

PERSONAL REACTIONS TO THE PROJECTS OF LEAR AND STARK
AS EXPRESSED IN DISCOURSE

By

Nadia M. Khorshed
Assistant Professor, Women's College,
Ain Shams University

Introduction

Social acceptability seems to be based on specific conditions which prevail in all societies. The actual requirements vary according to culture and situation. Many of the socially prominent figures attempt to follow the conventions which guide the individuals' behaviour. A project, set for the benefit of the whole group, requires a considerable amount of social participation. The persons constructing vital enterprises, expect appropriate behaviours at various circumstances to reinforce what they choose to carry out for the whole group. Individuals vary in their reactions to useful projects.

There is a universal trust in the essentially constant nature of the majority of the people in all societies. In All The King's Men by Warren and Lear by Bond, Stark and Lear deliberately want to be benevolent to their people and the future generations. States of hostility developed in both situations.

The comparative study of both texts aims at describing the features illustrating similar incidents. The validity of reform motivations are compared. The sincerity of the designers must be accompanied with realistic views of life so that projects acquire

manageable dimensions. Collective social activities should be based on sound decisions so that they can evade disappointing situations. Offensive behaviour has occasional clarification in social encounters. The precise roles chosen by Stark and Lear in serving their societies are compared to the unexpected effects from the unwilling beneficiary societies.

The opening situations in both texts are expressed by conversations which proceed on the basic concept that the actual words and utterances, the speakers use, create the whole fictional world. Discourse conveys the causes and characteristics of the presented incidents. Grice (1975) and Leech (1983) confirm the need for an adequate quantity of information that should be given. The conversation should furnish enough truthful knowledge to communicate the exact setting for the introduction of activities. The textual structure provides information that enables the readers to follow the characters without obscurity. Edmonson (1981), Levinson (1983) and Coulthard and Montgomery (1981) discuss the basic components of discourse and how the participants establish the necessary conditions for the positive accomplishment of communicative speech such as giving new information, stating clear ideas and using a scheme for understanding the performance of each other.

In each situation the readers expect specific kind of details to gain information which is adequate for the scenery and expectations. The initial scheme in Lear is the introduction of the mythical concept of the situation surrounding the building of a wall around the city. The main information about Lear is clearly accessible to the readers. This is supplemented with further knowledge that is given about his daughters. The builders are in unbearable conditions. Most of the information that is given to the readers denote that the situation is not of normal living. The impression is that of disorder and miserable public conditions. The text visualisation details portray people who are deprived of basic normal conditions which are essential for all positive accomplishments. Their city is to become safe by the performance of building the wall around it to keep the enemies out of it.

The introductory situation in All The Kings' Men implies disorder in the speech of the person who insisted on mentioning the name of Stark on the occasion of opening the Memoriam. The speakers describe successive details of events that happened in the past. The semantic denotation of the conversation is that there are information items which must be accessible to the general public. The readers of the text are invited to pay close attention to this knowledge about the context, as it states a

dispute between the first two speakers:

Man. (Rising in audience.) Say it! Can't you even say his name? Damn it -- it was Willie Stark!

p.7

The man's attitude to the specific aspect of mentioning the name conveys a personal meaning which requires observation of the intense feelings of dissatisfaction. The context denotes the introduction of a great public service of free medical treatment to all the persons in the vicinity without any sort of discrimination. All society members are expected to benefit from the hospital's usage of the latest technology. Very efficient personnel and staff are to work at the memoriam. The initial situation gives this specific information about the range of activities offered to society. But at the same time the conversation implies that the participants share background knowledge containing a form of dispute. The situation is further extended to reveal the man's intention of making his information quite explicit to the whole group. He expresses his feelings about the whole situation and his temper conveys a public disapproval which is based on previous knowledge. The listeners completely disregard shared information during this specific occasion. The reader is placed in a difficult situation as he tries to find the reasons for the clear dispute. Obscurity is caused by the deficiency in previous information which is basic

to the understanding of the conversational units. However, the issues of the dispute cause the continual revelation of past events and background information. The discourse is carefully organised to reflect the personal characteristics of all those involved. The implied common knowledge of the situation is based on the general behaviour of specific persons in the group which exhibit typified complexities.

The linguistic behaviour of the man causes confusion in the group who are gathered for the opening of the Memoriam. The Senator tries to preserve order by providing information about the kind of service to be offered by the project that was designed by the late Willie Stark. The existence of inaccessible information behind this great project is experienced. The speakers exploit this situation where the listeners are eager to get access of unknown information and proceed to describe past social events. The discourse implies the fact that there is a basic disagreement among the speakers in relation to the past knowledge that they claim to share. The activities of Willie are described by those who were involved in his election campaigns. Their references to persons and events are carefully constructed to describe only what they believe is necessary to characterise his unique life.

