

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology  
of Egypt / Egyptology

## A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF SYNECDOCHE IN SHAKESPEARE'S HAMLET

**Ali Muhammad Yousif (Corresponding Author)**

Department of English, College of Education for Humanities, University of Anbar, 11000  
Ramadi, Anbar, Iraq  
Email: [alimuhammed1@uoanabr.edu.iq](mailto:alimuhammed1@uoanabr.edu.iq)

**Hutheifa Yousif Turki (PhD)**

Department of English, College of Education for Humanities, University Of Anbar, 11000  
Ramadi, Anbar, Iraq  
Email: [ed.huzaiifa.youssef@uoanbar.edu.iq](mailto:ed.huzaiifa.youssef@uoanbar.edu.iq)  
ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3423-7754>

**Ali Muhammad Yousif, Hutheifa Yousif Turki, A Pragmatic Study of Synecdoche in Shakespeare's Hamlet-Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(7), ISSN 1567-214x**

### ABSTRACT

The current paper seeks to investigate how the synecdochical expressions were functioned in the tragedy of *Hamlet*. The paper's aim is to examine the use of the two main synecdochic types in this play. A qualitative data collection via document instrument was used. The qualitative data collected was analyzed qualitatively using content analysis. To such analysis, the meaning behind the word-symbols that matters i.e. what kind of communication is contained within the words. To cover the whole aspects of the analysis, two theories have been adopted in this study, Searle et al's. (1980) literalism as it deals with the semantic effect of the synecdoche and Plett's (2001, cited in Mey, 2009) taxonomy which demonstrates the synecdoche main types and their subtypes. The findings indicated that the dominant type was the generalizing synecdoche. Thus, the findings of the present study would inform the students of English interested in linguistics and literary fields on the way which they read and analyze any literary text as it paves the way to literary pragmatics. In addition, the study might be a useful reference for those who are interested in analyzing the literary texts pragmatically as it examined how synecdoche is functioned in these literary texts.

**Keywords:** Synecdoche; Hamlet; generalizing; particularizing.

## 1. Introduction

The study deals pragmatically with synecdoche in English, namely in a famous Shakespeare's tragedy '*Hamlet*'. In this regard, instead of going thoroughly into the literal meaning of synecdoche alone, it is better to relate it with pragmatics to know why this field of linguistics is needed in particular. Yule (2014b) stated that "Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning" (p. 3). This means that it concerns the communicated meaning of a speaker or a writer and its interpretation by the listener or the reader. This step needs to be analysed because some utterances communicate meaning other than the meaning of the utterances themselves. The synecdoches in general are utterances that have such property. According to Bullinger (1991, p. 613) who defined synecdoche as "one word receives something from another, which is internally associated with it by the connection of two ideas". In this respect, examples from common English expressions include 'suits' and 'boots', have intended meaning rather than their literal sense as the 'suits' refers to businessmen while 'boots' for soldiers. In this sense, readers lacking the pragmatic knowledge related to the figurative language may fail to infer what the writer means as he/she may depend on the literal meaning and neglect what is intended.

Accordingly, what makes people be sure that the hidden meaning may be understood by the listener is the field of pragmatics. Thus, hearers are required to understand the inference which goes beyond such examples; the inference can be defined as "additional information used by a listener/reader to create a connection between what is said and what must be meant" (Yule, 2014a, p. 292). In other words, inference is essential to be understood as it indicates what figure of speech is functioned. Thus, grasping the inference implied in these examples serves in clarifying that the trope used is synecdoche.

However, since the corpus of the study is a written text, we need only what Longman dictionary of language teaching called **inferential comprehension** and its "reading in order to find information which is not explicitly stated in a passage, using the reader's experience and intuition, and by inferring" (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 483). Put differently, the reader cannot understand everything by using only semantics, some sentences are beyond the semantic lines and need the reader's experience to grasp their meaning. However, the reasons behind employing synecdoche in writing are imaginative, condensational and rhetorical. This figure requires "using a component of something to stand for the thing itself, e.g. saying "I got some new wheels to refer to purchasing an automobile" (Richards & Schmidt, 2010,

p. 220). Language tropes or figures of speech like metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche attract many researchers interested in pragmatics because their studies are based on the notion that metaphoric, metonymic and synecdochic utterances might convey much more than what is linguistically stated. Different perspectives in various genres dealt with such tropes for their rich material. Thus, the present study is devoted to pragmatic analysis of synecdoche in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. This is due to the fact that pragmatics attempts to draw attention to the perplexity of this figure of speech because if it is ignored or misunderstood, it might result in semantic subtleties in the play and finally fails to communicate the intended messages of the dramatist.

An important cross-linguistic study was conducted by Khalaf (2013) in which he shed light on the perlocutionary force, the intended impact on the recipient, in indirect way, but forcibly conveying the intended meaning (Austin, 1962). He related this theory to the use of synecdoche in a religious context. Then Khalaf showed in many points whether translators could fully comprehend the logical relations built through the use of this figure of speech and opted for the most suitable renditions in English or not. The findings revealed that the use of synecdoche in religious texts is important and it causes some problems for translators; translators, who want to be faithful to the original text and wish to convey its meaning, will lose the stylistic part.

In contrast, Al-Kawwaz (2014) had a study about synecdoche as separate from metonymy. In his study, Al-Kawwaz showed how some scholars establish the identity of synecdoche as a separate trope while others regard it as a special form of metonymy. Despite Al-Kawwaz repeated what others stated in his own style, he made his study different by his view about Seto's (1999) study that treated synecdoche in a way that Al-Kawwaz found to some extent confusing. The findings indicated that Seto (1999) regarded synecdoche as an independent trope, but at the same time Seto made it lose its figurative status and displayed it as the least tropical of the three essential tropes: metaphor, metonymy and synecdoche.

