CHAPTER–I

Stylistics: An Overview
1.0. Preliminaries

Stylistics, a yoking of style and linguistics, is a discipline which has been approached from many perspectives. Its meaning varies, based on the theory that is adopted. When one carries out the different activities that are connected to the area of business, either in spoken or written forms, one often uses devices of thought and the rules of language, but there are variations so as to change meanings or say the same thing in different ways. This is what the concept of style is based upon; the use of language in different ways, all for the purpose of achieving common goals- to negotiate meanings. This chapter makes an attempt to define style and stylistics, its meaning, nature and scope. It tries to identify and explain the perspectives on style and discusses stylistics as a multi-dimensional discipline. It also examines issues relating to the function and goals of stylistics in order to identify the principles that are responsible for individual styles in the use of language.

1.1. Stylistics

The present chapter provides a historical account of stylistics, the branches of stylistics and major stylistic thinkers. Stylistics is the study of the ways in which meaning is created through language, literature and non-literature. Stylistics uses linguistic models, theories, and frameworks as analytical tools. It describes and explains the working of a text, and how meaning is created from the words on the page. The analysis focuses qualitatively or quantitatively on the levels of language such as phonological, lexical, grammatical, semantic, pragmatic or discourse features of text and cognitive aspects involved in the processing of those features by the reader. Stylistic approaches show an interest either in the producer of the text, in the text itself, or in the reader and the role of the reader in meaning construction. New developments in stylistics emphasize that the production of meaning needs to be accounted for as a double exercise encompassing text informed inferences as well as the mental processes that allow text comprehension.
Stylistics is often regarded as a linguistic approach to literature, as it is mainly
devoted to literary text. However, stylistics is recently engaged in various fields, and
expanded to include within its scope non-fictional forms such as advertising, academic
writing, news reports as well as non-printed forms such as TV, pictorial advertising, film
and multimodal publications. With its base in linguistics, stylistics is characterized by an
informed, systematic and contextual analysis, which is rigorous, consistent and verifiable.
Linguistics uses scientific method to study language, and so the stylistic approach to text
analysis may seem more objective than other branches of literary criticism. However, no
stylistic analysis can be absolutely objective as it can be influenced by a myriad of factors
such as the stylisticians’ individual preferences and foci, linguistic paradigm employed
for analysis or the chosen methodology. Notwithstanding these practical considerations,
stylistics provides itself useful tools and methods which allow its practitioners to conduct
informed analysis of the ways in which meaning is created in texts by linguistic means.
Stylistics is interdisciplinary in scope as it brings together linguistics and literary studies.
It claims to be eclectic by liberally allowing views from disciplines of philosophy,
cultural theory, sociology, history, and psychology to further stylistic analysis of
literature. Stylistics is both praised and criticized for being interdisciplinary.

1.1.0. Definition, Meaning, Nature and Scope of Stylistics

Stylistics is defined as the study of style used in literary and verbal language and the
effect writer or speaker intends to convey to the reader or hearer. It aims at establishing
principles which can explain the particular choices made by individual and social groups
in their use of language, such as socialization, the production or reception of meaning,
literary criticism and critical discourse analysis. Crystal and Davy rightly point out:

Stylistics is a discipline which studies literary or non-literary texts in a new way. It plays a significant role in the
teaching of English literature in India. It has been defined as a “Sub-discipline” of linguistics that is concerned with
the systematic analysis of style in language and how this can vary according to such factors as, for example, genre,
context, historical period and author. (1969:9 and 2008: 54)

Stylistics can also be defined as the study of language of literature which makes use of various tools of linguistic analysis. According to Simpson,:

Stylistics is a method of textual interpretation in which primary place is assigned to language. The reason why language is so important to Stylisticians is because the various forms, patterns and levels that constitute linguistic significance as discourse acts in turn as a gateway to its interpretation. While linguistics features do not of themselves constitute a text’s ‘meaning’, an account of linguistic features nonetheless serves to ground a stylistic interpretation and to help explain why, for the analyst certain types of meaning are possible. The preferred object of study in stylistics is literature whether, that be institutionally sanctioned ‘Literature’ as high art or more popular non-canonical forms of writing. (2004: 2-3)

Stylistics emerged as a discipline of serious study in the twentieth century. Prior, literary critics focused on the nuances of language use by writers rather than discussing literature from the point of view of their own feelings, or the writer’s presumed intentions, or abstract aesthetic qualities, or mere moral judgments. Thus, the study of language became part of literary education. I. A. Richards, in his book, Practical Criticism (1929), emphasized that close attention should be paid to the evidence being offered by the text. Soon, commentary on language became eminent within literary criticism. Nowottny took these assumptions and made them the guiding principles of his book The Language Poets Use (1962). In 1966, David Lodge published a book on similar pattern The Language of Fiction. In the same year, Fowler’s book Essays on Style and Language appeared.

Thus, Stylistics is mainly concerned with the idea of “style” and the analysis of literary texts. The application of linguistics to the literary texts and the ‘style’ is usually
understood within this area of study as the selection of certain linguistic forms or features over other possible ones.

1.1.1 Nature of Stylistics

The term ‘Stylistics’ is derived from the word ‘style’ which has several meanings. Its pre-linguistic meaning is the manner of writing, speaking and doing. It is the means through which human beings gain contact with others. However, style in literature is called ‘literary stylistics’. According to Halliday, Linguistic Stylistics is the description of literary texts, by methods derived from general linguistic theory, using the categories of the description of the language as a whole.

Stylistics is the systematic scientific study of the language of literature. It is a branch of applied linguistics. It is applied to the study of language in literary and non-literary texts. The basic framework of stylistics is borrowed from linguistics. As linguistics studies the relationship between the sound and meaning, Stylistics deals with the relationship between the language of literature and the meaning of literature. Style and theme are connected in literature. Stylistic analysis focuses on the thematic aspects of literature by analyzing its language. Stylistics is objective in the analysis of literature as it studies the literary text from the linguistic point of view. It depends more on the linguistic evidence in the text for its interpretations of literature.

Stylistics enables understanding of literature comprehensively. Literature is basically a special use of language. Stylistic analysis of literature should enhance our appreciation and enjoyment of literature. Stylistics studies some special features of literature and tries to show their poetic significance. Thus, Stylistics depends on systematic observation, classification and description of the language of literature. Such is the nature of Stylistics.

1.1.2. Scope of Stylistics

A brief discussion of some of the parameters of stylistics which define its scope will enable better understanding of stylistics. This will chart out the boundaries of
stylistics with reference to the kind of texts that it studies, the theories it draws on and the available methodologies.

1.1.2.0. Range of Texts

It has now become evident that the techniques of stylistics are applicable to literary as well as non-literary texts. There is no restriction on the kinds of text that may be taken up for stylistic analysis. However, there has been more emphasis on the literary aspects of style in the past. More focus is also laid on the written language as compared to the spoken language. Recording techniques has now enabled the transcription of spoken texts more accessible. So Stylistics deals with the full range of linguistic usage. Stylisticians now analyze the language of spoken communication, advertisements, humor and film. This is the recent development in the direction of multimodality.

1.1.2.1. Range of Theories

Stylistics was originated in theories of Formalism and was taken on the theory of Structuralism. But it is eclectic in its use of theory. These theories provided the descriptive apparatus which hints at writer’s use of techniques of construction that could demonstrate the linguistic basis of literary effects. Jeffries and McIntyre point out:

The focus on the actual language of the text which is epitomized by these theories is still present in some stylistics practice, and demonstrates that stylistics does not originate from an author-based view of textual meaning in the same way that, for example, some areas of literary studies did. (2010:10)⁸

Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis, based on contextual factors, emerged as a branch of stylistics. Evolution of Generative Grammar and Cognitive Linguistics is based on cognitive factors. The aim of all these was to explain textual meaning and effects. Stylisticians used the ideas of these theories to support new analytical processes and provide new insights in the style of texts and their reception. There are now stylisticians working with psychologists to establish some of the processes by which readers respond
to linguistic style. Some stylisticians work in critical discourse analysis with theories of social exploitation and manipulation. Some stylisticians work with computational and statistical theories who draw literary and linguistic inferences from the computer analysis of large quantities of data.

Recent developments in Cognitive Stylistics have drawn on theories such as Psychology and philosophy. They have provided models for analyzing the methods of processing of texts by readers. These theories include schema theory, possible worlds theory and theories of figure and ground.

1.1.2.2. Range of Methods

Stylistics also uses a wide range of methods. Theories produce possible models of what the kind of language or text is like. These models, in turn, dictate the methods to be used to analyze them. Methods have to be selected even when a theory and a model have already been chosen. For instance, if a stylistician wants to find out whether the vocabulary of Shakespeare is wider than the vocabulary of Ben Jonson, the model of a vocabulary range as the number of different lexemes used by each of the authors will dictate a corpus based methodology in which statistical analysis will be considered.

Stylistics has been qualitative but Stylometrics has been more quantitative in method. In recent times, there has been renewed interest in quantitative study in Stylistics. Quantitative study involves the statistical analysis of elements from large quantities to examine the significance of numerical findings. Hence, to compare the incidents of high-frequency function words by different characters in Jane Austen’s novels and discourse that Austen’s characters have their unique stylistic feature is possible. Then, the literary and stylistic questions of what these differences mean can be discussed. Qualitative study enables the contextual factors to be taken into account. This increases the possibility of the use of different range of tools. The reporting of the so-called ‘war on terror’ has been a regular feature of news reporting since 11 September 2001. It would be possible to collect every single occurrence of this phrase in news reporting since that date and subject these to computer-based analysis. It is also possible to choose few texts reflecting different attitudes or concentrating on a single incident, and
scrutinize them in detail using some tools of analysis, not amenable to automatic searching. This analysis provides some insights into the texts and the method could be tested by others at a future date.

1.1.3. Stylistics, Linguistics and Literary Criticism

Literary criticism contributes to Linguistics; similarly Linguistics, in turn, contributes to Literary Criticism. Stylistics is actually a study of literary discourse from a linguistics orientation. In fact, there is a link between Stylistics, Linguistics and Literary Criticism. Stylistics involves both Literary Criticism and Linguistics. It is an area of mediation between two disciplines. The following diagram suggests the relationship between Stylistics and other disciplines:

Disciplines: Linguistics                          Literary Criticism

                      Stylistics                      
                      △                             △

Subjects: (English) Language                        (English) Literature

Fig. 01. Stylistics as inter-discipline (Widdowson 1975:4)

The diagram suggests that stylistics is neither a discipline nor subject but a means of relating subjects and disciplines. As Widdowson says:

Stylistics can serve as a means whereby literature and language as subjects can by a process of gradual approximation move towards both linguistics and literary criticism, and also a means whereby these disciplines can be pedagogically treated to yield different subjects. (Widdowson 1975:4) 

Thus, Stylistics can propel student from either language or literature towards either literary criticism or linguistics.
Literary criticism is concerned with the interpretation and evolution of literary works. The main aim of a critic is to explain the message of the writer. His task is to unravel a message encoded in an unfamiliar manner and explain its meaning in a familiar way. The critic obviously uses language for this purpose. However, he is not concerned with the way the signals of the writer are constructed but with the message of these signals. He transfers the original message through evaluation and different means of expression. In the process, he ends up using the same kind of figurative and evocative language which characterizes the message of the writer.

The Literary Critic deals with message and his chief aim is to decipher the codes used by the writer. The linguist is primarily concerned with the codes and looks for how codes are constructed so as to reveal particular meaning. For instance, in a poem, the linguist will try to find out how codes exemplify the language system and account for its grammaticality. This does not mean that the linguist will ignore the meaning of the poem. In fact, the linguist’s analysis of the language of a poem may depend on prior intuitive interpretation of poem’s message. Though interpretation aids his analysis, it is not his aim. He strives to find out what aesthetic experience or perception of reality the poem attempts to convey. He also observes the usage of language system in literary works.

However, the purpose of Stylistics is to link the two approaches by extending the linguist’s literary intuitions and the critic’s linguistic observations. The linguist treats literature as text and focuses how literature exemplifies the language system. The literary critic treats literary works as message and searches for the embodiment of artistic vision in a text.

There is another approach which treats literature as discourse. It attempts to show how elements of a linguistic text combine to create messages; the way literary writing functions as a form of communication. This approach is more stylistic in nature.

The literary critic communicates his awareness to others by using impressionistic terminology. But the average reader may not share the critic’s impressionistic as his knowledge of the subtlety of language is less. Stylistician can intervene and discern the patterns of language in the context. He does not presuppose its artistic value but
investigates the way language is used in a text. He makes clear such linguistic patterns upon which the artistic value depends. In this way, Stylisticians makes a systematic study of the principles of style on one hand and the patterns of language on the other. Thus, Stylistics, Linguistics and Literary Criticism are linked and play significant role in the teaching of Literature.

1.1.4. Stylistics and Style

Stylistics can simply be called as the study of style. It is yoking together of style and linguistics. Style is defined as:

The effective use of language, especially in prose, whether to make statements or to rouse emotions. It involves first of all the power to put fact with clarity and brevity. (Lucas, 1955:9)

Style has also been defined as the description and analysis of the variability forms of linguistic items in actual language use.

Stylistics is also defined as a study of the different styles that are present in either a given utterance or a written text or document. Stylistics requires the use of traditional levels of linguistic description such as sound, form, structure and meaning. It is concerned with the recurrence of certain structures, items and elements in a speech, an utterance or in a given text. Linguistic Stylistics studies varieties that deal with the varieties of language and the exploration of some of the formal linguistic features which characterize them. Stylistics facilitates the immediate understanding of utterances and texts and makes them enjoyable.

