

Literary and Colloquial English: Formality Differences between the Novel *Pride and Prejudice* and its Screen Adaptation

*Dr. Mehvish Riaz**

ABSTRACT: *Focusing on formality in the literary and colloquial registers, the study compares the text of the novel *Pride and Prejudice* to the script of its film adaptation released in 2005. To find out the formality differences between the novel and its adaptation, 62 extracts from the novel have been compared with the same number of relevant extracts from the movie script. The analysis is informed by the concept of formality expounded by Heylighen and Dewaele, formal links and coherence markers suggested by Cook, elaborate and economy features proposed by Finegan and Biber, and the features of colloquial speech identified by Iqbal. Results show that formality in the novel has been brought by elaboration and well-formedness caused by using lexical and syntactic devices, such as attributive adjectives, prepositional phrases, parallelism, and sentence length and structure maintained through logical connectors and lexical diversity. Contrarily, features such as phrases, contractions, tag questions, clipping, passive constructions, topic-comment structures, and incomplete utterances are the colloquial markers of ease and informality in the script, thus making it appear as casual and flexibly structured speech. The study has implications for stylistics and pragmatics.*

Keywords: Formality, *Pride and Prejudice*, Literary register, Colloquial style, Context.

* Email: mehvishriaz@ymail.com

As language is not a monolithic whole, it can be subdivided or categorized into a host of distinct varieties. A demarcation line can be drawn between inter-lingual (variation within a language) and intra-lingual (variation due to switching between or learning two or more languages) varieties. Another discernible distinction between language varieties can be made on the basis of styles and registers where styles are related to users and registers to use (Riaz and Ahmed). Halliday defines three constituents of register: field i.e., what is happening in the text, tenor i.e., who is taking part, and mode i.e., what part language is playing. Trudgill defines register as a term that refers to a language variety related to a specific topic, subject, or activity. For example, register of cooking, playing football, medicine, and law, etc. Style, according to Labov, is the amount of attention paid to speech.

Heylighen and Dewaele consider formality “to be the most important dimension of variation between styles or registers... Deep formality is defined as the avoidance of ambiguity by minimizing the context-dependence and fuzziness of expressions. This is achieved by an explicit and precise description of the elements of the context needed to disambiguate the expression. A formal style is characterized by detachment, accuracy, rigidity and heaviness; an informal style is more flexible, direct, implicit, and involved, but less informative” (1). Heylighen and Dewaele are of the view that much of what is explained and made visible through words in a written text is expressed through implicature in speech. The spatio-temporal contexts need to be demonstrated through word power and additional information in a text, whereas, generally, they naturally exist in speech. Heylighen and Dewaele suggest that the use of “deictic categories” (13-33) “including pronouns, exclamations, interjections, conjunctions, verbs, and adverbs are associated with informality, while the use or higher frequency of nouns, prepositional phrases, adjectives, articles, long sentences and difficult and large words is associated with formality” (Akhtar and Riaz 3). Cook is of the view that formal and contextual links are two ways of approaching language. He terms these links as cohesive devices. He distributes these devices into certain categories, such as verb forms, parallelism, referring expressions, repetition and lexical chains, conjunctions.

Finegan and Biber propose that registers and dialects vary in terms of the more formal and “literate” situations which require elaborated variants (i.e., prepositional phrase, attributive adjectives, and

lexical diversity) to be employed which are congruous with “clarity mandate” and more informal or oral situations which require economy variants (i.e. “contractions, that-deletion in verb complement clauses, referential pronoun “it” and pro-verb “do”) to be employed which are congruous with “ease mandate” (321-22). Finegan and Biber state, “...elaboration features, such as prepositional phrases, attributive adjectives, and lexical diversity represent greater clarity, but they also require more effort at production; economy features such as contractions, that-deletions, it pronoun and pro-verb do greater ease but lesser clarity and explicitness” (322). Finegan and Biber describe three situational parameters of variation across registers and dialects: the opportunity for careful production, purpose, and degree of shared context. These factors lead to the choice of either elaborated or economy variants. In their view, “because informational purposes are facilitated by greater elaboration and explicitness of form, informational registers favor the clarity mandate. And because the precise, elaborated expression is less crucial for interpersonal, affective purposes, speech activities with such purposes permit greater tolerance for the ease mandate” (323).

According to Yule, “the choice of one type of referring expression than another seems to be based, to a large extent on what the speaker assumes the listener already knows. In shared visual contexts, those pronouns that function as deictic expressions (e.g., ‘Take this’; ‘look at him’)” (23) may be sufficient for successful reference, but more elaborate noun phrase (e.g., Remember the old guy with funny looking hat?) may be used where identification seems more difficult. Yule further describes the types of reference namely anaphora, cataphora, and ellipsis (23). According to Iqbal, lexical features of colloquial speech, such as phrases, idioms, slang, contractions, clipping, reduplicative, rejoinders, pause fillers, and tag questions can be used to differentiate between informal style and a literary register.

