Vilnius University

Faculty of Philology

Department of English Philology

Buse Binici

Stylistic Representation of 'Self' and 'Other' in Light of Postcolonial Theory: Case Studies from Poetry and Fiction

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of requirements
for the degree of MA in English Studies

Academic Advisor:
Assist. Prof. Dr Davide Castiglione

2022

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr Davide Castiglione for his consistent assistance, guidance, and patience throughout this process. My gratitude extends to the Study Programme Committee. I would also like to thank the professors that contributed to my studies in the last two years, namely Assoc. Prof. Dr Linara Bartkuvienė, Prof. Dr Almantas Liudas Samalavičius, Assoc. Prof. Dr Anna Ruskan, Prof. Dr Habil. Aurelija Usonienė, Assoc. Prof. Dr Birutė Ryvitytė, Assoc. Prof. Dr Deimantas Valančiūnas, Assist. Prof. Dr Grant Matthew Rosson, Assoc. Prof. Dr Jolanta Šinkūnienė, Assist. Prof. Dr Rimas Edvard Užgiris, Assoc. Prof. Dr Rūta Šlapkauskaitė for providing invaluable insights in their courses. I also thank Vilnius University for every encouraging scholarship I have received during my studies.

Finally, I am deeply grateful for the unconditional support and encouragement from my family all through my studies. Special thanks to my little sister for her patience every time I told her that I cannot play with her because I had to study.

Contents

Abstract…………………………………………………………………………………..………...4

1. Introduction………………………………………………………………………..………....5

1.1. Rewriting and defamiliarization…………………………………………………………8

1.2. Critical stylistics and critical discourse analysis………………………………………...9

1.3. The authors and their relevance to the dissertation………………………………………9

1.4. The case of Ireland in postcolonial perspective…………………………………………...10

2. Methods and data…………………………………………………….................................12

2.1. Methods ……………………………………………………......................................12

2.2. Data………………………………………………………………………………………..17

3. Stylistic analysis……………………………………………………………………………….19

3.1. Stylistic analysis of poetry…………………………………………………………...19

3.1.1. Thomas Pringle: "The Bushman"…………………………………………………….19

3.1.2. Thomas Pringle: "The Hottentot"…………………………………………………….22

3.1.3. Seamus Heaney: "Requiem for the Croppies"………………………………………..23

3.2. Stylistic analysis of prose………………………………………………………………25

3.2.1 Toni Morrison: *The Bluest Eye*……………………………………………………..25

4. Conclusion…………………………………………………………………………………..32

5. Data Sources………………………………………………………………………………..33

6. References………………………………………………………………………………….34

7. Summary in Lithuanian…………………………………………………...........................36

Abstract

Although a considerable amount of research has been devoted to stylistics and postcolonial study separately, rather fewer attempts have been made to develop postcolonial stylistics. This MA thesis titled "Stylistic Representation of 'Self' and 'Other' in Light of Postcolonial Theory: Case Studies from Poetry and Fiction" aims to contribute to the neglected area of postcolonial stylistics. The research seeks to illustrate opposition construction in postcolonial literature along with its subversive and critical functions. Drawing on Matt Davies' (2008) and Lesley Jeffries' (2010) typologies, this study investigates the underpinnings of contextual unconventional opposition in discourse. The qualitative analysis shows that opposition is foregrounded in Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye*, Thomas Pringle's "The Bushman" and "The Hottentot", and Seamus Heaney's "Requiem for the Croppies". The results and findings suggest that constructed opposites in these works subvert, undermine and criticise the established colonial discourse and white dominant culture.

1.Introduction

Opposition and binarism are intrinsic to postcolonial theory and texts that deal with colonial discourse. Colonial discourse, according to Edward Said (1978), is discursive knowledge produced by Western power to legitimise the domination and subjugation of the colonised. One of the focal textual features of various literary texts which propagate, or by contrast subvert colonial discourse is binary opposition. The concept of binary opposition is equally central in Saussure's structuralist theory of language, emphasising that a linguistic unit derives its meaning and is defined by its relation to other linguistic units. Thus, binaries are set off against one another and the meaning is determined through complementary pairs (e.g.: mortal/immortal antonymy). Far from being a neutral given, binary opposition is a tool through which Western thought has reinforced cultural hegemony. Following Gramsci (1971), cultural hegemony can be defined as the construction of 'common sense' achieved by manipulating cultural views in order to dominate ethnically, politically, and religiously marginalised groups. Binaries are instrumental to this hegemonic project, since they structure a rigid hierarchical system whereby certain cultural, religious or ethnic groups proclaim themselves as superior and in so doing alienate all those people/cultures that are dissimilar from them.

The key aim of this study is to examine linguistic features of textually constructed opposition in selected literary works by Toni Morrison, Thomas Pringle and Seamus Heaney. To this end, personal pronouns as the markers of the dichotomy of 'self' and 'the Other', contrastive structures and antonyms which are employed to emphasise or subvert colonial discourse will be analysed. The colonial discourse defines the colonised as 'the Other' and assigns the natives an irretrievable dissimilarity from 'self' which refers to the characteristics of Western people and practices. By constructing a perception which divides the world into two, imperial powers consolidate their hierarchy. Edward Said identifies Occident/Oriental and we/they oppositions as fundamental to the imperial and colonial discourse as he evaluates the imperial mentality of "'they' were not like 'us,' and for that reason deserved to be ruled" (1994, xi). Binary oppositions are linguistically construed, in particular, by the 'us/them' dichotomy. Although the pronoun 'we' is among the most ambiguous in discourse (Vladimirou 2007, 139), in the context of colonial discourse, it particularly refers to the 'our [Western] culture' in contrast to the culture of 'the Other'. The subversion of this notion occurs by the use of 'we' to refer to the culture/community of the colonised, and 'they' to refer to the coloniser. It is the purpose of the present dissertation to analyse the functions and effects of such pronouns in their possessive (our/their), subject (we/they), and object (us/them) forms. In addition to pronouns, the dissertation will analyse, in the light of postcolonial theory, other means of creating opposition in language: antonyms, comparative/contrastive structures, opposition triggers. Literary texts belonging to different forms (poetry/novel), periods (1820-1970) and nations (American, Scottish, Irish) have been chosen on the grounds that they all use binary opposition

and constructed opposition in a colonial context, with all of them variously subverting, undermining, and criticising the Western-centric conceptualization of 'the Other'.

The discipline that appears best equipped to fulfil this aim is stylistics, defined as "the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation" (Widdowson 2013, 3) and as "the principled, systematic and rigorous analysis of texts (mainly literary), using linguistic description" (Toolan 2014, 28). In general, stylistics has been linked to literary interpretation and literary criticism as a result of its potential in the analysis and our understanding of literary texts (Fowler 2017; Leech 1969; Widdowson 2013; Leech and Short 2007; Simpson 2004). Stylistics is then concerned not only with the analysis of prominent and recurrent linguistic patterns in literary texts but also with explaining their role in the creation of meaning and the representation of fictional worlds, including the representation of binarism and opposition. Since the present study deals with literary language, stylistics analysis will be employed to explore the oppositional patterns in Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye*, Thomas Pringle's "The Bushman" and "The Hottentot", and Seamus Heaney's "Requiem for the Croppies". Postcolonial studies are intrinsically contextual with a strong emphasis on historical, social and political factors; stylistics, by contrast, starts bottom-up from the texts. Notwithstanding their differences, the two approaches can be seen as complementary and mutually compatible. Although a significant amount of research has been carried out within stylistics and postcolonial studies separately, efforts at developing postcolonial stylistics are less common. Methodologically, this dissertation can be regarded as a contribution to this neglected interdisciplinary area.

For the sake of terminological rigour, the oscillating use of the orthographical variants 'post-colonial' and 'postcolonial' (with or without hyphen) throughout this paper is worth an explanation. This study follows the distinction John McLeod offers in his *Beginning Postcolonialism*:

> *The hypenated term 'post-colonial' seems better suited to denote a particular historical period or epoch, like those suggested by phrases such as 'after colonialism', 'after independence' or 'after the end of Empire'. In its hyphenated form, 'post-colonial' functions rather like a noun* (McLeod 2010, 5).

In contrast, the non-hyphenated form 'postcolonial' refers to "disparate *forms of representations, reading practices, attitudes and values*" as well as to "a way of thinking, a mode of perception, a line of enquiry, an aesthetic practice, a method of investigation" (McLeod 2010, 6; emphasis in the original). This study will then use 'post-colonial' to refer to the historical period following the emancipation of colonised countries and coeval to the subsequent process of decolonisation, and 'postcolonial' to refer to the thinking systems, literary practices, literary and cultural theories on colonial discourses.

Cultural influence, domination and resistance cannot be dissociated from language, for, language "constitutes our world-view by cutting up and ordering reality into meaningful units" (McLeod 2010,

21). Language is inextricable from colonial discourse because it "becomes the medium through which a hierarchical structure of power is perpetuated, and the medium through which conceptions of 'truth', 'order', and 'reality' become established" (Ashcroft et al. 2002, 7). It is primarily through language that Western colonisers assert their values as more progressive and developed, fashioning themselves as the leaders of the civilising mission, the so-called divine duty. A key component of cultural expression, language, is used to strengthen the colonial structure by perpetuating binary oppositions such as 'centre/periphery', 'self/other', 'savage/civilised', 'white/native', 'inferior/superior'. These oppositions can hardly be seen as conventional or fundamental, having been enforced and brought to the fore by imperialistic discourse.

Colonial discourse has thus attempted to legitimate its civilising mission through a polarising language made of contextually created antonyms. According to Fanon (2007), the coloniser attempts to enforce a Manichean world in which singularity cannot exist. However, neither the world nor this dichotomy is divided into two with clear and rigid boundaries. Fanon emphasises that colonial structures replicate the Manichean system's binary opposition of 'good/evil' with a slight change that constructs the condition of 'black/white'. In this structure, so-called uncivilised 'black' proves 'white' as the 'progressive' counterpart, and the civility of 'white' allegedly proves the necessity to alter the 'black'. Literary texts reflect these representations with constructed opposition. In that fashion, the contextually constructed opposition in literary texts that deal with colonialism corresponds to the research area of binarism in postcolonial theory which draws on colonial discourse's cultural construction of representation.

