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ABSTRACT

Documentaries, like other genres, are being increasingly used by wildlife conservationists for creating awareness and influencing viewers to become active backers of wildlife protection. While there have been analyses of documentaries that focus on cinematic techniques, stylistic analyses of the language used in them have been limited. This paper analyses the prologue to the documentary, “The journey from brutal poacher to delicate pastry chef”, and the visual monologue narrative, “The Pastry Chef”, to show how the scriptwriter uses language as rhetoric to raise social consciousness amongst its audience. The paper adopts the stylistic pluralism approach which blends literary criticism, linguistic analysis and stylistic description. Leech and Short’s (2007) broad framework of linguistic and stylistic categories (i.e. lexical items, grammatical features, figures of speech and other rhetoric features and cohesiveness) is used to show how the scriptwriter creates awareness of wildlife conservation and positions people as active backers of wildlife protection. It argues that linguistic choices – such as lexical items, grammatical features and cohesive devices – and rhetoric are critical features of documentary design.
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INTRODUCTION

Documentaries, like other genres – such as poetry, fiction and drama – use language in specific ways to convey particular messages, elicit emotional responses from audiences and persuade them to act in ways the scriptwriter desires. The explicit definition of the documentary genre is somewhat elusive and has even received contentious debate regarding what film clips could be classified as documentaries (for example, Grierson 1966, Nichols 2010). The dissension is mostly a result of the tension that exists between fiction and reality. As early as the 1930s, Grierson (1933, p. 8) proposed that a documentary is the “creative treatment of actuality”, thereby suggesting that a documentary is a creative representation of a world reality. This, however, does not dissolve the tension between the interplay of reality and imagination. The paradox is succinctly captured by Nichols (2010, p. 6): “[A definition of a documentary] will conceal as much as it will reveal.” In his book Introduction to Documentary, Nichols (2010, pp. 7-14) offers a useful multi-perspectival summary of the key characteristics of the documentary. Firstly, he affirms that “documentaries are about reality; they’re about something that actually happened” expressed multimodally in words, sound and images that appeal to a combination of reason and affect. Secondly, he asserts that, “documentaries are about real people who do not play or perform roles”; they present themselves by drawing on prior experience and habits as they are captured on camera. This self-presentation determines what the individual wants to reveal about her/himself and the manner in which s/he wishes to do so. Thirdly, he explains that, to a certain extent, documentaries tell stories about what happened in the real world, “the story is a plausible representation of what happened rather than an imaginative interpretation of what might have happened.” These views are reinforced by Bondebjerg (2014, p. 140) who states: “We expect documentary to deal with real events, real people and act actual problems of the world we
live in”, and that, that reality should comprise a “quality of truth, reality and authenticity”. When scriptwriters focus their cameras on specific realistic subjects, documentaries are able to change perceptions about the way the general public looks at certain issues (Purdy 2017). In addition to language use, visuality such as photographs and moving objects can shape people’s attitudes and understanding of certain issues but can also promote bias or stereotype (Zeiny 2017).

In actively resisting wildlife poaching and plundering for commercial gain, conservationists are increasingly using documentaries for raising social consciousness of wildlife conservation. While most analyses focus on landscapes and soundscapes, the relationship between documentaries and various literary genres – and by implication, stylistics – is documented by authors such as Strachan (2007) who notes that scriptwriters draw on an array of literary styles for effect and Periasamy et al. (2015) who include linguistic elements as one form of multimodal expression. Nichols (2010, pp. 67-77) also argues for the documentary as rhetorical form and compares the voice of the documentary to the voice of oratory: “Just like the orator or public speaker who uses his entire body to give voice to a particular perspective, documentaries speak with all the means at their disposal.” The rhetorical tradition provides a foundation for the oratorical voice as a persuasive device; “it seeks to inspire belief or instil conviction about the merit of a particular viewpoint on a contentious issue” (p. 77). Nichols argues that the spoken words are a “voice-of-authority” and explicitly conveys the point of view of the scriptwriter or promoter (p. 74).

