Chapter-I
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH DESIGN

1.1 Theoretical Framework:

1.1.1 Stylistics: Scope and Function:

One of the unique features of language is its creativity. Human beings continually generate utterances which create myriads of messages. The creativity resides in its structure and functions. The layers of structural elements—phonemes, morphemes and syntags—give rise to meanings which constitute the function of those elements. The creativity of language lies, therefore, in the fact that a limited number of these formal elements with their ability for manifold combinations, produce a puzzling amount of meanings. It is no wonder, then, that language as a phenomenon has always posed a challenge to the philosophers, theologists, rhetoricians, literary writers and linguists. Hence, opinions about language range from it being a ‘mystery’ to the more common place definition of it as a means of communication.

Literature is said to be the pre-eminent embodiment of the creative spirit of language. Therefore, language is not just an incidental medium of literature with which the writer expresses his views about himself and/or the world in different literary forms—poetry, drama, epic and novel, to mention a few. Language is an integral part of literature. Ching et al (1980:5) rightly point out that a very primary urge and capacity of all human beings is ‘to conceptualize, reshape and communicate the experiences of life through language’ (italics supplied) and it makes for the universal appeal of literature. Appreciation and enjoyment of literature has also been universal as evidenced by the literary scholarship since ancient times. An overwhelming variety of critical theories from Classical to modern times have, in addition to other aspects of literature, always evinced keen interest in the language of literature.

Around the 1950s, modern linguists developed deep interest in the principles of linguistic creativity. Jakobson, Chomsky, Firth, Halliday and others, in their attempt to study the creativity of language inevitably turned to literature. Their conviction was that literature is an example of language use where the creativity of language is fully exploited. Since the publication of Chomsky’s Syntactic Structures (1957), there have been numerous
efforts to apply the linguistic methodologies to literary analysis. Thus, the language of literature became a focal point of both critical and linguistic inquiries into literature. A close relationship was discovered to exist between the two disciplines of literary criticism and linguistic science. A new approach of ‘linguistic investigation of literature’, which mediates between the two disciplines of linguistics and criticism, came to be known as STYLISTICS.

The term ‘Stylistics’, ‘as the art of forming good style in writing’ and ‘as the science of literary style’, was first attested in 1882-83 in the Oxford English Dictionary. The derivation of the term ‘Stylistics’ reflects its preoccupation with the study of style, and the suffix ‘-istics’ designates that stylistics is, simply, the linguistic study of style. Stylistics is often regarded as an attempt to put literary criticism on a scientific footing, because linguistics serves as the basis of stylistic analysis by making use of the sophistication of linguistic categories and methods in the study of literature. It provides a powerful tool of analyzing literature and of systematically accounting for some of the intuitive judgments of a literary critic. Thus, stylistics has emerged as a valuable complement and sometimes a competing discipline, to literary studies and aesthetics.

Traditional stylistics began with Charles Bally, a pupil of Ferdinand de Saussure, who studied expressive features of language. Prague School considered the description of internal structures of language as a system at the phonemic, lexical and syntactic levels of language. Then, the Transformational Grammar and the Functionalist theory firmly located stylistics within the traditions of linguistics. The early battlecry of Harold Whitehall, ‘as no science can go beyond mathematics, no criticism can go beyond its linguistics’ put limitations on early stylistics by limiting its scope of interpretation and evaluation. But subsequently, stylistics became more generous in its aims and procedures. As a result of Roger Fowler’s interest from 1980s onwards in critical linguistics, stylistics began to lay emphasis on language and texts located and functioning in particular social, ideological and political practices. During the 1980s, the interest began to grow in the role of the reader in interpreting texts (Fish, 1973) and recently, there has been a surge of interest in the cognitive aspects of text comprehension (Stockwell, 2002a and many others). Hence, the analysis of style, which meant looking systematically at the formal features of a text and determining their functional significance for the interpretation of the text in question, has come under question. For, as Simpson (2004:2) rightly argues, linguistic features ‘do
not of themselves constitute a text’s meaning, but act as a ‘gateway’ to its interpretation. In recent years, stylistics has developed and is engaged in critique. Hence, new alternative terms for stylistics like literary stylistics, critical linguistics, literary pragmatics, practical stylistics and poetics have come in circulation. These terms are an attempt to find an appropriate term for the full range of activities practised by the modern stylisticians.

Today, stylistics aims at accounting for how texts project meaning, and how readers construct meaning and why readers respond to texts in the way that they do. The value of stylistic approach, therefore, lies in the precision and detail with which the textual effects of literature are described, and where the focus is on the text itself and on the reader’s response to it. Jeffries and McIntyre (2010:3) observe, ‘Stylistics has no settled view of the relation between author, text and reader, but constantly evolves new theories and models of this dynamic relationship, in order to elucidate ever more clearly the processes by which meaning comes about’. In due course of time, it has drawn upon theories and models from other disciplines such as literary studies, psychology, philosophy and sociology. As a result, it has developed so many strands and sub-fields over the years that it is hard to pin them down to a set of procedures, theories and methodologies. The versatality of approach and its open-mindedness make it a rich field of inquiry. It takes a wider view of the process of communication, which takes into consideration the relationship between writer and text, and reader and text, as well as the wider contexts of production and reception of texts. Pope, R. (1995:1-2) notes that stylistics is about interrogating texts, about seeing a text in the context of its other stylistic possibilities. One of the most effective ways of understanding how a text works, is ‘to challenge it, to play around it or to intervene in its stylistic make-up in some way, to enable or facilitate this sort of textual intervention…’.

Stylistics, right from its origins, has tended to concentrate on the analysis of literary works. Stylisticians have been interested in the style of an individual text, style of an author, a genre or a period. But gradually, stylistics embraced non-literary discourse and varieties or registers within its scope and spoken as well as written text. It has even evolved a detailed linguistic account of the kinds of persuasive techniques which are more generally covered by classical Rhetoric– the approach to the explicitly persuasive aspects of style as linguistic phenomena. Increasingly, attention is being drawn to media discourses such as those of film, news reporting, advertising, politics and to the oral discourses of story-telling and song-lyric. Nowadays, stylistics concerns itself with the full range of
linguistic usage. Jeffries (2007b), Simpson (2004), Simpson and Montgomery (1995) are a few studies of this kind. In principle, there is no restriction on the kinds of text for stylistic analysis.

However, stylistic analysis of any denomination, whether it be linguistic stylistics or cognitive stylistics, is based on certain fundamental assumptions. Firstly, the purpose of stylistics is to explore language, and more specifically, to explore creativity in language use. It is based on an explicit framework of analysis, underpinned by structural models of language and discourse. It is organized through explicit terms and criteria that constitute the metalanguage of stylistics. It sheds light on the very language system it derives from. It tells us about the ‘rules’ of language because it often explores texts where those rules are bent. Secondly, stylistics is text-based, that is, it is based on textual data, though it can be broader to contain discourse analysis evoking political, social and cultural outlooks or cognitive stylistics based on the processes the reader uses in reading a text. Thirdly, stylistics firmly believes that the essence of style is ‘choice’, a selection of linguistic elements from among the many at the level of phonology, grammar, lexis, semantics or discourse. Fourthly, stylistics as a discipline characteristically deals with the interpretation of texts by focusing in detail on relevant distinctive linguistic features, patterns, structures or levels and on their significance and effects on readers. Ohmann (1970:271) observes, ‘The move from formal description of style to critical and semantic interpretation should be the ultimate goal of stylistics’. The choice of linguistic data for study, the tools of analysis and the research questions raised are often dictated by the desire to explain something about interpretation, to draw conclusions from the results, which relate to the meaning of the text. Fifthly, objectivity and empiricism, which are derived from the disciplines in linguistics and natural sciences, are the important principles in stylistics. The rigor, consistency and clarity in the aims and procedures are essential to stylistic analysis. Analytical tools must be clearly stated and they should lead to verifiability and replicability. However, as Jeffries and McIntyre (2010:21) note, ‘[It is] worth noting that objectivity is easier to approximate to at the analysis than at the interpretation stage, though both are vital to stylistics’. Finally, stylistics as a discipline has been changing and responding to new linguistic and literary theories and modes, and virtually it has emerged as a multi-disciplinary phenomenon, and hence, eclecticism is not only necessary but acceptable. It is not to be constrained to one theoretical viewpoint or methodology. As a whole, the main strength of stylistics has been to remain open to new theories of language
and literature, and to evolve by incorporating new insights into its practice. Hence, the result of eclecticism has been an enriching contribution to stylistics as a discipline and in the analysis of texts in particular.

1.1.2 Language of Literature and Ordinary Language:

Stylistics as a discipline originated in the field of the study of literature, and even today, though it is interested also in the non-literary texts, literature remains the major field of stylistic inquiry. Literature and the language of literature offer a major avenue on which it bases its most fundamental assumptions. In the stylistic discussion, right from the beginning, it is quite normal to consider literary language as distinct from ordinary language. This assumption goes back to the ancient distinction between rhetorical language and ordinary language. But the classical Rhetoric analyzed the language of literature at a general level to understand its rhetorical or other effects. With the advent of linguistics, it became possible to explain in more detail the processes of the language of literature, particularly of poetry—a genre most distinct from everyday language, more accurately and objectively.

Ezra Pound once famously declared, ‘Great literature is simply language charged with meaning to the utmost possible degree’. It is the special use of language that contributes to the ‘literariness’ of a text. How do we define literature and literary qualities? How do we understand the special use of language? There are no easy answers to these questions.

The Russian Formalists were the first to formulate a theory of literature premised on the distinctive use of the language of literature. Viktor Sklovsky (1965[1917]) believed that the function of art is to make people aware of the world in a fresh way. The device whereby this is achieved is defamiliarization or making strange (Russian word ‘Ostranenie’). Sklovsky (1965:12) noted, ‘The purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known. The technique of art is to make objects ‘unfamiliar’, to make forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged.’ Thus, the aesthetic of literary language was considered a functional one. The task of the poet is to counteract the routine of the reader’s attachment to clichés, stock responses and automized perception and to bring about a heightened awareness of the world. The poet strives towards this effect. This effect is called density (‘fakura’) which
hinders the ease of communication: the processes of perception and of comprehension are slowed down. The attention of Sklovsky and other Formalists was focused on the devices which may activate these processes when readers are confronted with literary works of art. This led them to study literature mainly in its formal aspects. They proposed to conceive literature in terms of deviance from norms.

The Prague structuralists postulated *interdependence* of the various elements of literature as opposed to the Formalists’ emphasis on estrangement devices in isolation. Thus, the shift towards Structuralism became inevitable.

Havranek (in Garvin:1964) develops his argument on the functional differential of the standard language. On the basis of three processes (intellectualization, automatization, and foregrounding), he proposes differentiation of language into three modes: that of scientific language where the function is accuracy, everyday language which is geared to conventional communicative purposes, and poetic language which attracts attention to itself by virtue of foregrounding devices it contains. But this, according to him, does not imply that everything within poetic language will be foregrounded because the poetic language needs for its very existence the presence of automatized language. As literary language is organically dependent on ‘everyday’ language, he realized the need to understand and appreciate it as the starting point for the consideration of poetic language.

The most influential figure in shaping the concept of *foregrounding* as the fundamental characteristic of literary language was the Prague scholar Jan Mukarovsky (1964b [1932]). According to him, the essence of poetic language lies in the violations of the norms of the standard language, and this relationship is seen as essential for the very existence of poetry, while at the same time the violations of the standard language found in poetry enrich the standard language itself: ‘Its systematic violation is what makes possible the poetic utilization of language; without this possibility there would be no poetry’ (Mukarovsky,1971a:51). In this sense, Mukarovsky takes over the notion already formulated by the Russian Formalists. As it were, poetic language is not defined in terms of its properties, but in terms of its function– its aesthetic effect. This aesthetic effect results from the fact that attention is concentrated on the linguistic sign itself, and not as in ordinary language, on the communicative effect. So everyday language is largely automatized, and any aesthetic effect that may occur is subordinate to the flow of ideas. Mukarovsky identifies other characteristics of foregrounding: its uncommonness and
novelty (1971a:50), its unexpectedness, unusualness and uniqueness (1971a:53). He had realized that foregrounding devices occurred in ordinary speech as well as in the language-games children play, advertising, etc. But he argues that in all these cases, foregrounding devices are employed to attract attention to the subject matter of the communicative situation, while in poetry they are geared towards themselves, that is, in order to draw attention to the speech event itself. And again, the essential difference of foregrounding within and outside the field of literature, according to him, rests on the degree of integration of foregrounding into the complete structure of the work. Mukarovsky (1964b:32) calls this the ‘structured’ aesthetic while the occurrence of foregrounding in everyday language is labeled the ‘unstructured’ aesthetic. The latter works toward the practical, the momentary, while the former tries to achieve permanence and generality (that is, in the sense of being independent of the speaker of the communicative situation).

Roman Jakobson (1960) approached the problem of language of literature from another angle on foregrounding. The elementary factors that constitute any speech event–context, addressee, contact, code and message– and the focus on any of these will give rise to a different function. The focus on the message for its own sake becomes the poetic function (ibid:356). Jakobson’s system allows for some other functions, such as the emotive or even the referential functions, to play some part in it. Poetic function is characterized by its concentration on the message per se, drawing attention to itself and to its own properties. In this sense, the poetic function of language is self-conscious and auto-referential (ibid:357). The basic characteristic that he finds in the poetic function lies in the fact that the poetic use of language ‘projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection onto the axis of combination’ (ibid:358) (see section 1.1.6.3). In other words, while one would expect different kinds of elements that have been selected at different points in the syntagmatic chain, poetic language typically shows repeated combinations of some kinds of elements. This phenomenon is known as parallelism. Although parallelism occurs in daily language as well, Jakobson argues that in literature, it acquires the highest status in the organization of the work of art and it pervades all other aspects.

Leech (1970:123-124) introduces even more powerful interpretational constraint: that of the cohesion of foregrounding. In order to carry aesthetic value, there must be cohesion between deviational and parallel items within the text. If they are isolated, there is little to offer in terms of an overall interpretation. For instance, the deviant phrase ‘a well
of tears’ must be brought in conjunction with the parallelistic ‘tears, idle tears’ in a text and must be interpreted together to make sense of the literary text. Leech and Short (1981:137-138) make use of the terms ‘functional significance’ and ‘stylistic significance’, the former associated with non-literary, and the latter with literary language. If we speak of the stylistic values of a non-literary text, then, we are interested in the way in which linguistic choices are adapted to communicative function – to such functions as newspaper reporting, advertising and scientific exposition. The chief difference between this and the stylistic values of the language of literature cannot be adequately explained in terms of a need-oriented view of language. The function of literature being primarily aesthetic, we must search for explanations of stylistic value – of why this linguistic choice is made rather than that in terms of considerations internal to the work itself.

