

A pragmatic-Stylistic Approach to the Study of Dramatic Texts

Khamail Ali Waheeb
Directorate of Education Wasit
Khamail_waheeb@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present paper aims at investigating the role of interaction between stylistics and pragmatics, as two linguistic approaches, that play on the interpretation of literary texts. Stylistics is thought to be a multidisciplinary field that interacts with other linguistic fields and branches for the analysis of literary and non-literary texts. The language of dramatic texts is seen to be similar to that of everyday usage, therefore, pragmatic theories are used to interpret it. Stylistics applies these theories for stylistic effects. Consequently, the paper intends to examine the role which these two fields play in the analysis of literature and its importance

Keywords: Stylistics, pragmatics, dramatic texts, stylistic branches.

الخلاصة

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف على الدور الذي يؤديه التفاعل بين الأسلوبية والتداولية وهما فرعين من فروع علم اللغة في تفسير النصوص الأدبية بشكل عام والنصوص المسرحية بشكل خاص. وذلك لان علماء اللغة يعتقدون ان الأسلوبية هو فرع متعدد التخصصات التي تتداخل مع مجالات وفروع لغوية أخرى لتحليل النصوص الأدبية وغير الأدبية. ان لغة النصوص الدرامية مشابهة في تركيبها لتلك التي يستخدمها الانسان يوميا، لذلك تستخدم نظريات التداولية لتفسير لغة هذه النصوص. اما الأسلوبية فتستفيد من هذه النظريات التداولية للوصول الى تفسير اسلوبي لهذه النصوص وهذا التداخل هو ما تسعى اليه هذا الدراسة..
الكلمات المفتاحية: الاسلوبية، التداولية، النصوص المسرحية، فروع الاسلوبية.

Introduction

Stylistics has always caused a controversy among linguists and literary critics. Some of whom deny the advantages of this field, others view it as an essential branch of applied linguistics. The reason behind this controversy lies behind the fact that stylistics , as a term, is difficult to define, since it is an umbrella term. Crystal and Davy (1969:9) point out that linguistics is the academic discipline which studies language scientifically, and stylistics as a branch of this discipline deals with certain aspects of language variation. Wales (2001:2) also believes that “Stylistics is a branch of Applied linguistics concerned with the study of style in texts (especially but not exclusively) literary works”.

Therefore, stylistics is a sub branch of linguistics. It is identified as the study of style or the study of the distinctive linguistic expression Verdonk (2002:2).

It is important to emphasize that this field has old roots that went back to classic thought. Throughout its history, stylistics witnessed progressive development. Today it is a mature discipline which is concerned with analyzing the language of different texts. In its analysis, it largely interferes with other linguistic branches and levels. Since it deals with language, stylistics built its techniques on language levels and branches.

Stylistics aims to analyze and identify the linguistic features of texts in social contexts, to show the reasons behind choosing these features as opposed to other alternatives and to categorize them according to their functions in social context. Moreover, Lucas (1974:45) points out that the purpose of studying style is its relation to English language that through style one can appreciate, master and purify English

language. Thornborrow and Wareing (1982:2) suggest that the aim of the study of style is to describe the formal features of texts to indicate their functional purposes for the interpretation. Buss et al (2010:4) outline that the goal of stylistics in general terms is to identify the style of particular texts, authors or genres and qualify the analysts' intuitions about the text and make them aware of linguistic features and patterns.

In effect, stylistics has many goals including the exploration of; the linguistic features, the production of the message, the style of the text and the authors, and the language itself. Through these aims, stylistics can be proved to be a significant, powerful and useful approach to the study of language and all types of texts and discourses.

2-A Brief History of Stylistics

Stylistics as an academic discipline is a twentieth century invention, nevertheless, the concept of the word style is an old one. It goes back to the very beginning of the literary thought of Europe. The roots of the word style is attributed to the classical Rhetoric and Poetics. It is originally taken from the Latin word (Stilus) to mean a short stick made of reed used for writing on boards made of wax, Hough (1969:1).