Another significant study was conducted by Ali (2015) who dealt with the misunderstanding dilemma of the true meaning of synecdoche, especially in the language of the society. He showed how the synecdoche is used by the native speakers of English in their communication. He also put forward whether the natives use it in their casual conversation or not. The author finally gave examples of how authors and speakers employed this phenomenon in different fields of life such as political, educational as well as the social and informal speech.

Rohaniyah and Fadilah (2018) also made a study to examine Hyperbole and Synecdoche in Jokowi's Political Speeches in 2014 and 2015 Live On Metro Tv. Rohaniyah and Fadilahs' data was taken from two speeches by Jokowi. One was in APEC CEO summit 2014 forum taken place in November 10 of that year while the second speech delivered in Asian-African Conference Commemoration (AACC) continued from 19-21 April 2015. The data in this research included videos of the two speeches downloaded from [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com). The researchers then transcribed and analyzed the videos. The data analysis was fulfilled by categorizing the sentences that had hyperbole and synecdoche. The findings found that Jokowi used mostly literal language in both speeches. In the speech taken place 2014, he used eleven figurative expressions: five of them were hyperboles and the other six were synecdoches. In the speech of 2015, on the other hand, they found only seven expressions related to their study: three hyperboles and four synecdoches.

In the same line, Naseef (2018) made a study to investigate how metaphor is used in the holy Qur'an. In Naseef's study, the discussion was about the main Arabic figures of speech (*isti'ārah*, *tashbīh*, *majāz almursal*, *kināyah*) and in English (metaphor, simile, metonymy, synecdoche) respectively. In this sense, he did not separate between metonymy and synecdoche and regarded them as one trope. Naseef concluded then after detailed inspection that metonymy (in English) and *kināyah* (in Arabic) are actually not the same. Unlike Almisned (2001) who regarded synecdoche as equivalence to *Majāz mursal* not metonymy, Naseef (2018) indicated that *Majāz mursal* is probably the closest equivalent Arabic figure of speech to both metonymy and synecdoche. In this regard, Naseef's (2018) study deduced that metonymy and synecdoche share similar forms or semantic relationship between their literal and figurative meanings. That is why he regarded them as one. In his study, he surveyed the figures of speech that convey specific intended meanings indirectly to achieve a particular effect. The problem that the researcher tried to solve is the difficulty of the figure of speech if that figure is culture-specific. Then he discussed why *Kināyah* can be a difficult issue for translators. In addition, he showed more than one reason for this difficulty. The most important one was that *Kināyah* in all its cases has two different meanings, literal and figurative. For this cause a translator can be deluded by the literal and ignored the figurative ones which leads to a completely ambiguous meaning. Naseef's study was a comparative one so he resorted to different versions of the Holy Quran translations like

Abdel Haleem (2005), Saheeh International (2004) and others. And then he signified their differences and similarities, what is acceptable and what is not concerning Kināyah in their versions.

Thus, synecdoche is a debatable matter related or even confused with other tropes such as metonymy and metaphor. The main reason behind this problem is as shown by Smirlock (1976, p. 313) who said:

where metaphor relies on analogy and metonymy on association, synecdoche is more purely representational: the synecdochic term not only emphasizes certain attributes to the whole, as a vehicle does its tenor; it replaces that whole with a single attribute.

Some scholars like Nerlich and Clarke (1999), Seto (1999) and Mey (2009) considered synecdoche a trope by its own, others like Lakoff and Johnson (2003) regard it as a class of metonymy.

Synecdochic expressions can be found in different kinds of texts in different genres like religious, literary and political. Concerning the religious texts there is a huge book written by Bullinger (1991) entitled as 'figures of speech used in the bible'. In this book he dealt with synecdoche as a figure of speech. To him it has four main kinds: synecdoche of the genus, synecdoche of the species, synecdoche of the whole and synecdoche of the part. Under these principle types, there are more than twenty-two subtypes. These types are bible specific, so they are not applicable to every study. Under the same kind of texts, there are also studies that dealt with synecdoche in the Holy Quran (Almisned, 2001; Khalaf, 2013; Naseef, 2018). Studies on the Holy Quran, as an Arabic source, depended completely on Arabic rhetoric books particularly the classical sources.

Despite several studies have been conducted to investigate synecdoche in different literary, Holy and political texts, some focused on synecdoche as a part of metonymy (Almisned, 2001; Gains, 2013; Naseef, 2018), while others did not deal with it pragmatically (Acheson, 2004; Al-Kawwaz, 2014; Rohaniyah & Fadilah, 2018). However, the present study attempted to bridge the following gap:

- 1- Investigating synecdoche as not confused with metonymy and metaphor in literary texts precisely in '*Hamalet*'. This opinion was adopted by Leech (1994), Seto (1999).

For this purpose, the following question was raised:

- 1- How were the synecdochical expressions used and interpreted in '*Hamlet*' tragedy?

## **2. Methodology**

The Methodology of the current study comprises theories adopted for the analysis, the data collection followed by the theoretical framework and ends with a sample of the data analysis. They are presented in the following sections.

### **2.1 Research Design**

The study is qualitative in nature as it used descriptive qualitative method. It was defined by Fraenkel et al. (2012, p.380) as "a research study that investigates the quality of relationships, activities, situations or materials." In fact, qualitative research is assumed to be "exploratory research" as it is considered a type of scientific research that seeks to address questions inquiring about set of procedures related to the problem statement of a research study (DeFranzo, 2011).

