

Teaching Stylistics 1

1 Aims and Scope

Abstract

The main aim of this article is to propose an exercise in stylistic analysis which can be employed in the teaching of English language. It details the design and results of a workshop activity on narrative carried out with undergraduates in a university department of English. The methods proposed are intended to enable students to suggest, which are not as readily obtainable through more traditional techniques of stylistic analysis. The text chosen for analysis is a short story by Ernest Hemingway comprising only 11 sentences. A jumbled version of this story is presented to students who are asked to assemble a cohesive and well-formed version of the story. Their (re)constructions are then compared with the original Hemingway version: Much interest, it is argued, lies in the ways in which the students justify their own version in terms of their expectations about well-formedness in narrative. The activity is also intended to encourage students to see literary texts as a valuable means of providing insights into the subtleties of linguistic form and function.

The pedagogical benefit which can be derived from the integration of language and literary study was illustrated as long ago as 1975 with the publication of Henry Widdowson's *Stylistics and the teaching of literature*. Since then, there has been a steady output of research within this branch of applied linguistics. More recently, the potential of stylistics in language teaching has been underscored by the publication of articles on the subject (Carter 1982, Brumfit and Carter 1986, Short 1989, Carter and Simpson 1989). This article seeks to contribute to this pool of research by suggesting a teaching method which can be used to explain the concepts of cohesion and narrative structure. The stylistic importance of both of these features of language has been demonstrated at length elsewhere, most notably by Leech and Short (1981:243-54), Carter (1982,1984), Fowler (1986:53-68), Toolan (1988:146-82) and Haynes (1989: 32-40). Where the present study differs from this previous research is in the way it develops from a comparison of alternative versions of the same story. The rationale behind such a comparative analysis is that it brings into sharper focus those very features of language which might elude stylistic analysis of a more traditional kind.

In the light of these aims, this article attempts to cater for the interests of two types of mutually compatible readership. The first is the academic with a general interest

in stylistic theory and practice. To reflect this interest, the article follows the pattern of much stylistic work by using linguistic analysis to provide a window on the devices which characterise a particular work. The second type of reader is the teacher of English who is confronted by the practical problem of finding material which presents linguistic concepts and terminology in a 'user-friendly' manner. To this effect, care has been taken to develop material which is both accessible and replicable, and which will have direct practical benefit for those involved in the teaching of English language and literature.

The article will be structured as follows. In Section 2, a summary of the workshop plan will be provided along with proper contextualisation of the Hemingway short story. Section 3 will be devoted to the analysis and discussion of patterns of cohesion in the narrative developed by participants in the workshop. From their collected versions of the story, an idealised narrative will be developed which will then form the basis of comparison with the original Hemingway version. In Section 4, the analysis of cohesion will be supplemented with a discussion of narrative structure. A number of extensions to the main part of the study are also proposed in this section, including some suggestions as to how the kind of activity outlined here might be integrated into creative writing programmes and

finally , some concluding remarks are offered on the ways in which additional linguistic frameworks may be brought to bear on the same linguistic data.

2 Methodology and technique

The Hemingway text selected for the exercise is one of the many vignettes peppered throughout the collection . These vignettes are untitled, are seldom over 150 words long and are often simply wedged between the more substantial short stories in the collection. They are distinct from the longer stories not only in terms of content, but in graphology also: most are italicised, which separates them visually from the other material .

The original, unaltered version of the story had been used initially as a sample exercise in undergraduate stylistics tutorials. Participants were final year students following Lancaster University's BA programme in English Language and Literature . These students had opted to take the stylistics course as part of the Language 'track' of their degree; all were well motivated and their work in the first and second years had revealed that all had demonstrable ability for language study. The main intention of the tutorials was to highlight a variety of aspects of narrative organisation , with special emphasis on isolating the cohesive devices exhibited by the text. This, in turn, was

intended to lead to a comparative discussion of narrative structure through a contrastive analysis of this text with some 'social stories' told in everyday conversations . Despite the optimism of the tutor about stylistic potential of the text, these tutorials were, frankly, unsuccessful . While many of the more stock responses regarding the 'flatness' of Hemingway's prose style were produced , there were problems in explaining how this 'flatness' was created in the text . Furthermore , while many potentially illuminating comments on the 'disinterested ' and 'cynical' nature of the narrative style were made , students encountered difficulties in identifying precisely the linguistic features which triggered these responses. As the unsatisfactoriness of the exercise was clearly not due to any limitations on the part of the participants , it had to lie squarely in the design of the exercise itself .

So finally, in a last-ditch attempt to salvage the exercise as a whole , the following workshop activity was developed.

Given that the object of the exercise was to focus attentions on the linguistic devices which bind the story together, the first step was to dismantle the text entirely . Both the size and the overall structure of the text helped enormously here, in that it comprised only 11 sentences totalling 130 words. The story was (literally) cut up into its 11 constituent sentences , which were then 'shuffled ' .

Each of the pieces of paper containing a single sentence was then drawn in random sequence, and each sentence was assigned a letter from the consecutive sequence (a) - (k). Care was thus taken to ensure that the sequence of sentences was now completely random ; even if any particular combination happened to match the original it would have been entirely due to chance . The sequence which emerged is reproduced below.

