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Abstract: If a specimen of literary art is seen as a fine tapestry of words made by the skilled seamstress—the poet, then the lexis and structure of a language are the raw materials—the fabric and the thread—by weaving which into specific patterns the finished product is achieved. The choice of materials and their arrangement into unique patterns always bear an image of their creator, or the artist; thus, a close view of them reveals the artist’s identity and brings out the meaningful message that underlies the ornate running threads. Mostly, the students of literary studies cannot appreciate the beauty of the literary classics on their own. Consequently, they simply mimic the ideas, and sometimes even the words, of famous professional critics when asked to give their own critical judgment on the aesthetic merit or the thematic quality of a literary work in the shape of a home assignment, classroom presentation or an annual assessment test. Now, the researcher has got the inspiration for carrying out this study from an idea expounded in Widdowson (1975) that this mimicry can be replaced by genuine individual opinion if the students, or even those people who have non-academic concerns with literature, are brought to a standpoint from where they can have a closer view of the raw materials, the language resources, which are involved in the making of a literary product. And, if the product in its finished form cannot elicit a desired response from them then making them sensitive to the process of its making can be quite effective in this regard. Through the present study, an attempt has been made to show an easy access to the outlandish world of verse by means of the linguistic route which is laid with the familiar flagstones of grammar and vocabulary. Meaning thereby that in this study the elusiveness of poetry will be dealt with the precision of a social scientist, the linguist. The approach which serves as the basis of this study is not an invention of the researcher; rather, it is a well-known twentieth century approach known as stylistics (Jeffries & McIntyre, 2010, p. 30). Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s famous ballad, “The Rime of the Ancient Mariner”, being a widely read poem and bearing various stylistics features, offered itself as an ideal object for this study. The poet’s aesthetic message is explored by analyzing the
finest details of his linguistic expression. And, careful considerations have been made throughout the study to prevent the overlooking of any instance of deviant linguistic units or recurring patterns for interpretation because such elements contribute largely to the meaning of any literary product. The study is descriptive in its nature therefore qualitative data has been integrated with and substantiated by the quantitative one.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Answering the question what stylistics is seems a natural starting point for the introductory section of a study based on an application of stylistics. Stylistics is, as Widdowson (1975) puts it, “the study of literary discourse from a linguistic orientation” (p. 3). Now, for a while, if the more general term “literature” is substituted for its hyponym “literary discourse” then this sort of answer can satisfy the informant in its limited capacity. It signifies that literature is the prime object of study in stylistics and, through its use of the expression “linguistic orientation”, it implies that stylistics draws its resources from the linguistic reservoir or, to put alternatively, its proceedings are pivoted on the components of the language system—grammar and vocabulary. However, as long as the substituted word “literature” is retained in place of the original term “literary discourse”, this answer, or definition, is wanting in one aspect: it does not draw any obvious distinction between linguistics and stylistics, giving the impression that one is the replica of the other. Nonetheless, the two are distinct; they are distinct in the sense that the ends of a linguistic procedure serve as the means whereby a stylistic procedure takes its course. To expand on this, it can be said that if a piece of literature is given to a linguist, he “will be interested in finding out how it exemplifies the language system, and if contains curiosities of usage how these curiosities might be accounted for in grammatical terms” (Widdowson, 1975, p. 5). Whereas, provided with the same piece of literature, a stylistician, i.e. the scholar or learners of stylistics, will cross the linguist’s finishing line, or exceed his goal, and seek to find out how the language system is manipulated for obtaining optimum communicative value, and if there exist any curiosities of linguistic nature, how their inclusion was inevitable for the literary artist who wanted to capture or reflect “a reality other than that which is communicable by conventional uses of language code” (Widdowson, 1975, p. 54). For instance, if a linguist and a stylistician, both, are exposed to the following excerpt taken from a long fictional prose of John Wain, through Wright & Hope (2001, p. 174), and mainly comprising of two brief succeeding dialogues—the first between the characters Charles and Robert and the second between Charles and Edith, then the two would respond to it differently.

