A COMPARISON OF 20TH CENTURY THEORIES OF STYLE (IN THE CONTEXT OF CZECH AND BRITISH SCHOLARLY DISCOURSES)

Michal Křístek

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

0   INTRODUCTION

Although general problems of style, stylistically marked/unmarked means of expression, metaphors or tropes appear as early as in Aristotle's works (mainly in *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*, but partly also in *Organon*), modern stylistics as an autonomous theoretical discipline was not established until the first decades of the 20th century. Undoubtedly it would be very tempting to observe and compare the development of this discipline in various countries from the classical period through the Middle Ages up to the present, but the aim of this work is more modest. Its purpose is to provide a contrastive view of 20th century Czech and British theories of style and stylistics in general.

The period dealt with was chosen intentionally – stylistics during the 20th century, in the context of both Czech and British scholarly discourses, developed into an autonomous theoretical discipline, linked with numerous branches of linguistics and literary theory (discourse analysis, textual syntax, pragmatics etc.).

To avoid possible confusions, it is necessary to start by defining basic terms - the adjectives *Czech* and *British* used in constructions such as *Czech and British theories of style, Czech and British stylistics.* There are no major difficulties with the adjective Czech - books on stylistics written in Czech usually deal with stylistics of the Czech language, are aimed at a Czech audience and were published in the Czech Republic or in the former Czechoslovakia.

On the other hand, numerous works on style and stylistics written in English vary by many features: language whose stylistic features are being investigated, the country of origin, the audience at which they are aimed etc. and referring to all of them as simply *British* would be misleading. The use of the attribute *British* is therefore limited in this work to works

- concerning stylistics of the English language,
- written in English and aimed primarily at an English-speaking audience, - published in the United Kingdom and/or having a considerable theoretical influence on style investigations there.

The nationality of the particular authors is not taken into account here - this criterion would exclude e.g. the works of Roman Jakobson, Nils Enkvist, M. L. Pratt, David Lee or G. W. Turner.

As there is only a small number of Czech works available in English translation, I start with a detailed survey of 20th century Czech theories of style; he

following chapter deals with the most important British works on stylistics from approximately the last three decades of the 20th century.

In the study of Czech and British theories of style there are four main areas of comparison: 1) present-day definitions of style and stylistics, 2) the position of stylistics among other theoretical disciplines and its relation to them, 3) the stratification of stylistics into various branches and the criteria of the stratification, 4) the concept of function in studies of style. Further on, possible mutual influences of Czech and British theories of style will be briefly mentioned. After summarizing the facts emerging from the comparison, several possibilities for further research in this particular field of stylistic studies will be indicated.

This work focuses on Czech and British theories of style as they developed during the 20th century, and on their comparison. A survey of British theories of style is presented in the second part of the study; but as there are numerous general works on style and stylistics available, I have included only the most important theoretical works.

Surveys of this kind was necessary before I could begin comparing Czech and British theories of style; I have also attempted to find to what extent Czech and British theories of style influenced each other. Since research in the field of contrastive stylistics has till now focused mainly on comparing stylistic values of means of expression rather than on comparing theoretical approaches to style, I had also to develop a methodology for the comparison. In the last chapter I summarize the main results emerging from the comparison and to indicate several possibilities for further research in this particular field.

1   CZECH THEORIES OF STYLE

1.1   CZECH STYLISTICS DURING THE FIRST THREE DECADES OF THE 20TH CENTURY

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

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

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

1.1.1 The pioneering 20th century theoretical works

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

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

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

As mentioned above, modern theoretical approaches were represented in the Czech lands chiefly by members of the Prague Linguistic Circle, established in 1926; its brief history is given e.g. in Vachek (1966: 3-14). During the latter half of the 1920s the Prague Linguistic Circle scholars started to publish their works, in which they were developing the ideas of e.g. de Saussure, Badouin de Courtenay and Bally; the presence and activities of R. Jakobson also link Prague structuralism to the Russian formalist school. Members of the Prague School can be regarded as the founders of modern Czech *theoretical stylistics* focused on theoretical aspects of the

style of various texts, both from the viewpoint of linguistics and from that of literary theory (Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 10; this work, as the newest one in this field, will be referred to in this section whenever a comparison of the historical situation with the present state is made).

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

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

1.1.1.1 The first important work of this kind appeared even before the Prague Linguistic Circle was established. Mathesius (1911) in his pioneering work *O potenciálnosti jevů jazykových* (On the Potentiality of the Phenomena of Language) points out that it is necessary to examine e.g. the mutual relations of stylistics to linguistics and rhetoric as well as to define the subject stylistics should deal with.

Mathesius states here that linguistics studies language by examining the speech of individuals within the whole language community, while stylistics examines how language is used in individual literary works. The main difference then is not in the subject examined, but rather in the aim of such an examination. Mathesius makes a distinction here between *stylistics* as a discipline focused on the individual style of a particular literary work and so-called *styles of speech*. These styles of speech, as Mathesius puts it, are the common features of texts/utterances produced by various

people under similar circumstances. Referring to several earlier works of Jones, Bally, Jespersen and some other European linguists, Mathesius states that these styles of speech are manifested in pronunciation, vocabulary and syntax.

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

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

The *Works* were divided into ten sections: *general methodological problems of linguistics, tasks for examining the language system, functions of language, problems of Old Church Slavonic Language, the unification of phonetic and phonological transcription within Slavonic languages, linguistic geography, the conception of an all-Slavonic linguistic atlas, methods of Slavic lexicography, the cultivation and criticism of Slavonic languages, language teaching in secondary schools.*

Problems relating to stylistics are discussed particularly in the third section; attention is paid above all to functions of language, to standard literary language and to poetic language. At the beginning it is stated that when examining a language it is necessary to pay attention to the variety of its functions and to the ways the functions are realized in speech. According to these functions, there are several *functional modes of speech* and each of them has its own system of conventions, its own "langue" - e.g. internal vs manifested speech, intellectually vs emotionally orientated speech, speech with communicative, practical or theoretical, orientation vs speech with poetic orientation, i.e. with orientation towards the form. These modes of speech can either occur in particular texts alone, or several of them can be present at the

same time. As we can see, these *functional modes of speech*, as well as the *styles of speech* appearing in Mathesius's paper of 1911, are nearly identical with what today is called *functional styles*; this classification of styles according to their function is referred to as *horizontal stratification of styles*, as opposed to *vertical stratification of styles* - stylus humilis, stylus mediocris, stylus grandiloquus - which dates back to the ancient period (Hrabák 1977: 115-116).

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

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

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

On the other hand, *poetic language* - as well as other spheres of art - can be characterized by predominant orientation not towards the signified, but towards the sign itself. This means that the elements of all levels of language, which in non-poetic texts serve only for expressing a certain meaning, can in poetic texts acquire more or less independent values; they tend to become *foregrounded*. It is therefore suitable and necessary - as stated in the conclusion of the third part of the *Works* - to examine poetic language by itself, without digressions towards cultural history, sociology or psychology.

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

collection can be regarded as the beginning of modern theoretical investigations of language and style.

1.2   CZECH STYLISTICS 1932-1954

1.2.1   The 1932 debate on standard language

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

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

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

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

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

only correct version. This led to controversy with the renowned Czech writers and critics, such as O. Fischer, I. Olbracht, V. Vančura and F. X. Šalda.

