2.0. Style and its Definition:

According to Crystal and Davy,

Style may refer to some or all of the language habits of one person—as when we talk of Shakespeare’s style (or styles)... or when we discuss the question of disputed authorship… More often, it refers in this way to a selection of language habits, the occasional linguistic idiosyncrasies which characterize an individual’s uniqueness.

...style may refer to some or all of the language habits shared by a group of people at one time, or over a period of time, as when we talk about the style of Augustan poets, the style Old English ‘heroic’ poetry, the style in which civil service forms are written, or styles of public-speaking. (Crystal & Davy 1969, 9-10)

Stylistics is the study of ‘style’. A writer’s style, as Spencer (1964) said, ‘may be regarded as an individual and creative utilization of the resources of language’. The basic assumption of stylistics, therefore, is that style is formed by the use of language in literature. Such use of language may be creative, aesthetic, expression or situational distinctive. Literature is an art-form which uses language as its medium without which no creative activities, at the literary level, are possible. Stylistics, therefore, is exclusively concerned with the investigation and description of the medium of literature, i.e., language. (Beg, 2002-03, 11)

The discipline label ‘stylistics’ was popularized in the 1950s, and it came to be thought of as a discrete field of linguistics or applied linguistics. ‘General stylistics’ (Sebeok 1960) was interested in all forms of language text, spoken and written, distinguished from the
sub-field of literary stylistics. Early stylistics was dominated by linguistic structuralism, which emphasized the structural properties of texts at different levels of linguistic organization (phonological, grammatical, lexical, and prosodic). It gloried in the technical sophistication of linguistic description, at a time when linguistics was still developing momentum. Stylistics was largely based on taxonomies – lists of language features, levels and functions. (Nikolus Coupland, 2007, pg:10)

Stylistics presupposes style which is found in every writer. A writer utilizes language according to his own creative and communicative needs. He very often moulds and modifies the resources of language available to him and makes certain changes and alterations in the existing structures and patterns of language. He also on occasion deviates from the normal usage and violates linguistic norms. By doing so, he creates certain novel expressions and unique linguistic forms and patterns. He also produces fore-grounded elements in language. As Kelkar (1987, 2-3) observes, the language of a literary text is ‘handled by its author in a manner distinct from the everyday, non-literary use of that language. The author will on occasion carry out a discriminating selection from the sounds, words, sentence structures, sense structures offered by ordinary language; on occasion the author will effect an extension, a certain stretching beyond available language material; on occasion the author will indulge in a deviation from or an alterations of language norms; and finally there will be occasions when the author will even countenance a distortion of language material’. All these innovative efforts amount to his creative, aesthetic and expressive use of language and thus to his individual style. The basis of style, therefore, is the use of language as a medium of literature, in whatever manner writer uses this medium. (Beg, 2002-03, 11-12)
Linguists regard style as a variation in language, as choice between alternative expressions, as deviation from the linguistic norms, and as special usage of language. Following are some of the definition of Style which take into these considerations of language and are termed as linguistic or linguistically oriented definition of Style. (Beg, 2002-03, 13)

2.0.1. Style as Variation:

According to Lyons (1970, 19) definition of Stylistics regards style as ‘variation in the use of language’. According to Hockett (1958, 556), ‘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’.

2.0.2 Style as Choice:

Enkvist (1964, 12) defines style’ as the choice between alternative expressions’. Brooks and Warren (1950, 640) are of the view that the term style is ‘usually used with reference to the poet’s manner of choosing, ordering and arranging his words’. According to Traugott and Pratt (1980, 409), ‘style refers to patterned choice, whether at the phonological, lexical, syntactic, or pragmatic level’.

2.0.3. Style as Deviation:

Bloch (1953, 42) defines style as ‘the message carried by the frequency distribution and transitional probabilities of [a discourse’s] linguistic features, especially as they differ from those of the same features in the language as a whole’. According to Osgood (1960, 293), ‘style is defined as an individual’s deviation form norms for the situations in which he is encoding these deviations being in the statistical properties of those structural features for which there exists some degree of choice in his code’.
2.04. Style as Special Usage:

Wellander (1948, 18) holds the view that ‘style, in the linguistic sense, usually signifies every special usage clearly contrasted against the general’. According to Hough (1969, 3) is of the view that ‘language is the dress of thought, and style is the particular cut and fashion of the dress’.

2.1. Linguistic Theories:

After discussing the stylistics and the definition of Style, researcher of this thesis will deal with the theoretical issues and linguistic theories like Russian Formalism, Prague School, New-Criticism, Structuralism, Post-Structuralism, Deconstruction, Reader-Response Theory, Psycho-Analytical Theory, and Linguistic Stylistics.

2.1.1 Russian Formalism:

Russian Formalism is one of the movements of literary criticism and interpretation. It emerged in Russia during the second decade of the twentieth century and remained active until about 1930. The members of this school emphasize, first and foremost, on the autonomous nature of literature and consequently the proper study of literature was neither a reflection of the life of its author nor as a byproduct of the historical or cultural milieu in which it was created. In this respect, the proponents of a formalist approach to literature attempt not only to isolate and define the ‘formal’ properties of language (in both poetry and prose) but also to study the way in which certain aesthetically motivated devices (e.g. de-familiarization) determined the literariness or artfulness of an object. Simply, this movement of literary criticism is characterized by a concern both with the text itself and the literary aspects of the text. The Russian formalists were more interested with words and literary devices than actual meaning of words themselves (McCauley 1997).
2.1.2. Prague School:

Garvin (1964) shares the opinion that Moscow Linguistic Circle was formed in 1951 and Russian flourished during 1915-1930. In the initial stage, the members of the circle were preoccupied with problems concerning the language of literature and tried to build up a science of literature. As a result of political changes in the Soviet Union, some of its members moved out and worked in several places in Europe. One such city was Prague, which became the centre of the Prague School Theory of Linguistics. It represents the work of many scholars such as Roman Jackobson, Trubetzkoy and others. The time from 1929 to 1939 were known as the golden years of the Prague School. Twentieth century Semiotics and Structuralism emerged simultaneously from the same source. The first systematic formulation of Semiotic Structuralism came from scholars of the Prague Linguistic Circle (PLC) who are now known as the Prague School linguists. The PLC was founded in 1926 by Vilem Mathesius who used to be a director of the English seminar at Charles University and his colleagues such as Roman Jakobson, Bohuslav Havranek, Bohumil Tranka and Jan Mathesius.