Part I

The analysis of discourse is based on the fact that speech situations are mainly activities of interchanging reactions. Each conversation has a form of expressive units and coherence of its own. Emotional reactions in the contexts are motivated by authentic causes, as the participants attempt to affect each other. The reader of Lear must quickly start to understand the mythical symbols in the text so that he can form judgments about the persons in the speech situations. This is essential at the initial scene so that his tentative inferences concerning the future behaviour of each character can be reliable. The linguistic structure of discourse portrays the features of the speakers' characters. How does every speaker deal with the situations in the logical framework of the whole context denotes his personal characteristics. The reader is made to see Lear in relation to his particular circumstances. The building of the wall is causing a lot of death and misery to the constructing persons while Lear is exaggerating his oppressive measures in his desperate endeavours to build and carry out his project.

Lear. Show me this body.

Blow on the head.

Foreman. Axe.

Lear. What?

Foreman. An axe, Sir. Fell on him.

Lear. It's a flogging crime to delay work.(To WARRINGTON.)

You must deal with this fever. They treat their men like cattle. When they finish work they must be kept in dry huts. All these huts are wet. You waste men.

Councillor(making a note). I'll appoint a hut inspector.

Lear. They dug the wall up again last night.

Officer. Local farmers.We can't catch them,they scuttle back home so fast.

Lear. Use spring traps.(To FOREMAN.)Who dropped the axe?

Warrington(To FOREMAN).Be quick!

Lear. Court martial him.Fetch a firing squad.A drumhead trial for sabotage.

pp.2-3

Lear demonstrates a number of personal characteristics that the reader can perceive in his way of dealing with the working group. To make the behaviour of Lear predictable,the context contains various instances of his life which are related to immediate personal circumstances. Lear displays his personal judgment of others,which is premature in nature,and therefore has the quality of being full of errors. His concepts are self-confirming and he fails to see the danger expressed by his daughters when they disagree with his orders.

Lear moves out of the firing squad's way
Bodice.(loudly).Listen to me.All of you notice I
disassociate myself from this act.

Lear. Be quiet,Bodice.You mustn't talk like that
in front of me.

Fontanelle.And I agree with what my sister says.

Lear. O my poor children, you're too good for
this world.

p.4

The speeches of Lear give the reader cues to his ideas and concepts of his circumstances. The safety of his people is the central theme of his conversations; and he is careful to reveal the reason for his feelings of being in danger of outside attacks.

Bodice. Small and petty! All these things are in your head. The Duke of Cornwall is not a monster. The duke of North has not sworn to destroy you. I have proof of what I say.

Lear. They're my sworn enemies. I killed the fathers therefor the sons must hate me. And when I killed the fathers I stood on the field among our dead and swore to kill the sons! I'm too old now, they've fooled me. But they won't take my country and dig my bones up when I'm dead. Never.

p.5

Lear clearly draws a form of framework to his activities. The context discloses the reasons for the need for the wall in Lear's concept of safety. Nevertheless, the daughters do not share their father's feelings concerning the potential danger. Bodice and Fontanelle expose the features of their personalities by successive speech acts. They choose to defy their father and do not support the building of the wall during his reign. They marry the sons of his enemies and deprive him of his kingdom. During every conversation, both reveal different aspects of their

personalities. They present their rule of the city as chaotic during the short period they managed to hold the power. Each one does not only try to set the relation between her and her environment but also she tries to portray her concept of her sister as viciously as she could. They both participate in creating the story of their father's madness. But soon a revolution breaks and their co-operation is broken down as they try to save themselves. They accomplish nothing at all and they are killed after their involvement in public work.

The analysis of the two texts reveals a degree of similarity in an incident of losing a son or two daughters. Both situations display the members of the younger generations as having complete personal detachment from the fathers. The son of Willie Stark is committed to playing ball. He becomes publicly known for a short period while he is living with his divorced mother. He is instantly paralysed and later dies from an accident that causes an injury in his neck that cannot be cured. Lear and Stark develop their relationships to co-operate within their respective societies to attain personal involvement in social tasks which they decide for themselves.

Effective social work in All The King's Men and in Lear required change of attitude and behaviour. To guard their

interests both Lear and Stark had to learn to address the members of their environments in different techniques after situations of disappointments and strong emotional involvement. Other participants have to furnish an acceptable reason denoting and introducing the personal help needed. For example in the case of Stark, it is Sadie who tells him how to address the public after he understood why he could not succeed in the local elections.

