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1.1. Introduction

The study of style and the language of literature is one of the most traditional applications of linguistics. It has been given new impetus by the rapid new developments in linguistics since the development of generative grammar by Chomsky (1957). The first discussions of style in its fullest form occur in the fourth book of the first-century BCE Rhetorica ad Herennium and in the eighth and ninth books of Quintilian’s institutio oratoria from the first century CE (cf. Fahnestock, 2005:216). Though there are later Greek works on style still surviving, notably those by Hermogenes, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Longinus, these all focus on special aspects or types of style, not on the basic principles and taxonomy of devices, as do the Rhetorica ad Herennium and Quintilian’s institutio oratoria. In fact, most pre-twentieth century discussions appear as secondary components of rhetorical and grammatical analyses of literature and literary language.

Linguistics and literature are no doubt two different disciplines, but they share one significant thing, that is language. Language is the main concern of any linguistic study, and at the same time it is the medium of literature. In fact, language is not merely an incidental medium of literature; rather it is an integral
part of the whole creative process. There were many attempts made by scholars to bridge the gap between linguistics and literary criticism, which resulted in the emergence of a new discipline known as “stylistics”.

The emergence of stylistics as a semi-autonomous, if not really autonomous discipline was between the year 1910 and 1930 (cf. Cureton, 2003:467). In the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, interest in stylistics grew as stylisticians absorbed the descriptive methods of several new linguistic theories, namely European and American structuralism, transformational grammar, case grammar, systematic functional grammar and tagmemics. During this period, stylistics became organized as an academic discipline. The founding of the Anglo-American journals *Style* (1967) and *Language and Style* (1968) provided one convenient benchmark for the full arrival of stylistics. It should not be forgotten, however, that there are many linguistic and literary movements, namely New Criticism, Russian Formalism and Prague School, French Formalism, and Modern Linguistics, which contributed significantly to the development of the discipline.

Stylistics, in its course of development, had to struggle severely till it became an independent discipline. It was not an easy task for stylistics to enter into two different worlds, i.e. linguistics and literature. However, the newly born discipline could, at the end, succeed to become a full-fledged academic discipline in its own right in much the same way as biochemistry,
which draws on biology and chemistry, can claim to be an independent discipline

At the present time, the analysis of literary texts from linguistic perspectives has become one of the most effective and productive areas of literary studies. The importance of approaching literature using linguistic tools comes from the fact that linguistics can provide systematic ideas and thoughts, which truly help us in the process of understanding and interpreting literary texts. Traugott and Pratt (1980) highlight this significant point:

Linguistics can contribute a great deal to our understanding of a text. It can help us become aware of why it is that we experience what we do when read a literary work, and it can help us talk about it, by providing us with a vocabulary and a methodology through which we can show how our experience of a work is in part derived from its verbal structure.

(Traugott and Pratt, 1980:20)

Thus, linguistics is quite essential for the readers of literature to develop an adequate and consistent analysis and overcome the complexities and vagueness that may exist in a given literary text. It can also help critics make a proper and fair criticism, given the fact that texts are the primary data for all literary criticism.
1.2 Models of Stylistics

Stylistics, in its broader sense, can be divided into two main categories: Classical or Rhetorical stylistics and Modern stylistics. Given below is a brief account on these two categories.

1.2. a. Classical or Rhetorical Stylistics

The term rhetorical stylistics refers to the study of style within the framework of the Greek tradition. The concept of “style” is discussed in the Greek context under the term Oratory, which is defined as the art of discovering each and every possible means of persuasion. Thus, style is considered as a technique of persuasion. This persuasion, the Rhetori argue, cannot occur unless one produces an effect upon the audience. In order to achieve this ultimate goal, rhetorical stylistics considers four overall principles: correctness, clarity, appropriateness, and forcefulness.¹

The first principle concerns grammaticality, the second concerns the audience’s ability to understand the content, the third standard concerns decorum, whether an utterance is appropriate, and whether it corresponds to the occasion and the purpose for which it is said, and the last one deals with ornamentation or forcefulness, whether the speaker has achieved salience where it would be most useful (cf. Fahnestock, 2005: 218). A style that enjoys the above four criteria is regarded as an effective style and thus a good style, and the one that lacks them is ineffective and

¹ These principles are somehow consistent with Grice 1975 cooperative principles.
relatively bad style. The classical notion of style is, therefore, prescriptive in nature. It sets certain maxims, which have an overall goal of producing a good style that should be effective and relatively persuasive. Thus, language, within this tradition, is essentially communicative rather than a representational medium.

Accordingly, literature from rhetorical perspectives is viewed as having special effects on audiences, for example, as providing an aesthetic experience that transforms readers or hearers, convincing them to appreciate new beliefs or values. It can also be viewed as exhibiting a special abundance or intensity of figurative language. Both views have representatives in the world of twentieth century literary criticism.

Kenneth Burke (1966), for example, utilizes the rhetorical tradition of defining literature throughout his long career as a 20th century literary critic. He does not believe in making a demarcation between the two views in his analysis of a literary text. Wayne Booth, another prominent 20th century critic, writes within the tradition of rhetoric as persuasion. In The Rhetoric of Fiction (1961), Booth explains the rhetorical techniques used by authors to help the readers grasp the work and convince them to accept the fictional facts and various aesthetic, moral, and other values of their narratives.

Rhetorical stylistics has been criticized of being prescriptive rather than descriptive in nature and scope. Leech (1966) describes rhetoric as an "outmoded discipline" that nevertheless "lives on the present day study of literature at least in the figures of speech"
(Leech, 1966:135). It is full of words having fixed meaning and certain types of structures associated with certain effect. Bakhtin (1981[1934]) criticizes classical stylistics of being unable to deal with the dialogic profile of utterances. Traditional stylistics, according to Bakhtin, has nothing to do with the social life of language, as it places the situated production of utterances outside the domain of linguistic science. However, Simpson provides a more positive assessment, admitting that "some stylistic work is very much a latter-day embodiment of traditional rhetoric" (Simpson, 2004:50, see also Bradford, 1997: 8-11).

Whatever be the weaknesses or disadvantages of rhetorical stylistics, its role and contribution to the study of literature is, however, unquestionable. It has marked the beginning of stylistics as a mediator between linguistics and literature, and paved the road to many other stylistic models in the modern times.

1.2. b. Modern Stylistics

The roots and origin of modern stylistics can be uncovered in the works of Charles Bally’s Traite de Stylistique Francaise (1909) and Leo Spitzer’s Linguistics and Literary History (1948). Modern stylistics, in general, draws much of its power from the analytical methods and descriptive orientation of linguistics. Unlike traditional stylistics, the use of linguistic methodology has enabled modern stylistics to go beyond the normative and prescriptive descriptions of correct styles to a more comprehensive analysis of language itself and the purposes to which it is put. The use of linguistic procedures has offered modern stylistics both
an affinity with an established discipline, and the possibility of founding the description and interpretation of style upon the basis of science.

The rise of Chomskyan linguistics, particularly, Transformational Generative Grammar (syntactic structures 1957) signaled the real arrival of stylistics as a modern phenomenon. The distinction between deep structures and surface structures and the concept of transformational rules open a new horizon for stylisticians to apply this theory to the study of literature (e.g, Ohman 1967, 1970; Thorne, 1970; and Freeman, 1970). Within Chomskyan grammar, the postulation of tying intention to structure is quite justifiable. This central issue has been fully exploited, not only by linguistic stylisticians, but by literary critics as well.

In the early beginning of modern stylistics there were two different groups, looking at stylistics from two different perspectives. The first group is led by Charles Bally, who emphasizes that the description and analysis of a language is generally available stylistic properties. Literary texts, in Bally's formulation, are particular examples of language use for which analytical descriptions can be applied. Such analytical descriptions provide stylisticians with a precise methodology for describing the components and features of a text. Within Bally's tradition, stylistics has moved from an open-ended evaluative interpretive process to a more precise analytical attitude toward language study in general.
In contrast to the *stylistique* of Bally and his proponents, Leo Spitzer insists upon following the more philologically based tradition of textual (and often literary textual) analysis. Such work, while using the analytical techniques of modern linguistics, attempts to unite the analytical description with a critical interpretation that relates the style to a larger conceptual or situational frame (cf. Spitzer, 1948:1-39). In terms of Spitzer, style can be seen as an expression of a particular psychological, social or historical moment rather than a general property of a particular language. In other words, it focuses on the stylistic analysis of the message rather than the code. This tension, between general linguistic description and less formal social cultural interpretation, has resulted in the early separation of stylistics into linguistic stylistic description and literary stylistic interpretation. It is a separation and tension that remain at the heart of modern stylistics.