2.1.3. New Criticism:

From the 1930 to 1960 New Criticism was the most influential movement in the American Literary Criticism. Its sponsors, exponents and practitioners both English and American have made it a pervasive force in the 20th century. The term ‘New Criticism’ became current after the publication of John Crowe Ransom’s book ‘the New Criticism’ (1941). It has come to be applied to the widespread tendency on recent American Criticism deriving in part from various elements in Richard’s ‘Principles of Literary Criticism’ (1926) and from the ‘selected essays’ (1932) of T.S. Eliot. Notable critics in this mode are Cleanth Brook, Robert Penn Warren, R. P. Blackmur, Allen Tate, J.C. Ransom and William K. Wimsatt. An important English
critic who shares some critical tenets and practices with these American new critics is F.R. Leaves. It may be mentioned here that the brook and Warren’s book ‘Understanding Fiction’ (1959) is the standard book of the ‘New Criticism’. It did much to make the New Criticism as a standard method of teaching literature in America colleges and schools.

2.1.4. Structuralism and Post-Structuralism:

Structuralism and Post-Structuralism are new terms in literary criticism developed in the early 20th century. Before the growth of Structuralism, the literary criticism was purely classical and was also known as ‘traditional theory of literature’. The traditional theory of literature was based on an author. It was an author-centered theory. Literature was studied with reference to the author’s life, personality and the age in which he lived. However, in Structuralism the importance has been fully given to the text and significance of the author has been reduced to minimum. Structuralism is known as a text-centered theory. Saussure, Jakobson, Bloomfield, Chomsky, and Derrida are the prominent scholars who contributed much to the development of structuralism.

2.1.4.1. Structuralism:

In the beginning of 20th century (1916) the Swiss linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure in his work ‘Course in General Linguistics’ which was published posthumously, introduced a new approach to language whereas earlier linguists had been concerned with the history and characteristics of particular language. The credit for bringing a revolution in the field of linguistics goes to him. He is the founder of modern linguistics, or rather the father of structural linguistics which came to be called also descriptive linguistics. Saussure was interested in the structures that underlie all languages. He coined the terms langue (the complete system of language) and parole
(the individual utterance which are derived from it). Parole or speech is language in performance, and this is what earlier linguists had concentrated on. But Saussure was interested in the theoretical system that shapes all languages or langue and the result or principles that enables language to exist and function. It was in the work of Saussure that the movement known as Structuralism has its origin. According to him, language is a system of signs each of which consists of signifier (sound image) and signified (the concept evoked by the signifier). The relationship is a conventional one (generally agreed but not intrinsic) (Harris 1952).

Saussure’s ideas influenced literary and cultural criticism in several ways. They permitted structural critics to shift attention away from the relation between texts and world or between texts and meaning towards the study of systematization. They focus on how texts operate logically or what are the structures that texts possess in themselves and in common with other texts and how they are made up of parts in relation to one another and the like. In this concern, Rice and Waugh mention that langue is more important than parole. They state: Structuralism is not particularly interested in the meaning per se, but rather in attempting to describe and understand the conventions and modes of signification which make it possible to ‘mean’; that is, it seeks to discover the conditions of meaning. So langue is more important than parole-system is more important than individual utterance. (Rice & Waugh 2001:46). Peck and Coyle have the same idea when they define Structuralism as “an analytical approach which is less concerned with the unique qualities of any individual example than with structure that underlies the individual examples” (Peck & Coyle 1993:46).

The other main important point in the work of Saussure is that he makes clear distinction between ‘diachronic’ and ‘synchronic’. Diachronic traces the historical development of the language and record the changes that have taken place in it
between successive points in time. The synchronic on the other hand sees language as a living whole, existing as a state at one particular time. This state of language is an accumulation of all the linguistics elements that a language community engages in during a specific period. Saussure gives priority in linguistics to the synchronic approach because it studies language as a present and living organism. Saussure, as well, makes a noticeable difference between syntagmatic and paradigmatic relation. Syntagmatic refers to the relations between elements in a linear order. And it is by following this order, the structure of a word or sentence is built up. Paradigmatic means the relation in absentia, i.e. between elements which constitute a pattern or a paradigm of items usable in a certain context. This distinction corresponds to one traditional through their contiguity or through their similarity. Jakobson has generalized it in particular to many fields form rhetoric to language pathology. However for the majority of its early theories, Structuralism was an essentially formalist method which focused on literature’s signifying structures rather than on its content. Just as Saussure emphasized that signs depend on their differential relationship with other elements in the system in order to produce meaning and not on actual entities. It, therefore, follows that a structuralist analysis of literature would not be concerned with the liberal humanist view that the text expresses a truth about the real world. The investigation centers on the literary system (equivalence to langue) as a whole of which the individual text (parole) is a constituent part and governed by the system organizational principles. The author of a text and authorial intention correspondingly decline in priority. The author’s role is limited to only in selecting elements from the pre-existing (already written) system and producing new texts which combine these elements in different ways.
2.1.4.2. Post-Structuralism

In the 1960s Structuralism, which had dominated French intellectual life since 1950s, began to be replaced by another movement that would be called first Post-Structuralism then Post –Modernism. As mentioned earlier that Structuralism emphasizes orders, structures and rules but Post-Structuralism argues that language is subject to contingency, indeterminacy and the generation of multiple meanings. Post-Structuralism doubts the adequacy of Structuralism and, as far as literature is concerned, tends to reveal that the meaning of any text is, of its nature unstable. To describe the chain Derrida introduces the concept of ‘difference’ which means that words are defined by their difference from other words. And any meaning is endlessly differed as each word leads us to another word in signifying system. Language only makes sense if the reader imposes a fixed meaning on the words. Readers search for that fixed meaning because they are committed to the idea that there should be referent to a word and that word should make sense in relation to presence outside the text.

