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ABSTRACT
Parallel structure is one linguistic feature implemented to bring aesthetics to the delivery of the English language. Traditional grammar and writing classes usually emphasize that parallelism must be observed when the language is used. In literature, as well as in real-life usage, however, parallelism is often flaunted to effect various purposes, a fact that is generally overlooked in grammar classrooms. In the present study, the concept of linguistic markedness is applied to the investigation of the parallel structure in Alice Munro’s short story “Amundsen” in order to explore the pragmatic usage of parallelism, as opposed to the grammatical usage listed in general commercial grammar textbooks and to answer the research question: How and for what purposes is parallel structure flaunted in Alice Munro’s short story “Amundsen”? The investigation of the marked parallel structure in Alice Munro’s short story “Amundsen” shows that approximately one out of four instances of parallel structure is flaunted to effect emphasis, exaggeration, elaboration and evaluation, which affirms that parallelism is routinely observed as well as purposefully flaunted to bring about linguistic flavours that reflect hands-on usage of the language.

INTRODUCTION
The instruction of the English grammar has been part of the general EFL (English as a Foreign Language) pedagogy worldwide for over 50 years (Graham, 2011, p.30), at various degrees of involvement of different approaches and approval from the concerned academic community. Proponents of grammar instruction, those favouring the grammar-translation and cognitive approaches, for example, promote language accuracy through explicit grammar teaching and learning, convinced that by providing grammar rules and practice, learners “can induce or deduce meaningful hints out of these rules.” (Zhonggang Gao, 2001, as cited in Graham, 2011, p.36) Others offer opposing views and project their preferences for communicative, task-based learning and language discovery approaches, arguing that learners only require sufficient exposure to the target language in context for acquisition to occur (Krashen, 1982, as cited in Graham, 2001, p.36). Braddock, Lloyd-Jones and Schoer even claim that formal grammar could cause a harmful effect on the improvement of writing. (Martinsen, 2000, p.123)

In spite of the discrepancy in the conviction for the pedagogical merit of grammar instruction, many EFL teachers still rely on deductive methods to introduce grammar in language classrooms. They explain the rules and give examples of how these rules are applied in the language structure.

Many use commercial grammar textbooks as references as well as sources of practice exercises for their students. These textbooks usually detail rigid rules of the English grammar and provide exercises designed to encourage learners to apply those rules in the English structure. Although this methodical approach to grammar instruction proves efficient for rote learning, it is devoid of the practical merit of language in use where structural exemptions abound.

One such grammatical structure that often begs to be flaunted (Note 1), especially for communicative purposes, is the parallel structure, or parallelism. Parallel structure dictates “the repetition of the chosen grammatical form within a sentence.” (Evergreen Writing Center, n.d.) The concept and implementation of parallelism is usually introduced in a more advanced English class, most often in a writing class, as it involves the understanding of the English language and its structural mechanisms taught in basic English classes, e.g. parts of speech, cohesive devices and sentence types as well as the appreciation of “the power of balance and rhythm” and “another way to marry content and style.” (Martinsen, 2000, p.122) Parallelism is said to clarify and increase the readability of the writing by creating word patterns that can be followed easily by readers (Evergreen Writing Center, n.d.), and is a structural element usually instructed to be strictly observed by EFL students. It constitutes a trouble area...
in a 10-point checklist of problem areas in English structure. (King & Stanley, 1996, pp.255-265) Parallelism is regarded as such an important aspect of proficient language use that it features regularly in standardized English proficiency tests. It is a recurring element of the Structure and Written Expression section of TOEFL PBT and TOEIC and in other international-level tests such as Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) as well as national-level English proficiency tests such as Chulalongkorn University Test of English Proficiency (CU-TEP) and Thammasat University General English Test (TU-GET) in Thailand. The repetition of linguistic forms, moreover, creates rhythm, aesthetics, expectation and fulfillment effective in persuasive and literary writing. Kennedy & Gioia (2007, p.196) give a poetic example of a “neat” manipulation of parallels (when a pair of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences are put side by side in agreement or similarity) and antitheses (when they are juxtaposed in contrast and opposition) in John Denham’s lines on the river Thames:

O could I flow like thee, and make thy stream
My great example, as it is my theme!
Though deep, yet clear; though gentle, yet not dull;
Strong without rage, without o’erflowing full.

