenth century the same motive led to the substitution of the word 'chemise' and in the twentieth this has been replaced by 'combinations', 'step-ins', and other euphemisms."

Today we have a number of words denoting similar garments, as 'briefs', and others.

Conventional euphemisms employed in conformity to social usages are best illustrated by the parliamentary codes of expression. In an article headed "In Commons, a Lie is Inexactitude" written by James Feron in *The New York Times*, we may find a number of words that are not to be used in Parliamentary debate. "When Sir Winston Churchill, some years ago," writes Feron, "termed a parliamentary opponent a 'purveyor of terminological inexactitudes', every one in the chamber knew he meant 'liar'. Sir Winston had been ordered by the Speaker to withdraw a stronger epithet. So he used the euphemism, which became famous and is still used in the Commons. It conveyed the insult without sounding offensive, and it satisfied the Speaker."[2]

The author further points out that certain words, for instance, *traitor* and *coward*, are specifically banned in the House of Commons because ear-lier Speakers have ruled them disorderly or unparliamentary. Speakers have decided that *jackass* is unparliamentary but *goose* is acceptable; *dog, rat* and *swine* are out of order, but *halfwit* and *Tory clot* are in order.

We also learn from this article that "a word cannot become the subject of parliamentary ruling unless a member directs the attention of the Speaker to it."

The changes in designating objects disclose the true nature of the relations between words and their referents. We must admit that there is a positive magic in words and, as Prof. Randolph Quirk has it,

"...we are liable to be dangerously misled through being mesmerized by a word or through mistaking a word for its referent."[3]

This becomes particularly noticeable in connection with what are called *p o l i t i c a l* euphemisms. These are really understatements, the aim of which is to mislead public opinion and to express what is unpleasant in a more delicate manner. Sometimes disagreeable facts are even distorted with the help of a euphemistic expression. Thus the headline in one of the British newspapers "Tension in Kashmir" was to hide the fact that there was a real uprising in that area; "Undernourishment of children in India" stood for 'starvation'. In A. J. Cronin's novel "The Stars Look Down" one of the members of Parliament, referring to the words "Undernourishment of children in India" says: "Honourable Members of the House understand the meaning of *this polite euphemism.*" By calling *undenourishment* a polite euphemism he discloses the true meaning of the word.

An interesting article dealing with the question of "political euphemisms" appeared in "Литература газета"[3] written by the Italian journalist Entzo Rava and headed "The Vocabulary of the Bearers of the Burden of Power." In this article Entzo Rava wittily discusses the euphe misms of the Italian capitalist press, which seem to have been borrowed from the American and English press. Thus, for instance, he mockingly states that capitalists have disappeared from Italy. When the adherents of capitalism find it necessary to mention *capitalists*, they replace the word *capitalist* by the combination free enterprisers, the word *profit* is replaced by 'savings', *the building up of labour reserves* stands for unemployment, 'dismissal' ('discharge', 'firing') of workers is *the reorganization of the enterprise*, etc.

As has already been explained, genuine euphemism must call up the word it stands for. It is always the result of some deliberate clash between two synonyms. If a euphemism fails to carry along with it the word it is intended to replace, it is not a euphemism, but a deliberate veiling of the truth. All these *building up of labour reserves, savings, free enterprisers* and the like are not intended to give the referent its true name, but to distort the truth. The above expressions serve that purpose. Compare these word-combinations with real euphemisms, like a *four-letter word* (= an obscenity), or *a woman of a certain type* (= a prostitute, a whore); *to glow* (= to sweat), all of which bring to our mind the other word (words) and only through them the referent.

Here is another good example of euphemistic phrases used by Gals worthy in his "Silver Spoon."

"In private I should merely call him *a liar*. In the Press you should use the words: *'Reckless disregard for truth'* and in Parliament—that you regret he *'should have been so misinformed.'"*

Periphrastic and euphemistic expressions were characteristic of certain literary trends and even produced a term *periphrastic style*. But it soon gave way to a more straightforward way of describing things.

"The veiled forms of expression," writes G. H. McKnight, "which served when one was unwilling to look facts in the face have been succeeded by naked expressions exhibiting reality."

7.5. HYPERBOLE

Another SD, which also has the function of intensifying one certain property of the object described *is hyperbole*. It can be defined as a deliberate overstatement or exaggeration of a feature essential (unlike periphrasis) to the object or phenomenon. In its extreme form this exaggeration is carried to an illogical degree, sometimes *ad absurdum*. For example: "He was so tall that I was not sure he had a face." (O. Henry).

Hyperbole differs from mere exaggeration in that it is intended to be understood as an exaggeration. In this connection the following quotation deserve a passing note:

"Hyperbole is the result of a kind of intoxication by emotion, which prevents a person from seeing things in their true dimensions... If the reader (listener) is not carried away by the emotion of the writer (speaker), hyperbole becomes a mere lie."

Hyperbole is a device which sharpens the reader's ability to take a logical assessment of the utterance. This is achieved, as is the case with other device, by awakening the dichotomy of thought and feeling where thought takes the upper hand though not to the detriment of feeling."

Hyperbole is one of the most common expressive means of our everyday speech. When we describe our admiration or anger and say "I would gladly see this film a hundred times", or "I have told it to you a thousand times" - we use trite language hyperboles which, through long and repeated use, have lost their originality and remained signals of the speaker's roused emotions.

Hyperbole may be the final effect of another SD-metaphor, simile, irony, as we have in the cases "He has the tread of a rhinoceros" or "The man was like the Rock of Gibraltar".

Hyperbole can be expressed by all notional parts of speech. There are words though, which are used in this SD more often than others. They are such pronouns as "all", "every", "everybody" and the like. Cf.: "Calpurnia was all angles and bones" (H. L.); also numerical nouns ("a million", "a thousand"), as was shown above, and adverbs of time ("ever", "never"). Outstanding Russian philologist A. Peshkovsky once stressed the importance of both

communicants clearly perceiving that the exaggeration, used by one of them is intended as such and serves not to denote actual quality or quantity but signals the emotional background of the utterance. If this reciprocal understanding of the intentional nature of the overstatement is absent, hyperbole turns into a mere lie.

Hyperbole is aimed at exaggerating quantity or quality. When it is directed the opposite way, when the size, shape, dimensions, characteristic features of the object are not overrated, but intentionally underrated, we deal with understatement. The mechanism of its creation and functioning is identical with that of hyperbole, and it does not signify the actual state of affairs in reality, but presents the latter through the emotionally coloured perception and rendering of the speaker. It is not the actual diminishing or growing of the object that is conveyed by a hyperbole or understatement. It is a transient subjective impression that finds its realization in these SDs. They differ only in the direction of the flow of roused emotions. English is well known for its preference for understatement in everyday speech-"I am rather annoyed" instead of "I'm infuriated", "The wind is rather strong" instead of "There's a gale blowing outside" are typical of British polite speech, but are less characteristic of American English.

Some hyperboles and understatements (both used individually and as the final effect of some other SD) have become fixed, as we have in "Snow White", or "Liliput", or "Gargantua" Trite hyperboles and understatements, reflecting their use in everyday speech, in creative writing are observed mainly in dialogue, while the author's speech provides us with examples of original SDs, often rather extended or demanding a considerable fragment of the text to be fully understood.

Key words. Antonomasia, simile, hyperbole, interact , formation, speaking names, qualifying, common nouns, comparison, a trite simile, epic simile, disguised simile, understatement, logical periphrases, figurative periphrasis ,euphemistic.

Assignments for Self-Control

1. What is antonomasia? What meanings interact in its formation?
2. What types of antonomasia do you know? Give examples of each.
3. Do you remember any speaking names from the books you have read?
4. Give examples of personages'" names used as qualifying common nouns.
5. What is a simile and what is a simple comparison?
6. What semantic poles of a simile do you know?
7. Which of the link words have you met most often?
8. What is the foundation of the simile?
9. What is the key of the simile?
10. What is a trite simile? Give examples.
11. What is an epic simile?
12. What is a disguised simile?
13. What are the main functions of a simile?
14. Find examples of similes in your reading. State their type, structure and functions.
15. What meaning is foregrounded in a hyperbole?
16. What types of hyperbole can you name?
17. What makes a hyperbole trite and where are trite hyperboles predominantly used?
18. What is understatement? In what way does it differ? from hyperbole?
19. Recollect cases of vivid original hyperboles or under statements from your Russian or English reading.
20. Speak about semantic types of periphrasis.
21. In what cases can a logical or a figurative periphrasis be also qualified as euphemistic?
22. What are the main stylistic functions of periphrases?

23. Which type of periphrasis, in your opinion, is most favoured in contemporary prose and why?

LECTURE 9
SYNTACTICAL EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYLISTIC DEVICES

Plan

8.1. General Considerations
8.2. Problems Concerning the Composition of Spans of Utterance Wider than the Sentence
8.2.1. The Syntactical Whole
8.2.2. The Paragraph
8.3. Compositional Patterns of Syntactical Arrangement
8.3.1. Stylistic Inversion
8.3.2. Detached Construction

8.1 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is well known that the study of the sentence and its types and especially the study of the relations between different parts of the sentence has had a long history. Rhetoric was mainly engaged in the observation of the juxtaposition of the members of the sentence and in finding ways and means of building larger and more elaborate spans of utterance, as for example, the period or periodical sentence. Modern grammars have greatly extended the scope of structural analysis and have taken under observation the peculiarities of the relations between the members of the sentence, which somehow has overshadowed problems connected with structural and semantic patterns of larger syntactical units. It would not be an exaggeration to state that the study of units of speech larger than the sentence is still being neglected by many linguists. Some of them even consider such units to be extra-linguistic, thus excluding them entirely from the domain of Linguistics.

Stylistics takes as the object of its analysis the expressive means and stylistic devices of the language which are based on some significant structural point in an utterance, whether it consists of one sentence or a string of sentences. In grammar certain types of utterances have already been patterned, thus for example, we have all kinds of simple, compound or complex sentences, even a paragraph long, that may be regarded as neutral or non-stylistic patterns.

At the same time, the peculiarities of the structural design of utterances which bear some particular emotional colouring, that is, which are stylistic and therefore non-neutral, may also be patterned and presented as a special system which we shall call "stylistic patterns". Stylistic patterns should not be regarded as violations of the literary norms of standard English. On the contrary, these patterns help us to establish the norm of syntactical usage, inasmuch as their study reveals the invariant of the form together with the variants and what is more,"" reveals the borders beyond which the variants must not be extended.

Stylistic syntactical patterns may be viewed as variants of the general syntactical models of the language and are the more obvious and conspicuous if presented, not as isolated elements or accidental usages, but as groups easily observable and lending themselves to generalization.

This idea is expressed by Prof. G. Vinokur in his «Маяковский — новатор языка», where he maintains that in syntax it is no new material that is coined, but new relations, because the syntactical aspect of speech is nothing more than a definite combination of grammatical forms, and in this sense the actual words used are essentially immaterial. Therefore syntactical relations, particularly in poetic language, are that aspect of speech in

which everything presents itself as actualization of the potential and not merely the repetition of the ready-made.

By "the potential" G. Vinokur apparently means variations of syntactical patterns.

It follows therefore, that in order to establish the permissible fluctuations of the syntactical norm, it is necessary to ascertain what is meant by the syntactical norm itself. We have already pointed out what the word norm means as a generic term. In English syntax the concept of norm is rather loose. In fact any change in the relative positions of the members of the sentence may be regarded as a variant of the received standard, provided that the relation between them will not hinder the understanding of the utterance.

But here we are faced with the indisputable interdependence between form and content, in other words, between the syntactical design of the utterance and its concrete lexical materialization.

Syntactical relations can be studied in isolation from semantic content. In this case they are viewed as constituents of the whole and assume their independent grammatical meaning. This is most apparent in forms embodying nonsense lexical units, as in Lewis Carroll's famous lines, so often quoted by linguists.

"Twas brilling, and the slithy toves Did gyre and gimbol in the wabe: All mimsy were the borogroves, And the mome raths outrabe."

