

Comparison of Adjectives and Epithets

RANO MARDONOVA

Termez State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the study of epithets in science and a critical analysis of theoretical views on it. The author of the article tried to clarify the difference between a logical qualification and an epithet on the example of the views that dominated Russian linguistics and literary criticism at the beginning of the 20th century. The article also attempts to clarify the linguistic difference between defining and epithetic devices, a simple characteristic (in science it is also called a logical characteristic) and a poetic characteristic through ways to achieve an artistic characteristic (epithet) through a logical characteristic.

Keywords: Logical characteristic, artistic characteristic, relation of textual characteristic to simple characteristic.

INTRODUCTION

A. Shalygin: “The tool that increases the emotionality and figurativeness of speech, of course, is the epithet. An epithet is a word or combination of words added to the name of an object in order to increase its expressiveness, to bring it to the fore in order to attract the reader's attention [1]. However, the scientist argues that the epithet is not responsible for giving a specific characteristic of the subject, and it does not carry new information about the subject [1]. The same opinion was repeated by B. V. Tomashevsky, who writes that “the epithet does not attach a new sign to the subject of the word under study, but, on the contrary, repeats the sign represented by this word. In this

respect, the epithet as an artistic device differs from the logical definition," he says and gives examples of the logical definition: a wooden house, a three-story house, etc. [2]. However, in another source, published some time later, B.V. Tomashevsky noted: "The task of the logical qualification of an object (definition) is to individualize a concept or object, to distinguish it from neighboring objects or events," and added that the epithet serves "not to distinguish a sign in an object, but to give a special stylistic coloring to the word" [3].

Another scientific mistake in the views of B. V. Tomashevsky is the allocation of metaphorical epithets among epithets. However, it would be a scientific mistake not to realize that comparison underlies every poetic quality. The examples he cited: lead thoughts, pearl teeth were also criticized by V. M. Zhirmunsky, who wrote: "There is no need to single out metaphorical adjectives among epithets. Metaphorism is a phenomenon associated with poetic semantics. Metaphors can have different grammatical and syntactic content: pearl teeth, in turn, can change to the state of pearl teeth, the metaphor of a fierce blizzard can change to the form of snow falling like pearls [4].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A. N. Veselovsky sees in the epithet a compact volume of poetic style and poetic consciousness, in fact, the epithet highlights a sign that belongs to the nature of the subject: in this case, the separation of a sign that belongs to nature from unnatural signs reveals the poetic consciousness associated with the writer and the community of a certain period [5].

A. Gornfeld contrasts the epithet with other types of grammatical units, highlighting the epithet as an analytical whole between textual-synthetic and analytical expressions, according to which the epithet repeats the existing sign in the word representing it, without attaching a new sign to the object. For example, in comparison with the examples of A. Shalygin and B. V. Tomashevsky about white snow, cold snow, wide mountain, blue sea [6], the epithets are cited as transparent blue (clear azure), long-shadowed spear (long-shadowed spear).

V. M. Zhirmunsky understood the epithet in a broad sense, the style of the corresponding writers and the dictionary of epithets A. V. Zelenetsky included the concept of epithet [7]. However, the scientist understands the epithet in a narrow sense and interprets it as a unit that repeats the features related to the subject, and for some reason accepts expressions like "warm light" instead of epithets in the broad sense, instead of including them in epithets in the narrow sense. According to the scientist, the understanding of the epithet "literally" and "widely" is the result of the evolution of poetic style that took place in the 18th and 19th centuries. That is, expressions such as warm light and a golden field are not epithets in the narrow sense, since they convey new knowledge and information about the subject, highlight a new feature of the subject. In the first half of the 20th century, the epithet, as defined by V. M. Zhirmunsky, became a priority for understanding it as a "qualification in the narrow sense" in the first half of the 20th century, while during this period, on the contrary, the poetic characteristic "narrowing the meaning of the epithet" interpretation as a non-epithetic expression was widespread. In other words, during this period, the epithet was explained as an expression that does not convey new knowledge about the subject, does not add a new attribute to it, although adjectives such as a young branch, a dark shadow, a sharp look were interpreted as artistic adjectives, not epithets [4]. That is, adjectives expressing signs logically (naturally) related to the subject (for example, a straight road, a wide street, a tall house) - folk adjectives or epithets used in the artistic description of the subject, expressing additional information and knowledge about it,

V. M. Zhirmunsky noted that in the early (in our opinion, ancient) periods, the term epithet was used only as a poetic clarification without adding a new sign to the subject ("...non significandia gratia, sed ad ornandam... orationem"¹²), as a result, ancient theorists called the epithet a trope - therefore they interpreted it as "epitheton ornans" ("ornamental epithet"), therefore the epithet was called pleonasm[8] or a type of amplification [9, 10].

