

PALA
PALA
PALA

Occasional Papers
No. 3

**Pragmatic Aspects of Literary
Communication**

by
Tatyana Karpenko

PALA: The Poetics and

Linguistics Association
1993

Pragmatic Aspects of Literary Communication

Tatyana Karpenko

1. Introduction

In this paper I will examine some changes the Gricean Maxims undergo in written communication with particular emphasis on literary communication.

The idea of applying Gricean Maxims to the analysis of literary texts has been developed most fully in van Dijk's *Pragmatics and Poetics* and Pratt's *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse*.

Van Dijk states that all Gricean Maxims are violated in literary communication, that the speaker 'opts out' from the contextual principles of ordinary conversation and that the 'Cooperative Principle' does not hold. He proposes the so-called Cooperative Principle from which the four literary counterparts of the Gricean principle are derived (1977, pp. 46-54).

Pratt (1977, pp.173-74) also notes the conspicuous difference in communication on the levels of author-reader and hero-hero. She shares Ohmann's (1971, pp.241-54) view on speech acts of the latter level as 'mimetic' or 'imitation speech acts' and states that what counts as a lie, a clash, an opting out, or an unintentional failure on the part of a fictional speaker (or writer) counts as flouting on the part of the real-world author. The implicature involved as the result of flouting is that the non-fulfillment is in accord with the purpose of the exchange in which the reader and author are engaged.

Below I present my view on how the Cooperative Principle and Maxims work in literature.

Part I

At first glance it might seem that the Maxims of Quantity, Relation and/or Manner are violated in literary texts by definition: they can be full of reasonings and descriptions which are not directly connected with the plot and may be regarded as irrelevant or uninformative. On the other hand they may appear

significant and relevant with respect to the general message of the author. The only reasonable way to treat this contradiction is first to take into consideration the presupposition which is implicit in every published literary text, namely, that the author wants to communicate; otherwise his/her work would not appear on paper.

Taking for granted that the author observes the Cooperative Principle we should also take for granted the author's point of view on what s/he considers appropriate, relevant or informative for the purposes of communication. The author says as much on the subject as s/he thinks to be sufficient, and we cannot doubt his/her choice since, normally, we cannot doubt his/her desire to cooperate.

Maxims of Quantity, Relation and Manner (especially the third Submaxim - 'be brief') as related to literary communication cannot be prescriptive in stating the upper and lower boundaries of informativeness and brevity.

So, in my opinion an author never opts out; s/he does cooperate and has evidently proved it by having the book published. Nor can we say that the Maxims are violated because, as we have stated above, all the deviations are within the author's intention and necessary for the tasks set out by the author in the given literary work. The reader is never misled, which is often the case with the violation of Maxims in conversation.

It also seems impossible to treat all the deviant cases as flouting, because, for example, lengthy descriptions of nature in a book do not normally give rise to any implicature. What Pratt regards as implicature engendered by flouting of Maxims is rather one of general presumptions readers have when they take a book of fiction and start to read it:

- 1) The author cooperates.
- 2) Hence, everything the author says in a book is within the global purpose of communication.
- 3) The readers are dealing with the piece of literature, and so they must suspend disbelief.

Grice himself seems to have foreseen some limitations of his approach. In formulating his Quantity Maxim he emphasises one very important reservation: 'Make your contribution as informative as required (*for the current purposes of the exchange*)' (Grice, 1975, p.45). All the apparent contradictions in applying Grice's Maxims to literature can be resolved if the starting point of analysis is the purpose of literary communication.

Of great help here would be the goal-oriented approach, suggested by Leech (1983). Leech regards language activity as goal-directed, where multiple goals combine sequentially and simultaneously with one dominating major supraordinate goal. Leech's goal-oriented model of discourse includes the following binary oppositions of goals:

1) dynamic goals (goals with the function of changing the environment including the psychological state or attitude of the addressee) and regulative goals (with the function of preventing the environment from changing);

2) coexisting goals (which may be in competition or in conflict);

3) subordinate goals and supraordinate goals (one serving as a means to another);

4) long-term goals (persisting through a whole discourse or section of discourse) and short-term goals (which may, for example, be confined to a single sentence or utterance);

5) major goals and minor goals (i.e. some goals are more important than the others).

(Leech, 1983, pp. 145-150)

I will now analyse the applicability of Gricean Maxims to literary communication, employing this goal-oriented approach.