The views of Post-Structuralism put aside some concepts such as common sense and reason. And they regard them as merely ordering strategies that the reader imposes on literature. The reader wants to pull the text into his own frame of reference. Writer also attempts to impose ordering strategies on language, but these always prove inadequacy. The form of criticism that emerges from such thinking is referred to as deconstruction which is regarded as one of the main facets of Post-Structuralism theory which is used in literary criticism. Deconstruction owes much to the theory of the French philosopher Jacqued Derrida whose essays ‘Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of Human Sciences’ (1970) which he was to follow with his book ‘Of Grammatology’ (1976), began a new critical movement. Deconstruction, so far, has
been the most influential feature of Post-Structuralism because it defines a new kind of reading practices which is a key application of Post-Structuralism.

Deconstruction, as a method of literary criticism firstly was identified largely with the work of certain critics at Yale University. Geoffrey H. Hartman, J. Hillis Miller and Paul de Man are the scholars who have responded to Derrida’s view in markedly different ways. In the initial stages of deconstruction, from 1966 through the early 1980s, the Yale critics exerted the chief influence on the development of deconstructive criticism. Since then, however, deconstruction has not been confined to one school or group of critics, though many of today’s leading deconstructors do trace their critical affiliation back to Yale school as former students or otherwise.

2.1.5. Reader-Response Theory:

Obviously, there are some theories in literary criticism as mentioned before which give emphasis on the author and regard him as the central or pivotal factor in literary meaning. Some other theories shift the attention to the text only without reference to the biography of the author or age in which he lived. Other theories, which are called modern critical theories, transfer the alertness to the reader and stress on the role of reader to understand literature. Such theory is called ‘Reader-Response Theory’. Indeed some critics are interested in the way in which a reader receives, perceives and apprehends the literary work. They assume that the reader actively contributes something to the text meaning. The German critic Hand Robert Juss regards reader’s responses as essential to determine the meaning of literary work. Iser (1978) has the opinion that the text largely determines the response, but suggests that the text is full if gaps which the reader fills in. Reader-Response Theory is concerned with the reader’s contribution to a text and it challenges the text-oriented theories of
Formalism and the new Criticism which have tended to ignore or underestimate the reader’s role in analyzing the meaning.

2.1.6. Psycho-analytic Theory:

Literature critics in the Romantic epoch exposed the relationship between the author’s psychology and his work. They regard literary work as an expression of the psychological state of its creator. This point of view ceased until it appeared again in the 19th century in the writing of Sigmund Freud. In 1896 Freud carried the term ‘Psycho-analysis’ to characterize the ‘talking care’ which is a therapeutic method of recovering repressed material from the unconscious. He made use of the terms ego, super ego, id and Oedipus complex in his attempt at psychoanalysis. Freud views the dream house as useful concepts for the analysis of literature. Literature and other arts like dreams and neurotic symptoms consist of imagined or fantasized fulfillment of wishes that are either denied by reality or are prohibited by social standards of morality and propriety.

Conspicuously, the prominent phenomenon since the development of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism has been a strong revival of Freud, although in diverse reformulation of the classical Freudian scheme. Since the 1960s, psychoanalytic criticism has amalgamated with such other critical modes as Feminist Criticism, Reader-Response Theory, Structuralism, and Derridan commitment.

2.1.7. Linguistic Stylistics:

Stylistics is sometimes called literary stylistics: literary because it tends to focus on literary text; linguistics because of taking its model from linguistics. Halliday propounds the term ‘Linguistic Stylistics’ as another new name for stylistics. He justifies that the ‘Linguistic Stylistics’ refers to a kind of stylistics whose focus of
interest is not primarily literary text, but the refinement of a linguistic model which has potential stylistic analysis.

The term stylistics as a kind of language study emerged between 1910 and 1930 with the contribution of Russian formalists including Roman Jacobson, Victor Shklovskij; Romance philologists such as Charles Bally, Leo Spitzer; Czech structuralists like Bohuslav Harvranek and Jan Mukarovsky; British semiotists including I.A. Richards and William Empson and American new critics like John Crowe Ranson, T.S. Eliot and Cleanth Brooks. These groups altogether affirmed the significance of linguistic form to literary response and the importance of the aesthetic use of language in non literary discourse. However, they differed considerably in subject and method. Many of the stylistic studies, which appeared in that period, are still unsurpassed like Richard’s tenor analysis of metaphor, Tomashevskij’s statistical treatment of stress and word boundaries in verse, and Empson’s theories of semantics in verse.