The structural elements of these lines stand out conspicuously and make sense even though they are materialized by nonsense elements. Moreover they impose on the morphemes they are attached to a definite grammatical meaning, making it possible to class the units. So it is due to these elements that we can state what the nonsense words are supposed to mean. Thus we know that the sequence of the forms forcibly suggests that after twas we should have an adjective; the y in slithy makes the word an adjective; gyre after the emphatic did can only be a verb. We know that this is a poem because it has rhythm (iambic tetrameter) and rhyme (abab in 'toves-borogrove; 'wabe-outgrabe').

A closet examination of the structural elements will show that they outnumber the semantic units: nineteen structural elements and eleven which are meant to be semantic. The following inferences may be from this fact.

1. it is the structural element of the utterance that predetermines the possible semantic aspect;
2. the structural elements have their own independent me-ing which may be called structural or, more widely, grammatical;
3. the structural meaning may affect the lexical, giving contextual to of the lexical units.

8.2. PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE COMPOSITION OF SPANS OF UTTERANCE WIDER THAN THE SENTENCE

8.2.1. THE SYNTACTICAL WHOLE

The term *syntactical whole* is used to denote a larger unit than a sentence. It generally comprises a number of sentences interdependent structurally (usually by means of pronouns, connectives, tense-forms) and semantically (one definite thought is dealt with). Such a span of utterance is also characterized by the fact that it can be extracted from the context without losing its relative semantic independence. This cannot be said of the sentence, which, while representing a complete syntactical unit may, however, lack the quality of independence. A sentence from the stylistic point of view does not necessarily express one idea, as it is defined in most manuals of grammar. It may express only part of one idea. Thus the sentence: "Guy glanced at his wife's untouched plate" if taken out of the context will be perceived as a part of a larger span of utterance where the situation will be made clear and the purport of verbal expression more complete.

Here is the complete syntactical whole:

Guy glanced at his wife's untouched plate.

"If you've finished we might stroll down. I think you ought to -be starting."

She did not answer. She rose from the table. She went into her room to see that nothing had been forgotten and then side by side with him walked down the steps. (Somerset Maugham)

The next sentence of the paragraph begins "A little winding path!." This is obviously the beginning of the next syntactical whole.

So the syntactical whole may be defined as a combination of sentences presenting a structural and semantic unity backed up by rhythmic and melodic unity. Any syntactical whole will lose its unity if it suffers, breaking.

But what are the principles on which the singling out of a syntactical whole can be maintained? In order to give an answer to this question, it is first of all necessary to deepen our understanding of the term *utterance*.[1] As a stylistic term the word utterance must be expanded. Any utterance from a stylistic point of view will serve to denote a certain span of speech (language-in-action) in which we may observe coherence, interdependence of the elements, one definite idea, and last but not least, the purport of the writer.

The purport is the aim that the writer sets before himself, which is to make the desired impact on the reader. So the aim of any utterance is a carefully thought-out impact. Syntactical units are connected to achieve the desired effect and it is often by the manner they are connected that the desired effect is secured.

Let us take the following paragraph for analysis:

"1. But a day or two later the doctor was not feeling well. 2. He had an internal malady that troubled him now and then, but he was used to it and disinclined to talk about it. 3. When he had one of his attacks, he only wanted to be left alone. 4. His cabin was small and stuffy, so he settled himself on a long chair on deck and lay with his eyes closed. 5. Miss Reid was walking up and down to get the half hour's exercise she took morning and evening. 6. He thought that if he pretended to be asleep she would not disturb him. 7. But when she had passed him half a dozen times she stopped in front of him and stood quite still. 8. Though he kept his eyes closed he knew that she was looking at him." (Somerset Maugham)

This paragraph consists of eight sentences, all more or less independent. The first three sentences however show a considerable degree of semantic interdependence. This can be inferred from the use of the following cluster of concepts associated with each other: 'not feeling well,' 'internal malady,' 'one of his attacks'. Each phrase is the key to the sentence in which it occurs. In spite of the fact that there are no formal connectives, the connection is made apparent by purely semantic means. These three sentences constitute a syntactical whole built within the larger framework of the paragraph. The fourth sentence is semantically independent of the preceding three. It seems at first glance not to belong, to the paragraph at all. The fact that the doctor's 'cabin was small and stuffy' and that 'he settled himself... on deck' does not seem to be necessarily connected with the thought expressed in the preceding syntactical whole. But on a more careful analysis one can clearly see how all four sentences are actually interconnected. The linking sentence is 'he only wanted to be left alone'. So the words 'lay with his eyes closed' with which the fourth sentence ends, are semantically connected both with the idea of being left alone and with the idea expressed in the sentence 'He thought that if he pretended to be asleep she would not disturb him.' But between this sentence and its semantic links 'lay with his eyes closed' and 'wanted to be left alone', the sentence about Miss Reid thrusts itself in. This is not irrelevant to the whole situation and to the purport of the writer, who leads us to understand that the doctor was disinclined to talk to anybody and probably to Miss Reid in particular.

So the whole of the paragraph has therefore what we have called *g e s t a l t*, i.e. semantic and structural wholeness. It can, however be split into two syntactical wholes with a linking sentence between them. Sentence 5 can be regarded as a syntactical whole, inasmuch as it enjoys considerable independence both semantically and structurally. Sentences 6, 7 and 8 are structurally and therefore semantically interwoven. *But when* arid *though* in the seventh and eighth sentences are the structural elements which link all three sentences intoone syntactical whole.

It follows then that a syntactical whole can be embodied in a sentence if the sentence meets the requirements of this compositional unit. Most epigrams are syntactical wholes from the point of view of their semantic unity, though they fail to meet the general structural requirement, *viz.* to be represented in a number of sentences.

On the other hand, a syntactical whole, though usually a component part of the paragraph, may occupy the whole of the paragraph. In this case we say that the syntactical whole coincides with the
paragraph.

It is important to point out that this structural unit, in its particular way of arranging ideas, belongs almost exclusively to the belles-lettres style, though it may be met with to some extent in the publicistic style. Other styles, judging by their recognized leading features, do not require this mode of arranging the parts of an utterance except in rare cases which may be neglected.

Let us take a passage from another piece of belles-lettres style, a paragraph from Aldington's "Death of a Hero."

It is a paragraph easy to submit to stylistic and semantic analysis; it falls naturally into several syntactical wholes.

"1. After dinner they sat about and smoked. 2. George took his chair over to the open window and looked down on the lights and movement of Piccadilly. 3. The noise of the traffic was lulled by the height to a long continuous rumble. 4. The placards of the evening papers along the railings beside the Ritz were sensational and bellicose. 5. The party dropped the subject of a possible great war, after deciding that there wouldn't be one, there couldn't. 6. George, who had great faith in Mr. Bobbe's political acumen, glanced through his last article, and took great comfort from the tact that Bobbesaid there wasn't going to be a war. 7. It was all a scare, a stock market ramp... 8. At that moment three or four people came in, more or less together, though they were in separate parties. 9. One of them was a youngish man in immaculate evening dress. 10. As he shook hands with his host, George heard him say rather excitedly, "I've just been dining with..."

Analysis of this paragraph will show how complicated the composition of belles-lettres syntactical units is. There is no doubt that there is a definite semantic unity in the paragraph. The main idea is the anxiety and uncertainty of English society before World War I as to whether there would be, or would not be, a war. Bui around this main sense-axis there centre a number of utterances which present more or less independent spans of thought. Thus we can easily single out the group of sentences which begins with the words "After dinner" and ends with "...and bellicose." This part of the text presents, as it were, the background against which the purport of the author stands out more clearly, the last sentence of this syntactical whole preparing the reader for the main idea of the paragraph — the possibility of war—which

is embodied in the next syntactical whole. This second syntactical whole begins with the words "The party dropped the subject of a possible great war" and ends with "...a stock market ramp..." It is made structurally independent by the introduction of elements of uttered represented speech (See p. 241), the contractions *wouldn't, couldn't, wasn't*, the purely colloquial syntactical design *there wouldn't be one, there couldn't*, the colloquial word *scare*.

The shift to the third syntactical whole is indicated by the dots after the word *ramp* (...). Here again it is the author who speaks, there are no further elements of represented speech, the shift being rather abrupt, because George's thoughts were interrupted by the entrance of the newcomers. The connecting "At that moment" softens the abruptness.

The author's purport grows apparent through the interrelation — an interrelation which seems to be organic — between the three syntactical wholes, sensational and bellicose placards in the streets of London, the anxiety of the people at the party, the conviction backed up by such a reassuring argument as Mr. Bobbe's article that there was not going to be a war, and the new guests bringing unexpected news.

Syntactical wholes are not always so easily discernible as they are in this paragraph from "The Death of a Hero." Due to individual peculiarities in combining ideas into a graphical (and that means both syntactical and semantic) unity, there may be considerable variety in the arrangement of syntactical wholes and of paragraphs, ranging from what might be called clearly-marked borderlines between the syntactical wholes to almost imperceptible semantic shifts. Indeed, it is often from making a comparison between the beginning and the end of a paragraph that one can infer that it contains separate syntactical wholes.

It follows then that the paragraphs in the belles-lettres prose style do not necessarily possess the qualities of unity and coherence as is the case with paragraphs in other styles of speech and particularly in the scientific prose style.

Syntactical wholes are to be found in particular in poetical style. Here the syntactical wholes, as well as the paragraphs, are embodied in stanzas. Due to the most typical semantic property of any poetical work, *viz.*, brevity of expression, — there arises the need to combine ideas so that seemingly independent utterances may be integrated into one poetical unity, *viz.*, a stanza.

Let us take for analysis the following stanza from Shelley's poem "The Cloud":

"I bring fresh showers for the thirsting flowers
From the seas and the streams;
I bear light shade for the leaves when laid
In their noon-day dreams.
From my wings are shaken the dews that waken
The sweet buds every one,
When rocked to rest on their mother's breast,
As she dances about the sun.
I wield the flail of the lashing hail,
And whiten the green plains under;
And then again I dissolve it in rain,
And laugh as I pass in thunder."

Here there are three syntactical wholes separated by full stops.

Within the first, which comprises four lines, there are two more or less independent units divided by a semicolon and integrated by parallel constructions (*I bring fresh showers ... I bear light shade*).

Within the second syntactical whole — also four lines — there are also two interdependent ideas — the buds awakened by the dews and the earth moving around the

sun. These are strongly bound together by the formal elements *when* and *as* forming one complex sentence and a syntactical whole. The formal means used to connect different spans of utterance affect their semantic integrity.

The three syntactical wholes of the stanza are united by one idea — the usefulness of the cloud giving all kind of comfort, here moisture and shade, to what is growing... showers, shade, dews, hail, rain.

The syntactical wholes in sonnets are especially manifest. This is due to their strict structural and semantic rules of composition.

8.2.2. THE PARAGRAPH

A p a r a g r a p h is a graphical term used to name a group of sentences marked off by indentation at the beginning and a break in the line at the end. But this graphical term has come to mean a distinct portion of a written discourse showing an internal unity, logical in character. In fact the paragraph as a category is half linguistic, half logical. As a logical category it is characterized by coherence and relative unity of the ideas expressed, as a linguistic category it is a unit of utterance marked off by purely linguistic means: intonation, pauses of various lengths, semantic ties which can be disclosed by scrupulous analysis of the morphological aspect and meaning of the component parts, etc. It has already been Stated elsewhere that the logical aspect of an utterance will always be backed up by purely linguistic means causing, as it were, an indivisible unity of extra-linguistic and intra-linguistic approach.

Bearing this in mind, we shall not draw a mark of demarcation between the logical and the linguistic analysis of an utterance, because the paragraph is a linguistic expression of a logical arrangement of thought.

Paragraph structure is not always built on logical principles alone, as is generally the case in the style of scientific prose. In the building of paragraphs in newspaper style, other requirements are taken into consideration, for instance, psychological principles, in particular the sensational effect of the communication and the grasping capacity of the reader for quick reading. Considerations of space also play an important part. This latter consideration sometimes over-rules the necessity for logical arrangement and results in breaking the main rule of paragraph building, i.e. the unity of idea. Thus a brief note containing information about an oil treaty is crammed into one sentence, it being in its turn a paragraph:

"The revised version of an international oil treaty is to-day before the Senate Relation Committee, which recently made it clear that the Anglo-American oil treaty negotiated last August would not reach the Senate floor for ratification, because of objections by the American oil industry to it."