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

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

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

- every standard language norm must be based on the present-day usage, not on historical criteria, e.g. as far as the meaning of words is concerned,

- texts performing different communicative functions must inevitably differ in the means of expression used and in their organization; consequently, there can hardly be a set of rules suitable for all types of texts,

- as far as vocabulary is concerned, no words can be excluded merely because of their origin; the richer variety of expressions a language possesses, the better it can perform various communicative functions. Even if there are several expressions denoting the same extra-linguistic reality, they usually differ in the sphere, where they can by used, i.e. by their stylistic character; therefore it is questionable, to what extent it is ever possible to speak about synonymy.

And although after eighty years it is possible to see pros and contras on both sides of this argument, it is still possible to say that a confrontation of this kind was sooner or later inevitable – contradictory opinions on a relatively small territory could not possibly result into anything else. Jiří Haller (who in the following decades did a

lot of useful practical work, e.g. in the field of lexicography) and his colleagues from Naše řeč definitely were keen and well-trained professional linguists, and so were members of the Prague Linguistic Circle – but their theoretical background and professional orientation were hardly compatible.   And perhaps one more brief commentary at the end of this section: now it is possible – and maybe even desirable – to be tolerant to those purist approaches - all in all, they also express a great deal of concern with language, but it is far more difficult (if not impossible) to be tolerant if straightforward purist approaches prevail, with almost no alternative in sight, as it might seem before the period of the Prague Linguistic Circle.

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

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

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

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

private or *public* (*oral private* - monologue/dialogue, *oral public* - speech, discussion; *written private, written public* - notices, posters, journalistic texts, book/magazine writing).

These criteria for differentiating functional styles were gradually enlarged and during the following decades they formed a group of factors influencing the style of a text, i.e. of so-called *stylistic factors*. The stylistic factors, according to the present classification, can relate either to the text itself - to its function, topic, situational context, addressee etc. (so-called *objective stylistic factors*), or to the author of the text - to his age, social status,   education, knowledge of the topic etc. (so-called *subjective stylistic factors*;   Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 50-63). Havránek's 1932 classification   of functional languages and functional styles, based on 1929 *Works*, served as a starting point for future stylistic works, both theoretical and practical.

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

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

1.2.2   The situation after the 1932 debate

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

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

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

1.2.3 The 1941 debate on style

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

1.2.3.1 The debate was started by an article *O jazykovém stylu* (On Style in Language) by J. M. Kořínek (1941). The author points out that it is necessary to pay attention to the aims of texts examined from the viewpoint of stylistics. The

orientation of these aims can be classified as *logical, aesthetic,* and *ethical*. These three types correspond, as Kořínek puts it, to the three functions of language sign presented by K. Bűhler in his *Sprachtheorie*. The texts of logical type are usually orientated towards the deictic function of a language sign (text as a *Darstellung*), the texts of aesthetic kind towards its expressive function (text as an *Ausdruck*) and the texts of ethical kind towards its conative function (text as an *Appell*). Kořínek concludes that in future stylistic investigations it will be necessary to make a clearer distinction especially between the texts orientated towards appeal (*Appell*) and those orientated towards expression (*Ausdruck*), since this sphere has not been investigated much, unlike the texts of the first type.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The utterance itself consists of two elementary processes - a naming process and a process during which sentences are constructed. In the part concerning the naming process Mathesius focuses on the adequacy and accuracy of naming as well as on the stylistically marked/unmarked means of expression. Further

on, attention is also paid to parts of speech and to differences between nominal and verbal ways of expressing ideas. From the lexical level Mathesius switches to syntax and concludes this work with a detailed explanation of the basic principles of functional sentence perspective and the structure of a paragraph as a hierarchically higher unit constituting a text.

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

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

The first part focuses on the development and usage of the term *styl* (from lat. *stilus* - an engraving tool). In the classical period it started to be used metaphorically, with relation to the form of written and spoken texts, in the 17th century it was used for the first time in the sphere of music, in the 18th century for graphic and plastic arts and in the 19th century for style of life, teaching etc. The Czech equivalent *sloh* was, as Svoboda states, coined by a Czech writer A. J. Puchmajer and used for the first time in 1804. Since then, both the Czech and Latin terms have been used without any difference in meaning; the Czech equivalent can be found e.g. in Jungmann's *Slovesnost*, as mentioned in section 1.1.

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

genres, style of *literature* as a whole, as opposed e.g. to the style of music, painting, dance etc.

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

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

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

Since all of Bečka's texts are based on the same principles, a survey of his theoretical views will be carried out in section 1.3.8.2 dealing with *Česká stylistika*. Here it should only be pointed out that Bečka's approach is to a considerable extent

descriptive. He focuses on the stylistic values of means of expression, especially syntactic and lexical ones, rather than on general theoretical aspects of style.

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

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

As far as classification of styles is concerned, Trávníček suggests two basic approaches. The first one is classification of styles according to the spheres in which they are used. He distinguishes six styles arranged at two levels. There are three *primary styles*: *poetic style, technical style* (with two subtypes - *scientific* and *practical*) and *non-technical style.* Non-technical style includes four *secondary styles*: *journalistic style, rhetorical style, administrative style* and *conversational style.* At this point it is worth noting that Trávníček's classification concerns only texts belonging to standard language, although the possibility of the occasional use of substandard means of expression is mentioned here as well, especially in poetic, journalistic and conversational styles.

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

In this work, Trávníček also tries to define the basic tasks of modern teaching of stylistics in primary and secondary schools. It is stated here that the basic aim

should not be to force the students to produce imitations of poetic language used by reputable writers, but to provide them with basic information about the variety of means of expressions and their different functions and with an introduction to practical stylistics, i.e. to teach them the basic rules for writing business letters, CVs etc.

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

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

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

Although the explanation of the terms *stylistics, style* or *stylistic factors* is based on the conception of the Prague School, the theory of functional styles is not yet used. Attention is paid to stylistic aspects of all language levels and to problems of style in translations. The problems are mostly dealt with from the practical point of view, which is in accordance with the main aim of this textbook. Perhaps the most important sections here are those describing specific features of narrative and description, which are two of the so-called *stylistic procedures*; this is a question which was not particularly stressed in the earlier 20th century stylistic works.

Today a *stylistic procedure* is regarded as a way of organizing elements in a text to express the relation of these elements to the specific purpose of the text. There are five basic stylistic procedures: *informative, descriptive, narrative, explanatory* and *discursive.* Several of these procedures usually occur in every text; the basic stylistic procedures are also modified quite frequently, according to the spheres in which they are used - see Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová (1997: 66-74).

1.3. CZECH STYLISTICS FROM 1954 TO THE PRESENT

1.3.1 The situation in the early 1950s

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

1.3.2 The 1954 conference on style and stylistics

This conference took place on November 4 and 5 1954 in Liblice. It was organized by the Institute of Czech Language, which was part of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. The most important papers from the conference and its proceedings were published in the journal *Slovo a slovesnost.* It was an opportunity when mainly members of a generation of scholars born in the 1920 and because of the war events entering universities mainly after 1945 proved their abilities and competence to follow the first generation of the Prague Linguistic Circle that influenced them very significantly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

are often commented upon in a subjective way; these texts are usually aimed at the same audience as popularizing texts.

