

## Means of Speech Expressiveness in the System of Arthur Miller's Idiostyle

**Nataliia Glinka**

Faculty of Linguistics

Department of Theory, Practice, and Translation of English

Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, Kyiv, Ukraine

Corresponding Author: [nvglinka@ukr.net](mailto:nvglinka@ukr.net)

**Iryna Sydorenko**

Faculty of Linguistics

Department of English for Specific Purposes №1,

Department of Theory, Practice, and Translation of English

Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, Kyiv, Ukraine

**Hanna Matkovska**

Faculty of Linguistics

Department of English for Humanities №3

Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, Kyiv, Ukraine

Received: 2/22/2022

Accepted: 6/24/2022

Published: 7/1/2022

### Abstract

The article deals with the means of speech expression as representatives of the idiostyle specifics of the American playwright Arthur Miller. The main aim of the study is to consider Arthur Miller's idiostyle as a multilevel structured system of constant means and forms of linguistic expression actualized in the process of creating a new literary space following the aesthetic preferences and pragmatic intentions of the author. The methodology grounds of the research including method of theoretical generalization, method of analysis and synthesis, stylistic analysis, lexico-semantic analysis, structural-semantic analysis, contextual interpretation method, descriptive method, pragmatic analysis. It has been revealed that the speech-expressive level of Arthur Miller's idiostyle system is presented by a variety of stylistically marked means of lexical, figurative, and syntactic sublevels, which converge in specific combinations, act as a tool for the embodiment of literary conception, and define pronounced expressive and emotional coloring of the playwright's texts. Main findings have also made it possible to conclude about the symbiosis of elements of the intellectual, psychological, and routine as the distinctive features of the writer's idiostyle.

*Keywords:* Arthur Miller, idiostyle, dramatic text, speech expressiveness

**Cite as:** Glinka, N., Sydorenko, I., & Matkovska, H. (2022). Means of Speech Expressiveness in the System of Arthur Miller's Idiostyle. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Proceedings of KUST, Iraq Conference 2022* (1) 150-163. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/KUST.12>

## Introduction

The modern scientific paradigm transforms the perspective of language phenomena understanding, leads to the emergence of new directions and the implementation of new methods in linguistics. Philological studies of the last decade vividly illustrate that in the focus of researchers' attention is the user of language – a personality who cognizes the surrounding reality, evaluates, and feels. As Golubovskaya and Korolev (2011) rightly point out, the linguistic form is no longer considered as a separated, self-sufficient substance, the specificity of which can be comprehended and substantiated without ties with its bearer. Such an anthropological approach rethought the critical principles of linguistic analysis of the literary discourse, updating the research of literary text as the anthropocentric model determined by the specificity of the author's perception of the surrounding reality and individual communicative-pragmatic intentions (Golubovskaya & Korolev, 2011).

The leading tendency of contemporary linguistic thought has actualized the interpretation of the literary text through the prism of the verbal expression of the writer's worldview. Despite a reasonably wide variability of research views regarding the nature of the idiostyle as a linguistic phenomenon, scientists claim that it should be considered as the system of constant means and forms of linguistic expression depending on the aesthetic preferences of the author (Makar, 2010; Gaidenko, 2018).

It is on such a systematic approach to the understanding of idiostyle that our vision of the organization of Arthur Miller's authorial speech is based. Analyzing the author's idiostyle as a system, we consider means of speech expression to be the key elements that provide its uniqueness and subjective insinuation.

The creative path and uniqueness of the literary method of the writer, who is considered to be one of the brightest representatives of American drama of the twentieth century, is revealed in numerous critical works of researchers. However, the linguistic study of the playwright's creative heritage at this stage is presented only by fragmentary explorations (Bigsby, 2005; Roudane, 2015). To date, there are no fundamental linguistic studies of Arthur Miller's dramatic texts, and there are no scientific attempts to determine the general specifics of the linguistic means used by the author to create the textual canvas of his plays.

The purpose of this article is to clarify the features of functioning, the nature of the interaction, and the pragmatic potential of the expressive speech components in the system of Arthur Miller's idiostyle based on the textual corpus of the author's dramatic works.

## Methods

Using the methodological principles of stylistic analysis, lexical-semantic analysis, structural-semantic analysis, and pragmatic analysis, we consider it reasonable to explore idiostyle at the lexical, figurative, and syntactic levels of language. At the same time, the methodological basis of the research is made up of the method of theoretical generalization, the scientific practice of analysis and synthesis, the contextual-interpretive method, and the descriptive method.