2. Quantity

In failing to observe this Maxim the author can be:

1. completely uninformative;
2. not sufficiently informative;
3. excessively informative.

2.1. Complete uninformativeness

Complete uninformativeness in a text can be a requirement of genre - the simplest case would be puzzles, riddles, crosswords, etc.

Take the following text:

Three lads living in the same street each have a pet cat of a different colour. Bobby lives at a house with a higher number than Shane's. Philip's cat is named Fluff their house number is not seven higher than the one

at which the marmalade cat lives. Ronnie owns the black-and-white cat. Rajah, who is not the tabby cat, is not owned by the boy who lives at no.12. From the clues given above can you name each boy's pet and give its colour, and say at which number in the street they live?

Evidently the major goal here is not to inform but to entertain the readers, making them work out the answer. So, here we deal only with partial violation of the Maxim of Quantity. More sophisticated genres such as detective stories and thrillers operate on the same principle. Here the Maxim of Quantity is violated on the level of the subordinate goal, the superordinate goal being to build up and maintain suspense. In one of Agatha Christie's stories, for example, this is done by means of describing the consecutive, inexplicable deaths of twelve people. By the twelfth murder the readers are completely intrigued. All the necessary information is given at the end of the story and the partial violation of the Maxim of Quantity has a clear 'aperitif' function, to use Barthes's term. Partial violation here means the violation of the Maxim on discrete parts of the text which can be a subordinate short-term goal of the author.

Another instance of **partial violation** of the Maxim of Quantity can be found in coded texts - passwords, ciphers, some mystic and religious texts, instances of the so-called Aesop language. The addressers are totally uninformative and really mean to conceal information, being motivated by different extralinguistic rather than linguistic reasons. But in this case there is **partial violation of the Maxim of Quantity** - the addresser wants to cooperate with a very restricted group of people. The Maxim is violated with some addressees and observed with others, the initiated. Text is informative only for them and not informative for all the rest. This non-fulfillment of a Maxim is often the result of a **Clash between the Quantity and Quality Maxims**. Under certain conditions the addresser cannot be fully explicit, clear and truthful at the time. In this case the addresser has two coexisting major goals: to impart the information to the initiated and at the same time to conceal it from the rest. 'The initiated' may imply members of the same religious or mystic brotherhood, people of the same political beliefs or any other group of people who, for whatever reason, cannot speak out overtly.

Consider the following piece of text:

Tall tree, spy-glass shoulder, bearing a point
to the N. of N.N.E.
Skeleton Island E.S.E. and by E.
Ten feet.
The bar silver is in the north cache, you can find it
by the trend of the east, etc.

This is the coded message from R.L.Stevenson's *Treasure Island*. This piece represents partial violation of the Maxim of Quantity - partial in both senses - it is violated only within a part of the text and only with those addressees (both fictional and real) who are not familiar with the code.

However, with the readers' presumption of a cooperating author it will never be mistaken for a breach of the Cooperative Principle. This piece of text only serves to intrigue the readers and make them read on in anticipation of an explanation. The short-term goal of the author is to break the Maxim of Quantity; long-term, to spur the reader into reading on. The former goal can also be described as subordinate, the latter, as supraordinate.

The addresser can restrict the audience to a very small group of people. Nevertheless this cannot be called violation. An extreme example can be found in one of the Lermontov's poems. One of the most moving pieces of Lermontov's lyric has an acronym as a dedication. An eminent Russian literary critic, I. Andronnikov, has devoted several years of research and an exciting book, *The Enigma of....*, to decoding the addressee of this poem. There appears to be a romantic love story behind these initials that adds much to an understanding of the content of the poem. Evidently, Lermontov intended this poem to be fully understood only by his beloved. Although the poem was published during the poet's lifetime its main addressee was only one person.

These cases of partial violation of the Quantity Maxim often result in the **violation of the Maxim of Manner** - and, specifically, of Submaxims 1 and 2 - 'do not be obscure' and 'do not be ambiguous'. The following passage involves all the instances of non-fulfillment of the above-mentioned Submaxims:

The King Triumphant. Blessing the Bodies
Manifests the Catholics Pure Consolation together with his
Servants in Perpetuity the Majesty of the Rector Devotedly
Treated. Amen.