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

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

L. Doležel (1955b) in   the article *Rozbor uměleckého stylu* (Analysis of Literary Style) adds that the task of linguistic stylistics lies primarily in analysing the language of a literary work at all its levels, including also metaphorical expressions and their function in the thematic structure of the text. The language of literary works is analysed both by linguistic stylistics and literary theory; it is a point of contact between these disciplines. Nevertheless, literary theory - unlike linguistic stylistics - examines not only the principles of using linguistic means of expression, but also the structure of a literary work, the principles of its thematic composition, of using various motifs etc. (Doležel 1955b: 90, Hausenblas 1955: 2; Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová 1997: 10-11). By examining the means of expression, it is also possible to compare their semantic and stylistic differences and combinations of these differences; see Červenka (1991).

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

The position of stylistics in relation to literary theory was defined, the definition of style was revised, new stylistic factors were introduced into style investigations, the number of the main functional styles was increased to four (*colloquial, journalistic, technical, literary*) and their inner stratification began to be examined. This applies especially to technical style. Besides, many opportunities for future stylistic research were brought up in the discussion and further developed.

Most of the works characterized in the following sections use this theoretical basis as their starting point; I will therefore concentrate mainly on the new, different ideas they introduce, compared to the conception of stylistics established after the 1954 conference.

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

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

After a brief general survey dealing with modern definitions of style and stylistics, with stylistic factors and with functional styles, attention is paid to stylistic differentiation of the means of expression at the levels of morphology, syntax (including the basic facts concerning functional sentence perspective) and vocabulary. The last part focuses on various genres existing within journalistic style and on the most frequent types of stylistic mistakes occurring in these genres. Nevertheless, the authors do not try to establish a set of authoritative rules deciding which ways of expression are "good" or "bad", to put it in the pre-structuralist terminology. Instead, they try to provide against the background of theoretical knowledge some practical recommendations to all whose occupation occasionally requires contributing to newspapers - not only to professional journalists.

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

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

The dynamic development of stylistics after the 1954 conference and changes in codification of Czech orthography introduced in 1957 made it necessary to revise the text thoroughly. The chapters dealing with the development of stylistics were enlarged, characteristics of spoken and written texts were added and specific features of the main functional styles were incorporated into the text. More attention was also

paid to basic stylistic procedures and to various genres based upon them. From the formal point of view, more examples illustrating the theoretical explanations were added and the most important theoretical works which had appeared since 1953 were included in the bibliography. However, a new textbook for university students was still needed. The first modern work of this kind appeared approximately ten years later (Jedlička, Formánková, Rejmánková 1970; see section 1.3.6.2).

1.3.4 Investigations of literary style carried out in the 1960s

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

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

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

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

In *compact represented discourse*, both the *graphical indicators* and some *grammatical categories* change - above all the category of person. The 1st and 2nd

persons usually change to the 3rd person, which moves this type of discourse one step further from the characters' discourse to the narrator's discourse.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.3.5   Expressional theory of style

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

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

To sum up at least the most important points of Miko's theory: *style* is defined here as a differentiating aspect of each text. The components of style   are

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

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

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

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

style by *iconicity and conceptuality* and texts belonging to *literary style* by *iconicity and experienceness*. This is of course just the basic classification - the situation in individual texts can vary a lot.

1.3.6 Theoretical works on style and stylistics published in the 1970s

1.3.6.1 Another interesting work concerning general problems of style, especially literary style, appeared in 1971. *Výstavba jazykových projevů a styl* (Composition of Texts and Style) is a collection of studies on style published by K. Hausenblas during the 1960s. The author deals with the method of complex analysis of a text from the lowest level of linguistic means of expression to the highest level of intertextual relations. Other papers focus on various aspects of style; the two most important ones will be mentioned here.

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

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

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

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

Secondly, classification based on the existence of four main so-called *spheres of style*. Texts, according to their function, are categorized as belonging to one of

these spheres. The four main spheres, corresponding with four main functional styles, are *colloquial communicative sphere, technical sphere,* including also administrative texts, *journalistic sphere* and *literary sphere.*

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

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

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

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

1.3.6.5 Another theory, concentrating on one particular aspect of stylistics, was developed by M. Jelínek and described in his monograph *Stylistické aspekty gramatického systému* (Stylistic Aspects of the Grammatical System, 1974). He

developed the approach introduced twenty years earlier at the 1954 conference, presented in Jelínek (1955).

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

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

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

1.3.7 Theoretical works on style and stylistics published in the 1980s

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

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

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

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

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

Problems of textual syntax and coherence of a text are dealt with very thoroughly in this work. Referring among others to Halliday, Hasan (1976), Mistrík (1985) makes a distinction between *coherence* as a semantic aspect and *cohesion* as a formal aspect of a text. Then Mistrík concentrates on measuring the cohesion, for which he established a system of so-called *degrees of contiguity*. There are five degrees of contiguity, hierarchized according to the character of an element opening a new syntactic unit. In his classification typologies based both on parts of speech and

on sentence elements are used. Mistrík introduces here the following hierarchy: *subject* (zero degree), *object* (degree 1), *adverbial modifier* (degree 2), *finite verb* (degree 3) and *conjunction* (degree 4).

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

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

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

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

1.3.7.6 *Učebnice stylistiky* (A Textbook of Stylistics, 1987), written by J. Hubáček, is aimed at students in pedagogical faculties, especially at future primary school teachers. The explanations are therefore limited to the elementary facts. Each chapter contains several exercises, which is not common practice in Czech university

textbooks. *Stylistické minimum* (The Fundamentals of Stylistics, 1987) by J. Chloupek, M. Krčmová a E. Minářová is a short textbook the first part of which gives the basic facts about stylistics and the second part contains materials for analysis.

1.3.8   Theoretical works on style and stylistics published from 1990 to the present
1.3.8.1 *Stylistika češtiny* (Stylistics of the Czech Language, 1991) by J. Chloupek et al. is a textbook based on *Stylistické minimum*. Its primary aim was to give university students of Czech a detailed theoretical introduction to stylistics,   as Jedlička, Formánková, Rejmánková (1970) had done earlier.

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

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

An analysis of the main functional styles and their stylistic norms are also included in   Chloupek et al. (1991). The four main styles distinguished in this textbook are the same as in Jedlička, Formánková, Rejmánková (1970): *colloquial, technical* (including *administrative* style), *journalistic* and *literary*. The last chapter   provides a survey of theoretical and methodological approaches towards stylistics in the 20th century. Besides specialized bibliographical notes at the end of each chapter, there is also a detailed   bibliography of Czech and Slovak works on stylistics at the end of the textbook.

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

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

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

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

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

Besides the verbal model of a text, Doležel introduces here also a *functional model* of a text. It is a model based on the different functions of the narrator and the characters within the text. The primary functions of the narrator in relation to the text

are *representation* and *control*, while those of characters are *interpretation* and *action*. This model can serve as a basis for refining the typology of narrative modes. Each of the two primary narrative modes - *Er-form* and *Ich-form* - can be by using the functional model further divided into three subtypes: *objective* Er-form/Ich-form (the basic type; the subjects perform their primary functions: narrator - construction and control, characters - interpretation and action), *rhetorical* Er-form/Ich-form (narrator - construction, control plus interpretation, characters - action), *subjective* Er-form/Ich-form (narrator - representation, control, interpretation and action).