The research material is twelve plays belonging to different periods of the playwright's work with a total volume of 692 pages.

## Results

### *Lexical Level*

The analysis of the factual material indicates that the originality of Arthur Miller's dramatic texts is manifested through the individual features of the word usage. The lexical level of the author's speech is actualized by the active interaction of different layers of vocabulary. The basis of the playwright's language is the commonly used vocabulary of neutral stylistic tone. Most often, the author tends to neutral lexical units in the remarks. The author's remarks are rather extended. Every detail, every gesture, every emotion is significant and described with meticulous accuracy. The following remark is provided below as an example:

“George is Chris's age, but a paler man, now on the edge of his self-restraint. He speaks quietly, as though afraid to find himself screaming. An instant's hesitation, and Chris steps up to him, hand extended, smiling.” (Miller, 1981b, p. 79)

Neutral vocabulary plays an important stylistic role and obtains expressive possibilities in the author's remarks. Adverting to commonly used lexical units, the author not only creates nominative descriptions of the interior, household items, appearances of his characters but also psychologizes heroes, verbally draws vivid original images:

“Keller is near sixty. A heavy man of stolid mind and build, a business man these many years, but with the imprint of the machine-shop worker and boss still upon him. When he reads, when he speaks, when he listens, it is with the terrible concentration of the uneducated man for whom there is still wonder in many commonly known things, a man whose judgments must be dredged out of the experience and a peasant-like common sense. A man among men.” (Miller, 1981b, p. 79)

Along with this, the distinctive feature of the writer's language style is the active use of specific household vocabulary. The author tends to describe the household items of his characters rather precisely in detail. The theme of the polarity of human existence grounded in the daily routine of the surrounding reality and exalted by deep inner impulses permeates every author's play:

“Some canvas folding chairs ...; a wicker chair, a couple of short benches, a well-worn modern chair, and a lumpy couch. A couple of fine, dusty landscapes on one wall, as well as tacked-up photos and a few drunken line drawings of dead friends. At the big table, LEO is carefully lettering with a marker pen on a piece of cardboard.” (Kushner, 2006c, p. 3)

Among the stylistically active tokens that function based on the neutral vocabulary, we distinguish bookish, colloquial, obscene, and spatial.

The study results allow us to claim that the characteristic feature of the writer's style is bookishness. The playwright's speech in the remarks and the dialogues of the protagonists are mainly book-mediated. Following O. Perelomova (2010), we believe that the bookish language

form of the literary text is generated by the writer's focus on the inner essence of the intellectual person. The complex microworld of the genius, the desire for knowledge can be described using such language tools. (Perelomova, 2010).

Among the linguistic means of bookish style that function in the author's texts, we have identified barbarisms: chauffeur (Kushner, 2006a, p. 22), carte blanche (Kushner, 2006a, p. 1978), bona fide (Kushner, 2006a, p. 161); exoticisms: piazza (Kushner, 2006a, p. 586), borscht (Kushner, 2006b, p. 443), czar (Kushner, 2006a, p. 485); archaisms: bounder (Kushner, 2006c, p. 129), harlot (Kushner, 2006a, p. 429), parlor (Kushner, 2006a, p. 352); historicisms: Fascism (Kushner, 2006b, p. 138), Nazis (Kushner, 2006b, p. 146), S.S. (Kushner, 2006a, p. 140); terms: transmission (Kushner, 2006a, p. 419), engine (Kushner, 2006a, p. 421), wire (Kushner, 2006c, p. 228).

The bookish vocabulary defines the sublime sound of Arthur Miller's plays. Along with this, it has functional and pragmatic characteristics. It realizes the expressive potential of the textual material serving as a tool for creating individualized images through the prism of linguistic characterization. Good examples of the above-mentioned lexical means are found in the following quotation:

“JOE: Well, it's the idea that all of our relationships are basically ruled by money ... It's about socialism, where the girls would all have jobs so they wouldn't have to do this, see ... He shows that underneath our ideals it's all economics between people, and it shouldn't be.” (Miller, 1981b, p. 93)