1.2.b.i. **Literary Stylistics**

Stylistics, which is often practiced in the second half of the 20th century, is called literary stylistics. Its goal is typically the characterization and appreciation of literary genres, such as novels, poems, and plays, i.e. texts culturally marked as literary. According to Kumar (1991: ii), “literary stylistics provides a basis for a fuller understanding, more convincing interpretation and a balanced evaluation of literary texts”. Literary stylisticians focus on the language of literature and yet they don’t utilize any specific linguistic methodologies. Instead, they draw supports and
procedures from the basic but less analytically structured orientation of new criticism and practical criticism. The terminology used for analyzing the language is more or less conventional and “Semi grammatical” (Fowler, 1986:5). Those critics can be truly classified as belonging more to the traditions of the new critics than that of linguistic critics. For example, Davies (1955), Nowottny (1962), Baker (1967), and Leech (1969) all belong to this category.

Literary stylisticians show special interests in Mukarovsky (1967, first published 1932) that there is a dichotomy between poetic language and standard language, which was later supported by Roman Jakobson (1960). According to Mukarovsky, poetic language is distinct from standard language in its being *deviant*. Adopting a clear-cut comparative methodology, Mukarovsky states:

> The theory of poetic language is primarily interested in the differences between the standard and poetic language, whereas the theory of the standard language is mainly interested in the similarities between them.

(Mukarovsky, 1967:241)

The function of the poetic language “consists in achieving the maximum foregrounding of the utterance” (ibid: 243). Foregrounding and automatization are two opposite concepts, characterizing the poetic language and standard language respectively. The concept of foregrounding is a key issue in defining style as a deviation from the norm. This deviation can only occur when the standard form is systematically violated.
Levin (1963), who is interested in a stylistic work based on the theory of deviation, distinguishes between two types of deviation: quantitative and qualitative deviation. The quantitative deviation refers to the deviation in the frequency of occurrence, whereas qualitative deviation is represented in what can be called "ungrammaticalness" (cf. Levin, 1963:276-290). The notion of style as deviance is supported by many linguists, for example, Saporta (1960); Ohman (1967); and Leech (1969). Leech, in particular, explains deviation as a pervading feature of poetic language operating at all linguistic levels (phonological, grammatical, lexical, graphological and semantic). This phenomenon is largely extended, characterizing dialect, register, and historical period.

On the other hand, there are many other scholars who are dissatisfied with this notion. For example, Rifaterre (1967: 424) states that "it is difficult to show how we can use the deviation as a criterion, or even how we can describe it". Stankiewicz (1960) argues that violation of rules is not a defining feature of poetic language, and that:

Poetic language takes full cognizance of the rules of the linguistic system, and if it admits "deviations", they themselves are conditioned by the language or by the given poetic tradition.

(Stankiewicz, 1960:70)

Similarly, Fowler (1966) holds that there might be different types of utterances with different rules of structure within the permitted ranges of the whole language, but he rejects the idea of having two
categories, one deviant from the other. Fowler, in fact, objects to the whole argument of making a distinction between literary and non-literary language, without denying the existence of literature; this is what he says:

The form of utterances designated 'literary' is assumed to hold no special problems consequent upon the designation as literature—it is just linguistic form. This must not be misunderstood, interpreted as a denial of the existence of literature.

(Fowler, 1966: 10).

It is also opposed by Hymes who disagrees with those who take "deviation" as a basic principle for stylistic analysis and states that "to some "sources" especially poets, may be not deviation from but achievement of a norm" (Hymes, 1967:34).

Halliday (1971) highly criticizes the deviation-based model of stylistics. For him, stylistics of this type is restricted to those texts in which deviant forms exist; it cannot deal with texts in general:

Deviant forms are actually prohibited by the rules of whatever it is taken to be the norm, or, to express it positively, the norm that is established by the set of the deviant forms excludes all texts but the one in which they occur.

(Halliday, 1971:341)

Meanwhile, Halliday recommends a stylistic model based on general linguistic theory. It is an application rather than an extension of linguistics. This model came to be known as "Linguistic stylistics".
1.2. b.ii. Linguistic Stylistics

Linguistic stylistics has arisen out of the argument that the description of texts, any texts, whether literary or nonliterary is part of the task of linguistics. This model of stylistics does not confine its scope merely to the study of the language of the texts, but rather to the study of such texts by linguistic methods. Linguistic stylistics can be defined as:

The description of literary texts, by methods derived from general linguistic theory and within the framework of a description of the language in question, and the comparison of such texts with others, by the same and by different authors in the same and in different genres.

(Halliday, 1967: 218)

It is, therefore, inferred from the definition that a comparative linguistic methodology is fairly adopted by this model, and that the concept of style is manipulated with reference to the universal linguistic framework of a single language. Linguistic stylisticians justify themselves by claiming that a literary text is meaningful only in relation to the total description of the language concerned. Unlike literary stylistics in which the issue of "deviation" is a key point for generating aesthetic values, "Linguistic regularity" (Halliday, 1971:330) is highly emphasized in this model and taken as a major criterion in describing literary texts.

Stylistics, such as this, draws much of its descriptive and analytical power from a functional theory of language originated by Buhler (1934) in which he proposes a three-way division of language function, the representational, the conative and the
expressive. This theory has later been developed by Halliday, who has extensively worked in this field since the late 1960s. In Hallidayan functional grammar, language function is divided into ideational, interpersonal and textual function. The ideational function indicates the expression of content. It is the function in which the speaker or writer embodies in language his experience of the phenomena of the real world including his linguistic acts of speaking and understanding. It is further sub-divided into the experiential and the logical function (cf. Halliday and Hasan, 1989:18-21). The interpersonal function, on the other hand, refers to the use of language by the speaker as the means of his own intrusion into the speech event. It contains the expression of his comments, attitudes, and evaluations, and also of social relationship that he builds up between himself and the listener. It explains the communication role adopted by the speaker, such as informing, questioning, greeting persuading, and the like (Halliday, 1971:333). The third category, the textual function, is concerned with the creation of text by helping language make links with itself and with the situation. The most important aspect of the textual function is that, it is not interested only in building relations between sentences, but also in the internal organization of the sentences and its meaning in relation to the context. In linguistic stylistics, where the text and not the sentence is the basic unit of analysis, the textual function is particularly important.
Halliday (1971) proves that his functional approach can be well utilized in the analysis of literary texts. In his analysis of the intransitive processes in Golding’s the *inheritors*, for example, Halliday shows that the dominance of the intransitiveness of syntax in connection with Lok, a Neanderthal character in the novel, is a structural manifestation of his “ineffectual manipulation of the environment” and his “world view” that things in the world around him are not caused but they happen on their own. He further illustrates that Golding’s concern with the nature of humanity and the conflicts within it are realized syntactically in the form of conflicts between the types of transitivity. The concept of transitivity, thus, makes it possible to explore literary critical ideas like “world view” from linguistic perspectives, which is really a significant development in the world of stylistics. Halliday’s system has been appreciated by a number of stylisticians, for example, Enkvist (1971), Fowler (1975, 1981, 1986), Burton (1982), and Biron and O’Tool, (1988). Enkvist strongly supports this model, indicating that Halliday’s study:

> Will open up a new area of style markers for qualitative and quantitative analysis and it will bring linguistics closer to the study of literary structure.

(Enkvist, 1971:58).

Fowler (1986) takes great insights from the Hallidayan model in building his anti-formalistic theory of stylistics. The theory concentrates on the view that the works of verbal art are not “isolated and timeless artifacts” (Fowler, 1986:178) but they are moods of “social discourse”. Fowler attempts to incorporate
within his stylistic theory, historical, social, cultural, and biographical of a literary creation, which were banned by the new criticism and ignored by formalists and structuralists. Literary works, Fowler argues, should be approached as "transactions with society" and as the representations of "dominant or the problematic beliefs current within a historically specific society" (ibid: 178). These innovative trends lead him to come up with a new term called "Linguistic criticism", which is a conflation of literary criticism and critical linguistics. In defining linguistic criticism, Fowler emphasizes his (1966) rejection to the concept of literary versus non-literary language dichotomy, and stresses his (1981) of literature as "social discourse":

Linguistic criticism is an introduction to the critical study of discourse; the chief emphasis is on those works of language hailed as "literary" but I have tried to make it clear that all texts merit this sort of analysis, and that belief in an exclusive category "literature" or "literary language" is liable to prove a hindrance rather than a help.

