

Muntian A.O., Shpak I.V. Some Aspects of Definition of Expressive Means and Stylistic Devices. *Нове та традиційне у дослідженнях сучасних представників філологічних наук: матеріали міжнар. наук. конф.* (м. Одеса, 21–22 лютого 2020 р). Одеса, 2020. С. 151 – 153

Muntian A.O.

Associate Professor

Dnipropetrovsk National University of Railway Transport

Shpak I.V.

Associate Professor

Dnipropetrovsk National University of Railway Transport

SOME ASPECTS OF DEFINITION OF EXPRESSIVE MEANS AND STYLISTIC DEVICES

Annotation: The current piece is an attempt to closely look into some aspects of definition of expressive means and stylistic devices. In the course of the analysis the authors turn to the scientific works of renowned literary scientists and come to the conclusion that nowadays the terms “expressive” means and “stylistic techniques” are not homogeneous.

Key words: expressive means, stylistic techniques, synthetic approach, literary tropes, linguistic norms.

ДЕЯКІ АСПЕКТИ ВИЗНАЧЕННЯ ВИРАЗНИХ ТА СТИЛІСТИЧНИХ ЗАСОБІВ

Анотація: Дане дослідження являє собою спробу детально вивчити деякі аспекти визначення виразних засобів та стилістичних технік. В ході аналізу

автори розглядають роботи видатних науковців в області літературознавства і доходять висновку, що сьогодні терміни «виразні засоби» та «стилістичні техніки» не є однорідними.

Ключові слова: виразні засоби, стилістичні техніки, синтетичний підхід, літературні тропи, лінгвістичні норми.

Today, in the stylistics of interpreting the terms “expressive means” and “stylistic techniques” are not homogeneous

Currently, the situation is that there are three opposing approaches that have emerged to define the terms “expressive means” and “stylistic techniques”:

a) diffuse approach (or differential approach) (Arnold, Galperin, Morokhovsky, Kozhina, and others) whose representatives give a comprehensive classification of “expressive means” and “stylistic techniques”;

b) an integrative approach (Kukhareno, Skrebnev, Timofeev, Matsko, and others), whose supporters tend to combine the concepts of “expressive means” and “stylistic techniques” or to the integration of one concept into another;

c) the synthetic approach (Epstein, Belchehova, and others), the emergence of which is conditioned by the postmodern situation, where a new vision of poetic techniques can be traced.

According to the classification of Halperin’s, “stylistic techniques and lexical expressive means are divided into three subdivisions, interacting with the semantic nature of the word, but representing different criteria for choosing means and various semantic processes” [1, p. 30].

According to research by Halperin, lexical expressive means and stylistic techniques are divided into the following divisions:

a) the first unit has four groups:

- means based on the interaction of vocabulary and contextual meanings: metaphor, metonymy, irony;

- words are based on the interaction of the initial and derivative meanings: polysemy, zevgma, pun;

- the group compares means based on the opposite of logical and emotional values: interjection; exclamation, epithet, oxymoron;

- the group is based on the interaction of logical and nominal values: antonomass;

b) the second unit is based on the interaction between the two lexical meanings, simultaneously embodied in the context: comparison, periphrasis, euphemism, meiosis, lithotum, allegory, personification;

c) the third subdivision compares stable combinations of words in their interaction with the context: cliches, proverbs, sayings, sentences, citations, allusions, disorders of stable phrases [1, p. 30-31].

Galperin defines a stylistic method, as a deliberate and conscious increase of any typical structural and/or semantic property of a linguistic unit (neutral or expressive), elevated to a general status that becomes a generative model [1, p. 30]. According to this approach, as noted by Arnold, the main differentiating feature is the intention or purpose of using this or another element, is opposed to its existence in the language system. For decoding stylistics as stylistics of interpretation, rather than the generation of text (which is the essence of the 21st century stylistics), such an understanding is not relevant, since the reader does not have data to determine whether one or another trail is intentionally or unintentionally (intuitively) used [3, p. 55].

In “Stylistics of English” [2] Morokhovsky, Vorobyova, and N.I. Lykshosherst provide a comprehensive definition of expressive means and stylistic techniques in opposition to each other on the morphological, phonological and syntactic levels. So, analyzing the work of scholars, we find the assertions that the expressive means exist in the language due to the presence of the denotative and connotative significance of the elements of language, which are manifested in the synonymous paradigm [2, p.

