DOI: https://doi.org/10.24113/ijohmn.v6i4.189

# Leech and Short's Checklist of Lexical Features in *Style in Fiction*: A Theoretical Analysis

Suzan Makhloof

Assistant Lecturer at the Dept. of English

Faculty of Arts

Zagazig University

Egypt

m_suzan@zu.edu.eg

Abstract

This paper aims at investigating Leech and Short's Checklist of Lexical Features in their book Style in Fiction (2007) in order to help students of Stylistics at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels to deeply understand the application of such features. Leech and Short put these lexical features in the form of questions that should be answered by students who are conducting a stylistic lexical analysis of any literary work. In this paper, the researcher will mainly highlight how such features can operate in literary texts by providing explanation to these questions and answer them with examples.

Keyword: Vocabulary, lexical features, semantic functionality, syntactic functionality.

## Introduction

Stylistics is said by Leech and Short (2007) to investigate "the relation between the writer's artistic achievement, and how it is achieved through language …. It studies the

relation between the significances of a text, and the linguistic characteristics in which they are manifest" (pp. 55-56). These linguistic characteristics are called "markers" or "features" (ibid.). They are classified according to Leech and Short into four categories: lexical, grammatical, phonological and graphological. For them, the selection of these features to trace their significance in a given text is a difficult task if it is intuitive. This is why they prefer to have "a checklist of potential style markers… so that a reader may carry out a linguistic survey of the text, searching for significant features" (p. 56). Proposing this checklist makes the stylistic analysis of a text "very selective indeed: some studies concentrate on just one feature, and others on a mere handful of features" (ibid., p. 55). In this paper, the researcher is concerned with elaborating the lexical features, which are divided into: general features, Nouns, verbs, Adjectives and adverbs.

According to Mariam Webster Dictionary, lexicology is derived from the Late Greek *lexis-*, which means "words" or "vocabulary." Bussmann (2006) states that lexicology "describes the structure of the vocabulary of a language" and it also "examines linguistic expressions for their internal semantic structure and the relationships between individual words or lexical units" (p. 683). Crystal (2008, p. 278) gives a simple definition of lexicology as "the overall study of a language's vocabulary." Wales (2001) contends that linguists use the term "lexical item" or "lexeme" in place of the term "word." For them, "words can have different forms, but are felt to be the 'same word', and can be so cited in a lexicon" (p. 234).

## Lexical Features

Leech and Short (2007) display the lexical features in the form of questions that the stylistician or the student of stylistics should answer in his stylistic analysis of any text. These questions or features are categorized (ibid., pp. 61-62) according to their relevance

to the following aspects: general, nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs.

1. General

- Is the vocabulary simple or complex? formal or colloquial? descriptive or evaluative? general or specific?
- How far does the writer make use of the emotive and other associations of words, as opposed to their referential meaning?
- Does the text contain idiomatic phrases or notable collocations, and if so, with what kind of dialect or register are these idioms or collocations associated?
- Is there any use of rare or specialised vocabulary?
- To what semantic fields do words belong?

To be able to answer these questions while reading a given text, the reader should understand some stylistic concepts:

*1.1. Simple or complex vocabulary?*

Jackson and Amvela (2000, p. 4) make a distinction between simple and complex words, stating that this distinction is based on "morphological analysis" of the words. According to them, simple words "are all free morphemes" and they are "morphologically unanalyzable" (ibid.). Some examples are *fact, number, think, play, dear, secret ...etc.* Complex words, on the other hand, "are formed from simpler words by the addition of affixes or some other kind of morphological modification" (ibid.). Some examples are *disappoint, reconcile, reasoning, definition, reference, rougher ...etc.*

*1.2. Formal or colloquial vocabulary?*

According to Jackson and Amvela (2000), the formality and colloquialism of

Modern English words can be determined through the etymology of the word itself. Modern English words come from Old English (Anglo-Saxon invasion), French or Latin. They contend that "the Old English word is the most colloquial, the French is more literary, and the Latin word more learned" (p. 35). They add that "words from Old English are generally shorter than their French or Latin synonyms. They also tend to belong to the ordinary, colloquial language," whereas Latinate words "may sometimes be more formal or technical than a synonym that entered English as a consequence of the Norman French invasion" (p. 97). They exemplify this using three synonymous verbs, the first of which comes from Old English (i.e. *to ask*), the second from French (i.e. *to question*), and the third from Latin (i.e. *to interrogate*).

