



# A CRITICAL STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF BEKAS'S *THE CAP* AND *EPIGRAM* WITH REFERENCE TO METAPHOR

.....

ASSISTANT INSTRUCTOR MAYSOON KADHIM ALI  
UNIVERSITY OF TIKRIT / COLLEGE OF ARTS / ENGLISH DEPARTMENT  
MOBILE: 07709801220

DR. MAHMOOD KADIR IBRAHIM  
IMAM JA'AFAR AL-SADIQ UNIVERSITY / KIRKUK / COLLEGE OF ARTS  
/ ENGLISH DEPARTMENT  
MOBILE: 07705111797

INSTRUCTOR ALI KAREEM LATEEF  
IMAM JA'AFAR AL-SADIQ / SALAH ALDEEN  
COLLEGE OF ARTS/ENGLISH DEPARTMENT  
MOBILE: 07716776402







## *Abstract*

In poetic discourse, a major problem faced by researchers is how one can systematically identify the ideologies of the poets embedded in the poems, which are written about particular situations. Existing studies on poetry have concentrated on linguistic features of poems in relation to their themes. However, such studies have paid little or no attention to the ideological importance of these features. Meanwhile, there are two areas that can address the problem described above. One is critical stylistics - a set of textual conceptual tools which includes naming and describing, transitivity patterns, implying and assuming along side their underlying metaphorical bases if any- which strive for the explanation of the ideological importance of textual structures, whether the texts are literary or non-literary. Given that poetic language is highly metaphorical, the other area has focused on metaphor highlighting its relation to themes and ideologies.

However, critical stylistic and metaphor approaches have been followed independently of each other. To combine these two approaches, this study, therefore, tries to answer the question 'What part do the textual conceptual functions play in producing metaphors in poetic language? The question asked is picked up in the light of critical stylistics: the power of English (2009) (Jeffries, 2009).

The rationale for trying to see which textual conceptual functions produce metaphors and in what way these metaphors are delivered such as image schema, conceptual metaphors, etc., is as follows: the choices a particular writer makes from alternative linguistic resources at his/ her disposal are ideologically constrained. They, therefore, enhance an organised presentation of reality. In accordance, Charteris-Black (2004, p. 28) states that “metaphor is... concerned with forming a coherent view of reality”. Hence, there is a joint point between

metaphor and the textual conceptual functions, which are the presentation of reality.

The texts selected for the analysis are Sherko Bekas's short poems *The Cap* and *Epigram* (Bekas, 1987) which appear in his collection – second volume published in Kurdistan 2006, whilst the two poems were written in 1987- a year of high political unrest in Kurdistan.

Key words: Critical stylistics, textual conceptual functions, metaphor, ideologies, presupposition

## تحليل في الأسلوبية لقصيدتي القبعة والقصيدة بالشارحة إلى الاستعارة

م. ميسون كاظم علي

جامعة تكريت / كلية الآداب / قسم اللغة الانكليزية

د. محمود قاسم ابراهيم

جامعة الامام جعفر الصادق / فرع كركوك / كلية الآداب / قسم اللغة

الانكليزية

م. علي كريم لطيف

جامعة الامام جعفر الصادق / فرع صلاح الدين / كلية الآداب / قسم اللغة

الانكليزية

الملخص

هناك مشكلة اساسية يواجهها الباحثون فيما يتعلق بالخطاب الشعري ألا وهي تحديد الايدولوجية المكتوبة لموقف معين (المتضمنة في القصيدة) تحديدا منهجيا. وأن الدراسات الحديثة في الشعر تهتم بالخصائص اللغوية للقصيدة وعلاقتها بموضوع القصيدة بينما لم يكن موضوع القصيدة وايدولوجيتها من ضمن هذه الخصائص. هناك مجالين نستطيع من خلالهما أن نتناول هذه المشكلة: -المجال الأول هو الاسلوبية وهو عبارة عن مجموعة من الادوات تستخدم في تحليل المفاهيم المتضمنة في النصوص ومن هذه الادوات: التسمية والوصف ، انماط الانتقال، التلميح، والافتراض وما يرافق ذلك فيما إذا كانت هناك ركائز مجازية من أجل أن نجد شرحاً كافياً لأهمية الايدولوجية في بناء النص سواء كان نصاً أدبياً أو غير أدبي. وبما أن اللغة الشعرية لغة غنية بالمجاز فان المجال الثاني الذي يتناوله البحث يسعى إلى تسليط الضوء على المجاز وعلاقته بموضوع القصيدة والايولوجية المتضمنة فيها.

