Chapter 3
Approaches to Stylistic
3.0. Introduction

The main purpose of stylistic approaches which have been developed by some scholars is to find techniques that help to analyze and interpret the meaning of literary texts. Lyons (1970) mentions that stylistics is not only confined to a particular kind of linguistic analysis, but it is a word that is applied to various kinds of linguistic analysis. One reason for this variety of interpretation is that many scholars draw upon different theories of linguistic structure (to the extent that they have many definite theoretical commitments). The second main reason is that the word 'style' is often used to refer to a number of rather different aspects of language. Some prominent scholars in stylistics expound approaches concerning the stylistic analysis of a literary text. A survey of their contributions will be discussed in brief below:

3.1. H.G. Widdowson

Widdowson (1974) stresses on the value of reader centered approaches. He argues that the lack of situational context in literary texts facilitates the understanding of a text in a more concentrated and intense way because it compels readers to pay more attention to the language of the text.

Generally speaking, stylistic analysis aims at investigating how the performer effectively uses the resources of language code in order to produce actual message. It is concerned with the pattern of use in a given text.
Any user of language obtains two kinds of knowledge: knowledge of the rules of the code of a language which ensures the grammaticality of what has been said and the knowledge of the conventions which regulates the use of these rules in the production of messages and equally ensures the appropriateness of what has been said. Both kinds of knowledge are indispensable for the effective communication between interlocutors. Moreover, they together help in attributing unique features to the language. The users of language continually generate novel sentences which have never been spoken or heard before. These utterances are understood, however. The reason behind this is that although they are novel as manifestation of code, they are also familiar as messages. Thus, Widdowson writes:

The user of a language is creative because the novel linguistic forms he generates function as familiar units of communication: If they did not, he would only generate gibberish.

(Widdowson 1974:202)

The purpose of stylistics, in this concern, is to discover what linguistic units count as in communication and how the effects of different conventions reveal themselves in the way messages are organized in texts. Style then, as Chatman (1973) mentions is the product of a social situation of a common relationship between language users. And therefore stylistics may be considered as the study of social functions of language which may ultimately be treated as the branch of sociolinguistics.

Widdowson in his approach focuses the attention on literary text and the ways stylistics concerns itself with literary texts. He mentions two main reasons. The first is methodological and the second is pedagogical. To take the first reason, in
literature there are certain features as a mode of communication which are unique and, therefore, simplify the task of stylistics. In all forms of language except in literature, we have a sender of the message and a receiver of it, i.e. whenever we use language, we assume a receiver. But in literature the situation is different. The writer is separated from the reader and the reader from the addressee as well. And the message itself is a text-contained. It presupposes no wider context so that every thing that is important for its interpretation is found within the message itself. On the other hand, in the interpretation of all other uses of language, we shall take into consideration some of its social environments. This is the reason which makes the stylistic analysis of such texts difficult. But in literary texts the situation is some what different. There are no such problems because, according to Widdowson, in literary text the attention is given to the text itself. He accordingly distracts the social appendages in the analysis of a text in his approach. (Op cit)

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

As it has been mentioned above that the literary message has no social matrix, presupposes no preceding events and anticipates no future action. In brief, they are complete in themselves. Literature also contains a good deal of language which acts against the norms of grammar and semantics, i.e.
deviant (1). Furthermore, poetry as a form of literature makes use of one phonological unit (metrical line) which does not occur in other forms of language. The point which Widdowson wants to emphasize is that the forms that literary messages take do not completely conform either to the code of a language or the conventions of use. But in spite of that unconformity between literary message and code, they convey meaning or message conspicuously. He accordingly, raises two questions_ the first is how literary messages manage to convey meaning at all_and the second is what kind of meaning it is? To answer the first question, Widdowson mentions:

Literary messages manage to convey meaning because they organize their deviation from the code into pattern which is discernible in the texts themselves. What happens 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 acquire meaning by relation with other items within the internal context of the message. Thus the relations set up within a text constitutes a secondary language system which combines, and so replaces, the separate functions of what would conventionally be distinguished as code and context.