In this sense, Greene (1986) alleged that the qualitative research deals with meanings as they appear to or are comprehended by people in lived-social situations. Thus, it might be appropriate to use qualitative method as it enables readers to interpret the situations of the imaginative world of literature. Accordingly, the study requires an interpretation of synecdochical expressions in a literary text namely in '*Hamlet*' (Guest et al. 2013).

### **2.2 Data collection**

The data chosen for the analysis in this study include a text with synecdoche expressions taken from a well-known tragedian play '*Hamlet*' written by the great playwright, Shakespeare. As far as the present study is concerned, the total number of the synecdoches collected was twelve of one hundred seven. They were selected randomly from the tragedy under investigation. This is to get valid and authentic data that enables the researcher to generalize data.

### **2.3 Theories adopted for the analysis**

This section deals with the theories of the analysis which are Searle et al.'s (1980) literalism and Plett's (2001 cited in Mey, 2009) taxonomy. The first theory is Searle et al's (1980) literalism which clarifies the semantic meaning of the pragmatic meaning of the synecdochical expressions. This is because it adopts the idea that the figurative meaning is an extension to the

literal one so understanding the literal meaning is a key to understand the figurative meaning (the synecdochical meaning).

In this respect, Searle et al. (1980) maintains three groups of sentences and all of them have the verb “cut”. Though all the statements have the same verb, it has different interpretations in each group. To clarify, the researcher chooses an example from each group:

1- “Bill cut the grass.” **Literal group.**(Searle et al., 1980, p. 221).

2- “Sam cut two classes last week.” **Figurative group.** (Searle et al., 1980, p. 221).

3- “Cut it out!” **Part of larger idioms group.** (Searle et al., 1980, p. 221).

According to Searle et al. (1980), the word “cut” in the first group has literal meaning. It is so understandable. On the other hand, in the second group the “literal interpretation” is not helpful in understanding the real meaning, but if he knows the literal meaning, this may help him so much perceive the meaning. He regarded the meaning in the second group as “figurative extension of the literal meaning” (p. 222). According to this perspective, there is hierarchical relationship between the literal and the figurative meaning. Searle et al. (1980) regarded the literal meaning as the origin while the figurative to him requires the “defective” use of literal language. Thus, one may feel that it is easy to understand the literal meaning appropriately but not the figurative as it may imply different interpretations.

The second theory is Plett’s (2001, cited in Mey, 2009) taxonomy of synecdoche. This theory is chosen specifically, because it is wider than of Seto’s (1999) taxonomy of synecdoche in which Seto classified the synecdoche into only two types, whereas Plett (2001, cited in Mey, 2009) into two main types and each main type has three subtypes within it. It is important to mention here that two of the subtypes of Plett (2001) taxonomy are Seto’s (1999), so this taxonomy covers Seto’s taxonomy. Besides, Plett’s (2001, cited in Mey, 2009) taxonomy was accurate as it depended on the idea of ‘whole- part relation’ which is the most significant element in recognizing the synecdoche according to Lakoff and Johnson (2003). However, Plett (2001, cited in Mey, 2009) arranged the taxonomy depending on the representation of the whole to one of its parts and vice versa. According to the direction of representation, Plett (2001: in Mey, 2009) entitled the whole representation to one of its parts as *generalizing synecdoche* and it has three subtypes: *the whole stands for the part*, *the plural stands for the singular* and the third one is Seto’s (1999) type *the genus stands for the species*. The representation of

part(s) to its/their whole is termed as the *particularizing synecdoche* and its three subdivisions are: *the part stands for the whole*, *the singular stands for the plural* and the last one is Seto's (1999) *species stands for the genus*. Consequently, the variety of synecdoche types proposed by Plett (2001, cited in Mey, 2009) makes this framework more comprehensive and thus, more applicable to different types of this figure of speech. Another reason for choosing this synecdoche taxonomy as it is a pragmatic representation of synecdoche as Mey (2009) proposed that this representation is "a semantically broader concept that represents a semantically narrower one" referring to the *generalizing synecdoche* or "semantically broader concept standing for a semantically narrower concept" (p. 888) referring to *the particularizing synecdoche*. Thus, the present study employed Plett's (2001, cited in Mey, 2009) taxonomy of synecdoche for data analysis in relation to Searl et al's (1980) literalism.

#### **2.4 Data analysis**

The current study used content analysis to analyze the qualitative data collected via document instrument. Content analysis is the study of documents and communication artifacts, which might be texts of various formats, pictures, audio or video. Social scientists use content analysis to examine patterns in communication in a replicable and systematic manner (Bryman, 2011). One of the key advantages of using content analysis to analyze social phenomena is its non-invasive nature, in contrast to simulating social experiences or collecting survey answers. As for the procedures followed in data analysis, based on the theoretical framework adopted in this study and research question, the analysis focused on the semantic meaning and pragmatic interpretation of synecdoche.

In this regard, the researcher starts with the reader's identification of the semantic meaning of the synecdochical expressions which, in turns, deliberates the pragmatic meaning according to Searle's (1980) literalism in which he illustrated that pragmatic meaning is an extension of the literal meaning. To identify the pragmatic meaning, the researcher looks through Plett's (2000 cited in Mey, 2009) taxonomy which classified synecdoche into: generalizing and particularizing, in addition to their subdivisions which basically rely on the whole- part or part- whole relation. Finally, the author's intended meaning of the synecdoche should be illustrated.