وعلى أي حال فإن منهجي الاسلوبية والمجاز تم استخدام كل منهج باستقلالية عن الآخر. ومن أجل الدمج بين المنهجين فإن هذه الدراسة تحاول الاجابة عن التساؤل التالي: أي جزء من وظائف النص المفاهيمي يعمل على انتاج المجاز في اللغة الشعرية؟ وقد برز هذا التساؤل في ضوء التحليل الاسلوبي المسمى قوة الانكليزية لجفريز (٢٠٠٩).

إن الاعتقاد المنطقي الذي يحاول البحث في وظائف النص المفاهيمي المنتج للمجاز و ما هي الوسائل المستخدمة في إيصال الاستعارة مثل ترسيمة الصورة أو استعارة المفهوم الخ... سيكون بالشكل التالي: إن الخيارات التي يقوم بها كاتب معين من مجموعة من المصادر تحت تصرفه هي في الحقيقة محددة فكرياً. لذلك فإن هذه الخيارات تحسن العرض المنظم للواقع. ووفق ذلك فإن كارترس بلاك (٢٠٠٤ : ٢٨) يقول: إن الاستعارة تعنى بتشكيل منظور محكم للواقع. وعليه فإن هناك نقطة وصل بين المجاز و وظائف النص المفاهيمي الذي هو تمثيل للواقع.

لقد تم اختيار قصيدتين قصيرتين للشاعر شيركو بيكاس وهما بعنوان القبعة والقصيدة اللتان من ضمن قصائد المجموعة الشعرية الثانية المطبوعة في كردستان (٢٠٠٦). حيث كتبت تلك القصيدتين في العام ١٩٨٧ الذي شهد اضطراباً سياسياً آنذاك سياسي.



## **Introduction**

Critical stylistics (called CS here) has come to refer to a branch of applied linguistics associated with the researcher Lesley Jeffries. CS provides the missing links between stylistics (textual choices) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) (namely ideology). Critical stylistics was started at the University of Huddersfield and inaugurated with the publication of *Critical Stylistics: The Power of English* (Jeffries, 2009). CDA is a discourse analytical approach that studies how ideologies, identity, and inequality are produced, reproduced and maintained in text in social and political contexts (Van Dijk, 2001, p. 352). CDA also aims to identify manipulation and ideology hidden in texts (Fowler, 1997, p. 66). Language is crucial in the reproduction of ideologies and central in establishing and maintaining social identities and inequalities (Wodak, 2001, p. 10). On the other hand, stylistics is ‘the linguistic study of style’ studying the ‘relation between language and artistic function’ (Leech & Short, 2007, p. 11). It is mistakenly assumed that stylistics is solely concerned with the study of literary language. However, stylistics studies the language of non-literary texts too, because any textual phenomena that are found in literary texts can be found in non-literary texts too.

Critical stylistics attempts to ‘assemble the main general functions a text has in representing realities’ (Jeffries, 2009, p. 14). It offers a developed theory and a more rigorous methodology for CDA, which CDA has not yet developed. CS ‘introduces a set of tools, which, whilst not complete, are nevertheless more comprehensive than any provided in the literature on CDA’ (Jeffries, 2009, p.1). These tools (called textual conceptual functions) attempt to uncover ideologies implied by the linguistic choices that text producers make.

So far, this research shows that the textual conceptual functions could present realities. Accordingly, the mechanics of metaphor and its ideological dimensions will be introduced. Metaphor is a linguistic expression, which

prompts for the understanding of one thing in terms of another. Thus, metaphor is a linguistic phenomenon of particular importance to critical stylistics. Where critical stylistics contends that ideology is a systematic presentation of reality by the virtue of the textual conceptual functions, metaphors are ideological in that they present reality (Lakoff & Chilton, 1995). According to Lakoff and Chilton (1995, p. 15) metaphors “can contribute to a situation where they privilege one understanding of reality over others”. Then, Charteris-Black (2004, p. 28) contends that metaphor “is concerned with forming a coherent view of reality”.