The language of the coloniser, which is often imposed on the colonised, distorts the realities of subjugated people and represents them in manners that serve for the colonial agenda. As wa Thiong'o puts it, "To control a people's culture is to control their tools of self-definition in relationship to others" (1986, 16). Colonial discourse represents the non-Western as the antithesis of openly commendable qualities that the colonisers ascribe to themselves. Once the attributed inferiority is internalised, the coloniser's cultural and racial superiority is legitimised and presented as ideal. These attitudes result in othering which has been systematically used to maintain colonial hegemony and stabilise the colonial system. Othering requires not only defining the natives and indigenous people as 'the Other' but also persuading both sides (coloniser and the colonised) that such attribution is true. Situating the colonial state as the 'centre' in which the construction of 'self' takes place, is a way to consolidate the discourse; however, this argument is far from irrefutable, since the coloniser's ostensible superiority depends on the allegedly obnoxious qualities of 'the Other'. Binaries such as 'slave/master', 'colonised/coloniser', 'self/the Other' complement each other as one needs the other to be defined as such. The fragility and ambivalent nature of binarism in colonial discourse, however, does not undermine its ruthless efficacy

in pushing the colonised towards marginality in practice. As long as full decolonisation of the mind does not occur, the black/colonised/marginalised communities will remain as ‘the Other’. This is the social, historical and existential situation that contemporary postcolonial literature arises from and seeks to subvert at the same time.

1.1. Rewriting and defamiliarization

The interpretations of a text may vary according to the reader’s background, reading experience, prior knowledge, awareness of the canon and even worldview. In particular, intertextual text “demands of the reader not only the recognition of textualized traces of the literary and historical past but also the awareness of what has been done (…) to those traces” (Hutcheon 2004, 126). Opposition markers stimulate the mind of the reader that already has reading experience of the imperial canons and conceptual knowledge about colonial discourse. Guy Cook’s literary discourse theories ‘cognitive change’ and ‘schema refreshment’ point toward the schema-changing quality of literature (1994, 181). According to Cook (1994), linguistic markers or context can stimulate the mind and construct or reconstruct schema. Incidentally, Cook’s notion of schema-refreshment closely calls to mind the concept of defamiliarization introduced by the Russian formalists in the early 20th century and since then examined and thoroughly reconceptualised by various scholars (Childs and Fowler 2005; Leech and Short 2007; Jakobson 1987; Simpson 2004). As Dan McIntyre (2003) puts it, “the purpose of art and literature is to defamiliarize the familiar, and by defamiliarizing a work of art or a text we make it stand out from the norm — it becomes foregrounded” (2003, 2).

In light of Cook’s theory, the idea of defamiliarization and the intertextual practice of much postcolonial literature, I argue that subversion of established colonial discourse in literary texts is the schema disruption that defamiliarizes the reader from a discursive colonial stance and introduces the other means of storytelling from the perspective of the peripheral/marginalised/oppressed people. The reader’s schema is challenged by the deviation of conventional ‘norms’ which marks the native as ‘the Other’. In hundreds of years, the colonial discourse has been established within world cultures so inherently that the polarisation of the world, as visible from the predetermined dichotomy ‘Occident’ vs ‘Orient’, and its more recent equivalent ‘Western’ vs ‘Eastern’, becomes inevitable. For centuries, many European travellers, philosophers, theorists, historians, scientists, and authors used discursive language in their writings about empire and its overseas possessions. The high frequency of these pro-colonial and pro-imperialist writings, regardless of their form (travel writing, fiction, scientific journal, letters) have not only produced a particular worldview by influencing society but also established a standard norm in writing and linguistic performance. To this day, this polarity holds, and subversive rewriting has the function of refreshing this schema. In other words, the discursive imperialist stance becomes a norm

over time; resistance, subversion and appropriation of such norm is a style on its own. In this study, the subversion of us/them dichotomy is reviewed as a deviation from the norm.

1.2. Critical stylistics and critical discourse analysis

'Critical stylistics' is a new framework that combines critical discourse analysis (CDA) and stylistics (Jeffries 2014, 417). The purpose of this framework is that of explicating and identifying the "ideological underpinnings" of linguistic features (2014, 409). Critical stylistics can thus contribute to postcolonial studies by linking textual features to "the ideological landscape of the text" (Jeffries 2014, 418).

The precursor of Critical Stylistics in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), an interdisciplinary perspective and an "analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (Van Dijk 2001, 352). Like CDA, postcolonial studies fundamentally deal with power relations, domination, and ideology. Since the selected novel and poems for this thesis are products of social structures of the 18th and 20th centuries, they are socio-politically situated as they reflect, conform to, or subvert these social structures. Each selected work relates to colonial discourse and power relations within society; the central theme being an undermining of colonial discourse, colonial structures, and the us/them dichotomy. CDA, along with Critical Stylistics, is invaluable for the analysis of the linguistic means through which the aforementioned themes, representations and power relations are enacted. The typologies and frames that will be used for the analysis have been elaborated within these approaches.

1.3. The authors and their relevance to the dissertation

The works of three authors will be examined: novelist Toni Morrison (1931-2019), poets Thomas Pringle (1789-1834) and Seamus Heaney (1939-2013). In what follows a brief overview of their figures is provided so as to justify their relevance to the stated aims of the dissertation. More information regarding their works will be present in the data section.

Toni Morrison (1931-2019) was a Pulitzer and Nobel Prize winning American novelist. Central to her novels are themes such as assertion and reconstruction of identities in response to colonial hegemony and eradication of identity of the oppressed. Her novels bring to the fore the consequences of the past experiences of colonisation and offer vivid portraits of those living at the margins. Her works tackle the question of identity, its recovery and reconstruction. She employs rewriting techniques to provide a counter narrative to the stories told from the Western point of view, granting representative characters of formerly subjugated people an agency that they had long been denied.

In spite of living during the peak of imperialism, Scottish poet Thomas Pringle (1789-1834) was an acclaimed abolitionist who stood against the colonial atrocities perpetrated by the British empire.

Pringle's experience began when the Pringle family emigrated to South Africa to economically enhance its social standing. Pringle's transition from colonialist settler to abolitionist was marked by his observation of how indigenous people were treated in the Cape Colony. Damian Shaw argues that Pringle's activism was initiated by his dispute with the Somerset colonial administration, an incident that marginalised him like the indigenous Bushmen (1998, 41): "by late 1825 it is noticeable that Pringle's attention was shifting even further away from himself, and the injustice committed against the settlers to focus on general injustices committed against the natives" (Shaw 1998, 45). As a marginalised settler himself, he decided to take the responsibility of defending rights of the marginalised natives.

Seamus Heaney was a winner of various literary awards including the Nobel Prize. His poetry discusses political violence and history of Ireland, he uses Irish landscape as a trope for resistance against the British occupation in his pastoral and topographical poetry. This way, he brings issues of identity and origin into question. The search for identity and physical landscape of Ireland are merged into one focal point in many of his poems, which also use we (us)/them dichotomy. The following section aims to justify the selection of Seamus Heaney's "Requiem for the Croppies" to be analysed as postcolonial poetry.

1.4. The case of Ireland in postcolonial perspective

Ireland has its share of the system of domination as the country's resources, economy, identity, language, and institutions have been re-arranged by the English. Since European cultural imperialism placed the subordinated non-Western in the periphery, the subjugated peoples of the West had been overlooked regarding their colonial condition. The case of Ireland can be understood in terms of what Robert Blauner (1969) calls 'internal colonialism', the blurring of different cultures under the occupation of a dominant culture in close approximation:

> *For one thing the West has often colonized itself, as when England's subjects colonized what is now Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, and then fought to free themselves of England. Ireland's long history of English domination can also be invoked. Thus, the contemporary literatures of Ireland, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and more reluctantly the United States have been admitted into postcoloniality* (Moore in Kelertas 2006, 15).

The Irish resistance to the oppressor, its dominance and defaming representation of the Irish, and the historic language bans imposed by the English as well as the literary Celtic (Gaelic) Revival show similarities with the decolonisation process of the subaltern, with exception of geographical location. Starting from the 14th century, England enacted various laws and passed acts to restrict and prohibit the use of the Irish language. Often in English literature, newspapers and caricatures, the Irish had been depicted as drunk, folly people and caricaturised as simian creatures. Edward Hirsch reminds us of the Victorian stereotypes concerning the Irish: "(...) the stage Irishman was reduced in British characterizations to a subhuman figure, a "white Negro" portrayed in *Punch* as a primitive Frankenstein or peasant Caliban" (1991, 1119). Having been positioned on a "lower rung of the Darwinian ladder"

(ibid.), the Irish too have been represented as ‘the Other’. Charles Kingsley describes his experience in Ireland with these words:

> *I am haunted by the human chimpanzees I saw along that hundred miles of horrible country. (...) But to see white chimpanzee is dreadful; if they were black, one would not feel it so much, but their skins, except where tanned by exposure, are as white as ours* (Kingsley 1894, 111).