### *1.3. Descriptive or evaluative vocabulary?*

Any vocabulary can have either a descriptive or an evaluative meaning, depending on the context in which it is used. A descriptive meaning of a word (also called *propositional meaning*) is the one which "bears on reference or truth" (Kortmann & Loebner, 2013, p. 22). The evaluative meaning, according to Wales (2001), is "akin to emotive meaning: there are words which affect our emotions because they have connotations of approval or disapproval" (p. 139). The evaluative word, for Crystal (2008), is "a term used in semantics for a type of modality where propositions express the speaker's attitude (e.g. surprise, regret) towards what is being said"(p. 176). In this sense, descriptive words express objectivity because they are related to the truth; whereas, the evaluative words are subjective because they express the speaker's own point of view or attitude. For instance, words such as "wide," "thin" and "hard" are descriptive since they describe something is really like. On the other hand, the word " practical" in "John is thinks that he is a practical father" is an evaluative word because it evaluates John in his own eyes.

*1.4. General or specific vocabulary?*

According to Mandell and Kirszner (2012), the general words (also called *generic words*)" denote entire classes or groups," whereas specific words "refer to a particular persons, items, or events" (p. 194). For instance, the word "people" or "girl" are general words, but the words "John" and "George" are specific because they refer to specific persons. Wales (2001) believes that "pronouns, too, can have generic reference as in *you/one never can tell…* referring to people in general" (p. 176).

*1.1. The use of emotive (associative) meanings vs. referential meanings*

The emotive (also called *affective*, *occasional*, associative or *connotative* meaning) refers to "the effect that a word might have on the emotions of the reader or the listener" (Wales, 2001, p. 123). In contrast, the referential meaning is called denotation. According to Wales (2001), denotation is used to "distinguish what is seen as the basic or central conceptual or referential meaning of words or signs, without the associations (connotations) or metaphoric meanings which they can acquire in particular contexts" (p. 100). She adds that the "dictionary definitions of lexical items are based on denotative or denotational meaning" (ibid.). For instance, the word "home" denotes a place where we live especially with our family," whereas, this word may have an emotive meaning to the expatriate (i.e. longing or yearning).

*1.2. Collocations and Registers*

The term Collocation is first coined by J.R. Firth in his semantic theory (1957). It is derived from the Latin word "collocation" which means "ordering or arrangement" (Bussmann, 2006, p. 200). According to Crystal (2008, p. 87), it refers "to the habitual co-occurrence of individual lexical items". For him, the collocated lexical items are called

"collocates," and their ability to collocate together is their "collocability or collocational range." For example, the adjective "weak" collocates with the following nouns: character, tea, coffee, acid, heart, link, economy, cry, argument…etc (See McIntosh et al., 2009, for more collocates.). The meaning of the adjective *weak* differs according to the noun it collocates with. In "weak tea," it describes the flavour of the tea (i.e. it contains a lot of water compared to its other components); whereas in "weak character," it does not refer to the physical weakness but to moral or the social one (i.e., not persuasive or influential). This is proved by Aitchison (as cited in Partington, 1998, p. 16) who maintains that "humans learn word-meaning from what occurs alongside."

According to Partington, "a particular collocation in a particular text is usual or unusual" (ibid., p. 17). He adds that this "collocational *normality* is dependent on genre, register and style i.e. what is normal in one kind of a text may be quite unusual in another (ibid.). Wales (2001, pp. 67-68) maintains that "habitual collocations are a recognizable feature of different registers…. But poetic effect depends more on the exploitation of the non-habitual, the unusual."

The collocations can indicate the register and the style of the speech. Partington (as cited in Partington, 1998, p. 17) clarifies this relationship by an example as he points out that "collocations such as *vigorous depression* and *dull highlights* may seem odd out of context but that, placed in their register-specific habitats of, respectively, meteorology and photography, they are quite normal."

### *1.3. Specialized Vocabulary*

The specialized vocabulary is known as "jargon." Mandell & Kirszner (2012, p. 195) define jargon as "the specialized or technical Vocabulary of a trade, a profession, or an academic discipline." Bussmann (2006, p. 607) maintains that this specialized language

"is inaccessible to non-specialists." For instance, the term "phoneme" can be accessible for linguistics specialists but inaccessible for non-specialists of language.