The present study investigates the formality differences between literary and colloquial English used in *Pride and Prejudice* and its film adaptation. It finds out the differences between a style and a register, based on the degree of formality. It has been highlighted whether grammatical forms, frequency of literary devices, implicature or elaboration due to the presence or absence of a specific context, and the relationship between speakers cause variation in the levels of formality. Moreover, it also pinpoints how paralanguage and body language in the film compensate for the higher levels of formality in the novel.

This study investigates whether:

1. Diversity of language, grammatical forms and cohesive devices make an expression familiar or careful.
2. Formality is employed in specific texts and circumstances.
3. The effort to achieve the unstated assumptions (context with the help of deixis and reference) makes literary language more formal.
4. The main criteria for formality in speech are paralinguistic features and body language.

Bao differentiates movies and novels based on the visual images in the movie and verbal signs in the novel because the main distinction lies in showing and telling. Moody's review on the comparison between post-1971 and post-1995 movie versions of Jane Austen's novels revolves around feminism, characters, looks of heroes and heroines, use of music, action, gesture, scenic beauty, and the psychological spell created by them on the audience. Keles' research on the differences between the novel *Pride and Prejudice* and the film made on it is restricted to omissions in the film due to time factor and locale. The present study, however, is a comparative stylistic analysis of formality in the novel *Pride and Prejudice* and its film adaptation because it explores if and how the text of the novel is more formal or informal than the movie script and which linguistic choices, as pinpointed in the framework of this study, contribute to varying levels of formality in the novel and screen adaptation.

A film adaptation can be defined as "translation, transposition, recreation of written texts from a literary source such as novels, poems, short stories and plays into the cinematic mode" (Rahmoun 223). Though the concepts of consideration of the original and fidelity to the source text are important in adaptation studies, adaptation, like translation, may or may not adhere to the source material because it offers the filmmakers an opportunity to recreate or appropriate a text from another era according to their own times and perceptions. By reordering, modifying the duration, amplifying, dramatizing, sensualizing, and portraying components from the author's world to recontextualize and fit into a new medium, an adaptation creatively rearranges elements from the author's world to recontextualize and fit into a new medium (Jaana, Mushtaq and Akhtar; Rahmoun). At the same, it helps "draw attention to the literature" or source text and "set new trends in literature" (Zinnatullina et al. 258).

A film adaptation is, thus, a retelling of the stories through different readings of the text by the filmmaker or screenwriter. It is a creative

recreation of the original text on linguistic, contextual, thematic, and audiovisual levels. While authors and translators adopt various literary devices to defamiliarize their texts (Riaz; Riaz), filmmakers also refabricate the text to suit another genre and adopt unique cinematic and linguistic features to make the cinematic rendition impactful. Depending upon their cultural background, filmmakers also bring their “particular histories of literary and theatrical engagement” with the text (Burnett 41). Cultural influences also reorient the adaptation.

Though screen adaptations translate the long stretches of text into virtual reality to make the context visible, audible, enjoyable, and memorable for the audience, yet adaptations of literary works have “been downplayed as secondary, artistically inferior and subsidiary, and associated with popular culture rather than the high culture that makes the prestige of literature” (Rahmoun 224). On failing to capture the narrative, thematic and aesthetic effects, adaptations can also damage the effect of the source text. Adaptations are often compared to their source texts; however, a comparison is incomplete without considering the “why, how, and within what context” and for which audience the original text has been reproduced (Jaan, Mushtaq and Akhtar 152). The present study focuses on the modification of the linguistic choices based on formality made by the screenwriter and filmmaker to recreate the context in the screen adaptation of the novel *Pride and Prejudice*. The novel *Pride and Prejudice* written by Jane Austen, and the film with the same name, made on it have been used as primary data. *Pride & Prejudice* (2005) is a motion picture adaptation of the novel, “directed by Joe Wright and based on a screenplay by Deborah Moggach. It was released on September 16, 2005 in the UK, and on November 11, 2005 in the US” (*Pride & Prejudice*, Wikipedia). Data were analyzed qualitatively. The research was carried out by comparing the text of the novel and the script or dialogues of the film based on the markers of formality and informality suggested by Heylighen and Dewaele, Iqbal, Finegan and Biber, and Cook (see table 1).