Sadie. Hell, make 'em laugh. Make 'em cry. Stir 'em up. They aren't alive, most of them and haven't been in twenty years. Hell, their wives have lost their shapes, likker won't set on their stomach, and they lost their religion, so it is up to you to stir 'em up and make 'em feel alive again. For half an hour. They'll love you for it. Well, heat 'em up.

Stark. I've heard that kind of talk.

Sadie. Well, it's no secret. It gets around.

Stark. Maybe I can't talk that way.

Sadie. That's the only way you'll ever be Governor.

p.24

Every person has a unique form of reaction but at the same time he can change his behaviour for social purposes. The occasion of elections depends on cultural circumstances. Stark prepares few topics that he thinks are essential for his listeners. He vaguely forms a stanza that is to define his activities in the vision of his listeners.

Stark. Your will is my strength.
Your hope is my justification.

Your need is my law.
your heart is my own.

p.29

After deciding to succeed in the elections Stark decides to discuss particular topics with his society members. He pursues the issues that are suitable for the occasion only. The structure of the language he uses reveals his thinking and his intentions. His election campaigns do not depend on factual information but on the expression of the people's aspirations and feelings. Stark expresses a form of objectivity to what is happening in his society.

Lear changes his personal characteristics almost completely as a result of the huge amount of suffering he had to bear under the rule of his daughters and the revolution. At last he is willing to interact with all persons who expect him to inform them about life situations. His listeners are numerous though his speech is characterised by imprecision and fragmented knowledge. People continually come to his place and he casually speaks to them but the government does not tolerate this interference with the lives of others because now he is repeatedly encouraging people to live their normal life. Lear is trying to express the feelings of the values of life away from the revolutionary measures and even the building of the wall because he came to

realise its destructive effects on the lives of the peasants and the results of neglecting the cultivation of the land. The listeners are expected to figure for themselves the suitable life conditions. Lear only gives incoherent facts about life and recommendations as to how to attain expectations.

Lear. Stop people listening

Cordelia. I can't. You say what they want to hear.

Lear. If that is true - If only some of them want to hear- I must speak.

Cordelia. Yes, you sound like the voice of my conscience. But if you listened to everything your conscience told you you'd go mad. You'd never get anything done- and there's a lot to do, some of it is very hard.

p. 84

Lear is trying to explain to Cordelia and the readers as well the reasons why he has changed his point of view regarding the building of the wall.. He gives his concept of the consequences of neglecting the land on society as he has discovered them lately after personal experience. She is hesitant to accept his interpretation of the effects of the government measures which are not accepted by the majority of individuals. Cordelia has a completely different background. She is not seeking clarification and she is not the person who is to ensure the carrying out of the project of building a wall to keep the enemies out of their city. Both Lear and Cordelia have changed;

their interpretations of the present social situations are completely different. Each selects specific events which enforce his manner of thinking. The wall will be built by Cordelia and her government group which are revolutionaries. They are guided by the assumptions of defence which had moved Lear to begin the project previously. They are meeting most of the reactionary activities which have persisted behind the efforts of collecting workers. Uncertainty of the expected safety and the present intolerable measures give rise to confusion and chaos. During the reign of King Lear, Cordelia was a very weak person. She was the wife of the gravedigger's boy. Cordelia could not defend herself when the soldiers attacked her and her home. Initially she was introduced in the text as a person who kept crying for reasons she herself could not explain or even understand. She kept having fear of an unhappy future that she could not predict.

Wife.(crying).Hold me. Stop me crying.

Boy.(holding her). You must take things easy now. You work too hard.

Wife. Don't say that! It's not true!

Boy. All right, I won't.

Wife. But you don't believe me.

Boy. Yes I do.

Wife. You don't. I can see you don't. Why can't I make you happy?

Boy. I am happy.

p.20

The two analysed texts render the lives of Tiny Duffy and the wife Cordelia in similar accounts of lively events. The specific order of incidents which shape their lives is described according to one apparent pattern of events. The readers do not interpret them identically because they are constructed within the varied contexts of the situations. However the interpretations of the pattern of events reveal a similar succession of characterising events. The semantic component denotes a coherent pattern of behaviour in the activities of each. In most of the occasions the clarifying discourse supplies the readers with genuine causes for the structural events. In relation to family situations Cordelia is the daughter of a priest, who is higher in social standard than the gravedigger boy. She is introduced as intelligent and educated.

Boy. We're supposed to be a bad match. I know her father didn't want us to marry. He's never come to see us. I asked him. I don't like that, it makes you feel bad. He's a priest, he taught her everything. She's very clever, but she can't understand how I live.

p.26

The introduction of Duffy has a number of implied similar concepts. The basic principles which are intentionally communicated are his intelligence, experience and knowledge. This is stated indirectly in Duffy's own speech.