### *1.4. The semantic fields of words*

The semantic field is defined by Bussmann (2006, p. 673) as "a set of semantically related words whose meanings delimit each other and are said to cover a whole conceptual or objective field without gaps." Wales (2001, p. 150) also calls it "the conceptual field" and adds that this semantic or conceptual field is "reflected by the lexical field." Hence, the semantic field of emotions can be reflected by some lexical items such as *happiness, respect, love, care, ambition, hate, grudge, envy* and *anger*. These lexical items can be further classified into two different semantic subfields: *happiness, love, care* and ambition belong to the semantic field of positive emotions, while *hate, grudge, envy* and *anger* belong to the negative one.

## 2. Nouns

- Are the nouns abstract or concrete?
- What kinds of abstract nouns occur (e.g. nouns referring to events, perceptions, processes, moral qualities, social qualities)?
- What use is made of proper names? Collective nouns?

To be able to answer these questions while reading a given text, the reader should grasp some stylistic concepts:

### *2.1. Abstract vs. concrete nouns*

Mandell and Kirszner (2012, p. 467) define abstract nouns as those which "refer to ideas, qualities, or conditions that cannot be perceived by the senses." Some examples of

these words are happiness, materialism, beauty, anger and grudge. This means that abstract words do not have to do with the physical world but with the mental or imaginative world. Eschholz and Rosa (2012, p. 284) illustrate this idea by contending that if two people disagree about abstract things, this does not mean that one of them is right and the other is wrong. They exemplify this idea by stating that "you may find a forest beautiful, while someone else might find it frightening, and neither of you would be wrong." This is simply because "beauty and fear are ideas: they exist in your mind, not in the forest" (ibid.).

One the other hand, the concrete nouns are defined by Mandell and Kirszner (2012, p. 467) as words that "name things that readers can see, hear, taste or smell, or touch." For example, we have words like chair, soup, stone, table, number…etc. These concrete words have to do with the real physical world. This is also obvious in Jackson's (2013, p. 55) definition of concrete nouns as "nouns that refer to observable, tangible objects in reality." Eschholz and Rosa (2012, p. 284) clarify this point by stating that disagreement on concrete things means that one of the speakers is right and the other is wrong, or both of them are wrong. They maintain that "you claim that the forest is mostly birch trees, while the other person says that it is mostly pine – only one of you can be right, and both of you can be wrong." This is simply because "the kinds of trees that grow in the forest is a concrete fact, not an abstract idea" (ibid.)

This linguistic distinction between abstract and concrete words can lead us to a similar psychological distinction between abstract and concrete thinking. Corsini (2002, p. 202) believes that concrete thinking focuses "on immediate experiences and specific objects or events, as contrasted with thinking that involves abstractions, generalizations and totalities." For him, abstract thinking includes the ability "to grasp essentials and common properties, to keep different aspects of situation in mind and shift from one to another, to predict and to plan ahead, to think symbolically, and to draw conclusions" (ibid., p. 5).

Ylvisaker (2006, para. 1) stresses this fact by stating that "abstract thinking is a level of thinking about things that is removed from the facts of the 'here and now'." So, the concrete thinking focuses on facts and the physical world. He clarifies this point by many examples, one of which is that "a concrete thinker can recognize that John likes Betty; a more abstract thinker can reflect on emotions, like affection" (ibid.).

### *2.2. Proper names*

Sometimes, the author's selection of the names of his fictional characters or places is not arbitrary. These proper names can be symbolic of a certain characteristic that the author wants to convey to the reader. The role of proper names in characterization and place description can be furthermore shown in the fact that they can be either portmanteau words or onomatopoeic words. Portmanteau words are the result of "blending or telescoping." In this process, "two words of similar or merely associated meaning are merged into a new word" (Sihler, 2000, p. 85).

### 2.3 *Collective nouns*

Lyons (1977, p. 315) defines collective nouns as “lexemes which denote collections or groups, of persons or objects." These nouns fall into different grammatical classes. They can be "singular" such as clergy and cattle, or "plural" such as furniture. Others can be both singular and plural, and this depends on whether the noun is "seen as a single collective entity, or as a collection of individual entities (cf. *the committee is wrong vs. the committee are wrong*)" (Crystal, 2008, p. 86).

3. Adjectives

□□Are the adjectives frequent?

□□To what kinds of attribute do adjectives refer? Physical? Psychological? Visual? Auditory? Colour? Referential? Emotive? Evaluative? etc.

□□Are adjectives restrictive or nonrestrictive? Gradable or non-gradable? Attributive or predicative?

To be able to answer these questions while reading a given text, the reader should understand some stylistic concepts:

### *3.1. Frequency of adjectives*

It refers to the number of occurrence of these adjectives in the text. This depends on their usage: if the adjectives are used a lot in the text, they are frequent.