“Mind if I come in all the same? Come some distance,” muttered Charles. There’s only Edith and me here,’ said Robert as [............] Charles [........] went into the hall. Edith came out of the kitchen and confronted him. “Sheila isn’t here,’ she said. “Know,” said Charles, speaking too quickly to be fully intelligible. ‘Robert told me. Mind if come in perhaps cup of tea? Or when Sheila be back wanted to see her if I could.” (Hurry on Down)
The linguist might point out the extensive use of the cohesive devices, ellipsis in this excerpt, and might also explain that it mainly arises due to the deletion of some subject pronouns and auxiliary verbs from their respective slots (Wright & Hope, 2001, p. 174). Regardless of what exactly the linguist would say, his comments will be form-oriented. Whereas, the stylistician would not be contented with a mere formal analysis; he would go a step ahead to trace the link between the linguistic form used and its communicative function or, to put alternatively, the writer’s motive behind its use. Thus, he might be interested to indicate how the omission of certain forms in the excerpt can communicate chunks of information to the reader about the character of Charles. He might work out the following details in this regard: Charles is caught up in a state of mental anxiety which is reflected in his poor linguistic performance (production of utterances deficient in some compulsory syntactic categories—subjects and auxiliaries). His speech is marked by hastiness which hints at his disinclination to prolong the conversation with the other conversation participants which, in turn, reflects his aversion for them. He is a member of the upper-middle-class as the specific kind of ellipses employed in his speech characterizes the sociolect of that class. Thus, the instances of ellipsis in his speech become a token of revealing and maintaining his social identity in the novel (Wright and Hope, 2001, pp. 174-175).

Comparing the two constructed analyses—the former made from the outlook of a linguist and the latter from that of a stylistician—reveals that what is a mere formal feature of a text for the linguist becomes a carrier of manifold information for his occupational cousin, the stylistian, and is seen by the latter as capable of performing various communicative functions, such as reflecting the mental state of a character, defining the tempo of his speech, revealing the nature of his interpersonal relations with other characters and giving clues to his socio-economic background. The main purpose of this extensive example was to bring out the meaning and significance of the term “literary discourse” in Widdowson’s (1975) definition of stylistics which was stated at an initial point in the present discussion. Now, the original term can be restored in the definition with the development of the understanding that it is used as opposed to the term “literary text”. And, the difference between the two terms marks the difference between the respective approaches of a linguist and a stylistian towards literature. That is to say that the former treats it as text whereas the latter as discourse (Widdowson, 1975, p. 6). It follows from this when a linguist interacts with a literary text, he is concerned about the adherence to or departure from the norms of the language system that the text displays; whereas, when a stylistics specialist has to give his verdict on some literary product, he borrows the linguist’s data in his pursuit of showing how deviance of linguistic or nonlinguistic nature endows the product with its unique communicative character.

Now, it can be easily deduced from the preceding pair of example analyses that, unlike a linguist, the ultimate goal of a scholar of stylistics is not giving an account of the formal makeup of a literary work; rather, he aims at exploring what the literary artist has intended to express in his work. In this respect, he quite resembles with a literary critic who “is interested in
finding out what aesthetic experience or perception of reality the poem [or any other literary composition, for that matter] is attempting to convey” (Widdowson, 1975, p. 5). Nevertheless, unlike a literary critic, he does not attain his goal by relying largely on extratextual evidence or his own intuitive faculty; rather, his means are of linguistic nature. And, it is the very nature of his means which renders his approach more systematic and graspable than that of a literary critic.

A person working in the field of stylistics can be described as someone who takes the route outlined by linguistic flagstones to reach the destiny set by the literary critic. While, stylistics can be described as a language-oriented specialty which “attempts to characterize literary writing as discourse and so to mediate between the linguist’s treatment of literature primarily as text and the literary critic’s treatment of it primarily as messages” (Widdowson, 1975, p. 5).