Jack. (To professor, as light is down on Lucy and Tom).
Yes. Lucy knew him too. I'll tell you what he was
back when I first saw him. And if you can
understand that, you will understand what you must
understand. It was back in 1930, and I was in the
Lock room of Slade's speakeasy with Tiny Duffy who
was city tax assessor, a city hall swell with a
hard straw hat and a diamond ring and lard oozing
sweetly from every pore.

Jack. (Moving to platform, C. where Duffy, in shirt sleeves,
is reading a paper. A table with red-check cloth is
before him.) Who's this guy you waiting for?

Duffy. From the sticks. Name is Stark. Hey Slade, will you
turn that damn thing down? Name of Stark. County
Treasurer up in Mason County. Some hick, I never
laid eyes on him. A guy's bringing him to me to see
about some school bonds they're trying to float up
there. Just to get the benefit of my advice, my
experience.

p.21

The Professor and Jack give a clear description of the
relationship between Stark and Duffy as they are trying to
recollect their past experience. They do not state directly their
intentions of clarifying the ambiguities about the past of both
public figures. Duffy was exploited by Stark who was the
potential statesman. Success in political campaigns was giving
Stark power and popularity. The speakers are trying to recollect
and hypothesise what was going on through their past experience.
A general idea is conveyed about the situation. Duffy was called
tiny which implied his position in Stark's group. From the
discourse we assume that everybody used to follow Stark's orders
and directions.

Professor. All right, and there was Duffy. Don't forget him, Mr. Burden, the crook Stark made his Lieutenant-Governor.

Jack. Sure, he used him. And if you are the scientific realist, you ought to know why. Willie had been wised up and knew what he had to do. He had to use Duffy.

Professor. Oh, I don't object. It was historically necessary to use Duffy. I merely want to keep the record straight.

Jack. Well, to keep the record straight, had you thought of this? That Stark had Duffy because Duffy was another self - the self the Boss could give every insult to and contempt - what one self of Stark did to the other self as a tribute to what Stark wanted to be?

pp.29-30

The observation of Duffy's performance denotes a change in his character, for he becomes the Senator who succeeds Stark. He seems to accept the exploitation of Stark at the beginning of their co-operative work. He wanted to belong to Stark's group. But later he was able to create a role for himself within the framework of campaigning and ruling. In relating some particular details of events, the professor informs the readers that a few years after joining Stark's group Duffy was able to plan for the accomplishment of Stark's hospital.

Professor. That is amateur psychology, Mr. Burden. He wanted Duffy because Duffy was a crook, plain and simple. And it was Duffy, in 1938 when Stark was under impeachment, fixed up the rotten contract with Larsen for the hospital and who -

p.30

The change in Duffy's character is just one event in the coherent structure of the play. He manages to take over the influential post of Senator after the death of Stark. This is similar to the accomplishment that is achieved by Cordelia in society. She becomes the most important figure in the revolutionary government. She is conscious of her obligation to defend the city and therefore performs the project designed and introduced by Lear when he was in power. She performs according to her acquired responsibility even against the expressed will of Lear himself.

Lear. Don't build the wall.

Cordelia. We must.

Lear. Then nothing's changed! A revolution must at least reform.

Cordelia. Everything else is changed!

Lear. Not if you keep the wall! Put it down!

Cordelia. We'd be attacked by our enemies!

Lear. The wall will destroy you. It's already doing it. How can I make you see?

p.84

Her conscious determination is conveyed in a spontaneous speech that is marked by her feelings of personal appreciation towards Lear.

Through structural analysis the reader identifies a similar activity performed by Duffy, who is observed on a platform. He discusses the expectations of his post and his personal relations. In his case as he changes his role in society, he declares his responsibility of building Stark's hospital.

Duffy. (Revealed on platform, addressing the audience.)
- and friends, after all these years, on this memorable occasion, I can still promise you that Willie Stark's great dream will come true. I have built his hospital. I have kept faith with Willie Stark because I loved him -- We all loved Willie --
p.64

Part II

In Coulthard and Montgomery (1981) the description of discourse is divided into the focus and the frame where each serves to specify parts of the analysis. Stubbs (1983) concentrates on the social motivations of discourse and describes various motivations in discourse. To compare the activities of Lear and Stark and the social reactions to their projects, discourse in both situations is the reliable source of data. The context denotes the motives, the exact expressions of ideas and accomplished acts. The description provided by other persons sometimes conveys essential information. The reasoning

process is reflected in the social interactions which contribute to the characterising information by implying personal traits.