(Fowler, 1986: v)

Thus, with Fowler, stylistics seems to have taken new directions in dealing with literature. It still deals with so called literature but only as a kind of "documentation of social values and beliefs and as such no different from any other textual data" (Widdeson, 2004:131). It is no longer that typical stylistics whose aesthetic values are the ultimate goal. Rather, it is concerned with the
"social, ideological, and political dimensions encoded in texts" (Carter and Simpson, 1989: 17).

Stylistics with Halliday’s and Fowler’s contributions has appeared as a real rival to the previous version, i.e. literary stylistics. However, there are many stylisticians who have attempted to assume a middle position between the two extremes. They adopt approaches that are a conflation of the two models, i.e. linguistic stylistic description and literary stylistic interpretation. One of these approaches came to be known as a contextualized approach or “contextualized stylistics” (Verdonk and Weber, 1995)

1.2. b.iii. Contextualized Stylistics

This model, as its name suggests, is a context-oriented model. It is an introduction to “literary stylistic criticism” (Verdonk and Weber, 1995: 4). It has arisen in accordance with the developments that have taken place in literary criticism and linguistic theory. Following Macdonell (1986), the exponents of this approach regard all speech and writing as primarily dialogic, and that the meanings of the words cannot be divorced from their relevant contexts. Literary texts, it is argued, is part of a “complex social and culture process” (Verdonk and Weber, 1995: 2). The approach is by and large functional; it takes pragmatic and social-linguistic views of language as discourse or social interaction. The common level of linguistic analysis (syntax, lexis, semantics) should, according to this model, include a kind of extension accommodating the facets of language in use, which is the goal of pragmatics. One of the most important issues
negotiated in this model is that any interpretation of the text is only possible through linking what is happening inside the text with that of outside the text.

For these stylisticians, an utterance is given prior importance over a sentence. The utterance, they argue, is not associated only with face to face speech situation, it may also refer to written texts, it may apply to interactions between speakers and interlocutors within the texts as well as to the relation between text and reader, and that the dialogic nature of the utterance remains operative in all types of communications. In presenting this approach, the alternative, i.e. the text-oriented models are not totally denied. This approach, as a matter of fact, attempts to combine the obvious benefits of rigour and systematicity of the text oriented models with the deeper insights of the contextualized model. It is therefore clear that the contextualized stylisticians adopt a fairly middle position between the two previous models. Despite this positive attitude toward the text-oriented model, there remains an issue of a considerable dispute; it is the issue of meaning creation.

While the previous text oriented models adopt a semantically oriented model of meaning, which is produced by the abstract system of language forms divorced from the concrete situation of verbal communication, this model prefers a pragmatically oriented model of meaning. Since all speech and writing are regarded as primarily dialogic, it is inevitable for this model to view meaning from a pragmatic point of view. The approach relies heavily in
meaning creation on Levinson (1983) and Leech (1983), who have brilliantly contributed to the field of pragmatics. Meaning in the pragmatic model results from the art of communication; it is investigated in relation to a context of use and users. While semantics focuses on the meaning of the sentence as an abstract syntactic unit disconnected from a situational context, pragmatics centers on the meaning of the utterance, which represents the concrete realization of a sentence in a context of use. Pragmatics explores how utterances are interpreted in contexts, giving meanings for utterances, which are different from the meanings of the individual sentences, which comprise them. The pragmatic fact that a particular utterance can have more than one meaning depending upon the context in which it is used, has given rise to the assumption that interpretative diversity is very much present in this model. Widdoson (2004) highlights this point and says that all texts give rise to diverse interpretations, depending on contextual and pretextual conditions:

What is distinctive about literary texts—is that they provoke diversity by their very generic design in that they don’t directly refer to social and institutionalized version of reality but represent an attentive order that can only be individually apprehended.

(Widdoson, 2004:135)

Thus, it can be argued that the individual experience of both the reader and the analyst hinders the objectivity and the determinacy of the text interpretation. It is worth mentioning here that this model is not interested primarily in coming up with new and
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startling interpretations of the text it examines, rather its main aim is:

[T]o explicate how our understanding of a text is achieved by examining in detail the linguistic organization of the text and how a reader needs to interact with that linguistic organization to make sense of it.

(Short, 1995:53).

This model is particularly suitable to deal with fictional dialogues and speech style representations in a given literary text. There are many stylisticians who have adopted this model in their stylistic analysis. For example, Short (1995, 1996) shows how this model can be utilized in the analysis of literary conversations or "character talk", as he prefers to call. Using this model, Short argues that one can make an assessment about the social relationships holding between conversational participants in a given literary dialogue. Peter Verdonk (1995) finds this model suitable for the analysis of literary lexical repetition. He illustrates that this phenomenon can only be explained through a pragmatic model of meaning construction in which language is treated as fundamentally interactive or dialogic, and that lexical repetition can only be explained in reference to a context in use. Buck (1995, 1996, 1997) has extensively worked on fictional dialogues. She explains how, through fictional dialogues, many social features of the characters can be revealed. Buck uses the politeness theory as a major criterion in her analysis.
Since this study is primarily concerned with analyzing Forster’s literary dialogues, this model of stylistics will be largely adopted. As it has already been mentioned, this model takes help of neighboring disciplines, namely pragmatics and sociolinguistics. The following section highlights the relationship between stylistics and sociolinguistics, and stylistics and pragmatics. This is because our study draws primarily on concepts taken from these two disciplines.

1.3 Stylistics and Related Disciplines

Needless to say that stylistics draws considerably on works developed in linguistic theory. This argument presupposes that the relationship between stylistics and linguistics is inescapable. It further suggests that the relationship between stylistics and other linguistic disciplines is unavoidable. Prof. Chatman (1967), for example, draws our attention to the fact that stylistic aspects can be represented at all linguistic levels. The compound terminologies, such as phonostylistics, morphostylistics, and syntactostylistics provided by him, justify his argument. Moreover, the postulation that style can be considered as a “systematic linguistic variation” (Enkvist, 1971:47), makes it clear that this relation can be extended to other linguistic disciplines beyond the formal linguistic levels. The study of style as a linguistic variation predicates that sociolinguistic and pragmatic dimensions cannot be bypassed in any full study of stylistic variation, whether literary or non-literary.
1.3. a. Stylistics and Sociolinguistics

Style, as another name for variation, has traditionally been a central topic for sociolinguistics. Accordingly, stylistics, as a discipline, which offers training in analysis sensitive to features of variation and systematicity in instances of language use in general and literary language in particular, should be a welcome supplement for those who are interested in sociolinguistics. Sociolinguistics studies those types of variation, which result from the correlation between language and social factors, such as social stratification, role, age, sex, ethnicity, etc. Sociolinguistics also deals with the problem of code selection, which is not confined to multilingual societies, but can be found in any speech community with a well-developed range of regional and social dialects (cf. Fischer, 1958, and Fishman, 1972). Through sociolinguistics, one comes to know that people use language not merely to understand each others’ thoughts and feelings, but to define their social relationships to each other, to identify themselves as part of a social group, and to establish the kind of speech event they are involved in. The relationship between stylistics and sociolinguistics is highly demonstrated by Turner (1973), who states:

Stylistics is that part of linguistics, which concentrates on variation in the use of language, often, but not exclusively, with special attention to the most conscious and complex uses of language in literature.

(Turner, 1973:7)
Thus, the concept of variation is a key factor in both stylistics and sociolinguistics, but the angle from which this phenomenon is viewed is, to some extent, different. While sociolinguistics deals with this concept in relation to society and actual performance, stylistics considers it mostly in reference to literary representations.

There are strong evidences that authors and writers have realized this significant sociolinguistic concept and practiced it in their creative work. In the 16th century, for example, literature brought attention to various forms of language, including colloquial verses formal, regional versus non-regional. The prime use of varieties other than the author's own was basically for creating humour (cf. Traugott and Pratt, 1980: 336-351). In Shakespeare's plays, for example, regionalisms are restricted to rustics and clowns, and verse and prose function as separate verities, the former being considered more formal than the latter. This distinction extends itself to genre, verse being used for tragedy and prose for comedy.

In the late 18th century, a great interest in the no-standard varieties arose, beginning with the Romantic Movement. Many Romantics, such as Wordsworth in England and Rousseau in France, showed a great interest in the language of two group of people, namely "natural" and "common" and represented their language in their work. Others after them made attempts to represent language closer to actual speech, paying attention to language varieties. For example, the Scottish poet Burns, one of
the most popular poets of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, wrote many poems in standard British English, but is best remembered for his representation of his native lowland Scots dialect in poetry, (for example, his poem entitled “To a Louse”, cited in Traugott and Pratt, 1980: 337). The use of language variation continues in the 19th century and 20th century literature, for example, Emily Bronte (1847) and D.H. Lawrence2 (1913) respectively.