It is hoped that the reader will participate to some extent in this activity by sharing the perspective of the workshop team who worked on this text. For this reason , the original Hemingway version will be withheld for the moment as attention is focused on both the jumbled version and the reconstructions by the workshop participants.

- (a) All the shutters of the hospital were nailed shut.
- (b) When they fired the first volley he was sitting down in the water with his head on his knees.
- (c) There were pools of water in the courtyard.
- (d) They tried to hold him up against the wall but he sat down in a puddle of water.
- (e) One of the ministers was sick with typhoid.
- (f) Two soldiers carried downstairs and out into the rain.
- (g) There were wet dead leaves on the paving of the courtyard.

you to build up what you consider a 'normal' narrative sequence . This need not necessarily be an attempt to reassemble the original Hemingway text : just 'reshuffle' the sentences so that they produce a relatively satisfactory narrative pattern.

- 3 Now make a note of the sequence you've selected (e.g. a b c d e..... etc.) and try to justify your decisions in terms of cohesion . It may help to isolate any features of language which signal that a particular sentence should precede rather than follow another .Underline any such features .
- 4 Each group will be asked to state the sequence of their narrative and to account for the decisions they've taken.Each group's selection will be discussed.
- 5 Yes ... the original version will be produced !

One of the advantages of cutting up the card group, after having recorded its own reconstruction, was able to assemble the narratives proposed by the other groups. This ensured that all participants , when not presenting their own version, had before them the narratives of each of the other groups.

The activity was certainly engaged in with more enthusiasm than in the previous tutorials based on the complete version of the story. Group members co-operated

- (h) Finally the officer told the soldiers it was no good trying to make him stand up.
- (i) They shot the six cabinet ministers at half past six in the morning against the wall of a hospital.
- (j) It rained hard.
- (k) The other five stood very quietly against the wall.

The next stage was to transfer this jumbled narrative on to A4-sized cards . The sentences were enlarged as much as possible , but sizeable gaps were left between each sentence so that the temptation to interpret contiguous sentences as meaningfully related was to some extent avoided . The cards were then presented to six groups of undergraduate students , each group containing four or five members . In addition to a single card, each group received a worksheet containing the following instructions :

- 1 On the accompanying card you will find a complete (untitled) short story by Ernest Hemingway . The story comprises just eleven sentences . However, these sentences have been 'shuffled' so that now they do not occur in the sequence of the original story . Each sentence has been assigned a letter .
- 2 Working in groups, try to reconstruct the story . You may cut the card into strips if you prefer, thereby enabling

well with each other, electing a spokesperson to summarise and justify the narrative pattern agreed upon by the group as a whole . One particularly noticeable development was the way in which each group defended its position in response to the queries and suggestions of other groups.

3 Results discussion

The results obtained from this workshop activity are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 Results of workshop activity

	Sentence										
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th
Group 1	(i)	(a)	(e)	(e)	(c)	(b)	(d)	(h)	(k)	(g)	(j)
Group 2	(i)	(j)	(e)	(f)	(d)	(g)	(k)	(h)	(b)	(c)	(a)
Group 3	(i)	(j)	(c)	(a)	(e)	(f)	(d)	(h)	(b)	(k)	(g)
Group 4	(i)	(c)	(i)	(e)	(k)	(f)	(d)	(h)	(b)	(g)	(a)
Group 5	(i)	(g)	(e)	(f)	(c)	(d)	(k)	(h)	(b)	(i)	(a)
Group 6	(i)	(a)	(j)	(c)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(d)	(b)	(k)	(h)

One of the advantages of a quantitative study of this sort is that it is possible to view at a glance a collected set of responses. These responses are based specifically upon native speakers' intuitions about what constitutes a well- formed, coherent narrative .By tabulating these responses we can gain insights into not only the sorts of patterns which recur, but also the variety of responses which is reflected across the six groups . and , of course, all this will provide an illuminating contrast with the original Hemingway version.

3.1 General patterns of response

It is noticeable that only two of the available 11 sentences were selected as viable openings to the story . Of these two , sentence (i) was favoured :

They shot the six cabinet ministers at half past six in the morning against the wall of a hospital.

The justifications offered by the groups who chose (i) as the crucial opening sentence were interesting and some consideration. The underlying motivation behind selection was that of all the sentences this was the one which provided the neatest summary of the entire story. No other sentence encapsulated the point of the story in as 'snappy' a way. The precise linguistic justification offered in support of this centred primarily on two features of the sentence . Firstly the noun phrase 'the six cabinet ministers ' is the

most elaborated of all the references to the ministers , and would naturally be expected to precede subsequent, more reduced, forms. For instance , the appearance of the partitive expression 'one of the ministers ' later in the narrative presupposes an earlier reference to the group of ministers as a whole . Secondly, and more significantly , this is one of only two sentences in the story which contain an indefinite article : here , ' a hospital ' . This is a linguistic feature which is often used to introduce a new entity into the text, with subsequent references adopting the definite article, (See, for example , the reference to ' the hospital ' in sentence (a)) . In spite of this justification , however , some groups still expressed misgivings about the selection of (i) as an opening . One feature which perturbed a number of participants was the use of 'they ' without an antecedent . This is normally used anaphorically (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 14) . That is to say , it usually refers 'backwards', anaphora being the type of cohesive relation which points to some earlier , fuller reference in the text. By contrast, in the present example , the pronoun is used cataphorically ; it points forward to a reference or references in a subsequent portion of text. In this respect, the 'they' can be said to form a cataphoric link with the references to 'the soldiers' and 'the officer' later in the narrative. On balance , however , it was generally agreed that this feature did not warrant the

de-selection of (i) as best possible opening to the story . Indeed, a number of students suggested that this type of cataphoric reference was a common enough characteristic of the openings of literary texts . The two groups who chose sentence (j) for their opening took a somewhat different approach . They argued that a short 'scene-setting' sentence such as 'it rained hard ' was a more appropriate beginning to the story . Moreover , they had no problems in explaining away any unusual cataphoric references as the (it) in the sentence is simply a dummy subject ,an item which has no reference value and is purely a formal requirement of the grammar of English.