### *3.2. Attributes of adjectives*

Adjectives can be classified, according to the type of attribute they embody, into physical, psychological, visual, auditory, referential, emotive and evaluative. This classification of adjectives is a semantic one. Leech, Deuchar and Hoogenraad (1982, p. 47) maintain that "adjectives typically denote some quality or property attributed to nouns: most commonly they are used to narrow down, or specify, the reference of nouns."

**1)** Physical adjectives

They describe the physical appearance of something or someone. Leech et al. (1982, p. 47) state that the physical qualities can be "of colour, shape, etc.: *green, large, heavy, tall*." E.g.,

- *Tall* chimneys – *bald* head – *heavy* box

**2)** Psychological adjectives

They denote the mental or emotional state of a person. Leech et al. (1982, p. 47) contend that these psychological qualities have to do with "emotions: *funny, brave, sad, amazing*."

**3)** Visual adjectives: E.g., a *clear* sky - a *red* flower, a *big* bear.

**4)** Auditory adjectives:

Givón (2001, p. 82) contends that those adjectives "may cover several auditory properties such as: a. Loudness: Loud/soft, noisy/quiet, b. Absolute pitch: high/low, relative pitch: Sharp/flat, d. harmony: mellow/harsh, e. melody: melodious/caoophonous."

**5)** Colour adjectives

Givón (2001, p. 82) maintains that these adjectives are used for " a. brightness: dark/light, dark/bright, black/white," or "b. color: violet, blue, green…." E.g.,

**6)** Referential adjectives

It is also called "relational adjective." According to Lieber and Stekauer (2014, p. 279), relational adjectives (or referential) are those which are used to "classify entities, denoting the domain to which they belong, or to specify other entities with which they establish relations of various kinds."

**7)** Emotive adjectives

They are used to characterize emotions, whether positive, negative or neutral. E.g.,

- I never knew you were *unhappy*, my child.

**8)** Evaluative adjectives

According to Givón (2001, p. 82), these adjectives "signal subjective judgments of desirability along physical or social dimensions, pertaining to either inherent traits or temporary states." Examples of these adjectives are good/bad (temporary states); or beautiful/ugly (inherent traits).

### *3.4. Gradability of adjectives*

Adjectives can be classified into gradable and non-gradable. According to Leech et al. (1982, p. 48), gradable adjectives "are those referring to qualities that can vary along a continuous scale, such as size, age, weight, etc.: *large/small; old/young; heavy/light*" (ibid., p. 48). On the other hand, non- gradable adjectives are defined as those which "refer to 'all-or-none' qualities, like sex and nationality: *male, Australian, chemical, wooden*" (ibid.). They maintain that gradable adjectives differ from non-gradable ones in that "gradable adjectives can be modified by degree adverbs like *very, extremely* …. They can also have comparative and superlative forms" (ibid.). E.g.,

- Gradable adjective: *old older oldest very old*
- Non-gradable adjective: *American *Americaner *Americanest *Very American*

### *3.5. Attributiveness and predicativity of adjectives*

This classification of adjectives is based on their function. According to this syntactic classification, adjectives can be either attributive or predicative. Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik (1985, p. 402) maintain that the attributive adjectives are those which "occur in attributive function. *ie* they can premodify a noun, appearing between the determiner (including zero article) and the head of the noun phrase." E.g.: My *dear* son! - The *average* duration of human life is proved to have increased of *late* years.

According to Nida (1964, p. 89), however, the attributive adjective may not only premodify but also postmodify the head of the noun phrase. He calls these postmodifying attributives "post-posed attributives." Kim and Sells (2008, p.119) regard these post-posed adjectives in a noun phrase as one of the "postnominal modifiers." E.g.:

- anything *fanciful*, *fantastic*, or *sentimental*.

In this respect, Nida also mentions another case in which we have "adjective attributes which are in turn postmodified by post-posed attributives" (ibid.). E.g.:

- The best way *possible* is to manage your time.

On the other hand, the predicative adjectives have a "predicative function, *ie* they can function as subject complement, or as object complement" (Quirk et al., 1985, p. 403). E.g.:

- You are extremely *clever*. (Subject complement)
- Your hands are rather *cold*. (Subject complement)
- It makes you no *better*, but it makes you *worse*. (Object complement)

However, not all adjectives can be used both attributively and predicatively. Kim and Sells (2008, p. 118) maintain that "certain adjectives are restricted to their usages. Adjectives such alive, asleep, awake, afraid, ashamed, aware, can be used only predicatively, whereas others such as wooden, drunken, golden, main and mere are only used attributively." This can be exemplified as follows:

A) He is *asleep*.