The very name of stylistics is suggestive of the fact that it is an interdisciplinary domain where, the elsewhere diverse considered disciplines, literary criticism and linguistics are found confluent. The initial component, “style”, of its name creates some mental association between it and literary criticism because it is, and has always been, a major concern of literary criticism to appraise the style of literary products; whereas, the final component, “-istics” of its name is shared by “linguistics” so it binds the two together (Widdowson, 1975, p. 3). It cannot be justly denied that, at the present, stylistics cannot have an independent existence in the vast sea of knowledge and inquiry; rather, it orient itself as a linking rope for the planks of some fully autonomous disciplines and the subjects derived from them. In this regard, it is majorly a juncture of language and literature, linguistics and literary criticism, language and linguistics, and of literature and literary criticism. Therefore, its status is that of a subject-subject connector, discipline-discipline connector and subject-discipline connector (Widdowson, 1975, pp. 3-4).

Foregrounding essentially involves creating an effect of “standing out” from the surroundings (Jeffries & McIntyre, 2010, p. 31) because that is how someone’s concentration can be trapped and attention can be fully grasped. This “standing out” effect is produced in literature often by means of deviation from some established norm because that is how it is produced elsewhere. For example, if an NGO worker wears her bridal dress to work or if an army officer goes to a wedding-feast with his military uniform on then both would certainly stand out from the rest because it has become almost a set norm to be dressed formally at workplaces and to be dressed in pompous civil clothes at wedding parties, and the two would have deviated from the respective norms. Quite similarly, some segments of a (literary) text stand out from the rest by being deviant in one way or the other. And, what is meant by deviation in this context is “the occurrence of unexpected irregularity in language” which is capable of evoking surprise in the reader (Jeffries & McIntyre, 2010, p. 31).

If the deviance in a certain text is detectable by contrasting a few segments of the text to their general co-text then the deviation is internal in its nature as it has resulted from “the violation of a norm set up by the text itself” (Van Peer, 1986, p. 22).

The researcher was able to view a very small yet significant part of the corpus of literature produced on the issues whose understanding was
prerequisite to the carrying out of this study. A brief review of such issues is presented for better organization and ease of reference.

Verdonk (2002) describes the reader’s special response to the foregrounded parts of a text in the following words: “In making a stylistic analysis we are not so much focused on every form and structure in a text, as on those which stand out in it. Such conspicuous elements hold a promise of stylistic relevance and thereby rouse the reader’s interest or emotions. In stylistics this psychological effect is called foregrounding” (p. 6).

Jeffries & McIntyre (2010) states: “Essentially, foregrounding theory suggests that in any text some sounds, words, phrases and/or clauses may be so different from what surrounds them, or from some perceived ‘norm’ in the language generally, that they are set into relief by this difference and more prominent as a result. […………..] Poetry is the genre that most clearly exemplifies this feature” (p. 31).

Van Peer (1986) informs the reader that “in the case of a deviation a writer makes a choice outside a range of choices permitted by the language system, while in the case of parallelism the writer repeatedly makes the same selection. These are opposite processes, complementing each other.

Widdowson (1975) accounts for the fact that literary texts are intelligible despite containing so many deviant forms by saying, “linguistic deviations do not occur randomly in a literary work but pattern in with other linguistic features, both regular and irregular to form a whole. They are understood, therefore, not in isolation with reference only to the linguistic system, or code, but also with reference to the context in which they appear” (p. 27).

According to Bradford (1997), “the most basic and enduring definition of poetry is that the poem, unlike any other assembly of words, supplements the use of grammar and syntax with another system of organization: the poetic line”. It explains that “the poetic line draws upon the same linguistic raw materials as the sentence but deploys and uses this in a different way” (p. 15).

Widdowson (1992) asserts that poetry “outlives and transcends the occasion of its composition, and transfers its significance in some way to strangers in another time and place” (p. 4). Then, it explains that poetry “is expressive of some elusive reality outside the confines of what is conventional [………………and for expressing such an unconventional reality,] we need to mould ordinary language and logic into a different shape. We need to disrupt conventional patterns of thought and expression and reformulate them into patterns which follow different principles of order” (p. 5).

