Paradox in Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet: A Stylistic Analysis

Iman Khudhair Al-Abodi
University of Al-Qadisiya- College of Education

Abstract
   This study deals with the linguistic analysis of paradox as one of the figures of speech in which a statement contains apparently opposing or incongruous elements This study consists of two parts: theoretical and practical. The theoretical part is an attempt to explicate definition and uses of paradox, with reference to another related figure. Then, the study aims at studying two levels by which the grammatical form as well as the semantic perspective can be discussed. The practical one includes certain texts extracted from Shakespeare's **Romeo and Juliet**. Finally, the findings of the study are summed up in the conclusion.

الخلاصة
تتناول هذه الدراسة التحليل اللغوي للتناقض كإحدى صيغ الكلام والتي من خلالها تتكون الجملة من عناصر متعارضة، والتي عندما تقرأ معا، تتحول إلى عناصر ذات معنى.
   تتكون الدراسة من جزئيين : نظري وعملي. ابتدأ الجزء النظري بمحاولة لتعريف التناقض واستعمالاته بالإشارة إلى صيغة ذات علاقة. هدفت بعدها الدراسة دراسة جانبين والتي يمكن بواسطتهما مناقشة التركيب النحوي والجانب الدلالي لهذه الظاهرة اللغوية. تضمن الجزء العملي بعض النصوص المقتبسة من مسرحية شكسبير روميو و جوليت.و أخيرا، احتوت الخاتمة استنتاجات البحث.

1 Paradox : Definition and Uses

   Paradox is a figure of speech consisting of a statement or a proposition which on the surface seems self-contradictory, absurd, or contrary to established fact or practice, but on the further thinking and study may prove to be true, e.g., (**Figures of Speech**,2003:2) :

1.There is this quality, in things, of the right way seeming wrong
      at first.The writer implies in this statement that there is a paradoxical quality in life, that sometimes what one does right may seem at first, to most people, wrong and unconventional, when it is really the correct thing to do.

   2.This suspense is terrible. I hope it will last. (Oscar Wilde)
One usually doesn't wish something terrible to last, but Wilde is implying here that he really enjoys the suspense, and hopes it will last.

   3.John McEnroe: The Champ you Love to Hate.
This title wittily expresses the feelings of most fans of this world renowned tennis player: they love his beautiful tennis "art-form", but they dislike the way he throws "on-court tantrums" i.e., losing his temper during matches.

   In other words, Boyle (2004:1) defines paradox as an apparently true statement that seems to lead to an illogical contradiction, or to a situation that contradicts common intuition. Put simply, a paradox is 'the opposite of what one thinks to be true'.   When paradox is used as a statement or expression so surprisingly self-contradictory as to provoke one into seeking another sense or context in which it would be true. Wordsworth's line: "The child is father of the man" and Shakespeare's "the truest poetry is the most feigning" are notable literary examples (**Literary Dictionary**,2009:2).

   At first reading, one is struck by the absurdity of the statement: "The child is father of the man". How is that possible? On deeper study of the poem, however, one can deduce that Wordsworth meant that one's spiritual love of things natural begins from infancy and develops through manhood to death. It is a rounded process: "bound each to each by natural piety"(**Figures of Speech**,2003:2). It refers to the stages in manhood. A child eventually becomes a father of a son and so is a man to an eventual man. The circle of life can be painfully honest and innocent. The truth that they speak can be profound for adults (**Elaboration of meaning of paradox**,2003:1).

   Apparently self-contradictory statement whose underlying meaning is revealed only by careful scrutiny. Its purpose is to arrest attention and provoke fresh thought, as in the statement: (**Britannica Concise Encyclopedia**,2008:2)

   4.Less is more.
   The etymology of paradox can be traced back to texts appearing at the Asia and sometimes after the year 1500 AD. The first forms of the word appeared as the late Latin word *paradoxum*, but is also found

in Greek texts as *paradoxon*. The word is composed of the prefix *para-* which means "contrary to", "altered" or "opposite of", and conjoined with the noun suffix *doxa*, meaning "opinion" (Boyle,2004:1).

The paradox as a literary device has been defined as an anomalous juxtaposition of incongruous ideas for the sake of striking exposition or unexpected insight. It functions as a method of literary composition-and analysis which involves examining apparently contradictory statements and drawing conclusions either to reconcile them or to explain their presence (Rescher,2001:1).