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

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

1.3.8.4 In 1995, a collective grammar *Příruční mluvnice češtiny* (A Handbook Grammar of Czech) appeared. It was primarily intended for university students, but partly also for a wider public as a clear and concise source of theoretical information about present-day Czech; the chapter *Stylistika* (Stylistics) was written by M. Jelínek.

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

The most important feature of Jelínek's approach presented in this work is his very detailed classification of styles according to the stylistic factors influencing them. Among the *objective styles*, determined by objective stylistic factors, there are for example *monological* vs *dialogical* styles, *formal* vs *informal* styles, styles of *spoken* vs *written* texts and also *functional* styles. These styles are particularly important, because, as Jelínek puts it, *function* plays a dominant role among the objective stylistic factors. Jelínek's classification of functional styles includes twelve main functional styles: *literary, colloquial, epistolary, technical, administrative,*

economic, advertising, ideological, journalistic, essayistic, directive, orientational. Subjective styles, determined by subjective stylistic factors, include professional styles, styles of various age groups, styles of people with higher/lower education etc.; these particular styles are individually dealt with in greater detail.

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

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

Compared with Chloupek et al. (1991), there are several changes in this textbook. Besides refining some of the theoretical explanations, e.g. the passages on stylistic values of the means of expression, another important change introduced in Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová (1997) is increasing the number of the main functional styles. Compared with Chloupek et al. (1991), this number grew from four to six - *colloquial, technical, journalistic, literary* plus *administrative* and *rhetorical* styles.

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

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

1.4 PRESENT-DAY SITUATION OF CZECH STYLISTICS

As can be seen from the survey given in this chapter, Czech theories of style developed during the 20th century are quite homogeneous, as far as their theoretical bases are concerned. All of them are rooted in the Prague School structuralism and

functionalism. Attention is paid to both literary and non-literary texts and also to the factors which influence creating the texts. The investigations of style are orientated functionally - the main focus is on the functions of the text and on the extent to which the particular means of expression and their organization contribute to performing these functions. The functional orientation of stylistic investigations helps to see a text not only as an isolated structure, but also as a part of a wider social and historical context (on the concept of function in stylistics see also 3.6).

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

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 presentation*. 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 introducing 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 successful 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 structures - 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 provides more possibilities for analysing in detail the structure of discourses 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 advertisements.

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 represented e.g. by the works of R. Barthes), the *generative* approach and the *interpersonal* approach. The *structuralist approach* aims at revealing the macrostructure of the text as a whole, while the *generative approach* 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 temporal deixis, as expressed by pronouns such as *this, that,* adverbs *here, there, now, then* etc. *Psychological point of vie*w 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 transitional 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 discourses. 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, social and cultural situation should be taken into consideration in both the above mentioned parts of context (Mills 1995: 31ff.). All these elements are examined with respect to the extent to which they may influence 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, focusing 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 author 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 students; 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 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 *informative 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.

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 given 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 disciplines 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 identification 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 hierarchically 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 existing in various fields of linguistics if they are felt to be relevant for analysing a particular text. These methods are usually applied to avoid vague and impressionistic judgements (Wales 1997: 438). If the relations between 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 distinctive 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 examining texts, rather than being intentionally in opposition to each other. 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 motivation 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-centred, i.e. which take into account also the personality of the author are sometimes called *expressive stylistics* (Wales 1997: 166); the more general term *psycho-stylistics* refers to the approach focusing on research into literary effects in general, above all on the basis of psycholinguistics (Wales 1997: 384). The focus on writer/speaker can be found also in Czech theories of style; see the dichotomy between objective and subjective 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 theories of style mentioned above. Post-structuralist conceptions are not limited only to the study of language and style of a text, they are also orientated 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 possibility 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 divided 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 important 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 *stylobehaviouristics.*

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 existing 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 explicitly distinguished, e.g. in Turner (1973: 233) or Wells (1960: 213), but prescription 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 always 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, *description* 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 procedures, 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 perceived 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 literary 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' ability to express themselves, the extent to which they have managed to acquire 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 included 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 *theoretical 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.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

4.1 PROSPECTS OF STYLISTICS IN GENERAL

After the survey and comparison of Czech and British theories of style I will now proceed to summarize the main results emerging from the comparison and to indicate several possibilities for further research in the field of stylistics. Summarizing the results of the comparison, I will concentrate mainly on the differences found out, rather than on the identical points - the differences will serve as a much more useful starting point for dealing with the possibilities for further research.

I feel necessary to point out that although in this work I was primarily dealing with *theories* of style, i.e. with the sphere of metalanguage, on the most general level any theoretical analysis is connected with the extralinguistic reality - with the historical, social and political context. This is important especially for the disciplines such as stylistics whose investigations are not focused only on the means of expression existing on one particular level of language, but also on the links of the text with the situation in which the communication takes place, with the author of the text, with the addressee etc. Generally speaking, any social situation as well as any change to it require and prefer certain types of communication in which various kinds of texts are employed. The language norms according to which the texts are created are rooted in the norms existing in the sphere of extralinguistic reality. Depending on the social situation, both types of norms can change. Stylistics then has to define its own aims and to choose the type of texts it will deal with. The tasks which follow are to find and apply adequate methods of investigating and analysing the texts; the methods themselves can naturally be subjected to analysis and comparison as well.

As the world around us keeps constantly changing and developing, the main tasks and methods of stylistics cannot remain unchanged, and indeed they do not. From the surveys given in the first two chapters of the work it can be seen that although the general theoretical background of stylistics (in this particular case limited to Czech and British stylistics) may be to a certain extent similar - for example as to the definitions of style based on the principle of choice and variation - the stylistic investigations tend to differ a lot in practice. Some branches of stylistics, such as critical stylistics, feminist stylistics or pragmatic stylistics, focus on examining various ideologies present in texts and on the way they are supposed to influence the addressees. Some other investigate the style of literary works of art and yet other branches are orientated methodologically – towards the teaching of skills in stylization.

The result of the variety of tasks and approaches is the interdisciplinary status of stylistics; its position as a borderline discipline was dealt with in section 3.4.

Another result of this situation is that stylistic investigations can sometimes be carried out under a label other than "stylistics". This situation is known already from the past. Although stylistics as an independent theoretical discipline has been established only in the 20th century, the concept of style and its investigations existed in the previous centuries as well. It was focused especially on the texts belonging to the sphere of literary works of art and oratory, but at that time it was regarded as a part of poetics and rhetoric. A similar situation can be observed today. Some of the disciplines established during the previous decades, such as text linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, in many ways overlap with stylistics (Wales 1997: 129-131, 368-369, 461): they also examine the structure of a text and the means of expression used in it with regard to the participants of the communication, to their intentions, attitudes etc.

