1 Czech Theories of style

1.1 Czech stylistics during the first three decades of the 20th century

Up to the early 1930s, the term *stylistics* was in the Czech context applied above all to what is today called *practical stylistics*, i.e. a set of instructions on how to produce texts of various kinds; unless other sources are mentioned, all English equivalents of Czech terms used in this work were taken from *Slovník slovanské lingvistické terminologie* (Dictionary of Slavonic Linguistic Terminology). Attention was paid especially to written texts belonging to administrative style (Večerka et al. 1988: 30–31, Krčmová 2007), but also to formal and informal private letters. The character of the works establishing rules for creating texts of this kind was predominantly descriptive and prescriptive; it may be said that in this respect they used the same methodology as the majority of handbooks of poetics and rhetoric from previous centuries, which were still quite influential at that time.

However, during the 19th century several theoretical works dealing at least partly with style were written in the Czech lands; the 19th and early 20th century works on stylistics are listed in Bečka (1948: 409–448). Probably the most important of them was *Slovesnost* (Verbal Art), first published in 1820, with revised editions in 1845 and 1846. This textbook was written by J. Jungmann, one of the foremost leaders of the 19th century Czech revival movement, an author of the monumental Czech-German dictionary (1835–1839, 5 vols.).

The basic definition of style in this book is very close to the one established in the 1930s by members of the Prague Linguistic Circle: *style* is defined here as the selection and organization of concepts adequate to the subject matter and to the author's personality (Jungmann 1845: 59). *Slovesnost* also contains a detailed description of poetic genres, prose genres, figures and tropes illustrated with many examples, as well as passages focused on non-fictional texts. At the time of its publication, *Slovesnost* played another important role. In the 19th century it was necessary to re-establish Czech terminology in practically all fields of science (for the situation of Czech language in the 19th century see section 1.2.1) and *Slovesnost* became an authoritative work which contributed considerably to this aim in the field of literary theory. Among the terms used there, e.g. *sloh*, a Czech equivalent of style, can be found. But, as mentioned above, theoretical works of this kind were rather the

exception – most stylistic handbooks from before the 1930s could be, in present-day terminology, classified as works belonging to practical stylistics.

1.1.1 The pioneering 20th century theoretical works

This situation gradually started to change with the growing influence of structuralist theories. If not stated otherwise, the term structuralism in this work is primarily applied to the theories of the 1920s and 1930s developed by the members of the Prague School, not to the following decades when structuralist approaches became very influential e.g. in France and in the U.S.A.

It is necessary to point out here that the definitions of structuralism in linguistic encyclopedias and dictionaries and its periodization can vary depending on the period stressed by the particular author: Asher, ed. (1994c: 4359) regards the Russian 1920s formalism and the 1920s and 1930s Prague School theories as the early stages of structuralism; the same distinction can be found also in Matthews (1997: 119–120, 356–357). Wales (1997: 434–435) associates the term structuralism primarily with French scholars of the 1960s – Barthes, Lévi-Strauss etc., but also acknowledges the influence of de Saussure, the Russian formalists and the Prague School.

Probably the best source for a basic reference concerning the concept of structuralism is given by Dirven, Fried, eds. (1987). The authors provide a survey of 20th century linguistic schools which used the structural approach as their theoretical basis and briefly deal with their mutual influence (Dirven, Fried, eds. 1987: x-xii). Within the group of structuralists they distinguish two opposing poles: *the functionalist pole*, where the focus is on the functions of language forms, and *the formalist pole*, where attention is paid above all to the analysis of linguistic forms as such. The functional pole includes e.g. the Geneva School (de Saussure), the Prague School (Mathesius, Jakobson), the London School (Firth), the Dutch group (Dik); the formalist pole includes the Copenhagen School (Hjelmslev) and the American descriptivism (Bloomfield). Surprisingly enough, the table accompanying this overview and showing the mutual influences of the particular schools does not mention at all the Russian formalists and the impact they had on the work of the Prague Linguistic Circle – for example Jakobson and Trubetzkoy are mentioned only under the heading of the Prague School, which was undoubtedly a very important, but not the initial stage of their scholarly activities.

As mentioned above, modern theoretical approaches were represented in the Czech lands chiefly by members of the Prague Linguistic

Circle, established in 1926; its brief history is given e.g. in Vachek (1966: 3–14). During the latter half of the 1920s the Prague Linguistic Circle scholars started to publish their works, in which they were developing the ideas of e.g. de Saussure, Badouin de Courtenay and Bally; the presence and activities of R. Jakobson also link Prague structuralism to the Russian formalist school. Members of the Prague School can be regarded as the founders of modern Czech *theoretical stylistics* focused on theoretical aspects of the style of various texts, both from the viewpoint of linguistics and from that of literary theory (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 10; this work, as the newest one in this field, will be referred to in this section whenever a comparison of the historical situation with the present state is made).

On a more general level, the methodology used by members of the Prague Linguistic Circle for their investigations was influenced also by the philosophical and sociological works of T. G. Masaryk; these works helped to create the scientific paradigm of the period, which members of the Prague School further developed (Fronek 1988, Matejka 1986). This applies above all to the functional concept, influenced by Masaryk's teleological approach as presented for example in his work *Versuch einer konkreten Logik* (1887). The scholars of the Prague Linguistic Circle themselves admitted Masaryk's influence (e.g. Mathesius 1911: 32). This influence is also mentioned in a collective introduction to the Prague Linguistic Circle journal *Slovo a slovesnost* (Word and Verbal Art), established in 1935. This introduction was jointly written by B. Havránek, R. Jakobson, V. Mathesius, J. Mukařovský and B. Trnka; its English version was reprinted in Johnson, ed. 1978: 32–46.

In works of the Prague School linguists, stress is laid on a synchronic and functionally orientated approach towards language, literature and their other fields of interest, such as aesthetics, folklore etc. Their orientation differentiates them from the mostly descriptive and diachronically orientated works of the previous, Neo-grammarian period. Members of the Prague School who paid systematic attention to the theory of style were especially Havránek, Mathesius and Mukařovský. Jakobson, one of the founders of Prague Linguistic Circle, also contributed considerably to these ideas. Nevertheless, in the 1920s and 1930s it was above all Mathesius, Havránek and Mukařovský who wrote the principal theoretical works concerning Czech stylistics.

1.1.1.1 The first important work of this kind appeared even before the Prague Linguistic Circle was established. Mathesius (1911) in his pioneering work *O potenciálnosti jevů jazykových* (On the Potentiality of

the Phenomena of Language) points out that it is necessary to examine e.g. the mutual relations of stylistics to linguistics and rhetoric as well as to define the subject stylistics should deal with.

Mathesius states here that linguistics studies language by examining the speech of individuals within the whole language community, while stylistics examines how language is used in individual literary works. The main difference then is not in the subject examined, but rather in the aim of such an examination. Mathesius makes a distinction here between *stylistics* as a discipline focused on the individual style of a particular literary work and so-called *styles of speech*. These styles of speech, as Mathesius puts it, are the common features of texts/utterances produced by various people under similar circumstances. Referring to several earlier works of Jones, Bally, Jespersen and some other European linguists, Mathesius states that these styles of speech are manifested in pronunciation, vocabulary and syntax.

Although the terminology used here is sometimes different from the one established later (e.g. instead of the opposition *synchronic* vs *diachronic* Mathesius uses the terms *static* vs *dynamic*), the author's approach is quite modern even now, more than eighty years later. In Austria-Hungary at the beginning of the second decade of the 20th century, in the atmosphere of a predominant diachronic approach towards linguistics, this paper (read at a scientific academy session) proved to be too much ahead of its time and remained without any comment – either positive or negative. Vachek (1970: 68) mentions R. Jakobson's commentary on this work. On reading it, Jakobson remarked that if in 1911 such a paper had been presented in Moscow, it would have started a linguistic revolution.

1.1.1.2 Another important pioneering step towards a new conception of linguistics was made in 1929, when the First Congress of Slavists was held in Prague. On this occasion, members of the Prague Linguistic Circle jointly worked out works concerning a structuralist and functional approach to all spheres of language. *Teze předložené prvému sjezdu slovanských filologů v Praze 1929* (Works Presented to the First Congress of Slavists Held in Prague in 1929) were after their presentation, published as a part of the proceedings of the Congress; their English version is reprinted in Vachek, ed. (1983: 77–120).

The *Works* were divided into ten sections: *general methodological problems of linguistics, tasks for examining the language system, functions of language, problems of Old Church Slavonic Language, the unification of phonetic and phonological transcription within Slavonic lan-*

guages, linguistic geography, the conception of an all-Slavonic linguistic atlas, methods of Slavonic lexicography, the cultivation and criticism of Slavonic languages, language teaching in secondary schools.

