Style as a Product
of Three Structural Principles

Lect. Khalid Shakir Hussein   Lect. May Ali Abdul-Ameer

Thi-Qar University - College of Education

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper aims at investigating a specific scheme of analyzing sentence-structure as suggested by Christensen (2001, 34-72). This scheme sets the ground for the identification of certain aspects of the phenomenon called "Style", relying on a specific set of simple yet powerful analytical procedures.

Style, especially in literature, might be very common, but it is still elusive. There is a huge disagreement on the style as a concept of a precise definition. This situation raises disputes concerning the set of descriptive categories required for an adequate linguistic account of literary style (see Leech and Short, 1995: 10- 38). Different approaches have been suggested to contribute to a comprehensive view of style. However, they all investigate the same controversial area which is related to one usually raised question: "What language features should we examine to elucidate text style?" (Short, 1996: 334)

It is quite expected that different linguistic researchers are likely to differ in the way they provide an answer for this question. Consequently, they have used various linguistic approaches to identify the linguistic features that, they think, should be examined in a text or a corpus of an author's writing. Such features might be: vocabulary, sentence-structure, syntactic peculiarities, imagery and so forth (Hough, 1996:40). Nevertheless, any linguistic feature that contributes to the stylistic qualities of an author should be

investigated according to some *predetermined scheme* (ibid.). Therefore, this paper is concerned with the analytical potentialities of Christensen's Scheme, and the researcher will, hopefully, attempt applying this scheme in analyzing the linguistic features of style of Hemingway, Conrad, and Faulkner in a way that contributes to a rather objective observation of differences in the style of each.

2. FRANCIS CHRISTENSEN'S SCHEME

Christensen (2001), in his attempt to isolate the cues a linguist needs in identifying the different styles of sentence-structure, approaches the problem of form and content by demonstrating the relationship within the sentence between the grammatical structure and meaning (Payne, 1998:27). Following this approach, Christensen (2001) relies heavily on the sentence as a basic unit in his study of the sentence-style. However, certain classifications of sentence-structure are rejected within the theoretical frame of this scheme, such as : the traditional rhetorical classification of sentences as *loose, periodic, paratactic, hypotactic*, as well as the traditional grammatical classification of sentences as *statements* , *interrogatives*, *imperatives*, and *exclamations* (ibid. :35). It is beyond the scope of this paper to go after all the objections raised by Christensen concerning this point, but the main objection is that such classifications, especially the grammatical, rest on a semantic confusion, equating the complexity of structure with the complexity of thought and vice versa (ibid. :52- 68).

To introduce a practical scheme of sentence-structure analysis, Christensen (ibid.: 43) formulates *four principles* based on the levels of the sentence-structure, and the way this structure progresses throughout the text. Such principles focus on the key linguistic characteristics that constitute, according to Christensen, the core of any attempt to identify a text style.

2.1 Addition

The first structural principle is called *Addition*. It is a process that is based on a viewpoint related to the most essential part in any sentence-structure, which is the very process of adding certain parts to the main clause that constitutes the core of the sentence-structure. Enkvist (2000: 86) points out "what you say is found not in the noun but in what you add to qualify the noun . . . The noun, the verb, and the main clause serve merely as the base on which meaning will rise . . ." Christensen (2001: 36) approves the fact that the composition or the structure of a sentence is crucially based on addition as a process of elaborating such a structure. However, this addition must be carried out in a specific direction within sentence-structure.

2.2 Direct of Modification

The second principle is *Direction of Modification or Direction of Movement.* Generally speaking, the principle of adding modifiers is governed by two directions: when the modifier is added, whether to the noun, the verb, or the main clause, it should be added either before the head or after it (ibid. : 38). If it is added before the head, the direction of modification can be indicated by an "arrow" pointing forward; if it is added after, by an "arrow" pointing backward (ibid.).
However, Freeman (1995: 67-70) finds that within the clause there is not much scope for operating with this principle. The positions of the various sorts of modifiers are generally fixed inside the main clause and the modifiers are often obligatory:

(1) The man *who came to dinner* remained till midnight.

