

## Character Speech Individualization in Charles Dickens's Novels

Olena Panchenko<sup>1</sup>, Vira Zirka<sup>2</sup>, Tetiana Klymenko<sup>1</sup>, Anastasiia Plakhtii<sup>3</sup> & Iryna Suima<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Translation and Linguistic Training of Foreigners, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Dnipro, Ukraine

<sup>2</sup>Dnipro Department, Research and Educational Center of Foreign Languages of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine

<sup>3</sup>Department of Foreign Languages, Prydniprovaska State Academy of Civil Engineering and Architecture, Dnipro, Ukraine

Correspondence: Olena Panchenko, Department of Translation and Linguistic Training of Foreigners, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, 49010, 72 Gagarin Ave., Dnipro, Ukraine

Received: May 8, 2022

Accepted: November 30, 2022

Online Published: December 17, 2022

doi:10.11114/smc.v10i3.5848

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v10i3.5848>

### Abstract

The relevance of this investigation is explained by several reasons: first, the individual character of speech is one of the evidences of Charles Dickens's geniality and it is of importance for any person writing to analyze some techniques of the genius doing it; second, the analysis of these "speeches" can help understand peculiarities of various styles and genres separately and in interaction; third, everything related to Ch. Dickens is still popular among the readers, so these examples can be of use for teaching and learning English. There are three primary aims of the present paper: to extend coverage of linguistic studies to areas of literary peculiarities; to highlight gaps in the existing literature and promising directions for future research of Charles Dickens's language; to establish a theory-driven approach to investigating literature language by introducing a new model as a framework for this paper. Authors applied such general research methods as data collection, study of the works in allied fields on the problem of the research, analysis and synthesis of the ideas studied. The theoretical basis of the investigation integrated the main principles of linguistics, stylistics and literature studies. Ch. Dickens is incomparable in linguistic individualization, in creating a personage idiolect, a private language. According to calculations all these characters are minor, about 3 quarters of the are female and about 60% are negatively marked. The main linguistic levels involved in this process are in descending order phonological (graphemic in written form), lexical, syntactic and stylistic.

**Keywords:** language, literature, linguistics, vocabulary, personage

### 1. Introduction

The topicality of the article is defined by a growing interest in the problems of classical literature in general and its increasing role in the world literature in particular. Literary style is an inexhaustible source of studying and enriching not only the language competence but also general erudition of a human being. The bright specific features of Charles Dickens's novels and evolution of his art of writing demand definitions and scientific discussion. The present paper aims to fill the gap of connection of artistic effect and the language means of achieving it. A great deal of research has been examined that touch on this area (Page, 1973; Miller, 1997; Tyler, 2013; Han, 2016; Jeong et al., 2022). The novels by Ch. Dickens (as well as their translation) have received a wide coverage in theoretical research literature. D. Tyler (2013) underlines that Ch. Dickens, generally regarded as the greatest novelist of the Victorian age, was known as "the inimitable", not least for his distinctive style of writing. D. Tyler (2013) in his twelve essays addresses the essential but often overlooked subject of Charles Dickens's style, with each essay discussing a particular feature of his writing. All the essays consider Charles Dickens's style conceptually, and they read it closely, demonstrating the ways it works on particular occasions. They show that style is not simply an aesthetic quality isolated from the deepest meanings of Charles Dickens's fiction, but that it is inextricably involved with all kinds of historical, political and ideological concerns. Written in a lively and accessible manner by leading Ch. Dickens scholars, the collection ranges across all Charles Dickens's writing, including the novels, journalism and letters.

J. Egbert and M. Mahlberg (2020) discusses deeply the point of individual speech in the English language classical novels.

The authors summarize that from a stylistic point of view, J.F. Burrows (1987) shows how treating the speech of individual characters in J. Austen can distinguish different fictional people. These results are complemented by findings from P. de Haan (1996), who compared the fictional dialogue from seven novels and found that they varied with respect to several variables, including length of sentences and type of reporting verbs used. P. de Haan (1996) also observes: “fiction takes sort of a middle position between more formal writing on the one hand, and face-to-face conversation on the other” and he calls for future research to investigate stylistic variation in fictional dialogue more comprehensively. The individual characteristics under consideration has not received their complete theoretical evaluation yet as it differs greatly from those in other books which belong to this literary genre (Kim et al., 2020). Theoretical research seeks to analyze the peculiarities of character individual speech and the main ways of their creation. Thus, authors try to single out specific features of various characters’ speech and then unite and classify these features.

There are three primary aims of the present paper: to extend coverage of linguistic studies to areas of literary peculiarities; to highlight gaps in the existing literature and promising directions for future research of Charles Dickens’s language; to establish a theory-driven approach to investigating literature language by introducing a new model as a framework for this paper.

