

A Critical Study of the Role of “Advantage” in Constructing Contradictory Perspectives toward Religious Institutions in Robert Bolt’s ‘A Man for All Seasons’

Ali Basarati*

Department of English language Teaching, university of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

Seyyed Mohammad Razi Nejad

Department of English language Teaching, university of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

Abstract

The present study critically investigates the role of advantage in constructing different or contradictory perspectives toward religious institutions in Robert Bolt’s ‘A man for all seasons’. The corpus of the present study consists of the collection of specific dialogues taken from the body of the play that serve the objectives of the present study. The current research seeks to find out specific ideological textual elements that contribute to point out how advantage theoretically constructs various perspectives. Theoretically, this study is grounded on critical discourse analysis, and Norman Fairclough’s three dimensional approach applied for the analytical processes. The departing point of this study is that it focuses on the type of advantage as the main reason for the rise of any ideology and discourse. It was concluded that the opposite types of advantages in the same fields of action would result in contradictory discourses, even if they have sprung from the very ideology.

Keywords: advantage; ideology; perspective; critical discourse analysis

1. Introduction

Ideology and power are two important notions in critical studies that they mutually take one another under effect. There is a dialectic relationship between ideology and power. The former produces power and the later stabilizes the ideology. Ideologies give rise to power relations in social structures and contribute dominant block to set the society in predefined orders. There may always be a shadow of advantage in the rise of any ideology. Although this claim seems to be materialistic, there is no limitation extending the borders of advantage. Marx and Engels (1688: 305) focus on needs as a motivation for social structures and social practices. They claim, “Where individuals have needs, they thereby have a vocation and task”. In the realm of politics nothing but maintaining power is absolute. This is the constant factor in any power-practicing institution by which any socio-political practices are justified. Therefore, ethics in power is shaped and re-shaped in accordance with the requirements of power-maintaining processes (Soroush 2013:231). Hanna Arendt (1965:13) also believes that *necessity* has got various meanings in facing with different things, to the extent that, the necessity determines sufficient justifications to dub a war unjust rather than just. She believes that conquest, expansion, defense of vested interests, conversations of power in view of the rise of new and threatening powers for support of a given power equilibrium were not only the causes of the outbreak of most wars in history, they were also recognized as ‘ necessities; that is as legitimates motives to invoke a decision by arms. In this connection, Russell (1996:5) states that *love of power* is the characteristic of the men who are causally important. It may be mistaken if love of power may be regarded as a sole human motive, but this mistake would not lead us so much astray as might be expected in the search for casual laws in social science, since love of power is the chief motive producing the changes which social science has no study. So to speak, in order for an advantage, need, necessity, power maintenance or love of power to be achieved, an apt context is extremely required.

This context determines the kind of power, ideology and hegemony required to constitute a discourse. It is assumed that the discourse is the product of an advantage. By the time an appropriate context is provided, this is the task of power to apply the requirements of the advantage. Therefore, the power can also preserve the context or even transform it. The context is flexible and it adapts itself with the position of other contexts out of the realm the advantage. Context, on one hand, limits the range of possible interpretations and, on the other hand, supports the intended interpretations (Hymes 1962, quoted in Wotton 1975:44 and Brown and Yule 1983:37).The outer contexts may be socio-cultural, socio-political and socio-economic contexts.

The achievement of an advantage is done by the agency of power. This is to imply that without the presence of power beside the ideology, the project of acquiring advantage will remain null and void. For the agency of power facilitated, ideology should provide a natural context within the society. Inside this imaginary but naturalized context, the individuals become the subjects of that ideology and find illusionary identity, which their real existence is found related to it. In this connection, Althusser believes that “ideology is a ‘representation’ of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence” (Althusser 1971:241). Ideology acts in the way in which one formulates something, and the other formations are excluded by the choice of a

particular formulation and experience lies at the exertion of ideological influence (Sauer 1989:4).

Power begins its hegemony and domination when an imaginary ideological context or formulation is current in the society. Fairclough (1989:2) states that the exercise of power in modern society is increasingly achieved through ideology. Van Dijk (1998: 138) also claims that ideology serves to legitimate power and inequality. Similarly, ideologies are assumed to conceal, hide or otherwise obfuscate the truth, reality or indeed the objective condition of existence or the interests of social formation. Ideologies are seen as one modality of power, a modality that constitutes and preserves power relations (Fairclough 2010: 73).