B) *He is an *asleep* person.

C) This is a *main* idea.

*D)* * This idea is *main.*

4. Verbs

- Do the verbs carry an important part of the meaning?

- Are they stative (referring to states) or dynamic (referring to actions, events, etc.)?
- Do they "refer" to movements, physical acts, speech acts, psychological states or activities, perceptions, etc.?
- Are they transitive, intransitive, linking (intensive)…etc.?
- Are they factive or non factive?

To be able to answer these questions while reading a given text, the reader should understand some stylistic concepts:

*4.1. Stativity vs. dynamicity: A semantic classification*

Verbs are semantically classified by Leech et al. (1982, p. 46) into different types. They point out that "verbs can express action, events, process, activities, states, etc. Such actions, etc., can be physical (*eat*), mental (*think*), perceptual (*see*), social (*buy*), etc." Verbs which express actions or events are called dynamic verbs, while those expressing states or conditions are referred to as stative or state verbs. According to Quirk et al. (1985, p. 178), the stative verbs are those which "refer to states, and which indicate an unbroken state in sentences," such as *like*, *be*, *know*…etc. On the other hand, dynamic verbs express actions and they "cannot indicate a single unbroken state," such as *drink*, *walk*, *work*…etc. Quirk et al. make a "broad distinction between DYNAMIC (count) meanings and STATIVE (noncount) meanings of verbs…. rather than dynamic and stative verbs." This is because "one verb may shift, in meaning, from one category to another"(ibid.). For example, the stativity or dynamicity of the verb *have* is determined according to its meaning in the sentence:

- Stative meaning: I *have* a car. (*own*)
- Dynamic meaning: I usually *have* my lunch at 2.00. (*eat*).

One of the qualities that can differentiate between stative and dynamic verbs is

progressiveness. It is agreed among many linguists that stative verbs are generally not compatible with progressiveness: Comrie (1976), Quirk et al. (1985), Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad and Finegan (1999) and Römer (2005). However, Comrie (1976) contends that some stative verbs can be formed in the progressive, and he calls them "stative progressive verbs," most of which are "verbs of perception" such as *hear*, *see*. Quirk et al. (1985, p. 202) maintain that the progressiveness of some stative verbs requires "some change of interpretation." Biber et al. (1999, p. 472) agree with Quirk et al. in this respect, stating that there are "lexical associations of progressive aspect" of the stative verbs:

- I see you. I am seeing you. (includes some emphasis)

*4.2. Factivity of verbs: A pragmatic classification*

The term "factivity" is used in Pragmatics in classifying verbs or predicates in general into factive, non-factive and counterfactive verbs. Facitvity of verbs has to do with the term "presupposition." Levinson (1983, p. 181) lists factive verbs as one of the "presupposition-triggers" or "sources of presuppositions." Crystal (2008, p. 384) defines presupposition as "what a speaker assumes in saying a particular sentence, as opposed to what is actually asserted." It is also defined as "a certain type of logical relationship between statements" (ibid.).

A factive verb, according to Crystal (ibid., p. 184), is "a verb which takes a complement clause, and where the speaker presupposes the truth of the proposition expressed in that clause." Examples of these verbs are *know, agree, realize, regret,* etc. This is not only applicable to verbs but also to any "adjective, or even NP that can take complement clause" (Huang, 2012, p. 114). Examples of these are *sorry*, a *fact*, a shame etc. E.g.,

- She *know*s very well I am not a refined character.

- I do not *know* that I am sorry, I do not *know* that I am ashamed, I do not *know* that I am degraded in my own esteem.
- I am *sorry* to hear it.

Here, the factive verb *know,* whether in the affirmative or negative form, presupposes the truth of the propositions that *the speaker in the first sentence is not a refined character* as well as that *the speaker in the second sentence is sorry, ashamed and degraded in her own esteem*. Similarly, the factive adjective *sorry* in the third sentence presupposes that the proposition that *the speaker heard it* is true.

Factive verbs can further be divided into two types: (i) cognitive or epistemic factives and (ii) emotional factives. According to Huang (2012, p. 50), a cognitive or epistemic factive verb "is concerned with the knowledge of fact." Huang exemplifies this type of verb when he states that "the uttering of the sentence *John realized that her* [sic] *sister was unhappy with her new job* engenders the cognitive factive presupposition that *John's sister was unhappy with her new job*" (ibid.). Unlike cognitive factive verbs, we have the emotional factive verbs which are "concerned with the emotional attitude towards fact" (ibid., p. 101). The emotional factive verb *like* in *She likes that he is self- confident* unravels the speaker's emotional attitude (i.e. liking) towards the fact that he is self-confident.