While stylistic analysis is a well-established approach to the analysis of canonical poetry and prose as they are associated with imagination and creativity, texts for stylistic analysis have, over the years, rippled outward to include advertisements, lyrics, drama and documentaries. These “unlikely” texts “display a high degree of stylistic dexterity” (Simpson 2004), thus making them suitable for stylistic analysis. However, its application to documentaries is somewhat sparse; most documentary analyses focus on cinematic techniques and visual impact. This paper attempts to address this space by presenting a stylistic analysis of a prologue to a documentary, The journey from brutal poacher to delicate pastry chef, and its accompanying visual monologue narrative, The Pastry Chef. The documentary gripped my attention at the O R Tambo International Airport, where it was screened; it promoted the conservation of wildlife with a difference – it was a story of the journey of an African man from being a brutal poacher at Tanzania’s Serengeti, to a pastry chef in Singita. The narrative was analysable because of its systematicity and language used for conveying a profound message. The promoter, Mercedes Benz, which has created a digital platform for “Share your story” in “BeautifulNews, Reframing our world” (15 Jan 2017), used the documentary as a means for creating awareness and raising social consciousness of wildlife conservation. In this instance, the documentary makes use of a community based conservation (CBS) approach for saving wildlife, which, according to Hackel (1999, p. 726) acts to make people “active backers of wildlife protection”. This paper examines the language and style of the prologue (Appendix A) and the visual narrative (Appendix B) to show how they are intended to influence their audiences into making a conscious decision to reject poaching and wildlife plundering and become active backers of wildlife conservation.
(1973, pp. 6-7) succinctly described the concept in relation to linguistics as that which deals with variation and the study of style in language use. More currently, in his much acclaimed book of the same title, *Stylistics*, Simpson (2004, pp. 2-3) describes stylistics as a concept that has to do with exploring language, and more specifically, exploring creativity in language use. The place of language in stylistic interpretation is evident in his explanation, below:

Stylistics is a method of textual interpretation in which primacy of place is assigned to language. The reason why language is so important to stylisticians is [that] the various forms, patterns and levels that constitute linguistic structure are an important index of the function of the text. The text’s functional significance as discourse acts in turn as a gateway to its interpretation. While linguistic features do not of themselves constitute a text’s “meaning”, an account of linguistic features nonetheless serves to ground a stylistic interpretation and to help explain why, for the analyst, certain types of meaning are possible.

Modern stylistics, however, as noted by Parina and Leon (2014, pp. 91-92) has become a tool for enriching theories of discourse, culture and society and “technically a combination of many types of text analysis”.

Rhetoric is, more specifically, and in its strictest sense, concerned with modes of persuasion. It has its origin in the praxis of oratory and its function is to persuade the audience, even if that be a single person, as much as possible in a given circumstance to make a decision (Aristotle 1954, pp. 6-7, 105). Clearly then, rhetoric is an integral part of stylistics and has over the decades been formalised as figures of speech: schemes and tropes (Wales 2011, p. 369), a component of Leech and Short’s (2007) framework of stylistic analysis.

Stylistic analysis has attracted criticisms from within various disciplines, generally polarised between “pure” linguists who adopt an objective perspective and literary analysts who are thought to espouse a subjective approach. Probably the most contentious are the claims by “pure” linguists that literary analysis is based on reader-responsiveness and is therefore too subjective, and conversely, the contention of literary critics that using texts as “data” and focusing on syntax and semantics negates intuition and sociocultural meaning (McIntyre 2010). However, Sinclair (1991, p. 163) suggests that such contrasting standpoints are “unrealistic” while Stockwell (2012, p. 155) argues that these contentions can be addressed by fusing the linguistic and literary methods – by dealing with interpretation as a matter of language processing and dealing with literary value as a consequence of style.

Drawing on the views of Sinclair (ibid) and Stockwell’s (ibid), and Leech and Short’s (1981, 2007) call for a plural methodology of literary analysis, this paper adopts the approach of stylistic pluralism; it uses linguistic stylistic approach as a means of supporting literary interpretation. According to the pluralist, “language performs a number of functions, and any piece of language is likely to be the result of choices made on different functional levels” (Leech & Short 1981, p. 30). This, according to Zhengh (2014, p. 124) refers to writers’ specific linguistic choices to enable distinguishing between elements of meaning according to particular modes of expression. This approach, which focuses on the relationship between form and content, challenges the notion that the function of language is to communicate merely ideas or thoughts; language has a variety of functions which include the emotive, referential, connotative, poetic, persuasive and social.

Almost four decades ago, Leech and Short (1981) provided the following definition of style: “[It] is the way in which language is used in a given context, by a given person [and] for a given purpose” (p. 11). In their view, style is not peculiar to a particular writer, but can be characteristic of “a situation, a character, a particular text [and] a particular linguistic expression.” Leech and Short (2007) offer four levels of style viz. the semantic level, the syntactical level, the graphological level and phonological effects. These levels of style are
included in their checklist of four categories for literary analysis, a summary of which follows.

a. Lexical categories: This category responds to questions pertaining to the use of vocabulary with regard to word choice, part of speech of the vocabulary item, degree of formality, level of complexity, sensory allusions, connotations, intended effect on the audience and so on.

b. Grammatical categories: This category focuses on phrases, clauses, use of modalities and sentence structure – their types, functions and effects. The authors highlight the use of deviant grammatical structures for stylistic effect.

c. Figures of speech and rhetoric: Here the authors consider the incidence of imageries, schemes and tropes, structural repetitions, rhythmic patterns, deviant linguistic codes, rhetorical effect and so on.

d. Context and cohesion: In this final category, cohesion and the ways in which texts are internally organised at both sentence level and paragraph level are considered. Context deals with the external relations of a text or a part of a text, where the social relations between its participants (author and reader; character and character, etc.) and a sharing of knowledge and assumptions by the participants, are deliberated (pp. 61-64).