In this respect, the important point is that how ideology contributes to sustain relations of power. The key answer to this point is that ideology sustains or even undermines power relations through discourse practices. That is discourses are outputs of the interaction of power and ideology along with the super-ordination of an advantage. Fairclough (Ibid: 67) states that in principle power relations may be influenced by discursive practices in any type of discourse, even in scientific and theoretical discourse. In one aspect discourse is typically exploited for various senses, including meaning-making as an element of social processes and a way of constructing aspects of the world associated with a particular social perspective (Gee and Handford 2012: 11). Semiosis is preferred to be assumed as the meaning-making aspect of discourse. Therefore, semiosis is looked at as an element of social process, which is dialectically related to others. Thus, social relations, power relations, institutions, beliefs and cultural values are in part semiotic (Ibid). Therefore, discourses sustain social phenomena in specific semiotic system and provide certain meaning/s for them. According to Fairclough and Fairclough (2012: 18) the purpose of political discourse may be to convince an audience that a certain course of action is right or certain point of view is true. In other ways, the advantage of politics lies in shaping and re-shaping public's point of view toward specific actions. This is what Arendt (1965) calls it a necessity. Fairclough (1989:33) claims that ideological power, the power to project one's practices, as universal and 'common' sense is a significant complement to economic and political power because it is exercised in discourse. He also maintains that there are in gross terms two ways in which those who have the power can exercise and keep it: through coercion or consent. Ideology is the key mechanism of rule by consent and because it is favored vehicle of ideology, discourse is of significant social significance in this connection. However this is the nature of ideology that determines which of these ways exploited for the fulfillment of the major objective that is advantage.

Social consent is attained by means of hegemony. However, hegemony, as a unitary meaning can become dominant in the majority of social structures. For Fairclough (2010: 61) hegemony is power over society, but it is never achieved more than partially and temporarily. Hegemony means to construct solidarity and integration rather than simply dominating. Discourses include not only representations of how things are; they can also be representations of how things could be (Fairclough 2003).

For a consequence, discourses are constructed as a tool for the satisfaction of the advantage. Therefore, they are ideologically determined and determine ideologies. Discourse produces power and fuels it. Therefore, among very many sources of power in social life, it is ideological power of discourse that wins a greater share in constructing varying and contradictory perspectives. Needless to say that the ideological power of a discourse is also determined by the advantage. All the elements of a discourse revolve around the constant factor that is advantage.

2. Literature Review

Regarding the objective of the current study, having access to articles pondering on the role of advantage-like phenomena in constructing worldviews was not accomplished. Therefore, two studies concentrating on ideology in producing meaning were selected. These studies are partly in the same field with the present study.

In a study "The infusion of Islam into pluralistic politics: The need to explore the Islamist identity beyond ideological boundaries; the case of the Moroccan Party of Justice and Development", Mellouki (2015) analyzes the discourse of the Moroccan Party of Justice and Development (PJD) according to the plan by which women are integrated into development. In this research, it is aimed to explore the Islamist discourse beyond the sedimented assumption that it is ideologically premised that at least undermines the Islamist experience to an ideological principle. This research mainly contributes to both decentralize the ideology with which research on political Islam has been mainly concerned, and emphasize the processes of meaning-making and identity construction processes.

Goodman and Johnson (2013) in an article "strategies used by the far right to counter accusations of racism" address the way in which the leader of the far-right British National Party (BNP), Nick Griffin, tries to present the party as non-racist during hostile media appearances. The aim of the present study is to address the question: 'how the BNP is presented that makes it appear reasonable and achieve 'fascism recalibration'. It was found out that three strategies employed for this objective. These strategies are: the party is presented as acting as a moderating force, acting in minority groups' best interests and acting as opposing minority groups because of their own prejudices.

In the present study, it is intended to critically study the role of ‘advantage’ in giving rise to different and somehow contradictory perspectives toward religious institutions in Rober Bolt’s “A man for all seasons”. In spite of the most agreed upon principles, which state that discourses shape, and are shaped by ideologies, and they are involved in meaning-making processes, in this study it is intended to show that a discourse may be the product of an advantage Advantage can bear a vast domain of meanings and it is not contained in one monolithically materialistic definition. This issue serves as the departing point of the current research. In so doing the following research questions will be investigated.

1. What specific textual elements are used to indicate ideological methodologies?
2. How does advantage construct various perspectives?

3. Methodology

3.1 Corpus

The corpus of the present study consists of some of the ideologically significant dialogues of Robert Bolt’s ‘A man for all seasons’. In order for having the maximum result and congruence between the research questions and the data, those dialogues with having the most ideologically significant textual elements were chosen to be critically analyzed.

3.2 Instrumentation

Among the various methodologies for doing CDA, the data will be analyzed based on the three dimensional methodology of Norman Fairclough for Critical Discourse Analysis. The data will be investigated in the levels of Description, Interpretation and Explanation.

Description is the first stage of the CDA, which includes the analysis of the texture of texts. The first stage of the textual analysis is the examination of the linguistic analysis of the text on morphological and grammatical levels. In other terms, textual analysis includes experiential, interpersonal and expressive values of textual features. (1981:111).

Experiential or ideational value looks at sentences from the point of view of what it is about. Sentences can be regarded as a representation of some composite phenomenon in the outside world (Haliday and Hassan 1989:16-17).

Interpersonal or relational value deals with the function of language in the process of social interaction (ibid: 18).

Expressive value is to do with subjects and social identities (Fairclough 1989; 112).