Another attempt to define language of literature by reference to its function is by Cook (1994) who draws on the Russian formalist tradition in suggesting that one of the main functions of literature is to change the way in which readers see the world. Cook’s view is that what literature does is ‘schema-changing’ whereas other texts, such as advertising, are ‘schema-reinforcing’.

Various criticisms of such distinctions between literary language and everyday language have been proposed. Pratt (1977) and Fowler (1981) both discuss the ‘poetic language fallacy’. Both opine that the Structuralists never verified their assumptions about the ordinary language with reference to the data. Pratt (1977:14) asserts that the language of literature must be studied in the context of the whole range of language use and suggests that ‘The so-called grammar of communicating language can exist apart from the so-called grammar of poetry, but the reverse is not so, the latter exists only by contrast to the former’. Pratt (ibid:162) goes on to characterize literary works in entirely non-linguistic terms as utterances which are addressed to an audience, which pre-suppose preparation and selection and whose relevance is ‘tellability’ and the purpose being ‘displaying experience’.

Towards the end of the 20th century, the distinction between the language of literature and the ordinary language became untenable to sustain. It was recognized that there is not, or perhaps no longer, a language of literature which is inherently or exclusively ‘literary’ in all contexts, because the same kinds of stylistic phenomena turn up in all sorts of texts. Whilst literature might indeed be the area where much of the most
daring linguistic deviation, that is, foregrounding takes place, there are a great many other
genres, advertising, etc., where linguistic deviation is endemic, and on the contrary, many
regular forms of ordinary language which are stylistically typical of other genres (for
example, legal, medical and religious registers, regional dialect forms, conversational
features) occur within the boundaries of literary work. Cohesion is also a feature of all
kinds of texts, not just literary ones. Among other developments, the progress in
investigating metaphor in everyday language (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, Lakoff and
Turner, 1989) and in stylistics more generally made the literary approach to language
unteivable. The 21st century stylisticians believe that literary language is in no way
qualitatively different from other uses of language. The contemporary stylistics’ resistance
to a distinct form of ‘literary language’ is reflected in Paul Simpson’s (2004:98) opinion
that ‘Stylistics is interested in what writers do ‘with’ and ‘through’ language’.

The fact that critical discussion around the relationship between literary language
and non-literary uses of language continues, and this shows that the issue is still very much
alive, and to some extent, unresolved. This does not, however, prevent us from identifying
the noteworthy features of the literary use of language. Such features will inevitably belong
to the common repository of linguistic features and will be shared by some other varieties.
Moreover, the writing of literature is often highly self-conscious, and this self-reflexivity
may reach a point where there can be said to be a focus on the message for the message’s
own sake (Jakobson, 1960). But such radical reflexivity is a potential rather than a
necessary condition.

1.1.3 Stylistics and Literary Criticism:

The specific domain of literary style, which was traditionally a part of the
discipline of literary criticism, was usurped in early 20th century by the new discipline of
stylistics. Since then the question of whether style is a linguistic topic, a part of the
linguistic description of a text, or chiefly a topic in literary criticism and appreciation of a
text has arisen. Too many scholars have adopted a combative stance and indulged in an
extreme dialecticism of debate over a time. From Roger Fowler (1971) onwards, there is a
considerable merging of interests and approaches from both sides.

Traditional literary criticism considered style of a literary work as its own rightful
territory. Goethe (1788, quoted in Rene Welleck, 1971:70) observed that style ‘rests on the
deepest foundation of knowledge, on the essence of things, so far as we are able to know it
in visible and palpable forms. It is the term to designate the highest stage which art has ever reached and will ever reach’. Style, in this sense, is identical with great art. It is a critical concept and a criterion of evaluation. Sol Soporta (quoted in Rene Welleck, 1971:72) argues that ‘terms like value, aesthetic purpose, etc. are not available to linguists’. On the basis of these views Rene Welleck (1971) argues that a work of art is not an assemblage of neutral facts but is, by its very nature, an object charged with values. These values do not merely ‘inhere’ in structures. So the style or stylistic device cannot be considered a criterion of aesthetic value. It can hardly be so if style is taken in isolation from the totality of a work of art. No grounds of total evaluation can be established by linguistic or stylistic analysis as such. Welleck (1971:73) says, ‘We have to become literary critics to see the function of stylistic values, to the harmony and coherence of a work of art, to its relation to reality, to its insight into the meaning of life, and hence to its social and general human import’.

Thus, literary studies have traditionally been regarded as a branch of aesthetics, concerned with the total effect of literary texts as artistic wholes. The literary critic believes that the artistic value of a literary work is available to intuitive awareness. F. R. Leavis in *Great Tradition* (1948) makes his criteria clear: commentary characterized by impressionism, as the favoured mode of critical propositions. There is only minimal appeal to the medium from which the text is constructed. His followers, F. W. Bateson and Helen Vendler are those who objected more strongly to stylistics. The two important tenets of literary criticism of Leavis and his followers—firstly, the sense that a writer’s language is a medium through which ‘felt’ life is registered. Literary meaning was analyzed with reference to the writer’s openness to the complexity of experience, controlled by language. The workings of this medium are not the business of the critic. Secondly, it is the basic proposition that literary texts are sources of meaning in that they make statements about man, and man in the world. To this end, language is seen as transparent in its opening on to the world, and the relationship between language and the text and the world is essentially taken for granted, and considered unproblematic.

With the advent of the Structuralist and Formalist grammars in the 1950s and the 1960s, the language of literature became the focal point and the rightful territory of linguistics. There was an over-abundance of linguistic analyses of literary works by linguists. The early attempts in this direction were aimed more at demonstrating the
efficacy of a grammatical model than illuminating aspects of a literary creation. Firth, Thorne, Ohmann and many others were engaged in this model. Sinclair’s (1970) analysis of Larkin’s ‘First Sight’ is a case in point. The Transformationalists consolidated the already established critical opinions by providing ‘empirical’, ‘formal’ and ‘quantitative’ data. This large scale invasion of the critical world by linguistic analyses first baffled and then infuriated the traditional critics. Their perplexity was soon changed into anger as their well-thought-out critical opinions were branded by the linguists as ‘impressionistic’ and ‘subjective’. And above all, the linguists started making extravagant claims which posed a challenge to the critics’ legitimate domain itself. Perhaps the most audacious claim came from Whitehall (1951), and Jakobson (1960). Whitehall (quoted in Chatman, 1971:3) declared, ‘As no science can go beyond mathematics, no criticism can go beyond its linguistics’ and Jakobson (1960:354) said, ‘Poetics deals with problems of verbal structure… . Since linguistics is the global science of verbal structure, poetics may be regarded as an integral part of linguistics’. This set in motion a long-standing polemic which is generally known as the language-literature problem or ‘lang-lit’ problem.

The schism between the traditional critics and linguists, and their failure to communicate with each other, is evident from the reviews of the linguists’ works by the critics in the 1960s and 1970s. Fowler versus Bates on and Vendler versus Fowler are a case in point. Vendler’s review (1966) of Fowler’s essays in Style and Language (1966) is a telling example.

A more liberal and collaborative approach was put forth by linguist-critics like Freeman, Fowler, Widdowson, Leech, Short and others. Fowler (1971) in his newly coined term ‘New Stylistics’ raised questions which were essentially literary in origin. He pointed out that the linguists share their interest in literature with the critics, whereas the critics share their interest in literary language with the linguists. They differ only in their approaches to literature and their methodologies. A linguist treats the literary work as a ‘text’ and is mainly interested in the codes. A critic’s major concern is with the message underlying the codes. Yet despite these basic theoretical and methodological differences, it is possible for a single person to play both the roles of a critic and a linguist simultaneously and explore literature in its totality through a synthesis of these two faculties of his/her mind.
This synthetic approach to literature is recommended by Henry Widdowson (1975:3): ‘By ‘Stylistics’ I mean the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation and I shall take the view that what distinguishes stylistics from literary criticism on the one hand and linguistics on the other is that it is a means of linking the two’. He focuses on its integrative nature, not only between the two disciplines of linguistics and literary criticism but also between the two subjects of language and literature. The relationship is diagrammatically presented as follows:

Disciplines

| Linguistics |  
|---|---|
| Stylistics |

| Literary Criticism |
|---|---|
| Language |  
| Literature |

The dynamic nature of stylistics is revealed in its potential for a multi-directional progress from subjects to disciplines, or from one subject to another subject or from one discipline to another discipline.

Another group in literary criticism, which resisted the entry and acceptance of stylistics, is the reader-oriented critical theories. The reader-oriented view of literature is based on the obliteration of the objective existence of a text by shifting the critical focus from the author’s consciousness out of which it is born to the reader’s consciousness. The ‘ideal reader’ theory (Riffaterre,1959) or the ‘reception’ theory (Jauss,1974) assigns equal importance to the consciousness of the reader who, by virtue of his/her ‘active participation’, lends ‘full existence’ to the text. Riffaterre (1959) coins the terms ‘average reader’ and later ‘super reader’ (Riffaterre,1966) to refer to an image of an ideal, informed reader embodying the sum of reactions to linguistic features of texts in terms of their stylistic or non-stylistic value. His work on the images of texts in the readers’ minds is mainly a counter-movement to the text-oriented analysis of the structuralists, especially those of Jakobson (1960).

A parallel reader-oriented theory was later proposed by Fish (1979, 1983). It is mainly directed against the practitioners of generative grammar in stylistics, who, as he believes, work on a wrong assumption that meaning exists in structures and accordingly direct their energies to the futile exercise of deriving meanings from descriptions of formal patterns. In his opinion, such derived meanings are bound to be speculative and arbitrary for the simple reason that the grammar, on which their analytical procedures are founded,
itself, does not provide any paradigm for relating meaning with structures. Ultimately in the absence of any well-defined criteria for correlating formal patterns with meaning, transformationalists reduced stylistics to ‘a game that is just too easy to play’ (Fish, 1973:120). This game makes it possible for one not only to assign any semantic or psychological value to a structure but to draw contradictory meanings from the same structure through the application of the same grammatical category. Fish particularly criticized the work of Milic (1967), Ohmann (1971) and Thorne (1965,70) for their fondness for mentalist and interpretative leaps.

Fish (1983) attacked even Halliday (1981) for arbitrariness in following the procedure of proceeding from formal description to meaning in his analysis of Golding’s *The Inheritors*. But he finds the Hallidayan systematic grammar more satisfying since being semantically based, it offers an automatic interpretive procedure by which one can acquire a degree of inevitability in establishing a co-relation between form and meaning. As an alternative to the descriptive/formalist stylistics, Fish recommends *affective stylistics* in which ‘the focus of attention is shifted from the spatial content of a page and its observable regularities to the temporal content of mind and its experience’ (1983:144). This approach rejects the earlier assumption that value or significance exists in a text prior to the reading experience. It is the reader who is the ‘animate source’ of interpretation and meaning acquired in the context of the activity of reading. The formal patterns which are so crucial to stylisticians do not exist prior to interpretation; but they are a product of the reader’s mental perception of and emotional responses to the text.

In short, Fish’s views have been an invaluable corrective to the objectivist tendencies that stylistics had long nurtured since Bally, the Formalists and Structural stylistics. The critical limitations of early stylisticians were obvious. Saussurean formulations, after Derrida, have come to be seen as arbitrary formulations. The view of language as telementational in function (that is, the words convey speaker A’s thoughts, along the linguistic channel, to hearer B) and that this telementation is guaranteed by the fact that a language is a fixed code and the principle that effects produced in verbal communication have their causal source in observable features of the expression plane’. The authoritarian and oppressive orthodoxy of linguistics as a scientific study of a fixed structured system and the received view of literary criticism as *the* richest interpretation of the work as well-wrought icon of significations were questioned. Both enterprises were
considered to suppress the active role of the individual addressee in verbal communication. To resist this authoritarian approach, stylistics came to be viewed ‘as a way rather than a method– a confessedly partial or oriented act of intervention, a reading which is strategic, as all readings necessarily are’ (Toolan, 1990:11).

By the end of the 20th century, stylistics has come to acquire a firm footing as an approach to literature. Jiaoru (1995:144) observes, ‘Today … having gone through the phases of formal, functional and discourse stylistics in its course of development … stylistics seems to deserve the status of a fully fledged academic discipline in its own right in much the same way as bio-chemistry, which draws on biology and chemistry, can claim to be an independent discipline’.

1.1.4 Linguistic Stylistics and Literary Stylistics:

From the beginning, stylistics as a discipline has been polarized between two tendencies: linguistic stylistics based on linguistics and has developed into the Prague School Stylistics, the Neo-Firthian Functional Stylistics, Transformational Stylistics and so on and literary stylistics, as advocated by Leo Spitzer (1948) and his followers in the 1940s which is more subjective than objective, more literary than linguistic.

1.1.4.1. Linguistic Stylistics:

Professor Archibald Hill (qtd. in Enkvist et al 1964:26) defined stylistics as concerning ‘all those relations among linguistic entities which are statable, or may be statable, in terms of wider spans than those which fall within the limits of the sentence’. His first concern was to apply linguistics, outline the procedures leading to an ultimately practical view of style and method of stylistic analysis. He believed that linguistics can make great contribution to the study of literary style by providing a workable approach to the study of style. It was Halliday, who, in order to dissociate the term ‘stylistics’ from intuitive perceptions of the literary critic and the traditional style study, qualifies ‘stylistics’ with ‘linguistic’ and talked of ‘linguistic stylistics’. Halliday (quoted in Fowler, 1971:38) notes: ‘In talking, therefore, of ‘the linguistic study’ of literary texts, we mean, of course, not ‘the study of the language’, but ‘the study (of the language) by the theories and methods of linguistics’. There is a crucial difference between the ad hoc personal and arbitrary selective statements offered, frequently in support of a pre-formulated literary thesis, as textual or linguistic statements about literature, and an analysis founded on
general linguistic theory and descriptive linguistics. It is the latter that may reasonably be
called ‘linguistic stylistics’.

This definition makes it clear that stylistics is based on general linguistic theory,
and it undertakes linguistic description and/or comparison of literary texts using the
categories of the language as a whole and by using the linguistic tools and techniques.
Hence, linguistic stylistics makes for considerable precision in the analysis of the literary
text. The linguistic approach involves careful observation and detailed and consistent
description of the language phenomena. The value of linguist’s contribution lies in the very
explicitness and comprehensiveness of his statements about the language of a text or texts.
As against the intuitive judgment of language by the literary critic, linguistic stylistics
provides objective techniques of description of language phenomena. Thus, it is claimed
that linguistics is based on general linguistic theory and descriptive linguistics.

The linguistic stylistic approach provoked reservations about its relevance.
Widdowson (1975:13) objected to it in these words: ‘We may say that the description of a
poem, or any other piece of literature, as a text, using (as Halliday put it) ‘the theories and
methods developed in linguistics’ may be a ‘proper’ one in the sense that it is an accurate
specification of how linguistic elements are exemplified, but it does not, on its own, lead to
interpretation. It may be regarded as part of literary criticism only if the significance of its
findings is investigated and hypotheses are made as to what they contribute to an
understanding of the literary work as a discourse’.