### 3. Results and Discussion

To address the objective of this study, extracts implied synecdoche were chosen from Hamlet to be analyzed pragmatically. In this regard, the tragedy of 'Hamlet' has many twists and events; Events that contain mistrust, treason, murder, and bad omens. Such events require the use of figurative tropes as the characters need to conceal their intentions. For that, Shakespeare utilizes the trope synecdoche in these events frequently. The frequent use of synecdoches shows how important the use of such trope in the play under investigation is. For this purpose, the following table illustrates the overall frequencies and the percentage of the synecdoche used in this play:

**Table 3.1: the Frequencies of Synecdochic Expressions and their Percentage**

| Synecdoches of Hamlet             | Frequency  | Percent (%) |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| <b>Generalizing synecdoche</b>    | <b>66</b>  | <b>62</b>   |
| 1. Whole for part                 | <b>28</b>  | <b>26</b>   |
| 2. Plural for singular            | <b>18</b>  | <b>17</b>   |
| 3. Genus for species              | <b>20</b>  | <b>19</b>   |
|                                   |            |             |
| <b>Particularizing Synecdoche</b> | <b>41</b>  | <b>38</b>   |
| 1. Part for Whole                 | <b>28</b>  | <b>26</b>   |
| 2. Singular for Plural            | <b>05</b>  | <b>5</b>    |
| 3. Species for genus              | <b>08</b>  | <b>7</b>    |
| <b>Total</b>                      | <b>107</b> | <b>100</b>  |

As shown in table 3.1, the results revealed that the use of the generalizing synecdoche and particularizing one was not identical. The findings suggested that generalizing synecdoches were the prevalent one. In fact, the overuse of the subtype of the generalizing synecdoche '*the whole that stands for the part*' indicated how this type became preponderant. Furthermore, the opposite subtype '*the part that stands for the whole*' which is a subdivision of the particularizing synecdoche was also used frequently. This shows that the whole-part synecdochical relation is considered a common feature in this play. This is in line with Adams (1987) who claimed that "the part is invaded by a whole that has emanated or shrunk into it." It is a "miraculous synecdoche," (p. 47), because it designates a part which "is identical to the whole" (p. 43).

As for the utilization of the synecdoches in 'Hamlet' in general, Acheson (2004) illustrated that it "is perhaps the most important to consider in relation to Hamlet, which is itself a synecdochic part which is so often required to stand in for the wholes of Shakespeare's works, of English

Renaissance drama, and even of English historical literature and culture” (p. 120).

However, since the two main types of synecdoches subsume subcategories, they require subsections to manifest their classification and they are as follows:

### 3.1 Generalizing Synecdoche

Generalizing synecdoche is regarded as the first main kind. This type occurs when one substitutes a general idea or word for a more particular idea or word (Whitsitt, 2013:64). This kind is constituted by a relation in which a semantically broader term stands for a semantically narrower one (Mey, 2009 p. 888). Anyhow, it has the following three subtypes:

#### 3.1.1 The Whole Stands for the Part

This is the first subtype of the generalizing synecdoche. This subtype takes place when one employs a whole or totality to designate a part (Abrams, 2005). The next two samples would show how this subtype was utilized in ‘Hamlet’.

To elaborate, the following speech was uttered by Horatio (who was a friend of Hamlet) when the ghost appeared for the second time. Marcellus and Bernardo were the ones who saw it first. They brought Horatio to talk to the thing they beheld as he was a scholar.

*I- “What art thou that usurp’st this time of night/ Together with that fair and war-like form/ In which the majesty of buried **Denmark** Did sometimes march?”* (Shakespeare, 2011, 1. 1. 46- 48).

When Horatio talked, he referred to it as “Denmark” and this word is the synecdoche. The literal meaning of this word is that it is a name of a country (Allen & Rennie, 2006) while the figurative meaning which is reflected in these lines is that it is a reference to the killed king (as the ghost was like the killed king). It is the whole stands for the part because the king is a part of Denmark and here the Denmark which is the whole referred to him. This idea is supported by Abboud and McCarus (1983) who stated that countries sometimes refer to people of power. The reason behind such use may be to show a kind of glorification to the addressed person as he was the head of the kingdom. In this regard, Coyle (2002) agreed on the notion that magnificence can be reflected in such expressions. Secondly, in Shakespeare’s era, a ruler of country or even a territory was named after that ruled place. This kind of reference (referring to the kings by their kingdoms) was used in the past according to Mategrano (2000).

Another sample selected from the following extract in which a simple part of a letter sent by Hamlet's father in law to the king of England in which he ordered the English king to kill Hamlet as soon as he arrived England.

2- "*By letters congruing to that effect The present death of Hamlet. Do it, England*". (Shakespeare, 2011, 4. 3. 65).

The literal meaning of the word England is that it is a name of a whole kingdom (Merriam-Webster, 2014). But here the king of Denmark used the word "England" to refer to the English king who is part of the whole i.e. the country. For this reason, the word "England" is the whole for part synecdoche and it, at the same time, demonstrates the non-literal meaning. Put differently, the idea that country name refers to a single person is proposed by Holcomb and Killingsworth (2010). The use of this type is attributed to the claim that Claudius needed a service from him (to kill his nephew), so he flattered him in the letter by addressing him as a king. Maccary (1998) supposed that this is the only position that Claudius shows some humbleness for a hidden thing he mostly needed i.e. the assassination of Hamlet.

To summarize, '*the whole stands for the part*' synecdoches are used when the speaker is aware that the hearer would not misunderstand the meaning when only a part of it is uttered to represent the whole. Anyway, sometimes the plurality is used to stand for the singularity as the next section reveals.