However, when we discuss the use of language varieties in literature, it is not always assumed, though sometimes true, that a particular literary work is fully written in a non-standard form of language. It is rather assumed that a writer/poet sometimes tends to use certain non-standard forms in certain occasions of his work to provide his work with “a distinctive flavour” (Page, 1973:86) that cannot be achieved by other means. In other occasions, particularly in novels and drama, it is used to suggest resemblance between fictional speech and that of real life. However, it is the fictional situation itself that sometimes requires this type of use.

From this perspective, it is clear that sociolinguistic aspects are highly manifested in the work of literature. With the help of sociolinguistics, an analyst can have a good access to the social dimensions presented in the text. Many stylisticians in the recent time have started taking interest in sociolinguistic aspects and considered them as major criteria in their stylistic analysis, for

2 It is difficult to review all those writers and poets who have used language varieties in their work. I just want to emphasize that the use of language variation is evident in literature. For more details, however, see Page (1973) and Traugott and Pratt (1980).
example, Fowler (1977, 1981, 1986); Norman Page (1973); Herman (1994, 1995, 2001); and Scotton (1998). One cannot deny the fact that sociolinguistic structure has a considerable influence on the writer's contribution. Fowler (1977) emphasizes this fact:

Sociolinguistic structure bears on the novelist's writing in two ways. His style responds to his place in the history of forms of prose fiction; no matter how revolutionary, he occupies a place in the history of writing; he may belong to a 'movement' or at least relate antagonistically to a 'movement', he may relate to certain genres of non-fictional writing of his time.

(Fowler, 1977:77)

This statement can be said in another way, that is, a writer may assume a style, which announces his membership of a certain communicative group, and that stylistic choices he makes indicates the nature and structure of the social group within which he is communicating. Fowler further illustrates that many sociolinguists would argue that the individual's habitual perspectives on 'reality' are a consequence of his place in the socio-economic structure, and that the influence of social structure also operates to encode these cognitive habits in typical patterns of language usage (cf. ibid: 77). Therefore, it is true that the social structure of the writer is manifested in his literary work, and that it is through the presentation of sociolinguistic dimensions that literary work becomes closer to the reality; Page (1973) considers this:

In the creation of illusion in a work of fiction, the presentation of speech has a distinctive role, for it is in this element that the closest 'imitation of reality' is
likely to appear to take place, if only because the author's presence appears... to be least obtrusive.

(Page, 1973:3)

One of the most important advantages a stylistician can get by approaching fictional work from sociolinguistic perspective is that he can reveal many things about the fictional characters, regarding their social class, status, level of education, social power, and their relationship with each other. This can take place by virtue of investigating the speech style they adopt in their fictional communication (cf. Herman, 2001). With respect to speech variation, sociolinguistics realizes three important concepts: dialect, register, and style. These three concepts are sometimes difficult to be distinguished from each other.

1.3. a.i Dialects, registers, and styles

Sociolinguists have devoted much of their time in studying and investigating these three terms, believing that their understanding will lead to an apple-pie sociolinguistic order. All the three terms, following Herman (2001:64), “denote patterns of usage that can be contrasted with other such patterns along phonological, grammatical, lexical, and pragmatic dimensions”. Starting with dialect, it is often characterized as a pattern of usage shared by a particular speech community. Dialect, in this sense, functions as a distinguishing criterion of speech communities ethnolinguistically. For example, Southern American dialects or varieties have two distinguishing features which are phonological in nature: the emerger of /l/ and /e/ vowels before nasals (as in the
words pin and pen) and the monophthongization of the /ai/ diphthong in words like time (pronounced [ta:m] instead of [taim]) (Wolfram and Schilling -Estes, 1998:69). Dialects can be classified into two categories: “regional dialects” and “social dialects” (Hudson, 2003: 38-42). Regional dialects refer to variety differences based on geography. It is realized in the geographical distribution of linguistic items. Social dialects, on the other hand, indicate variety differences with respect to social factors, such as class, sex, age, status, etc., and because of these factors, a speaker may be more similar in language to people from the same social group in a different area than to people from a different social group in the same area (Hudson, 2003:42). The term dialect, thus, can be defined as “variety according to the user” (Halliday, 1978:35).

On the contrary, the term “register” is defined by Halliday as “variety according to use” (ibid: 35). Some researchers consider register as topic-specific, i.e. patterns of usage that manifest themselves “when certain topics are discussed by people with shared background knowledge and assumption about the topics” (Cheshire and Bell, 2003:455). Registers have always been associated with relatively stable, institutionalized patterns and varieties being connected with institutionalized situations, occupations, and the like. The difference between dialects and registers is always viewed as more functional rather than formal, i.e:
Which dialect you use indexes your social affiliation with a group of users (especially your locus of origin), which register you use indexes properties of your present situation and your social activity.

(Irvin, 2001:27).

To make it more explicit, a dialect shows who or what you are, a register shows what you are doing. For Halliday, these functional differences seem to have consequences for registers' and dialects' formal properties. According to him, the registers of a language tend to differ from one another primarily in semantics, whereas the dialects tend to differ from one another in phonetics, phonology, and "Lexicogrammar", but not in semantics (ibid:35).

Moving to style, the term has generally been used to refer to "variation within the speech of an individual speaker" (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998: 214). It has been used to differentiate language variation in the speech of individual speakers from language variation across different groups of speakers, i.e. "intra-speaker" from "inter-speaker" variation (Labov, 1972). Labov in his later work defines style in this way:

By ‘style...’ We mean to include any consistent...[set of ] linguistic forms used by a speaker, qualitative or quantitative, that can be associated with a [set of ] topic, participants, channel, or the broader social context.

(Labov, 1984:29).

The most important thing noticed in this definition is that Labov makes no reference to the speech variation of an individual as a defining factor of style; instead, he focuses on linguistic and
social aspects as defining criteria of the term. It is also clear that Labov’s definition makes style and register as two faces of the same coin. Moreover, the consistent linguistic forms referred to are also considered as defining features of the term “dialect”. Within this definition, one may say, following Herman (2001:64) that the three terms, style, dialect, and register are “sometimes grouped together under the single heading of style”. Even some sociolinguists who attempt to distinguish these three phenomena from one another are still uncertain whether these concepts are really distinguishable (cf. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, 1998: 216-217). In short, the terms dialect, register and style seem to denote overlapping but nonequivalent aspects of discourse usage. They can interact cooperatively in a single speech production, indexing the speaker’s membership in a particular social group, degree of familiarity with a particular type of communicative situation, and status-based need to be more or less formal in speaking with a particular interlocutor.

The irony is that the concept of style-shifting indicates not only shifting form one style into another, but also shifting from one dialect into another, and form one register into another (cf. Wolfram and Schilling-Estes, 1998: 217).

1.3.a.ii. Style shifting

The study of style shifting within the framework of sociolinguistic variation is commonly characterized as involving three principal components: linguistic or internal constraints, social or inter-speaker constraints, and stylistic or intra-speaker
constraints (Bell, 1984:145). Most of those variationists who studied this concept adopted a quantitative methodology in an attempt to get detailed insight into several aspects of language, including constraints or variable speech output, sound change and syntactic change, the mechanisms of vowel shifts, and structural relations among regional dialects.

William Labov's (1966) *the social stratification of English in New York City* gives central theoretical and methodological framework for the study of style. The study shows that stylistic variation constitutes a crucial nexus between the individual and the community, and between the linguistics, the cognitive, and the social. The study further illustrates that the speaker's stylistic activity, with style shifting at the center, is directly associated with the speaker's place in, and strategies with respect to, the socioeconomic hierarchy. Although the notion of prestige plays a significant role in Labov's work on style (e.g. 1972), it is *attention paid to speech* that he puts at the center of his theory, presumably because attention is the cognitive mechanism that links social to linguistic factors. In his work, Labov introduces the concept of sociolinguistic variable, which is "a set of alternative ways of saying the same thing, although the alternative will have social significance" (Fasold, 1992: 223-224). Labov argues that choices among the variants of a sociolinguistic variable are influenced by social and linguistic forces. The social force influence refers to class and style stratification. The claim that a
speaker can be socially judged depending on the style he adopts, is very much evident in Labov's work.

