Review

BASIC ISSUES IN LITERARY STYLISTICS

Dr. Mesfin Wodajo Woldemariam

Mizan-Tepi University, Department of English Language and Literature.

Email: mesfinwodajo33@yahoo.com or mesfinwodajo@gmail.com, Mobile: +251913576133 or +251917152723

This review aims to provide theoretical concepts of literary stylistics. Stylistics is the study of style. It can be seen as having various types based on its specific orientation. The paper deals with concepts, historical developments, types, approaches and basic features of literary stylistics. As the review shows, literary stylistics is not homogenous. As a result, there can be many ways of approaching literary stylistics since each type has its own concern in studying literary texts though they share certain stylistic features. Literary style is a phenomenon differing in form from person to person, place to place, time to time, genre to genre and language to language. Style is also resulted from linguistic choices, which effectively express the writer's unique thought and feeling. Literary style is a means of discovery for both writer and reader and sharpens expressive meaning as well as referential meaning, intensifying the tone of writing, making prose more persuasive. Literary style is not mere ornament; rather it conveys important subtleties of meaning and evaluation, which define the nature of the writer, his/her basic attitudes, his/her presuppositions, his/her moral stance, and his/her relation to his/her subject and reader.

Keywords: Stylistics, concepts, historical developments, types, approaches and basic features of literary stylistics

INTRODUCTION

According to Leech and Short (2007), the word 'style' refers to the way in which language is used in a given context, by a given person, for a given purpose, and so on" (p.9). Chatman (1971) defines style as "a product of individual choices and patterns of choices among linguistic possibilities (p. 6). For Zhukovska (2010), "style is one of the distinctive varieties of language, language subsystem with a peculiar vocabulary, phraseology, and constructions" (p. 15). It differs from other varieties by expressive and evaluative properties of its constituents and is connected with certain spheres of speech communication. As Timuçin (2010) states that style is a set of characteristics by which we distinguish one author

from another or members of one subclass from members of other subclasses, all of which are members of the same general class. From the above concepts of the scholars, it is possible to comprehend that style is a broad concept and it is a way an individual writer or speaker uses language in conveying his or her message. It varies from writer to writer or speaker to speaker concerning one's choice of word, syntax, tone and the like.

When it comes to the concept of literature, style may be seen from the perspective of genres. For example, the style of poetry is different from the style of prose or from the style of play individual style of a writer is a unique combination of language units, expressive means and stylistic devices peculiar to a given author, which makes

the writer's works or even utterances easily recognizable. Hence, style denotes the collective characteristics of writing, diction or any artistic expression and the way of presenting things, depending upon the general outlook proper to a person, a literary school, a trend, a period or a genre (Timuçin, 2010; Yosliifuini, 1997). Style is a pattern of linguistic features distinguishing one piece of speech or writing from another or one category of writings from another. Style includes the writer's way of thinking about his subject and his characteristic way of presenting it for a particular reader and purpose.

The Concept of Literary Stylistics

The formal study of style is called stylistics. Stylistics is a branch of applied linguistics, and it is the study and interpretation of texts in regard to their linguistic and tonal style. As a discipline, it links literary criticism to linguistics (Crystal, 1998). Hence, it examines the whole scheme of expressive resources available in a particular language. Leech and Short (2007) define stylistics as the linguistic study of style that explains the relationship between language and artistic function, giving due attention to questions such as "why" and "how" more than "what". From the linguist's perspective, stylistics is concerned with 'Why does the author here choose this form of expression? But from the literary critic's side, it focuses on 'How is such-and-such an aesthetic effect achieved through language? As a result, from the concept of Leech and Short, it is possible to view stylistics as a rigorous study of literary text on an advanced level, by making out the particular effect of the particular choice of language in literary communication.

For Widdowson (1992) stylistics is "the study of literary discourse from a linguistics orientation" (p. 3). As to Simpson (2004) stylistics can be seen as a practice of using linguistics for the study of literature and it grew from practical criticism as a methodology which attempted to be objective and rigor in the analysis of literature. From Simpson's and Widdowson's perspective it can be understood that stylistic analysis of literature is precise and objective that uses the concepts and techniques of linguistics. Therefore, stylistics as a conceptual discipline endeavors to establish principles capable of explaining particular choices made by individuals and social groups in their use of language, such as in the literary production and reception of genre, the study of folk art, in the study of spoken dialects and registers, and can be applied to areas such as discourse analysis as well as literary criticism (Bradford, 2005; Crystal, 1998, Simpson, 2004; Widdowson, 1975). Short (1996) indicates that stylistics proves to be complementary to literary criticism for its special focus to detail and linguistic rigor. The unclear and inexact nature of literary criticism is inoculated with a vigorous amount of stylistic analysis to gain an enhancement and awareness into a text and its

interpretation. This concept of stylistic has great bearing in the third world context where English is taught as a second language and literature is demonstrated as a challenging to learn.

Mukarovsky (1958) argues that literary criticism is concerned with defining, classifying, illuminating and evaluating works of literature which has led to the construction of several theories, which in turn have raised several questions on meanings, ideas propounded, realism, the reader and his response, the context of the literary text as well as the text itself. In order to make literary criticism explicit, formal, objective and publicly demonstrable, the discipline called literary stylistics, which is concerned with the resources of a language code for the production of messages, came about (Mukarovsky, 1958; Widdowson, 1975). From this point, it is possible to say that literary stylistics is an extreme form of language-centered, or rather text-oriented criticism, tending more towards the application of linguistic principles in the analysis of literature. As Kuolie (2010) states, the word 'linguistics' in literary stylistics means that the scientific study of language and its structures, rather than the learning of individual languages. The use of linguistic principles to approach literary texts constitutes one of the most important aspects of stylistics. Hence, literary stylistics is typically concerned with explaining the relation between linguistic descriptions and literary or aesthetic function.

In describing technical aspects of the language of a literary text, the concepts of modern linguistics are used to identify the stylistic features, or formal properties which are held to be distinctive of a particular work, author, literary tradition, or an era. These stylistic features may be phonological (patterns of speech, sounds, meter, or rhyme), or syntactic (types of sentence structure), or lexical (abstract vs. concrete words, the relative frequency of nouns, verbs, adjectives), or rhetorical (the characteristics use of figurative language, imagery, and so on). This aims to either provide objective linguistic data, to support existing readings or intuitions about a literary work or to establish a new understanding based mainly on this linguistic data and contradict the already existing interpretation (Kuolie, 2010; Leech and Short, 2007).