### **The Tools**

This section will introduce each textual function briefly. Then, each tool will be followed by an analysis of the poems under study - *the cap* and *Epigram*. These tools are stylistic in nature because they give writers textual choices out of which one is selected. Jeffries (2013: 13) states that the textual conceptual functions “refer to different aspects of the text world which the text produces”. These tools introduce a level of meaning realised out of context called linguistic meaning, i.e., a layer of meaning between language structure and use. The meaning these tools represent is called textual meaning which tells what the text is doing in the presentation of reality.

### **Naming and Describing**

Texts name and describe things. Naming is the process of giving names to ((in)animate) and abstract things. Given the stylistic nature of this tool, ‘naming and describing’ gives writers choices out of which a choice to be made. In critical stylistics, the choices a writer makes are ideologically governed. Whilst this function seems rather simple, it is more than whether to describe a dead person by a politically motivated poet *murdered*, *killed* or *dead*. Although these words are denotatively equivalent, they differ connotatively. These adjectives describing someone or something dead are more-or-less negatively evaluated



whereby 'kill' is negatively evaluated, 'murder' is more negative and 'dead' is neutral. Thus, the description of a dead entity seemed to emphasize the importance of how that case of 'death' happened, and this was reflected in the use of *murdered* for only a victim, whereas the less negative term *killed* tended to be used for killing an entity which/who might not be a victim wherein Kurdish culture killing may be a case of execution. Thus, the poet seems mostly negative with respect to the *perpetrator* of the act of killing.

Similarly, the post modification of the head noun *coffin* seems to be ideologically constrained in the following noun phrase: *the coffin of a flower or a twig*. In this phrase, the poet chooses to introduce an evaluative means whereby the corpse is represented as a *flower or a twig*, albeit in metaphorical form. In this case, *the flower* has a positive meaning. In this example, *flower* entails beauty and thus has a positive connotation on the part of killed people.

Describing dead people as *murdered bird* and post-modifying the head noun *coffin* with *a flower or a twig* are metaphorical. The metaphors exist within the noun phrase, i.e. the description of the names in the poem are metaphorical. The metaphor of a *murdered bird* constitutes a topos of a victim because it is cognitively associated with a victim connoting action- *murdered*. The victim connoting action is one which would have victimised the bird. Stockwell (2002: 108) calls the first type of metaphors (*murdered bird*) "premodification" because the premodifier *murdered* normally describes a human being whereas it describes a 'bird' in this poem.

When a metaphor exists within the scope of postmodification, this type of metaphor is called "genitive expression" (ibid) as in *the coffin of a flower or a twig*. Since any cognitive model of 'a coffin' is unlikely to include a flower as its main content, it is most likely that 'flower or a twig' is read metaphorically as a poetic representation of the beauty of the corpse inside the coffin. Therefore,

*the coffin* and the postmodification – *of flower or a twig* - present sources from which the dead person can be referenced so that the dead person is understood in different ways.

### **Transitivity Pattern**

In traditional grammar, verbs are classified into two classes depending on whether a verb needs a subject and an object in the same clause or it only needs a subject. If the verb requires a subject and an (obligatory) object in the same clause, then, it is transitive. If the verb does not require an object, it is intransitive. Ergative verbs are intermediate between transitive and intransitive verbs where verbs can be transitive and intransitive with the same meaning, where the object of the transitive is the same as the subject of intransitive (e.g. I grew flowers in the garden vs. flowers grew in the garden). Transitive verbs can be classified into mono-transitive and di-transitive depending on the number of objects associated with the verb, if the verb takes one obligatory object, then it is mono-transitive. If the verb takes two objects, then it is di-transitive.

Historically, transitivity can be traced to M. K. Halliday's systemic functional grammar. Transitivity, here, means the representation of actions, speeches, states of minds and states of being. It is the representation of meaning in the clause. This is especially surprising given the ideational qualities of transitivity, where transitivity is the transmission of ideas (Simpson, 2003). Furthermore, to quote Halliday (2004, p. 101), "Our most powerful conception of reality is that it consists of 'goings-on': of doing, happening, feeling, being. These goings-on are sorted out in the semantic system of the language and expressed through the grammar of the clause."

