



A Lingo-Literary Stylistic Analysis of ‘The Shepherd’s Psalm’

Abolaji S. Mustapha

Dept of English, Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos State, Nigeria

Email: abolajimustapha@hotmail.com

Article History

Received: May 8, 2020

Revised: May 30, 2020

Accepted: June 7, 2020

Published: June 9, 2020

Abstract

The recent interdisciplinary approach to stylistics has fostered the emergence of educational stylistics, discourse stylistics, cognitive stylistics, socio-pragmatic stylistics, socio-stylistics among others. Notwithstanding this development, some stylisticians still maintain the great divide between linguistic and literary stylistics preferring the latter to the former thereby suggesting that stylistics thrives more with literary than with non-literary works and that linguistic stylistics has little to contribute towards unpacking meanings in texts. Here, I scrutinize these claims by using both linguistic and literary approaches (eclectic) to analysis ‘the Shepherd’s Psalm’. My preliminary findings suggest that both linguistic and literary approaches to analyses are not only capable of doing robust stylistic analysis of literary texts but they also provide rigorous and insightful results that support the interface between linguistics and literature and their complementary analytical read for both linguists and literary scholars.

Keywords: Stylistics; Linguistic; Literary; Approaches; Shepherd’s psalm; Interdisciplinary; Poem; Analysis; Interdisciplinary.

1. Introduction

Stylistics, it might be argued, is an offshoot of applied linguistics, a position many linguists would subscribe to especially those in applied linguistics. However, that position may not enjoy a large following among literary scholars who might use both the historical beginnings and the larger population of literary stylistics scholars in the field of stylistics to argue that stylistics domiciles in literary studies. In fact, literary scholars and their students would be more comfortable to refer to stylistics as a child of literary studies than to accommodate what linguists do in the name of stylistics as part of core-stylistics. Literary stylisticians are sometimes not at home with the claims and works of linguistic stylsticians judging from their view that the latter have no business in stylistic analysis. In fact, linguistic stylsticians’ analyses are often termed linguistic analysis rather than stylistic analysis.

It appears these arguments have metamorphosed to the polarity between linguistic stylistics and literary stylistics as if both schools of thought have no common ground or borrowings from each other. For example, a scholar who once asked whether stylistics can provide a good read for both literary scholars (critics) and linguists suggestively heightened the division between what linguistic and literary stylsticians do. Acknowledging this division [Diller \(1998\)](#) notes the division between linguistics and literary studies that reflects current practice thus “most people would probably distinguish between literary and linguistic stylistics”. The questions that these claims and arguments raise are (i) whether linguistic stylistics and literary stylistics have anything in common; (ii) whether they can benefit from each other and (iii) whether both linguistic stylistic approach and literary stylistic approach can be used to do rigorous and insightful stylistic analysis of a literary text. Thus in this paper, I attempted to find answers to these questions and very importantly if their different analytical tools are complementary in deciphering how texts mean, which is the essential preoccupation of stylistics.

To answer these questions, I analyzed a literary text using both linguistic stylistic and literary stylistic tools in order to determine whether (i) linguistic tools are as useful as literary approach to doing stylistic analysis; (ii) the dichotomy between what linguistic stylsticians do and the workings of literary stylsticians is artificial and uncalled for; and (ii) blending the two approaches yields rigorous and rich analysis that would provide a good read for both literary stylsticians and linguists (interface between linguistics and literary studies).

2. Background

The developments in stylistic studies, especially the varied approaches (see Anonymous, 1999) to doing stylistic analysis has, on the one hand, commended its budding status but, on the other hand, demarcated practitioners into two groups. This division has given birth to what some would term linguistic stylistics and literary stylistics. This distinction has often led some scholars to assume that linguistic stylistics should be concerned with (only) non-literary texts while literary stylistics should address itself to literary texts. Thus in some institutions (e.g. in some Nigerian universities and departments of English and/ or literary studies in English, two separate courses are on offer for their students – Language and Style (for linguistic approach to analyzing non-literary texts such as the language of the law, advertisement, religion, the media, among others) and Stylistics (for literary stylistics) which takes care of literary texts – prose, poetry and drama.