The classical Rhetoric, from the Greek word(Techne Rhetorike), was known as the act of creating speeches in political and judicial ceremonies. According to Peter Barry (2002:2):

“Stylistics is, in a sense, the modern version of the ancient discipline known as ‘rhetoric,’ which taught its students how to structure an argument, how to make effective use of figures of speech, and generally how to pattern and vary a speech or a piece of writing so as to produce the maximum impact”.

Poetics, on the other hand, focused on the problem of how to express a piece of art before the actual moment of speeches. Style appears to be in connection with Rhetoric rather than Poetics, mainly because it is known as part of the technique of persuasion on which Rhetoric had largely based. (Ibid:4).

Lucus (1974:11) emphasizes the classical origin of the word style and its extended implications to be a man's way of writing and more generally his way of expressing himself via speech and writing.

Moreover, he considers Aristotle the pioneering figure in the fields of Rhetoric and poetics and his books and thoughts highly developed the concept of style. His distinction of epics, drama and lyrics within literary works, is still applicable (Ibid:12)

A further development of stylistics was in ancient Rome (300) years later brought by the works of Caesar and Cicero. During that period the concept of the word style was notably influenced by the distinction between the Analogists and Anomalists; the former approach emphasized the expression of facts and data in clear straight forward speeches as an approach, whereas the latter focused on the creative language of speeches, Simpson (1997:4).

During the era of Romanticism the term style was exclusively used to refer to the written form of writing, where Rhetoric is incorporated with Poetics, style was viewed as a dress of thought where thought is an existed verbal message clothed in language and this dress should be affective and creative, Hough(1969:3).

Later on, and because of the political conditions the concept of style was affected by the French classical theory of style which was represented by the usage of a (grand), high, style in all verbal works of arts opposite to the (plain) style used in everyday communication by low and middle class people. This usage reflects the

preliminary attempts to describe style as a concept based on the selection of expressive means, Fowler (1966:3).

This tradition was continued to the 18th century. Fabb (2002:2) proposes that the 19th century witnessed an important advances of the concept of style. For example, The works of the German linguist, Humboldt, provided for the first time a classification of types of style. He also has pointed out that poetry and prose differ in their expressive means. His contribution has been so influential that many linguists have adopted and elaborated his ideas later on. Among others were the members of the Prague circle (1926).

According to Hough (1969:6) the twentieth century is the real beginning of stylistics as a discipline .Three trends contributed to the development of stylistics ; the work of a group of linguists in Europe and Russia. Among them the circle of German linguists; B. Croce ,K. Vossler and L. Spitzer. Those linguists' approach was known as the Individualistic Approach. This approach generally aimed at looking for the individual peculiarities of language and the distinctive expressions and choices, style was seen to reveal the soul of the writer and aimed at exploring the creative principles of a text. Another European school was the school of Charles Bally, This school approached stylistics as emotionally expressive. Bally was virtually regarded the inventor of stylistics and called by many stylisticians the father of stylistics as he was the first to introduce the term *stylistique*. He was also the first to deal with stylistics scientifically. He emphasized that the receiver of the linguistic information has a role in its interpretation.

The second trend that contributed to the development of stylistics is the Russian school of Formalism. This school announced the beginning of a new solid method of literary and linguistic analysis within the framework of stylistics.(Ibid:7) .Much of what is now known as stylistic concepts and principles such as the concept of foregrounding and deviation was brought about by this school. In addition, the work of this school was centered on the artistry form and aesthetic art craft not on the content of the literary text , i.e.(how) and not (what) in simple words they emphasized creativity in language. The most prominent members of this school which was flourished in (1920-1923) were O. Jakobson , J.N. Tynjanov , and V.V.Vinogradov.

Another development brought about by a school known as the New Criticism was initiated in Cambridge by I.A. Richards and W. Empson during the twenties of the 20th century .This school provided an adequate basis for modern stylistics. Much of the productions of this school has been influenced by M. A. Halliday and his functional approach to the study of style, (Jeffries and McIntyre, 2010:2,13).