From the above explanations, it is possible to comprehend that literary stylistics places focus on the connection between the theoretical model of linguistic and the literary texts. Thus, it helps to enhance one's reading and interpretation of these texts through the application of various aspects of linguistic theory, and it builds on the assumption that the study of literature and language need not be regarded as mutually exclusive but rather as significantly related to each other.

Crystal (1998) contends that literary stylistic analysis deal with the complex and valued language within literature. In such investigation, the scope of stylistics is sometimes narrowed to concentrate on the more striking

features of literary language, for instance, its 'deviant' and abnormal features, rather than the broader structures that are found in whole texts or discourses. Thereby, for Crystal, literary stylistics focuses on peculiarities of literary language and means of artistic expressiveness. Therefore, literary stylistics studies the language and creativity in the language utilize by seeing if the rules of the language are or are not perceived to make particular effect in literary texts. According to Widdowson (1992), the interpretation of any literary text involves two sets of reactions; extra-textual (social conventions), which focuses on relations between language items and the codes set by society from which they derive, and intra-textual (inter-textuality) that deals with relations between language items within the context itself. In literary texts, these two sets of relations create a hybrid unit which derives from both the code and context. Literature is connotative since it is taken as a personal intuition, but it is also denotative because it refers to the secondary language system established by the regularities of the context. As a result, what literature does is to create patterns out of deviations from the normal text and the conventional code and present a different reality (Widdowson, 1992).

Leech and Short (2007) observe that literary stylistics has implicitly or explicitly, the goal of explaining the relation between language and artistic function. The motivating questions are not so much what as why and how. From the linguist's angle, it is 'Why does the author here choose this form of expression?' From the literary critic's viewpoint, it is 'How is such-and-such an aesthetic effect achieved through language?' Hence literary stylistics can be seen as relational concept and, its main focus is to be relational in a more interesting sense than that already mentioned: to relate the critic's concern of aesthetic appreciation with the linguist's concern of linguistic description. The task of linguistic–literary explanation proceeded by the movement to and from linguistic details to the literary center of a work or a writer's art. There is a cyclic motion whereby linguistic observation stimulates or modifies literary insight, and whereby literary insight in its turn stimulates further linguistic observation. This motion is something like the cycle of theory formulation and theory testing which underlies scientific method (Leech & Short, 2007; Spitzer, 1948).

Historical Development of Literary Stylistics

Bradford (2005) argues that although the academic discipline of stylistics is a 20th century phenomena, its origin can be traced back to the fifth century BC when the Greek settlers of Sicily began to study, document and teach rhetoric as a practical discipline. Ancient rhetoric and poetics treated style as a specific mode of expression, the proper adornment of thought. The orator or poet was expected to follow the norms of artful arrangement of words, to use model sentences and prescribed kinds of figures in order to achieve particular expressiveness. After the ancient period the normative approach dominated in style investigations. The discipline has originated the popular dualist approach to style based on the dichotomy between form and content. All the 'rhetorical' notions of style, which persisted through many succeeding centuries, hold this dualist view as against the monist one (Bradford, 2005; Leech & Short, 2007; Zhukovska, 2010). As a result, rhetoric an art of speech that deals with the use of public speech as a means of persuasion could be considered as notable predecessor of modern stylistics.

Nevertheless, stylistics as a recognized academic discipline can be seen as a logical extension of moves within literary criticism early in the twentieth century to concentrate on studying texts rather than authors. Stylistics began as a distinct approach to literary texts in the hands of Spitzer (1948) (Crystal, 1998; Short, 1996). Fowler (1981) contends that there were three direct influences which produced stylistics: Anglo-American literary criticism; the developing field of linguistics; and European, especially French, structuralism. Fowler further stated that nineteenth-century literary criticism concentrated on the author and in Britain the text-based criticism of the two critics I. A. Richards and William Empson, rejected that approach in order to concentrate on the literary texts themselves, and how readers were affected by those texts.

New Criticism mainly focused on the description of literary works as independent aesthetic objects, but Practical Criticism inclined to give greater emphasis to the psychological aspects involved in a reader interacting with a work. Nevertheless, these two critical movements shared two important features such as an importance on the language of the text rather than its author, and an assumption that what criticism needed was accounts of important works of literature based on the intuitional reading outcomes of trained and aesthetically sensitive critics (Bradford, 2005; Leech, 1969; Crystal, 1998). As Fowler (1981) points out, a more rigorous descriptive account was being developed in the field of linguistics. Bloomfieldian structural linguistics evolving between the 1920s and 1950s offered a precise terminology and framework for detailed analyses of metrical structure in poetry. Chomskyan transformational-generative grammar from 1957 onwards provided a means of exploring poetic syntactic structure with far more sensitivity to detail than had ever been possible in literary criticism (Crystal, 1998; Fowler, 1981; Leech, 1969). Stockwell (2006) claims that Hallidayan functionalism added a socio-cultural dimension that began to explain stylistic choices in literary texts.

As to Fowler (1981), another area that contributed to the development of modern literary stylistics was European structuralism, arising out of Saussurean

semiology and Russian Formalism through the work of Jakobson, Barthes, Todorov, Levi-Strauss, and Culler, among others. Modern poetics were in fact developed by the Moscow Linguistic Circle, the St Petersburg group Opayaz, and later the Prague School linguists Formalism. Scholars of these schools concerned with studies of metaphor, the foregrounding and dominance of theme, trope and other linguistic variables, narrative morphology, the effects of literary defamiliarization, and the use of theme and rhyme to delineate perspective in sentences. The Formalists called themselves 'literary linguists,' in recognition of their belief that linguistics was the necessary ground for literary study (Bradford, 2005; Fowler, 1981; Stockwell, 2006; Yosliifuini, 1997; Zhukovska, 2010).