Literary or rhetorical paradoxes abound in the works of Oscar Wilde and G.K.Chesterton. Statements such as Wilde's "I can resist anything except temptation" and Chesterton's "spies do not look like spies" are examples of rhetorical paradox. Further back, Polonius' observation in **Hamlet** that "though this be madness, yet there is method in't" is a memorable third (ibid.). Also, expressions that are illogical and metaphoric may be called "paradoxes", for example: "the pike flew to the tree to sing". The literal meaning is illogical, but there are many interpretations for this metaphor (**Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia**,2009:1).

Paradox in poetry means that tension at the surface of a verse can lead to apparent contradictions and hypocrisies. Brooks (1947:1) lays out his argument for the centrality of paradox by demonstrating that paradox is "the contention that referential language is too vague for the specific message a poet expresses; he must "make up his language as he goes". This, Brooks argues, is because words are mutable and meaning shifts when words are placed in relation to one another.

In the writing of poems, paradox is used as a method by which unlikely comparisons can be drawn and meaning can be extracted from poems both straightforward and enigmatic, as in Oscar Wilde's line: "Ignorance is like a delicate fruit; touch it and the bloom is gone". In short, a paradox in literature can be any contradictory or obviously untrue statement, which resolves itself upon later inspection. So that many critics maintain that paradox is not just a rhetorical or illustrative device but a basic aspect of all poetic language (**Columbia Encyclopedia**,2009:2).

The identification of a paradox based on seemingly simple and reasonable concepts has often led to significant advance in science, philosophy and mathematics. In moral philosophy, paradox plays a particularly central role in debates on ethics. For instance, an ethical admonition to "love thy neighbor" actively trying to kill somebody: if he or she succeeds , then one will be dead and thus unable to love him/her. But to preemptively attack or restrain him/her is also not usually considered loving. This might be termed an ethical dilemma (**Wikipedia**,2007:1).

Another example is the conflict between a moral injunction and a duty that cannot be fulfilled without violating that injunction: for example, the situation of a person who is obligated to feed his children (the duty) but cannot afford to do so without stealing, which would be wrong (the injunction). Such a conflict between two maxims is normally resolved through weakening one (or the other of them), e.g., the need for survival is greater than the need to abide by the law (Rescher,2001:7).

The word paradox is often used interchangeably with contradiction. Since it refers to a statement whose two parts seem contradictory yet make sense with more thought. Often, it is used to describe situations that are ironic (**Wikipedia**,2007:5).

Although paradox and irony as new critical tools for reading poetry are often conflated, they are independent poetical devices. Irony for Brooks (1971:2) is "the obvious warping of a statement by the context" whereas paradox is later glossed as a special kind of qualification which involves the overriding context of the surrounding words that make up the poem.

Paradox, however, is essential to the structure and being of the poem. Brooks (1947:2) shows that paradox was so essential to poetic meaning that paradox was almost identical to poetry. Brooks' use of paradox emphasized the indeterminate lines between form and content. Paradox often refers to the meaning and structure of the poem and is thus inclusive of irony. This existence of opposites or contraries and the reconciliation therefore is poetry and the meaning of the poem . Semantic paradoxes depend on language structure and the paradox is often used as a rhetorical device in epigrams and poetry.

Sometimes the term paradox is used for situations that are merely surprising. The paradox, for instance, is unexpected but perfectly logical. Paradox can also be used by Christ in his teaching: "They have ears but hear not". Or in ordinary conversation, one might use paradox, "Deep down he's really very shallow". Paradox, here, attracts the reader's or the listener's attention and gives emphasis (**Literary Terms**,2003:6).

1.2 Paradox Vs. Oxymoron

Paradox was cultivated especially by poets of the 17th century, often in the verbally compressed form of oxymoron. That is to say, when a paradox is compressed into two words, as in "living death", it is called an oxymoron. An oxymoron is a compressed paradox, formed by the conjoining of two incongruous terms (**Britannica Concise Encyclopedia**,2008:2).

Oxymoron is a literary figure of speech in which opposite or contradictory words, terms, phrases are combined to create a rhetorical effect by paradoxical means. The word is said to come from the Greek elements, *oxy* ="sharp, pointed" and *moros* ="dull, foolish"; in other words, "pointedly foolish" (Bulletin,2008:1).