The aim of the paper defines its concrete tasks, which are: to create a complete set of characters with individual speech characteristics from the novels by Ch. Dickens; to classify the said characteristics; to analyze types of their creation. Authors discuss the implications of these findings for researchers and educators interested in the language of literature.

## 2. Literature Review

E.N. Hubbard (2002) in a study focused entirely on a linguistic description of the dialogue portions of Jane Austen’s “Sense and Sensibility”. N. Oostdijk (1990) works with a small data set of samples from five fictional texts, and looks at a range of textual features that suggest that specifically dialogue in fiction takes up a middle position on a continuous scale of planned and unplanned discourse. Pointing out the limitations of research on the language of fiction, K. Axelsson (2009) lists the lack of suitably annotated corpora, as well as challenges of working with samples from novels among the reasons for the fact that “so little quantitative research on the language of direct speech in fiction has been published so far”. The issues connected with Charles Dickens’s individual style are focused on by such scholars as J.T. Fields (1876), A. Miller (1997), K. Ireland (2001), C.S. Han (2016), J. Egbert and M. Mahlberg (2020), P. Orford (2020). They study such aspects of his creative work as style in nineteenth century fiction (Egbert & Mahlberg, 2020), speech in the English novel (Page, 1973), the narrative art of Ch. Dickens which are to be taken into account when analyzing any work of literature. It is necessary to mention P. Ruano San Segundo (2016) who suggests a corpus-stylistic approach to Charles Dickens’s use of speech verbs, A.L. Soto Vazquez (2005) who discusses idiolects in “Martin Chuzzlewit”.

E. Finer (2019) set the problem as follows: “Dombey in Zhitomir, Pip in Taganrog: Reading Dickens “as if for life” in Russia”. This article focuses on the narrative strategies used by V. Korolenko (1853-1921) and N. Morozova (1924-2015) in their autobiographies to convey the importance of reading Ch. Dickens to their formation as writers. It argues that David Copperfield offers a useful model for understanding how V. Korolenko and N. Morozova write about reading, and that, rather than distancing Ch. Dickens and his characters from their global readership, translations increase proximity and facilitate empathetic readings. Among others, K. McGovern (2018) has done a substantial research into Charles Dickens’s expansion of the English language. G. Stewart (2001) and D. Tyler (2018) offer a broad survey of Charles Dickens’s language in general. The problem was studied much earlier by G.K. Chesterton (1986) and G.L. Brook (1970) has investigated Ch. Dickens language. Of great importance for authors are the papers by Ch. Luu (2016) who emphasizes that even the lowliest, most fleeting minor character in a Ch. Dickens novel, regardless of wealth or education, can have an individual personality and humanity. The research into this problem has been also done by R. Golding (1985) dealing with idiolects in Ch. Dickens. N. Page (1970) in his work “Convention and consistency in Dickens’s Cockney dialect” has analyzed the specific features of using Cockney dialect in Charles Dickens’s paper.

## 3. Materials and Methods

While developing the research methodology of the present study, authors substantiated the expediency of utilizing a variety of methods. According to the aims of the present paper, authors applied such general research methods as data collection, study of the works in allied fields on the problem of the research, analysis and synthesis of the ideas studied. The theoretical basis of the investigation integrated the main principles of linguistics, stylistics and literature studies. Selective and descriptive methods were used to collect the speech units and identify their specific features. Contextual analysis allowed determining in-depth senses encoded in a number of the units under consideration. The elements of qualitative analysis of the units studied highlighted their prominent characteristics and enabled to make objective conclusions. In order to verify quotes authors also used the web app CLiC (2022) Ch. Dickens which allows for word and phrase searching across Charles Dickens’s major works. Scholars can use this resource to demonstrate the value of proper citation practices in the digital era even in the context of university and library closures such as those recently experienced

during the COVID-19 (COronaVirus Disease 2019) pandemic (Craig, 2020; Sakibayev, & Sakibayeva, 2016; Yelubay et al., 2022).

Thus, the first step of research was to define characters' speech elements and strategies of its usage in the novels. The second stage was to select them and study their features. Next, authors arranged these units into bigger groups according to their meaning and ways of creation. Finally, authors calculated defined linguistic units realities in the material discussed. The mentioned methods were developed, approved and applied, based on the novels by Ch. Dickens. The number of the novels under consideration in the original is 15, and the number of characters analyzed is 44. Utilizing the continuous selection method, authors have chosen all linguistic units which can be classified as characterizing individual speech. The general number of fragments for analysis is 1213. Authors have not analyzed the American variant of English basing on the novel "Martin Chuzzlewit", it being the object of comprehensive paper (Soto Vazquez, 2005). Authors's hypothesis is that each novel comprises at least one or more often several characters who can be easily recognized by the very first words when he (she) speaks. All these personages are minor ones, of the second row, so to say. Very few of them are females, males prevail. No main character has any speech peculiarities. Speaking metaphorically, these minor characters are highlighted with their speech which makes them prominent and memorable.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

Authors consider that practically all possible language levels are engaged in creating individuality of characters' speech. Summarizing these means shortly authors speak about the following.