Giles and Smith (1979) discuss style-shifting in terms of accommodation theory developed by Giles and associates (e.g. Giles & Powesland, 1975), which incorporates ideas from four socio-psychological theories: similarity attraction, social exchange, casual attribution, and Tajfel's theory of inter group distinctiveness (Giles and Smith, 1979:47-53). The term "convergence" is very much used in this theory to refer to the process whereby individuals shift their speech styles to become more like that of those with whom they are interacting. The term "divergence" suggests the opposite, i.e. individuals shift their style to become more distant from that of those with whom they are interacting. The occurrence of style shifting from accommodation theory perspective is highly motivated by the speaker's orientation and attitude toward his addressee.

Bell (1984) seems to have been influenced by Gile's and Smith's insights, as he puts audience at the center of stylistic production. He argues that style shifting can be explained as a response to the audience, primarily the actual addressee, but also third persons (auditors and overhearers). The third person is called "referees", i.e. absent groups whose presence in the mind of the speaker can influence style variability. Style-shifting, that is motivated by the present audience, comes under what Bell (1984, 2001) calls "the audience design model". The basic argument of the audience design model is that style is oriented to people rather
than to mechanisms or functions. It focuses on the person; and it is essentially a social thing. According to this model, style shifts occur primarily in response to a change in the speaker's audience (Bell, 2001:143). It is generally manifested in a speaker shifting his/her style to be more like that of the person she/he is addressing. Bell realizes two types of style shifting: responsive style shifting and initiative style shifting. Responsive style shifting takes place according to the audience, setting, or topic. Initiative style shifting takes place when an individual speaker creatively uses language resources often from beyond the immediate speech community, such as distant dialects, or stretches those resources in novel directions. This type of shifting takes place because the referees possess salience for a speaker that they influence style even in their absence.

Coupland (1980) introduces the concept of style and style shifting in a quite different fashion. Style variation, according to him, is a speaker-oriented phenomenon. It takes place, not because of the audience addressed, but because of the speakers themselves. Introducing an emphasis on the identity dimension of style, Coupland treats stylistic variation as a dynamic presentation of the self. He focuses on the strategic use of variables in discourse, rather than focusing on the cumulative use of variables by speakers or group of speakers. Thus, for Coupland, style is an issue of identity in which the speaker expresses himself irrespective of whom he is addressing i.e. “audience” (Giles, Bell) or “attention paid to speech” (Labov, 1966, 1972, 1984). This
emphasis on style as a set of co-occurring variables associated with the speaker's own person is considered as a major departure from the studies of style and style-shifting that precedes, and has become increasingly effective in the study of style variation.

In the course of discussing style shifting, the question arising is, what are those sets of style within which a speaker can shift from one into another? Martin Joos (1962) answers this crucial question by identifying five types of speech styles: consultative, casual, intimate, formal, and frozen style (Joos, 1962:13). Joos holds that there is no law requiring a speaker to confine himself to a single style for one occasion. The speaker is free to "shift from one style to another, perhaps even within the sentence" (ibid: 17).

Consultative style, Joos argues, is characterized by two basic features: the speaker supplies background information without which he will not be understood, and the addressee participates continuously. It is used for addressing strangers who speak our language but whose personal stock of information may be different (ibid 19). On the contrary, casual style is featured by the absence of background information, and the addressee's participation is optional. It is characterized by two linguistic features: ellipsis and slang. It is designed to address friends, acquaintance, insiders and if addressed to a stranger, it serves to make him an insider (ibid: 19). By slang, Joos does not mean the ordinary meaning of the term, he rather means "words used in special senses, or phrases, usually metaphors or similes having a forced, fantastic, or
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grotesque meaning, or exhibiting eccentric or extravagant humor or fancy” (ibid:19). Moving to intimate style, it is systematically characterized by two features: extraction, and jargon, both features are stable. It is usually used by intimate group (normally a pair) (ibid 23). The fourth one is the formal style, which is designed to inform. The defining features of this style are “detachment and cohesion” (ibid 25). It signifies the minimization of personal relationship between participants, for example, the conversation between strangers begins in a formal style; once they get familiar to each other, and the formality disappears, they shift into an informal style. The last of these five categories is the frozen style, as Joos explains, it is for people who are to remain social strangers, it lacks participation and intonation but it gains one thing in return, i.e. reflection (because it is always written, a reader can re-read). Joos gives no explicit linguistic features as defining criteria for this sort of style. Although the description given by Joos is to some extent vague and complex, especially his argument about the frozen and intimate styles, one can still make use of his distinction in the analysis of speech style in general and style-shifting in particular, as one now knows those types of styles within which a speaker may shift from one to another. According to Selting (1985), style shifting can occur at all linguistic levels: phonological, lexical, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic (Our study focuses primarily on style-shifting at the pragmatic level). When style shifting is a marked choice, it becomes functionally similar to what Scotton (1985) calls “Lexical coloring”.

41
The term lexical colouring, as Scotton (1985) argues, cannot be distinguished totally from style shifting at the lexical level. In her definition of the term, Scotton states:

Lexical colouring consists of embedding a lexical choice implying a value judgment in an otherwise neutral utterance. Functionally, it is related to Style-shifting, since both propose a change in the talk exchange. But structurally lexical colouring is different since it does not involve a change in style but rather value-laden lexical choices within the same style as the ongoing exchange.

(Scotton, 1985:106)

From this definition one may further say that a particular lexical choice may lead either to lexical colouring, or to style-shifting (style-shifting at the lexical level). If this lexical choice carries a value-laden being positive or negative, it is called lexical colouring, but if it proposes a change in style, then it is called style shifting. For example, in "Vending humour" the use of vending is lexical colouring because it implies selling (vs words with more positive connotations, such as entertaining). In addition, the word vending, in this context, is used metaphorically, i.e. vending cannot collocate with humour except in metaphorical contexts.

Meanwhile, the lexical item which is responsible for causing style-shifting is called lexical variable. Hudson (2003:171)

---

3 In her later work, Scotton calls this type of style-shifting "lexical shift" (Scotton, 1988:199).
realizes the lexical variable as "where the same meaning can be expressed by two different lexical items—in other words, where two lexical items are at least partial synonymous". The relation between style variation and lexical choice is discussed by Cruse (1986), who states that "style is of particular interest to us because it is this dimension of variation which spawns the most spectacular proliferation of cognitive synonyms" (Cruse, 1986: 284). The choice of lexical items does not only give us implications about the nature of the style adopted, but also redefines the social relationship between participants, as Cruse further states:

A speaker can establish a relation of intimacy with a hearer merely by choosing one lexical item rather than another in the course of a conversation.

(ibid: 285)

Style-shifting and Lexical colouring share one important characteristic, being features of language of power. When we assume that these two concepts are considered as features of language of power, it is important to keep in mind that there are two types of power: "statusful power" and "interactional power". According to Scotton (1988):

Statusful power is the extent to which someone has control over the actions and destiny of someone else, whereas interactional power is the extent to which a speaker shows her/himself off to advantage in an interaction relative to other participants in any of these ways: in terms of controlling the sequential aspects of the interaction (e.g. controlling the floor) or the direction and/or outcome of the interaction (e.g. topics)
and also in terms of attracting favourable attention to oneself (e.g. highlighting one's expertise, on other interpersonal associations and experiences).

(Scotton, 1988: 199).

When we say that style shifting and lexical colouring are features of language of power, it is because they are features of powerful language. According to Allan and O’ Baar, (1979:73) power speech mode (powerful language) is associated with generally high social power individuals and the powerless mode with speakers having low social power. It is true, therefore, to argue that the use of powerful and powerless speech can provide strong evidences concerning the identity of the speaker with respect to his status, prestige, education and social power. Scotton and Owsley (1984) define powerful language as:

An aggregate of linguistic features which negotiate a position of “taking charge” in a talk exchange: features used in an attempt by one speaker, relative to other participants to control conversational content, evaluation of that content, and organization of the exchange.

(Owsly & Scotton, 1984:262)

There are many linguistic features, which characterize powerful and powerless language forms. Powerless language form is, for example, characterized by intensifiers (e.g. so, very, too), empty adjectives (e.g. divine, charming, cute), hyper-correct grammar (bookish grammatical forms), polite forms, gestures, hedges (e.g. well, you know, I guess), rising intonation, hesitations, and tag questions (cf. Hosman et al, 2006:33). In addition to the relative
absence of these linguistic features, powerful language is characterized by, interruptions, leading questions (eg. because? meaning?) and challenges (e.g. Don’t you think, however?)