Transitivity construes experience into process types in relation to participants and circumstances. By analysing the types of transitivity patterns,



we can see how texts present information, and thus expose the ideological significance in the text.

The cap

Have you noticed that,

when a flock of crested larks

is flying past

the coffin of flower or a twig

the birds pause, and

respecting the sorrow, take of their caps

until the coffin has passed?

Or have you noticed

How an acorn weeps for a murderd bird

And takes off its cap

To dry her tears with it?

But every time,

The news of a killed oak- tree

Or a strangled bird

Reaches me in my room,

my pen puts on its

and weeps.

Let us now consider the following sentences:

1. .... the birds pause, and respecting the sorrow, take of their caps, until the coffin has passed?
2. .... an acorn weeps for a murdered bird and takes off its cap to dry her tear with it?
3. .... the news of a killed oak-tree or a strangled bird reaches me in my room, my pen puts on its cap and weeps.

In the first stanza, there are three verbs *pause*, *take off* and *pass*. These verbs express different types of transitivity patterns. The main action in the main predicator is taken by the addressee *you* in *Have you noticed...*. This main predictor is Mental Cognition. Then, two of the subordinate Predicators (following the main predicator) are material, one of which (flying past, an object complement) is Material Intentional Action since *the birds* are intentionally *flying*. Then, the participant (*the bird*) is the animate Actor (the grammatical subject) and the process therefore should be termed an 'Action'. However, the actor *the birds* is given human characteristics of 'the ability to pause to show respect' in this example. Therefore, it can be seen that the poet has a negative feeling about the situation saying that those who are killed not guilty.

The verb *pause* expresses a Material Intentional Action and it is used metaphorically. The basic sense of the verb *pause* (when used for the sake of showing respect) belongs to one type of discourse (discourse of ceremony), then, is less likely used in its literal sense as it occurs in alternative types of discourse (poetic discourse). In this case, this verb in its basic sense requires a human being actor endowed with abilities to show respect. When, this verb occurs in poetic discourse, however, it is probably not used in its literal sense. Rather, the it (the verb *pause*) more regularly refers to the poet's feeling of sorrow and mourning, it is therefore metaphorical. The literal sense of the verbs *pause* does not allow, *the birds*, to be coded as its Actor of the Material Intentional Action when it is used to show respect, because birds are not



endowed with abilities to pause showing respect, for example, for a *coffin*. So, whenever the lexeme *pause* in the textual context of *birds- (to express respect)*, it must be used in metaphorical senses. This structure is a grammatical metaphor (meaning construction by means of grammatical structure. The same kind of analysis applies to the verb *take off*. The final predicate *has passed* in the first stanza expresses an “event” when we examine it superficially. However, a ‘coffin’ can not pass by its own. As a result, the process of passing must have been done by some other actors which the poet hides. As a consequence, the process is “Action”.

An interesting property of the transitivity, here, is that it can serve the basis image-schema and the conceptual metaphor “LIFE IS JOURNEY”. Let us look at the first stanza. The first stanza describes a travelling act. This stanza uses image metaphors mapping a detailed set of images from the source to the target. In the sentence, the *flock of larks flying past* is the population travelling, the coffin is an obstacle, the sky in which the flock is flying is the ground in which the population moves, the intended goal of the action of flying is the destination where the flock of *larks* intended to go. The mapping, here, is one-image superimposed onto the other. Thus, here, the motion schema of the *flock of crested larks* underlies the concept of a journey. The flying (movement) of the *larks* has the parts, an initial point, a movement, and a point. These parts have counterparts in ‘a journey’ the departure point, the travel, and the destination. In this way, according to Kovecses (2010, p. 44) “the target domains of many structural metaphors can then be seen as images schematically structured by their source (such as life is a journey).” These types of metaphors are image-based conceptual metaphors, they are rich in image schemas but do not manipulate them and/or they are a mixture of image schemas and conceptual metaphors.