##### 1. Phoneme or grapheme level:

- phonetic mistakes of native speakers;
- phonetic mistakes of babies or pseudo-babies' speech;
- phonetic mistakes of foreigners;
- spelling mistakes;
- pronunciation which reflects certain grammar mistakes.

##### 2. Word level:

- words of high stylistic register;
- words of low stylistic register;
- dialectal words, Cockney and Yorkshire in particular;
- individual "beloved" words of this or that character;
- interjections as a character' marker.

##### 3. Syntactic level:

- clipped sentences with ellipsis;
- prolonged exaggerated sentences;
- special syntactic construction, "wellerism" in particular.

##### 4. Stylistic level:

- wide usage of quotations;
- repetitions.

These features alone or in combination create the palette of the characters' idiolect. The phoneme and grapheme level is engaged in characterizing a lot of Charles Dickens's personages. The speech of Sam Weller and his father in "The Pickwick Papers" is characterized by a number of typical phonetic mistakes which allow the reader to recognize the character from the very first words, for example: "'Wery good, wery good", said Mr. Weller. "Always see to the drag ven you go downhill. Is the vay-bill all clear and straight for'erd?'" In their speech the sound [v] is replaced by the sound [w] and vice versa, the sound [w] is pronounced as [v]. Sound [h] is often omitted (par. 20; sent. 44-46; ch. 43). A foreign count, a guest at Mrs Leo Hunters' doesn't understand the words by hearing them and so he invents the content of conversation. "'No, count", said the lady, "Pick-wick". "Ah, ah, I see", replied the count. "Peek – christian name; Weeks – surname; good, ver good. Peek Weeks. How you do, Weeks? ". "Quite well, I thank you", replied Mr. Pickwick, with all his usual affability. "Have you been long in England?'" (par. 115; sent. 186-191; ch. 15). And he goes on: "'The word *politics*, sir", said Mr. Pickwick, "*comprises* in itself, a difficult study of no inconsiderable magnitude". "Ah!" said the count, drawing out the tablets again, "*ver* good – fine words to begin a chapter. Chapter forty-seven. Poltics. The word *politic surprises* by himself" – and down went Mr. Pickwick's remark, in Count Smorltork's tablets, with such variations

and additions as the count's exuberant fancy suggested, or his imperfect knowledge of the language occasioned" (par. 122; sent. 200-205; ch. 15) (Dickens, 2000).

This superior attitude of the British to foreigners can be also illustrated by the speech of a quite minor character from "Little Dorrit", Mrs Plornish, a poor woman, a kind one but converting her own language accommodating it to the mental abilities of a foreigner: "treating him like a baby, and laughing immoderately at his lively gestures and his childish English – more, because he didn't mind it, and laughed too. Mrs Plornish was particularly ingenious in this art; and attained so much celebrity for saying "Me *ope* you leg well soon", that it was considered in the Yard but a very short remove indeed from speaking Italian" (par. 17; sent. 54-64; ch. 11). Here it can be observed not only phonetic peculiarities (sound [h] is omitted) but also the wrong usage of pronouns ("me" instead of "i" and "you" instead of "your") and omitting linking verb "will be" (Dickens, 2008). Mrs Veneering from "Our Mutual Friend" spoils the speech pretending to be a baby to make charming impression on the listeners: "And then Mrs Veneering – for the Lady Tippins's winning wiles are contagious – folds her hands in the manner of a supplicating child, turns to her left neighbour, and says, "Tease! Pay! Man from *Tumwhere!*" At which the four Buffers, again mysteriously moved all four at once, explain, "You can't resist!". The resemblance to baby speech is achieved by replacing "please" by "tease", omitting "r" in pray, somewhere by "tumwhere", which sounds are usually mispronounced by babies just beginning to speak (par. 46; sent. 121-123; ch. 2) (Dickens, 1998).

Joe Gargery is a sample of an honest, noble but quite uneducated person in "Great Expectations". His lack of intellectual knowledge is underlined in different ways and one of them is his reaction to Pip's writing. Pip's written text is full of mistakes, but Joe admires it. "*Mi deer Jo i ope u r krwite well i ope i shal son b habell 4 2 teedge u Jo an then we shorl b so glodd an wen i m prengtd 2 u Jo wot larx an bleve me infxn pip*" (par. 6; sent. 26; ch. 7) (Dickens, 2002). In order to analyze the mistakes authors consider it reasonable to reconstruct the text in correct way: "My dear Joe, I hope you are quite well. I hope I shall soon be able to teach you, Joe, and then we shall be so glad and when I am to you, Joe, what luck". The number of spelling mistakes is unbelievable here, among them authors should mention omission of "h" and unnecessary insertion of "h", wrong spelling of diphthongs, indicating "tc" as "dg", and of course a difficult word "apprentice" – the dream of Joe and Pip – becomes quite unrecognizable. These feature – a lot of mistakes characterizes Joe and serves to oppose his rich inner world and interior lack of development. Thus, such a simple thing as spelling demonstrates its great artistic abilities.

