Chapter 2
Theories Relating to the Text Analysis and the Language of Literature
2.0. Theoretical Issues:

2.1. Russian Formalism

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

The disciples and followers of this movement were called 'formalists'. Formalism was interpreted as a pejorative term which implies limitations. At first, the opponents of the movement of Russian Formalism applied the term 'Formalism'
derogatively because of its focusing on the formal pattern and technical devices of literature and the exclusion of its subject matter and social value (Cuddon 1998).

From its inception, the Russian formalist movement consisted of two distinct scholarly groups, the first is the ‘Moscow Linguistic Circle’ which was founded in 1915 by Roman Jakobson, Grigorii Vinokur and Petr Bogatyrev. The second group was called Petersburg Opayaz which came into existence a year later (1916) and was known for scholars such as Victor Shklovskii, Iurii Tynianov, Boris Eikhenbaum, Boris Tomashevskii and Victor Vinogradov. They sought to place the study of literature on a scientific basis and made it systematic. Their investigation concentrated on the language and the formal devices of literary work.

Rice & Waugh (2001) and Enkvist (1973) demonstrate that Russian Formalism is often considered similar to American New Criticism because of their identical emphasis on close reading, and their treatment of the literary text as a discrete entity whose meaning and interpretation need not be contaminated by authorial intention, historical conditions or ideological demands. However, the Russian formalists regard themselves as the developers of a science of criticism and were more interested in the discovery of a systematic method for the analysis of poetic texts. Russian Formalism emphasizes a differential definition of literature as opposed to the new critical isolation and objectification of the single text. They were also more emphatic on their rejection of mimetic/expressive account of the text. Indeed, Russian formalists rejected entirely the idea of the text as reflecting an essential unity, which is ultimately of moral or humanistic significance. The central focus of their analysis was
not so much on literature per se, but literariness, which makes a given text ‘literary’. In this sense they sought to uncover the system of literary discourse and the systematic arrangement of language which makes literature possible. Their interest in literary texts was tended to center on the functioning of literary devices rather than on content. It focuses on the study of signification in a literary text and they regard Literariness as an effect of form.

Shklovsky’s pioneer essay ‘Art as Technique/Devices’ (1965) is regarded one of the first contributions to the movement. In this essay, he develops the key concept of defamiliarization. Literary language makes strange or defamiliarizes habituated perception and ordinary language. Russian formalists were the romantics who viewed literary studies in the light of the differences between ordinary and literary language. The ordinary language has a referential context and the meanings it generates are denotative whereas the language of literary text is fictive and the meanings it conveys are connotative. They think that the main purpose of arts is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known. The technique of arts is to make objects unfamiliar, to make forms difficult and to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged.

One of the most important implications of this view of the literary text is that it logically entails a view of literature as a rational system rather than an absolute or self-contained one and a system that is bound to change through history. Literary devices cannot remain strange for all time, they too become automatized, fail to retard and break up ordinary perception, so
that literature constantly has to produce new defamiliarizational devices to avoid perception. Such a view must see literary tradition as discontinuity where breaks and displacements in form and formal devices continually renew the system. This aspect of the view of the Russian formalists has proved to be very fertile ground for latter transformation in critical practice. Later, some other literary theories were influenced by the ideas of formalism. For example, Marxists adopted the method of formalists in their analysis of literature as a means of defamiliarizing ideologies. Similarly, Structuralism and Post-Structuralism follow the formalists' techniques in their exploration of inter-textuality. In the object of enquiry as that of 'literariness', formalists gave a systematic inflection to the study of literature, one that went beyond intrinsic study of the individual text. Russian Formalism had as well influences on some new American schools of criticism which later adopted some formalist assumptions. In this regard, McCauley (1997) mentions that Post Structuralism and Deconstruction in the 1970s and 1980s extended certain formalist assumptions. Scholars as Roland Barthes, Paul de Man, Julia Kristiva, and Fredric Jameson are all heavily indebted to the aims and strategies of Russian Formalism.

