

# Rhetoric of Persuasion: A Critical Look at Intertextuality and Interdiscursivity as Persuasive Discursive Practices in Robert Bolt's "A Man for All Seasons"

Basarati, Ali\*

University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

Razinejad, Seyyed Mohammad, PhD

University of Mohaghegh Ardabili, Ardabil, Iran

## Abstract

Rhetoric of persuasion, as a discursive practice, is a pivotal tool in obtaining consensus and establishing hegemony. On this basis, the present research seeks to study the exploitation of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, as two important tools of persuasion, in acquiring consensus for legitimating political affairs. To this end, Robert Bolt's "A man for all seasons" is analyzed based on the principals of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Fairclough's 3D approach to find out the historical and discursive elements that are enacted to construct intertextuality and interdiscursivity, and also the orders of discourse which may have been transformed as a result of enacting given persuasive discursive practice in the body of the society. Regarding the intertextuality, the historical events and religious issues like Tudors, Yorkist war, Leviticus and Deuteronomy are used to persuade Sir Thomas More. In connection with interdiscursivity, too, the king and Cromwell used mixed discourses to have the maximum of effect. Specifically concerned with the transformation of orders of discourse, it is to say that the King's new orders of discourse transform the pre-defined forms of administrative discourse, but keep its content and spirit untouched. This formal transformation adapts itself with the upcoming ever new needs of administration.

**Keywords:** rhetoric of persuasion, intertextuality, interdiscursivity, consensus, hegemony

## 1- Introduction

Critical study of practicing various discursive strategies intended to gain power and exercise discursive advantages by the ruling class has gained special attention of critical discourse analysts (Meadows, 2007; Musolff, 2008; Weiczorek, 2009). As an interdisciplinary approach to the analysis of language, Critical Discourse Analysis (henthforth CDA) has systematically contributed to deconstruction of mechanisms of persuasion, hegemony and relations of power in political discourse (Chilton and schaffner, 1997: 212).

Hegemony, as an ultimate objective of any political act, can be obtained through multifarious ways and socio-political strategies to give form to sociopolitical as well as socio-cultural mindsets through obtaining subjects' consent by non-violent ways (Femia, 1981; Fairclough, 1995). It is also the cultural and ethical engineering of a society as well as reshaping of subjectivities or 'selves' (Keat and Abercrombie, 1990) which is attained by consent rather than force of one class over the other classes (Forgacs, 1988: 249). The control of state, as Gramsci (1971) proposed, could not be sustained without the consent of the subjects through ideological persuasion (Philips, 1998, cited in Blackledge, 2005: 45). In this connection, the process of persuasion, as a discursive practice, in political terrains which are intended to direct and re-shape the subjects' mind to the best of a certain advantage can be considered an effective discursive instrument in acquiring hegemonic-intended consensus. It is also defined as 'the process of trying to alter, modify or change the saliency of the values, wants, beliefs and actions of others (O' Shaughnessy and O'Shaughnessy 2004: 5, cited in El. Nagggar, 2012). Rhetoric of persuasion has been extended to variety of discourses such as the field of advertisement that exploits the persuasive rhetoric to absorb the attention of the consumers to buy more goods and produce profit (Cook, 1992). The ultimate objective of persuasion is, thus, to influence people or direct them to grab certain beliefs in order that they may either adopt new mindsets and abandon the former ones (Poggi, 2005). Same as the discourse of advertisement, political groups and sects have the specific style of their language and manifest themselves, their ideology and discursive identity through defining certain jargons, slogans and stereotypes that constitute their specific language (Wodak, 1989: 137). Persuasion, though, is inherently a sort of interaction, it is widely accepted that it is omnipresent in all political acts (Mutz et al. 1999: 1). Although it is socially acceptable to have different perspectives about politics, there is always an attempt to attract people to one side or another (Jarraya, 2013: 5). Persuasion, as a rhetorical act, embeds the selection and arrangements of the stylistic resources and devices that may serve to bring a certain perspective, and to make one believe in something that the persuader him/herself may, or may not believe in, is actually what rhetoric and persuasion is all about (Soring, 1989: 95). Rhetoric of persuasion, thus, may play a considerably significant role in obtaining the power-loving results within the discourse of politics. Therefore, on this basis, El Nagggar (2012) mentions intertextuality and

