

A Stylistic Analysis of a Philippine Essay, “The Will of the River”

Pilar S. Caparas

Western Mindanao State University
Zamboanga City, Philippines
pilarcaparas@gmail.com

Abstract

The continuous study of stylistics has been regarded as significant in identifying the border between language and literature. Hence the study presented a stylistic analysis of Alfredo Q. Gonzales’s essay “The Will of the River.” The lexis-grammar complementary analysis on the personal narrative of the author focused on the vocabulary of the essay and the grammatical structure of the sentence primarily the use of sentence-initial adjuncts that leads to the unraveling of the essay’s general theme of man and nature.

1 Introduction

Understanding the depth and craftsmanship of any literary pieces poses challenges. It requires the analysis of the language to provide an objective interpretation and meaning of the literary text. It demands awareness on how the language works, its functions and components. From this point, understanding stylistics is quintessential.

The essay, “The Will of the River,” by Alfredo Q. Gonzales is the literary text under study. It is a narrative essay about the river, *Bacong*, whose resolute journey towards the sea is likened to the life of a man. The author’s style in writing exemplifies a pattern of structure foregrounded by an unconventional means of opening sentences which are the sentence-initial adjuncts, also called clause-initial adjuncts (Ernst, 2002). Its dominant pattern led to the consideration of the lexicon since adjuncts involve lexical selections as well, its grammatical and semantic functions and other major grammatical components of the text that provided a fertile and challenging ground for stylistic analysis. Significantly, this study hoped to contrib-

ute to the academic enrichment of Philippine Literature as a starting point in appreciating local literary writers and literary style of writing.

The essay seemed to involve a journey, a personal association with the narrator and a strong allusion to the duties and values of man. These initial observations led to the consideration of the chief gesture of stylistics that is to closely examine the ‘linguistic particularities of a text’ that leads to the ‘understanding of the anatomy and functions of the language’ (Toolan, 1998, p. ix). In other words, it is significant to pay attention to the language in the text to gain understanding and meaning of the literary piece because ‘literature is made of language’ (Watson & Zyngier, 2007, p. xii), and stylisticians uphold this principle for several years. This view is emphasized by Wellek and Warren (1977 in Yeibo, 2011) who posit that “language is the material of literature as stone or bronze is of sculpture, paints of picture, or sounds of music” (p. 137).

The paper took an eclectic approach as regards to the theoretical framework. The most important sources are the semantic categories in Biber et al. (1999), the analysis provided in Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Blake (1990). Blake’s conventions of clause elements are: a) subject, it refers to the one that performs the verb; b) predicator, the verb performed by the subject; c) object, the receiver of the action of the verb which could be a person or a thing in the sentence besides the subject; d) complement, refers to the subject; and e) adjunct, refers to anything that does not belong to the first four categories.

Furthermore, Halliday’s (1994) definition of adjuncts corroborates Blake’s when he says that “an adjunct is an element that has not got the potential of being subject. It is typically realized by an adverbial group or a prepositional phrase” (p.

80). Essentially, an adjunct is a grammatical function of adverbial and that adjunct is a realization of adverbial (Quirk et al., 1985).

Biber et al., (1999) classified adverbials by their functions: circumstance adverbials, to add circumstantial information about the proposition in the clause; stance adverbials, to express speaker/writer's stance towards the clause; and linking adverbials, to link the clause to some other unit of discourse.

Circumstance adverbials are the most varied class, as well as the most integrated into the clause structure. They add information about the action or state describe in the clause, answering questions such as 'how, when, where, how much, to 'what extent' and 'why.' (Biber, et al., 1999).

The seven major semantic categories of circumstance adverbials in Biber et al. (1999) are place, time, process, contingency, extent/degree, additive/restriction and recipient. Place circumstance adverbials convey distance, direction, or position. Distance adverbials typically answer the question 'How far', and include both general description of distance and specific measurements. Direction adverbials describe the pathway of an action. Position adverbials occur most often with stative verbs. They also occur with communication and activity verbs.

