Introduction -
Style and Stylistics
1.1 Style

The verdict of Buffoon that "Man is the style himself..." is a universal truth. Endowed with one tongue and two hands, man has proved the best creative creature in the universe. We can think and perform anything coping with the systems and traditions deep-rooted in the society and culture. In particular every man or woman is different from other men and women. This individual difference can be attested in all walks of life, i.e. members of the same family, students of the same teacher, speakers of the same language share the general characteristics but while performing or behaving they differ in a certain amount. Furthermore, the same person acts in different ways in different contexts of situation, e.g. A person usually doesn't use the same language at different times and places - at home, at work, in the market, etc. What appears from this is that Style is latent in human mind and behaviour and so results in different forms.

Speakers of the same language do speak the language not in the same manner. They vary to a great deal as regards pronunciation of sounds, selection of words, phrases & sentence-patterns, by which they identify themselves. So the
notion of style emerges from contrasts or differences not from similarities. So, it can be said that idiosyncracy or heterogeneity may be taken as the basis for style.

"Style" originates from the Latin word 'stylus' which means such an instrument made up of metal or bone that its one end is narrow to write on the plate of wax and the next end is wide to rub to correct whatever in written. Thus it indicates the constant practice of the writer. The Indian story of the origin of equivalent - 'SHAILI' is very interesting. It is the derivative of 'Sheel', which indicates the indivisible qualities as nature, temperament of the author on the one hand, and on the other hand it means concentration and practice devoted to creation.

Hockett (1973 : 556) feels very difficult to define the term 'Style'. In his own words "Roughly speaking, two utterances in the same language which convey approximately the same information but which are different in their linguistic structure can be said to differ in style..." Within a single language whatever differences among speakers and between two or more regional varieties are nothing but stylistic. Thus style can be either of an individual or of a group of
people. This is true when we compare English style to any other style, say Hindi or Marathi etc. In the English speaking world today there are several varieties e.g., British English, American English, Indian English etc. Styles of different periods in English literature can also be seen, namely Elizabethan style, Victorian style, Jacobean style, Miltonian style, Shakespearian style etc. In different genres of literature, style differs to a great deal. So we call poetic style, fictitious style, prose style and dramatic style.

'Style' seems to be an individual property of any work of art, but since all forms of literature or discourse are meant for communication, so it is pertinent to say that language is a common vehicle of communication. The individual differences in style do not create any obstacle. Actually what we call style is according to Likhachov (1967 : 35) "a combination of his (writer's) perception of reality and the artistic method which he chooses." Similar view is that of Grigorian. He claims that "style cannot be taken apart from artistic method, the artistic outlook or his personality, his understanding of time in which he lives and national characteristics of his art...... style is the closest unity of all that." "Style, he writes", is an understanding of reality. But style is also a form of this under-
standing, a form which sometimes determines that understanding and becomes an integral part of it."

Riffatarre (1959 : 413) has defined, 'Style' as an emphasis (expressive, effective and aesthetic) added to the information connected by the linguistic structure alternative of meaning which is to say that language expresses and that style stresses" According to this view, we have the matter - manner dicotomy which is united in a piece of literary work. It means the form can't be separated from its soul and hence style appears to be a pervasive characteristic of any work of art - which can be felt much more than analysed. This is why Kovalev opines that "Style is both form and content. It is a combination of artistic method, themes and ideas in all their uniqueness, united and determined by artist's world view and the social realities of his age."

In conclusion, style is a phenomenon differing in form from person to person, place to place, time to time, genre to genre and language to language. It is that specific or unique quality which can't be shared and imitated by others, because 'style' is the sum total of all specific features vested in the work of art. It is that creative individuality which spreads over all that
a person does. First as personality can't be precisely defined or analysed, likewise, 'Style' also can't be precisely defined or analysed. It can be felt, realised or experienced and creative life as such is sharing of experience by the author and the reader by way of different techniques - symbolism imagery, fantasy etc. all writhed in common code known as language.

Language becomes a bridge between man and man, i.e. it is a social asset but it is realised or manifested as differently as possible. The language used in a work of art is not necessarily the language used in day to day behaviour. The function of creative language is more expressive than descriptive or denotative. The subject matter or the theme, the form, the technique, all become one integral whole. So it expresses the self of the writer who depicts his world view, his life style and objectives in terms of language. So, 'style' can't be labelled as merely the theme, image, structural composition or metaphor or any particular speciality. To be precise, the whole personality of the writer is expressed in his style.