interdiscursivity as two major means of persuasive act of discourse and states that the speaker invokes some discourses and dismisses others to serve his/her specific persuasive intention. Specifically concerned with different elements of persuasive act of discourse, Jarraya (2013) studies the rhetoric of persuasion in Bin Ali's last public speech and states that the strategic use of deictic pronouns, agency, make use of ethos, non-observance of Grecian Maxims constitute the rhetoric of persuasion in Bin Ali's speech by which the persuader attempts to take other's mindsets under influence.

Regarding different influential and effective linguistic tools used in the rhetoric of persuasion, metaphor is used in politics and in any discursive event to stir and justify due to the fact that the metaphor for particular political situation not only fits the situation, but also resonates to a large degree that implies whole range of action (Mio, 1977: 120). Ezifeka (2013) introduces metaphor as a persuasive cognitive phenomenon meant to encode social meanings and cultural presuppositions has been treated as a linguistic tool under the control of media to sway the public perception and establish consensus around a certain issue intended to establish hegemony or strengthen its anchorage point. He concludes that inadvertent ideological solidarity of newspapers with power elite and class happens under the mask of metaphor to act out their pervasive role on readers' and subjects' perception.

In addition to metaphor, as a persuasive linguistic tool, ideological and discursive polarizations of 'US' and 'THEM', among many, contributes the addresser to affect the perception of the addressee in a one way or another. Accordingly, Writh-Coliba (2016) studies diverse and dynamic world of Us and Them in political discourse and states that the construction of such polarizations depends on the speaker's intention in the discourse and are prone to alternation, since the intentions and motivations may vary by the context change.

Intertextuality- defined as an instance of discursive practice- is 'the insertion of history into a text and of this text into history', Kristeva (1986a: 39) means that the text responds to, re-accentuates and reworks past texts, and in doing so helps to make history and contributes to wider process of change (Fairclough, 1992: 102) - as well as interdiscursivity which indicates that discourses are linked to each other through topics on other discourses (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009: 90) foreground in the addressee's mind a specific historical epoch or orders of discourse that may contribute the addresser to persuade his audience *en route* acquiring consensus for hegemony.

Such and such strategic exploitations of linguistic tools and discursive practices in discourse of politics and advertisement as well, are mainly aimed to persuade and convince the audience that the only truth is with the speaker to establish public consent intended to prepare the ground for hegemony, re-establish it or legitimate the power relations and specific order of discourse in society. Specifically concerned, the objective of this paper lies in following the interconnected relationship between persuasive act of language and establishing hegemony and legitimation, and introduce that persuasive function of language can be regarded as one way, among many, through which hegemony may be achieved. To this end, Robert Bolt's play named 'A man for all seasons' is chosen to be served as the corpus of the study. Cultural artifacts, including literature, serve to affect the conscious of societies with respect to their power and potentiality of representing and re-contextualizing historical events in order to induce and instigate certain influences within the context in which the reader lives in. On this basis, this paper is particularly concerned with investigating intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the body of the play to see what texts and discourses are decontextualized from their main contexts and in the following, are re-contextualized in order to persuade the protagonist to submit to the desire of the ruling class.

The critical study of the rhetoric of persuasion will help the researchers to come over with a critical insight to investigate the reasons behind which some texts entrap the audience's consciousness towards the bare reality and fill him with tendentious and skewed representations of truth.

### **1- 1 A man for all seasons**

Sir Thomas More, a scholar and statesman, objects to King Henry VIII's plan to divorce and remarry in order to father a male heir. But More, the diplomat, keeps quiet about his feelings in the hopes that Henry will not bother him about the matter. At a meeting with Cardinal Wolsey, Lord Chancellor of England More reviews the letter to Rome that requests the pope's approval of Henry's divorce. More points out that the pope provided a dispensation, or exemption, in order for Henry to get married in the first place, since Catherine, the woman Henry married, was the widow of Henry's brother. More doubts that the pope will agree to overturn his first dispensation. Wolsey accuses More of being too moralistic and recommends that he be more practical.