(Widdowson 1974: 205)

In order to interpret any text, as Widdowson argues, one shall recognize two sets of relation. The first is extra-textual relation between language items and the code from which they are derived and the second is intra-textual relation between items within the context itself. In literary texts, these two sets of relation converge to create a unit of meaning which neither belongs to the code nor to the context. Literary writer makes his

---

1- See foregrounding page (55)
writing unique and distinct by creating a hybrid unit which though comes from both the code and the context and yet it is a unit of neither of them.

Widdowson also points out that there is no noticeable difference between connotative and denotative meaning. Literature characteristically removes the distinction between them. Commonly, Connotative meaning is considered as a matter of personal association. It is unsystematizable. But, sometime, contextual meaning of literary texts is a result of the setting of linguistic items in a system of intra-textual relation. Widdowson comments:

While one may regard it, therefore, as connotative with reference to the code, one must regard it as denotative with reference to the secondary language system established by the regularities of the context.

(Ibid: 207)

Widdowson analyses some lines of Alexander Pope's poem. He considers the occurrence of the word 'coffee' in that poem. He comes to the conclusion that the meaning of the word 'coffee' in Pope's line is both connotative and denotative in one sense; and in the other, of course neither. This means that, literature and in particular poetry tends to destroy the distinction between denotation and connotation for the purpose of creating a hybrid meaning. And this answers the first question of how literary messages give meaning?

The second question, what a kind of meaning does a literary message convey? This question has a social consideration. As one knows that a language is a social phenomenon. It serves a social purpose. It organizes some aspects of reality in order to make it under control. To put the
matter simply, it is regarded as a socially sanctioned representation of the external world. "Without such a representation, the external world is a chaos beyond human control" (Ibid: 208). The reality under control gives a common attitude towards it by sharing a common means of communication which takes place if there are conventionally accepted ways of looking at the world.

However, the members of a society as human beings have needs. And the conventions of their society by nature are incapable of satisfying them. Therefore, there should be a necessary outlet for individual attitudes whose expressions would otherwise disrupt the ordered pattern of reality. Therefore all kinds of arts and literature are outlet for individuals. And they open vast space for society members to express their feelings in the way they like. For example, the poet Wilfred Owen in his poem 'Futility' gives the 'sun' the attribute of animacy in the context, though it is an inanimate noun in the code. He displays 'sun' as human being touching other human being to wake him up and whispering in his ears. And one, equally, notices that the word 'sun' retains the quality of unanimacy which accompanies or is linked with it from the code. That is to say, the two meanings of the 'sun' as an inanimate and animate can be perceived simultaneously in the context. In the above example, the amalgamation of context and code units results in the production of a new and a hybrid unit. The 'sun' here is both inanimate and human, and yet, of course, at the same time, neither2. This case is usually noticed in literature.

2-See metaphor page (156) It represents the hybrid unit that comes from the interaction between context and code.
This observation, which Widdowson comes out about the sun, has relation to the rest of the text. The recurrent theme in the text is the ability of the sun to awaken things, people, seeds, and the earth. This theme also is running throughout the poem. But as it has been said earlier that the 'sun', in the poem, has the characteristics of both inanimate and human, however, the question arises, when the sun performs the action of waking, is it in its human or in its inanimate capacity?

3.2. M. A. K. Halliday

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

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

The linguistic study of literature is textual description, and it is no different from other textual description; it is not a new branch or a new level or a new kind of linguistics but the application of existing theories and methods. What the linguist does when faced with a literary text is the same as what he does when faced with any text that he is going to describe.

(McIntosh & Halliday 1966:64)

Halliday (1970) investigates two kinds of texts; a Yeats' poem 'Leda and the Swan' and three passages of modern prose fiction. He proves that the linguistic theories are applicable to explain different characteristics in the language of texts. In the analysis of Yeats' poem, Halliday demonstrates the three different functions of deictic 'the'. He shows that the pattern in which 'the' occurs in the poem differs from those in which it occurs in ordinary language. There are three distinct relations into which 'the' as deictic enters, 'cataphoric,' 'anaphoric,' and 'homophoric' respectively.

