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Abstract
Ambivalence refers to the simultaneous combination of two opposite attitudes, ideas, etc., towards a person, a thing, etc. Although ambivalence is generally thought to be a literary device to produce literary effect, this research work attempts to prove that it is a Semantico - Pragmatic phenomenon, thus involving both the linguistic and the extralinguistic levels of Language.

The controversy over ambivalence is that some scholars deal with it as a synonym to ambiguity, others regard it as part of it, while still others propose that it differs from it. This study attempts to determine whether or not there is a distinction between ambivalence and ambiguity. Furthermore, the study attempts to prove not only that it is a semantic-pragmatic device, but also that it is a result of certain stylistic
deviations from the norm of the Linguistic levels of Language. The study also hypotizes that since ambivalence highly affects meaning, semantic deviation is the most frequent type which creates different types of ambivalence. Moreover, the paper proposes that as a literary device, ambivalence is used as a stylistic device to create further richness and subtlety of Language and style. Moreover, the study proposes that ambivalence violates Grice's maxim of manner. The paper is formed of four sections. Section one is devoted to discussing the nature and notion of ambivalence. Section two covers the types of ambivalence, while section three deals with the nature and notion of ambiguity. Section four is devoted to Grices maxims as related to ambivalence.

The study ends with the conclusions reached and the bibliography.

الملخص

تشير الازدواجية إلى مزيج متناقضين أو فكرتين متناقضتين. متناقضين تجاه شخص أو شيء الخ. على الرغم من المعتقد العام بأن الازدواجية هي إداة أدبية تستخدم لخلق أثر أدبي يحاول هذا البحث أن يثبت أن الازدواجية ظاهرة دلالي - تداولية ومن هذا المنطلق فهي إداة لغوية وما بعد اللغة.

وتمثل اراء متناقته في الازدواجية، فالبعض من العلماء يعدوها مرادفة للالتباس، والبعض الآخر يعدها جزءا من الالتباس، في حين جاءت هذا الدراسة لتجاوز إثاث الفرق ما بين الازدواجية والالتباس. إضافة إلى ذلك يهدف البحث لاثبات أن الازدواجية إداة دلالي - تداولية تنتج عن الانحرافات مقصودة في الأسلوب عن ما هو شائع ومقبول على المستويات اللغوية. كما تفترض الدراسة أن طالما أن الازدواجية لها أثر عال على المعنى، فإن الانحرافات الدلالية هي الأكثر حدوثاً وهي التي تنتج أنماطاً مختلفة من الازدواجية. كما يقترح البحث ان
The Nature and notion of Ambivalence:

The term ambivalence was initially created by the Swiss psychiatrist Bleuler in 1910 to refer to the negativism -and the diagnosis of schizophrenia to diagnose the conflicted emotions of schizophrenic patients. Thus, it indicates negative and positive sides. Later, this term was adopted to refer to emotions, cognitions, and volition of normal people, (Luscher and Lettke 2003:4), In its current sense ambivalence was first used by Freud (1914; 242; in Luscher and Lettke, 2003: 51) to refer to the emotional conflict between two opposite feelings who states:

We were from the very first equally inclined to love and hate, to criticize and respect. Psychoanalysis has given the name of 'ambivalence' to this readiness to contradictory attribute... it is in this existence of contrary feelings side by side that lies the essential character of what we call emotional ambivalence.

The etymology of ambivalence is rooted in 'ambi' which refers to 'two' or 'two fold'; and 'valence', which means 'values' or 'valuation'. The term, is currently used In literature, and particularly Literary Criticism. Some critics try to prove that ambivalence is found in literary works, especially in poetry.

1.2 Some Definitions of Ambivalence:

Many definitions of the phenomenon focus on the meaning of ambivalence. The Collius English Dictionary (in Luscher and Lettke,
2003: 4) defines ambivalence as "the co-existence of two opposed and conflicting emotions, attitudes, etc. The inadequacy of such a kind of definition lies in its neglecting the important element that creates an ambivalent situation, i.e., the reference to one person, or thing, thus unless emotions or attitudes refer to one person/thing, they are not ambivalent. Therefore, the notion should be expressed in a more comprehensive definition, to include all the elements that contribute to result an ambivalent state. The Oxford English dictionary (in Luscher and Lettke: 2003: 5), for example, defines ambivalence as "the co-existence in one person or one work of contradictory emotions and attitudes toward the same object or idea." Mifflin (2002: 1) defines it as "the co-existence of opposing attitudes or feelings, such as love and hate toward a person, object or idea." In addition, Hornby (2004: 36) defines ambivalence as the state of "having or showing both good and bad feelings about somebody/something." Consequently, in one person two forces exist with contradictory relation, i.e., each one discriminates from or contrasts with the other. Such a state of unbalance creates the idiosyncratic situation, that is, ambivalence.

Some definitions congregate attention on the bipolarity of an ambivalent situation or state which derives from words, concepts structures, which are ambivalent. Ewoldsen (2003: 1) states that ambivalence refers to the "attitudes existing along a bipolar evaluation dimension ranging from extreme dislike to extreme like." Huene (in Luscher and Lettke; 2003: 16) defines ambivalence as the polarization of emotions, thoughts, and structures which are interpreted as temporarily or permanently irreconcilable. The interpretation of the irreconcilable state cannot be resolved by simple decision-making. The two poles of the opposite sides must be interpreted to clarify the relation, whether temporal or permanent, between them simultaneously. Consequently, the relation between the two poles must be interpreted properly, i.e., unless the two poles are meaningfully opposite to each other, it is not ambivalence. Thus, if such opposites like love and hate; life and death, virtue and evil, etc, are used in a certain expression and there is no conflict between them, i.e., a dichotomy is not used to express the contradiction between them, then, anything other than ambivalence would be the result. To illustrate the notion consider the following example:

1 - Life is terrible whereas death is great.