The concepts of style and stylistic variation in language are based on the general notion that within the language system, the content can be encoded in more than one linguistic form. So it is possible for it to operate at all linguistic levels such as phonological, lexical, and syntactic. Hence, style can be considered as a choice of linguistic means, as deviation from the norms of language use, as recurrent feature of linguistic forms and as comparisons. Stylistics deals with a wide range of language
varieties and styles that are possible in creating different texts, whether spoken or written, monologue or dialogue, formal or informal, scientific or religious etc.

Stylistics is also concerned with the study of the language of literature or the study of the language peculiarity of particular authors and their writing patterns. It uses the techniques of explication which allows us to define objectively what an author has done in his use of language. Stylistics enables us to understand the intent of the author in the manner the information has been passed across by the author or writer. Hence, it is concerned with the examination of grammar, lexis, semantics, phonological properties and discursive devices. It is more interested in the significance of function that the chosen style fulfills.

1.1.4.0. Style as Choice

Choice is a very vital instrument of Stylistics as it deals with the variations and the options that are available to an author. Language provides its users with more than one choice in a given situation. As such, there are different choices available to the writer in a given text, depending on the situation and genre, the writer chooses in expressing thoughts and opinions.

The writer’s choice reflects his ego and the social ethos of his times. The paradigmatic and the syntagmatic axes are two significant choice planes available to the writer so as to determine the appropriate choice of linguistic elements. The paradigmatic axis is also referred to as the vertical or choice axis while the syntagmatic is the horizontal one. The vertical axis gives a variety of choices between one item and other items and then the writer chooses the most appropriate word. Thus, the paradigmatic axis is able to account for the given fillers that occupy a particular slot while still maintaining the structure of the sentence. At the paradigmatic level, for example, a writer or speaker can choose between ‘start’, ‘commence’, ‘go’ and ‘proceed’.

1.1.4.1. Style as the Man

Style as the Man is based on the notion that every individual has his or her own unique way of doing things and that no two persons bear the same character. These are
distinctive features that distinguish one person from the other. Thus in literary style, it is possible to differentiate between the writings of Shakespeare and Jane Austen based on their use of language among other things. A person’s style is also governed by his social and political background, religious inclination, culture, education, geographic location etc. The notion of style as man views style as an index of personality. But this is problematic. For instance, one may exhibit different styles on different occasions but in such case it would be wrong to say the writer has different personalities.

1.1.4.2. Style as Deviation

When an idea is presented in an unexpected way, then it is said such a manner of carrying it out has deviated from the norm. The concept of style as deviation is based on the notion that there are rules, conventions and regulations that inform the different activities to be executed. But when these conventions are not complied with, there is deviation. Deviation in stylistics is concerned with the use of different styles from the expected norm of language use in a given genre of writing. It is a departure from the norm and common practice. Language deviation refers to an intentional selection or choice of language use outside the range of normal language. Language is a system organized in an organic structure by rules providing phonetic, grammatical, lexical rules for its use. Thus, any piece of writing that throws to the wind the rules of language is said to have deviated. Traugott and Pratt suggest that the idea of style as deviance is favored by the ‘generative frame of reference’. It is an old concept which stems from the work of such scholars as Jan Mukarovsky. Mukarovsky relates style to foregrounding and points out that “the violation of the norm of the standard, is what makes possible the poetic utilization of language” (Traugott and Pratt 1980:31)\textsuperscript{11}.

Deviation may occur at phonological, graphological, syntactic, lexico-semantic level. At the graphological level, for example, one may see capital letters where they are not supposed to be. At the lexicogrammatical level, subject and verb may not be in agreement. The normal order of the clause elements may not be observed. For example, Adjunct may come before the subject. At the lexico-semantic level, words that should not go together may be deliberately brought together, e.g. ‘dangerous safety’, ‘open secret’.
1.1.4.3. Style as Conformity

Style as conformity is the first available option for a writer to express himself at all possible fields that a written material can belong to have been established. Any style that is distinct is due to deviation. The idea of ‘style as choice’ operates on the notion of ‘style as conformity’ and then brings out the possibility of style as deviation. The writer primarily needs to decide whether to conform to the established style or to deviate. The writers do not have flexibility to deviate in all circumstances. Style as conformity is often strictly enforced in certain fields or circumstances. This is a case especially in academic/education field particularly in students’ research projects. It is also found in some professional writings, where a considerable conformity to the established format or diction is expected. One major weakness of conformity to the established style is that it suppresses creativity to some extent. But when a text accommodates or infuses some creativity in the style, it becomes marked as deviation from the norm.

1.1.4.4. Style as Period or Time

Style may also relate to time/period. Language is dynamic and ever changing. It becomes evident if one observes the stages in the development of English language. Old English seems to be written in a different language because of differences in syntax, vocabulary, spelling etc. Even in Modern English, there are variations. The type of English used today is different from Shakespearean English in many ways. Since language changes along time axis, style also varies along the same axis. The study of language along time axis is termed diachronic linguistics whereas the study of language at a particular time/period is called synchronic linguistics.

The style of any given period has marked and predominant features that make such a period distinct. A period usually dictates the style employed by the writers. For instance, Shakespeare and his contemporaries used a particular style of writing i.e. writing in verses. Henrik Ibsen abandoned this style when he started writing plays in the prose form. Similarly, the Victorian, Elizabethan and even the modern periods have peculiar styles different from another. Thus, the noticeable convention and pattern of language use that inform the usage of a particular period make the style of that period.
1.1.4.5. Style as Situation

Language is used according to situation or circumstance. Context determines language choice in speaking or writing. Certain words are appropriate for certain occasions, while the same are considered taboo, vulgar or abominable. For instance, a Professor, in a scholarly conference, cannot indulge in Vulgarism.

A given situation has great influence on the choice made at every level of language description. The concept of register further reinforces this point. For instance, registers as aspect of style seem to be associated with particular groups of people or sometimes specific situations of use, e.g. Journales, Legalese, literature, Baby-talk, the language of sport commentaries, the language of criminals-argot, the language of the classroom, courtroom, etc.

1.1.4.6. Stylistics as an Inter-disciplinary field

Stylistics is inter-disciplinary in nature as it incorporates the overlapping elements of various disciplines. It would be interesting to observe such particular aspects of the various disciplines that stylistics has been influenced by intersection.

Stylistics is often defined as the study of literary texts using linguistic techniques. The techniques of linguistics are applicable to both literary and non-literary texts. Stylisticians have focused more on the analysis of literary texts with the aim to understand the workings of what is defined socio-culturally as literature.

Stylistics is primarily linguistic in orientation. It emerged out of the discipline of language study, formalized in the early twentieth century as linguistics. It is based on the principles of linguistics and thus aims to be objective, rigorous, replicable and falsifiable. It has more in common with other sub-disciplines of linguistics. As Linguistics, Stylistics agrees that objectivity and falsibility are keys to any analysis of the literary text.

Literary criticism involves analysis and interpretation of literary works. This involves explication of author’s message, socio-cultural factors, author’s use of various literary techniques and devices as well as his use of language. Stylistics extends literary
critic’s linguistic observation and focuses on the patterns of language use in the text. It provides the basis for the aesthetic appreciation of literary works.

Leech describes stylistics as a ‘bridge discipline’ that connects linguistics and literary studies and points out, “by undertaking a linguistics analysis as part of the interrelation between the two fields of study, we facilitate and anticipate an interpretative synthesis” (Leech 2008:2). Thus, Leech views stylistics as an inter-discipline which draws the insights of other disciplines. Other than linguistics, literary studies and literary criticism, even visual arts and cognitive science have intersection with Stylistics. Stylistics is concerned with form and function and meaning and covers a wide area of disciplines. As Leech puts it,

Placing linguistics in a broad humanistic and social science perspective, it no longer seems controversial that when we describe the characteristics of a piece of language, we can (and should) also study its interrelations with those things that lie beyond it but nevertheless give it meaning in the broadest sense. These include the shared knowledge of writer and reader, the social background, and the placing of the text in its cultural and historical context. (Leech 2008:3)

Stylistics is an expanding and developing area of recent studies. It is not limited to studying the language of literature. Many people consider stylistics and literary stylistics to be identical as it deals more with analysis of literary texts. However, non-literary texts can be analyzed for their stylistic features in the same way as literary texts. In such cases, features like foregrounding of deviation or the use of parallelism can be noted.

Stylistic analysis can also be used to establish the ideological basis of a text’s meaning. The study of ideology in language is evident in feminist linguistics and critical discourse analysis. Some of these studies are more sociological and political than linguistic. If a linguistic aspect is considered and carried out in these fields, it can be called stylistic. Some of the founders of the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) such as
Roger Fowler are also known as Stylisticians. This overlap in technique has become more evident in recent years.

Simpson demonstrated the usefulness of the tools of analysis commonly used by CDA, e.g. modality and transitivity in finding the points of view inherent in literary and non-literary texts. This tendency for readers to be invited to view a text-world from a particular point of view could influence the ideological outlook of readers. Hence, studies combining some of the insights of stylistics analysis with those of CDA are significant. Understanding readers method of processing a text evident in cognitive stylistics and the development of more ideologically sensitive tools of analysis will be vital in this task.

1.1.5. Multimodal Analysis

Stylisticians now focus on the issue of multi-modality. A number of different text-types include multimodal elements. Hence a complete analysis of such text should be taken into account.

Drama is defined in part by its multimodal elements. Dramatic texts are written to be performed and stylistic analysis of such texts account for performance-related effects. Theatre performances vary from show to show; hence, the object of analysis is unstable and critical discussion is not viable. But in the stylistic analysis of film drama, with the exception of remakes, there is only one record of a film performance to be taken into account. For example, McIntyre examines a film version of the Shakespeare play, Richard III and shows how the performance emphasizes the effects generated by the linguistic elements of the screenplay. Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory is based on the notion that social distance can be encoded in language and speaker’s linguistic choices can affect social relations. According to McIntyre, this model can also be used to explain literal movement closer to or further away from an interlocutor. He also refers to Kress and Van Leeuwen’s approach to multimodal texts which suggests that transitivity analysis can be applied to visual images to examine the syntactic connections between the constituent elements of an image.

Linguistic frameworks can be applied to the analysis of visual images for tackling multimodal texts. For instance, a New Labour political poster from the 2001 UK general
Election campaign seemed like a film advert, with the introductory caption ‘The Tories Present’ and the large title ‘ECONOMIC DISASTER’ across a photo of an apocalyptic landscape. Above the title are the faces of Michael Portillo who is introduced as Mr. Bust’. Sub-title like, ‘Coming to a home, hospital, school near you’ also appear. Thus the Labour Party used a visual style similar to cinema adverts which generates the conceptual metaphor THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY IS A FILM PRODUCTION COMPANY. This gives rise to the mappings between source and target domain (MPs ARE ACTORS, TORY POLICIES ARE FILM SCRIPTS, etc.) that substantiate the view of Conservative Party as substanceless and out of sense with the near world. But the mappings between source and target domains in a visual metaphor are not triggered as in the case of verbal metaphor. In multimodal metaphors, different set of mechanisms unravel metaphorical elements. Target domain in visual metaphors deviates from our schematic expectation and thus gets foregrounded. In 2001 UK General Election, one image blended together the faces of Margaret Thatcher and William Hague. This can be analyzed using blending theory to exemplify that the concepts of Thatcherism are linked to the policies of the then Conservative leader, William Hague.

It is now possible to use corpus linguistic approaches in the analysis of multimodal discourse. Stylistics continues to develop in new and exciting ways. Corpus Stylistics, Cognitive Stylistics, convergence of CDA and Stylistics in the field of Critical Stylistics, issue of multimodality, are based on the principles of Stylistics. This makes Stylistics a varied, rich and diverse field.

1.2. Branches of Stylistics

Historically, Stylistics may be seen to date back to the focus on the style of oral expression, cultivated in rhetoric, following the tradition of Aristotle’s Rhetoric. Stylistics flourished in Britain and the United States in the 1960s, which was largely spurred by the works of Russian Formalists such as Roman Jakobson, and Victor Shklovsky. The Russian Formalists wanted to make literary inquiry more ‘scientific’ by basing their explicit observations on formal linguistic features of text under scrutiny. They focused on literariness and linguistic features of forms and structures such as
parallelism and linguistic deviation that make a text poetic. The formalists solely focused on poetry. However, the formalists were criticized for their overriding focus on linguistic form at the expense of the function and effects of the formal features and for ignoring the significance of contextual factors.

Stylistics was also considered as a branch of literary criticism for being interdisciplinary in character and focusing on literature in general and poetry in particular. It was questioned whether Stylistics could be regarded as anything other than a method and whether it contained any ideological or theoretical foundations because of its eclecticism. Therefore, more focus was given to functions and context from the 1970s which resulted into a Functional Stylistics. Halliday’s functional model of language has made a particular impact with its focus on language as a social semiotics, a model of linguistics, meaning-making as a social phenomenon influencing and influenced by the context in which it occurs. Halliday offered three functions of language: ideational, interpersonal, and textual, actually used in specific contexts. Halliday’s model entailed an interest in longer stretches of texts. Hallidayan linguistics plays a significant role in branches of stylistics with an interest in the linguistic manifestation of ideology such as Feminist Stylistics and Critical Stylistics. Feminist Stylistics is especially concerned with the realization and maintenance of unequal gender relations in literary texts. Critical Stylistics and feminist stylistics are closely related; as feminist stylistics is a variant form of Critical Stylistics, which studies the linguistic embodiment of social inequality, power structures, and ideology.