To conclude, it may be said that Russia is the place where Formalism originated and developed. Formalism was discarded by 1930 because of the Stalinist and Social Marxist pressure on the individuals involved. Some of its prominent figures migrated to Czechoslovakia and there they developed a very prominent school in linguistics that is called Prague School.
2.2. Prague School

Gravin (1964) shares the opinion that Moscow Linguistic Circle was formed in 1951 and Russian Formalism flourished during 1915-1930. In the initial stage, the members of the circle were preoccupied with problems concerning the language of literature and tried to build up a science of literature. As a result of the political changes in the Soviet Union, some of its members moved out and worked in several places in Europe. One such city was Prague which became the centre of the Prague School Theory of Linguistics. It represents the work of many scholars such as Roman Jakobson, Trubetzkoy and others. The time from 1929 to 1939 were known as the golden years of the Prague School.

Twentieth-century Semiotics and Structuralism emerged simultaneously from the same source. The first systematic formulation of Semiotic Structuralism came from scholars of the Prague Linguistic Circle (PLC) who are now known as the Prague School linguists. The PLC was founded in 1926 by Vilém Mathesius who used to be a director of the English seminar at Charles University and his colleagues such as Roman Jakobson, Bohuslav Havránek, Bohumil Trnka and Jan Mathesius. They forged to give the group an organized form and a clear theoretical direction. The PLC counted among its members such prominent scholars as Jan Mukarovský, Nikolia Trubetzkoy, Sergej Karcevskij, Peter Bogatyrjov, and Dmitrij Cyzevskyj. Russian scholars, who used to be members of the formalist groups, represented a substantial contingent for the Prague School. For example, in the 1930s the younger scholars, such as. Rene Wellek, Felix Vodicka, Jiri Veltruský, Jaroslav Prusek, and Josef Vachek joined it. Similarly, many visiting linguists as Edmund
Husserl, Rudolf Carnap, Boris Tomasevskij, Emile Benveniste, and others presented papers in the circle (Lubomir:1997). Vachek (1964) mentions that the Prague school gave birth to the theory of functional style that is regarded one of the greatest contributions of the Prague school. The opponents of this school unified Formalism and Saussarian Linguistics and came up with the hybrid concept of 'Structuralism'. Roman Jakobson pursued the study of aesthetic communicative function of artistic expression and the emphasis on foregrounding procedures even after he settled in the U.S.A and started working with Chomsky and Halle. Trubetzkoy's theory of oppositions as natural divisions of phonological oppositions pursued by Roman Jakobson and Halle led to the theory of 'distinctive features' which has become a part of generative phonology. Distinctive feature, as Crystal (1985) puts it, refers to a minimal contrastive unit recognized by some linguists as a means of explaining how the sound system of language is organized. Distinctive features may be seen as either a part of the definition of phoneme or as an alternative to the notion of the phoneme. The first of these views is found in the approach of the Prague School where the phoneme is seen as a bundle of phonetic distinctive features; the English phoneme /p/, for example, can be seen as the result of the contribution of the features of bilabialness, voicelessness, and plosiveness. Similarly, the phoneme /b/ has a bunch of distinctive features as being voiced, bilabial and plosive.

Notions like 'neutralization' and 'archiphoneme' are also the contributions of the Prague School. Neutralization according to Richard & et al (1992) is the process which takes place when two distinctive sounds (phonemes) in a language are no longer distinctive (i.e., in contrast). This usually occurs in particular
positions in a word. For example, in German /t/ and /d/ are neutralized at the end of a word. Rad "wheel" and Rat "advice" are both pronounced /ra:t/. Archiphoneme refers to the way of handling the problem of neutralization. Nokolia Trubetskoy propounds this term to refer to the way of transcribing the neutralized phonemes with different symbols. A capital letter is sometimes used. For example, the two above mentioned neutralized German words are transcribed as /raT/ and /raD/. These are alternative ways of analyzing the problem of neutralization.

There is another theory that has been developed by many scholars in the later years of the Prague School. That is, the theory of 'markedness'. This theory was applied phonologically as marked and unmarked oppositions. Such as, /b/ is marked but /p/ is unmarked in terms of voicing. Certain linguistic elements that are basic, natural and frequent are unmarked whereas the others are marked. This view has been extended to the other levels too. For example in English, verbs ending in -ed are marked and other are unmarked. In lexis, for instance, the word 'bitch' is marked but 'dog' is unmarked. In all languages the unmarked ones have a wide range of occurrence. Thus the contribution of Prague School Theory is significant in many linguistic areas such as stylistics, sociolinguistics, and pragmatics.