In spite of this division, I argue, in this paper, that both literary and non-literary texts contain style that are realized via the use of literal and literary language although literary texts are rife with literary devices. In other words, both literary (figurative use of language) and non-literary texts contain style depending on our definition of style see [Mustapha \(1999\)](#). The style in non-literary texts that is rather termed ‘register’ going by their provinces, or ‘appropriateness’ in language use is captured in literary texts as figurative language and/or literary devices. In light of this position, it might be hasty to conclude that because of the copious use of figurative language and/or literary devices in literary texts, style can only be found in literary texts which should be the preoccupation of literary scholars or core stylisticians.

Similarly, it might be unhealthy in stylistics to see language and style (an undertaking that concentrates on non-literary texts) as a periphery stylistic investigation which lists out the linguistic characteristics of texts in the various provinces, on the one hand, and on the other hand, consider stylistics as a core literary course that should address style in literary works. The dichotomy between Language and Style and Stylistics as two separate courses might be considered as a convenient and tidy way of teaching stylistics in a department of English that houses both language and literary studies unlike in some departments of English where literary studies take the centre stage. However, it might be more appropriate to use similar terms for the two courses, such as Stylistics I and Stylistics II or merge them as one course that will take care of both literary and non-literary texts in its analysis.

It must be acknowledged, however, that the dichotomy between linguistic and literary stylistics might have been informed by the account of the beginnings of stylistics in some quarters (see [Kamalu, 2015](#)). According to [Kamalu \(2015\)](#), the two main groups – the formalists and the new critics that dominated stylistics in its infancy “aimed at defining literature as a discourse and an art form and tried to establish its function as something that can be properly studied: they wanted to make the study of literature more scientific” (Bradford, 1977:12 cited in [Kamalu \(2015\)](#)). It is not surprising that Kamalu, a stylistician says, “*Properly put* (emphasis mine), stylistics is the study of the language of literature” citing other works that corroborate this position ([Norgaard et al., 2010](#); [Syal and Jindal, 2011](#); [Toolan, 1996](#)).

However, [Kamalu \(2015\)](#), within the same paper says “stylistics is concerned with the ways meaning is created through language of literature and in other non-fictional texts” thereby acknowledging the place of non-literary texts in stylistics. From these definitions, it appears some stylisticians give literature the primary place to or endorses the claim that stylistics is a literary discipline that considers texts outside literature as add-on ventures in the discipline. This position places linguistic stylistics at the periphery and subsequently underrates the usefulness of its linguistic tools in doing stylistic analysis.

It might be arguably observed that the above perspective is alien to the earliest practitioners of stylistics (the Russian and Central European formalists and American and British scholars) who according to Kamalu, “...based their analyses purely on the linguistic features of the text such as its phonology, lexis, grammar and structural forms like parallelism and linguistic deviation” (Noggard et al, 2010:02 cited in [Kamalu \(2015\)](#)). In other words, to turn the table around by displacing linguistic approach might be the workings of some recent scholars who are uncomfortable with the significant place that linguistic tools occupied then and still occupy in contemporary stylistics.

To sum up this section, it appears that the dichotomy between linguistic stylistics and literary stylistics might be artificial and uncalled for. In fact, the subordinate place of linguistic stylistics with its significant linguistic tools to the literary stylistics and its approaches might be unhealthy for studies in stylistics. The position of this paper is that both linguistic and literary tools are capable complementary methods that are indispensable in rigorous and robust stylistic analysis. This view does not connote that scholars must use both analytic tools if their works would be adjudged truly stylistic since it is possible to have a stylistic analysis using either linguistic or literary tools, although it might be more profiting and insightful to combine both approaches in unpacking how texts mean. This is the approach I have termed lingo-literary approach to doing stylistic analysis. In what follows, I shall attempt to test out the applicability of this lingo-literary stylistic analysis on a literary text, a poem, titled ‘the Shepherd’s Psalm’.