Paragraph building in the style of official documents is mainly governed by the particular conventional forms of documents (charters, pacts, diplomatic documents, business letters, legal documents and the like). Here "paragraphs may sometimes embody what are grammatically called a number of parallel clauses, which for the sake of the wholeness of the entire document are made formally subordinate, whereas in reality they are independent items. (See examples in the chapter on official style, p. 325.)

Paragraph structure in the belles-lettres and publicistic styles is strongly affected by the purport of the author. To secure the desired impact, a writer finds it necessary to give details and illustrations, to introduce comparisons and contrasts, to give additional reasons and, finally, to expand the topic by looking at it from different angles and paraphrasing it. He may, especially in the publicistic style, introduce the testimony of some authority on the

subject and even deviate from the main topic by recounting an anecdote or even a short story to ease mental effort and facilitate understanding of the communication.

The length of a paragraph normally varies from eight to twelve sentences. The longer the paragraph is, the more difficult it is to follow the purport of the writer. In newspaper style, however, most paragraphs consist of one or perhaps two or three sentences.

Paragraphs of a purely logical type may be analyzed from the way the thought of the writer develops. Attempts have been made to classify paragraphs from the point of view of the logical sequence of the sentences. Thus in manuals on the art of composition there are models of paragraphs built on different principles:

1. from the general to the particular, or from the particular to the general;
2. on the inductive or deductive principle;
3. from cause to effect, or from effect to cause;
4. on contrast, or comparison.

So the paragraph is a compositional device aimed either at facilitating the process of apprehending what is written, or inducing a certain reaction on the part of the reader. This reaction is generally achieved by intentionally grouping the ideas so as to show their interdependence or interrelation. That is why the paragraph, from a mere compositional device, turns into a stylistic one. It discloses the writer's manner of depicting the features of the object or phenomenon described. It is in the paragraph that the main function of the belles-lettres style becomes most apparent, the main function, as will be shown below, being emotive.

In the paragraph from the "Death of a Hero", as we $aw, there are three syntactical wholes which together constitute one paragraph. If we were to convert the passage into one of the matter-of-fact styles it would be necessary to split it into three paragraphs. But Aldington found it necessary to combine all the sentences into one paragraph, evidently seeing closer connections between the parts than there would be in a mere impersonal, less emotional account of the events described.

The paragraph in some styles, such as scientific, publicistic and some others generally has, a *topic sentence, i.e.*, a sentence which embodies the main idea of the paragraph or which may be interpreted as a key-sentence disclosing the chief thought of the writer. In logical prose the topic sentence is as a rule placed either at the beginning or at the end of the paragraph depending on the logical pattern on which the paragraph is built. In the belles-lettres style the topic sentence may be placed in any part of the paragraph. It will depend on how the writer seeks to achieve his effect.

Thus in the paragraph we have been referring to, the topic sentence ('The party dropped the subject of a possible great war, after deciding that there wouldn't be one, there couldn't') is placed in the middle of the paragraph. The parts that precede and follow the topic sentence correspondingly lead to it (4he placard^...') and develop it ('George, who...'). The topic sentence itself, being based on uttered represented speech, is stylistically a very effective device to show that the conclusion (no war) was not based on sound logical argument, but merely on the small talk of the party (4here wouldn t', 'there couldn t').

However, paragraph building in belles-lettres prose generally lacks unity, inasmuch as it is governed by other than logical principles, two of the requirements being emotiveness and a natural representation of the situation depicted. Hence it is sometimes impossible to decide which sentence should be regarded as the topic one. Each syntactical whole of several combined into one paragraph, may have its own topic sentence or be a topic sentence. In other words, there are no topic sentences in emotive prose as a rule, though there may be some paragraphs with one due to the prevalence of the logical element over the emotional or the aesthetic.

In publicistic style paragraphs are built on more apparent logical principles, this style being intermediate between the belles-lettres and the scientific style. Let us subject to stylistic analysis the following paragraph from Macaulay's essay on Oliver Goldsmith:

While Goldsmith was writing "The Deserted Village" and "She Stoops to Conquer," he was employed in works of a very different kind, works from which he derived little reputation but much profit. He compiled for the use of schools a "History of Rome," by which he made £ 300; a "History of England," by which he made £ 600; a "History of Greece," for which he received £ 250; a "Natural History," for which the booksellers covenanted to pay him 800 guineas. These works he produced without any elaborate research, by merely selecting, abridging and translating into his own clear, pure, and flowing language what he found in books well known to the world, but too bulky or too dry for boys and girls. He committed some strange blunders; for he knew nothing with accuracy. Thus in his "History of England" he tells us that Naseby is in Yorkshire, nor did he correct this mistake when the book was reprinted. He was nearly hoaxed into putting into the "History of Greece" an account of a battle between Alexander the Great and Montezuma. In his "Animated Nature" he relates, with faith and with perfect gravity, all the most absurd lies which he could find in books of travels about gigantic Patagonians, monkeys that preach sermons, nightingales that repeat long conversations. "If he can tell a horse from a cow," said Johnson, "that is the extent of his knowledge of zoology." How little Goldsmith was qualified to write about the physical sciences is sufficiently proved by two anecdotes. He on one occasion denied that the sun is longer in the northern than in the southern signs. It was vain to cite the authority of Maupertuis. "Maupertuis!" he cried, "I understand those matters better than Maupertuis." On another occasion he, in defiance of the evidence of his own senses maintained obstinately, and even angrily, that he chewed his dinner by moving his upper jaw.

Yet, ignorant as Goldsmith was, few writers have done more to make the first steps in the laborious road to knowledge easy and pleasant..."

The topic sentence of this paragraph is placed at the beginning. It consists of two ideas presented in a complex sentence with a subordinate clause of time. The idea of the topic sentence is embodied in the main clause which states that Goldsmith derived "little reputation but much profit" out of some of his works. The subordinate clause of time is used here as a linking sentence between the preceding paragraph which deals with "The Deserted Village" and "She Stoops to Conquer" and the one under scrutiny.

The next paragraph of the passage, as the reader has undoubtedly observed, begins with a new topic sentence and is built on the same structural model: the subordinate clause sums up the idea of the preceding paragraph ("Yet, ignorant as Goldsmith was"), and the main clause introduces a new idea. This pattern is maintained throughout the essay and, by the way, in most of Macaulay's essays. This easy, flowing manner of exposition has a high degree of predictability. The reader, having read the first sentence and being conscious of the author's manner of building paragraphs, will not fail to grasp the gist of the passage at once.

It is interesting to point out how Macaulay develops the idea expressed in the topic sentence. He wished to show why Goldsmith derived 1) "little reputation" and 2) "much profit" from certain of his works. Of the two, Macaulay considers the former to be undoubtedly more significant than the latter. That is why he begins with insignificant details — enumerating Goldsmith's profits and then devotes all the rest of the paragraph to instances of Goldsmith's ignorance.

A paragraph in certain styles is, as has been said, a dialogue (with the reader) in the form of a monologue. The breaking-up of a piece of writing into paragraphs can be regarded as an expression of consideration for the reader on the part of the author. It manifests itself in the author's being aware of limits in the reader's capacity for perceiving and absorbing information. Therefore paragraphs in matter-of-fact styles, as in scientific prose, official documents and so on, are clear, precise, logically coherent, and possess unity, i.e., express one main thought. Paragraphs in emotive prose are combinations of the logical and the emotional. The aim of the author in breaking

up the narrative into paragraphs is not only to facilitate understanding but also for emphasis. That is why paragraphs in the belles-lettres prose are sometimes built on contrast or on climax, as is the paragraph from "A Christmas Carol" by Dickens, quoted on p. 220.

The paragraph as a unit of utterance is so far entirely the domain of stylistics. Yet these are obvious features of a purely syntactical character in the paragraph which must not be overlooked. That is why there is every reason to study the paragraph in syntax of the language where not only the sentence but also larger units of communication should be under observation. This would come under what we may call the "macro-syntax" of the language.

8.3. COMPOSITIONAL PATTERNS OF SYNTACTICAL ARRANGEMENT

The structural syntactical aspect is sometimes regarded as the crucial issue in stylistic analysis, although the peculiarities of syntactical arrangement are not so conspicuous as the lexical and phrase logical properties of the utterance. Syntax is figuratively called the "sinews of style".

Structural syntactical stylistic devices are in special relations with the intonation involved. Prof. Peshkovsky points out that there is an interdependence between the intonation and other syntactical properties of the sentence, which may be worded in the following manner: the more explicitly the structural syntactical relations are expressed, the weaker will be the intonation-pattern of the utterance (up to complete disappearance) and vice-versa, the stronger the intonation, the weaker grow the evident syntactical relations (also up to complete disappearance). This can be illustrated by means of the following two pairs of sentences: *"Only after dinner did I make* up my mind to go there" and *"I made* up my mind to go there *only after dinner." "It was in Bucharest* that the X th International Congress of Linguists took place" and "The X th International Congress of Linguists took place in Bucharest."

The second sentences in these pairs can be made emphatic only by intonation, the first sentences are made emphatic by means of the syntactical patterns: "Only after dinner did I..." and "It was.., that."

The problem of syntactical stylistic devices appears to be closely linked not only with what makes an utterance more emphatic but also with the more general problem of predication. As is known, the English affirmative sentence is regarded as neutral if it maintains the regular word order, i.e., subject — predicate — object (or other secondary members of the sentence, as they are called). Any other order of the parts of the sentence may also carry the necessary information, but the impact on the reader will be different. Even a slight change in the word order of a sentence or in the order of the sentences in a more complicated syntactical unit will inevitably cause a definite modification of the meaning of the whole. An almost imperceptible rhythmical design introduced into a prose sentence, or a sudden break in the sequence of the parts of the sentence, or any other change will add something to the volume of information contained in the original sentence. It follows that the very concept of inversion has appeared as a counterpart to the regular word order, the latter being a relatively unemotional, unemphatic, neutral mode of expression.

Unlike the syntactical expressive means of the language, which are naturally used in discourse in a straight-forward natural manner, syntactical stylistic devices are perceived as elaborate designs aimed at having a definite impact on the reader. It will be borne in mind that any SD is meant to be understood as a device and is calculated to produce a desired stylistic effect.

When viewing the stylistic functions of different syntactical designs we must first of all take into consideration two aspects:

1. The juxtaposition of different parts of the utterance.

2. The way the parts are connected with each other.

In addition to these two large groups of EMs and SDs two other groups may be distinguished:

1. Those based on the peculiar use of colloquial constructions.

Those based on the transferred use of structural meaning.

8.3.1. STYLISTIC INVERSION

Word order is a crucial syntactical problem in many languages. In English it has peculiarities which have been caused by the concrete and specific way the language has developed. O. Jespersen states that the English language "...has developed a tolerably fixed word order which in the great majority of cases shows without fail what is the Subject of the sentence." This "tolerably fixed word order" is Subject – Verb (Predicate) – Object (S – P – O). Further, Jespersen mentions a statistical investigation of word order made on the basis of a series of representative 19th century writers. It was found that the order S – P – O was used in from 82 to 97 per cent of all sentences containing all three members, while the percentage for Beowulf was 16 and for King Alfred's prose 40.

This predominance of S – P – O word order makes conspicious any change in the structure of the sentence and inevitably calls forth a modification in the intonation design.

The most conspicious places in the sentence are considered to be the first and the last: the first place because the full force of the stress can be felt at the beginning of an utterance and the last place because there is a pause after it. This traditional word order has developed a definite intonation design. Through frequency of repetition this design has imposed itself on any sentence even though there are changes introduced in the sequence of the component parts. Hence the clash between semantically insignificant elements of the sentence when they are placed in structurally significant position and the intonation which follows the recognized pattern.

Thus in Dickens' much quoted sentence:

"Talent Mr. Micawber has, *capital* Mr. Micawber has not."