Interpretation deals with the understanding of meaning embedded in texts. The level of interpretation is concerned with participant’s text production and text interpretation (understanding). Texts are produced and interpreted against a background of common-sense assumptions. The interpretations are constructed through the combination of what is in the text and what knowledge and beliefs the interpreter holds (Ibid: 151).

The explanatory stage in CDA sees discourse as a part of processes of social struggle and power relations. It shows how discourses are determined by social structures and what reproductive effects discourses have on those structures, e.g. by sustaining them or changing them. Explanation has two dimensions depending on whether the emphasis is upon processes of struggle or relations of power. First, discourses may be seen as parts of social struggle and the emphasis is on the effect of the discourse. Second, it is possible to show which power relationships determine discourses. These relationships are the outcome of struggles, and are established by those with power (Ibid: 163).

4. Data Analysis and Discussion

4.1 DESCRIPTION

Dialogue1:

1. Rich: But every man has his price.
2. More: No- no- no
3. Rich: Yes, in money too.
4. More: No, no, no
5. Rich: Or pleasure, titles, women, bricks and mortar, there is always something.
6. More: Childish.
7. Rich: in suffering. Certainly.
8. More: Buy a man with suffering?
9. Rich: Impose suffering, and offer him escape.

Sir Richard Rich mentions a materialistic measurable value for every human being. He places human being beside *money, pleasure, titles, women and bricks and mortars*. He states that one or all of these mundane affairs can seduce or coax a man to be bought. In response to his beliefs, Sir Thomas More considers Rich’s descriptions of human nature as *childish thinking*.

To Rich, Suffering can kneel a man to withdraw his/her values and ideas. More's rhetorical question "*By a man with suffering?*" is raised by surprise. The main terms with the major loads of meaning are: *impose suffering, offer escape*. These terms illuminate Rich's thinking methodology.

Using a modal *certainly* by Richard in utterance 7 indicates how strong these ideologies are in his thinking methodology.

Dialogue 2

10. Rich: Oh, everyone is affable here... Also of course, the friendship of Sir Thomas More. Or should I say acquaintance?

11. More: Say friendship.

12. Rich: A friend of Sir Thomas and still no office! There must be something wrong with him.

13. More: I thought we said friendship. The Dean of Saint Paul's offers you a post.

14. Rich: What? A post?

15. More: At the school.

16. Rich: A teacher!

17. More: A man should go where he won't be tempted.

18. More: But Richard, in office they offer you all sorts of things. I was once offered a village, with a mile, and a manor house and heaven knows what else- a coat of arms, I should not be surprised. Why not be a teacher? You would be a fine teacher. Perhaps even a great one.

19. Rich: And if I was, who would know it?

20. More: You, your pupils, your friends, God. Not a bad public, that....oh, and a quiet life.

The value order of Sir Thomas dramatically differs from Rich's ideas. In (10) the affability of More's guest with Rich is considered for the sake of his friendship with More. By asking the question '*Or should I say acquaintance?*' he then cleverly finds out how More regards his relationship with Rich. Both More and Rich consider each other as friends, but the values given to this very term are not identical. Rich equates *Friendship* with *having office*. For him these two have cause and effect relationship. In other way, he believes that friendship should result in having office and many different advantages. However, Sir Thomas regards not friendship equal with having worldly prosperities. For him friendship is the relationship beyond mundane and earthly affairs. In (17) More believes that there is a relationship between the position in the court and human characteristics. He mentions many temptations in accordance with having an office in the court. Unlike Rich who values fame and power of intimidation in society, More values ethics and morality in connection with organization for having a position in. More offers Rich to be a teacher, but Rich prefers to be known publicly and specially by the dominant block. More believes that being a teacher will result in being known by *yourself, your pupils* and more importantly, by *God*.

Dialogue 3

21. Wolsey: Let him die without an heir and we will have Yorkists back again. Let him die without an heir and this peace you think so much of will go out like that! England needs an heir, certain measures, perhaps regrettable, perhaps not, there is much in the church that needs reformation. Regrettable but necessary, to get us an heir! Now explain how you as councilor of England can obstruct those measures for your own, private consciences.

22. More: I believe when statesmen forsake their own private conscience for the sake of their public duties...they had their country by a short route to chaos.

Wolsey does his best efforts to acquire More's agreement and his dispensation. For this to happen, he reminds him the *Yorkist war*. Wolsey refers to some important matter of state such as: *Let him die without an heir, we will have them back again, this peace will go out and England needs an heir*. In Wolsey's dialogues *heir, Yorkist, peace and England* bear the highest value. He wants More's dispensation and agreement on marriage not for the sake of power, but for England and its prevalent peace sake. Wolsey, then, puts *reformation* as a process needed to *the church*. He means that some certain, measures of the church should be reformed.

Wolsey calls Sir Thomas with a new identity: *Councilor of England*. He intends to persuade More with respect to his governmental duty and the discourse community he belongs to. In (22), More persistently defends his ideology toward his public duty and equals *forsaking private conscience for the sake of public duties* with *leading a country to chaos*. More keeps his ideology steady through all forthcoming issues to him.