Time circumstance adverbials used to convey four-time related meanings: position in time, duration, frequency, and temporal relationship between two events or states. Process circumstance adverbials cover a wide range of semantic roles and are a less unified group than place or time adverbials. The most common subcategory of process adverbials is manner which describes the way in which something is done.

Process circumstance adverbials also include the category of means while instrument and agentive adverbials specify the agent of an action and are used with passive construction.

Furthermore, like the category of the process, contingency is a more diverse category than time and place. This category covers circumstance adverbials that show how one event or state is contingent upon another, including cause, reason, purpose, concession, condition, and result. While extent/degree circumstance adverbials function as intensifiers or diminishers, additive adverbials show that a current proposition is being added to a previous one. Finally, recipient adverbials typically

expressed by *for*-phrases express the target of an action.

The second classification of adverbials is stance Adverbials whose primary function in the clause is to provide comment on the content or style of a clause. Their semantic categories include epistemic stance adverbial, attitude adverbial, and style adverbial. The third classification of adverbials is the linking adverbials whose primary function is to state the speaker/ writer's perception of the relationship between two units of discourse. Because they explicitly signal the connections between passages of text, linking adverbials are important devices for creating textual cohesion, alongside coordinators and subordinators. Their semantic categories include enumeration and addition, summation, apposition, result/inference apposition, contrast/ concession, and transition.

Essentially, the syntactic realizations of adverbials are varied ranging from single adverbs and adverb phrases, noun phrases (including single nouns), prepositional phrases, finite clauses, non-finite clause and its subclasses: *ing*-clauses, *ed*-clauses, *to*-infinitive clauses, and verbless clauses (Biber et al., 1999).

Among the realizations of adverbials in the essay, predominant is the prepositional phrase and coordinating conjunctions. According to Quirk et al. (1985), prepositional phrases can perform some syntactic functions such as post modifiers in a noun phrase, adverbials of different kinds, verbs and adjective complements, clause subjects, and semi adjectives. Factually, Zihan's (2014) study highlighted two important arguments in comprehending the differences between linking adverbials and conjunctions. First, linking adverbials mark a meaning relationship at discourse level while conjunctions provide a structural link at clause complex level. Second, when a word form which can be used as a conjunction (e.g. and, so) is used as a discourse marker, it no longer belongs to the grammatical class of conjunction. Instead, it is a clause component which functions as a linking adverbial grammatically.

Applying these categories and concepts to explore the lexical behavior and grammatical components of the language used in the essay, the analysis would like to answer the following questions:

1. What are the occurrences of the initial position adjuncts found in the essay?

2. How do these initial position adjuncts unravel the meaning of the essay?

3. What other grammatical features found in the text that help shed the central theme of the essay?

2 Analysis

2.1 The Physical Structure

The essay consists of 15 paragraphs with 53 sentences and 1,356 words. The highest number of words in a paragraph is 229 which occurred in the last paragraph. It also has the greatest number of sentences, and the lowest number of words is 22 which occurred in the 9th paragraph, the only paragraph which contains only one sentence. The physical structure of the essay is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The Physical Structure of the Essay

Paragraph	Number of Words	Number of Sentences	Number of Initial Position Adjuncts	Number of Initial Position Adjuncts in Series
1	124	5	4	2
2	124	6	7	3
3	66	2	3	1
4	52	4	5	1
5	92	3	5	1
6	33	2	2	1
7	141	3	1	0
8	117	4	0	0
9	22	1	1	0
10	44	2	0	0
11	59	4	1	0
12	122	4	5	2
13	55	3	1	1
14	47	2	3	1
15	227	8	11	4
Total 15	1,325	50	49	17

The essay showed a high proportional use of initial adjunct adverbials including the adjuncts that appear in series in a clause. Thirteen out of fifteen paragraphs have initial position adjuncts which include coordinating conjunctions functioning semantically as adjuncts. The highest number of adjuncts is in the last paragraph in which the number of occurrences is almost one-fourth of the total initial adjuncts while the second higher in number occur in paragraph 2 with half of the total

number of the highest occurrences. Paragraphs 4, 5 and 12 have the third highest number of occurrences with the same distribution. The least occurrences are in paragraph 1, 3, 6 and 14 while single occurrences are recognized in paragraphs 7, 9, 11 and 13.