Colloquial vocabulary gives Arthur Miller's texts uniquely realistic, emotional, and expressive character. Colloquial lexical units of the textual corpus of the author's dramatic works function only in the speech of the actors and are represented by the following forms: 1) transformation of the lexeme structure with the transition from a neutral tone to a colloquial one by means of a word-forming model of a suffix: hearty (Kushner, 2006a, p. 304), girlie (Kushner, 2006a, p. 627); 2) modification of the anthroponyms: Hap (Kushner, 2006b, p. 196), B. (Beatrice) (Kushner, 2006a, p. 570), Biffo (Kushner, 2006a, p. 195); 3) exclamations of the non-derivative and derivative types: Oh (Kushner, 2006c, p. 195), Shh (Miller, 2001, p. 1957), Heh (Miller, 2001, p. 1958), Ah ha (Kushner, 2006a, p. 414), Gosh (Kushner, 2006a, p. 105), My God (Miller, 2001, p. 1945), Almighty God (Miller, 2001, p. 1947), God in heaven (Kushner, 2006a, p. 17); 4) commonly used colloquial tokens: booze (Kushner, 2006a, p. 416), kidder (Miller, 2001, p. 1950), bum (Miller, 2001, p. 1954); 5) fixed phrases of colloquial speech: gone and forgotten (Kushner, 2006a, p. 109), take it easy (Miller, 2001, p. 1952), for God's sake (Kushner, 2006a, p. 672); 6) appellative lexemes that mark the communicative situation as unfamiliar one: kiddo (Miller, 2001, p. 1955), fella (Miller, 2001, p. 1957), buddy (Miller, 2001, p. 1960); 7) phrasal verbs of the colloquial type: shut up (Miller, 2001, p. 1954), crab about (Kushner, 2006a, p. 99), tire out (Miller, 2001, p. 1952).

The characteristic feature of Arthur Miller's speech is the frequent use of obscene vocabulary in the dialogues of the protagonists. Obscene language intensifies the overall emotional and expressive coloring of the author's plays, creates the realistic tone of the author's dramatic narration, reduces the emotional distance between Miller's characters and the reader. The following structural-semantic models realize of vulgarities in the writer's texts: 1) exclamations of

vulgar coloring: damn (Miller, 2001, p. 1955), Goddam (Miller, 2001, p. 1962), screw (Miller, 2001, p. 1972); 2) abusive expressions: son's of beatches (Miller, 2001, p. 1977), rot in hell (Kushner, 2006c, p. 593); 3) epithets with vulgar connotation: damned (Kushner, 2006a, p. 592), rotten (Kushner, 2006a, p. 599); 4) obscenely marked nouns: shit (Kushner, 2006b, p. 461), fuck (Kushner, 2006c, p. 461), 5) invectives of vulgar expression: idiot (Kushner, 2006c, p. 25), sucker (Kushner, 2006a, p. 115), jerk (Miller, 2001, p. 1961).

Along with this, it is established that Arthur Miller tends to dialectal vocabulary. The latter creates a perlocutionary effect, contributes to the expressiveness of the playwright's texts, serves as a realistic reflection of the ideological and cultural identity of the protagonists. According to the differential features, we distinguish two groups of vernacularisms that function in Arthur Miller's plays: 1) those that are presented by the vernacular phonetic variants of literary lexemes: gal (Kushner, 2006a, p. 104), dast (Kushner, 2006a, p. 103); 2) those that are realized by assimilated or dissimilated vernacular forms: gimme (Kushner, 2006a, p. 94), lemme (Kushner, 2006b, p. 153). Jargons and slang identify such characterological parameters of the protagonists: 1) age: snappy jacket (Kushner, 2006a, p. 527), strudel (girl) (Miller, 2001, p. 1983); 2) profession: drummer (salesman) (Kushner, 2006c, p. 1992); submarine (someone who works illegally) (Kushner, 2006a, p. 697); 3) social status: big shot (Miller, 2001, p. 2000), big blow (Miller, 2001, p. 2000).

Thus, the textual corpus of Arthur Miller's plays is characterized by the active interaction of different layers of vocabulary. We establish that the characteristic feature of the author's speech at the lexical level is the convergence of neutral lexical units with bookish lexemes in the author's remarks. Also, writer's dramatic texts are differentiated by the convergence of neutral, bookish, colloquial, obscene, and vernacular lexical units in the speech of protagonists. In our opinion, such variability of lexical means allows us to consider the symbiosis of elements of intellectual, psychological, and routine to be a notable feature of the playwright's language creation.

### ***Figurative Level***

The system of individual artistic-linguistic vision of the reality is objectified by the mechanisms of transformation of linguistic means in the process of symbolic space creation (Yurina, 2016, p. 89). Accordingly, the analysis of the author's texts through the prism of symbolic specifics is an integral part of studying the characteristics of idiosyncrasy.