While these categories provide a useful framework for stylistic analysis, Leech and Short (2007, p. 61) caution that the checklist is heuristic and that a mixing of categories will be inevitable and harmless: “categories will overlap, so that the same feature may well be noted under different headings.” Numerous authors (e.g. Zhengh 2014, Puspita 2014, Kiminori 2015) have analysed various literary texts using this framework by focusing on how language functions in literary contexts; their studies show yields of rich data. In her analysis of Martin Luther King’s speech, “I have a Dream”, Zengh (2014) shows how the orator “enlivens” his speech by skilful use of lexicon (such as pronouns and contractions), syntactic features (such as repetition and parallelism) and figurative language (such as simile, metaphor and paradox) to achieve his purpose of persuading his audience to fight for equality of Blacks. In analysing figures of speech in the film Les Misérables, Puspita (2014) concluded that Leech and Short’s (2007) framework was ideal for mapping out how the various figures of speech are used, demonstrating that each type fulfils more than a single function. In addition, the figures of speech “give imaginative pleasure” and “add emotional intensity, and to concrete meaning in brief compass” (p. 105). Kiminori (2015) adopts the approach of stylistic pluralism in his study of film narrative; he explores how Leech and Short’s focus on style, point of view, plot, fictional worlds, character, theme and, evaluation and appreciation can be effectively used for analysing film narratology.

In addition, as the overall style of the texts analysed for this study is narrative, I draw on Toolan’s (1991, 2008) notion of sequence and emphasis, and characterisation of narrative. Firstly, he explains that narratives have a dual foci, viz. the storyteller and the story (1991, p. 1) but that the ultimate ratification of a narrative rests not on the storyteller but by the perceiver (2008, p. 460). Secondly, the narrative has a systematic sequence: it comprises a series of events raising specific issues; a conflict situation that acts as impulse for transformation; and a resolution to the issues. Toolan (ibid) maintains that the narrative is “a perceived sequence of nonrandomly connected events, i.e., of described states or conditions which undergo change (into some different states or conditions)”. By “nonrandom connection”, Toolan means “some connectedness that is taken to be motivated and significant”. He also contends that in a literary narrative, “the narrator is often ‘dehumanised’, attended to merely as a disembodied voice” (1991, p. 3). However, in
documentaries the narrator becomes the focal point of the story; his or her presence on the screen asserts a kind of authority by the orientation he projects and is intended to influence the viewer in specific ways. The narrative in documentaries, according to Nichols (2001, pp. 590) not only facilitates the representation in historical time, but “supplies techniques by which to introduce the moralising perspective or social belief of an author and a structure of closure whereby initiating disturbances can receive satisfactory resolution”. Narrative techniques guide the perceiver’s feelings, in particularly, character identification. The degree to which the perceiver sympathises (i.e. feeling for another person) or empathises (i.e. feeling with another person) can be motivated by conflict situations (Lutsenko, 2018).

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

It is not uncommon for stylisticians to apply textual tools of analysis to the study of moving images and some analysts claim that “many of the frameworks used in textual analysis can be used to explicate formats other than the printed text” (Nørgaard, Montoro and Busse 2010, p. 21). This paper adopts the stylistic pluralism approach foregrounded by Leech and Short’s (2007) four-category model of analysis. Two texts are analysed in this paper: (i) The journey from brutal poacher to delicate pastry chef, the prologue to the documentary (Appendix A); and (ii) The Pastry Chef, the documentary (Appendix B) which is hyperlinked to the prologue. Both texts share a common drive for wildlife protection.

As any narrative has two components, the storyteller and the story – irrespective of the mode in which the story is presented – both aspects are discussed. For each of the texts, the paper begins with a contextualisation, followed by a discussion of the rhetoric in the title and then an analysis and discussion of linguistic and stylistic features they generate. For ease of reference, “S” is used to denote “sentence”.