Pronunciation which reflects certain grammar mistakes is not one of the most used techniques by Ch. Dickens but it is quite remarkable. One of minor but bright characters of "David Copperfield" is Barkis the carrier, the husband of Peggotty. His famous phrase repeated by him at every appearance in the novel is "*Barkis is willin*". It is said in the very first scene when he appears: "'Ah!' he said, slowly turning his eyes towards me. 'Well! If you was writin' to her, p'raps you'd recollect to say that *Barkis was willin*'; would you?'" (par. 29; sent. 57-58; ch. 5) and these are the last words before his death: "*Barkis is willin*!" And, it being low water, he went out with the tide". Here besides the "pet" phrase authors see the incorrect pronunciation of the ending -ing which is a typical feature of an uneducated person's speech and of (Dickens, 2004). But, of course, the main set of means for creating an individual character is connected with vocabulary. Different scientists use different terms for indicating words and word combinations typical for this or that character. Thus, though often unable to keep the physical property of a character in his mind, the reader can easily remember the usual fixed phrases precisely, Dr. H. Çakir (2011) says. Authors would like to speak about recognizable vocabulary which allows recognizing the character immediately after several his or her (not so often) words. Among these vocabulary units authors differentiate words of high stylistic register; words of low stylistic register; dialectal words, Cockney and Yorkshire in particular; individual "beloved" words of this or that character.

Such characters as Mr Sapsea in "Mystery of Edwin Drood" are recognized to their high register words who is very proud of his style. This style can be illustrated by such examples. "*Half a dozen years ago, or so*", Mr. Sapsea proceeds, "when I had enlarged my mind up to – I will not say to what it now is, for that might seem to aim at too much, but up to the pitch of wanting another mind to be absorbed in it – I cast my eye about me for a nuptial partner" (par. 25; sent. 62; ch. 4) (Dickens, 2009c). And the climax of his style is the grave inscription suggested by him. Authors keep the form of presenting it, which is also typical for this character.

ETHELINDA,

Reverential Wife of

MR. THOMAS SAPSEA,

AUCTIONEER, VALUER, ESTATE AGENT, &c.,

OF THIS CITY.

Whose Knowledge of the World,

Though somewhat extensive,

Never brought him acquainted with

A SPIRIT

More capable of

LOOKING UP TO HIM.

STRANGER, PAUSE

And ask thyself the Question,

CANST THOU DO LIKEWISE?

If Not,

WITH A BLUSH RETIRE (par. 36; sent. 94-97; ch. 4) (Dickens, 2009c).

As the opposite register of speech, quite a low one, it can be presented another character from the mentioned novel, a homeless boy nicknamed Deputy, a rude ignorant creature who speaks like that: "'Yes, I'll give 'em you down your throat, if you come a-ketching hold of me", says the small boy, shaking himself loose, and backing. "I'll *smash* your eye, if you don't look out!"' (par. 3; sent. 5; ch. 5) or in another situation: "'Yer lie", returned the sportsman. "'E went and lamed issself. I see 'im do it, and I giv' 'im a shy as a Widdy-warning to 'im not to *go a-bruisin' 'is master's mutton any more*"' (par. 16; sent. 30-32; ch. 18) (Dickens, 2009c). Some brightest characters of Ch. Dickens are characterized by dialectal speech. Among them it can be mentioned John Browdie with his Yorkshire words, two Cockneys Sam Weller and his father, and Mr Peggotty from Yarmouth. Ch. Dickens is considered a great master of dialects, he "made free use of dialect to distinguish between one character and another, but the dialects he uses are class rather than regional dialects" as G.L. Brook (1970) marks. "'What!" cried John Browdie, with such an ecstatic shout, that the horse quite shied at it. "*Beatten* the schoolmeaster! Ho! ho! ho! *Beatten* the schoolmeaster! who ever heard o' the *loike* o' that *noo*! Giv' us thee hond agean, *yoongster*. *Beatten* the schoolmeaster! Dang it, I loov' thee for't'" (par. 127-128; sent. 207-208; ch. 13) (Dickens, 2009d). The most attractive way of distinguishing a person's speech is the usage of their "beloved" words (or pet words, catch phrases). They may be classified like this:

