2 British Theories of Style

2.1 British theoretical works

As distinct from Czech works on stylistics, British theoretical approaches to this discipline are much more varied. This is undoubtedly one of the results of different positions these two languages have in the modern world. Whereas Czech is a language limited to the territory of the Czech Republic and spoken by approximately 10 million people living there (plus members of the Czech minorities living e.g. in the U.S.A., Ukraine, Romania etc.), English is a worldwide language. It is spoken by approximately 337 million people as a mother tongue and by another 235 million as a second language (Crystal 1997: 106–108). Consequently, the number of theoretical works dealing with English is much higher than the number of those focused on Czech.

It was therefore necessary to choose carefully the works to be surveyed in this chapter so that they would cover the most important theoretical approaches to style. In linguistic encyclopedias and dictionaries I have found several different ways the British theories of style are classified. These stratifications and the criteria on which they are based are one of the points which will be included in the comparison in chapter three and will be dealt with in detail in this place.

As a basis of this survey I have chosen the stratification given in *The Stylistics Reader* (1996) edited by J. J. Weber (for details see section 3.5.2.3.3). Besides the present-day theories, this stratification also provides a diachronic view of the particular branches of stylistics and deals with their mutual relationships. In accordance with Weber's stratification, I have limited myself to the works published approximately during the last three decades. The works surveyed in this chapter include also those written by authors from the U.S.A. (Traugott, Pratt), Australia (Turner) and other countries (the definition of the term *British* as used in this work is given in the Introduction).

2.1.1 *Investigating English Style* by D. Crystal and D. Davy (1969) is a monograph trying to establish a methodology of stylistic analysis of both literary and non-literary texts. Stress is laid especially on non-literary texts of various types. Compared in this respect with previous British works on style and stylistics this monograph may be called a pioneering work. It will therefore be dealt with in greater detail.

The authors tried to introduce a consistent theoretical view of stylistics and a methodological approach towards analyses of texts/utterances. They focus primarily on non-literary texts, as these had been investigated only marginally in previous British works. Their aim is to provide an algorithm, which would enable language users, especially students and linguists, to analyse any texts from the viewpoint of stylistics.

In the first part of this book, three main tasks are defined: to identify a range of stylistically significant means of expression, to develop a method of analysis which will enable us to sort and organize them and to classify these means of expression into categories according to the extra-linguistic purpose they have, i.e. to find out their function(s). The analysis should be carried out at all levels of language, beginning with the phonemic/graphemic level, then moving on to phonological /graphological, grammatical, lexical and semantic levels.

The core of stylistic analysis consists in matching the linguistic features of the particular text to the so-called *dimensions of situational constraint,* i.e. to limitations which restrict usage of various means of expression. Any feature found at any level of the text can belong to one or more dimensions of situational constraint.

Eight main dimensions of situational constraint are distinguished in this work: 1) *individuality* of speakers/writers; this dimension covers above all the features which appear in their utterances unconsciously, as a part of their idiolect; 2) *dialect*, or, more generally, the language variety/varieties used in the particular text; 3) *time* – this dimension relates both to the time when the text originated and the stage of life of the author; 4) *type of discourse* (spoken vs written, dialogical vs monological); 5) *province* – the sphere of occupational or professional activity, in which the particular means of expression are used (legal, journalistic, religious etc.); 6) social *status* of the participants in the act of communication, their mutual hierarchic relations (connected with degrees of formality/informality, with expressing politeness, respect etc.); 7) *modality* – the decision of users to choose a specific type of means of expression to present for example their attitude towards the subject matter; 8) *singularity* – features constituting the unique character of the particular text and used by the authors deliberately. The deliberate use of the particular means of expression is different from the use which results from the language situation during the particular period, from language norms concerning the particular type of texts etc.; it is also different from the use of features expressing the authors' *individuality*, as defined for the first dimension. Nevertheless, as Crystal and Davy (1969: 76–77) themselves admit, the dimensions of individuality and singularity tend to overlap

and especially if there are only few texts by the same author it is not possible to make a clear distinction between them; a detailed statistical analysis of texts created by a particular author would be necessary to obtain reliable results.

The extent to which these dimensions are present in texts is variable – different communicative acts require different degrees of functional participation from each dimension and there are certain degrees of probability that some categories of various dimensions will probably co-occur (e.g. legal texts are usually formal).

The main spheres analysed by Crystal and Davy are conversation, unscripted commentary, religion, newspaper reporting and legal documents. The book ends with several suggestions for further analysis, such as the language of TV advertising, press advertising, public speaking, written instructions, the language of science etc.

As we can see, the approach of Crystal and Davy is very close to structuralist theories, especially to the functional conception developed in the 1930s by the Prague School on which present-day Czech stylistics is based. The similarity lies especially in the range of texts investigated, the methodology used for analysis and the fact that extralinguistic factors influencing the style of a text are also taken into consideration. The dimensions of situational constraint can be seen as counterparts of stylistic factors and stylistic spheres used in Czech theories. Nevertheless, as distinct from the Prague School, function as such is not explicitly included in the factors influencing the style of a text in this monograph.