The second example he considers is the distribution of verbal items in this poem. He argues "verbal items are considerably deverbalized" (ibid: 63). That is to say, the lexically more powerful verbs do not function grammatically as verbs but they are functionally altered to become other parts of speech. After the analysis of the poem by Yeats, Halliday tabulates the result as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Items in verbal group (i.e. functioning as 'predicator' in clause structure)</th>
<th>Items in nominal group (i.e. not functioning as predicator)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td>Finite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold</td>
<td>Lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>push</td>
<td>let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feel</td>
<td>master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>engender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>put on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram 1:** shows the distribution of verbal items in Yeat's poem

From the above diagram, Halliday makes some observations. Widdowson summarizes them as follows:

In 'Leda', the few verbal items... get lexically more powerful as they get grammatically less 'verbal': in finite verbal group in free clause we have "hold", "push", "put on", "feel"; while at the other end of the scale, including some not operating in verbal group at all, are 'stagger', 'loosen', 'caress'.

(Widdowson 1974: 220)

The third example Halliday (1970) shows is the comparison of one or two features in three short passages of prose, they are, "Room at the Top", "Adventure in Skin Trade", and "The Middle Sage of Mrs. Eliot", by John Braine, Dylon Thomas, and Angus Wilson, respectively. He concentrates on nominal group patterns, lexical sets, and cohesion.
3.3. J. McH. Sinclair

The approach, which Sinclair follows, is similar to that of Halliday. He applies Halliday's categories of descriptive linguistics in the analysis of the poem "First Sight" by Philip-Larkin. Then, he lists the results in a tabular form. Any other conclusions as to their relevance for interpretation are left to the reader to come out on his own.

Sinclair (1966) hypothesizes that the grammar and other patterns give meaning in a more complex and tightly packed way than the traditional ways and methods of describing language. In his approach, he stresses only on grammar for interpretation.

In the structure of a sentence, Sinclair recognizes two aspects of linguistic organization which plays a vital role in the setting up of intra-textual patterns in literary texts. The first one is called release clause/phrase and the second is named arrest clause/phrase. The former refers to the interposition of arresting adverbial to interrupt the sentence and delay its completion. For example, in the following three first lines of the poem mentioned above Sinclair explains the meaning of arrest:

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

Here, the syntactic pattern NP (Lambs that learn to walk in snow) and Vph (meet a vast unwelcome....) are interrupted by the inserting of adverbial clause (when their bleating clouds the air). Sincalir calls this adverbial clause arrest or bound clause because it delays the completion of the sentences.

Sincalir calls the second kind of linguistic organization of language free or release clause. It happens when a syntactic
structure is added to the sentence after all grammatical predictions have been achieved, i.e. the insertion of linguistic units in a pattern which is already whole is called release. For example, in the same poem which Sinclair investigates, the following line represents release:

_They could not grasp it if they knew._

The conditional clause *(if they knew)* is called a releasing element because the NP *(they could not grasp it)* is grammatically complete. Widdowson remarks:

> It is clear that by a use of releasing and arresting elements, a writer can deny the reader a fulfillment of his predictions as derived from his knowledge of the code and replace them with predictions derived from the intra-textual pattern set up in the context of the poem itself.

Widdowson (1974:221)

Stressing on grammar, Sinclair pinpoints some lexical and contextual matter. He points out:

> Grammar deals with contrasts, multiple choices from a great many systems simultaneously, and the meaning of a grammatical statement can only be fully elicited with reference to the total grammatical description. Nevertheless, the exercise shows how some aspects of the meaning of the poem can be described quite independently of evaluation.

(Sinclair 1966: 81)

### 3.4. Geoffrey Leech

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

Leech (1970: 120)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Leech furthermore points out another manifestation of foregrounding. This occurs when the writer instead of exercising a wider choice that is permitted by code. He deliberately renounces his choice and produces uniformity where variety would normally be expected. Leech in the poem finds that Thomas uses the following parallel constructions 'Man in the day or wind at night,' My wine you drink my bread you snap' Thomas, by using this parallelism, sets up a syntactic
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1 - See the interaction between dictionary meaning and contextual meaning page (155).
equivalence between the two prepositional phrases in the first one and sets up a kind of intra-textual syntactic equivalence in the second. Syntactic equivalence is also as Leech puts it is a feature of foregrounding in which poets introduce a pattern of language not found in normal use.4