– rude words which are typical for Mr Mantalini, for example: "'What a *demd* rum fellow you are, Nickleby", said the gentleman, "the *demdest*, *longest-headed*, *queerest-tempered* old coiner of gold and silver ever was – demmit'" (par. 106-107; sent. 188-189; ch. 10) or in another place: "'What a *demnition* long time you have kept me ringing at this confounded old cracked tea-kettle of a bell, every tinkle of which is enough to throw a strong man into blue convulsions, upon my life and soul, oh *demmit*", – said Mr. Mantalini to Newman Noggs" (par. 1; sent. 1; ch. 34) (Dickens, 2009d);

– fixed word combinations which may characterize a person, for example, any girl or woman by Edmund Sparkler: "The fault is not this chap's at all, but my mother's. Being a *remarkably fine woman with no bigodd nonsense about her – well educated, too* – she was too many for this chap. Regularly pocketed him" (par. 59; sent. 215-217; ch. 39). Just the same words are said by him about a girl "'I couldn't", said Mr Sparkler, after feeling his pulse as before, "couldn't undertake to say what led to it – 'cause memory desperat loose. But being in company with the brother of a *doosed fine gal – well educated too – with no biggodd nonsense about her* – at the period alluded to'" (par. 81; sent. 194-195; ch. 33) (Dickens, 2008).

This character is very stupid, but kind and loyal. The same book presents another character opposite both in character and speech, a mean Mr Flintwinch, whose favorite phrase is threat: "'Affery, woman", said Mr Flintwinch, with a friendly grin on his expressive countenance, "if you ever have a dream of this sort again, it'll be a sign of your being in want of physic. *And I'll give you such a dose, old woman – such a dose!*"' (par. 24-25; sent. 74-75; ch. 4) (Dickens, 2008). The novel "Little Dorrit" is extremely rich in such characters with pet phrases. One more negative personage changes names during the novel but he can be easily recognized by his talking about the features of his character. At the beginning of the novel being a Rigaud he says: "Now came the difficulties of our position. *I am proud. I say nothing in defence of pride, but I am proud. It is also my character to govern.* I can't submit; I must govern" (par. 85; sent. 235-237; ch. 1). Later under the name of Blandois he says: "*It's a part of my character. I am sensitive, ardent, conscientious, and imaginative.* A sensitive, ardent, conscientious, and imaginative man, Mr Flintwinch, must be that, or nothing!" (par. 86; sent. 258-260; ch. 30) (Dickens, 2008).

An interesting unusual, charming personage in the novel "Barnaby Rudge" is the raven. The Raven talks like a real person and he also has some pet phrases differentiating him from any other speaking member of the novel. "'– tle on", cried Grip, suddenly struck with an idea and very much excited. "– tle on. Hurrah! *Polly put the ket-tle on, we'll all have tea*; Polly put the ket-tle on, we'll all have tea. Hurrah, hurrah, hurrah! *I'm a devil, I'm a devil, I'm a ket-tle on, Keep up your spirits, Never say die, Bow, wow, wow, I'm a devil, I'm a ket-tle, I'm a – Polly put the ket-tle on, we'll all have tea*" (par. 88; sent. 229-233; ch. 17) (Dickens, 2009a). These words in various combinations are met through the whole novel creating

feeling of affection towards Grip and heavy preoccupation about his master. Jenny Wren from “Our Mutual Friend” has two favorite topics accompanied by her favorite words: her poor health and her future marriage. Thus she says: ““I can’t get up”, said the child, “because my back’s bad, and my legs are queer. But I’m the person of the house”. “I have been thinking”, Jenny went on, “as I sat at work to-day, what a thing it would be, if I should be able to have your company till I am married, or at least courted. Because when I am courted, I shall make Him do some of the things that you do for me. I’ll trot him about, I can tell him!”” (par. 76; sent. 170-173; ch. 18) (Dickens, 1998). A story “The Battle of Life” is not as rich in individually speaking characters, among them it can be mentioned Clemency the servant. This comic, but positive character constantly reads inscriptions on her favorite objects: a thimble and a nut-meg grater. ““It says”, replied Clemency, reading slowly round as if it were a tower, “*For-get and For-give*”. “The grater says”, returned Clemency, “*Do as you – wold – be – done by*”” (par. 157; ch. 1) (Dickens, 2017b). And the behavior of the character corresponds to her favorite words.

