THE SCOPE OF STYLISTIC AND DISCURSIVE ANALYSES OF THE LITERARY TEXT: INTERRELATION AND INCONSISTENCY

Abstract. The article explores the peculiarities of the stylistic and discursive analyses of a literary text. Meanwhile, there are mentioned the differences and the common boundaries between these two approaches. Discourse and Stylistics are different according to the objectives of their field of study. Still, they are two inseparable disciplines. Analyzing the discourse implies a bit of stylistic input. However, discourse is broader in its analysis scope. To make a distinction between these two types of analyses we would like to highlight that discourse represents a communication act while stylistics deals with the style of the communication, how and what is communicated. As a matter of fact, the discursive analysis of a literary text is namely guided by the peculiarities of discourse.
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People understand differently the terms of discursive and stylistic analyses. In a narrower meaning, the discursive analysis aims only the structure of the spoken discourse/text. This fact distinguishes the discursive analysis from the literary and pragmatic stylistics which constitute the study of the language functionality in the context. On the other hand, the discursive analysis can be carried out on both spoken and written texts and includes some elements used by the readers or the listeners, namely, the textual coherence, cohesion and the meaning which make the core of the analysis. Consequently, the discursive analysis includes pragmatics and some stylistics in its spectrum. As for the stylistics, it can be applied only to literary texts and in such a way it relates to the study of style and meaning [1].

These two disciplines, id est, discourse and stylistics, are different according to the objective of their field of study. Nevertheless, they are two inseparable fields.
As a matter of fact, it’s really hard to establish a border between them. Analyzing the discourse implies a bit of stylistic input. However, discourse is broader in its analysis scope. To make a distinction between these two types of analyses we would like to highlight that discourse represents a communication act while stylistics deals with the style of the communication, how and what is communicated. In the present article we’ll try to show the interrelation between discourse and stylistics, we’ll try to apply discursive and stylistic peculiarities while approaching a literary text [2].

Discursive analysis invites the reader to go beyond the text, as discourse is a language above the clauses, it is the study of more aspects of the language in use [3]. It is based on the notion that language needs a context for it to function properly. In this light, it’s impossible to comprehend language structures without putting them in a context [4]. Besides this, discourse represents a social action. As Fairclough states the dimensions of the social are: knowledge, social relations and social identity. These three factors support the language functions [5].

It should be taken into account that discourse is different from discourse analysis. As it was mentioned above discourse constitutes the communivation, while the discourse analysis analyses the communication. As for the discursive analysis of a literary text, it is the analysis of the aspects of the language of the text, how and what it communicates to the readers [6].

Discursive analysis completes the stylistic analysis as it continues where the second stops. The discursive analysis gives answers to the following problems: what are the reasons the speaker or the writer use language the way they do? how is the message interpreted by the hearer or reader? The answer to these questions underlines the discourse relation with the pragmatics. It’s necessary to say that the latter is the study of the language in use. Speaking about the literary text, indeed, the writer has total control of the choice of words to use but he or she certainly does not have control of the meaning the reader would deduce from those conveyed in the text. An efficient understanding of the language of the literary text is generated by coherence and cohesion. Coherence deals with meaning in a text. When a text makes sense to a reader or a hearer, it is said to be coherent. Cohesion relates to discourse as it focuses on how texts are held together lexically and grammatically
as a whole. A text without cohesion doesn’t produce any meaning. In the following examples we can perceive the peculiarities of coherence and cohesion:

– Ex. The driver made an accident. He had drunk at the party (in this case we can say that the sentences are coherent but they aren’t cohesive).

– Ex. The driver made an accident because three hours before he had drunk at the party (here the sentences are coherent and cohesive as the conjunction because and the pronoun he are cohesive means for making sense to a text. They are called referentials.

– Ex. The driver made an accident because the day was sunny (no coherence in the clause but there is cohesion).

– Ex. The driver made an accident. The day was sunny (no coherence and no cohesion).

While cohesion represents the linguistic connectivity of sentences using cohesive ties, coherence in discourse aims at establishing relationships between sentences in the process of interpreting illocutionary acts, using discursive markers.

The stylistic analysis can be made on non literary texts as well as on literary texts. The literary stylistics exploits the use of dialogue, choice of words and expression, the description of scenes, the use of active and passive voice and the distribution of the sentence length. It valorizes the principles that support the choices made by the speakers in the use of language such as socialization, the production or reception of meaning, literary criticism, and the analysis of critical discourse. Stylistic analysis offers the possibility to the reader to unravel the text by studying the style of the writer or speaker. Style is considered as the effective use of language, namely in prose, to make up ideas, to create emotive utterances.

Therefore, the objective of stylistics is the study of certain structures and elements in a given text. A stylistic analysis of a text reveals mostly, the good or the bad qualities of writing.

In making a stylistic analysis of a literary text, there are explored certain linguistic features such as graphology, semantics and lexis. The stylistic approach involves the interpretation of the linguistic features of the text in order to understand how the meanings are conveyed. It involves techniques and activities
regarding the study of literature, of the literary genre, and revealing the literary code which includes: *items of vocabulary, denotative and connotative meanings, versification in lyrical texts, procedures of expressiveness, ways of exposition, creativity, styles and originality of expression, artistic images, selecting, combining, paraphrasing language to communicate the idea, understanding of the word, the decomposition of the artistic imaginary, the expression of expressiveness, of the craft of words that acquire relief, color and life etc.* This kind of analysis helps the reader understand how the writer selects, combines words and meanings [7].

