MEANING FROM THE STYLISTIC POINT OF VIEW

Tina Oniani
Professor
Doctor Of English Grammar
The State University Of Sport. Tbilisi-Georgia
Email: Tinikooniani@Gmail.Com

Article history:		Abstract:
		Research aim is that what is stylistic domain importance of its word, word-combinations, sentences, and also the manner of expression. The linguistic term 'meaning'-has been defined in so many ways that there appears an urgent need to clear it. In stylistic meaning also is viewed as a category which is able to acquire meanings-imposed words by the context. In stylistics it is important to discriminate shades or nuances of meaning, but each of meanings, being closely interwoven and interdependent, can none the less be regarded as relatively autonomous and therefore be analysed separately. Words can be classed according to different principles, as there are: a) Morphological –part of speech; b) Semantic-synonims, antonims, thematic; c) Stylistic. and other types of classification. In each of these classifications lexical or grammatical meanings assumed different manifestations.in a morphological classification words are grouped according to their grammatical meaning.in a semantic classification, according to their logical meaning.in a stylistic classification, according to their stylistic meaning.

Stylistics is a domain where meaning assumes paramount importance. This is so because the term 'meaning' is applied not only to words, word – combinations, sentences but also to the manner of expression into which matter is cast.

The linguistic term m e a n I n g has been defined in so many ways that there appears an urgent need to clarify it; particularly in view of the fact that in so many lexical, grammatical and phonetic SDs this category is treated differently. It has already been mentioned that a stylistic device is mainly realized when a twofold application of meaning is apparent.

At some period in the development of a certain trend in linguistic theory in America, viz. descriptive linguistics, meaning was excluded from observations in language science; it was considered an extra-linguistic category.
The tendency was so strong that R. Jakobson proposed the term" semantic invariant" as a substitute for 'meaning'." If, however, you dislike the word meaning, because it is too ambiguous," writes R. Jakobson, "than let us simply deal with semantic invariants, no less important for linguistic analysis than the phonemic invariants" *(1)

But this tendency has been ruled out by later research in language data. One of the prominent American scientists, Wallace L. Chafe, is right when he states that ". the data of meaning are both accessible to linguistic explanation and crucial than the data of sound to structure—in certain ways more crucial than the data of sound to which linguistic studies have given such unbalanced attention" *(2)

The problem of meaning in general linguistics deals mainly with such aspects of the term as the interrelation between meaning and concept, meaning and sign, meaning and referent. The general period of time. This is reasonable, otherwise no dictionary would be able to cope with the problem of defining the meaning of words. Moreover, no communication would be possible.

In stylistic meaning is also viewed as a category which is able to a acquire meanings imposed on the words by the context. This is why such meanings are called c o n t e x t u a l m e a n I n g s. this category also takes under observation meanings which have fallen out of use.

In stylistics it is important to discriminate shades or nuances of meaning, to atomize the meaning, the component parts of which are now called the s e m e s, i.e. the smallest units of which meaning of a word consists." A proper concern for meanings", writes W. Chafe, "should lead to a situation where, in the training of linguists, practice in the discrimination of concepts

will be given at least as much as time in the curriculum as practice in the discrimination of sounds" *(3)

It will be shown later, in the analysis of SDs, how important it is to discriminate between the meanings of a given word or construction in order to adequately comprehend the idea and purport of a passage and of a complete work.

It is now common knowledge that lexical meaning differs from grammatical meaning in more than one way. L e x I c a l m e a n I ng refers to mind to some concrete concept, phenomenon, or thing of objective reality, whether real or a imaginary. Lexical meaning is thus a means by which a word- form is made to express a definite concept.

G r a m a t I c a l m e a n I n g refers our mind to relations between words or to some forms of words or constructions bearing upon their structural functions in the language-as-a –system. Grammatical meaning can thus be adequately called "structural meaning".

There are no words which are deprived of grammatical meaning in as much as all words belong to some system and consequently have their peace in the system, and also in as much as they always function in speech displaying their functional properties. It is the same with sentences. Every sentence has its own independent structural meaning. This structural meaning may in some cases be influenced or affected by the lexical meanings of the components or a by intonation. In the sentence 'I shall never go to the place again', we have a number of words with lexical meanings (never, go, place, again) and words with only grammatical meaning (I, shall, that) and also the meaning of the whole sentence, which is defined as a structure in statement form.