In oxymoron, there is a phrase that combines two words that seem to be the opposite of each other but not any specific idea, as in (5) and (6) whereas in paradox, there is a statement that contains two opposite ideas or seems to be impossible in (7) and (8) (**Figures of Speech**,2003:1-2):

5.Sweet sorrow

6.Hells Angels

7.The most incomprehensible thing about the world is that it is
   comprehensible.

8.One who losses her life shall find it.

An understanding of oxymoron can help to appreciate more fully the implied complexity of descriptions and feelings. Like paradox, an oxymoron initially surprises one with its incongruity of terms, which really hides a certain truth, or a significant point (ibid.:3).

Bulletin (2008:2) considered an oxymoron as a type of paradox that combines two terms ordinarily seem as opposites, such as: Milton's description of God in **Paradise Lost** as 'Dark with excessive bright'. But it is different from a paradox in that it creates its effect much more compactly, using a combination of two successive words while paradox involves a complete statement. Oxymorons also appear in a range of contexts, from inadvertent errors such as: *extremely average*, to deliberate puns like: *same difference*, to literary oxymorons that have been carefully crafted to reveal a paradox (**Wikipedia,the free encyclopedia**,2009:1).

1.3 Paradox : A Semantic Perspective

As a figure of speech, paradox has been defined as an assertion seemingly opposed to common sense but that may yet have some truth in it. This means that paradox based on contrast, being a statement contradictory to what is accepted as a self-evident or proverbial truth or antonymy as a kind of very useful semantic relation. Antonym pairs are used in a large number of idioms and proverbs in English. Whether in common speech or in literary writing, antonymy is often employed to achieve rhetorical effects, in fact, it is even indispensable in such figure of speech as paradox, in which two opposing or contradictory meanings co-occur in one way or another (Chuanya,2003:36).

However, paradox basically has two features: firstly, it is the juxtaposition of two apparently opposed or contrasted meanings which are incompatible; secondly, the juxtaposition is usually surprising yet does in a way make sense, thereby creating an emphatic or epigrammatic effect. In terms of semantic relation, the meanings in paradox are strongly opposed. Thus, (ibid.:37):

9.Freedom is slavery.

10.Ignorance is strength. (Orwell cited in Nordquist,2003:2)

The rhetorical use of antonymy violates the stereotypically accepted logic in the world, as in true of many other rhetorical devices; but in fact, such use of antonymy not only makes sense, but, more important, also creates rhetorical effect (Chuanya,2003:40).

Since paradoxes are statements that look meaningful, and often true, but that justify contradictory conclusions. Therefore, they cause consternation among logicians and mathematicians. The logician Quine (1962:84-96) distinguishes three classes of paradox:

- A veridical paradox produces a result that appears absurd but is demonstrated to be true nevertheless. Paradoxes in economics tend to be the veridical type, typically counterintuitive outcomes of economic theory. The following are examples of veridical paradox which are seeming absurdities yet have some truth:

11.It is better to give than to receive.

It seems obvious that the benefits of receiving inevitably outweigh any possible advantages of giving, but many people find that, contrary to expectations, this is not their experience.

12. All men destroy the things they love.

13. It was the best of time. It was the worst of times.

14. What a pity that youth must be wasted on the young.(George Bernard Shaw cited in Bulletin,2008:5)

Some veridical include mathematical and statistical paradoxes. These are unintuitive results of correct logical reasoning. It is quite possible to draw wrong conclusions from correlation. For examples, towns with a large number of churches generally have a higher crime rate because both result from higher population. Also, a professional organization once found that economists with a Ph D actually had a lower average salary than those with a B S but this was found to be due to the fact that those with a Ph D worked in academia, where salaries are generally lower (Quine,1962:90).

Psychological and philosophical paradoxes may fit into this category. People take actions in contradiction to what they really want to do, and therefore defeat the very purposes of what they were trying to accomplish. Also, Man can never be free of control, for to be free of control is to be controlled by oneself (ibid.).

