Křístek, Michal

Comparison of Czech and British theories of style

3   Comparison of Czech and British theories of style

3.1   Theoretical preliminaries

Having surveyed the most important Czech and British works on style, I will now try to compare the theoretical bases of Czech and British stylistics. Before focusing on contrastive approach in regard to stylistics, I will briefly deal with contrastive approach to languages in general.

3.1.1 *Main aims of comparing languages*

It is possible to compare the grammatical structure of two or more languages to find out details about their origin and possible common ancestors. It is also possible to compare them for the purpose of genetic or typological classification (Matthews 1997: 62–63).

These approaches can be traced many centuries back – detailed descriptions of language structures appear as early as the Classical Period. These works, starting from Panini's grammar of Sanskrit through works of Plato, Aristotle or Quintilian, served as sources for modern comparative studies of languages which started to appear in the 18th century. One of these works, a paper presented by W. Jones in 1786, is of considerable importance. On the basis of Panini's grammar, Jones compares Sanskrit, Greek and Latin, anticipating the reconstruction of their possible common source; in present-day terminology of Indo-European. From the 18th to the 20th centuries Jones's pioneering work in the field of comparative linguistics was followed by many other scholars – by R. C. Rask (*Investigation into the Origin of Old Norse or Icelandic Language,* 1814), J. Grimm (*Deutsche Grammatik*, 2nd ed. 1822), K. Brugmann and B. Delbrück (*Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 1886–1900), F. de Saussure (*Cours de linguistique générale*, 1916) and L. Bloomfield (*Language*, 1933) (Potter 1960: 144–161).

In the 20th century, contrastive analyses of languages started to serve – besides the above mentioned diachronically orientated investigations – also as an aid for improving language teaching. By comparing various levels of two languages it was possible to predict the students' difficulties and to build results of the analysis into teaching materials (Rinebom 1994 : 737–738).

3.1.2 *Contrastive approach and stylistics*

Comparing grammatical systems of languages and equivalent means of expression which exist at all levels of language can be very fruitful from the synchronic point of view for translation studies as well. This type of contrastive language studies is quite close to the sphere of stylistics. Choosing from several options is a procedure connected not only with creating, but also with translating a text. When the means of expression of two languages are compared, their stylistic values must also be taken into consideration. This is the basic level of abstraction closest to applied stylistics rather than to theoretical stylistics.

3.1.2.1 Contrastive stylistic analysis of means of expression for the purpose of translation is considered here, as mentioned above, the basic level of contrastive approaches towards stylistics. This approach is applied e.g. in a methodological textbook *Comparative Stylistics of French and English* (1958, English version 1995) by J.-P. Vinay and J. Darbelnet, which was already briefly mentioned in section 3.5.2. The translation should be equivalent to the original not only as far as the factual content of the text is concerned, but also with respect to its degree of formality, connotations included in it etc. The authors – referring partly to terminology introduced by C. Bally – call the discipline dealing with comparative studies of this kind *comparative stylistics* – or, because it relates to more languages that one, *external* comparative stylistics – and define its main purpose as "to identify the expressive means of two languages by contrasting them" (Vinay, Darbelnet 1995: 16–17). This concept may serve as an example of applied rather than theoretical stylistics.

However, the term *comparative stylistics* can be applied to more concepts than to comparing means of expression with regard to their stylistic values for the purpose of translation, which can be considered the basic level of comparative stylistics. The other, more abstract levels of comparative stylistics deal not only with comparing the stylistic values of the elements of language, but also with comparing the elements belonging to the sphere of metalanguage, such as definitions of style and stylistics, stylistic norms etc.

3.1.2.2 Textbooks written by D. Knittlová (see section 2.2.2) can serve as an example of works belonging to the more abstract level of comparative stylistics. In her works, the approach from the viewpoint of applied stylistics is based on a general theoretical background. She begins by giving a brief description of the terminology and methodology used by present-day Czech and foreign stylistics. Then she chooses one part of

Czech stylistic theory, the concept of functional styles, and with respect to an adequate translation compares the stylistic norms of Czech and English texts belonging to the particular functional styles.

3.1.2.3 Vachek (1974) (see section 2.2.1) is one level of abstraction higher than Knittlová (1990) and Knittlová (1995). There are two main differences in this textbook compared to Knittlová's works. Firstly, Vachek's textbook is concerned only with the theory of style, not with the practical application of theoretical rules. Secondly, he deals with theory of style not only from the synchronic, but also from the diachronic point of view, paying attention especially to works created during the 20th century. Vachek's work provides students with basic information about stylistic theories concerning Czech and English. Since it is the first modern Czech work of this kind, it focuses mainly on detailed description as a first step to a systematic comparison rather than on such a comparison itself. Nevertheless, it is the first theoretical attempt at contrasting the stylistics of Czech and English.

3.1.2.4 The monograph *Štýlové konfrontácie* (Style Confrontations, 1976) by the Slovak linguist F. Miko was already briefly mentioned in section 1.3.5. Among Czech and Slovak theoretical works on style and stylistics this is the first one in which a general methodology for systematic contrastive analysis of style is developed. As well as in his other works, Miko's approach is closely related to structuralist and functional theories as developed by Czech and Slovak linguists since the 1930s.

In this work, Miko concentrates on stylistic confrontations of texts written in different languages – i.e. on *external* comparative stylistics, not on *internal* stylistics which examines the stylistic values of means of expression only within one language (Vinay, Darbelnet 1995: 16–17). Three main levels of abstraction on which comparative stylistics can operate are distinguished here (Miko 1976: 17–19). The basic level deals with styles existing in particular languages, with stylistic norms applied within them and with stylistic values of means of expression existing at all levels of language. As Miko puts it, comparative stylistics on this level differs from comparative linguistics. Comparative stylistics at the basic level does not pay attention only to corresponding means of expression in the original text and translation, but above all to their expressional values. In accordance with Miko's functional approach, the focus is especially on examining to what extent these means of expression can contribute to expressing various expressional categories (Miko 1976: 21); a brief characterization of Miko's expressional theory of style is giv-

en in section 1.3.5. The results of these examinations are usually used in translation studies. Among works mentioned so far, Vinay, Darbelnet (1995), Knittlová (1990) and Knittlová (1995) belong to this category.

On a higher level, stylistic systems of particular languages can be compared. According to Miko, this is the proper sphere of comparative stylistics. The number of styles in the particular languages contrasted, the hierarchy of these styles and their mutual relations are examined at this level as well as the extent to which the styles and their stylistic norms are established.

Comparative stylistics on the highest level examines each of the compared languages with regard to the character of its language standard, the extent to which the norms of the standard language are established, fixed and respected. Attention is also paid to the relation of the standard language towards dialects and to spheres in which particular varieties are used.

3.2 The methodology used for comparison

Among the three above mentioned levels of abstraction, on which according to Miko comparative stylistics operates, the middle one is closest to the approach applied in this work. Nevertheless, the stylistic systems will be examined more broadly than suggested by Miko – attention will be paid not only to existing styles, their mutual relations etc., but above all to the general theoretical background of the particular conceptions of style.

The basic points of comparison will be, as already briefly mentioned in the Introduction, present-day definitions of style and stylistics, the position of this discipline among other theoretical disciplines and its relation to them, stratification of stylistics and the concept of function as used in Czech and British theories of style. Possible mutual influences of Czech and British theories of style will also be included.

