CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Chapter Preview

In this second chapter, a review of literature is presented from three perspectives, that is, in terms of the relevance of teaching literature, stylistics for poetry interpretation and pedagogical stylistics. The main reason for the review work in this chapter is to identify the gap in pedagogical stylistics research so far and to find out the relevance of stylistic practices in teaching Ethiopian poetry in English. The review work is intended to support the research methods and the conceptual framework of the thesis. Core stylistic areas reviewed include: formalist stylistics, functionalist stylistics, cognitive stylistics, feminist stylistics, critical stylistics, pedagogical stylistics, pragmatic stylistics and practical stylistics.

2.2. On the Relevance of Teaching Literature

Literature teaching in the EFL scenario is a contentious and multifaceted subject. Towards the subject, foremost researchers and veteran educators in the field still uphold divergent but equally important views. Some researchers cleave to the view that literature opens doors for English language learning. On the contrary, other exponents in the field argue that literature is taught fundamentally to equip the learner with literary competence or literary transferable skills. Due to the mismatch between methods and views, there were situations where literature teaching was totally excluded from the curriculum of English education. The researches and discussions here under on the significance of literature teaching can boil down to four models: the language development model, the cultural development model, the personal involvement model and the literary skill enhancement model.

Brumfit, one of the important exponents in the field, opposes the argument that literature teaching largely empowers the linguistic and cultural maturity of the learner in the EFL context. He stresses that “a true literature syllabus will not be simply the
use of literary texts for advanced language purpose, but an attempt to develop or extend literary competence” (Language and Literature Teaching. 185). The prime purpose, therefore, of literature teaching is to empower the student with literary skills so that students can read, understand, interpret and appreciate literary texts. Linguistic competence and cultural enrichment cannot be the ultimate goal of literature teaching. Brumfit also presents the criteria for selecting literary texts for EFL contexts.

On the other side, McKay, another exponent in the field, claims that “development of linguistic knowledge” is the sole objective of literature teaching in EFL contexts. McKay also avers that literature teaching promotes “awareness of language use, development of reading proficiency, increased motivation to interact with text and introduction of cultural assumptions” (191-198.) He argues that literature acts as a stimulus and increases interest in language learning. McKay also quotes Frye, who says, “It is clear that the end of literary teaching is not simply the admiration of literature; it is something more like the transfer of imaginative energy from literature to the students” (qtd in McKay 193). The argument implies that literature paves the way for the creative capability of the students and the novelty of ideas.

Conversely, the teaching of literature from the African perspective epitomizes an exclusively different proposition. The African EFL reality shows that English is taught as an ‘exotic’ language, at least in many non-Commonwealth countries of Africa. Divergent views are also held about the significance of literature in English in Africa. Say for example, some African literary figures like Nugugi maintain that literature should be taught to reflect the social being and situation of the people of Africa.

In his article “Literature in School”, Nugugi claims that literature should reflect the consciousness of the people:

It [literature] reflects in word images a people’s consciousness, tensions and conflicts arising out of their struggles to mould a meaningful social environment founded on their combined actions in nature to wrest the
means of life: clothing, food and shelter. Literature thus contains people’s images of themselves in history and their place in the universe (224).

Nugugi also solicits elemental questions towards the relevance and adequacy of the present day education system, the decision making personnel, the teaching staff and the approaches to literature (221). He audaciously asserts that Kenyan teachers should first teach Kenyan literature and then follow East African literature. On the impacts of Western literature, he enunciates. “Our children are made to look, analyze and evaluate the world as made and seen by Europeans. Worse still, these children are confronted with a distorted image of themselves and their history as reflected and interpreted in European imperialist literature” (225). For Nugugi, literature should assist Kenyan students fight imperialism and corruption. It should lend a hand also to revive the indigenous wisdom and the African identities.

Alternatively, literature teaching, for Showalter is a scholarship by itself. It is a profession in which literary skills are transferred to the students. Showalter reasons that “We need to find ways in which to help students learn how literary scholars think, read, analyze, annotate, evaluate and interpret texts” (7). She calls for the professionalization of literature teaching which can be critiqued, criticized and theorized. She also puts forward active learning methods (student-centered approaches) so that students can have hands-on experience on the various genres. Students of literature should not be seen as a ‘rapturous audience of a professional theatre’ (7).