As understood here, othering is not directly linked to inferences of black/white binary paradigm adjectives but rather what colonial discourse attributes to these adjectives. Being white does not grant proximity to the pole of ‘self’ on an axis with two ends; ‘self’ and ‘the Other’. Against these defaming representations, Hirsch argues, comes the necessity of Irish Literary Revival’s dismantling of the unjust peasant image (1991, 1119). During the construction of English national identity, a great significance has been attributed to the picturesque, green, paradise-like idyllic landscape. The upper classes favoured spiritual countryside properties and landowning over the trope of decadence, the urban city, associated with degeneration, pollution, and the working class. Christine Berberich refers to Rebecca Scutt’s lexical interpretation: “in English the word ‘country’ can be used to describe both a nation and a specific landscape” (2006, 214). While “the English landscape was held up to the soldiers of both World Wars as ‘what they were fighting for’” (Berberich 2006, 208), the Irish countryside was belittled as the home for peasantry. Heaney’s topographical poetry which uses landscape tropes subverts the centuries long glorification of English, he writes back to English countryside myth. Furthermore, he writes poems in English; writes back to the Empire, a writing that “involve[s] a confidence that English can be used in the process of resisting imperialism” (Ashcroft et al. 2002, 284). To sum up, the movement Celtic Revival enabled Ireland to construct an Irish identity distinct from the English so as to defy English cultural imperialism. The revitalisation and promotion of Celticism is a fruitful outcome of the colonial struggle.

2. Methods and data

2.1. Methods

This present dissertation employs descriptive and qualitative methods developed in stylistics. For the identification of linguistic features involved in opposition construction, this study draws on typologies developed by Davies (2008) and Jeffries (2010). They both have contributed to the study of opposition created in context, developed typologies and qualitative analyses of constructed opposition in the news, literary texts, and media. They have also refined syntactic frames building on Mettinger (1994) and Jones (2002), who classified and analysed conventional antonyms. Murphy (2003) explores semantic relations between words and classifies antonymy as a subtype of contrast and binary semantic contrast (2003, 9). As a part of her lexical semantics study, she notices that some pairs of antonyms have superordinate relationships with one another compared to other pairs. She claims that pairs thoroughly immersed in culture such as HOT/COLD are canonical antonyms. The elements of pairs which are each other's immediate candidates are canonical antonym pairs. To better understand why she identifies HOT/COLD as canonical antonyms, we can eliminate *hot* and think of other immediate and expected opposites of *cold*, but even *warm* which has close semantic relation with *hot* does not substitute for *hot* itself because HOT/COLD shares a distinct relation and the pair is culturally established (Murphy 2003, 10). Davies refers to non-canonical opposites as unconventional and views them as textually specific (2008, 43). Similarly in this study, conventional opposite is used synonymously with canonical opposite. The table below shows Davies' syntactic frame categories, their functions and his examples derived from his and Jones' (2002) data. The instances of typographical emphasis (italics and bold) are his.

Category	Common syntactic frames/ triggers	Canonical textual examples	Non-canonical textual examples	Function(s)
Negated opposition	X not Y not X, Y	"The government was elected to create **unity** in this country and *not* create **division**"	"**Clotted cream** *not* **ruptured spleen**".	Emphasises already inherent mutual exclusivity in canonical examples, and constructs mutual exclusivity in non-canonical ones. Often expresses preference for one state over another. Often combined with the contrastive 'but' (e.g. not X but Y).
Transitional opposition	X turns into Y X becomes Y	[…] *turn* the many decent, honourable and **law-abiding people** […] *into* **criminals**.	**Villages** are *turning into* **weekend rest centres or dormitories for commuting TV executives and merchant bankers.**	*Transformation* from one state to its opposite.
Comparative opposition	more X than Y	Dr Higgs was a lot *more* **right** *than* **wrong** […]	[…] the marchers seemed more **bemused** *than*	Measures X against Y by comparing them either *directly* (using the same relations of equivalence and

	X is more A than Y	[…] **reward** is *more effective* than **punishment.**	**offended** […] […] *moreimportant than* the fate of **Labour** is the fate of **mankind**.	difference) or *indirectly*, judged against another scale of equivalence and difference.
Replacive Opposition	X rather than Y X instead of Y X in place of Y	Wanting to be **happy** *rather than* **sad**, I accepted […] (Jones, 2002, 79).	*In place of* a **charismatic leader**, they have the **belief that politicians are lying.**	Expresses an alternative preferred *option* to that which it is opposed.
Concessive opposition	despite X, Y while X, Y although X, Y X, yet Y	[Not applicable as applies to phrases and clauses rather than individual canonical lexical items.]	*Despite* **the numbers, the march was peaceful.** *While* it was true that **militants** […] were out in force, the heart and mind of the protest was **ordinary people.**	Implies a contrast between two circumstances. The information given in the main clause is usually unexpected given the circumstances in the subordinate clause.
Explicit opposition	X contrasted with Y X opposed to Y the distinction/ division/ difference/ between X and Y X against Y	Being **young** and keen *as opposed to* being **old** and keen […] (Jones 2002, 90) This blurred *distinction between* **fact** and **fiction** […] (Jones, 2002, 81)	The **professionally-produced placards** […] *contrasted with* **cobbled-together banners.** The **Liberty** and **Livelihood** March began ostensibly *divided into two camps* [...] "**House music** *against* **war**"	Where a linguistic item within the syntactic frame makes an explicit metalinguistic reference to either a presupposed or a constructed contrast between X and Y.
Syntactic parallelism	[No specific frames. Relies on repetitive structures]	"You are ***as*** **young** ***as your faith*****,** ***as*** **old** ***as your*** **doubts**" (Jones 2002, 56)	[…] ***they can walk over our*** **lands** *but* ***they can't walk*** **over us.**	Repetition of a range of syntactic structures within which specific lexical items are foregrounded, inviting the addressee to relate them as oppositions. Often combined with other syntactic triggers such as 'but' or other more canonical oppositional items.
Contrastive opposition	X but Y	[Unlikely to conjoin individual canonical lexical items unless expressing simultaneously contradictory states e.g. "I was **happy** *but* also **sad**".]	[…] were all **London born and bred**, *but* **felt compelled to join the protest.** There was plenty of **passion** *but* the	Creates contrast between two conjoined phrases or clauses, often relating the unexpectedness of what is said in the second conjoin in view of the content of the first conjoin.

			marchers remained **good-natured.**	

Table 2: Syntactic frame categories and their functions as employed in the study of Davies (2008, 157)

While Davies (2008) observes conventional opposites which trigger unconventional opposites, Jeffries' (2010) study shows that conventional opposites sometimes emphasise unconventional opposites. What fundamentally distinguishes Jeffries' (2010) typology from Davies (2008) and earlier studies carried out on opposition (Jones 2002; Mettinger 1994) is that Jeffries asserts that there is a distinction between the structural and lexical aspects of opposition triggers. She shows that conventional opposites help to create unconventional opposites in context (2010, 47) and that constructed oppositions which depend on lexical choice should be distinguished from those that depend on structural aspects. Furthermore, Jeffries (2010) provides a provisional typology and points out that it should be further developed since textually constructed opposites and triggers vary in extent. Overall, Jeffries (2010) offers reasons as to why textually constructed opposition should be of concern for the critical discourse analysis as texts construct conceptual worlds that may have been manufactured by dominant groups to enforce or maintain hegemony.

Four main categories of opposition which have been exhausted over the years is listed by Jeffries (2010) as: mutual exclusivity, mutual dependence, gradability and reversibility (Jeffries 2010, 19-23). However, the emphasis of Jeffries' study is on the contextually constructed opposites. She theorises that structural and lexical triggers help constructed opposites to be formed. The frame she employs for her data in literary and non-literary texts demonstrates features that trigger the unconventional opposites. Jeffries categorises opposition triggers as structural and lexical triggers, whilst Davies (2008) only provides structural triggers. The subcategories of Jeffries' (2010) structural and lexical triggers are shown in the table below:

Triggers of constructed opposites					
Structural triggers of opposition			**Lexical triggers of opposition**		
Category	**Examples**	**Functions**	**Category**	**Examples**	**Functions**
Negation	"There is real enthusiasm for Labour. It's *not* just loathing for the Tories" (*Daily Mirror* 1st May 1997 Article) "The grey man pinned his hopes on making the people love him; *instead* he has been stripped bare" (*Guardian* 1st May	In the case of conventional opposites, negation emphasises the contrast. Negation constructs "local textual oppositional meaning" (Jeffries 2010, 35). Complementarity is indicated with the use of	**Explicit mention of opposition relation**	"To *change* from a bum to a billionaire." (Duffy in Jeffries 2010, 47) "He might have searched Europe over for *a greater contrast between* juxtaposed scenes (Hardy	Verbs such as *compare*, *change*, *transform* may set up contrast and create opposites. The use of explicit devices (nouns like *contrast*, *oxymoron*) may emphasise opposition (Jeffries 2010, 47-49).

	1997 Commentary)	negation in opposition creation (ibid.). “(…) X not Y frame may indicate a preference for either the positive or the negative term.”		in Jeffries 2010, 49).	In literary texts where two or more elements are explicitly contrasted, it is up to the reader to construe the sense in which these elements are opposed. Explicit antonymy is metalinguistic and oppositeness “is a cognitive reality for text producers and recipients” (Jeffries 2010, 50).
Parallel structures	“Labour says he’s *black*. Tories say he’s *British*” (Jeffries 2010, 2). “There is a plastic toy. There is no hope” (Duffy in Jeffries 2010, 40).	Parallel structures set up oppositional relationship between two elements, lexemes and concepts. Elliptical use of parallel structures may also indicate contrast between the missing element of the parallel structure. (Jeffries, 2010, 39-41). A conventional opposite in the structure may set up “the expectation of a further contrast in another part of the structure” (ibid., 41).	**Influence of conventional opposites in context**	“It was a struggle between *packaging* and *content*, between *politicians as soap powder* and *parties as vehicles for informed debate*”	Pair of conventional opposites may emphasise constructed opposites.
Coordination	“I find this difficult, *and then again* easy, / as I watch him push his bike off in the rain” (Duffy in Jeffries 2010, 43) “You kicked him, *but* stared / at your parents, appalled, when you got back home” (ibid.).	Coordinating conjunctions can be, in certain contexts, indicators of opposition.	**Auto-evocation**	“It is called the suburbs now, but when *black* people lived there it was called the Bottom” (Morrison in Jeffries 2010, 51).	It evokes “oppositional relationship by the use of only one of the relevant terms” (Jeffries 2010, 51). The evocation requires schematic knowledge and semantic interpretation of readers (ibid.).