Since 1950s the term stylistics has been applied to critical procedures which tried to reinstate the impressionism and subjectivity of standard language with a scientific and objective analysis of literary text. The stylistics absorbed the descriptive methods of several new linguistic theories such as European and American Structuralism, Transformational Grammar, Case Grammar, Functional grammar, etc. The time from 1950s to 1970s stylistics became recognized as an academic discipline with its own specialized journals, reference guides, disciplinary histories and general overviews. Stylistics in this period produced extensive treatment of topics like ‘poetic Vocabulary’ (Miles 1964), ‘Visual Form in Poetry’ (Hollander 1975), ‘Sound Symbolism’ (Fonagy 1979), ‘Poetry Syntax’ and ‘Meter’ (Tarlinskaja 1976).
Style as a term in criticism has been widely used for a long time before, often in a rather impressionistic way. It attempts to draw attention to the characteristic or peculiar use of language in a specific text, author or period. Modern stylistics is a way to approach the question of style on stricter, and more methodical lines; it is not so much a discipline in itself as a cross over point between linguistics, for which literary text are only items of interest in the broad study of language and literary criticism. It starts from the proposition that any idea or concept may be expressed in one of a number of different ways, and that an author exercises a choice (conscious or unconscious; dictated by personal taste or the demands of the reader, genre or whatever) in determining the precise form of the words to be used. Such a proposition is incidentally anathema to new criticism which refuses to distinguish between the form and content of literature; what is written is written.

Linguistic Stylistics poses itself the assignment of classifying the range of linguistic choices that are available to authors. It also identifies the ways in which features of the linguistics may call attention to themselves. These features may deviate from the accepted norms in their manner of expression. These classifications may be applicable to a particular text or number of texts in such a way as to highlight their peculiar verbal characteristics.

2.2. Approaches to Stylistics:

After discussing the whole theories in detail researcher of this thesis now want to discuss the Stylistic Analysis from the perspective of linguist like Widdowson, Halliday, Georffrey Leech, Jakobson, Levin, and Thorne.

H. G. Widdowson:

Widdowson (1974) stresses on the value of reader centered approaches. He argues that the lack of situational context in literary texts facilitates the understanding of a
text in a more concentrated and intense way because it compels readers to pay more attention to the language of the text. Generally speaking, stylistic analysis aims at investigating how the performer effectively uses the resources of language code in order to produce actual message. It is concerned with the pattern of use in a given text. Any user of language obtain two kinds of knowledge: knowledge of the rules of the code of a language which ensures the grammaticality of what has been said and the knowledge of the conventions which regulates the use of these rules in the production of messages and equally ensures the appropriateness of what has been said. Both kinds of knowledge are indispensable for the effective communication between interlocutors. Moreover, they together help in attributing unique features to the language. The users of language continually generate novel sentences which have never been spoken or heard before. These utterances are understood, however. The reason behind this is that although they are novel as manifestation of code, they are also familiar as messages. Thus, Widdowson writes: The user of a language is creative because the novel linguistic forms he generates function as familiar unites of communication: If they did not, he would only generate gibberish. (Widdowson, 1974:202).

The purpose of stylistics, in this concern, is to discover what linguistic units count as in communication and how the effects of different conventions reveal themselves in the way messages are organized in texts. Style then, as Chatman (1973) mentions is the product of a social situation of a common relationship between language users and therefore stylistics may be considered as the study of social functions of language which may ultimately be treated as the branch of sociolinguistics. Widdowson in his approach focuses the attention on literary text and the ways stylistics concerns itself with literary texts. He mentions two main reasons. The first is methodological and the
second is pedagogical. To take the first reason, in literature there are certain features as a mode of communication which are unique and, therefore, simplify the task of stylistics. In all forms of language except in literature, we have a sender of the message and a receiver of it, i.e. whenever we use language, we assume a receiver. But in literature the situation is different. The writer is separated from the reader and the reader from the addressee as well. And the message itself is a text-contained. It presupposes no wider context so that every thing that is important for its interpretation is found within the message itself. On the other hand, in the interpretation of all other uses of language we shall take into consideration some of its social environment. This is the reason which makes the stylistic analysis of such text difficult. But in literary texts, the situation is somewhat different. There are no such problems because, in somewhat different there are no such problems because, according to widdowson, in literary text the attention is given to the text itself. He accordingly distracts the social appendages in the analysis of a text in his approach.

The other reason, which is pedagogical, also supports the view that literary texts are of the main concern in stylistics. This is important because it gives justification for the inclusion of stylistics within applied linguistics and brings the findings of linguistics to bear on the practical problems of language teaching.

Widdowson also points out that there is no noticeable difference between connotative and denotative meaning. Literature characteristically removes the distinction between them. Commonly, connotative meaning is considered as a matter of personal association. It is unsystematization. But, sometimes, contextual meaning of literary texts is a result of the setting of linguistic items in a system of intra-textual relation. Widdowson comments:
While one may regard it, therefore, as connotative with reference to the code, one must regard it as denotative with reference to the secondary language system established by the regularities of the context.

**M. A. K. Halliday:**

In his essay “Descriptive Linguistics in Literary Studies”, Halliday (1970) explains that the categories and methods of descriptive linguistics are as much applicable in the analysis of literary texts as in the analysis of any other kind of textual materials. In this approach, he focuses the attention on the revelation and precise description of language features which might remain undiscovered because of inexact linguistic investigation.

Halliday in his approach uses the term ‘application’ to refer to the study of literary texts by theories and methods of linguistics. He focuses on one branch of linguistics, that is, descriptive linguistics (the study of how language works). This contrasts with both historical linguistics (the study of how language persists in time), and with institutional linguistics (the study of the varieties and uses of language). Within descriptive linguistics, there is one kind of description that is textual and the aim of linguist is to describe a written or spoken text. This contradicts with exemplified description which presents the categories of the language and illustrates them or generates a set of described sentences and derived other from them. McIntoch and Halliday write:

The linguistic study of literature is textual description, and it is on different from other textual description; it is not a new branch or a new level or a new kind of linguistics but the application of existing theories and methods. What the linguist does when faced with a literary text is the same as what he does when he faced with any text that he going to describe. (McIntoch and Halliday, 1966, 64)
J. Mc. Sinclair:

The approach, which Sinclair follows, is similar to that of Halliday. He applies Halliday’s categories of descriptive linguistics in the analysis of the poem “First Sight” by Philip Larkin. Then, he lists the results in a tabular form. Any other conclusions as to their relevance for interpretation are left to the reader to come out on his own. Sinclair (1966) hypothesizes that the grammar and other patterns give meaning in a more complex and tightly packed way than the traditional ways and methods of describing language. In his approach, he stresses only on grammar for interpretation. In the structure of a sentence, Sinclair recognizes two aspects of linguistic organization which plays a vital role in the setting up of intra-textual patterns in literary texts. The first one is called release clause / phrase and the second is named arrest clause / phrase. The former refers to the interposition of arresting adverbial to interrupt the sentence and delay its completion. For example, in the following three first lines of the poem mentioned above Sinclair explains the meaning of arrest:

Lambs that learn to walk in snow
When their bleating clouds the air
Meet a vast unwelcome………..