For a number of years, many studies have been carried out on powerful and powerless language forms. For example, Bradac et al (1989) find that high power style is evaluated positively because it indicates the speaker has control of others, and that type of control is positively evaluated. They also find that a low power speech style is negatively evaluated because it indicates a lack of control of others. Gibbons et al. (1991) find that a high power speech style is perceived as exhibiting more control of self and control of others than is a low power speech style. Holtgraves and Lasky (1999) find that a powerful speech style produces more positive attitude towards a message than does a powerless speech style. Besides, they find that the effects of power of speech style on attitude are mediated by perceptions of the speaker and argument strength. Hosman et al. (2002) argue that power of style can act as a central cue to the extent that it provides information relevant to assessing the merits of the position being advocated. A low power style, they add, suggests that a communicator is uncertain about the position he/she is advocating, causing a receiver to scrutinize message arguments more carefully.

Style shifting and lexical colouring are regarded as features of powerful language and consequently features of language of power because, Scotton (1985:103) argues, they “organize the exchange by modifying the current degree of social distance
between participants". These two features, Scotton further argues, “disrupt an ongoing exchange and leave the future course uncertain” (ibid: 110). The overall function of style shifting and lexical colouring is to enhance the speaker's power position within the exchange relative to that of the addressee. This enhancement, according to Scotton, takes place in three ways:

(a) By increasing uncertainty about the speaker's aims, thereby "throwing off the addressee; (b) by establishing multiple identities for the speaker by displaying a range of style, thereby presenting an intimidating and hence a powerful image; and (c) by assuming the role of a superior by initiating the use of socially significant variants encoding solidarity.

(Scotton, 1985: 116)

From this short survey, it is clear, I hope, that these two phenomena meet the conditions of powerful language, and since powerful language is associated with negotiating power positions, these two concepts can rightly be considered as features of language of power. Style shifting and Lexical colouring will be discussed as communicative strategies used by E.M. Forester's characters in their fictional conversations.

1.3.b. Stylistics and Pragmatics

The relationship between stylistics and pragmatics has been strongly established as a result of the interest some scholars have shown in a model of stylistic analysis based on subdivisions within linguistic pragmatics, such as speech act theory, politeness theory, the study of deixis, Grice's implicatures, etc. Another
factor that has further consolidated this relationship is the orientation towards a stylistic model based on contextual rather than formal model of literary interpretation. The preference of the utterance as a basic unit for stylistic analysis rather than the sentence has also played an important role in strengthening this relationship. Moreover, the role of linguistic variation, being inherent to pragmatics cannot be ignored in this regard. According to Salvador (2003):

Consideration of linguistic variation is inherent to pragmatics, especially where such variation relates to conceptual factors, an area where it frequently converges with work on stylistics.

(Salvador, 2003:1)

The involvement of pragmatic dimensions in the stylistics study of literature has ushered in a new branch of pragmatics called "literary pragmatics".

Literary pragmatics can be seen to grow out of an attempt to find in linguistics a model for literary theory. It takes no interest in the notion of a "grammar" of literature and largely excludes the study of metrics to which formal linguistics has made significant contribution; instead, it concentrates on narrative. Since pragmatics explicitly focuses on issues falling outside the scope of formal linguistics, the assumption is that literary form is appropriately treated not within competence, but as a type of linguistic performance. The fact that pragmatics deals with the study of meaning beyond that which is encoded in the linguistic structures themselves, suggests that literary pragmatics must
concern itself with the study of meaning beyond the linguistic structure of the text itself.

In Literary pragmatics, the writing and reading of literary texts are viewed as interactive communicative processes. This amounts to taking communication as the model for literature. Sell, a prominent literary pragmatist, baldly states:

Literary pragmatics takes for granted that no account of communication in general will be complete without an account of literature and its contextualization and that no account of literature will be complete without an account of its use of the communication resources generally available.

(Sell, 1991: xiv)

Taking into account that no communication can take place without a vital interaction between at least two participants, literary pragmatics maintains this principal by emphasizing that literary communication can occur through interactions between an author and a reader. Although this type of communication does not function face to face, one to one, it can not be separated from the socio-cultural contexts within which they take place. The fact that no communication can occur without the help of pragmatic theories, postulates that the role of these theories in literary communication is taken for granted. Given below is a brief account of speech act theory and politeness theory, which will be used in the analysis of style shifting in E.M Forster’s dialogues.
1.3.b-i. Speech Act Theory (SAT)

Speech act theory is associated with a series of lectures given at Harvard in 1955 by the Oxford philosopher of language, J.L. Austin (1911-60) and published posthumously in 1962 as *How To Do Things With Words*. The ideological and methodological roots of speech act theory in Western thought go back, however, to pre-Socratic philosophers and the Old Testament and have remained a peripheralized but still powerful force in the margins of the dominant platonic-Christian scientific intellectual tradition. As its name suggests, speech acts are acts performed in or by speaking language; as such they have an act component and a language component. Philosophers have focused on action and worked towards language, while linguists have focused on language and worked towards action. Linguistically speaking, SAT treats an utterance as an act performed by a speaker in a context with respect to an addressee.

Austin's specific formulation of speech act theory opens with a distinction between what he calls the "constative", an utterance used for stating things carrying information, and the "performative", an utterance used for "doing" things, or performing actions. The phrases, "I now pronounce you man and wife," "I bet you sixpence it will rain tomorrow", and "I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth" convey no information, Austin notes, and therefore are neither true nor false; they perform the action referred to in the phrase (marrying, betting, and naming) by saying it (Austin, 1962:5-6). However, later in *how to do things with*
words, Austin grows disenchanted with the constative-performative distinction, saying that it is finally impossible to make the distinction stick in linguistic analysis of specific utterances, and realizes that "stating is doing something" (ibid: 91). In his later lectures (1962) he attempts a preliminary characterization of the notion of the language use in terms of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts.

Austin proposes that a locutionary act is the act of producing a recognizable grammatical utterance in the language. It refers to the words artificially divorced from their social context. An illocutionary act, on the other hand, is what to do in saying something, i.e. the attempt to accomplish some communicative purposes, for example, warning, greeting, reminding, informing, and commanding are all distinct illocutionary acts. A perlocutionary act, Austin further proposes, is an act which normally produces certain consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the audience, or of the speaker, or of other persons. Thus, for example, the adult who says to a child, "I'd love to see your drawing", might be describing a state of mind (locution), promising to look at the drawing (illocutionary force), and attempting to make the child feel good, building the child's self esteem (perlocutionary effect). While phonology, syntax, and semantics focus on the locutionary act, pragmatics focuses on the illocutionary act which specifies what the language is being used for on a given occasion.
The next major advance in SAT comes with the work of John. R. Searle (1969). Here, for the first time we have a systematic theory of uses of language in terms of speech acts. Searle has modified Austin's idea of speech acts into a full-blown theory of language. He has dropped the notion of the locutionary act altogether and replaced it with the idea of "propositional act" (Searle, 1969: 24). Hence, for Searle, illocutionary acts are based on "propositional acts" rather than locutionary acts. This leads to Searle's well-known formalization of the illocutionary act as "F (P)" (ibid: 31), where "F" takes illocutionary force indicating devices as values and "P" takes expressions for propositions. The tendency to bind the distinctions of speech act theory to the formal characteristics of language becomes evident in Searle's classification of speech act. Searle argues that his dealing with speech acts must not be misunderstood as dealing with what Saussure calls parole, actual speech, "I am arguing, however", Searle writes "that an adequate study of speech acts is a study of langue" (ibid: 17). As far as illocutionary acts are concerned, Searle (1979) identifies five categories: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. The assertive illocutionary act refers to that act which commits the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, for example, "I state that it is raining" is an assertive sentence. A directive illocutionary act refers to the attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do something. There are many verbs denoting members of this class, for example, ask, order, command, request, beg, plead, etc. The
commissive illocutionary act, on the other hand, refers to those illocutionary acts whose point is to commit the speaker to some future course of action, for example, "I promise to come tomorrow". The expressive illocutionary act is used to express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the prepositional content. Searle identifies the "paradigms" of expressive verbs as "thank" "congratulate", "apologize", "condole", and "welcome". The last category is declarations; these are realized in bringing about some alternation in the status or condition of the object/s referred to. For example, the declarative sentence "I now pronounce you man and wife" includes a very explicit change in the status of the objects, i.e. from unmarried into married status.

A part from Austin and Searle and their philosophical orientations, there are many linguists who have shown a great interest in SAT. For example, Katz (1977) proposes to reconstruct, within an interpretive semantics, Austin's performative constative distinction, and on the basis of this analysis he shows how sentence types can be correlated with a taxonomy of illocutionary acts. The theory explains how lexical content and syntactic structure could be recruited to specify the speech act potential of sentences and their conditions of satisfaction. Gazdar (1981) deals with SAT in terms of formal semantics. For him, speech acts are understood as operations that change one context of utterance into another, for example, a promise to do something, Gazdar argues, converts a context with no commitment for the speaker to do it
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into one with commitment. Sadock and Zwicky (1985) examine SAT within data collected from 23 languages. They suggest that major moods, such as declarative, imperative and interrogative can be found in most languages.

