CHAPTER - 2

STYLO-LINGUISTICS:
A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
Stylo-Linguistics: A Theoretical Framework

The term style, stylistics, linguistic application, literary application, aesthetic application, conventional application, innovative application, etc. have been the trademark labels of formulating various theoretical constructs to analyse literature in general. To this list of terms, prosodic, rhetorical and figurative elements and their use have been added when we come to the analysis of poetry. The bewildering variety of technical terms used by various followers of theoretical postulates have quite often blurred the edges of the field of literary analysis. Many linguistic enthusiasts have tried to approach literature in complete defiance of the hitherto established norms of literary theoretical concepts. Before we proceed to summarise the present state of affairs of literary studies vis-à-vis the critical or linguistic theoretical terms of reference it would be relevant to define or at least describe the nature and scope of style in literary artefacts.
In simplistic terms stylistics is the study of style of a literary or non-literary discourse (text). It is, therefore, necessary to define style so that the various components of this aspect of a text can be studied. "Style is a highly complex phenomenon, which can be viewed from many different points of view." Enkvist has examined the diversity of definitions of style in order to find the common elements in the various viewpoints. Enkvist has argued in detail the various elements of style in both the camps of literary critics and linguists. Spencer has remarked in a lively manner which deserves to be quoted in some detail:

"--- Until recently no real dichotomy between linguistic and literary studies existed, and that scholars in both branches traditionally collaborated in an atmosphere of accord, to the extent that their interests and problems are overlapped. In the field of English studies with which we are concerned, this mutuality of interest seems to be confirmed by the work of many great scholars, such as R.W. Chambers or C.S. Lewis,

---

1 Enkvist, "On Defining Style, "a monograph published in Spencer edited Linguistics and Style, (OUP), p.X.
who were at home in both philology and literary studies, and in whose work the one supports and nourishes the other. This prelapsarian picture of English studies in the past would suggest that it was the development of modern descriptive linguistic into an autonomous discipline – a discipline perhaps often less grateful to its parent philology than a thriving son should be which induced the tensions inescapable, so romantic writers tell us, in any triangular relationship, especially one in which rejection of the father may imply Freudian complications.  

Because of increased scholarly activities in the field of applied linguistics there has been a plethora of materials published in books and journals on the theory and application of stylistic and linguistic approaches and methods to literary artefact. One tends to believe that this boom started with Bloomfield and diversified into various points of view and approaches from De Saussure, through the European Structuralists, Transformational-Generative

---

grammarians to Halliday, Enkvist, Spencer, David Crystal, etc. It will be cumbersome to enumerate the names of scholars across the Atlantic, on the British Isles, as well as in Europe who have been engaged in the various issues involved in stylistics, in literary stylistics and linguistic stylistics. India has not lagged behind in an increased spurt of scholarly investigations into this recently quite fashionable and useful academic pursuit.

If we have a look at the recorded history of literary studies, including theories, we can authoritatively argue that the problem of the study of style is as old as the theory of literature itself. We find that Plato discusses it in the context of the persuasive power of poetry and the inseparability of form and content in literature while he is discussing the immediacy and profundity of the effect of imaginative literature, especially dramatic literature involving empathy and impersonation. Aristotle discusses the issue of style in a more formal and direct manner in his Poetics.\(^3\) Infact while talking about the three types of style – low, middle and high in his Poetics – Aristotle is clearly emphasizing the inseparability of style (form & content), which in later times

\(^3\) Aristotle, Poetics, Tr. S.H. Butcher, (Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi, 1998), p. 134
became a matter of controversy. Critics from Horace, Longinus, Sidney, Dryden, Johnson, Wordsworth, Coleridge down to those in our own age have given serious thought to the consideration of style in a literary text. Some of them have considered 'Style' as an integral element in a literary discourse while some others have approached it as external cover to content, the real stuff we may call a literary composition. When Aristotle was talking about the three types of style he was ambiguous in asserting that content was embedded in style and the two could not be separated. When Sidney says that "it is no more a gown that maketh a lawyer than verse that maketh a poet", he was advocating the inseparability of form (style as external) and content (the subject mater of the literary discourse). Longinus' concept of the sublime\textsuperscript{4} is based on his according full recognition to style as integral to a literary text, which subscribes to the blending of the creator, the artefact (form & content) and the reader. We will take up the other issues relating to the study of style later in the chapter and try to explain what critics have quite often avoided, the meaning of style. Seymour