According to Stockwell (2006), in the 1970s, the field of stylistics largely avoided the theoretical swamp by taking an explicitly practical approach in the form of 'pedagogical stylistics.' This was a natural consequence of teaching English Language using literary texts. Teaching language through literature mirrored stylistics very clearly: texts tended to be those of contemporary literature; stylistically deviant texts were popular because they were fun and made it easy for the teacher to illustrate a specific point of usage; grammar and lexical choice were discussed as a motivating means of accessing the literature, rather than studied rather dryly for their own sake. Stylistics thus took itself out of literature departments and found adherents in education and modern language study around the world, enthusiastically supported by the international cultural promotion agency of the UK government, the British Council (Stockwell, 2006; Widdowson 1992). Moreover, in 1970s, literary stylistics moved beyond the analysis of short texts and sentence-level phenomena due to advancement in pragmatics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. Studies involving speech act theory, norms of spoken interaction, politeness, appropriacy of register choice, dialectal variation, cohesion and coherence, deictic projection, turn-taking and floor holding all allowed stylistics the opportunity of exploring text-level features and the interpersonal dimension of literature, especially in prose fiction and dramatic texts. New labels for a host of sub-disciplines of stylistics blossomed: literary pragmatics, discourse stylistics, literary semantics,' 'stylometrics,' 'critical linguistics,' 'schema poetics,' and so on (Stockwell, 2006).

Leech and Short (2007) notice that until 1981, most stylistic analysis had been carried out on poems, and Style in Fiction was one of the first book-length explorations of the stylistic analysis of extracts from prose fiction. Drama was virtually discussed, and stylistics still did not have enough extant analyses of literary texts to demonstrate adequately its assumption that 'examining the language of a literary text can be a means to a fuller understanding and appreciation of the writer's artistic achievement. Now, at the beginning of the new millennium, the situation is very different. Work on the stylistic analysis of poetry has continued and the linguistic examination of prose fiction has blossomed. Moreover, the stylistic analysis of drama is now more plentiful (Leech and Short 2007; Simpson, 2004).

Approaches to Literary Style

There are three main approaches to literary style. These are monist, dualist and pluralist. Each is discussed below.

The Monist View of Literary Style

Monism focuses on inseparability of style and content. Leech and Short (2007) state that for monists, the fundamental subject matter can never be detached from its verbal form and that the only means of reading the writer's mind is the completed text, which is a product of the synthesis of thought and style. The traditional dualistic view later clashed with the monist organic view of style of the new critics. The traditional notion of style has other weaknesses of being prescriptive and not descriptive in its nature and scope. It is interested in providing only a 'set of maxims' which should be rigorously producing certain effects. It is full of words having fixed meaning and certain types of structures are invariably associated with certain effects (Leech, 1969).

The dualist's notion of paraphrase in literature, particularly in poetry becomes problematic according to monism. Every metaphor, for instance, confronts us with a paraphrase problem. As Hawkes (1972) shows that metaphor is not fantastic sampler of the facts, but it is a way of experiencing the facts. As a result, poetic metaphor denies us a literal sense, and so induces us to make sense, to find interpretations beyond the truth functional meaning captured by paraphrase. Hence, stylistic monism finds its strongest ground in poetry, where through such devices as metaphor, irony and ambiguity, meaning becomes multivalued, and sense loses its primacy (Leech & Short, 2007). However, Lodge (1966) claims that in language of prose fiction, adopts a monist stance, saying that there is no essential difference between poetry and prose. Thus, he says that even the best translation of a prose work loses something of the original. As a result, the monists stand such as impossibility of paraphrasing literary writing, impossibility of translating a literary work and it is impossibility of divorcing the general appreciation of a literary work from the appreciation of its style hold true for both poetry and prose (Lodge, 1966).

Dualist View of Literary Style

In dualist view, style can be seen as choices of manner rather than matter, of expression rather than content.

Some such separation is implied in the common definition of style as a 'way of writing' or a 'mode of expression' (Leach & Short, 2007). This approach differentiates form from meaning or content. In dualist perspective literary style can be perceived as either the 'dress of thought' or the manner of expression. Concerning style as a dress of thought, the distinction between what a writer has to say, and how it is presented to the reader, underlies one of the earliest and most tenacious concepts of style. Although this metaphor of style as some kind of 'adornment' or 'covering' of thought or meaning is no longer widely current, it frequently appears in Renaissance and rationalist pronouncements on style, and is implicit (Leech & Short, 2007; Zhukovska, 2010). Style as the dress of thought was claimed by Renaissance and rationalism, and makes it some kind of adornment of thought or meaning. The Aesthetics of form (parallelism, alliteration, etc) tends to attract the reader's attention more than the meaning does, as seen in poetic lines (Zhukovska, 2010).

With regard to style as manner of expression, according to Ohmann (1964) every writer necessarily makes choices of expression and that it is in these choices, in a particular way of putting things, that style resides. In other words, the dualist view stated that there can be various ways of transferring the same subject matter. As a result, for dualists, the idea of style implies that the words on the page might have been different, or differently arranged, without a corresponding difference in substance.

Pluralist View of Literary Style

Pluralists are concerned with analyzing literary style in terms of functions. According to the pluralist, language performs a number of different functions, and any piece of language is likely to be the result of choices made on different functional levels. Hence, the pluralists are not happy with the dualist's division between 'expression' and 'content' rather they wants to differentiate numerous elements of meaning according to the various functions. Pluralists are not also content with monism or singularism because it gives greater concern to the view that for a given text there is ideally only one correct interpretation (Leech and Short, 2007). Halliday (1971) states that a language can perform varied functions or communicative roles are commonplaces of linguistic thought. Some kinds of language have a referential function (e.g., newspaper reports); others have a directive or persuasive function (e.g., advertising); others have an emotive function or a social function (e.g., casual conversation) (Leech and Short, 2007). To this general appreciation of functional variety in language, the pluralist adds the idea that language is intrinsically multifunctional, so that even the simplest utterance conveys more than one kind of meaning. For example, 'Is your father feeling better?'

may be simultaneously referential (referring to a person and his illness), directive (demanding a reply from the hearer), and social (maintaining a bond of sympathy between speaker and hearer). From this point of view, the dualist is wrong in assuming that there is some unitary conceptual 'content' in every piece of language (Leech and Short, 2007; Halliday, 1971).