Dialogue 4

23. Roper: The church is heretical! Doctor Luther has proved it to my own satisfaction.

24. More: Luther is an excommunicate.

25. Roper: From a heretic church! Church? It's a shop- Forgiveness by the florin! Job lots now in Germany! And is that a church? Is that a cardinal? Is that a Pope? Or Antichrist.

In (23) Roper refers to the church as *heretical*. In fact, his views regarding the church root out from Doctor Luther. Naming Luther with his complete title (Doctor Luther), shows his (Luther) plethora power over him. Unlike Roper, More addresses Luther as *an excommunicate* (refer to 24). It is worth mentioning that Luther has

acquired two opposing identities: one from Roper and the other from Sir Thomas More. In Roper's view, Luther is a theorist opposing the present practices of the church and its bodies, but, on the contrary, More knows not him as an opposition but as an excommunicate. In (25), Roper regards More as *bound to the church*, for he believes that only heretic church can consider its opposition as an excommunicate. Other than naming the church as heretic, he also introduces the church as *a shop*. It's a *shop- Forgiveness by the florin!* In this utterance forgiveness and Salvation considered as *an object*, or in better terms, a good that can be easily purchased by paying some florin. Then, he attributes the church as '*Job lots*' by which money and wealth can be accumulated and heretic deeds such as *divorce* may be blessed there.

In (26), Roper tries to undermine the church by questions that he certainly does not intend to find answer for. After setting three questions (*And is that a church? Is that a cardinal? Is that a Pope?*), he uses *Or* mainly to represent the contrast between the pure aims of the church and the current practices of its bodies. The word *Antichrist* is in full contrast and opposition with the church and its practitioner. Roper maintains that the practitioners of the church are not real Christians and have defiled their consciences for the sake of wealth and divorce of course. In Roper's utterance the collocations of three words *the church*, *the Pope* and the *cardinal* with three rhetorical questions are intended to devalue the body of the church.

Dialogue 5

27. The King: Thomas, Thomas, does a man need a pope to tell him when he is sinned? I have no son. It is my bounden duty to put away the Queen, and all the popes back to St. Peter shall not come between me and my duty.

28. More: Then why does Your Grace need my poor support?

29. The King: because you are honest. What is more to the purpose is that you are known to be honest.

30. More: I am sick to think much I must displease Your Grace.

31. The King: No Thomas, I respect your sincerity. Respect, O man, it is water in the desert.

The king sets an implicit question in (27) by which he does not recognize the Pope to have the competence to tell someone if he is sinned. *Putting away the Queen* is referred to as *his bounden duty*. By assigning such a necessity and obligation to this decisions, he belittles the church and rejects church's decree concerning his divorce; *and all the Popes back to St. Peter shall not come between me and my duty*. This utterance exhibits king's power over the church. Regarding King's decisive will to put the queen away, More counts his support as *a poor one* (28) that neither his support nor rejection will bring no effect at all.

What is the main reason behind seeking More's support is his *honesty*. King's utterance in (29) clarifies that More's social and religious fame in both society and the church can pave the way for him to accomplish his intention. *What is more to the purpose is that you are known to be honest*; More's true honesty is regarded as power source in blessing and authorizing his will. The king exposes his mind about needing More's support in (31): *Respect, O man, it is water in the desert*. The King metaphorically assimilates his condition to the desert that he is forced to respect More's sincerity and *respect* is regarded as a *necessity*.

Dialogue 6

32. The King: I say! No opposition! Your consciences is your own affair, but you are my chancellor. I will have no opposition! The bishops will oppose me the full-fed hypocritical, "Princes of the church"! As for the Pope. Am I to burn in hell because the bishop of Rome, with the king of Spain's knife to his throat, mouths me Deuteronomy? Hypocrites! They are all hypocrites.

In (32), the king leaves the matter of divorce to More. He, specially makes More the direct responsible for undergoing the order. Bearing no opposition in (32) and the use of pronouns *I* and *my* in *I say, my chancellor, I will have no opposition*, and use of imperatives all show the king's power in speech, even in cases where he feels respectful to his addressee. Like Wolsey, King also reminds More of his statesmanship and his governmental identity that he should put his ideology and beliefs aside, especially in such a great matter of divorce. In the following, like William Roper, the king attributed some identities and characteristic to the practitioners of the church and its main bodies. *Hypocrites; all the bishops, cardinals, and the Pope are full-fed hypocrites*. He clearly illuminates his state of beliefs toward the church.

Dialogue 7

33. Roper: I modify nothing concerning the body the church- the moneychangers in the temples- must be scourged from thence- with a scourge of fire if that is needed. But attack on church herself! No, I see behind that attack on God.

34. More: Roper

35. Roper: The devil's work to be done by the devil's ministers.

Roper refers to the body of the church as *money changers* and regards them corrupted. In (33), he names God as *the Devil* and the church as *the devil's work*. With respect to what Roper said, the supreme leader of the church who is the King himself is known as *the devil's minister*. According to him, a corrupted church abound with various corruptions can only belong to a devil whose name is God and the practitioners and leader of it are devil's minister. In (34&35), More tries to stop him stating such heretic and unorthodox statements about the church and its supreme head; the king.

