

THE SYNTACTIC ORGANISATION OF RETROSPECTIVE INTERIOR MONOLOGUE IN THE PROSE OF JAMES JOYCE AND VIRGINIA WOOLF

Kholmatov Davrbek Mavlonovich,

Researcher at Tashkent State Transport University

E-mail: xolmatovdavrbek388@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6991-0610>

Tel: +998 70 487 37 23

Abstract: The article examines the syntactic construction of fragments of retrospective interior monologue in two English modernist novels. The two opposite poles of Joyce's syntax – the verbless nominal fragment and the unbroken coordinated period – are described, and both are shown to remove the sentence from its role as a unit of measurement. Woolf's parallel enumeration, in which the listed members are gathered by a resumptive predicate, is contrasted with them. The signalling of the boundary of the unit and the place of interrogative structures are analysed separately.

Keywords: syntactic model, verbless fragment, coordination, parallelism, resumptive predicate, ellipsis, boundary signal, interrogative structure

JEYMS JOYS VA VIRJINIYA VULF NASRIDA RETROSPEKTIV ICHKI MONOLOGNING SINTAKTIK TASHKIL TOPISHI

Annotatsiya: Maqolada ikki ingliz modernistik romanidagi retrospektiv ichki monolog parchalarining sintaktik qurilishi tekshiriladi. Joys sintaksisining ikki qarama-qarshi qutbi – kesimsiz ot birikmasi hamda uzilmaydigan uyushiq davr – tavsiflanib, ularning ikkalasi ham gapni o'lchov birligi maqomidan mahrum qilishi ko'rsatiladi. Vulf matnidagi uyushiq sanash esa ularga qarama-qarshi qo'yiladi. Birlik chegarasining belgilanishi va so'roq qurilmalarining o'zni alohida tahlil qilinadi.

Kalit so'zlar: sintaktik model, kesimsiz parcha, uyushqlik, parallelizm, jamlovchi kesim, ellipsis, chegara belgisi, so'roq qurilmasi

СИНТАКСИЧЕСКАЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ РЕТРОСПЕКТИВНОГО ВНУТРЕННЕГО МОНОЛОГА В ПРОЗЕ ДЖЕЙМСА ДЖОЙСА И ВИРДЖИНИИ ВУЛФ

Аннотация: В статье рассматривается синтаксическое построение фрагментов ретроспективного внутреннего монолога в двух английских модернистских романах. Описываются два противоположных полюса синтаксиса Джойса – безглагольный

именной фрагмент и непрерывный сочинённый период; показано, что оба лишают предложение статуса единицы измерения. Им противопоставляется параллельное перечисление у Вулф. Отдельно анализируются сигналы границы единицы и место вопросительных структур.

Ключевые слова: синтаксическая модель, безглагольный фрагмент, сочинение, параллелизм, обобщающий предикат, эллипсис, сигнал границы, вопросительная структура

Introduction: The two novels are usually placed side by side because both are held to represent the movement of consciousness. Their syntax, however, is built on opposite principles. In one of them the sentence is broken into fragments so short that they can no longer be measured against the clause; in the other the clause remains intact and the pressure falls on the arrangement of clauses within the period. The difference matters for the analysis of retrospective fragments in particular. A remembered scene has to be entered and left, and the point at which the reader is taken into it is marked syntactically. Where the sentence boundary has been dissolved, this marking has to be carried by other means, and it is worth asking which means take over. The aim of the article is to describe the syntactic models by which retrospective interior monologue is constructed in the two novels and to identify the devices that signal the boundary of the fragment. The relevance of the study lies in the fact that the syntax of the two writers has been described mainly in terms of general stylistic impression, while the constructions that carry the retrospective layer have not been isolated.

Literature review: In the study of the flow of spoken discourse the intonation unit is proposed as the basic segment of production, and it is shown that such a unit typically contains one new item of information [1]. The value of the proposal for the analysis of written prose lies in the fact that it supplies an external standard against which the length of a written segment can be judged. Its limitation is that the standard is derived from speech, so that any transfer to fiction has to be argued rather than assumed.

Work devoted to the language of Joyce examines the effects produced by the disruption of ordinary syntactic expectation and insists that these effects are not reducible to the representation of thought [2]. Descriptive grammar supplies the terms in which such disruptions can be stated, distinguishing the various types of verbless and non-finite structure [3]. A typology of modern writing sets the two authors on different axes and relates their choices to two general modes of composition [4].

A stylistic study of the representation of consciousness in modernist fiction demonstrates that the reader's attribution of a passage to a character depends on a cluster of small grammatical signals rather than on a single marker [5]. Corpus work on register variation, in turn, shows that the frequency of coordination and of elliptical structures separates spoken from written registers [6]. None of the works listed isolates the retrospective fragment as a separate object, and within the sources examined no description of its syntactic construction in the two novels was encountered.

Research methodology: The study employs descriptive, contextual and comparative analysis. The material consists of fragments of retrospective interior monologue drawn from J. Joyce's "Ulysses" and V. Woolf's "The Waves". For every fragment three parameters were recorded – the presence or absence of a finite predicate, the type of connection between the parts, and the

device by which the beginning and the end of the fragment are signalled. The sample from “Ulysses” was assembled purposively rather than at random, since the style of the novel changes from episode to episode and a frequency measurement taken across the whole text would conceal precisely the variation that is of interest here.