Table 1
Framework Adapted to Study Formality Differences between Novel and Film

Markers of Formality	Markers of Informality
Elaboration, detachment, accuracy, rigidity and heaviness... nouns, adjectives, articles, prepositional phrases, difficult and large words, and long sentences ... (Heylighen and Dewaele, 1999)	Flexible, direct, implicit, and involved, but less informative style... pronouns, interjections, conjunctions, exclamations, verbs, and adverbs... (Heylighen and Dewaele, 1999)
Formal and contextual links or cohesive devices: verb forms, referring expressions, parallelism, repetition and lexical chains, and conjunctions (Cook, 1989)	Lexical features of colloquial speech such as phrases, idioms, slang, contractions, clipping, reduplicative, rejoinders, pause fillers and tag questions can be used to differentiate between informal style and a literary register. (Iqbal, 1999)
Prepositional phrase, attributive adjectives, and lexical diversity (Finegan and Biber, 1994)	Contractions, that-deletion, and referential pronoun "it (Finegan and Biber, 1994)

Comparison of Extracts from Novel and Film

The direct comparison of the extracts from the novel and the film in the following examples explicitly elucidates the differences in the use of features specific to literary and colloquial speech.

Novel: *"But what," said she, after a pause, "can have been his motive? What can have induced him to behave so cruelly?"*

"A thorough, determined dislike of me--a dislike which I cannot but attribute in some measure to jealousy. Had the late Mr. Darcy liked me less, his son might have borne with me better; but his father's uncommon attachment to me irritated him, I believe, very early in life. He had not a

temper to bear the *sort of competition in which we stood--the sort of preference which was often given me.*" (ch. 16)

Film:

Lizzie: *But why?*

Whickham: *Jealousy.*

Analysis: ‘*What can have been his motive*’ has been converted into ‘*Why?*’ in the script. A detailed account has been given in the novel, for a word ‘*Jealousy*’ used in the film. In this conversation that lasted the entire 16th chapter, expressions, such as ‘*estimated beyond their deserts*’, ‘*on my slightest acquaintance*’, ‘*delicacy of it prevented further inquiry*’, ‘*inducement to enter*’, ‘*forfeited all claim to it by extravagance, imprudence*’, ‘*despising*’ and ‘*suspect him of descending to such malicious revenge*’ undoubtedly make it a highly formal speech because script is devoid of such expressions that mark objectivity and a high-headed formality.

A host of attributive adjectives has also been adopted which is actually considered to be a feature of literary language, for example, ‘*most threadbare topic*’, ‘*ill-tempered man*’, ‘*thousand tender recollections*’, ‘*intelligible gallantry*’, ‘*conditional recommendation*’, ‘*unguarded temper*’, ‘*A thorough, determined dislike*’, ‘*malicious revenge*’, ‘*active superintendence*’, ‘*voluntary promise*’, and ‘*conversable companion*’, etc. Contrarily, the extract from the script consists of simple statements having no attributive adjective and longer sentences.

Novel: Full 19th Chapter

“...The next day opened a new scene at Longbourn. Mr. Collins made his declaration in form. Having resolved to do it without loss of time, as his leave of absence extended only to the following Saturday, and having no feelings of *diffidence*... *To such perseverance in wilful self-deception* Elizabeth would make no reply...and whose behavior at least could not be mistaken for the affectation and coquetry of an elegant female...”

Film:

“*Mr. Collins: Mrs. Bennet, I was hoping, if it would not trouble you, that I might solicit a private audience with Miss Elizabeth.*

Mrs. Bennet: Oh, certainly, Lizzie would be very happy indeed. Everyone, out. Mr. Collins would like a private audience with your sister.

Lizzie: Wait, Mr. Collins can have nothing to say to me that anybody need not hear.

Mrs. Bennet: I desire you will stay where you are. Everyone else to the drawing room.

Mr. Bennet. - But... Now.

Lizzie: Jane. Jane, don't... Jane! - Jane.

Lizzie: Papa, stay.

Mr. Collins: Dear Miss Elizabeth, my attentions have been too marked to be mistaken. Almost as soon as I entered the house, I singled you out as the companion of my future life... And now nothing remains but for me to assure you in the most animated language of the violence of my affections.

Lizzie: Mr. Collins! You forget I have given no answer."...

Lizzie: Sir, I am honoured by your proposal, but I regret that I must decline it."...

Mr. Collins: I must conclude that you simply seek to increase my love by suspense, according to the usual practice of elegant female.

Lizzie: I am not the sort of female to torment a respectable man. Please understand me, I cannot accept you."

Analysis: In the 19th chapter of the novel, Mr. Collins' proposal to Elizabeth has been described. The proposal is made in almost one and a half page, and the rest of the chapter is devoted to her refusal and Collins' insistence upon the suitability of the match. The dialogues are very long and well-structured in the novel. In the novel, a whole chapter is devoted to this purpose, whereas, though a bit of coherence is observed in the film, yet variations are found in sentence length, directness, and explicitness of the content. Moreover, Collins' language has an air of glorification and formality because he is a clergyman. Various phrases have been used in the construction of the script, for example, Mrs. Bennet's order to her family to leave the room. Elizabeth's baffled state of mind is also reflected through her scrappy expressions which endow a sense of fragmentation to her utterances.