Dialogue 8

36. Cromwell: The normal aim of administration is to keep steady the factor of convenience.

37. Rich: Whose convenience?

38. Cromwell: Oh, Ours. But everybody's too. However, in the present instance the man who wants to change his woman is our Sovereign Lord, by the Grace of God, the Eighth of that name, which is a quaint way of saying if he wants to change his woman, he will. So, that becomes constant factor. And our job as administrators is to make it as convenient as we can.

The duty of administration is constrained to support *the constant factor of Convenience* (36). In (37), Rich wonders whose convenience an administrator must supply. Cromwell answers Rich's question and regards supporting for everybody's convenience as the mere duty of administration but the importance of different social groups in supporting for is prioritized; *oh ours, but every body's too* (38). Occurrence of *ours* at the starting position of the sentence clarifies the priority of self-advantage in comparison with the advantages of the others.

He implicitly mentioned the king's power to do his so-called duty and no power can hamper him not to do; *if he wants to change his woman, he will*. According to Cromwell, in this very situation, the constant factor that an administrator must work for is providing a convenience for the king to change his wife.

Dialogue 9

39. Roper: the church is already a wing of the Palace, is it not? The king is already its "Supreme Head"! Is he not?

40. More: The Act states that the King is the Supreme Head of the Church in England. So far as the law of God allows.

Roper believes the church is in the service of the king or as he says the palace. By attributing *the church as the wing of palace*, he highlights the king's supremacy over the church (39). Roper uses rhetorical questions in order for emphasizing his so-called facts. On the other hand, More justifies king's supremacy by referring Roper to *the Act of the parliament*. More regards this Act as *the Law of God* (40) that allows the king remain as the Supreme Head of the church.

Dialogue 10

41. Norfolk: The Pope is a Prince. Is not he?

42. More: He is.

43. Norfolk: And a bad one?

44. More: Bad enough. But the theory is that he is also the Vicar of God, the decedent of St. Peter, Our only link with Christ.

45. Norfolk: Does this makes sense? You will forfeit all you have got for a theory?

Norfolk undermines the Pope as he says that *the Pope is also a prince*. This implies that the Pope is just a prince not a heavenly person (41). More and Norfolk share an idea about the *Pope's prince hood* and his bad reputation (41-44). In (44), More exposes the principles of the theory in which the Pope is introduced as: *the Vicar of God, the decedent of St. Peter, the only link with Christ*.

Norfolk sets a rhetorical question in order to undervalue More's beliefs and make it senseless. He also intends to show a Theory of Pope's Holiness just a theory; nothing more, nothing less (45).

Dialogue 11

46. More: Concerning my indictment and the king's title. The indictment is grounded in an Act of Parliament which is directly repugnant to the law of God. The king in Parliament cannot bestow the Supremacy of the church, because it is a spiritual Supremacy.

In (46), More exposes his true belief about the king's title and the parliament's competence to assign him the Superior head of the church. More sets down *the Act of parliament as repugnant to the law of God* and refers to *the spiritual supremacy* as a reason that the king cannot receive the supremacy of the church.

4.2 INTERPRETATION

The story takes place in political and religious contexts. Thereby the political status of the participants as well as their religious ideologies are involved in the organization of the story. The recognition of the context and its requirements as well as the identification of intertextualities involved in the flow of the story will help the reader to come across with apt results. As mentioned above, the context is political and religious, so the type of discourse exploited in this context should satisfy the needs of the context. The recognition of context will simply reveal the intertextualities used in the discourse. Therefore, in connection with the present study *the philosophy of Machiavelli, Yorkist war, the Lutheran philosophy, Deuteronomy, the Act of parliament* (by which the king became the supreme head of the church), *Reformation* and *The king's title* serve as intertextualities that contribute to better understanding.

Dialogue 1

Rich believes in the philosophy of Machiavelli. Master Rich maintains that man can be bought like goods only by paying his/her price. For this man, power of any kind is determiner of values and humanity. In his methodology, in order for grasping power, enslavement of man is appreciated. The quality of enslavement is

individual-specific that its type differs from one individual to another. A man can be bought by suffering; this idea clearly exposes Rich's methodology based on theories of Machiavelli. Giving a small bite of rudimentary hampered freedom back to a man who is being kept bereft of his/her primitive rights and liberties, will make him one's slave everlastingly.

Dialogue 2

To Rich, power serves as the only objective by which he would be no longer cramped from each of his liberties. Rather power will provide him a competence to contain others' freedom. Therefore, he will not accomplish this stage by being a teacher.

Reputation is assumed as a power-generating source that being a teacher will not bestow him such potentiality to acquire his desired power. That is why he prefers not to consent Sir Thomas More's suggestion. In his view, one's reputation must be well-famed in power centrality, not among a public who themselves are grossly influenced by the exercise of power.