O’Sullivan and Zyngier reveal that the teaching of literature in universities is generally fast growing. O’Sullivan states the worth of literature as follows: “Current approaches have endeavored to reexamine the value of literature and have begun to uphold its worth again …primarily, literature [should be taken] as an agent for language development and improvement, cultural enhancement” (1).

On the contrary, generalizing from her experiences in Europe, Asia, US and North America, Bassnet observes that there exists a general decline in reading culture. This
lack of interest in reading has greatly affected the inclusion of classical literature. The author strongly recommends changes in the literature teaching methodology (1). Correspondingly, the decline in literature teaching is also observed by Short and Candlin. They observe, “Post war English literature in the overseas context has been marked by a fairly consistent flight from the text” (179). Due to the discoveries in the digital technology and ICT, people spend more time on watching TV or listening than reading novels.

In his article, “Literature in the Modern Language Syllabus”, Sharman identifies three major reasons for literature teaching: 1) reading extended texts in the foreign language improves language skills, 2) literature introduces student to socio-cultural, political and historical development of the country and, 3) brings familiarity with period and genre (Sharman 1). The article proposes a thematic approach to literature teaching so that students can have access to the cultural and ideological experiences of the text.

The cultural enrichment, language refinement and development models have also been stressed by Zefreriadou. Referring to Carter and Long, Zefreriadou describes three models of the benefits of literature teaching: 1) the cultural model, 2) the language model, and 3) the personal model. These rely on educational, linguistic and psychological theories (Zefreriadou 1). Zefreriadou alleges that a lack of proper methodology and the inaccessibility of some literary texts have made the contribution of literature less negligible. As has been substantiated above, literature teaching in the EFL scenario is a litigious and multifaceted issue.

Collie and Slater present the relevance, selection criteria and methods of teaching literature. They view literature as:

1. a valuable authentic material which familiarizes students with various language functions, forms and rules
2. a cultural enrichment means which helps discover the thoughts, feelings, customs, possessions, beliefs, fears and joys of the native speaker
3. a language enrichment mechanism which provides a rich context for lexical and syntactic items and
4. a personal involvement instrument which helps the students ‘inhabit’ the text (3-10).

The book takes into account the needs, interests, cultural background and the language level of the students as the basic criteria for selecting a text for classroom purpose. Integrating student-centered approach, the book also states the following core strategies for literature teaching:

1. Maintaining interest and involvement by using a variety of student–centered activities
2. Supplementing the printed page
3. Tapping the resources of knowledge and experience with the group
4. Helping students explore their own responses to literature
5. Using the target language
6. Interacting with the target language (Ibid).

Following these methods, the book gives practical examples from novel, drama, and poetry and states the communicative language teaching methods appropriate to literature classroom. To successfully materialize and maximize the relevance of literature in the second language context, the teacher has to make a distinction between modern and traditional literature teaching methods. Table-3 below shows a summary of examples of the methods as classified by Parkinson and Thomas (27-39):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Literature Teaching Method</th>
<th>Modern Literature Teaching Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 rote learning and summary of content</td>
<td>reading for pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 reading aloud (extracts from novels, short stories and essays)</td>
<td>reading for content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 reworking of secondary source</td>
<td>Creating one’s own text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 translation</td>
<td>linguistic analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 lecture method (excessive use)</td>
<td>personal response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 games and fun activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 prediction and related guessing activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 performing a literary work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All in all, all the educators agree that literature teaching has relevance. To effectively exploit its relevance, the right teaching methods have to be implemented. It is assumed; therefore, stylistics maximizes the relevance of literature teaching and helps in interpreting the complexities in literary texts, especially in poetry.

2.3. Stylistics in Interpreting Poetry

Poetry, like god Siva, is both a destroyer and preserver, “undermining conventional and socially sanctioned reality but preserving the principle of order by recasting reality in a new image held within the patterning of verse” (Widdowson, Practical Stylistics, 82). Poetry is honored as an art but feared as an academic subject. The language of poetry, which causes fear, has often remained inaccessible to an EFL learner. In an EFL milieu, poetry teaching and learning is a problem both for the teacher and the student. Researchers and educators in the field attribute the problem to various researchable issues. Linguistic competence of the learner, complexities inherent in the language of poetry, unfamiliar syntax and diction, lack of proper methodology and inadequately trained teachers are some of the basic problems. To resolve the methodology dilemma, stylistics has been a key solution for the teaching of poetry specifically for the description, analysis, interpretation understanding and evaluation of poetic language and complex poetic texts in an EFL context.