Since the survey of British theories of style given in the second part of this work included fewer theoretical works than the Czech survey, the data about British stylistics will be for the purpose of comparison based also on the following general theoretical sources: *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (Asher, ed. 1994; 10 vols.), *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (Bright, ed. 1992; 4 vols.), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics* (Matthews 1997). Several important works focused above all on theory and history of stylistics, such as *A Dictionary of Stylistics* (Wales 1997), *The Stylistics Reader* (Weber, ed. 1996), *Style and Stylistics* (Hough 1969) and *Stylistics* (Bradford 1997) will also be

used for reference. Another reason for this choice is that most of the works surveyed in the second chapter provide above all a view of how the theoretical approaches have gradually been developing, whereas the above mentioned general works represent the most recent views of the concepts discussed here.

3.3   Definitions of style and stylistics

3.3.1   Most Czech theories of style are based on the so-called *selective conception of style.* It is based on a definition of style as a selection and organization of means of expression within a text. If we are dealing with a finished text, not with a text which is just being created, then style can be defined as the main principle according to which the text is organized (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 9) This definition is rooted in Havránek's works from the 1930s-1940s; a similar approach can be found as early as the 19th century in Jungmann's textbook *Slovesnost*, mentioned in section 1.2.2. In the late 1960s another important conception, the so-called *expressional theory of style*, was developed. Style is defined here as a configuration of expressional categories within a text represented by linguistic means of expression (see 1.3.5).

The selective theory has retained its dominant position and both theoretical and practical stylistics still employ the above stated definition without any substantial modifications. This definition proved to be so general that it is suited to any type of text. Circumstances which influence the style of a text are usually investigated within the concept of stylistic factors and do not concern the definition of style as such.

Contemporary Czech stylistics is defined as a theoretical discipline whose main purpose lies in analysing principles according to which texts of various kinds are created, in other words in analysing their *style* (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 9). This general definition can be further modified. The term stylistics can cover observations of stylistically marked means of expression at all levels of language, without examining in detail other aspects of the text, such as its thematic structure. It can also mean analysis only of literary texts and their structure or examining and establishing rules for creating texts of different kinds. Consequently, stylistics based on the above stated definition is not a homogeneous subject, but rather a discipline related to various other theoretical disciplines

3.3.2 In British theoretical works, several definitions of style can be found. The most general ones describe style as a typical way in which one or more people do a particular thing. This definition is similar to the one stated in some Czech works, e.g. in Hausenblas (1971) – see section 1.3.6.1. If we leave aside these definitions, which can relate for example to style in architecture, music, teaching or to life-style, and concentrate only on style in language, several definitions can be found. Style in language behaviour is generally defined as alternative ways of expressing the same content (Short 1994 : 4375). Another general definition refers to style as variation in literary or non-literary texts, as determined by aesthetic and contextual factors; in terms of textual units whose style can be examined, style is regarded as a suprasentential phenomenon (Carter, Cureton 1992: 79–80).

There are also several more specific definitions of style in language. Style can be defined as a linguistic choice of means of expression repeated on an iterative basis, as a feature relating primarily only to the content of the text (i.e. the choice of what is expressed and represented), as a characteristic feature of a particular text or as a feature common to texts produced by a particular individual or group of individuals (group styles) (Short 1994: 4375–4378).

If the circumstances under which a particular text is produced are taken into consideration, style can be defined as a manner of expression depending on the situation, medium and the degree of formality. It is a variation in language use, both literary and non-literary. Style can also be seen as the sum of distinctive features connected with various texts, genres, periods etc., consequently, as a result of a certain choice (Wales 1997: 435–436).

Definitions of stylistics presented in the above mentioned sources are usually based on the main subject investigated. Stylistics is defined in them as a discipline studying style or – more broadly – variations in language use (Birch 1994 : 4378; Matthews 1997: 357). Wales (1997: 437) adds that approaches to stylistics usually differ by the definitions of style employed. The definition of stylistics as a discipline dealing with variations in language is thus based on the definition of style as a result of a certain choice, usually a choice of topic and linguistic means of expression (Short 1994: 4375–4378; Wales 1997: 435–436). The variations themselves can be described as variations in usage among literary and other texts or more generally as any systematic variations relating to the type of discourse or its context (Matthews 1997: 357).

3.4   Relations of stylistics to other theoretical disciplines

Both Czech and British stylistics can be characterized as borderline dis-
ciplines sharing points of contact with other theoretical disciplines. The
relation of stylistics to several other disciplines will be dealt with in the
following sections.

3.4.1 *Stylistics and linguistics*

3.4.1.1 As Czech theoretical works put it, stylistic analysis includes
among other things an analysis of the language of a text and the identifi-
cation of stylistically marked/unmarked means of expression occurring
at all its basic levels – phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical,
the syntactic level including both the syntax of utterances and textual
syntax (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 10).

Stylistics is usually regarded as a discipline which is in a hierar-
chically higher position than e.g. phonology, morphology, syntax and
lexicology. As distinct from these linguistic disciplines, stylistics is not
concerned only with an inventory of phonological, morphological etc.
means of expression existing in a language, but primarily with their role
within a certain context. To characterize their function in a text properly
stylistic analysis must always take the context into consideration.

The main aim of stylistic analysis is to characterize the relation of
the means of expression used in a particular text to standard language,
to describe to what extent the stylistic values of the means of expression
apply to the stylistic norms of the sphere to which the text belongs and
to comment on the functions of the means of expression within a text.

3.4.1.2 British stylistics also works with models and terminology exist-
ing in various fields of linguistics if they are felt to be relevant for analys-
ing a particular text. These methods are usually applied to avoid vague
and impressionistic judgements (Wales 1997: 438). If the relations be-
tween stylistics and linguistics are described in terms of subordination,
the conclusions, just as in case of Czech theories of style, depend very
much on the perspective from which this problem is approached. From
the viewpoint of theoretical linguistics strictly limited to investigating
means of expression existing at all levels of language, stylistics can be
seen as a peripheral kind of applied analysis.

In this context it is also useful to mention R. Jakobson's commentary
on this problem as presented in his paper *Linguistics and Poetics* (1960).
According to Jakobson, linguistics has the status of a global science of
verbal structure, while poetics deals primarily with the structure of verbal

messages regarded as works of art. Texts of the latter type are examined by poetics with focus on their specific features in relation both to other arts and to other forms of verbal behaviour. From this point of view, it is possible to regard poetics as an integral part of linguistics (Jakobson 1960: 350). Following Jakobson's scheme, it would be possible to place stylistics midway between linguistics and poetics, because stylistics investigates the structure and characteristic features of all kinds of verbal messages, not only of those belonging to the sphere of art. (However, current trends in analysing the structure of texts go beyond the sphere of linguistic description – techniques used by semantics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics etc. are applied here as well.)

As far as the term *linguistic stylistics* is concerned, it is useful to be aware of at least two different meanings it has at present. Wales (1997: 438) stresses that the term *linguistic stylistics* need not relate only to stylistics using linguistic models, but also to the branch of stylistics intended to refine a linguistic model which has potential for further linguistic or stylistic analysis. In this work the term is used with only the former meaning.