Captain Cuttle from “Dombey and Son” can be easily recognized by three linguistic features: pronouncing the name Walter as Wal’r, asking to mark the place in the Bible and using sailors’ vocabulary, for example: ““Wal’r, my boy”, replied the Captain, “in the Proverbs of Solomon you will find the following words”, “May we never want a friend in need, nor a bottle to give him!”. *When found, make a note of*” (par. 33; sent. 71-72; ch. 15) (Dickens, 2001a). Even such small linguistic unit as interjection can become a bright characteristic. While reading “Little Dorrit” it can be recognized who is speaking just seeing a short “ha” or “hem” which are inevitably connected with Mr Dorrit in both his life – in poverty and in welfare. It can be illustrated by the following examples: “Something, I – *hem!* – I don’t know what, has gone wrong with Chivery. He is not – *ha!* – not nearly so obliging and attentive as usual to-night. It – *hem!* – it’s a little thing, but it puts me out, my love” (par. 35; sent. 113; ch. 19). ““My dear”, said he to his younger daughter, “I beg you to – *ha* – to say no more. Your sister Fanny expresses herself strongly, but not without considerable reason. You have now a – *hum* – a great position to support. That great position is not occupied by yourself alone, but by – *ha* – by me, and – *ha hum* – by us”” (par. 32; sent. 95; ch. 39) (Dickens, 2008).

As far as syntax is concerned authors pay attention to the usage of certain types of sentences. The English language is characterized by full sentences including subject, predicate with link words etc. So such background makes an unusual sentence structure quite prominent and individualizing. The brightest example is the speech of Mr Jingle from “The Pickwick Papers” whose speech looks like this: ““Heads, heads – take care of your heads!” cried the loquacious stranger, as they came out under the low archway, which in those days formed the entrance to the coach-yard. “Terrible place – dangerous work – other day – five children – mother – tall lady, eating sandwiches – forgot the arch – crash – knock – children look round – mother’s head off – sandwich in her hand – no mouth to put it in – head of a family off – shocking, shocking! Looking at Whitehall, sir? – fine place – little window – somebody else’s head off there, eh, sir? – he didn’t keep a sharp look-out enough either – eh, Sir, eh?”” (par. 32; sent. 95; ch. 39) (Dickens, 2000).

Some characters prefer too long complicated sentences. Thus, Mr Pecksniff from “Martin Chuzzlewit” has the habit of constructing such sentences and repeating their structure. ““Ye-es, a youth”, said Mr Pecksniff. “He will avail himself of the eligible opportunity which now offers, for uniting the advantages of the best practical architectural education with the comforts of a home, and the constant association with some who (however humble their sphere, and limited their capacity) are not unmindful of their moral responsibilities”” (par. 37; sent. 110-111; ch. 2). Repetitions appear to be a powerful means of creating a bright character and they should warn an experienced reader not to believe a personage doing it. ““No, John”, said Mr Pecksniff, with a calmness quite ethereal; “no, *I will not shake hands*, John. *I have forgiven you. I had already forgiven you*, even before you ceased to reproach and taunt me. I have embraced you in the spirit, John, which is better than shaking hands”” (par. 81; sent. 206-207; ch. 2) (Dickens, 2009b). An old syntactic structure which had been known since the 16<sup>th</sup> century became popular as *wellerism* after Charles Dickens’s novel “The Pickwick Papers”. This mini-genre got its name after the person who often uses it – Sam Weller. *Wellerism* is a statement that includes as necessary components: a) a stable expression having usually high, bookish flavour; b) the author of the quoted remark whose personality opposes the previous message; c) the situation; the connections of these three components are of the specific nature of the discrepancy between the meaning of the expression and the application that it acquires in the context. Some best examples of *wellerisms* may be presented like this: “It’s over, and can’t be helped, and that’s one consolation, as they always says in Turkey, ven they cuts the wrong man’s head off or “if this don’t beat cock” fightin’ nothin’ never vill, as the lord mayor said, ven the chief secretary o’ state proposed his missis’s health arter dinner” (par. 57; sent. 63-67; ch. 39) (Dickens, 2000).

A wide usage of certain quotations should be considered a specific feature of “*idiostyle*” of some characters. A kind, light-hearted and gregarious Swiveller from “The Old Curiosity Shop” is full of poetry and all the time quotes poetic lines. “Mr Swiveller, after favouring us with several melodious assurances that his heart was in the Highlands, and that he wanted but his Arab steed as a preliminary to the achievement of great feats of valour and loyalty, removed his eyes from the ceiling and subsided into prose again” (par. 26; sent. 56; ch. 2). And again, Mr Swiveller says “remember the once popular

melody of Begone dull care; fan the sinking flame of hilarity with the wing of friendship; and pass the rosy wine” (par. 87; sent. 178; ch. 6) (Dickens, 2001b). Quotations with one’s own addition is one more interesting means of characterizing a personage by his speech. Silas Wegg from “Our Mutual Friend” earns money by cheating a naive Mr Boffin and one way of cheating is his pretending to be an educated man. Thus, he recites fragments of poetry with his own commentaries which look like this: On which occasion, as the ballad that was made about it describes:

“Beside that cottage door, *Mr Boffin*,

A girl was on her knees;

She held aloft a snowy scarf, *Sir*,

Which (*my eldest brother noticed*) fluttered in the breeze.

