

STYLISTICS AND SEMANTICS

Style proves to be quite an elusive concept to define and there have been different perspectives on it that have given rise to various definitions.

Whatever point of view one may adopt, however, whether regarding style as personal individual expression, linguistic difference at the level of utterances, or deviation from agreed upon norms, there is a common underlying element in all such perspectives:

“they all assume the existence of some feature or features which are peculiar to style and distinguish it from language. It follows that stylistics is not a mere branch of linguistics but a parallel discipline which investigates the same phenomena from its own point of view.” (Ullmann 1973:41).

Considering Ullmann’s opinion on the matter at hand, one may thus look upon stylistics as displaying several levels, according to the science to which it is paralleled; consequently, one may analyze the stylistic effects that are created due to phonology, semantics, lexicology, morphology, syntax, discourse analysis, etc. Moreover, of the levels of language listed above, stylistics may be regarded as being in the closest relationship with lexicology and semantics; the latter is of greater interest for the present study, as the Joycean text is extremely rich with respect to expressiveness that is created by manipulating cognitive meaning of words with a view to enhancing their stylistic effect and impact on the reader. Such stylistic dimensions of semantics will further require a distinction to be drawn between the semantic structure of individual words and the semantic relations among words. The problem raised by the semantic structure of individual words within the field of semantics when analyzed against a stylistic background may be investigated according to a two-fold distinction: the case of simple semantic situations (one name corresponds to one sense), and that of complex semantic situations (one name corresponds to various senses).

With respect to simple semantic situations, Ullmann identifies three important factors in terms of their relevance to stylistics and, implicitly, to stylistic analysis:

“the ‘motivation’ of the name, the vagueness of the sense, and the overtones which may arise around either the name or the sense or both.” (idem:42)

When tackling the first factor, one may discover that, as stylistics parallels other related sciences, words may have a phonetic, a morphological, or a semantic motivation.

In the first place, phonetic motivation of words is clearly relevant with James Joyce, considering peculiar accumulation of sounds and word invention at the level of what may be identified as interjection or onomatopoeia.

Secondly, morphological motivation is by no means less important, as the Joycean discourse often resorts to opaque words and to unique word-building processes and word-inventions.

Last but not least, the semantic motivation may actually be considered as the most complex of the three, due to its underlying the imagery in a text and to its intricate manipulation of meaning. Finding its most artful realization in metaphor and simile, analyzing the semantic motivation of words in a certain text may disclose the most gifted writers, considering the high degree of difficulty in creating a resemblance relationship between two elements that sometimes are extremely different. Thus, such ‘play-upon-meaning’ is usually a very rich source of tremendous stylistic effects and it may create an equally powerful impact on the reader.

Where vagueness is concerned, it is true that it may cause problems in retrieving the message of the text if clarity and precision of language use are of the utmost importance. Yet, from a different perspective, if the author deliberately chooses to create a state of confusion

by means of peculiar use of language, vagueness becomes an important linguistic tool. As the case is with Joyce, vagueness turns indeed into a considerable source of unique stylistic effects, considering his artful melting language and molding it into different or even completely new shapes.

The last of the three factors, namely overtones, is in a very close relationship with the concept of 'connotations' of a word, as they actually almost overlap. Whether overtones reveal emotional involvement of the speaker or they simply perform an expressive function in the text, they play an important part in creating the stylistic dimension of a certain discourse.

Furthermore, Ullmann distinguishes three categories of overtones: overtones connected with the name, overtones connected with the sense, and overtones associated with particular registers (Cf. *idem*:50-53). Among the elements belonging to the first category, special attention will be paid to the stylistic effect of neologisms, barbarism, and what we dare call erudisms that permeate Joyce's discourse. The second class deals with specific connotations of words or even key-words that may be seen as pertaining to ephemeral fashionable speech within a certain interval of time. The third type of overtones performs an evocative function, as the register may be regarded as enshrined in a single word that stands out in a text that displays a different register than that of the respective word.