Among the figurative means that saturate the author's speech of Arthur Miller with verbal and dramatic images, we have defined the following stylistic devices: hyperbole, meiosis, epithets, irony, comparisons, metaphors, and allusions.

The use of hyperbole is quite common in the texts of the playwright. Moreover, the hyperbole of different semantic types is widely presented. It is established that the stylistic device of hyperbole expresses the psychological excitement or inner feelings of the characters. Examples of the above-mentioned figurative means are found in the following quotations:

“DANFORTH: ... – I should hang ten thousand that dared to rise against the law, and an ocean of salt tears could not melt the resolution of the statutes.” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 442)  
 “SUE: ... I can smell her perfume over the phone.” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 91)

Occasional hyperboles are used to implement communicative-pragmatic situations "excessive desire" and "excessive reluctance":

"WILLY: ... I want a seventy-yard boot, and get right down the field under the ball." (Miller, 2001, p. 202)

"BIFF: A team of horses couldn't have dragged me back to Bill Oliver!" (Miller, 2001, p. 2002)

Quite often, the author's occasional-hyperbolic structures are formed based on such means of figurative level as comparison or metaphor:

"LOUISE: ... there are more bacteriologists than bugs these days." (Miller, 1981a, p. 71)

"QUENTIN: Because I'm backed up to the edge of the cliff, and I haven't one inch left behind me." (Miller, 1981a, p. 115)

The emotional and evaluative speech of the protagonists is also realized with the help of literary and occasional meiosis. In the texts of Arthur Miller's plays, literary meiosis are presented by: 1) fixed phrases with numerals: an ounce of respect (Miller, 2001, p. 1959); 2) meiotic structures with formal markers of measure diminution: a piece of advice (Kushner, 2006a, p. 105); 3) adjectives with the semantics of reduction degree: hairline crack (Kushner, 2006b, p. 112).

Arthur Miller's occasional meiosis are convergent structures at the level of syntagms or supra-phrase units with metaphorically marked meaning characterized by enhanced expressive and emotional tone:

"LEONORA: So if I told you how unimportant I think I am, I might disappear in thin air, like a speck of dust on the nose of a mouse." (Kushner, 2006b, p. 18)

"KELLER: ... To him the world had a forty-foot front; it ended at the building line. ... You make a deal, overcharge two cents, and his hair falls out." (Kushner, 2006a, p. 152)

One of the manifestations of the linguistic richness of the writer is epithets. Numerous affective (terrific gorgeous, magnificent, marvelous, terrible, disgusted, filthy (Kushner, 2006b, pp. 3-497) and figurative epithets with positive and negative modalities intensify the speech expressiveness of the protagonists and the speech of the author in the remarks. It is determined that figurative epithets that function in the playwright's texts are presented by 1) single structures: hard glance (Kushner, 2006b, p.231), puzzling silence (Kushner, 2006b, p. 245), wild joke (Kushner, 2006a, p. 259); 2) phrasal structures: narrow-minded ignorance (Kushner, 2006c, p. 17), fragile-seeming home (Miller, 2001, p. 1935); 3) figurative structures: browbeaten attitude (Kushner, 2006b, p.407), brokenhearted person (Kushner, 2006b, p. 435); 4) synesthetic figurative structures: soft sound (Kushner, 2006a, p. 445), warm smile (Miller, 2001, p. 1964); 5) phrasal holophrastic forms: heaven-knows-what incredible improvement (Kushner, 2006b, p. 17), out-of-the-way places (Kushner, 2006b, p. 238).

The irony is another mean of speech expression that determines the stylistic color of the textual space of Arthur Miller's drama. In most cases, the author achieves a mocking or ironic

sound of the protagonist's speech through vivid comparisons formed by unexpected associative conventions. Some of these are provided below as examples:

“SUE: She sounds like she's in terrible pain – unless her mouth is full of candy.” (Miller, 1981b, p. 91)

“JIM: If your son wants to play golf, tell him I'm ready. Or if he'd like to take a trip around the world for about thirty years.” (Miller, 1981b, p. 91)

It is noteworthy that sometimes the specifics of the ironic modality formation are determined by the semantic and pragmatic potential of the occasional metaphors:

“FATHER: They all fall in love on my money. Only I can't fall in love unless I pay for it. I married into a love nest!” (Miller, 1981b, p. 23)

“BIFF: You saw it. The mice didn't bring it into the cellar!” (Miller, 2001, p. 1999)

Actualization of the ironic context by hyperbolizing certain traits or qualities of the heroes has also been established:

“EDDIE: You're savin' their lives, what're you worried about the table cloth? They probably didn't see a table cloth in their whole life where they come from.” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 575)

“KELLER: Without Frank the stars wouldn't know when to come out.” (Miller, 1981b, p. 108)

The conducted analysis suggests that the characteristic feature of Arthur Miller's authorial speech is the systematic use of comparisons. The author's comparisons are vivid, expressive, and emotional speech complexes that acquire symbolic meaning.