Thus, the only choice is whether to add more modifiers inside the structure of the main clause (ibid. : 69). Moreover, Ohman(1992: 149) points out that this second principle has frequently been exposed in structural grammar only for "loading patterns":

(2) The small boy *on the red bicycle who lives with his happy parents on our shady* . . .etc.

But, this is not always the case, it should be noted that the *direction of modification*, as a linguistic characteristic, is well identified with short noun clusters and verb clusters rather than with such loaded structures (ibid. : 150). This may sound right with non-literary writings, but not with certain kinds of literary writings that require such 'loaded structures" to achieve certain linguistic affects.

Christensen (2001: 41) admits that this principle is not well defined when one deals with modifiers within the clause. But it does come into full play when one deals with modifiers, not within, but added to the clause, or added outside the clause-structure, and Leech (1995: 226) calls such external modifiers as "sentence modifiers". Before going through this point, something should be said about the rhetorical distinction of "loose" and "periodic" sentence-structures in order to have a rather good idea about Christensen's position in this concern.

Turner (2001:45) stresses the stylistic significance of the way the writer uses to add "qualifications" to the main clause, and distinguishes between *loose-structure*, where the sentence begins with a main clause and the modifiers are added afterwards, and *periodic-structure*, which saves its main clause to the end and the modifiers are added just before it (Ibid.). The stylistic significance of the periodic-structure comes from its "anticipatory constituents" that bring an element of suspense into the syntax of the sentence-structure (Leech, 1995: 226):

(3) *That they have suffered through negligence*   is the truth.

Thus, the dependent constituent (*That they have suffered through negligence*) cannot stand on its own, and hence cannot be interpreted in isolation. Therefore, Leech (Ibid) stresses the fact that such an *anticipatory constituent* must be "held in the memory until the major constituent of which it is a part has been interpreted."

However, some writers more often prefer *loose-structures*, i.e., to begin with main clauses, adding modification afterwards and

taking into consideration the fact that this kind of sentence-structure is more easy to take in than *periodic-structure* (Ibid: 228-30), since it makes things easy for the reader and for the writer by, according to Turner (2001: 74-75), reducing the amount of syntactic information that has to be stored in the memory:

(4) The truth is *that they have suffered through negligence*.

As mentioned above, Christensen (2001:45) raises an objection against this distinction since it is based on negative implications of the term "loose": " . . . the term 'loose' seems to be taken as a pejorative (it sounds immoral)". Therefore, he thinks that the typical sentence one can stylistically examine is what he calls *the cumulative sentence*. (ibid.)

This kind of sentence-structure is rather an *intermediate* structure that combines the characteristics of both kinds, the *loose* and the *periodic*. The main clause, in the cumulative sentence, may or may not have a sentence modifier before it- this is the periodic part, and it advances the structure of the main clause by adding modifiers. Such modifiers are used to postmodify the statement of the main clause or more often to explicate or exemplify it, but the move is directed backward- this is the loose part (ibid:47- 8):

(5) *Knowing nothing*, he stood by the window *with a foolish smile on his face, watching a thin girl in a red rubber cap under the street light.*

Hough (1996:41) gives a more general justification of the *cumulative sentence-structure* on stylistic grounds:

> " . . . so that the sentence has a flowing and ebbing movement, advancing to a new position, and then pausing to consolidate it, leaping and lingering, as the popular ballad does."

Nevertheless, the loose part of the cumulative sentence is more powerful than the periodic part; thus, Christensen (2001:52)

declares that the cumulative sentence is the opposite of the periodic sentence in terms of the stylistic function of each:

> "It does not represent the idea as conceived, pondered over, reshaped, packaged, and delivered cold. It is dynamic rather than static, representing the mind thinking. The main clause exhausts the mere fact of the idea: logically, there is nothing more to say. The additions stay with the same idea, probing its bearings and implications, exemplifying it or seeking an analogy or metaphor for it, or reducing it to details."