Richards (1929) differentiates four types of function, as sense, feeling, tone, and intention. On the other hand, Jakobson (1960) identifies six functions such as: referential, emotive, conative, phatic, poetic, and metalinguistic based on systematic theory of language, each conforming to one vital feature of the discourse situation. Halliday (1971) also identified three major functions of language, which he calls 'ideational', 'interpersonal' and 'textual'. As these three scholars developed different functions of language, it is possible to say that pluralists do not have agreeable model of functions. As Leech and Short (2007) noted that, they also disagree on how functions are manifested in literary language. Richards (1929) holds that, in poetry, the function of 'feeling' tends to dominate that of 'sense', while Jakobson (1960) identifies a special 'poetic' function, which can be found in many uses of language, but which dominates over other functions in poetry. Although Halliday (1971) does not commit himself to a functional definition of literary language, he recognizes that different kinds of literary writing may foreground different functions.

Critical pluralism holds that there are a multiplicity of equally valid interpretations, resulting from the different backgrounds of interpreters who do not read with the same interests, concerns, and knowledge (University of Pittsburgh, 2005). Riffaterre (1978) states that interpretations of literary works are not accounts of their objects but projections from critical stances and sets of values. Similarly, Fish (1980) argued that any literary text does not provide any anchor for agreement among readers on what the text means. Interpretive communities come to a text with their strategies of reading, and the text serves as an occasion for those strategies to play out. The reason for such a possible multiplicity of equally valid interpretations lies in the nature of the object of interpretation. Since cultural objects have many properties, the existence of which depends on the background against which they emerge, there is no stable framework in which the truth or falsity of an interpretation can be decided (Fish, 1980; Li & Shi, 2015).

According to University of Pittsburgh (2005), pluralists assent to the possibility of multiple interpretations of the same text. Interpreters do not claim that a particular text means this and that without qualification, but are careful to specify the type of meaning they are interested in, the perspective they take, and the methods they use. In addition, interpreters can pursue different goals, take different perspectives, and use different methods.

Interpreters have to posit an intention behind the object of interpretation, even if it is a minimal intention having written the text and even if it is to dismiss it, because they are interested in figures of style or in a Freudian unconscious or in cultural stereotypes (University of Pittsburgh, 2005). The mistake of many advocates of pluralism is to focus exclusively on the event of interpretation and overlook the pragmatic aspect of interpretation as an act. They take a third-person perspective on what happens when an interpretation takes place and from this perspective they can assess or make assumptions about what influenced interpreters and the prejudices they had. If we take the first-person perspective of the interpreter when presenting a new interpretation, we see that the interpreter does not have available a knowledge of the influences and prejudices marring the enterprise of interpretation (University of Pittsburgh, 2005).

Types of Literary Stylistics

Taking into consideration the various aspects of analysis, there may be distinguished several types of literary stylistics.

• **Author's stylistics or genetic stylistics:** this can be seen from the point of view of the addresser, and it is interested in individual styles of writers focusing on their biography, beliefs, interests and other factors which could influence their literary creative work. Genetic stylistics is represented by some linguistic schools: logical analysis of M. Roustan, psychological analysis of M. Grammont, statistic stylistics of P. Guiraud, philological analysis of L. Spitzer (Kuolie, 2010).

• **Reader's stylistics or stylistics of perception or decoding stylistics**: this is from the point of view of the addressee (recipient), Stylistics of perception is presented by a number of trends: L. Shcherba's linguistic analysis, M. Riffaterre's stylistic analysis, I. Arnold's decoding stylistics. The term decoding stylistics suggested by M. Riffaterre stands for a new trend in stylistics, a theory evolved by Professor I.V. Arnold (Stockwell, 2006). Decoding stylistics combines concepts of poetics, literary stylistics, semasiology, theory of communication, text theory, sociolinguistics, pragma- and para-linguistics, aesthetics, hermeneutics, etc. It focuses on the reader's perception of a literary text, his/her reaction to it. The core of reader-oriented decoding stylistics is formed by special types of contextual organization known as foregrounding. Foregrounding expresses the idea that the function of literature is to restore freshness to perception which has become habitual and automated: to make things strange, to make the reader see them anew (Cook, 1994; Kuolie, 2010).

• **Statistical stylistics**: this analyses the peculiarities of language units functioning in texts of different functional styles obtaining the objective data by applying certain methods of statistics (Leech & Short, 2007).

• **Feminist stylistics:** this is concerned with the analysis of the way that questions of gender impact on the production and interpretation of texts (Wales, 2001).

• **Cognitive stylistics** is a relatively new, rapidly developing field of language study that attempts to describe and account for what happens in the minds of readers when they interface with literary language (Zhukovska, 2010). Cognitive stylistics is mainly concerned with reading, and more specifically, with the reception and subsequent interpretation processes that are both active and activated during reading procedures. At its core, cognitive stylistics is interested in the role that unconscious and conscious cognitive and emotive processes play when an individual or group of individuals interface with a text that has been purposely designed with the aim of eliciting certain emotions in a reader (Leech & Short, 2007, Stockwell, 2006).

• **Discourse stylistics**. this type of stylistics considers language as discourse, that is a text's status as discourse, a writer's employment of discourse strategies and the way a text means as a function of language in context how it functions as discourse. These days stylistics is interested in language as function of texts in context, and acknowledges that they are produced in a time, a place, and in a cultural and cognitive context (Simpson 2004; Zhukovska, 2010).

• **Corpus stylistics:** Corpus stylistics is a new direction at the interface between the fields of stylistics and corpus linguistics, namely the use of a corpus methodology to investigate stylistic categories in different text types or in individual texts. The qualitative and quantitative analyses of stylistic phenomena rely on the evidence of language usage as collected and analyzed in corpora (Leech & Short, 2007).

Basic Features of Literary Stylistics

According to Leech and Short (2007), stylistic analysis of literary text eventually relates the textual features and contextual aspects to interpretation. Hence, literary stylistics uses various stylistic devices and features in the interpretation of literary texts. Some of the commonly known stylistic features of literature are presented below.