Mr. Collins' speeches delegate the unique quality of the inimitable style of Jane Austen who, in Page's opinion puts several stretches of speech by the same person, at the same place, which diminishes the chance of interruption by the decoder and consequently generates a longer speech with no interruption or fragmentation. Most of Elizabeth's statements are interminably different from their film substitutes, with the former displays a greater tendency to contain embedded clauses, formal links, punctuation marks, prepositional

phrases, and lexical diversity and complexity, while the latter demonstrates an utter bereavement of glamour.

Novel: "And this is all the reply which I am to have the honour of expecting! I might, perhaps, wish to be informed why, with so little *endeavour at civility*, I am thus rejected. But it is of small importance." (ch. 34)

Film:

Darcy: Is this your reply?

Lizzie: Yes, sir.

Darcy: Are you laughing at me?

Lizzie: No.

Darcy: Are you rejecting me?"

Analysis: Short yes, no questions have been asked, instead of longer and highly planned sentence in literary extract consisting of expression such as, 'wish to be informed... at civility'. It is superb example of the discrimination between elaborate and economy features suggested by Finegan and Biber.

Novel: "I was never more surprised than by his behavior to us. It was more than civil; it was really attentive..." "To be sure, Lizzy," said her aunt, "he is not so handsome as Wickham; or, rather, he has not Wickham's countenance, for his features are perfectly good. But how come you to tell me that he was so disagreeable?" (ch. 43)

Film:

Mrs. Gardner: He's asked us to dine with him tomorrow. He was very civil, was he not?

Mr. Gardner: Very civil.

Mrs. Gardner: Not at all how you'd painted him.

Analysis: Elizabeth's aunt and uncle are telling her of the behavior of Mr. Darcy towards them. In the text, they admire him in an integrated language, for example, 'so...as', and 'or, rather, but', etc. are used to merge smaller sentences. In speech, contractions, a tag question, and a phrase, '*very civil*', enhance the effect of naturalness.

The analysis of 62 extracts from the novel, as well as their corresponding extracts from the film shows that at several points, Jane Austen has explicitly elaborated certain ideas and situations which, by

contrast, Deborah Maggoch did not do in the script. Through a keen observation of the modes of usage of these devices and words in the novel, as well as the film, it is perspicuous that larger and different or unusual words are employed in the literary language, while simple or commonly used words are employed in the colloquial. For example, *barefaced questions*, *ingenious suppositions*, *distant surmises* (ch. 3), *affectation of candour* (ch. 4), *silent indignation* (ch. 6), and *restless ecstasy* (ch. 41), etc. have been used in the novel. It has been observed that in the literary text, elaborated features (i.e., attributive adjectives, prepositional phrases, and lexical diversity) identified by Finegan and Biber have been enormously employed and vice versa. The following examples of attributive adjectives, prepositional phrases and lexical diversity may help illustrate the point:

Attributive adjectives: *inexhaustible subject* (ch. 25), *miraculous virtue* (ch. 29), *instantaneous conviction* (ch. 57), and *exceedingly awkward* (ch. 59), etc.

Prepositional phrases: “Amongst the most violent against him was Mrs. Bennet, whose dislike *of* his general behaviour was sharpened *into* particular resentment *by* his having slighted one *of* her daughters.” (ch. 3)

Lexical diversity: “But, however this *remonstrance* might have *staggered* or delayed his determination, I do not suppose that it would *ultimately have prevented* the marriage, had it not been *seconded* by the assurance that I hesitated not in giving, of your sister's indifference.” (ch. 35)

It is, thus, inferred that literary text widely employs attributive adjectives, prepositional phrases, and unusual and different words which contribute to lexical diversity. On the other hand, ‘economy features’ such as that-deletions and contractions have been identified at various points in the script. Other features of literary language such as the use of transitional words, syntactical hypotaxis, lexical richness and parallelism identified by Page and Cook have also been found.

Sentence length: The examples given below elucidate that lexical density and complexity are present in this text because linking devices, in the form of transitional verbs do exist to prolong the length of the sentence. Apart from formal and contextual links, the marks of punctuation also play a vital role in elongating the sentences. For

example: “*In the first place*, she persisted in disbelieving the whole of the matter; *secondly*, she was very sure that Mr. Collins had been taken in; *thirdly*, she trusted that they would never be happy together; and *fourthly*, that the match might be broken off. Two inferences, *however*, were plainly deduced from the whole: *one*, that Elizabeth was the real cause of the mischief; *and the other* that she herself had been barbarously misused by them all; *and* on these two points she principally dwelt during the rest of the day.” (ch. 23). Syntactic complexity is positively correlated with formality (Larsson and Kaatari). Larsson and Kaatari also found that expert writers make more frequent use of adjectival and prepositional modifiers than learners. Therefore, due to phrase-level syntactic complexity, British expert writers’ discourse is more formal.