2.3. New Criticism

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

Eagleton (1983) points out that the advocates of this theory in that epoch were opposed to the prevailing interest of scholars, critics and teachers in the biographies of authors, the social context of literature and literary history. They insist that the proper and prime concern of literary criticism is not with the external circumstances or effect or historical position of a work, but with a detailed consideration of the work itself as an independent entity.

The scholars associate with the New Criticism or rather new critics addressed themselves to the work of art and close reading of the text. Their honest and sensitive criticism was directed to the poetry itself not to the poet. Their analysis of a literary text was not concerned with the historical or sociological aspects of the age in which the particular poetry was written. Abrams (2001) summaries the attitudes of the new critics regarding their theory as follows:
1- The new critics believe that a poem should be treated as such in Eliot's words "primarily poetry and not another thing". In analyzing and evaluating a particular work, they usually do not refer to the biography of the author, to the social conditions at the time of its production, or to its psychological and moral effects on the reader. They also tend to minimize recourse to the history of the literary genres and subject matter. Because of this critical focus on the literary work in isolation from its attendant circumstances and effects, New Criticism is often classified as a type of critical Formalism.

2- The distinction between literary genres, although casually recognized, is not essential in the New Criticism. The basic components of any work of literature whether lyric, narrative or dramatic are conceived to be words, images and symbols rather than character, thought and plot.

3- The New Criticism has the assumption that literature is conceived to be a special kind of language whose characteristics are recognized by the systematic opposition to the language of science and of logical discourse, and the key concepts of this criticism deal mainly with the meanings and interactions of words, figures of speech and symbols. Brooks (1947) emphasizes the organic unity not separation of structure and meaning.

4- The distinctive procedure of the new critic is explication, or close reading: the detailed and subtle analysis of the complex interrelations and ambiguities (multiple meanings) of the component elements within a work. They derive their explicative procedure from such books as I. A. Richards
'Practical Criticism' (1929) and William Empson's 'Seven types of Ambiguity' (1930).

2.4. Practical Criticism

Practical Criticism, which is also called applied criticism or even descriptive criticism, can be defined as an effort to analyze specific passages of a prose or a poem bringing out what is indicated in the choice and arrangement of words, images, and describing accurately what a reader feels about them. Abrams outlines the main concern of practical criticism as follows:

Practical Criticism concerns itself with the discussion of particular works and writers; in an applied critique, the theoretical principles controlling the mode of the analysis, interpretation, and evaluation are often left implicit, or brought in only as the occasions demands.

(Abrams2001: 50)

Practical Criticism is distinguished from a purely impressionistic criticism where the reader or the critic is interested only in being faithful to his own response. That means what impressions and sensations the poem or the passage under investigation calls upon him. In general, Criticism can be bound into four main kinds:

1- Mimetic Criticism:

It is derived from Plato and Aristotle. It gives primacy to the work of art as an imitation or representation of the external world and human life.

2- Pragmatic Criticism:

It views the work as something which is constructed in order to achieve certain effect on the audience such as aesthetic
pleasure, instruction or kinds of emotion. In other words, the emphasis is shifted to the reader: how far and how successfully certain desired effects are produced on the reader of a poem by the devices the poet employs.

3- Expressive Criticism:

This kind of criticism puts its emphasis on the writer. It defines poetry as an expression or overflow or utterance of feelings or as the product of the poet’s imagination operating on his perception, thoughts and feelings. It tends to judge the work by its sincerity or its adequacy to the poet’s individual vision or state of mind. This kind of criticism often seeks in the work evidences of the particular temperament and experience of the author who has, consciously or unconsciously, revealed himself in it.

4- Objective Criticism:

It cuts the poem off from its creator and the world that one knows. It looks upon a work of art as something autonomous, sufficient into itself and as an object that can be understood and interpreted in terms of its own laws of organization and its intrinsic qualities such as coherence and interrelationship of parts, etc (Ibid).

