CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

I

The growing relationship between linguistics and literature in recent times is an example of the way in which interdesciplinary studies can provide highly useful perspectives and insights. Stylistics is ore such interdesciplinery subject placed at a point of irtersection between language and literature. Stylistics provides systematic methods and procedures for the aralysis of the distinctive idiom of a literary work of art. By concentrating on the lingustics techniques and devices used by a creative writer, it offers a more precise mode in which insights arrived at in traditional literary criticism are reinforced and supported in positive, exact terms.

Literature shows a highly individual and special patterning of language. The resources of language are manipulated in literature for aesthetic purpose, Within a system of literary conventions. Lingusistics is a systematic study of language in terms of phonology, lexis, syntax, grammar and discourse. It also studies language in its aspects of use and the users. Procedures used by the study of linguistics in these areas enhance or help us for our understanding of language as used by creative writers. It is here that stylistics comes into the picture. To take some concrete examples dialect and registers are

two concepts used in lingustics to define concrete
linguistic behaviour within a speech community. It is
here one meets his purpose of stylistic studies. Dialect
differs according to the user of the language while
register is an example of the variety of language according
to its use. In any way language differs as much according
to the user as to its use. Region, class and caste play a
very crucial role in generating varieties of this kind.
Dialect which differs according to the user of language
is a major example in this context. It depends upon the
social role played by the speaker. Register is another
example of the variety of language according to its use.
It depends upon the linguistic choices made in response to
particular situations. Within a register itself there are
stylistic variations indicating the speaker's or the
writer's relationship to the person or persons being
addressed. That is why literary language itself can be
described as a register because in creating a literary
work the author plays a distinct social role. The user has
at his disposal a fairly wide rnage of registers characte-
rised by the features of grammar, lexis, syntax etc. Both
dialect and register are varieties of language characterised
by geocultural significance. In the context of literature
this geocultural aspect decomes doubly significant because
language variation in terms of region, dialect, register,

speech, slang, idolect are extremely important features of a literary work at the level of phonology, lexis, syntax and grammar. What we call the style of the writer is his creative ability to exploit one or more of these resources of language. Style, therefore, is a mjaor indication of a writer's originality because it indicates as Mukarovasky says the extent to which a writer can achieve individual foregroudning in the general context of automatisation of language.

II

The brief glance offered in the foregoing discussion at the features of varieties of language in relation to literature raises the most important question: what is style? In his Linguistics and Style, N.E. Enkvist has compiled a great number of definitions of style. These give us an idea of the complexity of the problem. A philosopher life Benedetto Croce defines style as an activity of an individual rather than as a system of signals shared by a group. Benedetto Croce was apposed to the segmentation of language which described as arbitrary and extra-linguistic. Goethe defines style from the writer's point of view and describes it as a

higher active principle of composition wheraby the writer
reveals the inner form of his subject. Another example of
the definition of style is that which regaris style as an
addition to a central thought or expression as seen in the
follwoing definition from Joseph Shipley's Lictionary of
Literary Terms.

> S   Style consists in additing to a given
> thought all the circumstances calculated to
> produce the whole effect that the thought
> ought to produce. [1]

Here style is defined as something which exists
prior to thought and thus excludes the entire process of
verbalisation. Similarly De Quincy spoke of style as
having an independent value apart from content. In both
these definitions style is either prior to thought or
independent of content. Balley describes style as an
addition to the content effect by expression substituting
emotional effect for content effect. Herbert Seidler
starts from the apposite pole, that of the reader and
says 'style is a definite emotional effect achieved by
linguistic means in a text'. Cleanth Brooks and Robert
Penn Warren seem to give a modern definition of style as
choice. What they do however is to refer to selection
and ordering of language as part of a writer's mental
process. As part of such processes, choices made are

essentially non-stylistic. They become stylistic only in relation to various frames of phoneme, lexis, syntax and other larger units. We can, therefore, concludes in this context that classical definition of style from Benedetto Croce to Cleanth Brooks tend to be impressionistic, somewhat imprecise because they do not use the conceptual framework of procedures offered by the science of modern linguistics. Since developments in lingustics have pointed out the limited nature of the classical approaches, the term style must be defined in relation to the modern context of linguistics.

In this modern linguistic context, the term style has been defined from several points of view. One view is that style is a deviation from norm. Such a theory of stylistics studies the relationship between matter, manner and medium. It analyses the corelation between the recurrent elements in a literary text to the overall aesthetic effect they produce. Deviations that a writer makes from the norm are always purposeful since they are meant to exploit a wide rnage of ambiguities and semantic shades on the phonological, lexical, syntactic and grammatical levels.