Problems relating to stylistics are discussed particularly in the third section; attention is paid above all to functions of language, to standard literary language and to poetic language. At the beginning it is stated that when examining a language it is necessary to pay attention to the variety of its functions and to the ways the functions are realized in speech. According to these functions, there are several *functional modes of speech* and each of them has its own system of conventions, its own "langue" – e.g. internal vs manifested speech, intellectually vs emotionally orientated speech, speech with communicative, practical or theoretical, orientation vs speech with poetic orientation, i.e. with orientation towards the form. These modes of speech can either occur in particular texts alone, or several of them can be present at the same time. As we can see, these *functional modes of speech*, as well as the *styles of speech* appearing in Mathesius's paper of 1911, are nearly identical with what today is called *functional styles*; this classification of styles according to their function is referred to as *horizontal stratification of styles*, as opposed to *vertical stratification of styles* – stylus humilis, stylus mediocris, stylus grandiloquus – which dates back to the ancient period (Hrabák 1977: 115–116).

Further on in this section of *Works,* the situation of *standard literary language* is dealt with. It is stated here that attention should be paid not only to external factors influencing its establishment, such as political, social, economic and religious conditions, but also to the reasons why it became differentiated from so-called *popular language*, i.e. – in present-day terminology – from *substandard varieties of language.*

A specific function as a basic difference between standard literary language and all other varieties of language is emphasized here above all. This approach is in accordance with the functional orientation of the Prague School, as already mentioned in section 1.1.1, and represents its original distinctive feature, compared e.g. with the Danish glossematic school or the American descriptivism (Vachek 1966:7).

Since the standard literary language serves for expressing *facts* – very often of an abstract nature – relating to all aspects of life in modern society rather than for expressing *emotions*, its vocabulary must be very rich, precise and systematic; at the same time there must be syntactic structures capable of reflecting the interdependence and complexity of the particular mental operations.

On the other hand, *poetic language* – as well as other spheres of art – can be characterized by predominant orientation not towards the sig-

nified, but towards the sign itself. This means that the elements of all levels of language, which in non-poetic texts serve only for expressing a certain meaning, can in poetic texts acquire more or less independent values; they tend to become *foregrounded*. It is therefore suitable and necessary – as stated in the conclusion of the third part of the *Works* – to examine poetic language by itself, without digressions towards cultural history, sociology or psychology.

The ideas expressed in the *Work* met with a sympathetic response at the First Congress of Slavists in 1929 in Prague, as well as at the Linguistic Congress in Geneva in 1931 and at other important meetings (Vachek 1966: 9–11). Nevertheless, a real turning point in modern Czech linguistics came three years later. In 1931–1932 there was an intensive debate on standard language and language cultivation, which resulted in the publishing of a collection of papers called *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* (Standard Czech and the Cultivation of Language). Papers included in this collection can be regarded as the beginning of modern theoretical investigations of language and style.

1.2 Czech stylistics 1932–1954

1.2.1 *The 1932 debate on standard language*

Although members of the Prague School were developing modern approaches to examining language already in the 1910s and 1920s, their methodology did not become better known to a wider public until the early 1930s, during the above mentioned debate on standard language and language cultivation.

The impulse for opening the debate was several articles written by J. Haller, at that time editor in chief of *Naše řeč* (Our Language), a Czech linguistic journal established in 1916. Haller's attitudes were rooted mainly in Czech purist handbooks published in the latter half of the 19th century. In these articles it is assumed that the supreme quality of a language lies in its intact character, in the absence of traces of foreign influence, as well as in preserving as much as possible from the earlier stages of its development.

Czech purism has always been aimed mainly at removing Germanisms – or words believed to be Germanisms – from Czech. These tendencies appeared mainly as a result of the language situation in the Czech lands, populated by both Czechs and Germans. Purist tendencies trying to protect the Czech language from German influence were recorded as early as in the 15th century, during the period of an independent Czech kingdom.

These tendencies were considerably reinforced several centuries later, when the Czech kingdom became for approximately three hundred years a part of the Austrian Empire. From the 17th century till the establishment of the independent Czechoslovak Republic in 1918, German was the dominant language there. It prevailed over the Czech language in the spheres of state administration, law, science etc. This situation gradually began to change from the end of the 18th century, when a period called the Czech Revival started. Nevertheless, purist attitudes were quite frequent even after 1918 (on the character of Czech purism see Jelínek 1994 and Thomas 1991: 148–149, 198–199).

Haller shared the opinion of the purists that there is one ideal language standard suitable for all purposes, the rules of which should not be broken in any circumstances. He tried to enforce these rules very strongly, to a much greater extent than J. Zubatý and V. Ertl, his predecessors as editors of *Naše řeč*, both of whom were eminent linguists of the older generation. Some of Haller's articles in *Naše řeč* analysed the language of Czech contemporary writers, accusing them of "bad usage", making lists of their "mistakes" and demanding, in Haller's opinion, the only correct version. This led to controversy with the renowned Czech writers and critics, such as O. Fischer, I. Olbracht, V. Vančura and F. X. Šalda.

At that time members of the Prague Linguistic Circle continued developing their own theoretical view of these problems. Having realized the necessity of opposing Haller's opinions not only from the viewpoint of users of the language, but above all from the linguistic viewpoint, they decided to organize a series of lectures where a modern approach to the cultivation of language, standard language and poetic language would be presented. These lectures, held in January and February 1932, had a very wide public response and in the same year they were published under the above mentioned title *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* (Standard Czech and the Cultivation of Language).

This publication included six papers: *O požadavku stability ve spisovném jazyce* (The Requirement of Stability for a Standard Language) by V. Mathesius, *Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura* (The Purposes of a Standard Language and its Cultivation) by B. Havránek, *O dnešním brusičství českém* (Czech Purism Today) by R. Jakobson, *Jazyk spisovný a jazyk básnický* (Standard Language and Poetic Language) by J. Mukařovský, *Zvuková kultura českého jazyka* (Czech Orthoepy) by M. Weingart and a collective text *Obecné zásady pro kulturu jazyka* (General Principles for the Cultivation of Good Language); the English translation of the titles is taken from Garvin 1964:153.

It is possible to say that the publication of these lectures initiated a systematic exploration in the field of language cultivation. In these papers, there were three general starting points that were contradictory to purist ideas:

- every standard language norm must be based on the present-day usage, not on historical criteria, e.g. as far as the meaning of words is concerned,
- texts performing different communicative functions must inevitably differ in the means of expression used and in their organization; consequently, there can hardly be a set of rules suitable for all types of texts,
- as far as vocabulary is concerned, no words can be excluded merely because of their origin; the richer variety of expressions a language possesses, the better it can perform various communicative functions. Even if there are several expressions denoting the same extra-linguistic reality, they usually differ in the sphere, where they can by used, i.e. by their stylistic character; therefore it is questionable, to what extent it is ever possible to speak about synonymy.

And although after eighty years it is possible to see pros and contras on both sides of this argument, it is still possible to say that a confrontation of this kind was sooner or later inevitable – contradictory opinions on a relatively small territory could not possibly result into anything else. Jiří Haller (who in the following decades did a lot of useful practical work, e.g. in the field of lexicography) and his colleagues from Naše řeč definitely were keen and well-trained professional linguists, and so were members of the Prague Linguistic Circle – but their theoretical background and professional orientation were hardly compatible. And perhaps one more brief commentary at the end of this section: now it is possible – and maybe even desirable – to be tolerant to those purist approaches – all in all, they also express a great deal of concern with language, but it is far more difficult (if not impossible) to be tolerant if straightforward purist approaches prevail, with almost no alternative in sight, as it might seem before the period of the Prague Linguistic Circle.

After these general preliminaries I shall now concentrate on those parts of this collection, which relate to stylistics. The most important ideas, further developing the approach presented in 1929 *Works*, can be found in articles written by Havránek and Mukařovský.

1.2.1.1 Havránek in his article *Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura* (Havránek 1932; the abridged English version of this article can be found in: Garvin 1964: 3–16) defines four main functions of the standard language: *communicative,* 2) *workaday technical*; 3) *theoretical technical* and 4) *poetic.* On the basis of these functions, Havránek distinguishes four main so-called *functional dialects*: *conversational, workaday, scientific, poetic.* These functional dialects differ from one another in the relations of lexical units to their referents, in completeness and in accuracy in expressing the meaning.

Compared with Garvin's translation, I have made several terminological changes here, which, I believe, express Havránek's ideas more accurately. In Garvin's translation, the first function is called *communication*, but since in the Czech text the names of all four functions are adjectives, I preferred to preserve them in English as well. Since the first three functions are in Garvin's translation called *communicative* I tried to avoid possible confusion by introducing a term *mediatory.* The third change concerns the term *functional dialect*, which somewhat modifies the original meaning. The Czech term *funkční jazyk* ("functional language", literally translated) indicates more clearly that this notion belongs to the sphere of *langue*, as Havránek himself points out (Havránek 1932: 69; for the English version see Garvin 1964: 15–16).

At the level of specific texts/utterances – i.e. at the level of *parole* – Havránek distinguishes several *functional styles* of the standard language; these functional styles correspond to what is today called *type of style* (*genre*) (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 75). According to the *specific purpose* of the text/utterance there are *information, suasion, general explanation, technical explanation, codifying formulation*. According to the *manner of the response* (in Garvin's translation) there are *oral* and *written* functional styles; each of them can be *private* or *public* (*oral private* – monologue/dialogue, *oral public* – speech, discussion; *written private, written public* – notices, posters, journalistic texts, book/magazine writing).