Chatman says that Style is an ambiguous term and he goes on to elaborate its meaning in varied senses as follows:

Among other things, it has been used to refer to the idiosyncratic manner of an individual or group; to a small scale formal property of texts (in the language alone, or additionally in other attendant systems like meter); or to a kind of extra or heightened expressiveness, present in non literary language as well; or to a decorum based on social or cultural context; or to any one of a number of other concepts.

Linguistically, style has been seen either as a ‘deviation from a norm’ within and across the sentence structure or as a density of certain linguistic ‘features’ of a given text as opposed to those texts which set the norm. In both the situations one has to invoke the notion of ‘norm’ and a process of ‘comparison’ or ‘matching process’.

But then we have to decide what the norm is. Enkvist says that since the choice is made from the ‘norm’ it is necessary that we are clear in our mind about the notion of
norm itself. Enkvist, who elaborates the concept of "deviation from a norm", says, "The norm may be chosen from a wide field. One portion of a text may be matched against other portions or the whole of the same text. One text may be compared to other texts. Or the text may be set against an imaginary norm that only exists in a critics' mind."

Whatever the approaches to style through the ages, the aspect of formal property of a text has not been ignored. This formal property, again, has been expounded differently by different critics as well as linguists. It has been given an expanded dimension by Cleanth Brooks, one of the pioneers of New Criticism thus: "This term (style) is usually used with reference to the poet's manner of choosing, ordering and arranging his words. But, of course, when one asks on what grounds certain words are chosen and ordered, one is raising the whole problem of form. Style, in its larger sense, is essentially the same thing as form." For a literary critic style may include structure, like plot, character, narrator, listener, the whole discoursal situation, as well as the

---

rhetorical or figurative and prosodic devices to convey the author's experience or vision of the world. For a linguist, whatever the experience or vision of the author, the terminal artefact requires a medium which needs to operate in such an organized way that it suits the requirements of communicating what the text contains. Further, whatever the text contains, it does so in a system of language. This concept of the system of language has raised controversial debates about the nature of language.

The question is whether one should accept the Chomskian system of the abstract linguistic competence of the average native user of the language as the acceptable system. Transformative Generative grammarians hold that linguistics should be a 'hard' science, whose theories and procedures must be open to 'strong verification'. Spencer asserts that such views "are particularly to be regarded with suspicion. The predictive certainty they seek can be obtained only at the cost of neglecting the situational aspect of language – an aspect of prime importance in the study of style".

---

8 *Linguistics & Style*, op. cit., p.63.
Here we must remember two significant facts about (1) language use and (2) language variation, which determine the status of style of a particular discourse: (1) The range of choice available to a user is dependent upon the nature and structure of a given language and (2) any opted choice conveys some information in addition to the referential meaning. Both the facts operate simultaneously otherwise a ludicrous situation like ‘colourless green ideas sleep furiously’ cannot be avoided. The relevance of Transformational Grammar to the study of style has already been questioned on many scores such as the validity of the notion of ‘competence’ of the average user as model and the neglect of the situational aspect of language which, as Spencer has opined, can hardly be ignored in any meaningful analysis of a literary text.\(^9\)

However, the concept, which found greater acceptability, was De Saussure’s notion of ‘langue’ and ‘parole'. ‘Langue’ is the code or system of rules common to speakers of a language, such as English, for instance, ‘Parole’ is the particular uses of this system, or selections

---

\(^9\) Ibid.

from this system that speakers or writers make on this or that occasion. In simplistic terms ‘Parole’ is the actual language used by real people in all sorts of interactional contexts and situations. Style pertains to ‘parole’. It is a selection from the total linguistic repertoire that constitutes a style. This will be discussed in detail when we come to the controversy whether the language of poetry can be the language of people of a particular age or whether there is something called ‘poetic diction’; a made up language for special use in poetry.