The syntactic realization of these initial sentence adjuncts ranged from single adverbs to adverb phrases, clauses and coordinating conjunctions. Most of these series are a combination of single word and phrase or word and clause or clause and another clause in a clause. These series may affect the comprehension of the readers on the essay. However, Gonzales seemed to follow the principle of end weight in his distribution of series of adjuncts occurring in the same clause. It is said that this principle showed a “preferred distribution of elements in the clause by their weight [...] the tendency for long and complex elements to be placed towards the end of the clause” (Biber et al., 1999, p. 899). In the essay, the [] is used to show the series of initial adjuncts.

(1) [*And*] [*yet*], [*continuing our way into the hills*], *we found the river grow deeper and stronger than it was as it passed by our cottage.*

(2) [*Verily*], [*if a man derives his strength and inspiration from a low and feeble source.*] *he will fail to “arrive.”*

(3) [*Unless a man draws his power from some source of heavenly altitude*], [*unless the stream of his life issues from a never-failing source*], [*unless*], [*in other words*], *his soul is fed from heights of infinite power, he may well fear that he will not reach the sea.*

In (1) a combination of conjunctions semantically functioning as linking adverbials and a circumstantial contingency adverbial come in series while in (2) a circumstantial manner and circumstance contingency adverbial come in series. In (3), a series of circumstance conditionals occur. According to Biber et al., (1999), this kind of distribution eases comprehension by the reader who does not then have the burden of retaining complex information from earlier in a clause in short-memory while processing the remainder. The said distribution also provides the reason that even the compound and complex sentences in the essay do not leave a burden on the reader.

2.2 The Semantic Categories of the Initial Position Adjuncts

The classified adjuncts in the initial positions facilitated in the analysis of the meaning of the essay. Table 2 includes only the categories identified in the essay.

Table 2. Distribution of Initial Position Circumstance Adjuncts

Classification of Adjuncts	Occurrences of Initial Positions	Percentage
1.Circumstance Adjuncts	26	53.06
1.1 Place		
1.1.1. Position	2	4.08
1.1.2 Direction	1	2.04
1.2 Time		
1.2.1 Position in time	3	6.12
1.2.2 Temporal	2	4.08
1.2.3 Duration	1	2.04
1.3 Restriction	1	2.04
1.4 Process		
1.4.1 Comparison	2	4.08
1.4.2 Accompaniment	1	2.04
1.5 Contingency	2	4.08
1.5.1 Condition	8	16.32
1.5.2 Result	2	4.08
1.6 Agent	1	2.04
2. Stance Adjuncts	4	8.16
2.1 Epistemic		
2.1.1 Doubt/Certainty	1	2.04
2.1.2 Viewpoint or perspective	3	6.12
3. Linking Adjuncts	19	38.77
3.1 Contrast/Concession	3	6.12
3.2 Result/Inference	2	4.08
3.3 Conjunctions	14	28.57

Table 2 shows the distribution of the occurrences of initial position adjuncts within the three classifications: circumstance adjuncts, stance adjuncts, and linking adjuncts. The initial adjuncts were classified further into their categories and subcategories. The occurrences of circumstance adjuncts are one-half of the total initial position adjuncts dominated by contingency adjuncts that express condition while linking adverbials occur more than three-fourth of the total adjuncts which are predominantly conjunctions functioning semantically as linking adverbials. Stance adverbials have less and single distributions.

2.3 The Initial Position Adjuncts and Grammatical Functions Expressing Semantic and Pragmatic Meanings

The essay opened with a locative prepositional phrase function as a subject of the sentence. As a subject, it does not function as an adverbial. It fulfills a syntactically nominal function. But since it answers the question where it denotes a semantically adverbial function. It expresses circumstance.

(4) [*BY MY WIFE'S ancestral home*] flows a river.