These criteria for differentiating functional styles were gradually enlarged and during the following decades they formed a group of factors influencing the style of a text, i.e. of so-called *stylistic factors*. The stylistic factors, according to the present classification, can relate either to the text itself – to its function, topic, situational context, addressee etc. (so-called *objective stylistic factors*), or to the author of the text – to his age, social status, education, knowledge of the topic etc. (so-called *subjective stylistic factors*; Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 50–63). Havránek's 1932 classification of functional languages and func-

tional styles, based on 1929 *Works*, served as a starting point for future stylistic works, both theoretical and practical.

1.2.1.2   Mukařovský's article *Jazyk spisovný a jazyk básnický* (Mukařovský 1932) is, as well as the article written by Havránek, based on the 1929 *Works*. An abridged English version of Mukařovský's article was published in Garvin 1964: 17–30 and reprinted in Vachek, ed. 1983, pp. 165–185. This article deals mainly with specific features of poetic language and with relations between the norms of a standard language and the specific needs of poetic language. The norm of the standard language is characterized here as a background against which the poetic language can be examined. The more stabilized this norm is during a certain period, the more easily can the poetic neologisms be identified and examined as far as their specific functions in a text are concerned. On the other hand, the less stabilized this norm is, the more difficult it is to distinguish intentional poetic neologisms from variations in usage. Mukařovský uses in this article a term *foregrounding* for deviations from standard language norm, as they appear in poetic texts.

This foregrounding can occur at any level of language, but usually only at one level at a time. If more levels were foregrounded simultaneously, they would become equally relevant and the effect would be lost. If one of the levels, e.g. rhythm, is foregrounded, some others, e.g. vocabulary, are usually *backgrounded*, automated. Using as an example language of J. Conrad, Mukařovský also states that it is not particularly relevant whether this foregrounding originated intentionally or unintentionally, for instance due to the author's insufficient language competence. As Mukařovský concludes, it would be incorrect to analyse the language of literary works using the same criteria that are used for analysis of texts performing only communicative, not aesthetic functions.

1.2.2 *The situation after the 1932 debate*
After publication of the collection *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura* these new, functionally orientated approaches gradually started to prevail and modern conceptions of various branches of linguistics and literary theory – among others stylistics – could be developed in more favourable conditions. In 1940, several entries written by members of the Prague School were published in *Ottův slovník naučný nové doby*, an authoritative encyclopedia of that time. From the viewpoint of stylistics, four of these entries were of fundamental importance. Listed in alphabetical order they are: *Spisovný jazyk* (Standard Language; Havránek 1940a), *Strukturální linguistika* (Structural Linguistics; Havránek 1940b),

Strukturální věda o literatuře (Structural Literary Theory; Mukařovský 1940), *Stylistika* (Stylistics; Havránek 1940c).

The texts of these entries were aimed not only at linguists, but also at a wider public. This had never been done before to such an extent. In these entries, a basic survey of modern knowledge concerning the particular fields of study was given and definitions of elementary terms were presented, using the results of previous research work carried out by members of the Prague School.

Among other things, a first modern definition of style is explicitly given (Havránek 1940c: 472): *style* is defined as a selection of means of expression used in particular texts with respect to their aim, depending also on the author's nature. From the structuralist point of view, style means the organization of a certain structure, e.g. of a text. This definition, in many respects similar to Jungmann's stated approximately one hundred years earlier (see section 1.1), served as the basis for most Czech 20th century conceptions of style and with certain modifications it has been used up to now.

1.2.3 *The 1941 debate on style*

In 1941, a debate on style was opened in the Prague School journal *Slovo a slovesnost.* Although it was originally intended to include a great number of contributions, because of the war it ended with only three articles published. Despite this it is worth at least a brief mention here. Since the position of structural linguistics had been considerably reinforced during the 1930s and its basis was now firmly established, the Prague School linguists were able to carry out their work under much better circumstances. The debate might have contributed considerably to developing new theoretical views on stylistics, as can be seen even from the three above-mentioned articles.

1.2.3.1 The debate was started by an article *O jazykovém stylu* (On Style in Language) by J. M. Kořínek (1941). The author points out that it is necessary to pay attention to the aims of texts examined from the viewpoint of stylistics. The orientation of these aims can be classified as *logical, aesthetic,* and *ethical*. These three types correspond, as Kořínek puts it, to the three functions of language sign presented by K. Bűhler in his *Sprachtheorie.* The texts of logical type are usually orientated towards the deictic function of a language sign (text as a *Darstellung*), the texts of aesthetic kind towards its expressive function (text as an *Ausdruck*) and the texts of ethical kind towards its conative function (text as an *Appell*). Kořínek concludes that in future stylistic investigations it will

be necessary to make a clearer distinction especially between the texts orientated towards appeal (*Appell*) and those orientated towards expression (*Ausdruck*), since this sphere has not been investigated much, unlike the texts of the first type.

1.2.3.2 The following articles try to specify more precisely the sphere of stylistics and refine definitions of some basic terms. B. Trnka (1941) in the article called *K otázce stylu* (On the Problem of Style) tries to answer the question of whether and to what extent a style is an individual/inter-individual factor. He concludes that style is a result of coexistence of both individual and inter-individual levels. From the viewpoint of specific individual texts (*parole*), style means the unique character of each text, but at the same time there are certain general, inter-individual norms (within the sphere of *langue*), with which the individual style also corresponds to a certain extent.

V. Skalička (1941) in *Problémy stylu* (Problems of Style) pays attention to synonymy in language, stating in his article that synonymy does not occur only at the lexical level of language, although it is probably most obvious in this sphere. There are also synonymous means of expression at the lower levels of language – at the level of phonology, morphology and syntax. Nevertheless, these synonymous expressions often differ either semantically, or stylistically, i.e. they belong to different varieties of language. Therefore as Skalička concludes, referring also to the ideas of the Geneva School, synonyms cannot be described as words with precisely the same meaning, but rather as words mutually related by semantic similarity.

1.2.4 *Theoretical works on style and stylistics published between 1941 and 1954*

As can be seen from these three articles, the debate begun in 1941 really might have been very fruitful. It was not continued until thirteen years later, in 1954. Nevertheless, research work in the field of stylistics had been carried on after 1941 and several important works appeared.

1.2.4.1 One year later, V. Mathesius published an important article called *Řeč a sloh* (Speech and Style; Mathesius 1942), which appeared in a collection of papers called *Čtení o jazyce a poesii 1* (Readings on Language and Poetry, Vol. 1). Originally a collection of this kind was intended to be published annually, but the project – again due to the war – remained unfinished, the 1942 volume thus being the only one of the proposed series.

The main aim of Mathesius's article was to provide a practical survey of the principles of modern stylistics and to popularize new approaches to examining language; therefore it is illustrated by many examples from texts of all kinds. Mathesius's starting point here is that each utterance captures a certain part of reality which the speakers want to express as well as their attitude towards it.

The utterance itself consists of two elementary processes – a naming process and a process during which sentences are constructed. In the part concerning the naming process Mathesius focuses on the adequacy and accuracy of naming as well as on the stylistically marked/unmarked means of expression. Further on, attention is also paid to parts of speech and to differences between nominal and verbal ways of expressing ideas. From the lexical level Mathesius switches to syntax and concludes this work with a detailed explanation of the basic principles of functional sentence perspective and the structure of a paragraph as a hierarchically higher unit constituting a text.

All the explanations are based on the functional conception and on a requirement of intelligibility of a text. This article is not Mathesius's first work dealing with practical problems of style – his keen interest in this subject can be traced many years back. In one of his earlier papers Mathesius states it is necessary to elaborate and publish three main handbooks: a concise dictionary of present-day Standard Czech, a practical synchronic Czech grammar and a stylistic handbook which would describe the stratification of the Czech language, especially in regard to the practical requirements for producing texts belonging to various functional styles (1932: 29–30).

1.2.4.2 Another important work, examining stylistics from a different angle, was a study called *O literárním slohu* (On Style in Literature) written by a classical philologist and aesthetician K. Svoboda (1943). It is a concise diachronically orientated survey providing information about the development of stylistics from the classical period up to the present.

The first part focuses on the development and usage of the term *styl* (from lat. *stilus* – an engraving tool). In the classical period it started to be used metaphorically, with relation to the form of written and spoken texts, in the 17th century it was used for the first time in the sphere of music, in the 18th century for graphic and plastic arts and in the 19th century for style of life, teaching etc. The Czech equivalent *sloh* was, as Svoboda states, coined by a Czech writer A. J. Puchmajer and used for the first time in 1804. Since then, both the Czech and Latin terms have been used without any difference in meaning; the Czech

equivalent can be found e.g. in Jungmann's *Slovesnost*, as mentioned in section 1.1.

The following parts suggest classification of styles according to various criteria. In the second part, styles are classified according to the *subjects* which influence the style of a text or are influenced by it. The term *subject*, in Czech *nositel* – bearer, has a very broad meaning here; it can relate to texts, genres, people and groups of people. This classification, being too general, is not used at present. Nevertheless, it is quite interesting and definitely worth mentioning here – if not for any other reason, then just as an example of an approach not further developed. Svoboda distinguishes among style of an individual *text*, style of *texts written by one author*, style of *a group/generation of authors,* style of a particular *period*, style of a certain *social group*, style of a certain *nation*, styles of various literary *genres*, style of *literature* as a whole, as opposed e.g. to the style of music, painting, dance etc.

