Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan
SAMARKAND STATE INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

FACULTY OF ENGLISH PHILOLOGY

LECTURE

ON

STYLISTICS

Compilers: Suleymanov M.D. Yusupova Sh.A., Safaeva D.Sh.
Chair of Lexicology and Stylistics

Samarkand – 2005

Plan

Lectures - 20 hours; Seminars -12 hours; Individual work -6 hours

I. Introduction. General Notes on Style and Stylistics - 4 hours
II. Stylistic classification of the English vocabulary - 6 hours

a) General classifications. Neutral, Common Literary and Common Colloquial Vocabulary - 2 hours
b) Special Literary Vocabulary - 2 hours
c) Special Colloquial Vocabulary - 2 hours

III. Phonetic Expressive Means and Stylistic Devices - 2 hours
IV. Lexical Expressive Means and Stylistic Devices - 6 hours

a) Interaction of primary dictionary and contextually imposed meanings -2 hours
b) Interaction of primary and derivative logical meanings - 2 hours
c) Interaction of logical and nominal meanings — 2 hours

V. Syntactical Expressive Means and Stylistic Devices - 2 hours

LECTURE I

1.General notes on style and stylistics.
2.Expressive means and stylistic devices.
3.General notes on functional styles of language.
4.The English literary language.
5.Varieties of language.

INTRODUCTION

1. GENERAL NOTES ON STYLE AND STYLISTICS

S*tylistics,* sometimes called ***l i n g u o - s t y l i s t i c s,*** 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 analyzed 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 singles 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 styl*e, 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.
in. its 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 vith 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 ibstraction, 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.

LECTURE II

STYLISTIC CLASSIFICATION OF THE ENGLISH VOCABULARY

1. General considerations.
2. Neutral, common literary and common colloquial vocabulary.
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)
4. Special colloquial vocabulary:
   a) Slang
   b)Jargonisms
   c) Professionalisms
   d) Dialectal Words
   e) Vulgar words or vulgarisms.
   f) Colloquial coinages (words and meanings).

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. 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.[1] 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
get going	start	
make a move		

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.

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-crealions 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 modem 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, afternamed", 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.

4. SPECIAL COLLOQUIAL VOCABULARY

a) 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 if. 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. *leant/);* 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.

b) 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.

c) 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).

d) 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".

e) 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 *disphemisms.*

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.

f) 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.

LECTURE III

Phonetic expressive means and stylistic devices.

a) Onamotopoeia
b) Alliteration
c) Rhyme
d) 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.

a) 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"

b) 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.

c) 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 *might, 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)

d) 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.

LECTURE IV

LEXICAL EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYLISTIC DEVICES

1. Interaction of different types of lexical meaning
2. Interaction of primary dictionary and contextually imposed meanings.
    a) Irony
3. Interaction of primary and derivative logical meanings
    a) Zeugma
    b) The Pun
    c) The Epithet
    d) Oxymoron
4. Interaction of logical and nominal meanings
    a) Antonomasia
    b) Simile
    c) Hyperbole

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 leaning. 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.

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.

Many attempts have been made to pin- point the types of relation which metonymy is bas.ed 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:
   The hall applauded.
3. The relation of proximity, as in:

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

4. The material instead of the thing made of it, as in:

   V
   "The marble spoke."

5. 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.

a) 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.

3. INTERACTION OF PRIMARY AND DERIVATIVE LOGICAL MEANINGS

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 SD.

a) 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)

b) 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".*

(Dickens)

c) 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. ihat 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.* 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.

d) 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.* 11 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.

4. INTERACTION OF LOGICAL AND NOMINAL MEANINGS

a) ANTONOMASIA

The interplay between the logical and nominal meanings of a word is *called antonomasia.* As in other stylistic devices based on the interaction of lexical meanings, the two kinds of meanings must be realised in the word simultaneously. If only one meaning is materialised in the context, there is no stylistic device, as in *hooligan, boycott* and other examples given earlier. Here are some examples of genuine antonomasia.

> "Among the herd of journals which are published in the States, there are some, the reader scarcely need be told, of character and credit. From personal intercourse with accomplished gentlemen connected with publications of this class, I have derived both pleasure and profit. But the name of these is *Few,* and of the other *Legion,* and the influence of the good is powerless to counteract the mortal poison of the bad." (Dickens)

Antonomasia is intended to point out the leading, most characteristic feature of a person or event, at the same time pinning this leading trait as a proper name to the person or event concerned. In fact, antonomasia is a revival of the initial stage in naming individuals.

Antonomasia may be likened to the epithet in essence if not in form. It categorises the person and thus simultaneously indicates both the general and the particular.

The use of antonomasia is now not confined to the belles-lettres style. It is often found in publicistic style, that is, in magazine and newspaper articles, in essays and also in military language. The following are examples: "I suspect that the *Noes* and *Don't Knows* would far outnumber the *Yesses." (The Spectator)*

b) 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 characterised.

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)

c) 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." (0. 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 (lis'ener) 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 t.-. -tke 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.

LECTURE V

SYNTACTICAL EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYL/STIC DEVICES

1. Parallel construction.
2. Repetition
3. Suspense
4. Climax (Gradation)
5. Antithesis
6. Litotes

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 SPU 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 in close succession, 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. "* (D.ckens)

Parallel constructions are often backed up by repetition of wore s (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 r'ntactical design of the sentence. Parallel constructions may be partial or complete. *Partil parallel* arrangement, is the repetition of some parts of successive sentences or daisies. *Complete parallel* arrangement, also *called balance,* maintains the principle of identionl structures throughout the corresponding sentences.