The first and the last positions being prominent, the verb *has* and the negative *not* get a fuller volume of stress than they would in ordinary (uninverted) word order. In the traditional word order the predicates *has* and *has not* are closely attached to their objects *talent* and *capital*. *English* predicate-object groups are so bound together that when we tear the object away from its predicate, the latter remains dangling in the sentence and in this position sometimes calls forth a change in meaning of the predicate word. In the inverted word order not only the objects *talent* and *capital* become conspicuous but also the predicates *has* and *has not*.

In this example the effect of the inverted word order is backed up by two other stylistic devices: antithesis and parallel construction. Unlike grammatical inversion stylistic inversion does not change the structural meaning of the sentence, that is, the change in the juxtaposition of the members of the sentence does not indicate structural meaning but has some superstructufal function. *Stylistic inversion* aims at attaching logical stress or additional emotional colouring to the surface meaning of the utterance. Therefore a specific intonation pattern is the inevitable satellite of inversion.

Stylistic inversion in Modern English should not be regarded as a violation of the norms of standard English. It is only the practical realization of what is potential in the language itself.

The following patterns of stylistic inversion are most frequently met in both English prose, and English poetry.

1. The object is placed at the beginning of the sentence (see the example above),

2. The attribute is placed after the word it modifies (postposition of the attribute). This model is often used when there is more than one attribute, for example:

"With fingers *weary and worn..."* (Thomas Hood) "Once upon a midnight *dreary..."* (E. A. Poe)

3. a) The predicative is placed before the subject as in

"A good generous prayer it was," (Mark Twain)

or b) the predicative stands before the link verb and both are placed before the subject as in

"Rude am I in my speech..." (Shakespeare)

4. The adverbial modifier is placed at the beginning of the sentence, as in

"Eagerly I wished the morrow." (Poe) "My dearest daughter, *at your feet* I fall." (Dryden)

"A tone of most extraordinary comparison Miss Fox said it in". (Dickens)

5. Both modifier and predicate stand before the subject, as in

"In went Mr. Pickwick." (Dickens) *"Down dropped* the breeze..." (Coleridge)

These five models comprise the most common and recognized models of inversion. No other form of inversion can be a basis for a model, though occasionally a word order appears which is in violation of the recognized norms of the English sentence. In this respect Henry Sweet is wrong when in his "New English Grammar" he maintains that in order to make a word emphatic it must be placed in any abnormal position. The position of a word in the sentence may be changed within the recognized variants and the above models are the materialization of these variants.

Inversion as a stylistic device is always sense-motivated. There is a tendency to account for inversion in poetry by rhythmical considerations. This may sometimes be true, but really talented poets will never sacrifice sense for form and in the majority of cases inversion in poetry is called forth by considerations of content rather than rhythm.

Inverted word order, or inversion, is one of the forms of what are known as emphatic constructions. What is generally called traditional word order is nothing more than unemphatic construction. Emphatic constructions have so far been regarded as non-typical structures and therefore are considered as violations of the regular word order in the sentence. But in practice these structures are as common as the *fixed extraditional* word order structures. Therefore inversion must be regarded as an expressive means of the language having typical structural models.

8.3.2. DETACHED CONSTRUCTION

Sometimes one of the secondary parts of the sentence by some specific consideration of the writer is placed so that it seems formally independent of the word it logically refers to. Such parts of structures are called *detached*. They seem to dangle in the sentence as isplat-ed parts.

The detached part, being torn away from its referent, assumes a greater degree of significance and is givep prominence by intonation. The structural patterns of detached constructions have not yet been classified, but the most noticeable cases are those in which an attribute or an adverbial modifier is placed not in immediate proximity to its referent, but in some other position, as in the following examples:

1) "Steyne rose up, grinding his teeth, *pale*, and *with fury in his eyes."*

2) "Sir Pitt came in first, *very much flushed*, and *rather unsteady in his gait"* (Thackeray).

Sometimes a nominal phrase is thrown into the sentence forming a syntactical unit with the rest of the sentence, as in

"And he walked slowly past again, along the river — *an evening of clear, quiet beauty, all harmony and comfort,* except within his heart." (Galsworthy)

The essential quality of detached construction lies in the fact that the isolated parts represent a kind of independent whole thrust into the sentence or placed in a position which will make the phrase (or word) seem independent. But a detached phrase cannot rise to the rank of a primary member of the sentence — it always remains secondary from the semantic point of view, although structurally it possesses all the features of a primary member. This clash of the structural and semantic aspects of detached constructions produces the desired effect — forcing the reader to interpret the logical connections between the component parts of the sentence. Logical ties between them always exist in spite of the absence of syntactical indicators.

Detached constructions in their common forms make the written variety of language akin to the spoken variety where the relation between the component parts is effectively materialized by means of intonation. Detached construction, as it were, becomes a peculiar device bridging the norms of written and spoken language.

This stylistic device is akin to inversion. The functions are almost the same. But detached construction produces a much stronger effect, inasmuch as it presents parts of the utterance significant from the author's point of view in a more or less independent manner.

Here are some more examples of detached constructions:

"Daylight was dying, the moon rising, *gold behind the poplars.*" (Galsworthy)

"'I want to go,' he said, *miserable.*" (Galsworthy)

"She was lovely: *all of her — delightful*" (Dreiser)

The italicized phrases and words in these sentences seem to be isolated, but still the connection with the primary members of the corresponding sentences is clearly implied. Thus *gold behind the poplars* may be interpreted as a simile or a metaphor: *the moon like gold was rising behind the poplars*, or *the moon rising, it was gold*...

Detached construction sometimes causes the simultaneous realization of two grammatical meanings of a word. In the sentence "4 want to go,' he said, *miserable"* the last word might possibly have been understood as an adverbial modifier to the word *said* if not for the comma, though grammatically *miserably* would be expected. The pause indicated by the comma implies that *miserable* is an adjective used absolutely and referring to the pronoun *he*.

The same can be said about Dreiser's sentence with the word *delightful*. Here again the mark of punctuation plays an important role. The dash standing before the word makes the word conspicuous and being isolated, it becomes the culminating point of the climax - *lovely... — delightful*, i.e. the peak of the whole utterance. The phrase *all of her* is also somehow isolated. The general impression suggested by the implied intonation, is a strong feeling of admiration, and as is usually the case, strong feelings reject coherent and logical syntax.

In the English language detached constructions are generally used in the belles-lettres prose style and mainly with words that have some explanatory function, for example: "June stood in front, fending off this idle curiosity — *a little bit of a thing*, as somebody said, 'all hair and spirit'..." (Galsworthy)

Detached construction as a stylistic device is a typification of the syntactical peculiarities of the syntactical peculiarities of colloquial language.

Detached construction is a stylistic phenomenon which has so far been little investigated. The device itself is closely connected with the intonation pattern of the utterance. In

conversation any word or phrase or even sentence may be made more conspicuous by means of intonation. Therefore precision in the syntactical structure of the sentence is not so necessary from the communicative point of view. But it becomes vitally important in writing. Here precision of syntactical relations is the only way to make the utterance fully communicative. Therefore when the syntactical relations become obscure, each member of the sentence that seems to be dangling becomes logically significant.

A variant of detached construction is *p a r e n t h e s i s*.

"Parenthesis is a qualifying, explanatory or appositive word, phrase, clause, sentence, or other sequence which interrupts a syntactic construction without otherwise affecting it, having often a characteristic intonation and indicated in writing by commas, brackets or dashes."

In fact parenthesis sometimes embodies a considerable volume of predicativeness, thus giving the utterance an additional nuance of meaning or a tinge of emotional colouring.

10.1.1. ASYNDENTON

A s y n d e t o n, that is, connection between parts of a sentence or between sentences without any formal sign, becomes a stylistic device if there is a deliberate omission of the connective where it is generally expected to be according to the norms of the literary language. Here is an example:

"Soames turned away, he had an utter disinclination for talk, like one standing before an open grave, watching a coffin slowly lowered." (Galsworthy)

The deliberate omission of the subordinate conjunction *because* or *for* makes the sentence 'he had an utter...' almost entirely independent. It might be perceived as a characteristic feature of Soarnes in general, but for the comparison, beginning with *like*, which shows that Soames's mood was temporary.

Here a reminder is necessary that there is an essential difference between the ordinary norms of language, both literary and colloquial, and stylistic devices which are skilfully wrought for special informative and aesthetic purposes. In the sentence:

"Bicket did not answer his throat felt too dry." (Galsworthy) the absence of the conjunction and a punctuation mark may be regarded as a deliberate introduction of the norms of colloquial speech into the literary language. Such structures make the utterance sound like one syntactical unit to be pronounced in one breath group. This determines the intonation pattern.

It is interesting to compare the preceding two utterances from the point of view of the length of the pause between the constituent parts. In the first utterance (Soames...), there is a semicolon which, being the indication of a longish pause, breaks the utterance into two parts. In the second utterance (Bicket...), no pause should be made and the whole of the utterance pronounced as one syntagm.

The crucial problem in ascertaining the true intonation pattern of a sentence composed of two or more parts lies in a deeper analysis of the functions of the connectives on the one hand, and a more detailed investigation of graphical means — the signals indicating the correct interpretation of the utterance — on the other.

10.1.2. POLYSYNDENTON

P o l y s y n d e t o n is the stylistic device of connecting sentences or phrases or syntagms or words by using connectives (mostly conjunctions and prepositions) before each component part as in:

"The heaviest rain, *and* snow, *and* hail, *and* sleet, could boast of the advantage over him in only one respect." (Dickens)

In this passage from Longfellow's "The Song of Hiawatha", there is repetition both of conjunctions and prepositions.

"Should you ask me, *whence* these stories?
Whence these legends and traditions,
With the odours of the forest,
With the dew, and damp of meadows,
With the curling smoke of wigwams,
With the rushing of great rivers,
With their frequent repetitions..."

The repetition of conjunctions and other means of connection makes an utterance more rhythmical, so much so that prose may even seem like verse. The conjunctions and other connectives, being generally unstressed elements, when placed before each meaningful member will cause the alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables - the essential requirement of rhythm in verse. Hence one of the functions of polysyndeton is a rhythmical one.

In addition to this, polysyndeton has a disintegrating function. It generally combines homogeneous elements of thought into one whole resembling enumeration. But unlike enumeration, which integrates both homogeneous and heterogeneous elements into one whole, polysyndeton member of a string of facts to stand out conspicuously. That is why we say that polysyndeton has a disintegrating function. Enumeration shows things united; polysyndeton shows them isolated.

Polysyndeton has also the function of expressing sequence, as in:

"Then Mr. Boffin,, sat *staring at* a little bookcase of Law Practice and Law Reports, *and at* a window, *and at* an empty blue bag, *and* a stick of sealing-wax, *and at* a pen, *and* a box of wafers, *and* an apple, *and* a writing-pall — all very dusty — *and at* a number of inky smears and blots, *and at* an imperfectly disguised gun-case pretending to be something legal, *and at* an iron box labelled "Harmon Estate", until Mr. Lightwood appeared." (Dickens)

All these *ands* may easily be replaced *by then*s. But in this case too much stress would be laid on the logical aspects of the utterance, whereas *and* expresses both sequence and disintegration.

Note also that Dickens begins by repeating not only *and*, but also *at*. But in the middle of the utterance he drops the a/, picks it up again, drops it once more and then finally picks it up and uses it with the last three items.

10.3. TRANSFERRED USE OF STRUCTURAL MEANING

On analogy with transference of lexical meaning, in which words are used other than in their primary logical sense, syntactical structures may also be used in meanings other than their primary ones. Every syntactical structure has its definite function, which is sometimes called its structural meaning. When a structure is used in some other function it may be said to assume a new meaning which is similar to lexical transferred meaning.

Among syntactical stylistic devices there are two in which this transference of structural meaning is to be seen. They are rhetorical questions and litotes.