Here, the syntactic pattern NP (Lambs that learn to walk in snow) and Vph (meet a vast unwelcome…. ) are interrupted by the inserting of adverbial clause arrest or bound clause because it delays the completion of the sentence

Stressing on grammar, Sinclair pinpoints some lexical and contextual matter. He points out:
Grammar deals with contrasts, multiple choices from a great many systems simultaneously, and the meaning of a grammatical statement can only be fully elicited with reference to the total grammatical description. Nevertheless, the exercise shows how some aspects of the meaning of the poem can be described quite independently of evaluation. (Sinclair 1966:81)

**Geoffrey Leech:**

Geoffrey Leech in his approach tries to combine between linguistic description and critical interpretation in the analysis of a literary text. He says; “Linguistic description and critical interpretation are, to my mind, distinct and complementary ways of ‘explaining’ literary text”. (Leech 1970:120)

He also shows in his analysis how the critical interpretation benefits from the linguistic description and how they are related. In this view, his approach differs from that of Halliday and Sinclair. He clarifies “a work of literature contains dimensions of meaning additional to those operating in other types of discourse. The device of linguistic description is an handle these extra complexities” (citation). He mentions three main features of literary expression representing different dimensions of meaning which are not included in the normal categories of linguistic description.

Leech (1970), in his analysis of the poem “This Bread I Break” by Dylon Thomas, emphasizes the lexical and grammatical cohesion which the poet takes from the standard language to unify the poem. The precise discussion of the cohesion in the poem leads him to explore how different cohesive patterns are related to foregrounded elements in the poem. He, finally, arrives at the conclusion that the elements that are foregrounded in cohesive pattern lead to the interpretation of the entire poem. The three main dimensions will be discussed in detail below:
Cohesion:

“Cohesion refers to the ways in which syntactic, lexical and phonological features connect within and between sentences in a text” (Clark 1996:55). According to Leech the intra-textual relation of lexical and grammatical kinds unifies the parts of a text together into a complete unit of discourse in order to convey the message of the text as a whole. In the poem which Leech investigates, he finds a lexical cohesion which is more marked than grammatical cohesion. This cohesion appears in the repetition of some words in the poem such as, ‘break’ and ‘oat’. In the whole poem, the word ‘break’ is repeated four times and the word ‘oat’ occurs three times which share common semantic features such as, bread-oat-crops, day-night-summer-sun, and wine-tree-fruit-grapes-vine-drink.

The study of cohesion helps the reader to pick out the patterns of meaning running through the text and arrives at some kinds of linguistic account of what the text is about. It makes the readers easily follow the meaning which appears in the text. However, Leech comments on this kind of meaning. He elucidates that this kind of meaning is superficial. And it is yielded by an analysis of which could be equally applied to any text in English. He goes on to say “it is superficial, because we have only considered how selections are made from the range of possibilities generally available to users of language” (Leech 1970:120).

Leech additionally comes out to say that the language of poetry is not only confined to superficial meaning but it extends it to create novelty in language not used in the daily normal use of language. This view leads him to the second dimension of the analysis that is foregrounding.
**Foregrounding:**

This dimension is the only literary feature which generally dominates the literary writing. It is claimed that foregrounding is a basic principle of aesthetic communication. It is defined as a conscious or deliberate deviation from the rules of language code or from the accepted conventions of its use which stands out against a background of a normal usage. Leech, in his analysis, says that Thomas uses one of the semantic SDs, that is, metaphor (semantic oddity) in which the linguistic form is given something than its normal or literal interpretation. Leech clarifies that Thomas uses expressions, such as “The oat was merry” in which a noun ‘oat’ which normally has the feature of unanimity is given the characteristics of an animate or more exactly a human feature, thereby inventing a deviant expression which is fore-grounded against the normal expression such as ‘the man was merry’. Another expression, in this regard, can be noticed in the line ‘broke the sun’. the verb ‘broke’ in normal usage is always accompanied with a thing which has a feature of fragility, like cup, plate, etc. but in the poem, the poet uses the noun ‘sun’ which lacks the feature of being fragile. It is, therefore, a deviant choice which is fore-grounded against the background of the normal choice of the sun. Thus, foregrounding occurs when there is correspondence between the semantic feature of an item in the code and those which are bestowed upon it by the contextual environment in which it appears.

Leech furthermore points out another manifestation of foregrounding. This occurs when the writer instead of exercising a wider choice that is permitted by code. He deliberately renounces this choice and produces uniformity where variety would normally be expected. Leech in the poem finds that Thomas uses the following parallel constructions ‘man in the lady or wind at night’, ‘My wine you drink my bread you snap’ Thomas, by using this parallelism, sets up a syntactic equivalence
between the two prepositional phrases in the first one and sets up a kind of intra-
textual syntactic equivalence is also as Leech puts it is a feature of foregrounding in
which poets introduce a pattern of language not found in normal use.