The linguistic stylistics, then, will inevitably be partial and so will be the
interpretation. However, there has been no reliable criteria whereby specific functions or
effects can be unambiguously attributed to specific formal features of the language system.
And again, with any description, according to a linguistic model, there is the danger that
the analyst will reduce everything to the terms supplied by the system. It was, again,
Halliday (1971:70), who sensibly remarked that linguistics ‘is not and will never be the
whole of literary analysis, and only the literary analyst– not the linguist– can determine the
place of linguistics in literary studies’.
1.1.4.2 Literary Stylistics:

In linguistic stylistics, a lot of technical knowledge of linguistics is required. Rigorous statistical analysis of style and concentration on linguistic features, which may not necessarily be artistically relevant, such as range of vocabulary, sentence length, or frequency of certain conjunctions and features of text which remain constant whatever the artistic or other motives of the writer. Literary Stylistics, however, is concerned about the linguistic features determined by artistic motivation. A genuine style-study is not a mere catalogue of linguistic features, but is directed to the understanding of a work of literature. To quote Leech and Short (1981:5), ‘If the text is regarded in objective simplicity as a sequence of symbols on paper, then the modern linguist’s scrutiny is not just a matter of looking at the text but of looking through the text to its significance’. The knowledge of the linguistic methods is part of the mechanism of the study. But they are not rigorous and restricted methods, but relatively expansive procedures which throw light on works of literature as works of art. Hence, literary stylistics is relatively subjective and more oriented towards interpretation.

The pioneer stylistician, who began this kind of study, was Leo Spitzer, a philologist by profession, who saw the essential unity of literary and linguistic studies and believed that works of literary art can only be understood by a minute study of the language in which they are realized. This is the theme of his book Linguistics and Literary History (1948). The essence of his method, which he calls the philological circle, is to argue from an observed linguistic detail to the central core of a work of art, and then to proceed outward from the centre in search of further confirmatory details. The process can then be repeated as often as necessary until the limits of understanding have been reached. The philological cycle is represented in Leech and Short (1981:14) as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITERARY APPRECIATION</th>
<th>LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeking aesthetic function</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leech and Short (1981:13) follow in the footsteps of Spitzer when they define the concern of literary stylistics as ‘to relate the critic’s concern of aesthetic appreciation with
the linguist’s concern of linguistic description’. They use the term ‘appreciation’ to mean both ‘critical evaluation and interpretation’. The general impulse will be to draw eclectically on linguistic insights and to use them for fuller interpretation of language effects. In general, analysis will be multi-leveled and not confined to the single level rigours exemplified by much work in linguistic stylistics. Indeed, it is argued that style in itself is the result of a simultaneous convergence of effects at a number of levels of language organization.

Shiva M. Pandeya (1980:13) defines both linguistic and literary stylistics in these words: ‘The stylistics that studies the literary language within the conceptual framework of linguistics is linguistic stylistics, but that which studies literary language within the conceptual schema of criticism is literary stylistics’. Literary stylistics starts from description of linguistic elements and proceeds by relating them to the literary elements in the text. In order to be relevant to literary problems, stylistics has to have some workable conception of literature, workable within its own conceptual framework. Halliday (1964:246), for example, defines a literary work as that which ‘creates in own situation, its own framework of events, whatever the role attempted or achieved by literature in society, as language it is self-sufficient and self-contextualizing’. This definition of a literary work is adequate for a linguistic study of literary language in the sense that the understanding of a work of literature is continuous with the understanding of its language, and that of the close study of language is the only sure way to literary understanding. For a time, literary stylistics stayed firmly within its own terms of reference.

Stylistics is called literary stylistics or literary linguistics (Fabb,1997) or linguistic criticism (Fowler, 1986). It would also be regarded as a branch of poetics, which is primarily concerned with the classification of the essential properties of literature or conventions of genres, or theories of form. It became a middle-ground between linguistics and literary criticism. For much of the 20th century, stylistics was primarily a formal affair with the text and language playing a dominant role. By the late 20th century, literary stylistics came to be seen as a way of reading (not a method), whose shaping orientation is a systematic and analytical attention to the language of the text, in pursuit of interpretative ends and assumptions well beyond the methods of conventional stylistics. Burton (1982) implicitly recognizing some limitations of conventional literary stylistics— that of linking linguistic forms with literary appreciation— problematizes the relationship between words
and meanings, and the arbitrariness of the sign, the relationship between language, representation and cultural relativity, as well as the kinds of theories of language advanced by post-structuralists and deconstructionists. Burton exposes the theoretical shortsightedness of these theories. For her, stylistic analysis is a political activity. Neutrality and objectivity are not possible in a language game. A goal of neutral, value-free literary stylistic analysis embodies, for Burton, an ideologically reactionary adherence to keeping things the way they are. Roger Fowler (1981) comes close to this viewpoint.

Ultimately, the dividing line between linguistic and literary stylistics is very hard to draw, since both work from the same set of facts. Some scholars combine methods of both. Todorov (1971:37) says, ‘More generally, we see that there is no point in separating a ‘literary stylistics’ from a ‘linguistic stylistics’: one is only the application of the other’.

1.1.5 Approaches to Style:

The concept of style is an old one. It originated in the ancient art of rhetoric, a discipline concerned with the skills of public speaking as a means of persuasion. Etymologically, the term ‘style’ was derived from the Latin word ‘stīlus’ which meant ‘a pointed object’, ‘a writing implement’. In Classical Latin, the word ‘stīlus’ was extended to mean, first, ‘a way of writing’, then, more generally ‘a way of expressing oneself’, in speech as well as in writing. In due course, the term evoked innumerable responses as can be seen in myriads of definitions by writers and scholars. But still the word ‘style’ evades exact definition, though it is universally acceptable. It still remains a notional term.

1.1.5.1 Traditional Notions of Style:

1.1.5.1.1 Style as Ornament Approach:

Classical rhetoric distinguished between Res and Verba or content and form, Res or the demonstrative materials of the discourse which depends on Elocutio, that is, transformation of these materials into a verbal form. This ‘elocutio’ is roughly the style. The relationship of content and form is considered to be phenomenological: form is taken to be the ‘appearance’ or ‘dress’ of content, which is the ‘reality’ or ‘substance’ of form. The metaphors applied to form (style) are thus decorative: figures, colours, nuances—experienced in an expressive relationship with content.

This dualist approach to style is based on the dichotomy between form and content, logic and rhetoric, matter and manner. Aristotle thought of ‘embellishment’ of thought;
Cicero thought of style as ornament and a means of persuasion; Quintilian asserted that style is the product of both nature and art and what is ill-formed in its natural state, art raises it to its full stature. Longinus talked about elevated style that creates sublimity. These ‘rhetorical’ notions of style prevailed through many succeeding centuries during the Renaissance and Neo-classical periods. In the succeeding centuries, considerations of style were centred around the doctrine of ‘decorum’. De Quincey supports the idea that style has independent value apart from the content, as it is able ‘to yield separate intellectual pleasure quite apart from the interest of the subject treated’. Charles Bally’s theory of style identifies it with a layer of affective elements as opposed to dry or scholarly recapitulation of facts. To Bally, the origin of style is the addition of ‘contenu affectif’ to expression.

In the 20th century, this whole distinction between matter and manner, ‘dress’ and ‘thought’ has been decisively rejected. Leech and Short (1981) feel that the elaboration of form inevitably brings an elaboration of meaning. Style is not devoid of content. Barthes (1971:5) believes that style is one of a number of textual elements, one of a number of semantic levels (codes), the interweaving of which forms the text. For him the problem of style can only be treated by reference to ‘the layeredness’ of discourse. So the Image of style is like ‘an onion, a construction of layers (or levels, or systems) whose body contains, finally, no heart, no kernel, no secret, nothing except the infinity of its own envelopes—which envelop nothing other than the unity of its own surfaces’ (Barthes, 1971:5). Thus, the ancient distinction between form and content has been totally rejected.

1.1.5.1.2 ‘Style is the Man’ Approach:

Traditionally an intimate connection has been seen between style and author’s personality. The Latin dictum ‘stìlus virum arguit’, that is, ‘The style proclaims the man’ expresses the same sentiment. Longinus glimpsed the truth when he said, ‘Height of style is the echo of a great personality’. The idea itself goes back farther. Socrates is credited with the saying: ‘As the man is, so is his speech’. But it was Buffon, in 1753, the great French academician and Naturalist, with his famous aphorism ‘The Style is the Man’, contributed to the vogue. He said, ‘Style is the expression of the individual quality, characteristic of the writer’. This emphasis on the individual element of style is very important as it is well-known that many writers, including the great ones, have exhibited their individuality that makes it possible for an experienced reader to identify their writings. Particular writers have a general tendency to use some structures, such as
Flaubert’s use of tenses and Dr. Johnson’s devotion to parallelism and anti-thesis, or the prominence of insect vocabulary in the writings of Sartre.

1.1.5.2 Objective Theories of Style:

The traditional dualistic view of style, which was normative rather than descriptive, came into conflict with the monist-organic view of style, especially popularized by the New Critics. They consider literary works as ‘verbal artefacts’ to be analyzed in objective terms, ignoring consideration of the author, period, readers or other external factors. They believed that the underlying thought can never be separated from its final verbal form, and that the only means of reading the writer’s mind is the completed text, which is a product of the synthesis of thought and style. For Wimsatt (1954), style is a function of the ultimate selection and combination of words, and since words mean, style and the meaning are inseparable. All experience, feeling, idea that is committed to writing will vary. The experiences as such may be common to many. But the expression of it by different writers will vary as they individually select and combine words to express that experience. The experience, therefore, means different things to them. It is such difference of meaning that constitutes style. I. A. Richards (1936) holds the view that style is the way in which forms of thought are embodied in words.

1.1.5.3 Linguistic Notions of Style:

The linguistic notions of style developed within the sphere of stylistics in the 20th century are: style as deviation, style as choice and style as register.

1.1.5.3.1 Style as Deviation:

Style as deviation is one of the most widespread definitions of style. It denotes a distinctive way of doing things, because it is marked in relation to more standard or normal ways of doing things. Especially marked sometimes because the style concerned involves a break with particular rules or with the conventions associated with the process of writing. In the discussions of literary style, ‘normal’ usually has the meaning of most frequent in the statistical sense, usages that are most expected. Literary language will, therefore, either involve many unexpected, abnormal elements; or, unexpectedness will result from a text being organized in such a way that the normal usages are made to be deviant through such devices as foregrounding, ‘coupling’ (Levin, 1962) (for example, ‘A soul full of worth as void of pride’) or ‘parallelism (Jakobson, 1960) (for example, ‘Where wealth accumulates
and men decay’). Good examples of ‘deviation’ in a literary context would be the rule-breaking styles of writers such as e.e. cummings or Dylan Thomas.

Such a conception of style has its roots in theories of Russian and Czech Formalists (Havranek, Mukarovsky and Jakobson) in the 1920s and the 1930s (section 1.1.2). Central to many Formalists’ views of style is the process termed ‘automization’ and ‘foregrounding’. ‘By automization, we thus mean such a use of the devices of language, in isolation from or in combination with each other, as is useful for a certain expressive purpose, i.e. such a use that the expression itself does not attract any attention. By foregrounding, on the other hand, we mean the use of the devices of the language in such a way that this use itself attracts attention and is perceived as uncommon, as deprived of automization, as deautomized…’ (Havranek, 1932). Thus ‘foregrounding’ is the deviant use as against the ‘automized’ or normal use of language.

In a classic paper, Mukarovsky (1971 [1932]:52) argues that poetic language aims at ‘maximum of foregrounding’, that is, ‘the aesthetically intentional distortion of linguistic components’. ‘In poetic language foregrounding achieves maximum intensity to the extent of pushing communication into the background as the objective of expression, and of being used for its own sake; it is not used in the services of communication, but in order to place in the foreground the act of expression, the act of speech itself’ (Mukarovsky, 1971:53).

The ‘norms’ which the poetic language violates can be defined not only with reference to the rules of the standard language or the internal structures of the given text, but also in terms of the genre, period, place or the dialect the work belongs to.

However, there are many difficulties involved with this definition of style as deviation. Firstly, the problem of ‘frequency distributions and transitional probabilities’ of natural language is ‘not known and never will be’(Enkvist et al,1964). Secondly, style consists not in deviation from the norm, but in an appeal to the norm. One comes across normal linguistic constructions quite frequently. In reality, even natural language can be described as having a kind of style. Barthes’s description (1967a) of the neutral style of Camus’s Outsider as ‘writing degree zero’ is a case in point. An absence of style itself can have a stylistic significance. Another weakness in the Mukarovskian views is related to the concept of ‘norm’. Norm is a relative and, therefore, an illusive concept. For example, an utterance like ‘I ain’t done nothing’ can be deviant only in connection with the norms of
standard English. But it can be normative in the context of the dialect to which it belongs. The poetic language is deviant in relation to the norms of prose, but in the context of poetry itself the language is normative. In the poetry of an eccentric poet like e.e. cummings, deviation itself becomes the norm and norm a deviation.

1.1.5.3.2 Style as Choice:

Style is defined in terms of the linguistic choices from a repertoire of language system by the writer for an appropriate expression of his/her ideas or experiences. Choice of words in literature was advocated in classical times by Quintilian. He advised to choose ‘the oldest of the new, and the newest of the old’ words. Dr. Johnson, on the language of poetry, said, ‘Words too familiar or too remote, defeat the purpose of a poet’. Swift talked about, ‘proper words in proper places, makes the true definition of style’. Wordsworth says about diction, ‘a selection of the language really spoken by men’ and ‘that this selection, wherever it is made with true taste and feeling … sufficient for the gratification of a rational mind’.

This view equates style with the selection of linguistic structures at lexical, phonemic, morphemic or grammatical levels. Choice is thus related to the performance rather than the competence. The writer chooses from internalizing a system of rules which determines the relation between form and meaning.

Ohmann (1970), who is a staunch supporter of the view of style as choice, opines that ‘style is a characteristic use of language’ (p:262). He elaborates his view of style as choice by integrating it with the transformational generative theory, that is, ‘inclusive, unified and plausible’. Ohmann criticizes studies of style to proceed from the critic’s intuition, because of the critic’s inability to take into account the deeper structural features of language. He criticizes the attack on a dichotomy of form and content which has been persistent in modern criticism. ‘To put the problem more concretely, the idea of style implies that words on a page might have been different, or differently arranged, without a corresponding difference in substance. Another writer would have said it another way. For the idea of style to apply, writing must involve choices of verbal formulation’ (Ohmann, 1970:264).

According to Ohmann (1970), there are at least three important characteristics of transformational rules which are a source of insight into style:
1. The language system has a number of optional transformations. Naturally, it gives the user the ‘choice’ to use them or not to use them. This is precisely the sense of style required in stylistics.

2. A transformation brings about changes in a basic structure, but it normally leaves a part of the original structure unchanged. For example, when the active sentence ‘Columbus discovered America’ is passivized, the resulting structure retains the elements ‘Columbus’, ‘discovered’ and ‘America’.