10.3.1. RHETORICAL QUESTIONS

The rhetorical question is a special syntactical stylistic device the essence of which consists in reshaping the grammatical meaning of the interrogative sentence. In other words, the question is no longer a question but a statement expressed in the form of an interrogative sentence. Thus there is an interplay of two structural meanings: 1) that of the question and 2) that of the statement. Both are materialized simultaneously. For example:

"*Are these* the remedies for a starving and desperate populace?"

"*Is there* not blood enough upon your penal code, that more must be poured forth to ascend to Heaven and testify against you?" (Byron)

One can agree with Prof. Popov who states: "...the rhetorical question is equal to a categorical pronouncement plus an exclamation."[1] Indeed, if we compare a pronouncement expressed as a statement with the same pronouncement expressed as a rhetorical question by means of transformational analysis, we will find ourselves compelled to assert that the interrogative form makes the pronouncement still more categorical, in that it excludes any interpretation beyond that contained in the rhetorical question.

From the examples given above, we can see that rhetorical questions are generally structurally embodied in complex sentences with the subordinate clause containing the pronouncement. Here is another example:

"...*Shall the sons of Chimary*
Who never forgive the fault of a friend
Bid an enemy live?..." (Byron)"

Without the attributive clause the rhetorical question would lose its specific quality and might be regarded as an ordinary question.

The subordinate clause, as it were, signalizes the rhetorical question. The meaning of the above utterance can hardly fail to be understood: i.e., *The sons of* Chimary *will never bid* an enemy live.

There is another structural pattern of rhetorical questions, which is based on negation. In this case the question may be a simple sentence, as in

"*Did not the Italian* Mosico Cazzani
Sing at my heart six months at least in vain?" (Byron)
"Have I not had to wrestle with my lot?
Have I not suffered things to be forgiven?" (Byron)

•Negative-interrogative sentences generally have a peculiar nature. There is always an additional shade of meaning implied in them: sometimes doubt, sometimes assertion, sometimes suggestion. In other words they are full of emotive meaning and modality.

We have already stated that rhetorical questions may be looked upon as a transference of grammatical meaning. But just as in the case of the transference of lexical meaning the stylistic effect of the transference of grammatical meaning can only be achieved if there is a simultaneous realization of the two meanings: direct and transferred. So it is with rhetorical questions. Both the question-meaning and the statement-meaning are materialized with an emotional charge, the weight of which can be judged by the intonation of the speaker.

The intonation of rhetorical questions, according to the most recent investigations, differs materially from the intonation of or dinary questions. This is also an additional indirect proof of the double nature of this stylistic device.

The nature of the rhetorical question has not been fully studied and what structural peculiarities cause an ordinary question to turn into a rhetorical one is still to be discovered. In the question-sentence

"*Is the poor privilege* to turn the key
Upon the captive, *freedom?*" (Byron)

instead of a categorical pronouncement one can detect doubt. It is the word 'poor' that prompts this interpretation of the utterance.

A more detailed analysis of the semantic aspect of different question-sentences leads to the conclusion that these structural models have various functions. Not only ordinary questions, not only categorical pronouncements are expressed in question

form. In fact there are various nuances of emotive meaning embodied in question-sentences. We have already given an example of one of these meanings, *viz.* doubt. In Shakespeare's

"Who is here so vile that will not love his country?" there is a meaning of challenge openly and unequivocally declared. It is impossible to regard it as a rhetorical question making a categorical pronouncement. In the rhetorical question from Byron's maiden speech given above ('Is there not blood...') there is a clear implication of scorn and contempt for Parliament and the laws it passes. So rhetorical questions may also be defined as utterances in the form of questions which pronounce judgements and also express various kinds of modal shades of meaning as doubt, challenge, scorn and so on.

It has been stated elsewhere that questions are more emotional than statements. When a question is repeated as in these lines from Poe's "The Raven"

"— Is there — is there balm in Gilead?! Tell me — tell me—I implore!—"

the degree of emotiveness increases and the particular shade of meaning (in this case, despair) becomes more apparent. The rhetorical question re-enforces this essential quality,, of interrogative sentences and uses it to convey a stronger shade of emotional meaning.

Rhetorical questions, due to their power of expressing a variety of modal shades of meaning, are most often used in publicistic style and particularly in oratory, where the rousing of emotions is the effect generally aimed at.

10.3.2. LITOTES

Litotes *is a* stylistic device consisting of a peculiar use of negative constructions. The negation plus noun or adjective serves to establish a positive feature in a person or thing. This positive feature, however, is somewhat diminished in quality as compared with a synonymous expression making a straightforward assertion of the positive feature.

The stylistic effect of litotes depends mainly on intonation. If we compare two intonation patterns, one which suggests a mere denial *(It is not bad* as a contrary to *It is bad)* with the other which suggests the assertion of a positive quality of the object *(It is not bad = it is good),* the difference will become apparent. The degree to which litotes carries the positive quality in itself can be estimated by analysing the semantic structure of the word which is negated.

"Whatever defects the tale possessed - and they were *not a few* - it had, as delivered by her, the one merit of seeming like truth."

"He found that this was *no easy task."*

Litotes is a means by which the natural logical and linguistic property of negation can be strengthened. The two senses of the litotic expression, negative and positive, serve a definite stylistic purpose.

10.2.1. ELLIPSIS

E l l i p s i s is a typical phenomenon in conversation, arising out of the situation. We mentioned this peculiar feature of the spoken language when we characterized its essential qualities and properties.

But this typical feature of the spoken language assumes a new quality when used in the written language. It becomes a stylistic device, inasmuch as it supplies supersegmental information. An elliptical sentence in direct intercourse is not a stylistic device. It is simply a norm of the spoken language.

Let us take a few examples.

"So Justice Oberwaltzer - solemnly and didactically from his high seat to the jury." (Dreiser)

One feels very acutely the absence of the predicate in this sentence. Why was it omitted? Did the author pursue any special purpose in leaving out a primary member of the sentence? Or is it just due to carelessness? The answer is obvious: it is a deliberate device. This particular model of sentence suggests the author's personal state of mind, *viz.* his indignation at the shameless speech of the Justice. It is a common fact that any excited state of mind will manifest itself in some kind of violation of the recognized literary sentence structure.

Ellipsis, when used as a stylistic device, always imitates the common features of colloquial language, where the situation predetermines not the omission of certain members of the sentence, but their absence. It would perhaps be adequate to call sentences lacking certain members "incomplete sentences", leaving the term *e l l i p s i s* to specify structures where we recognize a digression from the traditional literary sentence structure.

Thus the sentences 'See you to-morrow.', 'Had a good time.', 'Won't do.', 'You say that?' are typical of the colloquial language. Nothing is omitted here. These are normal syntactical structures in the spoken language and to call them elliptical, means to judge every sentence structure according to the structural models of the written language. Likewise such sentences as the following can hardly be called elliptical.

"*There's somebody wants* to speak to you."

"*There was no breeze came* through the open window." (Hemingway)

The relative pronouns *who, which, who* after 'somebody', 'breeze', 'a man in this Borough' could not be regarded as "omitted" - this is the norm of colloquial language, though now not in frequent use except perhaps with the *there is (are)* constructions as above. This is due, perhaps, to the standardizing power of the literary language. O. Jespersen, in his analysis of such structures, writes:

"If we speak hereof 'omission' or 'subaudition' or 'ellipsis0, the reader is apt to get the false impression that the fuller _ expression is the better one as being complete, and that the shorter expression is to some extent faulty or defective, or something that has come into existence in recent times out of slovenliness. This is wrong; the constructions are very old in the language and have not come into existence through the dropping of a previously necessary relative pronoun." Here are some examples quoted by Jespersen:

"*I bring him news will* raise his drooping spirits."

"...or *like the snow falls* in the river."

"...when at her door *arose a clatter might* awake the dead."

However when the reader encounters such structures in literary texts, even though they aim at representing the lively norms of the spoken language, he is apt to regard them as bearing some definite stylistic function. This is due to a psychological effect produced by the relative rarity of the construction, on the one hand, and the non-expectancy of any strikingly colloquial expression, in literary narrative.

It must be repeated here that the most characteristic feature of the written variety of language is amplification which by its very nature is opposite to ellipsis. Amplification generally demands expansion of the ideas with as full and as exact relations between the parts of the utterance as possible. Ellipsis being the property of colloquial language, on the contrary, does not express what can easily be supplied by the situation. This is perhaps the reason that elliptical sentences are rarely used as stylistic devices. Sometimes the omission of a link verb adds emotional colouring and makes the sentence sound more emphatic, as in these lines from Byron:

"*Thrice happy he* who, after survey of
the good company, can win a corner."

"*Nothing so difficult* as a beginning."

"Denotes *how soft the chin* which bears his touch."

It is wrong to suppose that the omission of the link verbs in these sentences is due to the requirements of the rhythm.

Key words.

Sentence, syntactical SDs, sentence length, one-word sentences, sentence structure, punctuation, arrangement of sentence members, rhetorical question, types of repetition, parallel constructions, chiasmus, inversion, suspense, detachment, completeness of sentence structure, ellipsis, one-member sentences, apokoinu constructions, break, types of connection, polysyndeton, asyndeton, attachment.

Assignments for Self-Control

1. Comment on the length of the sentence and its stylistic relevance.
2. What do you know about one-word sentences?
3. Is there any correlation between the length and the structure of the sentence?
4. Can syntactical ambivalence be put to stylistic use?
5. What punctuation marks do you know and what is their stylistic potential?
6. What is a rhetorical question?
7. What types of repetition do you know?
8. Comment on the functions of repetition which you observed in your reading.
9. Which type of repetition have you met most often? What, in your opinion, makes it so popular?
10. What constructions are called parallel?
11. Have you ever observed chiasmus? What is it?
12. What syntactical stylistic devices dealing with arrangement of sentence members do you remember?
13. What types of inversion do you know? Which of them have you met more often and why?
14. What is suspense, how is it arranged and what is its function?
15. What do you know about detachment and punctuation used with detached sentence members?
16. What sentence members are most often detached?
17. Find in your reading material cases of all syntactical SDs based on the re-arrangement or intended specific arrangement of sentence members.
18. What syntactical stylistic devices deal with the completeness of sentence-structure?
19. What types of ellipses do you know and where is each of them used predominantly?
20. What member of the sentence represents "one-member sentences"?
21. Where are apokoinu constructions used?
22. What additional information about the act of communication and its participants is conveyed by the break?
23. What punctuation is used in the break?
24. Find examples with the above-mentioned SDs in your reading.
25. What types of connecting syntactical units do you know? Which of them are used to create additional information and achieve a specific effect?
26. Speak about asyndeton and its functions.
27. Discuss polysyndeton. Give some examples from your reading.
28. What is attachment? When and where is it used? Have you met it in your reading?

LECTURE 10
LEXICO-SYNTACTICAL STYLISTIC DEVICES

Plan

9.1. Parallel Construction
9.2. Chiasmus
9.3. Repetition
9.4. Enumeration
9.5. Suspense
9.6. Climax
9.7. Antithesis

9.1. PARALLEL CONSTRUCTION

Parallel construction is a device which may be encountered not so much in the sentence as in the macro-structures dealt with earlier, viz. the syntactical whole and the paragraph. The necessary condition in parallel construction is identical, or similar, syntactical structure in two or more sentences or parts of a sentence, as in:

"There were, ... real silver spoons to stir the tea with, and real china cups to drink it out of, and plates of the same to hold the cakes and toast in." (Dickens)

Parallel constructions are often backed up by repetition of words (lexical repetition) and conjunctions and prepositions (polysyndeton). Pure parallel construction, however, does not depend on any other kind of repetition but the repetition of the syntactical design of the sentence.

Parallel constructions may be partial or complete. Partial parallel arrangement is the repetition of some parts of successive sentences or clauses as in:

"It is the mob that labour in your fields and serve in your houses – that man your navy and recruit your army, – that have enabled you to defy all the world, and can also defy you when neglect and calamity have driven them to despair." (Byron)

The attributive clauses here all begin with the subordinate conjunction that which is followed by a verb in the same tense form, except the last (have enabled). The verbs however are followed either by adverbial modifiers of place (in your fields, in your houses) or by direct objects (your navy, your army). The third attributive clause is not built on the pattern of the first two, although it preserves the parallel structure in general (that+verb predicute+object), while the fourth has broken away entirely.