This is a coded message. In 1499 a Benedictine *Abbot*, John Trilheim, devised a cipher where every letter of the alphabet was coded by a word of a religious meaning. When put together the words composed a somewhat obscure religious text, which sounded like a passage from a sermon or an old, religious book. The real message could have been understood only by a small group of monks familiar with the cipher. The text given above means: *Do not use the bearer.*

Another example is obscure Masonic text. Some of the words, denoting principal concepts of Freemasonry, cannot be made public; others are highly symbolic and cannot, by strict Masonic regulation, be explained in public. This second example also involves the non-fulfillment of Maxims of Quantity and Manner:

Esoteric Significance of the C... T...

One reason for the concealment of esoteric truths is that whilst of almost immeasurable value to the sincere and officially-guided aspirant, for one who is neither completely sincere and altruistic, nor under correct guidance many such truths are distinctly dangerous in their full esoteric meanings. The c... t... is an example since like all objects associated with the Mysteries... they symbolize the coiled-up kundalini which moves in a serpentine path and through the Chakras...

These texts represent the **Clash of Maxims of Quality, Quantity and Manner** where the two latter are sacrificed for the sake of the former.

Texts may also appear to be uninformative as a result of **Opting out**. For the analysis of literary communication I would suggest a distinction between overt Opting out and covert, 'quiet' Opting out. The former is rather rare because, as has already been stated above, the writer is expected to communicate. The writer's explicit refusal to write any more (as was the case with Truman Capote) can, probably, count as overt Opting out. The latter can be exemplified by texts which were not originally intended for any addressees at all - for example drafts or parts of a novel the author never intended to publish or personal diaries published posthumously. All these texts are usually accompanied by extensive commentaries when they appear in print to supply the missing information or clarify some points. In such cases it could again be argued that there was no intent to communicate on the author's part (or, at least, only to him/herself).

2.2. Not sufficiently informative

A second case of non-fulfillment of the Maxim of Quantity is when the addresser is not efficiently informative. Take Umberto Eco's novel *Il Nome della Rosa*. Are all potential readers of it able to catch all the allusions - historical and intertextual - in which this text abounds? Clearly the novel may appear abstruse in many ways to the average reader. It is also evident that the author wishes to communicate with readers who belong to an intellectual elite and share a common background knowledge with the author. This text is slightly different from the cases mentioned above - the CP is not broken here. The range of possible readers is not rigidly encompassed and understanding depends more on the background knowledge of the addressee than on the knowledge of special clues or passwords.

These points can also be vividly illustrated in the poetry of Grienberg. If we take, for example, his poem *Iron Horse* we find that commentary to it consists of 30 entries, among which are:

Edward Carpenter: contemporary disciple of Whitman, British educator-poet...

Homer: poet Lawrence Ferlinghetti's late sizable black dog, subject of several popular poems.

Sahasrarapadma: seventh chakra, 'thousand-petal lotus' at skulltop.

Gavin Arthur, Bay area astrologer, grandson of US President Chester A. Arthur had slept with Carpenter, who had slept with Whitman, according to written testament entrusted to author.

Mr. Cummings and Mr. Vinal: e.e.cummings wrote much-anthologised poem mocking lesser poet H. Vinal.

The woman in the red dress: the woman who 'informed' on 'Public Enemy No.1', John Dillinger, leading FBI agent to the movie house where he was cornered and shot.

Xochimilco: ancient floating gardens Mexico City, where Kerouac Orlovsky and the author met a party of Mexican ballet boys in a sightseeing boat.

Shri Ramana Maharshi: 20th-century South Indian ascetic saint, etc., etc.

The above-mentioned cases should also be classed as a **partial violation of the Maxim of Quantity**.

In not sufficiently informative texts the Quantity Maxim can also get flouted. By this means the author gains the effect of text implicature. In his novel *A Maggot*, John Fowles gives insufficient information about the main character's disappearance. However, he gives several very ambiguous hints on what could have happened to him and why. This ambiguity is not resolved even at the end of the novel - Fowles leaves the readers to unravel the mystery themselves and to make their own conclusions. The author's supraordinate goal in the novel is to fire his readers' imagination as well as to cause them to reflect upon life's priorities without providing a wealth of information on the subject.