3. Transformational generative grammar is specially relevant for explaining the phenomenon of generating complex sentences and for their relationship with the simple sentences. The embedding style can be differentiated from the compounding style by pointing out the differences of their ‘transformational history’. This proves the value of transformational rules for bringing out the stylistic differences among different writers.

This argument leads to the widely accepted definition of style as a writer’s characteristic way of exercising the options available within the system of language. Trauggot et al (1980) go a step further and claim that even the ‘style as deviation’ view can be subsumed under this notion since it offers the author a choice to use or not to use the deviations.

1.1.5.3.3 Style as Sociolinguistic or Communicative Concept:

Rene Welleck (1971:73) includes in his conception of style the way the structure of the text represents reality, as in the analyses of Erich Auerbach. Welleck’s account of style also mentions devices that aim at rhetorical ends—i.e. features of the text as they relate to the presumed responses of readers. Welleck observes, ‘We have to become literary critics to see the function of style within a totality which inevitably will appeal to extra-linguistic and extra-stylistic values, … to its relation to reality, to its insight into the meaning of life, and hence, to its social and generally human import’ (ibid:73-74). The view of style as a ‘cultural phenomenon’ put forth by Spencer and Gregory (1970) is related to their notion of literature as a ‘part of the total patterning of a culture, language which is the medium of literature, is, in fact, a medium which carries the whole culture of which literature is one part. Therefore, the student of style must see language in literature in relation to the other functions of language’ (ibid:60). Crystal and Davy (1969) recognize the need of the language users to master the knowledge of the linguistic manners and conventions appropriate to each situation to achieve successful communication. Style, for them,
acquires the meaning of ‘an ability to conform in the approved manner to many disparate sociolinguistic situations’ which amounts to ‘communicative competence’ (ibid:7).

The perception of language not as a ‘homogeneous phenomenon’ or ‘a single unified entity’ (Fowler, 1981:20), but a variety of languages was first systematically formulated by Halliday (1961) in his theory of register. By ‘register’ he means a variety of language according to the situation. Style could then signify the situationally defined features of language. The three factors that he enumerates as affecting the style or the choice of situational features are *field* (subject matter), *medium* (speech/writing) and *tenor* (the address-addressee relationship). Every social person is ‘multi-lingual’ in the sense that he/she is required to use different kinds of language depending upon the interpersonal and situational contexts of its use. Halliday’s systemic functional grammar is ‘geared to the study of language as communication, seeing meaning in the writer’s linguistic choices and systematically relating these choices to a wider socio-cultural framework’. For him, register is ‘the clustering of semantic features according to situation type’ and ‘can be defined as a configuration of semantic resources that the member of a culture typically associates with a situation type’ (Halliday, 1978:111).

Carter and Nash (1990) consider style as resulting from an interplay of several levels of linguistic organization. Context (the internal context of text-convention and the outer, ‘interactive’ context) is an important level among them. Style, then, becomes a means of ‘seeing through language and increasing awareness of the uses to which language can be put’ (ibid:27).

One very significant development resulting from the socio-linguistically oriented view of style seems to be a change in the special status conventionally accorded to the literary language. The trend to treat literature as one of the discourses which was initiated by Todorov (1965) becomes well-established in the subsequent decades. The register of literature is found to be characterized by a lot of registral overlapping. In view of these observations, literature, like all other discourses, is considered a part of the social structure.

**1.1.6 Historical Perspective on Stylistics:**

**1.1.6.1 Origins: Traditional Rhetoric:**

As we have noted earlier, the concept of style and style-study goes back to the very beginnings of literary thought in Europe. It was associated with Rhetoric and was regarded
as part of the technique of persuasion, and therefore, was discussed largely under the head of oratory. The tone of the ancient rhetoric was largely prescriptive— the giving of instructions for appropriate and effective composition or speech. The proper vocabulary, type of syntax and figures of speech, particularly tropes and other devices, were prescribed for the purposes in hand.

It is with Plato (1963) that we encounter the most significant moment in the early history of rhetoric. In *Phaedrus*, Plato argues that unless a man pays due attention to philosophy, ‘he will never be able to speak properly about anything’ (261 A), and he says further, ‘A real art of speaking … which does not seize hold of truth, does not exist and never will’ (260 E). What concerned Plato was the fact that rhetoric was a device without the moral or ethical subject matter. That is how he problematizes the relationship between language and truth. Aristotle (1924) in his *Rhetoric* (330 BC) produced the counter-blast to Plato’s anti-rhetoric thesis. Rhetoric, argues Aristotle, is an art, a necessary condition of philosophical debate. Language is the mediator between the pre-linguistic truth or reality and appearance, and is useful in pre-empting manifestations of subjection and defence. The most prominent Roman rhetoricians were Cicero and Quintilian. Quintilian wrote a treatise in twelve books dealing with the art of style which applies as much to the written as to the spoken form.

During the English Renaissance, there was an outpouring of largely practical books on the proper use of rhetoric and rhetorical devices: for example, R. Sherry’s *A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* (1550), T. Wilson’s *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1553), R. Rainolde’s *A Book Called the Foundation of Rhetorike* (1563), H. Peacham’s *The Garden of Eloquence* (1557) and George Puttenham’s *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589). These were aimed at users of literature, but a distinction was frequently made between the literary and the non-literary functions of rhetoric. In George Puttenham’s *The Arte of English Poesie*, we find that there are specific regulations regarding the correspondence between literary style and subject (derived chiefly from Cicero’s distinction between the grand style, the middle style and the low, plain or simple style). It was considered a mistake, if the most extravagant rhetorical, and by implication literary, devices were transplanted into the serious realms of non-literary language. Because poetic function which involves metaphor is not instrumental in activities concerned with actual ‘life, lime, or livelihood’.
1.1.6.2 New Criticism:

In the 1920s, a new set of literary ideas entered the academic circle at Cambridge. The literary works of T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound and the prose of Joyce, in their several ways, tended to focus attention on the verbal texture of the work of art, indicating the quality of their imagination and as a way of the creative process. Writers like T. S. Eliot were focusing attention on the intrinsic and interior constituents of the work of art. This gave new direction to literary criticism and also to style study. I. A. Richards with his interest in semantics and communication theory introduced minute and sensitive textual analysis of poetry in the classrooms. The experiment called ‘practical criticism’ provided new apparatus for reading and interpreting literary texts. The weight was taken off literary history, facts ‘about’ literature and attention was concentrated on ‘close reading’ or ‘explication de texte’, with close attention to verbal texture and organization. The new critics, and later on the Formalists, are the most obvious inheritors of the discipline of Rhetoric in the sense that they maintained a belief in the empirical difference between literary language and other types of language and attempted to specify this difference in terms of style and effect.

William Empson interested himself in the question of ‘ambiguity’ or plurality of meaning in any highly organized piece of writing. In Seven Types of Ambiguity (1930), Empson discusses the ways in which the sound patterns of poetry create a fabric of meaning which can both supplement and deviate from the conventional structures of grammar, syntax and semantics. Cleanth Brooks, in The Well-wrought Urn (1947), employs a similar method in relation to poetic paradox. Empson’s and Brookes’s practice is a mode of stylistic criticism. The two New Critical essays, John Crowe Ransom’s ‘Criticism Inc’ (1937) and W. K. Wimsatt and M. Beardsley’s ‘The Intentional Fallacy’ (1954) were published, which recognized the primacy of the ‘text’ over all other extraneous factors and the essential unity of a work of art. They firmly believed in an integrated view of form and content, of matter and manner. The influence of New Criticism on stylistics is thus clear. By 1950, the verbal analysis had become an established practice among the students of literature and a conducive atmosphere for the introduction of new, linguistically based analytical tools was made readily available to the linguists. However, stylistic models, generally, take a functional view of language which does not allow an approach to texts as ‘artefacts’, ‘icons’ or ‘well-wrought urns’. Secondly, while
words on the page were held sacrosanct by the text-oriented critical approaches, they did not follow a linguistic model of analysis. Thus, stylistics differs from New Criticism and practical criticism in both theoretical assumptions and categories of analysis.

1.1.6.3 Russian Formalism and the Prague School:

The two linguistic as well as literary movements which paved the way for stylistics as an independent discipline in the early decades of the 20th century were Russian Formalism and the Prague School or Prague Linguistic Circle. These two schools systematically developed a theory of poetic language which was influential in both poetics and stylistics. Sklovsky (1965 [1917]), Propp (1968 [1928]) and Jakobson (1960) did significant work in developing ‘poetics’ as a distinct ‘science’ of literature. Jakobson later on moved from Moscow to Prague, and helped establish the Prague School in 1926 and significantly linked up the two schools. He and Mukarovsky, another influential member of Prague School, put forward some significant notions regarding the nature of poetic language which later on became the central issues in both literary criticism and stylistics. The thesis of all their arguments was that the characteristic poetic function consists in foregrounding and estranging language and meaning consciously and creatively against the background of non-literary language, by devices of deviation, repetition and parallelism (section 1.1.2 above).

Roman Jakobson (1960) distinguishes six functions of language depending on their orientation in the six constituents: the referential function is oriented in the content, the poetic function in the message, the emotive or expressive function in the addressee, the conative function in the addressee, the phatic function in the contact and the metalinguistic function in the code. Jakobson (1960) schematizes the constituents of the ‘speech event’ as

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresser ---------------------------- Addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Elaborating on the poetic function, Jakobson (1960) says that poetic language focuses on the message for its own sake. Echoing Mukarovsky, he declares that poetic language is used autonomously for the sake of the work of art itself, rather than for an extra-textual communicative or informational purpose. The ‘foregrounding’ principle of Mukarovsky
takes the garb of ‘equivalence’ in Jakobson (1960). He (1960:358) says, ‘the poetic function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection into the axis of combination’. These two axes of selection and combination can be represented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm</td>
<td>Syntagm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The axis of combination involves the system of rules and conventions (grammar and syntax) through which individual words are combined into larger units of meaning in the sentence, and in Jakobson’s terms, it is the *syntagmatic chain*. The axis of selection involves the choices made at each stage in the syntagm from the different words available for each grammatical class or type, and in his terms, it is the *paradigmatic selection*. The *principle of equivalence* involves the matching of the two axes: first in terms of the rules of the syntagmatic chain, and secondly, in terms of the agreed or ‘equivalent’ relation between the rules of the syntagm and the perceived relation between language (signifier) and the pre-linguistic world (the referent). The sentence ‘A tree walks’ would satisfy the rules of the syntagm, but would have disrupted the perceived or equivalent relation between language and the pre-linguistic world: ‘trees do not walk’. This unusual and unexpected use of the selective axis is the basic principle of metaphor. Jakobson claims that ‘for poetry, metaphor— and for prose, metonymy— is the line of least resistance and consequently the study of poetical tropes is directed chiefly toward metaphor’ (Jakobson and Halle, 1956:95-6). Metonymy is rather more indicative of the logic of prose while metaphor embodies the fundamental illogic of poetry. Metonymy involves a comparison between two conditions or elements that have a pre-established connection in the empirical world, for example, ‘crown’ and monarchical government. Metonymy involves the substitution of one element of an object or condition for its entirety. It embodies the governing principle of prosaic, non-poetic language: that language should reflect and articulate the perceived condition of the external world. Metaphor, conversely, uses the selective axis to variously disrupt and refocus the perceived relation between language and reality.
The Formalist emphasis on the formal devices of repetition and parallelism, as the only distinctive features of poetic language, was vehemently attacked by later critics. However, later on, the terms ‘form’ and ‘poetic language’ came to obtain pejorative connotations as a result of exaggeration of them by the Formalists. Nevertheless, the importance of the theoretical contribution made by Formalism to modern stylistics can never be denied. Modern stylistics still persistently takes recourse to some of the Formalist ideas like the distinction between poetic language and standard language, foregrounding, deautomatization and the aesthetics of metaphor and metrical patterns in poetry.

1.1.6.4 French Structuralism:

In the 1960s and the 1970s, another school of literary theory oriented in linguistics was developing parallel to that of stylistics. As Fowler (1981:14) describes it, the French structuralism is ‘a diffuse set of intellectual movements including French linguistics, literary theory, anthropology, the semiotics of language and culture’. In fact, the four French thinkers, Levi Strauss, Foucoul, Barthes and Lacan, who belonged to diverse disciplines of anthropology, history, literary theory and psychology respectively, they all have a ‘common ancestry’ which is related to the terminology or the lexicon they all derived from *Course in General Linguistics* (1960[1916]), an extremely influential book by the Swiss linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure.

Saussure’s (1960) insights into the nature of language in this book later became the basis of *Semiology*, a science of signs within society. According to Saussure, any word in a language is a sign and language functions as a system of signs. He analyzed the sign into two components: a sound component, which he called the *signifier* and a mental or conceptual component, which he called the *signified*. The signifier constitutes the material aspect of language and the signified its mental aspect. The three terms, *sign*, *signifier* and *signified*, together form the ‘lexicon of signification’. A word or an object, natural or artificial, can become a sign only when it is employed to communicate a message or signify something in a community. For example, the word ‘tree’ may signify a particular object in the material world or a ‘wreath’ may signify a feeling of condolence in a community. When signs are used in this way, they enter a *code*, a channel of communication to be employed by the people in a community to conduct cultural transactions.
Saussure distinguished between langue, the abstract system of rules or the structure of language, and the parole, which is the individual speaker’s use of the system he has internalized. The units of language do not have any independent identity since their value is determined by the relationships with other units they enter into. Another crucial premise of the Saussurean structuralism is that linguistic signs are ‘arbitrary’ because the link between the signifier and signified is not natural but it is determined by conventions. Saussure’s theory, thus, looks at language more as ‘form’ than as ‘substance’.

Extended to the study of literature, the linguistic structuralism provides three interrelated perspectives on texts. A text can be studied as a sequence of sentences each of which can be analyzed linguistically; or as a unified construction with its own internal structure or as a unit within the semiotic structure of the whole society or culture. Barthes (1964) and Todorov (1971) have produced some exemplary works in the tradition of structural poetics. Its relevance to stylistics, in addition, lies in the fact that it shares with it a linguistically based approach to literature and a terminology generated by structuralist linguistics.

Literary structuralism has often been criticized for being too formalistic and too text-centred to study the literary works in their entirety. The French structuralists themselves, alongside others, later on came to question their premises, consequently giving rise to poststructuralism.

1.1.6.5 Poststructuralism and Stylistics:

Barthes (1984) rejected the concept of a unified meaning or consistent purpose whereby the New Critics strove to find a unity in literary text. Barthes emphasized the radical ambiguity or the play of signifiers. Developing the notion of defamiliarization, he suggested that the greatest literature was scriptable (writable) but less than legible (readable). The value of the scriptable was that it undermined the stability of the code. ‘Code’ items in the scriptable texts are echoic, intertextual, fragments of voices from other texts, from other codes. Thus, deconstruction within stylistics can be seen as focusing on undermining the code, as well as the message.