Literary text is one way of communicating through the verbal medium as several other arts used other media for communication, such as colour for painting, gestures and movements for dance, etc. Sol Saporta has observed that “language is to poetry as stone is to sculpture” to underscore the point we have made above. But he warns that “all poetry is language but not all language is poetry”. Hence the verbal medium, where the writer makes choices at different linguistic levels – lexical and syntactical – need to be studied to see how meaning emerges from these choices.

---

and their arrangement in the system of the language. This is why Hockett defines style in terms of "optional features".

In an aesthetic approach to a literary text we primarily base our interpretation on our intuition and personal judgement and then proceed to see how this intuition or judgement is validated or refuted by the criteria of literary stylistic principles. In linguistic stylistics we proceed from the linguistic items, their choice, relevance and relation to the literary function which can be objectively established by linguistic evidence, i.e. choice and use of the linguistic forms and items. But as Geoffery N. Leech has asserted, "In both the literary and linguistic spheres much rests on the intuition and personal judgement of the reader for which a system, however good, is an aid rather than a substitute."

Douglas Thomas echoes the same view when he says, "There will always remain the mystery of having been moved by words."

In recent years there have been important developments in the linguistic study of literary text. We can

---

14 Ibid.
notice new ways of looking at language in psychological, sociological and philosophical terms and their application to the analysis of literary text. Various linguistic viewpoints can be isolated which had dominated the spheres of literary study during the latter half of the last century. We have already mentioned the model of Transformational Grammar, which had dominated linguistic thinking about four decades ago. This model uses language primarily as a capability of the human mind and therefore highlights the formal and cognitive aspects of language. But Transformational Grammar has been superceded by other models such as those which emphasise the social role of language. Halliday's functional model\textsuperscript{15}, for example, sees language as a 'socio-semiotic,' and so directs attention to the communicative and socially expressive functions of the language. Then the European Structuralists saw the same structural principles of contrast and pattern which underlined various forms of human activity. Leech and Short have summed up the situation thus:

\footnotesize{Halliday, M.A.K, The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching, (EIBS and Longman Group Ltd., 1971) Ch. 4.}
"If there is a single characteristic which unites these diverse enterprises in linguistics today, it is a tendency to explore for pattern and system below the surface forms of language; to search for the principles of meaning and language use which activate and control the code. In this, the linguist's concerns have moved in directions, which are likely to bring closer to those of the critic. If a 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 looking through the text to its significance."

Literary stylistics had looked askance at the terminal goal of linguistic analysis aiming at mechanical objectivity, in which it is quite likely to miss the wood in counting the trees. But Stylo-Linguistics, in fact, aims at checking or validating intuitions and hunches by detailed analysis. "Linguistic analysis does not replace the reader's intuition.... but it may prompt, direct and shape it into an understanding." Thus

16 Style in Fiction, op. cit, p.4.
17 Ibid.
approached, a 'New Stylistics' (a term used by Roger Fowler) is needed where language is not treated as an 'instrument', but is regarded "virtually as the medium" in which man, 'the speaking animal' exists, defining for him his relations to his fellow human beings, his culture, even his own identity.

No one can ignore the role language has in our day to day life as well as in our life of creativity or literary composing. Leech and Short have rightly observed that "literary expression is an enhancement, or a creative liberation of the resources of language which we use from day to day. Correspondingly, Stylistics builds on linguistics and in return, it challenges our frameworks, events, their deficiencies and urges us to refine them. In this stylistics is an adventure of discovery for both the critic and the linguist."