Rich has materialistic viewpoint toward the relationships and he seeks to win an advantage from a person whom he calls a friend, while More looks moralistically at friendships and gives non-material values to pure relationships.

Dialogue 3

Yorkist War had been a disaster in the past that serves to contribute Wolsey to persuade More to consent influencing the Pope's dispensation by sending him a dispatch concerning King's divorce. Wolsey invites More to be more sensitive in this case of the king and assist him to come over with a solution, since in case the King dies without an heir, England may have the Yorkist again and the widespread peace of England will keep no trace of itself. For Wolsey, religious and ideological beliefs must not be meddled with the state affairs. He also maintains that political leaders' private conscience should be kept for their own non-state issues and may not be involved in political and state matters. On the contrary, More believes that forsaking private conscience for the sake of public duties is a great betray. Law is More's redline, even if that law is enacted by the devil. He believes in reformation, but he never bind to put the law aside and let the power of whim and desire rule the state.

Dialogue 4

Dr. Luther's ideas and thinking methodology serves as an intertextual context to which William Roper is strongly bound. It also shows an alternative view toward the church. In accordance with this utterance, Richard Rich's ideology based on the philosophy of Machiavelli and Wolsey's idea concerning the separation of ethical beliefs from state matters can be connected. To Roper, the church lacks the required competence to judge whether one is heretic or excommunicate. He states that the churchmen have changed the church for a shop where salvation and forgiveness are sold for money. Religion is an instrument in the control of the Pope and he is under the influence of the king. Therefore, this is not the law of God which is current in the church, but the desires of the king and the Pope.

Dialogue 5-6

In line with former ideas about the church, the king has transcendental ideology concerning the Pope's involvement in man's religious affairs. The king's utterance (Thomas, Thomas, does a man need a pope to tell him when he is sinned?) indicates the King's transcendental beliefs through which human beings find truth within themselves and man should reject the power of Christianity and acquire the knowledge of God through insight (Yeganeh, 2006:1).

He has obliged himself to change his woman and his duty cannot be obstructed by any cardinal. What he needs is the support of a man who is known to be honest and has won the positive attentions of the public. More's honesty and his public positive face are intended to be used as an instrument for accomplishing a critical affirmation from society. More is respected, for his honesty is needed; otherwise, he would have been behaved differently. The king clarifies this matter in: "I respect your sincerity. Respect, O man, it is water in the desert". This utterance bears two readings. Implicitly, as a thirsty man in the desert needs water to stay alive, Henry the Eighth states that he values More's honesty and sincerity because he really needs it to stay in power. The second reading implies that respect is as invaluable as the water is in the desert, but as the context shows, the former seems more appropriate than the later. In order for having More in his own way, the king resorts to his power to oblige More not to make any opposition.

The Deuteronomy is an intertextual context, which is the center of disagreements about the king's business. King Henry disregards the laws of the church and states that his marriage with his brother's widow is the greatest sin he has ever committed. King believes that church is not independent and it is under the influence of the Palace of Spain. Calling the Pope as full-fed hypocritical Princes of the church indicate two main points. One refers to the great gap between the king and the church (full-fed hypocritical) and the other brings the dependency of the church to the Palace, because he calls the Pope as Price of the church. Making one prince as a pope indicates that the government has taking the power of religion under its control by putting a palace-bound prince as a Pope.

Dialogue 7

William Roper believes that the church is heretical and full of corruption and mere attack on church and having

all body of it punished does not suffice. Thus, he believes that the responsibility of church's corruption falls on God. The church with such a great amount of corruption and insincerity can only belong to a Devil; so the king and the practitioners of the church are all Devil's ministers who are truly believers of God. Not only they do not truthfully serve God, but also they are antichrists who are against the practice of God's true law on earth.

Dialogue 8

Providing convenience for the major power holder of the state is what an administrator or a minister is supposed to do. The source of the disagreement is the quality of supplying this convenience. Each side with specific ideology, exercise the fulfillment of the factor of convenience in their own way. Therefore, the various and of multi-purposed ways of satisfying convenience result in antagonism among the circle of administrators. More also agrees with the idea that the objective of an administrator is to serve for the convenience of the state, but this service must not cost to the defilement of neither beliefs nor the law of God.

Dialogue 9

The church is an instrument of power practice in the hands of the king. Roper believes that the king influences the law of God by his power of supremacy. It opposes the law of God to assign a king as the supreme head of the church, but the policy of the government is to constrain the power of the church and take its control into its hands. In the meantime, More sees the act of the Parliament along with the law of God.

Dialogue 10

More clarifies that it is not the individuality of the Pope that has made him a heavenly character rather, it is the theory that has made him so, and also it is the very theory to which More is strongly bound. These epithets bring uncontroversial power to the Pope and construct power relation and power institutions.

