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Abstract. The article is devoted to analysis of lexico-morphological devices used in the process of creation of stereotyped personage image in adventure novels. Such personages are clearly marked by the author’s axiological attitude. Both the characteristics and the means of their expression can be constantly used by different authors; thus we deal with the phenomenon of personage stereotype. The choice of our investigation material is determined by the fact that in an adventure novel the ethic opposition is based on the fundamental contrastive conceptions of human morality – evil and goodness, honesty and falsity. The primary contrast which isn’t tinted but, inversely, is explicitly emphasized by authors, is the constant feature of adventure poetics. In this paper we concentrate our attention on basic functions of nominative parts of speech (nouns and adjectives) in stereotype personage characterization and their formalized, standardized nature.
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Adventure novels are characterized by both types of oppositely oriented evaluative vocabulary – positively and negatively charged units which mark the corresponding author’s attitude to the represented characters. Usually evaluative meaning acts in conjunction with the emotional. Emotional (emotive) meaning reflects the attitude to the objects named and the very fact of the division of emotions into positive and negative indicates a close relationship between emotion and evaluation (Kukharenko, 1973, p. 41).

The aim of our investigation is to analyze the linguistic devices of creation of stereotype personage (SP) images (Hero and Antagonist) in the belles-lettres adventure texts. For our analysis we selected so called pejorative (negative) and meliorative (positive) lexical units according to the part of speech they belong to, and rated their estimates by object type (vocabulary characterizing Hero/Antagonist). Furthermore, in our investigation the objects of evaluation are differentiated into constant qualities or signs (External and Moral) as one and the same object can have multiple characteristics, relevant for assessment. The purpose of this paper is to analyze nominal morphological categories: adjectives and nouns involved in creation of the SP image.

The quantitative method of analysis of the judgmental lexicon which directly expresses the author's attitude to his characters, allowed us to determine that the most frequent category in the glossary, and in the text, is evaluative adjective (66.5% of the total number of selected lexical units constituting the vocabulary of descriptive fragments). In most cases these words appear in the function of epithets and indicate the principal ethical and external features in portrayals of SP. The fact of adjectives’ domination in portrait characteristics of characters in adventure stories certainly reflects their overall dominance in the system of evaluation of the English lexicon, and that is indicated by many researchers (Frenkel, 1982). According to them evaluation as one of the aspects of pragmatics, is a part of many lexical units, combined with the corresponding designative components of meaning, but is most clearly expressed in the system of adjectives. Grammatical invariant meaning of adjectives in modern English is quality, which is associated with the assessment and through it – with emotionality and expressiveness (Morokhovskiy, 1991).

The portrait description of a literary personage is characterized by a large number of attributive phrases, where the basic meaning of the adjective is enriched with secondary differential features – qualitative estimates or shades of subjective evaluation (Morokhovskiy, 1991, p. 78). The commonest model of such phrases in the texts under study is a combination of an adjective and a noun – A + N, where a substantive component acts as basic and adjective – as a dependent component in relation to the noun. Stylistic
connotations are usually conditioned by the possibility of the nominative component distribution, expressed by a noun through the use of adjuncts of emotive-evaluative features. Combinatorial potency of adjectives determines the fact that the majority of nouns in these phrases are of neutral evaluation (for example: “hostile eyes”, “pleasant voice”). However, functioning with negative/positive marked adjectives, they absorb this negative or positive charge, and their semantics gains estimated layers (Frenkel, 1982). The use of the word “smile” in portrait characteristics of Antagonist also attracts our attention: inherently indicating the manifestation of positive emotions under the influence of adjectives with negative evaluation it changes its coloring to the opposite, negative (for example: “spiteful smile” (Gann, p. 18); lewd smile (Thomas, p. 306). Our sample indicates the adjectives that operate correctly and not only as an adjunct, but as a predicate – the rheme component of the sentence – that promotes greater accentuation of the feature, and, consequently, the increase in estimate potential of lexical units. For example: “fellow’s fury was awful” (Wren, p. 14); “The man’s eyes were wild” (Cooper, 1960, p. 165); “His features were frank and open” (Niles, p. 18).

In the texts under analysis the evaluative adjectives are focused on negative characters which oppose Heroes, i.e. pejorative adjectives significantly prevail over the meliorative reclamation. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider negatively charged evaluative adjectives in portrait characteristics of SP in the first place. Estimation through the use of adjectives primarily exposes such features, as physical qualities of negative characters. Adjectives, describing this aspect, relate to nouns that nominate specific traits of a person’s appearance, as well as its certain physical characteristics (voice, facial expressions, etc.): “shrill voice” (Sabatini, 1961, p 35), “sunken eyes” (Gann, 1956, p. 218); “terrible voice”; “tallow face” (Stevenson, 1983, p. 17); “bloodshot eyes” (Niles, 1996, p. 254). Certain part of words, describing external features also reflects the negatively-marked traits of personality, i.e. adjectives, expressing moral judgments, are actively used as a means of negative characterization of Antagonists’ appearance: “hate-filled eyes” (Cooper, 1960, p. 191); “wicked eyes” (Niles, 1996, p. 136; Haggard, 1985, p. 169), “chilling laugh” (Bennett, 1989, p. 150); “cruel voice” (Stevenson, 1983, p. 26). This fact suggests a kind of transposition of ethical characteristics on the physical properties of the individual.