### 3.1.2 The Plural Stands for the Singular

In English some expressions are plural in form, but they function as a singular. One of the figures of speech that takes such form is synecdoche. In this regard, Arthur (1994) stated that "a synecdoche can also be a plural for a singular" (p.84). To expatiate, in 'Hamlet', Claudius referred to himself using the plural forms, which is not a sign that there is more than one ruler in Denmark.

To elaborate, "**us**" and "**we**" are used pragmatically to refer to one person, while the literal meaning of the three terms is that they refer to a person when talking about himself/herself if there is at least one person with him/her (Soanes & Stevenson, 2006). In addition, the pragmatic meaning is an extension of this literal meaning as it refers to 'majestic plural' or 'royal we'. According to Geisler and Howe (2008), the speaker who uses such figure, always a person with authority, refers to himself or herself in such a manner as to indicate that he/she is a full of power and dignity and depending on the

whole- part relation. This indicates that the type of this synecdoche is *generalizing* and the subtype is *the plural which stands for singular*.

3- “**King:** *O heavy deed! It had been so with us had we been there/ His liberty is full of threats to all; /To you yourself, to us, to everyone*”. (Shakespeare, 2011, 4. 1. 15).

The pragmatic use of ‘majestic plural’ by Claudius is to show his proud character. Shakespeare shows us that by this figure, even when there was nobody around but only his wife, he referred to himself as a royal thrice.

*The plural which stands for singular* type was also represented in the following quotation by using the word ‘givers’.

4-“*for to the noble mind Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind.*” (Shakespeare, 2011, 3. 1. 100).

Ophelia in this line is talking to what she thought her lover Hamlet. The occasion was that she wanted to give back some gifts that she received from him. The type of synecdoche (*plural stands for singular*) is represented by the word “givers”. The plural form of the word ‘giver’ literally refers to two or more than two people when they process the act of giving (McIntosh, 2013). The synecdochic meaning, the figurative, is simultaneously different since it refers to a singular person that is to say Hamlet. The cause behind such use by Ophelia is to show some respect to the prince as the status between the two is different. In accordance with Haverkamp (2011), who illustrated that Ophelia referred to him as “givers” as she was not talking to Hamlet in particular, but the givers in general and at the same she signified herself as singular “*noble mind*” (Shakespeare, 2011, 3. 1. 100).

Furthermore, the ‘*generalizing synecdoche*’ has a subtype that requires a less effort due to the use of words with general meanings to give specific details as the next subsection demonstrates:

### 3.1.3 The Genus Stands for the Species

This subtype is the third and the final subtype of the generalizing synecdoche as Mey (2009) proclaimed. Such type has expressions with general meaning, but it signifies less meaning than these expressions have. In other words, the words if used in their literal sense, they would give broader meaning. For example, in the next quotation the genus “bird” was used by Hamlet instead of its species ‘falcon’ which embodied how the genus stands for its species sometimes:

5-“*Hillo, ho, ho, boy! come, **bird**, come.*” (Shakespeare, 2011, 1. 1. 116).

This was said when Hamlet caught the ghost. He told him details about his father murder. After the ghost had left, Horatio and Marcellus (who were following Hamlet) entered and called for Hamlet then this line came. The ‘*genus for species*’ synecdoche is presented here in the word “bird” which its literal meaning refers to any species of this genus. It is the bird that its main properties are feathers, wings, and a beak and mostly have the ability to fly (Merriam-Webster, 2014). Chandler (2007) said that ‘*genus for species*’ synecdoche can be reflected by the use of the genus ‘waters’ to refer to ‘ocean’. The same thing can be said here as the ‘bird’ was used instead of ‘falcon’. So, the figurative meaning is not similar to the literal meaning as it is specific for one species only. In this regard, Mategrano (2000) mentioned that falconers use such expression to call their falcons. Simply speaking, they use the genus bird which has hundreds of species to refer only to one species.

Another speech came from Hamlet’s mouth addressed to Ophelia after she gave back his presents. He insulted her many times in this conversation but the one with synecdoche was that line.

6-“*if thou wilt needs marry, marry a fool; for wise men know well enough what for wise men know well enough what **monsters** you make of them*” (Shakespeare, 2011, 3. 1. 141).

The ‘*genus stands for species*’ synecdoche exists in the word “monsters” which its dictionary meaning indicate an “animal or plant of abnormal form or structure” (Merriam-Webster, 2014). Again, literally, it refers to the genus of animals with unusual shape. As for the figurative meaning, it refers to a particular species of ‘monster the ones with horns’. Such type of synecdoche was referred to by Huang (2005, p. 179) when saying that “barbed weapon” as genus is used for the species “harpoon” by the whale hunters. Likewise, the use of monster in this quotation is used to refer to the ‘monster’ the ones with horns’. As intended, Hamlet’s idea was that women are not faithful with their husbands and with the passage of time they turn them into ‘monsters with horn’ which figuratively refers to cuckolds (Mategrano, 2000). Another avail that made Hamlet use the word “monster” was to refer to himself. Therefore, this is an accusation of adultery to Ophelia. Curran (2006) said that the choice of the word might be for euphemistic reason as the addressee is a lady.

In a few words, the analysis of the first main type *generalizing synecdoche* and its three subtypes revealed that most literary texts are based

on different figures of speech, namely synecdoche, to convey different ideas and themes. Put differently, instead of writing so many paragraphs and pages, writers and playwrights resort to use the economic language represented by using various figures of speech such as: symbolism, metaphor, synecdoche and so on. In contrast to the first main type *generalizing synecdoche*, the next subsections will deal with the second main type *the particularizing synecdoche* along with its three subtypes.