3. Data

The Twenty-third Psalm of the Holy Bible which has been described as the Shepherd’s Psalm has been chosen for this analysis. It is a literary text – a poem that has been translated from its original form in Hebrew to the English language. I have chosen the Jerusalem Version because of its contemporary syntax that most modern readers might find more accessible than, for example, the King James Version. In addition, it is close to the primary audience of the poem, the Jewish people, and their geographical space, culture, and religion belief. A comparison of the two versions, the Jerusalem and the King James justifies our choice of the former. The latter is rife with Old (Elizabethan) English words that contemporary readers might find very odd (e.g. words such as *maketh*, *leadeth*, *restoreth*, thou among others).

3.1. The Shepherd’s Psalm

THE LORD is my shepherd; I shall not want/He maketh me to lie down in green pastures/He leadeth me beside the still waters/He restoreth my soul/He led me in the paths of righteousness for His name’s sake/Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death/I will fear no evils: for Thou art with me/Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me/Thou prepares a table before me in the presence of my enemies/Thou anoinest my head with oil; my cup runneth over/Surely, goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life/And I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever. (*Authorized King James Version*)

3.2. The Shepherd's Psalm

Yahweh is my shepherd, I lack nothing/In meadows of green grass, He lets me lie/To the waters of repose He leads me/There He revives my soul/He guides me by paths of virtue for the sake of His name/Though I pass through a gloomy valley, I fear no harm/Beside me, Your rod and Your staff are there to hearten me/You prepare a table before under the eyes of my enemies/You anoint my head with oil, my cup brims over/Ah, how goodness and kindness pursues me every day of my life/My home, the house of Yahweh, as long as I live!(*The Jerusalem Version*).

4. Method

In analyzing the text, I used both linguistic (linguistic stylistics) and literary tools (literary stylistics). At the linguistic level, I attempted graphological, lexical and syntactic analysis. It must be noted that this is not just a linguistic analysis that “merely identifies and describes and perhaps labels linguistic units within a text, bringing out (or drawing attention to) ‘variants and deviations which falls within the mainstream of grammar as grammar is often taken to mean “...in a wide sense all formal analysis of language in an attempt to arrive at the general pattern or scheme found in the sound and words of language and their arrangement which has been a central concern of linguistics”’ ... (Anonymous, 1993). The limitation of linguistic analysis lies in failing to draw attention to the communicative functions (how texts mean) the latter which is the concern of linguistic/literary stylistic analysis.

I also used literary stylistic analysis that dwells on the use of foregrounding and metaphors because of space as there are other literary tools such as deviation, imagery among others. According to Anonymous (1993) the literary stylistician might be one who is neither a competent linguist (at least, not willing to be one) nor a full-blown literary scholar since to them not all aspects of linguistics bear directly on literary studies and not all areas of literary studies (practical criticism, literary criticism among others) bear on literary stylistics. It might be observed that literary stylistic analysis is not what literary critic does because what matters to the latter, Chapman (1982) says, is to be able to describe accurately and precisely what is happening in the text... the only demand on the critic is that his/her reading shall be truly derived from the text and his/her interpretation be referable to it ... (although they are not to be afraid of subjective and personal response to literature)”. However, my literary stylistic analysis here of this work dwells more on the use of metaphor, which is rooted in cognitive stylistics. According to Simpson (2004) an important feature of cognitive stylistics has been its interest in the way, we transfer mental constructs, and especially in the way we map mental representation unto another when we read texts.