3.4.2 *Stylistics and theoretical disciplines investigating literary works of art*

3.4.2.1 Czech terminology distinguishes three main theoretical disciplines dealing with all texts regarded as literary works of art, i.e. with poetry, fiction and drama. These three theoretical disciplines are *literary history*, *literary theory* and *literary criticism.* In the Czech terminological system, these disciplines are regarded as three main branches of a complex discipline referred to as *literární věda* ("literary science") (Vlašín, ed. 1977: 205–207).

Of these three disciplines, literary theory in particular investigates problems similar to stylistics. Literary history and literary criticism operate mainly with results of these investigations. Nevertheless, there is one important point of contact between literary history and stylistics. When stylistic factors influencing the style of older texts are examined, a detailed knowledge of the particular period is needed, which is the field of literary history. But – as mentioned above – it is literary theory which has a similar field of interest to stylistics.

The difference between these two disciplines lies in the angle from which they approach the texts analysed. From the viewpoint of stylistics, literary texts are just one group of texts whose style can be examined, mainly by analysing its language and the stylistic values of the means of expression used (as mentioned in section 2.2.1). The most important dis-

tinctive feature of literary texts, compared with texts of any other kind, is that they are not intended merely to provide a certain amount of information, but also to present aesthetic values. In Jakobson's terms these texts perform not only a referential, but also a poetic function (Jakobson 1960: 353–356). Stylistic analysis takes into consideration the ways these functions are expressed.

Literary theory, besides considering the relationship between literature and the social life of a particular period, concentrates also on what is called *teorie literárního díla* – theory of literary work itself. This term includes the style and genre of the text as well as problems of textual criticism (Vlašín, ed. 1977: 386). Stylistic investigations constitute a part of the analysis carried out from the viewpoint of literary theory and investigations of the style of a literary work can thus be considered a point of contact between stylistics and literary theory (see section 1.3.2.5).

From this point of view it is therefore possible to conclude that the position of literary theory is hierarchically higher than that of stylistics. Analysis of style is just one component of the complex theoretical analysis of a literary work, which includes its relations to extralinguistic reality, the genesis of the final version of the text, etc. However, this applies only to the sphere of examining literary works of art. If all kinds of texts are taken into consideration, it is stylistics which can be considered hierarchically higher, as it can analyse not only literary texts, but also texts of any other type.

3.4.2.2 There are two main sources of modern British stylistics, especially literary stylistics. These sources are *synchronic linguistic examination* and *literary criticism*, the former being connected especially with European, the latter with Anglo-American scholars.

Both of these conceptions originated as a reaction against approaches dominating at the beginning of the 20th century. The synchronic investigations of languages as carried out by de Saussure, Bally, Spitzer and other scholars were a reaction against diachronically orientated Neo-grammarian approaches. The New Criticism, represented e.g. by the works of I. A. Richards, was focused above all on literary texts themselves, reacting thus to analyses which consisted mostly of describing the circumstances in which these texts originated and possible autobiographical elements present in them, but with hardly any attention paid to the structure of the texts as such (Hough 1969: 12–19). Since stylistics deals quite frequently with literary texts, it is considered to be important also for *literary criticism*. Some results of stylistic investigations might prove to be relevant also for *linguistic criticism*. (see section 2.1.6.1). This

applies for instance to the examination of prose rhythm started at the beginning of the 20th century by the Russian Formalists or to stylistic aspects of the syntactic organisation of a text (Carter, Cureton 1992: 84–86).

One of the purposes of stylistic investigations is to describe formal features of texts and to show the function of those features and their significance for the interpretation of these texts. Therefore the results of stylistic investigations of both literary and non-literary texts can also be used for improving methods of teaching literature and language, both to native and non-native speakers. This discipline is referred to as *practical criticism* or *practical stylistics* (Wales 1997: 367–368), see also section 3.5.2.3.3.

As can be seen from the previous passages, in British theoretical works the disciplines dealing with literary works of art are not separated as strictly as in the Czech works. As Wales (1997: 281–282) puts it, theoretical investigations of literary works are carried out not only by literary theory, but also by literary criticism or stylistics. From this point of view stylistics could be regarded as one of the alternatives to literary theory. (Nevertheless, this definition of stylistics is too narrow, since it excludes non-literary texts from stylistic investigations.)

Examining literary works of art is not limited only to the techniques dating back to the ancient and medieval textbooks of poetics which deal primarily with the form or aesthetic values of the investigated texts. The recent theoretical works are based also on disciplines such as general linguistics, philosophy, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics etc. It is therefore possible to conclude that the present-day trends in stylistics as well as in other scientific disciplines are orientated much more towards developing interdisciplinary approaches and establishing mutual cooperation rather than towards creating fixed hierarchies. The relationship of stylistics to sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics, which will be dealt with further on in sections 3.4.4 and 3.4.5 , can serve as an example of such an interdisciplinary cooperation.

3.4.3 *Stylistics and poetics, stylistics and rhetoric*
3.4.3.1 In the Czech context, the relationship of stylistics to poetics is very similar to that of stylistics and literary theory. From the synchronic point of view, *poetics* is defined as the part of literary theory dealing with the structure and organization of a literary work (Hrabák 1977: 11, Vlašín, ed. 1977: 281). The term *poetics* can also refer to a system of marked means of expression used in a particular text or to a textbook describing such a system and its rules (Vlašín, ed. 1977: 282). The first

meaning of the term is close to theoretical stylistics, the other to practical stylistics.

As far as the relationships of stylistics to poetics are concerned, the conclusions depend very much on the point of view adopted. The situation is similar to the above mentioned relationships of stylistics and literary theory. Poetics defined as a discipline investigating the structure of a literary work can be regarded as hierarchically higher than stylistics, investigating primarily the language of a particular text (Vlašín, ed. 1977: 282). Nevertheless, as mentioned in section 3.4.2.1, stylistics can analyse any kind of texts, not only the literary ones. Therefore it is possible to conclude that modern stylistics usually investigates a wider range of subjects than poetics.

The sphere covered by the other meaning of the term poetics is quite close to present-day practical stylistics. Both poetics and modern practical stylistics are based on a prescriptive approach. They present rules for creating texts of a certain kind and for reaching the intended communicative function – in this respect they are close also to rhetoric. The most important difference here is that modern practical stylistics is limited to presenting rules for creating texts belonging to the sphere of non-literary texts, such as contracts, business letters, private letters etc (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 10). On the other hand, poetic textbooks of previous centuries were also establishing rules for creating literary works of art – this is typical e.g. of the period of classicism.

3.4.3.2 British stylistics is from the diachronic point of view often regarded as a descendant of classical rhetoric rather than poetics (Bradford 1997: 3ff). It is connected especially with the part of rhetoric orientated towards studies of *elocutio*. This branch of rhetoric deals mainly with the style of expressing certain ideas, with the choice of rhythm, figures of speech etc. (Wales 1997: 139–140). The reason that stylistics is sometimes associated with rhetoric rather than with poetics may be that during the classical period style was regarded as part of the technique of persuasion and was therefore discussed within the sphere of oratory (Hough 1969: 1).