Widdowson (1975) says, “The language [of a poem] is organized into a pattern of recurring sounds, structures and meanings which are not determined by the phonology, syntax or semantics of the language code which provides it with its basic resources” (p. 36).

Verdonk (2002) ascribes the following features to the language of poetry: “Its meaning is often ambiguous and elusive; it may flout the conventional rules of grammar; it has a peculiar sound structure; it is spatially arranged in metrical lines and stanzas; it often reveals foregrounded patterns in its sounds, vocabulary, grammar, or syntax, and last but not the least it frequently contains indirect references to other texts” (p. 6).

Freeborn (1996) mentions: “Verse has been called a heightened form of
ordinary language, in the sense that it does nothing that is not done in ordinary language, but what it does is foregrounded and focused on for its own sake. So, natural rhythms are made more regular, and ‘sound effects’ like alliteration, assonance and rhyme, which occur in ordinary language but usually in a random way, are made a deliberate part of the sound pattern” (p. 152).

Wolosky (2001) defines poetry with respect to the language it generally employs as follows: “Poetry is language in which every component element—word and word order, sound and pause, image and echo—is significant, significant in that every element points toward or stands for further relationships among and beyond themselves. Poetry is language that means more. Its elements are figures, and poetry itself is a language of figures, in which each component can potentially open toward new meaning, levels, dimensions, connections, or resonances.[………….] No word is idle or accidental” (p. 3).

Simpson (1997) says, “[provided that stylistics] examines literary discourse against the totality of discourse, stylistics is essentially a comparative method of study. The assumption behind this is that a better understanding of literary communication can be reached only if it is viewed as contiguous with other discourses. It is pointless therefore to focus on literature in a restricted ‘cellular’ fashion whereby it is cut adrift from other contexts of language” (p. 7).

Widdowson (1975) expresses the relation between the literary and the non-literary uses of language in the following words: “The manner in which the resources of the language system are used in the fashioning of unique literary messages can be compared with other uses of the language so as to make clear by contrast how the system is used in conventional forms of communication.

At the same time, of course a comparison with other kinds of discourse will reveal what it is that is peculiar to literary uses of English” (p. 80).

Sinclair (2004, p. 51) has made the following assertion, as cited in Jeffries & McIntyre (2010, p. 3): “No systematic apparatus can claim to describe a language if it does not embrace the literature also; and not as a freakish development, but as a natural specialization of categories which are required in other parts of the descriptive system”.

METHOD

The findings are both qualitative and quantitative owing to the nature of the study. Techniques used for the analysis of the data are simply derived from the fundamental principles of General Linguistics as outlined in Yule (1985). And, a relatively higher interpretive value for the deviant parts of the text has been assumed during the analysis. Well-acclaimed dictionaries like Advance Oxford Dictionary (revised edn.7) and Chambers Essential English Dictionary (1995) have been used to assign semantic features and lexical roles to words. Unusual collocations have been specified by presenting the lexical string containing them in the shape of Cloze Procedure text as suggested in Simpson (1997, PP. 84-85).

The study is descriptive in its nature. This study is intended to show how, at least, a good preliminary understanding of “The Rime of the Ancient Mariner” can develop if a language-oriented bottom-up approach is adopted for its analysis which presupposes a relatively greater interpretive potential for those segments.
of the ballad’s text which stand out in the linguistic foreground, by the virtue of being deviant, than those segments which lay in the background by conforming to ordinary language usage.

A fine analysis of the style of a literary text can lead to some understanding of its overall content, especially if the analyst carefully directs his moves along the lines laid by the instances of foregrounding in the text. The three major aims during the course of the study were: to show the special interpretive capacity of the elements of the poem which are internally or externally deviant to the poem’s text on the lexical level, to bring out the interpretive potential of the semantically deviant units in the poem’s text, to point out the contribution of the typographical deviations in the encoding of the poem’s unique message.