Practical Criticism appeared as a revolution against the impressionism and subjectivity of literary criticism. The poets and critics who revolted against it tried to turn the attention of the reader from the poet to the poem. Thus, there emerged what is called 'Practical Criticism'. T. S. Eliot, I. A. Richards and William Empson were the eminent figures of this approach.
I. A. Richards, as one of the pioneers of Practical Criticism, was interested in the psychology of reading and his approach to the literature was empirical and not theoretical. He made experiment by giving unsigned poems to undergraduate students and asked them to comment on the poems. The resulting judgments after analysis were highly variable. Their critical responses were, deeply, entwined with their broader prejudices and beliefs. Richards was, primarily, interested in Practical Criticism and he was also recording what happened to a reader while reading poetry. His experiment shaped Practical Criticism as a powerful weapon of analysis.

Richards (1929) divides meaning into four aspects which he calls sense, feeling, tone, and intention:

**Sense:** It is a conceptual meaning. The writer uses words to focus the readers' attention upon some state of affairs and to present on them some items for consideration.

**Feeling:** It is the emotional attitude of the speaker towards the subject presented by the sense.

**Tone:** It refers to the attitude of the speaker towards the listener.

**Intention:** It is the purpose, conscious or unconscious of the whole utterance and the effect that a writer intends to promote.

The pioneering work of Richards was continued by the British critic William Empson's books 'Seven Types of Ambiguity' (1930) and 'The Structure of Complex Words' (1951). Empson was interested in psychology and explored literary works for the complex state of mind. Hence, he gives the importance to the 'ambiguity' in poetry. He used this term to mean any verbal
nuance, however slight, which gives room for an alternative reaction to the same piece of language. The similarities between Richards' 'irony' and Empson's 'ambiguity' may be perceived when the latter says that ambiguity itself can mean an indecision as to what you mean, an intention to mean several things, a probability that one or other or both the things have been meant, and the fact that a statement has several meanings.

The idea that should be noted down here is that Linguistic/Stylistic Criticism can be regarded as a variety of Practical Criticism in so far as its aim is to make a thorough analysis of the phonogrammatical constituents of a literary work. The discipline of linguistics emphasizes the synchronic study of language, i.e., a study of language in its existing state, and hold that what determines meaning is not that a word refers to the world or ideas and things that exit outside of language. It is the differences between the linguistic signs themselves that create meaning. Such a stand shifted the focus further on the 'message' (of a poetic discourse) for its own sake and prepared the way for Structuralism and Post-Structuralism.

2.5. Structuralism and Post-Structuralism

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

2.5.1. Structuralism

In the beginning of 20th century (1916) the Swiss linguist, Ferdinand de-Saussure in his work 'Course in General Linguistics' which was published posthumously, introduced a new approach to language whereas earlier linguists had been concerned with the history and characteristics of particular language. The credit for bringing a revolution in the field of linguistics goes to him. He is the founder of modern linguistics, or rather the father of structural linguistics which came to be called also descriptive linguistics. Saussure was interested in the structures that underlie all languages. He coined the terms langue (the complete system of language) and parole (the individual utterance which are derived from it). Parole or speech is language in performance, and this is what earlier linguists had concentrated on. But Saussure was interested in the theoretical system that shapes all languages or langue and the result or principles that enables language to exist and function.

It was in the work of Saussure that the movement known as Structuralism has its origin. According to him, language is a system of signs each of which consists of signifier (sound image) and signified (the concept evoked by the signifier). The relationship between signifier and signified from the Saussurean point of view is arbitrary i.e., the link between sound image and concept is a conventional one (generally agreed but not intrinsic) (Harris 1983).
Saussure's ideas influenced literary and cultural criticism in several ways. They permitted structural critics to shift attention away from the relation between texts and world or between texts and meaning towards the study of systematization. They focus on how texts operate logically or systematically, what are the mechanisms that produce meaning, what are the structures that texts possess in themselves and in common with other texts and how they are made up of parts in relation to one another and the like. In this concern, Rice and Waugh mention that langue is more important than parole. They state:

Structuralism is not particularly interested in the meaning per se, but rather in attempting to describe and understand the conventions and modes of signification which make it possible to 'mean'; that is, it seeks to discover the conditions of meaning. So langue is more important than parole—system is more important than individual utterance.