Another aspect of the object of evaluation is also the emotional state of the characters: “He drew back a chair and dropped into it, coldly furious” (L’Amour, 1988, p. 40). Adjectives that implement this evaluative trait are often syntagmatically contiguous with substantive vocabulary, nominating as physical characteristics of a person (“eyes”, “voice”) as its emotional reaction (“ferocity”), for example: “his eyes angry and affronted” (Thomas, 1985, p. 477), “the fiery eyes of Magua” (Cooper, 1960, p. 123), “he was recalled by an angry voice” (Sabatini, 1961, p. 64), “the gleam of ungovernable ferocity flashed from his eyes” (Cooper, 1960, p. 38). As we can see from examples given above, the italicized words have a high degree of intensity of evaluative feature “bad” which is mainly represented with semes “unpleasant”, “unattractive”, “unfriendly”, “immoral”, “harmful”, as evidenced by dictionary definitions of given lexical units. So the aim of the authors to give the contrastive image description is reflected in the choice of words used for the nomination of the opposition members.

Estimations are also given to the intellectual qualities of SP. For example, a Hero is traditionally described as “clever”, “intelligent”, “smart” etc.: Strong. Intelligent. A good man (Clavell, 2006, p. 169). He was ebullient, clever, alert (Thomas, 1985, p. 68). The use of adjectives describing this aspect of negative characters is connected with pragmatic logic of negative images’ construction: the Antagonist cannot be naive and stupid because, otherwise, any victory over him would not be significant, and therefore the triumph of good over evil is not so explicit: He must show me how clever he was and how wicked (Stevenson, 1983, p. 228). Thus we can conclude that intelligence is not exclusively or primarily a heroic feature, and therefore the opposition of features “smart”/”stupid” is not the part of the stereotype image of a Hero/Antagonist in adventure works.

In the analyzed texts of adventure genre adjectives that create a positive image of the character – the Hero–are also registered. They function as the predicate and the adjunct, describing the external and ethical characteristics: “He was so handsome and so swift and graceful” (Fleming, 1984, p. 145). “He smiled…and she thought that even his half-smile was strangely warm and direct” (Gann, 1956, p. 96). We should note the prevalence of adjectives denoting the external signs of stereotypical characters of adventure works in our sample – about 76% of the total number of adjectives (330 of 436 registered lexical units). Their contextual meaning has moral and ethical aspect of evaluation. Moreover, such adjectives are mostly used, as it was shown earlier, for the qualification of negative and positive characters on the basis of external physical
qualities. Most of the units refer to the so-called universal evaluative semes (Gyubbenet, 2010), characterized by the applicability to different objects and/or evaluative features.

However the subjective modality and evaluative statements are made not only of lexical units charged accordingly. The author of a literary work can arbitrarily, by his own choice, attach connotations to words (Kukharenko, 1973). In the particular act of speech creation the estimation is expressed not through the basic meaning or semantic content of the word, but mainly in the form of certain stylistic connotations. Even such inherently evaluative words like "good" and "bad" become truly evaluative only when the speaker is aware of assessment category as an individual attitude (Frenkel, 1982). In this regard we should distinguish between, on the one hand, the evaluative content and evaluative semantics of a lexical unit, and, on the other hand - metasemiotic expression of evaluation, since any word can be a carrier of contextually created axiological information. Thus, in the portrait characteristics of Hero and Antagonist in the novel of K. Thomas “The Bear’s Tears” can be found adjectives with negative evaluative semes which are absent out of context. Following the pragmatic intention of a literary work and performing the function of emotional and aesthetic impact on the reader, they acquire this evaluative seme in the respectively charged context. For example, in the sentence “He stood there for a moment, a mocking smile on his saturnine face …unmoved and merciless...” (Massey, 1976, p. 261) the adjective “unmoved” acquires contextual negative seme due to the fact that it is used within one syntactic structure with “merciless” which equates, unifies both adjectives in terms of their evaluative characteristics. In other context the positive meaning is acquired by neutral adjectives (“assured”, “self-important”) because, along with usually positive lexical units, they describe a Hero of the novel (Redmond Carn), creating the image of the extraordinary person: “Who is that, please?” a polite, assured voice enquired... Babbington recollected approaching the self-important figure... (Thomas, 1985, p. 333).

Nouns in portrait descriptions of SP amount 14% of the total number of the registered lexical units. As in the case of adjectives, we classified nouns by the type of objects under evaluation and arranged in the order of frequency: according to thenumber of different characters, named by different authors using the same lexical units. We proceeded from the specific semantic content of substantives, as units of this part of speech gain a sign of the object of evaluation that is explicitly contained within the semantic structure of the evaluative word (Frenkel, 1982). However, we also took into account their inline referential relatedness.