But each of the meanings, being closely interwoven and interdependent, can none the less be regarded as relatively autonomous and therefore be analysed separately.

It is significant that words acquire different status when analysed in isolation or in the sentence. this double aspect causes in the long run the growth of the semantic structure of a word, especially when the two aspects frequently interweave.

Words can be classed according to different principles: morphological (parts of speech) semantic, (synonyms, antonyms, thematic), stylistic and other types of classification. In each of these classifications lexical or/and grammatical meanings assume different manifestations. In morphological classification words are grouped according to their grammatical meanings, in a semantic classification, according to their logical (referential) meanings, in a stylistic classification, according to their stylistic meaning.

Lexical meanings are closely related to concepts. They are sometimes identified with concepts.

But concepts is a purely logical category, whereas meaning is a linguistic one. In linguistics it is necessary to view meaning as the representation of a concept through one of its properties. Concept, as is known is versatile; it is characterized by a number of properties. Meaning takes one of these properties and makes it represent the concept as a whole. there for a meaning in a reference to concept be comes as it were, a kind of metonymy. This statement is significant in as much as it will further explain the stylistic function of certain meaning.one and same concept can be represented in a number of linguistic manifestations meanings but, paradoxal though it may sound, each manifestation causes a slight (and sometimes considerable) modification of the concept, in other words, discloses latent or unknown properties of the concept.

"The variability of meanings" writes R. Jakobson, "their manifold and far-reaching figurative shifts, and an incalculable aptitude for multiple paraphrases are just those properties of natural language which induce its creativity and endow not only poetic but even scientific activities with a continuously inventive sweep. Here the indefiniteness and creative power appear to be wholly interrelated*(4)

The inner property of language, which may be defined as self-generating, is apparent in meaning. It follows then that the creativity of language so often referred to in this particular category of language science—meaning.

The variability of meaning caused by the multifarious practical application of the basic, fundamental meaning when used in speech has led to the birth of a notion known as p o l y s e m a n t I c i s m. this is a linguistic category which contains a great degree of ambiguity. On the one hand, we perceive meaning as the representation of a definite concept by means of the word. on the other hand, we state that the same concept may be expressed by different meaning all belonging to the same word.

Still more confusing is the well-recognized fact that different concepts may be expressed by one and the same word. But such is the very nature of language, where contradiction, ambiguity and uncertainty run parallel with rigidity, strictness, and conformity to standard requirements of grammatical acceptability.

S.D. Katznelson remarks in these connections that ''a lexical meaning may…conflict with the basic functional meaning of its class remaining, however, within its own class"*(5).

The ability of a word to be poly-semantic, i.e., to comprise several lexical meanings, becomes a crucial issue for stylistic studies. It must be clearly understood that the multitude of meanings that a word may have is not limited by dictionaries where this multitude has already been recognized and fixed. Some meanings,

which for the time being have not as yet been recognized as legitimate members of the semantic structure of the given word, may, in the course of time, though frequent use become such and subsequently become fixed in dictionaries. Convincing proof of this are the so-called addenda to new editions of dictionaries where new meanings are presented as already recognized facts of language.

A stylistic approach to the issue in question takes into consideration the fact that every word, no matter how rich in meanings it may be, leaves the door open for new shades and nuances and even for independent meanings. True, such meanings are not always easily accepted as normal. Moreover, many of them are rejected both by scholars and the people and therefore are not recognized as fact of language. Such meanings become obscure in the family of lexical meanings of a word; they can only be traced back to the original use. However, some of these meanings are occasionally re-established in the vocabulary at a later time.

Lexical meaning, be it repeated, is a conventional category. Very frequently it does not reflect the properties of the thing or the phenomenon it refers to. However, some meanings are said to be motivated, i.e., they point to some quality or feature of the object. The conventional character or meaning can best be illustrated by the following example.

The origin of the word 'white'-in English concept is denoted by the word 'linen', which is the name of the material, (Latin' linum'-flax) from the articles mentioned were made. In German the same concept is 'die Wasche', i.e., something that can be washed, a process, not the material, not the colour. The concept from which all meanings branch off is known as the inner form of the word.

So, we see the different properties, essential, non-essential, optional and even accidental may betake to name the object. The chosen property in the course of time loses its semantic significance and dependence on the inner form and the word begins to function in the language as a generic term, a sign for various objects.

Here we approach the theory of signs, which is so important in understanding the relative character of language units and their functioning.