The third part deals with the classification of styles according to the *qualities* expressed in them. As in the case of *subjects*, the term *quality* is used here in a very general sense; it can mean qualities of the *means of expression* used in the texts, of the *thematic elements* included in the texts and of the *authors* of the texts. This part begins with the trichotomy known already in the classical period – *stylus humilis/ mediocris/ grandiloqus.* It is also pointed out that from the 18th century onwards a lot of other types of classifications of this kind appeared. These types dealt mostly with qualities of authors of the texts, as reflected in their works. To quote just three of Svoboda's examples, F. Schiller speaks about *naive* (realistic) authors, who depict reality without any reflection and *sentimental* (idealistic) authors, creating their work according to their ideas. F. Nietzsche makes a distinction between the *Apollonian* (quiet) and *Dionysian* (excited) type of artist, C. G. Jung's classification is based on the difference between *extrovert* and *introvert* people.

The fourth part deals with the differences of *oral* vs *written* texts, *poetry* vs *prose*, *realistic* vs *idealistic* and *objective* vs *subjective* types of text. In the fifth part, containing a brief summary of the whole work, there is one interesting remark regarding one of the extralinguistic, ethical factors influencing the style of a text (using present-day terminology, about one of the *subjective stylistic factors*). Svoboda states here that a good style is not only an aesthetic, but also an ethical value – i.e. the author's character and his intention must be taken into consideration as well, when the style of a certain text is discussed. This may remind us for example of Plato's opinions expressed in his dialogue *Phaedrus* (Bradford 1997: 4–5). The concepts of a "good" style and a "good" intention are,

however, too subjective and have to be excluded from synchronic stylistic analysis, as developed by members of the Prague School. Despite that Svoboda's work remains an important and interesting attempt to approach stylistics from the diachronic point of view.

1.2.4.3 During the 1932–1954 period, two stylistic handbooks written by J. V. Bečka appeared. In 1938, he published a practical handbook *Technika slohu* (Technique of Style) and in 1948 a theoretical work, *Úvod do české stylistiky* (An Introduction to Czech Stylistics). The synwork of his investigations in the field of stylistics can be found in a monograph published nearly fifty years later, in 1992, under the title *Česká stylistika* (Czech Stylistics).

Since all of Bečka's texts are based on the same principles, a survey of his theoretical views will be carried out in section 1.3.8.2 dealing with *Česká stylistika.* Here it should only be pointed out that Bečka's approach is to a considerable extent descriptive. He focuses on the stylistic values of means of expression, especially syntactic and lexical ones, rather than on general theoretical aspects of style.

1.2.4.4 In 1953 F. Trávníček, another of the foremost linguists of that time, published a work *O jazykovém slohu* (On Style in Language). As the author himself puts it, this work reveals his approach to stylistics and it is intended as his contribution to a future debate about style and stylistics. Except for a short introductory chapter dealing with stratification of the national language (standard language, dialects etc.), the work is devoted to various aspects of style.

 Style is defined here as a selection from means of expression – both from those which already exist in language and from those which are newly created – and the use of these means of expression in texts of all kinds. There are three main factors influencing the style of a text: its aim, the communicative situation (*objective stylistic factors*) and the author of the text (*a subjective factor*). These factors influencing style were for the first time briefly mentioned by Havránek (1932); Trávníček (1953) carries this concept further on, introducing and analysing in greater detail so-called *objective* vs *subjective stylistic factors.*

As far as classification of styles is concerned, Trávníček suggests two basic approaches. The first one is classification of styles according to the spheres in which they are used. He distinguishes six styles arranged at two levels. There are three *primary styles*: *poetic style, technical style* (with two subtypes – *scientific* and *practical*) and *non-technical style.* Non-technical style includes four *secondary styles*: *journalistic style, rhe-*

torical style, administrative style and *conversational style.* At this point it is worth noting that Trávníček's classification concerns only texts belonging to standard language, although the possibility of the occasional use of substandard means of expression is mentioned here as well, especially in poetic, journalistic and conversational styles.

The other method of classification is not based on the spheres in which the particular styles are used, but on the type of means of expression used in the texts. There is *agile style* (živý sloh), whose typical features are simple syntax, mainly Czech vocabulary and very few terminological expressions. *Literary style* (knižní sloh) uses complex syntax and more exclusive vocabulary, including e.g. archaic expressions, neologisms, borrowings from other languages etc. The third type is *classical style* (klasický sloh), which can clearly express even very complex ideas by using simple and common means of expression, both at syntactic and lexical levels. The word *classical* here has the meaning "ideal, perfect", not the meaning "relating to any particular epoch of the classical period".

In this work, Trávníček also tries to define the basic tasks of modern teaching of stylistics in primary and secondary schools. It is stated here that the basic aim should not be to force the students to produce imitations of poetic language used by reputable writers, but to provide them with basic information about the variety of means of expressions and their different functions and with an introduction to practical stylistics, i.e. to teach them the basic rules for writing business letters, CVs etc.

Trávníček was not a member of the Prague Linguistic Circle, but his works are based on principles similar to those of Mathesius, Havránek, Mukařovský etc. Although Trávníček tended to use his own terminological framework, his basic approach – i.e. synchronic, functional and anti-purist orientation – was in accordance with the ideas developed by the Prague School, especially in the 1930s and 1940s.

1.2.4.5 In the same year when Trávníček's work appeared, Q. Hodura (1953) published a textbook *O slohu* (On Style), intended mainly for the students of Prague Pedagogical Faculty. Its revised edition appeared in 1962, in quite different circumstances; this edition will be mentioned in section 1.3.3.2.

This work mainly provides a summary of information about stylistics, rather than results of theoretical research in this field. After commenting on general linguistic problems, such as the relation of thinking to speech, several important linguistic trends are characterized (Neogrammarian school, structuralism etc.); at the end, a brief survey of the development of stylistics is added.

Although the explanation of the terms *stylistics, style* or *stylistic factors* is based on the conception of the Prague School, the theory of functional styles is not yet used. Attention is paid to stylistic aspects of all language levels and to problems of style in translations. The problems are mostly dealt with from the practical point of view, which is in accordance with the main aim of this textbook. Perhaps the most important sections here are those describing specific features of narrative and description, which are two of the so-called *stylistic procedures*; this is a question which was not particularly stressed in the earlier 20th century stylistic works. Today a *stylistic procedure* is regarded as a way of organizing elements in a text to express the relation of these elements to the specific purpose of the text. There are five basic stylistic procedures: *informative, descriptive, narrative, explanatory* and *discursive.* Several of these procedures usually occur in every text; the basic stylistic procedures are also modified quite frequently, according to the spheres in which they are used – see Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová (1997: 66–74).

1.3. Czech stylistics from 1954 to the present

1.3.1 *The situation in the early 1950s*
All the works dealt with so far helped to create modern Czech stylistics; each of them brought something original to it. Since in the early 1950s the new basis of Czech stylistics was already firmly established, it became possible to organize a wide-ranging debate which would, as Doležel (1954) puts it, summarize the current state of knowledge about stylistics, standardize the terminology used and introduce new ideas which could be developed and investigated further. As mentioned above, the debate begun in *Slovo a slovesnost* in 1941 was the first attempt of this kind. A conference on style and stylistics organized in 1954 was another important turning point in the development of Czech stylistics during the 20th century. Its importance can be compared to the impact on stylistics of the 1932 collection *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura.*

1.3.2 *The 1954 conference on style and stylistics*
This conference took place on November 4 and 5 1954 in Liblice. It was organized by the Institute of Czech Language, which was part of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. The most important papers from the conference and its proceedings were published in the journal *Slovo a slovesnost.* It was an opportunity when mainly members of a generation of scholars born in the 1920 and because of the war events entering

universities mainly after 1945 proved their abilities and competence to follow the first generation of the Prague Linguistic Circle that influenced them very significantly.

1.3.2.1 K. Hausenblas (1955) in his contribution *K základním pojmům jazykové stylistiky* (On the Basic Terms of Linguistic Stylistics) refines Havránek's former definition of style, adding that style is always a result of *intentional human activity.* Analysing the style of particular texts, there are two main possibilities. It is possible to focus on features that are *unique* – compared to other texts – and arrive thus at describing an *individual style* of the particular text/author.

The other possibility is to focus on features *common* to all texts originating under similar circumstances and with similar aims; in this way a description of so-called *objective styles* can be obtained. *Objective styles*, as opposed to *subjective styles*, are styles determined by one of the *objective stylistic factors*. Since one of these factors is a *function* of a text, *functional styles* form a group existing within *objective styles* (Hausenblas 1955: 6–7; Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 34).

When objective styles are investigated, it is necessary to take into consideration the *stylistic norms* and *stylistic factors*, especially *objective stylistic factors*, influencing them. The number of objective stylistic factors, compared for example to Trávníček (1953), is enlarged here (*function, aim, situation, contact, language material used*). At the end Hausenblas points out that problems of stylistics do not relate only to standard language, but also to substandard varieties.