In the second stanza, I have highlighted five predicators, each of which represents a transitivity choice. These predicators are divided into three levels: a main predictor (noticed), second level predictors (weeps and takes off) and the last is a third level predictors which occurs outside the verb phrase but carries transitivity choices (murdered and to dry) which occur in the object position. In this stanza, the main Predictor is Mental Reception. It is a rhetorical question which does not require a real answer, but it lays emphasis on the information included in it. The second level predictor which consists of two conjoined verb phrases, the first of which is *weeps* is Mental Reaction (expressing negative feelings as the verb is used to express sadness) and the second *takes off* is Material Intentional Action. Note that the Objects (which I called third level structure) also have transitivity choices. The object (murdered bird) of *weeps* also and the object (to dry) of *takes off* are Material Intention Actions.

The third stanza consists of two clauses expressing processes conjoined by coordinated conjunction *But every time*. The first process (reaches) is Material Intentional Action. The second clause includes *puts on and weeps*, the first of which (puts on) is Material Intentional Action and the second (weeps) is Mental Reaction. The Actor of the second clause is personified where *the pen* is given the characteristics of being able ‘to weep’. Note that the subject (in the post modification of the subject- *news*) of the first clause also has transitivity choice which consists of two conjoined noun phrases both of which expresses Material Intentional Actions by the verbs *killed* and *strangled* in *killed oak-tree* and *strangled bird* respectively.

The use of *every time* connector is interesting. It signals a relationship of temporal contiguity. It denotes that ‘putting on the cap and weeping’ happened at the same time as the news reaches the poet. In addition causation is also signalled. It denotes that ‘taking off the cap and weeping’ happened because ‘the



news reaches the poet'. As a consequence, the poet considers *the news* to be sad and negative.

On the cognitive account of transitivity, one of Charteris-Black (2004: 20–2) criteria to identify metaphors is personification. Personification is giving inanimate objects characteristics, which normally refer to human beings. A given lexical item is usually metaphorical when used in particular textual context than its original one. For example, in their normal senses, the verbs *put on* and *weep* denote 'to dress in and to cry' respectively. They are items of vocabulary primarily associated with discourse on social activities. When they occur in poetic discourse, however, they do not normally denote an act of 'dressing in or crying', although they may connote 'dressing in and crying', because poetic discourse is not concerned with 'dressing in or crying' matters. Rather, they more regularly refer to losing the ability to write and express sadness respectively (particularly in this poem), they are therefore metaphorical. To quote (Hart. 2010: 130) "It can be claimed that a given word is always metaphorical when it occurs in a particular textual context". For example, the basic sense of the verb *put on* does not allow *the pen* to be coded as the agents of the action. So whenever the lexeme PUT ON occurs in the context 'the pen—' or '— by pen' it must be being used in a metaphorical sense. The same is true the verb 'weep'.

The verb 'puts on' requires an animate actor. It is Material Intentional Action verb. Therefore, 'the pen' is animated, i.e., personified. In this sense, personification can change a transitivity process from Event (where the Actor is inanimate) to Action (where the Actor is animate).

This representation sustains the ideology of the poet toward a situation when someone was killed at that time. This type of metaphor is explained in

cognitive poetics (for more information I refer to Peter Stockwell's Cognitive poetics, 2002: 105-21).

The transitivity choices here demonstrate a tendency by the poet to choose Mental Reception process as the main Predicators and subordinate other process types. The main action in the main predicator is taken by the addressee *you* in *Have you noticed...* Then, two of the subordinate Predicators are material, one of which (flying past) is Material Intentional Action since *the birds* are intentionally flying to a destination. The second subordinate Predicator includes the two verb phrases *pause* and *take off*. Although the Actor of these two verb phrases (*pause* and *take off*) is *the birds*, the processes are Material Intentional Actions. The reason for calling these two processes Material Intentional Actions is that these two verbs (*pause* and *take off*), separated by a more lower level of subordination *respecting the sorrow*, require animate subjects able to perform intentional actions. Within *respecting the sorrow*, 'respect' is the main verb and 'sorrow' is the object, and 'respect' in its literal sense does not allow 'sorrow' to be coded as its object. Consequently, the same subject of these three verbs 'pause, respect and take off' is personified by the virtue of personification.

Like the first stanza, the second starts with a rhetorical question which includes the main predicate and the subordinate predicate includes *how an acorn weeps*. Again, the *acorn* is personified as a result the process is Mental Reaction. Note that the object *murdered bird* also has a transitivity choice which is a Material Intentional Action by the virtue of description explained in the previous section.