3.4.4 *Stylistics and sociolinguistics*
3.4.4.1 Stylistic analysis of a text takes into consideration also factors influencing the style of a text, in Czech terminology *stylistic factors* (see section 1.2.1.1). These factors constitute a link between stylistics and sociolinguistics. Stylistic factors can relate either to the text itself, to its function, topic, situational context, addressee etc. (so-called *objective*

stylistic factors), or to the authors of the text, to their age, social status, education, knowledge of the topic etc. (so-called *subjective stylistic factors*). Sociolinguistics defined as a discipline investigating correlations between linguistic and non-linguistic variables (Matthews 1997: 345) includes these factors, especially the subjective stylistic factors, among non-linguistic variables. A common feature of stylistics and sociolinguistics is the investigation of subjective stylistic factors, i.e. factors of an extra-linguistic nature relating to the author of the text. A psycholinguistic approach might be used here as well – psycholinguistics as a discipline investigating mechanisms for production and understanding speech (Matthews 1997: 303) can also be seen as relevant in this type of investigations.

The difference between stylistics and sociolinguistics lies in their aims. Stylistics focuses on analysing the style of a text and analysing the stylistic factors has only an auxiliary role, while sociolinguistics is centred on the mutual relations of linguistic and non-linguistic phenomena.

Since the field covered by stylistic examinations is very broad and includes both literary and non-literary texts, stylistics – or so-called general stylistics (Wales 1997: 438) – examines problems similar to those investigated by sociolinguistics. This applies to topics such as "fashions" existing in language, the language of writers regarded as social groups etc. The discipline dealing with these subjects is sometimes referred to as *sociostylistics* (Wales 1997: 438). In sociolinguistics, the term *style* relates, as mentioned in section 2.2.2, primarily to correlations among linguistic and non-linguistic variables (Matthews 1997: 345).

A more specific definition says that style refers to variations occurring in the speech of a single speaker in different situational contexts (Cheshire 1992: 324). The theoretical basis of this definition is very close to that of present-day stylistics – as mentioned in 3.1, the subject of stylistics can be described as variations in language. The different situational contexts are connected with the concept of *registers*, which is used in both stylistics and sociolinguistics for referring to a variety of language defined according to the situation (Wales 1997: 397–398). The choice of so-called *situational features* is influenced by three main variables: *field* (the subject matter), *medium/mode* (e.g. speech vs writing) and *tenor* (the relations among participants (e.g. their social roles).

3.4.5 *Stylistics and psycholinguistics*

Psycholinguistics, as Matthews (1997: 303) puts it, studies two main areas: the development of language in children (so-called *developmental psycholingustics*) and the psychological mechanisms for the production

and understanding of speech (so-called *experimental psycholinguistics*). The points of contact between stylistics and psycholinguistics can be found above all within the latter area.

It is for example the theory that style reveals the personality or psyche of the writer, presented in the 1920s-1930s by scholars such as B. Croce and K. Vossler (Wales 1997: 384). Another contact of the two disciplines is represented by applying the psycholinguistic techniques e.*g.* to investigating the perception and memorability of texts, especially the literary ones. Attention is also paid to the role played in these processes by factors such as rhymes, metaphors, imagery etc. A discipline dealing with tasks of this kind is sometimes referred to as *psychostylistics* (ibid.).

3.5   Stratification of stylistics

In this section the established stratification of present-day Czech and British stylistics will be considered first of all. This stratification will be followed by examining general distinctive features upon which the stratification is based.

3.5.1 *Stratification of Czech stylistics*
As already briefly mentioned in section 1.4, there are two main branches of present-day Czech stylistics – *theoretical stylistics* and *practical stylistics*. Theoretical stylistics analyses the style of texts of all kinds, focusing on the stylistic values of means of expression used. Since theoretical stylistics deals above all with language of the analysed texts, it is sometimes referred to as *linguistic stylistics* (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 10; Vlašín, ed. 1977: 367–368). If the same methodology is applied to literary texts, the term *literary stylistics* (Vlašín, ed. 1977: 367) can be also used as a term subordinated to theoretical stylistics; this applies especially to a situation where stylistic investigations are part of a complex analysis of a literary text.

The other main branch of stylistics, practical stylistics, uses the results of the investigations of theoretical stylistics (see section 1.1) to describe and to teach the rules governing the creation of texts of a certain kind. Present day practical stylistics deals especially with texts belonging to administrative style.

Theoretical and practical stylistics deal with the same subject – the style of a text. Theoretical stylistics deals with a richer variety of texts than practical stylistics. It is not limited only to texts of administrative style, but investigates texts of all kinds.

3.5.2 *Stratification of British stylistics*

British stylistics is stratified according to various criteria. In the following sections three main approaches will be considered. The first two are synchronically orientated. They are based on the types of texts studied by the particular branches of stylistics and on the purpose of the stylistic investigations. The third approach is orientated diachronically and deals with various theoretical conceptions of style as they have gradually developed during the 20th century.

3.5.2.1 If we use the *type of texts investigated* as the main criterion, two main branches of stylistics can be identified. The first one is *applied stylistics* investigating contextually distinctive varieties in language with particular reference to style as a linguistic phenomenon in non-literary, and partly also literary texts (Carter, Cureton 1992: 80). The other main branch is *literary stylistics*, which can generally be defined as the study of relevant differences among individual writers, periods or genres (Matthews 1997: 357). A more specific definition describes literary stylistics as the study of aesthetic use in language on phonetic, prosodic and lexicosyntactic levels, which appears both in predominantly aesthetic texts as well as in some others, e.g. in conversation (Carter, Cureton 1992: 81).

3.5.2.2 Another possible stratification can start with defining the *purpose of stylistic investigations.* In Birch 1994: 4378, three main branches based on this criterion are defined. The first branch analyses styles of texts, especially literary texts, for the purpose of better understanding the circumstances and the context of their production or the personality of the author. The second branch tries to provide a classification of various genres by their characteristic features or to attribute authorship to anonymous texts; statistical and computational analyses are frequently used here. The third branch uses stylistic analysis as a basis for the better understanding of language as a system. This applies to a language system in virtual time rather than to an actual communication in a real time.

This approach provides quite specific definitions of the purposes according to which stylistic investigations are stratified. However, this work is primarily concerned with comparing theoretical approaches towards stylistics, not with analysing or comparing concrete texts. It is therefore more convenient to use a general distinction of *description, prescription* and *evaluation* as three main purposes of stylistic investigations (see section 3.5.3.2).

3.5.2.3 Stratification of stylistics need not be strictly limited to the synchronic point of view, as presented in sections 3.5.2.1. and 3.5.2.2. It is also possible to deal with various branches of stylistics from the diachronic point of view and to observe their development with regard to their theoretical bases, mutual relations and contributions to further development of stylistics as a whole. The number of branches included in such a survey can of course vary according to the territory taken into consideration and to the criteria used to classify a group of theoretical works as a separate branch.

3.5.2.3.1 Bradford (1997: 12–14) suggests a basic classification according to parts of communicative acts, which are primarily investigated within various theoretical approaches, making a distinction between *textualist* and *contextualist* approaches (see also section 3.5.3.1).

Taken from the diachronic point of view, the textualist approaches are connected with the 1920s and 1930s Russian Formalists and the Prague School and also with Anglo-American New Criticism. These approaches are seen to stem directly from classical rhetoric, as they have maintained a belief in the empirical difference between literary and non-literary texts and tried to describe this difference in detail (Bradford 1997: 13). *Contextualist* theories, applied e.g. by R. Barthes or S. Fish, take into consideration also factors such as the competence and disposition of the reader, the methods of processing and interpreting various phenomena and sociocultural forces dominating linguistic discourses (Bradford 1997: 73).