Comparatives	"Each lighted / Window shows me cardiganed, *more* desolate / *Than* the garden, and *more* hallowed / *Than* the hinge of the brass-studded / Door that we close (McGuckian in Jeffries 2010, 46)	Comparative structures can set up opposition and relation between two opposed elements. Often, comparative forms indicate gradability between opposites (Jeffries 2010, 45-46).

Table 3: Categories and functions of opposition triggers as employed in the study of Jeffries (2010).

While Davies' (2008) syntactic frames are useful to analyse the structures where opposition appears, 'parallel structures' and 'auto-evocation' from Jeffries' (2010) taxonomy align with several instances in my analysis. Davies' (2008) category 'replacive opposition' is treated as negation by Jeffries (2010). She recognizes *in place of* and *instead* are not structurally identical to negated opposites, however she also argues they are semantically similar. To prove this, she replaces these triggers with *not* (2010, 38). Davies' (2008) 'contrastive opposition' and 'concessive opposition' have been contracted to a single category named as 'coordination' by Jeffries (2010).

The procedure of analysis starts with identification and specification of linguistic features and proceeds with description of function. Stylistic analysis and contextual postcolonial analysis will be used in parallel for the explanation of effects achieved by opposites employed in the texts. The explication of their functions requires interpretative tools such as cultural hegemony, schemata, foregrounding/deviation and intertextual parody, whose relevance to postcolonial texts has already been discussed in the introduction. Literary discourse may typically draw on unconventional opposites which need to be construed by the reader. Therefore, the objective of this study aligns with Jeffries' (2010) conceptualisation. In spite of that, since each peculiar instances and types of opposition are not likely to be covered by existing typologies, these taxonomies will have to be implemented by additional commentaries prompted by the literary texts analysed in this dissertation, e.g.: textually specific binary opposition of 'self' and 'the Other' or us/them dichotomy. These additional comments are based on observation of linguistic structures, lexical meaning and postcolonial interpretation for descriptive analysis.

2.2. Data

Title	Writer	Genre	Publication year
“The Bushman”	Thomas Pringle (1789-1834)	Poetry	1834
“The Hottentot”	Thomas Pringle (1789-1834)	Poetry	1834
“Requiem for the Croppies”	Seamus Heaney (1939-2013)	Poetry	1969
The Bluest Eye	Toni Morrison (1931-2019)	Novel	1970

Table 3: Selected works/data in detail

The data selected for this study belong to different genres, epochs and locations. This is a deliberate choice aimed at analysing distinct and recurring characteristics of texts dealing with colonialism from various perspectives. For all their geographical, generational and stylistic differences, all these authors have witnessed colonial discourse, either in the colonial period or its protracted aftermath. Texts written long before the emergence of postcolonial theory are selected to show that the discourse of colonial resistance is not exclusive to contemporary postcolonial literature. Presence of opposition in discourse (‘self’/’the Other’, ‘black vs. white’) is prominent and stands out in the selected literary works. At least two genres have been chosen to show that the salience of opposition in postcolonial context is not confined to one genre. The paper aims to explore set of linguistic means typically employed to construct opposition in discourse (pronouns, contrastive structures, antonyms) in the chosen novel and poems therefore the analysis will focus on the ways these oppositions are linguistically enacted.

2.2.1 Toni Morrison’s *The Bluest Eye*

Toni Morrison’s first novel, *The Bluest Eye,* published in 1970*,* explores the impact of contemporary white cultural hegemony on the lives of black communities. It is a story of self-loathing African American women who do not fit into the standardised beauty designed and perpetuated by white cultural hegemony. The biggest dream of Pecola Breedlove, one of the protagonists of the novel, is to be granted blue eyes. She believes acquiring blue eyes would mean she could be saved from the ‘ugliness’ attributed to her by society and internalised by her because of her skin colour. The power of white hegemony threatens the identity of Pecola Breedlove as she aspires to conform to white beauty standards. She equates blue eyes to whiteness, and whiteness to social approval. The commodified blue eyes, which Pecola wants to possess, drift her from her*self* towards the ‘self’ in colonial discourse. As her mental health declines, Pecola believes she acquires the blue eyes and wishes the eyes to be the bluest ones. The ambivalence of the colonial discourse itself suggests ‘the Other’ can never become white, only remains as a mimic. Pecola’s madness mimics one of the much-praised white feature, the blue eyes. It is the post-colonial experience that dominates the text despite the persisting influence of colonial past. For instance,

Pecola is taught to idolise white celebrities, and, along with her friends, she internalises that they are "lesser" (Morrison 2007, 74). White dominant culture, then, causes her to suffer "to the point of self-extinction" (Bloom 2010, 15). The dichotomy of 'self' and 'the Other' is a constant feature of *The Bluest Eyes*. This particular novel is selected as it inherently compares black self-image with white beauty standards and creates contextual opposition with pronouns, antonyms and seemingly synonymous opposites which will be made clear in the analysis section. Several episodes where us/them dichotomy is evoked, black and white societies are contrasted and 'self' and 'the Other' tension is emphasised will be analysed.

2.2.2 Thomas Pringle's "The Bushman" and "The Hottentot"

Thomas Pringle's later poems "release the full force of Pringle's moral outrage against colonial injustices and hypocrisy" (Klopper 1990, 43). Upon his return to London from South Africa, Pringle started to work at the 'Society for the Mitigation and Gradual Abolition of Slavery Throughout the British Dominions'. Poems such as 'The Bushman' and 'The Hottentot' make explicit Pringle's critical stance towards colonialism and slavery. Regarding the first poem, A. E. Voss argues that it is "written from the philanthropic and metropolitan viewpoint of the Anti-Slavery Society" (1982, 22), whilst Angus Calder interprets "The Hottentot" as an indignation of colonial rule (1982, 9) and adds that "The Bushman" is a poem that criticises the vicious Christians (ibid.).

Thomas Pringle's sonnets from his collection *African Sketches* are chosen on the grounds that they consist of comparisons between the colonised and the coloniser with highly visual representations. To oppose the Eurocentric 'good/evil' and 'civilised/savage' binaries, he subverts the dichotomies and signals the white coloniser as evil. His sonnet "The Bushman" compares 'bushman' to 'Christian man', portraying the latter as 'fiends'. The other sonnet "The Hottentot" portrays the injustice brought to the Hottentots by "White Man" (Pringle 1834, l.4). The repetition of the anaphoric possessive determiner 'his' in this poem is a pattern that creates a contrast between the native and the coloniser.

2.2.3 Seamus Heaney's "Requiem for the Croppies"

"Requiem for the Croppies", written in 1966, fifty years after the 1916 Rising, re-enacts the battle of Vinegar Hill, a tragic event; during which British armed forces attacked the headquarters of Irish people who sought independence by rebelling against the colonisers, resulting in many casualties from the Irish side in the late 18th century. In this poem "both historical moments collapse into one as the poem foregrounds the heroic sacrifice of a poorly equipped, hastily assembled militia against the military power of the British forces" (Mathews 2017, 14). The experience of rebellion during the colonial period is resurrected in 1996 and Heaney "seeks to locate the spirit of 1798 at the heart of the 1916 enterprise" (ibid.). The poem subverts the 'we/they' dichotomy of colonial discourse. Heaney uses 'we' to refer to the Croppies, the Irish rebels who sought independence, and 'they' for the English colonisers.

3. Stylistic analysis

The analysis will begin with detailed linguistic identification of opposition created in context in the aforementioned poems (Sect. 3.1) and Morrison's novel (Sect. 3.2). The potential effects and functions of constructed opposition will then be discussed.

3.1. Stylistic analysis of poetry

The table below shows the poems analysed. Bold font is used to mark the items of opposition.

"Requiem for the Croppies"	"The Bushman"	"The Hottentot"
(1) The pockets of **our** greatcoats full of barley - No kitchens on the run, no striking camp - **We** moved quick and sudden in **our** own country. The **priest** lay behind ditches with the **tramp**. (5) A people, hardly marching - on the hike - **We** found new tactics happening each day: **We'd** cut through reins and rider with the pike And stampede **cattle** into **infantry**, Then retreat through hedges where cavalry must be thrown. (10) Until, on Vinegar Hill, the final conclave. Terraced thousands died, shaking **scythes** at **cannon**. The hillside blushed, soaked in **our** broken wave. **They** buried **us** without shroud or coffin And in August the barley grew up out of the grave	(1) **The Bushman** sleeps within his black-brow'd den, In the lone wilderness: around him lie His wife and little ones **unfearingly** — For they are far away from **"Christian men."** (5) No herds, loud lowing, call him down the glen; He fears ***no* foe *but* famine**; and may try To wear away the hot noon slumberingly; Then rise to search for roots — and dance again. — But he shall dance no more! His secret lair, (10) Surrounded, echoes to the thundering gun, And the wild shriek of anguish and despair! He dies **—** yet, ere life's ebbing sands are run, Leaves to his sons a curse, should they be **friends** With the proud Christian men — "for they are **fiends**!"	(1) Mild, melancholy, and sedate, he stands Tending another's flock upon the fields, **His** father's once, where now the **White Man** builds **His** home, and issues forth his proud commands. (5) His dark eye flashes not; his listless hands Lean on the shepherd's staff; ***no* more he wields** The Libyan bow — ***but* to th'oppressor yields** Submissively his freedom and his lands. Has he no courage? Once he had — but lo! (10) Harsh Servitude hath worn him to the bone. No enterprise? Alas! The brand, the blow, Have humbled him to dust — even hope is gone! 'He's a **base-hearted hound**—not worth his food' — His **Master** cries —'he has no gratitude!'
Lines: 14	Lines: 14	Lines: 14

Table 4: Poems analysed in the study.