Stylistically speaking, it serves the needs of both the writer and the reader, the writer will find a good opportunity in this kind of sentence-structure to examine his thought, while the reader will have an access to the writer's thought by analyzing the "trailing constituents" of the main clause (Leech, 1995: 226).

2.3 Levels of Generality

The third principle is related to meaning rather than structure. It is called the *levels of generality or levels of abstraction* (Christensen, 2001: 54). *Addition* and *direction of modification* are structure-centered principles in the sense that they involve the grammatical character of the sentence. They display the structures that one must work with in analyzing literary styles, such as, sentence modifiers which are displayed by *relative and subordinate clauses, noun, verb, and adjective clusters*. But the structural positions of such modifiers which are determined by the second principle should be taken into consideration. The first two principles are relevant insofar as one is concerned with the layers of sentence-structure as a grammatical concept, while the third principle is concerned with the way one can bring in the dimension of meaning into these layers (ibid. : 62- 65).

The basic idea behind this principle is that within a single sentence a writer may present more than one level of generality (ibid.). The main clause is likely to be stated in general terms with no much specifications. The forward movement of the sentence stops when the main clause is stated in general, then, the writer begins to add a

lower level of generality, or as Rockas (2003: 175) puts it: "the writer shifts down to a lower level of generality or abstraction . . . and goes back over the same ground at this lower level."

The first level of the main clause always represents a general statement, and the subsequent levels will represent the different modifications that the writer adds to narrow down the wide circle of generality as it has been stated in the first level. For example, the following sentence consists of *four structural layers* each with a specific *level of generality*:

(6) He has just bought a new car, *a 1963 Ford, a Galaxie, a fastback hardtop with four-on-the-floor shift."*

Theoretically speaking, there is no limit to the number of structural layers or levels, each at a lower level of generality, that a speaker or writer may use (cf. section 2.1 above).

2.4 Texture

The three principles of *Addition, Direction of Modification*, and *Levels of Generality* work altogether to bring about the Fourth Principle in Christensen's Scheme: the principle of *Texture* or *style*. Though Texture, as a term, is generally oversimplified by Christensen, it still works in a rather good harmony with the three principles mentioned above. Two possibilities are handled insofar as one is concerned with the linguistic texture of the sentence-structure (Christensen, 2001: 61): the first is when a writer " adds to few of his nouns or verbs or main clauses and adds little, the texture may be said to be *thin.*" (Ibid.). Consequently, the style, as a product of a particular use of the linguistic potentialities of the sentence-structure (see Spencer, 1990:59-62), is said to be *plain* or *bare* depending on the characteristics of the linguistic texture under investigation (Christensen, 2001:63). The second possibility is when the writer " adds frequently or much or both, then the texture may be said to be *dense* or *rich*." (ibid.) Again, this would have its own affects on the style, especially in narrative: the

linguistic texture which shows the rich structural potentialities of the sentences will produce a rich and more effective style (ibid.).

However, a word should be said about the two words *thin* and *rich* as being used in Christensen's terminology. In what sense is the style or texture said to be *thin* or *rich*? One must figure out the structural context in which these two words are used. Structurally speaking, a linguistic texture is said to be *thin* if it is basically built upon the use of *simple, one or even two-level sentence-structures*, otherwise, it is said to be *rich* if more *complex*, *multi-level sentence-structures* are used. Thus, *thin* and *rich* should not be taken literally, but as synonymous of *simple*, and *complex* respectively.

3. SOME EXAMPLES ON CHRISTENSEN'S SCHEME

So far the researcher has not discussed any examples to show the analysis suggested by Christensen in practice. The structural principles discussed above work together simultaneously, therefore it is appropriate, for the sake of analysis, that each principle should be first explained separately, and then, one can workout a more complementary analysis based on the way they act altogether at the same time.