**Cohesion of foregrounding:**

This is the third dimension which Leech describes in his approach in order to analyze
literary texts. Foregrounded features, which are mentioned above, are related to each
other on the one hand and to the text in its entirety on the other. As mentioned earlier
that there are lexical cohesion appeared in the repetition of the same items of
vocabulary in different places of the text, and the choice of items which have the
semantic connection. According to Leech cohesion of foregrounding is the manner in
which deviation in a text are related to each other to form intra-textual pattern. For
example, the foregrounding expression “broke the sun” is a deviant against the normal
usage but takes on the normality in the context of the poem as a whole because it is
related to deviation of a similar kind in the poem like, “broke the grape’s joy”, “pulled
the wind down”. Similarly, intra-textual patterns are also shaped by the cohesion of
the foregrounded expression ‘the oats was merry’, ‘desolation in the vine’, and
‘sensual root’. In a nutshell, Leech investigates what he considers to be the principle
dimensions on which a linguistic analysis of any poem might proceed. His exposition
of the features of each dimension assures that these features are in linguistic sense part
of meaning of the poem and are matters of linguistic choice and can be described in
terms of categories of the language.

**Roman Jakobson:**

Jakobson discusses the poetic function of language which he defines as the use of
language which focuses on the actual form of the message itself. He gives important
remarks about the relationship between poetics and linguistics in the following effect:
Poetics deals with problem of verbal structure, just as the analysis of painting is concerned with pictorial structure. Since linguistics is the global science of verbal structure, poetics may be regarded an integral part of linguistics. (Jakobson 1960:350)

Some linguists proclaim that poetics in contrast with linguistics is concerned with evaluation. Jakobson argues that the basis on which the separation between linguistics and poetry depends is incorrect interpretation of the contrast between the structure of poetry and other types of verbal structure. Poetic language is non-casual and nature.

Literary writing is also different from other forms of expression in the sense that it consciously draws attention to itself. Jeoffrey Leech, in his approach which has been discussed above, investigates foregrounding. He directs the reader to the actual form of the message being conveyed. Widdowson (1974) mentions the relationship between the views of Jakobson and Leech. He writes that Jakobson explains the view that it is what Leech refers to as the second kind of foregrounding which is the essential criterion of the poetic function, that is to say, the setting up of equivalence where equivalence would not normally occur.

**Samuel R. Levin:**

Levin (1962) in his approach uses the same notion of equivalence as that of Jakobson. He shows how equivalence operates at the phonological, syntactic and semantic levels to produce structural features which mainly distinguish poetry from other types of discourse. As it has been mentioned above, Leech with his notions (cohesion, foregrounding and cohesion and foregrounding) and Sinclair with his terms (release and arrest) theorize descriptive categories other than descriptive linguistics in order to give account of the features of literary discourse. Levin postulates special types of linguistic patterning. He distinguishes two types of equivalence. He calls the first type
‘positional equivalence’ which is said to obtain between elements which have the same potentiality of happening in a given environment.

**P. J. Thorne:**

Thorne in his paper ‘stylistics and generative grammar’ (1965) investigates the type of deviant sentences which commonly happen in poetic language in terms of modern transformational generative theory. He proposes that a grammar should be considered as a device which generates all and the only well-formed sentence of language. It (grammar) cannot assign analysis of deviant sentences unless the linguists extend the capacity of grammar, so that, it generates those deviant sentences which are attested in poetic text. It will also involve generating a large number of unwanted and not attested deviant sentences. For example, from the poem of Dylon Thomas which is discussed above in Leech’s approach: if we make some modification to the grammar of English to generate sentence like “the oat was merry”, these rules will generate sentences like “potato was joyful”, “the barely was disconsolate”, etc. but these two latter deviant sentences are unwanted and they have no significant units in the meaning of the context of a poem or other types of literary text. Thorne is against the idea of increasing the complexity of grammar in order to characterize the ungrammatical sequence in poetry. He says that a poem should be considered as “a sample of a different language” Freeman (1970:182). Thorne adds that there should be a grammar for the language of specific poems and this grammar should also meet the requirements of logical consistency and generality demanded by the general theory of grammar. The task of stylisticians is to write a grammar which will describe the structure of unique language in poetry. This approach, as Thorne declares, relies a great deal on the intuition that generates poetic sequences beyond the data because a single text does not provide enough data for the analysis. The discussion about the
grammaticality in poetry must show how certain irregularities are regular in the context of the poem they appear. Poetic language like standard language makes infinite use of finite means. Levin calls the second kind of equivalence ‘natural equivalence’ which is said to obtain between elements share common semantic or phonological features. Levin, moreover to his two types of equivalence; positional and natural, adds a third notion: that is coupling. This occurs when one type of equivalence (positional or natural) converges with another in order to produce the structure wherein naturally equivalent forms occur in equivalent position.

2.3. Stylistic Devices:

Stylistic devices are some sort of language tools which are used by poets and writers to create novelty and uniqueness in the language. The uses of these devices make the language of a writer different from the language of another writer. Moreover, the exclusiveness and uniqueness of a writer lies in using the stylistic devices in his literary work. When a writer or a poet makes special use of language, his work of literature becomes very attractive and beautiful and people highly appreciate it. The stylistic devices, thus, are used to make a piece of literature a work of beauty so that the readers while reading it could go through an aesthetic experience.

There are three types of stylistic devices for example:

1. Phonological Stylistic Devices

2. Syntactic Stylistic Devices

3. Semantic Stylistic Devices
2.3.1. Phonological Stylistic Devices

Alliteration:

In a literary diction, when two or more words begin with the same sound, this technique is called alliteration. In other words, repetition of consonant sounds at the beginning of neighbouring words

Example: O wild west wind, …;
           Full fathoms five thy father lies, ..