Most often, the author tends to comparisons based on zoomorphic and phytomorphic images. The peculiarity of such comparisons is anthropometrics associated with the author's vision of man's place in society:

“LINDA: He's not to be allowed to fall onto his grave like an old dog.” (Miller, 2001, p. 1960)

“WILLY: You can't eat the orange and throw the peel away - a man is not a piece of fruit!” (Miller, 2001, p. 1973)

Quite regularly, the writer tends to comparative constructions in which he reveals negative social realities drawing axiological parallels with material phenomena:

“ROBERTSON: ... we've been tossing the whole country onto a crap table in a game where nobody is ever supposed to lose!” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 423)

“ROBERTSON: America you love is cold stone dead in the parlor.” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 448)

The specifics of individual-author associations are also clearly manifested in comparisons based on meiosis and metaphors. It allows the author to reproduce a wide range of feelings and emotions of his characters:

“LEO ..., and now I’m going back to being a chemical; all we are is a lot of talking nitrogen, you know ...” (Kushner, 2006c, p. 17)

“LYMAN: It feels like the moon is in my belly and the sun’s in my mouth and I’m shining down on the world.” (Kushner, 2006c, p. 267)

Often the writer builds extended and detailed figurative comparisons, thanks to which complete literary pictures of symbolic content are created. At the same time, the author’s speech acquires signs of the poetic one:

“LIVERMORE: ... Money is like a shy bird: the slightest rustle in the trees and it flies for cover. But money cannot bear solitude for long, it must come out and feed.” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 427)

Along with this, the original metaphorical comparisons as means of activating its expressiveness and figurativeness are found in the author’s remarks:

“ ... Its wide lookout windows are like eyes which at the moment seem blind and dark; bent reinforcing rods stick out of it like broken tentacles.” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 3)

The present study suggests that the metaphor is widely presented in all Arthur Miller’s plays. Various structural and semantic variations of the metaphorical transferences, determined by a clear sign of intellectualism and psychologism, actively function in the protagonists’ speech and the author’s remarks.

The writer always tends to metaphor to express the peculiarities of behavior, appearance, or internal state of his characters: iron character (Miller, 2001, p. 1986), massive dreams (Miller, 2001, p. 1936), turbulent longings (Kushner, 2006c, p. 936).

Numerous metaphors in the author’s remarks reproduce the appeal to the complicated world of human feelings and emotions:

“Mother is discovered on the rise, rocking ceaselessly in a chair, staring at her thoughts.” (Miller, 2001, p. 1978)

The playwright’s metaphoric expressions also illustrate the active social position, a sharp personal reaction to the social and political realities of American society:

“CHRIS: ... This is the land of the great big dogs, you don’t love a man here, you eat him!” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 15)

“ROOSEVELT: Clouds of suspicion, tides of ill will and intolerance gather darkly in many places.” (Kushner, 2006c, p. 466)

At the textual level, we observe the implementation of the compositional metaphor, which, acting as an architectural repetition, extends to the entire textual space of the work, ensures its semantic integrity and coherence. In the plays of the writer, its function is performed by: 1) the titles of some works: "The Golden Years", "Resurrection Blues", "All my sons", "Playing for Time"; 2) nicknames of the protagonists: Laughy (Kushner, 2006a, p. 136), Madonna (Kushner, 2006a, p. 582), Prince (Kushner, 2006c, p. 136).

The markers of the intertextuality of the writer's dramatic texts are the allusions. The allusions are used only in the protagonists' speech, identifying, above all, such communicative and pragmatic parameters as behavior and appearance. Along with this, allusions serve not only as means of vivid characterization of the heroes but also intensify the emotional expressiveness of their speech. The allusive space of the author's plays is actualized by the direct references to well-known historical and biblical figures. Interesting examples of allusions are found in the following quotations:

"CHRIS: Drink your tea, Casanova." (Kushner, 2006a, p. 113)

"PROCTOR: Pontius Pilate! God will not let you wash your hands." (Kushner, 2006a, p. 405)

The playwright also pays attention to mythological and folklore plots:

"WILLY ... there'll be open sesame for all of us!" (Miller, 2001, p. 1946)

"WILLY ... I thank Almighty God you're both built like Adonises." (Miller, 2001, p. 1947)

The all above mentioned makes it possible to consider that the originality of Arthur Miller's idiosyncrasy at the figurative level is due not only to the desire to create a distinct sound of dramatic contexts but also to model a unique literary reality following the aesthetic perception of the world. Such feature of the author's speech, in our opinion, is a verbal sign of complex figurative-expressive thinking, an appeal to the figurative-sensory dimension of human existence.