Meanwhile, Wolsey dies, leaving the position of Lord Chancellor vacant. The king was displeased with Wolsey's failure to secure a papal dispensation to annul his marriage to Catherine, and Wolsey died in disgrace. More is appointed as Wolsey's replacement.

The king honors to visit More's house, expecting him to submit to the king's desire and try to legitimate his re-marriage to father a son as an heir of his kingdom.

More does tell the king that he cannot agree to the divorce, reminding him that the king promised not to bother More about it. The king storms off, telling More he will leave him alone provided More does not speak

out against the divorce.

Parliament passes the Act of Supremacy, which establishes the Church in England and appoints King Henry as its head. More decides that if the English bishops decide to go along with the act, he will resign as Lord Chancellor. But he refuses to explain himself to anyone but the king. Even his wife and daughter cannot know his reasons, because he does not want to put them in the position of having to testify against him later.

Cromwell calls More to his office and attempts to malign More by accusing him of sympathizing with the Holy Maid of Kent, who was executed for treason. Cromwell also accuses him of having written a book attributed to King Henry. More deconstructs both these charges, but when Cromwell reads a letter from King Henry calling More a villain, More is genuinely shaken.

Cromwell, Norfolk, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, interrogate More in prison, but they cannot trick him into signing the oath or divulging his opinions on the king's behavior. As long as More refuses to talk or sign the oath, Cromwell can keep him locked up but cannot have him executed. He removes More's books but lets his family visit, hoping that they will be able to reason with him.

Though More never opened his mouth, Rich claims he heard More deny the king's authority over the Church. More is sentenced to death but not before he can express his disapproval of the Supremacy Act and his disappointment with a government that would kill a man for keeping quiet. More goes to his death with dignity and composure, and the play ends with his beheading.

## **2- Methodology**

### **2-1 Corpus**

Robert Bolt's 'A man for all seasons' comprises the corpus of the existing study. Since the objective of the present paper is to investigate the persuasive act of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, only relevant episodes of the play will be taken into consideration.

### **2-2 Data analysis approach**

In order to study the discursive practice of persuasion within the framework of critical discourse analysis, I resort to Fairclough's three-dimensional approach to CDA composed of three levels of analysis entitled as description, interpretation and explanation. Hence, I analyze the text with respect to the required analytical processes of the second and third layers of analysis: interpretation and explanation.

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 (Fairclough, 1989: 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).

### **2-3 Research questions**

The following research questions are going to be provided with justifiable answers.

- I. What historical and discursal elements are enacted to construct intertextuality and interdiscursivity?
- II. What orders of discourse may be transformed as a result of enacting given persuasive discursive practice in the body of the given society.

## **4- Results and discussion**

In the following section, aiming to answer the first research question, it will be tried to explicate how discourse production processes concerning rhetoric of persuasion are exploited in the play.

Regarding the persuasive function of intertextuality, the starting point of the struggle about the matter of divorce lies in the meeting between More, as the Counselor of England, and Wolsey, as the vice chancellor. Wolsey, living in doubt, tries to persuade More to dispense him with his dispensation, and help him to come to a conclusion. Wolsey has grounded his project of persuasion upon influencing the ideas of both the Pope and Sir Thomas by emphasizing on certain pivotal issues of the state.

It is clear that Wolsey, at bottom, is not content with the divorce, but he is stuck under the pressure of the king to do so. Therefore, he makes some excuses both for himself and for More to secure the divorce, and tries to have More to be in the same boat. These excuses take root from number of historical events by which Wolsey tries to influence More's decision, as his own decision is being influenced. These historical events that

are playing as inter-textual contexts may re-occur by the lack of an heir. Events such as Tudors and Yorkist wars are manifest intertextualities that have resulted in Wolsey to put aside private conscious and beliefs at the expense of the advantage of the state, and do a great part not letting the mentioned events happen again. Moreover, the king also has executed two religious inter-textual issues such as Leviticus and Deuteronomy to lead More in his desired way. 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 (Basarati and Razi Nejad, 2016).