A more comprehensive theory of style which takes into account the relationship between the deviation and

the norm but goes beyond it is seen in Jan Mukarovsky's concept of "foregrounding". A prominent theorist of the Russian formalist school, Mukarovasky defines foregrounding as any item inaa literary discourse which instead of acting as a vehicle for communication attracts attention to itslef. Foregrounding says Mukarovasky is always relative to the background of automatisation of language that is a language which has ceased to attract attention because it depends on overused cusomory, routine sets of procedures and conventions. Mukarovasky's concept of foregrounding is something of an advance over the norm-deviation concept because it essentially refers to the creative dynamics of style in the sense that what is foregrounded in one text can become automatised in a nother and vice-versa. As an aesthetically intentional distortion of linguistic component the concept of fore-grounding places a writer's stylistic creativity in the context of the standard language and the corventions of the relevant literary traditions.

Another major definition of style to have emerged in the context of modern linguistics is style as choice, which is quite different from Cleanth Brook's psycholo-gistic concept. With this concept of style as choice we have to distinguish between three types of selection that is grammatical, non-stylistic and stylistic. Grammar

differentiates the possible from the impossible. Stylistic
and non-stylistic choices however involve selections which
are grammatically optional. Both thechoices here are
between different and grammatically possible alternatives.
The line between these two choices is hard to draw. One
can, however, say that a stylistic choice is a choice
between items which roughly meant the same thing. A non-
stylistic choice is a choice which involves selections
between different meanings. Witness in the light of this
discusioon the following definitation of style:

> Good style, it seems to me, consists
> in choosing the appropriate symbolisation
> of the experience you wish to convey, from
> among a number of words, whose meaning area
> is roughly but only roughly the same (by
> saying 'Cat' for example, rather that
> 'pussy'). [2]

From the point of view of the reader to justify
the same we can mention a definition like the following
one:

> Roughly speaking, two utterenees in
> the same language which convey approximately
> the same information but which are different
> in their lingustic structure can be said to
> differ in style. [3]

These definitions are useful but there is no way
of knowing whether the information carried by the two
different utterences is approximately the same or not.
Thus, the definition of style as choice leais to problems
whose resolution is difficult.

A vast number of definitions emphasie the individual
quality of style. Here is one of Remy de Gcurmont's:

> Having a style means that in the midzt of the
> language shared with others one speais a
> particular, unique and inimitable dialect, which
> is at the same time everybody's language and the
> language of a single individual. [4]

Pierre Naert also ascribes style to the Saussurian
level of parole, not langue. Such definitians are useful
enough in the study of style of individual writers.
Individual modes of expression form a category too special
to give us a general basis for an ideally powerful style
definition.

This, ultimately, leads us to define style a deviation
from a norm. This however overlaps the definitions based
on individual features of expression. For example one such
definition is given below:

> Style, in the linguistic sense usually
> signifies every special usage clearly contransted

against the general. More closly, style could
be defined as that way of presenting a subject
which differs more or less from the everage
and which is motivated by the character of
the subject, the purpose of the presentation,
the reader's qualifications and the writer's
personality. [5]

Such definitions help us in defining both the norm
and the deviations. Prof. Hill defires stylistics as:

All these relations among linguistic
entities which are statable or may be statable,
in terms of wider spars than those which fall
within the limits of the sentence. [6]

Thus these a number of definitions can be considered
from the point of view of the writer and the impressions
of the reader. The definitions of style can be characterised
from subjective and objective views. However, all these
definitions together point out certain aspects of style
as a shall surrounding a pre-existing core of thought or
expression, as the choice between alternativeexpressions,
as a set of individual characteristics, as deviations from
norm; as a set of collective characteristics and those
relations among linquistic entities that are statable in terms
of widersspans of text than the sentence.

After considering these a few approaches of study and

definitions of style, we may say that style in literature
is a recognisable but elusive phenomenon. Style may be
regarded as one of the qualities out of several possessed
by any work of literature. Of its totality its style is
a part. But there is an implication of creator's indivi-
duality too. Again it is related and depends upon certain
notions of the proper function of language as a whole.
Literature can be regarded as a part of the total gestalt
of a culture. Language is not confined to literature along.
It is the medium which carries the whole of theculture.
Literature is one aspect of language and culture. This
interdependence of literature, language and culture makes
style as a cultural phenomenon. And to study style in
literature against the backgro nd of the whole range of
cultural phenomenon is an addition to literature which
helps for its better understand in turn.

III

A major breakthrough in the theory of style was
achieved with Roamn Jakobson's semianl distiaction between
metaphor and metonymy. The idea of oppostion between metaphor
and metonymy can be traced back to Russian Formalism Erlich
observes that Zirmuskjj described metaphor and metanymy as

the chief characertistics of the Romantic and classic
styles respective.y. However, it is in 'The Fundamentals
of Language' written by Jakobson and Halle and publihsed
in English in 1956 that this distinction finds its fullest
expression. According to Jakobson metanymy and metaphor
can be describfd as the charactersing features of two types
of literary discourse. The first is the poery of associa-
tion of continguity. The second is the poetry of associa-
tion by comparing andjoining the plurality of items.
Deriving his procedures from Saussaurian structural
linguistics, Jakobson says that like other systems of sins
language too has a twofold character. Its us involves two
operations ———— selection and combination ———— as
Jakobson puts it.