### *Syntactic Level*

In the course of the research, it has been found that the speech expressiveness and intense emotional coloring of Arthur Miller's dramatic texts are actualized through the syntactic organization of the author's speech. The latter is organized through the numerous variations of syntactic connections and transformations of typical syntactic constructions: repetition, parallelism, inversion, ellipse, parentheses.

One of the most widely used means of the expressive syntax in the playwright's dramatic texts is the repetition. In the analyzed plays of the author, actively function and interact various structural types of the repetitions: contact, distant, extended, ring, adjacent, chain, morpheme, anaphoric, epiphoric, synonymous, antonymic, and syntactic. Selected examples illustrate that this stylistic device serves the writer as one of the significant means of accentuation and rhythmic organization of dramatic speech of the characters, creates the effect of psychological tension,

condensation of feelings and emotions. Vivid examples of those mentioned above are found in the following quotations:

“QUENTIN: That there is a love; limitless; a love not even of persons but blind, blind to insult, blind to the spear in the flesh, like justice blind, like ...” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 111)  
“MICKEY: ... I didn't feel I had spoken. Something else had spoken, something automatic and inhuman. Yet there is something, something that closes my throat when I think of telling names. What am I defending? It's a dream, now, a dream of solidarity, but hasn't that died a long time ago? Because the truth, my truth, is that I think the Party is a conspiracy. ...” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 42)

Various structural types of parallel constructions are also the distinctive feature of Arthur Miller's expressive syntax. The playwright always tends to parallel syntactic devices not only in the speech of the characters but also in his remarks. It, in our opinion, allows testifying to the personal expressive and evaluative interpretation of the reproduced events.

Thus, microparallelism is illustrated, in particular, by the following textual fragments:

“Without expression, yet somehow stilled by some emanation from the room, he lets his gaze move from point to point, piece to piece ...” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 188)  
“QUENTIN: It's not only your success or that you're rich – you're straight, you're serious, you're first-class, people mean something to you.” (Miller, 1981a, p. 244)

Examples of partial macroparallelism of the syntactic models are presented in the following passages of the author's plays:

“BEATRICE: First it was gonna be when she graduated high school, so she graduated high school. Then it was gonna be when she learned stenographer, so she learned stenographer.” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 579);  
“EDDIE: I mean like me - I can't cook, I can't sing, I can't make dresses, so I'm on the waterfront. But if I could cook, if I could sing, if I could make dresses, I wouldn't be on the waterfront. I would be someplace else. I would be like in a dress store. ...” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 609)

The original feature of Arthur Miller's style is considered to be the double combinations of short sentences connected by full-type macro parallel connections:

“GEORGE: She knows. She knows.” (Miller, 1981b, p. 112)  
“ELSIE: Did you hear? Did you hear?” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 44)

It is noteworthy that the microparallelism and macroparallelism of syntactic constructions often accompany the lexical identity of the sentence elements serving as additional expressive intensifications of such stylistic figures as anaphora and epiphora:

“KELLER: ... Because he's my son. Because I'm his father and he's my son.” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 51)

“WILLY: I gotta get myself some coffee. I’ll get some coffee ...” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 1973)

Among the syntactic means of expression that function in the textual space of the playwright and intensify its pragmatic significance, we also find variations of stylistic inversion models:

“WILLY: On the road I want to grab you sometimes and just kiss the life outa you.” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 1950)

“TOM: Don’t be upset, a statement I’ll get from him this morning ...” (Kushner, 2006c, p. 7)

In addition, among the syntactic and stylistic means of the author, the ellipse is distinguished. It is used primarily to convey the natural speech of the protagonists, to reproduce its spontaneity realistically:

“FATHER: ... Been here every day ...” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 11)

“FRANK: ... Not a cloud.” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 88)

Typical for the playwright are the constructions with the modified elliptical sentences based on various forms of repetitions:

“BIFF: Loaded with it. Loaded!” (Miller, 2001, p. 1969)

“BIFF: ... Didn’t. Didn’t do a damned thing.” (Miller, 2001, p. 1976)

The ellipse is actively functioning in the author’s remarks. As a result, the writer manages to portray his characters concisely and accurately; create vivid, insightful images, and implicate them organically into the literary space of his dramas:

“In his mid-fifties, well-barbered; hatless, in a camel’s hair coat, very healthy complexion. A look of sharp intelligence on his face.” (Kushner, 2006b, p. 220)

Numerous nominative sentences are also a notable feature of Arthur Miller’s authorial speech. Nominative constructions that organize the author’s texts on the syntactic level are characterized by variable semantics and structure while obtaining a wide range of functions.