(Rice & Waugh 2001:46).

Peck and Coyle have the same idea when they define Structuralism as "an analytical approach which is less concerned with the unique qualities of any individual example than with structure that underlies the individual examples" (Peck & Coyle 1993: 46).

The other main important point in the work of Saussure is that he makes clear distinction between 'diachronic' and 'synchronic'. Diachronic traces the historical development of the language and record the changes that have taken place in it between successive points in time. The synchronic on the other hand sees language as a living whole, existing as a state at one particular time. This state of language is an accumulation of all
the linguistic elements that a language community engages in during a specific period. Saussure gives priority in linguistics to the synchronic approach because it studies language as a present and living organism.

Saussure, as well, makes a noticeable difference between syntagmatic and paradigmatic relation. Syntagmatic refers to the relations between elements in a linear order. And it is by following this order, the structure of a word or sentence is built up. Paradigmatic means the relation in absentia, i.e. between elements which constitute a pattern or a paradigm of items usable in a certain context. This distinction corresponds to one traditional in associationist psychology and between ideas associated through their contiguity or through their similarity. Jakobson has generalized it in particular to many fields form rhetoric to language pathology.

However for the majority of its early theorists, Structuralism was an essentially formalist method which focused on literature's signifying structures rather than on its content. Just as Saussure emphasized that signs depend on their differential relationship with other elements in the system in order to produce meaning and not on actual entities. It, therefore, follows that a structuralist analysis of literature would not be concerned with the liberal humanist view that the text expresses a truth about the real world. The investigation centers on the literary system (equivalence to langue) as a whole of which the individual text (parole) is a constituent part and governed by the system organizational principles. The author of a text and authorial intention correspondingly decline in priority. The author's role is limited to only in selecting elements from the
pre-existing (already written) system and producing new texts which combine these elements in different ways.

2.5.2. Post-Structuralism

In the 1960s Structuralism, which had dominated French intellectual life since 1950s, began to be replaced by another movement that would be called first Post-Structuralism then Post-Modernism. As mentioned earlier that Structuralism emphasizes orders, structures and rules but Post-Structuralism argues that language is subject to contingency, indeterminacy and the generation of multiple meanings. "Post-Structuralism doubts the adequacy of Structuralism and, as far as literature is concerned, tends to reveal that the meaning of any text is, of its nature unstable. It reveals that signification is, of its nature, unstable" (Cuddon 1998:691). Peck & Coyle expound the central idea of Post-Structuralism in literature by saying that "language is an infinite chain of words which has no extra lingual origin or end" (Peck & Coyle 1993:194-195). To describe this chain Derrida introduces the concept of 'difference' which means that words are defined by their difference from other words. And any meaning is endlessly differed as each word leads us to another word in signifying system. Language only makes sense if the reader imposes a fixed meaning on the words. Readers search for that fixed meaning because they are committed to the idea that there should be referent to a word and that word should make sense in relation to presence outside the text. According to Derrida, however, the text should be seen as an endless stream of signifiers with words only pointing to other words without any final meaning.
The views of Post-Structuralism put aside some concepts such as common sense and reason. And they regard them as merely ordering strategies that the reader imposes on literature. The reader wants to pull the text into his own frame of reference. Writer also attempts to impose ordering strategies on language, but these always prove inadequacy. The form of Criticism that emerges from such thinking is referred to as Deconstruction which is regarded as one of the main facets of Post-Structuralism theory which is used in literary criticism. Deconstruction owes much to the theory of the French philosopher Jacqued Derrida whose essays ‘Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of Human Sciences’ (1970) which he was to follow with his book ‘Of Grammatology’ (1976), began a new critical movement. Deconstruction, so far, has been the most influential feature of Post-Structuralism because it defines a new kind of reading practice which is a key application of Post-Structuralism.