1.3.2.2 P. Trost (1955) in a brief commentary *K obecným otázkám stylu* (On General Problems of Style) makes several important points: the style of every text can be characterized in terms of contrast *general* vs *individual. Stylistic norms*, which play an important role in analysing particular texts, are much less obligatory, compared to grammatical norms. It is also necessary to make a distinction between the *style of a particular language*, i.e. the number of stylistic norms existing in the language, and the *style of a language utterance*, in which elements of more languages and their norms can appear.

1.3.2.3 The Slovak linguist E. Pauliny (1955) gives in his article *O funkčnom rozvrstvení spisovného jazyka* (On Functional Stratification of Standard Language) a relatively broad classification of styles based on three main categories: *private style, public style, poetic style*; he also suggests enlarging the group of stylistic factors by adding *stimulus* to them.

1.3.2.4 Problems of technical style are dealt with in contributions presented by M. Jelínek (1955) and J. Filipec (1955). Jelínek in his article *Odborný styl* (Technical Style) describes its specific features. The main feature is a concise and explicit way of expressing the meaning of the text to which several factors contribute. The most important ones are complex syntactic constructions capable of expressing and hierarchizing the relations among elements constituting the text and a special terminology; the most important feature of all terms is that they should be unambiguous and stabilized.

After this general introduction, Filipec in his article *Rozbor odborného stylu a jeho vnitřní diferenciace* (Analysis of Technical Style and its Stratification) focuses on specific features of technical style at all language levels and distinguishes several types of text within this style. Depending on those at whom the texts are aimed there are four main types: *theoretical,* aimed at the scholars, *practical,* aimed at people who need to apply the theory in their profession, *popularizing,* aimed at non-scholars interested in the particular field of science, and *essayistic,* which can be considered a borderline type between technical and literary styles. In texts of this kind, given facts are often commented upon in a subjective way; these texts are usually aimed at the same audience as popularizing texts.

1.3.2.5 The last two papers from the 1954 conference published in *Slovo a slovesnost* concern *literary style.* In this section, dealing with contemporary theories of style, the term *literary style* is used in its present-day sense, i.e. "style of poetic works of all kinds"; to avoid confusion with what was in the previous section called *standard literary language,* I will use here the modern term *standard language* or *Standard Czech.*

K. Horálek (1955) in his contribution called *Styl umělecké literatury* (Literary Style) remarks that the periods during which literary style tends to be stable, following norms of various kinds, e.g. classicism, alternate with those during which the main stress lies on variability of style, on individual ways of expression, e.g. romanticism. Nevertheless, means of expression which can be used in literary texts during any of these periods usually exceed those which can be used in other types of texts.

L. Doležel (1955b) in the article *Rozbor uměleckého stylu* (Analysis of Literary Style) adds that the task of linguistic stylistics lies primarily in analysing the language of a literary work at all its levels, including also metaphorical expressions and their function in the thematic structure of the text. The language of literary works is analysed both by linguistic stylistics and literary theory; it is a point of contact between these dis-

ciplines. Nevertheless, literary theory – unlike linguistic stylistics – examines not only the principles of using linguistic means of expression, but also the structure of a literary work, the principles of its thematic composition, of using various motifs etc. (Doležel 1955b: 90, Hausenblas 1955: 2; Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 10–11). By examining the means of expression, it is also possible to compare their semantic and stylistic differences and combinations of these differences; see Červenka (1991).

1.3.2.6 Summing up the most important results of this conference, it may be said that the former theoretical basis of Czech stylistics was to a considerable extent enlarged and refined. Some conclusions emerged from the discussion, which means they are not included in the above-quoted articles; they are mentioned in Doležel (1955a).

The position of stylistics in relation to literary theory was defined, the definition of style was revised, new stylistic factors were introduced into style investigations, the number of the main functional styles was increased to four (*colloquial, journalistic, technical, literary*) and their inner stratification began to be examined. This applies especially to technical style. Besides, many opportunities for future stylistic research were brought up in the discussion and further developed. Most of the works characterized in the following sections use this theoretical basis as their starting point; I will therefore concentrate mainly on the new, different ideas they introduce, compared to the conception of stylistics established after the 1954 conference.

1.3.3. *Theoretical works on style and stylistics published between 1954 and 1960*

1.3.3.1 In 1955, a collective work *Kapitoly z praktické stylistiky* (Chapters from Practical Stylistics) was published (Daneš, Doležel, Hausenblas, Váhala 1955, 2nd ed. 1957). Its authors tried to provide a more detailed, practical view of the relatively recently established journalistic style. *Kapitoly z praktické stylistiky* is not a handbook of rules for writing business and private letters, as the above-stated definition of practical stylistics puts it.

After a brief general survey dealing with modern definitions of style and stylistics, with stylistic factors and with functional styles, attention is paid to stylistic differentiation of the means of expression at the levels of morphology, syntax (including the basic facts concerning functional sentence perspective) and vocabulary. The last part focuses on various genres existing within journalistic style and on the most frequent types

of stylistic mistakes occurring in these genres. Nevertheless, the authors do not try to establish a set of authoritative rules deciding which ways of expression are "good" or "bad", to put it in the pre-structuralist terminology. Instead, they try to provide against the background of theoretical knowledge some practical recommendations to all whose occupation occasionally requires contributing to newspapers – not only to professional journalists.

Kapitoly z praktické stylistiky was very successful with the public, therefore a new, revised edition was published two years later. In the following years several other books appeared aimed at investigating journalistic style. These books were both theoretical and practical – e.g. Jelínek's *O jazyku a stylu novin* (On Language and Style of Newspapers, 1957), a collective work *Žurnalistika – jazyk a styl* (Journalism – Language and Style, 1966) and J. V. Bečka's *Jazyk a styl novin* (Language and Style of Newspapers, 1973).

1.3.3.2 Due to lack of stylistic textbooks, a revised edition of Hodura (1953) was prepared in 1962, two years after Hodura's death (Hodura, Formánková, Rejmánková 1962).

The dynamic development of stylistics after the 1954 conference and changes in codification of Czech orthography introduced in 1957 made it necessary to revise the text thoroughly. The chapters dealing with the development of stylistics were enlarged, characteristics of spoken and written texts were added and specific features of the main functional styles were incorporated into the text. More attention was also paid to basic stylistic procedures and to various genres based upon them. From the formal point of view, more examples illustrating the theoretical explanations were added and the most important theoretical works which had appeared since 1953 were included in the bibliography. However, a new textbook for university students was still needed. The first modern work of this kind appeared approximately ten years later (Jedlička, Formánková, Rejmánková 1970; see section 1.3.6.2).

1.3.4 *Investigations of literary style carried out in the 1960s*

Literary style was another field intensively investigated in this period. After the pioneering works written by Mukařovský in the 1930s and 1940s, a new generation of scholars focusing on these problems appeared.

1.3.4.1 In 1960, Lubomír Doležel published a monograph called *O stylu moderní české prózy* (On the Style of Contemporary Czech Fictional

Prose). The main topic of this book, further investigated in Doležel (1973) and Doležel (1993), is the text of a fictional prose work and its structure. Attention is paid here to the so-called *verbal model* of narrative prose, i.e. to its vertical stratification represented by various types of discourse. Unless stated otherwise, the English terminology and the abbreviations used here are taken from Doležel (1973). Since Doležel (1960) is the first Czech work which pays systematic attention to this problem, it will be useful to summarize his theory in somewhat greater detail.

Unlike most 19th century fiction, where only the *narrator's discourse* (DN) and *characters' discourse* (DC) appear as two polar types, modern prose of the 20th century frequently uses also several transitional types of discourse. Doležel's work is focused mainly on these transitional types, on their formal indicators and on the characteristics and typology of transition among the types of discourse. Doležel introduces a system of the transitional types of discourse existing between the *characters' discourse*, represented by *direct discourse*, i.e. by *direct speech,* and the *narrator's discourse* (which also includes *indirect discourse*, i.e. *reported speech*). The first transitional type is *unmarked direct discourse* (UDD). It differs from direct discourse only formally, by omitting the inverted commas as a *graphical indicator* of the direct speech; the visual distinction between the characters' and the narrator's discourses is thus weakened.

The last transitional type of discourse is so-called *represented discourse* (RD). In Bally's terminology this type of discourse is called *le style indirect libre*, in English terminology *free indirect speech* (Leech, Short 1981: 325ff.). Doležel divides represented discourse into two subtypes.

In *compact represented discourse*, both the *graphical indicators* and some *grammatical categories* change – above all the category of person. The 1st and 2nd persons usually change to the 3rd person, which moves this type of discourse one step further from the characters' discourse to the narrator's discourse.

In *diffused represented discourse*, these *graphical and grammatical indicators* are preserved and some other features are added, namely so-called *subjective semantics* and *specific means of expression* frequently used by some of the characters. As a result, the text becomes more subjective – it seems as if some of the characters temporarily took on the role of the narrator, preserving the original narrative mode, but bringing his/her subjective point of view into it. Passages of this kind thus contain elements belonging both to the character's discourse and to the narrator's discourse. This ambiguity is aptly expressed by the Czech term for diffused represented discourse – *smíšená řeč*, literally translat-

ed "a mixed discourse". Doležel's conception of the structure of a prose text has been, as mentioned above, further developed and refined in his later works.