According to the category of content, we distinguish the following types of nominative sentences that are present in the plays of the playwright: 1) narrative: “EMILY: That snow. That sun. That light!” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 453); 2) interrogative: “HAPPY: What magazine?” (Miller, 2001, p. 1983); 3) exclamatory: “EMILY: My god!” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 453); 4) evaluative: “KELLER: ... Wonderful thing.” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 90); 5) vocative: “LINDA: Willy, dear? Willy?” (Miller, 2001, p. 1979); 6) transpositive: “WILLY: ... What fragrance in this room!” (Miller, 1947, p. 1938). Regarding the form category, the author’s nominative sentences are divided into: 1) one-component: “FINE: Man?” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 40); 2) two-component, distributed due to the attributive components: “RODOLPHO: Electric lights?” (Kushner, 2006a, p. 615); 3) multicomponent, distributed due to three or more components connected by a

coordinative-appositive connection: "WILLY: Me and my boys in those grand outdoors!" (Miller, 2001, p. 1975).

The writer tends to integrate nominative sentences into constructions with repetitions (1) or build upon its basis the parallelism (2) that may be considered as the distinguishing feature of the author's individual language:

(1) "LINDA: I made the last payment on the house today. Today, dear. ..." (Miller, 2001, p. 2004)

(2) "RODOLPHO: ... No wide streets? No flags? No cars?" (Kushner, 2006a, p. 615)

Parceling occupies a significant place among the stylistic devices of the syntactic level of Arthur Miller's dramatic texts. In the textual space of the author's plays, this syntactic technique helps to accentuate the fragments that are most important in the compositional part of the dialogue lines. In addition, the parceling of the sentences creates the effect of spontaneous, unprepared utterances, contributing to the realistic sound of the characters' speech. Good examples of parceling stylistic potential are found in the following quotations:

"LINDA: ... He said they have evidence. That all these accidents in the last year – were no just accidents." (Miller, 2001, p. 1976)

"ANN: ... I was crying all the time. Until the news came about Larry. Then I realized. It's wrong to pity a man like that. ..." (Kushner, 2006a, p. 111)

In addition, it is found that the function of expressing the syntactic organization of the protagonists' lines in Arthur Miller's texts is performed by parentheses. Most often, semantic and modal-evaluative parentheses are applied. Being differentiated by the explication of the subjective-evaluative and evaluative-commentary meaning, parentheses expand the informative saturation of the statement. Some of these are provided below as examples:

"WILLY: ... And old Dave, he'd go up to his room, y'understand, put on his green velvet slippers - I'll never forget - and pick up his phone and call the buyers ..." (Miller, 2001, p. 1972)

"WILLY: ... When he died - and by the way he died the death of a salesman, in his green velvet slippers in the smoker of New York, New Haven and Hartford, going into Boston - when he died, hundreds of salesmen and buyers were at his funerals. ..." (Miller, 2001, p.1973)

So, it is believed that the analysis of the factual material is the evidence that the syntactic level of the textual corpus of Arthur Miller's plays is determined by the functioning and interaction of various stylistic means and techniques. Its convergence determines the expressive-emotional tone, rhythmic organization, and realistic sound of the author's dramatic works.

## Conclusion

Thus, according to the main aim of the study, the system of idiostyle of Arthur Miller at the level of speech expression is analyzed. It is established that the expressive possibilities of the author's speech are realized on lexical, figurative, and syntactic sublevels.

The specificity of the lexical level is actualized by the interaction of neutral vocabulary with the bookish one in the author's remarks. Neutral, bookish, colloquial, obscene, and dialectical lexical units actively function in the dialogue lines of the protagonists. Such variability of the lexical layer determines the symbiosis of the intellectual and the routine as the characteristic feature of the playwright's language.