> Speech implies a selection of certain
> linguistic entities and their combination into
> linguistic units of a higher degree of
> complexity. [7]

This distinction between selection and combination
corresponds to the oppositions between 'langue and parole',
between 'paradigm and syntagm', between 'code and message'
in structural linguistics.

Jakobson further says that the process of selection
depends upon the knowing what the sets are and the process

of combination depends upon the knowing of the rules which
are acceptable. Selection involves the perception of
similarit and its implies the possibility of substitution.
This can be said the use of metaphor. But retanymy is a
figure in which the name of an attribute or adjunct is
substituted for that of the thing meant. So in selection,
substitution is possible but notion combination. For
example in language a writer selects words and combines them
in sentence. While selecting words he can substitute them
by accepting other. But incombination that is in writing a
sentence the substitution is not possible.as the combination
is a matter to run on the possible rules. Fichard A Lanham
defines metanymy as, 'substitution of cause foreeffect or
effect for cause, a proper name for one of its qualities
or vice-versa.' Metanymy is closely associated with
synechoche i.e. the substitution of part for whole genus
forspeices or vice-versa. For example as David Lodge
explains it 'the hand that rocks the cradle', 'hand' stands
for the person and by its influence it means mother. This
later can be said a synecdoche. Whereas 'cradle' stands for
'child' and it is a metanymy. Rhetoricians and critics from
Aristotle ot the present day have generally regarded metanymy
and synecdoche as forms or subspecies of metaphor because
superfically they seem to be the same sort of thing. But
Jakobson argues that metaphor and metonymy are apposed

because they are generated according to opposite principles.
Metaphor as we have seen belongs to the selection axis of
language and metonymy and synecdoche belongs to the
combination axis of language.

In Jakobson's scheme selection is opposed to combina-
tion and substituion is opposed to contexture. But contexture
is not an optional in quite the same way as substitution.
It is rather a law of language. So David Lodge in his
Modes of Modern Writing suggests a better term that is
deletion. Then we may say that deletion is to combination
as substitution is to selection. Metonymies and synecdoches
are condensations of contexture. The sentence 'keels
crossed the deep' is a transformation of a rational sentence.
'The keels of the ships crossed the deep sea' by means of
deletions.

In short, metonymy and synecdoche are produced by
deleting one or more items from a natural combination. This
is an attempt made to see metonymy as theprocess of
substitution but this does not affect the fundamental
structural oppositions of metaphor and metonymy. It rests
on the basic opposition between selection and combination,
though both centre round the principle of equivalence.

Selection (and correspondingly substituon)
deals with entities conjoined in the code, but
not in the given message, whereas in the case
of combination the entities are conjcined in
both or only in the actual message. [8]

Having discussed these two axes of selection and
combination, Jakobson further says:

the development of a discourse may take
place along two different semantic lines. One
topic may lead to another either through their
similarity or their contiguity. The metaphori-
cal way would be the more appropriate term for
the first case and the metonymic for the second,
since they find their most condensed expression
in metaphor and metonymy reppectively. In
aphasia one or other of these two processes is
blocked. In normal verbal behaviour both
processes are continually operative; but
careful observation wil reveal that under the
influence of a cultural pattern, personality,
and verbal style preference is given to one
of the two process over the other. [9]

Jakobson classifies a great variety of cultural
phenomena according to this distinction. Thus, drama is
basically metaphoric and film metenymy, while the art of
close-up is synecdochic. In literatuee Russian lyrical
songs are metaphoric and heoric epics are metonymic. Prose,
which moves essentially by contiguity tends towards the

metonymic pole, while poetry, with its devices such as similarity, tends towards the metaphoric pole. Romantic and symbôlist writing is metaphoric and realist writing is metonymic. According to Lodge, Jakobson's pairings of opposits can be schematised as in the following two lists.

Metaphor	Metonymy
Pardigm	Syntaçm
Similarity	Contiçuity
Selection	Combination
Substituion	(Deletion) Contexture
Contigutiy disorder	Similcrity disorder
Contexture deficiency	Selection deficiency
Drama	Film
Montage	Close-up
Dream Symbolism	Dream consideration and displacement
Surrealism	Cubisn.
Imiatative magic	Contacious magic
poetry	Prose
Lyric	Epic
Romanticism and Symbolism	Realisn

IV

The foregoing sections delating with the definitions of style thus give us major stylistic approaches. In view of these multiple approaches. One can study style as

deviation from the norm or style as choice. It is also possible to examine the different varieties of language used by a creative writer. A stylistic study of literary work can be taken up at the level of lexis and syntax. The present dissertation, seeks to offer a stylistic analysis of the later work of Salinger not in terms of deviation theory, choice theory, but in terms of the categories of metaphor and metonymy as described by Roman Jakobson. These categories are consistently used in order to bring out the stylistic strength and formal experimentation of J.D. Salinger as revealed in his later works ——— Franny, Zooey, Raise High the Roof Beam, Carpenters and Seymour: An Introduction.