Stylistics in its simplistic sense can be defined as the study of style. But then the question, which arises is "To what or whom do we attribute style?". In the broader sense Style can be applied to both spoken and written, literary and non-literary variety of language. The term sometimes has been used for the linguistic habit of a particular writer, or

\[18\] Ibid.
\[19\] Ibid.
the way language is used in a particular genre, period, school of writing etc. e.g. style of Pope, Epistolary style, style of Victorian fiction etc. This problem of the use of the term 'style' brings us to the central issue and that is the domain of style. The text as the domain is the commonly agreed upon concept because here we can study in a systematic manner the different properties and their inter-relationships in communication, because our working definition of style is that it is the linguistic characteristic of a particular text. Stylistics is concerned with the study of these characteristics, but not for the sake of merely describing them but to explore and explain the relation between language and artistic functions, to see why the author chooses to express himself in one way rather than another in matters of linguistic choices he makes. The chief aim of the study of a linguistic text is its appreciation. From the critic's point of view the important concern is to explore how such-and-such an aesthetic effect is achieved through language. The linguist's concern is to describe the linguistic characteristics of the language used in the text to confirm the aesthetic critic's response. Thus linguistics is complimentary to aesthetic stylistics while aesthetic
stylistics depends upon linguistics to produce evidences to support its conclusions.

The question often asked is what should be the starting point in literary appreciation? Spitzer argues, "There is a cyclic motion whereby linguistic observation stimulates or modifies literary insight and whereby literary insight in its turn stimulates further linguistic observation. This motion is something like the cycle of theory formulation and theory testing which underlies scientific method". The truth is that there cannot be a logical starting point, "since we bring to literary text simultaneously two faculties, however imperfectly developed: or ability to respond to it as a literary work and our ability to observe its language".

Before we proceed further with the strategy of analysing aesthetic response with linguistic explanation of the choices of language items, it will be useful to briefly glance over a few main controversial theories relating to style and stylistics which have gone on since antiquity and which we have only in passing referred to earlier in this

20 As quoted in *Style in Fiction*, op. cit., p.13.
21 Ibid.
chapter. This will make our perspective and presentation of the theory of stylistics more comprehensive and unorthodox. These theories can be presented under three heads: Dualism, Monism, and Pluralism.

The Dualists, the modern apostle of which is Richard Ohmann, takes style as the dress of thought and believes in the dichotomy between form or style and content or subject matter. Style is considered to be an adornment or covering of thought. This concept is based on the independent existence of thought and form. Here thought, idea, or subject matter exists prior to the choice of form or style or medium. This view had its currency during the Renaissance and was favoured by the Rationalists of the later epoch. It is contained in Alexander Pope’s famous definition of “Wit” in his An Essay on Criticism:

True wit is nature to advantage dressed,

What oft was thought but ne’er so well expressed.

This view of the embellishment theory was quite popular with Renaissance thinkers and practitioners of artificial styles, like Sidney and Lily in their creative prose
writings. This theory leans heavily on style as additive or optional extra and hence has no useful purpose for our scrutiny of style.

There is another kind of dualism. When we consider the view that style is a manner of expression, which is individualistic so far as the author is concerned. Every writer makes choices of expression, says things in a particular way and style which can be said to reside in that manner. The writer makes choices of content and choices of expressions. The dualists hold that there can be different ways of conveying the same content. For example, for them, "It was raining heavily" and "It was raining cats and dogs" would have the same meaning. Obviously the subtle nuances containing the two utterances, which contribute to the total meaning in a particular context, have not been paid any attention to. We here feel inclined to agree with the Monists that any alteration in form entails a change in content. The Monists rightly believed that choices of expression equal choices of content.
Ohmann has been quite influential in upholding the Dualists point of view. It would do well to quote him at some length in this regard:

"A Style is a way of writing— that is what the word means.... In general, [style] applies to human action that is partly invariant and partly variable.... Now this picture leads to few complications if the action is playing the piano or playing tennis.... But the relevant division between fixed and variable components in literature is by no means so obvious. What is content and what is form, or style? The attack on a dichotomy of form and content has been persistent in modern criticism; to change, so much as a word, the argument runs, is to change the meaning as well. This austere doctrine has a certain theoretical appeal.... Yet at the same time this doctrine leads to the altogether counter-intuitive conclusion that there can be no such
thing as style, or that style is simply a part of the content"\(^{22}\).