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

Parallel construction is used in different styles of writing with sl.gltly different functions When used in the matter-of-fact styles, it-carries, in the main, the idea f semantic equality of the parts, as in scientific prose, where the logical principle of arrangir *g* 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 devic. s, thus securing their unity.

2. REPETITION

Repetition is an expressive means of language used when the spe u is under the stress of strong emotion. It shows the state of mind of the speaker, as in t id I .Mowing passage from Galsworthy:

> "Stop!" - she cried, "Don't tell me! *I don't want to hear; Idc \'t vant to hear* what you've come for. *Jdon't want to hear."*

1'he 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.

Repetition is classified according to composiiional patterns. If the word (or phrase) comes at the beginning of two or more consecutive sentences, phrases, we have *anaphora.* If the repeated unit is place at the end of consecutive sei :;iees, clauses or phrases, we have the type of repetition called *epiphora.*

Anaphora: "Ignorant of the long and stealthy march of passion, ...;ignorant of how Soames had watched her, ignorant of Fleur's reckless desperation... ignorant of all this, everybody felt aggrieved." (Galsworthy)

Epiphora: "I am above the rest of mankind, *in such a case as* , *hat.* I can act philosophy *in such a case as that."* (Dickens)

3. SUSPENSE

Suspense is a compositional device which consists in airanging 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.

Suspense and climax sometimes go together, ii this cast all the information contained in the series of statement-clauses preceding the solution-statement are arranged in the order of gradation.

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

4. CLIMAX (GRADATION)

Climax is an arrangement of sentences (or of the homogeneous parts of one sentence) which secures a gradual increase in significance, inportance, .ir emotional te:,sion in the utterance, as in:

"It was a lovely city, a beautiful city, a fair city, a *vuritable gen. of a city."*

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

Logical c I i m a x is based on the relative iraportana of the componen'parts looked at from the point of view of the concepts embod ed in tlem. This relative. mportance may be evaluated both objectively and subjectively, the athor's attitude to^a-ds the objects or phenomena in question being disclosed.

Emotional c I i m a x is based on the relative cmoional tension prodi.cd by words with emotive meaning. Emotional climax is mainly fouril in sentences, moie rarely in longer syntactical units. This is natural. Emotional charge canot hold long.

Climax, like many other stylistic device, is a mean;by which the autinr d^closes his world outlook, his evaluation of Vs and phenuiena. The concreie stylistic function of this device is to show the relative importance of things as seen by the author, or to impress upon the reader the significance of the things described by suggested comparison, or to depict phenomena dynamically.

5. ANTITHESIS

In order to characterise 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)

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)

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.

Antithesis has the following basic functions: rhythm-form ing (because of the parallel arrangement on which it is founded); copulative; dissevering; comparative.

6. 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.

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 relevant for stylistic analysis?
8. What is decoding stylistics?
9. What is the main concern of the practical stylistics?
10. What is the ultimate goal of stylistic analysis of a speech product?
11. What can you say about the meaning of a word and its relation to the concept of an entity?
12. What types of lexical meaning do you know and what stipulates their existence and differentiation?
13. What connotational meanings do you know? Dwell on each of them, providing your own examples?
14. What is the role of the context in meaning actualization?
15. What registers of communication are reflected in the stylistic differentiation of the vocabulary?
16. Speak about general literary words illustrating your elaboration with examples from nineteenth- and twentieth century prose.
17. What are the main subgroups of special literary words?
18. What do you know of terms, their structure, meaning, functions?
19. What are the fields of application of archaic words and forms?
20. Can you recognize general colloquial words in a literary text? What do they mainly occur?
21. What are the main characteristics of slang?
22. What do you know of professional and social jargonisms?
23. What connects the stock of vulgarisms and social history?
24. What is the place and the role of dialectical words in the national language? In the literary text?
25. To provide the 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.

26. What lexical meaning is instrumental in the formation of epithets?
27. What semantic types of epithets do you know?
28. What structural types of epithets do you know?
29. What parts of speech are predominantly used as epithets and why?

30. What is antonomasia? What meanings interact in its formation?
31. What types of antonomasia do you know? Give examples of each.
32. What meaning is foregrounded in a hyperbole?
33. What types of hyperbole can you name?
34. What makes a hyperbole trite and where are trite hyperboles predominantly used?
35. What is an oxymoron and what meanings are foregrounded in its formation?
36. What are there comparatively few trite oxymorons and where are they mainly used?
37. What syntactical stylistic devices dealing with arrangement of sentence members do you remember?
38. What types of inversion do you know? Which of them have met more often and why?
39. What is a suspense, how is it arranges and what is its function?
40. What do you know about detachment and punctuation used with detached sentence members?
41. What sentence members are most often detached?
42. What do you know about antithesis? Why is it viewed separately from parallel constructions?
43. Speak about the SD of climax and its types.
44. In what way does the structure of an emotive climax differ from that of other types?
45. What can you say about the negative form of the climax?
46. What is anticlimax?
47. Is every paradox expressed by a climax?
48. What is a simile and what is a simple comparison?
49. What semantic poles of a simile do you know?
50. What are the main functions of a simile?

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Арнольд И.В. “Стилистика современного английского языка” Ленинград 1981 год
2. Гальперин И.Р. “Очерки по стилистике английского языка” Москва 1958 год
3. Galperin I. “Stylstics” Москва High School Publ House, 1977.
4. Galperin I. “An Essay in stylistic analysis” Москва High School Publ House, 1968
5. Kukharenko V.A. “A book of a practice in stylistics” Москва ВШ 1986 год
6. Mincoff M. “The study of style” Димитров “Наука и искусство” 1966 год
7. Sebeck T. “Style in language” Cambridge MIT Press 1960.
8. Sosnovskaya V.B. “Analytical Reading” Москва High School Publ House, 1974.