Arguing about the religious consideration for king's divorce, the king tries to demonstrate that his appeal to secure his divorce has religious justification. A church law named as Leviticus bans one from getting married with his brother's wife. King asserts that his marriage with his brother's widow was a sinful deed. He cites a verse from the Bible that proves his statement:

Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife.

This manifest inter-text serves the king to overcome More's withdrawal from supporting the divorce. In response to king's reference to a verse in the Bible, More also presents another religious writ supposedly forbids the divorce; Deuteronomy, one of seven sacraments of the church that the king regards it ambiguous, and by that means makes his trial to marginalize Pope's influence on subjects' belief.

Thomas, Thomas, does a man need a Pope to tell him when he is sinned?

Am I to burn in the hell because the Bishop of the Rome, with the king of Spain's knife to his throat, mouths me Deuteronomy? Hypocrites! They are all hypocrites!

Specifically connected with interdiscursivity as an element of the rhetoric of persuasion, both the king and Cromwell resort to this persuasive discursive practice to persuade More to come along with them.

In order for having More in line with himself, the king, in some occasions, changes his kingly manner of talking and opens an amicable conversation with More; however, in some other occasions, while the king loses his temper and sees More as a hard nut to crack, he turns back to his kingly style of talking. In this connection, the matter of inter-discursivity is obviously significant.

The specific genre of kingly talk which would be indicated by having more turns, high pitch of voice, topic controlling mingled with power is accompanied by a friendly genre of speaking in which certain inter-personal ceremonial rituals are overlooked. This generic change happens by the king's side, but More still keep steady court-specific genre of speaking.

The king's new mixed genre, comprised of kingly and amicable talk, has the greater share kingly genre than his amicable style. At the very beginning lines of the king's conversation with More's family his style is grossly friendly. Then to the extent he approaches to the main topic of the discussion, his style gets some alternations between his kingly and friendly genres. The following excerpt is an instance of the king's friendly talk:

MORE: Your Majesty does my house more honor than I fear my household can bear.

HENRY: No ceremony, Thomas! No ceremony! (They rise) A passing fancy-I happened to be on the river.

HENRY: Can you dance, too? I dance superlatively!

In spite of the fact that he exploits a friendly genre of speaking, he also controls the topics of the discussion and has the control of more turns than other participants. This might seem that the king exercises self-promotion in the eyes of his subjects. In other way, he may pretend to have a close relationship with More. Through his friendly style of talking he may prepare the ground to commence discussing with More about his divorce; therefore, he alternated between friendly and kingly genres of behaving.

King Henry: And thank Gog I have a friend for my chancellor. Readier to be friends, I trust, than he was to be chancellor.

While talking seriously about the matter of divorce, the king apparently sticks to his kingly genre of talking and adds some furiousness to his tone. As long as the micro advantage of the king is to manage the project of divorce, it has become centralized in the articulation of the king's discourse; so other elements revolve around this central constant factor and get their positive or negative meaning due to the circumstances of their position with the nodal point. It worth mentioning that to the extent the elements and subjects take far distances from the nodal point or position in contrast to the nodal point, the style of the king's speech gets drastic, harsh and furious.

MORE: He was a statesman of incomparable ability, Your Grace.

HENRY: Was he? Was he so? Then why did he fail me? Be seated-it was villainy then! Yes, villainy. I was right to break him; he was all pride, Thomas; a proud man...

Hence, the king is really in need of More's support, for he has a positive and respectable among both the public and the power holders. So his supports could sooth the anger of the church and pretend it acceptable among common people who still suffer from religious ideologies. This can be the reason for the king's hesitation in choosing the alternations of kingly and friendly genres of speaking. Here is an instance of harsh, furious kingly genre of speaking:

HENRY: Then you have not thought enough! . . . (With real appeal) Great God, Thomas, why do you hold out against me in the desire of my heart-the very wick of my heart?