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In our opinion, the views of Quintilian in the interpretation of V. M. Zhirmunsky have some errors and distortions, moreover, the theorist writes: “The main decoration of the epithet is transference: like “unbridled passion”, “unbridled ideas”. By adding these new aspects, the epithet becomes a trope” [11]. The scientist adds that metaphorical and metonymic epithets are tropical epithets [11, 12].

V. M. Lomonosov’s analysis of the examples given regarding the epithet is also noteworthy: in his opinion, the poetic adjectives given by V. M. Lomonosov (bitter whey, long journey, fast running, red and fragrant rose) are typical of the corresponding concept, that is represents an ideal sign [9]. But here V. M. Zhirmunsky again contradicts his definition of a logical definition, i.e., a simple definition, because he himself repeatedly emphasizes that the typical, i.e., ideal feature of a concept is reflected not in an artistic definition, but in an epithet in a narrow sense, and V. M. Lomonosov, the simple characteristics given by him are now interpreted as poetic characteristics [9, 4].

V. M. Zhirmunsky, who highlighted the place of classicism of the 18th century in English literature, gives examples of some phraseological clichés. For example, floating clouds, a bright stream, a flowering valley, shady grottoes, a shady grove, a twilight hill, a murmuring stream, smiling fields [4]. Interestingly, the scientist notes that similar phraseological clichés are also present in Russian classical poetry, and characterizes them as epithets of an international character [4].

With stylistic reforms in the literature of the French and English Romantic period, the replacement of traditional decorative epithets with expressions clearly denoting the subject was carried out in earnest. It is noteworthy that the literature of romanticism opened a wide way for the birth of individual epithets in exchange for the rejection of such clichés, as indicated above. As a result, traditional ideas about the subject were replaced by separate ideas, and instead of the adjective white

snow, pink snow, green snow, and a fiery sail (scarlet sail) began to appear in poetry [4].

CONCLUSION

Analyzing the theoretical views on the epithet of V. M. Zhirmunsky, A. Shalygin, B. V. Tomashevsky, A. Gornfeld, we observe that among them only A. Gornfeld was able to reason close to scientific truth. After all, V. M. Zhirmunsky, A. Shalygin, B. V. Tomashevsky made a mistake when comparing logical qualifications and poetic qualifications, taking only logical qualifications (simple qualifications) as an epithet. However, epithets that are considered logical adjectives have no artistic coloring and movement and, ultimately, no connotative meaning. But these scientists do not see or do not understand the ways to achieve an artistic definition (epithet) through the same logical qualification. That is, if a logical qualification (in other words, a simple qualification) is used to perform an aesthetic task in a text, on its basis, an artistic qualification (epithet) is also formed. In particular, V. P. Moskvina[13] gives worthy examples on this occasion: Marble columns, statues, vases, chambers and In the shade of porphyry baths and marble chambers, Roman nobles met their sunset (A. S. Pushkin). In this case, the semantic development forms the expression: marble columns - marble rooms. Therefore, the epithet can also express the signs included in the semantic scope of the word representing the object, among the signs that logically (naturally) belong to the object. marble columns - marble rooms. Therefore, the epithet can also express the signs included in the semantic scope of the word representing the object, among the signs that logically (naturally) belong to the object. marble columns - marble rooms. Therefore, the epithet can also express the signs included in the semantic scope of the word representing the object, among the signs that logically (naturally) belong to the object.

REFERENCES

1. Shalygin A. Theory of Literature and Reader. Ed. 5th. - Pg., 1916. - S. 37.
2. Tomashevsky B. V. Theory of Literature. Ed. 3rd. - M. - L., 1927. - S. 34.
3. Tomashevsky B.V. Stylistics and versification. - L., 1959.
4. Zhirmunsky V.M. Theory of Literature. Poetics. Stylistics. - L. : Nauka, 1977.
5. Veselovsky A. N. Historical poetics. - L., 1940. - C. 73.
6. Gornfeld A. Epithet. - In the book: Questions of the theory and psychology of creativity, vol. 1. Ed. 2nd. - Kharkov, 1911. - S. 340.
7. Zelenetsky A. Epithets of literary Russian speech, part 1. - M., 1913.
8. Gerber G. Die Sprache als Kunst, Bd 1. Berlin, 1885, S 437 ff 449 ff; Bd 2, S. 251ff.
9. Lomonosov M. V. Full. coll. cit., vol. 7. - M. - L., 1952. - S. 130.
10. Quintianiani MF Institutio oratoria, lib. VIII, car. 6.
11. Ancient theories of language and style. SPb., 1996
12. Quayle Th. Poetic diction. A study of eighteenth century verse. London, 1924, p. 25 (chap. 3, "The stock diction").
13. Moskvina V.P. Epithet as a subject of theoretical understanding // Electronic scientific and educational journal of VGPU "Edges of knowledge". No. 4 (14). December, 2011. www.grani.vspu.ru.

RANO MARDONOVA
LECTURER,
TERMEZ STATE UNIVERSITY,
UZBEKISTAN,