INVERSION AS A MEANS OF EXPRESSIVE SYNTAX

Egamnazarova D.Sh.
Senior teacher at Andijan State University.
E-mail: durdona-e@mail.ru

Abstract: The article discusses different descriptions and specific interpretations of inversion in English, one of the most vexed issues in pragmalinguistics. An analysis of different views and approaches to reverse order of words in the category of expressiveness and the conclusions based on them are presented.

Key words. Syntax, inversion, reverse order of words, grammatical inversion, expressive inversion, emphasis.

Introduction: Word order transformations, which are used as an expressive tool, are the subject matter of stylistics. Ch. Bally first discussed the relevance of expressiveness for syntax in the. He emphasized the fact that syntactic means could be used in order to bring a particular affective colour to the statement [1:34]. The capacity of syntactic forms to maximize the pragmatic potential of an utterance above the degree reached by the lexical values of the items that occupy these syntactic forms is considered to be expressiveness in syntax. In English, one of the tools of expressive syntax – inversion is a vexed issue kindling the interest of modern linguists. Traditionally, inversion refers to a reversal of the syntactically correct order of the subject, the predicate-verb, and the object in a sentence. This process is also known as *anastrophe*, from the Greek "to reverse" [14:5]. In many languages, word order is an important feature of syntax, and it is crucial in English since there is a relatively fixed pattern for sentence construction, usually the Subject-Verb-Object order, despite the fact that many other languages allow for looser structures of sentence members.

Main part:O. Jespersen claims that English "has developed a tolerably fixed word order which in the great majority of cases shows without fail what is the Subject of the sentence" [2: 66], that is Subject, Predicate and Object (S-P-O). In his research O. Jespersen also states that "according to statistics delivered from a series of representative 19th century writers the S-P-O order was used in 82 to 97 % of all sentences containing all the 3 members" [2: 66], whereas 16 per cent were for Beowulf and 40 per cent for King Alfred's prose [3:22]. This shows that the syntactic inversion was used in the English language as early as at the end of the 7th century. In the English language the term *inversion* can be applied "to a significant number of sentence structures and within its own structural bounds also can cover a great variety of subcategories as *an umbrella term*" [4: 5] whose "clear-cut distinctions are not found to be standardised, at least in relevant literature on inversion" [4;5;6]. G. Green states that "there exist on the order of 20 to 40 types of inverted sentences in English" [7: 117]. Some definitions of inversion are quite broad, including "subject-auxiliary inversion and even existential *there* constructions" [7: 120]. B. Birner gives a more restrictive definition of inversion. She defines it as "a sentence in which the logical subject appears in the post-verbal position while some other, canonically post-verbal, constituent appears in the clause-initial position" [8: 12]. Moreover, "being the reversal of the subject and the verb inversion represents a deviation from the norm and, therefore, is a «norm-breaking» word order alternation» [6: 1].

Any shift in standard word order in the English language is important stylistically and plays a significant part. I. V. Arnold divides inversion into 2 parts: *grammatical* and *stylistic.* I. V. Arnold states that the stylistic inversion is "a violation of the order of sentence constituents during which one

of them is emphasized and receives a special connotation of emotionality or expressiveness" [8: 219]. Since focus is placed on one of the sentence constituents, the stylistic inversion gives the utterance emotional shade. In literary discourse, inversion is used as a medium of expressive and effective speech. According to B. B. Karashaeva "any violation of canonical word order results in additional connotations, emphasizes or weakens the semantics of a sentence constituent" [9: 58]. I. R. Galperin points out that "the stylistic inversion aims at attaching logical stress or additional emotional colouring to the surface meaning of the utterance" [10:204]. He also adds that inversion is not to be considered a breach of the norm of standard English.

The grammatical inversion is a syntactic form in which the word order of two sentence members is reversed. *T*wo types of grammatical inversion are commonly distinguished: full inversion, and "subject-auxiliary inversion, which is also known as *subject-operator inversion*" [12: 1381]. V. A. Kochetova also singles out two major types of inversion: "*full inversion* where the predicate-verb is shifted before the subject and *partial inversion* where the auxiliary is found in the position preceding the subject" [13: 18].