This indicates that the very basis of theoretical investigations of texts is the purpose of the investigations and the methods of analysis chosen according to this purpose (the functional concept especially in regard to stylistics was characterized in section 3.6). The names of the particular disciplines undertaking such investigations and their borders are only of secondary importance in this respect. The names, the borders and the specific tasks of the disciplines as well as the disciplines themselves may originate, change or disappear, according to the purpose and extent of theoretical investigations which prevail during a particular period and in a particular area. At present I would nevertheless hesitate to make predictions about the coming "end of stylistics" (and not only because of the fact that the term *style* itself is now widespread and very firmly established). As can be seen at least from the Czech and British theoretical works used as sources for the work, during the 20th century stylistics has established its specific purposes of investigating practically all kinds of texts, its own terminological system and methods of analysis. Therefore, as long as these tools will be applicable and as long as the scholars dealing with stylistics will keep improving and updating them according to the new trends which appear in linguistics, the decline of stylistics is not too likely to be in sight.

4.2   RESULTS EMERGING FROM THE COMPARISON OF CZECH AND BRITISH 20TH CENTURY THEORIES OF STYLE

The extralinguistic factors mentioned above have naturally influenced the Czech and British theories of style as well. The first factor of this kind to be taken into consideration is the different position of Czech and English among the languages of the world (see section 2.1). Czech theories of style have been developed on a much smaller area by a much smaller number of scholars and have been aimed at a much smaller audience than the British ones, which has to a considerable extent influenced their methodological homogeneity.

Another, even more important factor contributing to the homogeneity was the dominant position of the Prague School. Its prominent members - especially B. Havránek, J. Mukařovský and R. Jakobson - paid systematic attention to the theories of style, having established the general theoretical frame of modern stylistics, developed and improved during the following decades. Moreover, the dominant position of the functional and structuralist approach has lasted since the 1930s practically without an interruption to the present. The only exception was perhaps a short period in the early 1950s, under the Communist regime, when structuralism was labelled by orthodox Marxists as a "bourgeois pseudo-science"; but in practice the continuity has not been broken.

As mentioned in the first chapter, one of the impulses that have contributed to the establishment of the theoretical basis of modern Czech stylistics was the anti-purist polemic led by the members of the Prague School in 1932. The antipathy to the purist directives and rules applied without taking the context into consideration has also considerably influenced the orientation of modern Czech theories of style – they are mostly descriptive, rather than prescriptive and evaluative. This applies especially to stylistic analyses of literary works of art (as it was shown in section 3.5.3.2, the recent British works on stylistics, dealing with various ideologies, tend to be more evaluative; they are based on the presupposition that an absolute objectivity cannot be reached). In Czech stylistics, the prescriptive approach is applied only in texts belonging to the sphere of practical stylistics whose main purpose is to teach rules of writing certain fixed types of texts, such as business letters, congratulations, invitations etc.

The attention paid in the Czech context especially to the general theoretical problems of stylistics was partly influenced also by the political situation, to name one more of the important extralinguistic factors. For approximately sixty years, since the Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia lasting from 1939 till 1945 and the during the period of the Communist regime lasting from 1948 till 1989, there were topics which could not be officially analysed on Czech territory. In the sphere of stylistics, such taboo topics included various ideologies manipulating the audience, e.g. the language and style of propaganda. Investigations of texts which are in the British context regarded for example as a part of feminist or radical stylistics did not take place at all, simply because the trends themselves - feminism or radical political movements - did not exist in Czechoslovakia at that time. The situation started to change after the fall of the Communist regime in autumn 1989. At the present moment these trends and movements have already appeared, but their detailed analysis from the viewpoint of stylistics has not been carried out so far – it is one of the tasks of Czech stylistics for the future.

The 20th century British theories of style, on the other hand, have developed under completely different conditions. The position of English as a worldwide language, whose importance has considerably grown especially during several past decades, has also influenced the extent of its scholarly investigations, including stylistic investigations. The investigations of this kind have been carried out in various countries by various scholars and for various purposes – hence the theoretical and methodological plurality, which is characteristic of the 20th century British theories of style (the definition of the adjective *British* as used in the work is given in the Introduction). The democratic systems of government in the United Kingdom, the U.S.A. etc. did not – at least to my knowledge - prevent the scholars from analysing the style of any particular types of texts. A lot of detailed studies dealing with various ideologies manifested in texts could therefore originate in the British context, such as Fowler (1996), Mills (1995), Lee (1992), Simpson (1993).

Another important factor which has influenced the British theories of style is the extent of the territory on which the theories were developed. English is a language spoken in many countries, very often of different political systems, cultural traditions etc. Under such circumstances the possible tensions such as those that took place between the Czech purists and anti-purists in the early 1930s are not usually as strong as it may be in the opposite case - each of the parties involved has the possibility to look for support and the necessary background elsewhere.

The extent of the territory influenced by the British theories of style is the factor which has also contributed to the above mentioned variety of theoretical approaches towards style. In such a situation a universal theoretical basis, however excellent it might have been, which would keep its dominant position for decades could hardly appear. However, the fact that, compared to the Czech situation, there was no single theoretical frame dealing on the general level with all possible kinds of texts had its specific effect for example on the number of the single branches of stylistics distinguished in the British context. According to the Czech model, the branches such as feminist stylistics, pragmatic stylistics, radical stylistics, simply deal with texts influenced by similar stylistic factors – similar authors, similar addressees, similar functions of the texts etc.; the similarity of stylistic factors leads to the similarities of style of the text and to the similarities of their effect. It is certainly possible to speak about the specific features of style of feminist, pragmatically orientated and radical texts. Nevertheless, following the concept of stylistics which among other things employs the inventory of stylistic factors, it does not appear necessary to create new branches of stylistics; similar approach is applied by Crystal, Davy (1969), who have for the purpose of stylistic analysis introduced the system of dimensions of situational constraint.

From the Czech point of view such simplifications and generalizations seem quite fruitful. They enable the scholars to use similar methodological approaches for the basic analysis of practically all texts and to develop special techniques above all for the advanced stages of stylistic investigations, e.g. for measuring the coherence of texts and examining its relevance from the viewpoint of stylistics. Besides simplifying the basic stages of the stylistic analysis there is another advantage – if similar methodologies are used, the results obtained by various scholars analysing various types of texts can be relatively easily subjected to mutual comparison. This of course does not mean that I am in favour of one universal and absolutely binding method of stylistic analysis. I was only trying to show that in stylistics as well as in other disciplines simplifications and the effort to find a common denominator of the phenomena investigated can sometimes simplify the research work, making it more effective at the same time.

4.3   POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The conclusions from the previous section indicate the possibilities for further research in the field of stylistics. There are at least two main areas of the research work to be carried out in the future: 1) theoretical stylistic investigations of various texts plus the practical application of the results, 2) investigations into the metalanguage, such as studies in the history of stylistics also using the contrastive approach – e.g. for the comparison of various methods used for stylistic investigations. Working on these tasks, Czech and British theories of style can complement each other very well.

As far as the first area is concerned, the theoretical background of Czech stylistics has been developed to the extent that can subject to analysis practically any text. In the theoretical research, more attention could perhaps be paid to the stylistically relevant features occurring at the levels of graphemics/graphology, as is done by Crystal, Davy (1969) or Cummings, Simmons (1983). Some observations of this kind have already been made by Hausenblas (1971).