The subject of the clause itself identifies the location of the river in the essay. According to Busse (2012), a *by my* construction is lexically primed because “the persons, concepts or things referred to are usually held high in high esteem by the speaker. Also, they are thought to be appreciated by the hearer” (Hoey, 2005 in Busse, 2012 p.302). This said construction seems to tell us that the river is very significant to the narrator.

Essentially, the succeeding clauses of the essay show initial position adjuncts of circumstance time providing more information of time duration and temporal position that make the narration of the author vivid.

(5) [*For a dozen summers*] I have visited it, and almost every year I make an effort to trace its course back to its source in the neighboring hills; I do not consider my vacation there complete without doing this.

(6) [*But*] [*this past summer*] I saw something I had never seen before, though I know that if I had been sufficiently observant in other abnormally dry years, I am sure I could not have failed to notice the same thing earlier.

(7) [*One morning*] [*last April*], [in company with a student friend and my elder son], I started out for the hill to spend the day by the rapids and cascades at a place called Intongasan.

Circumstance time duration in the initial position in (5) informed the reader of the number of times the speaker has visited the river. The lexicon *summer* in the Philippines usually refers to either in the month of April or May where most Filipinos have their vacation by spending it to some beautiful destinations or visit their relatives in the provinces just like what the narrator did in the essay. The duration of time suggests not only the fondness and value of the river to the narrator but also its deep familiarity with him. Evidently,

the narrator has known the river for so long. Initial adjuncts in (6) contribute to cohesion by being anaphoric through the repeated word such as summer that exemplifies cohesion of the text.

In (7), a series of two circumstance position in time adjuncts plus a circumstance accompaniment process adjunct that express accompaniment appears in the initial position. Each type of adjunct does not modify each other but amplify the information provided. According to Murar, Trantescu and Pisoschi (2011), “time adverbials can be a hierarchical relationship: the order of the adverbials depends in part on information focus, but the tendency is for the adverbial denoting the most extended period to come last” (p. 55). Thus, one morning precedes last April showing this hierarchy. This series of temporal adverbials corroborate to the claim made by the authors that temporal adjuncts can be placed initially. However, the position of the process adverbial in the series shifted the emphasis from the temporal adjuncts to process adjuncts.

Significantly, the river and its journey were described by the speaker through the initial adjuncts as illustrated in the following.

(8) [**In common with other streams of its kind**], our river suffers much from the summer drought.

(9) [**After we had walked a kilometer or more**], I saw that the river had disappeared and its bed was dry.

(10) [**But**] [**where we stood**] [**at the moment**] there was no water to be seen. All about us, the wide river bed was hot and dry.

(11) [**And**] [**yet**], [*continuing our way into the hills*], we found the river grow deeper and stronger than it was as it passed by our cottage.

(12) [**Flowing down from its cradle**] [**in the mountains**] [**just**] [**as it left the last foothills**], the river had been checked by the long, forbidding stretch of scorching sand.

(13) [**But**] Bacong- because that is the name of our river - determined to reach the sea, tunneled its way, so to speak, under its sandy bed, of course choosing the harder and lower stratum beneath, until at last it appeared again, limpid and steady in its march to sea.

Process circumstance in which expresses comparison describes the kind of journey the river had as observed by the narrator. This kind of comparison has the intention of amplifying the subject since the speaker seemed to characterize the river as ennobling in character (Lowth, 1825).

Substantially, initial place adjuncts in (9) *where we stood* and in (12) *flowing down from its cradle, in the mountains* allow information to connect more specifically with the clause content, and can have scope over the entire clause and can be used to set the scene for the direction (Biber et al., 1999). Result contingency circumstance in (11) *continuing our way into the hills* and (12) *as it left the last foothills* express information of the destination of the river.

Moreover, circumstance adverbials are dominated with conditional adjuncts which foregrounded the message of the essay. Conditional adjuncts can present a rhetorical condition. When clauses take the form of a conditional but combined with the main clause, they make a strong assertion (Biber et al., 1999). Thus, the essay brought forth a strong assertion as exemplified in the following lines:

(14) [**If our river had not remained faithful to its duty,**] [*instead of a landscape with the varied green of foliage of shrubs and trees and gay with the voices of the birds singing and calling to one another in the branches*] [**that April morning**], there would have been spread before us a wide expanse of desolate and lifeless land, fit only for the wandering of Cain.