With the intention of reducing fear of poetry and revealing the inherent nature of poetic language, Leech writes: “Just as there is no firm dividing line between ‘poetic’ and ordinary language, so it would be artificial to enforce a clear division between the language of poetry … and that of other literary language” (6). Poetic language, which is a complex subject for the learner, is brought to the level of ordinary language.

Leech, however, argues that the poet has the unique freedom to creatively use the language of the past, present, dialects, archaism and register. Linguistics, therefore, provides the tools to unlock the complexities inherent in poetic language. Consequently, vivid comprehension of poetic language which encompasses deviation,
foregrounding and verbal repetition, patterns of sound, meter, figurative language and ambiguity empowers the student to discover the meaning of poetry. He also asserts that the work of some poets cannot be understood fully without a detailed social and political history. Interpretation of poetic texts also depends on familiarity with literary tradition, conventional symbolism and mythology. Consequently, he argues “…it is better to regard linguist and critic not as different people, but as different roles which may be assumed by the same person” (226). Here Leech provides the basis for the linguistic stylistic analysis of poetry.

Jakobson’s “Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics” lays the foundation for formalist stylistics. His statement not only provides the formalistic stylistic methods of understanding poetry but also classifies the functions of language. According to his profoundly illustrated argument, from a Russian indigenous wisdom and context, poetry is a language. He argues, “language must be investigated in all the variety of functions” (Jakobson 353). Consequently, the study of poetry is based on the six functions: emotive, conative, referential, poetic, phatic and metalingual (Ibid). Jakobson also emphasizes that “the linguistic scrutiny of poetry cannot limit itself to the poetic function (Ibid). Jakobson exemplifies that poetic function should not be limited to poetry only. To justify his argument, he exemplifies from the poetic language in spell, incantation, folktale and Russian folk epic. It is argued that the Russian folk epics and folk tales also pervasively employ poetic language and rhythm. All in all, his closing statement provides the linguistic tools with which one can stylistically describe and interpret poetic language. Poetic ‘forms’, he further explains, like meter, rhyme, rhythm, foregrounding, parallelism and symbols help interpret poems objectively. Issues like selection and combination have been presented as the significant qualities of a poem which should be considered during analysis and teaching poetry.

Halliday’s notion of the functions of language can be drawn to investigate poetic language to aid the teaching of poetry. Adopting his functionalism, one can also compare the dominant use of language in poetry. In his functionalist model, three
functions of language are described: the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual (The Inheritors. 91-92).

In the ideational function, language serves as an expression of content. It includes the writer’s own internal world: reaction, cognition and perception. In serving this function, language also gives structures to experiences and helps determine the way of looking at the world around (91). Transitivity, tense and lexical content are expressions of ideational function. The concepts of actor, goal and beneficiary are represented as logical subject, logical direct object and logical indirect object.

In the interpersonal function, language serves to establish and sustain social relations. Language allows us to express social and individual attitude, assessment, judgment, question and persuasion. Different types of expression of mood, persons, attitude, comment and tone come under this function (94).

In the textual function, the reader expects a smooth flow of ideas from one sentence to the next. “The textual function refers to the use of language in the creation of a text. It is instrumental in realizing the other two functions” (Srinivas 362). Textual features like theme, voice, deixis, conjunction and collocation come under this function of language. Consequently, a clear understanding of Halliday’s functionalist stylistics will help describe how language is used in the Ethiopian poetry.

Taylor and Toolan make a distinction between formalist and functionalist stylistics though they regard them as subdivisions of objective structural stylistics. They argue that functionalists link formal stylistic features with specific stylistic functions (effects or values). On the other hand, the formalists disregard the functional criteria in identifying stylistic forms. Instead, they prefer purely formal criteria in identifying stylistic patterns and features (Taylor and Toolan 88).