C.F. Hockett chimes in with Ohman when he asserts that "two utterances in the same language which convey approximately the same information but which are different in their linguistic structure can be said to differ in style\(^{23}\)." Dualism, in fact, is founded on the concept of paraphrase (i.e. same meaning in different form), and depends on the agreed conception of 'meaning' or 'content', two terms often used loosely and interchangeably. A student of Modern Literary Theory is well aware of the New Critics' opposition to the question of the validity of paraphrase so strongly stated by Cleanth Brooks\(^{24}\). We will have occasion to discuss the New Critics' point of view in the next chapter. Leech and Short have suggested that the ambiguity between 'meaning' or 'content' can be avoided by replacing these two terms by 'Sense' and 'Significance', where the former would "refer to the basic logical, conceptual, paraphrasable meaning" and the latter to "the total of what is communicated to the world

\(^{23}\) A Course in Modern Linguistics, op. cit., p. 556.
by a given text, Short and Leech continue to say that "Dualism assumes that no one can paraphrase the sense of the text, that there is a valid separation of Sense from Significance. Dualists do not in general treat stylistic choices as devoid of significance; if they did they would scarcely find style worth studying . . . . Rather, an enlightened Dualist will search for some Significance, which we may call Stylistic Value in a writer's choice to express his sense in this rather than that way. This view may be formalised in the equation: Sense + Stylistic value = (total) Significance."

The Dualists' notion of paraphrase rests on the assumption that there is some basic sense that can be preserved in different renderings. This possibility is not likely to be challenged in workaday uses of language. But in literature, especially in poetry paraphrase becomes problematic. Every metaphor for instance, confronts us with a paraphrase problem. We can take the following lines from Shakespeare to see whether the hidden metaphorical

25 Style in Fiction, op. cit, p.23.
26 Ibid.
meaning or the surface literal meaning or both can be expounded if we were asked to paraphrase them:

Come, Seeling night,

Scarf up the tender eye of pitiful day

*(Macbeth, III, ii, 46-47)*

We can give numerous examples from Eliot's *The Wasteland*, such as the concluding lines of the Hyacinth girls' encounter with her lover in the Hyacinth garden, sexual depravity in the modern world contained in "Jug Jug to dirty ears" and a host of lines where metaphorical meanings defy paraphrasing. Terence Hawkes has said, "Metaphor is not fanciful embroidery of facts. It is a way of experiencing the facts.* Metaphor, alone is the language of poetry for the New Critics. Metaphor denies us a literal sense, and so induces us to make sense, i.e. to find interpretations beyond the truth. Paraphrase captures only the functional meaning.

Monism finds its strongest evidence ground in poetry. Here the devices such as metaphor, irony and ambiguity give 'multivalued' meaning, and sense, the consequence of

---

paraphrase, loses its primacy. Monism, which rejected the form-meaning dichotomy of the Dualists, was also the tenet of New Criticism. Cleanth Brookes' 'Paradox' and William Empson's 'ambiguity' are well known to the students of English literature. The New Critics, unlike the Dualists, did not believe that a poem conveys some message. They believed that a poem was an autonomous organism existing per se. The most emphatic assertion in this respect came from Archibald MacLeish who said, "A poem should not mean but be." This concept had dominated critical thinking during the forties and fifties of the last century which is confirmed by a strong assertion by no less a critic than W.K. Wimsatt in the following statement:

"It is hardly necessary to adduce proof that the doctrine of identity of style and meaning is today firmly established. The doctrine is, I take it, one from which a modern theorist can hardly escape or hardly wishes to."

It was argued by Ohmann that Dualism was desirable when we study prose where 'underlying meanings', derived from figurative devices as in poetry, are not so frequent. Refuting his argument, a recent critic, David Lodge, has argued against Ohmann's stand in declaring that

... there is no essential difference between poetry and prose in so far as the following tenets apply to both:

(i) It is impossible to paraphrase literary writing;

(ii) It is impossible to translate a literary work;

(iii) It is impossible to divorce the general appreciation of a literary work from the appreciation of its style.