A method of stylistic analysis eclectically derived from the example stylistic analyses presented in Widdowson (1975) and Simpson (1997) has been adopted as the research tool. Textual data has been collected. Only those parts of the poem’s text served as the data which either violate any absolute or relative selection restriction rule, or depart from the established typographical norms. To put it alternatively, the data collected for this study comprises of lexically, semantically and graphologically deviant linguistic forms.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

An understanding of the title ought to be developed as precursory to the understanding of the whole poem because the title sets the frame or conceptual confines for the interpretation of the poem which it tags. The title of the chosen poem contains two noun phrases, the latter of which is embedded in a prepositional phrase, ‘The Rime’ and ‘the Ancient Mariner’. Now, if the latter noun phrase is set for a cloze procedure test by replacing its head noun ‘Mariner’ by an empty slot as follows

The Ancient ………………

then the respondents having an average knowledge of English language are likely to come up with combinations like the following ones:

- The Ancient Times
- The Ancient Civilization
- The Ancient Ruins
- The Ancient City
- The Ancient Hills
- The Ancient Monuments
- The Ancient Pyramids
- The Ancient Greeks
- The Ancient Philosopher

because ‘ancient’ is usually used either for describing non-human entities which belong to or have been existent since the remote past, or for describing human entities which existed in the remote past and have become extinct long ago. However, in the title, it collocates with the word ‘Mariner’ which does not refer to a human entity which existed and died out in the remote past but to a man who is alive in the deictic world of the poem. This unusual collocation conjures up the bizarre image of a man who has outlived many generations. Thus, this instance of lexical deviation charges the character of the Mariner with some element of supernaturalism and prepares the reader to anticipate some supernatural activity in the poem.

The poem was published during the eighteenth century while the head noun ‘Rime’ in the first noun phrase of its title conforms to Middle English orthographic conventions or, to put simply, has an archaic spelling for the Modern English word ‘rhyme’, which is used to refer to a ‘rhymed verse’. This graphological deviation on the
diachronic plane of English, coupled with the use of the attributive adjective ‘ancient’, having the semantic features /+temporal/ and /+remoteness/, in the succeeding noun phrase, defines the chronological climate of the poem and sets its events in the remote past. This might have been done by the poet as a distancing technique to increase the plausibility of the action of the poem for the readers.

The graphological deviation foregrounds the word ‘rime’ so it invites the reader to dig out for an even deeper meaning, or perhaps for a dual meaning. Actually, ‘rime’ if taken as a Modern English word, means ‘hoar frost’. Reconciling the meanings of the two diachronic homonyms conveys the sense of a rhymed verse which contains frequent references to frostiness. So, this is how a single foregrounded word foreshadows the thermal imagery of the poem.

The personal pronouns ‘he’ and ‘she’ are exclusively reserved for third-person gender-specified entities in conventional modes of language. However, in the poem, these pronouns are frequently used to refer to non-human natural entities like the Sun, the Moon and the Storm. The first instance of such unconventional use appears in line 26:

The Sun came up upon the left------- l.25
Out of the sea came he ------------ l.26

This semantic deviation builds an aura of animation or vitality around the natural elements and prepares the reader to watch them, at least, at par with human beings. In line 41, the whole noun phrase ‘storm blast’ appears in upper case:

And, now the STORM-BLAST came, and he ------------------ l.41

If viewed at the textual level, it can be clearly identified as a typographical deviation. However, when viewed at the level of discourse, it becomes an iconic representation of the magnitude and effect of the entity which it refers to. This instance of foregrounding may also leave the impression on the reader’s mind that the storm would have broken as abruptly in the deictic world of the sea voyagers as these block letters show up in the poem’s text. In line 42, the predicative adjectives ‘tyrannous’ and ‘strong’ occur to post-modify ‘the storm-blast’. And, in the two lines which immediately follow line 42, the storm-blast assumes the lexical role of agent for spiteful actions like striking<struck> and chasing<chased> which essentially require their agent to be /+animate/. It is also to be noted here that human beings (the mariners), referred to by the plural objective pronoun ‘us’ in line 44, become the theme for these actions. The lines are stated below for reference:

Was tyrannous and strong: ------------- l.42
He struck with his o’ertaking wings, ----- ---------------- l.43
And chased us south along. ----------- l.44

Now, the three words ‘tyrannous’, ‘struck’ and ‘chased’ do not only share the semantic feature /+animate/, which make these utterances in which they occur semantically odd, but they also have in common two other features: /+might/ and /+ offence/ or /+opposition/. So, the triad of these semantically foregrounded lines suggest that the Nature’s agency – the storm – is not only infused with an animated spirit but is also powerful or mighty enough to show antagonistic tendencies towards man. Thus, this instance of foregrounding induces the element of Nature’s determinism in the poem’s narrative. Nature’s antagonism towards man is reinforced by referring to the storm as a ‘foe’ in line 47.
At the very end of Part I of the poem, the noun ‘albatross’ occurs in bold typeface: I shot the ALBATROSS. --------------------- 1.82

This typographical deviation marks the climax of the poem and suggests that the albatross is the entity around which the plot of the poem revolves.

The poem is saturated with references to natural elements and forces till its very end but, keeping in mind the delimitations of the study, only the few lexically, semantically or graphologically deviant references to nature have been discussed here.

The action ‘hold’ requires its instrument to have the feature /+grip/. However, after releasing the wedding-guest’s hand from the grasp of his own hand, the Mariner held him with his eyes, which obviously refer to a /-grip/ entity. And, the mentioning of the two actions in succession reinforces the idea that his eyes could hold something just as his hands could.

Eftsoons his hand dropt he. ---------1.12
He holds him with his glittering eye-- -- -------------------1.13

This instance of semantic deviation is evocative of the enchanting powers that the Mariner possessed and, thus, it gives him his quasi-supernatural identity.

In line 193, the description of the female member of the grotesque crew is given as:
The Night-mare LIFE-IN-DEATH was she ----------------------1.193

A tension is created between the words ‘life’ and ‘death’ in the name of the woman typed in block letters by the insertion of two hyphens on both sides of a linking preposition. This graphical tension suggests whom the weird lady wrecks will be caught up in the tension between life and death. In other words, the person whom the lady victimizes would be set in suspense from life and death, both. The word ‘nightmare’ in this line is hyphenated. The splitting of the word prepares the ground for some inter-textual reference. The Mare is a female evil supernatural character in the Germanic folklore that sets out at night for all sorts of malicious deeds. So, the word Night-mare, owing to its graphological deviation, is capable of conveying dual meaning. The first and the more obvious meaning is that the lady’s appearance was nightmarish whereas the second possible meaning is that she was malevolent and supernatural like the Mare in Germanic folklores.

If the pair of line 55 and line 56 is adapted for a cloze procedure test as follows:
And through the drifts the snowy cliffs ---------------------------55
Did send a ………… sheen       ---------------56
then the respondents are likely to supply words like ‘silver’, ‘pearl-white’, ‘glassy’, ‘smooth’ and ‘fine’ as the collocates for ‘sheen’ because the word ‘sheen’ has /+brightness/ as its major semantic component and all these attributive words refer to a state of visual brightness or smoothness so they would accentuate its meaning. But, surprisingly, in the poem’s text, ‘dismal’, which has /-brightness/ as one of its semantic components, collocates with ‘sheen’ as recorded below:
And through the drifts the snowy cliffs ---------------------------1.55
Did send a dismal sheen ------------------------1.56

Their lexical relation seems odd because the two are usually expected to occur as antonyms, not as collocates. However, the apparent lexical deviation in this combination disappears as soon as the reader realizes that ‘dismal’ is not
used here to refer to a dull visual state but to a dull emotional state. This realization can come about by bringing to mind the deictic world of the weatherstricken sea-voyagers. Naturally, in such a world, the sheen of snow or ice is likely to cause a dull mood despite its bright visual impact.

In line 161, an interesting example of wordplay appears. The line is as follows: And cried, A sail! A sail!  