The rise and development of stylistics during the second half of the 20th century can generally be attributed to the growth of linguistics schools and approaches, Generative Grammar and Systemic Functional Grammar, which have postulated various theories and perspectives added to the study of language in general and stylistics in particular. Many books after the sixties have been written to establish and enrich the study of style because a large number of researchers have attempted to explore it and its relevant theories, among them, R. Carter (1967), Crystal and Davy(1967), (M. Short(1981,1985,1996), G. N. Leech(1969;1981;1985) and many others. Simpson (2004:2).

At the end of the 1970s the Poetics and Linguistics Association (PALA) was initiated by a group of scholars including Ronald Carter, Roger Fowler, Mick Short and Katie Wales. The main concern of this association is to provide a common framework and to legitimize stylistics as a professional discipline. The name of the

association was a reflection to the relation between language and literature. PALA has grown worldwide by the end of 20th century due to its annual conference and international journal, *Language and Literature*, which includes valuable articles and researches on stylistics, Wales(2006) edited by Mey (2009:1049).

In a broader sense, Stylistics is a new developing discipline which has old roots. Through its history, stylistics has witnessed a great deal of advance and development. This progress is in part a result of the rise of linguistic theories, and the other part is also caused by the political changes in society as these changes affect the life and the language of people.

3-Branches of Stylistics

The latest development of stylistics has led to the emergence of sub-branches. These branches stem from the main source i.e. the study of style, yet linguists and stylisticians try to deal with these branches in a detailed and thorough investigation. Some stylisticians classify different sets of stylistic branches that there is no agreement upon any set of branches. According to Wales (2001:4) there are various overlapping sub-disciplines of stylistics including literary stylistics, interpretive stylistics, evaluative stylistics, corpus stylistics, discourse stylistics, feminist stylistics, computational stylistics and cognitive stylistics.

According to Galperin (1977:3) there are three types of stylistics branches: Linguo-stylistics; literary stylistics and Stylistics of decoding. Linguo-stylistics is the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation. Linguistics is concerned with the language codes themselves and particular messages of interest and so far as to exemplify how the codes are constructed. Literary stylistics is to explicate the message to interpret and evaluate literary writings as the works of art. Stylistics of decoding can be presented in the following way:

Sender – message – receiver speaker – book – reader.

Fabb (2002:16) postulates another group of branches; linguistic stylistics, literary stylistics, functional stylistics, decoding stylistics, encoding stylistics, phono-stylistics and critical discourse stylistics. Busse et al (2010:6) point out that the branches of stylistics comes under two main groups; linguistic stylistics and literary stylistics. Linguistic stylistics includes formal stylistics (phono-stylistics, graphological stylistics, morpho-syntax stylistics, and lexical stylistics), functional stylistics (pragmatic stylistics, discourse stylistics and multi-modal stylistics), cognitive stylistics, feminist stylistics and corpus stylistics.

Consequently, there are various branches of stylistics, yet, there is no general consensus on the number of these branches. In general the most remarkable branches are: linguistic (general) stylistics including; phono-stylistics, pragmatic-stylistics, discourse stylistics...etc., literary stylistics, functional stylistics, feminist stylistics, critical stylistics and cognitive stylistics. The most prominent branches are the following:

3-1 Linguistic Stylistics

For most of the above mentioned scholars, general stylistics or linguistic stylistics is a sub-discipline of stylistics. It is basically concerned with the varieties of language and the exploration of their features. The concept of style and stylistic variation in language are in essence based on the notion of the possibility of rendering the same content in more than linguistic form through the use of the same language system. Accordingly, the language system is the main source for achieving variations. As stylistics deals with a wide range of varieties and styles spoken , written, monologue , dialogue, formal , informal, scientific, religious...etc. It is possible to

explore the linguistic varieties at all linguistic levels such as phonological, syntactic, morphological...etc. (Crystal and Davy,1969:12).

It is generally believed that linguistic stylistics directs the attention towards the way in which any piece of discourse expresses the language system. On the other hand, linguistic stylistics studies the devices in languages and their structural patterns.