However, in real-life usage, especially in communicative English, idealized language such as that taught and honed in grammar classrooms is not always ideally effective. Rules are often bent, violated or disregarded to allow for situation-specific expressions. Parallelism, as mentioned earlier, is one such rule that is flaunted fairly frequently in communicative English to achieve conversational aims of emphasis, interruption, exaggeration, and so on. While these cases of grammatical digression are allowed in practical usage mainly by native speakers, they can cause confusion among EFL learners who have been trained to use only “perfect” English grammar. In addition, for many EFL students, encountering real usage of contextual English is not a frequent occurrence, many of them being in the context where English is hardly, if ever, used outside of the classroom. For such EFL learners, literature offers a rich alternative to experience context-based language use at the learners’ own pace. Although it cannot be denied that the words in literary works are constructed and planned, and, thus, cannot be a perfect substitute for firsthand exposure to the spontaneous use of the target language, literature as a reflection of life serves as a handy alternative representing the verisimilitude of real language use.

This study, therefore, aims to investigate the marked parallel structure in Alice Munro’s short story titled “Amundsen” to discover how and for what purposes the parallel structure is flaunted, under the hypothesis that in “real” language usage, as represented in the short story, the grammatical feature of parallel structure can be routinely observed as well as purposefully flaunted in order to bring about emotional coloring that is a landmark of communicative English.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Parallel Construction

Kathleen Jones White Writing Center of Indiana University of Pennsylvania (n.d.) defines parallelism as “a similarity of grammatical form for similar elements of meaning within a sentence or among sentences” used in series, comparisons, lists and headings, and connected with coordinating conjunctions (e.g. and, but, or, nor, yet) and correlative conjunctions (e.g. either…or, not only…but also). The rule of parallelism dictates that “single words should be balanced with single words, phrases with phrases, clauses with clauses” and cautions that when parallel structure is violated, “a sentence will be needlessly awkward.” (Kathleen Jones White Writing Center, n.d.)

Kennedy & Gioia (2007, p.111) explain the term “parallelism” as “an arrangement of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences side-by-side in a similar grammatical or structural way” and add that “parallelism organizes ideas in a way that demonstrates their coordination to the reader.”

Author’s Craft (n.d.) echoes the defining characteristics of parallel structure explained by other authorities and adds that it creates “a satisfying rhythm in the language an author uses,” giving examples from well-known literary sources, namely William Shakespeare’s play The Tragedy of Julius Caesar and Martin Luther King Jr.’s speech “I Have a Dream” as follows.

Example 1:

Friends, Romans, Countrymen, lend me your ears; I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him. (Shakespeare, 1599, retrieved from OpenSourceShakespeare, n.d.)

In the above example, Shakespeare uses parallel structure in both lines. In the first line, he employs parallelism to equate three different groups of people, namely “Friends”, “Romans”, and “Countrymen.” In the second line, the playwright makes use of a contrast in parallel structure to emphasize Mark Anthony’s determination “to bury Caesar” and “not to praise him.”

Example 2:

I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.’ I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood... I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. (King, 1963, retrieved from American Rhetoric Top 100 Speeches, n.d.)

In this example, King repeats the words “I have a dream” to emphasize his message of the belief in the American dream and to express that this dream can be circumscribed in many ways, all of which are equally important. The repetition also lends the sense of rhythm that renders the delivery of the speech eloquent and satisfying.

The Concept of Markedness in Language Use

Markedness is defined as “a state in which one linguistic element is more distinctively identified (or marked) than another (unmarked).” (Nordquist, 2017) It indicates the
characterization of a “regular” linguistic unit against its possible “irregular” forms. In a marked-unmarked relation, the dominant default form is known as “unmarked,” while the other, secondary one is called “marked.” (Wikipedia, n.d.) Although the modern concept of markedness was pioneered in the Prague School structuralism of Roman Jakobson and Nikolai Trubetzkoy in the 1920s and 1930s as a means of characterizing binary oppositions and initially applied exclusively to phonology, the terms “marked” and “unmarked” have since been applied in other linguistic areas such as grammar, semantics, and typology (Battistella, 1990, Eckman, 2008, Nordquist, 2017, and Wikipedia, n.d.), as Leech (2006, p.62) explains: 

Where there is a contrast between two or more members of a category such as number, case or tense, one of them is called ‘marked’ if it contains some extra affix, as opposed to the ‘unmarked’ member which does not. For example, the regular plural (such as tables) of a noun is the marked form in comparison with the singular (table) because it has an extra affix, the -s (or -es) plural inflection. In a similar way, the ordinary form of an adjective such as old is unmarked in contrast to the comparative and superlative forms, older and oldest. By extension, the marked form can also be marked syntactically, by having more words. For example, the passive was eaten is marked in relation to the unmarked active ate. Generally the unmarked form is the more frequent option and also the one that has the most neutral meaning.