 1. Foregrounding

Leech and Short (2007) define foregrounding as

"artistically motivated deviation" (p. 110). Foregrounding is a term usually used in art, having opposite meaning to background. It is the cautious deviation from the rules of the language or from the putative conventions so that a particular message unit or units stands out against a background of normal usage (Leech, 1970). Leech and Short (2007) state that the understandable illustration of foregrounding comes from the semantic opposition of literal and figurative meaning. Similarly, Mukarovský (1958) states that foregrounding is deviation from linguistic or other socially accepted norms. It refers to the range of stylistic effects that occur in literature, whether at the phonetic level (e.g., alliteration, rhyme), the grammatical level (e.g., inversion, ellipsis), or the semantic level (e.g., metaphor, irony). As Mukarovský (1958) points out, poetic language is an aesthetically purposeful distortion of standard, its systematic violation, is what makes possible the poetic utilization of language, without this, there would be no poetry. The statement implies that the poetic language is a twist of language, and this kind of alteration creates poetry.

Foregrounding establishes the hierarchy of meanings and themes in the text, bringing some to the fore and shifting others to the background. Concepts such as coupling, convergence, strong position, contrast, irony, inter-textual connection and defeated expectancy effect are grouped under the general heading of foregrounding, and they together form the missing link between the whole text and its minor parts, and help to sharpen the response of the reader to ideas, images and emotions reflected in a work of art (Mukarovský, 1958; Yosliifuini, 1997). As Mukarovský (1958) claims, foregrounding may occur in normal, everyday language, such as spoken discourse or journalistic prose, but it occurs at random with no systematic design. In literary texts, on the other hand, foregrounding is structured: it tends to be both systematic and hierarchical. That is, similar features may recur, such as a pattern of assonance or a related group of metaphors, and one set of features will dominate the others.

According to Li and Shi (2015) there are two kinds of foregrounding: qualitative foregrounding and quantitative foregrounding. In the qualitative, there is deviation from the rules of the language code or from the conventions of language use or both. In the quantitative, the deviance is from some expected frequency of linguistic occurrence and nor from the language code. When a writer writes he is constantly involved in making linguistic choices. The choices he makes both outside and inside the language system may thus lead to foregrounding. Yosliifuini (1997) notes that the conceptual relation between deviation and foregrounding is not clearer than their individual meanings are. However, Peer (1986) couples 'deviation' with 'parallelism' as two major techniques which bring about foregrounding. This consideration suggests that 'deviation' should be subcategorized under 'foregrounding', though the former gets closer in meaning

to the latter as it is measured more relatively and contextually.

2. Deviation

Leech and Short (2007) consider deviation as one of stylistic features in literary text. Deviation is a linguistic phenomenon that has an important psychological effect on readers (and hearers). In any literary text, if a part is deviant, it becomes especially noticeable or perceptually prominent. This psychological effect is called foregrounding". Since "foregrounded " elements in any given text is of vital importance for understanding the message(s) conveyed, stylistic analysis should consider aspects of a literary texts which are foregrounded through parallelism, metaphor, semantic, syntactic or graphological deviations. A message is considered deviant when it violates the rules of language or when it shows features not found elsewhere. In poetry, linguistic deviation is the most significant part of the message which the reader interprets by measuring it against patterns of language (Leech & Short, 2007). There are various types of deviation in literary studies. Some of them are presented below.

• **Phonological deviation**: this is to bring out the pronunciation features of common speech, specifically the dialect. It is true that stylistic studies are mainly concerned with the linguistic investigation of written language however; phonology has much to contribute because it is the only means that enables the stylistician to examine the phonetic potential of certain literary texts (Li & Shi, 2015).

• **Morphological deviation:** this is to correct the shortcomings and offset the diffuseness of ordinary speech, restoring to language part of its flexible power of suggestion (Li & Shi, 2015).

• **Syntactic deviation**: this type of deviation has been used as an attempt to figure out the patterns and characteristics of reported conversations and oral or spoken language. This kind of deviation has occasionally been a measure or a device of characterization which signals every character with certain syntactic features and departures (Li& Shi, 2015; Timucin, 2010).

• **Lexical deviation:** this serves essentially to work out the rustic vocabulary which distinguishes the familiar world of colloquial speech and everyday life (Li & Shi, 2015).

• **Semantic deviation:** this is created to heighten the effect of mental disarray which makes itself felt through the suppressing of logical semantic links, creating a disturbing atmosphere or a total failure to understand (Timucin, 2010).

• **Graphological deviation:** Yosliifuini (1997) stated that graphological deviation can be considered as one of stylistic device. Graphology takes care of paragraphing, italicization, capitalization, hyphenation, spelling, spacing, indention, and so on. In other words, graphical choice focuses on how to arrange and display the language of the text visually. It is through this process of graphological choice that the whole text is finally realized on the page. Although graphological variation is a relatively minor and superficial part of style', it can indicate a special idiosyncratic way of speech, an emphasis on a certain textual element, a change of the scene and/or the point of view, or a time-shift (Leech & Short, 2007). In most cases, the standard or neutral way of textual display will do, but the author should try to exploit the visual realization of his/her literary ideas by giving due concern to extra effects that can be attained through graphological variation (Yosliifuini,1997).

3. Parallelism

Parallelism rests upon the principle of equivalence. Every parallelism sets up a relationship of equivalence between two or more elements where equivalences would not normally occur. The similarity of syntactical structure in neighboring phrases, clauses, sentences or paragraphs (Lüders, 2013). Parallelism tends to foreground the relations of meaning between parallel words and phrases which fill the variable positions. The relations of meaning foregrounded in this way are in general relationships of similarity or of contrast. The synonymical or antonymical relations of meaning between the expressions paralleled may also be reinforced by phonological, morphological, and grammatical features. Parallelism has thus an effect on readers: it makes them interpret the parallel items either as opposed or parallel in meaning (Shen, 1987). However, Short (1996) argued a note of caution against ascribing these particular relations of meaning to all parallelisms as a general rule. He (1996) considered the interpretations rather as the result of a "processing tendency" by which it is the readers, when faced with parallel structures, who "try to interpret them in this way."

4. Cohesion

Cohesion is the intra-textual relations of a grammatical and lexical kind which join the parts of a text together into a complete unit of discourse which convey the meaning of the text as a whole (Timucin, 2010). In studying cohesion, patterns of meaning that runs through the text can be identified which will give some sort of linguistic account of what the poem is about (Leech & Short, 2007). Leech (1970) explains cohesion as a stylistic device gives emphasis to the lexical and grammatical means which the poet draws from standard language to unify the poem. Thereby, cohesion is one of the prominent devices in the stylistic study of a text.