In his book “Linguistic Criticism”, Fowler explicates linguistic structures which relate literature to practices and skills. He argues, “Language is not just knowledge; it is also a skill, a practice” (39). For Fowler, as a critical linguist, the particular aim of
linguistic criticism is demystification, demonstration of the practices by which language is used (37). Fowler also gives contextualized examples to justify “how texts are made”. While analyzing the organization of a literary work of art, Fowler recommends probing critically into cohesion, progression and thematization. Among these elements of text organization, Fowler says, a significant device which can be employed for poetic analysis is “cohesion” (also in Halliday and Hassan, Beaugrande and Dressler, Halliday, Short and Peer).

Verdonk’s “Stylistics” shows that stylistics does not replace literary criticism, but “serves to bring it into picture” (65). He also holds that stylistics and literary perspectives are complementary (57). The range of perspectives included in the analysis of various texts in this book exemplify that there is no single road map to stylistics. The book shows that diversified approaches can be implemented. It implies that stylistics has porous boundaries. This is an interesting point to research. Similarly, Widdowson describes the relationship between linguistic orientation and literary orientation as follows. “Stylistics might be regarded as a method for accumulating linguistic evidence which the literary scholar can draw upon to support his intuitive judgment. It seems to me that it is a mistake to separate means [linguistic orientation] and end [literary orientation] in this way” (Ching, et.al. 236).

In opposition to the claims of some stylisticians towards scientific objectivity of textual stylistics, Fish proposes what he called affective stylistics. For him “a stylistic fact is the fact of response” (160). The relationship between formal patterns and meaning is arbitrary. He argues that “the objectivity of the text is an illusion” (140). Fish explains “meaning” as the experience which the reader gets while reading and interpreting the text. It is the structure of the reader’s responses and experiences rather than the textual form that should be the ultimate aim of stylistic interpretation. He argues, “I am concerned with the responses that are the act of perception, the moment to moment experience of adjusting to the sequential demands of prose and poetry …” (162). Text which provides spatial experiences should not be relied upon but response, which gives temporal experiences, should be the basis for meaning. Meaning,
consequently, relies on the social, educational and ideological background of the reader and the context of situation. He proposes a movement from textualistic to contextualistic stylistics.

Focusing on the reader, Mills proposes a model in which text production and reception are integral parts of context. In the model, the reader gets prominence in negotiating, resisting and questioning meaning. This feminist stylistics model is rooted in contextualized stylistics which in turn is partly shaped by the reader’s socio-historical background and ideology. Mills argues that in texts “…the reader is addressed in a more complex and indirect way” (Mills 266). To illustrate reader-address using linguistics, she argues for the usefulness of investigating deixis, vocatives and selectors in texts. Similarly, directing the reader to see how the image of woman is presented in literature, Burton argues that “Stylistic analysis is not just a question of discussing ‘effects’ in language and text, but a powerful method for understanding the ways in which all sorts of ‘realities’ are constructed through language” (228). These feminist stylistic views bridge both text and context in the making of meaning.

Traditional stylistic analysis of poetry provides the interpretation of a poetic text at all linguistic level: phoneme, morpheme, lexis, syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Nevertheless, contemporary stylistics has opened its doors to encompass and assimilate the research results of other disciplines such as feminist studies, cognitive linguistics, computer science, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics and critical linguistics. These disciplines have become basis for the movement from textualism to contextualism. One of these contemporary trends which contributed to stylistics recently is cognitive stylistics.

According to Burk’s study, cognitive stylistics and traditional stylistics are complementary. In this work, the three tools that can augment traditional stylistics include: figure and ground, image schemata and cognitive metaphor (185). A figure can be a character or location in the text. It is also called attention or attractor. Image schemata, on the other hand, is the recurring pattern of every day perceptual
interaction and bodily experiences. Finally, cognitive metaphor maps the characteristics of the source domain on to a target domain (190). Burk stresses linguistic analysis of a poem may not provide a complete interpretation of the poem. “It is at this stage stylisticians might turn their cognitive tools” (188). His argument underlines that since cognition deals with all mental activities related with thinking, knowing, communicating, remembering and is embedded in culture, cognitive stylistics supplements and promotes stylistic analysis (189).