Effect: sound device, musical effect

Assonance:

It is that stylistic device in which two or more words have the same vowel in the middle, but different consonants either in the beginning or at the end of the word means the repetition of the same or similar vowel sounds within stressed syllables or neighbouring words

Example: fate and lake

Effect: musical

Consonance:

When the writer uses two or more words that begin with the same consonants and end with the same consonants, it is called consonance.

Example: Criss-cross
           Tit for tat

Effect: Sound effect and music

Onomatopoeia:

It is that device in which the writer uses a word that imitates or produces the sound of an object.

Word whose sound tries to imitate its meaning
Example: hum, buzz, crash, swish, cuckoo

Effect: sound device, creates an especially vivid impression

**Rhyme:**

When the last portion of two or more words ends with the same sound, it is called rhyme. Means similarity or identity of vowels (several types: end-rhyme, cross-rhyme, embracing rhyme)

Example: In the drinking-well

Which the plumber built her

Aunt Eliza fell,

We must buy a filter.

**Enjambment:**

It is the breaking of a syntactic unit (a phrase, clause, or sentence) by the end of a line or between two verses. It is to be contrasted with end-stopping, where each linguistic unit corresponds with a single line, and caesura, in which the linguistic unit ends mid-line.

Example: On her white breast a sparkling cross she wore

Which Jews might kiss, and infidels adore.

Effect: fluent, flowing

**2.3.2. Syntactic Stylistic Devices**

**Allusion:**

An allusion is a figure of speech that makes a reference to, or representation of, a place, event, literary work, myth, or work of art, either directly or by implication. Or a reference to a famous person or event; may be literary, historical, biblical …

Example:

Effect: emphasis, to give credibility, to show off one’s education
Anaphora:
The same word or expression is repeated at the beginning of two or more lines or sentences. It is generally known as a kind of verbal repetition.

Example: Did he smile his work to see?

   Did he who made the lamb make thee?

Effect: emphasis

Epiphora:
Wales (1989) elucidates that epiphora is just the opposite of anaphora. It occurs when the repeated unit is placed at the end of running sentences, causes or phrases. In other words, it is the repetition of a word or phrase at the end of several clauses.

Example: "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as child."

Framing:
Framing takes place when the initial part of a syntactical unit in a paragraph is repeated at the end of it.

Example: eat them, fish. Eat them. Please eat them. How fresh they are and you down there six hundred feet in that cold water in the dark. Make another turn in the dark, and come back and eat them.

Anadiplosis:
Anadiplosis is another kind of repetition known as ‘linking or reduplication’. Its structure is identified when the last word or phrase of one part of an utterance is repeated at the beginning of the next part, thus hooking two parts together.

Example: "Information is not knowledge, knowledge is not wisdom, wisdom is not truth, truth is not beauty, beauty is not love, love is not music and music is the best."
Enumeration:

Galperin elucidates the nature of enumeration in which different things are mentioned one by one. These things are in the same syntactic position and show a kind of semantic homogeneity. He states, Enumeration is a SD by which separate things, objects, phenomena, properties. Actions are named one by one so that they produce a chain, the links of which being syntactically in the same position (homogeneous parts of speech) are forced to display some kind of semantic homogeneity, remote though it may seem. (Galperin 1977:216)

Example: Since you are gone we have nothing but frostbites, chilblains, jaundice gonorrhoea, self-infected wounds, pneumonia and hard and soft chancre.

Anticlimax:

Often surprising descent from the important to the unimportant, normally in a series of statements.

Example: He pawned his life, his watch and his word.

Effect: surprise, humour

Antithesis:

In rhetoric, it is a figure of speech involving the bringing out of a contrast in the ideas by an obvious contrast in the words, clauses, or sentences, within a parallel grammatical structure. Contrasting statements are balanced against each other.

Example: To err is human, to forgive divine.

Effect: to create emphasis

Asyndeton:

It is a stylistic scheme in which conjunctions are deliberately omitted from a series of related clauses. Examples are veni, vidi, vici and its English translation "I came, I saw,
"I conquered." Its use can have the effect of speeding up the rhythm of a passage and making a single idea more memorable.

In other words, words are not linked by conjunctions; they are separated only by commas.

Example: Another poster, torn at one corner, flapped fitfully in the wind… covering…

Effect: staccato-like

**Chiasmus:**

It is a crossing parallelism, where the second part of a grammatical construction is balanced or paralleled by the first part, only in the reverse order. In other words, the syntactic structure is criss-crossed; inversion in second phrase of order in first phrase.

Example: to stop too fearful, and too faint to go

Effect: emphasis

**Climax:**

Words are arranged according to the value of their importance; the most important word is the climax.

Example: We strive for the good, aim for the better, and seize the best.

Effect: to increase tension, emphasize importance

**Contrast:**

It is a literary technique in which the author examines two opposites.

Example: The energy of youth and the infirmity of age

    Academic success and extra-curricular activities

Effect: to give the emphasis on characteristics
Connotation:
It refers to the implication of meaning, emphasizing the feelings or subjectivity that surrounds the word. It differs from denotation in the sense that, the later one emphasizes the literal and dictionary meaning that is used to create objective tone. For example: the words (prone to tears, has womb, weak) bear connotative meaning of woman.
Effect: to give the emphasis on characteristics

Ellipsis:
Richards (1992:121) writes “ellipsis refers to the leaving out of words or phrases from sentences where they are unnecessary because they have already been referred to or mentioned”. The reader is supposed to understand the omitted part of an utterance or a grammatical structure from the context because such information is already given or understood from the context. For example, when the subject of the verb in two coordinate clauses is the same, it may be omitted in the second clause to avoid repetition.
Example: What did you catch?
One the first day. One the second and two the third.

Epiphra:
Repetition of one or more words at the end of two or more lines or sentences
Example: Whirl your pointed pines,
Splash your great pines
Effect: emphasis (front and end positions are always emphasized)

Exclamation:
It is a stylistic device used by the writer to give the sense of astonishment, anger or urgency.
Example: Do that!