She breathed a prayer for him, Mr Boffin;

A prayer he could not hear.

And my eldest brother lean’d upon his sword, Mr Boffin,

And wiped away a tear” (par. 97; sent. 230-232; ch.5) (Dickens, 1998).

These and other example serve to prove that the linguistic palette of classical English enabled Ch. Dickens to make dozens of his minor characters as bright and rememberable as the major ones and sometimes even brighter. The Table 1 below summarizes these characters and their literary and linguistic features.

Table 1. Books, characters and speech characteristics

Novel	Character	Connotation	Speech peculiarity
The Pickwick Papers	Jingle	negative	syntactic level: clipped sentences
	foreigner at Leo Hunter’s	neutral	pronunciation
	Sam Weller	positive	dialectal words, wellerism
Nicholas Nickleby	Mr Mantalini	negative	rude pet phrases
	John Browdey	positive	Yorkshire dialectal words and pronunciation
The Old Curiosity Shop	Swiveller	positive, humoristic	poetry quotations
Barnaby Rudge	Raven	positive, animalistic	vocabulary
Martin Chuzzlewit	Penksniff	negative	long sentences
The Battle of Life	Clemency	positive humoristic	vocabulary
Dombey and Son	captain Cuttle	positive humoristic	vocabulary
David Copperfield	Barkis	positive humoristic	vocabulary, grammar mistake
Bleak House	Jo	positive	vocabulary
Hard Times	Gradgrind	negative	vocabulary
Little Dorrit	Mister Dorrit	negative	interjection, vocabulary
	Rigaud-Blandois-Flintwinch	negative	vocabulary
	Sparkler	in between	vocabulary
Great Expectations	Jo	positive	dialect, mistakes
Our Mutual Friend	Jenney Wren	positive	vocabulary
	Silas Wegg	negative	vocabulary
Mystery of Edwin Drood	Boy Deputy	neutral	mistakes
	Sapsea	negative	long sentences

Source: Ch. Dickens (1998; 2000; 2001a; 2001b; 2002; 2003; 2004; 2008; 2009a; 2009b; 2009c; 2009d; 2017a; 2017b).

The Table 1 shows the correlation of characters and their positive or negative function in the novel. The number of individualized characters is not limited by those in the Table 1.

## 5. Conclusions

This paper has provided an overview of the state of the literature concerning, introduced the research hypothesis. In paper authors draw broader conclusions than can be achieved by any investigation of characters' speech, to which end authors highlight gaps in the existing literature, which will be useful for generating avenues for further research. Also, authors introduce a modified version of the characters' speech complex analysis to aid in synthesizing and identifying successful research methods.

The masterpieces of Ch. Dickens have been researched for decades and centuries and are still in the center of attention of contemporary linguists. Being the greatest master of individualizing his characters by means of manner, mimics, possession etc. Ch. Dickens is incomparable in linguistic individualization, in creating a personage idiolect, a private language. According to calculations all these characters are minor, about 3 quarters of the are female and about 60 % are negatively marked. The main linguistic levels involved in this process are in descending order phonological (graphemic in written form), lexical, syntactic and stylistic.