Looking into Wilson and Sperber’s views of contextual effects and verbal irony can be relevant to cognitive stylistic analysis. In order to process the cognitive meaning of a poetic text, analysis of contextual effects and verbal irony, which root in the principles of relevance, can be resourceful. The principle of relevance assumes that the greater the contextual effect, the greater the relevance for the individual who processes it (271). Similarly, Freeman’s cognitive metaphor can also be a resourceful cognitive stylistic tool in the analysis of figurative language. Analysis of cognitive metaphor would allow to probe into “balance, links, path and scale” (294) in poetic texts objectively.

Consequently, developing models from cognitive, formalist, functionalist, feminist and pedagogical stylistics, the researcher will teach Ethiopian poetry. These trends will help assess the pedagogic relevance of stylistics.

2.4. Pedagogical Stylistics in Teaching Poetry

A stylistic presentation of poetry in an EFL context empowers the student both with literary and linguistic competence. The basic question here is which approach to stylistics: formalist, functionalist, feminist, critical, cognitive, cultural, practical and pragmatic? The researcher’s argument here is that pedagogic stylistics brings all the stylistic trends to the classroom. It is an eclectic approach to the teaching of poetry.
When the reader reads the title of Widdowson’s “Practical Stylistics: an Approach to the Teaching of Poetry”, the reader expects practical, pedagogic approaches and principles to the teaching of poetry. Some eclectic theories which can be implemented and later critiqued by professionals are expected in the book. Part one of Widowson’s book presents the significance of poetry. It provides practical examples of poetic lines from graveyards and post cards to justify and demystify poetic language. This part characterizes the nature of poetry. Although broader approaches are missing, this part is really intriguing to read. Part two of the book is entirely devoted to the teaching of poetry. His defense of poetry can convince ELT curriculum designers and experts not to exclude poetry from ELT curriculum. He supports his arguments with examples which show the potential poetry has for inclusion in the curriculum. It is held that the proper selection and presentation of poetic texts improve linguistic skills and creative capabilities. Quite a substantial portion of part two is devoted to composition, completion and comparison exercises. These are specific practical exercises quite familiar to many poetry teachers.

Clark and Zyngier conceptualize the theoretical framework and the fundamental aim of pedagogic stylistics. The authors underline that pedagogical stylistics, a branch of applied stylistics, aims at “sensitizing awareness of language use rather than formulating new theories or testing new theories” (341). It is a sub discipline within applied stylistics which chiefly applies stylistic theories in the classroom. It considers text as an art of communication. Summarizing the results of a project group, PEDSIG (Pedagogical Stylistics Interest Group), the authors also assert that “Consequently, the consensus of PEDSIG was that the principal aim in using stylistics method in the classroom situation of either kind (L₁ or L₂) was essentially the same...” (340). This assertion, however, lacks sufficient data on the teaching of stylistics in the L₂ scenario in which the student grapples with equally convoluted but honored subjects: poetry and English. The authors make this statement on the responses collected from “seven questionnaires in five different countries” (345). Carter also raises this concern and asks whether the kind of stylistic analysis in the mother tongue can be transferred without amplification to a foreign or second language learning context. He
recommends pre-analysis of language work before the application of stylistic approach (Directions 19).

Compared to Clark and Zyngier, Carter presents wider and comprehensive approaches for the implementation of stylistics in the teaching of literature. He demonstrates that different teaching strategies need to be accommodated within stylistics. He exemplifies the teaching of the following skills through stylistic implementation: 1) teaching grammar, 2) teaching text as discourse, 3) creative writing, 4) comparative textology, 5) teaching the ‘nature’ of language through literature, 6) studying the nature of literariness and 7) interpreting texts (What is Stylistics? 61-174). Unlike Clark and Zyngier, his approach is not limited to just teaching writing and reading skills.

The other contentious argument of Clark and Zyngier is the statement made on the purpose of pedagogic stylistics. They argue that “The purpose of this pedagogy is not so much to produce the next generation of stylisticians … or create even more accurate users of the language ….”(342). This statement implies that only L1 learners can be stylisticians and only L2 students can accurately use English. This, however, requires further research and consultation. In both L1 and L2 contexts, there should be an aim and relevance in learning stylistics.