By contrast, non-factive verbs or constructions "do not commit the speaker to the truth of the proposition expressed in the complement clause, e.g. *believe, think*" (Crystal, 2008, p. 184) as in the following examples:

- I *think* he makes bets.
- I *believe* you have tried hard.

In the above examples, the non-factive verbs *think* and *believe* presuppose that *he may or may not make bets* and that *the addressee has or has not tried hard* respectively.

On the other hand, we have also what is called counter-factive verbs or constructions which "presuppose the falsity of the proposition expressed in the complement clause, e.g. wish, pretend," (ibid.) as in:

- I *wish* she could walk.

It should be noted that Westra (2014, para. 6) recommends the use of factive and counter-factive verbs in persuasive arguments. He maintains:

Keep in mind the factive verb predicates. They are a powerful linguistic tool to help you be more influential and persuasive in your day to day communication with others. Notice how some verbs you use create hesitation and resistance, while the factive and counter- factive verbs create more certainty and believability in your arguments.

*4.3. Transitivity of verbs: A syntactic classification*

Verbs can be syntactically divided into transitive, intransitive or linking (intensive) verbs. According to Hurford (1994, p. 242), a transitive verb "takes a (direct or indirect) object," such as *hear, know, give, make* …etc. These verbs are "followed with noun phrases." This type of verb is contrasted with the intransitive verbs "which do not take objects" as well as with linking verbs or copular verbs which "may have a noun phrase after them as in *Geraldine is a bright student*." However, according to Hurford, the noun phrases after transitive verbs are "held to be the direct objects" of these verbs, while those after intransitive verbs are regarded "the complements of these verbs" (ibid.).

Biber et al. (1999, p. 380) agree with Hurford's classification of verbs into transitive, intransitive and copular. However, they extend the classification of transitive verbs to include three categories: monotransitive, ditransitive and complex transitive verbs. They discuss these types with reference to what is called "valency patterns." These are "patterns of clause elements…such patterns contain a subject and can contain additional adverbials"

(ibid.). Accordingly, they classify verbs according to their occurrence in these patterns into five categories: intransitive, monotransitive, ditransitive, complex transitive and copular verbs. According to them, intransitive verbs "occur in the SV pattern with no subject or predicative complement," (ibid.) as in: I *work* hard - They *slept*. On the other hand, transitive verbs can be monotransitive, ditransitive or complex transitive. Biber et al. define monotransitive verbs as those which "occur with a single direct object in the pattern $SVO_d$," (ibid., p. 381) as in: Your father *breaks* horses, doesn't he? Ditransitive verbs "occur with two objects noun phrases – and indirect object and a direct object – in the pattern $SVO_iO_d$," (ibid.), as in: Can you *give* me a chance? Complex transitive verbs "occur with a direct object noun phrase followed by either an object predicative (noun phrase or adjective) in the pattern $SVO_dP_o$, or by an obligatory adverbial in the pattern $SVO_dA$," (ibid.) as in: Don't *call* yourself idiot - If you *put* it in those terms. However, copular verbs "are followed by a subject predicative (a noun, adjective, or prepositional phrase) in the pattern SVP, or the obligatory circumstance adverbial in the pattern SVA," (ibid.) as in: I *feel* sorry - I *am* in the garden. Some verbs can take more than one valency pattern such as *speak* and *help* which can occur with either intransitive or transitive patterns: I will *help*. (intransitive) - I will *help* you. (monotransitive)

5. Adverbs

- Are adverbs frequent?
- What semantic functions do they perform (manner, place, direction, time, degree, etc.)?
- Is there any significant use of sentence adverbs (conjuncts such as *so*, *therefore*, *however*; disjuncts such as *certainly*, *obviously*, *frankly*)?