2.1.2 A collection of papers *Linguistics and Literary Style* edited by D.C. Freeman (1970), was another work stressing the importance of linguistic approaches for the analysis of style. This book, aimed primarily at undergraduate and graduate students of literature, includes contributions dealing with general theoretical problems, with the methodology of stylistic investigations and with the application of these principles to the analysis of prose and poetry.

A wide range of theories as they gradually developed approximately from the 1930s to the 1960s is presented in this collection. Among the articles in this collection there is for example Leo Spitzer's essay *Linguistics and Literary History*, written in 1948, in which Spitzer proposes the theory of so-called "philological circle". This technique of basic stylistic analysis of a text starts with the observation of a certain superficial detail of the analysed literary work, then proceeds with its thorough characterization and finally tries to find a common denominator of the particular detail with the literary text as a whole (Freeman, ed. 1970: 32). Another

important theoretical approach included here is theory of so-called foregrounding as presented by Mukařovský (1932) (see section 1.2.1.2).

This collection also deals with concepts originating during the 1950s – 1960s. Richard Ohmann's article *Generative Grammars and the Concept of Literary Style*, first published in 1964, investigates the relationship of stylistics and transformational grammar. As far as transformations of deep structures of sentences into their surface structures are concerned, Ohmann stresses that for investigations of style especially optional transformations are important and that a generative grammar relevant for stylistic analysis must generate several alternatives for the particular stretch of the text. M. Halliday in his article *Descriptive Linguistics in Literary Studies* focuses among other things on cohesion of the particular text as one of several features important for analysing its style; attention is paid also to cataphoric and anaphoric relations among the means of expression used in the text and to various types of word order.

The conceptions presented in the collection *Linguistics and Literary Style* are illustrated by analyses of a variety of texts written e.g. by Chaucer, Swift, Hemingway, Dylan Thomas etc. However varied the range of theoretical approaches and literary texts used as a material for analysis, the main aim of this collection still remains the same: "[to] assert in various ways that modern linguistics, with its increasing interest in those characteristics of mind which underlie aspects of natural language, can make substantive theoretical and factual contributions to our understanding of the poetic process" (Freeman, ed. 1970: 16).

2.1.3 In G. W. Turner's monograph *Stylistics* (1973), three main purposes of this discipline are defined as examining varieties in language, relating them to their contexts and observing the patterns emerging from interference of these varieties. As Turner (1973: 17) puts it, stylistics differs in this respect from grammar – grammar examines varieties in language and schemes existing within them separately, for its own sake. The supreme value of stylistics is seen in the fact that it reveals the complexity of language (Turner 1973: 242).

Special attention is paid to varieties existing at various levels of language, to their stylistic values, to typology of these varieties and to their relationships to each other. All varieties are examined with respect to the situation in which they are used. Turner deals especially with stylistic values of varieties occurring at the levels of phonetics, phonology, syntax and vocabulary, including metaphors.

He suggests a typology of these varieties; the starting point of this typology is the idiolect of an individual; in this respect Turner's approach

is different from Crystal, Davy (1969), who start from texts as such. There are three main ranks of varieties and subvarieties observable within the idiolect: varieties relating to the text in regard to its *time and place of origin*, subvarieties relating to its *technicality, formality,* the use of *speech and writing*, varieties connected with specific communicative functions expressed in texts: *declarative, interrogative, imperative, negative* etc. The number of communicative functions established depends mainly on the level of abstraction and therefore it cannot possibly be seen as something fixed and firmly established.

Turner also pays attention to the evaluative approach towards style as it appears e.g. in criticism and in teaching and to the importance of statistical data in examining style. Besides these scholarly aims of stylistic investigations, Turner to a much greater extent than the other authors quoted in this study stresses the ethical aspect of stylistic investigations and of putting their results into practice.

He points out that in modern civilized society there are many types of communication and therefore it is necessary for everybody to learn several different varieties of the mother tongue, otherwise such people are risking that they will remain in unfavourable social conditions. "... the choice today is finally between literacy and impoverishment. Unless a child develops with rich experience of the several varieties of adult language, he will remain permanently restricted in his linguistic experience and therefore in his participation in the wider community and the sources of power" (Turner 1973: 229). "When we understand the full richness of language, we recognize that not everyone masters it equally well, and this implies a human duty to enrich the language of others when we can" (Turner 1973: 243).