The various pragmatic approaches to text analysis, also basically functional in nature, emerged in the 1960s, and have started playing a major role from the 1980s. Like Functional Stylistics, Pragmatic Stylistics is concerned with language in use; and the significance of contextual factors such as the linguistic, social, cultural, and authorial contexts of the production or reception of the text. The crux of the Pragmatic Stylistics is the focus on conversation as exchange, or interpersonal meaning, and linguistic features such as speech acts, discourse markers, politeness strategies etc which make it a useful approach to drama and other types of texts characterized by dialogue.
Another major branch in Stylistics, witnessed recently, springs from the rise and growth of Cognitive Linguistics. For the Cognitive Stylisticians, the point of interest is the human cognition, and its role in the creation of meaning. Cognitive Stylistics/Poetics fuses cognitive science, Linguistics and literary studies in analysis, where meaning is seen as a product of the text and the human conceptualization of it. That equal importance is given to the text and the reader, and meaning is the effect of the interaction between the text and the reader.

Corpus Stylistics has recently developed along with Corpus Linguistics. Corpus Stylistics applies the method of modern Corpus Linguistics to the analysis of large amounts of literary texts, and fuses it with the major tenets of Stylistics. There is skepticism among some literary critics whether computer would handle the issues of literature. Notwithstanding such criticism, Corpus Linguistic Methods are increasingly acknowledged in Stylistics today as a practical tool for handling large amounts of the texts and identifying the style of particular texts, authors or genres.

Recently Multimodal Stylistics and Historical Stylistics have emerged on the Stylistics scene. Multimodal Stylistics is interested in meaning-making not only by wording but also by other semiotic modes. Historical Stylistics combines elements from other branches of Stylistics to draw concepts, methodologies and models.

1.2.0. Formalist Stylistics

Roman Jakobson is well known as a formalist, but he is also a functionalist as he has systematically described the functions corresponding to aspects of language in a system of communication, i.e.: language in use in the ‘Closing Statement: Linguistic and Poetics’ at ‘Style in Language’ Conference 1958, (Sebeok 1960)\(^{13}\).

To be operative the message requires a context referred to --; a code fully, or at least partially, common to the addressee and addressee--; and finally a contact, a physical channel and psychological connection between the addresser and the addressee, enabling both of them to stay in communication. (Jakobson, quoted in Weber 1960)\(^{14}\)
Jakobson becomes functionalist by relating language to its communicative setting. But a poetic function is a special case where the linguistic artefact has no function beyond itself where (as it were) language turns in on itself.

A goal-oriented multi–functionalism means a function that presupposes some kind of orientation towards a goal.

- A language is used connatively in order to influence the addressee in some way.
- Emotive use of language serves to express opinions or attitudes.
- Phatic use of language is a means to establish or maintain contact with one’s interlocutor.

Functionalism implies goal orientation. Geoffrey Leech reinterprets Jakobson’s poetic function as follows:

whereas in relation to other functions, a message/text is seen as a means to an end, in relation to the poetic function, a message/text is regarded as an end in itself. It is ‘auto functional’ or to use technical term, auto telic. (2008:106)\(^{15}\)

Function involves value. Leech observes, “whereas in relation to other functions, message/texts are evaluated in terms of their efficacy in attaining intrinsic goals, in relation to the poetic function, they are evaluated by criteria intrinsic to themselves” (Ibid). Leech suggests two points to appreciate the poetic language.

1. Multi-functionalism is the norm i.e. a given utterance or text may have and in general will have more than one function. One function may be dominant over the other functions as Leech observes, “Within this framework, poetry or literature is definable as that kind of text in which the poetic function is dominant over others” (Ibid). But the framework allows for texts which combine a dominant poetic function with subsidiary functions of another kind: i.e. a love poem is not only poetic but also emotive/expressive; a didactic poem is not only poetic but also connative. Jakobson’s functional model therefore exonerates him from the poetic language fallacy. The functional model, on the contrary, makes the quality of literariness depend on the evaluation or interpretation of
the text by readers, by a social or linguistic community. Poetics always (says Jakobson) is --- “a total reevaluation of the discourse and all its components whatsoever” (1960:377).

2. There is an important connection between function and meaning. What from the speaker’s point of view is function or communicative intention becomes from the hearer’s viewpoint significance or interpretation. Grice’s (1957) explication of non-natural meaning makes applicable to an individual utterance.

The terms Stylistics and linguistic function can be understood in simple terms. Stylistics is the study of style with a view to explicate the relation between the form of the text and its potential for interpretation. Linguistic function relates to internal aspects of the structure of language as well as external larger systems of society/culture/belief systems. The formalist explanations refer to relations between the elements of linguistic text itself; however, linguistic function also refers to relations between language and what is not language.

It is a paradox that Roman Jakobson is a formalist as well as a functionalist. The paradox can be explained with his definition of the poetic function as ‘the set (Einstellung) towards the message itself focus on the message for its own sake’ (Sebeok, 1960:356)\(^\text{16}\).

For Popper, the functions of language are important in explaining the evaluation of the human mind, and particularly the development of scientific thought. He sees the function as forming a hierarchy leading from the primordial ‘expressive function’ which enables us to interconnect logically and reflect on our descriptions of the world, and hence to criticize and to evaluate them.

**1.2.1. Structural Stylistics**

Charles Bally published *Traite de Stylistique Francaise* in 1909. The aims and methods of contemporary stylistics are much the same as those originally proposed by Bally; and problems too remain the same that perplex the stylistician today. Nevertheless, there a few signs of shift from the structuralist principles of Bally i.e. objective and scientific. What is ironic about the new developments is, from Bally’s point of view, they might well be seen, not as progressive, but as regressive, i.e. return to prescriptive
rhetorical theories that preceded Bally’s structuralism. Like his mentor F. de, Saussure, Bally advocated descriptive method for the study of language and literature. The argument that even his own descriptive enterprise had always, in fact, been covertly prescriptive. Stanley Fish’s *Is There a Text in This Class*? is an account of why he left descriptivism and returned to prescriptivism.

Recently Contemporary Structuralist Stylistics has been split into camps that practice objective theory on one hand and on the other affective theory.

**Structural Stylistics**
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Fig. 02. Structural Stylistics (From Taylor and Toolan (ed.) J.J. Weber, 1996:88).

Objective Stylistics believes style to be an inherent property of the text itself, taken as an utterance of the language. Within Objective Stylistics, a further split has been clearly viewed between the formalists and the functionalists. Functionalists take the stylistic system of a language to be bi-planar, linking formal stylistic features with specific stylistic ‘functions’ (or effects or values). Consequently, functionalists consider only those linguistic features of a text stylistically significant which have a stylistic function. Formalists, however, disregard the call for functional criteria in identifying stylistic forms. Formalists prefer purely formal criteria in identifying stylistic patterns and features.
Geoffrey Leech and Michael Short (like Bally and Halliday) adopt a pluralistic view of language function. Bally and Halliday are the source of their functional pluralism. Pluri-functionalism leads to pluri-structuralism.

What this means for their theory of style is that the formal stylistic features and patterns of a text may be identified from any one of several differing functional perspectives. A further practical benefit of pluralism is that it allows the authors to borrow freely from different linguistic methodologies in constructing an eclectic method of stylistic analysis. Thus one finds incorporated into their method, ideas and techniques from such diverse fields as Gricean pragmatics, generative syntax, Prague School functionalism, quantitative stylistics, speech act theory, structuralist poetics, discourse analysis and French semiotics. It is perhaps this eclecticism which in spite of its lack of methodological coherence makes this book such a useful introduction text book for students of stylistics. Leech(2007)\(^{19}\)

1.2.2. Functionalist Stylistics

M. A. K. Halliday is the main exponent of this approach. Contrary to Jakobson, he argues that literature does not form the mere pattern in language, be it phonological or syntactical (Halliday 1971:56)\(^{20}\). He feels that the Study of Semantics is important for the study of styles as it makes the students understand the functional theories of language and their relevance. He makes a distinction between the functions:

1. In the experiential mode, reality is represented more concretely in the form of concrete whose elements make some reference to things. In the logical mode, reality is represented in more abstract terms, in the form of abstract relations which are independent of and make no reference to things.
2. Halliday stresses that the functions of language are integrated within the grammar: that they are manifested in the organization of the language in terms of system and structure. He thus achieves a kind of synthesis of function within form: functions determine not only how we use the language, but how the language itself is constructed.

3. Halliday recognizes that the emotive and conative functions cover the same ground— that the resources of language we use to express our own emotions and attitudes are to a large extent the same as those which we use to influence the emotions and attitudes of others. Hence he subsumes the addressee-oriented and addressee-oriented functions under the single heading of the ‘interpersonal’ function.

4. Halliday’s triad consists of ideational, interpersonal and textual. Textual function is not in the strict sense a function of language ‘relating language to what is not language’ at all: Halliday recognizes its special status by calling it an ‘enabling function’ (1970: 143, 165).

Geoffrey Leech re-interprets Halliday’s three functions as a hierarchy of instrumentality. Addresser–addressee operate on three different planes: an interpersonal (discourse), an ideational (representation); and a textual (text).

Leech’s conclusion of multifunctionalism is that “there is no discontinuity in functional terms between everyday communication and literature. The same methods and principles of interpretation apply to both. In particular, multiplicity and indeterminacy of meaning are characteristics of both literature and conversation and in both literature and conversation, as readers or hearers; we have to engage our minds fully (in terms of background knowledge, intelligence and imagination) to reconstruct the addressee’s intention as well as we can (Leech 2008:112).

This functional stylistics is an explication of a literary work in which, not satisfied with a study of just the formal linguistic features, stylisticians seek an interpretation of linguistic features in terms of stylistic or functional values. These values attribute to the work in an endeavor to explain why the author used this or that form of expression.
A literary work, in its textual form, is what Epstein (1975) calls a ‘self-reflexive artefact’: its very physical substance instates or enacts the meaning that it represents.

The sequencing, although it is recognized as such on the textual plane, can directly dramatize the ideational and interpersonal functions of the work.

The other functions are sub-ordinate to the auto-telic function in literature. The auto-telic quality of literature means that literature can be experimental arena for possible discourse possible experience worlds, and possible texts; and literature can be an ‘adventure playground’ to explore the human communicative interpretative faculty.

Thus, Fowler quotes the functionalist credo, “The particular form taken by the grammatical system of the language is closely related to the social and personal needs that language is required to serve” (Halliday 1970, quoted in Fowler 1981, p. 28).

The stylistic function in which Fowler is interested is that which he calls the ‘Ideological’ function:

We have been studying the meanings and functions of poetic discourse in a divided society, a society based on inequalities of power and opportunity: contemporary British society… Given the nature of society we live in much communication is concerned with establishing and maintaining unequal power relationships between individuals, and between institutions and individuals. Our studies of various genres of discourse argue that this practice is carried out through a much wider variety of language usages and speech acts than just the rules and directives by which interpersonal control is obviously managed. Because language must continuously articulate ideology and because ideology is simultaneously social product and social practice, all our language and that of others expresses theories of the way the world is organized,
and the expression of these theories contributes to the legitimization of this theorized organization. (Fowler 1981: 29)\textsuperscript{24}

By taking the ideological function of style as their analytical target, Fowler and his colleagues reduce the focus of stylistics to only one function i.e., ideological function, while at the same time greatly enlarging its domain to all use of language. It is from the perspective of function that the functionalist stylistician must identify stylistically significant formal features. It is difficult to know when a/an sentence/expression has a particular ideological expression and when it has not the practice they seem to rely on a mixture of case analysis, pragmatics and political intuition in identifying ideological functions.

1.2.2.0. Functional Theory of Language

M.A.K. Halliday’s main concern in the paper Linguistic Function and Literary Style\textsuperscript{25} is with criteria of relevance, one of the central problems in the study of ‘style in language’: the problem of distinguishing between mere linguistic regularity, which in itself is of no interest to literary studies and regularity which is significant for the text of literature. The pattern in language does not by itself make literature still less good literature. Halliday observes that there is no general criterion for determining whether any particular instance of linguistic prominence is likely to be stylistically relevant or not.

Halliday emphasizes the place of semantics in the study of style; and this in turn will lead to a consideration of ‘functional’ theories of language and their relevance for the student of literature, he does not find any antithesis between the ‘textual’ and the ‘theoretical’ in the study of language. His analysis of William Golding’s The Inheritors or language in general can be separated in any way.

Halliday primarily focuses on four points: first, a functional theory of language; second three questions regarding style in language conference of 1958 and in other current writings; features of the language of The Inheritors; and fourth, the question of stylistic relevance.
Halliday uses the term ‘function’ in two distinct but related senses. First, it is used in the sense of grammatical (or syntactic) function. Second, it is used to refer to the ‘functions’ of language as a whole: for example Karl Buhler proposes a three-way division of language functions into representational, the connative and the expressive (Buhler 1934, Vachek 1966, Ch-2).

Functional theory of language attempts to explain linguistic structure, and linguistic phenomena, by reference to the notion that language plays a central part in our lives, that it is required to serve certain universal types of demand. This approach is valuable in general for the insight it gives into the nature and use of language, but particularly so in the context of stylistic studies. (Buhler 1934)  

Halliday identifies Buhler’s method as psychological and individual; however, Malinowski’s (1935) as pragmatic and magical function.

Halliday observes ‘functional’ plurality clearly built into the structure of language and forms the basis of its ‘semantic’ and ‘syntactic’ (i.e. grammatical and lexical) organization. His functional framework represents a general characterization of semantic functions- of the meaning potential of the language system. He proposes a functional framework of three basic functions one of which has two sub-headings:

i) representational/ ideational function
   a) experiential
   b) logical

ii) interpersonal function

iii) textual function.