Thus, the examples, that will be discussed below, go over the same points of Christensen's principles. The researcher will use an adapted way to analyze the layers of sentence-structure: this way, as it is the case with Christensen (ibid. : 65-67), is based on indenting the word groups, or the additions, of a sentence and numbering the levels of generality. Christensen (ibid.) adds symbols to mark the grammatical character of the additions: *SC, Subordinate Clause*; *RC, Relative Clause; NC, Noun Cluster; VC, Verb Cluster; AC, Adjective Cluster; Abs. , Absolute (i.e., a VC with a subject of its own); PP, Prepositional Phrase.*

However, these symbols and categories are sometimes vague and one should elaborate them to disambiguate certain grammatical elements, as it will be shown below. Thus, the researcher will use the same symbols but with an extra indication or clarification of a more specific grammatical character and function whenever it is

needed. The examples below have been chosen to illustrate the general procedures of the analysis showing the range of sentence-structures used in the lower levels. The examples are drawn from different novels and articles related to prose.

1

(1) She seized the child
    (2) pulling him back (VC)
       (3) from the edge of the cliff. (PP)

2

(1) Pa stands over the bed,
   (2) dangle-armed, (AC)
   (2) humped,   (AC)
   (2) motionless.   (AC)

3

   (2) Calico-coated, (AC)
   (2) small bodied, (AC)
   (2) with delicate legs and pink faces (PP)
     (3) in which their mismatched eyes rolled wild and subdued, (RC)
(1) they huddled,
   (2) gaudy motionless and alert, (AC)
   (2) wild as deer, (AC)
   (2) deadly as rattlesnakes, (AC)
   (2) quiet as doves. (AC)

4

(1) We all live in two realities:
   (2) one of seeming fixity, (NC)
     (3) with institutions, dogmas, rules of punctuation, and routines (PP)
      (4) the calendared and clockwise world of all but futile round on round (NC)
(2) and one of whirling and flying electrons, dreams, and possibilities, (NC)
   (3) behind the clock, (PP)-

5

   (2) As he dropped this cynical confession (SC)
(1) he looked

(2) straight and hard (AC)
(2) at the candidate (PP)
   (3) for the honour of taking his education in hand. (PP)

The examples above show different degrees of multi-level narrative sentence-structuring: sentence (1) has one (*second-level*) addition and one (*third-level*) addition; sentence (2) has only three parallel (*second-level*) additions, sentence (3) is much more complex, first it has three parallel (*second-level*) additions with only one (*third-level*) addition, all added before the main clause (they huddled), second it has four parallel (*second-level*) additions all added after the main clause. Sentence (4) shows a sort of variety in the degree of additions: two parallel (*second-level*), two parallel (*third-level*), and only one (*fourth-level*). Sentence (5) is more balanced than (4), it has one (*second-level*) addition before the main clause (he looked), and two parallel (*second-level*) additions with one (*third-level*) addition backward.

As for the grammatical character of the additions in the examples above, one might be confused with certain terms and categories used by Christensen. From the very beginning, Christensen (ibid. : 72) uses a combination of immediate constituent and transformation grammar suggested by Paul Robert (2000: 102- 53), which he thinks the best in displaying the layers of structure of the English sentence.

Thus, what he identifies as a Verb Cluster is called, according to Quirk and Greenbaum (1988: 310-11), participle construction (*-ed participle*, and *–ing participle*) which is regarded as non-finite clause (Ibid:311). The Absolute, as well, is a participle construction but with a subject of its own. For example, the sentence below:

The flame sidled up the match, *driving a film of moisture*.

is analyzed as

(1) the flame sidled up the match,
   (2) driving a film of moisture. (VC)

But, a sentence like:

He stood at the top of the stairs and watched me, *I waiting for him to call me, he hesitating to come down.*

is analyzed as

(1) He stood at the top of the stairs and watched me,
    (2) I waiting for him to call me, (Abs.)
    (2) he hesitating to come down. (Abs.)

So, the subject of the Verb Cluster in the Absolute is not the same as that of the main clause, otherwise, it is going to be only a Verb Cluster.