2.1.4 *Style in Fiction* by G. N. Leech and M. Short (1981**)** is described as a linguistic introduction to English fictional prose. Nevertheless, the scope of problems this monograph deals with is not limited only to stylistically marked means of expression occurring at the levels of phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary. The main aim of this work is to provide students of English with a wide theoretical background in disciplines which can be related to investigations of style, above all of style in literary works.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first part, various definitions of style and stylistics are given, on the basis of which the authors try to form their own view of style applicable to the practical study of texts. According to Leech and Short, style is the way in which language is used – it is a matter of parole rather than of langue. Style consists in

choices made by a particular author creating a text belonging to a particular genre. As the authors point out, stylistic choices are not identical with linguistic choices in general – the term "stylistic choice" applies only to those which concern alternative ways of expressing the same subject matter. Stylistics as such is usually concerned with investigating the style of literary texts (Leech, Short 1981: 38–39).

Chapters in the other part of this book provide basic facts about disciplines relevant for stylistic studies. Attention is paid to the concept of the fictional world of a literary work, to its structure and to the so-called mind styles present in the particular text. As the authors put it, the fictional world is the subject apprehended in a literary work, whereas the mind style represents the way this subject is apprehended (Leech, Short 1981: 187).

The authors also examine the structure of discourse in literary works. Since communication in a literary text can be seen as one specific type of communication, it is possible and useful for the purpose of stylistic analysis to take into consideration pragmatic aspects of this communication, which can be investigated for example with regard to Grice's maxims of *quantity, quality, relation* and *manner* (Leech, Short 1981: 295–297).

Nevertheless, there is one important difference between literary and non-literary communication. As distinct from non-literary communication, two main levels can be distinguished within the communication in literary texts. The basic level is communication between real people – it is communication between a real author (addresser) and a real reader (addressee) through a particular text (message). Besides this primary communication, several levels of secondary communication also appear in literary texts. In Leech's and Short's terms, participants in this secondary communication are called *implied author* and *implied reader*; implied author is usually identified with the narrator, implied reader is a hypothetical reader who shares with the author the same background knowledge, a similar set of presuppositions etc. The message, the subject of their communication, can include the characters in the particular literary work, their activities, dialogues, monologues, which creates one or more other levels of a literary text (Leech, Short: 1981: 259–262).

The authors also analyse literary texts with regard to the degree of narrator's (NOT author's) control of report. The spheres where the narrator is apparently in total control of report are *narrative report of action* (NRA) and *narrative report of speech act* (NRSA). Except for NRA, all the other spheres mentioned here deal with various ways of expressing speech in a literary work and are therefore called *varieties of speech pres-*

entation. NRSA is limited only to reproducing the main subject matter of the speech. This feature distinguishes NRSA from indirect speech (see below), in which the precise words appearing in the character's speech are reproduced at least partly. Spheres where the narrator is apparently in partial control of report are *indirect speech* (IS), *free indirect speech* (FIS) and *direct speech* (DS). The sphere where narrator is apparently not in control of report at all is *free direct speech* (FDS); one of the main differences between direct and free direct speech, as well as between indirect and free indirect speech, is omitting the reporting clauses and sometimes also the inverted commas (Leech, Short 1981: 318–336). Although the structure of a literary discourse as presented by Leech and Short (1981) resembles the one introduced by Doležel (1960) and Doležel (1973) (see section 1.3.4.1), Leech and Short use their own approach, independent of Doležel's works. Whereas Doležel focuses on the hierarchy and formal features of the transitional types existing between the narrator's and the characters' discourses, Leech and Short stress above all the degree of the narrator's control of the discourse and its pragmatic aspects.

Theories presented in the monograph *Style in Fiction* are illustrated by detailed analyses of texts; at the end the authors add several texts for readers' individual analysis and – with relation to the subjects investigated in particular chapters – give suggestions about features which might be observed in these texts; at the end of the book a list of works relating to the topics analysed in this monograph is added.

2.1.5 During the 1980s and early 1990s three important works appeared which belong to the sphere of so-called *pedagogical stylistics* (see section 3.5.2.3.3). It is *Linguistics for Students of Literature* by E. C. Traugott and M. L. Pratt (1980), *The Language of Literature* by M. Cummings and R. Simmons (1983) and *Literary Studies in Action* by A. Durant and N. Fabb (1990). The main aim of these works is to give students of English a complex theoretical background of information relevant to stylistic investigations and a reliable methodology for the description and the critical analysis of texts, especially literary texts. The theoretical background comes not only from linguistic and literary disciplines, but also from other fields of science (sociology, psychology etc.). In all three works, an interactive approach is used – they try to stimulate the readers' active interest and their participation in acquiring new pieces of information and working with them, instead of just a passive reception.

These textbooks thus partly adopt methodology used in various practical workbooks. The Routledge series *Language Workbooks* can serve as an example here. This series is orientated towards introduc-

ing various linguistic disciplines to beginners – non-specialists. The workbooks cover discourse analysis, dialectology, sentence structure etc. As a part of this series, a workbook *Stylistics* by J. Haynes (1995) was published. It provides elementary commentaries on several basic topics investigated by stylistics – stylistic values of means of expression, synonyms, organization of a text, the influence of various ideologies on the structure of texts etc. and complements them with exercises for the readers. The works dealt with in sections 2.1.5.1–2.1.5.3 use a similar approach, although to different degrees; but since they are intended mainly for university students of English, more stress is laid on the theoretical explanations which are practised in the exercises following them.