**Cohesion of foregrounding:** This is the third dimension which Leech describes in his approach in order to analyze literary texts. Foregrounded features, which are mentioned above, are related to each other on the one hand and to the text in its entirety on the other. As mentioned earlier that there are lexical cohesion appeared in the repetition of the same items of vocabulary in different places of the text, and the choice of items which have the semantic connection. According to Leech cohesion of foregrounding is the manner in which deviation in a text are related to each other to form intra-textual pattern. For example, the foregrounding expression "broke the sun" is a deviant against the normal usage but takes on the normality in the context of the poem as a whole because it is related to deviation of a similar kind in the poem like, "broke the grape's joy", "pulled the wind down". Similarly, intra-textual patterns are also shaped by the cohesion of the foregrounded expression 'the oats was merry', 'desolation in the vine', and 'sensual root'.

In a nutshell, Leech investigates what he considers to be the principal dimensions on which a linguistic analysis of any poem might proceed. His exposition of the features of each dimension assures that these features are in linguistic sense part of meaning of the poem and are matters of linguistic choice and can be described in terms of categories of the language.

---

4 - See Parallelism page (89).
3.5. Roman Jakobson

Jakobson discusses the poetic function of language which he defines as the use of language which focuses on the actual form of the message itself. He gives important remarks about the relationship between poetics and linguistics in the following effect:

Poetics deals with problem of verbal structure, just as the analysis of painting is concerned with pictorial structure. Since linguistics is the global science of verbal structure, poetics may be regarded as an integral part of linguistics.

Jakobson (1960:350)

Some linguists proclaim that poetics in contrast with linguistics is concerned with evaluation. Jakobson argues that the basis on which the separation between linguistics and poetry depends is incorrect interpretation of the contrast between the structure of poetry and other types of verbal structure. Poetic language is non-casual and purposeful. But other types of verbal structure are casual by nature. Literary writing is also different from other forms of expression in the sense that it consciously draws attention to itself. Jeoffrey Leech, in his approach which has been discussed above, investigates foregrounding. He directs the reader to the actual form of the message being conveyed. Widdowson (1974) mentions the relationship between the views of Jakobson and Leech. He writes that Jakobson explains the view that it is what Leech refers to as the second kind of foregrounding which is the essential criterion of the poetic function, that is to say, the setting up of equivalence where equivalence would not normally occur.

Jakobson (1960) also states that literary studies in general and poetry in particular like linguistics. Both have two sets of
problems; synchronic and diachronic. The synchronous
description, as we know, studies the literary production of any
given time (stage). It also tackles that part of literary tradition
which for the stage in question has remained vital or has been
revived. Jakobson similarly observed that synchronous poetics,
like synchronous linguistics is not to be confused with static; any
stage discriminates between more conservative and more
innovatory forms. The diachronic investigation, on the other
hand, in both linguistics and poetics is concerned not with the
changes that take place in literature but also with the factors of
continuity, endurance and static.

Jakobson has the view that there is a relationship
between linguistics and poetics. He mentions that there is no
contrast between them. "... there seems to be no reason for
trying to separate the literary from the overall linguistics"
(Jakobson1960: 377). The only way of keeping linguistics apart
from poetics is warranted when the field of linguistics appears to
be illicitly restricted. For instance, when some linguists deem
sentence as the highest analyzable construction or when the
field of linguistics is confined only to grammar or to non-
semantic questions of external form or to the inventory of
denotative devices with no reference to free variation.

In this approach, Jakobson mentions two main axes on
which literary studies with poetics as their focal portion are
organized; the paradigmatic axis or the axis of selection and the
sentagmatic axis or the axis of combination. He says "The poetic
function projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of
selection into the axis of combination"(ibid: 358). The selection is
based on the similarity and dissimilarity, equivalence,
synonymity and anonymity, while the combination is produced
on the base of contiguity. Equivalence is promoted to the constitutive device of the sequence. In poetry, one syllable is equalized with any other in the same sequence; word stress is assumed to equal word stress, similarly, unstressed is equal to unstressed; prosodic long is equivalent with long, and short with short; word boundary is equal with word boundary; syntactic pause is equivalent with syntactic pause, etc. When the items of the same class are arranged paradigmatically (on the axis of selection), they represent the alternative choices for any place in a structure and are in this sense equivalent. The following table displays a number of alternative choices for completing the given structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>soaked</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>smothered</td>
<td></td>
<td>mud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man who had been</td>
<td>lamed</td>
<td></td>
<td>stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cut</td>
<td></td>
<td>flints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stung</td>
<td>by</td>
<td>nettles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>torn</td>
<td></td>
<td>briars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Diagram 2: shows a number of alternative choices to complete the structure