- A falsidical paradox establishes a result that not only appears false but actually is false; there is a fallacy in the supposed demonstration. An example would be: **all is one** which is contrary to the evidence of senses, the belief in plurality, and in particular that motion is nothing but an illusion. Another example is: **all horses are the same color**. These are incorrect result of subtly false reasoning (ibid.:96)

- A paradox which is in neither class may be an antinomy, which reaches a self-contradictory result by properly applying accepted ways of reasoning. *This sentence is false* is an example of this class: it is a sentence which cannot be consistently interpreted as true or false, because if it is false it must be true, and if it is true it must be false. Therefore, it can be concluded the sentence is neither true nor false (**Paradox**,2003:2).

One version of the lying Cretan paradox occurs interestingly in the Bible as another example: A Cretan says "All Cretans are liars" . Here, Hughes (2003:1-2) outlines three laws of the paradox:

a- Self reference -so *all Cretans* are liars, said the Cretan, is self referential, because the Cretan describes all Cretans;

b- Contradiction -so all Cretans *are liars*, said the Cretan, is contradictory because the Cretan is saying that Cretans are liars;

c- Vicious circularity or infinite regress -so if all Cretans are liars, and the Cretan told so, then it cannot be true, but if it is not true that ALL Cretans are liars, then SOME Cretan must be a liar, and if there is only one Cretan, the statement stands, but then it is true that all Cretans are liars, so it must be a lie ...and so on.

The Cretan could be telling the truth about all Cretans being liars. They *could* all be liars, but that does not mean that they are lying about everything all of the time.

-A fourth kind has sometimes been asserted since Quine's work. A paradox which is both true and false at the same time in the same sense is called a dialetheia. In Western logics it is often assumed, following Aristotle that no dialetheia exist, but they are sometimes accepted in eastern traditions and in Paraconsistent logics. If someone says, **I am lying**, for example, and one assumes that if his statement is true, it must also be false. The paradox is that the statement: **I am lying** is false if it is true (**Paradoxes**,2003:1).

1.4 Paradox : A Grammatical Form

Syntactically, paradoxes come in different forms. Some are presented as a statement or a group of statements that leads to a contradiction or a situation which defines intuition; or it can be an apparent contradiction that actually expresses a non-dual truth. Typically, either the statements in question do not really imply the contradiction, the puzzling result is not really a contradiction, or the premises themselves are not all really true or cannot all be true together (**Paradox**,2003:1):

In English literature two forms may be distinguished. One is Particular or Local and the other is the General or Structural. Examples of the first one are short pithy statements with verge on epigrammatic such as, a well-known Socratic paradox would be the phrase (**Paradox in Literature**,2003:1):

15. I know nothing at all.

The question arises, then, is how he knows that he knows nothing, if this is the only information he possesses.

    16.I must be cruel to be kind.

    17.The sun itself is dark simulacrum and light is shadow of God.

The second one is more complex both in prose and poetry. For instance, there is paradox at the heart of Christian Faith that the world would be saved by failure. Notable example of structural form of paradoxical poetry is found in Donne's sonnet (ibid.):

    18. Death be not proud, though some have called thee,

      Mighty and dreadful, for, thou art not so..

But since what is opposed or contrasted in paradox is not the statement form but meaning, then the syntactic frame of paradox can be beyond statement level, for example, (Chuanya,2003:39):

a. Subject vs. predicative as in:

    19.A friend to everybody is a friend to nobody.(proverb)

b. Subject vs. object as in:

    20.The greatest hates spring from the greatest love. (proverb)

Furthermore, one of the most characteristic and essential features of paradoxes is their shortness and conciseness. They are achieved by the syntactical pattern of paradox. The syntax of this stylistic device is laconic and clear-cut, e.g., (**Stylistic Features of Oscar Wilde's Wrightings**,2009:4-5):

    21.Men become old, but they never become good.

    22.Do not use bid words. They mean so little.

In these examples one can see the parallel constructions widely used by Oscar Wilde. These paradoxes are short and laconic, and are not very complex that makes them easy for remembering. So paradoxes create the individuality of Oscar Wilde who is famous for his brilliant epigrams and the wittest paradoxes that serve a perfect means of creating the clear-cut syntax of paradoxes.

Some paradoxes are phrased as questions, for example, which came first, the chicken or the egg? The answer seems paradoxical; the chicken must exist first to lay the egg, but the egg must exist first to hatch the chicken. Both answers seem to be backed up by solid logic, but only one can be the correct answer. Thus, a paradox (**Paradox**,2003:7).