Heyligan and Dewaele (1999) consider clarity created through the elimination of ambiguity as essential for a formal text. Sentence length and elaboration in the novel are means to eliminate ambiguity and bring clarity, the reason being that the literary text should be made lucid due to the absence of the visual setting and atmosphere already present in the case of spoken language. In the film, as the context is already shared by the speakers and made visible to the audience with the help of locale, body language, light-effects, music, and dance, etc., so it is not incumbent upon the writer of the script to unleash the intricacies of the context because it is already understood and perspicuous. The writer of the literary text, however, needs to stamp an impression of the validity and credibility of the happenings and incidents by making them perceptible through elaboration. In the case of this novel, several stretches of information have been narrated by the author, and they have sometimes taken a full chapter for this purpose.

Formal links identified by Cook have been extensively observed in the text. Conjunctions, parallelism, and verb forms, etc. have been observed to be a valuable source of linking and shaping the text. Linking devices such as *however*, *moreover*, *since*, *firstly*, *secondly*, and *because*, etc., as well as punctuation, repetition of words, and anaphoric references, have been observed to be responsible for the coherence of the text. Many instances of parallelism have also been found. Cook identifies parallelism as one of the formal links that hold the text together which turns it into a literary text. For example, “they could describe an entertainment with accuracy, relate an anecdote with humour, and laugh at their acquaintance with spirit.” (ch. 11). According to Baleghizadeh and Asadi, due to different use of linguistic devices, the formality levels of the articles

written by native and non-native speakers of English are also medium and high, respectively.

Language of the Script Based on the levels of Formality

On the contrary, the language of the film, at times, displays abruptness and disjointedness. The dialogues dispel the cultivated sophistication and exquisite exhibition of manner, form, or style, replacing it with a guileless candour and inherent ease, flow, and naturalness. The features pinpointed by Iqbal have been observed in the speech of the characters in the film. Tag questions and contractions, such as *I've*, *he'd*, *didn't*, *it's*, and *can't*, etc., pause fillers, such as *you know* or *I mean*, etc., rejoinders, such as *how wonderful*, *indeed*, *of course*, and *precisely*, etc., phrases, such as *the miserable half* by Lizzie, and *a very agreeable alternative* by Collins, etc., clippings of names, such as *Lizzie* or *Kitty*, etc., exclamations, such as *oh!*, and topic-comment structures or passive constructions have been excessively found in the script. These features enhance the ease and economy of the speech and maintain a casualness and straightforwardness, thus, shunning away the richness of the literary text. Though the dialogues have been derived from the text and various sentences are copied from the novel, they give a colloquial effect.

Colloquial speech is chosen in the script to easily get the message across and to maximize its spontaneity and acceptability not only for native speakers but also second language learners. It contains pauses, hesitations, incomplete sentences, interruptions, loosely structured or linked utterances, and slips of the tongue, which characterize real-life language because more formal expressions appear to be mechanical, artificial, and inappropriate in this context.

In the script, rapid fragmentation, and enormous ease due to the abundant use of the features of colloquial speech have been observed. In a conversation between Charlotte and Elizabeth in a ball, the former says *'I didn't know you were coming to see me'* which exhibits 'that' omission. In the same conversation, (line 87), Lizzie utters *'precisely'* which is a rejoinder. 'That omission' has also been observed at many points as in: *'it's quite certain, he's coming'* spoken by Mrs. Bennet (line 1040), *'that's the most unforgiving speech you've ever made'* spoken by Elizabeth (line 1132), and *'if that is the case, you cannot suppose he would make an offer to me'* spoken by Elizabeth (line 1166). Various

rejoinders have been used on different occasions in the film, for example, '*she is indeed*' by Bingley; '*of course not*' by Bingley (line 170), and '*I do. Absolutely*' by Darcy (line 201). In the conversation between Elizabeth and Wickham about the misconduct of Darcy, plenty of rejoinders and phrases or incomplete statements have been used. A bunch of phrasal verbs and idioms are also used, for instance, '*all in uproar*', '*taken off*', '*came off*', '*get along*', and '*like anything*', etc.

Phrases and incomplete or loosely structured statements in the form of precise answers or comments have been frequently used, such as in the following examples: '*the miserable half*' spoken by Elizabeth in her conversation with Charlotte (line 52), '*Not his friend*' by Elizabeth while talking to Jane about her tendency to think well of people (line 118), '*A little unpatriotic*' spoken by Caroline while confabulating with Darcy about the decoration of a ballroom (line 157), '*such expensive furnishings*' by Mrs. Bennet on her visit along with her daughters to Mr. Bingley (line 236), '*Very little*' spoken by Elizabeth while dancing with Darcy and discussing Wickham (line 441), and '*Very short. Nothing about her family*' spoken by Mrs. Bennet while apprising Mr. Bingley of the present situation on his arrival at their home (line 1065). During the same conversation, another phrase i.e., '*At least three courses*' (line 1086) is spoken by her. '*Just a small misunderstanding*' spoken by Elizabeth to her mother at the departure of Lady Catherine from their house (line 1181) is another example of the same sort. There are other phrases that have not been used as phrases in the text of the novel, such as '*perfectly tolerable*' spoken by Bingley, and '*not handsome enough to tempt me*' spoken in turn by Darcy.