H. Dorgeloh states that "full inversion is found in all those structures where the subject follows the whole of its verbal phrase, i. e. a full (lexical) verb or copular *be*" [6: 23]. Nevertheless, speaking of inverted sentences some linguists use the terms *inversion* and *fronting* [11: 18]. For example, S. Chalker and M. Foley use the syntactic transformation, which is called as "fronting" by them [13:132]. They regard fronting as "a way of changing the normal word order of a structure" [13: 326], in which part of a sentence is placed in the position preceding the subject for the purpose of emphasis. This is commonly an adverb or adjective expression, a nominal phrase or a clause, or, sometimes, a verb. It's worth noting that when an adjective or adverbial modifier is moved to the first position, the word order is reversed. These changes in sentence constituents are not referred to as inversions by S. Chalker and M. Foley, they refer them to fronting [11: 18].

Thus, the predicate-verb comes before the subject in the grammatical inversion structure. In the English language there are two main types of the grammatical inversion: *subject-auxiliary inversion* (partial) and *subject-verb inversion* (full). The difference between the two is based on whether the verb in question is a complete or auxiliary verb. The partial (subject-auxiliary) inversion is a common occurrence. Inversion in which a finite auxiliary verb, and its finite forms, is inverted. Be, the link-verb, shifts its role in relation to the subject. Therefore, the word order is *auxiliary-subject*, which is opposed to the canonical *subject-verb* order of declarative sentences in English.

The expressive inversion is mainly used in literature, that is, in prose and poetry and in spoken discourse. The use of inversion enables the writer to convey the message in a way as to excite the reader's imagination and emotions. The use of emphatic constructions improves understanding.

As for spoken discourse, V. A. Kochetova once said "colloquial speech is vitally emotional and using inverted word order can help to express different shades of emotional states" [11:54].

Conclusion

According to the above-said, it can be inferred that while grammatical inversion is mostly used for emphasis, the expressive type is a syntactic arrangement that gives logical stress to sentence constituents in reverse syntactic positions without altering the contextual meaning. It is a stylistic device for emphasis, which involves putting a word in an unusual or prominent position in the sentence – either first or last. As a result of the expressive inversion, the utterance sounds more emotional and the speaker is able to convey a wider range of emotions

References

1. Балли Ш. Французская стилистика. Пер. с фр. Изд. 3 //М.: Издательство Либроком. – 2009. – 392 с. [Bally, Ch., Stylistics of the French Language. – M., Librokom publishing house, 2009. – 392 p.]
2. Jespersen O. Essentials of English grammar //London: Allen & Unwin. – 1933. – 340 p.
3. Coseriu E. Collection of scientific works. Issue 333. Formal and semantic organization of the text, 2007. – 670 p.
4. Kreyer, R. Inversion in Modern Written English: Syntactic Complexity, Information Status and the Creative Writer. Tü: Gunter Narr, 2006.
5. Birner, B. J. The Discourse Function of Inversion in English. Routledge Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2012.
6. Dorgeloh, H. Inversion in Modern English: Form and function. John Benjamins Publishing, 1997.
7. Green, G. Colloquial and literary uses of inversions // Deborah Tannen (ed.), Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy, Norwood NJ: Ablex. 1982. - P. 119–154.
8. Арнольд И. В. Стилистика. Современный английский язык. М.: Флинта, Наука, 2010. [Arnold, I. V. (2010). Stilistika. Sovremennyj anglijskij yazyk (Stylistics. Modern English Language). Moscow: Flinta, Nauka. (In Russ)].
9. Карашаева Б. Б. Стилистическая инверсия как средство выражения эмоциональности и экспрессивности в английской литературе XIX–XX вв. //Актуальные проблемы языкознания, 2015. № 1. С. 46–48. [Karashaeva, B. B. (2015) Stilisticheskaya inversiya kak sredstvo vyrazheniya emotsional'nosti I ekspressivnosti v angliiskoi literature XIX–XX vv. (Stylistic inversion as a means of expression of emotion and expressiveness in the English literature of the 19–20th centuries). Aktual'nye problemy yazykoznaniya, 1, 46–48 (In Russ)].
10. Galperin, I. R. English Stylistics / Ed. by L. R. Todd. M.: LIBROCOM. 2018
11. Кочетова В. А. Прагматические особенности инверсии в современном английском языке // Современные проблемы науки и образования. 2012. № URL: http://science-education.ru/ru/article/view?id=7757 (дата обращения 27.08.2020) [Kochetova, V. A. (2012) Pragmatic features of inversion in Modern English. Modern Problems of Science and Education, 6. URL: http:// science-education.ru/ru/article/view?id=7757 (In Russ)].
12. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London and New York: Longman, 1985. – 1779 p.
13. Chalker, S. Current English Grammar. Prentice Hall, 1997. – 296 p.
14. Cioffi. *The Imaginative Argument: A Practical Manifesto for Writers*. Princeton University Press, 2009. – 137 p.