Complete parallel arrangement, also called balance, maintains the principle of identical structures throughout the corresponding sentences, as in

"The seeds ye sow – another reaps, The robes ye weave – another wears, The arms ye forge – another bears." (P. B. Shelley)

Parallel construction is most frequently used in enumeration, antithesis and in climax, thus consolidating the general effect achieved by these stylistic devices.

There are two main functions of parallel construction: semantic and structural. On the one hand a parallel arrangement suggests equal semantic significance of the component parts, on the other hand, it gives a rhythmical design to these component parts, which makes itself most keenly felt in balanced constructions.

Parallel construction is used in different styles of writing with slightly different functions. When used in the matter-of-fact styles it carries, in the main, the idea of semantic equality of the parts, as in scientific prose, where the logical principle of arranging ideas predominates. In the belles-lettres style parallel construction carries an emotive function. That is

why it is mainly used as a technical means in building up other stylistic devices, in particular antithesis and climax.

It is natural that parallel construction should very frequently be used in poetical structures. Alternation of similar units being the basic principle of verse, similarity in longer units - i.e. in the stanza, is to be expected.

9.2. CHIASMUS (REVERSED PARALLEL CONSTRUCTION)

Chiasmus belongs to the group of stylistic devices based on the repetition of a syntactical pattern, but it has a cross order of words and phrases. The structure of two successive sentences or parts of a sentence may be described as reversed parallel construction, the word order of one of the sentences being inverted as compared to that of the other as in:

"As *high* as we have mounted *in delight*
In our dejection do we sink as *low.*" (Wordsworth)

"*Down dropped* the breeze,
The sails *dropped down.*" (Coleridge)

Chiasmus is sometimes achieved by a sudden change from active voice to passive or vice versa, for example:

"The register of his burial *was signed* by the clergyman, the clerk, the undertaker and the chief mourner. Scrooge *signed* it. (Dickens)

This device is effective in that it helps to lay stress on the second part of the utterance, which is opposite in structure, as *in our dejection; Scrooge signed it.* This is due to the sudden change in the structure which by its very unexpectedness linguistically requires a slight pause before it.

As is seen from the examples above, chiasmus can appear only when there are two successive sentences or coordinate parts of a sentence. So distribution, here close succession, is the factor which predetermines the birth of the device.

There are different variants of the structural design of chiasmus. The first example given shows chiasmus appearing in a complex sentence where the second part has an opposite arrangement. The second example demonstrates chiasmus in a sentence expressing semantically the relation of cause and effect. Structurally, however, the two parts are presented as independent sentences, and it is the chiasmatic structure which supports the idea of subordination. The third example is composed of two independent sentences and the chiasmus serves to increase the effect of climax. Here is another example of chiasmus where two parallel constructions are followed by a reversed parallel construction linked to the former by the conjunction *and*:

"The night winds *sigh*, the breakers *roar*,
And *shrieks* the wild sea-mew." (Byron)

It must be remembered that chiasmus is a syntactical, not a lexical device, i.e. it is only the arrangement of the parts of the utterance which constitutes this stylistic device. In the famous epigram by Byron:

"In the days of old men made the manners
Manners now make men,"

there is no inversion, but a lexical device. Both parts of the parallel construction have the same, the normal word order. However the witty arrangement of the words has given the utterance an epigrammatic character. This device may be classed as *lexical chiasmus* or chiasmatic repetition. Byron particularly favoured it. Here are some other examples:

"His *jokes* were *sermons*, and his *sermons jokes.*"

"'T is *strange*, — but *true*; for *truth* is always *strange*."

"But *Tom's* no *more* — and so *no more* of *Tom*."

"*True*, 'tis a *pity* — *pity* 'tis, 'tis *true*."

"*Men* are the sport of *circumstances*, when
The *circumstances* seem the sport of *men*"
"'Tis a pity though, in this sublime world that
Pleasure's a sin, and sometimes *sin's a pleasure*"

Note the difference in meaning of the repeated words on which the epigrammatic effect rests: *'strange-strange', 'no more-no more', 'joke-jokes'.*

Syntactical chiasmus is sometimes used to break the monotony of parallel constructions. But whatever the purpose of chiasmus, it will always bring in some new shade of meaning or additional emphasis on some portion of the second part.

The stylistic effect of this construction has been so far little investigated. But even casual observation will show that chiasmus should be perceived as a complete unit. One cannot help noticing that the first part in chiasmus is somewhat incomplete, it calls for continuation, and the anticipation is rewarded by the second part of the construction, which is, as it were, the completion of the idea.

Like parallel construction, chiasmus contributes to the rhythmical quality of the utterance, and the pause caused by the change in the syntactical pattern may be likened to a caesura in prosody.

As can be seen from this short analysis of chiasmus, it has developed, like all stylistic devices, within the framework of the literary form of the language. However its prototype may be found in the norms of expressions of the spoken language, as in the emphatic:

'He was a brave man, was John."

9.3. REPETITION

It has already been pointed out that *r e p e t i t i o n* is an expressive means of language used when the speaker is under the stress of strong emotion. It shows the state of mind of the speaker, as in the following passage from Galsworthy:

"Stop!" —she cried, "Don't tell me! *I don't want to hear, I don't want to hear* what you've come for. *I don't want to hear.*"

The repetition of 'I don't want to hear', is not a stylistic device; it is a means by which the excited state of mind of the speaker is shown. This state of mind always manifests itself through intonation, which is suggested here by the words 'she cried'. In the written language, before direct speech is introduced one can always find words indicating the intonation, as *sobbed, shrieked, passionately*, etc. J. Vandryes writes:

"Repetition is also one of the devices having its origin in the emotive language. Repetition when applied to the logical language becomes simply an instrument of grammar. Its origin is to be seen in the excitement accompanying the expression of a feeling being brought to its highest tension."

When used as a stylistic device, repetition acquires quite different functions. It does not aim at making a direct emotional impact. On the contrary, the stylistic device of repetition aims at logical emphasis, an emphasis necessary to fix the attention of the reader on the key-word of the utterance. For example:

"For that was it! *Ignorant* of the long and stealthy march of passion, and of the state to which it had reduced Fleur; *ignorant* of how Soames had watched her, *ignorant* of Fleur's reckless desperation... - *ignorant* of all this, everybody felt aggrieved." (Galsworthy)

Repetition is classified according to compositional patterns. If therepeated word (or phrase) comes at the beginning of two or more consecutive sentences, clauses or phrases, we

have *anaphora*, as in the example above. If the repeated unit is placed at the end of consecutive sentences, clauses or phrases, we have the type of repetition called *epiphora*, as in:

"I am exactly the man to be placed in a superior position *in such a case as that*. I am above the rest of mankind, *in such a case as that*. I can act with philosophy *in such a case as that*." (Dickens)

Here the repetition has a slightly different function: it becomes a background against which the statements preceding the repeated unit are made to stand out more conspicuously. This may be called *the background* function. It must be observed, however, that the logical logical function of the repetition, to give emphasis, does not fade when it assumes the background function. This is an additional function.

Repetition may also be arranged in the form of a frame: the initial parts of a syntactical unit, in most cases of a paragraph, are repeated at the end of it, as in:

"*Poor doll's dressmaker!* How often so dragged down by hands that should have raised her up; how often so misdirected when losing her way on the eternal road and asking guidance. *Poor, little doll's dressmaker*". (Dickens)

This compositional pattern of repetition is called *framing*. The semantic nuances of different compositional structures of repetition have been little looked into. But even a superficial examination will show that framing, for example, makes the whole utterance more compact and more complete. Framing is most effective in singling out paragraphs.

Among other compositional models of repetition is *linking* or *reduplication* (also known as *anadiplosis*). The structure of this device is the following: the last word or phrase of one part of an utterance is repeated at the beginning of the next part, thus hooking the two parts together. The writer, instead of moving on, seems to double back on his tracks and pick up his last word.

"Freeman and slave... carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open *fight, a fight* that each time ended, either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes." (Marx, Engels)

Any repetition of a unit of language will inevitably cause some slight modification of meaning, a modification suggested by a noticeable change in the intonation with which the repeated word is pronounced.

Sometimes a writer may use the linking device several times in one utterance, for example:

"A *smile* would come into Mr. Pickwick's face; *the smile* extend ed into *a laugh*; *the laugh* into *a roar*, and *the roar* became general." (Dickens)

or:

"For glances beget *ogles, ogles sighs, sighs wishes, wishes words*, and *words* a letter." (Byron)

This compositional pattern of repetition is also called *chain-repetition*.

What are the most obvious stylistic functions of repetition?

The first, the primary one, is to intensify the utterance. Intensification is the direct outcome of the use of the expressive means employed in ordinary intercourse, but when used in other compositional patterns, the immediate emotional charge is greatly suppressed and is replaced by a purely aesthetic aim, as in the following example:

THE ROVER

A weary lot is thine, fair maid,
A weary lot is thine!
To pull the thorn thy brow to braid,

And press the rue for wine.
A lightsome eye, a soldier's mien
A feather of the blue,
A doublet of the Lincoln green –
No more of me you knew
My Love!
No more of me you knew. (Walter Scott)

The repetition of the whole line in its full form requires interpretation. Superlinear analysis based on associations aroused by the sense of the whole poem suggests that this repetition expresses the regret of the Rover for his Love's unhappy lot. Compare also the repetition in the line of Thomas Moore's:

"Those evening bells! Those evening bells!"

Meditation, sadness, reminiscence and other psychological and emotional states of mind are suggested by the repetition of the phrase with the intensifier 'those'.

The distributional model of repetition, the aim of which is intensification, is simple: it is immediate succession of the parts repeated.

Repetition may also stress monotony of action, it may suggest fatigue, or despair, or hopelessness, or doom, as in:

"What has my life been? *Fag and grind, fag and grind. Turn the wheel, turn the wheel."* (Dickens)

Here the rhythm of the repeated parts makes the monotony and hopelessness of the speaker's life still more keenly felt.

This function of repetition is to be observed in Thomas Hood's poem "The Song of the Shirt" where different forms of repetition are employed.

"Work – work – work!
Till the brain begins to swim!
Work – work – work
Till the eyes are heavy and dim!
Seam, and gusset, and band,
Band, and gusset and seam,–
Till over the buttons I fall asleep,
And sew them on in a dream."

Of course, the main idea, that of long and exhausting work, is expressed by lexical means: 'work till the brain begins to swim' and 'the eyes are heavy and dim', till, finally, 'I fall asleep.' But the repetition here strongly enforces this idea and, moreover, brings in additional nuances of meaning.

In grammars it is pointed out that the repetition of words connected by the conjunction *and* will express reiteration or frequentative action. For example:

"Fledgeby *knocked and rang*, and Fledgeby *rang and knocked*, but no one came."

There are phrases containing repetition which have become lexical units of the English language, as *on and on, over and over, again and again* and others. They all express repetition or continuity of the action, as in:

"He played the tune *over and over* again."

Sometimes this shade of meaning is backed up by meaningful words, as in:

"I sat desperately, *working and working*."

"They *talked and talked* all night."

"The telephone *rang and rang* but no one answered."

The idea of continuity is expressed here not only by the repetition but also by modifiers such as 'all night'.

Background repetition, which we have already pointed out, is sometimes used to stress the ordinarily unstressed elements of the utterance. Here is a good example:

"I am attached to you. But *I can't* consent and *won't* consent and *I never did* consent and *I never will* consent to be lost in you." (Dickens)

The emphatic element in this utterance is not the repeated word 'consent' but the modal words 'can't' 'won't' 'will', and also the emphatic 'did'. Thus the repetition here loses its main function and only serves as a means by which other elements are made to stand out clearly. It is worthy of note that in this sentence very strong stress falls on the modal verbs and 'did' but not on the repeated 'consent' as is usually the case with the stylistic device.

Like many stylistic devices, repetition is polyfunctional. The functions enumerated do not cover all its varieties. One of those already mentioned, the rhythmical function, must not be under-estimated when studying the effects produced by repetition. Most of the examples given above give rhythm to the utterance. In fact, any repetition enhances the rhythmical aspect of the utterance.