3.1.1 Thomas Pringle: "The Bushman"

An exonym is a name attributed to a place or group of people by foreigners, and an ethnonym is a name given to ethnic groups. When the ethnonym is an exonym, a name used to refer to the ethnic group is a name attributed to people by a non-native to the culture. *Bushman* is an exonym attributed to a group of hunter-gatherers believed to be one of the first inhabitants of South Africa. The term is borrowed from the Dutch ethnonym "bosjesman" attributed to the natives during the Dutch colonisation of South Africa. Therefore, the term has colonial connotations. It is worth noting that this paper uses the term only to refer to the poem and group of people defined as "Bushman" by the poem. Colonial history shows that during colonial rule and its aftermath, pejorative and derogatory exonyms that were used to mark the

racially Other often become endonyms as colonial discourse radically alters the subjugated people's perception of themselves. Words and names that denote a community by the community itself are endonyms.

> ***The Bushman** sleeps within his black-brow'd den,*
> *In the lone wilderness: around him lie*
> *His wife and little ones **unfearingly** —*
> *For they are far away from **"Christian men."***
> *No herds, loud lowing, call him down the glen;*
> *He fears **no foe but famine**; and may try*
> *To wear away the hot noon slumberingly;*
> *Then rise to search for roots — and dance again. —*
> *But he shall dance no more! His secret lair,*
> *Surrounded, echoes to the thundering gun,*
> *And the wild shriek of anguish and despair!*
> *He dies — yet, ere life's ebbing sands are run,*
> *Leaves to his sons a curse, should they be **friends***
> *With the proud Christian men — "for they are **fiends**!"*

Schematic knowledge of colonial past allows the reader to interpret and evaluate *"the Bushman"* (l. 1) and "*Christian men"* (l. 4) as a constructed pair of opposites. At one end of the spectrum there is the Christian coloniser and on the other the colonised Bushman. These opposites would not per se be mutually exclusive since a Bushman can convert to Christianity and become a Christian, however postcolonial studies in general, and Homi Bhabha's (1994) mimicry theory in particular, have forcefully argued that the colonised/the Other can only mimic but never become white/Western. In light of this, this pair is formed of mutually exclusive opposites in the context of the poem. This mutual exclusiveness at the level of semantics does not only imply a lack of interdependence at the level of discourse, quite the contrary: because of the ambivalence of colonial discourse mentioned in the introduction, the pair denotes a mutually dependent relationship: the coloniser co-exists with the colonised, the master with the slave, the colonised Bushman with the Christian coloniser. It is not possible for the coloniser to be colonised at the same time, and vice versa. Without the concept of a coloniser, the colonised cannot exist, and with no concept to colonise, there can be no coloniser.

The white/Western (coloniser) and Christian men (coloniser) in this context are co-referential, thus the emphasis on religion can be explained by the moral concerns intrinsic to the alleged civilising mission and humanitarian service of spreading and saving the so-called lost souls. The moral justifications expounded by the Christian coloniser for their civilising mission stand in sharp contrast with the coloniser's killing of the natives. This contradiction between alleged morality and murder is not present at the structural or linguistic level of the poem, but knowledge of colonial history helps in pointing it out. If "white men" was used instead of "Christian men" in the poem, the so-called civilising mission's sincerity would not have been negated by the immoral act of killing. The rhetoric use of moral mission to legitimate the colonial rule, which is not explicitly stated in the poem as it is part of our schematic

knowledge, is subverted by the textual depiction of murder committed by the Christian coloniser. With these taken into consideration, it can be claimed that the poet's choice to set off *Christian men* with quotation marks further signals the poet's or the speaker's distancing from the phrase. It can also be argued that the poet/speaker draws attention to the hypocrisy of the phrase by using quotation marks.

The Bushman's family lie around him *unfearingly* on the condition that the coloniser is distant. Although 'fear' is not mentioned as a single lexical unit, it is clearly evoked by the derived antonymic word 'unfearingly'. The causal relationship between lack of fear and the distance of the Christian men is made explicit by the causal conjunction 'for' in l. 4 ("*for they are far away from 'Christian men'*"). Therefore, we can easily infer that the family would be in fear if the settler/coloniser were closer.

According to Shula Marks, acquiring cattle and living as herder had become difficult following the Dutch settlement in the Cape therefore the natives either worked for whites or became hunter-gatherers (1972, 59-60). The fifth line ("*No herds, loud lowing, call him down the glen;"*) can be read within the historical insight Marks provides. The poem specifically points to the lack of herd, which can be explained with white settlers' livestock trade and their involvement in the demographic change. The negated opposition occurs (no X but Y) on the sixth line ("*no foe but famine"*) with adversative *but* as an opposition trigger. This instance can be categorised, using Davies' syntactic frames (2008) as negated opposition (X not Y) combined with the trigger *but* and as contrastive opposition (X but Y) which occurs with the negator *no.* The bushman's foe can be both the settlers and other natives, but it is the scarcity of food that scares him. The opposition expresses that the real cause of fear is famine rather than the enemy. According to Elana Bregin, who has described the colonial atrocities directed at the Bushman beginning from the 16th century to the 19th, such food scarcity has been caused by the colonial administration that controls the labour of natives and exploit their resources: "they [the Bushman] had been butchered, starved and hounded to the brink of mass extinction - their culture and society devastated, their hunter-gatherer lifestyle irrevocably destroyed" (Bregin 2000, 37). Given that famine is directly caused by the colonial rule, and *famine* is contrasted to *foe* based on which causes more fear, *foe* likely refers to other natives of the land.

Throughout the poem, the native is depicted as a sleeping and dancing individual whereas the settler/coloniser is depicted as a Christian man whose proximity causes fear and who kills. The contrasted lives frame Pringle's anticolonial stance. In contrast to the colonial discourse which pronounces the natives as savage, brutal and uncivilised, it is the Christian coloniser who does the killing with "*the thundering gun*" (l.10) brought by civilisation. The dying father considers the proud Christian men as fiends, and consequently, intends to curse his children if they become friends with these

settler/colonisers. The poem uses the antonymy of *friends/fiends* based on the supposition of the conditional clause (l.13). These rhyming antonyms (l. 13-14) are suggestive of paronomasia as there is only one sound that withholds these two from being identical. The opposition is constructed in context through phonetic relationship.

To sum up, the lexical choices and contrasts between *the Bushman* and *Christian men* illustrate the civilised brutality of the latter. The subversion of colonial discourse is enacted by the portrayal of the Bushman as the idle native whose herder-gatherer status has been stolen from him. The presence of family, as opposed to the armed men, underscores his innocence. It should be additionally noted that this particular portrayal of the native as idle and innocent can be reminiscent of the notion noble savage, hence a representation of the colonial gaze.

3.1.2 Thomas Pringle: "The Hottentot"

"Hottentot" is another exonym attributed to the Khoikhoi people, another indigenous population of southern Africa. Since the natives have been subjected to colonial exploitation, human exhibition and commodification, the term has long acquired derogatory connotations linked to racial slurs, steatopygia, savagery and sexual primitivism. These exonyms were overtly used by writers of the colonial period. The term "Hottentot" too will be used in this study only to analyse the poem of the same title.

> *Mild, melancholy, and sedate, he stands*
> *Tending another's flock upon the fields,*
> ***His** father's once, where now the **White Man** builds*
> ***His** home, and issues forth his proud commands.*
> *His dark eye flashes not; his listless hands*
> *Lean on the shepherd's staff; **no more he wields***
> *The Libyan bow — **but to th'oppressor yields***
> *Submissively his freedom and his lands.*
> *Has he no courage? Once he had — but lo!*
> *Harsh Servitude hath worn him to the bone.*
> *No enterprise? Alas! The brand, the blow,*
> *Have humbled him to dust — even hope is gone!*
> *'He's a **base-hearted hound**—not worth his food' —*
> *His **Master** cries —'he has no gratitude!'*

The lexical repetition of possessive determiner *his* stands out in the poem (l.3, l.4, l.5, l.8). The anaphoric *his* on lines three and four have different referents ("*His father's once, where now the White Man builds / His home, and issues forth his proud commands").* The referent of the former is the native and the latter is the white man. The native (Hottentot/the son of the father who once owned the lands) and *white man* (coloniser/settler) are constructed as opposites. The conventional opposite of the noun phrase *white man* would be non-white man; however, it can be inferred that the Hottentot is constructed as the unconventional opposite of white man, and this can be inferred through schematic and intuitive knowledge as much as interpretative skills. The reader is likely to consider the poetic depiction of loss of land and white man's commands as intrinsic to colonial situation and infer that *another's* refers to the settler who currently owns the land. The title, syntactic context, and the pronoun followed by genitive

marker *another's* suggest that the man who tends *"another's flock upon the fields"* (l.2) is a native. This further explains the constructed opposition between the native and the *white man*. As explained above, perhaps one of the most conspicuous features of the poem is the use of *his* for two distinct referents which are repeatedly contrasted throughout the poem and are formed as oppositional pairs. One possible explanation can be that Pringle equates the native to the white man as a rightful owner of human rights and subverts the colonial discourse's dehumanisation and degradation that has long left natives deprived of human rights as they had been reduced to inhumanity by the colonial gaze.

The structure of comparative opposition construction (No more X but Y) on the sixth and seventh lines ("*no more he wields / The Libyan bow — but to th'oppressor yields / Submissively his freedom and his lands"*) exposes the past and current actions of the native. The parallel structure (Jeffries 2010), sound similarity and rhyme positions reinforce the opposition between *wield* and *yield*: giving freedom replaces wielding a bow. The bow is a synecdoche, its meaning extends as it stands for the hunter-gatherer culture, the African way of life and tradition. The episode is an epitome of colonisation. The indigene's culture, along with his land, is taken away from him, leading to his poverty and despair and paving the way to the silent negotiation in which the indigene renounces his freedom and lends his labour force. On these lines, the pronoun he is used for the native and oppressor for the settler/coloniser (l.6-7) Given that *oppressor* of the oppositional pair *oppressor/oppressed* is present, the latter can be inferred by the reader. In other words, 'oppressed' is auto-evoked (Jeffries 2010) although it is not mentioned in the text. In the last two lines, the native is described by the settler/coloniser as *base-hearted hound*. The pejorative use of an animal epithet is common in imperial and colonial narratives which often reduces the natives – the 'Other' – to the state of animality or, liminality between the human and the animal. As opposed to this label, the settler is defined as *master,* evoking the master/slave dyad. The conventional antonym of 'slave' would be 'freeman'; however, the poem establishes new oppositional pairs (Hottentot/Master), with the implication that the Hottentot is the slave and the white man the Master: this shows how historical, cultural and colonial paradigms of power have perpetuated the master/slave dichotomy under new lexical forms.