For Halliday, a ‘text’ is an operational unit of language as a sentence is a syntactic unit. It may be spoken or written, long or short, and it includes as a special instance a literary text, whether Haiku or Homeric epic. It is the text and not some super sentence that is the relevant unit for stylistic studies; this is a functional semantic concept and is not definable by size. Therefore, the ‘textual’ function is not limited to the establishment
of relations between sentences; it is concerned just as much with the internal organization of the sentence, with its meaning as a message both in itself and in relation to the context.

A functional theory of language is a theory about meanings, not about words or constructions. We shall not attempt to assign a word or a construction directly to one function or another. The functions are differentiated in language semantically, i.e. ‘meaning potential’. Language is in itself a potential: it is the totality of what the speaker can do. For Halliday, all options are embedded in the language system: the system is a network of options, deriving from all the various functions of language and he claims that there are no regions of language in which style does not reside.

1.2.2.1. Three Questions at 1958 Style in Language Conference

Halliday does not believe in drawing lines at all- the boundaries on the map only shade and overlap. The contrasts between denotation and connotation relate to the functional map of the language as a whole and thus they may be incorporated into the linguistic study of style. Halliday states:

It is through this claim of reasoning that we may hope to establish ‘criteria of relevance’ and to demonstrate the connection between the syntactic observations which we make about a text and the nature of the impact which that text has upon us. If we can relate the linguistic patterns (grammatical, lexical and even phonological) to the underlying functions of language, we have a criterion for eliminating what is trivial and for distinguishing ‘true foregrounding’ from mere prominence of a statistical or an absolute kind. (Ibid: 64)

Foregrounding, according to Halliday, is prominence that is motivated. This contributes to the writer’s total meaning. Foregrounding relates to the meaning of the text as a whole.

This relationship is a functional one: if a particular feature of the language contributes, by its prominence to the total
meaning of the work, it does so by virtue of and through the medium of its own value in the language—through the linguistic function from which its meaning is derived where that function is relevant to our interpretation of the work, the prominence will appear as motivated. (Ibid)

Halliday then considers three questions raised at the 1958 Style in Language Conference as their answers will be pertinent to the question of ‘criteria of relevance:

1. Is prominence to be regarded as a departure from or as the attainment of a norm?
2. To what extent is prominence a quantitative effect, to be uncovered or at least stated by means of statistics?
3. How real is the distinction between prominence that is due to subject matter and prominence that is due to something else?

All the three questions are very familiar and some partial answers are needed for attempting an integrated approach to language and style, which will further be pertinent to the question of ‘criteria of relevance’.

Halliday uses the term ‘prominence’ for the phenomenon of linguistic highlighting whereby some features of the language of a text stand out in some way. He hopes to avoid the assumption that a linguistic feature which is brought under attention will always be seen as a departure; however, it is quite natural to characterize such prominence as departure from a norm, since this explains why it is remarkable. Geoffrey Leech refers to ‘schemes’ (‘foregrounded patterns….. in grammar or phonology’), and writes, “it is ultimately a matter of subjective judgment whether….. The regularity seems remarkable enough to constitute a definite departure from the normal functions of language,” (1960:70). However, Wellek R. points out:

The danger of linguistic stylistics is its focus on deviations from and distortions of, the linguistic norm. We get a kind of counter-grammar, a science of discards. Normal stylistics is abandoned to the grammarian, and deviational stylistics is reserved for the student of literature. But often the most
commonplace, the most normal, linguistic elements are the constituents of literary structure. (1960: 417-18)

Two kinds of answer have been given to this objection. First, there are two types of prominence, a departure from the norm which is negative; and other is positive, which is the attainment or establishment of a norm. Second, that departure may in any case be merely statistical: we are concerned not only with deviations, ungrammatical forms, but also with what we may call ‘deflections’, departures from some expected pattern of frequency. Hymes, D.H., remarks, “in some sources, especially poets, style may not be deviation from but achievement of a norm” (1967: 33-34)27.

There are differences of perspective. Much depend on the point of view of the observer, it is therefore, not a distinction between the two types of prominence and there is no single universal norm. The text may be viewed as a ‘part’ of a larger ‘whole’, such as the author’s complete works. The expectancies may lie in ‘the language as a whole’, in a diatypic variety, or register characteristic of some situation type in a genre or literary form (Osgood, 1960: 293). This departs from a pattern or this forms a pattern, there is always a choice. On the other hand, there are differences of attention. Stylistic studies are essentially comparative in nature; and either may be taken as the point of departure.

Deviation, the use of ungrammatical forms, seems to be regarded as prominence ‘par excellence’. But deviation is of very limited interest in stylistics. It is rarely found; and when it is found, it is often not relevant. On the contrary, McIntosh found it ‘a chastening thought’.

Bloch (1953) assumes that prominence may be of a probabilistic kind, defined as “frequency distributions and transitional probabilities (which) differ from those ….. in the language as a whole”. This is what has been referred to as ‘deflection’ by Halliday. It too may be viewed either as departure from a norm or as its attainment.

The assumption that numerical data on language may be stylistically significant, there is need of some counting of linguistic elements in the text, such as phonological units, words, or grammatical patterns and figures. There are two counter arguments: the first is that, since style is a manifestation of the individual, it cannot be reduced to
counting. The second objection is that numbers of occurrences must be irrelevant to style because we are not aware of frequency in language and therefore cannot respond to it. This is almost certainly not true, as we are rather sensitive to the relative frequency of different grammatical and lexical patterns, which is an aspect of meaning potential. It is an evidence of the probabilistic nature of the language system.

Our concern here, in any case, is not with psychological problems of the response to literature but with the linguistic options selected by the writer and their relation to the total meaning of the work. If in the selections he has made there is an unexpected patterns of frequency distributions, and this turns out to be motivated, it seems pointless to argue that such a phenomenon could not possibly be significant. (Halliday quoted in J. J. Weber 1996: 67)

However, Miller G.A. argues “what cannot be expressed statistically is foregrounding: figures do not tell us whether a particular pattern has or has not ‘value in the game.’ (1960:394). Ullmann offers a balanced view: ‘yet even those who feel that detailed statistics are both unnecessary and unreliable (in a sphere where quality and context, aesthetic effects and suggestive overtones are of supreme importance) would probably agree that a rough indication of frequencies would often be helpful’ (1965:22). Halliday observes the factors which govern the relevance of ‘effects’ in grammar and vocabulary. The significance of rhythmic vocabulary has to be formulated linguistically, since it is a phonological phenomenon, although the ultimate value to which it relates is not ‘given’ by the language- that the sonnet is a highly valued pattern is not a linguistic fact, but the sonnet itself is .

Ullmann warns of the danger in the search for statistically defined key-words: ‘one must carefully avoid what have been called contextual words whose frequency is due to the subject matter rather than to any deep seated stylistic or psychological tendency” (1965: 27).
The third and the final question: can we in fact dismiss, as irrelevant, prominence that is due to subject matter? Can we even claim to identify it? This closely relates to an interpretation of the style of *The Inheritors*. In *The Inheritors*, the features are syntactic, i.e.: syntactic imagery, where the syntax in Ohmann’s words, “serves (a) vision of things…. Since there are innumerable kinds of deviance, we should expect that the ones elected by the poem or poet spring from particular semantic impulses, particular ways of looking at experience” (1967: 237)²⁹.

Halliday remarks that the vision provides the motivation for their prominence, it makes them relevant, and however ordinary they may be. The style of *The Inheritors* rests very much on foregrounding of this kind. Pattern of syntactic prominence may reflect thesis, theme or ‘other aspects’ of the meaning of the work; every level is a potential source of motivation, a kind of semantic ‘situational norm’. Halliday even suggests that one cannot really discount ‘prominence due to subject matter’ at least, as far as syntactic prominence is concerned; vision and subject matter are as closely related as in *The Inheritors*. In Stylistics we are concerned with language in relation to all the various levels of meaning that a work may have. However, Halliday also argues that neither thesis nor theme imposes linguistic patterns; therefore, prominence that is motivated cannot be said to be ‘due to’ either subject matter or some other aspect. According to Ullmann, in stylistics we have both to count things and to look at them one by one, and when we do this we find that the foregrounding effect is the product of two apparently opposed conditions of use. The foregrounded elements are certain clause types which display particular patterns of transitivity; where at certain instances they are expected as well as unexpected. The immediate thesis and the underlying theme come together in the syntax; the choice of subject matter is motivated by the deeper meaning, and the transitivity patterns realize both. This is the explanation of their powerful impact. *The Inheritors* provides a remarkable illustration of how grammar can convey levels of meaning in literature and this relates closely to the notion of linguistic functions. Language, because of the multiplicity of its functions, has a fuzzy-like quality in which a number of themes unfold simultaneously; each of these themes is apprehended in various settings, or perspectives, and each melodic line in the syntactic sequence has more than one value in the whole.
1.2.2.2. Analysis of *The Inheritors*

*The Inheritors*, in the words of Linkead Weekes and Gregor (1967), is a ‘reaching out through the imagination into the unknown.’ The persons of the story are a small band of Neanderthal people: their world is then invaded by a group of more advanced stock, a fragment of tribe, ‘others’ and latter called as ‘The New People’. The principal character is Lok.

Halliday analyzes three passages A, B and C from *The Inheritors*. Linguistically, A and C differ in rather significant ways while B is in certain respects transitional between them. Halliday analyzes the language in terms of transitivity patterns. The picture is one in which people act but they do not act on things, but they move only themselves, not other objects. The syntactic tension expresses this combination of activity and helplessness. Lok’s behavior is that Lok has a theory – as he must have, because he has language (Ibid).

Halliday responds to the syntactic structure rather than syntactic reflection of the subject matter. The syntactic foregrounding has a comprise significance: the predominance of intransitives reflects first, the limitations of the people’s own actions; second the people’s world view which cannot transcend these limitations; and thirdly, a dim apprehension of the superior powers of the ‘others’. Golding’s concern is with the nature of humanity and development of intellect and spirituality. Golding uses syntax with a strong preference for processes having only one participant. The restriction to a single participant also applies to mental processes clauses. A grammar of language A would tell us not merely what clauses occurred in the text but also what clauses could occur in that language (Thorne 1965).

Halliday observes that, as far as action clauses are concerned, an intransitive clause is one in which the roles of ‘affected’ and ‘agent’ are combined in the one participant; a transitive clause is one in which they are separated, the process is being treated as one having an external cause. To be brief, there is no cause and effect in language A. The language of passage B implies a transition between the two parts of the book; and there is a language C.
I have not, in this study, emphasized the use of linguistic analysis as a key; I doubt whether it has this function. What it can do is to establish certain regular patterns, on a comparative basis, in the form of differences which appear significant over a broad canvas. In *The Inheritors* these appear as differences within the text itself, between what we have called ‘language A’ and ‘language C’. In terms of this novel, if either of them is to be regarded as a departure, it will be language C, which appear only briefly at the very end; but in the context of modern English as a whole it is language A which constitutes the departure and language C the norm. There is thus a double shift of standpoint in the move from global to local norm, but one which brings us back to more or less where we started. (Halliday quoted in J. J. Weber 1996: 80)\textsuperscript{30}

1.2.2.3. Criteria of Relevance

The problem of the criteria of relevance is central in functional perspective. As critics of functional perspective especially Taylor and Toolan observe:

Although functionalist stylistics whether dualistic or pluralistic, relies on a functional perspective from which to identify patterns and features of stylistic form, in practice no criteria are ever given with which one might identify the function (or functions) of an utterance. So the question will always arise: how is one to tell if this passage (utterance, word etc.) has the same or a different function from another passage? Similarly, one may ask how it is possible to decide whether a particular passage does or does not have a particular function. When we recall that it is from the criterial perspective of function that the functionalist stylistician is obliged to identify features and patterns of
stylistic form, it may be seen that the problem of first identifying function is a crucial one, and yet, to date, no functionalist theory has been able to provide criteria for identifying the function (or stylistic effect, or ‘value’, etc.) of a passage. Indeed, the notion of ever producing such criteria becomes even more implausible when we ask ourselves whether one and the same passage (or utterance) can justifiably be assumed to have the same function (effect, significance, value, etc.) for each of its readers or whether function is not, to some degree imposed upon the passage by those who read it. If the latter is the case, we see how misleading it would be to locate the structural source of stylistic functions or particular formal patterns of linguistic features in the text. (Taylor and Toolan quoted in J.J. Weber, 1996:89)

A Resume on Relevance

The focus of attention has been on language in general, the language system and its relation to the meanings of a literary work. The particular systematic portions have been selected with a greater than expected frequency. The meaning of these syntactic options taken in the ideational function of language as a whole, relates to an interpretation of the meaning of the work. They are relevant both as subject matter and as underlying theme. Within the context, prominence is motivated. The fact that a particular pattern constitutes a norm is the meaning.

Transitivity is really the cornerstone of the semantic organization of experience; and it is at one level what The Inheritors is about. The theme of the entire novel, in a sense, is transitivity: man’s interpretation of his experience of the world, his understanding of the processes and of his own participation in them. This is the motivation for Golding’s syntactic originality: it is because of this that the
syntax is effective as a mode of meaning (see Firth). The particular transitivity patterns that stand out in the text contribute to the artistic whole through the functional significance, in the language system of the semantic options which they express. (Ibid: 81)

Halliday further states, “This is what we understand by ‘relevance’- the notion that a linguistic feature ‘belongs’ in some way as part of the whole” (Ibid). Hymes remarks, ‘It has been said of phonological foregrounding that ‘that there must be appropriateness to the nexus of sound and meaning’ (Hymes 1967:53) 32. This is also true in case of syntactic and semantic levels, where the relationship is not between sound and meaning but between meaning and meaning. Here ‘relevance’ implies congruence with an interpretation of what the work is about and hence the criteria of belonging are semantic ones.