Monism, thus, rejects both paraphrase and translation and valid critical methods to explore meaning of a literary text, particularly a poem. Dualism, as we have averred to above has based its tenets and the validity of both these methods. Inspite of David Lodge's argument that there is no

---

essential difference between the language of prose and poetry, we believe that the linguistic exploitation in poetry is characterised by greater sophistication, precision, indirectness and multiplicity of the levels of meaning. It is distinguished from that of prose especially in matter of what the Prague School of Poetics calls ‘Foregrounading’ and ‘Deautomisation’ of the linguistic code. In poetry, the medium with its figurative infusion and elements of surprise resulting from various ‘violations’ of lexical and grammatical categories, (e.g. collocations, inversions etc.) attracts greater critical attention than the usual ‘transparent’ qualities of prose. The Prague School of Poetics, which became popular with those interested in the textual study of literary text, would, therefore permit the conclusion that “To be truly creative an artist must be destructive: destructive of rules, conventions, and expectations\(^3\)”. The Prague School of Poetics has distinguished the ‘Poetic function’ of language by its ‘Foregrounading’ or ‘Deautomisation’ of the linguistic code. This means that the aesthetic exploitation of language takes the form of “surprising the reader into a fresh awareness of, and sensitivity to, the linguistic medium,

\(^3\) Style in Fiction op. cit., p.29.
which is normally taken for granted as an 'automatised' background of communication.\textsuperscript{32}

Stylistic Pluralism offers itself as an alternative to both Monism and Dualism. It considerably widens the scope and role of Stylistics or Stylo Linguistics. It proposes to analyse style in terms of function. It is because of the variety and multiplicity of language functions that various linguistic choices on different functional levels are necessitated. Some of the generally familiar functions are referential (such as newspaper reports); directive and persuasive (such as advertising); social interaction or emotive function (such as casual conversations; and multilevel functions of the same utterance). For example, "Is your father feeling better?" may simultaneously be referential, directive (because demanding reply), and social or even emotive (maintaining a bond of sympathy between the speaker and the hearer). From this point of view the dualist is wrong in assuming that there is some unitary conceptual 'content' in every piece of language.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid. p 28.
At the theoretical level three classes of language functions can be isolated in chronological order. They are
(1) I.A. Richards, (Practical Criticism, 1929), who has mentioned four types of functions and four kinds of meaning\textsuperscript{33}: Sense, Feeling, Tone and Intensity. (2) Jakobson (1961) mentions six functions\textsuperscript{34}, Referential, Emotive, Conative, Phatic, Poetic, Metalinguistic – each corresponding to one essential aspect of the discourse situation. (3) Halliday talks of three types of functions\textsuperscript{35}. They are Ideational, Interpersonal and Textual. This model of Halliday is preferred because it has been worked out in considerable detail and is convincingly illustrated by his analysis of William Goldings's novel, The Inheritors.

Halliday's view is that all linguistic choices are meaningful as well as stylistic. In this respect his Pluralism can be regarded as a more sophisticated version of Monism. "The flaw of monism," argue Leech and Short, is that it tends to view a text as an undifferentiated whole, so that examination of linguistic choices cannot be made except on

\textsuperscript{35} The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching, op. cit., ch. 4.
some ad hoc principle. One might even argue that the Monist if he followed the logic of his position would not be able to discuss language at all: if meaning is inseparable from form, one cannot discuss meaning except by repeating the very words in which it is expressed and one cannot discuss form except by saying that it approximately expresses even its meaning. But the pluralist is in a happier position. He can show how choices of language are interrelated to one another within a network of functional choices.$^{36}$

Halliday talks of linguistic categories of the textual function of literary text and asserts that 'extra textual' elements cannot be ignored in the investigation of a literary text. This point has been very lucidly explained by Enkvist while talking about the narrowing of the earlier existing barrier between literary scholars and linguists in the wake of the popularity of New Criticism during the later first half of the last century. The New Critics like the linguists emphasized textual reading rather than background studies. Enkvist has summed up the situation thus:

$^{36}$ *Style in Fiction*, op. cit., p. 33.
To the former (linguists) the investigation of style is essentially a scientific description of certain types and sets of linguistic structures that occur in a particular text and of their distribution. On the contrary, the literary scholar must be more preoccupied with matters outside the text. Thus he will study the reader's responses and his linking of given textual stimuli with features that lie beyond the text itself but are a part of his past experience recalled by stimuli in the text. (e.g. only the literary scholar can tell us all that is implied in Milton's making Comus the son of Circe by Bacchus)\textsuperscript{37}.