The following example aptly illustrates the difference between well-formed sentences from the text and phrases from the script.

Novel: "Can I have the carriage?" said Jane.

"No, my dear, you had better go on horseback, because it seems likely to rain; and then you must stay all night."

Film:

Lizzie: Mama, the carriage for Jane?

Mrs. Bennet: Certainly not. She'll go on horseback.

Lizzie and Jane: Horseback!

Besides rejoinders, contractions and pause fillers have also been used, as in the following example, *'I mean'* and *'of course not'* have been used as pause fillers, *'it's a pleasure'* as a rejoinder, and *'it's'* and *'she's'* are contractions.

Mr. Bingley: 'It's a pleasure. I mean, it's not a pleasure that she's ill. Of course not. It's a pleasure that she's here, being ill.'

There are also incomplete statements in which the characters remain unable to communicate their purpose fully, as in the following examples derived from the script: *'So, I feel...'* spoken by Bingley when he, along with Darcy, visits Bennet family (line 1090), *'It was suggested...'* and *'There was, however, your family...'* spoken by Darcy while talking to Elizabeth about the causes of the break up between Mr. Bingley and Jane (lines 768, 771), *"You don't know him Papa... what he's done..."*, and *'Papa, I ...'* during her conversation with her father on the issue of her marrying Mr. Darcy.

Tag questions have also been markedly used, as in: *'You don't mind delaying our journey another day, do you?'* spoken by Mrs. Garner on their visit to Darcy's house where Elizabeth's aunt and uncle portray Darcy in very favourable terms (line 912). Two more examples of tag questions have been given in the following:

1. *Mr. Bingley: 'Absolutely, I find the country very diverting. Don't you agree, Darcy?'*

2. *Mrs. Bennet: 'But Miss Lizzie, next to her in age and beauty, would make anyone an excellent partner. Do not you agree? Mr. Collins?'* (Tag question)

Mr. Collins: 'Indeed. Indeed. A very agreeable alternative.' (Rejoinder and phrases) (ch. 15).

Repetition is a common feature of speech which has been taken advantage of in the script. For example, the repetition in the following dialogue is not found in its substitute in the novel.

Darcy: 'You must know. Surely you must know it was all for you.'

Cutajar considers the availability of time as the vital factor in the formality differences stating that "speech is time-based, active and does not last long... We usually think while talking and this results in looser construction, repetition, rephrasing, and comment clauses... speech also

contains loudness, tempo, rhythm, and other intonations and pauses that cannot be easily transmuted to the written form...Writing, on the other hand, is space-bound, static and permanent..." (1). Brown and Yule also pinpoint that spoken language is syntactically less structured, contains many incomplete sentences--often a series of phrases and little subordination. They attribute the coherence and formality found in writing to an "extensive set of meta-lingual markers" or "logical connectors" and rhetorical organizers of larger stretches of discourse. They state, "The speaker is typically less explicit than the writer" (16).

Speakers use "topic-comment structures", gaze directions to supply a referent, repetition of syntactic forms, gap fillers, and generalized vocabulary (e.g., stuff, things like that, thing, got, and do, etc.). Warvik also holds emotional expressions and colloquial items responsible for involvement in speech and nouns, adjective phrases, prepositions, and longer words for detachment in written discourse. Hellman juxtaposes various perspectives on coherence in a single study. From his point of view, coherence becomes a distinguishing mark between a text and a non-text. Liardét, Black and Bardetta suggest that the use of infelicitous clause-level grammar, grammatical intricacy, informal lexis, and human interaction even make the students' essays informal. According to Heylighen and Dewaele, formality is an "attempt to avoid ambiguity...formal language will avoid ambiguity by including the information about the context...by explicitly stating the necessary references, assumptions and background knowledge which would have remained tacit in an informal expression of the same meaning". Heylighen and Dewaele, and Finegan and Biber emphasize the need for clarity in a formal or literary text because the context is not already understood. In this research too, the term formality implies the requirement and eventual fulfillment of clarity through elaboration and explicitness brought through lexical and syntactic means.