Cohesion can be seen as structural cohesion and lexical cohesion. Structural cohesion is attained through the use of the determiners, pronouns, certain adverbs and connectives; whereas, lexical coherence can be achieved through lexical items based on collocations and other semantic features. Cohesion of foregrounding as intra-textual patterns is also formed by the cohesion of the foregrounded expression. When one element of the text presupposes another, the interpretation of the one is dependent on that of the other. The repeated use of the different varieties of cohesive relations contributes to the creation of a text (Leech, 1970).

Leech and Short (2007) identify 'cross-reference' and 'linkage' as the two major kinds of cohesion. Cross-reference relates to the various means which language uses to indicate that the same thing is being referred to or mentioned in different parts of the text. Linkage, on the other hand, is the use of overt connectors such as coordinating conjunctions, subordinating conjunctions, and linking adverbials (Leech & Short, 2007).

5. Contextualization

Leech and Short (2007) consider contexualism as one of the basic stylistic features in studying literary stylistics. They argued that the rules of the language of the language system and the actual situations of language use are different. Linguistically skilled person may have capacity to create several grammatically correct sentences, but he/she may not be able to communicate in the social context if he/she does not know the rules and norms of the society. As a result, such socio-linguistic features form a major part of creative writing. According to Shen (1987), socio-linguistic is a study of language in operation. Its determination is to examine how the conventions of language used relate to the other aspects of social behavior. Therefore, there is a need to approach style from a socio-linguistic point of view. The task is to determine to what extent the writer's choices are determined by the 'context' of utterance, and to what extent the concept of deviance from the socio-linguistics norm applicable in the study of style. And, therefore, in texts, the context is created through the use of language, and thus a Stylistic study should not ignore the parameters of the socio-linguistic aspects of language use. Creative use of language in literature cannot be done in isolation. Thus language has to be used in a socio-cultural (includes political and economic) context where human beings interact (Leech & Short, 2007; Widdowson 1992).

6. Connotation and Figurative Expression

According to Enkvist (1973), every linguistic feature acquires its stylistic value from the textual and situational environment. Connotation can be understood as its related notions of expressive or emotive features. This

concept derives from the idea that every semantic unit - word, phrase, sentence, etc. - has a primary, literal, basic or referential meaning (its denotation) and may have other indirect or more figurative meanings (its connotation) (Yosliifuini, 1997). Connotation as opposed to denotation normally refers to the additional associative meanings. Connotation may also mean discoursal meanings which cannot necessarily be traced back to the individual lexical connotations in the relevant sequence of words. Hence, connotation can be narrowed down, in a clear-cut way, from the overall linguistic phenomena. It occurs mainly on the semantic level of word-choice, so that the idea tends to exclude concern for the other levels, especially phonological and graphological. Instead, it may be seen as the hidden half of the whole meaning. This idea of style, therefore, cannot capture, for example, the stylistic effects brought about through the tension between denotation and connotation (Enkvist (1973; Yosliifuini, 1997).

Figurative expression as an aspect of connotation is about a word's extension of meaning, which is in contrast to a word's literal, basic or conceptual meaning (Leech & Short, 2007). Common types of figurative expressions are *Simile*, in which an explicit comparison between two things which are basically quite different using words such as like or as; *metaphor*, where a comparison between two things which are basically quite different without using like or as; *personification* which is a kind of metaphor in which animals, plants, inanimate objects or abstract ideas are represented as if they were human beings and possessed human qualities; *allegory* which is a form of an extended metaphor in which objects, persons and actions in a narrative are equated with meanings outside the narrative itself; *synecdoche*, in which a part of something stands for the whole; *hyperbole* also called as *overstatement* is a figurative expression where deliberate exaggeration is made to emphasize something or to produce a humorous effect; *understatement* is the opposite of hyperbole, in which the deliberate presentation of something as being much less important, valuable etc. than it really is, *irony* which says the opposite of what you actually mean; *paradox* in which a statement that seems to be self-contradictory or opposed to common sense (Brandford, 2005; Fubb, 2002; Lüders, 2013).

• **Sound Techniques**

Brandford (2005) argues that sound techniques in literary texts, particularly in poetry are important stylistic features. These sound effects include, *alliteration*: the repetition of the same consonant sound at the beginning of neighboring words; *meter*: a regular pattern of stressed and unstressed syllables within a line of a poem; *onomatopoeia:* the use of words which imitate the sound they refer to; *rhyme:* the use of words which end with the same sounds, usually at the end; *consonance:* is the repetition of the same or similar consonant sounds in a line or succeeding lines of verse; *contrast*: which is used by an author or poet to produce a significant effect with opposing elements, ideas, or objects in the way a painter does with paints so as to create an astonishing emotional effect on the reader (Brandford, 2005; Lüders, 2013).

Rhythm is another device of stylistics and it is also considered one of the foremost stylistics traits in certain poems. It helps in achieving both cohesion and foregrounding. It is an important aspect of literary semantics. Rhythm can be both internal and external; the former deal with content and external rhythm deals with expression while the latter is ideational and semantic which is achieved through 'reinforcement of ideas; building up of an argument; imagery and figures of speech; coupling or cohesion. External rhythm is achieved through meter and phonological figures (Fabb, 2002; Leech & Short, 2007; Prakasam 1982).

8. Mind Style

According to Fowler (1981) mind style is an instrument through which a 'world view' is given through the eyes of the narrator and main character from a social and personal perspective at the same time. It is commonplace that a writer's style reveals that particular writer's habitual way of experiencing and interpreting things. The term 'mind style' can also be applied to more restricted domains of style: when a character's mind style belongs not to its author's work as a whole, but to one novel, and in fact to one character within the novel. So mind style, in this context, is a realization of a narrative point of view. More narrowly still, mind style can be associated with quite local stylistic effects, for example in the description of a character or a landscape (Leech & Short, 2007). Semino (2007) notes that when the choice is more normal, the mind-style concept tends to have less force. More specifically, a crucial part of the suspension of disbelief that is associated with the reading of fiction is the possibility of accessing directly the minds of characters, primarily when a third-person, omniscient narrator tells us about characters' mental events or allows us to "listen in" to what a character is thinking (Semino, 2007).