### 3.2 Particularizing Synecdoche

This is the second main type of synecdoche which “is constituted by a representative relation that consists of a semantically broader concept standing for a semantically narrower concept” (Mey, 2009, p. 888). Whitsitt (2013) further explained that this kind occurs when one substitutes a particular idea or word for a more general idea or word. The three main subcategories of this type of synecdoche in accordance with Mey (2009) are:

#### 3.2.1 The Part Stands for the Whole

This subtype takes place when someone employs a part of something to denote the whole of that thing (Mey, 2009), for instance, the word ‘flesh’ used in Hamlet’s play in the following quotation to refer to a bigger entity:

7- “O! that this too too solid **flesh** would melt, Thaw and resolve itself into a dew” (Shakespeare, 2011, 1. 3. 115).

This part was extracted from the first soliloquy in the play. Soliloquy is “a dramatic speech uttered by one character speaking aloud while alone on the stage (or while under the impression of being alone)” Baldick (2001, P. 239). Here Hamlet revealed his inner feelings about the marriage of his mother and wishes to commit suicide. The word that holds the ‘*the part stands for the whole*’ synecdoche in this extract is “flesh” which refers literally to “the surface of the human body (with reference to its appearance or sensory properties)” (Soanes & Stevenson, 2006). The figurative meaning, conversely, shows that Hamlet is talking with himself as a whole, but addressing only his flesh as representation of that whole. Hebron (2004) supports the view that synecdoche associates an entity with its parts. So when someone hears: “He paid the workers 5\$ per head” (p.149), the word “heads” substitutes the “worker”. The reason that led to utilize “flesh” here is that such word is a reference to Lutheranism which is part of Protestant church as opposed to Catholicism that Hamlet followed. In this matter, Kaula (1984) stated that such expressions were used differently to refer to how Hamlet’s exposure (while studying at Wittenberg) to this sect changed his thinking way, even

though he remained catholic. So, the word “flesh” represented the controversy between the parts of one religion.

The second sample of synecdoche was represented by using the word ‘hand’ which is one of any body parts. This can be demonstrated in the following quotation:

**8-** “*Thus was I, sleeping, by a brother’s **hand** Of life, of crown, of queen at once dispatched, Cut off even in the blossoms of my sin*” (Shakespeare, 2011, 1. 5. 74).

This quotation exposes the first time at which the ghost talked with someone. On this occasion the ghost pretended that he is Hamlet’s father spirit. He also told him that his brother was the one who stole his life, kingdom and even his wife. Figuratively speaking, the ‘part for whole’ synecdoche is demonstrated in the use of the “hand” which its literalism refers to “the end part of the arm beyond the wrist, including the palm, fingers, and thumb” (Waite & Hawker, 2009). This means that it is a part of human body. The figurative interpretation of the synecdoche “hand” implies that Claudius, in other terms choosing this part of the body “hand” to stand for the whole (Claudius). Bredin (1984), in this perspective, affirmed that there should be an extrinsic relation between the part and the whole that part represents. Thus, the reason behind choosing this part is due to the fact that the text is about stealing things from someone and the only the part of the body (hand) that can do what extrinsically related to the stealer (Claudius). Haverkamp (2011) has a nice explanation of Shakespeare’s Claudius’s theft which is that Claudius did not steal the kingdom from Hamlet’s father only, but also from his son in the sense that Hamlet was the elder son and the succession is his, but Claudius was smart enough to use the marriage and to become the king. However, in *particular synecdoche* the singularity sometimes is used to refer to plurality as the next section reveals.

### 3.2.2 The Singular Stands for the Plural

‘*The singular stands for the plural*’ is the second subtype of the particularizing synecdoche. In this type “The singular stands for the plural forms a ‘collective singular’” (Mey, 2009, p. 888). So, this type of particularizing synecdoche is the practice of referring to many individuals by a singular term instead of a plural one (Fahnestock, 2011, p. 101). To clarify the idea, the two excerpts from *Hamlet’s* tragedy may clarify more.

**9-** “*Oh, there be players that I have seen play and heard others praise (and that highly), not to speak it profanely, that, neither having the accent of*

*Christians nor the gait of **Christian, pagan, nor man***" (Shakespeare, 2011, 3. 2. 34).

The '*singular for plural*' synecdoche can be seen in the words "Christian", "pagan" and "man" that refer to only one person for each of them (Soanes & Stevenson, 2006). Indifference, the figurative meaning of these synecdoches is that each singular noun (Christians, pagans and man respectively) represents the community to which an individual belongs. Abdul-Raof (2006) stated that the use of his kind is existed in the Holy Quran, as in: "*My Lord, indeed my **bone** has weakened, and my head has filled with white,*" (The Quran 19: 04) (Translated by Pickthall, 2010). This verse includes the words of the Prophet Zachariah's supplicant while invoking God, in which "the bone" is used in its singular form to signify the whole bones. Correspondingly, "Christian", "pagan" and "man" are used to refer to their plural forms. The reason behind using singular to stand for the plural is that each community has its own characteristics and the individuals within mostly follow these characteristics. This pyramidal order of the communities reflected by the synecdoches which started with "Christian" then "pagan" and ended with merely "man" was not a random order; the intended meaning might as Curran (2006) stated when he talked about saints and pagan in literary Elizabethan text that "later we learn of the superiority of Christian patience over that of the pagans, and how it makes the saints ...." (p. 177). So, the order was hierarchical from, what Hamlet regarded, top to down.

On another occasion, synecdoche was used when Hamlet showed up at Ophelia's funeral, Laertes attacked him. Laertes attacked hamlet believing that he was the one responsible for her death. Then, these lines were said by Hamlet to Laertes. However, the '*singular stands for the plural*' synecdoche is found in the word "hand" which refers literally to singularity i.e. one hand (Waite & Hawker, 2009), but the next quotation shows something else.