When markedness occurs, especially within a communicative context, it affects the pragmatic meaning of the utterance. In other words, the interpretation of the utterance is situation-specific. According to Battistella (1990), the term “markedness” refers to the relationship between the two poles of an opposition. Whereas the simpler, more general pole is unmarked, the more complex and focused pole is marked.

Semantic markedness, for example, is clearly seen in the use of lexical oppositions in certain rhetorical questions. To quote an example from Battistella (1990, pp.2-3), the adjective “old” is often used in a general, unspecific way to ask about age in questions such as “How old are you?” This sentence, asked in the rising-falling intonation, is unmarked as it implies nothing about the age of the addressee. However, when the adjective is replaced by its binary opposite, the question “How young are you?” becomes marked as it implies that the addressee is in fact young.

Phonological markedness indicates a deviation from the normal interpretation of an utterance. For example, the verbal delivery of a WH-question in English, e.g. “What is your name?” following the rising-falling intonation is unmarked since it is designed to elicit rather than to state specific information. However, when the same question is spoken with the rising intonation, the prosody is marked and signals “I didn’t hear everything you said.” (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000, p.41)

Similarly, when a grammatical structure, such as parallelism, is marked, the physical structure is flaunted resulting in the deviation of the pragmatic interpretation, as shown in this example from “Amundsen”:

I was angry and humiliated, because I had not really been showing off. Or not only showing off. I had wanted to explain what a wonderful effect this scenery had on me. (Munro, 2012, p.5)

The phrase in bold would generally be considered as fragmental in a usual English classroom. In literature, however, separating the phrase from the previous sentence marks a gap between thoughts and a reconsideration – a repair – of the idea projected earlier, something that happens frequently in real life but is hardly allowed in a language classroom. This exemption is supported by Recine (2016) who states that “parallel structure should only be broken for specific reasons.”

Marked parallel structure, therefore, indicates specific communicative purposes not usually listed in grammar books nor taught in language classes. An analysis of the marked parallel structure for pragmatic usage could help enhance an awareness of the discrepancy between the idealized English instructed in EFL classrooms and the hands-on English faced daily in the real world.

Alice Munro and “Amundsen”

Alice Munro (b.1931) is a Canadian short story writer who has won many distinguished awards and prizes for writing including the Nobel Prize in Literature in 2013. (Wikipedia, n.d.) Her stories are known to illustrate “the foibles of love, the confusions and frustrations of life or the inner cruelty and treachery that can be revealed in the slightest gestures and changes of tone” (The Washington Post, cited in Munro, 2013) and explore “human complexities in what appear to be effortless anecdotal re-creations of everyday life.” (Meyer Literature, n.d.)

“Amundsen” is a short story written by Munro, published in The New Yorker on August 27, 2012, and included in a collection of short stories, Dear Life, which came out in the same year. In “Amundsen”, Vivien Hyde, a college graduate from Toronto, travelled to Amundsen towards the end of the Second World War to teach elementary school children in a sanatorium there. She was seduced by her boss, a lung surgeon named Alister Fox, who promised to marry her, broke off the engagement on the wedding day, and sent her back to Toronto on a train that same day. They met one more time many years later on a crowded street in Toronto and exchanged only perfunctory greetings.

Since there are several variations in the writing, which in no way affect the plot, between the short story “Amundsen” published in the New Yorker and the same story in Dear Life, this study refers to the short story and its linguistic content as published in the New Yorker on August 27, 2012.

METHOD

In the present study, the concept of linguistic markedness is applied to the investigation of the parallel structure in Alice Munro’s short story “Amundsen” in order to explore the pragmatic usage of parallelism, as opposed to the grammatical usage listed in general commercial grammar textbooks and to answer the following research question: How and for
what purposes is parallel structure flaunted in Alice Munro’s short story “Amundsen”?

In order to determine markedness in parallel structure in the study, the following guideline has been set and observed.