Another example, when one supposes there is a town with just one male barber; and that every man in the town keeps himself clean-shaven: some by shaving themselves, some by attending the barber. It seems reasonable to say that he shaves all and only those men in town who don't shave themselves. Under this situation, one can ask the following question: Does the barber shave himself ? The answer of this is: if he does, then he doesn't (because he does not shave those who shave themselves), and if he doesn't, then he does (because he shaves all those who do not shave themselves) (Suber,1990:2).

2.1 Analysis

    A linguistic analysis of paradox as one of the rhetorical device has been tackled in one of Shakespeare's play **Romeo and Juliet**. In the tragedy, **Romeo and Juliet**, Shakespeare uses many literary devices to give his marvelous creation meaning; through his use of foreshadowing, metaphors and paradoxes he emphasizes the essential message of the play.

    Romeo Montague and Juliet Capulet absolutely adore each other. However, the Montague family absolutely despises the Capulet family, and vice versa, because of an old grudge. How is it possible for Romeo and Juliet to love and live happily in so poisonous atmosphere? That is the central issue of this play (Cummings,2003:1).

    Shakespeare's **Romeo and Juliet** has an edge-of-the-seat plot full of murder, love, feuding, and betrayal. Driving this tragic play forward is the fast-paced, witty, and convoluted dialogue of the script. Effectively capturing the audience's attention, Shakespeare has used a number of important literary devices, which serve to amuse, guide, and hypnotize the viewer of this production (**Romeo and Juliet: The Story**,2003:1).

    Therefore, Shakespeare uses paradoxes to illustrate the themes of the play in subtle ways. Paradox is used by Shakespeare to express contradictory emotions. Paradox suggests the split that people often feel in their hearts. Much of what it means to be human is embodied in the device of paradox. **Romeo and Juliet** is based upon paradox in the way Shakespeare views his characters by the language that they speak. The nurse's dialogue is always in prose which denotes lower station in life. Juliet's lines, on the other hand, are often delightful poetry, ranging from erotic couplets to apostrophes. The nurse offers a practical solution to Juliet's plight concerning her father's arranged marriage to the County Paris, while Juliet has no intention of betraying her husband, Romeo. Therein lies the paradox of the nurse and

Juliet. Romeo and Juliet are alike in the respect that they both are of noble birth, but different in the way they handle a crisis. Although Mercutio and Romeo are close friends, the former is a character who lives life to it's fullest with abandon and recklessness, while Romeo is a bit more immature and cautious (**Paradoxes in Romeo and Juliet**,2009:3).

There are also many other paradoxes used to differentiate between the social classes of the characters. The courtly love of Romeo is balanced by the earthly love of Mercutio, the sexual innocence and loyalty of Juliet are counter balanced by the Nurse's carnal knowledge and shifting loyalties, the peace-loving Benvolio is offset by the ferocious Tybalt, and the irrational hatred between the Capulet and the Montague is counter balanced by rational Prince and Friar Lawrence (**Romeo and Juliet: Literary Devices**,2006:6).

Text 1

> **Nurse: His name is Romeo, and a Montague,**
> **The only son of your great enemy.**
> **Juliet: My only love sprung from my only hate!**
> **Too early seen unknown, and known too late!**
> **Prodigious birth of love it is to me,**
> **That I must love a loathed enemy.   (Act I,Scene 5:55)**

Those who are unfamiliar with the play would think the statement "My only love sprung from my only hate" rather strange, for how could one love what one hates? But knowing the story they would find the paradox is used most effectively to express Juliet's mixed feelings at the enormity of her act: that she has fallen in love with the son of the family she has been brought up to hate (**Figures of Speech**,2003:2).

Juliet expresses a paradox when she speaks of Romeo, saying, "My only love sprung from my only hate" Semantically, this seems to be a contradictory statement, because love and hate are opposites. Juliet appears to contradict herself as she realizes a sad fact: Romeo, her "only love" belongs to the Montague family, a family she has been taught to despise since birth (her "only hate"). This might seem to contradict itself but is nevertheless true which reflects a veridical paradox. From a syntactic viewpoint, the frame of this statement consists of subject vs. object: **My only love** vs. **my only hate**.