The application of cognitive psychology tends to focus on the process of reading rather than writing thereby “cognitive stylisticians have addressed precisely this problem arguing that literature is perhaps conceptualized as a way of reading than as a way of writing”. In other words, readers may have different interpretation of a piece of literary work (Simpson, 2004). This “orientation accounts for the stores of knowledge which readers bring into play when they read, and how these knowledge stores are modified or enriched as reading progresses” (Simpson, 2004). Consequently, readers are not passive consumers neither are they solely reliant on the writer's use of language and devices but they bring to bear on the text their stored knowledge in order to decode the text or make meaning. This suggests that readers may have different or additional meaning to what the writer of the text has written.

5. Linguistic Stylistic Analysis

At the graphological level of analysis, the poet couches names and pronouns referring to the Deity using initial capital letters, especially the first letter even when the first letter of the word or word does not begin the sentence. For example, YAHWEH, a Hebrew word for God, begins with a capital letter. This feature is characteristic of the language of religion, where names and pronominal referring to the deity are couched in special letter. It suggests a deliberate choice of letters or word to index reverence.

The choice of lexical items (religious words) also suggests a deliberate effort not only to mark off the poem as a religious text but, in addition, to convey that religious air to the faithful in the religion – the language of inner members. Thus the choice of words such as *repose*, *revives*, *soul*, *virtue*, *hearten*, *anoint*, *goodness*, *kindness* among others the vocabulary in the religion of the first audience of the text.

To convey the sense of shepherd-sheep relationship which the poet does not want its reader to miss, the poem is loaded with terms (words and phrases) that are commonplace to the field - shepherding. Such words as shepherd, meadow of green grass, the waters of repose, leads, guides, pass through a gloomy valley, your rod and staff, anoint with oil. In addition, to convey the message of care that the poet receives, he lists the shepherd's duties – ‘He lets me lie’, ‘He leads me’ ‘He revives my soul’ ‘He anoints’, ‘You prepare a table...’ and the abiding presence of the shepherd he alludes to when he says “Though I pass through a gloomy valley, I fear no harm...” to convey the kind of pastoral care.

These terms guide the reader to capture the sense of shepherd's care for the sheep which is comparable to what the faithful enjoy as the sheep of the Great Shepherd – Yahweh. It is noted that these words are essentially concrete words which appeal to readers' senses of touch (‘let’ ‘guides’ ‘rod’ ‘staff’, sight (‘table’ ‘before me’ my cups brims over, live), feeling (hearten, revive, fear).

Consider the use of ‘path’ which suggests an unpopular way of life to capture the unpleasant places the sheep sometimes go through. In addition, the picturesque language exploited to capture the journey through such path ‘a gloomy valley’ while the chastening roles of the shepherd is given the physical sense through the use of ‘rod and ...staff’ which are paradoxical as they are the sources of heartening or comfort. Similarly, vivid pictures are painted through the use of expressions such as the ‘shepherd prepares a table before me’ ‘you anoint my head with oil’, ‘my

cup brims over' and as if in a race, the poet captures 'goodness and kindness pursue me' as the poet runs through daily life.

The choice of the above concrete words, phrases and expressions might be deliberate in order to reduce abstraction and to make up for the gap between the written text and its readers. This device is further pursued as the poet conveys the sheep's sense (or the poet's sense of satisfaction and safety), which he uses phrases and clauses such as 'I lack nothing', 'there He revives my soul', 'I fear no harm' 'to hearten me'; 'my cup brims over'.

The poet does not fail to capture his experiences with the shepherd as a personal and intimate one. This is evident in the poem which is rife with possessive and objective case pronouns 'my shepherd' 'lets me' 'leads me' 'revives my soul' 'guides me' 'beside me' 'hearten me' 'before me' 'my enemies' 'my cup' 'my life' 'my home'.

It appears that the choice of verbs in the poem is calculated to convey a sense of currency that expresses general truth (timeless truth) such as 'the sun rises in the east' which is couched in the present habitual action. It has been argued elsewhere that English verbs (tenses) do not adequately specify time especially the present. In fact, for the simple present, [Leech and Svartvik \(1973\)](#) identify eight main ways of referring to something which occurs at the present moment – present state, present event, present habit, temporary present, temporary habits. Thus the poet conveys present experiences, his present state and present habit of his shepherd. Thus the poet says 'he lets me' 'he revives' 'he guides' 'You prepare' 'You anoint' 'Yahweh is my shepherd'.