There is a variety of repetition which we shall call "root-repetition", as in:

"To live again in the *youth* of the *young*." (Galsworthy) or,

"He loves a *dodge* for its own sake; being... the *dodgerest* of all the *dodgers*." (Dickens)

or,

"Schemmer, Karl Schemmer, was a *brute*, a *brutish brute*." (London)

In root-repetition it is not the same words that are repeated but the same root. Consequently we are faced with different words having different meanings *(youth: young, brutish: brute)*, but the shades of meaning are perfectly clear.

Another variety of repetition may be called *s y n o n y m i c a l r e p e t i t i o n*. This is the repetition of the same idea by using synonymous words and phrases which by adding a slightly different nuance of meaning intensify the impact of the utterance, as in

"...are there not *capital punishments* sufficient in your *statutes*?

Is there not *blood* enough upon your *penal code*?" (Byron)

Here the meaning of the words 'capital punishments' and 'statutes' is repeated in the next sentence by the contextual synonyms 'blood' and 'penal code'.

Here is another example from Keats' sonnet "The Grasshopper and the Cricket."

"The poetry of earth *is never dead*...

The poetry of earth *is ceasing never*..."

There are two terms frequently used to show the negative attitude of the critic to all kinds of synonymical repetitions. These are *pleonasm* and *tautology*. The Shorter Oxford Dictionary defines *pleonasm* as "the use of more words in a sentence than are necessary to express the meaning; redundancy of expression." *Tautology* is defined as "the repetition of the same statement; the repetition (especially in the immediate context) of the same word or phrase or of the same idea or statement in other words; usually as a fault of style."

Here are two examples generally given as illustrations:

"It was a clear starry night, and *not a cloud was to be seen*."

"He was the only survivor; *no one else was saved*."

It is not necessary to distinguish between these two terms, the distinction being very fine. Any repetition may be found faulty if it is not motivated by the aesthetic purport of the writer. On the other hand, any seemingly unnecessary repetition of words or of ideas expressed in different words may be justified by the aim of the communication.

For example, "The daylight is fading, the sun is setting, and night is coming on" as given in a textbook of English composition is regarded as tautological, whereas the same sentence may serve as an artistic example depicting the approach of night.

A certain Russian literary critic has wittily called pleonasm "stylistic elephantiasis," a disease in which the expression of the idea swells up and loses its force. Pleonasm may also be called "the art of wordy silence."

Both pleonasm and tautology may be acceptable in oratory inasmuch as they help the audience to grasp the meaning of the utterance. In this case, however, the repetition of ideas is not "considered a fault although it may have no aesthetic function.

9.4. ENUMERATION

Enumeration is a stylistic device by which separate things, objects, phenomena, properties actions are named one by one so that they produce a chain, the links of which, being syntactically in the same position (homogeneous parts of speech), are forced to display some kind of semantic homogeneity, remote though it may seem.

Most of our notions are associated with other notions due to some kind of relation between them: dependence, cause and result, likeness, dissimilarity, sequence, experience (personal and/or social), proximity, etc.

In fact, it is the associations plus social experience that have resulted in the formation of what is known as "semantic fields." Enumeration, as an SD, may be conventionally called a sporadic semantic field, inasmuch as many cases of enumeration have no continuous existence in their manifestation as semantic fields do. The grouping of sometimes absolutely heterogeneous notions occurs only in isolated instances to meet some peculiar purport of the writer.

Let us examine the following cases of enumeration:

"There Harold gazes on a work divine,
A blending of all beauties; streams and dells,
Fruit, foliage, crag, wood, cornfield, mountain, vine
And chiefless castles breathing stern farewells
From grey but leafy walls, where Ruin greenly dwells." (Byron)

There is hardly anything in this enumeration that could be regarded as making some extra impact on the reader. Each word is closely associated semantically with the following and preceding words in the enumeration, and the effect is what the reader associates with natural scenery. The utterance is perfectly coherent and there is no halt in the natural flow of the communication. In other words, there is nothing specially to arrest the reader's attention; no effort is required to decipher the message: it yields itself easily to immediate perception.

That is not the case in the following passage:

"Scrooge was his *sole executor*, his *sole administrator*, his *sole assign*, his *sole residuary legatee*, his *sole friend* and his *sole mourner*." (Dickens)

The enumeration here is *heterogeneous*: the legal terms placed in a string with such words as 'friend' and 'mourner' result in a kind of clash, a thing typical of any stylistic device. Here there is a clash between terminological vocabulary and common neutral words. In addition there is a clash of concepts. 'friend' and 'mourner' by force of enumeration are equal in significance to the business office of 'executor', 'administrator', etc. and also to that of 'legatee'.

Enumeration is frequently used as a device to depict scenery through a tourist's eyes, as in Galsworthy's "To Let":

"Fleur's wisdom in refusing to write to him was profound, for he reached each new place entirely without hope or fever, and could concentrate immediate attention on the *donkeys* and *tumbling bells*, the *priests, patios, beggars, children, crowing cocks, sombreros, cactus-hedges*, old high white *villages, goats, olive-trees, greening plains, singing birds* in tiny cages, *watersellers, sunsets, melons, mules*, great *churches, pictures*, and *swimming grey-brown mountains* of a fascinating land."

The enumeration here is worth analyzing. The various elements of this enumeration can be approximately grouped in semantic fields:

1) donkeys, mules, crowing cocks, goats, singing birds;

2) priests, beggars, children, watersellers;

3) villages, patios, cactus-hedges, churches, tumbling bells, sombreros, pictures;

4) sunsets, swimming grey-brown mountains, greening plains, olive-trees, melons.

Galsworthy found it necessary to arrange them not according to logical semantic centres, but in some other order, in one which, apparently, would suggest the rapidly changing impressions of a tourist. Enumeration of this kind assumes a stylistic function and may therefore be regarded as a stylistic device, inasmuch as the objects in the enumeration are not distributed in logical order and therefore become striking. Thus heterogeneous enumeration gives one an insight into the mind of the observer, into his love of the exotic, into the great variety of miscellaneous objects which caught his eye, it gives an idea of the progress of his travels and the most striking features of the land of Spain as seen by one who is in love with the country. The parts of the enumeration may be likened to the strokes of a painter's brush who by an inimitable choice of colours presents to our eyes an unforgettable image of the life and scenery of Spain. The passage itself can be likened to a picture drawn for you while you wait.

Here is another example of heterogeneous enumeration:

"The principal production of these towns... appear to be *soldiers, sailors, Jews, chalk, shrimps, officers* and *dock-yard men*." (Dickens, "Pickwick Papers")

9.5. SUSPENSE

Suspense is a compositional device which consists in arranging the matter of a communication in such a way that the less important, descriptive, subordinate parts are amassed at the beginning, the main idea being withheld till the end of the sentence. Thus the reader's attention is held and his interest kept up, for example:

"*Mankind*, says a Chinese manuscript, which my friend M. was obliging enough to read and explain to me, for the first seventy thousand ages *ate their meat raw*." (Charles Lamb)

Sentences of this type are called *periodic sentences*, or *periods*. Their function is to create suspense, to keep the reader in a state of uncertainty and expectation.

Here is a good example of the piling up of details so as to create a state of suspense in the listeners:

"But suppose it passed; *suppose one of these men*, as I have seen them, – meagre with famine, sullen with despair, careless of a life which your Lordships are perhaps about to value at something less than the price of a stocking-frame;–*suppose this man* surrounded by the children for whom he is unable to procure bread at the hazard of his existence, about to be torn for ever from a family which he lately supported in peaceful industry, and which it is not his fault that he can no longer so support;—*suppose this man*, and there are ten thousand such from whom you may select your victims, *dragged into court*, to be tried for this new offence, by this new law; still *there are two things wanting* to convict and condemn him, *and these are*, in my opinion, – *twelve butchers for a jury, and a Jeffreys for a judge!*" (Byron)

Here the subject of the subordinate clause of concession ('one of these men') is repeated twice ('this man', 'this man'), each time followed by a number of subordinate parts, before the predicate ('dragged') is reached. All this is drawn together in the principal clause ('there are two things wanting...'), which was expected and prepared for by the logically incomplete preceding statements. But the suspense is not yet broken: what these two things are, is still withheld until the orator comes to the words 'and these are, in my opinion.'

Suspense and climax sometimes go together. In this case all the information contained in the series of statement-clauses preceding the solution-statement are arranged in the order of gradation, as in the example above from Byron's maiden speech in the House of Lords.

The device of suspense is especially favoured by orators. This is apparently due to the strong influence of intonation which helps to create the desired atmosphere of expectation and emotional tension which goes with it.

Suspense always requires long stretches of speech or writing. Sometimes the whole of a poem is built on this stylistic device, as is the case with Kipling's poem "If" where all the eight stanzas consist of *if*-clauses and only the last two lines constitute the principal clause.

"*If* you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you,
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you
And make allowance for their doubting too,
.....
If you can dream and not make dreams your master,
If you can think and not make thoughts your aim,
.....
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,...
And which is more, you'll be a Man, my son."

This device is effective in more than one way, but the main purpose is to prepare the reader for the only logical conclusion of the utterance. It is a psychological effect that is aimed at in particular.

A series of parallel question-sentences containing subordinate parts is another structural pattern based on the principle of suspense, for the answer is withheld for a time, as in Byron's "The Bride of Abydos":

"Know ye the land where the cypress and myrtle...
Know ye the land of the cedar and vine...
.....
.....
'Tis the clime of the East — 'tis the land of the Sun."

The end of an utterance is a specially emphatic part of it. Therefore if we keep the secret of a communication until we reach the end, it will lead to concentration of the reader's or listener's attention, and this is the effect sought.

One more example to show how suspense can be maintained:

"Proud of his "Hear him!" proud, too, of his vote,
And lost virginity of oratory,
Proud of his learning (just enough to quote)
He revell'd in his Ciceronian glory." (Byron)

It must be noted that suspense, due to its partly psychological nature (it arouses a feeling of expectation), is framed in one sentence, for there must not be any break in the

intonation pattern. Separate sentences would violate the principle of constant emotional tension which is characteristic of this device.

CLIMAX

Climax is an arrangement of sentences (or of the homogeneous parts of one sentence) which secures a gradual increase in significance, importance, or emotional tension in the utterance, as in:

"It was a lovely city, a beautiful city, a fair city, *a veritable gem of a city.*"

or in:

"Ne barrier wall, ne river deep and wide,
Ne horrid crags, nor mountains dark and tall
Rise like the rocks that part Hispania's land from Gaul." (Byron)

Gradual increase in emotional evaluation in the first illustration and in significance in the second is realized by the distribution of the corresponding lexical items. Each successive unit is perceived as stronger than the preceding one. Of course, there are no objective linguistic criteria to estimate the degree of importance or significance of each constituent. It is only the formal homogeneity of these component parts and the test of synonymy in the words 'lovely', 'beautiful', 'fair,' 'veritable gem, in the first example and the relative inaccessibility of the barriers 'wall', 'river', 'crags', 'mountains' together with the epithets 'deep and wide' 'horrid', 'dark and tall' that make us feel the increase in importance of each.

A gradual increase in significance may be maintained in three ways: logical, emotional and quantitative.

Logical climax is based on the relative importance of the component parts looked at from the point of view of the concepts embodied in them. This relative importance may be evaluated both objectively and subjectively, the author's attitude towards the objects or phenomena in question being disclosed. Thus, the following paragraph from Dickens's "Christmas Carol" shows the relative importance in the author's mind of the things and phenomena described:

"Nobody ever stopped him in the street to say, with gladsome looks, 'My dear Scrooge, how are you? When will you come to see me?' No beggars implored him to bestow a trifle, no children asked him what it was o'clock, no man or woman ever once in all his life inquired the way to such and such a place, of Scrooge. Even the blind men's dogs appeared to know him, and when they saw him coming on, would tug their owners into doorways and up courts; and then would wag their tails, as though they said, 'No eye at all is better than an evil eye, dark master!'"