Personification is used frequently throughout the poem. In the first stanza, *a flower* or *a twig* is personified as someone who died. *An acorn* is also personified as someone who *weeps* for someone who is *murdered* (who is the birds which is also personified by being described as *murdered* in the poem). In



the last stanza, the *pen* is personified as someone who *puts on his/her cap* and *weeps*. Here, the words ‘weep’ and ‘murder’ have negative connotations. As a result, the poet has a negative ideology towards what was happening when someone was killed.

The purpose of the transitivity choice on two levels: main and subordinate has further ideological significance where the processes in subordinate predicates are not questionable. Therefore, the poet lays what the birds did (expressing negative attitudes) at a subordinate level. Further, the main predicator has *notice* as main verb, which is semi-factive verbs implying what follows it is taken for granted and not questionable.

The question the poet is setting is rhetorical, where no real answer is expected. The poet asks the rhetorical question to lay emphasis on what the birds did. The choices made by this poet, then, indicate that he is implying that these notices (how birds pauses, respecting the sorrow etc.) happened at his sight.

Finally, the poet’s ideology is uncovered. His description of the birds’ feelings throughout the poem is a reflection of his (the poet) feelings, which are negative.

### **Assuming and Implying with Reference to Prioritising**

‘Assuming and implying’ is a textual conceptual function, which is vital in the creation of implied and assumed meanings which are significant in the construction of ideational function of language. Jeffries (2009) states that assuming and implying are powerful in influencing readers’ viewpoints, because assuming and implying can make these view points common sense. Therefore, they create world views and thus ‘assuming and implying’ is part of the ideational metafunction. In some ways, then, assuming and implying may construct political ideologies in poetry, because they (assuming and implying)

draw upon the readers' background assumption for example killing of innocent people, which is unacceptable. Therefore, the ideology the killing innocent people as unacceptable appears as taken for granted and naturalized in *the cap*.

Assuming and implying are delivered through the pragmatic processes of presupposition (Levinson, 1983) and implicature (Grice, 1975) respectively. The former is divided into logical and existential. Existential presupposition is triggered by the definite article (the), possessive pronouns (e.g. my, her) and demonstratives (this, that, these and those). In contrast to existential presupposition, logical presupposition is triggered by an open ended set of items (e.g. change of state verbs presuppose the process indicated by the verb- stop indicates movement, factive verbs presuppose the contents their clausal complement and cleft sentences presuppose the content of their post modifying relative clauses etc.) (Jeffries, 2009). In presupposition, meaning is assumed while in implicature meaning is implied. To Jeffries (2015: 397) presuppositions do not construct sentence propositions. Therefore, the distinction between presupposition and implicature is a fine one. If a sentence is negated, the presupposition remains intact. In contrast, if we negate a sentence, implicature will invalidate. Another less clear distinction is in implicature, background information is recruited into the text whilst in presupposition, meaning is inferred from the text.

I shall now analyse 'assuming and implying' in *the cap*, and demonstrate how they work to produce ideologies in the poem.

The first and second stanzas start with logical presuppositions, which arise by the virtue of clausal complement of a semi-factive verb *noticed* at the beginnings of the first and second stanzas. Therefore the poet is assuming that the contents of the subordinate clauses are true. In the first stanza, the presupposition that 'there is a flock of larks which pauses respecting the sorrow



of someone who is killed' can not be debated. In the second stanza, , the poet assumes that the disaster of killing innocent people exists and there is a fact that tells us there is *an acorn weeps for a murdered bird*. In addition, the presupposition that 'an acorn weeps for a murdered bird and try to dry her tears' is not available for discussion.

Thus, prioritising has already been seen to play a significant role in the textual construction of assumption. Presenting the idea 'there is a flock of larks which pauses respecting the sorrow of someone who is killed' at subordinate level is presupposed to be true.