1.3.4.2 In 1961, a collective work *Knížka o jazyce a stylu soudobé české literatury* (A Book on the Language and Style of Contemporary Czech Literature) was published. It was prepared by members of the academic Institute of Czech Language – F. Daneš, L. Doležel, J. Filipec, K. Hausenblas, J. Kuchař, A. Stich and J. Zima. The book was based on a series of popularizing broadcast lectures held in 1958–1959. The main purpose both of the lectures and of the book was to help readers to achieve a better understanding of the composition and structure of modern literature. The book deals in turn with the basic theoretical characteristics of modern prose, poetry and drama.

Chapters dealing with prose concentrate above all on innovations of form in 20th century prose, compared to the prose of the 19th century. Several important features are discussed: new narrative modes, subjectivization of the narrative and basic types of transitory discourses between the narrator's discourse and the characters' discourse, indicators and functions of these transitory discourses. Attention is also paid to specific means of expression used in literary style, to metaphorical expressions and to tendencies towards specific/abstract ways of expression.

In the section on poetry, the basic principles of versification are explained, the focus being especially on metrical and rhyming schemes. This section also contains a brief commentary on the character and function of poetic neologisms. The final chapters analyse the structure of a drama. They deal chiefly with functions of dialogue and monologue in dramatic texts, with switching from the one to the other and with specific means of expression used for the purpose of comic effect in drama.

1.3.4.3 In 1967, Z. Kožmín in his book *Umění stylu* (The Art of Style) presented a theoretical analysis of Czech prose of the 1960s based on several important theoretical preliminaries, which will be briefly summarized here. As Kožmín (1967: 7–8) puts it, stylistics – especially literary stylistics – investigates the way aesthetic values are realized by means of expression existing in the language.

The style of a particular work can thus be examined as a linguistic and formal realization of its content. Generally speaking, each element of a text has its formal and contentual aspect, which are neither identical, nor opposing each other; there is a certain tension between them and their relation to each other is of a complementary character. Style is

one of the components which influence perception, understanding and interpreting the content of a work.

The last important general term introduced in this work is *stylistic principle.* In Kožmín's conception stylistic principle is the way the content of a particular work is expressed by language. This approach – emphasizing that style is a linguistic realization of a certain content/of certain aesthetic values – is quite close to the *expressional theory of style* dealt with in the following section.

1.3.5 *Expressional theory of style*

All the stylistic theories described up to now have one important feature in common: they are all based on Havránek's definition of style as the selection of means of expression and the principle of their organization in a text; this approach can be called a *selective theory of style.* In the late 1960s, a Slovak linguist F. Miko introduced a considerably different conception of style, which can be applied to all types of texts. This conception is based on the existence of so-called *expressional categories* (see below), therefore it is called an *expressional theory of style.* The basic definitions of selective and expressional theories of style are given in Popovič (1983: 72–73).

This theory has gradually been worked out in Miko's works *Estetika výrazu* (Aesthetic Aspects of Expression, 1969) and *Text a štýl* (Text and Style, 1970). Its enlarged version appeared in collection of Miko's papers *Od epiky k lyrike* (From Epic to Lyrical Genres, 1973); English translations of Miko's most important theoretical works were published under the title *Style, Literature, Communication* (1978). Miko also dealt with general problems of comparative stylistics; his monograph *Štýlové konfrontácie* (Style Confrontations, 1976) will be treated in section 3.1.2.4.

To sum up at least the most important points of Miko's theory: *style* is defined here as a differentiating aspect of each text. The components of style are called *expressional categories*; these expressional categories are elements which differentiate the styles of various texts. At paradigmatic level, the expressional categories form a system; at syntagmatic level, individual styles of texts are formed by their occurrence within them. In other words: *style is a configuration of expressional categories within a text.* This configuration is represented by linguistic and thematic means of expression functioning as indicators of the particular expressional categories and consequently of the style itself. The survey of the system of expressional categories and their indicators can be found e.g. in Miko (1973) and Miko (1978); here only the four basic categories from which the others are derived will be mentioned.

The central opposition in the system of expressional categories is *operativeness* vs *iconicity* of expression. *Operativeness* means orientation of the text towards the recipient, which follows a certain practical aim (appeal, announcement, evaluation. The formal signals of operativeness are the presence of the 1st and 2nd persons in the text, a limitation of the topic, attention focused on the formal aspects of the text. On the other hand, *iconicity* means orientation of the text towards expression as such. Formal indicators of this expressional category are the predomination of the 3rd person and orientation of the text towards developing the theme.

The other basic opposition is an opposition of *conceptuality* vs *experienceness*. *Conceptuality* means a tendency towards using specific means of expression with exact and explicit meaning and towards expressing logical relations among these means of expression. The indicators of conceptuality are terminology, explicit syntactic constructions and logical organization of the text. *Experienceness* can be characterized as using motives and means of expression which have pragmatic connotations, i.e. which conjure up previous experiences and emotions in the reader/listener; Miko speaks here about the *anthropological character of a text. Experienceness* is indicated by the high frequency of elements with pragmatic connotations of this kind.

Although the starting points of Miko's expressional conception of style are different from the selective approach, it does not mean that there are no points of contact between them. Even though beginning with different preliminaries, Miko also incorporates the concept of *functional styles* into his theory. He works with four main functional styles – *colloquial style, practical* (i.e. administrative, business etc.) *style, technical style* and *literary style.* As Miko concludes, these main – or, as he puts it, *primary* styles – can be defined on the basis of the two abovementioned oppositions of expressional categories. Texts belonging to the sphere of *colloquial style* are usually characterized by *operativeness and experienceness*, texts belonging to *practical* style by *operativeness and conceptuality*, texts belonging to *technical style* by *iconicity and conceptuality* and texts belonging to *literary style* by *iconicity and experienceness*. This is of course just the basic classification – the situation in individual texts can vary a lot.

1.3.6 *Theoretical works on style and stylistics published in the 1970s*
1.3.6.1 Another interesting work concerning general problems of style, especially literary style, appeared in 1971. *Výstavba jazykových projevů a styl* (Composition of Texts and Style) is a collection of studies on style published by K. Hausenblas during the 1960s. The author deals with the

method of complex analysis of a text from the lowest level of linguistic means of expression to the highest level of intertextual relations. Other papers focus on various aspects of style; the two most important ones will be mentioned here.

Hausenblas states that it is possible to stratify each language according to four main criteria: *regional, social, generational* and *stylistic.* The *stylistic stratification* is a stratification based on *stylistic factors* – e.g. spoken vs written texts, prepared vs spontaneous texts etc. It is therefore possible to speak about *simplex styles*, which are determined mainly by one stylistic factor and *complex styles,* styles determined by several stylistic factors.

Hausenblas also provides a more detailed version of his former definition of style (Hausenblas 1955: 3–4): *style* is a specifically human phenomenon, appearing in spheres where certain norms exist and connected with an intentional activity – although the intentional factor need not necessarily be consciously perceived. Style can thus be defined as a *principle* on which this activity is organized. This theoretical section ends with a comparison of *style* and *method.* As Hausenblas puts it, *style* is tied to the *structure* of the particular artefact and can be deduced from the artefact itself; on the other hand, *method* is tied to the *genesis* of the artefact and cannot be deduced from it.

1.3.6.2 At the beginning of the 1970s a new textbook for university students was needed to provide a systematic introduction to modern stylistics, including the most important results of theoretical research undertaken in this field during the previous decades. A textbook of this kind, written by A. Jedlička, V. Formánková and M. Rejmánková, was published in 1970 under the title *Základy české stylistiky* (The Fundamentals of Czech Stylistics).

Like the majority of Czech stylistic works, *Základy české stylistiky* is based on the selective conception of style. The book introduces two main ways of classifying texts. Firstly, classification according to *objective stylistic factors*, which determine the style of the texts. Each of the objective stylistic factors forms a binary opposition – e.g. *private* vs *public* texts, *spoken* vs *written texts, prepared* vs *spontaneous* texts, *monological* vs *dialogical* texts. Every text can be described by members of these oppositions.

Secondly, classification based on the existence of four main so-called *spheres of style*. Texts, according to their function, are categorized as belonging to one of these spheres. The four main spheres, corresponding with four main functional styles, are *colloquial communicative sphere,*

technical sphere, including also administrative texts, *journalistic sphere* and *literary sphere.*

Within each of these spheres a group of specific means of expression (*stylistic layer/level*) exists and certain general rules – *stylistic norms* – are applied. A set of these stylistic norms is called *type of style*. Within texts belonging to a particular *type of style* there exist different *stylistic forms*, such as announcement, discussion, advertisement etc. In these genres, various *stylistic procedures* are used; on the concept of stylistic procedures see section 1.2.4.5. These theoretical preliminaries are explained in greater detail in this textbook and illustrated by a rich variety of examples taken from all kinds of texts. At the end a survey of the development of stylistics is added and the most important theoretical approaches to this discipline are briefly mentioned.