2.1.5.1 The textbook *Linguistics for Students of Literature* by E. C. Traugott and M. L. Pratt (1980) stresses above all the importance of adequate background of information from various fields of linguistics as a basis for analysing style in texts. Such information can help the readers understand the principles on which texts are organized, providing them also with the methodology and the metalanguage necessary for describing and discussing these texts. The main aim of this work is to present to university students of English a detailed and consistent theoretical frame for linguistic analysis of style, especially of the style of literary texts.

The work is therefore divided into chapters dealing with the symbolic nature of language, phonology, morphology, vocabulary, syntax, semantics, the theory of speech acts and the theory of discourse; varieties of English are also included – attention is paid to regional dialects, social dialects and – with reference to contacts of English with other languages – to bilingualism or to origin and characteristics of pidgins and creoles. Theoretical explanations contained in these chapters are focused above all on the pieces of information relevant for systematic analysis of style; for those with a deeper interest in this particular subject, a list of works for further reading is added. At the end of each chapter, there are several practical exercises and students can test their understanding of the particular subject. There are e.g. exercises in transforming sentences and observing the stylistic differences among all possible versions, in creating and comparing groups of synonymous expressions, in describing and characterizing the language of advertisements for the same product but aimed at different audiences, in analysing means of expression by which point of view is expressed in literary works etc. However, the main stress remains on the comprehensive theoretical explanations necessary for stylistic analysis.

2.1.5.2 *The Language of Literature* by M. Cummings and R. Simmons (1983) is a textbook focused on literary style which tries to combine theoretical explanations with practice exercises, considering both components equally important; this user-orientated approach was further developed several years later in Durant, Fabb (1990).

The main aim of this book is to help students appreciate literary texts not only intuitively, but also through understanding their language structures and the effects these structures can create. The authors stress in the introduction that "Stylistics is not intended to replace the enjoyment of literature with mere comprehension. Rather it is an avenue leading to increased enjoyment through the understanding of the ways in which texts have been put together" (Cummings, Simmons 1983: xvii).

Each chapter of the book consists of four parts. After analysis of one particular problem (e.g. rhythm and measure in a modern poem, mock-epic sentence in Tom Jones, the play of vocabulary in Emily Dickinson's works) a general theoretical framework follows. The third part – application – provides the readers with an opportunity to apply the newly gained information for independent solving of a similar problem. Questions for review follow at the end of chapters.

The chapters deal with phonetics and phonology, graphology, grammar, vocabulary and various contexts relevant for examining texts; the grammar section concentrates especially on syntax and partly also on functional sentence perspective. The structure of the book was designed by the authors so that it could serve as a classroom teaching textbook and at the same time as a workbook for seminars on the particular topics. It provides students not only with the opportunity to check their own progress and understanding of the topic, but also with the methodology they can use for further independent work in the field of stylistics.

2.1.5.3 The work of A. Durant and N. Fabb *Literary Studies in Action* (1990) represents an exceptional combination of handbook and workbook. Compared with the other two textbooks previously mentioned, the interactive approach is developed here to a considerably higher degree. The activities and tasks for readers (over one hundred in total) are built directly into the text. After reading a theoretical passage, the reader is led to a certain activity and then directed to another theoretical section; if the questions asked concern knowledge of some factual data, correct answers can be found in the key at the end of the book.

The theoretical explanations presented in this textbook concern not only various levels of grammar, but also some important data from the

history of the theoretical study of literature. Another important point included here is that every text must be analysed with regard to the context in which it originated.

This applies for example to medieval texts, where the readers have to be aware not only of different language norms, different meanings of many words compared with present-day language, but also of different social norms and the different range of knowledge shared by the author and the audience. To be able to understand the meaning intended by the author, modern readers must become acquainted at least partly with these differences (different images of the world, nature, different symbols etc.). Factors concerning the social and language background of the particular language community must be kept in mind also when modern English texts are analysed which were written by authors whose mother tongue is not English.

This book stimulates the readers to test their knowledge of the position of English among other languages in the world, to think about the purpose of literary studies and to clarify their own aims for undertaking this activity. It is concluded by a section which should help the readers test their own ability to apply the newly gained knowledge in practice.

2.1.6 The last four works to be dealt with in this section have one important feature in common: they all pay close attention to the way of presenting reality in texts, or – more broadly – in discourses and examine various perspectives and ideologies appearing in them. These works could be regarded as representatives of so-called *critical stylistics* (see section 3.5.2.3.3). One presupposition of this branch of stylistics is that no text can be regarded as an objective account of reality and that there is always a certain amount of ideology which tries to influence the reader. The authors see as their main purpose to analyse these mechanisms present in texts and to help the readers be aware of them; nevertheless, they themselves claim that their view of the analysed texts is just one of several possible views.