In literature, style is a unique use of language. Hence the language as a whole needs to be taken into consideration. In doing so socio-cultural factors which come under, what Enkvist has called, extra-linguistic elements cannot be ignored. Here Halliday's theory of the social function of language, which emphasises the Neo-Firthian concept of the 'Context of Situation', comes in for

\textsuperscript{37} Linguistics and Style, op. cit., p. 4.
consideration automatically. The situation and context of the language event includes the various sociological, cultural, biological factors. In a literary composition we have three broad components: ‘Author’, ‘Text’ and ‘Reader’ – a pattern which operates in inter-personal interaction in a specific socio-cultural context. The schematic framework of Firth’s theory of the Context of Situation is given below in some detail where we have more than one factors involved in speech event besides the personal, relational and attitudinal features of a particular dyad:

A key concept in the technique of the London group is the concept of context of situation. The phrase ‘Context of Situation’ was first used widely in England by Malinowski.... Malinowski’s context of situation is a bit of the social process, which can be considered apart and in which a speech event is central and makes all the difference, such as the drill sergeant’s welcome utterance on the square, “stand at ease.” The context of situation of Malinowski is an ordered series of events considered ‘in rebus’. My view was, and still is that ‘context of situation’
is best used as a suitable schematic construct to apply to language events, and that it is a group of related categories at a different level from grammatical categories, but rather of the same abstract nature. A context of situation of linguistic work brings into relation of following categories:

A. The relevant features of participants: persons, personalities.
   (i) The verbal action of the participants.
   (ii) The non-verbal action of the participants

B. The relevant objects

C. The effect of the verbal action

Firth's notion which was adopted by descriptive linguists like Halliday was quite popular in British linguistic thinking during the 60's of the last century and was instrumental in encouraging socio-linguistic researches in literary studies. In fact socio-linguistic aspect of stylistics cannot be undermined even though we may lay the greatest

---

emphasis exclusively on the text. John Spencer has rightly summed up the situation as follows:

...... language is part of human social behavior. Language events do not take place in isolation from other events; Rather they operate within a wider framework of human activity. Any piece of language is therefore part of situation, and so has a context, a relationship with that situation. Indeed, it relationship between the substance and form of a piece of language on the one hand and the extra-linguistic circumstances in which it occurs on the other, which gives what is normally called 'meaning' to utterances."^^

The importance attached to the context of situation or the extra-linguistic circumstances will include both oral and written language under Stylistic or Stylo-linguistic investigation. However, Spencer voices the general agreement of both aesthetic and stylo-linguistic theorists

39 Linguistics and Style, op. cit., p.68.
when he says, "Stylistic studies are primarily concerned with written language."  

The above narrative about Style, Stylistics, and Stylo-linguistics, relates primarily to the use of language from the author's point of view. When we approach language for stylistic study from the reader's point of view then concepts of style as recurrence, pattern, frequency as determining it come in for discussion. When a single occurrence of choice is repeated in preference for alternatively available choices it is a feature of style. The same thing can be said of pattern and frequency. Bernard Bloch has defined the 'Style' of a text as, "The message carried by the frequency distributions and transitional probabilities of its linguistic features especially as they differ from those of the same features in the language as a whole." The definition of style by Bloch suggests the notion of quantification based on frequency for objectivity. Without entering into any argument about this we can say that such a task, in practice, would really be a difficult one. This is not to reject the value of Quantitative

---

40 Ibid. p. 69.
Stylistics which can provide greater objectivity in the confirmation of the reader's hunches and insights which are quite often in aesthetic terms conveyed by such expressions as 'urbane', 'curt', 'exuberant', 'florid', 'lucid', 'plain', etc. These aesthetic responses conveyed in the words mentioned above need to be justified by linguistic evidence to confirm the reader's intuition or hunch. It is here that Stylo-linguistics comes in handy.