Derrida (1973) also developed, and challenged two formalist ideas: with his notion of différance (difference/deferring) he conflated the distinction between the paradigmatic and the syntagmatic, as distinguished by Jakobson, and also between diachrony (the change of language code through time). Meanings, dependent as they are on difference, are
deferred and never complete (Derrida, 1973). Secondly, he emphasized most strongly the lack of context which is independent of message. For him, there was nothing outside the text, no meaning or truth independent of language (Derrida, 1978). All we have is a play of signifiers without any pre-existing signifieds or referents.

### 1.1.6.6 Modern Linguistics and Stylistics:

One of the most important influences which led to the rise and development of stylistics was the parent discipline of linguistics itself, which had gradually replaced the traditional prescriptive grammar in the early 20th century. The impulse came from 19th century comparative philology, in practice the comparative study of the Indo-European languages. A great change, however, came with Saussure’s *Course in General Linguistics* (1960 [1916]). Stylistics, since then, took deep orientation in linguistics and incorporated almost each and every significant development in the linguistic science. Some of the major theoretical developments, which affected the nature and the growth of stylistics, are reviewed below.

#### 1.1.6.6.1 Structural Linguistics:

It is a grammatical approach made popular by some American linguists in the 1950s and the 1960s, following the pre-War work of linguists like Sapir and Bloomfield. Since the Structural linguistic focus falls on the *description* of the structure, it is also known as descriptive linguistics. By 1950, the American Structural linguists had developed a set of fairly comprehensive and systematic procedures for analysis, and the formal structures of sentences. Equipped with the tools and the terminology provided by Structuralism, a number of linguists attempted to ‘describe’ the formal patterns found in literature, especially in poetry. Using some basic concepts of Structural Linguistics, Chatman (1964) developed a structuralist approach to metre. A paper by Sinclair (1970), ‘Taking a Poem to Pieces’, is a telling example of the extent to which the structuralist technique was stretched by the linguist critics of that period. Sinclair goes on mechanically tabulating and meticulously describing the clausal and group structures in the poem without any concern for their correlation with the meaning of the poem.

The Structuralist model was severely criticized for its inordinate emphasis on the formal structure of a literary work. Even the analytical mode, being rigorously empirical in nature, does not account for the intuitive aspects of one’s linguistic competence. It does not
provide any perspective on the data. Structuralists, by their indifference to making value judgments about their data, are found to be unsuitable to study literature as literature.

1.1.6.6.2 Transformational Grammar:

The structural linguistics was superseded by the rise of a new grammatical theory variously known as Transformational Grammar, Transformational Generative Grammar or Generative Grammar (hereafter TG grammar), associated with the name of Noam Chomsky. The publication of Noam Chomsky’s *Syntactic Structures* in 1957 was a revolutionary development in the history of linguistics. Chomsky began by pointing out some inherent flaws in the structural grammar. There are several properties of a sentence which do not come within the scope of structuralism: relationships between types of sentences such as active and passive, ambiguity (‘Flying planes can be dangerous’), major structural differences concealed by superficial syntactic similarities (‘John is easy to please/John is eager to please’); discontinuity (‘He held the bank up’) and degrees of grammaticality. There are many layers of structural complexity of language which the structural linguistics could not cope with.

In his theory, Chomsky tries to remedy the flaws existing in the grammar of his predecessors. In the process, he formulates a linguistic theory with two terms: linguistic competence (i.e. the knowledge speakers possess) and linguistic performance (i.e. the speakers’ actual use of language). He aimed at formulating a model which would describe and ‘generate’ all and only grammatical sentences of a language.

The TG grammar theory is based on the belief that the surface structure of a sentence is different from its deep, underlying structure. It is the deep structure which determines the semantic content of the sentence and not the surface structure of a sentence. Chomsky proposes that the underlying structure is purely syntactic. He uses the term ‘phrase structure’ to represent the underlying skeletal structure of a sentence. The ‘transformational component’ of a sentence modifies the structures in defined ways to derive the well-formed surface structures in the language. The speaker’s linguistic competence consists in his/her knowledge of a set of ‘transformational rules’ (T-rules) through the application of which he/she can ‘generate’ grammatical sentences. Lexical items are introduced into the phrase structure by ‘lexical insertion rules’. The phrase structure and the lexicon together form the ‘base’ of the grammar. Chomsky reduces the basic grammatical relations between the components of a sentence to simple formulae like
Among the stylisticians, who tried to study the syntax of poetry in the light of the transformational theory, Freeman and Fairley should be prominently mentioned. Freeman (1975) extended the stylistic principles of Ohmann (1970), especially his contention that stylistic preferences reflect cognitive preferences. Fairly (1980[1975]) analyzed five of cummings’s poems in an attempt to show that cummings uses syntactic deviation as a cohesive device in his poems.

TG greatly enriched the theoretical and the methodological resources of stylisticians. However, as an analytical tool, the Chomskean linguistics has certain limitations. Its major flaw lies in its excessive preoccupation with the formal aspects of language. Being basically a sentence grammar and strictly empirical in its approach, it fails to take cognizance of the implicational content of a given text. The lack of concern for the implicational meaning of a text proved a great setback for the stylisticians depending on this model for their linguistic analyses of literature. Another drawback of this grammar derives from its indifference to the communicative aspect of language. The communicative dimension of language is closely associated with the extra-linguistic contexts in which the communication takes place.

1.1.6.6.3 Systemic Functional Grammar:

In the introduction to his *Functional Grammar* (1994), Halliday presents his own perception of the ideological differences between formal grammar and functional grammar. The formal grammars are arbitrary since they treat grammar or syntax as the foundation of language. Their aim is to look for the universals of language by organizing grammar around the sentence. The functionalists, on the contrary, interpret a language as a network of relations, with structures coming as realizations of these relationships. The functional grammar is ‘natural’ in the sense that everything in it can be explained with reference to how language is *used*. It takes semantics as its foundation and emphasizes variables among different languages.
The functional-systemic theory of grammar follows in the European functional tradition of Buhler (1934) and Jakobson (1960), Firth’s concept of system-structure and the Prague School. Halliday insists on calling his grammar **systemic-functional**, because ‘system’ is the organizing concept in his grammar. The systemic component forms the theoretical aspect of a more comprehensive grammar which interprets grammatical patterns in terms of their configuration of social and linguistic functions. Here a brief explanation of his basic concepts of his extremely complicated grammar is given.

The theoretical basis of Halliday’s systemic-functional grammar is provided by a tripartite system of what Halliday calls functions of adult language: **ideational**, **interpersonal** and **textual**.

1. The Ideational Function: The ideational function corresponds to the ‘referential’ function given by Buhler (1934) and Jakobson (1960). Representation of experience is the basic function of language. Halliday uses the term ‘experience’ in the comprehensive sense to include not only the experiences of the physical world but also the mental world of thoughts and feelings. Besides, language also serves the function of expressing certain fundamental logical relations which are derived from the speaker’s experience. In the language they are encoded in the form of co-ordination, apposition, modification and so on. Halliday, therefore, recognizes two sub-categories within the ideational function: experiential and logical.

2. Interpersonal Function: The expressive and conative functions mentioned by Buhler (1934) and Jakobson (1960) merge into this function. It is concerned with the relation between the addressee and the addressee in the discourse situation or the speech event and the communicative role that the speaker adopts of informing, questioning, persuading and the like. The interpersonal function in language is both interactional and personal.

3. Textual Function: The textual function is related to the language constructed as a ‘text’, making links with itself as well as the situation in which it is used so as to have a ‘texture’ or a ‘message’.