The example makes one at once feel that there is no conflict between life and death though they are opposites. But consider the following example:

2- Life is terrible as well as death.
There is a kind of confusion. Life and death are opposites, but both come to express one idea, therefore, there is a state of ambivalence. One may think, at first, that such an example indicates ambiguity since the addressee finds some kinds of difficulty in determining the addresser's intended meaning, but because those meanings are opposite to each other, it is a state of ambivalence rather than of ambiguity. Cohen (2002: 1) elaborates on such a state arguing that ambivalence is not one thing understood to mean something else, but rather forms an irresolvable state of more than one meaning signification simultaneously. The irresolvable state originates from the addresser's need for two things though each one does not coincide with the other. Such notions are also expressed adequately by Cucineela (2004: 2), stating that "ambivalence utilizes the contradictions to present conflicting desires without any attempt to reconcile those desires." Then, there are conflicting wants and ardours, one demands both inspite of their contradiction, e.g:

3- I want to succeed and I want to fail.

Such an example expresses the need for both, success and failure, although each one does not accord with the other. One may think it is a meaningless example, however, the addresser means both in a certain context which may not be clear to the addressee.

1.3 The Notion of Opposition:

The notion of opposition, has been dealt with by a considerable number of linguists, including Fromkin and Rodman (1988), Crystal (1995), and Yule (1999), yet no distinction has been made between the notions of opposition and antonymy. However, others, including Lyons (1977), Hurford and Heasley (1983) distinguish between opposition and antonymy proposing that the latter involves only one type of opposition, i.e gradable oppositions. Since such a distinction does not affect this study, it is not further discussed.

Accordingly, opposition is defined by Crystal (1995: 270) as a remarkable term in semantics which focuses on oppositeness of meanings to concern all semantic oppositions. Yule (1999: 118-119) and Finch (2000: 151) attribute oppositions to two forms which are opposite in their meanings. Lyons (1965: 40), Nida (1975: 17), and Saeed (1997: 66) define oppositions as occurring between such words which are similar in everything except in one semantic dimension, which is noticed in one but lacked in the other member.

Opposition is classified differently. Some linguists including, Lyons (1977), Crystal (1995), and Yule (1999), agree on the two types gradable and un-or nongradeable or even complementary oppositions. Other linguists, including Ljung (1974: 75), Ginzburg (1979: 60), and Kearns
(2000: 6-8) agree on the three types gradeable, complementary, and rational oppositions, each of which, e.g., reversive and implicit, have some unique characteristics of its own which can be summarized as follows:

1.3.1 Gradeable Oppositions:
1. They can be used in comparative forms, e.g., taller/shorter.
2. The negative form of one does not indicate that it is a synonym of the other in the same member, e.g.:
4. It is not hot.
   Such an example does not certainly mean that it is cold, or
5. He is not happy.
does not mean that he is sad. Accordingly, such a kind is not predictable, i.e., because one member, predicts the other.
3. The increasing in one implies the decreasing in the other, for instance:
   more bigness implies less smallness.
4. There are degrees in such a kind of oppositions, e.g.:
   cool → cold → colder → etc
5. In a gradeable pair, one member can be distinguished as marked or committed as, Labelled by Lehrer (1985: 400), Lipka (1992: 146) and Cruse and Togia (1995: 133); and the other is unmarked or 'uncommitted' (ibid). The latter can be used as an intermediary term which refers to "properties which are accustomed to ascribe to one super-ordinate term, is ascribed to an object which also contains properties normally associated with the opposite super-ordinate term," Sonesson, (2004: 6). Hence, the unmarked term is used in question of degrees, e.g.:
6. How long...? instead of b- How short...?
7. How high is it? Instead of b- How low is it?

1.3.2 Ungradeable Oppositions:
1. The negativeness of one member represents the other, for example:
   'alive' means 'not dead'; and vice versa. It seems that one completes the other, that is why they are called complementary, (Kearns; 2000: 6).
2. Accordingly, such a kind of pairs is predictable, e.g. 'not alive' means 'dead' no other things, (ibid).
3. They cannot normally appear with comparative forms, therefore, it is semantically anomalous to say, e.g., 'deader'.

6
1.3.3 Rational Oppositions:
The two members of a pair show a balance in their meanings, for example, when somebody 'gives', normally the other 'takes'. Or one is a 'teacher', therefore, the other is a 'student'.

1.3.4 Reversive Oppositions:
Yule (1999; 119) proposes another type of opposition in which pairs like, 'tie/untie'; 'dress/undress'; 'lengthen/shorten', etc, are considered reversive oppositions since each pair implies the undoing of a certain act. Therefore, the word undress implies doing the reverse of dressing.

1.3.5 Implicit Oppositions:
The types of oppositions mentioned above are explicit oppositions, involving two words that are directly and explicitly recognized as being opposites. Implicit oppositions concern ideas and expressions that are implicitly and indirectly opposite. Explicit oppositions belong to language system, i.e., they are lexically opposite. Senesson (2004:1-6) deals with a particular type of opposition, which is used in literary works that is not derived from the language system, but rather from the text, i.e., it is created in a given text, to illustrate, e.g.:

8- She has a terrible beauty.
The adjective terrible and the noun beauty are not opposites in themselves, but, each represents something in the context which does not coincide with the other. Thus, they are opposites only in this context. but may not be so in others.

Cruse (1986: 197-262) tackles near-opposition, namely impure and weakly contrasted items. Cruse characterizes oppositions that result from adjectives as being pure oppositions, whereas, those which descend from nouns or verbs are described as being impure oppositions, "which include within their meaning a more elementary opposition." For example, the two nouns elf and giant are impure oppositions since they encapsulate the opposition between the two pure opposite adjectives large and small.