Style differs from technique. Technique is the device employed by the author in his work. And while doing it, he must choose the best among many styles or his own technique.
evolved by himself also comes into existence. Chaucer, Milton, Chekhov, Donne have their own styles - unique and precious. In different genres, the same author adopts different ways of saying the same thing which provides that power to shape the style of expression. Subject matter also plays a vital role in the formation of style. As Goethe put it, "style is based upon the strong holds of knowledge on the essence of things itself."

1.2 Style : Types

Undoubtedly there may be as many types of style as is the number of persons. However, there are common traits which call upon thinking of types of style. Based upon different norms and contexts, Style can be classified as under -

a. **Formal-informal style** which can be further classified as intimate-non-intimate depending on the relations between two or more persons.

b. **Old-modern style** which can be further divided into many groups or many sub types e.g. Modern style has so far developed as post-modern and again post-post modern.

c. Works of different natures have also their own styles viz. classical, neoclassical, romantic, metaphysical, existential,
psychoanalytical, classical, satirical, etc.

d. **Regional style** are also identifiable such as British, American, African, Indian etc.

e. **Philosophical**, Scientific, religious, historical styles are based on the subject matter. Literary styles and non-literary styles are very popular.

f. **Elegant**, lucid, rustic archaic are some of the styles depending upon the effect on the readers.

g. **Different genres** have their own styles such as prose style, dramatic style, poetic style, fictional style etc.

h. **Different languages** also have their own styles for e.g. English style, French style, Greek style, Latin style etc.

i. **Allegorical style** is also one of most effective modes of style.

In brief, it's very difficult to delineate all types of style and ultimately it is wise to say that style is not a static entity rather it is a dynamic one which goes on changing according to the need of situation. Not only this but also it takes its shape in different readers as the impression or effect on them. The same work read by the same person at different
times implants differently and therefore the dynamics of style is there forever.

1.3 Stylistics

John Spencer says, "A writer's style may be regarded as an individual and creative utilization of the resources of language which his period, his chosen dialect, his genre and his purpose within it offer him. To understand and to make explicit his linguistic creativity, to appreciate in full the alchemy by which he transmutes the base metal of everyday language into the gold of art, it is first necessary to recognise and where possible to specify the ranges of language within which he is working, and upon which he is able to draw. The attempt to do so in analytical detail is not to destroy the wonder of literature but to enhance it."

It is obvious that the main purpose of stylistics is to highlight those features that make discourse distinct and impressive and in doing so the critic or the stylistician is nobody to separate the quality (known as 'style') from rest of the creative work since style is the impression on the reader or the viewer drawn from the work as a whole. H.G. Widdowson, therefore, has a broad opinion on this matter. He writes, "By
'stylistics' I mean the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation and I shall take the view that what distinguishes stylistics from literary criticism on the one hand and linguistics on the other is that it is essentially a means of thinking the two and has (as yet at least) no autonomous domain of its own.

Thus, there are mainly two directions of stylistic study, viz. Lingua-stylistic or Linguistic stylistics and literary stylistics. But, to be precise, to study stylistically a verbal art, it would be wise not to ignore the aesthetic value(s) of a work of art, because linguistic elements such as discourse, discourse situations, types of narration, narrative voice, tone, point of view, etc. contribute a lot to the making and the total effect of the work. Jan Mukarorsky observes this fact clearly: "It cannot be said of novel that here the linguistic elements are the aesthetically indifferent expression of content, not even if they appear to be completely devoid of foregrounding, the structure is the total of all the component, and its dynamics arises precisely from the tension between the foreground and the foregrounded components. In the art we evaluate each component in terms of the structure of the work in question and the yardstick is in each individual case determined by the function
of the component within the structure".

When we speak of the linguistic style of a novel or any work of art, the following are the dimensions to be shagged out by the analyst:

i. the subject-matter, i.e. the thing spoken about, the referent or the semantic core;

ii. the participants - the speaker and the addressee;

iii. the speech act i.e. the concrete physical event in the delivery of the message;

iv. the code i.e. the language in which the message is transmitted; and

v. the message.

N.E. Enkvist says that "Style (stylistics) is one of those areas where linguistics, pragmatics, and aesthetics readily overlap. Part of the difficulty in discussing style follows from the temptation to attempt simultaneous answers to linguistic, pragmatic, and aesthetic questions."