The theoretical background of Czech stylistics should be complemented by detailed analyses of texts which either for political reasons, or simply due to the absence of the particular phenomena could not be investigated in the past. Some areas, for example journalistic and technical styles, have often been explored in Czech theoretical works, while others, such as the style of advertising, propaganda or religion have been examined only rarely. Using e.g. the methodology of critical linguistics, such analyses could bring a lot of specific information concerning the influence of ideologies on style.

On a more general level, it is possible to investigate the nature and issues of style from various perspectives, which need not necessarily mean negation of previous approaches, as it hopefully emerges form the previous chapters; and since I have been recently trying to work out one of the possible approaches (referred to as the Resultative Theory of Style – RTS), I will add a brief summarization of its main features: RTS is rooted especially in the context of functional stylistics as represented by the Prague School. Style is understood here as a triple result: 1) as the result of the influence that stylistically relevant features linked with the means of expression present in the text perform upon the recipient, 2) as the result of application of rules relevant for creating texts of the particular kind (in the established Czech terminology "stylové normy" – stylistic norms, 3) as the result of influence of factors linked with the wider extralinguistic context ("slohotvorní činitelé" – stylistic factors, such as the function of the text, its supposed addressee, context, topic, author etc.). Another aspect dealt with are possible ways of visualization of style (various kinds of stylistic mps) and stylistic models – these tools are meant to be used in practice, by future philologists, teachers, translators – and generally, by all who for specific needs of their professions need to explore style in any kind of texts (Křístek, 2010).

A part of this concept is a phenomenon referred to as stylistic pitch: In Czech terminology, these features are called "stylová dominanta" – stylistic pitch; in the Czech context it has been developed since the 1930s, e.g. by R. Jakobson, K. Hausenblas and O. Uličný. Five main points were presented as possibilities for further research in this particular field: 1) Stylistic pitch can be defined as those elements in the text which are active from the viewpoint of stylistics and at the same time frequently occurring. 2) An effort to identify the stylistic pitch can be seen as a transition from the subjective to the objective stage of stylistic analysis. 3) Identification of the stylistic pitch should begin from the viewpoint of an observer standing outside of the text (i.e. not from the stylistic norms, which give rules for stylization of texts). 4) It is also necessary to take into consideration how existence of the stylistic pitch may be motivated. 5) Stylistic pitch can provide a lead for locating the text within a certain sphere of communication. (Křístek 2009).

In the Czech context it would also be useful to produce a practical textbook of literary theory which could also serve as a workbook with exercises built directly into the text, such as Durant, Fabb (1990). A textbook of this kind would be of great

help to the students of both language and literature; a first step in this direction was taken by Hubáček (1987); a recent, practically orientated attempt was made e.g. by M. Křístek (2011) in a handbook *Stylistika češtiny : úvodní kurs (základy teorie a praktická cvičení)*. As the title itself indicates (Czech stylistics – an introductory course: elementary theoretical explanations and practical exercises), this handbook consists of both theoretical and practical sections – its main aim was to serve in university seminars in stylistics. (As a matter of fact, I was hesitating a bit whether it is appropriate to quote my recent contributions repeatedly, but all in all I have decided to leave the final decision upon the readers – I considered these quotations appropriate as well as the readers may consider appropriate to skip those sentences or to throw the book away.)

The British theoretical works on stylistics could aim at developing further a methodology which could serve as a basis for a complex stylistic analysis of any kind of text in the spirit of the pioneering work of Crystal, Davy (1969), thus making the results of the analyses easier to process and compare (without distorting them, of course). It would probably be fruitful to include in such methodology the approaches of critical stylistics, discourse analysis and other disciplines which have developed especially since the 1970s. More attention could also be paid to analysing the style of the texts belonging to non-literary genres and to various sub-types existing within them, for example to a stratification of technical style, differences among style of scientific monographs, textbooks, popularizing articles etc.

Both Czech and British stylistics can also develop comparative stylistic studies, starting from the basic level on which stylistic values of the particular means of expressions existing in two or more languages are compared. Such comparisons are usually undertaken for practical purposes, such as translating texts adequately also from the stylistic point of view.

The topics in the second area, that of metalanguage, can also use the comparative approach. It is possible, for instance, to undertake comparisons of Czech and British, or any other, theories of style. Moreover, the research work in this area is not only limited to comparing theoretical approaches to style. Moving one level higher in the stratification of comparative stylistics suggested by Miko (1976) it is possible to examine and to compare the development of the standard varieties of Czech and English, their positions among other varieties of language, the basis on which they were established and the circumstances under which this happened.

Although this work dealt mainly with works that originated during the 20th century, the end of the 20th century does not certainly mean the end of stylistics as an autonomous discipline, even though its interdisciplinary nature may strengthen its intertwining e.g. with discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics etc. And it is mainly the development of cognitive approaches towards style that became dominant in the

English scholarly discourse in the early 21st century; this tendency is reflected e.g. in the revisesed version of Katie Wales' *A dictionary of stylistics* (second edition 2001; third edition is being prepared). In the Czech context, some of the previously mentioned traditions and concepts continue e.g. in collective monographs *Současná česká stylistika* (Contemporary Czech stylistics; Čechová, Chloupek, Krčmová, Minářová, 2003) and *Současná stylistika* (Contemporary stylistics; Čechová, Krčmová, Minářová, 2008), a chapter on the history of stylistics from the Middle Ages to the present day was included in the book *Kapitoly z dějin české jazykovědné bohemistiky* (Chapters from the Czech studies from the viewpoint of linguistics, 2007, a chapter by M. Krčmová), thus the history of stylistics as well as its present-day state are dealt with form modern points of view.

***

During the 20th century stylistics, at least in the context examined, has become an autonomous discipline with a rich and modern theoretical background which also enables it to play an important role in the future. Stylistics belongs to the disciplines very closely connected with extralinguistic factors, open and responding to impulses coming from the outside world. Its future development and the specific tasks it will face will therefore to a considerable extent depend for example on the development of the social situation.

On the other hand, it is known e.g. from radical stylistics that this connection can also work the other way round. It means that stylistics – or, to put it in a more accurate way, the scholars specialized in stylistics – can also to a certain extent influence the social situation. The future stylistic investigations carried out from both the synchronic and diachronic points of view should to a greater extent operate in a cross-cultural dimension. They can help people learn about texts which have originated in different cultures developing under the influence of different hictorical and cultural traditions and they can also help them understand the particular cultures themselves - the opinions and value systems possibly different from their own, but from a different point of view equally acceptable.

These tasks represent a great challenge for stylistics in the 21st century. If it manages to cope with them adequately, it will mean not only progress in the sphere of scholarly research work, but also in the sphere of the relationships among people in general.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asher, R. E., ed. (1994) *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics.* 10 vols. Oxford/New York/Seoul/Tokyo: Pergamon Press.

Bečka, J. V. (1948) Úvod do české stylistiky. Praha: Kruh přátel českého jazyka.

Bečka, J. V. (1992) Česká stylistika. Praha: Academia.

Birch, D. (1994) Stylistics. In Asher, ed. 1994. Vol. 8 (Soc-Sze). Oxford/New York/Seoul/Tokyo: Pergamon Press. pp. 4378-4383.

Bradford, R. (1997) Stylistics. London/New York: Routledge.

Bright, W., ed. (1992) *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics.* 4 vols. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carter, R.; Cureton, R. D. (1992) Style. In Bright, ed. 1992. New York/Oxford Oxford University Press. pp. 79-86.