Comparison is based on interpretations and inferences from the texts. The speech acts and situations described denote the intention of the main character in each case to carry out a project for the welfare of society. The cues of similarity lie in both the character sketches of Lear and Stark and in events surrounding the projects. The actions are portrayed in both texts by discourse in verbal accounts communicating the present states of affairs which are based on the implied former experience. The verbal description of Stark's hospital accompanied his definite intention of signing the contract for constructing it.

Stark. Slaves down in the Legislature, and sons-of-bitches up here. (Stark sits at desk, brooding a moment.) Damn it, nobody understands me, not even you. (After a pause.) I'm gonna build the biggest and best hospital money can buy. And any man or woman or child, in sickness or in pain, can walk through those doors, and know that all man can do will be done to cure sickness and ease pain. Free. Not as a charity, but as a right. And I don't care if he votes for me or not. Hear me?

p.32

The reconstruction of environmental characteristics can imply an identifying aspect in the effects of this project and the wall

suggested by Lear. The projection of the benefits that other persons are to gain is the focus of the two emotionally loaded expressions describing the projects. The texts do not contain all the details but only a selection of events conveying the processes, as well as incorporating implications of connected reactions. Lear defines his motives as he clarifies some of his actions which seem irresponsible and need supplementary interpretation.

Lear. I started this wall when I was young. I stopped my enemies in the field, but there were always more of them. How could we ever be free? So I built this wall to keep our enemies out. My people will live behind this wall when I'm dead. You may be governed by fools but you'll always live in peace. My wall will make you free.

p.3

The interpretation of the excerpts reveals similarities in the goals to be attained by the projects. Because of the differences in the type of social life, they are trying to give their societies future safety from sickness in one case and from aggression in the other. The analogy denotes similar abilities of defining their goals and identifying the needed measures. Both are confronted with a series of problems from other persons who cannot perceive or attach the same values to the work needed. Death comes at the end as an immediate action following the assassination. It takes place in a situation where their are

witnesses and as a result of an intentional act of shooting to kill in each case.

Discourse reveals the personal characteristics of Lear. The situation of building the wall clarifies his concepts of life situations in his environment. The significant change in his life takes place when he is dethroned. He expects contradictory measures as he expresses unexpected ideas in his new situation. He is informed about his wall and the war in fragmentary details that roughly denote a lack of stability which signifies a coming reorganisation. Past information about the way people reacted to the building of the wall is given by the gravedigger's boy

Lear. I could have a new life here. I could forget all the things that frighten me - the years I've wasted, my enemies, my anger, my mistakes. I've been too trusting, too lenient! I'm tormented by regrets - I must forget it all, throw it away! Yes! - let me live here and work for you.

Boy. Good. You'll be a real help to me when you've settled in. I'll be able to clear some more fields. You needn't worry about the soldiers. They are too busy looking for the king to worry about you. Did you know they're pulling his wall down?

Lear. The wall?

Boy. Up and down, up and down. The king was mad. He took all the men from this village. But I hid. They'd worked with their hands all their lives but when they started on the wall their hands bled for a week.

Lear. No.

Boy. You died of work or they shot you for not working. There was a disease -

Lear. They tried to stop that.

Boy. - 'wall death'. Their feet used to swell in the mud. The stink of it even when you were asleep! Living in a grave! He should come here - I'd go back to my old job and dig a grave for him! We used to dig his wall up at nights, when they were working near here.

p.25

Lear's past knowledge of the situation around his wall is changed according to the new information he gets from the boy. His ideas concerning the effects of the wall as the shield for human life and safety which was previously held is replaced by the newly acquired meaning denoting the destructive processes which accompany its construction.

The comparison of the units of events in the lives of Lear and Stark denotes that both portray a past life of a prominent figure. The recognised analogy is identified by the details of life conditions which led to their social relations in a probable succession of situations. The direction of activities coincides in the eagerness to preserve human life in a society that does not recognise the amount of emotional involvement in the project. The people surrounding the project do not feel the great necessity for it in each case. The process of building the wall is met with defying individuals. The construction of the hospital is faced with continual hardships by the impeachment group. The impression Stark gives of his project clashes with Tiny's intentions of choosing the contractor and Jack's digging of past

information about public figures.