To be able to answer these questions while reading a given text, the reader should understand some lexical concepts:

*5.1. Semantic functionality of adverbs*

Leech et al. (1982, p. 48) divide adverbs into three types. The first type is the circumstancial adverbs which "add some kind of circumstacncial information (of time, place, manner, etc.) to the idea expressed in the core of the clause." The second type is the degree adverbs which "modify adjectives and other words in terms of gradability" (ibid., p. 49). The third type is the sentence adverbs which "apply to the whole clause of sentence, express an attitude to it, or a connective between it and another clause or sentence" (ibid.). In semantically classifying the first two types of adverbs, Leech et al. depend on the "Question Test" where each adverb is categorized according to the type of question it answers. Consequently, they (ibid., p. 50) come up with the following table:

| Adverb type | Eliciting question | Examples |
|---|---|---|
| Manner | How? | Well, nicely, cleverly |
| Place | Where? | Here, there, somewhere |
| Direction | Where to/from? | Up, back, forward, home |
| Time-when | When? | Then, once, tonight, soon |
| Duration | How long? | Long, briefly, always |
| Frequency | How often? | Always, weekly, often |
| Degree | To what degree? | Rather, quite, much, hardly |

However, this cannot be said of the sentence adverbs since "sentence adverbs, like fortunately, probably, actually and however, do not answer questions" (ibid.).Yet they can be categorized into: attitude and connective (They are also called stance and linking respectively by Biber et al., 1999, p. 549). Attitude adverbs are like *fortunately, probably, however*; and connective adverbs are like *so, yet, therefore*.

Concerning the attitude adverbs, they are classified into three groups, according to Eastwood (1994, pp. 260-261): focus and viewpoint adverbs such as only, especially (The

adverbs only and especially are called restrictive according to Biber et al., 1999, p. 556.) and medically; truth adverbs such as probably and truly; and comment adverbs such as luckily and unfortunately. Biber et al.'s (1999, pp. 557-558) treatment of attitude adverbs is somehow different. They regard the attitude adverbs as one of the three types of the stance adverbs along with the epistemic stance and style stance adverbs. For them, the attitude stance adverbs "tell a speaker's or writer's attitude towards a proposition: I lost the manual that goes with it, unfortunately" (ibid.). The style stance adverbs, however, are used to "comment on the manner of speaking which the speaker is adopting: for example, is the speaker (or writer) using the language sincerely, frankly, or simply?" (ibid.). The epistemic stance adverbs have different semantic functions: they can "show levels of certainty or doubt: No it's alright I'll probably manage with it," or they can "comment on the reality or actuality of a proposition: Actually I'm not very fussy at all," or they can be used "to show that a preposition is based on some evidence without specifying the exact source" such as apparently and clearly, or they can "show the limitation on a proposition: Our losses were mainly due to promotional activity from our rivals," and finally they can be intended to "convey imprecision" such as the "the hedges: It was kind of strange" (ibid.).

As per degree adverbs, they are believed to "mark that the extent or degree is either greater or less than usual than that of something else in the neighboring discourse" (Biber et al., 1999, p. 554). Hence, they are categorized into two groups: amplifiers (or intensifiers) which are intended to "increase intensity" (ibid.) such as *more*, *very*, *so*, *too*, *extremely*…etc.; and diminishers (or downtoners) which are meant to "scale down the effect of the modified item" (ibid., p. 555) such as *slightly*, *somehow, quite* and *rather*.

*5.2. Context-dependency of semantic adverbs*

Biber et al. (1999, p. 252) assign great importance to the context in order to understand the meaning of any adverb. They believe that "the meaning of an adverb is often

context-dependent." The adverb *just* can best exemplify this dependency. According to Biber et al. (ibid.), this adverb can be "denoting closeness in time e.g. *the horse has just had its foal*." It can also be used for "increasing the intensity of a following element: e.g. *just dreadful*." The same adverb may be used in some contexts for the purpose of "decreasing intensity of a following element: e.g. *just 4.5 pints down*," or for "signaling manner: e.g. *it'll just stop*."

*5.3. Syntactic functionality of adverbs: (conjuncts, adjuncts, disjuncts, subjuncts)*

Quirk et al. (1985, p. 440) make a distinction between the four basic syntactic functions of adverbs: adjuncts, subjuncts, disjuncts, and conjuncts. This distinction is based on the adverb's integration with or peripherality to the clause elements. They maintain that adjuncts and subjuncts are "relatively integrated within the structure of the clause." On the other hand, the disjuncts and the conjuncts have "a peripheral relation in the sentence" (ibid.).

Quirk et al. (1985, p. 504) differentiate between adjuncts and the other types of adverbials by stating that "it is only the adjuncts that closely resemble other sentence elements such as S, C, and O. Like them, for example, and unlike the other adverbials, an adjunct can be the focus of a cleft sentence," as in: I have held no confidence with anyone, *because*- you anticipated my reason just now. (It is *because*- you anticipated my reason just now; I have held no confidence with anyone.)