One of the more striking aspects of the table of results is the way in which it highlights certain configurations of sentences which are almost invariable across all groups . Particularly noteworthy is the following sequence of sentences proposed by five of the six groups :

- (e) One of the ministers was sick with typhoid
- (f) Two soldiers carried him downstairs and out into the rain.

The justification for this configuration rested on both the formal aspects of the language system and on the background assumptions of the participants themselves . First of all , the pronoun 'him' in (f) provides a clear anaphoric link to the antecedent phrase 'one of the ministers'.

Secondly, further coherence is created through the suggestion of causality :the minister is ill sohe has to be carried . This 'commonsense 'interpretation prompted a number of illuminating comments on the general lack of causality in Hemingway's style. Formal links between propositions , such as if , so and therefore , tend to be uncommon and , consequently, 'cause-and-effect' and 'logical' relationships often have to be constructed by readers.

The agreement reached over the sequence of sentences (h) and (b) also warrants some comment . Four groups proposed the following pattern, remarkably, at identical points in the narrative :

(h) Finally the officer told the soldiers it was no good trying to make him stand up.

(b) When they fired volley he was sitting down in the water with his head on his knees.

The reasons put forward in support of this pattern were interesting . In addition to the cohesion created through the use of the anaphoric pronouns 'they' , 'he' and 'his' all group pointed out that extra cohesion was created by the juxtaposition of the opposites 'stand up' and 'sitting down ' . This cohesion through antonyms is identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976 : 285) as one of the main types of lexical cohesion in English.

Another area of cross-group similarity is the sequencing of sentences (i),(e) and (k). Although the exact position of these sentences in the narrative varied, and the sentences were interrupted by other elements the precise sequence was, with only one exception , invariable. Only group 5 did not propose the following pattern :

- (i) They shot the six cabinet ministers at half six in the morning against the wall of a hospital . (...)
- (e) One of the ministers was sick with typhoid. (...)
- (k) The other five stood very quietly against the wall.(...)

The relative rigidity of this pattern can be explained by reference to the cohesive chains which develop through it. As was pointed out above , the partitive expression 'one of the ministers' is tied to the initial reference in (i).The cohesion between (e) and (k) is even more rigid , with the expression 'the other five ' undergoing ellipsis. This cohesive device is a type of 'substitution by zero ' , where one or more items may be deleted but may still be inferred from the linguistic context.For instance , in the second clause of the following sentence both the verb scored and the noun goals have been ellipted , yet are presupposed through reference to the first clause :

(1) Everton scored three goals and Liverpool two.

Returning to the text, it is clear that 'the other five' is only meaningful through reference to sentences (e) and (i), thus developing strong anaphoric links between this particular group of sentences. The cohesive chain which emerges might be formulated in the following way :

- (i) the six cabinet ministers
(anaphoric reference)
- (e) One of the ministers
(anaphoric ellipsis)
- (k) The other five.....

The chain is further strengthened by the presence of other cohesive links such as repetition ; in this instance , the phrase 'the wall' occurs in both (i) and (k) .

The one group who placed (i) after (e) and(k) had specific reasons for doing so, although they felt unhappy about the overall structure of their narrative .

Their decision for placing (i) towards the end of the narrative will be dealt with later , in Section 4.2.

It is also interesting that only one group chose to conclude the narrative with a sentence which contains a clear 'signpost ' in the form of the initial adverb 'finally'. Group 6, then, took 'finally' to mean precisely that , yet the

other five groups were dissatisfied with the sense of incompleteness which final (h) would generate .

3.2 An idealised narrative

It was hoped at the outset that the results of the workshop would produce an 'idealised' narrative based on the majority preferences displayed in each of the 11 sentence columns . This would produce sample narrative derived from the collected responses which could then be contrasted with the original version . Unfortunately , given the set of results obtained , genuine abstraction of this sort is difficult : some preferences are evenly distributed over a number of columns while other columns yield no statistically significant set of preferences . In any case , the sample is too small to permit rigorous quantification of results.

Nevertheless , it is still possible to select a sample narrative representing the most 'typical' narrative produced by all the groups. In this respect, the narrative of group 2 is appropriate, as their choices are most widely shared by other groups. The complete narrative proposed by this group is as follows, with letters retained for ease of reference , but with the gaps between the sentences closed up in order to render the sequence 'story-like'.

(i) They shot the six cabinet ministers at half past six in the morning against the wall of a hospital . (j) It rained hard. (e) One of the ministers was sick with typhoid.(f) Two

soldiers carried him downstairs and out into the rain . (d) They tried to hold him up against the wall but he sat down in a puddle of water. (g) There were wet dead leaves on the paving of the courtyard. (k) The other five stood very quietly against the wall. (h) Finally the officer told the soldiers it was no good trying to make him stand up . (b) When they fired the first volley he was sitting down in the water with his head on his knees. (c) There were pools of water in the courtyard. (a) All the shutters of the hospital were nailed shut.

A significant feature of this narrative as a whole is the division between what might be loosely termed descriptive and actional frames . The group who produced this version attempted to create a balance between , on the one hand the central action of the shooting , and , on the other , the more 'static' descriptions of the rain , the hospital and the courtyard . To this end , the descriptive sentences such as (j), (g) and (c) were quite consciously woven around the central narrative events realised chiefly by sentences (f), (d) , (k), (h) and (b). Like many other groups, this group felt that the narrative which resulted from this strategy was 'smoother ' , more balanced and more neatly structured.

Another important feature of this narrative which also reached a wide measure of agreement was the narrowing of focus created through the placement of sentences (j), (g) and

(c). Almost invariably , sentence (j) precedes both(c) and (g), the most common configuration across all groups being:

(j) It rained hard . (.....)

(c) There were pools of water in the courtyard. (...)

(g) There were wet dead leaves on the paving of the courtyard. (...)

The justification offered for this sequence us illuminating. Group 2 argued, for instance, that this configuration is not only cohesively linked by a broad lexical set including the items 'rained', 'water' and 'wet', but it is also linked in terms of an implicit cause-and-effect relationship between the propositions expressed by each sentence. On the basis of largely commonsense reasoning, the following argument could be proposed , where the second and third sentences are predicated by the first:

It rained

and so there were pools of water

and so there were wet dead leaves

Again, it should be stressed that the relationship between the propositions is implicit, the absence of formal connectives forcing readers to infer cause-and-effect relations.

While a number of groups had (j) adjacent to either (c) or (g), there was a tendency to seek maximum separation between (c) and (g). Group 2's justification for this was echoed unanimously : (c) and (g) were felt to be too repetitive to be placed side by side. For one thing, both are existential sentences beginning with the dummy subject 'there'; for another , both contain virtually identical sentence-final prepositional phrases ('in the courtyard ', of the courtyard'). In short, the very similarity in structure of the two sentences made their proximity to one another feel 'unnatural'.

Another common pattern reflected in the group 2 narrative is the tendency to make sentence (a) the ending of the story . Again, the justification for this is interesting as it draws on both structural and thematic evidence. First of all , sentence(a) is part of the descriptive frame which is woven around the actional frame, providing a particularly apposite ending with its echo of 'the hospital' referred to in the opening sentence (a cohesive tie of repetition).The thematic evidence concerns the 'allusion' created by the phrase 'nailed shut'. This group, and indeed the others who chose an (a) ending, argued that this developed an image of a coffin being nailed shut, thereby providing a symbolic analogue to the death of the cabinet ministers . This decision to adopt an 'emblematic' reading is specially telling, as this

particular sentence never provoked such an interpretation in tutorials which used the unaltered , original version . Comparable identifications of an image of death in other parts of the descriptive frame (for example, in the reference to the 'dead leaves' in sentence (g)), which were not made in previous tutorials, were also made in the course of the present exercise.

Of course the absence of any such response to these sentences in the original version might have been due in part to their location in the story . However , if this and other related points are to be developed more fully, it is to the original that we must now turn. In the following subsection, therefore , the 'real' version will be produced and discussed.

3.3 The original version

Here, at last , is the original Hemingway vignette:

(i) They shot the six cabinet ministers at half past six in the morning against the wall of a hospital . (c) There were pools of water in the courtyard . (g) There were wet dead leaves on the paving of the courtyard . (j) It rained hard . (a) All the shutters of the hospital were nailed shut . (e) One of the ministers was sick with typhoid. (f) Two soldiers carried him downstairs and out into the rain . (d) They tried to hold him up against the wall but he sat down in a puddle of water. (k) The other five stood very quietly against the wall.

(h) Finally the officer told the soldiers it was no good trying to make him stand up. (b) When they fired the first volley he was sitting down in the water with his head on his knees.

Dealing firstly with the similarities between this and the student reconstructions , it is noticeable that the preferred opening is vindicated:sentence(i) is indeed the first sentence of the story. (The reasons why (i) was considered most appropriate need not be repeated here.) The agreement reached over the (h)- (b) and (e)-(f) pairs is also borne out by the original . Noticeably , however , both sequences are part of the actional frame, and there is a strong sense of a temporal progression from the first element of the pair to the second . It would be difficult to produce a coherent pattern by reversing these sentences . Beyond this, there are few similarities between the original and the reconstructions.

There are a number of substantial differences between the texts, many of which are highly illuminating . There is broad disagreement on the distribution of the actional and descriptive frames, for example. In the Hemingway version, these frames are separated into two blocks which, if we leave aside the opening sentence, comprise five sentences of description followed by five sentences of action. These are not at all interwoven in the style of most of the reconstructions. Moreover, although the (h)-(b) configuration

Table 2 Labov's narrative categories

Category	Function	Form
Abstract	Signals that a story is about to begin and draws attention from the listener; gives some idea as to what the story is going to be about	Normally a short summarising statement, provided before the narrative commences.
Orientation	Helps the listener to identify the time, place, persons activity and situation (i.e. the 'who, what, when and where' of the story).	Often characterised by past progressive verb forms and adverbial modifiers of time, manner and place.
Complicating Action	The core narrative category providing the 'what happened' element of a story.	Realised by narrative clauses which are temporally ordered and normally have a verb in the simple past.
Resolution	Recapitulates the final events of a story (i.e. the 'what finally happened' element).	Comprises the last of the narrative clauses which began the Complicating Action.
Evaluation	Functions to make the point of the story clear, toward off responses such as 'so what?'	Marked by a number of different linguistic forms. Includes: evaluative commentary, embedded speech, departures from basic narrative syntax (e.g. intensifiers, comparators, explicatives, negatives, future, modals, etc.)
Coda	Signals that a story has ended; brings the listener back to the point at which he or she entered narrative.	No specific linguistic features, although frequently a generalised statement which is timeless in character.

conjunctions. However, only one explicit signal is provided in the form of 'finally' (sentence (h)) and yet the sentence which it governs does not constitute the last of the story. Indeed, much of the benefit of this type of students' and the original versions, thereby highlighting the peculiar characteristics of the latter.

4.2 Natural narrative

Part of the point of an exercise such as this is that it can be supplemented with a variety of additional linguistic models which enable the analysis to be developed in a number of different directions. One such model, which would not only provide an insightful analysis of the story in its own terms but would also help clarify some of the reconstructions discussed earlier, is the framework of natural narrative proposed by the sociolinguist William Labov. Although this is not the place to undertake a detailed introduction to the model, a brief sketch will nonetheless prove useful.

Labov defines a natural narrative as a method of recapitulating past experience by matching a sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is implied) actually occurred. A minimal narrative can be defined as a sequence of two clauses which are temporally ordered: that is, a change in their order will result in a change in the temporal sequence of the original semantic interpretation (Labov 1972: 359-60). From the dozens of stories collected Labov proposes the narrative categories shown in Table 2.

all-round literary merit . This in itself provides some considerable insight into what students of literature regard as 'literary', at least in terms of the kinds of structures which they expect literary texts to exhibit.

4. Extending the analysis

4.1 Cohesion

In the course of the analysis and discussion of the previous section, a number of key terms from Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model of cohesion were introduced . Although this was done in an ad hoc and somewhat piecemeal fashion, it was intended to mirror the direction taken by the workshop itself . In other words, linguistic terminology was not introduced prior to the comparative analysis , but was instead allowed to unfold during the course of the analysis . As was pointed out in section 1 , one of the functions of the present study is to cater for the interests of those seeking replicable materials for English-language teaching . Thus , it was thought best that the development of the linguistic framework should parallel the development of the workshop activity.

Among the specific terms introduced during the workshop were the notions of anaphora and cataphora . Anaphoric references , which 'point back ' to earlier reference in the text, provide one means of developing

coherence in a narrative . In relation to this, a number of cohesive chains were identified in the analysis, the most significant of which are the progressions of phrases relating to the cabinet ministers and the soldiers . By contrast , it was pointed out that a more striking pattern of cataphora is established early on with the pronominally reduced form 'they' used to refer to the soldiers. The pronoun here therefore points forwards 'to subsequent elaboration in the form of full noun phrases such as 'two soldiers' , 'the officer' and ' the soldiers'. Cohesion through antonymy ('oppositeness') is also created in the text through the juxtaposition of the verb phrases 'stand up' and 'sitting down' in adjacent sentences (h) and (b). The first immediately precedes (b).

However, these largely straightforward patterns of cohesion were offset by a number of 'anomalies' in the original . The 'over-cohesiveness 'in adjacent sentences (c) and (g) was commented on particularly , with workshop participants expressing dissatisfaction at the repetitiveness of the 'there were ' construction and the similarity of the phrases 'in the courtyard 'and ' of the courtyard ' . Also noted was the general absence of connectivity among the sentences in the story . A wide variety of devices is available in English for developing this type of cohesion , including additive (and), adversative (but) and causal (so)

Short's term, over-cohesive (Leech and Short 1981: 252- 4).

More will be said on the discrepancies between the workshop and Hemingway versions in the following sections, where some further explanations will be offered as to why such dissimilarities occur. but one thing that the introduction of the original version should have highlighted is how a break-up and subsequent reconstruction of the text is possible in the first place . There is a marked lack of formal connectives between the sentences of the text , allowing considerable manipulation of their sequencing to take place without much disruption to the over all meaning of the story. This, in turn, leads to a clearer picture of the technique-some would say lack of technique-of the author.

There is little, if any , authorial commentary on the events of the story, just as there is little signposting as to how one event precipitates another . Neither is it made explicit how one element in the descriptive frame is supposed to interconnect with another .One general outcome of the comparison between the original and the reconstructions is that it brought out the very blandness and the almost self-conscious 'flatness' of Hemingway's style. Moreover, the linguistic analysis undertaken during the comparison provided concrete support for these observations. Indeed , many of the groups actually felt that their own efforts were neater , more polished , and had more

is widespread in the reconstructions, no group even contemplated this as an appropriate ending to the story. When confronted with the actual ending, all the groups were surprised and many felt that (b) rendered the story incomplete, or, at least, indeterminate.

Even more surprise was expressed at the sequencing of sentences in the descriptive frame of the story. Contrary to the intuitions of the participants, the anticipated (j), (c) (g) is dispreferred in favour of the following:

(c) There were pools of water in the courtyard.

(g) There were wet dead leaves on the paving of the courtyard.

(j) It rained hard.

The focalisation created through this pattern is almost the reverse of that expected, with a narrowing to the detail of the 'leaves' in the second sentence, followed by an abrupt transition outwards to general statement about the rain in the last sentence. Furthermore, the cause-and-effect relationship which forms the basis of most of the students' predictions is actually reversed to an effect-and-cause relationship. Another consequence of this pattern is that (c) and (g) are now side by side—a configuration which was ruled out by every group.

Many felt that combining (c) and (g) in this way was repetitive and clumsy, almost becoming, to use Leech and

With the exception of Evaluation , the categories listed above are arranged in the sequence in which they would occur in a typical oral narrative .Evaluation is situated outside the central pattern and can be inserted at virtually any stage during a narrative . A fully formed narrative realises all six categories, although many narrative may lack one or more components .

The Labovian model can be used to explore further the similarities and differences between the idealised and original versions . In this regard , perhaps the most significant point of agreement between the two versions is the correct selection of sentence (i) by the students as an opening :

They shot the six cabinet ministers at half past six in the morning against the wall of a hospital .

Interestingly, this sentence, in the context of the story as a whole , satisfies the criteria for a well-formed Abstract. It provides a short summary of the main event of the story , although in itself does not constitute a narrative . There was also substantial cross-group agreement on the selection of this feature, with most groups arguing that the 'summarising ' nature of this sentence made it a strong candidate for an opening to the story . The one group who placed (i) towards the end of their story did so for reasons which will be discussed shortly.

A major pattern of disagreement centres on the distribution of what were loosely termed the descriptive and actional frames of the story. Hopefully, it should be clear from the foregoing that these ~~two informal categories~~ may be now aligned with the natural-narratively categories of Orientation provides the all-important background detail which helps the listener/reader identify the 'who, what, when and where' of the story. It is realised by sentences such as :

(c) ~~There were pools of water in the courtyard.~~

(g) ~~There were wet dead leaves on the paving of the courtyard.~~

(e) One of the ~~ministers~~ was sick with typhoid.

By contrast, the Complicating Action of the story is realised ~~primarily~~ through those sentences which have an 'actional' verb in the simple past. These core narrative clauses are represented by sentences (f) and (d) in the following sequence ~~from the original version~~:

(e) ~~One of the ministers~~ was sick with typhoid.

(f) Two soldiers carried him downstairs and out into the rain.

(d) They tried to hold him up against the wall but he sat down in a puddle of water .

Much wider agreement was reached on such patterns, where the sentences are temporally ordered and where a change in their sequence would result in a change in the interpretation of the chronology of the story. Furthermore, a reversal of (f) and (d) above would be difficult to justify on the grounds of coherence.

Where the idealised and original versions diverge most noticeably is in the way in which the descriptive (Orientation) frame is deployed. Although it is scattered throughout the idealised version, in the original version it is confined to the first half of the story. In fact, the original version is virtually split evenly into two blocks of Orientation and Complicating Action. The idealised version, by contrast, is peppered with sentences of Orientation which break up what would otherwise be almost continuous Complicating Action. (Consider, for example, the (d)-(g)-(k) and (h)-(h)-(c) patterns.) Students' reactions to the pattern of the original version were interesting: they argued that it felt too 'top-heavy', too 'symmetrical' and was on the whole rather unsubtle. In support of their own mixed pattern, they contended that a more balanced narrative emerged, with the transitions between Complicating Action and Orientation creating a more 'engaging' and 'dialogic' story.

This last point leads us directly to the question of the problematic ending to the story. It may be recalled that no group contemplated placing the following sentence at the end:

(b) When they fired the first volley he was sitting down in the water with his head on his knees .

From an analysis point of view , this sentence raises a number of issues. For one thing, it tends to cut across the distinctions between narrative categories established in this section. It satisfies to some extent the criteria for the recognition of Complicating Action : it has an actional verb in the simple past ('fired') and generally has a 'what happened' rather than 'who, what, where' feel to it .Yet a couple of features in the sentence push it towards Orientation: it contains an explicit temporal signal in the form of 'when ' and more significantly , contains a past progressive verb phrase ('he was sitting'). Both features are more characteristic of Orientation sections of natural narrative. This categorical indeterminacy is what many groups felt renders the story itself indeterminate . It possesses no clear Coda, no signal that the events of the narrative are over and the narrator is, so to speak , giving up the floor . Group 5 felt, for example , that sentence (i), the opening of the original and idealised versions, accomplished this much more effectively-which is why

they placed it near the end in their version. Certainly , all of the group were unhappy with (b) as an ending : in all six reconstructions it was placed at least three sentences from the end. Instead , more 'symbolic 'Codas were preferred , such as (i) ('It rained hard'.) , (g) ('There were wet dead leaves on the paving of the courtyard.) and most popularly, (a) ('All the shutters of the hospital were nailed shut.')

The first of these was chosen because it is by far the shortest sentence of the story, whilst the remaining two contain , respectively, explicit and symbolic allusions to death. All of these choices, it was felt , not only avoided the sense of incompleteness generated by (b), but also round the story off more neatly with a short descriptive statement devoid of any actional content.

Much more could be said of the implications of a natural-narrative analysis here. The lack of Evaluation in the story, for example, has not been touched upon. To do so would in turn lead to questions of authorial modality , mind style and point of view - and such questions really deserve fuller treatment elsewhere. (See, for example, Fowler 1986 : 127-47.) One consequence of Hemingway's non-evaluative technique, however , is the notable absence in the story of any rhetorical 'colour'. There are no stylistic flourishes , such as departures from the basic syntax through the use of modals, questions and negatives . Indeed, one might wonder

how the same basic story line would look if supplemented with those evaluative devices . Would rewrites, rather than reconstructions , reveal more about what participants informally termed the ' flatness ' of Hemingway's style? It is issues such as this that the following short section will address.

4.3 Creative writing and stylistic analysis

Up to now, information on the biographical and literary-critical context of the story under analysis has been quite consciously withheld . This has not been done in the interests of achieving a strictly formalist, text-immanent reading of the story, nor is it suggested that contextual detail does not have a part to play in a multidimensional , interpretative process. On the contrary ,it has been done simply because , as a language-orientated activity, the concern with linguistic form and function has been uppermost. As a preparatory stage in the development of the 'sub-exercise' which follows, however, it is necessary to introduce precisely such contextual detail.

The actual historical event portrayed in the vignette is the executions of six Greek cabinet ministers, including the ex-premier , in Athens in 1922. The executions took place after Greece's unsuccessful campaign against Turkey . Hemingway had previously covered the war for the Toronto

Star and ,although based in Paris at the time , would have followed these events closely. Three months after the executions , he wrote his vignette,probably basing it on a newspaper account he read in the Paris edition of the New York Tribune (Baker 1969:108; Reynolds1972 :82).The full text of the incident , including a short editorial , is reproduced in full in the appendix to this article .

The compositional differences between the short story and its source material need only be sketched here. Most noticeable perhaps is that the dead minister of the newspaper account is removed completely, thereby channelling attention towards the sick minister in the vignette. Indeed, it would be difficult to cover both a sick man and a dying man in so short a space . The time of the execution is also altered , being brought back to a time traditionally associated with 'dawn' executions . Extrapolating from a reference to a heap in the mud', Hemingway foregrounds the inclement weather through a series of references to rain and wet conditions .The location is also altered with the executions conveniently taking place just outside the hospital, as opposed to one and a half miles away . Again, this allows for further economy of description .Interesting also are the allusions by Hemingway to the 'nailed shut' windows of the hospital, which, while provoking particular comment in the workshop discussion,are, on the basis of this evidence, entirely fictitious.

Although the juxtaposition of short story and source material would provide in-itself a useful basis for an informal discussion of composition and technique, the proposed extension to the activity undertaken here involves participants developing their own story based on the newspaper account . The protocol outlined below could be carried out , depending on language skills and number of participants, either by individuals or by small groups.

- 1 Read the accompanying newspaper report which describes certain events that took place in 1922. The report appeared in the New York Tribune and details the execution of six Greek cabinet ministers .
- 2 Now compose a short story based on the events portrayed in the newspaper text. Do not exceed two hundred words. Feel free to :
 - (a) omit events that you feel are less central to the main story .
 - (b) add or amplify certain details which you feel are thematically significant . In short , you may use your imagination .
- 3 Now explain how you reached your particular story . Have you felt it necessary , for example , to delete certain events during the transition from news report to short story? Or, have you embellished aspects of the

news report for thematic or 'literary' reasons and , if so, why?

- 4 Now examine the following short story written in 1922 by the American writer Ernest Hemingway . This story is believed to have been based on the newspaper account you have just read. Are any features of Hemingway's version particularly striking? Make a list of the ways if you can.

The advantages of restricting the stories in length in this way are that it saves time, forces students to focus only on details which they regard as essential, and yields versions which are comparable in terms of length and economy to the Hemingway version. Although comparisons with the latter may be less rigorous linguistically and will not focus directly on specific features such as cohesion and ~~narrative~~ structure, there is none the less some stylistic benefit. For one thing , it may be more appropriate with non-advanced learners of English , or in a context where language expertise is generally not as developed. On the other hand, it may be suitable in creative writing classes where such activities are common but where an exercise such as that proposed here would have the added advantage of providing an insight into Hemingway's method . In both contexts , such a comparative analysis would provide a point of entry for linguistic and stylistic analysis .

5 Concluding remarks

The linguistic frameworks of cohesion and natural narrative are clearly only two of many frameworks which may be usefully employed in the analysis of texts. What helps make these two frameworks particularly appropriate for the purposes of the present exercise is their shared emphasis on the 'surface of textual connectivity. This, however, caters for only one layer of the multilayered process of meaning construction, and, if a fuller account of such meaning is to be obtained, then some discussion of textual 'coherence' is required. In this respect, attention would need to be given to the ways in which the students sought to map meanings onto the text, and how, more specifically, they attempted to relate propositions in the text despite the absence of overt 'surface' clues. This emphasis on 'coherence', rather than 'cohesion', would take the workshop into quite a different area; an area where it would be informed by relevant stylistic work on, for example, plot structure (Stubbs 1982) discourse structure (Hoey 1989) and semantic-relational structure (Crombie 1989). By focusing on the inferencing strategies used to derive satisfactory readings of a text, a coherence analysis might also extend to research in relevance theory, text linguistics and artificial intelligence. Again, the potential of all three frameworks has been explored by stylisticians, three representative

samples of which are, respectively, Pilkington (1990), Virtanen (1990) and Van Peer (1987). To have attempted an analysis of coherence in the main body of this article would, however, have proved unwieldy and would have confused parts of the discussion. Yet the design of the experiment is such that the use of alternative linguistic models is still possible. Indeed, the comparative analysis of two versions of the same text may be undertaken from a number of linguistic perspectives; it has been the concern of this article to suggest but two of this range of possible models.

Notes

- 1 I am grateful to Mick Short, Janice Hoadley, David Seed and Pater Stockwell for their students at Lancaster University who took part in the workshop and allowed me to publish its results.
- 2 Reprinted with permission of Charles Scribner's sons, an imprint of Macmillan Publishing Company, from ~~In~~ Our Time by Ernest Hemingway. Copyright 1925, 1930 by Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1953, 1958 by Ernest Hemingway. Copyright c 1929: all rights outside US, Hemingway Foreign Rights Trust.

Appendix

ATROCITIES MARKED GREEK EXECUTIONS OF

FORMER LEADERS

Uncensored Account Brought From Athens - Dead Man Was Propped Up in Line

GOUNARIS NERVED BY DRUG

Ex- Premier, Dying Fromm Illness, Was Artificially Stimulated to Stand LONDON, Dec. 20-The Daily Express published the first detailed account of the recent executions of the Greek ex-Ministers supplied by its correspondent who was lately in Athens.

M. Gounaris , an ex-Premier, was in a hospital in a very critical condition . about 11 a.m. he was taken out on a stretcher, placed in a motor van and driven to a place about one and a half miles outside of the city . He was left lying on his stretcher in a dying condition while the car went back to fetch five others from the prison where they had all been confined in a single room.

To begin the horrors of that morning it was discovered by the guards that one of the five had died in the van on the way out from heart failure.

On the arrival of the van Gounaris was lifted out of stretcher to stand up and face a firing party. It was then found that this wretched man, who, after all, had been a figure in the recent history of Europe , was unable to stand at all. He was thereupon given sufficient injections of

strychnine to strengthen the action of his heart to enable him to stand up in front of the firing party.

The man who had died on the way out was propped up beside him - a ghastly line of four live men , one half alive and one dead man. They were then asked-Gounaris, the dead man and all - if they had anything to say , an appalling instance of mockery . No reply was made but M. Baltazzis took out his monocle, polished it and put it back again. General Hadjanestis calmly lit a cigarette.

The order to fire was given . The moment the prisoners fell the firing party rushed forward and emptied their revolvers into the corpses . Including that of the man who had died on the way from the prison . The bodies were then thrown into a lorry and taken to a public cemetery just outside of the city and were thrown out casually in a heap in the mud which covered the ground.

(Originally printed in The New York Times, 20 December 1922, p.1, col.3. The Paris edition of the New York Tribune is likely to have reproduced an identical story. (See Reynolds 1972: 82 for a fuller account of Hemingway's source material .))

References

- Baker, C. (1969) *Ernest Hemingway : a life story* , Scribner's New York
- Brumfit, C. and Carter, R. (eds.) (1986) *Literature and language teaching*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Carter , R. (ed.) (1982) *Language and Literature* , Allen and Unwin London
- Carter, R. (1984) Why have I started to talk to you like this? : narrative voices , discourse pragmatics and textual openings , in W. van Peer and J. Renkema (eds.) *Pragmatic and stylistics* , Acco, Louvain 95-132.
- Carter, R. and Simpson, P. (eds.) (1989) *Language, discourse and Literature*, Unwin Hyman, London
- Crombie, W. (1989) Semantic relational structuring in Milton's 'Areopagatica'. in Carter and Simpson (1989), 113-22
- Fowler, R. (1986) *Linguistic criticism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Halliday , M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*, Longman, London
- Haynes , J.(1989) *Introducing stylistics* ,Unwin Hyman, London
- Hoey, M. (1989) Discourse-centred stylistics : a way forward? , in Carter and Simpson (1989), 123-38.

- Labov, W.** (1972) *Language in the inner city*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia
- Leech, G. and Short, M.** (1981) *Style in fiction*, Longman, London
- Pilkington, a.** (1990) A relevance theoretic view of metaphor, *Parlance* 2(2):102-17
- Reynolds, M.** (1972) Two Hemingway sources for *In our time*, *Studies in short Fiction*, 9 :81-6
- Short, M.** (ed.) (1989) *Reading ,analysing and teaching Literature* , Longman, London
- Stubbs,M.** (1982) Stir until the plot thickens , in Carter and D. Burton (eds.) *Literary text and Language study*, Arnold , London 57-85
- Toolan , M.** (1988) *Narrative : A critical linguistic introduction*, Routledge , London
- Van Peer,W.** (1987) Top-down and bottom-up : interpretative strategies in reading E E Cummings, *New Literary History* , 18 (3) :597-609
- Virtanen , T.** (1990) Participant continuity and empathy : a text-linguistic approach to a literary text, *Carina Amicorum* , Abo Academy Press, Abo
- Widdowson , H.G.** (1975) *Stylistics and the teaching of literature* , Longman,London