From the above diagram, we see items that are arranged vertically in column 2, 3, 4. Those items are equivalent because any one of them could be chosen to make up the complete structure. Jakobson's point of view in this regard projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of selection where it normally functions to the axis of combination where it does not
normally function. He, instead of selecting one of the items, combines all of the alternatives to acknowledge the poetic function of language. This method can be noticed in the following passage of Dickens:

"A man who had been soaked in water, and smothered in mud, and lamed by stones, and cut by flints, and stung by nettles, and torn by briars..."

Jakobson deems this type of intra-textual equivalences which occur at the phonological, syntactic and semantic levels as the defining features of the poetic function of language. "Measure of sequences is a device which, outside of poetic function, finds no application in language" (Widdowson 1974: 224).

3.6. Samuel R. Levin

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

*I saw him *at night

------------------- seven.

------------------- your house.

------------------- the end of this semester.

Similarly, the prefixes di-, re-, per-, ad-, in-, sub-, are equivalent in their position because they each occur in front of the stem.

Levin calls the second kind of equivalence ‘natural equivalence’ which is said to obtain between elements share common semantic or phonological features. When some items are semantically connected by the systems of sense relation in the language, they would be regarded as belonging to the identical natural equivalence class whether the items has synonymic relation like 'happy' and 'gay', antonymic connection like ' happy' and 'sad' or hyponymy closeness such as 'emotion' and 'sadness'. Similarly, the group of words which belong to the same equivalence class; for instance, names of animals, names of birds, sets of abstract terms and all the items which semantically affiliated are naturally equivalent.

The natural equivalence phonologically, as Levin states, is existed between elements which have the same syllable structure. For example, the elements which share certain distinctive phonological features like, plosion, voice, nasality, etc, are naturally equivalent. The following line from Shakespeare shows the natural phonological equivalence:

"Full fathom five thy father lies"

The first, second, third and fifth words are naturally equivalent because they have the same initial fricative consonant
The fourth and sixth have medially natural equivalent vowel /a/. The words 'fathom' and 'father' have the same syllabic structure and they both consist of two syllables. The first and second syllables have the same initial segments.

Levin, moreover to his two types of equivalence; positional and natural, adds a third notion: that is coupling. This occurs when one type of equivalence (positional or natural) converges with another in order to produce the structure wherein naturally equivalent forms occur in equivalent position. For example, in Pope's line:

"A soul as full of worth as void of pride"

The tow phrases 'full of worth' and 'void of pride' are equivalent from the positional point of view because they modify the soul in the context and similarly equivalent from the natural point of view because they have the same rhythmic structure. Here we note that the positional equivalence converges with the natural phonological equivalence to form the third notion 'coupling'. The words 'full' and 'void' in the line are positionally equivalent in the sense that; they share the same environment and are naturally equivalent because they are semantically antonyms and phonologically monosyllables. The words 'worth' and 'pride' and their occurrence in the identical environment has the effect of producing the antonymic relation between 'void' and 'full'. This example is a type of intra-textual pattern of the context which bestows meaning on words above the meaning recorded in the code of the language. Widdowson elucidates the sense in which Levin's approach is similar to that of Halliday and Sinclair in the following sense;

Levin illustrates his notion of coupling by an analysis of Shakespeare's sonnet 'when to the
session of sweet silence thought'. Unlike, Leech, however, he does not apply his analysis to the interpretation of the poem: he is interested only in revealing how the language of poem is patterned: 'the analysis is therefore not at attempt at a full-scale interpretation; it is an attempt to reveal the role that couplings play in the total organization of the poem.' In this respect, Levin's approach to the stylistic analysis is similar to that of Halliday and Sinclair.