3.5.2.3.2 In Asher, ed. (1994e: 4379–4382), three main branches of stylistics are distinguished. Firstly, *impressionist stylistics* based on description of features felt as stylistically relevant and on interpretation of their meaning in the text. This approach, connected to a considerable extent with literary criticism, is very often quite subjective; the Anglo-American school of the 1920s-1930s – New Criticism – can serve as an example of impressionist stylistics.

The second main branch is *structuralist linguistic stylistics*, which originated in the same period. However, the opinion expressed by Asher, ed. (1994e) that the structuralist conception represented a response to the mainly intuitive approach of impressionistic stylistics could be doubted. As already mentioned in section 3.2.3, structuralism and New Criticism originated independently during the first decades of the 20th century. Both structuralism and New Criticism represented alternatives to diachronically orientated Neo-grammarian approaches towards ex-

amining texts, rather than being intentionally in opposition to each oth-
er. Early structuralism is associated primarily with European scholars
– de Saussure, Bally, Russian Formalists, Prague School – and the New
Criticism especially with Anglo-American scholars, such as Richards,
Leavis, Forbes (Hough 1969: 12–19).

Structuralist stylistics uses *formalist* and *functional* methods. As
Asher, ed. (1994e) puts it, the difference between them lies in the motiva-
tion of linguistic structures. The *formalists* say that they are motivated
internally, by the principles of grammar, the *functionalists* say that they
are motivated *externally* by social and cultural forces. The structuralists
pay attention to both types of motivation for the purpose of an explicit
linguistic analysis. Stylistic approaches which are writer/speaker-cen-
tred, i.e. which take into account also the personality of the author are
sometimes called *expressive stylistics* (Wales 1997: 166); the more gen-
eral term *psycho-stylistics* refers to the approach focusing on research
into literary effects in general, above all on the basis of psycholinguis-
tics (Wales 1997: 384). The focus on writer/speaker can be found also in
Czech theories of style; see the dichotomy between objective and subjec-
tive stylistic factors, sections 1.2.1.1, 1.3.8.1. and 2.2.2.

The third main branch is *post-structuralistic* stylistics. This general
term refers to conceptions which examine not only the text, but also the
context; this term roughly corresponds to Bradford's contextual theo-
ries of style mentioned above. Post-structuralist conceptions are not lim-
ited only to the study of language and style of a text, they are also orien-
tated towards the study of the institutions that shape ways of expressing
ideas. These approaches are closely concerned with praxis – i.e. they are
not focused only on stylistic effects, but also on ways of constructing
reality and various ideologies by language. They also deal with the pos-
sibility of effecting changes in society through language, for example
opposing social injustice. For approaches of this kind, there is a term
radical stylistics (Wales 1997: 389).

3.5.2.3.3 The last stratification dealt with in this section was already
briefly introduced in section 2.1. This stratification is presented in Weber,
ed. (1996: 1–8) and it is aimed mainly at theories investigating literary
discourses in comparison with other types of discourses. Stylistics is di-
vided here into eight main branches as gradually developed within the
past thirty-forty years. This survey thus does not include New Criticism,
Russian Formalism or pre-war European structuralism.

Weber's survey gives a brief description of theoretical preliminaries
of the particular branches of stylistics and the names of several impor-

tant scholars representing each of these approaches. The survey starts with the theories of the 1950s-1960s based on structuralism. Formalist and functional approaches towards stylistics are here dealt with separately, unlike in the stratification mentioned in section 3.5.2.3.2. The subject that *formalist stylistics* (R. Jakobson) examines in greatest detail is the formal patterning of the literary texts rather than the readers' interpretations of these texts. *Functional stylistics* (M. Halliday) stresses that only those formal features which perform a certain function are considered stylistically relevant; this helps to narrow the gap between analysis and interpretation. However, this part of Weber's stratification does not take into consideration the fact that the functional approach had appeared already several decades earlier. It was an important part of the theoretical basis of the Prague School, of which Jakobson was a prominent member (see section 1.1.1).

The starting point of *affective stylistics* (S. Fish) is that stylistic effects are not located in the text itself as the formalists supposed, but in the activity of reading. Therefore the readers' assumptions, expectations and interpretative processes are most important. These approaches based on sources such as structuralism, reader response theory etc. are sometimes referred to as *new stylistics.* However, the label *new* may be somewhat misleading (Wales 1997: 319). This becomes quite apparent especially if we take into consideration that all these three approaches are above all connected with the 1950s-1960s and in Weber's stratification they are regarded more or less as a part of linguistic history. The attribute *contemporary* is in Weber's stratification applied especially to the theories developed from the 1970s to the present day.

Pedagogical stylistics (H. Widdowson, R. Carter, A. Durant, M. Cummings) is, as Weber puts it, one of two main important tendencies appearing during the 1970s. It is orientated to practical aims of stylistic investigation rather than only to the theoretical investigations themselves. This approach is sometimes also referred to as *practical criticism* or *practical stylistics* (Wales 1997: 367–368). One of these practical aims can be teaching/learning both of the students' mother tongue and of foreign languages. Problems of style play a very important role especially in the teaching of language and literature to foreign students. Such courses should – besides teaching grammar and vocabulary – develop the students' awareness of the fact that some means of expression are stylistically marked and their ability to recognize them; Enkvist (1964: 47) refers to this level as the level of *stylolinguistics*. As a further step, the students should be taught to use such means of expression in the proper contexts. This type of training should not therefore be only passive, but

also active; Enkvist (1964: 47) calls this level the level of *stylobehaviour-istics.*

Pragmatic stylistics (M. L. Pratt, M. Short) is a branch of stylistics connected with stylistic investigations focused on the context. Pragmatic stylistics is the other main trend that has been influential especially since the 1970s. The increasing importance of pragmatics, discourse analysis and theory of speech acts during that period influenced the establishment of pragmatic stylistics. The definition of style used in this branch is a compromise between the formalist/functionalist and affective approaches. From the viewpoint of pragmatic stylistics, style is an effect produced in, by and through the interaction between the text and the reader.

The main theoretical preliminaries of *critical stylistics* (R. Fowler, D. Birch) are that every representation through language is just an approximation to reality and that there is no neutral representation of this reality. In the relation between language and ideology, various social, cultural or intertextual factors play an important role. The scholars involved in critical stylistics take as their main task unmasking various ideologies and developing readers' awareness of the ways the ideologies are presented in texts. As distinct from some previous approaches, e.g. from the structuralists, they therefore see their final aim rather in interpretation than in objectivity.

Feminist stylistics (D. Burton, S. Mills) has a similar basis to critical stylistics. The main aim of this branch is to study the representation of women in literature and popular culture and to reach awareness of these ways which – as Weber puts it – would lead to resistance and linguistic and/or social change. One common theoretical preliminary of critical and feminist stylistics is that reality can be influenced by linguistic constructions.