In the bulk of nouns there can be distinguished several groups:

1. Names of persons (the number after the name indicates the number of novels in which they are used);
   Antagonist: pirate – 6 (Sabatini, Stevenson, Wren, Bennett, Thomas, Clavell), brute – 4 (Fleming, Sabatini, Wren, Stevenson), villain – 3 (Stevenson, Bennett, Sabatini), fiend – 3 (Clavell, Niles, Stevenson), beast – 2 (Sabatini, Simmons), scoundrel – 2 (Sabatini, Stevenson).
   Hero: gentleman – 5 (Cooper, Wren, Stevenson, Bennett, Sabatini), warrior – 2 (Gann, Niles).

Naming of characters plays a leading role in the implementation of the main functional load of units of this part of the speech – the creation of positive- and especially negatively-pointed character images. E. g., the noun “fiend”, the expressive and figurative potency of which is based on the intensity of the evaluative component, characterizes its referents as extremely negative in moral aspect persons. In the example from the novel of I. Fleming the negatively-marked word “bastard” under the influence of the adjective “lousy” gets additional evaluative connotation: “Goldfinger, you are a lousy... bastard” (Fleming, 1984, p. 219).

2. Nouns, describing emotional manifestations, and naming features of characters.
   Antagonist: mockery – 6 (Sabatini, L’Amour, Stevenson, Bennett, Thomas, Abbey), cruelty – 6 (Wren, Clavell, Abbey, Haggard, Thomas, Fleming), hatred – 5 (L’Amour, Bennett, Niles, Sabatini, Stevenson), coldness – 4 (Bennett, Coppell, Sabatini, Stevenson), fury – 4 (Sabatini, Haggard, L’Amour, Wren), rage – 3 (Cooper, Sabatini, Abbey), rapacity – 3 (Bennett, Stevenson, Sabatini), evil – 3 (Cooper, Fleming, Sabatini), violence – 3 (Clavell, Cooper, Sabatini), anger, wildness – 2 (Cooper, Bennett), envy – 2 (Wren, Abbey), malevolence – 2 (Bennett, Sabatini), greed – 2 (Fleming, Sabatini), lust – 2 (L’Amour, Wren), ferocity – 2 (Cooper, Thomas).
   Hero: dignity – 5 (Bennett, Cooper, Stevenson, Sabatini, Adams), daring, resolution, taint – 3 (Simmons, Massey, Haggard), goodness – 3 (Stevenson, Bennett, Sabatini), courage – 3 (Stevenson, Bennett, Sabatini), power – 2 (Sabatini, Bennett, Stevenson), ease – 3 (Cooper, L’Amour, Anderson), calmness, quietness – 2 (Sabatini, Wren), kindness – 2 (Bacheller, Clavell), strength – 2 (Massey, Cooper), confidence – 2 (Sabatini, L’Amour), determination – 2 (Bacheller, Adams), sincerity, truth – 2.
(Bacheller, L’Amour), generosity – 2 (Bacheller, Gann), countenance – 2 (Cooper, Wren), assurance – 2 (L’Amour, Cooper).

The basic function of these nouns is defining. They are used not only to identify the subject of speech, but for the expression of subjective axiological speaker's attitude to the object. The main part of their semantic content does not just indicate a character’s objective features that it is necessary for their identification, but also the evaluative attitude towards them from the point of the author.

Thus, the results of our research in general, and the given examples in particular show, that the method of direct characterization by means of language units having inherent positive / negative evaluation is not the only one. The authors of adventure novels in the process of creating images of SP use in their descriptions lexemes, which, being initially neutral, acquire adherent additional value that is supported by the semantics and the original evaluation of other linguistic units used in the same context. The semantic diversity of pejorative and meliorative names, emotional reactions and mental conditions of SP, as well as their objectified moral and intellectual qualities that characterize different personality traits, enhances the depth and expressiveness of character features in adventure novels. The frequency of nouns’ use in portrait description of Hero and Antagonist should also be mentioned (45.7). This fact indicates a high degree of repeatability and low variability of nominal lexical units in the adventure prose. Registered number of nouns and adjectives is approximately the same (90:93 units), but substantives are used in the text four times often (1 375:4 115 word usage). Consequently, a noun plays more significant role in creation of typical, standard features and characteristics of stereotype characters in adventure genre. The analysis of linguistic material also indicates that authors of adventure prose have different linguistic ways of characters’ similar traits nomination. However, these descriptive signs are rather conventional and sketchy, as they can include virtually every Hero or every Antagonist in any adventure novel. They do not create individualized images; moreover, they are expressed through templates, iterative, identical or semantically similar adjectives and nouns. Therefore, we can say that the stereotype of Hero and Antagonist in adventure literature led to formalization of lexical units in portrait characteristics of characters, their standardized nature.
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