Text 2

> **And in the taste confounds the appetite.**
> **Therefore love moderately; long life doth so:**
> **Too swift arrives as tardy as too slow.   (Act II,Scene V:99)**

This is the paradox of Friar Laurence's remark to Romeo. The Friar is gathering herbs and plants "too swift arrives" that can be beneficial to people, but then he recognizes that the same plants and herbs can be deadly, as well, when used inappropriately. The Friar realizes that the same is true for man. This semantically reflects a veridical paradox when both herbs and man contain the ability for good and evil.

The Friar experiences this first hand. In attempting to do something good-agreeing to secretly marry the young lovers, his actions without considering dire consequences lead to Romeo and Juliet's destruction. The Friar is like a plant or herb, he is in many ways a resource, yet his actions lead to dire consequences for those who rely on him (**The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet**,2007:2).

The syntactic pattern of this statement is subject: **Too swift** vs. predicate: **as tardy as too slow**.

Text 3

> **O serpent heart, hid with a flowering face!**
> **Did ever dragon keep so fair a cave?**
> **Despised substance of divinest show,**
> **Just opposite to what thou justly seem'st,**
> **A damned saint, an honourable villain!**
> **O nature, what hadst thou to do in hell,**
> **When thou didst bower the spirit of a fiend,**
> **In moral paradise of such sweet slesh?**
> **Was ever book containing such vile matter**
> **So fairly bound? O that deceit should dwell**

> In such a gergeous palace! (Act III,Scene II:119)

In this text, paradoxes have a great deal of meaning between Romeo and Juliet, both, use many paradoxes when describing each other as well as, the feeling they experience for one another. When Juliet speaks this after hearing that the love of her life Romeo has slain her cousin Tybalt. She criticizes him for killing Tybalt while praising her beloved, she manages to squeeze in five paradoxes (**Romeo and Juliet**,2009:8).

Semantically, the first line "O serpent heart, hid with a flowering face!" reflects antinomy paradox since Juliet knows that Romeo is not a serpent nor does he have a face full of flowers, her use of these descriptions show how paradoxically he is her lover and the murderer of her cousin at the same time. The syntactic frame of this paradox is a short particular statement.

Text 4
> **More light and light, more dark and**
> **dark our woes.   (Act III,Scene V:139)**

Semantically speaking, Romeo uses paradox of lightness and darkness as he leaves Juliet to flee to Mantue to give a surreal image of love and death. Romeo's uses of imagery of "light" and "dark" as a sense relation to give strongly opposed meaning. Light associates with their love and happiness which is contrary to dark that stands for their death and misery.

Metaphors for lightness and darkness in **Romeo and Juliet** are extremely prevalent; the darkness shields their light, their love, from the eyes of their family. The structural form of this paradoxical line combines a general statement about the paradoxical condition of love and death.

Text 5
> **Well, Juliet, I will lie with thee to-night.**
> **Let's see for means. O mischief, thou art swift**
> **To enter in the thoughts of desperate men!(Act V,Scene**
> **I:183)**

Most of the paradoxes that spring up in the string, disturbing final acts of this play revolve around Juliet's supposed death, and around a key Elizabethan pun on the word "death". "To die", to the Elizabethans, didn't just mean "to stop living", but also "to have an orgasm" (**Enotes**,2009:2).

One paradox comes, when Romeo hears of Juliet's death from Balthasar. He says "I will lie with thee to-night". What Romeo means is that he will lie dead with her tonight, committing suicide next to her dead body. From a semantic point of view, a dialetheia paradox occurs here since Romeo will lie with her in that she will be alive when he physically lies next to her, he will "lie with her" (which can also mean "sleep with her"). And in an old sort of way, the two of them will "die" (orgasm) next to each other. Paradox after paradox here. The basic feature of this line is its shortness which is achieved by the syntactical pattern of paradox, i.e., laconic and clear-cut.

And, as the two of them die, another paradox comes when they say:

Romeo: O true apothcary!
> **Thy drugs are quick. Thus with a kiss I die.**

Juliet: O happy dagger!
> **This is thy sheath; there rust, and let me die. (Act V,Scene193-97)**

Both of them, lying next to each other, "die" on the word "death". And both of their deaths have a sort of sexual context. Romeo dies with a kiss, and Juliet by putting a dagger into her body, a "sheath" (an Elizabethan word for the female genitals) (**Enotes**,2009:2).