Moreover, Cruse (ibid) states that within the case of pure oppositions, one can easily determine the semantic dimensions among them. For instance, in opposites like tall and short, the semantic dimension which combines between them to make them pure opposites, is 'length'. Yet, sometimes such a semantic dimension is not clear-cut to give rise to the other type of near-opposition which is weakly contrasted because the opposites of such
a type are only opposites in certain contexts and not in others. Consider
the phrase sad freedom the adjective sad and the noun freedom are not
opposites in themselves but they are in a certain context which combines
between the two. Such a kind of near-opposition coincides with implicit
opposition.
In instances of ambivalence, one may be exposed to all these types of
explicit and implicit oppositions.

2.1 The Characteristics and Types of Ambivalence
Empson (1930; 225) observes that instances of ambivalence are
very common in literary works, in general and poetry, in particular.
Ambivalence "reflects a conflict between the positive and negative
dimensions of an attitude, "Bell (1997: 6). Therefore, ambivalence
increases and decreases as a result of the opposite dimensions
relationship, the more they oppose each other the greater conflict is
created, and the greater ambivalence is obtained; and vice versa, i.e.,
more non-opposed polarity implies less conflict which in its turn leads to
less ambivalence. The two opposite meanings of a word or a certain
expression may reflect the emotional conflict concerning a certain state.
Empson (1930: 225), Bell (1997: 1-12), and Hamnett (1997: 1-12)
generally agree on the main characteristics of oppositions which can be
noticed in any instance of ambivalence. This could be summarized as
follows:
1 - Empson (ibid) states that "no two points are in themselves opposites."
This reflects what has been mentioned by Cruse (1986) and Senesson
(2004) (see 1.3).
2 - Ambivalent state emphasizes the psychological state of an addresser
and his attitudes in certain situations. Therefore, the situation has a
considerable effect on determining an addresser's attitudes, or intended
meaning.
Frued, (cited in Empson; 1930: 231), has his own viewpoint of opposition
or contradiction, to reflect the notion that what one lacks implies what
one cannot obtain, and this implies the opposite that what one
experiences, one cannot abstain from or avoid. This also can be echoed in
language in general, so the notion of what one desires implies the notion
that it is something one lacks, and this implies the opposite, identified by
the context, that one needs something different in another part of one's
mind. Accordingly, such a contradiction is not necessarily expressed
explicitly, they may be dealt with implicitly. The conflict is limited to two
opposite forces, i.e., what one hankers for may contrast with what one
already has. Consequently, there is a need for both, separating and, with the hardiness, joining them. Such a kind of contradiction, since it happens deliberately, is meaningfully expressed and an addresser not only describes a certain state of ambivalence, but also wants his addressees to feel and experience such a conflict by evoking the experiences of ambivalence inside them. Hamnett (1997: 3-6) states that in the case of ambivalence an addressee is exposed to two references; and ambivalent words, concepts, or items may either belong to one of them according to the context and how one interprets them; or belong to both references at once. This encourages him to relate ambivalence to vagueness through two ways:

1- The consideration or the reference of ambivalence is vague because of the lack or insufficient information concerning the situational context
2- Although each reference consideration is clearly specified, it is vague because there is no specification as to which meaning is intended.

Accordingly, Hamnett (ibid) observes that "ambivalence quality... regularly depends on the possibility of interpreting a word, concept, or situation in two quite different senses simultaneously." Therefore, how one interprets instances of ambivalence determines its type.

2.2 The Notion of Interpretation:

Grice (1989 in Recanti, 1989: 3-5) states that addresser's meaning is an intentional process, "what someone means is what he/she intends to get across through his or her utterance,". The success of any communication rests highly on the addressee's awareness of the addresser's meaning. To grasp addresser's intended meaning, the addressee can depend on two evidences:

1- The meaning expressed by the addressee is through what the linguistic components result in, thus the addressee does not need to extend the addressee's literal meaning, thus, addresser's meaning equals the literal meaning expressed.
2- Literal meaning does not express the addresser's intended meaning, the addressee extends the addresser's meaning to include what is beyond, or even what deviates from the literal meaning. In such a case background knowledge or external information plays a prominent role in deciding the addresser's intended meaning.

Accordingly, there are two types of interpretation: semantic and pragmatic.: The first evidence refers to the semantic interpretation, whereas the second refers to the pragmatic interpretation, where linguistic components and syntactic combination play little role that differs greatly
from the semantic one, where the linguistic combinations play the major role. These two kinds of interpretation differ from each other in two obvious ways:
First/while pragmatic interpretation is defeasible, semantic interpretation on the other hand, is not. Defeasible is defined as "even if an excellent explanation is available, it can always be overridden if enough new evidence is adduced to account for the subject behaviour. This again contrasts with the non-defeasible, monotonous character of semantic interpretation," (ibid)
Second/the other difference is restricted to the type of context interpretation. Bach (1995: 7) differentiates between two kinds of contexts, one is narrow and restricted to linguistic components. It deals with the short history of variables, such as the identity of the addresser and the addressee, as well as with the time and place of an utterance, i.e., the setting of the utterance. The other covers a wide sense, which includes all external factors which help to interpret the addresser's intended meaning.

2.3 Types of Ambivalence:

According to the types of interpretation, ambivalence can be classified into two major categories: (1) semantic, and (2) pragmatic.

The Salient definitions of semantics and pragmatics, are proposed by different scholars, including Morris (1945: 45) who defines semantics as that field which focuses on the study of signs and their relations, whereas pragmatics, in addition to semantic concentration, deals with how interpreters understand their relations. Kempson (1988: 139) states that "semantics provides a complete account of sentence meaning for the language... Pragmatics provides an account of how sentences are used to convey information in context." Fotion; (1995: 709) defines pragmatics as the study of language which focuses on the users and the context of language in use, while semantics, concentrates on reference, truth, and grammar. These definitions show that semantics in one way or another, deals with meaning on the Linguistic level, i.e., the literal meaning, whereas pragmatics concentrates on meaning on the extraLinguistic level, thus deals with how to reach the addressee's intended meaning, i.e., how to fill the gap between linguistic meaning and addresser's intended meaning and how an addressee could ultimately interpret an utterance meaning. These differences should be taken into account before dealing with instances of ambivalence.