1.2.3. Pragmatic Stylistics

Pragmatic Stylistics is a part of the manifestation of Linguistic Stylistics. This variety of Stylistics shows the meeting point between Pragmatics and Stylistics, that is, how pragmatic resources, such as performative and speech acts, can be employed to achieve stylistic effects. The application of pragmatic and stylistics theories to text analysis indicates a clear departure from how text was analyzed when modern linguistics began to develop. In this respect, Dressler et al inform us that the tradition of the evolution of modern linguistics was for analysts to confine the analysis of text to the domain of sentence which was regarded as the largest unit with an inherent structure. The pragmatic meaning of a text can be recovered through the context that produces the text (1993:16).

Michael Halliday asserted the impact of the Chomskyan revolution on linguistics thus:

For much of the past twenty years linguistics has been dominated by individualistic ideology, having as one of its articles of faith the astonishing dictum, first enunciated by
Katz and Fodor, in a treatise on semantics which explicitly banished all reference to the social context of language that ‘nearly every sentence is uttered for the first time’. Only in a very special kind of a social context could such a claim be taken seriously – that of a highly intellectual and individual conception of language in which the object study was the idealized sentence of an equally idealized speaker. (Halliday 1978:4)\(^3\)

Halliday observes that linguistic theories encode social values: that they are among the things ideologically determined. The ideological determinants are observable in the assumptions, significant characteristics of language, and the claims of language normal or unmarked. Halliday suggests that linguistic theories often reproduced ideologies that hold in the social milieu of the people doing the linguistics: academic elites make theories in their own image.

Speech–act theory has been seen as a corrective to the abstract, individualized concept of language criticized by Halliday. It has offered a way to shift from language as autonomous, self-contained grammatical system into the realm of language as social practice. Hymes (1972) reads ‘communicative competence’ in speech–act theory while Bierwish (1980) sees it as a part of a theory of communication distinct from the theory of language and yet others see it as a replacement for autonomous linguistics. For Halliday language is as it is because of the functions it has evolved to serve in people’s lives (1978:4).

Speech-act philosophers, however, tend to be very skeptical about the theory’s potential for characterizing language as social product. Catherine Belsey characterizes Ideology’s Capacity to present the position of the subject as fixed and unchangeable an element in a given system of differences which is human nature and the world of human experience, and to show possible action as an endless repetition of ‘normal’ familiar action (1982: 90).
Like most contemporary linguistics speech–act theory implacably adopts one to one speech as the norm or unmarked case for language use. It becomes therefore apparent that people always speak from and in a socially constituted position, a position that is; moreover, constantly shifting and defined in a speech situation by the interaction of many different forces. According to Pratt, M.L., context is not just the backdrop against which a person speaks; rather the context and the subject mutually determine each other ongoingly. Beliefs, desires and intentions are seen not as arising out of and attaching to an authentic monolithic self, but rather as forces that are in play in the situation.

Thus Pratt has tried to show one–to–one interaction and a unified, personalized subject are normalized by speech act theory. Speech act theory stresses language as essentially a co-operative form of behavior in which participants work together rationally to achieve shared or common goals. These basic tenets emerge most explicitly in Paul Grice’s well known co–operative principle and conversational maxims. Grice points out the limitation on his maxims that they are formulated only to apply to language used for the ‘maximally efficient exchange of information’, and that they would have to be modified to apply to other situations.

Elinor Keenan showed the inadequacy of the maxims for explaining the way knowledge circulated in the Madagascar community. The only linking counterexample to Grice Gazadar’s research seems pertinent when he states:

Thus last mentioned practice is in direct contravention of a special case of Grice’s quantity maxim. Keenan’s findings imply that Grice’s maxims are only ‘reasonable’ and ‘rational’ relative to a given culture, community or state of affairs. They cannot be defended as universal principles of conversation. (Gazadar quoted in J. J. Weber 1979:54 – 55)³⁴

It has been pointed out that three factors–affective relations, power relations, and the question of shared goals were missing from accounts of Grice and Searl. The
discourse of truth and falsehood has been examined from the ideological viewpoint by writers including Foucault, Derrida, Greimas, Fowler etc. George Alexander indicates:

A certain kind of function is given to language in assertive discourse which is ruined with difficulties: language is keen as representation and intentional, and therefore the position of the subject who signifies (judges, and affirms, and then goes on to legislate) remains unchallenged… The tactics of assertion bring into play an either/or logic essential to the production of the discourses of truth and falsity, which function as effects of power. (1978:25) \(^{35}\)

Several maneuvers are available to deal with the many cases where the standard account of verbal cooperativeness, sincerity, does not fully apply. The sentences such as quarreling, gossiping, flattery, exaggeration, bargaining, advertising, and so on involve deviant, infelicitous, or otherwise non-normal kinds of language use. Bach and Harnish (1979) set up a category called ‘collateral acts’ of deviant practices, including jokes, kidding around, punning, mimicking, reciting, circumlocution, changing the subject, small talk, ambiguity, and something they call sneaky presupposition. These ‘collateral bets’ they argue are not illocutionary acts, but acts which can be performed in conjunction with or in lies of illocutionary acts (1979:97).

Such ‘deviant’, ‘infelicitous’, or ‘collateral’ words may be attached with social meaning. The instance in question falls outside the system and the grammar proper. These are ideologically laden. For Jurgen Habermas, ideal speech act is postulated as the basis for a social critique: to the extent that people’s actual activities diverge from the norms of the grammar, those activities are seen as distorted – ‘systematically distorted’, by malformations of their society (Habermas 1979, 1984; MaCarthy 1978).

Pratt observes that questioning the norms of sincerity and cooperativeness has some clear repercussions for the analysis of literature. One must be able to talk about the nature of relation between reader/text/author in a text.
The speech–act theory has been used to account for the literary question of fictivity. According to Roy Harris (1980), the speech–act theory uses a ‘surrogationalist’ view of representative discourse. That is, it views representative (constative or assertive) speech act as language that stands for the world, as verbal undertakings to fit words to the world (Searl 1975).

Pratt brings out the irony that re–examining the norm of assertive discourse promises to open better ways of talking about fiction; at the same time it calls into question the very discourse to which linguistics and criticism aspire. If there is going to be a serious linguistic criticism, there must also be a seriously critical linguistics. He proposes a theory of linguistic representation which acknowledges that representative discourse is always engaged in both fitting words to world and fitting world to words, that language and linguistics institutions in part construct or constitute the world for people in speech communities, rather than merely depicting it. Representative discourses, fictional or non–fictional, must be treated as simultaneously world–creating, world–describing and world changing undertakings. For fiction, one must talk not only about assertions that staved in negative relation to actual worlds, but about utterances which place fictional states of affairs in some, but complex, positively specifiable, relation to actual worlds. As this formulation implies, Pratt believes the problem of how fictional discourses relate to actual worlds will not be solved by an attempt to find referential assertions embedded in fictional texts, as some have proposed (Graff 1979:41-58; Woodmans 1978). It is just too simplistic to reduce all the signifying practices involved in representation to the production of true or false assertions.

1.2.4. Critical Stylistics

There has been a dispute between literary critics and linguistics over the issue of application of linguistic method for the study of literature. Roman Jakobson (1960) puts the linguistics case thus:

Poetics deals with problems 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 as an integral part of linguistics. (Jakobson, in J.J. Weber 1996: 10)\(^36\)

Fowler–Bateson controversy is well known to the students of stylistics. Bateson’s counter – argument was based on an allegation of unfitness. According to Bateson, Linguistics is a science, but Literature has an ‘incurable subjective core’ which is ‘inaccessible to science’. Again linguistic processing is only a preliminary to literary response, so the linguist is incapable of taking us enough in an account of literary form and experience.

David Lodge claims that linguistics and criticism shall never meet or be united for analysis and interpretation of literature:

One shall feel obliged to assert that the discipline of linguistics will never replace literary criticism or radically change the bases of its claims to be a useful and meaningful form of human inquiry. It is the essential characteristic of literature that it concerns values. And values are not amenable to scientific method. (Lodge 1966: 57)\(^37\)

Roger Fowler mentions some common failures of theorization in response to a question so naïve as ‘can linguistics be applied to literature?’

1. A major difficulty on both sides is a completely uncritical understanding of ‘linguistics’. The literary critics point to the fact that ‘there exist different linguistic theories with quite distinct characteristics’. e.g. description and individualistic.

2. A second persistent fallacy about linguistics, again on both sides, concerns the analytic modus operandi of linguistic method. The different models have quite diverse aims, and procedures towards those aims. One model may have the purpose of accounting for the structure of particular texts; another may focus on sociolinguistic variation; another may be concerned to increase our knowledge about linguistic universals; and so on.
Roger Fowler points to a common misconception that linguistics – any linguistics— is a kind of automatic analyzing device which, when fed a text, will output a description without a human intervention. He thinks that all would agree with Chomsky’s insistence that linguistics is not a discovery procedure. Linguistic analysis works only in relation to what speakers know already, or what linguistics hypothesizes in advance. So the whole range of objections to linguistics on the grounds that it is merely a mechanical procedure can be dismissed. Linguistic analysis is a flexible, directed operation completely under the control of its users, who can direct it towards any goals which are within the scope of the model being used.

There is one more difficulty that there is no guarantee that they will present language in a realistic and illuminating way. To prove this point Fowler records three models of language that are particularly unhelpful:

1. The first problem is that language in literature is regarded as an object. The case referred is that of Roman Jakobson’s ‘poetic function’ that results in the amimisation of communicative and interpersonal i.e. pragmatic functions of the text.
2. The other problem is that language is treated as a medium through which literature is transmitted. Fowler quotes David Lodge: “The novelist’s medium is language: whatever he does, qua novelist, he does, in and through language” (1966:9). But Fowler concludes that, for linguistics, literature is language.
3. The assumption about language that there is a distinct difference between poetic or literary language on one hand and ordinary language on the other. A critic takes for granted this difference and Roman Jakobson and Mukarovsky argue on the basis of these appreciations, but they have failed to prove empirically.

Fowler then proposes a solution to ‘can linguistics be applied to literature?’ in positive in these words:

The solution is, it seems to me, to simply theorize literature as language, and to do this using the richest and most suitable linguistic model.
Fowler accounts for the adequate linguistic model with the following broad characteristics:

1. It should be comprehensive in accounting for the whole range of dimensions of linguistic structure, particularly pragmatic dimensions.
2. It should be capable of providing an account of the functions of given linguistic constructions, e.g. Halliday’s ideational function.
3. It should acknowledge the social basis of the formation of meanings.
4. The requisite linguistics for our purpose, unlike most other, artificially restricted, forms of linguistics, should aim to be comprehensive in offering a complete account of language structure and usage at all levels: semantics, syntax, phonology and phonetics, text grammar, and pragmatics.

The requisite linguistics for our purpose unlike most other, artificially restricted, forms of linguistics, should aim to be comprehensive in offering a complete account of language structure and usage at all levels: semantics, the organization of meanings within a language. Syntax, the processes and the orderings which arrange signs into the sentences of a language; phonology and phonetics, respectively the classification and ordering, and the actual articulation, of the sounds of speech; text grammar the sequencing of sentences in coherent extended discourse; and pragmatics, the conventional relationships between linguistic. A general principle that language structure, in its ideational function, is constitutive of a speaker’s experience of reality constructions and the users and uses of language. (quoted in J.J. Weber 1996:199)  

Fowler focuses on interactional facets of ‘literary’ texts. The system of shared knowledge with communities and between speakers is fundamental in interactive communication. This is the area where pragmatics and semantics overlap.
‘Social semiotic’ means a ‘community’s experience.’ The communities are ideologically diverse. Most meanings are social. Some of the meanings encoded in a language are natural in origin. The dominant preoccupations, theories, or ideologies of a community are coded in its language, so that the semantic structure is a map of the community’s knowledge and its organization. The traditional assumption is that a style embodies a view of the world.

Fowler then illustrates the application of his model by analyzing an extract from William Faulkner’s *The Sound and the Fury*, a familiar but striking example of the way in which ‘language structure gives form to a view of the world’.

The language is deviant but systematically patterned in certain areas of structure. Certain types of structure through repetition are foregrounded: foregrounding implies perceptual salience for readers, a pointer to areas of significance.

1. Fowler finds in Faulkner’s passage a consistent oddity in Transitivity: the linguistic structuring of actions and events. There are no transitive verbs and only use of intransitive verbs which implies that Benjy has little sense of actions and their effects on objects: a restricted notion of causation.
2. Benjy has no names for certain concepts. This implies that he has command of only a part of his society’s classification of objects.
3. Benjy uses personal pronouns in an odd way. “them ….. they….. he….. the other.” It means Benjy does not appreciate what is needed, a severe communicative handicap.
4. There is a problem with Benjy’s deictic terms: the words used to point to and orient objects and actions. The implication is Benjy’s disorientation, disjointed or incoherence in the narration.

Fowler first noted a recurrent linguistic construction, and then added an interpretive comment. The question arises of what is the authority for these comments. Fowler makes it clear that there are no mimetic considerations involved, and no question of objective criteria for fidelity of representation. What happens here is that the specific language of this text somehow creates Benjy’s consciousness ab initio. But this kind of argument is not plausible since it is probable, then that the significances here are
conventional, but having said that, it is necessary to define more precisely what is going on in the interaction between text, reader, and culture. Fowler agrees that he cannot be absolutely exact, but can indicate something of the complexity of the processes. Functional grammar, he adds, maintains that linguistic constructions are selected according to the communicative purposes that they serve. It can be assumed that the total linguistic resources available to a speaker have been cumulatively formed by the communicative practices of the society in which he/she is born, and then by the practices in which he/she participates during socialization.