This sentence asserts the fulfillment of the river's duty to play its part in the processes of nature, to live, in other words, for the rest of the creation; that the river had lived not for itself but of others. In comparison with the duty of man, the line further asserts that because of the faithfulness of the river to its duty, we will not experience a desolate and lifeless land.

(15) [**For**] [**if in the face of obstacles it lacks the strength of will to continue keeping itself fit to serve and seeking new opportunities for service**], it will ultimately become useless to others.

(16) [**Unless a stream draws its power from a source of sufficient height and magnitude**], it cannot do as our river did this summer.

In (15) and (16), the conditional adjuncts emphasize that the result of the assertion on the determination of the river will have an unfavorable result if the river is weak. The same conditions were presented to man if he wishes to reach his goal in life as exemplified in the sentences below. On the other hand, the stance adjunct verily did not only contribute to cohesion but also emphasized the importance of the assertion.

(17) [*Verily*], [*if a man derives his strength and inspiration from a low and feeble source*], he will fail to 'arrive'.

(18) [*Unless a man draws his power from some source of heavenly altitude*], [*unless the stream of his life issues from a never-failing source*], [*unless, in other words, his soul is fed from heights of infinite power*], he may well fear that he will not reach the sea.

(19) [*But*] [*if his spirit is impelled and nourished by an inexhaustible power*] he will in spite of all obstruction, finish the course...

Gonzales must have strongly brought forth the message of the essay using conditional adjuncts in sentences (17), (18) and (19). These arguments were presented in the last part of the sentence, but they emerged as the focal point of the essay which made the great impact on the reader. It provided strong arguments.

Looking at other circumstance adjuncts, the place, and manner adjuncts were also dominant in the essay. Gonzales was also concerned with mental images that he used other circumstance adverbials to create a mental picture that brought out the landscape of the mountainous areas where the river flowed and narrated its 'journey' towards the sea using initial position adjuncts.

Furthermore, the essay also showed a minimal use of stance adverbials, but their semantic roles expressed the assertion of the author on his comparison of the river and the life of man from his experience and evaluative assessment as exemplified in the passages:

(20) [*To most people*], I suppose, there is nothing significant in this.

(21) [*To me*], [*however*], it was a new experience, and it impressed me like all new experiences.

(22) [*To me*], it was not merely strange, it suggested a spiritual truth.

Initial viewpoints adjuncts here, *to most people*, and *to me* assert more truth in the author's perspective and indicate that other people who experienced the same presence of the river in the community may hold another view about the river.

Significantly, the author has effectively woven the events using linking adverbials which are important devices for creating textual cohesion (Biber et al., 1999). The author employed them to organize and connect long stretches of clauses and to help readers follow the preceding discourse. In the essay, most occurrences of this classification are conjunctions which introduce another context

with their pragmatic meaning while others retained their semantic meanings. They function as linking adjuncts as shown in the following lines in the essay:

(23) [*But*] [*this past summer*] I saw something I had never seen before...

(24) [*But*] [*where we stood at the moment*] there was no water to be seen.

(25) [*And*] [*yet*], [*continuing our way into the hills*], we found the river grow deeper...

(26) [*But*] *Bacong* - because that is the name of our river determined to reach the sea...

(27) [*And*] [*then*] I thought of human life.

(28) [*But*] I thought most of all of those who, like our river...

(29) [*On the other hand*], think of other lives that, ...

(30) [*And*] what is the duty of a river?

(31) [*For*] part of the ministering duty of a river is to flow on and on...

(32) [*And*] does this not suggest that the river of man's life should be likewise?

(33) [*For*] [*if in the face of obstacles*] it lacks the strength...

(34) [*For*] *Bacong* was able to carry on...

(35) [*But*] [*if his spirit is impelled and nourished*] [*by an inexhaustible power*] he will...