Moreover, what Christensen sometimes identifies as a "PP" is called an Adverbial, as it is shown in the examples (1) and (5) above, which, following Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 207), is considered as being a realization of "Place Adverbials". The researcher thinks that such notes on the categories used by Christensen in his scheme may help in rendering the analysis more feasible. Besides, they would, hopefully, help in avoiding any misunderstanding of the grammatical categories which should be consistent with the common knowledge of those who have a basic degree of familiarity with the way the English language works in literary or even non-literary contexts.

4. A CASE STUDY

In the remainder of this paper, the researcher will apply Christensen's analysis with its own categories to three texts which are rather comparable both in length and in that each of them is the opening paragraph of a short story. The three authors are Hemingway, Conrad, and Faulkner. The procedure in each case will be to use Christensen's scheme in analyzing the sentence-structures in each text relying on the procedures mentioned above, and then to bring to the attention what appear to be the most significant features of sentence-structure that distinguish the style of each.

4.1 Hemingway's *Cat in the Rain*

THE ANALYSIS

(1) There were only two Americans
   (2) stopping at the hotel. (VC)

(1) They did not know any of the people
   (2) they passed on the stairs on their way to and from their room (RC)

(1) Their room was on the second floor
   (2) facing the sea. (VC)

(1) It also faced the public garden and the war monument.

(1) There were big palms and green benches
   (2) in the public garden. (PP)

   (2) In the good weather (PP)
(1) there was always an artist
   (2)with his easel. (PP)

(1) Artists liked the way
   (2) the palms grew and the bright colors of the hotels (RC)
      (3) facing the gardens of the sea. (VC)

(1) Italians came from a long way off
   (2) to look up at the war monument. (PP)

(1) It was made of bronze and glistened in the rain.

(1) It was raining.

(1) The rain dripped from the palm trees.

(1) Water stood in pools
   (2) on the gravel paths. (PP)

  (1) The sea broke in a long line
     (2) in the rain (PP)

  (1) and slipped back down the beach
     (2) to come up and break again (PP)
       (3) in a long line (PP)
         (4) in the rain. (PP)

  (1) The motor-cars were gone
     (2) from the square (PP)
       (3) by the war monument. (PP)

  (2) Across the square (PP)
     (3) in the door way (PP)
       (4) of the café   (PP)
(1) a waiter stood
  (2)looking out (VC)
   (3)at the empty square. (PP)

It is perhaps evident, in this opening paragraph, that the vast majority of the sentences are structured into two levels. Out of (16) sentences, we have the following numbers of sentence-structures: (4) one-level; (7) two-level; (3) three-level; (1) four-level; and (1) six-level.

Moreover, the grammatical character of the additions is overdominated by the (PP). This paragraph has an unusually large number of Prepositional Phrases: (14). However, it has only (4) Verb Clusters and only (2) Relative clauses, with no Subordinate Clause at all. Therefore, the simple two-level sentence-structures together with the grammatical character of the additions involved in these structures suggest a *simple* or *thin* style based on a

structurally limited number of levels and on one particular dominant grammatical category which is the (PP) that enhances the syntactic simplicity of the additions.

4.2 Conrad's *The Secret Sharer*

THE ANALYSIS

- Sentence (1) –

   (2) On my right hand (PP)

(1) There were lines of fishing-stakes

   (2) resembling a mysterious system of half-submerged bamboo fences, (VC)

     (3) incomprehensible in its division of the domain of tropical fishes,
                  (AC – modifying the noun "system" in level- 2)

     (3) and crazy of aspect (AC- modifying the noun "system" in level- 2)

       (4) as if abandoned forever by some nomad tribe of fishermen (PP)

         (5) gone now to the other end of the ocean; (VC)

          (6) for there was no sign of human habitation (PP)

            (7) as far as the eye could reach. (PP)

- Sentence (2) –

   (2) To the left (PP)

(1) a group of barren islets, -------------, had its foundations set (embedding involved)