## References

- Axelsson, K. (2009). Research on fiction dialogue: Problems and possible solutions. Retrieved from <https://cutt.ly/FI1w1Bv>
- Brook, G. L. (1970). *The language of Dickens*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Burrows, J. F. (1987). *Computation into criticism: A study of Jane Austen's novels and an experiment in method*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Çakir, H. (2011). Dickens and his memorable characterization. Retrieved from [www.core.ac.uk/download/pdf/153446833.pdf](http://www.core.ac.uk/download/pdf/153446833.pdf)
- Chesterton, G. K. (1986). *The collected works of G.K. Chesterton*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Craig, L. (2020). What Charles Dickens never said: Verifying Internet "Quotes" and accessing the works with online resources Dickens Quarterly. *Dickens Quarterly*, 37(3), 249-263. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dqt.2020.0033>
- de Haan, P. (1996). More on the language of dialogue in fiction. *Icame Journal*, 20, 23-40.
- Dickens, Ch. (1998). *Our Mutual Friend*. London: Penguin Book.
- Dickens, Ch. (2000). *The Pickwick Papers*. London: Penguin Book.
- Dickens, Ch. (2001a). *Dombey and Son*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dickens, Ch. (2001b). *The Old Curiosity Shop*. London: Penguin Book.
- Dickens, Ch. (2002). *Great Expectations*. London: Penguin Book.
- Dickens, Ch. (2003). *Bleak House*. London: Penguin Book.
- Dickens, Ch. (2004). *David Copperfield*. London: Penguin Book.
- Dickens, Ch. (2008). *Little Dorrit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dickens, Ch. (2009a). *Barnaby Rudge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/owc/9780199538201.003.0004>
- Dickens, Ch. (2009b). *Martin Chuzzlewit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/owc/9780199554003.001.0001>
- Dickens, Ch. (2009c). *Mystery of Edwin Drood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/owc/9780199554614.001.0001>
- Dickens, Ch. (2009d). *Nicholas Nickleby*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/owc/9780199538225.001.0001>
- Dickens, Ch. (2017a). *Hard Times*. Scotts Valley: CreateSpace.
- Dickens, Ch. (2017b). *The Battle of Life*. Traverse City: Independently publisher.
- Egbert, J., & Mahlberg, M. (2020). Fiction – one register or two? Speech and narration in novels. *Register Studies*, 2(1), 72-101. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rs.19006.egb>
- Fields, J. T. (1876). *In and out of doors with Charles Dickens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Finer, E. (2019). Dombey in Zhitomir, Pip in Taganrog: Reading Dickens “as if for life” in Russia. *The Modern Language Review*, 114(2), 316-335. <https://doi.org/10.5699/modelangrevi.114.2.0316>
- Golding, R. (1985). *Idiolects in Dickens*. London: Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-18021-9>
- Han, C. S. (2016). Pickwick’s other papers: Continually reading Dickens. *Victorian Literature and Culture*, 44(1), 19-41. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1060150315000406>
- Hubbard, E. H. (2002). Conversation, characterization and corpus linguistics: Dialogue in Jane Austen’s *Sense and Sensibility*. *Literator*, 23(2), 67-85. <https://doi.org/10.4102/lit.v23i2.331>
- Ireland, K. (2001). *The sequential dynamics of narrative: Energies at the margins of fiction*. London: Associated UPs.
- Jeong, M. J., Seo, I. S., Kang, M. S., Shin, C. W., Seok, J. O., Chung, Y. B., & Chung, J. K. (2022). A Critical Analysis on Vladimir Surin’s “Korean Manifesto”. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(3), 3776-3788. Retrieved from <https://journalppw.com/index.php/jpsp/article/view/2173/1342>
- Kim, I. S., Kenzhibayeva, G. S., Janpaizova, V. M., Kупenova, A. A., Dairabaeva, G. I., Esenbaeva, K. A., & Torebaev, B. P. (2020). Features of developing a concept of industrial copyright collections as a way of creative self-realization for designers. *Izvestiya Vysshikh Uchebnykh Zavedenii, Seriya Tekhnologiya Tekstil'noi Promyshlennosti*, 388(4), 148-152.
- Luu, Ch. (2016). *Charles Dickens and the Linguistic Art of the Minor Character*. Retrieved from <https://daily.jstor.org/charles-dickens-minor-characters/>.
- McGovern, K. (2018). *How did Charles Dickens expand the English language?* Retrieved from <https://cutt.ly/oI0sHa4>.
- Miller, A. (1997). Specters of Dickens’s study. *Narrative*, 5(3), 322-341.
- Oostdijk, N. (1990). The language of dialogue in fiction. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 5(3), 235-241. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lc/5.3.235>
- Orford, P. (2020). Speculation and silence: Reading Dickens by instalment in time, at the time and for our time. In: L. Litvack, N. Vanfasse (Eds.), *Reading Dickens Differently* (pp. 167-184). Hoboken: Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119602262.ch9>
- Page, N. (1970). Convention and consistency in Dickens’s Cockney dialect. *English Studies*, 51, 339-344.
- Page, N. (1973). *Speech in the English novel*. London: Humanities Press.
- Ruano San Segundo, P. (2016). A corpus-stylistic approach to Dickens’ use of speech verbs: Beyond mere reporting. *Language and Literature*, 25(2), 113-129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963947016631859>
- Sakibayev, S. R., & Sakibayeva, B. R. (2016). Strategies for increasing the academic performance of students at school-level computer programming lessons. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(46), 107572.
- Soto Vazquez, A. L. (2005). Charles Dickens makes fun of idiolects in Martin Chuzzlewit. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 18, 261-273. <https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2005.18.13>
- Stewart, G. (2001). Dickens and language. In: J. O. Jordan (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens* (pp. 136-151). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL0521660165.011>
- Tyler, D. (2018). *Dickens’s language*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198743415.013.43>
- Tyler, D. (Ed.). (2013). *Dickens’s style*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139236201>
- Yelubay, Y., Dzhussubaliyeva, D., Moldagali, B., Suleimenova, A., & Akimbekova, S. (2022). Developing future teachers’ digital competence via massive open online courses (MOOCs). *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 13(2), 170-195.

## Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.