The order of the statements shows what the author considers the culmination of the climax. The passage by Dickens should be considered "subjective", because there is no general recognition of the relative significance of the statements in the paragraph. The climax in the lines from Byron's "ne barrier..." may be considered "objective" because such things as 'wall', 'river', crags', 'mountains' are objectively ranked according to their accessibility.

Emotional climax is based on the relative emotional tension produced by words with emotive meaning, as in the first example with the words 'lovely', 'beautiful', 'fair'.

Of course, emotional climax based on synonymous strings of words with emotive meaning will inevitably cause certain semantic differences in these words - such is the linguistic nature of stylistic synonyms -, but emotive meaning will be the prevailing one.

Emotional climax is mainly found in sentences, more rarely in longer syntactical units. This is natural. Emotional charge cannot hold long.

As becomes obvious from the analysis of the above examples of climatic order, the arrangement of the component parts call for parallel construction which, being a kind of

syntactical repetition, is frequently accompanied by lexical repetition. Here is another example of emotional climax built on this pattern:

"He was *pleased* when the child began to adventure across floors on hands and knees; he was *gratified*, when she managed the trick of balancing herself on two legs; he was *delighted* when she first said 'ta-ta'; and he was *rejoiced* when she recognized him and smiled at him." (Alan Paton)

Finally, we come to *quantitative climax*. This is an evident increase in the volume of the corresponding concepts, as in:

"They looked at *hundreds* of houses; they climbed *thousands* of stairs; they inspected *innumerable* kitchens." (Maugham)

Here the climax is achieved by simple numerical increase. In the following example climax is materialized by setting side by side concepts of measure and time:

"Little by little, bit by bit, and *day by day*, and *year by year* the bar- on got the worst of some disputed question." (Dickens)

What then are the indispensable constituents of climax? They are:

a) the distributional constituent: close proximity of the component parts arranged in increasing order of importance or significance;

b) the syntactical pattern: parallel constructions with possible lexical repetition;

c) the connotative constituent: the explanatory context which helps the reader to grasp the gradation, as *no. ... ever once in all his life, nobody ever, nobody, No beggars* (Dickens); *deep and wide, horrid, dark and tall* (Byron); *veritable (gem of a city)*.

Climax, like many other stylistic devices, is a means by which the author discloses his world outlook, his evaluation of objective facts and phenomena. The concrete stylistic function of this device is to show the relative importance of things as seen by the author (especially in emotional climax), or to impress upon the reader the significance of the things described by suggested comparison, or to depict phenomena dynamically.

ANTITHESIS

In order to characterize a thing or phenomenon from a specific point of view, it may be necessary not to find points of resemblance or association between it and some other thing or phenomenon, but to find points of sharp contrast, that is, to set one against the other, for example:

"A saint abroad, and a *devil at home."* (Bunyan)

"Better to *reign in hell* than *serve in heaven."* (Milton)

A line of demarcation must be drawn between logical opposition and stylistic opposition. Any opposition will be based on the contrasting features of two objects. These contrasting features are represented in pairs of words which we call antonyms, provided that all the properties of the two objects in question may be set one against another, as 'saint'- 'devil', 'reign' - 'serve', 'hell' - 'heaven'.

Many word-combinations are built up by means of contrasting pairs, as *up and down, inside and out, from top to bottom* and the like.

Stylistic opposition, which is given a special name, the term *antithesis*, is of a different linguistic nature: it is based on relative opposition which arises out of the context through the expansion of objectively contrasting pairs, as in:

"Youth is *lovely, age* is *lonely,*
Youth is *fiery, age* is *frosty."* (Longfellow)

Here the objectively contrasted pair is 'youth' and 'age'. 'Lovely' and 'lonely' cannot be regarded as objectively opposite concepts, but being drawn into the scheme contrasting 'youth' and 'age', they display certain features which may be counted as antonymical. This is

strengthened also by the next line where not only 'youth' and 'age' but also 'fiery' and 'frosty' are objective antonyms.

It is not only the semantic aspect which explains the linguistic nature of antithesis, the structural pattern also plays an important role. Antithesis is generally moulded in parallel construction. The antagonistic features of the two objects or phenomena are more easily perceived when they stand out in similar structures. This is particularly advantageous when the antagonistic features are not inherent in the objects in question but imposed on them. The structural design of antithesis is so important that unless it is conspicuously marked in the utterance, the effect might be lost.

It must be remembered, however, that so strong is the impact of the various stylistic devices, that they draw into their orbit stylistic elements not specified as integral parts of the device. As we have pointed out, this is often the case with the epithet. The same concerns antithesis. Sometimes it is difficult to single out the elements which distinguish it from logical opposition.

Thus in Dickens's "A Tale of Two Cities" the first paragraph is practically built on opposing pairs.

"It was the *best* of times, it was the *worst* of times, it was the age of *wisdom*, it was the age of *foolishness*, it was the epoch of *belief*, it was the epoch of *incredulity*, it was the season of *Light*, it was the season of *Darkness*, it was the *spring* of *hope*, it was the *winter* of *despair*, we had *everything* before us, we had *nothing* before us, we were all going *direct to Heaven*, we are all going *direct the other way*..." (Dickens)

The structural pattern of the utterance, the pairs of objective antonyms as well as of those on which antonymical meanings are imposed by the force of analogy makes the whole paragraph stylistically significant, and the general device which makes it so is antithesis.

This device is often signalled by the introductory connective *but*, as in:

"The cold in clime are cold in blood
Their love can scarce deserve the name;
But mine was like a lava flood
That boils in Etna's breast of flame." (Byron)

When *but* is used as a signal of antithesis, the other structural signal, the parallel arrangement, may not be evident. It may be unnecessary, as in the example above.

Antithesis is a device bordering between stylistics and logic. The extremes are easily discernible but most of the cases are intermediate. However, it is essential to distinguish between antithesis and what is termed *contrast*. Contrast is a literary (not a linguistic) device based on logical opposition between the phenomena set one against another. Here is a good example of contrast.

THE RIVER

"The river—with the sunlight flashing from its dancing wavelets, gilding gold the grey-green beech-trunks, glinting through the dark, cool wood paths, chasing shadows o'er the shallows, flinging diamonds from the mill-wheels, throwing kisses to the lilies, wantoning with the weir's white waters, silvering moss-grown walls and bridges, brightening every tiny townlet, making sweet each lane and meadow, lying tangled in the rushes, peeping, laughing, from each inlet, gleaming gay on many a far sail, making soft the air with glory -is a golden fairy stream.

But the river—chill and weary, with the ceaseless rain drops falling on its brown and sluggish waters, with the sound as of a woman, weeping low in some dark chamber, while the woods all dark and silent, shrouded in their mists of vapour, stand like ghosts upon the margin, silent ghosts with eyes reproachful like the ghosts of evil actions, like the ghosts of

friends neglected—is a spirit-haunted water through the land of vain regrets." (Jerome K. Jerome)

The two paragraphs are made into one long span of thought by the signal *But* and the repetition of the word *river* after which in both cases a pause is indicated by a dash which suggests a different intonation pattern of the word *river*. The opposing members of the contrast are the 'sunlight flashing' — 'ceaseless rain drops falling', 'gilding gold the grey-green beech-trunks, glinting through the dark, cool wood paths' - 'the woods, all dark and silent, shrouded in their mists of vapour, stand like ghosts...', 'golden fairy stream' — 'spirit-haunted water'.

Still there are several things lacking to show a clear case of a stylistic device, *viz.* the words involved in the opposition do not display any additional nuance of meaning caused by being opposed one to another; there are no true parallel constructions except, perhaps, the general pattern of the two paragraphs, with all the descriptive parts placed between the grammatical subject and predicate, the two predicates serving as a kind of summing up, thus completing the contrast.

'The river..., is a golden fairy stream.' — *But* the river..., is a spirit haunted water through the land of vain regrets.' The contrast embodied in these two paragraphs is, however, akin to the stylistic device of antithesis.

Antithesis has the following basic functions: rhythm-forming (because of the parallel arrangement on which it is founded); copulative; dissevering; comparative. These functions often go together and inter mingle in their own peculiar manner. But as a rule antithesis displays one of the functions more clearly than the others. This particular function will then be the leading one in the given utterance. An interesting example of antithesis where the comparative function is predominant is the madrigal ascribed to Shakespeare:

A MADRIGAL

"Crabbed age and youth
Cannot live together:
Youth is full of pleasance,
Age is full of care;
Youth like summer morn,
Age like winter weather,
Youth like summer brave,
Age like winter bare:
Youth is full of sport,
Age's breath is short,
Youth is nimble, Age is lame:
Youth is hot and bold,
Age is weak and cold,
Youth is wild, and Age is tame:—
Age, I do abhore thee,
Youth, I do adore thee;
O my Love, my Love is young!
Age, I do defy thee—
O sweet shepherd, hie thee,
For methinks thou stay'st too long.

Key words

Parallel construction, Antithesis, contrast, *Emotional climax, Logical climax, quantitative climax*, Climax , arrangement, the homogeneous parts, *Suspense, periodic sentences*, or *periods*, enumeration, *heterogeneous, repetition.*

Assignments for Self-Control

1. Comment on linguistic properties of sentences which are foregrounded in lexico-syntactical stylistic devices.
2. What do you know about antithesis? Why is it viewed separately from parallel constructions?
3. Have you ever met in your home-reading cases of antithesis in which the structure of a word was also used in the creation of the SD
4. Speak about the SD of climax and its types.
5. In what way does the structure of an emotive climax differ from that of other types?
6. What can you say about the negative form of the climax?
7. What is an anticlimax?
8. Is every paradox expressed by a climax?
9. What is a litotes?
10. What is there in common between litotes and understatement?
11. Describe most frequently used structures of litotes.
12. Speak about semantic types of periphrasis.
13. In what cases can a logical or a figurative periphrasis be also qualified as euphemistic?
14. What are the main stylistic functions of periphrases?
15. Which type of periphrasis, in your opinion, is most favoured in contemporary prose and why?

The list of used literature

1. Арнольд И. В. Стилистика современного английского языка. Стилистика декодирования. Л.1973.
2. Будагов Р. А. Литературные языки и языковые стили. М. 1967.
3. Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического анализа. М. 1981.
4. Ди Пьетро Р. Дж. Языковые структуры в контрасте. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Контрастивная лингвистика. Переводы.М.1989.
5. Иванова Т.П., Брандес О.П. Стилистическая интерпретация текста. Пособие по английскому языку. Для институтов и фак. Иностранного языка. М.1991.
6. Кухаренко В.А. Интерпретация текста. Изд. 2-е, перераб. М. 1988.
7. Мороховский А.Н и др. Стилистика английского языка. Учебник. К.1991.
8. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып.17. Теория речевых актов. Перевод с анг. Сост. и вступ. ст. И.М. Кобозевой и В.З. Демьянкова. Общ. ред. Б.Ю. Городецкого. М.1986.
9. Орлов Г.А. Современная английская речь. Учеб. пособие для вузов по спец. «Анг. яз. и лит-ра». М.1991.
10. Разинкина Н.М. Функциональная стилистика английского языка. М.1989.
11. Семенец. О.Е. Социальный контекст и языковое развитие. Киев,1985.

12.Чаковская М.С. Взаимодействие стилей научной и художественной литературы. (На материале грем. яз.). Учеб. пособие. М.1990
13.Galperin "Stylistics" M.1977
14.Benvenisfce E. On Discourse // The Theoretical Essays: Film, Linguistics, Literature. Manchester Univ. Press,1985.
15.Brown G., Jule G. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge, Lnd., N.Y., 1983.
16.Davis G., Walton P. Language, Image, Media. - Lnd., 1983.
17.Fowler's Modern English Usage. Second Edition revised by Sir Ernest Cowers and completely reset. Oxford.1980.
18.Joos M. The Isolation of Styles // Readings in the Sociology of Language. The Hague, 1968.
19.Turner G.W. Stylistics. - N.Y., 1977.
20.Galperin "An essay in stylistic analysis" M. 1968.
21.Kudrat Musaev "English Stylistics" T. - 2005