Duffy. Boss, with Mr.Larsen this would be slick --(Pwng Stark's shoulder.) Boss, I know you know. And Boss -- (Delighted with himself.) --it'll be slick. Boss, I got a surprise for you! (Gesturing U.L.Larsen appears, composed and watchful. Stark stares at him an instant, dumbfounded, as Duffy continues.) Yeah, Boss, I knew you'd want to see Mr.Larsen. I just knew you'd want to talk a little turkey with Mr.Larsen, I knew --

Stark. (Moving on Duffy, but speaking in a low, grating, controlled voice.) Say it again and I'll strangle you. Larsen won't touch my hospital -- Larsen or nobody like him. And you--you hyena-headed, feist-faced, belly-dragging son of a slack-gutted she-wolf--(with anguished look at Larsen, Duffy flees. Stark turns on Larsen.) And as for you Gummy--(Larsen completely calm and cold confronts him, rolling a cigarette between a thumb and forefinger.)

Larsen. Yes, Governor, it is all a matter of timing. The timing was bad. You are not ready to do business with me.

p.31

The lexical structure of the quotation reveals Stark's choice of words as well as his personal relation to Duffy who becomes the senator after Stark's death. The units of the text denote the power of Stark over his group. The speech shows other facts as well. Duffy is the recipient of all these successive insults and he runs away from the room when Stark gets very angry. The quotation illustrates the impression of Stark's characteristic trait of expressing his feelings towards others and giving his judgment of their characters. The portrayal of Stark is also

supplemented by the speeches of his friends as they relate how they participated in the sequence of events. Thus the information defining Stark's qualities are furnished from different persons, who keep remembering actions from past time.

The comparison of Lear to Stark can connect between the status of Lear in his surrounding group and towards his successors to that of Stark. The coincidence lies in the recognition of his ability to direct the whole group depending on his own extraordinary competence. Speech acts accomplish the relations between him and his daughters who are to succeed him in power over the kingdom. The fundamental weakness of Bodice and Fontanelle is expressed by Lear.

Lear. Work! Get your men to work! get them on the wall!
(Workers, soldiers and foremen go out. They take the two bodies with them).
I knew it would come to this! I knew you were malicious!
I built my wall against you as well as my other enemies!
You talk of marriage? You have murdered your family.
There will be no more children. Your husbands are
impotent. That's not an empty insult. You wrote? My
spies know more than that! You will get nothing from
this crime. You have prevented lusts. They won't be
satisfied. It is perverted to want your pleasure where
it makes others suffer. I pity the men who share your
beds. I've watched you scheme and plan - They'll lie by
you when you dream! Where will your ambition end? You
will throw old men from their coffins, break children's
legs, pull the hair from old women's heads, make young
men walk the streets in beggary and cold while their

wives grow empty and despair - I am ashamed of my tears!
You have done this to me. The people will judge between
you and me.

p.7

Lear is addressing his daughters and the units of speech are similar to those chosen by Stark to insult Duffy for getting Larsen to construct the hospital and thus be in charge of the project. The recognised connection relates the experience of the prominent figures and the continuity of the situations they establish. Information about Larsen is similar to that about North and Cornwall. Thus the reaction to a suggestion of the benefits that might come to his group by Larsen's works is completely refused by Stark. Similarly Lear refuses to accept the idea that his kingdom might benefit by the efforts of North and Cornwall when they marry his daughters and thus enter into his family. The implied concepts of these persons are based on incomplete information. Their direct speech does not reveal fundamental characteristics but only serves to add some connecting units to the sequence of activities.

There is a form of parallelism between the life of Stark and that of Lear which is based on the information inferred from the analysed texts. Bond and Warren created fiction characters which can be related to each other through imaginative events and speech acts. The concept of a prominent figure is initially drawn

as mainly sensitive to social problems and intentionally taking measures towards an unexpected improvement of existing conditions. Grice(1975) describes situational implications which can be inferred from various speeches. The comparison of the experience and life events of both denotes several destructive actions which disturb their peace and personal situations. The changes in the attitude of Lear and Stark are apparent evidence of the effects of human reactions when persons become aware of varied destructive factors on their achievements.

Part III

This analysis specifies the similarities in the two texts as they are used in the construction of the explicit contexts. Although many similar incidents distinguish the rational progression of the content, the structure in each case is rendered unique by the differences in the technique of exposition. The quotations exemplify the perceptual semantic components as analogous actions which are interpreted in relation to their contexts to facilitate inferences from speech events.

Therefore the illustrated correlations are concentrated on the incidents and activities which serve to function as focusing the content on human attitudes. The discourse construction displays rational succession of events in unique situations. Lyons(1979) differentiates between regular components and standard components of texts. The research does not assume implied simplicity of texture but it denotes features of subject matter. The notion of similar incidents in varied contexts describes the framework in each case by specifying how they are being used to organise relevant constituents of definable situations. A partially common framework of incidents is used to denote contextual features similar in the semantic components only. The lexical components of the descriptive constituents are suitable to the propositional meaning of the discourse. Figurative expressions and sentence structures convey typical attitudes with their components. The background situations are specifying aspects of each which are recognised as the typical causes of events. The environment incidents construct discourse implications which require specific processes of responsive activities. Grammatical constituents enhance the explicitness of both texts. The sentences are intentionally constructed to denote the subject-matter explicitly in almost all situations. Direct speech constitutes the majority of the sentences, which conveys the speakers' behaviour directly.