3.1.3 Seamus Heaney: "Requiem for the Croppies"

The pockets of ***our*** *greatcoats full of barley -*
No kitchens on the run, no striking camp -
We *moved quick and sudden in* ***our*** *own country.*
The ***priest*** *lay behind ditches with the* ***tramp****.*
A people, hardly marching - on the hike -
We *found new tactics happening each day:*
We'd *cut through reins and rider with the pike*
And stampede ***cattle*** *into* ***infantry****,*
Then retreat through hedges where cavalry must be
thrown.
Until, on Vinegar Hill, the final conclave.
Terraced thousands died, shaking ***scythes*** *at* ***cannon****.*
The hillside blushed, soaked in ***our*** *broken wave.*

***They** buried **us** without shroud or coffin*
And in August the barley grew up out of the grave

The poem designates the two sides of the battle through the mutually exclusive plural subject pronouns *we* and *they*. The Irish and English defined by these pronouns contribute to the thematic context of the poem as they form two opposing sides. The poem writes back to an attack launched by the British in response to the Irish rebellion against the colonial rule of Britain in 1798. One of the poem's thematic concerns is to show the contrast between resistance/self-defence on the one hand and invasive attack on the other. Heaney, while depicting the British attack, subverts the 'we/they' (us/them) dichotomy propagated by the colonial discourse: "*The hillside blushed / soaked in **our** broken wave. / **They** buried **us** without shroud or coffin / And in August the barley grew up out of the grave*" (l. 12-14). The speaker of these lines is likely to be an Irish farmer or one of the Croppies who witnesses the events, supposing that the last line enables two potential interpretations. The speaker either speaks after his death to indicate the loss is only partial as the spirit of resistance and the dead's memories remain, or he has not died, and uses 'we' and 'our' to refer to his fellow Irish. In the latter case, the pronouns suggest collective identity for the nation. In both cases, 'we' which refers to the Irish and 'they' which refers to the British are constructed as mutually exclusive opposites. The subversive function of this opposition should be read under the lens of postcolonial theory. The speaker is aligned with the Irish rebels and detached from the British. The unrest and determination of the Irish are further implicated in the third line: "***We** moved quick and sudden in **our** own country"*. The possessive determiner *own* acts as a semantic trigger highlighting the owner of the lands as opposed to the British oppressor.

During the time in which the poem is set, a priest and a tramp ("*the **priest** lay behind ditches with the **tramp***", l. 4) would not co-exist in the same hierarchical social category in peace time. Such schematic knowledge about social stratification allows the reader to infer that the priest/tramp pair would be read as oppositional under normal circumstances. During the aggression, however, the priest and tramp were together, side by side. Once confronted with the British attacks, the social stratification and social identities of the Irish are removed, and only two identities remain: the Irish vs. the British. The priest and tramp were persecuted together regardless of their distinct social class because in the eyes of the British soldiers, they shared the same identity: that of being Irish. As a result, by neutralising the conventional *priest/tramp* oppositional pair, the poem establishes the Irish (colonised) / the British (coloniser) dichotomy and constructs Irishness as opposed to *they*.

The Irish are unarmed, they use farming equipment and pikes: "*We found new tactics happening each day: / We'd cut through reins and rider with the **pike***" (ll. 6-7) as they have been forced to learn how to

produce weapons to protect themselves against the well-equipped British. Although the comparison between the rudimentary equipment of the Irish and the modern artillery of the British is not made linguistically explicit in the poem, the contrast between them can be inferred by the reader's schemata and encyclopaedic knowledge: it is "*scythes*" against "*cannon*", "*cattle*" against "*infantry*". Scythes opposed to cannon and cattle opposed to infantry in this context demonstrate how non-canonical opposition is constructed. Neither of these are immediate antonyms of one another, however the contrast created emphasises the dramatic power imbalance between the well-armed British and the Irish who lack artillery and troops. Thus, scythes and cannon become oppositional pairs in the poem, and the same holds true for the cattle/infantry pair.

To conclude, these constructed oppositions contextually highlight the colonial excessive force the Irish have been subjected to. Furthermore, it is inferred that the Irish were on the run, unrehearsed and incautious, unable to defend themselves let alone being organised to fulfil an attack.

3.2. Stylistic analysis of prose

3.2.1 Toni Morrison: *The Bluest Eye*

(1) "*They were **big, white, armed men**. He was **small, black, helpless**. His subconscious knew what his conscious mind did not guess—that hating them would have consumed him (...)*" (Morrison 2007, 150-151)

This episode is from a hostile incident Cholly and Darlene encounter during their consensual sexual intercourse. Two-armed white men approach and force the two to continue the intercourse which then becomes non-consensual as they watch and insult Cholly with racial slurs. The racial hostility causes anger and hatred however Cholly cannot direct his anger toward white men, thus he misplaces his anger and hatred on Darlene.

Identical in structure and similar in grammar, the first two sentences set up a relationship of contrast achieved through conventional opposites: *big/small* (gradable antonyms), *white/black* (complementary antonyms) and unconventional opposite: *armed men/helpless*. They occur in what Jeffries (2010) calls 'parallel structures'. The flow of parallel structure in two consecutive sentences sets up oppositional relationship between these two sentences and draws attention to these contrasted elements. It is not possible to 'grade' whether the white officers are physically larger than Cholly. The *big/small* opposition does not refer to physical condition but to Cholly's internalisation of inferiority and the power granted to the white men through which they oppress the so-called 'Other'. Therefore, it can be said that contextually constructed opposition of big/small deviates from its conventional gradable form.

Although Cholly is not alone at the moment events take place, *they* is used for the white men but not for Cholly and his companion Darlene. These pronouns do not only represent the division of social actors but also imply white men's collective force and Cholly's isolation as a young black man.

The conventional opposite of *armed men* would be unarmed men, however, semantic evaluation between *armed men* and *helpless* portrays another spectrum: *strong/weak*. It can be implied that even if Cholly had a gun, he could still be helpless as his helplessness comes from his place within society as a person of colour, not from an absence of gun. The *armed men* is associated with power and control while Cholly as an unarmed black man is *helpless*. Beyond any weapons, he is helpless in a country/world where white supremacy and hostility abuse him.

(2) "*Here was an* ***ugly*** *little girl asking for* ***beauty*** *(...) A little black girl who wanted to rise up out of the pit of her blackness and see the world with blue eyes."* (Morrison 2007, 174).

The idolised whiteness and white dominant culture make Pecola perceive her blackness as the source of her ugliness, consequently, she wants to acquire what idolised white celebrities possess: blue eyes. Pecola inherently compares her appearance to the advertised beauty of celebrities such as Shirley Temple. Pecola's internalisation of the ugliness attributed to her by the dominant culture which traces back to imperialism evolves into self-contempt and derision. Subservient to others' definitions, she wishes to end the peculiarity attributed to her by mimicking whiteness.

The conventional gradable antonymy *ugly/beautiful* is constructed here as a non-gradable absolute binary. It is possible to grade ugly and beautiful along with adverbs, e.g.: X is more beautiful, Y is less ugly. However, here ugliness is associated with blackness, and acquiring blue eyes is equated to beauty. The construction suggests that the little black girl (Pecola) is exclusively 'ugly' because she is in "*the pit of her blackness*". This opposition construction implies a polarised world which is made up of two features "*ugly*" (blackness) and "*beautiful*" (blue eyes, no blackness hence the whiteness). Through this opposition construction, the quality of relativity is reduced and absolute polarity between ugly and beauty is established. The disappearance of scalar quality makes Pecola switch from ugly to beautiful, in other words, from blackness to whiteness. The two extreme poles bring attention to the magical realism in the novel as Pecola seeks blue eyes from a self-declared adviser and believes she acquired them.

Since it is the conventional gradable opposition which constructed the non-gradable binary in context, the opposition can also be categorised within Jeffries' (2010) "influence of conventional opposites in context" where pairs of conventional opposites emphasise constructed opposites.

(3) "*Safe on the other side, she screamed at us, "**I am cute**! **And you ugly**! **Black and ugly** black e mos. I am cute!""* (Morrison 2007, 73)

Maureen attends the same school as Pecola. She has lighter skin than Pecola and her black friends, her family is relatively rich, and she is treated well by both the black and white students. The speaker of the quote above is Maureen, and the addressees are Pecola and Claudia. By "Black e mos", Maureen means to say that the other girls have darker skin than her and use this as an insult. "*I am cute! And you ugly*" can be categorised as "syntactic parallelism" by Davies (2008) and "parallel structures" by Jeffries (2010). The use of coordinating conjunction *and* also overlaps with Jeffries' "coordination" category. The conjunction here indicates opposition of I/you and cute/ugly.

On "*Black and ugly*" (X and Y), the coordinating conjunction *and* constructs near synonymy between *black* and *ugly*. When Pecola is referred to as 'black and ugly', one of the inferences is that she would not be ugly is she was white, and she is ugly because she is black.