The last branch included in Weber's survey is *cognitive stylistics* (G. Lakoff, D. Wilson). It is focused above all on the ways in which the assumptions of addressees influence their interpretation of texts. The active role of the addressees in constructing the indeterminate implicit content of utterances is also considered. These constructions are based on the principle of relevance, which is determined by the cultural and intertextual context, so for example a metaphor need not be viewed only as a matter of language, but also of thought. More broadly, cognitive linguistic disciplines focus above all on the way people classify phenomena of the surrounding world and their experience and on the way this classification is expressed in language.

As Weber suggests at the end of his survey, an important task for the future is to work on a synwork of cognitive and social approaches,

which would lead to creating a more complex and more effective model for stylistic investigations.

3.5.3 *Comparison of Czech and British stratifications of stylistics*

To be able to compare the stratifications of present-day Czech and British stylistics, it is necessary to establish the basis on which this comparison will be carried out. In the case of both Czech and British stylistics I will therefore try to establish some general criteria as the basis for their mutual comparison. I will concentrate here on two criteria: firstly, *parts of communicative acts* primarily investigated by stylistics, secondly, a *purpose* of stylistic investigations.

3.5.3.1   The classification of parts constituting communicative acts is taken from Jakobson (1960: 353ff). There are six parts described in this paper, each of tem connected with one of the basic functions of language: 1) *addresser* (emotive function), 2) *addressee* (conative function), 3) *context* seizable by the addressee; either verbal or capable of being verbalized (referential function), 4) *message* – usually represented by a text (poetic function), 5) *contact* – a physical channel and a psychological connection between the addresser and the addressee (phatic function) and 6) *code* common to the addresser and the addressee (metalingual function). Bradford (1997: 12–14) suggests a classification of theories of style according to the part of a communicative act on which the particular theories focus; he distinguishes *textual* vs *contextual* theories of style (see section 3.5.2.3.1).

From this point of view it may be said that contemporary Czech stylistics – both theoretical and practical – can be characterized as textual. Although factors influencing the style of a text, i.e. objective and subjective stylistic factors, are also taken into consideration for the purpose of analysis, the main focus is not on the context, but on the text itself, on its structure and on the means of expression used. British theories of style, on the other hand, are much more contextualized. Attention is paid not only to the text itself, but to a considerable extent also to readers' perception of the text and to extralinguistic factors which influence the communicative acts.

3.5.3.2 The other general criterion is the purpose of stylistic investigations, the basic aim of analysing a certain text. In this work three main purposes will be distinguished: *description, prescription* and *evaluation*.

The terms *description* and *prescription* are used especially in the sphere of examining language and establishing its standards. Theoretical

works can be focused either only on describing grammatical rules exist-ing within a particular language or – as a further, hierarchically higher step – on prescribing which of them are binding within a certain variety of language, usually within standard language. These rules are taught in schools, incorporated into manuals on correct usage etc. (Cullen 1994: 3310–3311; Milroy & Milroy 1992: 269).

Sometimes only the stages of description and evaluation are explic-itly distinguished, e.g. in Turner (1973: 233) or Wells (1960: 213), but pre-scription is always more or less implicitly also taken into consideration. In works which operate only with the scheme *description/evaluation*, prescription is usually included in the stage of *evaluation* by mentioning criteria according to which texts are judged. Although evaluation can be based on prescription given by someone other than the person carrying out the description and evaluation of the particular text, it need not al-ways be the case. Those who describe and evaluate texts can create their own norms and criteria.

If these three terms are applied to the stylistic analysis of texts, *de-scription* as the basic level includes creating an inventory of stylistically relevant means of expression appearing in the texts. The hierarchically higher level of *prescription* is focused on establishing rules concerning style of these texts, i.e. ways these means of expression are used in them. Since *evaluation* is based both on descriptive and prescriptive proce-dures, it can be regarded as the hierarchically highest level.

 In modern stylistics the term *evaluation* usually means assessment of the effectiveness or appropriateness of linguistic features to their per-ceived function. Although it was sometimes considered undesirable, e.g. by Crystal, Davy (1969), it is still an important part of stylistics (Wales 1997: 161).

Using this terminology, present-day Czech *theoretical* stylistics can be said to be mostly *descriptive*, *practical* stylistics *prescriptive*. *Evaluation* is primarily used in *literary criticism*, which is a separate part of literary science, where it may, but need not, follow a theoretical analysis of a lit-erary work. Another sphere in which the evaluative approach is applied to texts is teaching. All students' activities are evaluated in a way; texts produced by the students being also included among these activities. Various aspects of these texts can be evaluated – e.g. the students' abil-ity to express themselves, the extent to which they have managed to ac-quire language and communicative norms, the stylistic norms of various genres etc. Nevertheless, the evaluative approach applied here might be regarded as *secondary*, because it does not constitute the principles

upon which modern theoretical and practical stylistics are based. Even though texts belonging to the sphere of practical stylistics give recommendations and instructions, the evaluative approach – i.e. that ignoring these rules is usually considered negative – is usually only implicit.

British theories of style, especially the newer ones, such as pedagogical, critical or feminist stylistics, provide not only a description, but also an evaluation of certain features from the viewpoint of their ideological basis. As distinct from Czech theoretical approaches, which try to reach objectivity and neutrality, branches such as critical stylistics are based on the presupposition that this aim cannot be reached. It can therefore be said that the more recent British works on stylistics are *more evaluative* and *less orientated towards objectivity* than the Czech ones.

3.6   Functional concept in Czech and British theories of style

The systematic application of the functional approach to investigating texts can be regarded as perhaps the most original contribution of the Prague School to modern linguistics in general (see Daneš 1987, Fronek 1988 and Johnson, ed. 1978). A general survey dealing with views of function in linguistic investigations from Karl Bűhler's *Sprachtheorie* of the 1930s up to the present is given in Wales (1997: 195–199), a comparison of the various functional approaches is given by Leech (1987). Contemporary Czech stylistics is very firmly based on the functional approach, as well as practically all other linguistic and literary disciplines. It will therefore be interesting to compare the extent and the form in which the concept of function appears in Czech and British theories of style. The results of this comparison will also be partly included in section 3.7.2 dealing with the relations and influences of Czech and British theories of style.

3.6.1   Among Czech theoretical works investigating style, the concept of functions was for the first time systematically applied by Havránek (1932). This work further developed ideas of the 1929 *Work* which were presented at the First Congress of Slavists; for details about Czech works mentioned here see sections 1.1.1.2 and 1.2.1.1. A survey given by Dubský (1972) is focused especially on the concept of functional styles and its possible application to teaching language skills connected with producing texts of various kinds.

Havránek's concept of functions of language and functional styles corresponding to these functions became a generally accepted basis for

modern Czech stylistics. This applies also to works briefly mentioned in sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2. written by Czech authors investigating style in English texts. The functional concept proved to be flexible enough to include changes connected with modified definitions of style as well as changes emerging at least indirectly from the extralinguistic context. During the following decades, the concept of functions and functional styles began to be applied not only to texts using exclusively the standard language, but also to those in which both standard and non-standard varieties were used.

Depending on the degree of specification, the number of functional styles has varied a lot. Most commonly four main functional styles were distinguished: *colloquial/communicative, journalistic, technical* and *poetic/literary.* This distinction can be found e.g. in Hodura, Formánková, Rejmánková (1962), Jedlička, Formánková, Rejmánková (1970), Miko (1973), Hubáček (1987), Chloupek et al. (1991).