So Romeo and Juliet die (die) and die (orgasm) at the same time which semantically means the opposite situation happens when to have the beginning of life and the end of it at the same time can only be a paradox. General statement is found syntactically since it describes the complex situation of life and death.

Conclusion

Paradox is a literary figure of speech based on a statement whose two parts seem absurd or self-contradictory, but which turn out to have a believable and coherent meaning. A logically valid argument based on premises that are generally accepted as true, yielding either a contradiction or conclusion that conflicts with other generally accepted beliefs.

The appeal of paradox lies in the fact that, however, contradictory it may seem to be the accepted maxim, it contains nevertheless, a certain grain of truth, which makes it an excellent vehicle of satire and irony. Indeed, it is a device much favoured by many English and American literary writers.

It is also concluded that semantical and grammatical paradoxes depend on language structure, and the paradox is often used as a rhetorical device in **Romeo and Juliet** since it is a play that is built around opposites to attract the reader's attention and gives emphasis.

References

Boyle,R.(2004).**Paradox**.URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Articleabout ParadoxtheEnglishWikipedia)

Britannica Concise Encyclopedia.(2008).London:Encyclopedia Britannica Inc.

Brooks,C.(1947).**The Well Wrought Urn:Studies in the Structure of Poetry**.New York:Reynal and Hitchcock.

-----------.(1971).**Irony as a Principle of Structure**.**In Critical Theory Since Plato**,edited by Hazard Adams.NewYork:

Harcourt BraceJovanovich,Inc.

Bulletin,V.(2008).**Oxymoronvs.Paradox**.Jelsoft EnterprisesLtd.URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Oxymoron vs.Paradox.mht)

-----------.(2009).**Oxymoron**.Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.URL

(http://mhtml:file://I:/Oxymoron..rhetorical effect by paradoxical means)

Chuanyu,F.(2003).**A Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to**

Antonymy in English. Anhui:Anhui University Press.

Columbia Encyclopedia.(2009).Columbia University Press.

URL(www.cc.columbia.edu/cu/cup)

Cummimgs,M.(2003).**Romeo and Juliet:A Study Guide**.

URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Romeo and Juliet.mht)

Elaboration of meaning of paradox. (2003).URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Elaborationof meaningofparadoxthechild)

Enotes.(2009).URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/What are some examples of paradox in Romeo andJuliet)

Figures of Speech.(2003).URL(http://file://I:/Figures of Speech.The Learning Exchange)

Hughes,P.(2003).**Logical Paradox**. URL (http://mhtml:file://I:/Wapedia-Wiki.Paradox.mht)

Literary Dictionary.(2009).Oxford:Oxford University Press.

LiteraryTerms.(2003).URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/LiteraryTerms.mht)

Nordquist,R.(2003).**Paradox**.URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/paradox- definition and examples of paradox...)

Paradox.(2003).URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Wapedia-Wiki.Paradox.mht)

Paradoxes.(2003).URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Paradoxes.mht)

Paradox in Literature.(2003).URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Paradox in Literature.mht)

Paradoxes in Romeo and Juliet.(2009).URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Paradoxes in Romeo and Juliet.mht)

Quine,W.(1962).**Paradox. Scientific American.**London:Longmans Ltd.

Rescher,N.(2001).**Paradoxes: Their Roots, and Resolution**.Chicago: Open Court.

Romeo and Juliet.(1965).Edited by John Ingledew. London: Longmans,Green and COLTD.

Romeo and Juliet. (2009). URL (http://mhtml:file://I: / RomeoandJuliet.mht)

Romeo and Juliet: Literary Devices. (2006).URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Romeo and Juliet: Literary Devices- Literature)

Romeo and Juliet: The Story. (2003). URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/ ARTSEDGE:RomeoandJuliet:TheStory.mht)

Stylistic Features of Oscar Wilde's Wrightings. (2009).

URL(http://file://I:/Stylistic Features of Oscar Wilde'sWrightings.Refine.htm)

Suber,P.(1990).**Paradox of Self-Amendment**. Richmond: Eartham College.

The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet. (2007).

URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet Act 2 what...)

Wikipedia.(2007).URL(http://mhtml:file://I:/WizComTechnologiesLtd)
Wikipedia,the free encyclopedia.(2009).
URL(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paradox-(literature))