(4) "*It was empty now, but sweetly expectant of **clean**, **white**, **well-behaved** children and parents who would play there above the lake in summer before half-running, half-stumbling down the slope to the welcoming water. **Black people** were not allowed in the park, and so it filled our dreams*" (Morrison 2007, 105)

The first paralleling opposition here is *white/black* binarism. The parallelism suggests white people are allowed in the park whereas black people are not. Therefore, the structure sets a possible implication: any description of the white people that will be given following this structure will remain untrue for the black people. For example, the white children are defined as *well-behaved*, since there is a white/black binarism in the episode, it can be inferred that black children are the contrasting group and thus the opposite of *well-behaved*. Hence the oppositional pair of poorly-behaved or disorderly is auto-evoked (Jeffries 2010). Jeffries' auto-evocation typology can be further used auto-evoke *dirty*, the oppositional pair of clean although it is not mentioned in the episode. The structure of contrasted white/black children and families auto-evoke dirty as the opposite of clean.

(5) "*His mother did not like him to play with niggers. She had explained to him the difference between **colored people** and **niggers**. They were easily identifiable. **Colored people** were **neat** and **quiet**;*

niggers *were* ***dirty*** *and* ***loud****. He belonged to the former group: he wore white shirts and blue trousers; his hair was cut as close to his scalp as possible to avoid any suggestion of wool, the part was etched into his hair by the barber. In winter his mother put Jergens Lotion on his face to keep the skin from becoming ashen. Even though he was light-skinned, it was possible to ash. The line between* ***colored*** *and* ***nigger*** *was not always clear; subtle and telltale signs threatened to erode it, and the watch had to be constant*" (Morrison 2007, 87)

The second sentence exhibits Davies' (2008) "explicit opposition" category (difference between X and Y). The metalinguistic reference *difference* is employed to construct a contrast between *colored people* and *niggers*. The construction is strengthened through parallel structure (Jeffries 2010) in the following sentences where two parallel clauses are linked by semicolons. The conventional opposites neat/dirty and quiet/loud contribute to the constructed opposition on a superordinate plane: *colored people/niggers.*

The son is constantly controlled by his mother to look as tidy as the standards require. It is also suggested that his hair was cut to avoid Afro-textured hair or the hair most natural to people of colour. The same "explicit opposition" category of Davies' (2008) can be attributed to the last sentence (between X and Y). The sentence constructs a continuous spectrum, it can be inferred that unless such control and watch take place, a black person leans towards the *nigger* pole of the spectrum. If we position neat-quiet/dirt-loud on a superordinate conceptual opposition such as positive/negative, we infer that neat-quiet have positive connotations, and dirt-loud have negative. Therefore, *colored people* is constructed as an ideal identity as opposed to *niggers.*

The episode suggests that in order to avoid being on the negative pole of the spectrum, black people should alter themselves. They must conform to the unwritten rules set for them by the white dominant culture. They are confined to the norms predetermined for them, from haircut to the dress code, from the level of noise they make to their presence in public. When they conform and become *colored people,* they in fact negate their blackness to an extent, in return what they get is to be released from a contemptuous identity for which racial myths and prejudices have been created by the dominant society.

(6) *"(...) teacher education to instruct black children in obedience; music to soothe the weary master and entertain his blunted soul. Here they learn the rest of the lesson begun in those soft houses with porch swings and pots of bleeding heart: how to behave. The careful development of thrift,* ***patience****,* ***high morals****, and* ***good manners****. In short, how to get rid of the* ***funkiness****. The dreadful funkiness of passion, the funkiness of nature, the funkiness of the wide range of human emotions*" (Morrison 2007, 83)

The schematic knowledge about funk being originated from African American communities in the United States and funkiness being used to refer to the style of funk imply that characteristics particular to African Americans are contrasted with white codes. The oppressor instructs *obedience*, religious music as opposed to funk, *patience*, *morals*, and *good manners*. At microlevel, all these are constructed as opposites with *funkiness*, *passion*, *nature,* and *human emotions*, yet on the superordinate level white oppressive culture is contrasted with black oppressed culture. Funkiness is a form of resistance against white oppression, yet the latter also tries to erase the former.

(7) "*He wondered if God looked like that. No. God was a* ***nice old white man****, with long white hair, flowing white beard, and little blue eyes that looked sad when people died and mean when they were bad. It must be the devil who looks like that—holding the world in his hands, ready to dash it to the ground and spill the red guts so niggers could eat the sweet, warm insides. If the devil did look like that, Cholly preferred him. He never felt anything thinking about God, but just the idea of the devil excited him. And now the strong,* ***black devil*** *was blotting out the sun and getting ready to split open the world.*" (Morrison 2007, 134)

Cholly looks at a black father figure and questions whether God looks like him. The explicit implication of God being black is negated by the negator trigger *no*. The following clause defines God as a a) nice, b) old and c) white man. Based on our contextual background regarding the preceding episodes, we infer that *no* negates God being black. If we form a specific frame for the instance, using Jeffries' (2010) auto-evocation for the first part, we have (X is black, *no,* X is nice, old, white). In addition to *white*, the structure also positions *nice* and *old* as mutually exclusive opposites of *black*. Jeffries' (2010) auto-evocation suggests that oppositional relationship can be evoked by one of the oppositional pairs. Through the contextual background, we can infer that God cannot be nice and black at the same time. Cholly then associates the black father figure with devil and prefers who is similar to him over the white God. As discussed in the introduction, Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* (2007) explains how colonial discourse constructs an assumption that associates the concepts of evil with the black and good with the white. Throughout centuries, concepts of sin, devil and deviance from Christian morals have been associated with the colonised 'Other'. Cholly imagines a black God however he cannot disassociate this image from the devil, this may be an implication of the colonisation of the mind. Whereas it can also be argued that Cholly prefers the black devil rather than the white God which he thinks would oppress him.

(8) "*I thought about the baby that everybody wanted* ***dead****, and saw it very clearly. It was in a dark, wet place, its head covered with great O's of* ***wool****, the black face holding, like nickels, two clean* ***black eyes****, the* ***flared nose****,* ***kissing-thick lips****, and the living, breathing silk of* ***black skin****. No synthetic*

yellow bangs suspended over ***marble-blue eyes****, no* ***pinched nose*** *and* ***bowline mouth*** *(...) I felt a need for someone to want the black baby to* ***live****—just to counteract the universal love of white baby dolls, Shirley Temples, and Maureen Peals*." (Morrison 2007, 190).

The features of a black baby are contrasted with those of a white baby doll: baby's hair (*wool*) is contrasted with *yellow bangs, flared nose* with pinched nose, *kissing-thick lips* with *bowline mouth*, and *clean black eyes* with *marble-blue eyes.* The contrast is triggered by the negator *no.*

Claudia, resentful against what society imposes as worthy and beautiful, wishes for Pecola's baby to be notable to someone. *Universal love of white baby dolls, Shirley Temples, and Maureen Peals* are contrasted with the *black baby*. Unconventional opposition is set between the baby who receives no love from the community it belongs, and white baby doll which is universally cherished. The complementary antonyms *alive/dead* also imply the hypocritical contrast between people who want the baby dead yet cherish the universally loved inanimate white baby dolls. Claudia wants, for once, people to care about black babies more than advertised white dolls.

(9) "*We were sinking under the wisdom, accuracy, and relevance of Maureen's last words. If she was* ***cute****—and if anything could be believed, she was—****then we were not****. And what did that mean? We were lesser. Nicer, brighter, but still lesser. (...)* ***Jealousy*** *we understood and thought natural—a desire to have what somebody else had; but* ***envy*** *was a strange, new feeling for us. And all the time we knew that Maureen Peal was not the Enemy and not worthy of such intense hatred. The Thing to fear was the Thing that made her beautiful, and not us.*" (Morrison 2007, 74)

Claudia, the speaker of this episode, reacts to Maureen's disposition covered in the example (3). From the beginning of the novel, Claudia is seen to be baffled by people's admiration for figures like Shirley Temple and white blue-eyed dolls. Claudia does not want to have any of these dolls as gifts and dismembers them. "But the dismembering of dolls was not the true horror. The truly horrifying thing was the transference of the same impulses to little white girls" (Morrison 2007, 22). It is likely that Maureen's racially inclined words enable Claudia to grasp the reason why an unworthiness was attributed to her and her friends. Within this epiphany, Claudia understands that if Maureen is cute, then Claudia and her friends cannot be. The elliptical use "*she* was*—then we were not*" is a form of parallel structure (Jeffries 2010). The missing element is "cute", the structure triggers a contrast between Maureen and Claudia's friends.

According to Merriam-Webster online dictionary (n.d.), ‘jealousy’ and ‘envy’ are often perceived as synonyms and near-synonyms. The dictionary notes they can be interchangeably used in many cases except for romantic jealousy for which envy cannot substitute for jealousy (n.d., jealousy entry). Sarah Protasi postulates philosophical grounds to analyse distinct semantic characteristics of two nouns which are similar and co-occur (2017, 316). Although there are studies which take uncovering the distinct semantic values of these nouns as their starting point, it is not canonical to regard these two nouns as opposites. Nonetheless, *jealousy* and *envy* are contrasted and constructed as opposites here: “*Jealousy we understood and thought natural—a desire to have what somebody else had; but envy was a strange, new feeling for us.*” They experience envy for the first time and understand it to be different from jealousy. The conjunction *but* following the divisive semicolon creates “contrastive opposition” (Davies 2008). Often in sentences where a semicolon divides separate sentences or links two clauses, conjunctions are omitted and avoided because the semicolon substitute for the conjunction *and*, *but*, etc. The structure of contrast established by a semicolon is further emphasised with the use of *but.*

Claudia refers to the society dominated by the white culture and white hegemony here: “The *Thing* to fear was the *Thing* that made her beautiful, and not us”. The syntactic frame (X not Y) is present here, the opposition occurs in Davies’ (2008) “negated opposition”. It constructs mutual exclusivity in the opposites of lighter skin/darker skin. If it is the skin tones that make one beautiful and the others not, then *her* does not only refer to Maureen but denotes people that have lighter skin and *us* hold a broader semantic depth, alluding to people with darker skin colours. To sum up, the structure does not only emphasise the mutual exclusive conventional her/us, but also constructs a broader possibility of opposition.