(1) The aspects of parallel structure focused on in this study include (Author’s Craft, n.d., Evergreen Writing Center, n.d., Kathleen Jones White Writing Center, n.d., King & Stanley, 1996, and Towson University Online Writing Support, n.d.):

(1.1) Words, phrases and clauses joined by coordinating conjunctions “and”, “but”, “or”
For example:
On the bench outside the station, I sat and waited. (Munro, 2012, p.1)

(1.2) A series of three or more words, infinitives, prepositional phrases and clauses in a row
For example:
The doctor’s office was similarly out of bounds, Matron’s room being the proper place for all inquiries, complaints, and ordinary arrangements. (Munro, 2012, p.6)

(1.3) A comparison
For example:
The surgery he went in for was going to become as obsolete as bloodletting. (Munro, 2012, p.15)

(1.4) Elements joined by correlative conjunctions “either…or”, “neither…nor”, “both…and”, “not only…but also”
For example:
It was a secret from nobody, not even from the nurses, who said nothing, either because they were too lofty and discreet or because such carrying on had ceased to interest them. (Munro, 2012, p.16)

(2) Punctuations can be used in place of coordinating conjunctions in cases as follows (Johnson, 1991, pp.101-102 and pp.121-122, The Punctuation Guide, n.d.):

(2.1) The listing comma can substitute the conjunction “and” when two or more adjectives independently modify a noun.
For example:
A long, white, wooden building in front of it. (Munro, 2012, p.1)

(2.2) A semicolon can be used between two independent clauses when a coordinating conjunction is omitted.
For example:
Their tone was friendly; they seemed to approve. (Munro, 2012, p.16)

(3) When the language use deviates from the rules in (1) and (2), the parallel structure is considered flaunted.

(4) Although certain authorities (The Chicago Manual of Style (Note 2) and Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage (Note 3) among others) declare that beginning a sentence with a conjunction is grammatically acceptable, this study opts to regard, as does the practice in general EFL classrooms, such usage as flaunting the rules of parallelism and resulting in language fragments; for example:
But the figs would catch in my teeth and betray me. (Munro, 2012, p.3)

Or some of his words, such as those about boredom being the enemy: (Munro, 2012, p.7)
And he’d ask Anabel, ‘What makes it so heavy? What did you have for breakfast?’ (Munro, 2012, p.11)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

(1) Out of the 397 instances of possible parallelism in “Amundsen”, 101 (or 25.44%) are marked structure. In other words, for roughly every four cases of parallel structure, one is flaunted.

This finding, although far from being conclusive, points to the inclination that parallelism is flaunted fairly regularly in hands-on usage of the English language reflected in this study, in a literary writing.

(2) Out of the 101 instances of marked structure, 22 are from the dialogues, both the actual dialogues in quotation marks and the ones reminisced by the female protagonist, and 79 are from the narrative passages.

Although it would seem more natural to assume that flaunting a grammatical structure will be found more in conversational English (i.e. in the dialogues) than in the narrative of the story, “Amundsen” as a whole is conversational in tone. The short story is narrated through a first-person point of view of the female protagonist who tells the story as if she were talking – reminiscing – with a present audience. This, together with the fact that the narrative passages of “Amundsen” far outnumber its dialogues, accounts for the astonishing (dis)proportion above.

(3) Overall, the flaunting could be classified into 5 types with varying degrees of frequency, as follows:

(3.1) Starting a sentence with a conjunction
Frequency: 55 instances (17 from dialogues and 38 from the narrative)
For example:
- “My mom never wanted me to hang around with kids that had TB anyway. But Reddy talked her into it.” (p.11)
- “Mary. We are eating supper. And you are not invited. Do you understand that? Not invited.” (p.18)
- I didn’t dump everything on them at once, of course. And I had to go easy with the ones who had never learned such things because they had got sick too soon. (p.7)
- It was a secret from nobody, not even from the nurses, who said nothing, either because they were too lofty and discreet or because such carrying on had ceased to interest them. But the aides teased me. (p.16)
- Perhaps he will tell me that this was all a joke. Or a test, as in some medieval drama. Or perhaps he will have a change of heart. (p.24)