Margolin (2003) states that cognitive style can be seen as equivalent to mind style since it is "a tendency to process information in a particular way which constitutes an interface between cognition and personality" (p. 277). He (2003) considers the delivery of unrestricted access to the minds of characters as a constitutive convention of literary narrative, and argued that, by being exposed to the functioning of fictional minds, readers can enrich their understanding of the human condition, and of their own personal experiences. A preference of much literature for nonstandard forms of cognitive functioning, be they rare or marginal, deviant, or involving a failure, breakdown, or

lack of standard patterns, and adds that   the fictional presentation of cognitive mechanisms in action, especially of their own breakdown and failure, is itself a powerful cognitive tool which may make us aware of actual cognitive mechanisms, and, more specifically, of our own mental functioning (Margolin, 2003; Semino, 2007). Margolin (2003) further claims that concepts and categories from cognitive science have much to contribute to the study of fiction generally and of fictional minds in particular. This applies both to the description of the minds of characters and, more obviously, to the description of how readers interpret literature and attribute minds and mental lives to characters. In other way, Fowler (1977) stated that the term "mind style" is intended to capture an impression of a world view and any distinctive linguistic representation of an individual mental self.

As to Semino (2007), the term mind style is ambiguous as to whether it refers to linguistic patterns in texts (style) or to the characteristics that we attribute to particular (fictional) minds by interpreting linguistic patterns in texts. There are also problems at the "normal" end of mind style, where, the concept seems to lose its usefulness, and to become equivalent to the more general notion of style (Short as cited in Semino, 2007). Consequently, while the term mind style may be the most appropriate in particular cases, it is useful to reflect on the extent to which other existing terms can successfully capture the variety of phenomena that need to be taken into account in the study of fictional minds. The two most central and interrelated aspects which need to be considered in mind style are: a character's internal representation of the world they live in (including the minds of other characters), and the workings of a character's mind. These aspects correspond to the well-established (but not uncontroversial) notions of representations and processes in psychology and cognitive science (Semino, 2007).

9. Register

Register is the stylistic organization of lexis. Literary register refers to the set of meanings, the configuration of semantic patterns, that are typically drawn upon under the given conditions and it involves some degree of coherence in the actual meanings expressed: in the total selection from the semantic resources of the language (Halliday, 1971). In choosing a particular literary register, the writer takes up an interactive role and a relevant set of social relations. It is thus the concept of tenor that explains the relative flexibility inherent in the concept of stylistic register. The concept of stylistic register can be neatly aligned with the concept of the three levels of style inherited from the tradition of classical rhetoric (Fabb, 2002; Shen, 1987). There are three kinds of stylistic registers and they are the first or the Grand, the second

or the Middle and the third or the Simple. The Grand type consists of a smooth and ornate arrangement of impressive words. The Middle type consists of words of a lower, yet not of the lowest and most colloquial, class of words. The Simple type is brought down even to the most current idiom of standard speech. In contrast with the polar distinction between texts that are relatively more transparent and those that are relatively more opaque, the notion of distinct levels of style allows for a more nuanced differentiation of the possible varieties of literary language (Leech &Short, 2007).

10. Plot Structure and Storyline

In prose literature, plot structure and story line are common stylistic devices. Plot is often created by having separate threads of storyline interact at critical times and in unpredictable ways, creating unexpected twists and turns in the overall storyline. The storyline is the chronological account of events that follow each other in the narrative. Plot includes the storyline, and the way in which elements in the story interact to create complexity, intrigue, and surprise. Plot structure refers to the configuration of a plot in terms of its exposition, rising action, climax, falling action, and resolution/denouement (Fabb, 2002). Margolin (2003) states that f HYPERLINK "https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flashback_%28narrative%29"lashback is one of the most easily recognized utilization of plot structure, and it is a scene in a writing which occurs outside of the current timeline, before the events that are actually occurring in the story. It is used to explain plot elements, give background and context to a scene, or explain characteristics of characters or events. For instance, one chapter may be at the present time in a character's life, and then the next chapter might be the character's life years ago. The second chapter gives meaning to the first, as it explains other events the character experienced and thus puts present events in context. When there is a lengthy flashback comprising more than half of the text, a frame story is the portion outside the flashback. Another form of plot structure is Foreshadowing This is when the author drops clues about what is to come in a story, which builds tension and the reader's suspense throughout the book(Fabb, 2002; Margolin, 2003).

11. Fictional Point of View and Stream of Consciousness

According to Leech and Short (2007) conforming to the interpersonal function of style, there is the slanting of the fictional world towards 'reality' as apprehended by a particular participant, or set of participants, in the fiction which is called fictional point of view. In fictional point of view, the person whose point of view is represented a

reflector of the fiction. A fiction writer, although not compelled to take one person's point of view, can voluntarily limit his 'omniscience' to those things which belong to one person's model of reality. He can also vary the fictional point of view, sometimes claiming authorial omniscience, sometimes giving us one character's version of events, sometimes that of another. He can even take the point of view of an animal, or of a man on the point of death, bypassing the problem of authenticity Fictional point of view, by the standard of authorial omniscience, can be regarded as a selective withholding of information, or relinquishing of omniscience. The demarcation of fictional point of view is difficult to determine where the narrative refers to psychological events and states: to perceptions, volitions, emotions, thoughts, judgments (Fabb, 2002; Leech& Short, 2007; Lüders, 2013).

Regarding stream of consciousness, Timucin (2010) describes that it is a style of writing that reflects the thoughts of a person. Often the ideas will move quickly and flow from image to image and idea to idea like a stream flowing. Because of the uninterrupted flow of thought from a human mind, a stream is the best way to describe the way we think. Writers will use this style of writing to represent the thoughts and ideas of a character through an internal monologue. This is another device which reveals the inner thoughts of a character (Lüders 2013; Timucin, 2010).