PROLOGUE: “THE JOURNEY FROM BRUTAL POACHER TO DELICATE PASTRY CHEF”
(APPENDIX A)

THE TITLE

The journey from brutal poacher to delicate pastry chef, is a prologue which the scriptwriter uses to contextualise the direct narrative by a former poacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The journey from brutal poacher to delicate pastry chef</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rhetoric in the title is designed to capture the reader’s attention by its use of alliteration (“poacher…pastry”); contrasting adjectives, “brutal” and “delicate”; their connotations and the nouns they qualify, “poacher” and “pastry chef”, respectively, which are all linked to “journey”. The change in behaviour, denoted by the prepositions “from…to”, is something that occurs over a passage of time, representing a realistic worldview. Psychologically, the reader is drawn into knowing that s/he is not expected to make an overnight change, providing a temporal space for her/him to adjust her/his attitude and behaviour, and make a decision to do the do-able. “Brutal” drives home the point of the savagery or inhumanity involved in the act of poaching and raises moral and ethical questions. Conversely, the artfully selected “delicate” is not only located in stark opposition to “brutal”, evoking ideas of tenderness and gentleness, but appropriate in the context of pastry-making which requires gentle manipulation of the ingredients. The choice of “pastry
chef” and not a meat chef is significant; it highlights the shift that the character has made from working with meat and blood to an other, devoid of connotations of butchery.

SEQUENCE AND EMPHASIS

The narrative classically comprises the three typical characteristics identified by Toolan (1991): an issue, an impulse for change through conflict and a resolution. Firstly, the three paragraphs comprising 18 sentences, are constructed in such a way that there is a specific sequence and emphasis.

In paragraph 1 a profile of the main character, Peter Andrew, as a poacher is provided; in paragraph 2, the events that led to transformation in the character’s life and the change that he underwent is described; and in paragraph 3, the scriptwriter shows the character’s current lifestyle as a pastry chef. Secondly, the narration contains an element of typicality – something that the reader can relate to from her/his own knowledge repertoire. As readers, we are sensitised to the wrongfulness of poaching and the knowledge that we can change our attitude toward poaching and choose a different path of livelihood. Thirdly, the narrative has a trajectory; it has a conflict and a resolution. Following the build-up in paragraph 1, “a crisis of conscience” becomes the catalyst for the conflict in paragraph 2 – Peter must choose between continuing a life of poaching and a new livelihood as pastry chef. In this paragraph, a resolution is systematically formulated in the change that the character undergoes; he transforms himself by becoming a pastry chef. These three characteristics create a cohesiveness in the story. This is further supported by use of internal cohesion constructs that head the sentence: “But” (S6), “And then” (S8), “In a moment” (S10] and “After a year” (S14).

STYLISTIC FEATURES OF OPENING SENTENCES

I now turn to the salient stylistic features of each paragraph, including how contextually, the social relations between the scriptwriter and the reader, the scriptwriter and the main character (Peter), Peter and his grandmother, and Peter and Brian Harris (the agent of change) gel the narrative semantically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Opening sentences</th>
<th>Lexical items and phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hunter. Poacher. Pastry Chef.</td>
<td>Hunter skilled hunter Poacher poaching for subsistence/ hacked tusks from elephants Pastry chef most delicate confectionary treats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>And then, a crisis of conscience.</td>
<td>grandmother’s desperate plea opportunity for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The same hands that once hacked tusks from elephants now make the most delicate confectionary treats.</td>
<td>strength and poise find expression kneading dough newfound respect for animals wants to instil the values of conservation and appreciation for wildlife down to his children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Hunter. Poacher. Pastry Chef.” The three opening staccato-type sentences are particularly arresting in that each noun-use followed by a period foregrounds Peter’s characterisation over a period of time. Here we see that the scriptwriter draws on the reader’s extratextual knowledge to make sense of each of the three nouns. “Hunter” positions Peter as a powerful predator against whom the hunted animal is defenceless. However, it is devoid of the more intensive negative connotations of debauchery associated with “poacher” which are reinforced in the third paragraph with, “hacked tusks from elephants” (S15). The third sentence, is semantically unpredictable, demonstrating a complete turn-about. Collectively, the three nouns are meant to astound the reader in their un-believability, which is amplified in S4, “Tough to imagine”. S5, (A skilled hunter … Serengeti region) raises two interesting insights. Firstly, the scriptwriter’s position in this sentence, together with the use of “But” (S6), is one of sympathy for the poacher; the reason for poaching, “poaching for subsistence”, is meant to “soften” the reader’s attitude toward Peter, psychologically preparing her/him to forgive the poacher as he redeems himself. Secondly, the identification of the region where Peter poached, Tanzania’s Serengeti, adds authenticity to the narrative.