MORE: (Draws up his sleeve, baring his arm) There is my right arm. (A practical proposition)  
Take your dagger and saw it from my shoulder, and I will laugh and be thankful, if by that means  
I can come with Your Grace with a clear conscience

Or:

MORE When I took the Great Seal your Majesty promised not to pursue me on this matter.

HENRY: Ha! So I break my word, Master More! No no, I'm joking . . . I joke roughly . . . I often think I'm a rough fellow . . . Yes, a rough young fellow.

As it is clear, the king's style dramatically changes phrase by phrase. At the first phrase he speaks harshly like 'then thou have not thought enough', so I break my word; then he promptly repairs his furiously tempered language: 'Great God Thomas, why do you hold up against me?' and 'Oh no no, I am joking...'

the king's friendly style of speaking is pretentious intended to have More under his influence, this can be suspected that the purpose of the king is to use More's honesty to gain public consensus and legitimation from the church after coming over with a solution to the matter of divorce. This idea can be perceived in his response to More's given in turn to the king's utterance on his bounden duty to put away the Queen. See:

HENRY: 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! How is it that you cannot see? Everyone else does.

MORE: (Eagerly) Then why does Your Grace need my poor support.

HENRY: Because you are honest. What's more to the purpose, you're known to be honest . . .

Supposedly, knowing that More's honesty and fidelity is more predominant in the society, he can be used as leverage to the duty and produce a change in the discursal order of the church for the benefit of the king's advantage. By saying 'what is more to the purpose, you are known to be honest', King implicitly states that he does not value whether More is truly an honest minister of his state, rather what really matters to him is the More's fidelity and honesty is 'known' and believed to be real.

In his friendly style of talking, the king, though, ambiguously reveals his intention to respect More's sincerity; the need to get to his advantage violently urges him to do so. See:

MORE I am sick to think how much I must displease Your Grace.

HENRY No, Thomas, I respect your sincerity. Respect? Oh, man, it's water in the desert . . .

By a metaphorical clause 'It is water in the desert' the urgent need to satisfy the requirements of the advantage to which he is the subject can be obviously inferred. In this relation, the support of Thomas More in the case of the divorce is considered as 'water' that enables him to survive in the hardships such as 'divorce' that metaphorically mentioned as 'the desert'.

At all, the king exploits a new persuasive genre intended to make transformations in the discursal order of the discourses of religious institutions and the laws of the church. This genre is comprised of emphasizing the element that contribute subjects in attaining the advantage on one hand, and marginalizing, desecrating and even effacing the elements that may cause some hindrance en route the advantages. The only influential instrument to this end may be language by which emphasis, marginalization, desecration and deletion are administered.

In case of Cromwell, he, too, resorts to interdiscursivity to make More to be under his control. He tries to enforce More to declare his loyalty by supporting the king's divorce. He says: and that is all we need – a brief declaration of his loyalty to the present administration. To this end, Cromwell, surely, does not limit himself to certain sorts of pressure. He makes use of juridical genre and puts some questions with an aim to drag some hints to convict More.

In his juridical behavior, Cromwell, like the king, obviously shows signs of inter-discursivity; to label calling Sir Thomas for integration as an 'invitation' and being so thankful for his coming.

Cromwell: I am sorry to invite you at such a short notice, Sir Thomas; good of you to come.

The spirit of Cromwell's invitation is grossly concordant with interrogation, but, predominantly, he hides the interrogative nature of their meeting by opening a genre of official talk.

More: I understand there are certain charges.

Cromwell: some ambiguities of behavior I should like to clarify- hardly 'charges'.

Another sign of inter-discursivity that makes the interrogation seemingly like a conversation lies in the pretensions of Cromwell. He reformulates legal 'charges' as 'some ambiguities in behavior'. He admires and interpellates More very respectably. He intends to imply that he has not any animosity with More and he is not guilty; he is just there for having a friendly talk to resolve some miss-understandings, or as he says: ambiguities of behavior.

CROMWELL: Believe me, Sir Thomas-no, that's asking too much-but let me tell you all the same, you have no more sincere admirer than myself.

...Sir Thomas . . . You know it amazes me that you, who were once so effective in the world and are now so much retired from it, should be opposing yourself to the whole movement of the times?