By a sign, generally speaking, we understanding one material object capable of denoting another object or idea. The essential property of a sign is its relatively conventional character. A sign does not possess the properties of the object it denotes. It is made to denote other objects by its very nature. In other words, people impose on certain objects the quality to denote another object. thus, a flag is the sign of a nation state, a cross is the sign Christianity, a plain

gold ring is the sign of marriage, a uniform is the sign a definite calling or a profession, a crown is the signs which are not material objects.

The science that deals with the general theory of signs is called s e m I o t I c s. It embraces different systems of a signs, --traffic signs, communication between different species of living beings, etc.

The following is a widely recognized definition of a sign:

''A sign is a material, sensuously perceived object (phenomenon, action) appearing in the process of cognition and communication in the capacity of a representative (substitute) of another object (or objects) and used for re3ceiving, storing recasting and transforming information about this object''

Signs are generally used in a definite system showing the interrelations and interdependence of the components of the system. This system is called a c o d e. Thus, we speak of language code which consists of different signs—lexical, phonetic, morphological, syntactical and stylistic. Every code is easily recognized by its users, they understand the nature, meaning, significance and interrelation of the signs comprising the given code. Moreover, the user of the code must be well aware of possible obstacles in deciphering the meaning of different signs.

This presupposes a preliminary knowledge not only of the basic meanings of the signs in question but also the derivation meanings and the minimum of seems of each meaning.

One of the essential features of a sign, as has been stated above, is its conventional, arbitrary character. However, the language system, unlike other semiotic systems, has the following distinctive feature: having once been established and having been in circulation for some period of time, it becomes resistant to substitutions. No effort to replace a sound, or a morpheme, or a word, not to mention a structural pattern, has been successful. If an innovation is forced by reiterated usage into the language-as –a-system it an inevitably undergoes a certain modification of its meaning (ideographic or stylistic)

It will be noticed here that we often speak of signs and meanings, having in mind words. To clear up possible ambiguity let us make it clear that words are units of language which can be compared to signs, for there are materialized manifestations of ideas, things, phenomena, events, actions, properties and other concepts, whereas meanings are the products of our mental decisions. The materialized manifestations are products of words take the form either of a chain of graphical signs which are the interpretation of these sounds. Meanings are not material phenomena. That is why we frequently meet the definition of the word as having a twofold nature: material and spiritual. The form of the word which, as has been stated above also

contains meaning differs from the word only in one respect. It is not independent, in other words, at cannot be used autonomously. It is always a part of a word.

For example, the word s p I r I t is a self-sustained unit. But the suffix –al in 'spiritual' is not so, though it possesses both material form and a meaning (grammatical; a unit that can form an adjective).

This contradictory nature of a word is the source by which its semantic wholeness, on the one hand, and its diversity on the other, is caused. The study of how words gradually develop, change and lose their meaning and acquire new ones is the subject of lexicology and lexicography.

A word can be defined as unit of language functioning within the sentence or within a part of it which by its sound or graphical form expresses a concrete or abstract nation or a grammatical notion, though one of its meanings and which is capable of enriching its semantic structure by acquiring new meanings and losing old ones.

To explain the semantic structure of a word is not an easy task. Only lexicographers know difficult it is. This difficult mainly caused by the very nature of the word. It may in some circumstances reveal such overtones of meaning as are not elements of the code.

The following analogy will not come amiss. There are in a nature sounds that we do not hear, there is light that we do not see, and heat that we do not feel. special apparatus is necessary to detect these phenomena.so, we have a dealt at some length with such concepts as meaning and sign because these are the crucial issues of stylistics. Nothing can ever be achieved in stylistic studies without a thorough understanding of these highly complicated notions.

There is a different in the treatment of the potentialities of language signs in grammar, phonetics and lexicology, on the one hand, and in stylistics, on the other. In stylistic we take it for granted that a word has an almost unlimited potentiality of a acquiring new meanings, where as in lexicology this potentiality is restricted to semantic and grammatical acceptability.

REFERENCES:
1. Jakobson R. The conference of Antropologists and Linguists—In: "Selected Writings". The Hague. (V-th editions) 2013. p.565.
2. Chafe w. L.   Meaning and the structure of Language. Chicago. (VI-th editions) 2010. P 351.
3. Baugh Albert C.   A History of the English Language. London (III-th editions) 2013 p. 319.
4. Wild H.C. A History of Modern Colloquial English. London. 2013.P.18-19.