1.3.6.3 In 1971, following the patterns of *Základy české stylistiky*, V. Staněk prepared a work called *Praktická stylistika* (Practical Stylistics; not published until 1994). It was intended as a textbook for secondary school students – the title is therefore somewhat misleading, it is not a handbook of *practical stylistics* in the sense used in this work.

1.3.6.4 *Základy české stylistiky* was the first of the stylistic textbooks published in the 1970s. During this period, a set of textbooks was written by J. Říhová for students of the Pedagogical Faculty in Ostrava. *Úvod do stylistické systematiky* (Introduction to the Paradigm of Stylistics, 1972) and *Teorie stylistiky* (Theory of Stylistics, 1977) are theoretically orientated, while *Slohová čítanka* (A Stylistics Reader, 1982) provides an algorithm for the stylistic analysis of a text and a collection of texts to be analysed.

Říhová in her works gives an all-round view of stylistics, adding some new, interesting ideas. She regards *stylistic procedures* as a very important element serving as a link between the *textual* and *thematic* levels. In other words, stylistic procedures link the level of horizontal and vertical stratification of a text with the level of its thematic build-up. It may be said that she combines a more practical approach used in textbooks, mainly in Jedlička, Formánková, Rejmánková (1970) with general theoretical conceptions as introduced by Hausenblas (1971).

1.3.6.5 Another theory, concentrating on one particular aspect of stylistics, was developed by M. Jelínek and described in his monograph *Stylistické aspekty gramatického systému* (Stylistic Aspects of the Grammatical System, 1974). He developed the approach introduced twenty years earlier at the 1954 conference, presented in Jelínek (1955).

Jelínek (1974) concentrates on the means of expression acting potentially as *competitors* within the examined texts. Since such means of expression exist at all levels of language he systematically and thoroughly analyses the phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical and phraseological levels. The stylistic values of these competitors can be marked on a so-called *stylistic axis.* The means of expressions are organized on the stylistic axis from the *substandard* ones through *colloquial, neutral*, and *bookish* to the *archaic* means of expression, which represent the other pole of the axis.

As the language develops, the means of expression tend to shift and change their position on the axis. For example colloquial means of expression gradually become neutral, neutral ones become bookish etc. Jelínek's next work (Jelínek 1995) is also based on this conception, but its text is organized in a slightly different way. This monograph will be dealt with in section 1.3.8.4.

1.3.6.6 It is worth mentioning briefly that problems of style were also described in handbooks and dictionaries dealing with literary theory, especially from the diachronic point of view and in the context of European culture. The most important works of this kind published during the 1970s are Hrabák (1977) and Vlašín, ed. (1977). Items concerning style and stylistics can also be found in Popovič, ed. (1983). It is a Slovak-English-German-Russian terminological dictionary aimed mainly at problems of translation.

1.3.7 *Theoretical works on style and stylistics published in the 1980s*
1.3.7.1 In 1983 there appeared a monograph *Ztvárnění komunikačních faktorů v jazykových projevech* (Figuration of Communicative Factors in Texts), written by A. Macurová. In this work Macurová investigates several factors influencing the structure of a text. Although she approaches the material examined mainly on the basis of theory of communication, her conclusions are important also for stylistics because these factors could also be ranged among stylistic factors. Since Macurová's work is the first Czech monograph of this kind and since some of these factors are not yet included in present stylistic textbooks, at least the most important points will be summed up here.

The structure of every text is influenced by *social norms, norms of communication* and *language norms*; elements of these norms are always present. The basic structure of each text is called *texture*; Macurová defines the texture as a sequence of elements constituting the text. Normally the texture is of linear character, based on the principle

of addition, but this type of structure can be disrupted in several ways. The texture can be disrupted in *an unmarked way*, i.e. in accordance with generally accepted conventions. This applies for example to two-dimensional (horizontal) stratification of written texts, where new lines, paragraphs etc. are separated. There is also a *marked way* of disrupting the structure of a text. This marked way applies to cases when the space of the text is organized like the space of a painting, such as in visual poetry. Another type of marked way of disrupting the text occurs when the organization of this space disrupts the linearity for semantic reasons – to establish new relations among the elements of the text and thus to create a new meaning (graphs, charts, tables etc.).

Another important concept introduced and investigated by Macurová in this work is *perspective* which is defined here as projection of extra-linguistic reality into the text. In every text, there is a *perspective centre*, i.e. a point towards which the projection is realized. There can also be more than one perspective centre in each text. Every text is hierarchized and perspectivised according to various criteria, which can sometimes be contradictory. If we for instance give an enumeration of people present at a certain event, we usually proceed hierarchically – from the more important to the less important ones. Nevertheless, in accordance with ethical norms, we usually mention ourselves at the very end of the enumeration, irrespective of our real position in the hierarchy. As Macurová concludes, from this viewpoint it is possible to speak about texts with *simple perspective* with only one perspective centre and with *complex perspective*, including more perspective centres. Within the latter type it is possible to distinguish texts of so-called *framed type*, in which the perspective centres are functionally hierarchized, and texts of so-called *dialogical type*, in which the perspective centres are functionally equivalent.

1.3.7.2 In 1985, a very detailed textbook called *Štylistika* (Stylistics) was published. Like most Czech and Slovak stylistic works it is based on the structuralist approach. Its author, the Slovak linguist J. Mistrík, presents his theoretical approach to this discipline. In the introductory part there is a very detailed history of stylistics from the classical period to the present, including the contemporary situation in Europe. Later Mistrík deals with stylistic values of means of expression at all levels of the text.

Problems of textual syntax and coherence of a text are dealt with very thoroughly in this work. Referring among others to Halliday, Hasan (1976), Mistrík (1985) makes a distinction between *coherence* as a semantic aspect and *cohesion* as a formal aspect of a text. Then Mistrík concentrates on measuring the cohesion, for which he established a sys-

tem of so-called *degrees of contiguity*. There are five degrees of contiguity, hierarchized according to the character of an element opening a new syntactic unit. In his classification typologies based both on parts of speech and on sentence elements are used. Mistrík introduces here the following hierarchy: *subject* (zero degree), *object* (degree 1), *adverbial modifier* (degree 2), *finite verb* (degree 3) and *conjunction* (degree 4).

The final chapter of this textbook deals with the characteristics of functional styles and the main genres existing within them. In Mistrík's classification there are seven basic styles: *technical, administrative, journalistic, rhetorical, essayistic, colloquial,* and *literary*. Mistrík's textbook – compared with some others – provides a very detailed bibliography including many foreign works.

1.3.7.3 Another theoretical work published in 1985 is *Vyučování slohu* (Teaching Stylistics). Its author, M. Čechová, provided here a survey of methodological approaches to teaching stylistics in primary and secondary schools from the end of the 18th century to the present. The book deals above all with teaching written and oral communicative skills and with their classification.

1.3.7.4 Children's literature is investigated by Uličný (1987). The work *Prostor pro jazyk a styl* (Scope for Language and Style) focuses on stylistic aspects of composition as they appear in fictional prose for children. In analysing this kind of literature so-called *children's aspect* must be taken into consideration. This means it is necessary to be aware of the factors which influence communication between two different age groups – adults and children. The important factors here, which are reflected in the texts, are the age of the readers, the estimated amount of their general knowledge, the presumed way of reception of the text – listening, reading with an adult's assistance, independent reading. Uličný (1987) provides the first systematic analysis of style in children's literature.

1.3.7.5 During the 1980s, several works were published the main aim of which was to provide an introduction to stylistics for professionals from different branches, who have to produce or classify all types of technical texts; examples of such works are Uličný (1980) – *Jazyk a styl v práci s textem* (Language and Style – Treating a Text), aimed mainly at librarians and Kraus (1987) – *O jazyce a stylu pro informační pracovníky* (On Language and Style for Information Technologies Professionals). Besides these more or less popularizing works several new textbooks also appeared during that period.

1.3.7.6 *Učebnice stylistiky* (A Textbook of Stylistics, 1987), written by J. Hubáček, is aimed at students in pedagogical faculties, especially at future primary school teachers. The explanations are therefore limited to the elementary facts. Each chapter contains several exercises, which is not common practice in Czech university textbooks. *Stylistické minimum* (The Fundamentals of Stylistics, 1987) by J. Chloupek, M. Krčmová a E. Minářová is a short textbook the first part of which gives the basic facts about stylistics and the second part contains materials for analysis.

1.3.8 *Theoretical works on style and stylistics published from 1990 to the present*

1.3.8.1 *Stylistika češtiny* (Stylistics of the Czech Language, 1991) by J. Chloupek et al. is a textbook based on *Stylistické minimum*. Its primary aim was to give university students of Czech a detailed theoretical introduction to stylistics, as Jedlička, Formánková, Rejmánková (1970) had done earlier.

The introductory passages provide a systematic survey of stylistic terminology followed by information about stratification of the national language and a description of its varieties. The textbook then deals with stylistic factors. Unlike some earlier works, e.g. Hausenblas (1955), and to a certain extent also Jedlička, Formánková, Rejmánková (1970), *topic* is ranked in Chloupek et al. (1991) among stylistic factors as one of the objective stylistic factors. Although one topic can be dealt with in texts belonging to various genres, similar stylistic norms are applied to these texts and the particular genres have some basic features in common.