Soon after, by introducing charges, Cromwell changes the conversation to an interrogation: Sir Thomas there is a more serious charge. He uses the interrogative-specific genre in which formally goes to the main point and asks

More's idea concerning king's marriage. He introduces his sentence as a charge:

CROMWELL: (Goes apart; formally) Sir Thomas More, is there anything you wish to say to me concerning the King's marriage with Queen Anne?

MORE: (Very still) I understood I was not to be asked that again.

CROMWELL: Evidently you understood wrongly. These charges...

It is apt to suspect that Cromwell applies inter-discursive method of interrogation in order to get the ultimate results through the easiest and feint ways of interrogation. On the other hand, it can be supposed that More's prior position in the court has influenced Cromwell's discourse. This idea seems extreme possible, because in the co-texts he completely disregards More's fame and his last position as a vice chancellor.

Cromwell: yet the state has harsher punishments.

In this statement, Cromwell gets serious and threatens More before other interrogation group.

Specifically concerned with the transformation of orders of discourse, it is to say that The King's new orders of discourse transform the pre-defined forms of administrative discourse, but keep its content and spirit untouched. This formal transformation adapts itself with the upcoming ever new needs of administration. The new order of discourse enables the king's administrators to perform flexibly and conform themselves with any novel situation they come across. For an administrator, the advantage stays at bottom of any theory and performance. In other words, it is advantage inhabits the heart of any the discourse of administration that makes selection and determine the perspectives. It also marks the sorts of principals and rules toward institutions, subjects, phenomena and belief. In fact, the discourse of administration is legitimized and conventionalized manifestation of King's desired order of discourse which is exerted by means of law. For this to happen, some contributory, persuasive and seemingly logical advantages are needed to be produced in order to become as a master signifier to be enacted by RSA and ISA. Practicing the contributory advantage as a master signifier enables a power institution to enact laws for any occasion that requires a new adaptable law. Interestingly, the enacted laws are usually introduced to be in line with the contributory micro advantages. Within the king Henry's state apparatuses, Master Cromwell, just assigned as the chancellor, defines the above procedures under the guise of 'the factor of convenience'. He also mentions that there are no rules and it is the administrative convenience that determines the rules. He says:

Cromwell: There are no rules. With rewards and penalties-so much wickedness purchases so much worldly prospering...it's much more a matter of convenience, administrative convenience. The normal aim of administration is to keep steady this factor of convenience-and Sir Thomas would agree. Now normally when a man wants to change his woman, you let him if it's convenient and prevent him if it's not-normally indeed it's of so little importance that you leave it to the priests. But the constant factor is this element of convenience.

In this extract it is clearly obvious that the rules and laws are subject to the advantages which are termed as 'convenience' in Cromwell's terminology.

## 5- Conclusion

Critical discourse analysis is systematically involved in studying the ways through which language is used to legitimate unequal power relations, organize and stratify the society in favor of the ruling class. The rhetoric of persuasion is one instance of discursive practices by which the required consensus for establishing hegemony can be obtained. Two of the most important discursive tools of rhetoric of persuasion are intertextuality and intertextuality that are used to coherently tie up different historical events and discourses together in a text to receive preset objectives and goals. In this respect the existing research has studied the exploitation of intertextuality and interdiscursivity as two discursive tools of the rhetoric of persuasion in Robert Bolt's widely-known play named "A man for all seasons" and investigated the probable transformation of orders of discourse as a result of enacting given persuasive discursive practice in the body of the given society.

As a conclusion it was found out that Wolsey, at bottom, is not content with the divorce, but he is stuck under the pressure of the king to do so. Therefore, he makes some excuses both for himself and for More to secure the divorce, and tries to have More to be in the same boat. These excuses take root from number of historical events by which Wolsey tries to influence More's decision, as his own decision is being influenced. Events such as Tudors and Yorkist wars are manifest intertextualities that have resulted in Wolsey to put aside private conscious and beliefs at the expense of the advantage of the state, and do a great part not letting the mentioned events happen again. The king also has executed two religious inter-textual issues such as Leviticus and Deuteronomy to lead More in his desired way.