“And then, a crisis of conscience.” This opening sentence of paragraph 2 marks the internal moral conflict, awakened by his grandmother, which Peter experiences – this too is intended to subtly “soften” the reader’s attitude toward Peter. Such sympathy is reinforced by Peter’s resilience as he concedes to his grandmother’s “desperate plea” to “change his ways”, made possible by an opportune job offer by Brian Harris. The invitation to work in a “hospitality industry” is significant in highlighting the turn-about position a person can take, once a decision is made; the hands of a killer will become the hands of a pastry chef. The sequence of events in S11 to S14, indicative of challenges and struggles in, “After an initial stint”, “found his feet”, and “In a new environment, still learning English” as Peter develops as a pastry chef, influences the reader to empathise with him and support his endeavours. Psychologically, the reader experiences a parallel growth in respect for the former poacher as he distances himself from his previous activities and moves toward an acceptable mode of livelihood. The use of proper nouns in this paragraph i.e. the name of the person who makes a job offer (Brian Harris) and his designation (former Wildlife Development Manager of Singita Grumeti), and the name of the place where Peter becomes a chef (Faru Faru), add to the reality and hence authenticity of the narration further persuading the reader to believe that change is possible.

“The same hands that once hacked tusks from elephants now make the most delicate confectionary treats.” The third, final paragraph – the resolution to the narrative – presents an optimistic outlook that has also been captured in the title of the text. Covert sympathy that is created at the outset is sustained in S15, the first sentence of the paragraph: the use of synecdoche in “the [] hands that hacked” and not “Peter who hacked” creates a distance between the doer and the deed; the superlative adjective, “most delicate” in describing the confectionary treats, increases the distance from “hacking” and marks the contrast and change from the gruesome deed. Similarly the “strength and poise” (S16) that had previously characterised the “skilled hunter” and “prolific poacher” (S7), now characterises the pastry chef. The use of the past tense in the singular “hacked” (S15) and numerous present tense lexicons, “now” (S15, S17), “find” (S16), “kneading” (S16), “walks” (S17), “has” (S17, S18) and “wants” (S18) foreground the present livelihood of Peter, pushing the undesirable act of poaching into the shadows of the past. However, critical for a real worldview is that the past is not forgotten. Instead, even though the “same path” is trodden, the implicit critical reflection of past actions and consequentially conscious decision-making break the cycle of traditional habits and creates attitudinal change and desire to change future generations into backing wildlife conservation. That the final word of the text is “children” (S18) is of critical
significance: the allegorical imperative lies with the need to educate children today to protect wildlife tomorrow.

THE DOCUMENTARY: “THE PASTRY CHEF”  
(APPENDIX B)

The prologue was a report by the scriptwriter about Peter’s journey; the documentary, typical of its genre, is a first person narrative offered by a real-life character who relates his story with a purpose: to show his audience how he had turned from poacher to backer of wildlife conservation. The documentary itself is a multimodal presentation of visual landscapes, soundscapes and voice of the narrator. A variety of visual and audial techniques is used to complement the narrator’s voice and advance the message of the documentary. For example, the visual portrait varies in setting between wildlife landscape and bakery; no human character other than the narrator is shown; the music changes in rhythm and tempo to match the tone of the narrator’s voice; and so on. However, as this analysis is not a multimodal but a stylistic one, this scant sensory description must suffice. In transcribing the narrative, I have created four paragraphs; each paragraph depicts a distinct scene or movement in the documentary.

THE TITLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4. Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The pastry chef</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The title of the documentary, unlike the nine-word title of the prologue which explicitly depicts the narrator’s journey, comprises only three words: “The Pastry Chef”. Even though the documentary itself actually relates Peter’s journey, the short, crisp title represents the narrator in his final, socially acceptable occupation as pastry chef. The title does not provide any hint of Peter’s previous occupation as poacher, suggesting that a turn-about from active slaughterer to active protector of wildlife is not only possible, but can be a permanent shift. This is also significant as the reader is left with a favourable perception of the narrator.

SEQUENCE AND EMPHASIS

The documentary, like the prologue, exemplifies a classic narrative in sequence and emphasis comprising four explicit movements, comprising 29 sentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5. Sequence and emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first movement (S1–S4) the narrator, Peter Andrew, contextualises the narrative by positioning himself as a dangerous poacher. In the second, sustained movement (S5 – S23) he provides details of his internal conflict and journey of transformation. In the third movement (S24 – S28), Peter presents himself in present time as a man transformed in attitude and one who has a vision for promoting wildlife conservation in the generations to
come. The fourth, final movement, a single line paragraph (S29) is a universal resolution that focuses on the welfare of animals and not himself.

GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES

A most striking feature in the narrator’s storytelling is his use of everyday English; it is devoid of “literary” language or oratory, yet is a planned discourse with the viewer, characteristic of rhetoric. It is also devoid of uses of tropes generally characteristic of rhetoric, lending authenticity to the speech of someone who is learning to speak English as an additional language. The narrator has, since his commencement of his job as a pastry chef, acquired sufficient proficiency as an English foreign language speaker, to communicate in the language. We are, however, reminded that even though documentaries portray real life scenarios they are not uninfluenced by features of creativity. Of the 29 sentences, 19 contain one or multiple grammatical deviances.

TABLE 6. Grammatical deviances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb tense (examples)</th>
<th>Representative pronouns (examples)</th>
<th>Concord</th>
<th>Other (multiple errors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I start poaching (S1)</td>
<td>My life it was going so hard (S5)</td>
<td>like someone who are professional (S9)</td>
<td>my grandma, she was crying and she sayed (S13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I kill a lot (S3) (in context, it should have been in the past tense)</td>
<td>His job it was to poach (S8)</td>
<td>he want you to stop poaching (S11)</td>
<td>and then I came in Singita [S15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get one answer (S6)</td>
<td>my problem it was English [S18]</td>
<td>he need to give you (S11)</td>
<td>I started like a staff cook for one year [S16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wasn’t having a job to do (S7)</td>
<td>My children, it wasn’t going to be a poacher (S27)</td>
<td>I want them to be a teacher [S28]</td>
<td>picked me to the main kitchen (S17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what it is my grandpa doing (S7)</td>
<td>like someone who are professional (S9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>I have no much education (S24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chairman…he was coming to me and asking me (S10)</td>
<td>he want you to stop poaching (S11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>to be end of story (S26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is some person calling Brian (S10)</td>
<td>he need to give you (S11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>teacher of stopping people (S28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when I got there I start learning [S17]</td>
<td>I want them to be a teacher [S28]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how bad it is when you killing animal [S28]</td>
<td>like someone who are professional (S9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most salient grammatical deviances from standard English belong to the category of tense usage. There are a total of 12 such errors, examples of which are provided in Table 6, above. Interestingly, however, even though there are numerous examples of tense errors, in some instances the use of verb tenses is accurate, for example: ‘I was a good runner” (S2), “I saw my problem” (S18), “I must learn to speak” (S21) and “I wasn’t shy” (S22). Another common error, 7 in total, is the use of the representative pronoun. Other errors include errors of concord and mixed grammatical errors. I suggest that these errors in syntax – which do not interfere with fluency and understanding – reflect Peter’s sociolinguistic competence as an African speaker of English; engage the audience in ways that they can identify with the narrator; and is a subtle persuasive technique toward the ultimate goal of attitudinal and behavioural change. These errors do not devalue the realism and authenticity of the narrative; rather, within a sociolinguistic context, it adds credibility to the character.

Other key grammatical and stylistic features that add credibility to the story and act as persuasive are the use of proper nouns, direct speech, personal pronouns, progression of tenses within the text, repetition for semantic cohesion, and amplification.
The use of the proper nouns: “Intchoka Village” (the name of the village where the narrator lived), “Brian from Singita” (the person who offers Peter a job and where he is from) and “Singita” (the place where Peter makes a life-change) are realistic and the choice of Singita is convincing in its reference to *Singita Game Reserve* in Kenya. The significance of the choice of this site of wildlife conservation is twofold: Firstly, the word “Singita” is the Shangaan word for “Place of Miracles” and it is here that Singita’s enduring purpose is to conserve, preserve, and protect the miraculous places of which they are custodians. Secondly, it is ironic that the site that would have once been his hunting ground, is the site that Peter learns to become a backer of wildlife protection, emphasising his personal moral courage and amplifying the possibility for transformation.

The three uses of direct speech – which I have orthographed using linguistic features – punctuates the lengthy narrative of the second movement comprising the narrator’s self-quotation and incorporation of the voice of his grandmother. These instances create a dramatic atmosphere that captures the actual utterance in immediate time and underscores Peter’s anxieties and conflicts, and his resolution: “From there I say, ‘Oh, which kind of job am I going to do?’” (S12) and “For you my grandpa, my grandma, I will stop and I will go work for that white man” (S14). The tension that exists is heightened by the question (S12) and “that white man” (S12) – both the work and the potential employer are foreign to Peter. His personal courage in entering a foreign space acts as motivation to the viewer. The use of an embedded voice in “My grandma, she was crying and she sayed, ‘You have to stop this’” (S13), provides documentary evidence of the relationship between Peter and grandmother and her influence over Peter. Grandmother’s short imperative, “You/ have to/ stop/ this” (S13) is semantically loaded: Peter is addressed directly, the infinite verb acts as command, the verb espouses a tone of finality and the use of the adverb, “this”, instead of “poaching” suggests the psychological discomfort in explicitly stating Peter’s undesirable actions.