70]. Poverty of the system of expressive means at the morphological level is offset by the possibility of widespread use of stylistic techniques, which are understood as a deliberate shift in the folding distribution of speech units, in this case morphemes and word forms [2, p. 71]. Stylistic reception on the morphological level arises either as a result of a change in the syntagmatic sequence of morphemes in the context of the word, or as a result of a change in the syntagmatic sequence of wordforms in the context of the sentence [2, p. 72]. On the phonological level, there are no expressive means, since no phoneme can be stylistically marked with respect to another, but stylistic techniques can be created on the phonetic level [2, p. 50]. Expressions on the syntactic level are syntactic models of sentences that carry additional logical or expressive information, which contributes to enhancing the pragmatic efficiency of speech and language in general [2, p. 138]. Stylistic reception on the syntactic level can be formed by transposing the sentence model in a speech or situational context [2, p. 139].

“Stylistic Encyclopedic Dictionary” by Kozhina gives a definition of terms such as stylistic figure and expressive means of language. The author stresses the fact that in modern stylistics there is no generally accepted point of view on nature, the terminological definition and classification of stylistic figures [4, p. 452]. Kozhina defines a stylistic figure as a syntagmatically formalized stylistic technique, built on a pragmatically motivated deviation from the linguistic or linguistic norm, which sometimes includes tracks and/or other rhetorical techniques [4, p. 453]. The expressive means of language, according to the interpretation of Kozhina’s is a concept which is differently defined in the special literature in connection with the ambiguous interpretation of the category of expressiveness [4, p. 37]. In the writings of some researchers, for example, Arnold, expressive means are identified with stylistic figures [5, p. 53] and, more broadly, with stylistic techniques (“Culture of the Russian Language” edited by Groudina and Shiryaev, [6, pp. 264-280]). Savova in the Dictionary of Reference notes that means of expression can be all means of

speech and language, if they correspond to the communicative goals of the author [7, p. 28-29]. The same opinion is shared by Fedorov. He believes that In the stylistic system, any means or element of a language or speech that performs a stylistic function is an expressive means, regardless of whether it creates in conjunction with other elements the impression of the habit of the given speech fragment, or, on the contrary, forces it to stand out as a whole in contrast with neutral forms of speech, or, in the end, creates a contrast inside it, coming into contact with words or grammatical constructions [8, p. 73].

Kozhina also notes that “one of the richest means of stylistic expressiveness of speech is the means of verbal imagery, mostly lexical, but also syntactic (metaphors, metonymy, syntactic figures, and other means)” [4, p. 107]. Greatly supporting this scholar’s ideas it is worth adding that another important source of stylistic means is synonymy first of all lexical, as well as grammatical as long as a number of other.

References:

1. Galperin I.R. Stylistics / I.R. Galperin. – M.: Higher school, 1981. – 332 p.
2. Мороховский А.Н. Стилистика английского языка / А.Н. Мороховский, О. П. Воробьёва, Н. И. Лихошерст, З. В. Тимошенко. – К.: Вища школа, 1991. – 272 с.
3. Арнольд, И.В. Современный английский язык: учебник для вузов [Текст] / И.В. Арнольд. 5-е изд., испр. и доп. – М., 2002. – 384 с.
4. Кожина М.Н. Стилистический энциклопедический словарь русского языка / [под ред. М. Н. Кожинной; члены редколлегии: Е. А. Баженова, М.П. Котюрова, А. Н. Сковородников]. – 2-е изд., испр. и доп. – М.: Флинта: Наука, 2006. – 696 с.

5. Арнольд И. В. Стилистика современного английского языка (стилистика декодирования): Учеб. пособие / / И. В. Арнольд. – 3-е изд. – М.: Просвещение, 2004. – 384 с.
6. Граудина Л.К. Культура русской речи. Уч. для вузов // [Под ред. Л.К. Граудиной, Е.Н. Ширяева]. – М.: НОРМА-ИНФА. – 368 с.
7. Савова М.Р. Выразительность // Педагогическое речеведение: Словарь-справочник / М.Р. Савова. – М.: Флинта: Наука. – 1998. – 308 с.
8. Федоров А.В. Очерки общей и сопоставительной стилистики: Учеб. пособие для институтов и факультетов иностр. языков / А.В. Федоров. – М.: Высшая школа, 1971. – 324 с.