   (2) suggesting ruins of stone wall, towers and block houses,
     (VC- embedded within the main clause modifying the noun "islets")

   (2) in a blue sea (PP)

    (3) that itself looked solid, so still and stable (RC)

     (4) did it lie below my feet; (SC- subordinating through subject-operator inversion)

      (5) even the track of light ---------------- shone smoothly, (SC) (embedding)

       (6) from the westering sun (PP- modifying the NC "the track of light")

       (6) without that animated glitter (PP)

        (7) which tells of an imperceptible ripple. (RC)

- Sentence (3) -

(2) And when I turned my head to take a parting glance at the tug (SC)
        (3) which had just left us (RC)
             (4) anchored outside the bar, (VC)
      (1) I saw the straight line of the flat shore
        (2) joined to the stable sea, (VC)
        (2) edge to edge, (NC)
        (2) with a perfect and unmarked closeness, (PP)
        (2) in one levelled floor (PP)
          (3) half brown, half blue (AC)
             (4) under the enormous dome of the sky. (PP)

Though Conrad's paragraph consists of three sentences only, the structures are more complex and more various than Hemingway's. Each sentence of the three has a *cumulative structure*: sentence (1) has *one* premodifying addition of the main clause, and *seven* postmodifying additions; sentence (2) , as well, has *one* premodifying addition and *eight* postmodifying additions; sentence (3) has *three* premodifying additions and *six* postmodifying additions.

Even the number of the levels for each sentence-structure is larger: sentence (1) is structured into *nine* levels, sentence (2) and (3) into *ten* levels. Two things may increase the complexity of sentence-structure. First, the additions which are *embedded* within the clause, as in sentence (2) which has *two* cases of additions embedded within the clause: the *first* postmodifying (second-level) addition (VC) is embedded within the main clause; and the *first* (sixth-level) addition is embedded within the (fifth-level) Subordinate Clause. Second, subordinate clauses which work as a good grammatical means for structural elaboration, as in the (SC) in the fourth and fifth levels in sentence (2), and the Subordinate Clause in the first premodifying (second-level) in sentence (3).

It is noteworthy that the grammatical characters of the additions used by Conrad is more various than those used by Hemingway: *ten* (PP); *five* (VC); *three* (RC); *three (*SC); *one* (NC); and *three* (AC). The

variety in the grammatical character of the additions used in Conrad's sentence-structures makes his style dynamic and rich. However, the sentence-structure is well elaborated through the multi-levels of additions which are layered through subordination and even some cases of coordination. This flexible range of the cumulative constructions expresses the rather complex texture of Conrad's style in structuring his sentences.

4.3 Faulkner's *Big Woods*

THE ANALYSIS

- ONE-SENTENCE PARAGRAPH -

(1) The rich deep black alluvial soil ------- (syntactically incomplete main clause)

(2) which would grow cotton taller than the head of a man on a horse, (RC)

(3) already one jungle one brake one impassable density of brier and cane and vine (NC)

(4) interlocking the soar of gum and cypress and hickory and pinoak and ash, (VC)

(2) printed now by the tracks of unalien shapes- (VC- modifying level-1)

(3) bear and deer and panthers and bison and wolves and alligators and the myriad smaller beasts, (NC)

(3) and unalien men to name them too perhaps- the (themselves) nameless (AC)

(4) though recorded predecessors (SC –modifying "unalien men" in level-3)

(5) who built the mounds (RC)

(6) to escape the spring floods (PP)

(5) and left their meager artifacts (RC):

(5) the obsolete   (AC- modifying "unalien men" in level-3)

(5) and the dispossessed,   (AC- modifying "unalien men" in level-3)

(6) dispossessed by those (VC)

(7) who were dispossessed in turn (RC)

(8) because they too were obsolete (SC):

(9) the wild Algonquian, Chickasaw and Choctaw and Natchez and Pascagoula, (AC)

(10) peering in virgin astonishment down (VC)

(11) from the tall bluffs (PP)

(12) at a Chippeway canoe (PP)