(3.2) No coordinating conjunction between constituents
Frequency: 32 instances (1 from a dialogue and 31 from the narrative)
For example:
- “Drawing, music, stories preferred.” (p.6)
- Waxed linoleum, dull green paint, an antiseptic smell. (p.4)
- People either take to her or they don’t. (p.8)
- Books on the American Civil War, the South African War, the Napoleonic Wars, the Peloponnesian War, the campaigns of Julius Caesar. (p.13)
- It still seemed as if we would make our way out of that crowd, as if in just a moment we would be together. (p.25)

(3.3) Unparalleled constituents
Frequency: 3 instances (all from dialogues), as follows:
- “People either take to her or they don’t.” (p.4)
- “Here, I’ve got some things I’ve written out about the kids here and what I was thinking you might try to do with them.” (p.6)
- “Games O.K., but watch for overexcitement or too much competitiveness.” (p.6)

(3.4) Incomplete conjunction
Frequency: 1 instance from the narrative, as follows:
Or not only showing off. I had wanted to explain what a wonderful effect this scenery had on me. (p.5)

(3.5) Multiple conjunctions
Frequency: 10 instances (1 from a dialogue and 9 from the narrative)
For example:
- “I’m your janitor and your cook and your server,” he said. (p.12)
- Not just on bookshelves but on tables and chairs and windowsills and piled on the floor. (p.13)
- When I come out, Alister stands up to greet me and smiles and squeezes my hand and says I look pretty. (p.22)
- The driver gets out and comes and raps on Alister’s window. (p.22)
- What he was saying was terrible but at least his tight grip on the wheel, his grip and his abstraction and his voice had pain in them. (p.22)

(4.0) Overall, the perceived reasons for flauting could be classified into 4 types with varying degrees of frequency, as follows:

(4.1) Emphasis
Frequency: 54 instances
Parallel structure is found to be flaunted for emphasis to stress the contradiction, addition, sequence and series in which each item listed is equally emphasized.
For example:
The key to his house showed up on the floor of my room, slipped under the door when I wasn’t there. But I couldn’t use it after all. (p.15)

In the above example, parallel structure is flaunted in the second sentence to emphasize the contradiction between Vivien’s uneasy feelings and the comfort of a heated house promised by the appearance of the house key provided by her suitor.
“And you could just as well do without any of those cookies. You’re on your way to getting as plump as a young pig.” (p.18)

In this example, parallel structure is flaunted in the first sentence to add the weight to Alister’s warning to Mary against her eating habit.
At his house, he told me not to take off my coat until the place had warmed up a bit. And he got busy at once making a fire in the woodstove. (p.12)

In this example, parallel structure is flaunted in the second sentence, which starts with a coordinating conjunction “and” to emphasize the sequence of actions – that the one after “and” follows the one preceding it in a quick and neat sequence.

Then gradually he let his voice die down. Down, down, first to a mumble, then to a whisper, then to complete inaudibility. (p.8)

A sequence of actions can also be stressed by omitting the use of coordinating conjunction altogether, as shown in this example in which Alister lowers his voice to different degrees of audibility. The lack of conjunction in this instance enables a sense of seamless transition from complete audibility to complete inaudibility.

After the sawmill, beneath us, were some ugly cuts in the woods and a few shacks, apparently inhabited, because they had woodpiles and clotheslines and rising smoke. (p.10)

In the example above, parallel structure is flaunted in the noun phrase in the bold type to indicate signs of a residential area, with each sign receiving equal stress as an indicator of inhabitation.

(4.2) Exaggeration
Frequency: 22 instances
Parallel structure is found to be flaunted for exaggeration of speed in imitation of a quick stream of thoughts and observations.
For example:
The building, the trees, the lake were never again the same to me as they had been on that first day, when I was caught by their mystery and authority. (p.9)

The stringing of different nouns in this example without a coordinating conjunction represents a quick mental listing of items that come to mind quickly and effortlessly through familiarity.

Books on the American Civil War, the South African War, the Napoleonic Wars, the Peloponnesian War, the campaigns of Julius Caesar. (p.13)

In the above example, a series of books on various wars is presented without a coordinating conjunction. This gives the impression of the speaker (Vivien) glancing at a bookshelf and scanning the titles of a stack of books, apparently clustered together due to their common theme of war, quickly and with no interruption.

He asked about my life in Toronto, my university courses, my family. (p.14)

In this example, Alister is questioning Vivien about her life. The lack of conjunction indicates the quick succession of the questions as well as the intensity of his interest in finding out more about the woman he is going to seduce.