The degree of difficulty of the issue is enhanced when touching upon complex semantic situations, when more senses are attributed to the same name in a specific situation in the text.

Such linguistic ambiguity has its manifestations at the level of discourse in the use of polysemy and homonymy with a view to building peculiar stylistic effects. Either explicit or implicit, both linguistic devices seem to serve a certain stylistic effect in particular, i.e. creating a highly ambiguous text, plunging the reader into a unique state of confusion, and encoding the message to a great extent, and, thus, making the reader's task to retrieve it very difficult, even almost impossible sometimes.

The issue of semantic relations among words may be regarded as a proof of the well-known aphorism according to which the whole is sometimes more than the sum of its parts. Considering that each word has the possibility to give rise to a stylistic effect on its own, combinations or choices of words may create even more complex stylistic dimensions of texts.

Therefore, when dealing with the relationships established among words, one must lay focus on the paradigmatic versus syntagmatic relations dichotomy; the former refer to operating choices among various possibilities, whereas the latter contribute to the creation of context, as their interest lies with collocations, with the way in which words co-exist at the level of the text.

Among the different paradigmatic relations, synonymy may be of greater importance to the study of stylistics, as the choice of synonyms may display overtones, and, thus, help create a stylistic effect.

There has been debate on determining the criteria that underlie authors' choices of synonyms in a certain context, but the issue has proved to be of a quite elusive nature. The fact remains that synonymy is a rich source of stylistic effects, may that be by means of operating a peculiar choice, or by employing an accumulation of synonyms with a view to emphasizing the message that is conveyed.

Such an accumulation of synonyms may actually be looked upon as an instance of the paradigmatic becoming syntagmatic, and, in the process, giving rise to clear stylistic effects.

Moreover, there is another instance of combinations of terms that, according to the norms of language, could never have occurred in a collocation, i.e. the pairing of antonyms equally clearly meant to serve certain stylistic purposes. In this case, style may indeed be regarded as obvious deviation from norm.

Consequently, it may be fairly clear that stylistics and semantics enjoy a very close relationship, displaying similar levels of analysis, and proving once more the highly

interdisciplinary nature of stylistic itself. A complex science in its own right, stylistics has evolved from a mere branch within linguistics to comprising elements belonging to various other sciences and paralleling them with respect to levels of analysis.

To conclude, stylistics reveals its interdisciplinary nature, as that of style itself, and the purpose of any stylistic analysis will be of utmost importance in establishing the necessary perspectives on style and stylistics that the analyst needs to adopt.

REFERENCES

- Dima, G. 2003. *Outlines of English Semantics*, Galați: Editura Fundației Universitare "Dunărea de Jos".
- Hulban, H. 1984. *Elements of English Semantics*, Iași: Universitatea "Al. I. Cuza".
- Leech, G., M. Short. 1990. *Style in Fiction*, London and New York: Longman, eighth impression.
- Leech, G. 1990. *Semantics. The Study of Meaning*, London: Penguin Books, second edition.
- Strunk Jr, W., White, E. B. 2000. *The Elements of Style*, Massachusetts: Longman, fourth edition.
- Ullman, S. 1973. *Meaning and Style*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wales, K. 1991. *A Dictionary of Stylistics*, London and New York: Longman, second impression.
- Wilson, P. 2000. *Mind the Gap. Ellipsis and Stylistic Variation in Spoken and Written English*, London: Pearson.

ABSTRACT

It may be fairly clear that stylistics and semantics enjoy a very close relationship, displaying similar levels of analysis, and proving the highly interdisciplinary nature of stylistic itself. A complex science in its own right, stylistics has evolved from a mere branch within linguistics to comprising elements belonging to various other sciences and paralleling them with respect to levels of analysis. One of the most important such symbiotic relationships seems to be exactly the one linguistic stylistics has with semantics.