The three basic functions of language are embodied in the internal organization of language which has evolved in response to the needs and the demands of society. The functions, though categorized like this, are simultaneous and compatible; and they are manifested by and reflected in the grammatical structures of language. For example, the
range of ideational meaning potential (which acquires the technical name of ‘transitivity’ in Halliday) is realized in a structure formed by elements like process, affected and agent. The interpersonal meaning is represented by the structural categories of mood and modality and proposition, and the textual function by a variety of structural elements like subject, predicate, complement and adjunct (symbolically represented in Halliday as SPCA) or by the bipartite systems like given-new or theme-rheme. Consequently, the same grammatical structure, for example, a clause, can be interpreted and described in its multiple dimensions of meaning or function. The point can be further explained with the following analysis of the clause: ‘The boy was walking on the road’.

```plaintext
//       the boy   was walking  on the road    //
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideational</th>
<th>Affected</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Locative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>Propositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Rheme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Given</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Predicate</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hallidayan model offered the stylisticians a new perspective on the language of literature. The single aspect of this grammar which tremendously enhanced the role of stylistics in the literary critical theory was the concept of transitivity. It was now possible to explore the literary critical ideas like ‘world-view’ or ‘point of view’ from a linguistic angle. As a structural manifestation of the ideational function of language, the transitivity patterns could be analyzed to decode the ‘world-view’ (Halliday, 1981) or the ‘mind-style’ (Fowler, 1986) of the author or a character as it is embodied in the language of the text. Halliday’s paper (1981) beautifully demonstrated how it is possible to reach the ‘mental-self’ of the author or the character through the analyses of the transitivity patterns used as they naturally arise out of the semantic structure of his/her universe.

1.1.6.7 Contextualist Theories:

With the development, in the 1970s, of disciplines such as discourse analysis and pragmatics in linguistics on the one hand and reception aesthetics and reader-response criticism in literary theory on the other, stylistics shifted its focus of the text to its interactive discourse context (functional stylistics, discourse stylistics, or contextualized stylistics) and to the reader as constructing the meaning of the text, rather than as simply
the decoder of a given message or single or eternal truth encoded by the writer. There was a more explicit recognition that the parameters of the situational context contributed to a text’s meaning, and that, therefore, contextualization needs to be part of the theory or model.

Contemporary stylistics is characterized by openness to matters of context, which has moved from purely Formalist and text-oriented to more functional and contextualized approaches. From a theoretical point of view, this contextualized model has greatly increased the literary critical potential of stylistics. It is a combination of Formalist and textualist’s rigor and systematicity with deeper insights of contextuality. This new movement in stylistics recognizes the existence of the external world. The stylisticians regard all speech and writing as primarily dialogic, that it is a social discourse in which the words used and meanings of words cannot be divorced from their relevant contexts. Accordingly, they also view literary texts as part of a complex social and cultural process (Fowler, 1981). So, the adoption of a functional approach to their linguistic descriptions meant that the common levels of linguistic analysis (lexis, syntax and semantics) should also include a kind of extension accommodating the facets of language in use, which is the business of pragmatics.

1.1.6.7.1 Literature as Social Discourse Theory:

Fowler was influenced by Halliday, his theory which ‘integrates formal linguistics, social linguistics and cognitive semantics’ and is consequently, ‘full, dynamic, functioning within historical, social and rhetorical contexts’ (Fowler, 1986:6). As an alternative to the traditional formal stylistics practised by Jakobson, who, he believes, ‘promotes a cultural ideal of literature as a contained, quiet, socially unresponsive object outside of history’ (Fowler, 1981:85). So, the literary works are not ‘isolated and timeless artefacts’ (Fowler, 1986:178), but they are modes of ‘social discourse’. The sociolinguistically based Hallidayan model with its roots in the fusion of ideational, interpersonal and textual functions of language offers him the promising prospect of developing a new stylistic approach which can illuminate the language of a literary text in all its extra-textual and extra-linguistic contexts. In the light of his revised perception of the role of stylistics which is far more compatible with literary criticism than the traditional one, he renames the discipline as ‘linguistic criticism’ (Fowler, 1986). He opines, ‘Basically [socio-linguistic programme] is a theory of varieties, of correlations between distinctive linguistic choices
and particular socio-cultural circumstances. The individual text can be described and interpreted in relation to the stylistic conventions which generate it and the historical and sociological situation which brought it into existence’ (Fowler, 1981:174).

Thus, Fowler provides a contextualist model of literary style situated in history. Fowler shifts the perspective on literature away from Jakobson’s concept of diachronic axis as a ‘system’, and towards the social and cultural values that affect literature at any given historical point. He does not deny that literature has certain intrinsic features, but he regards the effects created by these as contingent upon the historically variable perceptions of what literature is and what literature does.

1.1.6.7.2 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA):

The word ‘critical’ is used in the term *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA, for short) to denote that language is regarded not as something ‘neutral’ or ‘transparent’, but instead, focuses on the social and ideological functions of language in producing, reproducing or changing social structures, relations and identities. This approach to discourse has its roots in the movement known as ‘critical linguistics’ advocated by Roger Fowler (1981, 1986) and is now mainly associated with what has become known as CDA. One possible limitation of critical linguistics, as expressed by Fairclough (1992), is that the interconnectedness of language, power and ideology has been too narrowly conceived. While the features of grammar, semantics and vocabulary fall within the normal perview of critical linguistics and may have ideological significance, other larger structures, such as the whole argumentative and narrative fabric of a text, are significant as well. The early critical linguists have also been criticized for their tendency to see texts as products and for their giving only scant attention to the processes of producing and interpreting texts, or to the possibility that texts can have different meanings to different groups of readers. Nonetheless, critical linguistics’ development of a theory of language as a social discourse, where ‘the rules and norms that govern linguistic behavior have a social function, origin and meaning’ (Hodge and Kress, 1993:204) has had profound influence on much subsequent research, and particularly on scholars working within CDA.

CDA is probably the most comprehensive attempt to develop a theory of the interconnectedness of discourse, power, ideology and social structure. CDA criticizes mainstream linguistic approaches ‘for taking conventions and practices at face value, as objects to be described in a way which obscures their political and ideological investment’
(Fairclough, 1992:7). Although CDA is mainly associated with Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak and Teun Van Dijk, there is no single, homogeneous theory of CDA, but a whole range of critical approaches which can be classified as CDA. Common to all these approaches is the view of language as a means of social construction: language both shapes and is shaped by society.

1.1.6.7.3 Pragmatics:

Around 1970, the theory of language as a communicative system or a mode of communication in context was well-established. The Chomskean term ‘linguistic competence’ led to the concept of ‘communicative competence’. The developing discipline of sociolinguistics and Halliday’s interpersonal function of language and as a result of the growing emphasis on the communicative aspect of language, many other functionally-based linguistic theories were developed around 1970. They were centred around the interactive aspect of language than the formal one. Prominent among them are the theory of Pragmatics, the Speech Act Theory, the Co-operative Principle and the Politeness Principle.

Pragmatics, at its simplest, deals with language in use. Unlike the Chomskyan grammar, pragmatics is mainly concerned with utterances rather than with sentences or propositions. It is focused on the meaning that arises out of the contextual and interpersonal situations and thus distinguishes itself from ‘semantics’, which studies only the meaning of the formal patterns of language. Pragmatists are interested in knowing the functions, intentions, goals and effects of utterances in various contexts and ultimately in the kind of linguistic competence required to use language in specific social situations and in the context of different kinds of interpersonal relationships. It thus studies the surface forms in conjunction with their interpersonal functions and environmental contexts.

1.1.6.7.3.1 Speech Act Theory:

Austin (1962) and his student, Searl (1969), propounded the Speech Act theory which is concerned with the ‘linguistic act’ one performs while speaking to serve some social and interpersonal purpose and produce a pragmatic effect.

Austin categorizes the Speech Acts into locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. The locutionary act refers to the physical act of producing an utterance recognizable in terms of its phonology, syntax and semantics. The illocutionary act is the
act which is ‘performed’ in the course of the utterance with the intention of communicating the purpose of the utterance. The perlocutionary act denotes the effect produced on the addressee as a result of saying something. Every utterance comprises all these three acts. For example, the utterance ‘Smoking is dangerous to health’ in itself is a locution, the ‘warning’ that underlies it is the illocution and the effect of ‘persuasion’ it has on the addressee is the perlocution.

1.1.6.7.3.2 The Cooperative Principle:

The Cooperative Principle appears to be fundamental to any communication. The principle sums up the conditions under which a conversation can become a communicative success. In a sense, Cooperative Principle represents a ‘norm’ generally observed in a speech situation. Within the terms of this principle, Grice mentions four maxims generally observed in a communicative situation. They are: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation and the maxim of manner.

As the Cooperative Principle is related to the performance, it differs from situation to situation. The Cooperative Principle is useful in the linguistic analysis of speech situations where people mean more than what they actually say. Some of the maxims of the Cooperative Principle may be violated in such situations to produce an implied meaning for which Grice uses the technical term ‘Conversational Implicature’. For example, if a girl responds to a boy’s question ‘Will you marry me?’ by saying, ‘I have more important things to do’, the answer can be interpreted as having a negative implicature.

1.1.6.7.3.3 Politeness Principle:

The Politeness Principle is related to the cooperative principle and is given a higher rating than the Cooperative Principle in certain situations. Leech (1983:132) describes a number of maxims dealing with polite behavior. He mentions that politeness concerns a relationship between two participants whom he calls self and other. The label self applies to the addresser and the label other may apply to addressee, and also to people designated by third-person pronouns. The maxims of the Politeness Principle are: tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim and sympathy maxim.
1.1.6.8 Cognitive Stylistics:

Cognitive stylistics is a relatively new and rapidly developing field of language study that attempts to describe and account for what happens in the minds of readers when they interface with language. Cognitive stylistics is thus crucially concerned with reading, and more specifically, with the reception and subsequent interpretation processes that are both active and activated during reading processes. Cognitive stylistics can be said to have evolved primarily from literary stylistics, when in the late 20th century the formal and text-centred approaches gave way to the role of contexts and readers in interpretation and meaning-making. The notion of ‘context’, is still crucial in current cognitive stylistics, refers not just to the socio-cultural context of a reading situation, but to an emotive-cognitive context. Contextual developments in linguistics on the one hand, and somewhat similar contextual developments in literary studies in the form of reading reception and phenomenology heralded a parallel need in stylistic scholarship for a rigorous account to be given for the mental processes, as well as the already existing linguistic ones that came into play during reading. The main difference between mainstream literary stylistics and cognitive stylistics is that whereas the former focuses almost exclusively on language, style and other formal linguistic aspects of processing, the latter expands on these ‘bottom-up’ processing features, and considers the cognitive, affective and mnemonic aspects of ‘top-down’ processing. This addition is something literary stylistics had not previously dealt with in any systematic or meaningful way.

Some of the popular cognitive stylistic concepts among the practitioners are ‘schema theory’ and the ‘conceptual metaphor theory’. The schema theory reveals a theoretical consideration of how we package world knowledge and use this in the interpretation of texts. It considers that meaning is not located solely in the formal structures of the text, but is, in a sense, negotiated as a result of readers utilizing aspects of their pre-existing background knowledge of the real world as they read. In a discussion of how readers make sense of the fictional worlds of poems, Semino (1997:125) makes a useful distinction between what she terms, projection and construction. Texts project meaning while readers construct it. That is, texts contain triggers which activate aspects of reader’s background knowledge. This then allows readers to construct mental representations of the world of the text.
One of the most influential aspects of cognitive stylistics has been Cognitive/Conceptual Metaphor Theory. It was developed initially by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) and Turner (1987) and subsequently developed by, amongst others, Crisp (2002), Steen (2007) and Semino (2008). The theory asserts that metaphor is not merely a feature of language but a matter of thought which is central to our conceptual system and the way in which we make sense of ourselves and the world we live in. And the pervasiveness of metaphor in all discourse types has been one of the major findings of cognitive metaphor theory. Here, we may consider the following conventional metaphors: ‘I feel as if I’m going nowhere’; ‘You’ll get there, I promise you!’; ‘He overcame a lot of hurdles to gain his degree’. In cognitive metaphor theory, the underlying metaphor is called a conceptual metaphor as in ‘Life is a Journey’. All conceptual metaphors consist of a target domain (similar to the traditional vehicle). In the above examples, ‘life’ is the target domain and ‘journey’ is the source domain. When we interpret conceptual metaphor, we map concepts from the source domain on to the target domain. In the above example, one of the mappings is to think of the person living the life as a traveler. Other mappings are: ‘Purposes are destinations’, ‘Difficulties are obstacles on the journey’. Apparently conceptual metaphor theory makes clear the connection between language and thought. It has the capacity to be a useful analytical tool for cognitive stylisticians. Applying cognitive metaphor theory can also show up ideologies that underlie the surface form of the text.

The field of cognitive stylistics is still very much in its formative years. But as it develops, it will help to illuminate the interactive roles that bottom-up and top-down processes play in a variety of subjective and inter-subjective literary discourse processing situations.

1.1.6.9 Feminist Stylistics:

Feminist stylistics, which relates the language of texts to the extra-textual political processes, has a precursor in critical linguistics. It is concerned with the analysis of the way the questions of gender impact on the production and interpretation of texts. Feminist stylistics shares with New Historicism a view of discourse as something which transmits social and institutionalized prejudices and ideologies, specifically the respective roles and the mental and behaviouristic characteristics of men and women. Feminism as defined by its stylistic character represents a special instance of the mediation and formation of perceived gender roles. Feminist literary theorists have made many attempts to consider
the language of texts in some detail. From Woolf’s pioneering work (*A Room of One’s Own* [1929]) on sentence structure and gender to Kate Millett’s ground-breaking analysis of language and sexism, language has been focused. In current Feminist literary and psychoanalytical theory, language is a key issue in literary analysis. Sara Mills (1995:16) observes, ‘Close language analysis, such as the feminist critical analysis, emphasizes the importance of studying language and ‘commonsense’ views of it, and of taking gender issues into account when constructing theories of what language is and how it works’.

Deidre Burton’s (1982) work places gender issues at the centre of academic study. In her essay, which has been of fundamental importance in the effort to construct a feminist stylistics, Burton produces an analysis of the transitivity choices in a passage from Sylvia Plath’s *The Bell Jar*. She explores the ways in which language can be used to produce the sense of a character being powerless: how the linguistic form of the verbs contributes to the protagonist’s apparent feeling of lack of control over her own life. The essay concludes with examples of students’ rewritings of the passage from Plath, experimenting with the ways in which changes in grammar can be made to reverse this effect, to confer greater power and control on a literary character and also more importantly, on the reader. Burton’s view is that no analytical work can be conducted which is truly apolitical– all work either supports or challenges the existing social order: ‘All knowledge is contained and produced within an ideological framework’ (Burton, 1982:197). She extends this argument to point out that methodologies used in the analysis of data are governed by the theoretical framework which also governs the data collection, and to make sense of any work, the researchers must be explicit about their political affiliations: ‘As all methodological components of theories are intricately related to the goal of those theories, responsible academics must continually state and refer to both the lower-order and higher-order constraints of the particular work they are doing, in order to make sense of that work’ (Burton, 1982:197).

Some feminist linguists have argued that we need to analyze the point of view from which characters are viewed, since if characters are viewed negatively by the narrator, this will colour the reader’s judgment of them. Semino (2002) has analyzed the mind style of particular narratives and the way that this is constructed from a range of linguistic elements. Other feminists have argued about the need to analyze how the text addresses the reader, either by direct address (addressing the reader as ‘you’) or by indirect address, for example, assuming that certain information can be considered to be commonsense or
shared (Mills, 1994a; Montgomery et al, 2002). A dominant reading is one which the text constructs as the self-evident interpretation for the text, and this reading may be composed of ideological information. However, readers may find that they wish to construct a resisting reading of the text, informed perhaps by the feminist thought (Fetterley, 1978). The interpretation that readers construct of a text will, therefore, be a complex negotiation between reader and text with neither of them wholly determining the meaning.

Thus, on the whole, feminist stylistics is still largely concerned with discriminatory practices within the process of production and reception of texts. It is much more subtle in its analysis and has recognized the need for more context-sensitive analyses that can draw on extra-textual as well as textual features.

1.1.7 Stylistics and Fiction:

The initial focus of stylistics as a discipline was on literary language, particularly the language of poetry. At that time, the predominant mode of thinking was the Formalist one which firmly believed in the distinction between ‘poetic’ and ‘everyday’ language. Prose fiction, particularly the novel, is a narrative written in prose. Moreover, the novel is particularly an extended work of fiction and the ‘sheer bulk of prose writing is intimidating… . Traditional criticism viewed language as one of its ‘aspects’ just like character, plot and setting. Language was a medium worked ‘through’ it and not ‘in’ it’ (Leech and Short, 1981:3).

Even stylisticians, with the elaborate linguistic apparatus, did not, in early days, deal with prose. However, since the 1970s tentative beginnings were made. A comparison between earlier models– Lodge (1966), Fowler (1977), Fowler (1981, 1986), Leech and Short (1981) and Michael Toolan (1990) shows that the models of analysis were becoming at once more comprehensive as well as precise. However, stylistics of fiction has become an extremely interesting area of research because of the constant influx of new ideas not only from linguistics and pragmatics but also from the parallel areas of discourse analysis and text linguistics. And also the emergence of new sub-disciplines such as corpus stylistics and cognitive stylistics has instilled confidence into the practitioners of stylistics of fiction. Now a days, stylistics of fiction is practiced as enthusiastically as stylistics of poetry.

Traditionally, there have been two– extrinsic and intrinsic– approaches to fiction. The general history of literature gives ample evidence for the view– motifs, themes,
images, symbols, plots and compositional schemes, genre patterns, character types, qualities such as the tragic or comic, sublime and grotesque can be studied with little regard to their linguistic formulation. So there was comparable independence of literature from language. And hence, the distinction between ‘extrinsic’ and ‘intrinsic’ approaches to literature. Leech and Short (1981) make a distinction between text and fiction similar to the distinction between ‘rhetoric’ and ‘fiction’ proposed by Fowler (1966:27). Fiction creates a ‘mock reality’ that transcends its linguistic expression. Hence the novelist is both a fiction maker and a text maker. Thus, fiction exists beyond language. Style/linguistic choice does not operate at the fictional level– the level of referential reality. Stylistic choice operates at the level of the ‘text’. Thus, conventional categories of novel criticism– plot, setting, theme, character are entirely in the realm of fictional technique. David Lodge (1966) and Fowler (1977) also distinguish between the fiction and the text. Most stylisticians are in agreement with this view.

However, stylistic models of fiction generally take a socio-functional view of language which does not allow the approach to texts as ‘artefacts’, ‘icons’ or ‘well-wrought urns’ as has been the case with New Criticism.

1.1.7.1 Models of Narrative Analysis:

In this section, some of the important theories of fiction and narrative that have contributed to the stylistic analysis of fiction are presented. Narrative is a *sequence* of *events*, and though the term ‘events’ is a complex term, we can presuppose a recognizable state or set of conditions at the beginning of the narrative and something happens causing a change to that state. This is a minimalist definition. Its typical characteristics are: (i) a degree of pre-fabrication– sequence, emphasis and pace are usually planned; (ii) narratives typically seem to have a ‘trajectory’ (Michael Toolan, 1988:3), that is, they usually exhibit some sort of development and even a resolution, or conclusion; (iii) narratives have to have a ‘teller’, as narrative is a linguistic communication like any other, requiring a speaker and some sort of addressee; (iv) narratives involve the recall of happenings that may be spatially, but more crucially, temporally remote from the teller and his audience. A broader view is that of Trauggott and Pratt’s (1980:248) definition of narration as ‘essentially a way of linguistically representing past experience whether real or imagined’.

Here, we are concerned with language-oriented perspectives on narratives, i.e. ways of looking at narratives that attend systematically to the language of the stories, and models
of narrative analysis that focus on the linguistic form of narratives or their linguistically describable structure.

There are two major domains or levels of inquiry:

- Early Russian Formalist, Propp (1928) – *fabula* and *sjuzhet*
- Barthes (1967) – *histoire* and *discourse*
- Chatman (1975) – *story* and *discourse*
- Paul Simson, Montegomerry (2004) – *narrative plot* and *narrative discourse*

The first terms of these pairs *fabula/history/story/narrative plot* are the basic unshaped story material and (with qualifications) comprise events, characters and settings. The second terms *sjuzhet/discourse/narrative discourse* refer to the order, manner and style in which they are presented in the novel. They roughly denote all the techniques that authors bring to bear, in their varying manner, on the presentation of the basic story. They suggest the artistic and individualized working with the genres, conventions, in the distinctive styles, voices or manners of different authors. For example, the *fabula* in Dickens’ *Great Expectations* (1961) concerns the experiences of the hero, Pip, from early childhood to the adulthood. Its *sjuzet* involves the presentation of these events in Pip’s first-person account of their temporal, spatial or emotional registers. If a third-person omniscient narrator were to narrate, we might know more about the characters. In short, the *sjuzet* can effectively alter our perceptions of the fabula. Hence, the realm of stylistics is the realm of *sjuzet*.

The above taxonomy of narratives is more closely concerned with the structure of literary works than directly with style. But if style is defined as that kind of linguistic variation that correlates with context, and if these elements are viewed as contextual categories, they become relevant to stylistics as well. The quest for such universals of narrative structure has been provided by many scholars. Some of their theories, which have implications for this style study, are discussed below.

### 1.1.7.1.1 Vladimir Propp on Narrative:

Vladimir Propp, the pioneer Russian analyst of narrative structure, in his *The Morphology of the Folktale* (1968[1928]), observes that all narratives involve the report of some state and some change/s to that state. In the process of the analysis of this aspect, he discovered the most basic patterns of narratives. He devised a grammar of the folktale based on combinations of two discrete elements. He listed thirty one thematic/functional
categories such as the theme of absence (‘one of the members of a family is absent from home’), departure (‘the hero leaves home’), interdiction (‘the hero is forbidden to do something’), provision (‘the hero is given a magic agent’) and so on. Thus, each folktale is no longer seen as a unique object but rather a selection from, and combination of, these universal themes or functions. Terminology introduced by Chomsky (1957) to explain syntactic relations between simple sentences and more complex ones, and how the latter are derived from the former, may be applied here. Story/fabula is a chronologically-ordered deep structure representations at the abstract level from which all concrete narratives, embellished by variations of content are derived.

When the analytical principle is extended to cover characters, Russian folktales were found to have seven types of dramatic personae: a villain, a donor, a helper, a sought-for person, a dispatcher, a hero, and a false hero. Prop demonstrates that there is a predictable and finite number of permutations of the role-function relation. This scheme is comparable with Jakobson’s division between the syntagmatic axis of language (villain, hero, helper, etc. create narrative sequences in the same way that noun, verb, and adjectives create syntactic units) and its paradigmatic axis (king and hero can be substituted in certain functional roles in the same way that the verbs walk, stroll, or stride are substitutable in the same place in a sentence).

Two of the most influential scholars who objected to Prop were Levi Strauss and Frederick Jameson. Strauss (1968:124) complained that the approach was too oriented in the logic of formal structures and was neglectful of content. Jameson (1972:12) observes, ‘Formalism is the basic mode of interpretation of those who refuse interpretations … Moreover, Formalism as a method stops short at the point where the novel as a problem begins’.

1.1.7.1.2 Labov and Narrative:

The narrative as socially situated, i.e. from socio-linguistic point of view, is provided by the American sociolinguist, William Labov (1967, 1972). He studied the naturally occurring narratives, particularly the narratives of ordinary people in their extraordinary lives. The hypothesis is that fundamental narrative structures are to be found in oral versions of personal experience. Like all structuralists, his analysis is based on the perception of a delimited set of recurrent patterns. And again, in broadly structuralist fashion, he sets aside the surface differences in pursuit of the deep structural similarities
with the help of the basic techniques of linguistic analysis.

Labov (1967) relates the identified linguistic-structural properties to functions, and he nominates two broad functions in particular viewed *within the human context*. The first is, the referential function by which he means the function of narrative as a means of recapitulating experience in an ordered set of clauses that matches the temporal sequence of the original experience. The second function is termed ‘evaluative’, and attends to the users of narratives that it has a *point*, and it is *worth telling*.

Labov (1972:355) revises and expands the earlier model. He proposes a six-part structure of a fully formed oral narrative. He presents it in his famous ‘diamond figure’:

![Diamond Figure Diagram](image)

The ‘abstract’ is an optional element, and it outlines the story; ‘complicating action’ is the phase in which most of a story’s positionally fixed narrative clauses occur and here is the obligatory nucleus. The ‘orientation’ specifies the participants and circumstances, especially of place and time of the narrative and is equivalent to setting. The most interesting use of orientation is seen where components of it are strategically delayed, creating effects of surprise, even of shock. The ‘evaluation’ consists of all the means used to establish and sustain the *point*, the contextual significance and tellability of a story. It is the pre-eminent constituent by means of which the narrator’s personal involvement in a story is conveyed. In Labov’s words, it is ‘the means used by the narrator to indicate the point of the narrative, its *raison d’être*: why it was told, and what the narrator is getting at’ (Labov, 1972:366). The spreading waves shown in the figure above are to be something that can permeate throughout the telling, occurring anywhere. The ‘coda’ signals the ‘sealing off’ of a narrative (for example, ‘And that is the end of the story’), just as the ‘abstract’ announces the ‘opening up’ of one. Labov speaks of codas as having ‘the
property of bridging the gap between the moment of time at the end of the narrative proper and the present. They bring the narrator and the listener back to the point at which they entered the narrative’ (Labov, 1972:365).

The above unraveling of the narrative/evaluative dichotomy highlights an important issue, for in Labov as in other fabula/sjuzhet theorists, the separability of the plot from the surrounding or discoursal elaborations is an operational necessity. And in working with that dichotomy, the language reflects the assumption that plot is the core, that the clauses of narrative action are the heart of the matter and that evaluation is to a degree external, and always intrusive.

Pratt (1977) applies Labov’s model to literary works– novels and short stories revealing various forms of abstracts, orientations, and so on.

1.1.7.1.3 Fowler’s Linguistic Approach to the Narrative:

Roger Fowler (1977) provides, for the first time, a comprehensive model of textual analysis of narrative. Fowler’s later works (1981 and 1986) may be seen as further developments in his thinking. He uses linguistic approach to the study of novel assuming that a text has an overall structure analogy to that of a single sentence. He has derived from this analogy some general structural notions such as ‘discourse’ to work in cooperation with established literary concepts of the ‘elements’ of the novel. The use of analogy occurs in the analysis of ‘character’ and ‘theme’ which draws on semantic features, the conception of deriving the surface structure of a whole text from an underlying ‘theme’ in the same fashion as a sentence surface structure is derived from semantic ‘deep structure’. In his Preface (1977:ix), he says, ‘I have concentrated on topics which need a more advanced linguistics and which demand that linguistics should be used progressively, not just as a source of descriptions that can be phrased just as well in critical language’. His basic assumption is that ‘Texts are structurally like sentences’, and that ‘the categories of structure we propose for the analysis of individual sentences [in linguistics] can be extended to apply to the analysis of much larger structures in texts’ (Fowler, 1977:3).

The application of linguistics is not just a device for formalistic analysis capable of drawing the texture and contours of a text, but as a mode of analysis which can suggest interpretations of structural form– to interpret a writer’s linguistic structures in relation to the values and pre-occupations of the community for which he writes. As sets of sentences and narratives are codings of experience, both can be seen as consisting of proposition and
modality. He uses transformational generative categories of ‘surface’ and ‘deep’ structure to propose the following model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Prose Fiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface Structure</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Fowler (1977), *text* means the textual surface structure, the most ‘perceptible’, ‘visible’ dimension of work, a formal object. *Discourse* can be seen in aspects of the novel to which concepts like dialogue, point of view, attitude, world-view and tone are relevant. By *content* he means plot, character, setting, theme regarded in terms of deep verbs, nouns and semantic features. Form and content are separable and so the analysis of surface structure reveals the deep structure and will, thus, tend towards interpretation.

Fowler’s categories are comparable to Halliday’s metafunctions of language: Fowler’s ‘textual structure’ and Halliday’s ‘textual function’ and ‘discourse’ with Halliday’s ‘interpersonal function’, though Halliday’s ideational function cannot be compared to Fowler’s content. He treats the ideational choices, which are stylistically relevant, under the rubric of discourse. He treats the textual structure, i.e. how information in narratives is structured according to information, tone and music and mentions iconicity in textual structure while underlying the fact that textual structure is not usually foregrounded. For Fowler (1977:52), ‘The linguistics of discourse applies most naturally to point of view, the author’s rhetorical stance towards his narrator, towards his characters (and other elements of content) and towards his assumed readers’. He subdivides ‘point of view’ into: ‘perspective’ and ‘attitudes’. The perspective positions the author/narrator in space and time, and entails the concept of ‘distancing’. The second and more important in his scheme, ‘attitudes’ refers to the stance taken by the narrator towards his subject and his readers. Fowler discusses Booth’s concepts of ‘real author’ and ‘implied author’ and Barthes’ idea that reader is the sole producer of meaning in text. Fowler seems to agree more with Barthes than Booth. His position is ‘the co-operative process is not personal in that it does not depend on the private feelings of writer/reader, nor impersonal in that human beings are vitally involved but *intersubjective*, a communicative act calling upon shared values’ (Fowler, 1977:81).
Fowler’s (1977:103) most significant contribution is the concept of mind-style, which is the ‘distinctive linguistic presentation of an individual mental self’. Mind-style has a wide-range: it covers both superficial and fundamental aspects of the mind, as well as both local and pervasive manifestations of an individual mind. Fowler identifies ‘agency’ and ‘animacy’ as the fundamental aspects of the linguistic structure of mind-style.

Fowler’s analysis does not always seem to be rigorously ‘linguistic’. Besides, his framework of ‘text’, ‘discourse’ and ‘content’ depends as much on traditional critical categories as on linguistic ones. And also, the claim that sentence is compared to text in its structure, raises doubts. Both, of course, are codings of experience and have a propositional and a modality component. But a sentence is a grammatical unit and a text is not. Texts create a fictional reality which exists beyond language.

1.1.7.1.4 Seymour Chatman on Narrative:

Chatman (1975) believes that narrative is a semiological structure quite separate from the language which communicates it. As such it consists of an expression plane (called ‘narrative discourse’) and a content plane (called ‘story’). The expression plane contains the set of narrative statements, where ‘statement’ is independent of and more abstract than a particular manifestation. Since narrative as such is independent of medium, the fundamental narrative verb is DO, as for Aristotle for whom action is the fundamental narrative element. Since actions are performed by or happen to actors, upon or in reference to objects, they are called Process statements. And the narrative statements of existence are called Existence statements and these include descriptions.

The narration is addressed to an audience and this presupposes a narrator who presents the narrative or who mediates through it to the readers. For Chatman (1975), this is essentially the ancient distinction between mimesis and diegesis, or in modern terms between showing and telling. In so far as there is telling, there must be a teller, a narrating voice. So a central consideration for the theory of narrative is the transmitting source. By ‘transmission’, he means the class of kinds of narrative presentation which includes the two sub-classes of showing and telling. Traditionally this is subsumed under the term ‘point of view’. If an audience feels that it is in some sense spoken to, then the existence of a teller must be presumed. If the audience feels that it is directly witnessing the action, then it is showing and it is mimetic.
In modern criticism, it is common not to confuse author and narrator. Chatman refers to Wayne Booth (1961) who postulates the concept of ‘implied author’. Booth says, (1961:70-71) ‘As he writes, (the real author) creates not simply an ideal, impersonal ‘man in general’ but an implied version of ‘himself’ that is different from the implied authors we meet in other men’s works … whether we call this implied author an ‘official scribe’ … or the author’s ‘second self’– it is clear that the picture the reader gets of this presence is one of the author’s most important effects’. And what establishes the character or image of the implied author is the moral and other norms of the work taken as a whole. Booth (1961:73-4) says, ‘Our sense of the implied author includes not only the extractable meanings but also the moral and emotional content of each bit of action and suffering of all of the characters. It includes, in short, the intuitive apprehension of a completed whole; the chief values to which this implied author is committed, regardless of what party his creator belongs to in real life, is that which is expressed by the total form’. But Booth does not elaborate how the implied author addresses his readers.

According to Chatman, there is a set of sentences which by their form as well as content may be identified as utterances of a narrator. Clearly distinct from these are sentences attributable to the voices of characters. They are the elements of any discussion of the structure of literary narrative. Chatman (1975) bases such distinctions on the recent movement in philosophy called ‘speech act’ theory propounded by John Austin (1962). According to Austin, the intention of sentences, the ‘illocutionary’ aspect is to be sharply distinguished from their grammatical, or ‘locutionary’ aspect and from the effect which they achieve on the hearer or ‘perlocutionary’ aspect. An illustrative table, for example, of the illocutionary act of ‘predicting’ is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Illocution</th>
<th>Possible Perlocution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John will doubtless go mad</td>
<td>predicting</td>
<td>Persuade the interlocutor, deceive, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fundamental to any analysis of the complex relations between the Speech Acts of the narrator and of characters is a purely linguistic description of the basic ways of communicative speech (external voice) or thought (internal voice). A basic distinction is between quotation and report, or in the more traditional terms, ‘direct’, ‘oratio recta’ and ‘indirect’ style, or ‘oratio oblique’– commonplace for centuries. It is usually formulated in terms of speech– the difference between ‘I have to go, she said’ and ‘She said that she had to go’. The grammatical differences between direct and indirect styles are quite clear cut.
In the 20th century, there has grown another distinction which cross cuts the distinction between direct and indirect styles, namely between ‘tagged’ and ‘free’ (‘style indirect libre’) styles. The free style is without tag clauses. The following table illustrates this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free Style</th>
<th>Tagged Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Speech</td>