The 39 displays of the personal pronoun first person “I” and their forms – 6 uses of the possessive “my” and 4 counts of the accusative “me”, collectively foreground the narrative as a personal testimony. In speaking to “you” the viewer, even though the discourse is not an eye-to-eye interaction in real time, it espouses what Fahnestock (2011, p. 280) describes as “real-time immediacy” and draws the viewer into the world of the narrator. The numerous cases of Peter’s self-reference shows that he personalises his experiences whilst simultaneously evaluating them (for example, “I was a good runner” (S2) and “I was so dangerous” (S4)). Because the narrator addresses his audience directly, his evaluations are persuasive as recommendations for attitudinal and behavioural change.
VERBS

Many stylisticians consider verbs to be the most powerful part of a sentence (Strunk and White 1979) and show that tense usage and the progression of tenses in a text have rhetorical significance (Fahnestock 2011). The narrator begins his storytelling in the past tense (S1 – S4) and continues in the past tense for much of the rest of the storytelling (S5 – S22). This signifies the gap between his past life as poacher and the present time of utterance. More importantly, it is a technique to distance himself from his previous actions. Peter changes to using the present tense in the third movement (S23 – S27); this captures the vividness of his current status and as a mark of present action it emphasises a time in his life of which he is proud. In the final sentence (S28), he progresses to the infinitive “to be” whilst simultaneously expressing an optative mood, a wish for animals to be protected and alive, well into the future.

SEMANTIC COHESION

While stylisticians focus mostly on linguistic elements in a text, such as verbal connectors for a discussion of cohesion (see, for example, Leech & Short 1981, p. 79), the way ideas are repeated, even antithetically, contributes to semantic cohesion. In the documentary, the key characteristics of Peter are his self-confidence and pride in his “achievements” as poacher and accomplishment as pastry chef. In S2 – S4, these qualities are expressed in his self-assessment: his athletic prowess (“I was a good runner, no-one catch-ed me”); the countless number of animals he had killed (“I kill a lot of animals”) and his stature as a dangerous man (“I was so dangerous”). He also prides himself on learning to poach like a professional: “I was so quick …” (S9); in his ability to learn to become a pastry chef and identify the obstacle to his learning (the English language): “…and then I was so quick to understand and then I saw my problem it was English” (S19); and finally “[work] like a professional” (S24). Collectively, we see a constancy in Peter’s physical and mental dexterity that enable his transformation. These act as persuasive as the viewer can see how one can use one’s personal resources to make a turn-about in behaviour.

AMPLIFICATION

A final stylistic device that is foregrounded is that of amplification. Drawing on the works of Melanchthon, from as far back as the mid-16th C, Fahnestock (2011, p. 390), says that “to amplify an element means to endow it with stylistic prominence so that it acquires conceptual importance in the discourse and salience in the minds of the audience” and that this could be key words, details, images, abstract concepts and a line of argument. A key characteristic of amplification is that the good is foregrounded and the bad is subdued. In “The Pastry Chef”, the title, showing the better part of Peter, in present time, is amplified; there is no mention of his past as a poacher. Indeed, the act of poaching is backgrounded; only the first four sentences describe him explicitly as a poacher. Even when he says, “I was poaching like someone who are professional” (S9), this is preceded by an implicit plea for an understanding of his circumstance: his life was difficult, he was uneducated and that he had no option but to continue the trade of his grandfather (S5 – S8). On the other hand, his self-confidence and pride in being able to learn English and transform himself as a pastry chef, as discussed above, is amplified. The greater transformation, however, is evident in S 26 – 29:

I don’t want this story to be the end of story. [26] My children it wasn’t going to be a poacher like me. [27] I want them to be a teacher of stopping people and telling people how bad it is when you killing animal. [28] / It’s better the animal to be alive than be dead. [29]
Peter’s story and introspection persuade viewers that we as individuals can learn from our experiences: one can challenge one’s moral fibre, change one’s attitude and behaviour, and more importantly break the chain in animal cruelty by educating future generations.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing stylistic analysis of the prologue, “From Brutal Poacher to Delicate Pastry Chef” and the visual narrative, “The Pastry Chef” support Nørgaard’s et al. (2010) notion that frameworks of literary analysis can be used for both print and moving images. In applying Leech and Short’s (2007) framework of literary analysis to both the print text and documentary, what emerges is that not all stylistic categories of the framework are necessarily evident in texts chosen for analysis, nor are they discrete categories. Rather, as the authors have signalled, their application for textual analysis is heuristic in nature.