Fowler points to a more realistic view of linguistic interaction that we process text as discourse, that is, as a unified whole of text and context – rather than as structure with function attached. We approach the text with a hypothesis about a relevant context, based on our previous experiences of relevant discourse, and relevant context; this hypothesis helps us to point to an interpretation, to assign significances, which are confirmed or disconfirmed or modified as the discourse proceeds. In the case of face-to-face interaction in conversation, feedback occurs to assist the refining of the hypothesis with written texts; we are reliant on our existing familiarity with relevant modes of discourse and on our skill (developed in literary education and in other conscious studies of discourse e.g., sociolinguistics) at bringing appropriate discourse models to bear. As critics know, the reader’s realization of a literary text as discourse takes reading and re-reading, on the basis of the maximum possible previous experience of the canon of literature and of other relevant discourse; to assist this process and to firm up our hypothesis, discourse with other experienced readers of literature is invaluable.

Fowler’s brief pedagogical and methodological conclusion based on theory of literature as language can be understood from the following passage:

Let me add a brief pedagogical and methodological conclusion. The theory of literature as language as I have articulated it is congruent with the elementary observation that students critical performance, ability to ‘read’ in the sense of realizing text as significant discourse, is very much dependent on how much and what they have read. Because
reading and criticism depend on knowledge of discourse, not ability to dissect text structurally, it should not be expected that teaching formal linguistic analysis to beginning literature students will in itself produce any great advance in critical aptitude. However, linguistics of this kind indicated in this paper with sociolinguistics, discourse analysis and pragmatics, in the context of a literature course of decent length – in our case three years – very effective. In this type of course students mature gradually in their command of modes of literary discourse, simultaneously gaining a theoretical knowledge of language and its use, and an analytic method and terminology with which to describe the relationships between linguistic structures and their functions in ‘literary’ discourses. Finally, since knowledge is formed for the individual in social structure, this approach is best taught and discussed in seminar groups rather than lectures and tutorials: thus experience of discourse can be shared. (Fowler in J.J. Weber 1996:204)39

Fowler concludes with these comments on linguistic criticism. These comments are in response to a question whether linguistic criticism is objective. The linguistic description of structures in text is certainly objective particularly at the level of syntax and phonology. But it is clear that the assignment of functions or significances is not an objective process because of the noted lack of co-variation of form and function. This does not mean that interpretation is purely subjective, individual practice. Criticism is an inter-subjective practice. The significances which an individual critic assigns are the product of social constitution; cultural meanings coded in the discourses in which the critic is competent. It is understandable then, that critical interpretation is a matter of public discussion and debate; linguistic description allowing clear descriptions of structures and a theory of social semiotic is of fundamental importance in ensuring a clear grasp of the objective and the inter-subjective elements of texts under discussion.
1.2.5. Reader-Response Stylistics

Inspired by Roland Barthes’ view, the new critics believed that the meaning of text can solely be determined through the interaction between the reader and the words on the pages of the text. Thus, the reader-response stylistics examines the readers' response to a text as a response to a horizon of expectations. By a horizon of expectations, it means that there is multiplicity of meaning or interpretations in a text and these can be accused by the reader according to his or her level of what Jonathan Culler describes as "literary competence"(1981:25). The reader-response stylistics evokes a situation where individual readers give meaning to the text.

Reader-response stylistics has evolved into a variety of new forms. S…… like David Bleich, Norman Halland, and Robert Crossman have viewed the reader's response not as one 'guided' by the text, but rather as one motivated by dys-sealed, personal, psychological needs. (Culler, J. quoted in J. J. Weber 1996)\textsuperscript{40}

David Birch suggests that the starting point for interpretation processes has to be the language of the text. According to Deirdre Burton, literary and stylistic analysis is a “powerful method for understanding the ways in which all sorts of realities are constructed through language,” (Burton in J.J. Weber 1996:230). David Birch suggests that a close attention to be paid to the reader’s Intertextuality. The question Burton has posed is:

And where do you go from here? You have taken some poem or conveniently sized piece of prose. You have spent time and effort mastering a sensible descriptive grammar of English. You have method understanding and knowledge of both to produce a rigorous analysis of the language used to construct your text, together with a relevant sensitive interpretation ; you have talked about ‘effects’, ‘foregrounded features’, ‘over all impressions’, and so on.

For him, reader and his intertextuality determines the answer to whereby why and what? A man committed, apolitical or neutral way of analysis is not possible. Burton quotes Fowler’s views on language use: “Language use is not merely an effect or reflect of social organization and processes, it is a part of social process. It constitutes social meanings and thus social practices” (Fowler et al, 1979:2).

Linguistic structures can and are used to systematize, transform and often obscure analyses of reality; to regulate the ideas and behavior of others; to classify and rank people, events and objects in order to assert institutional or personal status.” Fowler et al: 1979:2) it is therefore, quite useful to add Jonz’s observation in this light: A critical linguistics in this light is therefore an alternative to a mainstream linguistics which has failed to serve as a tool for a reformation of society. (1982:176)

Deirdre Burton, therefore, suggests that linguistic analysis and the experiences of the reader should determine the analysis and interpretation from the very beginning. He further adds that the Cartesian legacy of self, free from context is no longer tenable in linguistics and the myth of ‘self’ as writer, and ‘self’ as reader functioning as separate, unrelated entities becomes equally untenable (Ibid 1982:34). Linguistic structure is not arbitrary it is determined by the functions it performs. A Stylistics limited to the text itself within the single text, tends to be a linguistically oriented practical criticism, with the ideologies of a literature discipline determining the theoretical direction of the stylistics and not the ideologies of a linguistic discipline that sees language as social semiotic.

It is interesting to know the type of Stylistics David Birch prefers:

I prefer to work with a stylistics that is more focused on the semiotics of the production of meanings in social discourse, of which a text, determined by whatever means to be
literary, is just a part, not the whole; a stylistics, then, which is rather more concerned with reading processes; a stylistics which is intertextual, instead of treating the text as an autonomous artifact labeled as intrinsically special by literary ideologies. This does not mean that this stylistics is simply a study of register but that it is concerned with understanding literariness and intertextuality as a process of reading, and with demythologizing notions of autonomy of text and ‘poetic language’ and that language style, literary form and critic are innocent, disinterested and transparent vehicles for the expressing of meaning. (David Birch, in J.J. Weber, 1996:208)\(^{44}\)

David Birch analyzes a poem ‘\textit{Steel}’ written by Edwin Thumboo, who was a Professor of English Literature in the National University of Singapore, critic, academic, ‘blooded’ dissenter against British Colonial rule in the 1950’s, and now a member of one of the higher echelons of the Singapore establishment. Birch reads the poem ‘beyond the text itself’ and uses the text as a surface on which to combine a variety of intertextual sources of his previous reading knowledge. He incorporates some of his reading history into his analysis of his reading of ‘Steel’. As Thamboo says:

\begin{quote}
The shift from descriptive to creative modes, which turned English into an instrument meeting the expanding psychos themselves evolving, was crucial to the growth of literature.\textit{(Ibid)}\(^{45}\)
\end{quote}

This shift is caused by vested interests of the people. This is the sort of analysis Birch would offer in an alternative, intertextual stylistics designed to explain readings. It is not disinterested; it is motivated from a position that is interested in understanding a text as a surface upon which meanings can be produced-meanings created by readers, not meanings supposedly encoded in a text by a writer: whether they are ‘in there’ is not the issue. To conclude Birch writes:
My message is that an interested, intertextual reader’s stylistics will necessarily be open ended; it will be discursive and will not be specifically designed to articulate as its sole purpose, connections between linguistic levels and literary effects, but will be as concerned with the readers connections amongst texts as well. Intertextual approaches argue against seeing a text as an end in itself, and argue against explanations of reactions and responses to texts by intralinguistic means only. (David Birch, in J.J. Weber, 1996:220)

1.2.6. Pedagogical Stylistics

This type of stylistics shows the instructional use into which stylistics is put. Pedagogical stylistics emphasizes that the process of improving students' linguistic sensibilities must include greater emphasis upon the text as action, that is, upon the mental processing which is such as proactive part of reading and interpretation; and how all of these elements - pragmatic and cognitive as well as linguistics function within quite specific social and cultural contexts.

According to H. G. Widdowson, the purpose of stylistic analysis is to investigate how the resources of a language code are put to use in the context of actual messages. It is concerned with patterns of use in the texts. Widdowson observes that the user of a language acquires two kinds of knowledge: knowledge of the roles of the code and the conventions which regulate the use of these rules in the production of messages. The code insures the grammaticality and the convention insures the appropriateness. For effective communication, knowledge of code and convention is essential. The user of a language acquires creativity the unique feature of a language. Because of creativity, it is possible to produce and understand novel utterances. Therefore, the user of language is creative.

The interplay of code and convention make the units of the message not only tokens but types also in a social communication. In the words of Widdowson:
Stylistics is concerned with such message types; its purpose is to discover what linguistic units count as in communication and how the effects of different conventions revel themselves in the way messages are organized as the texts. (Widdowson in J. J. Weber 1996:138)\textsuperscript{47}

Stylistics is the study of the social function of language and is, therefore, a branch of socio–linguistics. Stylistics aims to characterize texts as pieces of communication. It does not aim to discover the different social functions of language: it is technological rather than scientific as it works on data provided by others. It is assumed that texts are given.

Widdowson limits the scope of stylistics to the study of only literature. He gives two reasons for limiting the study to literature. The first reason is methodological which relates to the nature of literature. The second reason is pedagogical which relates to the value stylistic analysis has for the teaching of language.

Literature as a mode of communication has certain unique features which simplify the task of stylistics. Literary communication does not fit into any conventional communication situation. Widdowson points out the essential difference between literary and other uses of language in the following words:

…… in literature, the message is text contained, and presupposes no wider context so that everything necessary for its interpretation is to be found within the message itself. All other uses of language on the other hand find some place in the general social matrix; they develop from antecedent events and presuppose consequent events; they are contextualized in a social continuity. Clearly, to characterize the message in a conventional text some account must be taken of its social environment. It is this which complicates matters and makes stylistic analysis difficult. With literary texts, this problem does not cause
such difficulties; generally speaking we can concentrate on
the text itself without worrying about distracting social
appendages. This is not to say, of course, that there are no
problems. As we shall see they are plenty: most of them are
corollaries of the unique feature of literature i.e. as a mode
of communication. (quoted in J.J. Weber 1996:139)48

By tradition, the study of literature has been regarded as a branch of aesthetics. It
is, therefore, concerned with the total effect of literary texts as artistic works. Description
is basically by reference to artistic value. By implication, there are certain ‘universals’ of
art which find expression in different ways in different media as in a poem, a painting
and a piano concerto. Literary criticism of the tradition makes appeal to a theory of
aesthetics which postulates artistic universals. Unfortunately, the absence of explicitness
is crucial. The literary critic assumes that the artistic value of a work is available to
inactive awareness, and he makes use of an impressionistic terminology to communicate
this awareness to others the difficulty with this procedure is that it makes appeal to
intuitions which the reader may not share with the critic. In this case, the critic’s
impressionistic description can find no response. Widdowson accounts for this
contribution of stylistics in the following words:

This is where stylistics can make its contribution. Its
concern is with the patterning of language in texts and its
make no presupposition as to artistic value. By
investigating the way language is used in a text, it can make
apparent those linguistic patterns upon which an intuitive
awareness of artistic values ultimately depend. It provides a
basis for aesthetic appreciation by bringing to the level of
conscious awareness features of the text otherwise only
accessible to trained intuition. In brief, stylistics takes the
language as primary and artistic values are regarded as
incidental to linguistic description: literary criticism, on the
other hand, takes artistic values as primary and refers to
language in so far as it serves as evidence for aesthetic assessments. Stylistics renders an essential service to language learning in that even if the learner does not develop an appreciation of literature as literature, he will have acquired as awareness of the way language functions in at least this form of communication: he will have developed an awareness of literature as language. This indicates how the study of literary texts can be correlated with the study of texts exemplifying other forms of social communication and suggests a means of coordinating the teaching of language and the teaching of literature (at present so often undertaken in mutual isolation) in a way which would be beneficial to both. (J.J. Weber, 1996:140)\textsuperscript{49}

Widdowson thus underlines the irregular realization of the addressor/ addressee relationship in literary writing, the literary message does not find a place in the social matrix as do other messages. Literary messages are complete in themselves, they presuppose no preceding events and anticipate no future action, their significance is enclosed within the limits of the form of the text. However, the significance of normal messages derives from external circumstances, from the social situations in which they occur. Literary messages make use of the code idiosyncratically. It also makes use of language grammatically and semantically deviant. Furthermore, poetry is metrical. Therefore, Widdowson raises two questions:

Since the forms that literary messages take do not wholly conform to either the connections of use or the rules of the code, the question arises: how do they manage to convey any meaning at all? And even if they do manage to convey meaning, what kind of meaning is it? The two questions are closely related, and in considering them we shall be defining the task which stylistic analysis must undertake.
Literary messages manage to convey meaning because they organize their deviations from the code into patterns which are discernable in the text themselves. What happen is that the writer in breaking the rules of the code diminishes the meaning of language and then proceeds to make up for the deficiency by placing the deviant item in a pattern whereby it acquires meaning by relation with other items within the internal context of the message. Thus the relations set up within a text constitute a secondary language system which combines, and so replaces, the separate functions of what would conventionally be distinguished as code and context. The interpretation of any text involves the recognition of two sets of relations: extra-textual relations between language items and the code from which they derive and intra-textual relations between language items within the context itself. What is unique about literary texts is that typically the two sets of relations do not converge to form one unit of meaning which represents a projection, as it were, from code into context. Instead, they overlap to create a meaning which belongs to neither one nor the other: a hybrid unit which derives from both code and context and yet is a unit of neither of them. (quoted in Weber, J.J 1996:141)\textsuperscript{50}

Widdowson then illustrates the distinction between the denotative and connotative meaning. Literature is characteristically connotative; and characteristically effaces the distinction between denotative and connotative meaning. The meaning due to intra-textual relations, one may regard it as connotative or denotative, therefore, the meaning of the linguistic item can be both connotative and denotative in a sense; and in a sense of course, neither Widdowson illustrates this by reference to the use of item ‘coffee’ in Alexander Pope’s \textit{Epistle to Miss Blount}, on her leaving the town after the coronation, and also ‘bibles’ in \textit{The Rape of the Lock}. Thus Widdowson shows that poetry blurs the
distinction between denotation and connotation. Poetry also blurs the linguistic distinction between phonology and syntax. Phonology thus takes up the function that is a prerogative of syntax:

It is by compounding linguistic distinctions in this way that literary language is able to express meanings other than those which are communicable by conventional means.