Čechová, M. (1985) Vyučování slohu. Úvod do teorie. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Čechová, M.; Chloupek, J.; Krčmová, M.; Minářová, E. (1997) Stylistika současné češtiny. Praha: Institut sociálních vztahů.

Čechová, M.; Chloupek, J.; Krčmová, M.; Minářová, E. (2003) Současná česká stylistika. Praha: Institut sociálních vztahů.

Čechová, M.; Krčmová, M.; Minářová, E. (2008) Současná stylistika. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.

Červenka, M. (1991) Individuální styl a významová výstavba literárního díla. In *Styl a význam. Studie o básnících*. Praha: Československý spisovatel. pp. 246-262.

Cheshire, J. (1992) Register and Style. In Bright, ed. 1992. New York/Oxford. Oxford University Press. pp. 324-327.

Chloupek, J.; Krčmová, M.; Minářová, E. (1987) Stylistické minimum. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Chloupek, J. et al. (1991) Stylistika češtiny. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Crystal, D. (1997) The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D.; Davy, D. (1969) Investigating English Style. London: Longmans.

Cullen, C. (1994) Prescriptive and Descriptive Grammar. In Asher, ed. 1994. Vol. 6 (Pac-Qur). Oxford/New York/Seoul/Tokyo: Pergamon Press. pp. 3310-3311.

Cummings, M.; Simmons, R. (1983) The Language of Literature. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Daneš, F. (1987) On Prague School Functionalism in Linguistics. In *Functionalism in Linguistics;* ed. by R. Dirven and V. Fried. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 3-38.

Daneš, F.; Doležel, L.; Hausenblas, K.; Váhala, F. (1957) Kapitoly z praktické stylistiky. 2nd, revised edition. Praha: Orbis.

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

Doležel, L. (1954) K obecné problematice jazykového stylu. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 15. pp. 97-105.

Doležel, L. (1955a) Pracovní porada o otázkách stylistiky. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 16. pp. 56-64.

Doležel, L. (1955b) Rozbor uměleckého stylu. Ibid. pp. 90-96.

Doležel, L. (1960) O stylu moderní české prózy. Praha: Nakladatelství ČSAV.

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

Doležel, L. (1993) Narativní způsoby v české literatuře. Praha: Český spisovatel.

Doležel, L. (1998) Heterocosmica. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dubský, J. (1972) The Prague Conception of Functional Style. In *The Prague School of Linguistics and Language Teaching*; ed. by V. Fried. London/Oxford: University Press. pp. 112-127.

Durant, A.; Fabb, N. (1990) Literary Studies in Action. London/New York: Routledge.

Enkvist, N.E. (1964) On Defining Style. In *Linguistics and Style*; ed. by J. Spencer. London: Oxford University Press. pp. 3-56.

Fabb, N.; Attridge, D.; Durant, A.; MacCabe, C., eds. (1987) The Linguistics of Writing. Arguments between Language and Literature. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Filipec, J (1955) Rozbor odborného stylu a jeho vnitřní diferenciace. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 16. pp. 37-52.

Fowler, R. (1996) Literary Criticism. 2nd, revised edition. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Freeman, D.C., ed. (1970) Linguistics and Literary Style. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, Inc.

Fronek, J. (1988) T. G. Masaryk and Prague School Linguistic Structuralism. In *On Masaryk. Studien zur österreichischen Philosophie.* Band XIII. Amsterdam: Rodopi. p. 81-96.

Galperin, I. R. (1977) Stylistics. 2nd, revised edition. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House. Garvin, P. L. (1964) A Prague School Reader on Aesthetics, Literary Structure and Style. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973) Explorations in the Functions of Language. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd.

Halliday, M. A. K; Hasan, R. (1976) Cohesion in English. London: Longman Group, Ltd.

Hausenblas, K. (1955) K základním pojmům jazykové stylistiky. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 16. pp. 1-15.

Hausenblas, K. (1971) Výstavba jazykových projevů a styl. Praha: Univerzita Karlova.

Hausenblas, K. (1996) Od tvaru k smyslu textu. Praha: Univerzita Karlova.

Havránek, B. (1932) Úkoly spisovného jazyka a jeho kultura. In *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura.* Praha: Melantrich, pp. 32-84.

Havránek, B. (1940a) Spisovný jazyk. In *Ottův slovník naučný nové doby. Dodatky k velikému Ottovu slovníku naučnému.* Díl šestý, svazek první, Sm-Še. Praha: Novina. pp. 180-185.

Havránek, B. (1940b) Strukturální linguistika. Ibid. pp. 455-457.

Havránek, B. (1940c) Stylistika. Ibid. pp. 471-473.

Haynes, J. (1995) Style. London/New York: Routledge.

Hodura, Q. (1953) O slohu. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Hodura, Q.; Formánková, V.; Rejmánková, M. (1962) O slohu. 2nd, revised edition. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Horálek, K. (1955) Styl umělecké literatury. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 16. pp. 87-90.

Hough, G. (1969) Style and Stylistics. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Hrabák, J. (1977) Poetika. 2nd, revised edition. Praha: Československý spisovatel.

Hubáček, J. (1987) Učebnice stylistiky. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Jakobson, R. (1960) Linguistics and Poetics. In: *Style in Language*; ed. by T. A. Sebeok. New York/London: John Wiley and Sons. pp. 350-377.

Jakobson, R. (1984) Shifters, Verbal Categories and the Russian Verb. In *Russian and Slavic Grammar. Studies 1931-1981*; ed. by L. R. Waugh and M. Halle. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers. pp. 41-58.

Jedlička, A.; Formánková, V.; Rejmánková, M. (1970) Základy české stylistiky. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Jelínek, M. (1955) Odborný styl. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 16. pp. 25-37.

Jelínek, M. (1974) Stylistické aspekty gramatického systému (gramatické dublety a konkurenty). Stylistické studie 2. Praha: Ústav pro jazyk český ČSAV.

Jelínek, M. (1994) Český jazykový purismus a jeho překonávání. In *Přednášky a besedy z XXVII. běhu Letní školy slovanských studií.* Brno: Masarykova univerzita. pp. 9-15.

Jelínek, M. (1995) Stylistika. In *Příruční mluvnice češtiny.* Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny. pp. 701-782.

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

Jungmann, J. (1845) Slovesnost. 2nd, revised edition. Praha: nákladem Českého museum.

Knittlová, D. (1990) Funkční styly v angličtině a češtině. 2nd, revised edition. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.

Knittlová, D. (1995) Teorie překladu. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.

Knížka o jazyce a stylu soudobé české literatury (1961). Praha: Orbis.

Kořínek, J. M. (1941) O jazykovém stylu. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 7. pp. 28-37.

Kožmín, Z. (1967) Umění stylu. Praha: Československý spisovatel.

Kožmín, Z. (1995) Tvořivý sloh. Praha: Victoria Publishing.

Kraus, J. (1987) O jazyce a stylu pro informační pracovníky. Praha: Ústředí vědeckých, technických a ekonomických informací.

Kraus, J.; Hoffmannová, J. (1996) Písemnosti v našem životě. Praha: Fortuna.