This is further corroborated by the poet's use of declarative sentences which essentially establishes statement of facts. Thus the poet conveys his personal experience using basically declarative sentences. For example, /Yahweh is my shepherd; I lack nothing/ /He guides me by paths of virtue for the sake of His name/. Thus declarative sentences dominate the poem aside from the last sentence though declarative is rather more of commitment of the sheep 'my home, the house of Yahweh as long as I live'.

6. Literary Stylistic Analysis

At this level, I used two literary stylistic tools – foregrounding and metaphor to analyze the poem. Foregrounding, whether achieved via deviation or other linguistic phenomena has a way of triggering psychological effect on readers thereby making it "especially noticeable, or perceptually prominent". According to [Short \(1996\)](#) the term foregrounding is borrowed from art criticism where art critics usually distinguish the foreground of a painting from its background. The foreground is that part of painting which is in the centre and towards the bottom of the canvas. Simpson defines foregrounding as a form of textual patterning which is motivated specifically for literary aesthetic purposes.

Traditionally, foregrounding works through deviation, repletion or parallelism, however, going by Short's argumentation, there are other linguistic phenomena that can be used to foreground or bring to the fore the message of work of art. Thus [Short \(1996\)](#) noted whether the foregrounded pattern deviates from a norm, or whether it replicates a pattern through parallelism, the point of foregrounding as stylistic strategy is that it should acquire salience in the act of drawing attention to itself. Furthermore, this salience is motivated purely by literary considerations and as such constitutes an important textual strategy for the development of images, themes and characters, and for stimulating both effect and affect in a text's interpretation. The place of foregrounded part of a poem in stylistic analysis has been stressed by [Short \(1996\)](#) thus the matter in the foreground is more important than the rest. It is often said of poetry that even if you change something as small as a comma you can change the meaning of the poem as a whole. But even so, some elements remain more important than others, and the foregrounded is most important of all.

The first two lines of the poem "Yahweh is my shepherd, /I lack nothing" foreground the thematic preoccupation of the poem the compound sentence does not only announce the theme of the poem but also triggers the affect of the reader and betrays a psychological effect. By attributing the human vocation of shepherding to the Invisible Yahweh, the poet shocks the reader further by taking on the role of sheep – human. The effect thus created is that of a sheep who is entirely dependent on the role of its shepherd (YAHWEH) for its existence and pleasure.

The Compound sentence "I lack nothing" sums up the experience of satisfaction of the poet for being a sheep of Yahweh. In order to make bold his claim, /Yahweh is my shepherd/the poet confesses his exodus from the 'land' of lack (note all the sentences are in the present) and the use of this kind of sentence pattern foregrounds the intent to foreground his continual experience with the shepherd. By placing this sentence first, attributing humanistic (anthropological instruments) to the Invisible One and giving the animalistic quality to human, the poet announces the theme of the poem and thereafter itemizes the provisions he enjoys for making Yahweh his shepherd in the other parts of the poem - provision for his body, soul, spirit and mind. The sheep is led in the path of virtue that leads to light and life. His shepherd is there as a stronger companion in life-threatening and dangerous paths with His rod and staff to 'hearten me'. Under the watching eyes of foes, his Shepherd furnishes a table for him and anoints his head. With these adequate provision, he sums up by claiming that the appointed pursuers that the shepherd has secured for him are "goodness and kindness (that) pursue me" and thus his vows or commitments at last for having such a caring Shepherd is– "my home, the house of Yahweh/As long as I live/.