Analysis and results: The first pole of Joyce’s syntax is the nominal fragment without a finite verb. The eighth episode opens with a sequence of such fragments: “Pineapple rock. Lemon platt, butter scotch” [7]. Three noun groups follow one another, two of them separated only by a comma, and no predicate is supplied. The grammatical relation between the groups is not stated, so the reader has to supply it from the situation. In a retrospective passage this construction produces a particular effect, since the objects of the remembered scene appear before any judgement is passed on them.

The second pole is the opposite one. In the final episode the period is extended without limit and the parts are joined by coordination alone: “I was a Flower of the mountain yes when I put the rose in my hair like the Andalusian girls used or shall I wear a red yes and how he kissed me under the Moorish wall” [7]. There is no punctuation, and the connectives belong to the simplest class. Subordination is present in the sense that clauses are embedded, but it is not marked graphically, so the hierarchy has to be recovered by the reader. The two poles are opposite in appearance and identical in consequence, because in both of them the sentence ceases to function as a unit of measurement.

Woolf’s syntax retains the finite clause and works instead on the arrangement of clauses. The most frequent arrangement is parallel enumeration closed by a contrastive member. In the schoolroom passage the pattern is exposed with unusual clarity: “Louis writes; Susan writes; Neville writes; Jinny writes; even Bernard has now begun to write. But I cannot write” [8]. Four clauses of identical structure are followed by a fifth which departs from the pattern and then by a sixth which negates it. The remembered scene is not fragmented; it is built up member by member and then broken at a single point.

A second characteristic arrangement is enumeration gathered by a resumptive predicate. Bernard sums up his material in this way: “Waves of hands, hesitations at street corners, someone dropping a cigarette into the gutter—all are stories” [8]. The first part of the sentence consists of noun groups without a predicate, and to this extent it resembles Joyce’s nominal fragment. The difference lies in what follows, since a summarising word gathers the groups and a finite predicate is supplied. Woolf therefore uses the same material as Joyce but closes the construction, whereas he leaves it open.

The semicolon has a structural function in Woolf’s text that it does not have in Joyce’s. It joins clauses which stand in a relation of identity rather than sequence: “I am the foam that sweeps and fills the uttermost rims of the rocks with whiteness; I am also a girl, here in this room” [8]. Two identifying clauses are placed on the same level, and the adverb in the second of them anchors the speaker to the present situation. Constructions of this type allow the remembered and the present layer to be held together within a single sentence without a subordinating conjunction.

The boundary of the unit is signalled differently in the two texts. In “The Waves” it is carried by the reporting formula, which is repeated at regular intervals and always contains a verb of speaking and a proper name. The formula is a purely conventional device, since the monologues are not spoken aloud, and its function is to close one deictic field and open another. In “Ulysses” no such formula exists, and the boundary is carried by graphic means – a

paragraph break, a shift in the length of the segment, or the sudden disappearance of the finite verb. The consequence is that in one novel the boundary is lexical and predictable, in the other it is graphic and has to be inferred.

Interrogative structures occupy different positions in the two texts. In Woolf's novel the question is normally embedded in a reporting clause and thus kept within the syntactic frame: "But I have never yet found the story. And I begin to ask, Are there stories?" [8]. The interrogative retains its word order but is introduced by a verb of asking, so that it is presented as an object of reflection rather than as an appeal. In Joyce's text questions occur without such an introduction and merge with the surrounding fragments. The distribution supports the observation made above, namely that Woolf keeps the syntactic frame and works inside it, while Joyce removes the frame and lets the segments stand alone.

Measured against the standard of the intonation unit, the two texts fall on either side of it. Joyce's nominal fragments are shorter than the unit and contain no predication at all, whereas Woolf's clauses regularly exceed it and carry more than one new item of information. Neither text therefore imitates the rhythm of speech, although both are habitually described as doing so. What they reproduce is not the segmentation of speech but two contrasting written organisations of it.

Conclusion: The syntax of retrospective interior monologue in the two novels is built on opposite principles. In "Ulysses" the sentence is dissolved either downwards, into verbless nominal fragments, or upwards, into an unbroken coordinated period, and in both cases it loses its status as a unit of measurement. In "The Waves" the finite clause is preserved and the work is transferred to the arrangement of clauses, principally to parallel enumeration and to enumeration closed by a resumptive predicate. The boundary of the fragment is signalled by a repeated reporting formula in the selected Woolf material and by graphic means in the selected Joyce material. Interrogative structures are kept within the syntactic frame in the former and left outside it in the latter. Neither text reproduces the segmentation of spoken discourse, since the segments of one are consistently shorter and those of the other consistently longer than the unit established for speech. The observations hold for the fragments examined here and require verification on a wider sample.

References:

1. Chafe W. Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing. – Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994. – 392 p.
2. Attridge D. Joyce Effects: On Language, Theory, and History. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – 195 p.
3. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. – London: Longman, 1985. – 1779 p.
4. Lodge D. The Modes of Modern Writing: Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature. – London: Edward Arnold, 1977. – 279 p.
5. Sotirova V. Consciousness in Modernist Fiction: A Stylistic Study. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. – 251 p.
6. Biber D. Variation across Speech and Writing. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. – 299 p.
7. Joyce J. Ulysses. – Paris: Shakespeare and Company, 1922. – 732 p.



8. Woolf V. The Waves. – London: The Hogarth Press, 1931. – 324 p.