Krčmová, M. (2007) Stylistika In Pleskalová, J.; Krčmová, M.; Večerka, R.; Karlík, P., eds. Kapitoly z dějin české jazykovědné bohemistiky. Praha: Academia, pp. 296-335.

Kress, G., ed. (1976) Halliday: System and Function in Language. Selected Papers. London: Oxford University Press.

Křístek, M. (1999) Czech and British 20th century theories of style. Manuscript of an M.Phil. dissertation. University of Glasgow.

Křístek, M. (2009) Stylistický rozbor textu a stylová dominanta. In Lehečková, E. and Táborský, J., eds. Struktura, variety, funkce. Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica 2, Slavica Pragensia XLI. Praha: Karolinum, pp. 65-70.

Křístek, M. (2010) Rezul′tativnaâ teoriâ stilâ v kontexte funkcional′noj stilistiki. Vestnik Permskogo universiteta, No. 5 (11), pp. 208-210.

Křístek, M. (2011) Stylistika češtiny : úvodní kurs (základy teorie a praktická cvičení). České Budějovice: Nakladatelství Vlastimil Johanus.

Lee, D. (1992) Competing Discourses: Perspective and Ideology in Language. London/New York: Longman.

Leech, G. N. (1987) Stylistics and functionalism. In Fabb, N.; Attridge, D.; Durant, A.; MacCabe, C., eds. pp. 76-88.

Leech, G. N.; Short, M. H. (1981) Style in Fiction. London/New York: Longman.

Macurová, A. (1983) Ztvárnění komunikačních faktorů v jazykových projevech. Praha: Univerzita Karlova.

Matejka, L. (1986) Postscript. Prague School Semiotics. In *Semiotics of Art. Prague School Contributions*; ed. by L. Matejka, and I. W. Titunik. 3rd printing. Cambridge, Mass./London: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press. pp. 265-290.

Mathesius, V. (1911) O potenciálnosti jevů jazykových./On the Potentiality of the Phenomena of Language. Translated by Josef Vachek. In Vachek, ed. (1964), pp. 1-32, and Vachek, ed. (1983), pp. 3-43.

Mathesius, V. (1932) O požadavku stability ve spisovném jazyce.   In *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura.* Praha: Melantrich. pp. 14-31.

Mathesius, V. (1936) Ten Years of the Prague Linguistic Circle. Translated by Josef Vachek. In Vachek 1966. pp. 137-151.

Mathesius, V. (1942) Řeč a sloh.   In: *Čtení o jazyce a poesii.* Praha: Družstevní práce. pp. 13-102.

Matthews, P. H. (1997) The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Miko, F. (1969) Estetika výrazu. Teória výrazu a štýl. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

Miko, F. (1970) Text a štýl. Bratislava: Smena.

Miko, F. (1973) Od epiky k lyrike. Bratislava: Tatran.

Miko, F. (1976) Štýlové konfrontácie. Kapitolky z porovnávacej štylistiky. Bratislava: Slovenský spisovateľ.

Miko, F. (1978) Style, Literature, Communication. Translated by Jessy Kocmanová. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

Mills, S. (1995) Feminist Stylistics. London/New York: Routledge.

Milroy, L.; Milroy, J. (1992) Prescriptive Grammar. In Bright, ed. 1992. Vol. 3 (Morp-Slav). New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 269-271.

Mistrík, J. (1985) Štylistika. Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

Mukařovský, J. (1932) Jazyk spisovný a jazyk básnický. In *Spisovná čeština a jazyková kultura.* Praha: Melantrich. pp. 123-244.

Mukařovský, J. (1940) Strukturální věda o literatuře. In *Ottův slovník naučný nové doby. Dodatky k velikému Ottovu slovníku naučnému.* Díl šestý, svazek první, Sm-Še. Praha: Novina. pp. 457-459.

Pauliny, E. (1955) O funkčnom rozvrstvení spisovného jazyka. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 16. pp. 17-24.

Popovič, A. et al. (1983) Originál, preklad. Bratislava: Tatran.

Potter, S. (1960) Language in the Modern World. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, Ltd.

Říhová, J. (1972) Úvod do stylistické systematiky. Ostrava: Pedagogická fakulta.

Říhová, J. (1977) Teorie stylistiky. Ostrava: Pedagogická fakulta.

Říhová, J. (1982) Slohová čítanka. Ostrava, Pedagogická fakulta.

Rinebom, H. (1994) Contrastive Analysis. In Asher, ed. 1994. Vol. 2 (Cad-Dys). Oxford/New York/Seoul/Tokyo: Pergamon Press. pp. 737-742.

Short, M. (1994) Style: Definitions. In Asher, ed. 1994. Vol. 8 (Soc-Sze). Oxford/New York/Seoul/Tokyo: Pergamon Press. pp. 4375-4378.

Simpson, P. (1993) Language, Ideology and Point of View. London/New York: Routledge.

Skalička, V. (1941) Problémy stylu. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 7. pp. 191-197.

Slovník slovanské lingvistické terminologie./Dictionary of Slavonic Linguistic Terminology (1977, 1979). 2 vols. Praha: Academia.

Staněk, V. (1994) Praktická stylistika pro střední školy. 2nd, revised edition. Praha: Fortuna.

Svoboda, K. (1943) O literárním slohu. Praha: Karel Voleský.

Thomas, G. (1991) Linguistic Purism. London/New York: Longman Group, Ltd.

Threadgold, T. (1994) Structuralism and Semiotics, Literary. In Asher, ed. 1994. Vol. 8 (Soc-Sze). Oxford/New York/Seoul/Tokyo: Pergamon Press. pp. 4359-4373.

Trávníček, F. (1953) O jazykovém slohu. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

Trnka, B. (1941) K otázce stylu. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 7. pp. 61-72.

Traugott, E. C.; Pratt, M. L. (1980) Linguistics for Students of Literature. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Trost, P. (1955) K obecným otázkám stylu. *Slovo a slovesnost.* Vol. 16. pp. 15-17.

Turner, G. W. (1973) Stylistics. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Uličný, O. (1980) Jazyk a styl v práci s textem. Čtenář. Vol. 32. Supplement.

Uličný, O. (1987) Prostor pro jazyk a styl. Lingvostylistické analýzy současné české prózy pro děti a mládež. Praha: Albatros.

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

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

Vachek, J. (1970) U základů pražské jazykovědné školy. Praha: Academia.

Vachek, J. (1974) Chapters from Modern English Lexicology and Stylistics. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.

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

Večerka, R. et al. (1988) Vývoj odborných zájmů o češtinu. Brno: Univerzita Jana Evangelisty Purkyně.

Vinay, J.-P.; Darbelnet, J. (1995) Comparative Stylistics of French and English. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vlašín, Š., ed. (1977) Slovník literární teorie. Praha: Československý spisovatel.

Wales, K. (1997) A Dictionary of Stylistics. 5th impression. London/New York: Longman.

Weber, J. J., ed. (1996) The Stylistics Reader. London/New York/ Sydney/Auckland: Arnold.

Wellek, R.; Warren, A. (1968) Literary theory. 3rd ed. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Wells, R. (1960) Nominal and Verbal Style. In *Style in Language*; ed. by T. A. Sebeok. New York/London: John Wiley and Sons. pp. 213-220.