To understand what the *Thing* denotes better, John McLeod’s take on Frantz Fanon and his experience is worth mentioning here: “Identity is something that the French *make for him*, and in so doing they commit violence that splits his very sense of self” (McLeod 2010, 23). McLeod argues that the distinction between ‘self’ and the ‘Other’ is an imaginative one yet it “imprisons the mind as securely as chains imprison the body” (ibid.).

4.Conclusion

Colonial discourse establishes 'self' and 'the Other' binarism to reinforce colonising forces as the dominant power, and to emphasise the subordination and alienation of the colonised. Imperial narratives are often complicit in maintaining the colonial status quo, and they use demonstratives and pronouns to construct the dichotomy of 'European versus the Natives', or of what this paper pronounces as 'self'/'the Other'. Conversely, postcolonial literature and literatures written at the peak of imperialism and defy colonial discourse often write back to this binary. Writing back, from peripheries, to the centre where colonial discourse has emerged is a critical practice. The practice is employed to challenge the inferiority and subhuman identity attributed to the subjugated people. Although this literary resistance gained popularity in the 20th century, it is not intrinsic to a century. To demonstrate this, literary works written in different centuries were chosen as data.

The thesis considers subversion as a deviation from the ubiquitous norms firmly established by the colonial discourse. As preliminarily proposed, the analyses of the selected data have shown that opposition is foregrounded in colonial/postcolonial writings. Methodologically, the study borrowed Davies' (2008) and Jeffries' (2010) typologies to analyse opposition in discourse. The results of the analyses drawn on these typologies have shown that contextually constructed oppositions often occur in syntactic frames and parallel structures, accompanied by negator triggers and coordinating conjunctions. It is observed that contextual oppositional relationships can be inferred from the elliptical use of conventional oppositional pairs, often based on schematic knowledge or textual interpretation. As for the poetry analysis, certain incidents of antonymy constructed through sound similarities and rhyming patterns have been observed. Further taxonomies related to opposition in discourse are needed to conceptualise these compelling instances.

Several studies conducted previously on opposition used sentence-level units. This particular study attempted to analyse longer texts which range over genres and a number of topics. As a result, the study demonstrates how useful stylistic analysis can be in investigating the effects and function of opposition in literary works, specifically postcolonial literature. As in-depth analyses of linguistic construction of 'self' and the 'Other' as well as their subversion meaningfully complement literary interpretation and give a basis to literary postcolonial theory, it is intended that this thesis contributes to the neglected field of postcolonial stylistics and opens the way for further research.

5. Data sources

Hall, Jason. 2002. Heaney's Requiem for the Croppies. *The Explicator* 61 (1), 56-59, DOI: 10.1080/00144940209597755

Morrison, Toni. 2007. *The Bluest Eye.* New York: Vintage International.

Pringle, Thomas. 1834. “The Bushman”. In *African Sketches.* E. Moxon. Available at: www.books.google.com. Accessed: 3 June 2021.

Pringle, Thomas. 1834. “The Hottentot”. In *African Sketches.* E. Moxon. Available at: www.books.google.com. Accessed: 3 June 2021.

6. References

Ashcroft, Bill & Griffiths, Gareth & Tiffin, Helen. 2002. *The empire writes back*: *theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. New York: Routledge.

Berberich, Christine. 2006. This green and pleasant land: cultural constructions of englishness. In *Landscape and englishness.* Robert Burden & Stephen Kohl, eds. 207-224. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The location of culture.* London: Routledge

Blauner, Robert. 1969. Internal colonialism and ghetto revolt. *Social problems* 16 (4), 393–408. https://doi.org/10.2307/799949

Bloom, Harold. 2010. *Bloom's guides: The Bluest Eye.* New York: Infobase Publishing.

Bregin, Elana. 2000. Representing the bushmen: through the colonial lens. *English in Africa* 27 (1), 37-54. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/40238891. Accessed: 17 May 2022.

Calder, Angus. 1982. Thomas Pringle (1789-1834): a Scottish poet in South Africa." *English in Africa* 9 (1), 1-13. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/40238497. Accessed: 11 May 2022.

Childs, Peter & Fowler, Roger. 2005. *The Routledge dictionary of literary terms*. London: Routledge.

Cook, Guy. 1994. *Discourse and literature: the interplay of form and mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, Matt. 2008. *Oppositions in news discourse: the ideological construction of "us" and "them" in the British press.* Huddersfield, UK: University of Huddersfield dissertation.

Fanon, Frantz. 2007. *The wretched of the earth*. Grove Press.

Fowler, Roger. 2017. *Essays on style and language: linguistic and critical approaches to literary style*. London: Routledge.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Hegemony.*

Hirsch, Edward. 1991. The imaginary Irish peasant. *PMLA* 106 (5), 1116-1133. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/462684. Accessed: 8 June 2021

Hutcheon, Linda. 2004. *A poetics of postmodernism.* Routledge: Taylor and Francise e-Library.

Jakobson, Roman. 1987. *Language in literature*. Harvard University Press.

"jealousy" n.d. In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Accessed: 20 May 2022, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/jealousy

Jeffries, Lesley. 2010. *Opposition in discourse: the construction of oppositional meaning*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Jeffries, Lesley. 2014. Critical stylistics. In *The Roudledge Handbook of Stylistics.* M. Burke, eds. 408-420. Routledge.

Jones, Steven. 2002. *Antonymy: a corpus-based perspective*. London: Routledge.

Kingsley, Charles. 1894. *Charles Kingsley: his letters and memories of his life.* Macmillan.

Klopper, Dirk. 1990. Politics of the pastoral: the poetry of Thomas Pringle. English in Africa 17 (1), 21-59. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/40238653. Accessed: 11 May 2022.

Leech, Geoffrey. 1969. *A linguistic guide to English poetry*. London: Longman

Leech, Geoffrey & Short, Mick. 2007. *Style in fiction: a linguistic introduction to English fictional prose* 13. Pearson Education.

Marks, Shula. 1972. Khoisan resistance to the Dutch in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *The journal of African history* 13 (1), 55-80. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/180967. Accessed: 17 May 2022.

Mathews, Patrick J. 2017. Bard of Erin: Moore, Yeats and Heaney. In *One day, Seamus Heaney*. Burçin Erol (eds). 9-22. Hacettepe University.
McIntyre, Dan. 2003. Using foregrounding theory as a teaching methodology in a stylistic course. *Style*, 37 (1), 1-13.
McLeod, John. 2010. *Beginning postcolonialism*. Manchester University Press.
Mettinger, Arthur. 1994. *Aspects of semantic opposition in English*. Oxford University Press.
Moore, David Chioni. 2006. Is the post- in postcolonial the post- in post-soviet? Toward a global postcolonial critique. In *Baltic Postcolonialism*. Violeta Kelertas (eds). 11-30. New York and Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Murphy, Lynne. 2003. *Semantic relations and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press.
Protasi, Sara. 2017. 'I'm not envious, I'm just jealous!': on the difference between envy and jealousy. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association* 3 (3), 316-333.
Said, Edward. 1994. *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
Shaw, Damian. 1998. Thomas Pringle's "Busmen": images in flesh and blood. *English in Africa* 25 (2), 37-61. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40238865. Accessed: 20 April 2022.
Simpson, Paul. 2004. *Stylistics: a resource book for students*. London and New York: Routledge.
Thiong'o, Ngugi Wa. 1986. Decolonizing the mind: the politics of language in African literature. London: James Curry.
Toolan, Michael. 2014. "The theory and philosophy of stylistics" In The Cambridge handbook of stylistics. Peter Stockwell & Sara Whiteley, (eds) 13-31. Cambridge University Press.
Van Dijk, Teun A., 2001. Critical discourse analysis. In *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen & Heidi E. Hamilton, (eds). Blackwell Publishers.
Vladimirou, Dimitra. 2007. 'I suggest that we need more research' personal reference in linguistics journal articles, *Lancaster University postgraduate conference in linguistics and language teaching* 1, 139-157.
Voss, A. E. 1982. "Thomas Pringle and the image of the 'Bushmen'" *English in Africa* 9 (1), 15-28. Available at: www.jstor.org/stable/40238498. Accessed: 10 May 2022.
Widdowson, Henry. 2013. *Stylistics and the teaching of literature.* New York: Routledge.

7. Summary in Lithuanian

Daugybė tyrimų bei įvairių studijų buvo atlikta tyrinėjant stilistiką bei bendrąją postkolonizaciją, tačiau tik keli tyrimai buvo atlikti bandant sukurti postkolonialistinę stilistiką. Magistro baigiamuoju darbu „Savęs“ ir „Svetimo“ stilistinis vaizdavimas postkolonializmo teorijoje: poezijos ir prozos atvejai”, siekiama įnešti daugiau indėlio studijuojant apleistąją postkolonializmo stilistikos sritį. Šiuo tyrimu siekiama iliustruoti opozicinę (priešingą) konstrukciją postkolonijinėje literatūroje kartu su netradicinėmis bei kritinėmis funkcijomis. Remiantis Matt’o Davies'o (2008) ir Lesley’ės Jeffries (2010) tipologijomis, šis tyrimas apžvelgs kontekstinė netradicinę opoziciją diskurse. Ši kokybinė analizė įrodo, kad priešingybės yra įsitvirtinusios Toni’ės Morrison „The Bluest Eye“, Thomas’o Pringle’o „The Bushman“ ir „The Hottentot“, bei Seamus’o Heaney’o „Requiem for the Croppies“. Rezultatai rodo, kad konstrukcinės priešingybės jų kūriniuose nublanksta: darbas nuvertina bei kritikuoja įkurtą kolonijinį diskursą bei dominuojančią baltaodžių kultūrą.

(Vertimą iš anglų į lietuvių k. atliko Aleksandra Bekerytė ir Julija Vaitiekūnaitė)