2.3.1 Semantic Ambivalence:
Wlassics (1995: 1-5) states that semantic ambivalence comes from the use of an ambivalent word, concept, or structure. Unlike pragmatic ambivalence which is difficult to interpret or even to resolve, semantic ambivalence is resolvable, i.e., one can disambiguate the state with the help of limited or narrow context. Semantic ambivalence is of two types: lexical and structural or (syntactic ambivalence), i.e., it is caused by one or both of these linguistic levels:

2.3.1.1 Lexical Deviation:
Linguists, including Yule (1999: 15-16) propose various ways of representing word meanings. The most common is that which relates words to certain semantic features that coincide with their sense components. Semantic features are used to describe word meaning by resorting to componential analysis, i.e., marking plus (+) the existing feature found and minus (-) to that which does not. Therefore, e.g.:

- man = + human, + masculine, + adult
- woman = + human, - masculine, + adult

Lexical ambivalence is raised when both features (+) and (-) are combined in one word to express two opposite meanings at once. Empson (1930: 288) states that such ambivalence "occurs when the two meanings of the word... are the two opposite meanings defined by the context, so that the total effect is to show a fundamental division in the writer's mind." Thus, according to a particular context a word may be interpreted in two opposite ways simultaneously. To disambiguate the two opposite meanings of a word and adopt one only, narrow contextual information is useful.

One may make no distinction between an ambivalent word and pun, but, in fact, there is a distinctive difference. Pun refers to two different meanings which are not opposite whereas, an ambivalent word, refers to two different and opposite meanings of a word.

2.3.1.2 Structural (Syntactic) Deviation:
Another kind of semantic ambivalence may be created through the structure or the syntax of a certain sentence. Syntactic ambivalence is not a modern phenomenon, in fact, it dates back to the ancient Greek rhetoricians, who introduced the term 'apoloino' which means 'belonging to both'. In language a sentence or a phrase can be ambivalent not because of two opposite meanings of a word, i.e., word's meaning have no effect on the sentence structure; but because of the structure, or arrangement of words in the sentence. Therefore, structural ambivalence breeds when two
opposite ideas or attitudes exist side by side as a result of syntactic construction, (Hamnett, 1997: 17).

Consequently, syntactic ambivalence arise when a sentence combines between two opposites, e.g.:

9- *she loves and hates him.*

The unusual combination between the two opposite pair *love* and *hate* creates the syntactic ambivalence of that sentence.

Moreover, Lyons (1977: 315) states that syntactic ambivalence may result from the presence of certain collective nouns, e.g., family, government, etc., because it "may be regarded from one point of view as a single entity, but from another point of view, or for other purposes, as a plurality". Therefore, one can say either:

10- *The family, which has......is.......* (unit)

Or

11 - *The family, who have......are.......* (members)

Structural (syntactic) ambivalence, may also result from two sentences or clauses having opposite ideas; e.g.:

12- *It is not worthy to stop there, yet I stop.*

Additionally, structural ambivalence may be attributed to the ambivalent use of certain class of parts of speech to another, for example, a noun is used as a verb, or as an adjective; a verb is used as an adverb, or adjective, and so forth. This thing happens mainly in literary works especially, poetry, e.g., Cummings (in Stuart, 1997: 2-6):

13- *When man determined to destroy himself he picked the was of shall and finding only why smashed it into because.*

The poet uses verb to be *was*, the modal *shall*, the causal conjunction *because* as nouns.

2.3.2 Pragmatic Ambivalence:

Grice(1957, 1969, 1981, 1989, cited in Sperber and Wilson; 2002: 1) views pragmatic interpretation as a psychological act or exercise, in which an utterance, which is linguistically coded, must be linguistically decoded in order to infer the addressee's intended meaning. Thus, it is not a process of mind reading but a result of common background knowledge and common knowledge of the world. Such a process helps to resolve ambivalences and ambiguities, to identify and interpret implied meanings, and to resolve the linguistic indeterminacies of such instances while providing appropriate contextual information. The addressee's role is to
reach the addressee's intended meaning. Thus, it is the role of pragmatics to clarify how such instances occur, (Sperber and Wilson, 2002: 1-18).

In instances of pragmatic ambivalence, narrow contextual information, which is the basis for solving semantic ambivalence, is insufficient, therefore, to disambiguate meaning wide contextual information is required.

In pragmatic interpretation, the lack of information is only apparent, i.e., the incompleteness is only apparent, Throughout pragmatic interpretation an addressee uses two opposite members simultaneously, which may result in a third member, i.e., behind or in-between the two poles. Therefore, there is an additional one which may imply the addressee's intended meaning. But one should remember that there is no guarantee that the meaning constructed, is the one that the addressee intends to convey, (Sperber and Wilson, 2002: 4). To illustrate how a third element may occur, consider the following example proposed by Keats (in Empson, 1930: 249).

14- Let the rich wine within the goblet boil cold as bubbling well.

Pragmatic ambivalence is not only used to express the addressee's creation of an ambivalent instance, but also to express a normal experience. Keats's combination of oppositions, e.g., hot (or boiling) and cold may be used to express 'fever'. Since all ambivalences are used deliberately, thus, they are used, non-literally, i.e., they are adopted to express something Outside the relation between linguistic components. Therefore, Atlas (1989; in Bach, 1995: 2) states that strange use of an expression is best explained not by different pieces of linguistic information, but by one piece of linguistic information combined with extra linguistic information. Therefore, it seems that there is a need for some more contextual information, that is broad context information, to resolve the ambivalence.

3.1 The Nature and Notion of Ambiguity:

Basically, ambiguity occurs when there is more than one interpretation for a word or a sentence, i.e., ambiguity increases the range of possible interpretations. Sometimes the addressee unconsciously manages to resolve the instance of ambiguity to the point that it is not obvious that there was an instance of ambiguity. Meanwhile, if the addressee cannot disambiguate the meaning, an instance of vagueness arises.