After this brief account, the question is; has SAT been designed to deal exclusively with natural discourse, or rather its scope can be extended to all types of discourse, including literary discourse? Let’s see.

1.3.b.ii. Speech Act Theory and Literary Discourse

The most important issue that Austin has been criticized for is the issue of parasitic language. Austin excludes poetic or figurative language in his work, claiming that they are non-serious acts:

A performative utterance will, for example, be in a peculiar way hollow or void if said by an actor on the stage, or if introduced in a poem/or spoken in a soliloquy.... language in such circumstances is in special ways- intelligibly-used not seriously, but in ways parasitic upon its normal use-ways which fall under the doctrine of the etiolations of language. All this we are excluding from consideration.

(Austin, 1962:22)

So it is clear that Austin supports the idea of making a dichotomy between literary language and non-literary language, and that speech act theory is mainly concerned with language used in normal conditions. Searle (1979) holds a more extreme-position than Austin. He makes a dichotomy not between literary and non-
literary utterances, but between fictional and non-fictional utterances. According to Searle, fictional discourse is a series of "pretended assertions" in which the author "pretends to perform a series of illocutionary acts, normally of the assertive type" (Searle, 1979: 65). He describes fictional utterances as "non-serious" (ibid:60). However, he admits that fiction does not have different illocutionary acts form non-fiction:

Anyone therefore who wishes to claim that fiction contains different illocutionary acts form non-fiction is committed to the view that words do not have their normal meanings in works of fiction. That view is at least prima-facie and impossible view since if it were true it would be impossible for anyone to understand a work of fiction without learning a new set of meanings for all the words and other elements contained in the work of fiction.

(Searle, 1979:64)

Thus, both Austin and Searle do not approve the idea of applying SAT to figurative language or fictional language. For them, SAT is meant for the serious utterances only, and since fictional utterances are non-serious, they lay out of the scope of the theory.

It is this issue for which Austin and Searle have been attacked severely by a number of linguists and critics. For example, Derrida argues that excluding parasitic language from the domain of performative communication is "willy-nilly to exclude all language from this space" (Quoted in Nair, 2002:131). For Derrida, all language is "coded" and "iterated", all language feeds off previous instance of language use, and literary language
is non-exception. In his deconstruction of Austin, "Signature Event context" (1977), Derrida claims that the exclusion of parasitic language from the domain of SAT undermines the explanatory power of this theory. Also, in his "Limited Inc." (1977), he explains that "serious" speech acts are in fact grounded in the very possibility of linguistic parasitism, or, "iterability" (pp: 91-92). To put that simply, Derrida wants to say that one is always acting, in both senses of the word, whether he has memorized his lines from a specific script for a specific play or, more generally, from "life", from previous speech encounters. In fact, the issue of parasitic language became one of the turning points of the Searle-Derrida debate (cf. Robinson, 1994:685).

In her well-written and well-argued book, Pratt (1977) attacks those who commit what she calls the poetic language fallacy. In opposing the dichotomists, Professor Pratt is not radical. She wants to say that there are differences between literary and ordinary discourse, but if the exact nature of these differences and similarities is to be appreciated, a fair comparison needs to be made. Pratt attempts to refute the assumption that literary discourse is beyond the scope of SAT. Restricting her self to literary narrative discourse, Pratt shows that this type of discourse can be classified into basic speech acts, borrowing form Searle rather than from Austin. She also discusses Austin's and Searle's concept of appropriateness conditions (or rules) for specific speech acts (e.g., the role that apologies presuppose a past negative action on the part of the speaker).
that the directive speech acts apply to future actions of the hearer) and the general rule (e.g. that the speaker and hearer must speak the same language). Pratt finds it useful to deal with literature, particularly the narrative, in terms of speech act theory, stating that:

There are enormous advantages to talking about literature in this way, too, for literary works, like all our communicative activities, are context-dependent. Literature itself is a speech context.

(Pratt, 1977:86)

One of the most important and recent works, which has been devoted to discussing this issue, is Nair (2002). Nair criticizes Searle’s idea that the speech act of fiction is “parasitic” upon the act of assertion, and that “sincerity condition” which enjoins truthfullness is suspended in fictional discourse. Illustrating his position, Nair states:

My position in Narrative Gravity, on the contrary, is that there can be a lot of truth (facts as well as tenets of cultural faith) in a fictional assertion, and that the audiences know how to negotiate facts in a fictional story without (a) making a binary distinction between the categories of ‘fiction’ versus ‘assertion’ and (b) having to relate fiction ‘parasitically’ to the prior and more basic speech act of assertion.

(Nair, 2002:8).

In the course of his discussion, Nair goes on refuting Searle’s claims and declares that fiction is not only an independent speech act but the most performative one because “its existence is
typically predicated on its announcing itself as fiction, and that's that, in the same way as a promise is a promise" (ibid:74). The fact that some illocutionary acts are associated with perlocutionary effects has further strengthened Nair's argument because "fiction is conventionally associated with those leaky perlocutionary effects (curiosity, surprise, fear, wonder" (ibid 75).

In addition to what have been argued by Derrida, Pratt, and Nair, there are other critics who have written in this connection, surveying which will add nothing other than emphasizing the claim that SAT can be well-exploited in the study and interpretation of literary discourse (for a good survey, however, see Straus 1987; Robinowitz, 1995; and Petrey 1990). It seems useful, however, to conclude with what Pratt suggests in this regard that:

A linguistic model that can describe and explain the use of language in non literary situations should be able to account as well for how we understand language in literary contexts.

(Pratt, 1977: XII)

1.3.b.iii. Politeness Theory (Brown and Levinson 1987)

Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory is based on the assumption that speakers in any given language do not just convey information through their language; they use their language to do things. They propose that participants in conversation actually construct and build personal relationship through the dialogue they negotiate with each other. They further
argue that the social principal guides and constrains our choice of language in everyday discourse.

The most central component to Brown and Levinson's theory is the concept of face, a dimension of social interaction initially introduced by Goffman (1967: 15) as "the positive social value [self-image] a person effectively claims for himself", and consistently attempts to maintain in interactions with others. Brown and Levinson construct their interactional model around a model person (MP), one who, from the outset, in addition to demonstrating a command of the language and a rational capability for determining the means needed to accomplish end goals, possesses two basic, somehow conflicting, "face wants" (Brown & Levinson, 1987:61). The first is the negative face wants, that is the want to be free to act unimpeded by others and to have one's individual rights, possessions, and territories uninfringed upon (ibid:61). The second is the positive face wants, that is the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others.

Brown and Levinson use speech act theory as the framework for their analysis. Speech acts, such as orders, requests, and threats, for example, threaten the hearer's negative face, while acts of criticism, disapproval, and disagreement, among others, threaten the hearer's positive face. Speakers can also perform acts that are self threatening: the expression of thanks or the acceptance of an offer, for example, in Brown and Levinson's system, are acts that impinge on the speaker's negative face because they impel future obligation, whereas apologies and
confessions, among other self-humiliating acts, reduce the positive face image of the speaker (ibid: 68). These acts, which are inherently threatening to the speaker or hearer, become the principal unit of analysis in Brown and Levinson's model and are called "face-threatening acts", (FTAs) (ibid: 60).

Brown and Levinson realize two types of politeness: positive politeness, and negative politeness. Positive politeness is oriented toward the positive face of the hearer. It is associated with the positive self image the hearer claims for himself, i.e. it considers the face of the addressee by indicating that in some respect, S (speaker) wants H's (hearer's) wants, for example, by treating him as a member of an in-group, or a friend. FTAs can be reduced in this case by assuring he hearer that the speaker wants at least some of his wants. Negative politeness, on the other hand, is oriented mainly toward partially satisfying (redressing) the hearer's negative face, i.e. his basic want to maintain claims of territory and self determination. The realizations of negative politeness, Brown and Levinson argue, "consist in assurances that the speaker recognizes and respects the addressee's negative face wants and will not interfere with the addressee's freedom of action" (ibid:70). Negative politeness, they add, is characterized by "self effacement, formality and restraint, with attention to every restricted aspects of H's self image, centering on this want to be unimpeded" (ibid: 70).
Brown and Levinson introduce five basic strategies from which a speaker may choose either to minimize or maximize the FTA to the hearer's face. These five strategies are as follows:

1. Do the FTA without redressive action baldly, with maximum efficiency.
2. Do the FTA with redressive positive politeness action, on record (showing clear unambiguous intent).
3. Do the FTA with redressive negative politeness action, on record.
4. Do the FTA off record (showing ambiguous intent).
5. Don't Do the FTA.