Linguistic stylistics is concerned with the linguistic choices which the writer makes and the effects of these choices on the reader\listener. This assumption leads to view linguistic stylistics as it primarily focuses on the use of language and its effects on a text, (Busse et al,2010:45).

Many stylisticians claim objectivity in their linguistic work as opposed to literary criticism. This notion has vexed the field of stylistics since its origins. They claim that the selection of linguistic features which might be significant to the description and the interpretation of the work cannot be based on the analyst's intuitions because it will be subjective. A subsequent analysis which involves both classification and explanation, is in contrast described as objective as it is based on the application of relevant theoretical frameworks and on a systematic understanding of patterns of variation in language use. Semino (1997 as cited in Simpson ,2011:543)

Simpson (2004:175) concludes that stylistics is concerned with the description of literary work and it helps the critic in his evaluation, he emphasizes the objective measurements of stylistics as well.

Furthermore, many developments in linguistic stylistics are brought about due to the general development of stylistics such as in pragmatic studies and discourse analysis, conversational analysis etc.

3-2 Literary Stylistics

As a matter of fact, this branch is the origin of stylistics as a discipline. It is essentially concerned with the relationship between the form and the meaning of the literary works. It studies the way with which the choices and patterns affect the interpretation of literary texts.

Since its emergence, stylistics was concerned with the study and analysis of literary works. Many linguists have analyzed the poetic language in particular and the choices, patterns and the attitudes of the authors as well as their effect on the general interpretation of the work. Theories of Formalists and the Prague School helped in analyzing literary texts in terms of their linguistic features of foregrounding and deviation. More recently and as a result of the general development in pragmatics and discourse analysis, different approaches are implemented to analyze other genres of literature; prose and drama. Stylisticians among them Short (1996: 172–186) have shown how the theories and analytical frameworks developed by linguists interested in interaction can explain the ways in which readers or audience perceive characters and infer meanings between the lines in interpreting fictional interaction. Moreover many recent works emphasize the role of the reader in the creation of meaning, which requires the exploitation of cognitive approaches in analyzing the way by which the reader can interpret meanings (Jeffries and McIntyre ,2010:7).

3-3 Formal Stylistics

According to Busse et al (2010:24) this type of stylistics represents the work of a group of theoreticians called Russian Formalists during the period (1910-1930). This approach was highly interested in the poetic language and tried to systemize its study on the basis of their formal features which distinguish the literary text from other types of texts. It was thought that the function of the literary work could be shown through its formal features. In other words, the phonological, morpho-syntactic and semantic aspects of the text draw the attention of the reader to its message.

Formal features according to this approach were represented by parallelism and deviation from the usual norm of language.

Many linguists criticize the formal approach for its concentration on the formal features more than the function of the text. Moreover, it is criticized because it neglects the contextual and social factors of the text, (Weber ,1996:2).

Among others, Fish (1973) in (Freeman ,1981:54) has criticized formalist stylistics for its claim of scientific objectivism and for neglecting the role of the reader in the identification of the stylistic effects. Yet, formal stylistics remains an important approach to stylistic analysis as many models of analysis still follow this manifest approach in analyzing poetry.

3-4 Pragmatic Stylistics

Pragmatic stylistics is a branch of stylistics which emerged in the 1960s but came to be a focal approach to text analysis during the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s. Stylistics is the study of the ways in which

meaning is created through language in literature and other types of texts. Thereby, stylisticians use linguistic models, techniques and theories as their analytical approaches to demonstrate how and why a text works as it does, and how can the meaning of the text be understood via the words of that text. Busse et al (2010:1)