In addition, the definite noun phrase *the sorrow* shows existential presupposition in which the existence of 'sorrow' is not open for discussion. Also, in the second stanza, the noun phrase *murdered bird* implies the existence of 'a bird which is murdered' which is more difficult to debate than if it had been expressed in a clause (e.g. A bird is murdered.). This example is metaphorical (and therefore there is an implied meaning- implicature) since the poet and the receiver of the poem know that this expression is not literal and the maxim of quality is flouted. In the same stanza, the poet assumes the existence of the "tears" (and part of our schematic knowledge is that tears do not appear unless something sad happened). The existence of 'tears' is triggered by the possessive pronoun *her*. In the third stanza, another existential presupposition is found in *the news of a killed oak tree or a strangled bird*. There are two more presuppositions found in *a killed oak tree* and *or a strangled bird* which are more difficult to debate than if they had been expressed in clause forms, for example 'an oak tree is killed and a bird is strangled'. The negative feeling of the poet is revealed by the two negative words *killed* and *strangled*.

## Equating and Contrasting

‘Equation and contrasting’ is another textual function, which is vital in the creation of the ideational features of the text. ‘Equation and contrasting’ refers to the construction of oppositional and equivalent meanings in the text. The critical stylistic approach to opposition constructions draws on how novel opposites rely on understanding and constructing conventional opposites ‘good and bad’. Oppositional and equivalent meaning are triggered often syntactically by co-ordinating and subordinating conjunctions (e.g. *and*, *or*, *but*, *yet*, etc). However, according to Coffey (2013, p. 73) “not all equivalence or opposition is signalled by syntactic means, as they sometimes rely on semantic relationships or parallel clause structures.” Though I see *parallel clause structures* as *syntactic means* and I think Coffey intended the phrase *syntactic means* to be co-ordinating and subordinating conjunctions here.

I shall now analyse ‘opposition and equivalence’ and implying in *Epigram*, and demonstrate how they work to produce ideologies in the poem.

In *Epigram*, the poet uses parallel expressions, the copula verb (be) and the coordinating conjunction *but* to trigger the opposition between *many things*. Note that the similarity of forms and positions of the subjects in the main clause (cleft sentences) helps us to set up their oppositions in the clausal complements of the cleft sentences. There is an explicit opposition between the *many things* in the first sentence and the *many things* in the second, this opposition is triggered by the co-ordinating conjunction *but*. However, the subjects are also contrasted by the complement of that clause, so there are two sets of opposites being created:



Rust	do not decay
be	not be
Finally	never
Crown	hat
Sceptre	the stick
A king	Charlie Chaplain
Throne of a king	the shoes of Charlie Chaplain

The situation is complex here. Though there is an implicit opposition between any king and Charlie Chaplain, whereby we expect the former to have things that can be forgotten and the latter to have things that can not be forgotten, so we see the ideology which is that if a king does not want to be forgotten he has to do things, for example, like what Charlie Chaplain did. However, the other opposition between forgetfulness and unforgetfulness is there to show that kings will be forgotten unless they behave like Charlie Chaplain.

Notice that the characterization of these *many things* as human beings is clear. A human being undergoes some change caused by aging, illnesses, etc. In these two stanzas, the *many things* are human beings who get old or sick, as a consequence, they stop to exist. And they will finally be forgotten. Notice, the characterisation of these *many things* as human beings (personification) does not say anything about getting old or sick. However, the general structure of death shares the skeletal structure of the event of death in these two stanzas.

Thus, contrasting is seen to play a very important role in the construction of three-example lists of exemplification as in :

there are many worldly things

that do not decay and will not be forgotten

and never die

like the hat, the stick and the shoes of Charlie Chaplain

What is presented in this example is a particular kind of contrasting by giving three examples. From the surface reading, the first stanza seems redundant, since ‘negating’ the existence of things that *decay, die and be forgotten* ought to make the reader/ hearer aware of the existence of the things *that decay, die and be forgotten*. However, the poet might have mentioned *decay, die and be forgotten* in both stanzas because the examples listed in the first stanza might not be counterpart opposites of the items in the second stanza if taken out of this textual context. In other words, if we deprive the following two lists from textual context in this poem, *the crown* is not opposite of *the hat*, *the sceptre* is not the opposite of *the stick*, and *the throne of a king* is not the opposite of *the shoes of Charlie Chaplain*.

Finally, the poet has a positive attitude towards Charlie Chaplain and a negative attitude towards kings.

### **Exemplifying and Enumerating**

‘Exemplifying and Enumerating’ is another textual function, which is vital in specifying a complete list of a category and exemplifying the types of things that belong to a category. ‘Equation and contrasting’ is important in creating the ideational features of the text.