<td>I have to go.</td>
<td>‘I have to go’, she said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Thought</td>
<td>I have to go.</td>
<td>‘I have to go’, she thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Speech</td>
<td>She had to go.</td>
<td>She said that she had to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Thought</td>
<td>She had to go.</td>
<td>She thought that she had to go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that only Direct Free Speech and Direct Free Thought are expressed identically and thus ambiguously as in Indirect Free Speech and Indirect Free Thought. Further, there is an additional ambiguity implicit in such indirect free constructions as ‘She had to go’, which might equally issue from the voice of the narrator.

Thus, Chatman relates to ‘narrative mode’, specifically to the linguistic techniques associated with different kinds of narrative ‘transmitters’ in various situations of mimesis. He emphasizes that narrative is a source of the encoding experience and the narrative discourse is an activity under the control of some fictional speaker, language necessarily mediating between the story and our experience of it. Wayne Booth’s (1961) theory lacked reference to conventions of verbal patterning. Chatman’s aim is to supply this particular vacuum, to specify how the various acts of narration, the various states of the ‘transmitter’, are realized in distinct linguistic manifestations.

1.2 Research Design:

In the light of the theoretical discussion presented above, the researcher seeks to study the style of Virginia Woolf’s major novels.

1.2.1 Hypotheses:

Woolf was a highly self-conscious literary writer and a modernist who revolted against the orthodox novel. She sought to deconstruct the conventional novel with respect to its formal aspects, and also, its style. She provided her individualistic aesthetic of the ‘modernist’ novel through progressive interiorization of the narrative, eccentric structures, multiple points of view, and the most pertinent to the purpose of this study, an innovative and dynamic style, in the place of the conventional discursive style, commensurate with her artistic purposes.
With regard to Woolf’s language and style, the following hypotheses are postulated:

1. Since Woolf’s fundamental aim, like Henry James, was to write novels with aesthetic appeal, and not just ‘realistic’ novels, the formal organization of language and of the novelistic material is intense and complex.

2. As per her aesthetic of the language of fiction, her language, instead of performing referential function as in a traditional novel, potentially evokes the stylistic milieu of Jakobson’s (1960) poetic function with a focus on the message itself, and therefore, the language is highly suggestive and disorienting.

3. As Woolf uses Stream of Consciousness technique, her syntax is flexible and open-ended with features of incoherence and discontinuity; and since the mental states are fluid and complex with the admixture of memory, desire, imagination and intuition, Woolf concretizes them through imagery and symbolism which are also highly suggestive.

4. In order to dismantle the conventional novel, Woolf merges the generic features of the narrative, drama, poetry, music and painting in her fiction.

5. Woolf developed her own unique style in comparison with other contemporary modernist novelists, particularly James Joyce.

1.2.2 Aims and Objectives:

1. To make a comprehensive study of Woolf’s style in her major novels;

2. To interpret Woolf’s novels in the light of the stylistic observations made in the process of stylistic analysis;

3. To understand the nature of her experimentation with language and the ways in which she merges her prose with elements drawn from other arts such as poetry, music and painting;

4. To discover the developmental patterns in her style from the initial stage of her writing to the final stage; and

5. To identify the unique features of her style in comparison with her contemporary novelists, particularly James Joyce.
1.2.3 Novels Selected for Stylistic Study:

Woolf wrote, in all, nine novels. Among these, the following five novels have been selected, which represent the three phases of her novelistic career– one from the initial stage, two from the middle phase and two from the final phase. They are:

1. *The Voyage Out* (1915)
2. *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925)
3. *To the Lighthouse* (1927)
5. *Between the Acts* (1941)

1.2.4 Research Outline:

Woolf was proclaimed a genius during her lifetime. Her writings gained swift and persistent attention and critical acclaim. The first full length study of Woolf’s novels was done by Winifred Holtby (1932). She emphasized similarities between Woolf’s work and the philosophy of Bergson. In the years following her death in 1941, her novels were studied from the point of view of themes, form, psychology and feminism. David Daiches (1942) and R. L. Chambers (1947) examined her subject matter, technique and the moral significance of her works. Bernard Blackstone (1949) emphasized the thematic unity of her novels and the gradual evolution of her art.

The critics of the 1960s onwards were more appreciative of Woolf’s art and projected her as a novelist with a vision. A. D. Moody (1966), Jean Guiguet (1965) and Harvena Richter (1970) enlightened aspects of the profound life Woolf portrayed in her novels. Reuben Brower (1970) and Ralph Freedman (1966) based their studies on the poetic element in her novels. Norman Friedman (1955) and N. C. Thakur (1966) showed interest in her use of imagery and symbolism.

In the 1970s, Woolf was almost resurrected from the relative oblivion by the feminists due to the feminist content in her novels. Toril Moi (1985), Black Naomi (2004), Elaine Showalter (1978), Herbert Marder (1968), Richard Bowlby (1988), etc. studied feminist aspects of her works. The psychoanalytical approach to her works was also in vogue in those decades. In the contemporary scenario, Woolf’s works have also been studied from different angles, as the postmodernist theories offer new insights and
approaches for the study of literature.

The brief summary, no doubt incomplete, reveals that a large number of critics have studied many aspects of her works.

1.2.5 Rationale for the Present Study:

Woolf’s self-conscious experimentation with language has been an obvious object of critical comment like many other aspects of her works. Some of the major critical observations are provided here to ascertain how the critics of different generations have viewed her style. Beatrice Webb (1995:32) notes in her diary that Woolf was ‘a gifted lady … with subtle observation and symphonic style’. Gerard Brenan (1995:47) remarks, ‘[Woolf] would throw off a cascade of words like the notes of a great pianist improvising and without the affectation, born of delight in verbal mastery that sometimes crept into the style of her novels’. Clive Bell (1995:108,110) justifies her style in these words: ‘… No one ever has denied that Virginia Woolf chooses and uses words beautifully. But her style is sometimes accused, injuriously, of being ‘cultivated’ and ‘intellectual’ … Cultivated it is, in the sense that it reveals a finely educated mind on terms of easy acquaintance with the finest minds of other ages; and perhaps it is cultivated also in the sense that to enjoy it a reader must himself be pretty well educated … Intellectual? Yes, it is intellectual in that it makes demands on the reader’s understanding. … The difficulty is caused not by eccentricity of expression but by the complexity of what is being expressed.’

Rose Macaulay (1995:181) opines, ‘Perhaps this is only to say that Virginia Woolf was a poet. Writing a poet’s prose from a poet’s angle, and at the same time a novelist with more than the novelist’s zest for actual life and actual people. The two in her combine … That fluid, darting prose, informed with light, shade, colour stirred by a hundred quick, crossing currents that flow and interflow like deep blue shadows on a running sea.’

David Daiches (1942:153) remarks about the language of The Years: ‘Virginia Woolf had by now achieved a control over words that enabled her, at this last stage of her career, to convey her unique sensibility by sheer luminosity of language. … This plastic, effortless prose with its supple rhythms and easy flow is writing at its most civilized.’

R. L. Chambers (1947:12) writes, ‘In the prose of Virginia Woolf the overtones of meaning are not pervasive but percussive, not vague but precise, not homogeneous and large but individual and particular and repetitive. They are often not concerned only to
affect our emotions…, but to enlarge our knowledge of the situation and the character presented. They are factual as well as emotional. … Again and again we are jolted to feel the impact of truth, beyond what the words in themselves can tell. … Where the classical method is precise and logical, Virginia Woolf’s is allusive and emotional. We are invited not to an analysis but to a synthesis.’

Maria Dibatista (2000:134) notes, ‘Virginia Woolf thought that authors might be divided into two kinds: the ventriloquists and the soliloquists. Her fictions are structured by alternating currents of poetic soliloquy and novelistic impersonation … The dialogue between these two languages, the ventriloquist tethered to the present, the soliloquist anchored in the timeless realm of her own sensations and imaginations, is as much a part of the ‘action’ in a novel by Virginia Woolf as the giving of a party, the leap from a window, the journey to a lighthouse or the putting on of a pageant.’

Sue Roe (2000:160,165) observes, ‘Her writing is split, throughout her oeuvre into the kind of writing which makes discoveries through styles of aesthetic charge, and the writings in which she plied her social conscience. In the latter, she wrote under strain: The Years, A Room of One’s Own and Orlando. She used her aesthetic palette, as in her depiction of Septimus in Mrs. Dalloway: the novel in which language is stripped and unpeeled. The imagery is graphic, intensely visual, … The difference between the painter’s brush and the writer’s is that the writer may, as we travel through the linear compulsion of the sentence, give us…evolution of a technique of synaesthesia— which is tactile, transformative, but never suffocates. There is a kind of organism in this; a shapely, rhythmical form which connects with the interacting forms of the flowers themselves as they open out into the light.’ Ruth Gruber (1995:13) describes Woolf’s style as ‘feminine style’: ‘Her will to remain true to herself, to create as a woman, … her urgent cry for true self-expression; struggle between integrity and self-betrayal … to the wisdom of authority.’

However, these and other observations on Woolf’s style are subjective impressions and not the products of sustained and rigorous analysis of her language in the novels. They are actually critical asides in the tradition of literary criticism and not the outcome of the study of style made on the basis of objective linguistic theories. Mitchel A. Liaska’s (1970) stylistic study of To the Lighthouse appears to be the only detailed style study of a single novel. Bradbrook’s (1932) article ‘Notes on the Style of Virginia Woolf’ and Dorothy
Bevis’s (1955) article ‘The Waves: A Fusion of Symbol, Style and Thought’ have the word ‘style’ in their titles, but they are actually critical essays of general nature and not particularly focused on the linguistic aspects of her works. Some critics like David Daiches (1942) and David Lodge (1966) have commented upon certain linguistic elements such as the use of indefinite pronouns, the use of for and the non-finite present participle clauses (referred to in the relevant sections in this study). However, their comments also appear to be off-hand remarks which do not stand the linguistic scrutiny.

The researcher perceives limitations in the critical attention of the earlier critics towards Woolf’s style, and hence, feels the need for linguistic and critical assessment of this fundamental aspect of Woolf’s fiction. However, the study of Woolf’s style, or stylistics for that matter, in this research study, is not considered an end in itself, but a means, a medium with which the researcher intends to provide a comprehensive critique on her novels. The researcher believes in David Lodge’s (1966:1) assertion that ‘the novelist’s medium is language: whatever he does, qua novelist he does in and through language.’ Hence, she is intent upon studying Woolf’s novels from the stylistic point of view in order to unravel, in explicit terms, her vision and art and also her contribution to the novel form.

1.2.6 Research Methodology:

The present study is an attempt to explore the style of Woolf’s novels through the application of methods and categories derived from the modern linguistic theories and practices. Though the approach adopted here is linguistically based, the aim is to support the literary-critical judgment on her novels. In this study, ‘style’ is understood as ‘choice’ the novelist makes to convey her particular vision of life in the novels. Since Woolf is a serious and highly conscious experimentalist with language, as with all other aspects of the novelistic art, the study is expected to yield insights into her motivated organization of language and the purpose they serve in the overall context of the texts of her novels. In this study, the Formalist view of literature as ‘verbal artefacts’, and also, the other extremely subjective view of literary text as ‘inseparable from the activity of reading’ (Fish, 1973:130) are avoided. Instead, a balanced view between the objective and the subjective approaches is sought. It would be termed as descriptive-functionalist-contextualist approach in which literature is understood as ‘discourse’. It includes the constituent factors in the act of communicative situation: the addressee (author), the addressee (readers), genre-bound conventions and the socio-cultural milieu in which the discourse is conducted. It means, in
other words, the description of linguistic features is placed within the broader Hallidayan (1981) functions—*the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual*. And also, the approach indicates Fowler’s (1977, 1981, 1986) concept of *social discourse* seen in aspects of the novel to which concepts like point of view, world-view or mind-style, tone and modality are relevant— which are an indication of the structure of the author’s beliefs and the types of judgment she makes. Thus, the study is expected to grasp the full significance of Woolf’s novels in their formal, textual, expressive, socio-cultural and ideological dimensions.

**1.2.6.1 Analytical Framework:**

In this study, it is believed that stylistics is a mode of textual interpretation in which the primacy of place is assigned to language. The various forms, patterns and levels that constitute the linguistic structure are an important index of the function of the text. Therefore, the following levels of analysis have been proposed:

1. Structure and Technique
2. Linguistic Style
3. Literary Style

**1. Structure and Technique:**

Since linguistics provides tools for the analysis of formal aspects of the novel (1.1.7), which, once were considered to lie ‘beyond’ the linguistic structure of the novel, these aspects have been incorporated as one of the levels of the style-study. The linguistic approach to them is supposed to provide fresh insights into the organization of the fictional material in the novels, since Woolf constantly tries to destroy the ‘old’ forms in order to create ‘anew’. The linguistic analysis of *structure* includes, in addition to the narrative structure, the spatio-temporal dimension of the fictional world. The analysis of technique includes linguistic analysis of thought/speech representation and point of view emanating from it.

**2. Linguistic Style:**

Any text is organized through several distinct levels of language: the lexical, syntactic, phonological and semantic. These levels are interdependent and interpenetrate and therefore, their functioning in the contexts of one another is complex. Stylistic analysis
based on the levels model is unavoidably detailed because it requires close scrutiny of the interplay of these levels in the texts. In this levels-approach, the following layers are considered:

i) **Lexical Analysis:** Lexical Sets, Collocations, Word Structure, Compounding, Lexical Experimentation and Grammatical Words.

ii) **Syntactic Analysis:** Phrases, Clause Structures, Sentence Complexity, Ellipsis, Causatives, Parentheticals, Punctuation, Thematization, etc.

iii) **Phonological Analysis:** Sound Patterns, Onomatopoeia and Sound Symbolism, Rhythmic Structures and Intonation Patterns

iv) **Semantic Analysis:** Unusual Collocations, Semantically Deviant Sentences, Intertextuality or Multiple References, etc.

v) **Cohesion:** Textuality of the novels with reference to substitution, pronoun references, ellipsis, conjunctions and lexical ties

3. **Literary Style:**

i) **Metaphors and similes, Modern Imagery, Extended Metaphors and Similes, Conceptual Metaphor and Symbols**

ii) **Poetic Style**

iii) **Mind Style**

iv) **Feminist stylistics: The Female Sentence**

The researcher, thus, intends to focus on a wide range of factors both micro– and macro– features of the texts that make it a complex analysis. This approach, it is believed, will be comprehensive enough for the overall interpretation and evaluation of the novels.

However, one important omission is the study at the level of pragmatic/discourse analysis. Since it was thought that the pragmatic aspects require an independent and thorough inquiry in their own right, pragmatic analysis was naturally left out of the perview of the present study.

1.2.6.2 **Analytical Tools and Categories:**

The following linguistic tools and categories are used in the stylistic analysis:
1.2.6.3 Analytical Procedure:

The five novels of Woolf selected for the study are analyzed in accordance with the well-defined procedure. However, there is normally some choice of methods involved in the analysis. One of the important methodical distinctions in all research is the difference
between the quantitative and the qualitative methods. In recent years, with the development of the powerful computer software, there has been keen interest in the quantitative study in stylistics. It involves the statistical analysis from large quantities of data to test the significance of numerical findings. But traditionally, most stylistic analysis has been qualitative. What constitutes a qualitative study is less easy to define. But the advantage of such a study is that it promotes the possibility of taking many more contextual factors into account, and so, it is possible to use a different range of linguistic tools.

In scientific terms, the researcher’s approach proceeds from a formulation of the hypothesis about Woolf’s style, as mentioned above. Then follows the collection of the data from the texts in terms of the interrelated levels of language—phonological, lexical, syntactic, semantic and imagery, etc. The method employed for the collection of data has been to identify linguistic features in view of the different levels of analysis and chart their occurrence throughout the text, in order to emphasize the regularity and the consistency of the feature/s under investigation. This method is considered to be comprehensive in the chosen textual domains. A few representative examples will be cited in each category or aspect under analysis. This method of classifying the textual data according to the levels is believed to facilitate: (i) a systematic organization of the material; (ii) a focused study of the specific level of linguistic organization; (iii) specific stylistic feature, if possible; and (iv) a general statement on Woolf’s style on the basis of the frequency distribution of a stylistic feature across the texts.

In the procedure laid down for stylistic analysis, the following stages have been followed:

1. General observations on the text made by the novelist in her diaries, letters and even in the texts in the light of which the stylistic study is conducted. These and the researcher’s hypothetical interpretative remarks at the beginning of the analysis of each novel provide a comprehensive conceptual framework with reference to which the subsequent analysis has been conducted.

2. The identification and the collection of the data pertaining to each level of the study, as mentioned above, are carried out.

3. Description and analysis of the data; and

4. Interpretation and evaluation. In the elaboration of textual interpretations, intuitive as
well as those ones emerging from the linguistic analysis are used. Hence, a certain amount of subjectivity in the interpretation of data cannot be ruled out. As Short et al (1998) observe:

‘For a stylistian, then, being objective means to be detailed, systematic and explicit in analysis, to lay one’s interpretative cards, as it were, clearly on the table…. Like the natural and social scientists, we are human analysts, not machines. But, like them … we do think that it is incumbent upon us (a) to produce proper evidence and argumentation for our views, and to take counter-evidence into account when making our interpretative claims, (b) to make claims which are falsifiable, and (c) to be explicit and open about our claims and the evidence for them. This does not constitute a claim to be natural scientists, but merely to be systematic, open, honest and rational’.

1.2.6.4 Chapter Scheme:

There are, in all five chapters in the thesis. Three chapters are devoted to the discussion of Woolf’s style of her five novels representing major phases in her career. The chapter scheme is:

Chaper-I : Theoretical Framework and Research Design
Chapter-II : Woolf’s Life, Vision and Art / Stylistic Analysis of *The Voyage Out*
Chapter-III : Stylistic Analysis of *Mrs. Dalloway* and *To the Lighthouse*
Chapter-IV : Stylistic analysis of *The Waves* and *Between the Acts*
Chapter-V : Conclusion
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