Huang (2012:19) defines Pragma-stylistics or pragmatic stylistics by stating that it "refers to the application of the findings and methodologies of the theoretical pragmatics to the study of the concept of style in language". Stylistics, through its formal approach at the beginning of the twentieth century, embraces the analysis of the poetic language. From the 1980s and on, prose fiction has attracted the attention of stylistician like Simpson(2004), Verdonk(2002), Toolan(2006)...etc; partly, this has been due to a shift in the concern of linguistic research away from a core of syntax, phonology, lexicology, semantics, and towards the interdisciplinary studies of text and discourse. Disciplines such as cognitive science, pragmatics and discourse analysis (including critical discourse analysis) have found their place in the expansion of interest. For example, Carter and Simpson argued for discourse-analysis oriented approach and Sell for a pragmatics-oriented approach to the language of literature. On the other hand, the ability to explore whole works of literature from a linguistic viewpoint, rather than to confine attention to short poems, has been enhanced and sustained through the methods of corpus linguistics, and the technology of the computer, Leech (2007:2).

Short (1996:195) also comments, on the same issue, that to understand the interaction of the characters and the relation between them and the use of the context in literary texts, we have to see how to apply the pragmatic analysis of ordinary conversation. Black (2006:2) points out that stylistics deals with the way of understanding the meaning of (a literary) text by different readers or individuals and this can be affected by the language style the reader used to, and since pragmatics is defined as the study of language in use including the situation around the user, it is better for stylistics to take into consideration the use of the tools that are proposed by pragmatics.

Pragmatic stylistics is part of the manifestation of linguistic stylistics. This variety of stylistics shows the meeting point between pragmatics and stylistics, that is, how pragmatic resources, such as performative and speech acts can be employed to achieve stylistic effects. Scholars have demonstrated that the objective of pragmatics is to show how users of any language can use the sentences to convey messages which are not directly or explicitly shown in the propositional content of the sentences.

Stylistics has been proved to be a useful tool in the hands of an analyst who wishes to analyze a text from any stand point. (Niazi and Gautum ,2-10:12). This branch shows the purpose that relates stylistics with pragmatics. That is to say the need for pragmatic theories to the analysis of narrative texts.

4- Stylistics and literary criticism

Though, it is believed that stylistics is a bridge between linguistics and literature and originally it developed from literary criticism, many critics do not agree with the manipulation of these ideas .

Fowler and Bateson's debate, published in the academic journal "Essays in criticism" during the 1960s, is a good starting point. Fowler (1966) as a linguist defends the usefulness of stylistic analysis to literary works and literary criticism. Bateson (1966), on the other hand, argues that there is no connection between linguistics and literature, style is not a level of language, it is exclusively literary. He accuses the stylistician to be a grammarian whose job is only counting the nouns and verbs of texts, thereby no value can stylistics afford to the analysis of literary texts. One is either a natural grammarian or born a literary critic. Literature is only measured subjectively according to various human judgments. Fowler points out the importance of grammatical analysis to the literary work. Stylistics is concerned with the description of literary work and help the critic in his evaluation, He emphasizes the objectivity measurement of stylistics as well, Simpson (2004:175) and Busse et al (2010:18)

Subjectivity and objectivity are considered to be the most distinguishing factors between stylistics and literary criticism. Crystal and Davy (1969:12-13) illustrate the idea of 'objectivity' in Stylistic analysis. They propose that the stylistician interrelates his analytical approach within the framework of some theory: In other words, it is a systematic analysis based on scientific bases of explicit observations of linguistic features in scrutiny. Literary criticism is recognized as 'subjective' in its manipulation of literary texts. There is no general framework for the critic's interpretation which depends on analyzing the plot, the metaphor the ideology...etc.

Lyons (1981:296) comments on the relation between linguistics and literary criticism by stating that: "In recent years ,there has been something of a rift between linguistics and literary criticism". He clearly attributes this rift to two reasons; the first is the misunderstanding and prejudice. The other is the exaggerated claims of particular linguists and literary critics about the aims and achievements of their own disciplines.

According to Fish (cited in D. Freeman(1981:3)), stylistics was born as a reaction to the subjectivity of literary critics. Stylistics purports to substitute the precise and rigorous descriptions and put literary criticism on a scientific basis.