**10-** "*Yet have I in me something dangerous, Which let thy wisdom fear. Away thy **hand!***" (Shakespeare, 2011, 5. 1. 273).

The figurative sense the synecdoche refers to is Laertes's two hands which in English are plural. The reason behind the singularity could be that the text has more than one singular noun and pronoun, that is to say, "I", "me", "something" and "wisdom". Thus, he ended the sentence with a singular to concord the context. Another possible cause is that the absence of duality makes it somehow hard to show that there are only two hands and no more than two. Therefore, the playwright employed the singular to show to the readers (not to the theatregoers) that no one intervened and what



substantiates this view is the next dialogue when the king says: “*Pluck them asunder*” (Shakespeare, 2011, 5. 1. 276). Allott (2010) talked about this subject and said that in English there is only singular and plural. To be more specific, there is no dual form like Arabic, so the context decides the choice between the singular and plural form.

### 3.2.3 The Species Stands for the Genus

This kind employs the member of a class (the species) to denote the class (the genus) that includes it (Chandler, 2007). In depth, the following excerpts from Shakespeare's ‘*Hamlet*’ will deal with this subtype thoroughly.

**11-** “*He took my father grossly, full of **bread**, With all his crimes broad blown, as flush as May*” (Shakespeare, 2011, 3. 3. 81).

While Claudius was praying, the prince was prepared to kill him, but the latter thought and said the quoted line. In this line, Hamlet expressed how his father's life was superb by using the word “bread” along with the expression “full of”. This means that the ‘bread’ was used as synecdoche of a type ‘*species stands for genus*’ to indicate literally the “food made of flour, water, and yeast mixed together and baked” (Soanes & Stevenson, 2006). The referential meaning of the synecdoche differs, in the sense that this species of food represents all kind of food i.e. the genus food is represented by one of its species namely bread. The reason behind using “bread” is that it is the primary species among the other species. According to Brown (2007) when someone says: “He gets his bread by his labor” (p. 462), he refers to any kind of food not only that species in particular.

The second example on this subtype of synecdoche is implied in the use of ‘word’ in the following quotation said by Guildenstern to Hamlet.

**12-** “*Good my lord, vouchsafe me a **word** with you*” (Shakespeare, 2011, 3. 2. 300).

Guildenstern is the speaker who asks Hamlet a permission to talk to him. The expression “word” is, here, the ‘*species stands for genus*’ synecdoche which has literally the meaning of “a single distinct meaningful element of speech or writing, used to form sentences with others” (Soanes & Stevenson, 2006). Figuratively speaking, however, this did not reflect that Guildenstern uttered only one word to Hamlet; instead, he has at least two or more sentences to tell the prince. So the “word” is a species that reflects the genus speech. Sommer and Weiss (2001) as well gave an example of the use of this ‘word’ as a synecdoche taken from a play called ‘the miser’, as in: “*in a **word**, he loves money more than reputation, than honor, than virtue, and the*

*mere sight of anyone asking for money sends him into convulsions*" (p. 291). In this light, the species "word" refers to the genus speech that follows it. The same expression is still used as a species for genus in everyday language. For example, one might hear: "I would like to have a word with you (Merriam-Webster, 2013). The reason behind using the species "word" to represent the genus speech might be for its property of being the basic element of the speech. According to Waite and Hawker (2009) the "word" is "a single distinct meaningful element of speech or writing, used to form sentences with others".

#### 4. Conclusion

To address the question raised in the present study, it focused on the pragmatic analysis of synecdoche in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Synecdoche is of two types: generalizing and particularizing alongside with their subtypes. Anyhow, the findings suggested that generalizing synecdoches were the prevalent type. In fact, the generalizing synecdoches became common and preferred ones due to the overuse of its subtype *'the whole that stands for the part'*. Furthermore, the opposite subtype *'the part that stands for the whole'* which is a subdivision of the particularizing synecdoche was also used frequently in *Hamlet*. This shows that the whole-part synecdochical relation is considered a common feature in *Hamlet*. This is in line with Adams (1987) who claimed that "the part is invaded by a whole that has emanated or shrunk into it." It is a "miraculous synecdoche," (p. 47), because it designates a part which "is identical to the whole" (p. 43).

Anyhow, the current study is different from previous studies like (Acheson, 2004; Al-Kawwaz, 2014; Rohaniyah & Fadilah, 2018) whom their studies were reviews and arguments about synecdoche with no model or theory. This study employed two theories: Searle et al.'s (1980) literalism and Plett (2001 cited in Mey, 2009) taxonomy in analyzing data under investigation. So, this can be regarded as a theoretical contribution. In addition to that, the study contributed pedagogically to the repertory of scholarly work on literary pragmatics in terms of updated knowledge of synecdoche in relation to pragmatics. In this light, the study gives insight into the pragmatics of figure of speech, namely synecdoche, used in a literary text. Thus, the findings of this study may serve as lens for a better understanding and interpretation of the nature and intended meaning of synecdoche.