The coordinating conjunctions *and*, *then*, *but*, and *for* in sentences 27 to 35 can be "deleted without causing any grammatical concern" (Zihan, 2014). Thus, they function as adverbials and not conjunctions. They mark meaning between sentences. In (23), *but* marks a meaning difference in what the speaker notices about the flow of the river in his time of writing. In (24), *but* introduces additional information about the flow of the river. In (25) linking adverbials *and* and *yet* occurring with circumstance manner expressing concession relationship initiated another important piece of information about the river whose flow has grown stronger. The concession circumstance is important because it is a means of presenting new arguments.

Essentially, the initial linking adverbials connect previous events that made the narrative connected. They help refer to the past events. Linking adverbials carried what Halliday & Hasan (1976) called retrospective effect or 'retrojective' as a better word according to them. They further explained that this retrospective effect is significant because it made the action/events in the text whole. Seemingly, the retrospective quality of *and* provided a useful insight into the meaning of *but* in the essay. The word *but* "expresses a relation which is not

additive but adversative [...], but contains within itself also the logical meaning of and; it is a sort of portmanteau, or shorthand form, of *and however*. The evidence for this is the fact that *but* is also retrospective – but the meaning which it projects in his way is not *but* but *and*” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 237). This concept is exemplified in (23), (24), (26), (28) and (35). Then in (27) it is also anaphoric. As these linking adverbials express retrospective and anaphoric element, they are thereby cohesive. Linking adverbial in (29) is important to show the contrasting relationship of meaning.

2.4 Focalization

Since the literary piece is a narrative essay, it encompasses authorial omniscience, his personal version of events. The writer serves as the first-person-actional participant since the main character tells his story. This focalization has a clear authorial viewpoint which projects the coherence or purpose and human perception.

The essay has 23 occurrences of personal pronoun *I* which justifiably indicate the subject. However, there is also greater occurrences of the pronoun *it* with 18 occurrences, referring to the river, which justifies the significance of the river throughout the essay. The term *river* occurs 19 times and *Bacong* five times. For the first time, *Bacong* was introduced in sentence (20) *But 'Bacong-because that is the name of our river-determined to reach the sea, tunneled its way, so to speak, under its sandy bed, of course choosing the harder and lower stratum beneath, until at last it appeared again, limpid and steady in its march to sea.'* It was introduced like a very close entity to the narrator as realized in the use of pronoun *our* in the passage. It was mentioned the second time in the sentence (26) *'Another lesson I learned from Bacong is found in the fact that the river was not merely determined to flow just anywhere; it was determined to reach the sea, to reach the great end.'* Here the narrator described its determination to reach the sea. Then third in the sentence (43) *'Bacong, by continuing its march to the sea, kept itself fit for the service of nature and man; and not only it expanded its field of usefulness.'* In this sentence, *Bacong* is in the vocative case as it is addressed directly by the narrator. In sentence (46) *'As I marveled at the power of Bacong to push its way through such a seemingly impassable barrier, I discerned the secret-a secret that has a message*

for all of us.' The narrator saw the power of *Bacong* to push its way to the sea; and finally, in the sentence (47) *'For Bacong was able to carry on, to continue its watery pilgrimage and reach the immensity and sublimity of the sea, only because its source is the vast and lofty mountains.'* The narrator acknowledges the great source of power that helped *Bacong* reached its destination.

3 Conclusion

The essay is foregrounded with the use of initial position adjuncts dominated by the circumstance adjuncts followed by linking adjuncts and very few stance adjuncts. The initial circumstance adjuncts particularly the initial conditional adjuncts have the greatest number of occurrences in the essay. They showed the strong argument of the essay on the comparison of the river to the life of man. The essay also exemplified greater occurrences of personal pronoun *I* which refer to the narrator and pronoun *it* that refers to the river. These language components have facilitated the understanding of the meaning of the essay.