Short (1996:2) also discusses the debate between linguists and critics as a border dispute over territory. For him , stylistics looks like either linguistics or literary criticism depending on the side one is at. Furthermore, he highlights the relation and the role each field plays by claiming that literary criticism has a core and this core has three major parts, as expressed below:

Description → Interpretation → Evaluation
Linguistics ,on the other hand, provides the text with a non- literal interpretation. It helps show the linguistic facts about the construction of the literary work. One can deduce out of this discussion that Short wishes to say that stylistics is concerned with relating linguistic description of a text to its interpretation.

Simpson(2004:3) proposes that many critical circles believe that stylistician is an old grammarian whose function is only to count the nouns and verbs in literary

texts. He attributed this belief to the limited understanding of how linguistic analysis works and the relation between language and artistic craft of the writer. The stylistician is concerned with the language of a literary work as a function of a text in context not merely the statistic account of it.

Moreover, Leech and Short (1981: 13) see literary style as a relational concept, that is, it aims at relating or explaining the relation between 'the critics' concern of aesthetic appreciation with the linguists' concern of linguistics description". Jeffries and McIntyre (2010:5) address those who criticize stylistics as being more concerned with literary criticism than linguistics or vice versa by commenting that literary texts are the data for which stylistics employs, develops and applies linguistic theories and then these theories become available to other types of texts.

Generally speaking, practical stylistics can be useful to practical criticism through describing the linguistic features which the latter concentrates on in its analysis and highlighting their function in the whole work.

5- Dramatic Texts and Plays

When one deals with dramatic texts, one has to bear in mind that drama differs considerably from poetry or narrative in that it is usually written for the purpose of being performed on stage. Although plays were mainly written for readers, dramatic texts are generally meant to be transformed into another mode of presentation or medium: the theatre.

One of the main bases of drama is that it is written to be enacted or performed. The structure of the play is conventionally built on being performed. It consists of characters (represented by players or actors), action (by gestures and movements), thought (by dialogue and action), spectacle (by scenery and costume) and audience.

When drama is seen as a theatrical art, the situation becomes complex because drama is more often related to performance than to literary reading. The dramatic text is different from the production of a play. The same play can be different from performance to performance, Tennyson (1967:1-2).

Critics usually distinguish between the primary text, i.e., the main body of the play spoken by the characters, and secondary texts, i.e., all the texts 'surrounding' or accompanying the main text: title, dramatis personae, scene descriptions, stage directions for acting and speaking... etc. Depending on whether one reads a play or watches it on stage, one has different kinds of understanding to dramatic texts. As a reader, one receives first-hand written information through the secondary text about what the characters look like, how they act and react in certain situations, how they speak, what sort of setting forms the background to a scene...etc, (Lethbridge and Moldorf, 2004:4).

To read a story in written form of play is different from seeing it in its multidimensional aspects of communication. To read, one imagines the events in his eyes. So it is a matter of reception. Analyzing a play text indicates dealing only with its composition to arrive at its interpretation. The performance of a play, on the other hand, depends on the perspective of its director and his understanding to the dramatic texts, (Lane, 2010:5-6).

Short(1989:139-143) points out that it is incorrect to say that the only adequate analysis of drama must be the analysis of performance. He emphasizes the necessity that critics should concentrate on dramatic texts. He also argues that analyzing drama on the basis of performance has come partly because of inability of practical criticism to cope with the meanings of dramatic texts. Such analysis will be incoherent and impressionistic because of the variability views among critics about the same

performance, so that the meanings and values will be different from performance to performance and from producer to producer.

Accordingly, dramatic text is the primary text for analysis. Dramatic text or discourse can be studied within the general study of literary discourse whereas the performance of the play may be studied within the framework of theatrical criticism.

5-1 Dramatic Dialogue

It is generally accepted that the dialogue of the characters in dramatic texts resembles the real conversation since drama is an imitation of life. A phrase for example may mean little in everyday life but has typical qualities when it is said in dramatic dialogue. The context in which the speech is presented plays a prominent role in understanding its meaning and effect. It is true that conversation can do several functions together on the stage. For example, a sentence like the following:

'Whatever you think. I am going to tell him what said'.