The brief lexical string ‘a sail’ becomes foregrounded by being tied up in the lexical relation of homophony with the word ‘assail’. For the mariners, the sight of a sail has the connotation of rescue but a sail’s homophone ‘assail’ has the denotation of ‘attack’. This foreshadows that the things may not turn up to the mariners’ expectations, and whom they are anticipating as their rescuers might turn out to be the exact opposite—the assailants.

A prominent element of supernaturalism gets added to the poem when dead men become the agent for actions like groaning, stirring and rising up, all of which can only take /+living/ noun phrases as their agents.

The dead men gave a groan.  

They groaned, they stirred, they all uprose, 

Table 1: Tabular representation of the findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Deviant Form/Description of Deviant Form</th>
<th>Linguistic Level</th>
<th>Textual Location</th>
<th>Effect / Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>The Ancient Mariner</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>projecting the narrator and principal character as somewhat outlandish or weird; setting the remote past as the chronological climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Rime</td>
<td>graphological</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>setting the action of the poem in the Middle Ages; foreshadowing the prevalence of the frost in the poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>use of (s)he to refer to non-human natural entities</td>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>l.25, l.26, l.41, l.43 and many succeeding lines</td>
<td>infusing the Nature with vitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>the STORM-BLAST</td>
<td>graphological</td>
<td>l.141</td>
<td>iconic representation of the referent of the word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>The storm-blast takes a negative human attribute — ‘tyrannous’.</td>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>l.142</td>
<td>endowing the natural agency with an animated power; establishing Nature’s agency as an antagonist to man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>the storm-blast as the agent of oppressive or oppositional actions, taking human entities as the theme</td>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>l.143, l.144</td>
<td>depicting Nature’s activity as highly dynamic and harmful to man’s state of being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>the ALBATROSS</td>
<td>graphological</td>
<td>l.182</td>
<td>marking a climatic point in the plot; giving an iconic representation of the significant status of the bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>He holds him with his glittering eye</td>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>l.13</td>
<td>an illustration of the Mariner’s enchanted powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>LIFE-in-DEATH</td>
<td>typographical</td>
<td>l.193</td>
<td>The name bears a resonance of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION
The analysis made through this study may resemble greatly in its contents with other analyses available readily online or in the shape of student handouts or guidebooks but the approach that it takes is unfortunately not very common in the sphere of pedagogy or elsewhere as yet. The purpose of the analysis was to show how subjective judgments or individual opinions about literary works can be brought to a common objective testing ground from where everyone can trace them and access them.

It is proposed here that the stylistics tool of interpretation may be given preference over ‘ready-made’ exegeses of and commentaries on literary compositions because it is equally handy to use but far-more beneficial than them.
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A guy walks into a bar with his pet monkey. He orders a drink and while he's drinking, the monkey jumps all around the place. The monkey grabs some olives off the bar and eats them. Then grabs some sliced limes and eats them. Then jumps onto the pool table, grabs one of the billiard balls, sticks it in his mouth, and to everyone's amazement, somehow swallows it whole. The bartender screams at the guy "Did you see what your monkey just did?". The guy says "No, what?" "He just ate the cue ball off my pool table-whole!". "Yeah, that doesn't surprise me," replied the guy. "He eats everything in sight, the little bastard. Sorry. I'll pay for the cue ball and stuff." He finishes his drink, pays his bill, pays for the stuff the monkey ate, then leaves. Two weeks later he's in the bar again, and has his monkey with him. He orders a drink and the monkey starts running around the bar again. While the man is finishing his drink, the monkey finds a maraschino cherry on the bar. He grabs it, sticks it up his butt, pulls it out, and eats it. The bartender is disgusted. "Did you see what your monkey did now?" he asks. "No, what?" replies the guy. "Well, he stuck a maraschino cherry up his butt, pulled it out, and ate it!" said the bartender. "Yeah, that doesn't surprise me," replied the guy. "He still eats everything in sight, but ever since he swallowed that cue ball, he measures everything first..." (Source: http://www.study-express.ru/humour/funny-stories.shtml, picture: www.google.co.id)