The other literary tool that is stylistically significant in the poem is the use of metaphor which in no small way helps the reader access the meaning of the text. It must be noted that metaphor does not only reduce abstraction to concrete terms but it is also a powerful means readers use to access meaning in literary works. Thus metaphor in this case serves dual role of concretizing abstract terms and making the meaning of texts accessible (using what is familiar) to the readership.

I have used two ways to explore the use of metaphor in the text. The first way is to identify the types of metaphor used in the poem following the pattern of some stylisticians. In this case, I identified three kinds of

metaphor – humanistic, concrete and animistic (see Anonymous (1993)). Using a functional systematic mode of analysis, we shall identify the tenor, vehicle and ground of the metaphors used (see Table 1 for the types of metaphor identified in the text)

Table-1. Metaphorical elements in the Shepherd’s Psalm

Type	Tenor	Vehicle	Ground
Humanistic	“Yahweh”	shepherd	care
Concrete	feeding place	in the meadow of green grass	care
Concrete	resting place	lie	retire/repose
Concrete	peace	waters of repose	calmness and tranquility
Humanistic	go before	leads	direction
Concrete	righteous living	paths of virtue	narrow and unpopular
Concrete	go through	pass	transitory
Concrete/animistic	difficulties	gloomy valley	unpleasant
Concrete	chastisement	rod and staff	corrective
Concrete/humanistic	set	prepare	available
Concrete	provision	table	provision
Concrete	in the presence	under the watching eyes	environment
Concrete	pour	anoint	shower
Concrete	abundance	brims over	overflowing
Animistic	overtakes	pursues	following
Concrete	abiding	my home, the house of Yahweh	commitment/settlement

Table 1 shows how Yahweh (The Invisible One) is concretized as human in the field of shepherding. By giving Him the human quality or the role of a shepherd, the reader is given the picturesque image of a human activity while the poet is given the animistic quality of the sheep. These metaphors aid the reader to access the thematic preoccupation of the poet and the characters in the text, especially the poet-personal. In this case, as shepherds care for their sheep, so the vehicle (shepherd) captures the ground of ‘care’ which the reader gets from this use of metaphor. To capture the place of feeding, that is, the tenor, the vehicle “in meadow of green grass” is used to give the ground of where calmness and tranquility is evoked in the reader’s mind: *greenness* typifies freshness. Animistic and concrete metaphor is used to concretize the tenor of chastisement that the sheep gets from the shepherd and the vehicle here is ‘rod and staff’ that brings the image of corrective instruments (the ground).

To access the role of the shepherd, the imagery of a shepherd ‘let(ing) and the lead(ing) the sheep, prepar(ing) a table and anoint(ing) my (the) head the sheep is evoked using humanistic and concrete metaphors that suggest directing, furnishing, showering, respectively. To access the pleasures and benefits that the poet-persona enjoys, concrete metaphor is employed to capture the vehicle of ‘waters of repose’ that provides the ground (calmness and tranquility); the difficulties (tenor) of ‘gloomy valley’ that evokes unpleasantness is lessened just as the chastisement that the shepherd gives is given through the vehicle of ‘rod and staff’ for correction.

With the copious use of concrete metaphors, I find that the ground of furnishing a table, showering blessing overflows with the vehicles such as ‘a table’, ‘anoint’ and ‘brims over’ respectively. The use of this metaphor is so rife and effective that what would have appeared as farfetched ideas (abstraction) are brought nearer home to the reader. For example, consider how the tenor of presence is reduced to a concrete expression such as “under the eyes of my enemies” which gives a vivid environment or surrounding where the sheep feeds on the fields that are normally inhabited by carnivorous animals. Thus readers have access to many concrete metaphors - more humanistic and animistic metaphors that they are familiar with to access the meaning of the text.