According to the methodology and purposes of their research, some scholars preferred to reduce the number of the main styles – e.g. Bečka (1992) works with only three main functional styles – *technical, pragmatic* and *literary.* Other scholars have increased the number of styles, sometimes quite considerably. Trávníček (1953) distinguishes six styles altogether (without explicitly referring to them as *functional* styles); they are arranged at two levels. There are three *primary styles* (*poetic, technical and non-technical*); non-technical style includes four *secondary styles* (*journalistic, rhetorical, administrative* and *conversational*). Jelínek (1995) distinguishes twelve main functional styles – *literary, colloquial, epistolary, technical, administrative, economic, advertising, ideological, journalistic, essayistic, directive.* Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997 operate with six main functional styles – *colloquial, technical, journalistic, literary, administrative, rhetorical.* As mentioned in section 1.3.8.6, the increasing number of functional styles in recent theoretical works can be connected with the growing importance of certain types of texts in everyday life and consequently with more theoretical attention paid to them.

Another important factor to be mentioned here is that since the 1930s-1940s, function has been regarded as one of the most important *objective stylistic factors*, These are factors influencing the style of texts connected with the text itself, such as the function of the text, the situational context, the addressee etc. On the basis of objective and subjective stylistic factors, objective and subjective styles can be distinguished – see for example Jelínek (1995), section 1.3.8.4.; functional styles thus represent one group of objective styles. The fact that function was in-

cluded among the factors influencing style linked functions of language varieties with analysis of style, provided stylistic investigations with a widely applicable theoretical basis and considerably contributed to the dominating position of the functional concept in Czech stylistics.

Investigating the concept of function and its relation to style and stylistics, Hausenblas (1996: 59–61) moves one level of abstraction higher and examines not only the functions of various texts, but also the functions of style, i.e. the functions which style can perform within a text. Hausenblas based these investigations on his own general definition of style as a principle according to which intentional activities of human beings are organized; this definition applies above all to spheres where certain norms exist (see section 1.3.6.1).

According to Hausenblas, there are four main functions of style. One of the main functions of style is to *integrate* the text. This function can be described as repeating various elements which create the unique character of the text in accordance with its function. Elements of this kind can occur at any level of the text – it can be various syntactic constructions, metaphors etc.

Another function of style is to *characterize* the text. It is a twofold function: it differentiates the text from other texts and at the same time it classifies the text as a member of a group of texts created according to similar stylistic norms.

Then there is the *aesthetic* function of style, which, as Hausenblas puts it, can be present in both literary and non-literary texts, and finally so-called *semantic* function. This function relates the style of a particular text to its meaning. Sometimes the style of a text is in accordance with its meaning, sometimes the style can contradict the meaning, e.g. in the case of irony.

3.6.2   British works on stylistics included in the survey in the second part also – at least partly – employ the concept of function. For example, Crystal, Davy (1969: 10) state that in analysing a text, the main aims of stylistic investigations are to identify features restricted to a certain kind of social context, to explain why these features were used in the particular text and to classify these features into categories based on their function in the social context. Similarly, Turner (1973: 235) points out that any style can be justified, if a purpose is found for it. The readers should learn to take into account these purposes when approaching texts; Turner himself applies this rule especially to the field which he calls *evaluative literary stylistics*. In Traugott, Pratt (1980) attention is paid to stylistic analysis of texts using the theory of speech acts, as

developed by J. L. Austin and J. R. Searle during the 1950s-1960s and to *communicative functions* of utterances, such as suggesting, estimating, requesting, welcoming, promising, bidding etc. (Traugott, Pratt 1980: 229). Besides these functions, the authors also briefly mention functions of language introduced by Bűhler and Jakobson (Traugott, Pratt 1980: 269; for Jakobson's classification see section 2.3.4.1) and also the difference in functions of standard and non-standard varieties of language (Traugott, Pratt 1980: 324).

Leech, Short (1981) and Fowler (1996) operate with three main functions of language, examining especially the way the system of language is used for the purpose of communication (Leech, Short 1981: 136). These functions, as defined by M. A. K. Halliday (1973: 22–47, 104–112) include the *ideational function*, representing experience and categorizing the perceived reality. Within this function, two sub-functions can be distinguished: *experiential sub-function*, expressing the speakers' experience of the real world and *logical sub-function*, structuring this experience in terms of artificially created logical relations, such as coordination, apposition, modification etc. (Halliday 1973: 105–106). The other two functions are *interpersonal function*, which is present in expressing roles, purposes and relationships, as well as at creating the addresser and addressee by linguistic means of expression, and *textual function*, which is concerned with the way texts are constructed. This function is observable for example in the cohesion of the text.

3.6.3   As can be seen from the comparison carried out in this section, the concept of functions in Czech and British theories of style is somewhat different. Although all the types of functions mentioned in this section relate to language, communication and style, a distinction can be made among at least four main types. These types can be hierarchically arranged according to the level of abstraction on which they operate. Starting from the most general ones, it is possible to distinguish:

1) *functions of style* as a principle on which particular activities or works are organized (see Hausenblas's classification given in section 3.6.1),

2) *functions of language as a means of communication*; this type can include the functional concepts introduced by Bűhler, Jakobson or Halliday,

3) *functions of language varieties*; *standard languages* serving usually as a language of official communication, scientific, legal, administrative etc., *non-standard* varieties used e.g. as a signal of intimacy in private

communication or as a signal of identification with a certain territorial/ professional community,

4) *communicative functions* of utterances in texts; this type can sometimes be called *social functions* (Wales 1997: 196).

Using this distinction, the term *function* as used in most Czech theories of style may be said to relate to the third type, i.e. to *functions of language varieties* and the particular means of expression belonging to them. This type of functions is primarily used for classification of texts and the means of expression used in them into various spheres of communication and serves as a theoretical basis for the Prague School theory of functional styles. The concept of the *functions of style* as such can be found in Hausenblas (1996).

British theories of style more frequently employ the second type, *functions of language in general*, and sometimes also the fourth type – *communicative functions of utterances* creating texts. Among British theoretical conceptions, functions of the third type are employed e.g. by Crystal, Davy (1969).

At the end of this section I will briefly summarize the main conclusions emerging from comparing Czech and British theories of style:

– Czech and British stylistics work with similar definitions of stylistics and style, they are mostly based on the principle of choice and variation.

– Czech as well as British stylistics may be said to have the status of borderline disciplines. From the synchronic point of view, they both share points of contact for example with general linguistics, literary theory, sociolinguistics or psycholinguistics. From a diachronic point of view, Czech stylistics can be seen as a descendant of classical poetics, British stylistics as a descendant of classical rhetoric.

– Stratification of Czech and British stylistics was observed on the basis of two criteria. Generally speaking, the first one is the object investigated by the particular branches of stylistics, the other one is the purpose of stylistic investigations. As far as the first criterion is concerned, contemporary Czech stylistics, both theoretical and practical, can be characterized as mainly *textual,* contemporary British stylistics as mainly *contextual*. In terms of the three main purposes of stylistic analysis distinguished in this work present-day Czech *the-*

oretical stylistics may be said to be mostly *descriptive*, *practical stylistics* mostly *prescriptive*; on the other hand, the British theoretical works on stylistics are *more evaluative* and less orientated towards objectivity than the Czech ones.