Widdowson (1974:225)

3.7. P. J. Thorne

Thorne in his paper 'stylistics and generative grammar' (1965) investigates the type of deviant sentences which commonly happen in poetic language in terms of modern transformational generative theory. He proposes that a grammar should be considered as a device which generates all and the only well-formed sentence of language. It (grammar) cannot assign analysis of deviant sentences unless the linguists extend the capacity of grammar, so that, it generates those deviant sentences which are attested in poetic text. It will also involve generating a large number of unwanted and not attested deviant sentences. Thus, the E.E.Coming's line "he danced his did", will make one accepts the idea of generating sentences like "we thump their hads". Another example from the poem of Dylon Thomas which is discussed above in Leech's approach: if we make some modification to the grammar of English to generate sentence like "the oats was merry", these rules will generate sentences like "potato was joyful", "the barely was disconsolate", etc. But these two latter deviant sentences are unwanted and they have no significant units in the meaning of the context of a poem or other types of literary text. Thorne in his approach gives solution to this dilemma. He is against the idea of increasing the
complexity of grammar in order to characterize the ungrammatical sequence in poetry. He says that a poem should be considered as "a sample of a different language" Freeman (1970:182). Thorne adds that there should be a grammar for the language of specific poems and this grammar should also meet the requirements of logical consistency and generality demanded by the general theory of grammar. The task of stylisticians is to write a grammar which will describe the structure of unique language in poetry. Widdowson quotes Thorne as follows:

...the extra-textual relations which obtain between the language as represented on the context and that as represented in the code should be ignored, and attention directed exclusively to the intra-textual relation, which are regarded as representing a separate code altogether.

(Widdowson 1974: 226)

This approach, as Thorne declares, relies a great deal on the intuition that generates poetic sequences beyond the data because a single text does not provide enough data for the analysis. The significant attribute to the various syntactic features in the text depends on the analyst's intuitive sense of what the poem, as a whole, is about. Thorne declares "This approach sets a high premium on intuition" (Thorne 1970:190).

To read a poem is often like to learn a language. When we learn a language, we increase the capacity of our intuition about its structure. A grammar is a special kind of statement about this intuition. The discussion about the grammaticality in poetry must show how certain irregularities are regular in the context of the poem they appear. Poetic language like standard language makes infinite use of finite means.
Thorne applies his approach on the very famous deviant poem 'anyone lived in a pretty how towr' by E. E. Commings. This poem showed the very high degree of deviance from the standard language. He as well claims that this approach can be applied to texts which reveal a high degree of grammaticalness. He for example, analyzed the poem "A nocturnal upon S. Lucies day' by Donn. He pinpoints that a grammar for this text would have to include rules quite contrary to those of standard English by which normally inanimate nouns are given the feature of animacy and the reverse. This grammar helps to generate sentences like 'yea plants, yea stones detest and love' and reject 'I love' or 'you love' as ungrammatical.

3.8. Concluding Remarks

In the present chapter, we have dealt with the different approaches set out by the scholar such as Widdowson, Halliday, Sinclair, Leech, Jakobson, Levin, Thorne, etc. The effort of these scholars culminated in the form of theories and helped in devising methods for studying and analyzing literary texts. They all have their own view points and methods of interpretation. Widdowson discards the situational context to interpret a literary text. He concentrates on the language of the texts and mentions the vital role of the readers in the interpretation. Halliday uses the term 'application' as a code in his approach. He focuses on one branch of linguistics; that is 'descriptive linguistics'. He has the view that theories of linguistics can be used to analyze the literary texts. Sinclair follows the same technique of Halliday. He makes application of descriptive linguistics in the analysis of the poem' First Sight'. Leech's approach is different from Halliday and Sinclair. He finds differences between linguistic descriptive and critical interpretation. Roman Jakobson clarifies the
relationship between poetry and linguistics. He considers poetry as an integral part of linguistics. The approach of Levin shows how equivalence operates at the linguistic levels to produce structures that distinguish poetry from any other type of discourse. Thorne's approach explains that poetic language like standard language makes infinite use of finite means.