The fundamental aim of pedagogic stylistics in the L2 scenario requires research and consultation. It is not only the students’ “own skills in reading and writing” that are improved, as claimed by these authors, but also the listening and speaking skills. In a stylistics classroom, in the context of interactive and contextualized activities, a student argues, debates, interprets, analyzes and thinks creatively. Stylistics lays the foundation for those who wish to be the future critics, stylisticians and literary professionals and most important of all, users of the language, whether they are L1 or L2 learners of stylistics. There is always an aim in learning stylistics or English or poetry.
Widdowson, in his “Explorations in Applied Linguistics II”, presents two views of teaching literature in the language classroom. Literature can be disruptive by its “quantitative lack of control and subversive by its qualitative lack of correctness” (162). He also describes the challenges in the complex poetic text in the L2 situation. However, he concludes that if there is careful selection and presentation, “It [Literature] can contribute significantly to both the process and the purpose of learning because it is a significant use of language” (172). He also stresses that a poem uses “unique language systems in which the regularities of langue and parole converge” (149).

In his other article “Teaching, Learning and Study of Literature”, Widdowson also emphasizes the significance of selection and presentation of literary texts. He underscores, “… the task for literature teaching is to develop in the students the ability to perform literature as readers, to interpret it as a use of language, as a precondition of studying it” (194). However, the selection of literary texts has been a difficult task and selection implies the generalization that L2 students respond to a text differently from L1 (also in Carter). Carter argues that language is the “medium and can be taught as such but response [literary] is a matter of personal, cultural and linguistic experience” (Directions 19). Criticizing Cox and Dyson for their ‘visceral sensation’ in generalizing the meaning of a poem intuitively, Widdowson recommends the production of textual evidence to generalize the meaning of a poem. In an ELL scenario, he suggests the integration of literature teaching with the teaching of English language (194).

Simpson argues that there are six good reasons for using stylistics in literature teaching. These six good reasons for using stylistics can help us summarize the argument for using stylistics in literature teaching in EFL context:

1. **Heuristic:** a way of discovering more about the structure and function of language; looking at what writers do is a good way of finding out about language.
2. **Critical**: the literary-interpretative function; looking at language is a good way of finding out about what writers are doing.

3. **Generic**: a way of comparing different genres and registers

4. **Intersubjective**: empirical techniques; shared “metalanguage”; stylistics as empowering tool to support experience of reading.

5. **Pedagogical**: stylistic analysis: not only text-orientated, but teaching-orientated.

6. **Linguistic**: testing ground for theories and constructs in linguistics; highlights “norms” of communication (Simpson 1)

### 2.5. Chapter Summary

Chapter two presented a review of literature from three perspectives, that is, in terms of the relevance of literature teaching, stylistics for interpreting poetry and pedagogical stylistics. The main reason for the review work in this chapter was to identify the gap in pedagogical stylistics research so far and to find out the relevance of stylistic practices in teaching Ethiopian poetry in English. Core stylistic areas reviewed include: formalist stylistics, functionalist stylistics, cognitive stylistics, feminist stylistics, critical stylistics, practical stylistics, pedagogical stylistics, pragmatic stylistics and practical stylistics.

Finally, while reviewing all these research articles and books, the present researcher found out that the relationship between stylistics, poetry and language has not been comprehensively researched. None of the researchers exemplify and justify pedagogical stylistics as an eclectic approach to the teaching of poetry. The pedagogical relevance of stylistics has not been researched intensively. This is the gap the researcher finds while reviewing the literature on stylistics. Each stylistic theoretician struggles for the acceptance of her or his own theories of stylistics.

From the review work and field survey, three fundamental questioned were raised:
1. Can stylistic go beyond the teaching of productive and receptive language skills to include other forms of competence such as pragmatic, functional, sociolinguistic and creative?

2. Is pedagogical stylistics an eclectic or a monolithic approach to the teaching of poetry?

3. Does aboriginal literature fit for language education in EFL context?

Therefore, the thesis is designed to answer these questions and fill gaps developing eclectic models from formalist, functionalist, feminist, cognitive and pedagogical stylistics. In the words of Taylor and Toolan the possibilities and advantages of eclecticism are argued as “a further practical benefit of pluralism is that it allows authors to borrow freely from different linguistic methodologies in constructing an eclectic method of stylistic analysis” (89). With this major research stand, the conceptual framework is presented in the next chapter. The experimental research design and data analysis also rely on the review work and the conceptual framework that follow. As presented in the next chapter, the conceptual framework of the research is born out of the literature review and guides the entire stylistic experimentation.