Zwicky and Sadock 1975 (cited in Whitman, 2002: 21) distinguish between ambiguity and vagueness, stating that ambiguity happens when there are two unrelated senses of a word or a sentence, i.e, it is easy for
the addressee to select the correct one, whereas vagueness occurs when a word or a sentence has different senses which are close to one another, i.e., it is difficult for the addressee to choose one. Although this is not a rule, one can infer that vagueness occurs when the difference between the senses is slight, thus the correct meaning is not easy to specify therefore there occurs several possible interpretations. One also infers that ambiguity arises in instances of two distant meanings, while vagueness involves several meanings.

3.1.1 Some Definitions of Ambiguity:

Linguists define ambiguity in various ways. The most plausible definitions agree on that ambiguity involves a variety of connotations and two possible meanings. For example, Fromkin and Rodman (1988: 169), and Crystal (1997: 17) state that ambiguity occurs when an expression has more than one definition, interpretation, or meaning. Therefore, a word, a sentence or a phrase, instead of presenting one particular meaning, presents an additional meaning. Hornby (2004: 36) also argues that ambiguity is the expression which has more than one possible meaning. These definitions relate ambiguity to an alternative interpretation, i.e., ambiguity has the ability to present more than one interpretation or explanation since it is understood differently. Thus, in instances of ambiguity there are choices, and, frequently, only one is more suitable to a certain situation. This leads Visser (2003: 40) to define ambiguity as "a style characterized by an inability to accept without discomfort situations or stimuli that allow interpretations". Other scholars emphasize that ambiguity involves doubtfulness and uncertainty of adopting a specific interpretation. This view is adopted by Wilhelmsson (2003: 5) who maintains that ambiguity is the "doubtfulness or uncertainty as regards interpretation". Draney (2002: 3) proposes two different definitions of ambiguity, the first states that uncertainty occurs "when a term has more than one possible meaning and one specific meaning is not obvious" and the second states that "a kind of playing on the multiple meaning of words, so that a word actually is supposed to offer two or more equally suitable meanings at a time". These definitions can be related to previous notions of ambiguity regarding it as a state of uncertainty and doubtfulness on the one hand, and as a matter of alternative interpretation on the other.

Simpson and Weiner (1999: 390) propose a set of notions in defining ambiguity. They state that the notion of ambiguity varies to involve: (1) the notion of double entendre in linguistics, (2) the notion of lacking clarity in a context, and (3) the notion of ambiguity which results from different situations. Consequently, as far as (1) is concerned,
ambiguity is the result of different underlying meanings, whereas (2) emphasizes the role played by context in determining the exact situation since the context contributes to eliminating ambiguities in a given message (Leech, 1978: 77). The notion relating ambiguity to the nature of situation is proposed by Budner (1962: 29) who elaborates on three different types of situations which cause ambiguity: (1) new situation where new information or poor knowledge or even inadequate ideas are involved, (2) complex situation where complicated information is presented; and (3) contradictory situation where contradictory information is exhibited.

3.1.2 Types of Ambiguity:
Ambiguity can be classified into two main types: (1) semantic and (2) pragmatic. Each has its characteristics which may separate or interrelate with the other one's according to the nature of each characteristic.

3.1.2.1 Semantic Ambiguity:
A considerable number of linguists including Bach (1995), and Inman (1997), mention different types of semantic ambiguity caused by other linguistic levels of language, mainly: (1) lexical (2) structural.

3.1.2.1.1 Lexical Devices:
Lexical ambiguity is limited to certain words which have two or more very distinct meanings to ambiguous phrases or sentences in which they occur. Black (2002 in Wilhelmsson, 2003: 5) defines lexical ambiguity as "those emerging from a word when it has several possible meanings". Such a type does not restrict to one part of speech rather than another, it includes nouns like, chip, pen, and suit; verbs like, call, draw, and run; adjectives like, deep, and quick, etc, (Bach, 1995: 1-5).

Lyons (1977: 550-569), Palmer (1981: 100-108), and Ravin and Leocock (2000: 40-42), argue that lexical ambiguity descends from homonymy and polysymy. Homonym refers to a form which has different meanings. Therefore, a word, e.g., Brood is lexically ambiguous because it means either 'to sit on eggs to hatch them' or figuratively 'to think a lot and deeply or resentfully'.

Polysemy refers to close relationship between meanings of a word, i.e., one word with several meanings. For example, the word bright denotes
either (1) clear/transparent or (2) clever/brilliant. For illustration consider the following instances:

15- The stars are bright tonight.
16- She must be very bright if she scored an 'A' in the test.

Inman (1997: 3-5) distinguishes two types of lexical ambiguity:

1- Categorical ambiguity, which refers to different terminal symbols for a word, e.g., a word like *time* can be used as different parts of speech. Consider the following examples:

17- a. *Time is money*, (noun)
b. *Time me on the last lap*, (verb)
c. *Time travel is not likely in my life time*, (adjective)

2- Word sense ambiguity, which arise when a word belongs to a particular part of speech but refers to different concepts, i.e., has different senses of meaning. In contrast, to reference of certain linguistic items and their relations to some objects in the world they refer to, sense may deal with the relationship among linguistic items themselves, i.e., it deals with intra-linguistic relations. Example (18) illustrates such a kind of ambiguity:

18- I will give you a ring tonight.

The word *ring* in example (18) has two lexical meanings; it refers to a piece of jewellery, or a telephone call.

Hence, comparing the former two types of lexical ambiguity with the latter two types, one can observe that they correspond to each other. The kind which depends on words senses coincide with homonymy; while that of categorial ambiguity accords with polysemy.