(Widdowson in J.J. Weber, 1996:143)

These are, according to Widdowson, very simple illustrations of how literary messages convey meanings. Widdowson then considers the second and related question: what kind of meaning does a literary message convey?

Widdowson clears the implications of the nature of language and its function and purpose in the society. Language is essentially a social phenomenon. It serves a social purpose. It codifies the aspects of reality that society intends to control in some way. Language is socially sanctioned representation of the external world. Without such a representation, external world will be a chaos without human control. In the beginning was the word.

The language provides the codification and the members of the society accept the codification. It provides them a necessary sense of security. Widdowson says:

Reality is under control because they share a common attitude towards it by sharing a common means of communication. Communication can only take place if there are commotional accepted ways of looking at the world. But now we come to the important point: because people as members of a society accept a conventional view of reality as a social convenience, it does not follow that as individuals they are not aware of reality beyond that which their language represents. Indeed, the existence of religion and art is evidence that they are very much aware of reality beyond the bounds of common communication and social sanction. Social conventions supply people’s need in so far as
they are members of society, but they have needs as individuals which such conventions by their very nature are incapable of satisfying. Every society has some form of art and some form of religion, and these serve as a necessary outlet for individual attitudes whose expression would otherwise disrupt the ordered pattern of reality which society promotes and upon which its survival depends. Art and religion are recognition that there is other reality apart from that which is, as it were, officially recommended. What, then, is the nature of this reality? (quoted in Weber, J.J, 1996:144)\(^2\)

According to Widdowson, the first thing to notice is that it is both a part of conventional reality and apart from it. He illustrates with the consideration of religion which deals with such contradictions as mortal–immortal, present–absent, divine–human, animate–inanimate etc.

What literature, and indeed all art, does is to create patterns out of deviations from normality and these patterns then represent a different reality from that represented by the conventional code. In so doing, literature gives formal expression to the individual’s awareness of a world beyond the reach of communal communication.

Now one more question is significant and that is related to the kinds of patterning which occur in literary texts and the meanings they convey. Widdowson illustrates this by analyzing a poem. The patterns are recognized in a whole text as such. The patterns are often in a hierarchical arrangement the smaller being the constituents of the larger ones. The types of patterns can be identified by selecting from different levels. Widdowson analyses Wilfred Owen’s a short poem ‘Futility’ to show how to discover the patterns of language and reality represented in the poem. First, he picks on features in the text which appeal to first impression as unusual or striking in some way and then explores their ramifications. The word ‘sun’ relates three distinct processes – animate, inanimate and at times neither. Secondly the poem has two passages the first line of both is imperative but the first means ‘order’, however the second means ‘appeal’. The shift represents
‘transition’. The words ‘morning’ and ‘snow’ occur in identical syntactic environment and both function as temporal locatives. This is an example of equivalence.

The word ‘once’ illustrates ambiguity. Does it occur once or recur again and again. The last three sentences of the text are interrogative in form, and are, therefore, in some degree of syntactic equivalence and yet differ in ‘illocutionary force’. Widdowson observes a shift from rationality to the complexity of the sun as animate, inanimate or neither. The poet recognizes different implications.

1.3. Critique of Stylistics

Stylistics, however, has been considered to be neither a part of linguistics nor of literary criticism, some feel stylistics is only a sub-branch of literary criticism. Further, because of its interdisciplinarity, it is questioned whether stylistics could be regarded as anything other than a method. And because of its eclecticism, it is also questioned whether it contained any ideological, and theoretical foundations. Sinclair, in particular, points out that it has neither established as a sound theoretical position of its own, nor grafted itself securely found to either of its parent discipline (2004, p-51). The Fowler-Bateson debate discussed the alleged discrepancy between rigorous descriptiveness and literary sensibility. Stanley Fish and Michel Toolan debate, over the status of interpretation, is an illustration of the issue as objectivity is an illusion in stylistics.

Affective Stylistics

Stanley Fish, an American critic and stylistician appreciate the reader-response criticism as affective stylistics. Affective stylistics came around to be identified as one of the two varieties of a major branch of stylistics, namely, literary stylistics and expressive stylistics. Whereas expressive stylistics is writer/speaker oriented, that is, focuses on style as purely the representation of the personality of the author, affective stylistics is reader/hearer-oriented i.e. its focus is on the consumers.

According to Fish (1970), in affective stylistics, the stylisticians rely primarily upon his or her affective responses to stylistic elements in the text. Here, the literary text is not formally self-sufficient; it comes alive through the interpretative strategy that the
reader deploys. Hence he used to analyze the developing responses of the reader in relation to the words as they succeed are another in the text. The work and its result are one and the same thing; what a text is and what it does.

Stylistics was born as a reaction to the subjectivity and impression of literary studies. For the appreciative raptures of the impressionistic critic, stylistician purports to substitute precise and rigorous linguistic descriptions and to proceed from those descriptions to interpretations for which they can claim a measure of objectivity. Stylistic, in short, is an attempt to put criticism on a scientific basis.

Stanley Fish points out a serious defect in the procedures of stylistics, the absence of any constraint on the way in which one moves from descriptions to interpretation, with the result that any interpretation one puts forward is arbitrary.

Ohmann too attempted to correlate the syntax and the ‘conceptual orientation’ as he believed that this correlation is one of the main justifications for studying style. But Halliday observes that since there is no warrant for that connection in the grammar, he appropriates, there is no constraint on the manner in which he makes it, and therefore his interpretations will be as arbitrary and unverifiable as those of the most impressionistic of critics.

Fish’s comment on Thorne J.P. makes the issue very much clear that the task of stylistics is to construct a typology that would match up grammatical structures with the effects they invariably produce: “if terms like “loose”, or “terse”, or “emphatic” have any significance--- and surely they do --- it must be because they relate to certain identifiable structural properties” (Thorne 1970:188-189). Fish then examines M.A.K. Halliday’s findings and makes the following observations: unit, structure, class, and system are four categories: unit and structure are syntagmatic categories. Class and system are categories of choice i.e. paradigmatic axis of selection.

In addition, Halliday introduces three scales of abstraction which link the categories to each other and to the language data. They are rank, exponence, and delicacy. The scale of rank refers to the operation of units within the structure of another unit: a clause, for example may operate in the structure of another clause; or of a group,
or even of a word, and these would be first, second and third degree rank shifts, respectively. Exponence, is the scale by which the abstractions of the system relate to the data. The scale of delicacy is the degree of depth at which the descriptive act is performed.

Halliday adopts Karl Buhler’s model with some modifications viz., ideational, interpersonal and textual functions. Halliday accepts multi functionalism and its implications “each sentence embodies all functions--- and most constituents of sentences also embody more than one function” (Halliday quoted in Weber, J.J 1996: 61). Fish, therefore, says:

the result is that while the distinctions one can make with the grammar are minute and infinite. They are also meaningless, for they refer to nothing except the categories of the system that produced them, categories which are themselves unrelated to anything outside their circle except by an arbitrary act of assertion. It follows, then, that when this grammar is used to analyze a text, it can legitimately do nothing more than provide labels for its constituents, which is exactly what Halliday does to a sentence from Through the Looking Glass: it’s a poor sort of memory that only works backwards. When a text is run through Halliday’s machine, its parts are first disassembled then labeled, and finally recombinied into their original form. The procedure is a complicated one, and it requires a great many operations, but the critic who performs them has finally done nothing at all. (Fish in J.J. Weber 1996: 101)

According to Fish, Halliday’s analysis of The Inheritors is fixed and arbitrary as what Milic, Ohmann and Thorne do with theirs. Fish’s main quarrel is with the procedure of the stylisticians that the procedures are arbitrary and without constraints on that interpretation of data. However, the main objection of Fish is:
I have been arguing all along that the goal of the stylisticians is impossible but my larger objection is that it is unworthy, for it would deny to man the most remarkable of his abilities, the ability to give the world meaning rather than to extract a meaning that is already there. (Fish in J.J. Weber 1996: 105)\textsuperscript{54}

Fish then finally states,

In short, I am calling not for the end of stylistics but for a new stylistics, what I have termed elsewhere, an affective stylistics, in which the focus of attention is shifted from the spatial context of a page and its observable regularities to the temporal context of a mind and its experiences. (1996: 104)\textsuperscript{55}

Fish proposes that interpretative acts are what are being described. His focus is on reader’s response and his interpretative activity.

\subsection*{1.4. Literary Linguistics}

The concept of style has been in trouble in modern times. The change was that it is used without knowing its meaning. Subjectivity or arbitrariness is the factor associated with style. Michael Toolan outlines the background of outdoor literary and linguistic studies that have influence on style, stylistics, literature and linguistics. After Derrida, all types of binarities are vulnerable to deconstruction. Many recent studies argue quite explicitly for the need to attend a new observed phenomena of linguistic behaviour, in all their seemingly chaotic diversity, and notwithstanding the difficulties for modeling and description that this involves. Michael Toolan tells of two problems of literature—that literature is essentially different from ordinary language use, and that it is non–paraphrasable. Neither of these can be plausibly defended today without substantial reformulation.
Lodge’s important amendments to Jakobson’s claims are worth holding in mind: thoroughly massage–focused literature is literary language at its most material and metaphorical, but a great deal of literature is (read as) less thoroughly self–focused, more other focused, more conventionally referential, communicative, and to use the Jakobsonian term, metonymical. Mention may be made here of Attridge’s excellent reassessment of Jakobson’s seminal ‘Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics’, and the commitment there in to ‘objective’ explanations of poetic language. Regarding ‘functions’ and functionalism, Attridge notes, “the avoidance of any appeal to the reader, and to the values or expectations he or she brings to the text, is part of a wider illusion of the cultural determination of literature itself, in its many changing and differently interpreted forms, though the word ‘function’ remains like the ghost of these excluded possibilities” (Attridge in J.J. Weber 1996: 40-41)56.

1.2.8.0. Style and the Bi–planar model of Language

The bi–planar model of language propounds that two essential levels in language production and description are those of surface linguistic forms (morphological/phonological) and underlying semantic contexts. A general principle is asserted, namely, that surface forms are systematically and predictably relatable to underlying abstract semantic contexts. The new twentieth century science of linguistics is bi–planar to its Saussurean roots and is now experiencing a painful resisted process of demythologizing.

According to Harris, the assumptions of contemporary language myth are that language is telementational in function (that words convey speaker its thought, along the linguistic channel, to hearer B), and that this telementation is guaranteed by the fact a language is a fixed code (the thoughts in the various heads of members of a language community are firmly linked to the verbal symbols in use, thanks to a fixed collective code). Such an idea is responsible for the view that human linguistic activity is machine like. Harris insists upon the routine unexpectedness of language use, its everyday creativity and the cotemporal integratedness of verbal and nonverbal activity.