2.3. Excessively informative

The addresser can be excessively informative on

the subject. Here it should be repeated that what might seem to the readers excessively informative may well form part of intention and, as a result of that, may have a message in itself. Thus it cannot count as a violation of the Maxim of Quantity. Rather it is suspension or flouting, and is accompanied by **suspension of the Brevity Submaxim.**

Another reason for the author's being too informative or verbose (or seeming too informative or verbose) is the matter of style or genre: compare an epic novel and a limerick. In these cases violation does not occur either.

3. Relation

Non-fulfillment of the Maxim of Relation takes place against the background knowledge of the cooperating author which makes complete violations of the Maxim impossible. Cases of partial violation are not uncommon, especially in 'stream of consciousness' literary texts or literature of the absurd, where we can speak of **partial violation of the Maxim of Relation** only in terms of a short-term, subordinate, minor goal. On the level of a long-term, subordinate, major goal of the literary work this Maxim is observed, the reader seeking to relate sentences which at first glance seem unrelated. (These instances are referred to as 'superrelevance' in the *Dictionary of Stylistics*(1987).) Analysing the passage from Joyce, Leech and Short note, 'The Maxim of Relation is particularly pertinent in describing the sequencing of apparently unrelated pieces of information in Joycean "stream of consciousness" writing.' (1981, p. 302).

It is no less important in the literature of the absurd. It is impossible to correlate the utterances of Ionesco's *Jacques* or *Obedience* characters. Only on reading the whole play does its meaning emerge out of the scattered clues. P. Vernois sees it as reflecting social pressure on a rebellious individual and the conflict of sexuality with this social pressure. (Vernois, 1972, p. 78).

4. Manner

I have already mentioned an instance where non-fulfillment of the Maxim of Quantity is accompanied by non-fulfillment of the Submaxims of the Maxim of Manner 1 & 2 (the Lermontov poem). I shall now provide some more examples.

1. & 2. Avoid obscurity of expression

& avoid ambiguity.

It is very difficult to make a clear-cut distinction between the first two submaxims of the Maxim of Manner in a literary text, and so I will discuss the two together. Cases in point are such literary genres as fable and parable. Indirectness of expression and ambiguity are the constituent features of the genres in question. So, **the first two Submaxims of the Maxim of Manner** are flouted in these texts by definition, giving rise to implicatures. The message itself becomes a code, a symbolic structure. Genre imposes upon the author the necessity to be ambiguous but in such a way that the message is quickly discerned. The author does not declare the moral message overtly respecting the genre, s/he conveys it under the guise of a story or anecdote for readers to grasp the moral lesson on their own. Thus it becomes semantically 'foregrounded' as the result of cooperative effort between author and reader. So in fables and parables flouting of the Maxim of Manner is in conformity with a major dynamic goal - to influence the reader.

Ambiguity, obscurity, and lack of orderliness can also be part of stylistic innovation in 'stream of consciousness' writing or, more generally, in the modernist approach, a characteristic feature of which is ambiguity and illogicality. In texts that are obscure, ambiguous or utterly disorderly the author challenges the reader's creativity and invites the reader to participate in building up the meaning. Here again analysis should be based on the presumption of the author's cooperation (and not opting out) which is always present in any literary discourse. If ambiguity, obscurity and lack of orderliness extend over a whole novel or poem we can speak about suspension of the Maxim of Manner; if they appear in discrete parts of the text, of partial violation of Maxim of Manner.

4. Be orderly.

Lack of orderliness, apart from being, in its extreme version, an inevitable feature of innovative style, has long been known in literature. Changing the order of events and relocating characters to new settings has become a norm of literary texts. The mental exercise of putting the events in the right order and of locating them correctly does not normally seem difficult at all. The partial violation of the Submaxim of orderliness is conventional in literary texts.

It is more difficult to cope with disorderliness as a result of suspension of the Maxim of Manner that persists throughout a text - in Sasha Sokolov's *School for Fools*, for example. But in both cases disorderliness is part of the method.

Literary texts are orderly in their own way, the order being subservient to the supraordinate major goal of the writer in a given work of literature. This goal superimposes its specific logic on the whole written text.

5. Quality

Grice has emphasised that this Maxim is valued by the speakers much more highly than the others - its violation amounts to moral offence, whereas violation of the others is at worst inconsiderate or rude (1975, p.45-46). The same holds good for literary communication. Violation by the author of the Maxim of Quality (being insincere, expressing or advocating ideas s/he does not believe in), is considered immoral and leads to ethical and aesthetic failure. There are many examples of such violation in the literature of socialist realism.