In ‘exemplifying and enumerating’ textual function, Jeffries (2015: 349) states that the social and linguistic background assumption is seen to play a very important part “about what it belongs in which category, so that the reader is obliged to, whilst reading the text at least to conceptualise the world”, for instance, *crown, sceptre and a throne of a king* belong to the things not that *will*



never *be forgotten* but of the things that *will be forgotten*. It is noticed that the items in the list are placed at the end of a relative clause beginning with ‘that’ and therefore their importance is reduced.

It can be seen that a list can contrast another list, for example, the list in the first stanza is in contrast to the list in the second stanza. The two lists, here, are in contrast because of their preceding clauses beginning with *that*, these clauses are contrasted by the virtue of the negative adverbials *not* and *never* followed by *decay*, *be forgotten* and *die* respectively in the second stanza. The same verbs *be forgotten* and *die* are found in the first stanza without being preceded by the negative adverbs. These negative adverbs cause the contrast between the two lists and consequently any elements in one of these lists contrast its counterpart element in the other list.

This list advances an ideological stance of the poet whereby he sees these items as unforgettable. The placement of the idea that *many things will die and be forgotten* and many other *things that will never die and will not be forgotten* in a clausal complement makes the idea less amenable to debate. Giving examples of this idea in a lower level (after the relative clause beginning with *that*) makes the idea that the examples in the first stanza *will die and be forgotten* less open to discussion. However, not everyone will agree with the idea that every *crown, sceptre and throne of a king* will be forgotten. This list is not enumerating all things that will be forgotten, but exemplifying the category of unforgettable things. The writer could have included other items in the list, but his choice is ideologically constrained by his viewpoint of Charlie Chaplain against which no one will argue that they are forgetful. Thus, the job of the list is to tell that *crown, sceptre and a throne of a king* can be forgotten.

We can infer from this poem which puts ‘rust and death’ at two extremes and ‘forgetfulness’ between them that oppositional meanings are not absolute.

This is not to say that ‘rust’ and ‘death’ are counterparts of ‘good and bad’ respectively. Here, ‘death’ is more negative than ‘rust’ and ‘forgetfulness’ is better than death and worse than ‘rust’. The consequence of this is that doing things that will be forgotten is bad and unforgetfulness is good.

It is important to say that in this example, the lack of form function relationships is causes same textually constructed meaning to be expressed in different forms.

### **Conclusion**

This work has dealt with two short poems from Bekas's poetry- *The Cap* and *Epigram*. The work uses critical stylistic models (naming and describing, transitivity patterns, implying and assuming alongside their underlying metaphorical bases) for the purpose of analysis. In addition, metaphor is also involved in the analysis of these poems. The analysis has shown that the tools used in this study are consistent in their representation of realities. Moreover, the study has found that some of the tools used in this study construct metaphors; metaphors are not used as a separate tool. This is to help us avoid repetition.

The study has shown that the poet resists those who are in power because he longs for freedom. This is very clearly constructed in his use of personification and equation and contrasting. Those who are dead in this poem are constructed positively. Their depiction as flower or twig entails that there are defenseless. In addition, this construction denote that they are useful for life and killing them is harmful. Furthermore, reality presentation employed by the poet increases the brutality of their murdering.



## References

- Bekas, S. (1987, 8/8/1987) *The Whole Sky of my Borders*. Folklore Hois.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis*: Springer.
- Coffey, L. (2013). "Innocent Until Proven Filthy": *A Corpus-Based Critical Stylistic Analysis Of Representations Of Men In Women's Magazines*. University of Huddersfield,
- Fowler, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. In: JSTOR.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). " Logic and conversation" In Cole, P., and Morgan, J.(Eds.). *Syntax & Semantics*, 3.
- Halliday, M. A. (2004). An introduction to functional grammar. Revised by Christian MIM Matthiessen. *London: Arnold*, 3.
- Jeffries, L. (2009). *Critical stylistics: The power of English*: Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Kovecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Chilton, P. (1995). Foreign Policy by Metaphor.
- Leech, G. N., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*: Pearson Education.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics* Cambridge University Press. *Cambridge UK*.
- Simpson, P. (2003). *Language, ideology and point of view*: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 1, 95-120.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about—a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 1, 1-13.