In this section of the analysis, I explore the other way of exploring the use of metaphor in texts within cognitive stylistics. As a contemporary mode of stylistic analysis, cognitive stylistics like other new ways of doing stylistic analysis has been drawing from various disciplines such as philosophy, critical theory, psychology, and many others. The input from cognitive psychology (cognitive scientists and psychologist) gave birth to cognitive stylistics that has snowballed into many models – schemata, mind style and the others. According to (Simpson, 2004:41) a metaphor is a process of mapping between two different conceptual domains – the target domain and the source domain... where the target domain is the topic or concept that you want to describe through the metaphor while the source domain refers to the concept that you draw upon in order to create the metaphorical construction. Using this framework, I analyzed the poem in what follows.

The poet uses the metaphor of a shepherd and his/her sheep as the source domain to convey the target domain of the role that a shepherd plays in the life of the sheep. In fact, it appears that from the beginning to the end of the text, the Psalmist uses the metaphor to relate his experiences as God’s sheep. In other words, from his account in the poem, I see the role of God-shepherd and the benefits of the poet-persona–sheep.

Using the source domain, he maps a human shepherd and their sheep with a Supernatural (God) Shepherd that he calls, ‘the LORD/Yahweh and His sheep his target domain. As a shepherd boy, David, the poet might have been acquainted with shepherding, a popular vocation among the Jewish people of his days or those from the Far East. Although, it might be argued that the language of the Bible especially the parts describing the activities of God in

human language and experiences is rife in the Holy Writ, it is difficult to overlook how the Psalmist (or has been inspired) uses cognitive metaphor to recount his experiences with God using source domain and target domain.

A typical shepherd takes and leads his sheep to places where there is pasture (green plant) and the sheep follow him... It is not uncommon for shepherds to lead their sheep where there is 'still water' that will satisfy their sheep in the name of caring for them. This caring quality in shepherds for their sheep extends toward anointing the ailing sheep with oil although they (the shepherd) would sometimes engage the rod on straying or rebellious sheep. This caring role of the shepherd as caring as he is is what the Psalmist draws largely from in order to convey the role of God-shepherd as the target domain.

In this part of the analysis, we explore how David metaphorically constructs himself as the sheep of the Lord who is well catered for due to the role of His shepherd. Using the care of animal - sheep receive from their shepherd as the source domain, he enjoins the reader to see with Him that the Lord, (his shepherd) is good to him as his target domain. He elaborates on this care that he foregrounds in /I lack nothing/. Recounting his benefits, he talks of 'green pastures', 'waters of repose' and revival of his soul when fainting, "... fears no harm when passing through the gloomy valley" (unpleasant life experiences) because of the abiding presence of His shepherd.

His head does not lack oil and his cup runs over. At the height of his satisfactions he exults His shepherd's care thus: Ah, goodness and kindness pursue me every day of my life" and having no better place to be than the abode of His shepherd "...my home, the house of Yahweh as long as I live" he vows.

From the above analysis, it appears that in the Psalmist mind's style, there are profound correspondences between play towards their sheep and the role God plays towards his human sheep. Similarly, the unparalleled all-round benefits that accrue to animal sheep under the care of true shepherds are similar to those that human sheep enjoy under the care of God.

7. Discussion

The use of two approaches – linguistic approach (which might be termed *writerly* approach – relying heavily on the use of language), and the literary approach from cognitive stylistics framework, (which might be termed *readerly* approach - how readers access meanings in texts) appears complementary as our analysis demonstrates. One method of stylistic analysis that has been patronized by many stylisticians working within linguistic stylistics is the use of linguistic tools of the writer to unpack or interpret text. The acceptance that this *writerly* method enjoys might have given the impressions that it might be a more veritable tool in stylistic analysis than literary approach.