Harris emphasises on integrational linguistics thus,
The basic principle which an integrational linguistics will be concerned to give adequate expression to is that language is continuously created by the interaction of individuals in specific communication situations. It is this interaction which confers relevance upon the participants past experience with words; and not an orthodox linguistics would have us believe, past experience (that is to say mastery of ‘the language’) which determines the communicational possibilities of their present introduction. If language is a game at all, it is a game we mostly make up as we go along. It is a communication game in which there is no referee, and the only rule that cannot be bent says that players shall improvise as best they can. An integrational linguistics would be concerned with the analysis of this improvisation as a function, simultaneously of relevant past experience and a current communication situation. It would however, give priority to the latter. What is important from an integrational perspective is not so much the fund of past linguistic experience as the individual’s adaptive use of it to meet the communication requirements of the present. (Harris 1981: 167,187 quoted in Weber)\textsuperscript{57}

Taylor, T. exposes the foundation of bi–planar linguistics and the works of Bally, Jakobson and Riffarterre to the generativist stylisticians, and concludes, “The guiding principle throughout the development of structural stylistics has been linguistic reductionism. This principle holds that the effects produced in verbal communication have their causal source in observable features of the expression place,” (Taylor, T., 1980:104). Taylor, T. urges that stylisticians adopt a new concept of communication that our perception and interpretation of speech events are heavily influenced by situational, experiential, emotional, and social factors. So that:
The result is a rather curious cause effect study where the cause is supposed to be observable, but the identification of the effect remains a question of guesswork, tradition, and some rather autocratic theory–making. The empirical study of how language ‘gives’ us what we get in communication continues to be frustrated by the impossibility of analyzing just what it is we all do indeed ‘get’. (Ibid: 106)\footnote{58}

All models which claim to identify and predict fixed correlations between form and meaning in language behavior tend towards error. Michael Toolan claims that there are no independent grounds for predicting meanings: these are always, from an integrationalist perspective, context–bound, individual–bound, and provisional. Analysis may, therefore, need to be content with reporting and understanding (apparent) uses. Relatedly, any stylistic theory of reading is doomed if it claims to capture, prescribe, or predict on the basis of what a particular stylistician ‘does and thinks’. Edward Sapir’s theory has been echoed in the definition of culture as what a society does and thinks, and emphasizes that stylistics itself is a cultural activity and a culture–bound practice. According to Michael Toolan, a stylistics model is a way of reading, and is a partial or contingent as any written grammar or dictionary. He further adds that a stylistic reading is in part, an artefact shaped by the adopted model and theory; but there is no alternative to this. There is no absolute or essential reading of a particular literary work, since there are no absolute context–free models or theories. Interpretation and persuasion are always at work. The case has been succinctly proposed by Paul. B. Armstrong as:

The presuppositions of any interpretive method are both enabling and limiting. They give us vantage point from which to construct the work – a specific place of observation, without which knowing would be impossible. They also furnish a set of expectations with which to pose questions to work that would otherwise remain silent and they provide guidance and inspiration as we begin to make
guesses. But presuppositions are at the same time limiting because in opening up a work in a particular way they close off other potential modes of access. Every interpretative approach reveals something only by disguising something else that a competing method with different assumptions might disclose. (Armstrong 1983:343 quoted in Weber)\textsuperscript{59}

Thus, Fish and Armstrong appeal to the notion of the ‘interpretive community’ as a ground for justification.

1.2.8.1. Literary Linguistics and its Critics

The weaknesses in deferent approaches to stylistics have been noted in the recent works of Roger Fowler (1975) and (1979). It has been made very clear that the close study of the language features of a text may often be valuable to the literary critic, but such study can never supplant interpretation and criticism more broadly conceived. The features cannot be canonized as absolutes and are subject to contextual variations and influences affecting the textual form. Recently Fish (1980) has fully exposed the subjectivity of the stylisticians and their procedures. Fish criticizes Milic (1967), Ohmann (1971, 1972) and Thorne (1965, 1970) for its fondness for mentalist and interpretative leaps. Fish argues that transformational grammar is particularly conducive of bad stylistics: “For since its formalisms operate independently of semantic and psychological processes (are neutral between production and reception) they can be assigned any semantic or psychological value one may wish them to carry” (p.99). Fish finds in Halliday the unproven assumptions that ‘syntactic preferences correlate with habits of meaning’ and that the yoking of grammar to interpretation is not arbitrary. Fish advocates ‘affective’ stylistics as it is the reader and his assumption manipulate the text and never the reverse. Fish’s reader is engaged, active and responsible. The text is given interpretative shape not by individual but by community property. They are sustained or authorized by ‘interpretive communities’ made up of ‘those who share interpretive strategies not for reading but for writing texts for constituting their properties’ (Fish 1980:14).
Steven Mailloux articulates the shift in his own thinking as well as that of Fish.

It is true that reader–response criticism claims to approximate closely the content of reading experiences that are always assumes to pre–exist the critical performance. But what in fact takes place is quite different: the critical performance fills those reading experiences with its own interpretive moves. Like all critical approaches, reader response criticism is a set of interpretive connections that constitutes what it claims to describe. (Mailloux 1979: 107 quoted in Weber)

Fish’s text *Is There a Text in This Class?* Looks an extended discussion of the nature of interpretative communities which his theory requires. Cain, W. has objection to Fish: “His theory lacks a potentially charged vocabulary which would reveal ‘interpretation’ to be a system of difficult, even violent, exchanges, with forced entrances of new communities and exclusions of old ones” (1981: 86). Fish writes, ‘here I assert that the act of description is itself interpretive and that therefore at no point is the stylistician even within hailing distance of a fact that has been independently (that is, objectively) specified’ (1980:246). Michael Toolan, however, points out:

Fish highly argues that the stylisticians focus on a particular phonological or syntactical pattern is itself an interpretive act. As I hope to have suggested, this in itself does not --- an overwhelming argument to stop doing stylistics unless a) that interpretive act is shown to be ----- or ill grounded, or b) more coherent interpretative acts are presented, and preferably both. (quoted in Weber)

Michael Toolan further evaluates the framework of Stanley Fish as:

No such moves are made in the book under discussion. We are reminded that any description we offer is an imposed interpretation, that responses are occasional by
interpretative frameworks which themselves are products, nor ‘real’ objective --- - sources, because they are no such things. No more than Archimedes can he find one firm spot on which to stand so as to move the earth. To the troubled question ‘what, then, is interpretation an interpretation of?’ (Ibid)\(^{62}\)

Fish cheerfully assures us, ‘we cannot finally know the answer: we must (will, inevitably) carry on, not quite as before, more aware that we are necessarily interpreting interpreter’ (Toolan, in J.J. Weber 1996:13). Fish raises the question of interpretative groundings from a Whorfian perspective. Dillon argues that stylisticians make a claim which roughly parallels a Whorfian one, namely that analyzing the structure of a literary work can yield insight into the way the work conceptualizes experience(or “the world of the poem”)(Dillon 1982:73)\(^{63}\).

The first thing Dillon comprises is that neither Whorfinnism nor stylistics is so mechanical or arbitrary a procedure as Fish pretends. Intrinsic to these efforts of generalization will be varying conclusions due to varying interpretative assumptions: “the characterization of the unique function of speaking is as much a product of the interpreter’s art as the characterization of the culture’s world view. This art in both instances is largely interpretation and cannot be reduced a method” (Ibid: 74).

Dillon rightly dismisses the idea that stylistics can be a discovery procedure for finding interpretations or a means of validating an interpretation, and suggests that such imagined scientific purposes-discovery; validation- would not be applied to this activity.

One engages in formal analysis to specify and articulate one’s own response and perhaps share it with others. The proper response to a successful piece of stylistic analysis would be ‘I see’ and not ‘you have proved your point’. (Ibid: 75).
1.5. Assumptions

The forgoing discussion helps to form the following assumptions:

1- Style is conceived variously as choice, variation, recurring pattern, and saying the same thing differently.

2- Stylistics is developed as an interdiscipline of language and literature studies.

3- T.S. Eliot’s The Waste Land has always been in critical debate for its rich and innovative style.

4- Style and Stylistics has a special relevance for the teaching of poetry.

1.6. Objectives

Therefore, the research project aims:

1- To make a useful and effective review of style in poetry.

2- To know the development of Stylistics as an interdiscipline of language and literature studies.

3- To attempt a Stylistic analysis of T.S. Eliot’s The Waste Land using an eclectic framework.

4- To know the relevance of style and stylistics for the teaching of poetry.

1.7. Major Thinkers in Stylistics


**F.de Saussure**, a Swedish linguist has left an immense impact on modern linguistics due to his concept of language as structure and four dichotomies of language namely system-evolution, langue-parole, syntagmatic-paradigmatic, and signifier-
signified. A central element of Saussure’s theory of language is his concept of the sign. His principles of language as binarity, arbitrariness and creativity have set a new direction for language study. According to Saussure meaning does not reside in the individual sign, but in the general system of oppositions of which the sign is a part. Saussure observed the relationship of choice and the relationship of chain as basic in constituting a structure of language. His seminal text *A Course in General Linguistics* is the source of reference for the students of Stylistics.

**Roman Jakobson**, a Russian linguist and a key figure of Moscow Linguistic Circle, and also one of the founders of Prague Linguistic Circle has made seminal contributions to the growth of structural thinking. Jakobson modified Bühler’s tri-partite model of communication. Bühler’s (1934) model comprised of three factors- the addresser, the addressee, and the message. Jakobson (1960) added three additional factors, namely context, contact, and code.

Jakobson ascribed a communicative function to each communicative aspect, such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Addresser</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Referential)</em></td>
<td><em>(Emotive)</em></td>
<td><em>(Poetic)</em></td>
<td><em>(Conative)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Phatic)</em></td>
<td><em>(Metalingual)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dominant function of the verbal art is centered on the message itself that is the poetic function. However, orientation set toward a particular function shall highlight
the concerned function in the event of communication. Jakobson’s work on ‘Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances’ (1956) is central to Stylistics, where he talks of metaphor and metonymy, similarity and contiguity. According to Jakobson, the metaphoric principle is closely associated with the poetic function of language, and the metonymic principle is characteristic of the referential function of language. However, Jakobson has been criticized for disregarding the function of the formal features and structures with no consequence to the poetic effect of the text.

M. A. K. Halliday is the founder of the functional branch of Linguistics known as Systemic Functional Linguistics as well as of social semiotics, the broader field. Halliday, who is influenced by B. K. Malinovasky and J. R. Firth, views language as a social phenomenon, and proposes a descriptive theory of language, which focuses on language in use. Halliday claims that language is a purposeful behavior, and the most basic function of language is to create meaning in different contexts. According to Halliday, language has developed to construct or construe three major types of meaning simultaneously: ideational, interpersonal, and textual meaning—referred to as the three metafunctions of language. Metafunction means whenever we use language we make not just one kind of meaning but three kinds of meaning simultaneously. It is central to Halliday that meaning is always made in context. Therefore, a text needs to be analyzed in its contexts; and the context itself is in the text. The most central idea of Halliday is that language does not represent but constructs/construes meaning. It means the linguistic choices themselves actively ‘construe’ these meanings. His most famous research article is ‘Linguistic Function and Literary Style: an inquiry into the language of William Golding’s The Inheritors (1971). In this article, Halliday shows transitivity patterns of processes and characterizes the behavior of the characters either dominant or subservient and ineffective. Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics has occupied a central place in the discipline of Stylistics, discourse analysis and educational linguistics. His Introduction to Functional Grammar is the seminal text of systemic functional linguistics.
Michel Toolan is a British stylistician and integrational linguist, who has special interest in narrative analysis and Corpus Stylistics. Toolan brings together notions from narratological circles and the linguistic concerns that characterize stylistics.

H. G. Widdowson is the applied linguist, who has contributed Practical Stylistics to the Discipline of Stylistics. He has published on Stylistics of poetry with a special focus on Pedagogical Stylistics. He has played a major role in establishing Stylistics as a discipline, which mediates dynamically between Linguistics and Literary Criticism. He explains the points of intersection between stylistics and literary criticism, and identifies the significance of particular uses of language.

Roger Fowler has been associated with the Fowler- Bateson controversy, a debate over a confrontation between the new discipline of Stylistics and the well-established field of literary Criticism. Bateson dismissed the idea that linguistics may offer just description to the Literary critic, however, Fowler argued for the potential fruitfulness of interdisciplinarity which he called ‘linguistic criticism’. After 1970s, he shifted to Halliday’s model of functional linguistics, and he becomes one of the first stylisticians to embrace Bakhtinian ideas in his writing. He was more focused to the relations between language and social meaning, and proposed new kind of Linguistics called as ‘Critical Linguistics’.

Geoffrey N. Leech has been working on various areas of language in English literature. He has been known for A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry which is a landmark in early stylistic approaches to poetry. He keeps “an ear open for readerly matters of interpretation and affect” (Carter and Stockwell 2008:60). Leech has furthered the theory of foregrounding and he calls his book Language in Literature: Style and Foregrounding (2008), ‘as a small collection of articles on “Practical Stylistics” (2008: VIII)

Mick Short co-authored with G. Leech, the most influential book Style in Fiction (1981, 2nd ed. 2007). His special contribution is for the analysis of the language of narrative fiction and a model of discourse presentation whose influence goes beyond Stylistics.
Katie Wales’s work covers a variety of fields, such as stylistics of poetry, language of James Joyce, Shakespeare’s language, and critical discourse analysis. Her Dictionary of Stylistics (2001, 2nd ed.) is a landmark and an important reference for any stylistician.

Deirdre Burton has interest in discourse analysis, stylistics, linguistic theory, and stylistics of modern drama. She is known for her article ‘Through Glass Darkly: Through Dark Glasses’ (1980).

In Stylistics, Ronald Carter’s main interest is in the relationship between language, creativity, and pedagogical stylistics. He is also editor of Language and Literature: Reade. One of his claims is that attention to language and language use is crucial for the identification of creativity. Creativity can be associated with both writing and speaking. Carter dismisses the distinction between literary and non-literary language. He suggests that literature should be seen as continuum on a cline of literariness.

1.8. Conclusion

From the above review, it becomes clear that the study of style is the preoccupation of stylistics. Stylistics can be approached from different perspectives. The basic objective of stylistics is to reveal how language is used to expose what is expressed in a given text. Stylistics adopts a multidisciplinary approach to achieve its goals. It examines language use in different contexts in order to determine the style, purpose, meanings, etc and overall merit of a particular work. With the techniques of Stylistics at one’s disposal, one will be able to evaluate any instance of language use with respect to its content and form.

In short, Stylistics enables one to interact meaningfully well with a text. It opens one’s mind to the various dimensions of a particular literary or non-literary text/work. It is a discipline which is relevant to all activities which rely on the use of language. Through the knowledge of Stylistics, the knowledge of textual appreciation increases. Thus, Stylistics makes one an informed observer and analyst of language use in the process of negotiating meaning.