Transformational Grammarians are of the view that style lies in the process of selecting one of the many transfor-
mations which relate the deep structure with its surface representations. The functional approach to the study of style of a work of art suggests that stylistic devices employed in which the literary object is captured. If style, according to Riffatare (1959 : 413), is an emphasis (expressive, effective, or aesthetic) added to the information, then it must be borne in mind that the effect or impression can be had only being in the literary world not elsewhere or merely linguistic world, Suresh Kumar, has the opinion that, "Literary Stylistics provides a basis for a fuller understanding, more convincing interpretation, and a balanced, evaluation of literary text." The same scholar is of the view that "impressionism, those responsible for many a shortcoming in criticism, cannot be totally eliminated. We can only make it a controlled and verifiable activity by means of an approach to literature and alone this can help us. Language in literature is a special use, related to the total product - a literary work - in a way as to be responsible for realisation of a particular configuration of aesthetic qualities that a work of art symbolises in itself. Stylistics investigates patterns of correlations between linguistic and literary categories in all their aspects."

The other main features of stylistics is that it persists
in the attempt to understand technique, or the craft of writing. If we agree that Hemingway's Short story 'Indian Camp' and Yeats poem 'Sailing Byzantium', are both extraordinary literary achievements! what are some of the linguistic components of that excellence? Why these word-changes, clause-patterns, redeems and intonations, contextual implications, cohesive links, choices of voice and perspective and transitivity etc.-etc... and not any of others imaginable? Conversely can the linguistic bases of same aspects of week writing bad poetry, the confusing and the baral be located? Stylistics asserts we should be able to particularly by bringing to the close examination of the linguistic particularities of a text, understand of the anatomy and functions of the language.

In essence, stylistic deals with whatever grammar doesn't. That is, stylistics start where grammar ends. This is beyond doubt that grammar deals with generalisations in language whereas stylistics, with specifications in language. In other words the grammar of a language cannot capture all the uses that the people make in different situations. It rather talks of the usual features of a language only. On the contrary, stylistics always attempts to study those specific uses which are the outcome of specific situations whereby, the speaker or the
writer is identified. As Turner rightly says, "Grammar leaves out part of real language and we feel that what it leaves out, the detailed particularity of particular occasions, brings us nearer to what we mean when we talk of 'Variation' or 'Style'. Can we simply say that the very setting up of a grammatical scheme isolates for us the companion study of stylistics? Is grammar what is said and stylistics how it is said? Can style be defined as what grammar leaves out? The True nature of style is elusive and will need subtler nets than this to catch it."

This is why he further stresses the need of particularising the scope of stylistics as follows: "stylistics must therefore deal with a particularity it can never reach, ever indicating and lighting up what it cannot capture. Details are described in terms of other details; variations in the scheme of language are schematized. Merely the name 'Variation' implies a scheme to vary from the stylistian needs to begin with a theory of the linguistic scheme and relate in to particular speeches and writings even if he is ultimately justified as the linguist not of our abstract competence in language but of our particular performances."

Literature draws heavily on language but the language
of literature is meant not to inform or communicate a message rather it aims at captivating the reader or the hearer at its best. So naturally, it has to go beyond words, i.e. even silence speaks much more in literature along with images, symbols, myths allegories, and figures. Style identifies that a language is not constant. It varies according to its context and situation. Thus G.W. Turner writes: "Stylistics is that part of linguistics which concentrates, often but not exclusively with special attention to the most conscious and complex use of language in literature."

It appears from the above, that stylistics is the study of the work of art which aims at exhibiting variation and the choice for the context. As such stylistics in its nature gives emphasis on the rich potentials of the language of the writer. In other words it can be said an ideally economical and developed idiolect. The literary style deals with the manner of expression characteristically intrigued in the work of verbal art. From the semantic point of view, stylistics takes its place where grammar leaves out. Thus Shift talks of style, "Proper words in proper places makes the true definition of style."

With the emergence of transformational generative
grammar, the concept of foregrounding and ambiguity got access to stylistic studies in that whatever artistic creation takes place is backgrounded by language per se. So, stylistics cannot and must not undermine linguistics in any case, for stylistics is the furtherance of linguistics, i.e. linguistics studies the general characteristics of language, whereas stylistics does study the language in use based on the grammar and semantics of it.