4.3 Explanation

The Discourse of Palace (henceforth, DP) is the one to which King Henry adheres. Institutionally, DP belongs to the Palace or better to say, it belongs to government. DP also belongs to the church, but, as long as, the king is the supreme head of the church, it is considered to be within the political institution. In other words, political institution is comprised of governmental institution and religious institution. Regarding to construction of DP, two important determinant ideologies play a crucial role. One backs to religious ideology and the other relates to governmental ideology. Religious ambiguities in some important cases like getting married with brother's widow and divorce on one hand and the theory by which the Pope is assumed as the Vicar of God and Decedent of Saint Peter on the other, has induced half of DP's ideological needs. On the other side, the matter of *heir* contributes a greater share in the constitution of DP.

The theory by which the Pope is known as the Vicar of God gives pope a power of holiness and opens a discourse by which greater majority of society become the subject of that discourse. The holiness of the Pope and the church can be regarded as a motivation for DP to be shaped and organized. An interesting point is that the distribution of Pope's power does not positively motivate DP, rather it produces a power struggle between the two leading institutions: the church and the Palace. The religious ideologies of the king and his outlook toward the church and the Pope's power over society, which is in the opposite direction of the policies of the Palace, give rise to DP. In other terms, DP is a result of the struggle between the power of the church and the power of Palace. DP is ideologically specific for: having the Pope and the religion separated from private life, depending on one's own insight in distinguishing sinful acts from un-sinful ones, introducing the Pope and the body of the church as full-fed hypocritical and antichrists. Other than the religious theories and ideologies, an important matter acts as a source for the rise of DP. This source is the matter of Advantage that satisfies the second half. It is clear in the play that England lacks any heir and religion blocks divorce. Therefore, this obstruction must be taken away in any way that it is required. In the course of the play 'advantage' is considered as 'convenience'. So, to make long story short, the rise of DP is guaranteed mainly by two ideologies; one is the theory by which the Pope is the Vicar of God and the law of the church is the law of God that gives incomparable power to the church that is not resisted by the side of the Palace (this ideology does not act in benefit of the church, but provides a ground for politics' more dominance over religious institutions) and the other is the matter of advantage or convenience of the state by obstructing church's power and then to satisfy the country's matter of convenience.

The effects of DP can be organized in two vast classes; the effects in power relations and effects in kind of perspectives. It is notable that the relationship between later effects and the former ones is dialectic and later ones help to sustain and empower present power relations. In fact, these two classes of effects are in the service of each other and always work hand in hand.

In the domain of the first class of effects, the king becomes the supreme head of the church by an Act of parliament and owns the control of the religious institution. DP changes the power relations, pushes the power of the church into shadow, and takes its under control. The how-ness of these results lies in the what-ness of the effects concerning the matter of perspective.

Regarding the second class of effects, DP produces different ideological and meaning-making processes

both in the governmental and societal institutions. In other word, DP resorts to its political, economic power, which is current among the mob and makes its ideological principles as hegemonic perspectives. In doing so, DP has the louder voice in comparison to its rival because the economic and ordinary affairs of the mass is under the effect of the government. When the perspectives changed, the influence and role of the church in social organizations became trivial. Therefore, with the marginalization of religious institutions among the public, the king easily succeeds to throne of the church.

The main result of DP regarding the matter of inducing different perspectives in the governmental and societal institution is the advent of the methodology of Machiavelli. In this methodology to which Sir Richard Rich and Master Cromwell are adhered, public must be taken under control by any means possible and become enslaved by abstaining them from their primary liberties and freedom and offering the minimum of them. Legitimatization of any act in order to achieve the advantage or the matter of convenience by the king himself results alike consequences. With the advent of DP in politics and society, values become materialistic. Individuals like Richard Rich learn to misuse moral values in order to accomplish their advantage or their own matter of convenience. In this methodology, religious laws should be skirted in order to attain to the convenience of the state. This is the idea by which Wolsey tries to persuade More to put his private beliefs away for the sake of the state. Separation of Pope and religion from private life and distinguishing sinful deeds is also saluted. In this connection, the King states that man does not need Pope to warn him when he is sinned and man can rely on his own insights to find out what he has committed. This idea causes a turbulence in religious judgments of one's deed. For everybody would hammer his deeds relying on his own insight and understandings and, in result, no consistent and fixed classifications of evil or good deeds can be set. In lie with this idea, DP also promulgates an issue that the bodies of the church are corrupted and have not the competence to judge the deeds. For DP, the convenience of the dominant block must be fulfilled by any means. This is an idea that Cromwell centralizes on his explanations of the duties of an administrator to Rich. This is advantage and its requirement that determines how it is ought to be attained, not fixed and stable laws of religion. For this to happen, religion must become the wing of the palace and religious laws get devised based on the requirements of the matter of convenience or advantage.