2.1.6.1 *Linguistic Criticism* by R. Fowler, the first edition of which was published in 1986, is one of the first monographs of this kind. The main task of linguistic criticism is defined here as reflexive understanding of the transmission and transformation of values in culture, rather than merely reproducing values dominant at that time, as literary criticism often does. Linguistic criticism studies texts not as timeless artefacts, but as products of a particular period of writing and reading. The criticism itself is regarded as a dynamic phenomenon: "The significance of the

text changes as cultural conditions, and beliefs, change, and so criticism is a dynamic process" (Fowler 1996: 251).

Fowler's monograph uses as its main theoretical basis several concepts of *cognitive linguistics*, as developed during the 1970s-1980s especially by G. Lakoff. The starting point is that language provides its users with an instrument for classification of phenomena present in the surrounding world and for their orientation in it. According to the features they have in common, these phenomena can be divided into various *categories.* Some of the categories are *natural*, based on physiological capabilities of the human body (e.g. recognizing colours), but most of them are *social* (e.g. which animals usually come into the category of "pets" and which do not). The social categories are results of conventions existing within a society and people acquire them gradually by learning as they grow up (Fowler 1996: 23ff.).

Our experience is organized by means of schemes which include features typical of a particular event, profession etc.; these schemes are often referred to using the original Greek expressions – *schema* (sg.)/ *schemata* (pl.). Since most of the categories and schemata are learned, it may be assumed that at least some of them, although to a different extent, are common to most people living in a particular community (Fowler 1996: 240–241). Such common-sense assumptions and attitudes through which the world can be transformed and interpreted are called e.g. *world-view*, *hypoworks* or *ideologies.* As Fowler explicitly states, the last term is not used in its traditional meaning which is applied to theories presenting a false and distorted view of reality. In a way all theories do this, as they all are interpretations and representations rather than reflections (Fowler 1996: 26); hence the claim of the impossibility of reaching an *absolutely* objective view of reality.

Language is a means of expressing this kind of experience; it can serve to encode different views of how things and events in the world are organized (Fowler 1996: 33–34), for expressing various purposes, ideologies, points of view and strategies of communication present within discourses. As Fowler puts it, there is a tendency in language towards affirmation of fixed, sometimes prejudicial categories – and the task of linguistic criticism is seen as combating this tendency (Fowler 1996: 48). The tools which can be used for this purpose are a thorough knowledge of the historical and social background in which the analysed texts originated accompanied by a knowledge of the technique of linguistic analysis – e.g. function of the text, its cohesion, modality, the rules existing in the particular sphere of communication etc. This knowledge can considerably develop readers' awareness of the various factors playing

an important role in constituting texts and can enrich their competence in the language they are using.

2.1.6.2 The monograph *Competing Discourses: Perspective and Ideology in Language* by D. Lee (1992) examines two main topics: processes connected with classification of the perceived reality and the structure of various types of discourses. It starts with a brief survey of theoretical opinions from de Saussure to the present.

Lee investigates, among other things, the influence of ideologies on the way the same events are reported in different newspapers. This influence can be found for example in choosing expressions with negative or positive connotations (*riots* vs. *demonstrations*) or in different agent-patient structures (who caused what, who was the subject and who was the object of a certain action etc.). Attention is paid also to creating perspectives of various characters in fiction, to mutual relations of gender in language (characteristic features of male and female discourses) and to the metaphorical character of language communication in general – i.e. not only to metaphorical expressions which can be found in literary works. As in Fowler (1996), Lee uses as his theoretical background here the approach of cognitive linguistics. The approaches of G. Lakoff, as surveyed by Lee (1992: 71–83), are briefly mentioned in the next paragraph.

One of the possible ways in which metaphorical expressions can originate is structuring one domain of experience in terms of another domain of experience. Some metaphorical expressions are so deeply embedded in everyday language that the speakers no longer perceive them as metaphors – e.g. argument seen as war (*an indefensible claim, to shoot down sb's arguments, to attack weak points*), life as a journey through physical space (*to come through an experience, to run into difficulties, a problem is looming ahead*) etc. (Lee 1992: 71–83).

At this stage I will quote in detail another example of this kind, because it results in Lee's own definition of language and of the process of communication. When we talk for example about *radio shadow*, we are – through the use of language – structuring the domain of radio transmission in terms of the domain concerning the perception of light. This metaphor is based on the similarity between the diffusion of light and transmission of radio signals, both of which can be blocked by solid objects (Lee 1992: 81). As distinct from Lakoff, Lee points out that language cannot be regarded as a container of meaning or as a vehicle which, in the form of utterances, transfers meanings from speaker to addressee, as Lakoff puts it. The knowledge base of the addressees, which they use for interpreting utterances, must also be taken into consideration. The

above stated explanation of radio shadow will probably not be success-
ful if we use it when talking to a little child who might believe that there
are little people living in the radio.