Stylistic analysis in literary studies is usually done with a view to interpret the meaning of the text, the effect or the impact the writer/speaker intends to communicate to readers or listeners. Studying a literary text from a stylistic perspective supposes first reading the text to understand the overall picture. Then, we should start asking questions for every part of the text [8]. In the process of making a stylistic analysis of the literary text we should consider the following points:

– Does the text contain some striking irregularities of form in comparison to traditional texts that are within the same genre?
– Are there deviant grammatical or graphological elements?
– Despite all deviant characteristics, is there order in the text?
– How about the text’s phonological qualities? Are some sounds repeated? Are there some sounds missing?
– Are there neologisms or awkward word usage? Does the author use jargon, slang, or standard language?
– Semantic fields are especially important while analyzing a text stylistically. What kind of feeling do the verbs give? Do verbs show an action of the past or do they point at an ongoing activity?[ibidem]

In the graph of those mentioned above, it is a herculean task in attempting to establish a delimiting mark between Stylistics and Discourse. It has been proven that these two text approaches use different but in the same time similar methods. For example, while the discursive analysis of the text we focus on such things as the textuality, coherence and cohesive which by extension could reveal ideology and
power inherent in a discourse. The stylistic analysis on the contrary, focuses on the style and language patterns of the text.

The discursive approach of the literary represents an action which has to adapt and update the sentence/message to the context of communication. The text is considered a discourse. As the literary work is a social activity, the device used by the author is both textual and socio-cultural. In such a way the discursive analysis supposes *going beyond the text*. Besides this, the discursive approach of the literary text can be seen as an effective tool in integrating all the competences in the process of studying the English language. It generates the development of the sociolinguistic, cultural and pragmatic competences.

According to the speciality literature, we infer that, discursive analysis focuses on the social aspects of communication and the ways in which people use language, while linguistic approaches focus only on the rules of language use.

Moreover, the discursive analysis of the literary text is influenced by elements of a wide range of sub-disciplines, such as pragmatics, conversational analysis, speech act theory, and speech ethnography. Taking into account all these aspects in the process of analysing a text, the language is regarded as a whole in terms of transcripts, larger texts, audio or video recordings, which gives the analyst an opportunity to work with the language rather than with a single sentence [9].

Stylistics focuses on texts and pays a lot of attention to devices, parts and figures of speech, for style in language. Discursive analysis, on the other hand, tries to analyze literature in terms of cooperative principles, with derived maxims, speech acts and conversational analyzes, which is a totally different approach from that followed by stylistics in the analysis of literary texts. In turn, literary criticism is the practical implication of literary theory. It has a subjective approach to analyzing and evaluating literature, while stylistics and discourse analysis claim to follow the objective approach. In addition to these differences, all three disciplines have one thing in common: they analyze the literature, they attract knowledge and methodologies from each other, so it is very difficult to put a clear line of demarcation to separate them.

In the process of analyzing texts in the English classroom we are dealing with texts which are studied within a literary genre, within broader contexts, such as
society or culture. In this way, interest goes beyond the language and studies other social relations. The discursive analysis of the literary text respects the principles of the following fields:

– Pragmatics which focuses on contextual considerations.

– Interactional sociolinguistics which supposes to study the interactive construction and organization of discourse regarded as social interaction.

– Conversational analysis. Here are highlighted the dialogues which explore the conventions in a social group.

– Ethnography of communication which aims the study of language in a cultural setting.

– Sociolinguistic variation analysis. It studies the modalitites of the language variation according to communities or speakers. For example, the social factors as a speaker’s gender, ethnicity, age, degree of integration into their community, etc, and linguistic structures (such as sounds, syntactic forms, intonation features, words, etc.) are taken into consideration.

– Functional sentence perspective explores the sentence structure with a communicative purpose.

After relating the common boundary of all these fields, it is necessary to state that doing discourse analysis primarily consists of doing pragmatics. The difference could be established in that discourse analysis is a natural consequence of pragmatics. Actually pragmatics studies the context but discursive analysis deals more with the terms of reference, presupposition, implicature and inference. The scope of the discursive analysis of a text focuses on the relationship between the writer and reader and on the intertextuality rather than the relationship that exists between one sentence more. The concept of intertextuality used by Iulia Kristeva is based on the idea that all texts influence each other.

As stated above, discourse will never take texts in isolation but within a background, circumstances that will be taken into consideration giving them the same importance as the text itself, but, according to the purpose for the context analysis, different schools have been created [10].
Conclusion

We would like to infer that in the discursive analysis of a literary text there are three elements: grammar, intertextuality and context. *Grammatical analysis* describes the skeleton, the machinery of the text; *intertextuality* and *context* constitute the external elements in which this text was written. The three lead to a deep analysis of the text through which we can deduce the intention and influences of the author and not only his personal style.
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