Formality and Nonverbal Cues

In the film, formality in speech has been acquired by the use of language, paralanguage, and body language. The findings indicate that in the film, they have been effectively used to transmit the feelings of characters but are also used to communicate formality, as well as informality by way of a controlled serene and cautions tone for conveying the former and a hostile, abrupt, and crude or jerky tone for transferring the latter. Characters in this film bow so many times while meeting and

parting. This gesture shows humbleness, a well-behaved demeanor, and decency. It also reflects the tendency to be formal because they bow, especially when they meet people other than the members of their own families (Riaz and Ahmed). Another indicator of formality is the posture of the characters because they stand straight and balances when they are meant to be formal, whereas walk, jump or move when they are supposed to be informal. For example, when Bennet sisters accompanied by Mr. Wickham happen to see Mr. Bingley and Darcy who were riding their horses, the body language of Lydia shows ease and informality because she displays a playful and joyful mood through her body language as well as her chirping tone. On the other hand, the posture of Mr. Collins in his meeting with Lady Catherine manifests height of formality because he is standing straight with a bowed head. His words "*Your Ladyship*" have been accompanied by a bow and a mild and serene tone. In another scene where Darcy expresses his love for Elizabeth for the first time, she yells at him in response and her facial expression and tone play a significant role in conveying the harshness of her feelings. It simultaneously diminishes her tendency to be formal towards Darcy. In another scene in a ball, Darcy offers Elizabeth to dance with her in a formal expression i.e., "*May I have the next dance?*" and reduced stiffness in his tone. Aggression and irritation are visible through the tone of Elizabeth when Mr. Collins proposes to her. On the rejection of the proposal by her, the body language and tone of Mrs. Bennet show an extreme kind of casualness. She is shown as running after Elizabeth, screaming, and informally yelling at her. Formality in speech is also the same as in writing, in the sense that it also manifests a careful attitude.

Change in Formality due to Change in Situation or Relationship

It has also been found that levels of formality change according to a change in situation or relationship among the speakers. This point can be elucidated in three ways. Firstly, the dialogues in the novel have sometimes been given colloquial touches by employing quite a few of the features of colloquial speech, such as repetition, contractions, and exclamations. Despite that, they differ from those in the film in many ways. Secondly, the language of the letters in the novel is formal. Thirdly, the formality of language increases when the characters are put into a serious situation, for example, Collins's proposal to Elizabeth, his speech as a clergyman in the church, Charlotte's speech on her acceptance of the proposal of Mr. Collins, and conversation between Wickham and Elizabeth about Mr. Darcy's unjust attitude, etc. On the other hand, with

the change in the situation, the formality of speech may also diminish. For example, Jane's positive remarks on Mr. Bingley, the conversation between Elizabeth and her father in the last chapters of the novel, and by the end of the film are almost similar. Formality is also dependent upon the relationship of the speakers because the structures of language become more and more intricate when the conversation takes place between Mr. Collins and another person, Mr. Darcy, and Elizabeth or Mr. Bingley and Mrs. Bennet, etc., whereas they tend to be lax if it takes place between Jane and Elizabeth and Mr. Bingley or among other members of the Bennet family.

Conclusion

Based on formality, the literary and colloquial varieties of English display a remarkable distinction. They show a deep contrast in their richness and diversity of language due to the distinctive pragmatic use of linguistic devices, with the former manifesting a prominent degree of formality and control and the latter, a distinctive level of simplicity and naturalness. In written discourse, formal and contextual links or cohesive devices work like fibers tightly knitting the discourse and adding structural integration and coherence, whereas, in speech, their role is diminished. There is also a colossal difference between elaboration and precision caused by the context-dependence of the utterances. The literary language requires more elaboration and explicitness because the writer needs to make every situation clear to the reader. On the other hand, in speech, this kind of elaboration is not required because the context is most of the time already explicit. Paralanguage and body language make formality possible in speech whereas punctuation marks, parallelism, sentence length, sentence structure, and lexical diversity bring formality to literary language.

The degree of formality varies depending on the text and circumstances, and formality is only used for specific texts. Based on the framework employed to study the formality difference between the novel and its screen adaptation in this research, it has been observed that the novel may take eight pages to describe something which can be described in two minutes on the screen. The main reason is that since a novel cannot show pictures, it must help envision what a film can show. Such elaboration makes the literary text more formal. Furthermore, the relationship between speakers also brings variation in the level of formality in the script or speech.

Suggestions and Recommendations

The study can be used in teaching the features of formality and informality. With the help of screen literature, the second language learners can be exposed to colloquial language. Vocabulary, sentence length, literary devices, and interpretation of the text through these features can be taught through text. Students can be given passages from literary text to comprehend, summarize, correct, complete, and rewrite. Corpus studies can be carried out on the comparison of the lexical and grammatical features of various texts, such as emails and text messages. The correlation of context and formality in Pakistani literature in English, the special effect of literary devices used in literature and screen literature, the impact of filmmaker's socio-cultural background on adaptations, and cultural aspects of nonverbal communication in films can also be studied. Urdu novels and their adaptations can also be compared to understand if certain contextual features are amplified.