Bach (1995: 2) elaborates on the type of ambiguity in which one meaning of a word is derived from another. This applies to some verbs like, *see* which derives its cognitive sense from that visual one. Strict role is played by lexical semantics in determining and identifying the exact sense which is appropriate to the context in which such words appear. In addition, lexical semantics deals with a kind of words which are to a great degree not restricted to one sense but rather highly flexible, e.g., the verbs *do* and *put*; and the prepositions *at*, *in*, and *to*. Such verbs and prepositions are applicable to several uses but still have a close relation. To characterize and identify the meaning of a given semantically ambiguous word, one directly makes one's decision for the more frequent meaning or the meaning which fits best into the sentential context. Accordingly, contextual information plays a pivotal role in determining the meaning of a lexical ambiguous word depending on its ability to limit attention to a single meaning which coincides with that context. Moreover, some lexical ambiguities can be solved with the help of
selection restrictions where only one sense, satisfies the restrictions since other senses violate the restrictions.

3.1.2.1.2 Syntactic Devices:

The other cause that leads to semantic ambiguity is that which results from a sentence or a phrase structure which consequently influences the meaning, i.e., lexical ambiguity differs from structural ambiguity in that the former is caused by a word that exhibits more than one meaning, while the latter is caused by a certain structure or a word order of an expression. Thus, structural ambiguity can be defined as that which leads to more than one syntactic form of a certain language's grammar, (Wilhelmsson, 2003: 5; Bach, 1995: 2-3; and Inman, 1997: 4-7). Such a kind of ambiguity as Wilhelmsson (ibid) states is frequently common to certain expressions like some prepositional phrases, example (19) is illustrative:

19- The boy saw the man with the telescope.
Such a phrase with the telescope results in an ambiguous sentence because it may be considered a modifier of either the verb or noun phrase. Structural ambiguity is also prevalent with coordination of nominal, examples (20 and 21) are illustrative:

20- Old men and women.
21- You can have a sandwich and cola or tea with the set meal.

It is platitude that such sentences acquaint with several semantic interpretations. Accordingly, the ambiguity of (19) is between the telescope as an instrument of seeing and as a modifier of the man. In (20) the ambiguous meaning lies between either old as a modifier to the men excluding women, or old as a modifier of both. Finally, (21) indicates that either:

a- you can have a sandwich and cola or have tea only.
b- you can have a sandwich and cola or a sandwich and tea.

Moreover, some elliptical senses are good reasons for structural ambiguity because it is not always clear which interpretation one should adopt as it is shown in the following examples by Inman (1997: 5-6):

22- Peter worked hard and passed the exam, Kevin too.

Three interpretations can be derived from the second part of the sentence:

a- Kevin worked hard.
b- Kevin passed the exam.
c- Kevin did both.

The double (or more) meanings of ambiguous sentences can be shown by resorting to the deep or surface structure of phrase-structure tree, as illustrated through example (23):
Each tree diagram represents a certain interpretation which is distinct from the other, (Brew, 2000: 1).

25- The chicken is ready to eat.

The possible interpretations of the sentence are:

a- The chicken is ready to eat something.
b- The chicken is ready (for somebody) to eat.
or The chicken is ready to be eaten.

To adopt the surface structure of the sentence, the result will be only one tree diagram which is:

Therefore, one can adopt the deep structure of such a kind of ambiguous sentences in order to denote their tree diagrams. As a result (a) and (b) can be shown as follows respectively:

Thus, some ambiguous expressions are only divulged in their surface structures, others are only revealed in their deep structures. The uttering of ambiguous expressions in one way or another, affects the disambiguation of the former, but not the latter; (Fromkin and Rodman, 1988: 234-38; and Bach, 1995:2).
3.1.2.2. Pragmatic Ambiguity:

Semantic ambiguity, is fundamentally a linguistic expression; which carries linguistic meanings rather than addresser's intended meaning, because generally ambiguity results in unconsciously unless it is intended. However, the deliberate use of ambiguous expressions or even the ambiguous use of language. Which involves pragmatic processes, that extend from semantic forms toward prepositional ones, should be used after the expelling of semantic ambiguity, (Kempson, 1979: 82).

In contrast to semantic form which is broad and indefinite, propositional form is specific and limited. Pragmatic interpretation descends from general and inspecific form of semantics, "pragmatic inference without sense-generality is blind, but sense-generality without pragmatic inference is empty", (Atlas, 1989: 124 in Bach, 1995). Hence, deliberate ambiguity is not a matter of semantic interpretation but rather the interpretation of double meaning as achieved through the extra linguistic level of use of language, i.e., pragmatics.

Accordingly, the interpretation of a semantic ambiguous sentence varies according to different contexts, each one is appropriate to certain distinct use. Context, then, helps to determine the interpretation of a given sentence, i.e., different interpretations of a single sentence, (Levinson, 1995; ibid.). To clarify the point, consider the following examples from Bach (1994: 268; in Bach, 2000):

24- you are not going to die.
25- I have not eaten.
26- Every-one must wear a costume.
27- Steel is not strong enough.

In order to recover the intended meanings each example needs additional piece of information to determine its situation, for example (24) may require the addition 'of the fever' (25) demands a momentary limitation, (26) lacks restriction; and (27) needs the aim for which steel is used. The finishing off of these examples is achieved with the help of pragmatic processes, hence, what starts semantically ends pragmatically.

Sweetser (1990: 6-18) adds that pragmatic ambiguity is distinct from semantic ambiguity and that an ambiguous expression preserves one meaning but works for several communicative purposes. She provides some utterances carrying modals like ought to, must, etc., and causal conjunctions like because, since, as, etc, in which modals and causal conjunction meanings are stable but employed in different types of contexts. Therefore, such modals and conjunctions are pragmatically ambiguous in that they can communicate in different contexts which are
of three types: context of content or about the world, context of speaker's state of mind 'epistemic' usage, and context of linguistic interaction between interlocutors. Consider the following example (28) which serves in different contexts:

28 - We ought to be there.