However, the syntactic integration of subjuncts within the clause elements is due to the fact that they "have to a greater or lesser extent, a subordinate role in relation to one of the other clause elements or to the clause as a whole" (Hoye, 1997, p. 155), as in the following instances:

- She has come *just* now. (just is related to the adverb *now*)

- She *certainly* did see her. (*certainly* related to the whole clause)

On the other hand, disjuncts are peripheral to the clause elements and they are divided by Quirk et al. into two categories: style disjuncts and attitudinal disjuncts. Style disjuncts are used to "convey the speaker's comment on the form of what he is saying, defining in some way under what conditions he is speaking," whereas the attitudinal disjuncts "comment on the content of the communication" (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973, p. 242). This kind of adverbialcan be exemplified by the following sentences:

- *Frankly*, I do not know. (style disjuncts) - *Unfortunately,* he lost the game. (attitudinal disjuncts)

However, according to Quirk et al. (1985, p. 504), conjuncts "express the speaker's assessment of the relation between two linguistic units" as in: She did not say a word, *for* her heart was broken.

## Conclusion

To conclude, Leech and Short's checklist of stylistic features (the lexical category) presented in their book Style in Fiction (2007) is very handy for those who seek to conduct a lexical analysis of literary works. Presenting such checklist in the form of questions to be answered for any lexical analysis of a text facilitates the lexical analysis of any text. However, these questions are not enough elaborated in the book. Hence, this paper tackles such questions with detailed explanation and examples so that it would be a guide for those who want to conduct a stylistic analysis in terms of the lexicology of the text.

Works Cited

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow & Essex, UK:Pearson Education Limited.

Bussmann, H. (2006). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics* (G. Trauth & K. Kazzazi, Trans.). London and NY: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Comrie, B. (1976). *Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. NY, US: Cambridge University Press.

Corsini, R. J. (2002). *The dictionary of psychology*. NY, US: Routledge.

Crystal, David. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Uk: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Eastwood, J. (1994). *Oxford guide to English grammar*. Oxford, US: Oxford University Press.

Eschholz, P. & Rosa, A. (2012). Models for Writers. Boston, US: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax: An introduction*. Philadelphia, US: John Benjamins B. V.

Hoye, L. (1997). Adverbs and modality in English. NY, UK: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Huang, Y. (2012). *Dictionary of pragmatics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hurford, J. R. (1994). *Grammar: A student's guide*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Jackson, H. & Amvela, E. Z. (2000). *Words, Meaning and Vocabulary: An Introduction to Modern English Lexicology*. NY, US: A&C Black.

Jackson, H. (2013). *Words and their meaning*. NY, US: Routledge.

Kim, J. B. & Sells, P. (2008). *English syntax: An introduction*. Stanford, US: Center for the Study of Language and Information CSLI publications.

Kortmann, B. & Loebner, S. (2013). *Understanding semantics*. NY, US: Routledge.

Leech, G. N. & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. Great Britain: Pearson Education Ltd.

Leech, G. N., Deuchar, M. & Hoogenraad, R. (1982). *English grammar for today*. Hampshir and London, UK: English MACMILAN Press LMT.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lieber, R. & Stekauer, P. (2014). *The Oxford handbook of derivational morphology*. NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. NY, US: Cambridge University Press. Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mandell, S & Kirszner, L. (2012). *The brief Wadsworth handbook* (7th ed.). Boston, US: Cengage Learning.

McIntosh, C., Francis, B., & Poole, R. (2009). *Oxford collocations dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nida, E. A. (1964). *A synopsis of English syntax*. In B. Elson (ed.). Norman: The Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.

Partington, A. (1998). *Patterns and meanings: Using corpora for English language research and teaching*. US: John Benjamins B.V.

Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A university grammar of English*. London, UK: Longman Publishing Group.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. NY, US: Longman Inc.

Römer, U. (2005). *Progressives, patterns, pedagogy: A corpus-driven approach to English progressive forms, functions, contexts and didactics*. Philadelphia, US: John

Benjamins.

Sihler, A. L. (2000). *Language history: An introduction*. Philadelphia, US: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Wales, K. (2001). *A dictionary of stylistics* (2nd ed.). Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.

Westra, B. (2014). Factive predicates, Non-factive predicates, and counter-factive predicates. Retrieved from http://www.sales-hypnosis.com/factive-predicates-non-factive-predicates-and-counter-factive-predicates/#sthash.EC3fkfyi.dpuf

Ylvisaker, M. (2006). What are concrete and abstract thinking?. Retrieved from http://www.projectlearnet.org/tutorials/concrete_vs_abstract_thinking.html