Therefore language in Lee's view is more like a *catalyst* in a chemical
reaction: utterances interact with addressees' sets of conceptual struc-
tures – i.e. with their knowledge base – and meaning is then a product,
a result of this reaction (Lee 1992: 81). Knowledge of various ways of
shaping and expressing reality in the process of communication pro-
vides more possibilities for analysing in detail the structure of discours-
es and the ideologies present within them.

2.1.6.3 *Language, Ideology and Point of View* written by P. Simpson (1993)
is devoted to a similar topic. As the title indicates, this work concentrates
mainly on ways in which point of view is represented by language and
on the extent it is influenced by various ideologies. In other words, this
book tries to decode the stylistic choices which shape the meaning of
the text (Simpson 1993: 8). The material is taken from both literary and
non-literary texts, the latter including mainly newspaper articles and ad-
vertisements.

Simpson in his brief survey of ways of investigating point of view
distinguishes three approaches: the *structuralist* approach (the term
structuralist applies here above all to French structuralism as repre-
sented e.g. by the works of R. Barthes), the *generative* approach and
the *interpersonal* approach. The *structuralist approach* aims at reveal-
ing the macrostructure of the text as a whole, while the *generative ap-
proach* focuses on the microstructure of sentences constituting the text.
The *interpersonal approach* investigates a wider range of problems – it
deals not only with the composition of texts but also with devices used to
orientate/slant the messages towards the readers or hearers (Simpson
1993: 30ff.).

Point of view itself is described at three basic levels: 1) *spatial and
temporal* point of view, 2) *psychological* point of view and 3) *ideological*
point of view. *Spatial and temporal points of view* relate to the viewing
position of the narrators, to their presentation of space and time within
the discourse. This level is connected with concepts of spatial and tem-
poral deixis, as expressed by pronouns such as *this, that,* adverbs *here,
there, now, then* etc. *Psychological point of view* reflects means by which
narrators construct their own view of the particular story. This applies
above all to literary texts where a rich variety of narrative modes exist
(see section 3.5.4), which can express various degrees of the narrators'
control of the narrative, the type of narrative in terms of its proximity to

the narrator's discourse, to the characters' discourse or to the transition-al types in between. In investigating *ideological point of view* Simpson examines chiefly value systems and sets of beliefs present in texts as well as the way they are presented (e.g. gender in language).

This definition and stratification of point of view is complemented by a thorough practical analysis of texts based on concepts of modality, transitivity, speech and thought presentation – narrative modes etc. The analysis uses also techniques and approaches developed by semantics, pragmatics and discourse analysis.

2.1.6.4 The last monograph dealt with in this section, *Feminist Stylistics* by S. Mills (1995), investigates in detail one particular type of ideology present in texts – the way gender is presented in various types of dis-courses. At the beginning the author provides a model of approaching texts from the feminist perspective.

This model deals mainly with elements constituting the context of a particular work. The context is divided into two main parts: the *context of production* and the *context of reception. Context of production* includes *literary conventions and trends* of the particular period, *publishing practices*, or *textual antecedents* of the literary work concerned. *Context of reception* includes *intended and actual audience, implied and actual reader* etc.; *social and historical factors* such as the economic, so-cial and cultural situation should be taken into consideration in both the above mentioned parts of context (Mills 1995: 31ff.). All these ele-ments are examined with respect to the extent to which they may in-fluence presentation of gender in published texts. This is the case with literary conventions in particular types of texts and periods based on the dominant role of men and the submissive role of women, publishers' demands for texts written in a way which will suit the market etc.

From this point of view Mills analyses three levels of language, fo-cusing on differences in the presentation of genders and also on some examples of sexist usage of language; the term *sexism* is defined in this work as "irrelevant and derogatory reference to gender; sexism usually consists of statements which are derogatory to women" (Mills 1995: 211).

At the basic levels of *vocabulary* so-called *generic pronouns and nouns* are examined. The term *generic* refers to words which present a male-oriented experience as a norm for all human beings. This applies for instance to pronouns *he/him/his* in sentences such as "when an au-thor has completed *his* manuscript, *he* can send it to the publishers", to words containing prefix or affix "man" – *man*-power, *man*-hours, chair-*man*, post*man*, fisher*man* etc. (Mills 1995: 87ff.). At the level of *phrases/*

sentences the focus is on established phrases and idioms presupposing and expressing male dominance and superiority. Among the examples and commentaries given by Mills there is e.g. the phrase "old wives' tale" interpreted as a negative reference to any knowledge or practice outside the sphere of male expertise (Mills 1995: 129). This level includes also commentaries on the representation of male and female characters with regard to *transitivity choices*, i.e. to the agent-patient relations within sentences (*who acts* and *who is acted upon*). These choices are one of the features which play an important role in shaping ideologies present in a particular text – in some types of texts there usually are *active men* vs *passive women*. Finally, at the level of *discourse* Mills concentrates on stereotypes of describing male and female characters and also on stereotyped ways of presenting male and female positions and roles. According to Mills, there are more expressions used to describe the appearance of female characters than of male characters; in newspaper reports women are usually referred to in terms of their relation to other people (*mother of…*) or to their appearance (*a trim brunette*), while men are usually described with reference to their occupations etc. (Mills 162–163).