It is a remark that, in its context, can shed light on the speaker, the character spoken to, the character spoken about, for a fourth person listening as a spectator witnessing a play. On the other hand, dramatic dialogue differs from real conversation in being a readymade one with a predetermined end providing meaning and effect to the action of the characters, (Styan, 1976:11-12).

Dramatic language is modeled on real-life conversations among people, and yet, when one watches a play, one also has to consider the differences between real talk and dramatic language. Dramatic language is ultimately always made up and it often serves several purposes. On the world of a play, language can assume all the pragmatic functions that can be found in real-life conversations such as: to convey information, to persuade or influence someone, to relate one's experiences or signal emotions...etc. However, dramatic language differs from standard usage in order to draw attention to its artistic nature. When analyzing dramatic texts, one ought to explore the various forms of utterances available for drama. In drama characters typically talk to one another and the plot is carried by and conveyed through their verbal interactions. Language in drama can generally be presented either as monologue or dialogue; Monologue means that only one character speaks while dialogue always engages two or more participants. A special form of monologue, where no other person is present on stage beside the speaker, is called soliloquy. Soliloquies occur frequently in (Richard III)for example, where Richard often remains alone on stage and talks about his secret plans. Through soliloquies, the characters explain their feelings, motives...etc. on stage appears unnatural from a real-life standpoint but this is necessary in plays because it would otherwise be very difficult to convey thoughts, for example. In narrative texts, by contrast, thoughts can be presented directly through techniques such as interior monologue or free indirect discourse, (Lithbredg and Mildorf, 2004:22).

6- Pragmatic-Stylistics Analysis and Literature

Though stylistics is largely interested in those linguistic features of a text written or spoken. It tries to study the norms and the deviations of it, the linguistic choices among other possibilities, the aesthetic effect of the writer style and so on, this is not to mean the only concern of stylistics or the ultimate determinations of style. Enkvist (1973:51) defines style as" contextually restricted linguistic variation". Style then accounts for the context of situation of the utterances and the texts. Stylistics pays attention to those aspects of linguistic choices among other possibilities that enable the speaker or writer to convey the same content differently depending on contextual factors to achieve or perform certain objectives. In other words, through the pragmatic component within the study of stylistics, it becomes possible to

investigate how two utterances with the same meaning or connotations may differ in their linguistic form and situational appropriateness to achieve stylistic effects, (Hickey ,1993:574).

Pragma-stylistics thus involves the study of all the conditions, linguistic and extra-linguistic, it studies the rules of language and the elements of the context to produce a thorough and comprehensive interpretation which depends on the meaning or semantic aspects of a sentence or text and its usage or effectiveness in a specific situation and from the writer's perspective or what he means or intends to achieve by using it.

Generally, a pragma-stylistic analysis will focus on any piece of language in use, ranging from a phrase or clause to a complete discourse or text, written or spoken, (Niazi and Guatum ,2010:22).

In account of recent development in linguistics, stylistics and pragmatics have been moving closer to one another. The value of pragma-stylistics is that it can keep clear the differences between stylistic effects (elegance, formality, aesthetics etc.) and pragmatic effects (what is being done and whether it is done politely, clearly, effectively etc.) .The difference between their approaches for analysis can be demonstrated by the following suggested questions: if linguists are interested in asking (What do you say?), stylisticians ask (How do you say?) and pragmaticists ask(What do you do?), then pragma-stylisticians ask (How do you do?) (Hickey ,1993:583).

Pragmatic-stylistic analysis is considered an important and comprehensive approach for the investigation of conversational interaction. It includes the complex interplay between norm and deviation as well as forms and meanings. The pragmatic-stylistic investigation of dialogues underlies central questions such as: (How and why the dialogue in a play mean what it does? What is the style of conversational exchange? How can it be analyzed? What are the effects of the linguistic choices made? What these choices say about the characters' \speakers' interpersonal relations and their inherit power structures? How is humour created? Why do we perceive interactional exchange, as for example, impolite? (Busse et al ,2010:40).