–   As far as the concept of function is concerned, Czech theories of style operate mainly with *functions of language varieties* and the particular means of expression belonging to them and occasionally also with *the functions of style* as such. British theories of style employ frequently the concept of *functions of language in general* and also the concept of *communicative functions of utterances* creating texts. Among British theoretical conceptions, *functions of language* are used e.g. by Crystal, Davy (1969).

3.7   Mutual influences of Czech and British theories of style

The main criterion for choosing works included in this section was their relevance for stylistic investigations. It is not my aim to provide here a general survey of Czech and British contacts in the fields of linguistics, literary science etc. Basic information of this kind can be found for example in Threadgold (1994) and Dirven, Fried, eds. (1987). The latter mention e.g. the influence of the Prague School on the linguists of the London School (Halliday) or the Dutch group (Dik) and also the influence of American generativism (Chomsky) on Sgall, one of the Czech linguists developing the traditions of the Prague School. In this work, however, various relationships among Czech and British theoretical concepts are not examined so generally, but mainly with respect to their influences on investigations of style.

3.7.1   First of all it is necessary to point out that Czech theoretical works on style and stylistics are based mostly on autochthonous sources and very little other influence can be found. Probably the main reason for this is the dominating position of Prague School theories of style, as developed especially by Havránek, Mathesius and Mukařovský. Since the 1930s, when modern theoretical investigations of style began, most Czech theories of style have been based especially on the structuralist and functional approach of the Prague School. Of course, it is necessary to take into consideration also the fact that the Prague School itself was, besides being influenced by Czech sources, considerably influenced by Geneva structuralism or Russian formalism, but all these influences resulted in an original systematic theoretical approach. Another reason

for the relatively small amount of direct influence of foreign works on Czech theories of style was that Czech monographs of this kind usually examine the style of texts written in Czech and are aimed primarily at the Czech language community which is much smaller than the English one.

3.7.2   On the other hand, theories of style developed in the Czech lands had a certain influence on stylistic investigations carried out in English-speaking countries; this applies above all to the theoretical concepts of the Prague School. This influence may sometimes be indirect, yet it is possible to trace it back.

For example, some British works investigating style, e.g. Leech, Short (1981) or Fowler (1996), operate with concept of language functions as developed by Halliday. In addition to using as a source works by J. R. Firth and B. Malinowski, Halliday also used to develop his functional approach Prague School functionalism, above all the theory of functional sentence perspective, as represented by works of J. Firbas, F. Daneš, P. Sgall and others (Kress, ed. 1976: 26ff.). In this particular case the relationship is even more complex – Halliday's work on cohesion, especially *Cohesion in English* (Halliday, Hasan 1976) partly influenced investigations carried out in this field by a Slovak linguist Josef Mistrík, who included the results of his research on cohesion and coherence in his stylistic textbook (Mistrík 1985; see section 1.3.7.2).

The influence of Prague School theories may result from two facts: firstly, some Prague School scholars were living and teaching abroad and secondly, several works, which included translations of Prague School theoretical contributions to investigating style, were published in English, especially during the 1950s-1960s.

3.7.2.1   R. Jakobson is probably the most important Prague School scholar who worked abroad. In Jakobson's case it is possible to speak even more generally about a link between European and Anglo-American theoretical approaches. Jakobson started at the beginning of the 20th century as one of the members of the Russian formalist school, in the 1920s-1930s became one of the leading scholars of the Prague School and after World War II helped to spread structuralist and functionalist approaches in the U.S.A. Some sources speak – to some extent exaggeratedly – about Jakobson's "ubiquitous presence" (Threadgold 1994).

In this context is also useful to mention at least two other scholars connected with the Prague School – R. Wellek and L. Doležel – who examined problems of style in their works. Wellek lived in Great Britain from

1935 and later in the U.S.A. He was one of the pre-war members of the Prague Linguistic Circle. Structuralist and functional approaches can be found e.g. in the work *Literary Theory* written jointly with A. Warren (Wellek, Warren 1968). The authors analyse the nature of aesthetic functions and aesthetic norms of literature, using as one of the sources the works of Mukařovský. They point out that although various practical intents, such as propaganda, or scientific intents, for example provision of various facts, can be present in literary texts, they never play a dominant role in them (Wellek, Warren 1968: 238ff.). The functional approach is applied also to investigating the style of literary works. As the authors put it, deviations from usage for example in syntactic structure as well as on other levels should be observed primarily with the purpose of discovering their specific aesthetic purpose (Wellek, Warren 1968: 180).

L. Doležel, who has been teaching at American and Canadian universities since the 1970s, is another scholar whose theoretical and methodological basis lies in the structuralist and functionalist approach of the Prague School. As already mentioned in sections 1.3.4.1 and 1.3.8.3, he examines chiefly the structure of literary texts and the narrative modes which appear within them. For the English version of his work on typology of narrative modes see Doležel (1973); another of his fields of interest, especially in the 1960s-1970s, included the relevance of statistical analysis for investigating style (Doležel, Bailey, eds. 1969).

3.7.2.2 The other important factor which influenced the spreading of the structuralist and functional approach to style and stylistics was the translation into English of the most important theoretical works originally written in Czech. As mentioned above, these works started to be translated in the 1950s-1960s. Since the Prague School, whose members developed these ideas, was at that time relatively little known, especially in the U.S.A., selections of that kind were usually accompanied by commentaries on the history and theoretical basis of the Prague School. The works of Jakobson, naturally, were an exception, since he himself had been teaching in the U.S.A. for several decades.

Works at least partly concerned with theories of style as developed by Czech scholars and published in English are included in the list below. It contains works presenting theories from the 1930s as well as some newer theoretical approaches. For convenience I have inserted this list directly into the text, rather than to the Appendix. The works quoted in previous sections are included both in the list and in the Bibliography.

Functional approach towards languages in general, history of the Prague School:

Dirven, R.; Fried V., eds. (1987) Functionalism in Linguistics. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Matejka, L., ed. (1978) Sound, Sign and Meaning. Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Matejka, L.; Titunik, I. W., eds. (1986) Semiotics of Art. Prague School Contributions. 3rd printing. Cambridge, Mass./London: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Vachek, J. (1966) The Linguistic School of Prague. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press.

Functional approach towards style

Doležel, L.; Bailey, R. W., eds. (1969) Statistics and Style. New York: Elsevier.

Doležel, L. (1973) Narrative Modes in Czech Literature. Toronto/Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Fried, V. (1972) The Prague School of Linguistics and Language Teaching. London: Oxford University Press.

Garvin, P. L. (1964): A Prague School Reader on Aesthetics, Literary Structure and Style. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Johnson, Marta K., ed. (1978) Recycling the Prague Linguistic Circle. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, Inc.

Mukařovský, J. (1977) The Word and Verbal Art. Selected Essays. New Haven/ London: Yale University Press.

Mukařovský, J. (1978) Structure, Sign and Function. Selected Essays. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

Steiner, P., ed. (1982) The Prague School. Selected Writings, 1929–1946. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Vachek, J., ed. (1964) A Prague School Reader in Linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Vachek, J., ed. (1983) Praguiana. Some Basic and Less Known Aspects of the Prague Linguistic School. Praha: Academia.