Oh, my God!

Effect: for astonishment and anger.

**Inversion:**

One of the stylistic devices where the writer forms the sentence by inverting subject, verb and compliment order. Poets do this sometimes to conform to normal rhyme and rhythm patterns. Prose writers, sometimes do this for emphasis.

Example: away they fly; up go the windows, out run the people, …

Effect: to emphasize or dramatize an event

**Irony:**

It is a technique of indicating, as through character or plot development, an intention or attitude opposite to that which is actually or ostensibly stated. In other words it is a meaning is expressed that is the opposite of the intended one.

Example: the noble Brutus

Effect: ridicule; often didactic

**Juxtaposition:**

Placing two items side to create a certain effect, reveal an attitude or accomplish a purpose.

Example: Wealth and poverty, guilt and grief, God and satan.

Effect: for comparison

**Litotes:**

Leech (1983) and Wales (1989) describe Litotes as another kind of structural meaning transference. It consists of a peculiar use of a negative construction. The purpose of the negation plus noun or adjective is to establish a positive attribute in a person or a thing. Litotes as an SD, Galperin argues “…this positive feature, however, is
somewhat diminished in quality as compared with a synonymous expression making a straight forward assertion of the positive feature”.

Understatement, often ironical, expressing an affirmative by the negative of its contrary

Example: she is not stupid (= she is quite clever)

Effect: emphasis

**Parallelism:**

It refers to parallel linguistic construction when the syntactic structures of two or more sentences or parts of a sentence are similar or identical; it is called parallel construction or parallelism.

Example: there were real silver spoons to stir the tea with, and real China cups to drink it out of and plates of the same to hold the cake and toast it.

**Polysendeton:**

Polysendeton is the opposite of asyndeton. Asyndeton (refers to the omitting of conjunctions or connectives between phrases or clauses). Short (1986) points out that polysendeton refers to the repetition of the connectives (mostly conjunctions and prepositions) between sentences, phrases or words.

**Portmanteau word:**

Two words are used to form a new one.

Example: breakfast + lunch = brunch

**Pun:**

A humorous play on words that sound similar, but have different meanings

Example: These sausages are unidentified frying objects.

Is life worth living? That depends on the liver.

Effect: humour, fun
Repetition:
A device used by a writer to emphasize an important character trait, to reinforce a theme, to create parallel construction, to highlight the speaker’s attitude, or to focus the reader’s attention on a person, place, thing, or idea.
Example: water, water everywhere
Effect: to emphasize; can seem monotonous
Effect: musical

Synaesthesia:
Words describing different sensations (e.g. colour, smell, vision)
Example: murmuring light; cold colour
Effect: poetic; provokes thoughts; strikes as unusual

Synecdoche:
Uses a part of something to refer to the whole
Example: He was sent behind bars (= prison)
Effect: vivid impression

Tautology:
Superfluous repetition of words that does not clarify a statement
Example: to divide into four quarters
Effect: for emphasis

2.3.3. Semantic Stylistic Devices

Metaphor:
A figure of speech that implies more of a comparison than a direct impression
(Without “as” or “like”!!)
Example: You are the wind beneath my wings.
Effect: emphasis; appeals to our imagination; creates a vivid picture in the reader’s mind

**Metonymy:**

It is a figure of speech used in rhetoric in which a thing or concept is not called by its own name, but by the name of something intimately associated with that thing or concept. In this a word is substituted by another with which it is associated.

Example: crown stands for monarchy

Effect: visual effect

**Oxymoron:**

A juxtaposition of two unlike things used to create ambiguity through contradiction.

Means two contradictory terms are used together in a phrase.

Example: sweet death; wise fool; cruel love

Effect: provokes thoughts; emphasis

**Paradox:**

A statement which is obviously absurd or contradictory, but has a deeper meaning

Example: The King is dead! Long live the King!

So fair and foul a day I have not seen.

Effect: thought-provoking

**Parallelism:**

It refers to parallel linguistic construction when the syntactic structures of two or more sentences or parts of a sentence are similar or identical; it is called parallelism or parallel construction. The two or more sentences in which parallel constructions are found should occur in close succession. There are two kinds of parallelism: partial parallel construction and complete parallel construction. Example: Cannon to the right of them,
Example: Cannon to the left of them,
Cannon behind them
Volleyed and thundered.
Effect: impresses the reader

**Personification:**
Attributes a human quality to animals or inanimate things
Example: Justice is blind; dancing daffodils
Effect: to emphasize similarity

**Hyperbole:**
It is defined as a deliberate overstatement or exaggeration of a feature essential to the object. In its extreme form this exaggeration is carried to an illogical degree (Leech, 1983)
Example: Sue is extremely rich. She is rolling in money.
I haven´t seen you for ages!
Effect: used for exaggeration; to attract the reader´s attention; to emphasize statements

**Euphemism:**
A direct, unpleasant statement is replaced by an indirect, more pleasant one to avoid bluntness.
Example: to put an animal to sleep, instead of: to kill it because it is ill
Effect: to avoid bluntness, to be polite

**Simile:**
A simile is a figure of speech comparing two unlike things, often introduced with the word "like" or "as".[1] Even though similes and metaphors are both forms of
comparison, similes allow the two ideas to remain distinct in spite of their similarities, whereas metaphors seek to equate two ideas despite their differences.

Example: He runs like the wind.

Effect: conveys a vivid picture to the mind by linking up unrelated objects

**Zeugma:**

It is a figure of speech describing the joining of two or more parts of a sentence with a single common verb or noun. A zeugma employs both ellipsis, the omission of words which are easily understood, and parallelism, the balance of several words or phrases.

One word modifies or governs others although it fits with only one.

Example: He took leave and his hat.

Effect: comical