In principle, a same ideology can motivate different discourses. Regarding the present study, a theory that sanctifies the laws of the church and makes the Pope Vicar of God, gives rise to two opposing discourses and, consequently, two opposing perspectives. On the other end of the extreme, there is Sir Thomas More, the Chancellor of England, who does not look at the church and it bodies as bad as the King does. More agrees that the Pope and some of the cardinals are not true Christ rather they are antichrists. However, he believes not in a specific individual like the Pope, but he truly believes in the pure position of the Pope and the church. More strongly opposes the succession of the King as the supreme head of the church because he sees the position of the church more purified and heavenly to be defiled by politics. It becomes clear that the very ideology that contributed to the construction of DP, this time, helps to construct other discourse in opposition with the former one; the Discourse of Opposition(DO) that is represented by More. Now, what perspective DO expresses is that the king has no potentiality to become the supreme head of the church and no power is right to violate the religious values and laws for the sake of advantage. More expresses his ideology in the court and states that the king is not the right person to bear the title of the Supremacy of the church, for he is a politician and will abuse the power of religion in order to obtain political objectives. In his view, the church needs a spiritual supremacy for not being misused, not a political supremacy. To More, the church in its ideal status, should be independent from the power center and work as a distinguisher. This is the point of struggle between the two discourses which both of them are drawn from a very ideology.

Different advantages require different contexts. Therefore, this is context/s that determine what ideology to be bound to or even what ideology with what features is needed to be devised for satisfying the needs of the advantage. King Henry seeks to eliminate the uprising power of the church and hamper its involvements in state's affairs. So to speak, King's advantage lies in marginalization of religion and religious institutions. On the contrary, More tries to preserve the pure and infallible position of the church and let not the religion be defiled and misused by the power holders. As it is clear, More and the King are struggling for two different institutions; the later for political institution and the former for religious institution.

At last, the essence of every discourse is an ideology by which the principles of a discourse are determined. For hegemonizing the principle of any discourse, there is needed an administrator or group of administrators. These administrators are powers such as political power, economic power and religious power. The type of power needed for administration is determined by the context. In this study, advantage plays a key role in producing different ideologies or perspectives that differentiates the discourses that spring from the very ideology. Advantage is the constant factor in the rise of any ideology that leads to the construction of any discourse. Requirements of an advantage need contexts and the ideologies are chosen or devised based on the required contexts and their position. Therefore, even the discourses, which are constituted on the very ideological ground, can be antagonistic or allied according to the nature of their advantages, and different

advantages result in different or contradictory perspectives. Contrary outlooks may be the result of the cases that the discourse-constructive ideology is the same or the one that does not cross its counterpart, but advantages are in the opposite sides and cross each other out. In this case, the one with more hegemonizer power crosses the other out. However, different outlooks may be the consequence of the cases, which the advantages are not radically in opposition with each one and existence of the other counterpart have no harm for the remaining members.

5. Conclusion

The present critical study of Robert Bolt's 'A man for all seasons' intended to investigate the textual elements which reflects ideological values and also study the role of advantage rather than discourse in constructing different or contradictory perspectives in sociopolitical institutions. In the present study, textual elements describe the church from different perspectives and assign various identities to Pope and the church. These descriptions reveal the type of advantage that each participant is trying to achieve within the specific discourse order.

Concerning the role of advantage in constructing different perspectives it was concluded that advantage plays a key role in producing different ideologies or perspectives that differentiates the discourses that spring from the very ideology. Advantage is the constant factor in the rise of an ideology that leads to the construction of a discourse. Requirements of an advantage need contexts and the ideologies are chosen or devised based on the required contexts and their position. Therefore, in line with the present study, even the discourses, which are constituted on the very ideological ground, can be antagonistic or allied according to the nature of their advantages.

6. References

- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatus. In Lenin and philosophy and other essays. London: New left review.
- Arendt, H. (1965). On revolution. London: Penguin group.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). Discourse analysis. New York: Cambridge university press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and power. New York: Longman group LTD.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). Political correctness: the policies of culture and language. Discourse and society. Sage publication. Vol. 14(1):17-28
- Fairclough, N. (2010). Critical discourse analysis; the critical study of language. Second edition. Pearson education limited.
- Fairclough, I. and Fairclough, N. (2012). Political discourse analysis. New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. and Handford, M. (2012). The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis. Routledge publication.
- Goodman, S and Johnson, A. (2013). Strategies used by the far right to counter accusations of racism. Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines. Vol. 6(2). 97-113
- Haliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1989). Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective. Second edition. Oxford: oxford university press.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1932). A critique of German ideology. Progress publisher, 1968.
- Mellouki, El. S. (2015). The infusion of Islam into pluralistic politics: The need to explore the Islamist identity beyond ideological boundaries; the case of the Moroccan Party of Justice and Development. Discourse and society. Vol.28 (6). 662-681
- Russel, B. (1996). Power. A new social analysis. Bertrand Russel Press foundation LTD.
- Sauer, C. (1989). Structure of consensus-making and interaction: the concept of Nazi language policy on occupied Holland. In Wodak, R. (Eds.), language, power and ideology: studies in political discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamin publishing company. (PP. 1-37)
- Soroush, A. (2013). The ethics of power, the ethics of justice. Fifth edition. Tehran: Serat publication.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology; a multidisciplinary approach. London: sage Publication.
- Yeganeh, F. (2006). Literary schools: a new reader. Tehran: Rahnama Press