The modal ought to involves the sense of obligation, yet, it can connect to different communicative contexts, e.g., suppose that a man and his wife are invited to a party, and the man reminds his wife that they both have to go there. This context reflects real world context, i.e., presents a social obligation. However, this sentence may be uttered when the addresser and his spouse get lost en route to the party. In such a context the modal 'ought to' involves no social obligation, instead, it reflects the addresser's state of mind, i.e., the addresser knows the way, but is not sure where the party is. Third, suppose that the addresser and his wife attend the party and he utters this sentence addressing the host, which would make no sense since the addresser and his wife have already performed the action by attending the party. Therefore, such contexts help to disambiguate such a sentence.

The causal conjunction because may also show some features of pragmatic ambiguity, as is illustrated in the following examples:

29 - John went to the store because he ran out of milk.
30 - John ran out of milk, because he went to the store.
31 - John! Go to the store, because we are out of milk.

Sentence (29) uses 'because' in order to justify John's act of going to the store, being out of milk, is a good stimulus to such an act. The use of 'because' in sentence (30) reflects the addresser's inference about John, whereas sentence (31) reflects linguistic interaction between the addresser and the addressee. It relates the request of going to the store with another act which is to buy milk, (ibid.).

Consequently, pragmatic ambiguity can be defined as the disagreement between the addresser and the addressee on what the current situation is. That is, if there is some sort of agreement on the appropriate context whether narrow or wide, there is not any kind of ambiguity whether semantic or pragmatic. Accordingly, Pragmatic ambiguity can be resolved or disambiguated by taking types of contexts, into account. The process of disambiguation automatically happens through interaction between the interlocutors, i.e., the addressee has unconscious decision on the exact context, which controls the interpretation of the whole utterance. "Control of the interpretation determines whether the addressee attends to the event reported by the [addresser], to the warrant for the [addresser's] belief about the event, or
to the linguistic interaction between the [addresser] and the addressee", (Sweetser, 1990: 6-18).

4.1 Grice's Conversational Maxims:
Grice (1957, cited in Wilson and Sperber, 2002: 2-42) states that the interpretation of any utterance depends on what is called cooperative principle stating "make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged". In light of that principle, Grice derives a series of maxims which govern communication as follows:

1- Maxim of Quality:
supermaxim: 'Try to make your contribution one that is true'.
i. "Do not say what you believe to be false".
ii. "Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence".

2- Maxim of Quantity:
   i. "Make your contribution as informative as required".
   ii. "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required".

3- Maxim of Relation:
   - "Be relevant"

4- Maxim of manner:
   - Supermaxim: 'Be perspicuous'
i. "Avoid obscurity of expression".
ii. "Avoid ambiguity".
iii. "Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)".
vi. "Be orderly".

Accordingly, the maxims of quality, quantity, and relevance define what should be said; whereas the maxim of manner defines how it should be said.

If one heeds Tauli’s principles of clarity and economy (1968; in Traunmuller, 1996: 2-12) one notices the similarity between those principles and those of Grice. Some principles of clarity and economy may coincide with the maxims of what should be said on the one hand, and with the maxims of how it should be said on the other. Therefore, the clarity principle "the expression must convey to the listener all the meanings intended by the speaker", and the economic principle "the expression must not convey more meaning than necessary" coincide in quite a striking way with the maxims of quantity, while the clarity principle "the expression must contain redundancy" and "the greater the possibility for semantic confusion the greater must be the difference in
expression", may accord respectively with the first two maxims of manner: avoid obscurity of expression, and avoid ambiguity, while the two principles of economy "the expression must be as short as possible", and "the more frequent the expression the shorter it must be", coincide with the third maxim of manner, i.e., be brief.

Grice (1957) observes that these maxims may be violated differently. He identifies four different ways in which it is possible to violate such maxims:

1. Covert violation and lies deliberately violates the maxims of truthfulness.
2. Opting out overtly through jokes and fictions.
3. Figures of speech or stylistic devices may lead to another form of violation which is, in this case, overt, i.e., resulting in flouting/violating the maxims, e.g., by the use of metaphor.
4. Clash between one maxim with another, i.e., to avoid the violation of one maxim, one violates another, e.g., providing incomplete information due to Lack of information.

The violation of conversational maxims leads to what is called 'implicature'.

4.2 Implicature:

Grice (1957; in Cole and Morgan 1976: 41-50) defines implicatures as those inferences which are drawn in conversations. One of the crucial concerns of pragmatics deals with what addressers say and what they intend to communicate. A considerable part of what one communicates may not be exhausted by what is explicitly conveyed. There is a distinction between what is said, which refers to linguistic knowledge, and what is implied, which is beyond linguistic knowledge i.e., extralinguistic, thus pragmatic, and may affect language use, (Gazdar; 1979: 38; Lakoff, 1975: 253; and Brown and Yule, 1983:31).

Grice (ibid) distinguishes between two types of implicatures which are as follows:

4.2.1 Conversational Implicatures:

Refer not only to literal meaning of a certain expression but also to a certain interplay between literal meaning of an expression and the extra linguistic knowledge of the speech situation. In such a kind of implicatures the addressee observes the cooperative principle and the conversational maxims though the appearance is to the contrary "inferences arise to preserve the assumption cooperation", (Levinson, 1983: 102). What is said seems to be inept to the context of an utterance but in fact the addresser wants to convey additional meanings. Such

32. Steve: Are you going to the big party this weekend?
   Sally: Didn't you hear that Bob is going to be there?

   Although Sally answers Steve by raising a question it is appropriate to the given context, yet, it may not be so to another. Therefore, in order to understand the meaning one has to know the context which depends on the background knowledge shared between Steve and Sally. If Sally likes Bob, the implied answer will be 'yes', but if she dislikes him the implied answer will be 'no'. Steve presumely knows whether Sally likes Bob or not. Therefore, he immediately interprets the answer. Such implicatures are highly context-dependent. Grice (1975) refers to such a kind of implicatures as 'particularized conversational implicatures' to involve great number of figures of speech or figurative language. The following example may further illustrate the notion of particularized conversational implicature, (ibid)

33- a. Can you tell me what time it is?
   B- Well, the milkman has come.