Concerning the same point, Culpeper, et. al. (1998:3) highlight the interaction between stylistics and pragmatics in providing literature with a comprehensive approach of analysis. The main support pragmatics and discourse analysis can afford is in analyzing conversations and dialogues in prose and drama. Some studies have focused on the linguistic structure of dramatic dialogue (e.g. Burton 1980; Herman 1991); some have used politeness theory to illuminate the social dynamics of character interaction (e.g. Simpson 1989; Leech 1992); and others (e.g. Short 1989) have drawn eclectically from pragmatics and discourse analysis, in order to shed light on aspects such as characterization and absurdity.

Conclusions

Given that stylistics emerges as the study of the style of literary texts, many linguists explicitly admit the relation between stylistics and literature. Pragmatics, on the other hand, is typically defined in contrast with semantics. Though both of them are concerned with meaning, pragmatics is concerned with aspects of meaning which are derived from the context of use of utterances. Throughout its history, pragmatics deals with literary writing. For many scholars, pragmatics postulates various models to analyze literature. They distinguish between linguistic pragmatics; the study of language in use, and literary pragmatics; the contextualized study of literature. Pragma-stylistic analysis of literary studies tries to develop techniques and models borrowed from the two disciplines (pragmatics and stylistics) to provide a better

understanding of how language in literary works employed to mean in different contexts of use. It is an attempt to provide solutions to the analysis of different texts which cannot be analyzed by stylistic models.

References

- Black, E.(2006) *Pragmatic stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Busse, B. et al (2010) *Key Terms in Stylistics*. London: Continuum.
- Carter, R. ed.(1967) *Language and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Stylistics*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Crystal & Davy(1967) *Investigating English Style*. London: Longman.
- Culpeper, J. (1998) *Impoliteness in Drama*. Exploring the Language of Drama from Text to Context. Verdonk, p., M. Short,M. and Jonathan Culpeper (eds.), London: Routledge.
- Enkvist, N. (1973) *Linguistic Stylistics*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fabb, N. (2002) *Language and the Structure of Literature. The Linguistic Analysis of Form in Verse and Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fowler, R. (1966) *Essays on Style and Language*. London: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Freeman, D.(1981) (ed.), *Essays in Modern Stylistics*, London: Methuen,
- Galperin, I. (1961) *Stylistics*. Moscow. Higher School Press.
- Hickey, L. (1993) *Stylistics, Pragmatics and Pragma-Stylistics*. On: Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire. Tome 71 fasc. 3, Langues et littératures modernes — Moderne taal- en letterkunde. pp. 573-586.
- http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/rbph_0035-0818_1993_num_71_3_3890 .
- Huang, Yan (2007) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jeffries, L & D. McIntyre(2010) *Stylistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lane, D. (2010) *Contemporary British drama*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Leech, G.N. 2nd ed. (2007) *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G.N. & M. Short (1981) *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman.
- Lucas, F. L.(1974) *Style: The Art of Writing Well*. Hampshire: Harriman House Ltd.
- Lyons, J (1981) *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Niazi and Gautum(2010) *How To Study Literature: Stylistic and Pragmatic Approaches*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Ltd.
- Semino, E. (1997) *Stylistics*, The Routledge Handbook of Applied Linguistics. Simpson, J. ed. (2011) London: Routledge.
- Short, M.(1996) *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London: Longman.
- (1989) *Reading, Analyzing and Teaching Literature* London: Longman.
- Simpson, P. (2004) *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- Styan, J. (1976) *The Elements of Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tennyson, G.B.(1967) *An Introduction to Drama*. New York: Holt
- Thornborrow, J. and Sh. Wareing (1998) *Patterns in Language: An Introduction to Language and Literary Style*. London: Routledge.
- Verdonk, P.(2002) *Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wales, K.(1989) *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. London: Longman.
- Weber, J. (1996) *Towards Contextualized Stylistics: An Overview* in J. Weber (ed.), *The Stylistics Reader*. London: Arnold.