All The King's Men makes use of the exposition form of a person recollecting successive incidents back in the past that he shared with Willie Stark. There is a certain projection of the present before the movement towards past incidents. The actions narrated in the past are placed amidst a group of living persons who are present at the opening of the hospital. After giving a sketchy idea about Stark's past, the context implies a substantial change in his behaviour. The speech of the surrounding group is portrayed as effectively bringing about the change that would lead to his death. Originally he came from a small county where he acted as a very conscientious member of society and was happily living within this provincial environment with his wife and son. The background reflects pure human honesty. This scenery is evoked later amidst the expression of the central theme of energetic campaigning where Stark changes almost completely to reach the popularity of city prominent figures. The group around him is not the family relations but business personnel who serve his new job which is appropriate to the huge city construction. The inferred contrast in Stark's attitudes towards his family convey his contradictory thinking. He urges his friend to dig for any condemning past event on the judge that he likes. He insists on building the best type of hospital to give his society the best medical facilities free to

every person. Meanwhile, he uses every possible way to force Dr. Adam to work at the hospital knowing that the doctor would not easily accept to co-operate with any project of his. He has learned to be very convincing and can fascinate a crowd with his passionate speech. But he does not have a normal family life after his wife took his son and left their home. A sense of loneliness is implied in his awareness of the fact that he has to take all the decisions by himself. A strong sense of responsibility defines his leadership of the campaigning group. His views of life and realistic situations imply his acceptance of all forms of differences in the huge environment with which he is related after his political career succeeded and he attained influence and power.

Lear begins with an inexplicable situation symbolising the great suffering of the society. This initial structure prefigures the complete reversal of the whole regime. The speech situations reflect the incomprehensible problems which are not accepted by the society around the wall. Lear is the only person who is convinced with the benefits of the wall to the city. Everybody else even his daughters express their uncertainty and doubt. The radical reversal in Lear's ideas are reached after his experience amidst the painful darkness of his blindness. The solitude in prison obviously is an effective experience. He refuses to run

away from prison when he gets a chance. Groping in the darkness of great suffering, Lear begins to love all members of society and speaks of the essence of life. His decision to live on the farm is a preliminary action to be followed by all those who will come and listen to his wise and expressive speeches. Meanwhile he does not accept to relate himself with the ruling society of the revolution whose members he had known before. He does not pacify the aggressive power which follows him to this secluded place. Lear is more influential in his maturity because his views of life support the preservation and safety for all existing members. The presentation of his relationship towards all his visitors reflects his deep concern for all. The theme is stressed by stylistic features denoting his complete refusal to deny any person his sincere counselling. He comes to symbolise human experience, as he teaches the love of life while the ruling group lacks the safety conditions. With all their forces they cannot convince him or control his activities.

The situation of complete helplessness is implied in the governmental resolution to remove Lear by force from his village. His hope of mixing with people is ended, when they are resolved to imprison him again. Lear's established practice of speech among eager listeners has to end. In his despair, he is killed by

overnment officials.

The biographical style is constructed around the idea of building the wall and its effects on the personal and society levels.

The use of speech to influence groups of people can be described in relation to the ideas expressed by Leech(1983) and Brown and Yule(1983). Speech is an action of sending messages using words which are chosen by the speaker from the repertoire of his own memory to affect a change in the listener's information about specific ideas. Personal impression, communicated with speech, can convince the listener with the speaker's point of view. Language units add personal identifying shades of meaning to influence the listener. These usages of the spoken expressions of ideas are exploited by both Lear and Stark to achieve their intended ends. Both achieve power and social influence by using their skill in convincing their listeners, who come to them by their own free will.

The analysis of the texts proves that both have some forms of perspectives they want to convey. These messages are frequently intended to convey a beneficial idea to the listeners by the intentional act of speaking. Lear is giving his wise

advice concerning the ways of peaceful living. Stark in his election campaigns is drawing flowery pictures of the future that he promises to bring about. The medium of spoken language is used in expressive utterances. The speaker's selection of linguistic units is related to the situations in which the encoding and the decoding of the ideas are taking place. The speaker's feelings are frequently used to place the focus on a certain item of the utterance. The emphasis to be conveyed by the utterances has to be encoded into intonation contours which can specify the focus in speech. Linguistic functions enable the speaker to emphasise any aspect of the situation according to his own choice from the potentials of the context. Occasionally, Lear makes use of specific associations to his experience in the past. Meanwhile, Stark expresses his inferences from associating his concept of social life with the aspirations of his contemporaries. He affects his fans with his decisive statements.