In the author's texts, various figurative means are active. Its occasionality and combinatorics reflect the specifics of the individual worldview. The playwright equally uses both literary and individual-author hyperboles, meioses, epithets, irony, comparisons, metaphors, and allusions. Such literary approach is considered to be a verbal sign of the inexhaustible energy of the author's word, complex figurative thinking, and appeal to figurative-human sensory.

The expression and pronounced emotional tone of Arthur Miller's dramatic works are also achieved through the complex syntactic system of the textual material. Among the stylistic methods of syntax, the most significant become the syntactic structures of repetition. Its possibilities of rhythmic and expressive-intonational expression of the text are intensified by the convergence with other stylistic means. In addition, the use of elliptical constructions, nominative sentences, and parceling is frequent, which is due to the author's desire to reproduce the dynamics and expression of living spontaneous speech.

The emotionally expressive coloring of the textual space of the writer's dramatic works is conditioned by the active use of speech expression means not only in the dialogues of the protagonists but also in the author's remarks.

So, it is concluded that the specifics of Arthur Miller's idiostyle are objectified by the variety of speech-expressive means. Such means converge in various, chosen by the author combinations, act as a tool of the literary idea realization, and implement the author's intention of pragmatic and aesthetic influence on the reader. The authors of the present article see the perspective of the research in the analysis of the compositional and cognitive levels of the playwright's idiostyle system.

## About the Authors:

**Nataliia Glinka**, Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Theory, Practice and Translation of English, National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", directs research activities to under-graduate, graduate and post-graduate students. She is delivering some lecture courses, under her guidance two post-graduate students successfully defended their theses. The scope of Nataliia Glinka's scientific interests include research in the field of linguistics, text studies and literature.

ORCID ID: [https:// orcid 0000-0001-7249-3615](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7249-3615)

**Iryna Sydorenko** works at the Faculty of Linguistics, at the Dept. of ESP in the Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute as the English language teacher. She delivers courses of English as a foreign Language and English for Specific Purposes to the extramural students of all years. She is a PhD student of the subdepartment of Theory, Practice, and Translation of the English Language. Her research interests are stylistics, pragmatylistics, and literary discourse.  
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8276-9048>

**Hanna Matkovska**, PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of English for Humanities №3, National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute". The scope of her research includes the style of narrative fiction, audiovisual narrative and audiovisual translation. ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0823-7905

### References

- Bigsby, C. (2005). *Arthur Miller: A Critical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Gaidenko, Yu. (2018). Semantyko-prahmatychnyi potentsial avtorskoi movy ta avtorskoho movlennia Sharlotty Binhkhem [Semantic and Pragmatic Potential of Charlotte Bingham's Author's Language and Author's Speech]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Chernivtsi National Univ. Yuri Fedkovych, Chernivtsi.
- Holubovska, I., & Korolov, I. (2011). *Actual problems of linguistics*. Kyiv: Kyivskyy universytet.
- Kushner, T. (2006a). *Arthur Miller. Collected Plays 1944-1961* (rev. ed.). New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc.
- Kushner, T. (2006b). *Arthur Miller. Collected Plays 1964-1982* (rev. ed.). New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc.
- Kushner, T. (2006c). *Arthur Miller. Collected Plays 1987-2004* (rev. ed.). New York: Literary Classics of the United States, Inc.
- Makar, I. (2010). *Lonh I yoho roman "Dafnis i Khloia"* [Long and his Novel "Daphnis and Chloe"]. Chernivtsi: Chernivtsi National Univ. Yuri Fedkovych.
- Miller, A. (2001). Death of a Salesman. In J. Beaty, A. Booth, J. P. Hunter, & K. J. Mays, (eds.), *The Norton Introduction to Literature* (8<sup>th</sup> ed, pp. 1935-2004). London: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Miller, A. (1981a). After the Fall. In *Arthur Miller's Collected Plays (vol. II, pp. 240-277)*. New York: Viking Press.
- Miller, A. (1981b). All my Sons. In *Arthur Miller's Collected Plays (vol. I, pp. 78-119)*. New York: Viking Press.
- Perelomova, O. (2010). *Idiostyl Valeriia Shevchuka [Idiostyle of Valery Shevchuk]*. Sumy: SumDU.
- Roudane, M. C. (2010). Death of a Salesman and the Poetics of Arthur Miller. In Brenda Murphy (ed.), *Critical Insights: Death of a Salesman* (pp. 241-272). Salem: Salem Press.
- Yurina, Yu. (2016). Idiostyl Oleny Telihiy [The Idiostyle of OlenaTeliha]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Zaporizhzhia National University, Zaporizhzhia.