Another case of intentional violation of the Maxim of Quality can be found in literary mystification.

At first glance it might appear that this Maxim is violated in every fictional text by definition. But semantically speaking it is irrelevant whether the text represents a model of the real world or simply one of the many possible fictional worlds. Pragmatically speaking it is not relevant either. The Maxim of Quality should be applied not to the fact that the author is trying to deceive us into believing that Martians exist, but to the value set of literary message. Literary message is the author's regulative supraordinate major goal. Suspension of disbelief on the level of perception means suspension of Submaxims of the Quality Maxim on the level of the subordinate goals.

In this part of the paper I have examined the applicability of Gricean Maxims to literary texts. For the sake of clarity I have so far disregarded important peculiarities of written literary communication, as distinct from oral communication, such as the temporal, local and/or cultural distance of addresser and addressee. Now I will proceed to these peculiarities.

Part II

Literary communication is fundamentally different from oral communication in that the addresser and the addressee in literary communication are temporally, locally and possibly culturally distanced. As a result literary communication is a one-sided process with no feedback on the part of the addressee.

I will now discuss the effects these peculiarities have on the applicability of Gricean Maxims to literary communication. These effects are most evident in the case of the Maxims of Quantity and Manner.

6. Quantity

What was sufficiently informative at the time of writing may not be sufficiently informative centuries later. Take this extract from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as an example:

No, in despite of sense and secrecy,
Unpeg the basket on the house's top,
Let the birds fly, and, like the famous ape
To try conclusions, in the basket creep,
And break your own neck down.

(III, iv).

The story or fable to which Shakespeare is alluding is lost: commentaries usually say that this is an allusion to an unknown fable. On the other hand Shakespeare refers to one of the heroes of the fable as 'the famous ape'.

This, and similar cases, present an interesting text semantics phenomenon; the text becomes semantically insufficient with the passage of time. What was 'famous' in Shakespearean times is now irrecoverably lost, and the Maxim of Quantity is felt to be violated in texts that originally were semantically sufficient. In most cases, to ensure more adequate understanding of the text, to make it semantically sufficient, a new piece of text has to be added in the form of commentary or footnotes.

Another example is one of the opening lines of *Eugene Onegin* by Pushkin, a line which is so well-known to the Russian reader that it would hardly seem to warrant any commentary:

He made others respect himself...

However familiar it may be to everybody in Russia, this line is not at all properly understood by most readers: 'to make others respect oneself' was used in 18th-century Russian as a euphemism for 'to die' which is not common knowledge now.

Another case of non-fulfillment of the Maxim of Quantity is when the text is sufficiently informative for one culture but not sufficiently informative for another. It is well-known that realia often present difficulties in understanding for readers of different cultural backgrounds. Editor's or translator's footnotes and comments are generally used to bridge this cultural semantic gap. In such cases the physical boundaries of the text should be extended to promote its adequate understanding

Let me exemplify this statement by a short extract from M.Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita*:

...Riukhin raised his head and saw that he was in the middle of Moscow... and that a metal man stood on a pedestal pretty near to him, his head bent down a little, and looked blankly at the boulevard.

Some strange thoughts overwhelmed the head of the sick poet. 'That's an example of real luck.., whatever move he had done in his life, whatever had ever happened to him, everything conspired to make him famous! But what had he done? I can't get it... Is there anything special in the words "Tempest covers with a mist...". I don't understand. Luck, luck!' -suddenly Riukhin drew a sinister conclusion...this White Guard man had been shooting at him had hit his hip and thus had granted him immortality...

One has to be very familiar with Russian culture understand this passage. There are, though, sufficient clues for the Russian reader to conclude immediately and without any effort that the 'metal man' is the monument to Pushkin in Moscow. These clues are 'the boulevard', the place where the monument stands, 'wounded hip' - an allusion to Pushkin's duel and, of course, the initial line of a poem known to every primary school pupil in Russia. Even the words 'the White Guard man' do not create ambiguity in spite of the fact, that the White Guards only appeared eighty years later. Riukhin's mention of the White Guard serves to characterise him as a rather uneducated man: the expression 'White Guard man' was in current use at that time as the equivalent of a swear word.