( Ibid: 60)

These five strategies are identified by Brown and Levinson as higher-order strategies. Strategies 2, 3, and 4 are realized linguistically by virtue of various selections of lower order strategies by the speaker.

Doing the FTA baldly without redressive action (strategy 1) means that S conforms directly with Grice's maxims without attending to face. Speakers choosing this option may have the effect of being rude and not caring about the hearer. However, in many circumstances using this strategy is quite justifiable. For example, in emergency situations, the choice of this strategy may be the most appropriate because attending to face takes more time involving more strategic choices to be made. Thus, a surgeon in an
operating room, for example, may use this strategy with his
technical team by saying “go get the scalpel” with the knowledge
that the intent of the act will not be inferred by the technical team
as a face threatening act.

Positive politeness redressive action, on the other hand, is
used by S to soften the FTA by partially satisfying H’s positive
wants. This cannot take place without using at least one of the
linguistic strategies identified by Brown and Levinson (cf. ibid:
102). For example, S in saying “what a beautiful dress you’re
wearing! The bank is closed today. I came to borrow some
money”, shows positive face attention to the hearer in the course
of committing the FTA (this linguistic strategy is realized by
Brown Levinson as “Attend to H’s wants and needs”).

Similarly, Negative politeness redressive action (strategy 3)
is used by S to maintain and satisfy H’s negative face wants at
least partially. It can be accomplished with the help of certain
linguistic strategies (cf. ibid: 131). For example, if S says “can
you lend me some money”? S attempts to minimize the imposition
of the FTA by giving H the option not to comply (This strategy is
realized by Brown and Levinson as “minimize the imposition of
the FTA”).

Doing the FTA off record (strategy 4) is a strategy selected
by S if he does not want to be responsible directly for his intent to
commit a FTA. By using various linguistic strategies that violate
one or the other of Grice’s maxims, such as hinting, understating,
being ironic, etc (ibid: 214), S allows H to interpret his intent in
various ways and S himself can always deny that he has committed a FTA. For example, if S says “I am out of cash, I forgot to go to the bank today”, S may be intending to get H lend him some money, but S cannot be held to have committed a FTA (borrowing), because if H responds by saying “I will not give you money”, S can simply deny requesting anything from H.

Finally, avoiding doing FTA (strategy 5) simply means that S avoids offending H at all with his particular FTA. By doing so, a speaker fails to fulfill his ultimate desired communicative goals from the hearer. As a matter of fact, the type of strategy selected and thus the consequent level of politeness depends on the speaker’s assessment of the degree of seriousness of the FTA. Strategy 5 may be the best option for the speaker when he is at the highest risk of losing face as a result of threatening H. Brown and Levisnon specify three sociological variables that influence the speaker’s assessment of the seriousness of the FTA: the social distance between S and H (D), the relative power of H over S (P), and the culturally determined ranking of the imposition or threat of the FTA in that culture (R) (ibid 74). These three variables are significant on condition that the actors share mutual knowledge of the significance of the values of these variables. In terms of Brown and Levinson, the Distance variable is realized as “asymmetric social dimension of similarity/ difference within which S and H stand for the purpose of this act” (ibid: 76). It is usually based on an assessment of “the frequency of interaction
and the kinds of material and non-material goods (including face) exchanged between ‘S and H’ (ibid: 77).

The variable of Power is defined as “the degree to which H can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation (face) at the expense of S’s plans and self-evaluation” (ibid: 77). The third variable, Ranking, measures the degree to which an act is considered to “interfere with an agent’s wants of self-determination or of approval......” (ibid: 77).

The politeness model presupposes, then, that the model person (MP) is supposed to select the highest numbered strategy (i.e. one that carries the highest level of politeness) in communication circumstances where the (MP) considers him/herself at the highest risk in committing the face threatening act. This takes place in situations where, for example, the MP’s interlocutor is a stranger (a high D variable), a dominant participant hearer (a high P variable), or where a particular FTA is of a high ranked imposition (a high R variable). This accordingly suggests that the MP’S intention directs him to choose the highest strategic option to be in the safe side of committing a FTA. It is this intention around which the model has been designed. In this respect Brown and levinson state that “what the agents do is related systematically to their intents, and thus that intentions of actors are reconstructable by observers or recipients of actions” (ibid: 7). The politeness model has been utilized largely in a wide variety of fields, including literature, especially literary dialogues and conversations.
1.3.b.iv. Politeness in Literature

The idea that literary discourse is not different from other kinds of naturally occurring utterances has been emphasized by a number of linguists. For example, professor Firth, an eminent British linguist, considers that all written texts have "implication of utterance" (Quoted in Fowler 1966:7). Frye holds the same position, illustrating that "we have no real standards to distinguish a verbal structure that literary from one that is not" (Quoted in ibid: 11). The same stand is held by Gordon who argues that literary dialogue "consistently echoes the accepted speech of the day" and that "there is no line of dialogue from a novel that couldn't be easily imagined proceeding from the mouth of an actual person" (Quoted in Page, 1973:3). Accordingly, it can be suggested that the dialogues of literary characters could be examined in the same way that linguists study naturally occurring conversations (cf. Burton, 1980 (introduction); Carter, 1990: 590-600; and Toolan, 1990:273-277). However, this does not presume that the language of conversation is identical to the language encountered in literary dialogues. But since writers create the illusion of naturally occurring conversation, they require that the reader make meaning of the characters' utterances as if the characters were producing and negotiating their utterances in real time.

To some scholars interested in a rapprochement of linguistic and literary studies, Brown and Levinson's model proposes a new way of connecting politeness with literary texts. These scholars
have looked at the way FTAs are handled in the language of authorial personae and of characters. Sell (1991), for example, explains how Wadman notices that, in the poems of George Herbert, a crucial turning point sometimes coincides with the mention of Christ's atonement for man's sins, after which Herbert presents himself in ways that are self-effacing. He further illustrates that in the poem, the speaker uses politeness realizations, such as hedges, negatives, questions to emphasize both his distance from God and God's enormous power.

Simpson (1989) makes use of the politeness phenomenon in his analysis of some dialogues of Ionesco's play, *The lesson*. The play is about a professor who gives a lesson to an eighteen year old girl. By tracing certain utterances in their dialogues, Simpson shows how the relationship between the professor and the pupil develops, resulting in a powerful climax.

Short (1996) finds that Brown and Levinson's model can be well-exploited in the analysis of literary dialogues. He, particularly, notices that the variant forms of the vocatives which characters use to address one another have different effects in terms of politeness. Short argues that politeness plays an important role in the conversations of plays' and novels' characters, and therefore it will be helpful to examine the phenomena carefully. (see Short, 1996, especially pp. 212-217). Sell realizes this type of politeness as "politeness in literature" (Sell, 1991:221).
The main concern of politeness in literature is to investigate the social relationships among the conversational participants (characters) demonstrated in their literary dialogues. By analyzing literary dialogues, an analyst attempts to show how the politeness phenomenon is maintained and practiced by fictional characters, and how it is possible for him to build certain assumptions about their relationships. Since politeness is a significant feature of the naturally occurring conversations between people, characters’ politeness makes one claim that literary dialogues and utterances can be examined in the same way as naturally spoken discourse. Politeness of characters or politeness in literature, as Sell prefers to call, is one of the main concerns negotiated by this study. It will be used in the analysis of style shifting in E.M. Forster’s fictional dialogues.

The politeness concept can also be discussed in terms of “politeness of literature” (Sell, 1991:221). Politeness, in this sense, attempts to explore the relationship between the writer and reader. In order to be polite, a writer must maintain “selectional politeness” as well as “presentational politeness”. By maintaining selectional politeness, a writer pays attention to all the taboos and conventions dominated in his society and culture. He does not say anything or use any words which would be considered as threatening the readers’ positive or negative face. The writer must also avoid some types of subject matter constituting FTAs and all types of language that are in themselves offensive. On the other hand, a writer who maintains presentational politeness takes into
account to observe the cooperative principles at all costs. He should not leave his readers in the slightest doubt about his arguments. He must avoid all vague expressions, sentences, and words that may create understanding problems to the readers. In short, the writer must not lead his readers blind of "what was happening, what he meant, or why he was saying what he was saying" (Sell, 1991: 222). In the following chapter, I intend to give a brief account on E.M. Forster's life and art.