(13) bearing three Frenchmen. (VC)

In comparison with the other two paragraphs, this one has an extraordinary complex sentence-structure. It is one paragraph consisting of only one syntactically incomplete main clause with a large number of postmodifying additions structured into (20) levels. This indicates an extreme shift in the number of the structural levels making Faulkner's style, in relation to sentence-structure, more complex than Hemingway's and Conrad's: the highest degree of structural levels shown in Hemingway's paragraph is *six* levels, while in Conrad's *ten* levels, however, it rises up in Faulkner's into (20) levels. Nevertheless, the variety in the grammatical character of the additions is rather similar to the range of variety displayed in Conrad's paragraph: *three* (PP); *four* (RC); *two* (SC); *two* (NC); *four* (AC); and *five* (VC). Consequently, Faulkner's style in structuring the sentence exposed in this opening paragraph is so complex that it exhausts the most structural possibilities to load one sentence-structure with (20) levels.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In analyzing these three paragraphs in terms of the style of sentence-structure, the researcher no doubt lost a great deal by isolating them from their literary context. However, Christensen's Scheme proved to be useful in characterizing the literary style used in each paragraph, regardless of the subject matter on the ground that the features the scheme deals with belong not so much to the subject matter, but to the characteristic way of handling the different structural levels of the sentence. The simple numbering system devised by Christensen helps ,as well, in going through the different ranges of the grammatical constructions in the literary writings by focusing on the way one can analyze sentence-structure as a primary unit for stylistic description.

One often reads statements or suggestions on style of a particular writer that lack the support of concrete evidence: that Hemingway's style tends to be simple or that Faulkner is characterized with using complex forms of language and so on and so forth. Such statements, even if they look self-evident as it is the case with Hemingway's relatively simple style, appear to have no

empirical status. They are merely guesses, unless supported by certain linguistic data. Here comes the role of Christensen's Scheme, among other ones, in consolidating or refuting some general statements like the ones mentioned above. It provides an objective method of stylistic analysis which might be simple but powerful in checking or even validating certain guesses and intuitions about prose style.

It gives insights into the structural principles that govern a writer's production of different multi-level sentence-structures. This kind of examination shows objectivity and flexibility in identifying the features of different sentence-structures as being a stylistic quality of different writers, each is characterized with different patterns of structuring sentences into interrelated levels.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Christensen, F., (2001). *Notes Toward a New Rhetoric*. London: Harper and Row Publishers.

Enkvist, N., (2000). *Linguistic Stylistics*. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co..

Freeman, D., (1995). *Linguistics and Literary Style*. New York. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hough, G., (1996). *Style and Stylistics*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Leech, N., and Short, M., (1995). *Style in Fiction*. London and New York: Longman.

Ohman, R., (1992). 'Literature as Sentences', *College English*, 27, 149-57. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Payne, Michael, (1998). *Contemporary Essays on Style*. New York : Modern Library.

Paul Robert, (2000). *English Sentences*. New York: New American Library.

Quirk, R. ,and Sidney Greenbaum, (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman.

Rockas, L., (2003). *Abstract and Concrete Sentences*. New York: Macmillan.

Spencer, J., (1990). *Linguistics and Style*. London: Oxford University Press.

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

Turner, G., (2001). *Stylistics*. London: Penguin Books.

APPENDIX

Hemingway's *Cat in the Rain*

There were only two Americans stopping at the hotel. They did not know any of the people they passed on the stairs on their way to and from their room. Their room was on the second floor facing the sea. It also faced the public garden and the war monument. There were big palms and green benches in the public garden. In the good weather there was always an artist with his easel. Artists liked the way the palms grew and the bright colors of the hotels facing the gardens and the sea. Italians came from a long way off to look up at the war monument. It was made of bronze and glistened in the rain. It was raining. The rain dripped from the palm trees. Water stood in pools on the gravel paths. The sea broke in a long line in the rain and slipped back down the beach to come up and break again in a long line in the rain. The motor-cars were gone from the square by the war monument. Across the square in the door way of the café a waiter stood looking out at the empty square.