The above-mentioned passage would certainly not seem sufficiently informative to foreign readers who are unfamiliar with the place in Moscow where the monument stands, the details of Pushkin's duel, or the initial lines of his poem. They can also be easily misled by 'the White Guard man', as it is a part of the realia of the revolutionary period.

The information is obviously insufficient, but it is nevertheless obvious that the Quantity Maxim is neither violated, flouted nor suspended intentionally. This instance might also be classified as unintentional violation of Maxim of Quantity.

7. Manner

What is obscure or ambiguous at one historical

period may be neither obscure nor ambiguous in another.

Take the example of Walter Scott's novel *Redgauntlet*, which is set only about 60 years earlier than the time it was written. In the novel Scott refers to Charles Edward Stuart as either the Chevalier or the Prince. This indirect nomination (violation of Maxim of Manner) used by Scott contained some very important implications (implicatures) for Scott's contemporaries. Back in 1832 it was quite clear to whom he was referring and why he was referring to him in such a way and not, say, calling him the Pretender. These implicatures cannot be recovered by the majority of present-day readers. Hence the need for the footnote, which serves to supply us with the lost implicature. In the 1988 Oxford University Press edition of *Redgauntlet* the title 'the Chevalier' is accompanied by a lengthy commentary:

From the three titles most often used to describe Charles Edward Stuart, Scott chooses in his 1832 introduction to *Redgauntlet* to use Prince (Charles's adherents acknowledged him Prince of Wales) and Chevalier (his father was given the title of Chevalier de St. George by Louis XIV). The common Hanoverian description - the Pretender - with its connection of false claimant he deliberately avoids.

(Scott,1988, p. 420)

No violation or other non-fulfillment of the Maxim of Quantity is here meant by the author: the author's intention is to make the literary work sufficiently informative. Nevertheless, the violation takes place. This case I propose to term an **unintentional violation of the Maxim of Quantity**.

What is obscure or ambiguous in one cultural tradition may be neither obscure nor ambiguous in another. New Testament allusions, for example, are transparent and easily decoded in Christian cultures, but may present certain difficulties for understanding in Muslim, or, say, atheist ones. Biblical allusions can be lost on many readers of the former Soviet Union, especially among the younger generation, as the Bible was excluded from the official cultural tradition, and, moreover, the book itself was difficult to obtain.

8. Conclusion

The most important conclusion of this paper is that in written texts, and, specifically, in literary communication, there exists a strong tendency to observe the Maxims. They prove to

hold good for literary as well as for oral communication. They cannot be said to be totally violated or flouted nor is there any necessity to introduce special Maxims for literary communication. The non-fulfillment of Maxims can be accounted for in terms of the goal-oriented approach by the presence of a predominant goal supraordinate to that of communicating something to the reader.

In a short paper like this, it has been impossible to undertake a full-scale analysis of Maxims in literary discourse. The survey of cases of non-fulfillment of Maxims treats the problem in a somewhat over-generalized and over-simplified way. It fails to cover a great number of borderline cases where the interplay of major and minor subordinate and supraordinate goals can give rise to more complex instances of fulfillment/non-fulfillment of Maxims, which are not unambiguously classifiable.

REFERENCES

- Dijk, van T.A.** (1976). *Pragmatics and Poetics*, University of Amsterdam, North Holland Publishing Company.
- Grice, H.P.** (1975). 'The logic of conversation', in *Syntax and Semantics*, New York,: Academic Press.
- Leech, G.** (1983). 'Pragmatics, discourse analysis, stylistics and *The Celebrated Letter*', in *Prose Studies* 6 (2).
- Leech, G.** and **Short, M.** (1981). *Style in Fiction*. London, New York, Longman.
- Ohmann, R.** (1972). 'Speech, literature and the space between', in *New Literary History* 4.
- Pratt, H.L.** (1977). *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse*. Bloomington, London: Indiana University Press.
- Sell, R.** (1989) 'Disciplinary fragmentation and integration: grammatology and literary Pragmatics', in *Parlance* 2 (1).
- Wales, K.** (1987) *Dictionary of Stylistics*. London, New York, Longman.

Copyright © Poetics and Linguistics Association

For further information, contact:

Dr. Urszula Clark,
University of Wolverhampton,
Castle View,
Dudley DY1 3HR

email: U.Clark@wlv.ac.uk