The succeeding parts deal with the composition of a text, particularly with stylistic procedures and their modifications, horizontal/vertical stratification of the text, coherence and cohesion and also with *stylistic values* of means of expression at all levels of language – phonology, morphology, word-formation, syntax and vocabulary. These stylistic values can be *permanent* – existing irrespective of the context and *contextual* – appearing only in a particular context. Within the first group it is possible to distinguish two types: *inherent* stylistic values, *adherent* stylistic values. *Inherent* stylistic values usually originate with the creation of an expression. This applies above all to technical terms – they are created to be explicit, neutral and unambiguous. *Adherent* stylistic values are usually attached to the particular means of expression when they are in usage; journalistic language can serve as an example here.

An analysis of the main functional styles and their stylistic norms are also included in Chloupek et al. (1991). The four main styles distinguished in this textbook are the same as in Jedlička, Formánková,

Rejmánková (1970): *colloquial, technical* (including *administrative* style), *journalistic* and *literary*. The last chapter provides a survey of theoretical and methodological approaches towards stylistics in the 20th century. Besides specialized bibliographical notes at the end of each chapter, there is also a detailed bibliography of Czech and Slovak works on stylistics at the end of the textbook.

1.3.8.2 A somewhat different approach to stylistics is presented in J. V. Bečka's monograph *Česká stylistika* (Czech Stylistics, 1992), which is a synwork of Bečka's theoretical approach towards style and stylistics. It is based on Bečka (1948); this textbook was briefly mentioned in section 1.2.4.3. Bečka (1992) concentrates on a detailed description of means of expression, on their functions and on their stylistic values; three out of four long chapters are devoted to these problems; only the introductory section deals with general problems of style and with functional styles.

As distinct from the majority of modern stylistic works, the author operates with the system of only three main functional styles – *technical, pragmatic/practical* (administrative, journalistic etc.) and *literary*. Bečka does not include colloquial style in the group of main functional styles, because, as he puts it, texts of this kind contain not only standard but also substandard means of expression.

His conception of style is thus limited only to texts using standard language, although a strict application of this rule would mean that some literary works could not be analysed either, as substandard means of expression appear there not only in the discourse of the characters, but also in the narrator's discourse. This approach, dated from today's point of view, is in some ways similar to opinions presented in Trávníček 1953 – see section 1.2.4.4. Nevertheless, Trávníček admits the possibility of substandard means of expression occurring in certain types of texts and does not regard this fact as a reason for excluding such texts from stylistic investigations – a similar attitude is expressed also in other new stylistic works.

In Bečka's monograph, means of expression are investigated with focus on meanings of words in general – semantics, expressiveness, synonymy, homonymy etc. – and on their usage – direct/metaphorical ways of expression, figures of speech, tropes. He also examines types of sentences, sentence elements and differences between monological/dialogical texts and composition of larger thematic units – paragraphs, chapters etc. There is a brief commentary on individual style at the end of the book.

1.3.8.3 A year later, a revised Czech version of Doležel (1973) was published under the title *Narativní způsoby v české literatuře* (Narrative Modes in Czech Literature, 1993). This work carries on investigating the structure of a prose text, begun in Doležel 1960. The starting point is the *verbal model* of a text examined in his previous work, i.e. the stratification of a text into the narrator's discourse, the character's discourse and the transitional types between these poles. The distinctive features constituting differences between these polar types are referred to as *shifters* (Doležel 1993: 20, 40; Jakobson 1984: 42–44).

Besides the verbal model of a text, Doležel introduces here also a *functional model* of a text. It is a model based on the different functions of the narrator and the characters within the text. The primary functions of the narrator in relation to the text are *representation* and *control*, while those of characters are *interpretation* and *action*. This model can serve as a basis for refining the typology of narrative modes. Each of the two primary narrative modes – *Er-form* and *Ich-form* – can be by using the functional model further divided into three subtypes: *objective* Er-form/Ich-form (the basic type; the subjects perform their primary functions: narrator – construction and control, characters – interpretation and action), *rhetorical* Er-form/Ich-form (narrator – construction, control plus interpretation, characters – action), *subjective* Er-form/Ich-form (narrator – representation, control, interpretation and action).

If the functional model is combined with the verbal model, the result is a scheme describing various degrees of objectivity/subjectivity of a text; Doležel presents this scheme as a circle, where the *objective Er-form* and the *direct discourse*, as the polar types of *objectivity* and *subjectivity,* are placed opposite each other and the other types are placed in between these types (for the scheme see Doležel 1973: 11 and Doležel 1993: 49). These main theoretical preliminaries serve as a starting point for the analysis of several Czech literary works (from the 17th to the 20th century), which are dealt with in the following chapters of Doležel's work.

In his following works, the most significant of which is Heterocosmica (1998, Czech version 2003), L. Doležel pays his attention to the concept of possible worlds, as reflected in fiction, moving from issues of style and structure of literary works to issues of philosophy.

1.3.8.4 In 1995, a collective grammar *Příruční mluvnice češtiny* (A Handbook Grammar of Czech) appeared. It was primarily intended for university students, but partly also for a wider public as a clear and

concise source of theoretical information about present-day Czech; the chapter *Stylistika* (Stylistics) was written by M. Jelínek.

The basic conception in Jelínek (1995) is the same as in Jelínek (1974), i.e. means of expression acting as competitors (see section 1.3.6.5), but with respect to the orientation of this grammar the theoretical explanations are enlarged so that they cover the basic terms of stylistics as well.

The most important feature of Jelínek's approach presented in this work is his very detailed classification of styles according to the stylistic factors influencing them. Among the *objective styles*, determined by objective stylistic factors, there are for example *monological* vs *dialogical* styles, *formal* vs *informal* styles, styles of *spoken* vs *written* texts and also *functional* styles. These styles are particularly important, because, as Jelínek puts it, *function* plays a dominant role among the objective stylistic factors. Jelínek's classification of functional styles includes twelve main functional styles: *literary, colloquial, epistolary, technical, administrative, economic, advertising, ideological, journalistic, essayistic, directive, orientational. Subjective styles*, determined by subjective stylistic factors, include professional styles, styles of various age groups, styles of people with higher/lower education etc.; these particular styles are individually dealt with in greater detail.

1.3.8.5 In the mid-1990s three more works concerning stylistics were published. *Tvořivý sloh* (Creative Style, 1995) by Z. Kožmín is a practical handbook providing suggestions on how to teach stylistics at secondary schools and improve the writing skills of the pupils. *Písemnosti v našem životě* (Written Documents in Everyday Life, 1996 by J. Kraus a J. Hoffmannová is the first modern handbook of Czech practical stylistics; besides recommendations concerning formal aspects of letter writing there is also a set of extracts from letters written by prominent personalities from the 15th to the 20th century. K. Hausenblas's book *Od tvaru k smyslu textu* (From the Form to the Meaning of a Text, 1996) contains his theoretical articles published in the 1970s, 1980s and the first half of the 1990s.

1.3.8.6 The last work on Czech stylistics to be dealt with is *Stylistika současné češtiny* (Stylistics of Contemporary Czech) written by M. Čechová, J. Chloupek, M. Krčmová, and E. Minářová and published in 1997; it is a revised and enlarged version of Chloupek et al. (1991).

Compared with Chloupek et al. (1991), there are several changes in this textbook. Besides refining some of the theoretical explanations, e.g. the passages on stylistic values of the means of expression, another im-

portant change introduced in Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová (1997) is increasing the number of the main functional styles. Compared with Chloupek et al. (1991), this number grew from four to six – *colloquial, technical, journalistic, literary* plus *administrative* and *rhetorical* styles.

The increased theoretical attention paid to the norms and structure of texts belonging to the administrative and rhetorical styles is connected with the social changes that took place at the turn of the 1990s. Since then the importance of developing both oral and written communicative skills has grown considerably. This applies especially to the spheres of politics, business communication and public relations in general.

The other changes are of a more or less formal character. They include for example updating the bibliography and commenting on changes in the codification of Czech orthography introduced in 1993 (rules of hyphenation, writing capital letters, spelling of loanwords etc.). As mentioned in section 1.1.1, *Stylistika současné češtiny,* is used in this work as one of the main sources of information about present-day Czech stylistics.

1.4   Present-day situation of Czech stylistics

As can be seen from the survey given in this chapter, Czech theories of style developed during the 20th century are quite homogeneous, as far as their theoretical bases are concerned. All of them are rooted in the Prague School structuralism and functionalism. Attention is paid to both literary and non-literary texts and also to the factors which influence creating the texts. The investigations of style are orientated functionally – the main focus is on the functions of the text and on the extent to which the particular means of expression and their organization contribute to performing these functions. The functional orientation of stylistic investigations helps to see a text not only as an isolated structure, but also as a part of a wider social and historical context (on the concept of function in stylistics see also 3.6).

One of the results of this theoretical homogeneity is that there are just two main branches of present-day Czech stylistics, *theoretical stylistics* and *practical stylistics.* Theoretical stylistics investigates style, structure and functions of various texts and also the norms which are applied in various genres. Practical stylistics uses the results of the theoretical investigations as a basis for teaching the norms of writing texts, especially texts belonging to the non-literary genres.