This monograph ends with a brief overview of the present-day situation. To be aware of the ways gender can be presented in various types of discourse is very useful; it is also useful to be aware of the fact that these types of discourses are not universal – they relate to a particular type of society in a particular period of time, which means that it is possible to influence and change this situation, mainly through the language. This can be done both by analysing and criticizing existing discourses and also by creating new types of discourses based on different points of view (Mills 1995: 198–199). At the end of this work, a methodology is added which can be used for critical analysis concerning ways gender is presented in texts.

2.2   Present-day situation of British stylistics

As can be seen from the works surveyed in this chapter, British theories of style are very closely connected with the development in other theoretical disciplines. The interdisciplinary approach to style, which is another point for the comparison carried out in the following chapter, can be regarded as the common denominator of most of the works surveyed, especially the newer ones; this applies to both the theoretical and practical works. Of course, there is considerable variability in the

disciplines whose methodology is used for stylistic investigations. For Crystal and Davy (1969) it is above all general linguistics, Turner (1973) includes in his work also a sociolinguistic point of view, Fowler (1986, 1996), Simpson (1993) and Mills (1995) approach stylistic investigations using the methodology of cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, gender studies etc.

The theoretical attention has gradually been expanded also to non-literary texts and, as can be seen from the range of disciplines used for stylistic investigations, the scholars started to focus not only on the texts themselves, but also on the context in which the texts are rooted. As Birch (1994: 4382) puts it: "...a critical study of language, which recognizes political, social and cultural theory as essential to its own theoretical base is not just a study of the structures of the language and style of a text, but is a study of the institutions that shape the various ways in which language means. ... Interpretation is never separated from analysis; explanation is never separated from description; critique is never separated from praxis."

2.3   Czech works on the stylistics of the English language

There are several works concerning stylistics of the English language written by Czech scholars; the expression *stylistics of the English language* is used here because the works do not deal only with British English. Three important works of this kind will be mentioned here; two of them were written in Czech – Knittlová (1990), Knittlová (1995), one in English – Vachek (1974). All these works were published on the Czech territory and served mainly as textbooks for Czech university students of English. Although theoretical approaches towards stylistics developed in English-speaking countries are usually incorporated into these textbooks, the methodology used for characterizing English texts is based above all on Czech theories of style – on the concept of four main functional styles, objective and subjective stylistic factors etc.

As can be seen from this basic characterization, these works do not fully match the criteria stated in the Introduction, therefore they were not included among the main sources used for the study of British theories of style. Nevertheless, they are relevant to the subject of this work and will be briefly commented upon.

2.3.1   In 1974, J. Vachek published a textbook *Chapters from Modern English Lexicology and Stylistics.* It was a textbook for university stu-

dents; its main aim was to provide a practical introduction to lexicology and stylistics of Czech and English rather than to create a theoretical work focused on a contrastive view of these two disciplines.

The section dealing with stylistics starts with a basic description of the theoretical basis of Czech stylistics. It serves as a background against which stylistics of the English language is characterized. This introductory part presents Czech theory of style, including the concept of functional styles, as developed by members of the Prague Linguistic Circle in the 1920s and 1930s and established during the following decades (see section 1.2); Vachek himself, although much younger than Mathesius, Jakobson, Havránek or Mukařovský, was also a member of Prague Linguistic Circle.

Vachek's definitions of stylistics and style presented in this work are in accordance with the structuralist and functional approach. *Stylistics* is defined as a discipline examining the language system with respect to the means which provide ways of differentiating various texts according to their function (Vachek 1974: 125); *style* is defined as an individual, unifying character present in any work resulting from intentional activity (Vachek 1974: 125). This definition is very close to the one used in Hausenblas (1971) (see section 1.3.6.1). Vachek suggests three basic criteria for classifying styles: classification according to the *approach to the subject matter* (texts focused on the *content* vs texts focused on the *form* of the message), classification according to the *approach to the recipient* (text *containing an appeal* towards the addressee vs texts *not containing* this appeal) and classification according to the *medium* used (*spoken* vs *written* texts) (Vachek 1974: 168, 194).

As far as the stylistics of the English language is concerned, Vachek refers not only to modern theoretical works on style such as Spencer, ed. (1964), Crystal, Davy (1969), or Turner (1973), but also to older works dealing with this subject – e.g. to the German textbooks *Neuenglische Stilistik* by P. Aronstein (1922) and *Neuenglische Wortkunde* by M. Deutschbein (1936). Both are, as Vachek puts it, based on G. T. Warner's book *On the Writing of English* (1915).

Besides examining stylistic textbooks, Vachek also turns his attention to books such as *The King's English* (first published 1912) and *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (first published 1926), both of them written by H. W. Fowler, which deal with concepts of usage and norms of standard language. These concepts are closely related to general problems of style – style is usually investigated on the background of language norms and standards of the particular period. Nevertheless, the development of language standards in Modern Czech and Modern

English is not the main subject of this work, therefore these problems will not be examined in greater detail here.