Works Cited

- Akhtar, Raheela, and Mehvish Riaz. "Formality in Academic Writing: Investigating Stylistic Competence of undergraduate EFL learners." *UW Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2019, pp. 1-20.
- Baleghizadeh, Sasan, and Faria Asadi. "A Comparative Study of Text Formality of Applied Linguistics Papers Written in English by Iranian and Native Speaking Researchers." *Journal of Language Horizons*, 2022, doi: 10.22051/lghor.2021.30138.1472
- Bo, Bao. "The Difference between Novels and Films: Enhance Literature Teaching by Using Films". 2008, <http://www.teacher.org.cn/doc/ucedu200807/ucedu20080707.pdf>.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Burnett, Mark Thornton. "Shakespeare and Keraliyatha: Romeo and Juliet, adaptation, and South Indian cinemas." *Cahiers Élisabéthains: A Journal of English Renaissance Studies*, vol. 105, no. 1, 2021, pp. 41-59, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0184767821999984>
- Cook, Guy. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Cutajar, Maria. *Speech and Writing*. 2009, <http://www.helium.com/items/1694513-speech-and-writing>
- Finegan, Edward, and Douglas Biber. "Register and Dialect Variation: An Integrated Approach." *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Register*, edited by Douglas Biber, and Edward Finegan, Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 315-347.
- Halliday, Michael. A. Kirkwood. *Learning to Mean—Explorations in the Development of Language*. London: Edward Arnold, 1975.
- Hellman, Christina. "Coherence as a Formal Property of Texts." *Focus and Coherence in Discourse Processing*, edited by Rickheit Gert and Habel Christopher, Walter de Gruyter, 1995, pp. 191-196.
- Heylighen, Francis, and Jean-Marc Dewaele. "Formality of Language: Definition, Measurement

- and Behavioral Determinants.” 1999, <http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/papers/Formality.pdf>
- Iqbal, Zafar. “Lexical Features of Colloquial Speech.” *Journal of Research (Humanities)*, vol. 16, 1999, pp. 49-59.
- Jaan, Ghulam Maaz, Hammad Mushtaq, and Amer Akhtar. “Film Adaptation of Saadat Hasan’s Short Stories in Manto: A Postmodern Critique.” *Global Social Sciences Review*, vol. VI, no. II, 2021, pp. 150-166, [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021\(VI-II\).16](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021(VI-II).16)
- Keles, Veysel. *Pride and Prejudice, Differences between the Movie and the Novel*. 2009, <http://weblog.veyselkeles.com/2009/06/pride-and-prejudice-differences-between.html>
- Labov, William. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.
- Larsson, Tove, and Henrik Kaatari. “Syntactic complexity across registers: Investigating (in) Formality in Second Language Writing.” *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 45, 100850, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100850>
- Liardét, Cassi L., Sharyn Black, and Vani Sharren Bardetta. “Defining formality: Adapting to the Abstract Demands of Academic Discourse.” *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 38, pp. 146-158, doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2019.02.007
- Long, D. L., & Graesser, A. C. “Difference between Oral and literary Discourse: The Effect of Pragmatic Information on Recognition Memory.” *Empirical study of literature: Proceedings of the second IGEL conference-Amsterdam*, edited by, Elrud Ibsch Dick H. Schram, Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1991, pp. 105-110.
- Moody, Ellen. “Jane Austen on Film: Or How to Make a Hit.” *Jimandellen.org*, 2003, <http://www.jimandellen.org/austen/janeausten.onfilm.html>
- Page, Norman. “Forms of Speech in Fiction.” *The language of Literature*, edited by Norman Page, The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1973, pp. 83-99.
- Pride & Prejudice, 2005, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pride_%26_Prejudice_\(2005_film\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pride_%26_Prejudice_(2005_film))

- Rahmoun, Omar. "Film Adaptation between the Pride of Literature and the Prejudice of Inferiority." *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2021, pp. 222-236, <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol4no1.18>
- Riaz, Mehvish. "Stylistic Deviation and Pakistani Idiom: Creative Use of English in Moni Mohsin's *Duty Free*." *Creativity Studies*, vol. 15, 2022, In press.
- Riaz, Mehvish. "Foregrounding and Creative Translation: Stylistic Deviation in the English Translation of Bulleh Shah's Poetry." *Kalich Research Journal*, vol. 7, 2021, pp. 57-71.
- Riaz, Mehvish, and Ahmed, Khalid. *Language Varieties: A Comparative Analysis of the Formality Differences between Literary and Colloquial English Language*. LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012.
- Trudgill, Peter. *Introducing Language and Society*. England: Clays Ltd, 1992.
- Warvick, Brita. "When you Read or Hear this Story Read: Issue of Orality and Literacy in Old English Texts." *Discourse Perspective on English: Medieval to Modern*, edited by Risto Hiltunen, and Janne Skaffari, John Benjamin Publishing Company, 2003, pp. 13-55.
- Yule, George. *Pragmatics*. USA: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Zinnatullina, Zulfia, Diana Davletbaeva, and Reseda Mukhametshina. "Literature and Cinema: Ways of Interaction in the 21st Century." *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, vol. 10 no. 4, 2019, pp. 357-369