Derrida shows that a text (any text either to be a polemic, a philosophical treatise or a poem) can be read as saying as something can be quite different from what it appears to be saying. And it also may be read as carrying many different things which are fundamentally at variance with, contradictory to and subversive of what may be seen by critics as a single and a stable meaning. A deconstructive criticism of a text reveals that there is nothing except the text. Derrida in his book ‘Of Grammatology’ makes the well known proposition that the text is a thing that one cannot evaluate, criticize or construct a meaning for it by reference to any thing external to it. Derrida carries his logic still further to suggest that the language of any
discourse, is at variance with itself and by so being, is capable of being read as yet another language (Derrida 1976).

One of the Derrida's clearest examples of a deconstructive reading concerns the relation between speeches and writing. Saussure as a phonocentric linguist favors speech as the proper object of linguistic investigation, and writing as a secondary representation or even disguise of speech. He is forced to acknowledge the dangerous usurping power of writing over speech (Harris 1983). Derrida approaches this problem first by confirming historically the priority of voice over letter. Speech is immediate self-present and authentic in that it is uttered by a speaker who hears and understands himself at the moment of speaking; by contrast, writing is the copy of speech and is therefore derivative, marginal and delayed. But having outlined a speech/writing hierarchy in this way, Derrida shows how Saussure's text inverts the hierarchy by giving priority of writing over speech. The inversion of the hierarchy constitutes one half of deconstruction.

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

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

Basically, any text has no existence until it is read. Reader completes its meaning by reading it. The reader is an active agent in the meaning creation. Though the text controls the reader's response, there are nevertheless gaps that the reader must fill in by a creative act.

In 1979, the Italian semiotician and novelist Umberto Eco published 'The Role of Reader', in which he proposes a distinction between what he calls 'open' and 'closed' text. An
open text requires the reader's close and active collaboration in the creation of meaning whereas a closed text more or less determines or predetermines a reader's response. In 'Semiotics of Poetry' (1978) Riffaterre postulates what he describes as the 'super reader', who analyses a text in search for meanings beyond and below surface meanings. Riffaterre believes that the stylistic function of a text can be analyzed objectively. He suggests that the task of stylistician is to reveal what is ungrammatical or in any other way unconventional or abnormal in the way a text is composed.

Fish (1970) discussed the concept of 'affective stylistics'. He concentrated on the psychological effects of a text on the reader: no text is self-contained; the meaning of any utterance is not on the page. Since every linguistic experience affects actively the reader's consciousness, the informed reader's responses (including his errors) comprise the total meaning of an utterance.

The stress on the text provides a certain stimulus and the reader completes the process. It is a form of give and take, a dialogue between the text and the reader. Such view is uncontroversial; they probably match common assumption about how much a text offers and how much a reader contributes.

2.7. Psychoanalytic Theory

Literary critics in the Romantic epoch exposed the relationship between the author's psychology and his work. They regarded literary work as an expression of the psychological state of its creator. This point of view ceased until it appeared again in the 19th century in the writing of Sigmund Freud. In
1896 Freud carried the term 'Psychoanalysis' to characterize the 'talking care' which is a therapeutic method of recovering repressed material from the unconscious. He made use of the terms ego, super ego, id and Oedipus complex in his attempt at psychoanalysis. Freud views the dream house as useful concepts for the analysis of literature. Literature and other arts like dreams and neurotic symptoms consist of imagined or fantasized fulfillment of wishes that are either denied by reality or are prohibited by the social standards of morality and propriety. Freud's comments on the working of the artists' imagination in his work 'Introduction to Psychology' set forth the theoretical framework of what is called 'classical psychological criticism' where the work is read as a symptom of the author who produces it or as an analogous to the relationship between the dreamer and his dream, as if the work is a symptomatic reproduction of the author's infantile and forbidden wishes. Freud theory of criticism had deemed a literary work as an author sublimation of unacceptable desires and a substitute gratification. The example of this criticism is 'The life and Works of Edger Ellen Poe' (1949) for Marie Bonaparte which is conventionally referred to as 'Psychobiography' which was pioneered by Erik Erikson. It (Psychobiography) is concerned with the subject psychological event. It makes a search for and discovery of a writer's intentions and motives.