Of more pivotal importance in persuading More is the matter of interdiscursivity. In order for having More in line with himself, the king, in some occasions, changes his kingly manner of talking and opens an amicable conversation with More; however, in some other occasions, while the king loses his temper and sees More as a hard nut to crack, he turns back to his kingly style of talking. In this connection, the matter of inter-discursivity is obviously significant. In case of Cromwell, he, too, resorts to interdiscursivity to make More to be under his control. He tries to enforce More to declare his loyalty by supporting the king's divorce. In his juridical

behavior, Cromwell, like the king, obviously shows signs of inter-discursivity; to label calling Sir Thomas for integration as an 'invitation' and being so thankful for his coming.

Specifically concerned with the transformation of orders of discourse, it is to say that The King's new orders of discourse transform the pre-defined forms of administrative discourse, but keep its content and spirit untouched. This formal transformation adapts itself with the upcoming ever new needs of administration.

## References

- Basarati, A. & Razi Nejad, S. M. (2016). A critical study of the role of "Advantage" in constructing contrary perspectives towards religious institutions in Robert Bolt's "A man for all seasons". *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, Vol. 22. Pp. 7-17
- Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and power in multilingual world*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publication Co.
- Chilton, P. & Ch, Schaffner (2002). *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourses*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co.
- Cook, G. (1992). *The Discourse of Advertising*. London: Routledge.
- Ezenfeka, C. R. (2013). Strategic use of metaphor in Nigerian newspaper reports: A critical perspective. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*. Vol. 6(2): 174-192.
- El Naggari, S. (2012). Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the discourse of Muslim televangelists: the case study of Hamza Yusuf. *Critical approach to discourse analysis across disciplines*: Vol. 6(1): 76-95
- Fairclough, N. (1998). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *The critical study of language. Critical discourse analysis*. 2nd edition. London: Longman group limited.
- Femia, J. V. (1981). *Gramsci's political thought. Hegemony, consciousness and the revolutionary process*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Forgacs, D. (1988). *A Gramsci Reader*. New York: new York University Press.
- Keat, R. & Abercrombie, N. (1990). *Enterprise culture*. London: Routledge.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva reader* (ed. T. Moi). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Meadows, B. (2007). "Distancing and showing solidarity via metaphors and metonymy in political discourse: A critical study of American statements on Iraq during the years 2004-2005". *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*. 1(2): 1-17.
- Mio, J. S. (1997). Metaphor and politics. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 12(2), 113-133.
- Musolf, A. (2008). What can critical metaphor analysis add to the understanding of racist ideology? Recent studies of Hitler's anti-Semitic metaphors. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*. Vol. 2(2): 1-10
- Mutz, Diana, Sniderman, Paul, and Brody, Richard (1999). *Political Persuasion and Attitude Change*. The University of Michigan Press. Ann Arbor.
- O'Shaughnessy, J. and N.J. O'Shaughnessy (2004). *Persuasion in Advertising*. London: Routledge.
- Philips, S. (1998). Language ideologies in institutions of power: A commentary. In B. Schiffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.). *language ideologies: practice and theory* (pp.211-222). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Poggi, Isabella (2005). "The Goals of Persuasion". *Pragmatics and Cognition* 13: 2. John Benjamin Publishing Company: 297-336.
- Reisigl, M. and R. Wodak (2009). The Discourse Historical Approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage. pp. 87-121.
- Soring, K. (1989). Some remarks on linguistic strategy of persuasion, In Wodak, R. (ed.). *Language, power and ideology: studies in political discourse*. Vol. 7, Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company. Pp. 95-...
- Weiczorek, A. E. (2009). This is to say you're either in or out: some remarks on clusivity. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*. Vol. 3(2): 118-129.
- Wodak, R. (1989). The power of political Jargon- a club-2 discussion, in Wodak, R. (ed.), *language, power and ideology. Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin publishing company. Pp. 137-164
- Writh-Coliba, V. (2016). "The diversity and dynamic world of 'US' and 'THEM' in political discourse". *Critical approach to discourse analysis across disciplines*: Vol. 8(1): 23-37.