   One may think that B's answer is inadequate to A's question, but A accepts that answer, which implies that B does not know the exact time but the arrival of the milkman indicates it, so, B predicts the approximate time. In addition, context contributes to interpreting different meanings. Raymond and Gibbs (ibid) propose the following two examples to illustrate the notion:

34- a. You are a teacher at an elementary school.
   You are discussing a new student with your assistant.
   The student did extremely well on her entrance examinations.
   You say to your assistant,  
   This one's really sharp.

35- You are a teacher at an elementary school.
   You are gathering teaching supplies with your assistant teacher. Some of the scissors you have are really bad sharp.
   You choose one pair that won't cut anything.
   You say to your assistant, 
   This one's really sharp.

   The expression this one's really sharp takes different meanings according to different contexts. In the first example it is used metaphorically to express how clever that student is, whereas in the second it is used ironically since the teacher does not really mean what he says, he really means the opposite.
In contrast to particularized conversational implicatures, Raymond and Gibbs (ibid) propose another kind which is not context-dependant, i.e., 'generalized conversational implicatures' which can bring their implied meanings headless of context. The following example may denote such a kind of conversational implicature.

36- It took us sometime to get there.

One immediately interprets that sentence implies 'It took us a long time to get there'. There is no immediate need for a certain context to determine the implication of such a kind of sentence, or other, since they have general, not specific implicature.

4.2.2 Conventional Implicatures:

Conventional implicatures refer to implications that rely on the conventional meaning of words and structures, (David, 2000: 16). Such a kind of implications are bred by the meaning of certain lexical items. Hence, it deals with the expression itself rather than with the relation between the interlocutors, (Sadock, 1978: 283). Consider example (37):

37- a. John didn't manage to reach the summit.

By the virtue of the conventional meaning of the word 'manage' (a) implies (b):

b- John tried to reach the summit.

In addition, some conjunctions and adverbials bring forth conventional implicatures as is shown in the following example:

38- a- Sam is clever, but fails in the exam.

According to the meaning of the conjunction 'but', this sentence implies the following:

b- Sam's failness is somehow surprising in light of his being clever.

40- a- John got a passing grade, too.

Relying on the adverb 'too' which provides a conventional implicature, the sentence implies (b):

b- John was not the only one passing, there are others.

In some cases many deictic items convey conventional implicature such as 'however', 'moreover', 'besides', 'furthermore', etc. In addition, some socially deictic items seem to carry conventional implicatures in particular contexts, like, 'sir', 'madam', 'mate', 'your honor', etc. Such deictic forms frequently reflect the social relationship between interlocutors. To see how different social deictic items may influence or shape the meaning of different sentences, consider examples (40) and (41):

40 - A- Do you prepare your homework?
      B- Yes, sir.
From the word 'sir', one can induce that such a word implies that the addresser is a person who has a higher rank than the addressee. Therefore, the social relationship between both is formal. But if the answer of the same question carries another deictic item for example:

41- A- Do you prepare your homework?
   B- yes, mate.

It implies that the relationship between the addresser and the addressee is intimate.

4.2.3 Conversational Implicatures vs. Conventional Implicatures:

Conversational implicatures with contrast to conventional ones, are cancelable in terms of their cancelling the apparent implication, i.e., the addresser adds more information to the original sentence or expression by which conversational implicatures disappear, Consider the following example (42):

42- a- I went into a house.

In (42-a) the sentence implies that it was not the addresser's house, but if it is put in another context, such apparent implicature immediately disappears, for example:

b- I went into a house, It was mine.

c- I will not tell you whether it was my house or not. But it is true that I went into a house yesterday.

d- I know that we were supposed to stay outside all day, but I went into a house, because some one cut his hand and I had to go home and get some bandages.

Conventional implicatures, on the other hand, are not cancelable as is shown in the following examples:

43- a- John has stopped reading.

Such a sentence implies that John has once read, such an implication is not cancelable as is illustrated through (43 b)

43- b- John has stopped reading, though he never did read.

The additional information does not cancel the implication.

Conclusions

Through the research work the following conclusions are reached:

1- Ambivalence results from certain deviations from the norms of any of the linguistic levels.
2- Semantic deviation is the most frequent type of ambivalence.
3- Ambivalence is used as a stylistic device. It is not used to deviate from the content, but enriches style through forcing extra effort to grasp the intended meaning.
4- Ambivalence and ambiguity are distinct, since the former involves two opposite meaning meant simultaneously by the addressee, while the latter involves two related or acceptable meaning which need to be interpreted Semantically and/or pragmatically by the addressee to grasp the addresser's intended meaning.

5- Both, ambivalence and ambiguity raise the feeling of doubt and uncertainty. The difference is in instances of ambivalence doubt is about two opposites in coinciding meanings, while in instances of ambiguity doubt is about meanings that are not contradictory to each other.

6- Ambivalence occurs not only as a result of the combination of two direct opposites, but also and more frequently as a result of context oppositions, i.e., indirectly opposites.

7- Semantic ambivalences that can not be resolved Semantically in the light of wide contexts, otherwise they are odd, thus are not stylistic devices.

8- All the Semantic ambivalences lead to pragmatic ones.

9- The type of deviation does not necessarily coincide with the type of ambivalence, i.e., lexical deviation may lead to syntactic ambivalence, Semantic deviation May lead to pragmatic ambivalence.

10- Obscurity is involved in the interpretation of ambivalence, thus different types of ambivalence deliberately violate Grice's maxim of manner overtly since the addressee knows that the addresser flouts the addresser flouts the maxim of avoiding obscurity.

11- Ambivalent oppositions do not necessarily belong to the same part of speech, e.g., sad freedom, i.e., adjective to noun.
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