The psychoanalysts who followed Freud had different trends regarding this theory. Among these critics is Jacques Lacan who interpreted Freud's theory in the light of modern linguistic theory and argued that Freud and his followers had laid stress on the controlling ego (the conscious or thinking self) as separate from id (the repressed impulses of the unconscious).
Peck & Coyle (1993) state that Lacan saw the ego as a carrier of neurosis; there could be no such thing as a coherent, autonomous self. The 'I' can never separate itself from the 'other'. Its image is seen in the mirror through which it comes to know itself and by which enabling its identification and alienation in language and it creates a condition of desire in the split subject. Such thinking struck a chord in the seventies and eighties because it was consistent with the effort of Structuralism, Deconstruction, Marxism and Feminism in its stress on the extent to which the various varieties of Western thinking, such as a coherent or unified sense of the self, were simply historical linguistic and fictional constructs.

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

2.8. Linguistic Stylistics

Stylistics is sometimes called literary stylistics: literary because it tends to focus on literary text; linguistics because of taking its model from linguistics. Halliday propounds the term 'Linguistic Stylistics' as another new name for stylistics. He justifies that the 'Linguistic Stylistics' refers to a kind of stylistics whose focus of interest is not primarily literary text, but the refinement of a linguistic model which has potential stylistic analysis.
Cureton (1992) explains that stylistics or literary stylistics is concerned with aesthetic use of language both in text that are typically aesthetic such as canonical literature, oral narrative, jokes and in other text that have other predominant aims like conversation. As such, stylistics contributes to the study of literary discourse and similarly to the study of verbal texture in other discourse varieties. Stylistics mediates between two disciplines that are linguistics and literary criticism. It applies the methods and insights of linguistics to traditional problems in literary analysis and the methods of literary criticism to the analysis of language. That is why some scholars like Fowler (1986) prefer to call it 'linguistic criticism' and some other like Fabb et al (1987) call it 'literary linguistics'.

The term stylistics as a kind of language study emerged between 1910 and 1930 with the contribution of Russian formalists including Roman Jakobson, Victor shklovskij; Romanc philologists such as Charles Bally, Leo Spitzer; Czech structuralists like Bohuslav Harvranek and Jan Mukarovsky; British semiotists including I.A Richards and William Empson and American new critics like John Crowe Ranson, T.S. Eliot and Cleanth Brooks. These groups altogether affirmed the significance of linguistic form to literary response and the importance of the aesthetic use of language in non literary discourse. However, they differed considerably in subject and method. Many of the stylistic studies, which appeared in that period, are still unsurpassed like Richard's tenor analysis of metaphor, Tomashevskij's statistical treatment of stress and word boundaries in verse, and Empson's theories of semantics in verse.
Since 1950s the term stylistics has been applied to critical procedures which tried to reinstate the impressionism and subjectivity of standard language with a scientific and objective analysis of literary text. The stylisticians absorbed the descriptive methods of several new linguistic theories such as European and American Structuralism, Transformational Grammar, Case Grammar, Functional Grammar, etc. The time from 1950s to 1970s stylistics became recognized as an academic discipline with its own specialized journals, reference guides, disciplinary histories and general overviews. Styisticians in this period produced extensive treatment of topics like 'Poetic Vocabulary' (Miles 1964), 'Visual Form in Poetry' (Hollander 1975), 'Sound Symbolism' (Fonagy 1979), 'Poetic Syntax' and 'Meter' (Tarlinskaja 1976).

Style as a term in criticism has been widely used for a long time before, often in a rather impressionistic way. It attempts to draw attention to the characteristic or peculiar use of language in a specific text, author or period. Modern stylistics is a way to approach the question of style on stricter, and more methodical lines; it is not so much a discipline in itself as a cross over point between linguistics, for which literary text are only items of interest in the broad study of language and literary criticism. It starts from the proposition that any idea or concept may be expressed in one of a number of different ways, and that an author exercises a choice (conscious or unconscious; dictated by personal taste or the demands of the reader, genre or whatever) in determining the precise form of the words to be used. Such a proposition is incidentally anathema to new criticism which refuses to distinguish between the form and content of literature; what is written is written.
Linguistic Stylistics poses itself the assignment of classifying the range of linguistic choices that are available to authors. It also identifies the ways in which features of the linguistics may call attention to themselves. These features may deviate from the accepted norms in their manner of expression. These classifications may be applicable to a particular text or number of texts in such a way as to highlight their peculiar verbal characteristics.