2.3.2 Two textbooks written by D. Knittlová – *Funkční styly v angličtině a češtině* (Functional Styles of English and Czech, 1990) and *Teorie překladu* (Theory of translation, 1995) were primarily aimed at Czech university students of English, especially at future translators. Therefore attention is paid above all to practical problems of translation from the viewpoint of stylistics. In this respect, Knittlová's texts are quite close for example. to *Comparative Stylistics of French and English* (first published 1958, English version 1995) by J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet; on the contrastive approach to languages, with particular regard to stylistics see 3.1.

These two textbooks can be regarded as complementary to each other. Knittlová (1990) begins with a brief survey of Czech and foreign approaches to style, predominantly of the functional ones. One of the sources for this survey is Vachek (1974). Then Knittlová focuses on an important part of the Czech theoretical approach – on so-called functional styles. Since this is a practical textbook, most attention is paid to non-literary functional styles – to *technical, journalistic* and *administrative* styles. Stylistic norms existing in Czech and English technical, journalistic and administrative texts are in turn analysed and compared. The main criterion for a successful translation is to perform the same function and to have possibly the same effect on the recipient as the original text – i.e. the so-called *principle of functional equivalence* (Knittlová 1990: 5).

The facts investigated in *Funkční styly v angličtině a češtině* are used as a theoretical basis for *Teorie překladu.* This recent textbook focuses on general problems of translation rather than on theory of style. Nevertheless, the results obtained by analysing stylistic norms of Czech and English texts belonging to non-literary functional styles were also included into the newer textbook. As mentioned above, *Funkční styly v angličtině a v češtině* and *Teorie překladu* can be regarded as complementary to each other. The former work analyses the non-literary styles, the latter deals also with texts belonging to literary style. Special attention is paid to translating stylistic differences appearing in the original texts and substandard expressions of various kinds – dialectisms, slang, vulgar expressions. These two textbooks by Knittlová thus cover practically the whole range of texts existing in language and provide very useful information about stylistic aspects of translation.

2.3.3   One of the textbooks on stylistics of the English language available to Czech linguists and used by both Vachek and Knittlová is the

textbook *Stylistics* written by the Russian linguist I. R. Galperin. The Russian original was first published in 1958, its English version in 1971 and the second, revised edition of the English version in 1977. Since it was quite influential in the Czech context, it will also be included in this section. This textbook is based both on Russian stylistic studies and on the works of many foreign scholars, such as S. Chatman, D. Crystal, D. Davy, R. Jakobson, R. Quirk, I. A. Richards, R. Wellek and many others.

For describing the style of English texts Galperin uses his own methodology, based on the functional approach. In this respect his work is similar to that of Vachek and Knittlová. After general notes on style and stylistics and varieties of English, including an outline of the development of Standard English, Galperin concentrates on stylistic aspects of English vocabulary and syntax. At the end he establishes five basic functional styles in English – *belles-lettres* (i.e. literary) *style*, *publicistic style*, *newspaper style*, *scientific prose style* and *style of official documents*. As we can see, this classification is limited only to written texts, spoken texts are not included. Another interesting aspect of Galperin's approach is that texts appearing in newspapers are divided into two categories – *publicistic* and *newspaper* style; this classification is used also in Knittlová (1990). The basic criterion here is – as Galperin puts it – that genres belonging to the publicistic style, e.g. a *commentary* or an *essay*, contain a direct appeal to the addressee; *suasive function* can thus be considered their primary function (Galperin 1977: 287). On the other hand, genres of newspaper style, *brief news, headlines, advertisements and announcements,* are aimed mainly at providing information (Galperin 1977: 295–297) without the appeal to the addressee.

However, this criterion seems to be somewhat confusing. Besides giving a certain amount of information every journalistic text does contain an appeal to the addressee. If we, for instance, agreed with Galperin's classification, which classifies advertisements as purely informative texts, it would in fact imply that the form of advertisements is totally unimportant – which is obviously not the case – and that the very necessity of their existence is questionable.

From the viewpoint of present-day Czech stylistics, suasive function is the basic function of all texts belonging to journalistic style, even though the extent to which it is present in these texts varies quite considerably (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 176). Moreover, the suasive function can be performed also by selecting news of a certain type and by organizing it in the newspaper. Texts belonging to journalistic style can be divided into three main groups according to the genres in which similar stylistic norms apply. There are texts belonging to *inform-*

ative genres (news, reports, interviews, advertisements), *analytical genres* (editorials, commentaries, critiques) and *literary genres* (columns, sketches) (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 195–199).

Although Galperin's approach may today be viewed as a bit dated in some respects, at the time when his textbook appeared it was one of the valuable sources of information for Czech linguists about stylistics of the English language with an original approach to the subject.