The analysis reveals that language in digital media and in documentary form, as rhetoric, can be a powerful agent for promoting the ideologies of a scriptwriter. The intention of the scriptwriter in both the prologue and documentary texts is to create awareness of animal conservation and raise social consciousness by influencing audiences to become active backers of wildlife protection. The texts have been artfully constructed using various literary and stylistic features, more particularly lexical and grammatical items and elements of semantic cohesion, to realise the aims of conservationists and sponsors. This is firstly achieved by the joint role of the narrators in the prologue and the documentary – as observer and direct narrator in the form of self-presentation, respectively. In both texts, these serve a dual function: to influence the feelings and attitude of the reader toward the protagonist, and to provide authenticity to the story. The careful linguistic and stylistic choices in titles serve as rhetoric by positioning the protagonist in a period of time. In addition, lexical items such as specific noun choices (e.g. “poacher”, “hunter” and “pastry chef”); adjective and diction selections (e.g. “brutal”, “delicate” and “dangerous”); prepositions (e.g. “from” and “to”) and verb tenses (present, past and future) serve to develop characterisation, create atmosphere and provide temporal setting. Combined, they are also powerful agents for positioning viewers. Furthermore, sentence construction (both grammatical deviances and accurate syntax) and use of direct and indirect speech aid in creating a realistic worldview, drawing the audience into a state of belief as a result of which they will possibly take action. Moreover, the use of poetic devices such as alliteration add linguistic colour to the text; and construction of paragraphs and movements for sequence and emphasis, as well as semantic repetition gel the text cohesively and convincingly. Collectively, the language and style used in the prologue and documentary are rhetoric; the artful narratives of the scriptwriter show earnest intent in influencing people into turning their back to poaching and making a turn-about by becoming active backers of wildlife protection.
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APPENDIX A

“THE JOURNEY FROM BRUTAL POACHER TO DELICATE PASTRY CHEF”


And then, a crisis of conscience. [8] His grandmother made a desperate plea for Andrew to change his ways. [9] In a moment that changed his life forever, Brian Harris, former Wildlife Development Manager of Singita Grumeti, offered Andrew the opportunity to work in the hospitality industry. [10] Following his grandmother’s prompting, Andrew took the opportunity. [11] After an initial stint helping to construct a new lodge, Andrew found his feet in the kitchen. [12] In a new environment, still learning English, he excelled. [13] After a year, he was appointed as a full-time chef at Singita Faru Faru, earning the title of pastry chef. [14]

The same hands that once hacked tusks from elephants now make the most delicate confectionary treats. [15] His strength and poise find expression kneading dough. [16] Occasionally, he walks the same paths he used to hunt but now he has a different outlook. [17] He has a newfound respect for animals and wants to instil the values of conservation and appreciation for wildlife down to his children. [18]

APPENDIX B

“THE PASTRY CHEF”

I was fifteen when I start poaching. [1] I was a good runner, no-one catch-ed me. [2] I kill a lot of animals. [3] I was so dangerous. [4]

My life it was going so hard. [5] I get one answer. [6] I wasn’t having job to do rather than to learn what it is my grandpa doing. [7] His job it was to poach. [8] I was so quick and I was poaching like someone who are professional. [9] One day I was sitting in my home and the chairman of the village of Intchoka Village he was coming to me and asking me about there is some person calling Brian from Singita. [10] He want you to stop poaching and he need to give you a job. [11] From there I say, “Oh, which kind of job am I going to do?” because I am not educated I would just… [slight pause] just like I don’t want to go there. [12] My grandma, she was crying and she sayed, “You have to stop this.” [13] And then I said, “For you my grandpa, my grandma, I will stop and I will go work for that white man.” [14] And then I came in Singita. [15] I started like a staff cook for one year. [16] After that they picked me to the main kitchen and then when I go there I start learning but I was interested to be a pastry chef. [17] I start training in pastry I took like three months to make this nice rye bread and then I was so quick to understand and then I saw my problem it was English. [18] You have to know that English. [19] Everything in pastry, every book is written in English. [20] I was like, I must learn to speak this language. [21] I wasn’t shy. [22] I tried hard and I was to speak even if I speak broken but that was how I was learning in English. [23]

I have no much education but I’m working like a profession. [24] I’m proud of myself. [25] I don’t want this story to be the end of story. [26] My children it wasn’t going to be a poacher like me. [27] I want them to be a teacher of stopping people and telling people how bad it is when you killing animal. [28]

It’s better the animal to be alive than be dead. [29]