Conrad's *The Secret Sharer*

On my right hand there were lines of fishing-stakes resembling a mysterious system of half-submerged bamboo fences, incomprehensible in its division of the domain of tropical fishes, and crazy of aspect as if abandoned forever by some nomad tribe of fishermen gone now to the other end of the ocean; for there was no sign of human habitation as far as the eye could reach. To the left a group of barren islets, suggesting ruins of stone walls, towers and block houses, had its foundations set in a blue sea that itself looked solid, so still and stable did it lie below my feet; even the track of light from the westering sun shone smoothly, without that animated glitter which tells of an imperceptible ripple. And when I turned my head to take a parting glance at the tug which had just left us anchored outside the bar, I saw the straight line of the flat shore joined to the stable sea, edge to edge, with a perfect and unmarked closeness, in one levelled floor half brown, half blue under the enormous dome of the sky.

Faulkner's *Big Woods*

The rich deep black alluvial soil which would grow cotton taller than the head of a man on a horse, already one jungle one brake one impassable density of brier and cane and vine interlocking the soar of gum and cypress and hickory and pinoak and ash, printed now by the tracks of unalien shapes- bear and deer and panthers and bison and wolves and alligators and the myriad smaller beasts, and unalien men to name them too perhaps- the (themselves) nameless though recorded predecessors who built the mounds to escape the spring floods and left their meager artifacts: the obsolete and the dispossessed, dispossessed by those who were dispossessed in turn because they too were obsolete: the wild Algonquian, Chickasaw and Choctaw and Natchez and Pascagoula, peering in virgin astonishment down from the tall bluffs at a Chippeway canoe bearing three Frenchmen

ABSTRACT

Styles of structuring English sentence can be seen as a product of certain structural principles. Christensen suggests four principles that one should take into consideration when analyzing sentence-structure into layers or levels. Two principles are structure-centered: *Addition*.; and *Direct of Modification*, while one is meaning-centered: *principle of levels of generality*; and the fourth is stylistically oriented, *principle of Texture or Style*. The researcher thinks that Christensen's Scheme holds a great deal of analytic linguistic potentialities that could be used in characterizing the literary styles of different writers. Thus, the styles of three writers, Hemingway, Conrad, and Faulkner, are taken as a subject of analysis. Then, the style of sentence-structure of each is characterized differently, whether in relation to the structural levels of the sentences they used or in relation to the grammatical categories of the Additions which they added either to premodify or postmodify the main clauses.

الخلاصة

قد تعد الأساليب الخاصة ببناء الجملة في اللغة الانكليزية نتاجا لبعض المبادئ البنيوية. ويقترح كريستنسن أربعة مبادئ يتوجب على المرء أخذها بنظر الاعتبار عند تحليل بنية الجملة إلى طبقات أو مستويات. ويتمركز مبدآن منها حول البنية: وهما مبدأ الإضافة، ومبدأ اتجاه التقييد النحوي، كما يتمركز مبدأ آخر حول المعنى وهو مبدأ مستويات التعميم، أما المبدأ الرابع فيعد أسلوبيا من حيث التوجه، وهو مبدأ النسيج أو الأسلوب. يعتقد الباحث أن لمشروع كريستنسن مقدارا هائلا من القدرات اللغوية التحليلية والتي يمكن استخدامها في تمييز الأساليب الأدبية لمختلف الكتاب. ولذا كان موضوع التحليل هو تناول الأساليب الخاصة بثلاثة من الكتاب هم: همنغواي، كونراد، فوكنر، موضوعا للتحليل. كما تم بعد ذلك تمييز الأسلوب الخاص ببناء الجملة لكل كاتب على نحو مغاير، سواء من حيث المستويات البنيوية للجمل التي استخدموها أو من حيث الفئة النحوية الخاصة بالإضافات التي أضافوها قبل وبعد العبارة الرئيسية لتقييدها نحويا.