The generative aspects of discourse are used by the speakers to communicate clearly not only ideas but also all forms of relations. Lear assumes the role of the sage in his society as he expresses his deep concern for the strangers who come to listen to his speeches and walk along their own life situations. The government representatives do not find this situation neutral

to their efforts to build the wall around their territory. The speaker's past experience always affects his usage of the language. The listener in decoding every linguistic message is also guided by past comprehension of various communication factors.

The wide popularity of Stark is based on his ability to use the tools of the language to influence and convince large groups of people. His efforts to persuade the voters are based on his intelligent understanding of their basic interests. Stark understands the public general knowledge and in addressing his voters; he is always relating his personal effort to the groups' service. His selection of a public perspective is exemplified in insisting to provide the best medical care for everybody and free as an insurance against unexpected injuries and illnesses. Stark impresses his audiences as a reliable representative of their aspirations. His observation of the individual experiences of his associates illustrates his exceptional competence. His expressions are specifically informative; even the names he gives to his assistants are comprehensible. The use of slang words conveys a message to the reader of the text. The characteristics of the context as one whole are based on Stark's behaviour, and that of the other main characters but not with the same criterion of judgment. His personal relationships are expressed in more

detail than those of the other persons in the context. His death is brought about by social values that he did not anticipate.

Conclusion

The analysis of the speech segments given by Stark denotes that his choice of expressions formulates a favourable environment for his ideas to be inferred within. This is also achieved by Lear amidst the listeners who walk to his home far from the city and are made to accept his advice by the atmosphere of free choices that he suggests. Both leaders depend on the construction of contextual messages that are part of their personal dreams of happy social situations coming true. The words chosen to convey these messages are simple and clear. The listeners are given the suggestions which denote the possibility of achievements by implications. The novelty of expressive form adds to the implied meaning because the listener will always direct the new message towards his own stream of rationalisation. As a way to attain power, language is carefully manipulated. The repetition of the effective structures renders the utterances exceptionally communicative.

Choosing the suitable time to speak to people is another basic issue. The particular choice of situation is as important as the particular choice of linguistic structures in exercising influence by convictions. This is possible when the speaker chooses practical messages. Then he can perceive the effects immediately. Therefore we can state that both Lear and Stark make use of an aspired social reality to attain social popularity. Their main tool is the construction of new and effective linguistic constructions that lead the listeners to believe their own inferences about the possibility of better social situations. A favourable situation is created where the feelings of love and understanding are formed between Lear and the villagers. Stark is able to attract a large crowd of fans who are always attending his speeches.

Lear denounces his project which was the reason for the hatred of the people towards him. He dies symbolically trying to remove parts of its structure. Stark dies asking "why", denoting his failure to comprehend the deplorable situation of his assassination and his willingness to understand linguistic messages.

Bibliography

- Bond, E. Lear, New York: Hill and Wang, 1972.
- Brown, P. and Yule, G. Discourse Analysis, London: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Coulthard, M. and Montgomery, M. (Eds.) Studies in Discourse Analysis, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Edmonson, W. Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis, London: Longman, 1981.
- Frazier, L. The Study of Linguistic Complexity, In A. Davison and G. M. Green (Eds.) Linguistic Complexity and Text Comprehension, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980, pp193-222.
- Green, G. M. Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1989.
- Grice, H. P. Logic and Conversation, In P. Cole and J. Morgan (Eds.) Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts, New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Harre, R. Persuasion and Manipulation, In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.) Discourse and Communication, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985, pp126-140.
- Jong, I. J. F. Narrators and Focalizers, Amsterdam: B. R. Gruner Publishers Co., 1987.
- Leech, G. Principles of Pragmatics, London: Longman, 1983.
- Levinson, S. Pragmatics, London: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Lyons, J. Semantics, London: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R. W. Conversational Analysis, In J. C. Richards and R. W. Schmidt (Eds.) Language and Communication, London: Longman, 1983, pp 117-156.
- Scharine, R. The Plays of Edward Bond, London: Associated University Press, 1976.

Snipes, K. Robert Penn Warren, London: Fredric Ungar Publishing Co., 1983.

Stubbs, M. Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.

Warren, R.P. All The King's Men, New York: Dramatists Play Service Inc., 1960.