(4.3) Elaboration
Frequency: 22 instances
Parallel structure is found to be flaunted for elaboration on the similar and/or different aspects of the object/person...
being discussed and for affirmation of information already stated. For example:

But the birch bark not white after all, as you got closer. Grayish yellow, grayish blue, gray. (p.2)

This example describes the colours of the birch bark as seen by the speaker. Although the bark is described to be in different shades of gray, the string of adjectives of colour with no conjunction gives the impression of a passing observation which registers no striking distinction among them.

Across the tracks was the electric train, empty, waiting. (p.1)

The phrase in bold contains two words – an adjective “empty” and a verbal adjective “waiting” – both modifying the noun phrase “the electric train.” The two adjectives describe different aspects of the same train. The lack of a coordinating conjunction allows the writer to dissociate these characteristics of the train, making the emptiness felt more intensely and prolonging the wait.

I am the Captain of the Pinafores.
And a right good captain, too. (pp.17-18)

In this example, the second line starting with the coordinating conjunction “and” affirms the information already stated in the first line, elaborating on the characteristics of the Captain of the Pinafores.

(4.4) Evaluation
Frequency: 3 instances

Parallel structure is found to be flaunted to set the tone of informality, particularly in spoken language, and to project the speaker’s evaluation of the situation, usually in a predictive or speculative manner. The three instances are as follows:

Here, I’ve got some things I’ve written out about the kids here and what I was thinking you might try to do with them. (p.6)

The above example contains faulty parallelism. The noun phrase “the kids here” and the noun clause “what I was thinking you might try to do with them” are connected with the coordinating conjunction “and”, thus constituting a marked parallel structure as the two constituents (the noun phrase and the noun clause) are usually regarded as syntactically unequal. Coupled with the use of a wh-clef (i.e. “what I was thinking…”), the tone of spoken informality is hinted despite the fact that the sentence is delivered by a figure of authority (Alister).

Games O.K., but watch for overexcitement or too much competitiveness. (p.6)

Similar to the previous example, this example contains unequal constituents connected by a coordinating conjunction (“but”). The noun phrase “Games O.K.” is syntactically outweighed by the imperative clause “watch for overexcitement or too much competitiveness.” However, in the context of spoken language, this sentence shows spontaneous mental evaluation (i.e. “Games O.K.”) as well as authoritative caution (i.e. “but watch for overexcitement or too much competitiveness.”)

He began to talk about thoracoplasty. Of course, removal of the lobe had also become popular recently.

“But don’t you lose some patients?” I said. (p.15)

In this example, the use of marked parallelism registers Vivien’s speculation about the efficiency of thoracoplasty. It shows that in spite of the popularity of the practice, Vivien did not have full confidence in its effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

The investigation of Alice Munro’s short story “Amundsen” reveals five types of marked parallelism: starting a sentence with a conjunction, no coordinating conjunction between constituents, unparalleled constituents, incomplete conjunction, and multiple conjunctions. In addition, parallel structure is found to be flaunted for emphasis, exaggeration, elaboration and evaluation. Approximately one out of four instances of parallelism is flaunted, with enhanced semantic effects on the message it carries, which affirms that flaunting parallelism is neither degenerative nor unusual in the context of real language use and should not be indiscriminately and dismissively frowned upon in EFL classrooms. Future studies may explore that the high incidence of flaunted structures in celebrated pieces of literature demonstrates that one of the reasons they are so enjoyed is their use of flaunting or marked structures which in substance break away from traditional grammar rigor.
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END NOTES

1. Flaunting, in this study, refers to the bending of the rules of grammatical structures such as parallel structure which often results in language fragments and non-standard expressions.

2. The Chicago Manual of Style (2003, p.193) projects that “There is a widespread belief – one with no historical or grammatical foundation – that it is an error to begin a sentence with a conjunction such as and, but, or so. In fact, a substantial percentage (often as many as 10 percent) of the sentences in first-rate writing begin with conjunctions.”

3. Webster’s Dictionary of English Usage (1989, pp.93-94) starts the entry “and” with the following: “Everybody agrees that it’s all right to begin a sentence with and, and nearly everybody admits to having been taught at some past time that the practice was wrong.”

REFERENCES

American Rhetoric Top 100 Speeches. (n.d.). I have a dream. Retrieved from http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkhaveadream.htm