The above discussion may appear of the omnibush type for Stylo-linguistic analysis of any literary text irrespective of their generic existence. They may apply well to fiction of all type, dramatic writings in prose, essays, to even travelogues. But as averred to earlier in the present chapter, poetry makes use of language where other criteria are also required. Poetry, as we know, has the license for linguistic violence in the sense that it transgresses the established rules and norms of the linguistic structure of a language, particularly its lexis and syntax. In this context we would pause briefly to discuss the concepts of Deviance, Prominence and Literary Relevance discussed by Halliday and the Prague School of Linguists. Besides this, a brief reference to Stephen Ullman's theory of stylistic resources
of a language will also be made to complete both the points of view, i.e. those of the author as well as of the reader.

We have already talked about the concept of 'norm' in a stylistic study. Deviance is related to the norm. It is purely a statistical notion of the difference in the normal frequency of a feature and its frequency in the text. But even if we ignore the quantitative concept of statistically measuring frequency as not a very feasible procedure, deviance would mean a sort of violation of a particular normal feature of the language either lexically or syntactically. This feature is quite significantly used in the language of poetry.

'Prominence' is the related psychological notion. Halliday defines it simply as "The general name for the phenomenon of linguistic highlighting, whereby some linguistic features stand out in some way." Linguistic highlighting has been given another term by the Prague School of Linguists, which is 'Foregrounding', or artistically motivated deviation. This is what Halliday calls 'Literary

---


relevance' which depends upon the notion of 'foregrounding'. Foregrounding can be either 'qualitative' or 'quantitative'. Qualitative foregrounding is a deviation from the language code (rules and convention) itself, whereas quantitative deviance is a deviance from some expected frequency. Again deviation may be 'external' e.g. with reference to a norm, or 'internal', which occurs mostly in poetry and stands out against the background of what the text has led us to expect. Here we can safely remark that literary and linguistic criteria converge in the concept of Foregrounding. If only we could train our students to select and identify this device in a poem we, as teachers, would have helped them (students) in the technique of Stylo-Linguistic analysis of a selected artefact. We will have occasion to talk about this concept again in the next chapter while discussing the Methodology of teaching poetry. Before we close this discussion of the various concepts and components of Stylo-Linguistics it is relevant to mention Ullmann's concept of stylistic resources of a language\footnote{Language and Style, op. cit., p 100.}, which he says, are 'expressive' and 'evocative' devices. Everything that transcends the purely referential and communicative side of language belongs to
the province of expressive devices. It includes the motive, overtones, emphasis, symmetry, euphony which place our style in a particular register (e.g. literary, colloquial, slangy, etc. are all associated with a particular milieu e.g. historical, foreign, provincial, professional). Charles Bailey had emphasised emotive elements. But this term was found to be too narrow and was replaced by Ullmann with 'expressive'.

Evocative devices involve, says Ullmann, three levels:

1. **Stylistics of sound** (phono stylistics): Onomatopoeia,
2. **Stylistics of word-formation**, synonym ambiguity, contrast between vague and precise, abstract and concrete, rare and common terms;
3. **Stylistics of Sentence**: Components of sentence, sentence structure, and higher units into which single sentences combine. Halliday has given a more systematic presentation of the three levels mentioned by Ullmann, which we will discuss in the next chapter.

---

What emerges from our long discussion of the various aesthetic and linguistic approaches and concept in the foregoing pages can be summed up as follows:

(1) The controversy between the aesthetic and the linguistic stylistics is unnecessary as both acknowledge that they deal with study and analysis of language in literature. They agree to the concept that style is the study of language in a literary text.

(2) Linguistic Stylistics cannot ignore the element of intuition and impressionistic response to literature. The aesthetic stylistics should be prepared to collaborate with linguistics to confirm by linguistic evidence the reader’s literary intuition, hunches, response, etc.

(3) Descriptive linguistics should be exploited for providing the framework for analysis of the language of literature whereas literary or aesthetic theories should be geared to collaborate with linguistics.