## REFERENCES

- Abboud, P., & McCarus, E. (Eds.). (1983). *Elementary modern standard Arabic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Abdul-Raof, H., (2006). *Arabic Rhetoric: A Pragmatic Analysis*. Routledge.
- Acheson, K. (2004). Hamlet, Synecdoche and History: Teaching the Tropes of "New Remembrance". *College Literature*, 31(4), 111-134.
- Adams, H. (1987). *Synecdoche and Method*. Duke University Press
- Ali, A. (2015). The use of synecdoche in social speech interaction. *Journal of the College of Basic Education*, 21(88).
- Al-Kawwaz, S. (2014). *Vindicating Synecdoche: A Study in Rhetoric and Cognitive Semantics*. Journal of the College of Languages, 29.
- Allen, R. & Rennie, S. (2006). *Oxford English Dictionary for Schools*. Oxford University Press.
- Allott, N. (2010). *Key Terms in Pragmatics*. Continuum.
- Almisned, O. (2001). *Metaphor in the Qur'an: An Assessment of Three English Translations of Surat Al-Hajj*. [Doctoral, Durham University].
- Arthur, K.(1994). *How to Study Your Bible*. Harvest House Publishers.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Martino Fine Books.
- Baldick, C. (2001). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford Univ. Press.
- Bredin, H. (1984). Metonymy. *Poetics today*, 511, 45- 58.
- Brown, D. (2007). *Synecdoche: Bible Thought*. Bible Press.
- Bryman, A. (2011). *Business research methods*. Bell, Emma, 1968- (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Bullinger, E. W. (1991). *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated*. Baker Book House.
- Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The Basics*. Routledge.
- Coyle, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Hamlet, William Shakespeare: Contemporary critical essays*. Palgrave.
- Curran, J. (2006). *Hamlet, Protestantism, and the Mourning of Contingency: Not to Be*. Ashgate.

- DeFranzo, S. (2011). ' *what's the difference between qualitative and quantitative research* ', *Snap Surveys*, 16 September, Available at <http://www.snapsurveys.com/qualitative-vs-quantitative-research/> (Accessed 13 November 2020).
- Fahnestock, J. (2011). *Rhetorical Style: The Uses of Language in Persuasion*. Oxford University Press.
- Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages. from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41917225>
- Gains, N. (2013). *Brand esSense: Using Sense, Symbol and Story to Design Brand Identity*. Kogan Page.
- Geisler, N., & Howe, T. (2008). *The Big Book of Bible Difficulties*. Baker Books.
- Greene, M. (1986). Qualitative Research and The Uses of Literature. *Journal of Thought*, 21(3), 69–83.
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & Mitchell, M. (2013). *Collecting Qualitative Data: A Field Manual for Applied Research 10 (1)*, 221-234. SAGE Publications.
- Haverkamp, A. (2011). *Shakespearean Genealogies of Power: A Whispering of Nothing in Hamlet, Richard II, Julius Caesar, Macbeth, The Merchant of Venice, and The Winter's Tale*. Routledge.
- Hebron, M. (2004). *Mastering the Language of Literature*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holcomb, C. & Killingsworth, M. (2010). *Performing Prose: The Study and Practice of Style in Composition*. Southern Illinois.
- Huang, Y. (2005). *English Rhetoric*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kaula, D. (1984). Hamlet and the Image of Both Churches. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 24(2), 241.
- Khalaf, A. S. (2013). A Semantico-Pragmatic Study of Synecdoche in the Glorious Quran with Reference to its Realizations in English. *Journal of Al\_Anbar University for Language and Literature*, 9.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Leech, G. (1994). *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. Longman, an imprint of Pearson Education.
- Maccary, T. (1998). *Hamlet: A Guide to the Play*. Greenwood Press.
- Mategrano, T. (Ed.). (2000). *CliffsNotes Shakespeare's Hamlet*. Cliffs Notes.

- McIntosh, C. (Ed.). (2013). *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary: With CD-ROM*. Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam-Webster, I. (2013). *Webster's All-in-One Dictionary & Thesaurus*.
- Merriam-Webster, Inc (Ed.). (2014). *Merriam-Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus* (Revised and updated edition). Merriam-Webster, Incorporated.
- Mey, J. (2009). *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. Elsevier.
- Naseef, R. (2018). *Kināyah as a figure of speech in the Qur'an: An analysis of four English translations* [Phd, University of Leeds].
- Nerlich, B. and Clarke, D. (1999). Synecdoche as a Cognitive and Communicative Strategy. *Historical Semantics and Cognition*, 197-213. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.KG.
- Pickthall, M. (2010). *The Koran*. Independent Pub.
- Richards, J., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). Longman.
- Rohaniyah, J., & Fadilah, S. (2018). *The Analysis of Hyperbole and Synecdoche in Jokowi's Political Speeches On 2014 and 2015 Live on Metro TV*. *Wacana Didaktika*, 6(01), 76–85.  
<https://doi.org/10.31102/wacanadidaktika.6.01.76-85>
- Searle, J., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (Eds.). (1980). *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics*. Kluwer Academic.
- Seto, K. (1999). 'Distinguishing Metonymy from Synecdoche'. In: Panther, K. and G. Radden (eds.). *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, pp.91- 120. John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Shakespeare, W. (2011). *Hamlet*. Harper Press.
- Smirlock, D. (1976). Rough Truth: Synecdoche and Interpretation in The Egoist. *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, 31(3), 313–328.
- Soanes, C., & Stevenson, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Concise Oxford English Dictionary* (11th ed., rev). Oxford University Press.
- Sommer, E., & Weiss, D. (2001). *Metaphors Dictionary: 6500 Comparative Phrases, Including 800 Shakespearean Metaphors*. Visible Ink Press.
- Waite, M., & Hawker, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Oxford Paperback Dictionary and Thesaurus / Edited by Maurice Waite, Sara Hawker* (3rded.). Oxford University Press.

- Whitsitt, S. (2013). *Metonymy, Synecdoche, and the Disorders of Contiguity*. Padova University Press.
- Yule, G. (2014a). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (2014b). *Pragmatics*. Oxford Univ. Press.