CONCLUSION

Literary stylistics places focus on the connection between the theoretical model of linguistic and the literary texts. Thus, it helps to enhance one's reading and interpretation of these texts through the application of various aspects of linguistic theory. As a result, it builds on the assumption that the study of literature and language need not be regarded as mutually exclusive but rather as significantly related to each other. Henceforth, literary stylistics must not undermine linguistics in any case, for stylistics is the continuance of linguistics that means, linguistics studies the general characteristics of language, whereas literary stylistics does study the language as peculiarly used in literature. With regard to literature, stylistics is concerned with the way a meaning is obtained. What let the readers to reach at comparable interpretations of the text is their familiarity of the structure of a language and the communal events of inference, illustrating on both the context in which a text is entrenched and the overall knowledge of the world. Thus, uncommon collocations of the words can typically be made sense of by associating them to their acquainted equivalents. As a result, the study of literary style is mainly concerned with the manner of expression characteristically intrigued in the works of literary texts. It provides a basis for a fuller understanding, more

convincing interpretation, and a balanced, evaluation of literary text.

Concerning the historical development of stylistics, the first reflections on style can be dated back to the ancient times. Ancient rhetoric and poetics, which are considered to be the predecessors of stylistics, treated style as a specific mode of expression, the proper adornment of thought. However, as an academic field it emerged in the 20th century. For the development of modern literary stylistics, Anglo-American literary criticism; the developing field of linguistics; and European, especially French, structuralism played influential roles.

There are some controversial views of style. Dualist view of style focuses on the dichotomy between form and content. The dualist embraces the notion that there can be varied ways of transmitting the same content. However, monist view focuses on oneness of form and content and argues that it is impossible to paraphrase literary writing to translate a literary work and to divorce the general appreciation of a literary work from the appreciation of its style, for the inevitable loss of the hidden, metaphorical meaning. On the other hand, pluralist view contends against both dualism and monism. It provides multiple approaches to the study of literary stylistics. Pluralists examine literary language in terms of its functions or meta-functions based on the notion that different kinds of literary writing may foreground different functions. Although these three views of style apparently in conflict with one another, all have something to contribute to a comprehensive view of style.

Finally, various stylistic devices and feature which are relevant to literary stylistics are presented. Some of stylistic devices in studying literary texts are related to linguistic features. As a result, the role of linguistics in literary stylistics is very significant. Some of the devices and features in literary stylistics may seem to overlap each other. For instance, some scholars use foregrounding and deviation interchangeably while others present them differently. However, each device and feature may have its own impact and importance in studying literary stylistics.

REFERENCES

Bradford, R. (2005). *Stylistics: The New Critical Idiom*. New York: Tylor & Francis E-Library.

Chatman, S. (1971). *Literary Style*. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Cook, G. (1994). *Discourse and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (1998). *Language Play.* London: Penguin.

Enkvist, N. (1973). *Linguistic Stylistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

Fabb, N. (2002). *Language and Literary Structure: The Linguistic Analysis of Form in Verse and Narrative* .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Fish, S. (1980). What is stylistics and why are they saying

such terrible things about it? In S. Fish (Ed.). *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities (pp. 68–96).* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fowler, R. (1971). *The Languages of Literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Fowler, R. (1977). *Linguistics and The Novel*. London: Methuen.

Fowler, R. (1981). *Literature as Social Discourse*. London: Batsford.

Halliday, M. (1971). Linguistic function and literary style: An inquiry into the language of
William Golding's The Inheritors. In S. Chatman (Ed.) *Literary Style,* (pp.330-36). Oxford: Oxford UP

Hawkes, T. (1972). *Metaphor.* Methuen.

Kuolie, K. (2010). Stylistics and Tenyimia Invocation Poetry. Retrieved from *www.google.com*

Jakobson, R. (1960). Linguistics and Poetics*.* In T. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language (pp. 350- 377).* Cambridge, Mass: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press*.*

Leech, G. (1969). *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry.* England: Longman Group Ltd*.*

Leech, G. (1970). This Bread I Break: Language and Interpretation. In D. C. Freeman (Ed.) *A Review of English Literature* (*pp.119-28*).

Leech, G. & Short, M. (2007). *(2ⁿᵈ ed.) Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Prose Fiction.* Britain, Pearson Education Ltd*.*

Li, X. & Shi, M. (2015). A Stylistic Study on Linguistic Deviations in E. E. Cumming's Poetry.
Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 19(2), 23-54.

Lodge, D. (1966). *Language of Fiction. Routledge & Kegan Paul.*

Lüders, J. (2013). Stylistic Devices. Retrieved from *www.google.com*

Margolin, U. (2003). Cognitive Science: The Thinking Mind and Literary Narrative. In D. Herman &C. Stanford, *Narrative Theory and the Cognitive Sciences*, pp. 271-294. Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Mukarovsky, J. (1958). Standard Language and Poetic Language. In P.L. Garvin (ed.) *A Prague School Reader on Esthetics. Literary Structure, and Style*, *(pp. 17–30).* Washington D.C.: Georgetown UP.

Ohmann, R. (1964) Generative Grammars and the Concept of Literary Style. In D.C Freeman(Ed.) *Word*, *(pp. 258–278)*.

Prakasam, V. (1982). *Stylistics of Poetry: A Functional Perspective.* Hyderabad: Omkar Publications.

Richards, I. A. (1929). *Practical Criticism. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul*

Riffaterre, M. (1978*) Semiotics of Poetry.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Semino, E. (2007). *Mind Style 25 Years on*. UK: Lancaster University.

Shen, D. (1987). *Literary Stylistics and Translation: With Particular Reference to English Translations of Chinese Prose Fiction* .University of Edinburgh.

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose.* Longman.

Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students.* London: Routledge*.*

Spitzer, L. (1948). *Linguistics and Literary History.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Timucin, M. (2010). Exploring the language of poems: A stylistic study. Journal of *Novitas-Royal: Research on Youth and Language*, *4* (2), 129-140.

Stockwell, P. (2006). Language and Literature: Stylistics. Retrieved from www. google.com

University of Pittsburgh . (2005).The Debate Between Monism and Pluralism. Retrieved from http// www. google. com

Wales, K. (2001). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. Harlow: Longman

Widdowson, H. (1975). *Stylistics and the Teaching of Literature*. London : Longman.

Widdowson, H. (1992) *Practical Stylistics*. London: Oxford University Press *.*

Yosliifuini, S. (1997). *Style and Creativity: Towards a Theory of Creative Stylistics.* Nottingham University.

Zhukovska, V. (2010). *English Stylistics: Fundamentals of Theory and Practice.* Retrieved from http://www.llas.ac.uk/resources/gpg/2241