Stressing the role linguistics plays in stylistic analysis, (Diller, 1998) claims that linguistics seems more central to literary stylistics than literature is to linguistic stylistics and that highly revealing stylistic analysis are in fact possible that make minimal reference to literature... while on the other hand, linguistic stylisticians can afford to treat literature minimally or not at all"

However, scholars that have brought into stylistics a new way of analyzing text from the cognition of the reader within the purview of cognitive stylistics – 'readerly' approach has also been enriching the discipline. What my analysis (that uses both linguistic and literary tools) demonstrates is that blending both approaches or applying both tools to unpacking meanings in texts is a fruitful interdisciplinary way of enriching stylistics analysis. It appears to me that rather than display disparity, the two approaches are complementary – one looking at the text from the way the writer has written – writerly and the other from the way readers access meaning from the text – readerly. It must be noted that this is not another use of intertextuality that is often addressed in textlinguistics and discourse analysis but a new way of looking at stylistic analysis. Therefore the dichotomy between linguistic stylistics and literary stylistics is not only artificial but divisive and unhealthy for the growth of stylistics.

In addition, this attempt is also one of the ways that stylistics or stylistic analysis provides a common ground for literary reader and a linguistic observer so that linguists and literary scholars are no longer "antipodes and hostile to each other". Rather this attempt creates an interface between the two groups. In the words of another scholar (Daniel Henkel) "in point of fact, language and literature are deeply intertwined and as such, can embrace and benefit each other in various ways". This is in some way demonstrated in our analysis. In fact, Chika Fred Ononye (in a social media post) holds that every creative nuances of literature can still be explained using linguistic stylistic approaches for the reader of literature to better appreciate the art expanded in the work. To Enam Jafaar, (in a social media post) stylistics is a 'dialogue' between a literary reader and linguistic observer because while it gives due recognition to the significance of text, it also concentrates on the aesthetic purpose of every linguistic device the way it serves a totality (Welleck, 1960).

8. Conclusion

From the foregoing, it might appear that literary tools tend to yield more insightful analysis as useful tools for detailed interpretation of the twenty-third psalm perhaps than linguistic tools. However, the insight in the linguistic analysis of this paper shows that no approach is superior to the other. The cognitive theory, it must be acknowledged lets us, as analysts, into the mind style not just of the text but also of the writer of the psalm or poem. However, this does not suggest that *writerly* (analysis based on the use of language by the writer) approach might be more rigorous than *readerly* (analysis from the reader's perspective) approach within cognitive stylistics although it has been claimed that mind style thrives better in poetry and narratives than in the other genres. It might be helpful to play down on the divide between literature and linguistics in stylistic investigation and forge ahead to foster the interface between them by highlighting their complementary roles thereby creating a multidisciplinary approach to doing stylistic analysis.

References

- Anonymous (1993). *A stylistic analysis of the Twenty-third Psalm of David. An unpublished MA Disstertation*. Dept of English, University of Lagos: Lagos.
- Chapman, R. (1982). *The language of English literature*. Arnold: London.
- Diller, H.-J. (1998). Stylistics: Linguistic and textual. *European Journal of English Studies*, 2(2): 155-74.
- Kamalu, I., 2015. "Stylistics." In *Ikenna, Kamalu , Isaac Tamunobelem (eds.) Issues in the study of language and literature: Theory and Practice*. Ibadan: Kraft Books Limited. pp. 143-68.
- Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1973). *A communicative grammar of English*. Longman: London.
- Mustapha, 1999. "Style and traditional stylistics: Issues and approaches." In *Olorunleke, Ojo, Ladele, Lola (eds) New Perspectives in Linguistics and Literature. Lagos: A Publication of the Department of English, Lagos State University*. pp. 148-57.
- Norgaard, N., Montoro, R. and Busse, B. (2010). *Key terms in stylistics*. Continuum: London.
- Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. Longman: Harlow.
- Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Syal, P. and Jindal, D. V. (2011). *An introduction to linguistics: Language, grammar and semantics*. PHI Learning Private Limited: New Delhi.
- Toolan, M. (1996). *Language in literature: An introduction to stylistics*. Hodder Education: London.
- Welleck, R. (1960). *Style in literature: Closing statement*. In *thomas A. Sebeok (ed.) style in language*. Technology Press and John Willey: Cambridge, MA. 408–18.