Further analysis showed that the analyses are in the domains of physical, psychological, social and philosophical aspects although the comparisons were not provided explicitly. The river was presented and described in the first part of the essay from sentence 1 to 27 where the essayist paused with the statement *How like so many lives* which explicitly brought the comparison further in the essay. Firstly, the physical aspects of the river were described in sentences (13) and (43). Secondly, the psychological aspects centered on the determination of the river to reach the destination, the sea, as it surmounted from the various obstacles along its way, and how it had overcome and under come obstacles as it tunneled its way through. Thirdly, the social aspects centers on the duty of the river as it flows not only for itself but at the service of man and nature. Finally, in the philosophical aspects, the river is faithful to its duty, and its source of power had come from the sufficient height and magnitude as compared to the source of power of man from heavenly altitude. These descriptions of the river in four aspects were reflected in the life of man on earth in a comparison showed implicitly and explicitly in the essay.

Implicitly, the narrator would question how men keep himself fit for service, what is his

duty, how faithful he is in his duty and where does he draw his inspiration and source of power to live for him and others. These arguments were clearly presented using initial condition adjuncts.

Significantly, it was also noted that these arguments are from the personal viewpoints and perspectives of the narrator which were pointed out using the initial viewpoint or perspective adjuncts. The initial viewpoint or perspective adjuncts showed that to the narrator; this is how he perceived his personal experience, relationship and lessons and realizations in life with the river in the community where his wife lives. These perspectives also mean that his insights will surely be different from the insights and experiences of other people about the river in the community where the river is located.

Further, the initial contrastive/concessive adjuncts which are subcategories of linking adjuncts presented the comparison between the flow of the river and the life of man on earth which is the central theme of the essay. More than revealing the central theme of the essay, they also serve as cohesive devices. Halliday & Hasan (1976) define cohesion as “the relation between sentences in a text, and the sentences of a text can only follow one after the other” (p.227). The conjunctive adjuncts together with the other types of adjuncts forming continuum or cluster or series of adjuncts faithfully perform their cohesive functions making a general impression that the initial position adjuncts serve explicitly as the text strategy of the text. They further indicate the movements in the text and navigate through the text as the various information were presented in adjacent with the other elements in the clause in mostly long and complex stretches of sentences shaping the meaning of the essay.

Indeed, the lexical and grammatical analyses provide the description and understanding of the ecological psychology of nature and the relationship to man and vice versa. This essay, which is river-personified, reminds us of the inexhaustible power – the omnipotent God; we are destined to reflect his glory.

References

Beatrix Busse. 2012. Historical Text Analysis: Underlying Parameters and Methodological Procedures. In W. Bisang (ed.), *Methods in Contemporary Lin-*

guistics.KG, Berlin/Boston:Walter de Gruyter GmbH &Co.

Douglas Biber, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad & Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Ebi Yeibo. 2011. Patterns of Lexical Choices and Stylistic Function in J. P. Clark-Bekederemo’s poetry. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 1(1) 137-149.

Greg Watson and Sonia Zyngier. (Eds.). 2007. *Literature and Stylistics for Language Learner’s Theory and Practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ioana Murar, Ana-Maria Trantescu. & Claudia Pisoschi. 2011. *English Syntax the Simple Sentence*. Retrieved From http://cis01.central.ucv.ro/litere/idd/cursuri/an_2/lb_straina/engleza/lec_an2_sem1_trantescu.pdf

Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday.1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). People’s Republic of China: Edward Arnold, Ltd.

Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. Harlow : England.

Michael Hoey.(2005). *Lexical Priming: A New Theory of Words and Language*. New York: Routledge.

Michael Toolan. 1998. *Language in Literature an Introduction to Stylistics*. London, New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Norman Francis Blake. 1990. *An Introduction to the Language of Literature*. London: Macmillan.

Robert Lowth. 1825. *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews*. London: JF Dove, St. John’s Square.

Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, G. & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English language*. London:Longman.

René Wellek, and Austin Warren. 1977. *Theory of Literature* (3rd ed.). New York, London: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, - A Harvest/HBJ book.

Thomas Ernst. 2002. *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zihan Yin. 2004. *Linking Adverbials in English*. Ph. D. Dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington.