

## **I. George Orwell's *1984*: Text and Context**

George Orwell's *1984* is a fiction of Winston Smith, a civil servant in the Ministry of Truth in Oceania, a hypothetical country. The country is ruled by a heroic and cunning leader called Big Brother. Big Brother is the charismatic leader of the country who has been ruling and establishing his power for a long time, ensuring people that the political system the country has adopted is the socialism, called INGSOC. Big Brother ascended into the ruling position after the socialist revolution in the country. Socialism adopted Oceania brings numerous changes in the society as a cultural, linguistic and political revolution. Social-cultural-linguistic aspects are revised and packaged into new flavors. New codes are written and novel conducts are adopted. Country is renamed, ministries get new names and the new socialist language called double think is created.

On the grounds of these massive changes, the country creates the rhetoric of its own by establishing the narratives of dichotomies of divine and devil. The ruler is divinized with glorious history and masculine appearance. Instantly, a villain is projected. Goldstein is depicted as the traitor who betrayed the leader in the revolution. Every two Minutes Hate, the daily ritual, is devoted to the defilers like Goldstein. History is newly written and new truths are created. Prejudices of the ruler are inherent in the creation of the history and new language. A separate ministry is employed for the purpose of writing history and crafting new truths – Ministry of Truth. Ironically, the ministries are named. History is deleted and the historical events are altered as per the requirement of the ruler.

Apart from these activities, the people are protected under the surveillance of cameras, telescreens and other devices. Big Brother is of divine quality that he can

snoop from every corner and end at any length. Every activity of every person is watched by Big Brother from a remote distance.

Precisely, *1984* is a narrative of a middle-aged Winston Smith's wrestling against the totalitarian government, ruled by a god-like ruler Big Brother of Oceania. Despite written in 1949, the novel projects the future political world of *1984*, the then 40 years later, London in particular and Oceania in general. Oceania, as a geopolitical division, includes the Americans, the United Kingdom, Australia and their allies whereas Eastasia includes China and its satellite nations. Eurasia refers to Russia and its federal territories. Eastasia and Eurasia are in constant war whereas Oceania shifts the alliances as per the situation. Citizens are merely informed about the unstable political alliances and expected to suppose their enemies as per the changed political situation.

Spatially, the novel is set in London where the different ministries are functional as they are named in Newspeak, a newly invented language in Oceania. "Doublethink" is the specialty of Newspeak because the Ministry of Truth distorts the facts and creates the new versions of truths as per the requirements of the political system. Ministry of Love, unlike its name, is famous for the physical punishment and torture. O'Brien, one of the members of Inner Party, the suspicious trustee of Winston, works in the Ministry of Love as the party member. The ambiguous role O'Brien plays marks the true nature of the Party or the State in general.

Winston, a regular worker of Ministry of Truth, who shares the dilapidated Victory Mansion, a party members' residence, attempts his best to revolt against the extremely oppressive regime of his own country, at least by expressing his thoughts in his personal diary evading the eyes of Thought Police. Amid political restrictions and ubiquitous presence of the monitoring mechanism, Winston feels scared to have his

own personal choices and selections. Telescreens are capable of broadcasting and recording visual and audio both and, because of which, everyone has to be aware of their own - a kind of self-censorship. Everywhere he is in chains- the locks of restrictions that deprive of his intimate individual choices and selections, let alone the romantic relationship. Ban ranges from what to buy and where to buy to what not to think. The personal identity and subjectivity are all stripped off at the cost of living, otherwise the Ministry of Truth vaporizes the existence like that of Syme, a contributor to the Newspeak dictionary.

Very carefully and tactfully, Winston becomes able to engage in a relationship with Julia, the co-worker in the Ministry of Truth. Their affection and romantic life remains secret as they manage to avoid the eyes of Thought Police and Big Brother. The positive inclination towards the Brotherhood, the supposed anti-ruling or the opposing force, and sympathy towards Emmanuel Goldstein inspire them to be more rebellious against the scary regime of Big Brother. Mr. Charrington, the owner of shop that provides the facility for secret romantic stay, surprisingly appears to be a Thought Police who assists to arrest Winston and Julia. A hidden recording device is posed against the deceptive wall in order to record their private talks. The visual and audio traps are everywhere.

The political discourse created by the Party is sustained through the media television screens, radios and posters. Restriction on the language use and the recreation of history confuse the people like Winston who cannot properly remember his mother and other family members. The oppressive mechanisms include the use of technology, language and the humane force. People are put into a writhing situation where their identities are lost, exempt from their past and given with newly formed selected lexicons. The words which mean individual existence, personal practices and

revolution are excluded in the Newspeak with a supposition that language frames the thought and practice.

Imprisoned Winston becomes a helpless pathetic fellow who surrenders to the perpetrators, led by once his supposed friend O'Brien. The country's official history erases the entries of those people who go against the state rule and, so is the potential case with Winston. Winston, before getting the severe punishment and extreme torture for being charged of committing against the codes set by Big Brother, finds Parsons in the same torturing Ministry of Love for his children reported him of committing crime. Ampleforth is also subjected to be punished for his poems. From the very beginning to the ultimate event, the people like Winston are dispossessed from their decision making quality, and regularly observed snatching away their free will. It all converts them into the "docile being" (Foucault, 138) that do not have any kind of political agency in the discourse practiced by Oceania.

Winston, O'Brien, Julia, Parsons and other party members and the Prols, the other community members who are social elites, are trapped in a political cum social condition where they have no any kind of rights and their rational selections are denied. They are, rather, controlled by the powerful social cum political discourse of the ruler. This has converted the people into a mere obedient being – the goal or the patient that are compelled to react as per the expectation – the sensor.

The futuristic novel *1984* received many warm critical comments after its publication. The novel is interpreted from multiple perspectives. Some of the critics took it as the criticism of the possible communist era, the time of totalitarian regime. Isaac Asimov, a notable writer, describes the novel as the critic of any sort of government, which might turn into a despotic one not only a totalitarian communist government. For him, "*1984*, therefore, came to stand not for Stalinism, or even for

dictatorship in general - but merely for government” (1). He believes that the description of the use of advanced technology as something great to achieve. He, thus, evaluates it as an achievement that “came to mean everything that was too big for the individual to control. It was not only big government and big business that was a symptom of 1984 but big science, big labour, big anything” (1). The scientific and technological advancement mentioned in *1984* was beyond the use during the time of the forties and fifties. So, it was a big achievement.

Government restrictions push the life of the common people into the state of powerlessness. The bright hope of life crushes under the weight of civil rights abolition. Denizens suffer and suffocate with the pessimism around. Faint expectation and attempt of crusading the revolution by a common person disappear in the dark alley. David Lowenthal rightly puts, “it is the work of a disappointed political revolutionary for whom moral rather than political solutions have become supremely important” (163). Social revolution is subjected to the social and economic structures. Mostly, the revolution is associated with the leftists, who believe that capitalism helps to create a totalitarian state, where the proletarians have to engage in protesting against the bourgeoisie, which in a way or next mistreats the proletariats. Relating the condition of Winston as the unsuccessful revolutionary, critic Robert Paul Resh evaluates the novel as the narrative of unattainable hope. He posits:

In short, the relevance of Nineteen Eighty-Four remains surprisingly undiminished by the victory of capitalism over peasant-based revolutions in the so-called developing nations. Orwell demonstrates that, as long as capitalism dominates the world system, totalitarianism remains a real possibility, and the notion of a progressive alliance of the middle and working classes a chimera. (140)

Restriction and curtailing the civil rights have been two major measures so as to control the citizens. The possible revolution failed because of the heavy restrictions. Ban is even put on sexual behavior. Silencing the male sexual desires equals with the silencing of the political desire of protesting against the rulers. Critics Jennifer Storey, Catriona Mulholland, William Simpson and Matthew Hammer, in “Zamyatin and Orwell: A Comparative Analysis of *We* and *1984*”, take it as the restriction on the sexual drive itself. Defining sexual desire as the dangerous force, they observe it as:

inherently dangerous to the Party and Big Brother. Julia was acutely aware of this; she subverted the sexual repression of the Party through deviant sexual activity, and was fully cognizant of the personal political ramifications of her actions. Sexual desire felt for another individual is shown to be, in and of itself, subversive (4).

Julia, the lover of Winston, maintains multiple sex relations not just to entertain her desires but to go against the rule of the state which makes her feel better. Such a hopeless situation of the narrative vindicates the possible dystopian political scenario. Literary critic Roger Luckhurst, in “Nineteen Eighty Four and the Politics of Dystopia”, featured on British Library, evaluates that:

Orwell’s novel is a *dystopia*, a distinctly 20th-century extension and inversion of the long tradition of the utopia, the imagined *eu-topos*, or ‘good place’. Dystopias, like E M Forster’s ‘The Machine Stops’ (1909) or Yevgeny Zamyatin’s *We* (written in 1921, but published first in English in 1924), typically envisage the relentless forces of a technologised society extending its power over the human race, offering a nightmare of the individual crushed by inhuman state forces.

(1)

The bleak pessimist future with the heavy guard of the technological advancements that jeopardized human being's political existence certainly displays dystopian picture as Luckhurst affirms. It projects the nightmare where the human values and significance are much reduced to its lowest, and the hope gets lost.

In a linear fashion, conjuring Foucault, a critic, Roger Paden, in "Surveillance and Torture: Foucault and Orwell on the Methods of Discipline", presents punishment as the vehicle to assert power on the people. In the name of discipline, "torture" and "disappearance" are exercised. They are oriented to tame "local-upper class" to which Winston belongs. He summarizes with Orwell's intention. He concludes:

*In 1984* Orwell envisions a world in which torture and disappearances are used as the major methods of discipline. Orwell has all the major powers using these methods, and while he does restrict their use—for example, it is used neither on the proles, the lower classes, nor is it used in the "equatorial zones", the contested Third World—it seems to be the only method of discipline used to control the local upper classes.

(261)

Even though the novel is accessed from different political-theoretical assessments along with some pure linguistic approaches, these investigations remain unabridged, and for that a combined socio-politico cum linguistic approach is essential. This research, following the ideas from critical stylistics, attempts to cover up the all that research abyss. The perfect amalgamation of politico cum discursive methodology promisingly penetrates into the essence of the narrative, with new insights.

Unlike language in particular and politics in prime concern, this research takes the personal relations among the characters in terms of their positioning which is reflected through the political system as well as linguistic representation. Hence, the

methodology of the research is a unique convergence of the available methods in political as well as in linguistic, bringing a new wider perspective and rigorous engagement.

Therefore, this research rests on the hypothesis that under the totalitarian regime personal preferences and choices are crushed with the severe intervention of the state in the form of repressive state institutions and mechanisms. Even the rulers use modern technological advancements in order to jeopardize the private life of the individuals, which in return, rewards the ruler with the access to exercise deliberation as per the context and their need. Privacy remains no more since the modern panopticon sustains the persistent presence of the ruler in varied forms.

Despite such a horrific condition, the novel still sparks the hope as the role relation somehow gets complicated along with narrative focus on Winston and his considerable doubt on the system as having pseudo agency and limited role of sensor.

In order to unpack the complex social and political relationship among the characters, this research adopts the critical approach available in the critical stylistics in interlocution with the political theories of agency. The linguistic cum social and political theories, in collaboration, best serve to unpack the undercurrent of the novel in an explicit analysis. Since the research hinged on the singular approach, either political or linguistic, cannot truly explore the complete textual maneuver, this project adheres the socio-political as well as linguistic approach. For this purpose, Lesley Jefferies's notion of non-transitive grammar is explicitly adopted in an interaction with other critical insights from notable critics.

This research project is designed to be carried out in five chapters. The first chapter is an introduction to the text and issue. This chapter explores into the text and its events that are significant from the thematic aspects. Along with the textual



introduction, this chapter evaluates the notable critical reviews that the novel received after its publication. The second chapter concerns on the theoretical framework that is essential to be noted in order to explore into the basic nuances of the text. This chapter creates an engaging exploration into the linguistic as well as political notions regarding the role of agency, goal, sensor, phenomena and panopticon. As a complex convergence, this exploration creates a unique perspective that enables to unearth the writer's textual politics and the undercurrents of the text.

Likewise, the third chapter, "Social Roles and Linguistic Representation: Agency-Goal Analysis in *1984*" evaluates the roles of agency and goal conferred on the different participants of the text. The text has multiple dimensions but this chapter examines on the social, political and linguistic grounds. The characters have maintained their social and political roles, and are linguistically represented. Some of them are given agentive quality socially and politically whereas others are linguistically focalized. This chapter checks out how these forces and roles are functional. The fourth chapter, similarly, unpacks the complicated role of sensor of the given characters. Very cleverly, the writer or the novelist sets the characters in the role of sensor that contradict with each other. The deeper exploration reveals how the complicated and oppositional renditions of the roles carry the intention of the author, or the textual politics. Finally, the ultimate chapter concludes and exposes how the textual format supply the hopelessness and hope both at the same time, hinting the then hue and cry against the growing influence of socialism and communism in Europe. Thus, it explicates that there always remains an unshakable role of faith as resistance during a strangling time under the totalitarian regime or modern panopticon.

## **II. Role Relations and Panopticon**

In a linguistic as well as social phenomenon, participants are rewarded with certain roles to perform. Their role relations establish a relationship between or among them that, if analyzed well, exhibits the complicated dynamics of their importance. In *1984*, the relationship among characters is complicated which can be best understood in two ways – agency-goal relation and sensor-phenomena connection. Likewise, the exploration into the concept of panopticon assists in locating the relationship.

### **Agency – Goal/ Patient Analysis**

Linguistically, agency is realized in the level of language with the help of grammatical categories. In most of the cases, linguistically, the agency goes with the actor or the noun who actively participates in the respective or given condition. Such a noun, mostly, comes in the role of subject. The participant that comes in the object position becomes the goal. Actor is always with agency because they are supposed to have volition, and are capable of deciding oneself. Someone who has free will, decides independently and works out means the person has agency. Normally, subject becomes agent or possesses agency.

The other participant, in the linguistic level, or the object of the sentence turns out to be the patient or the goal. Charles J. Fillmore, in his case grammar, explains the roles of subject and object. In some cases, the use of tactful language – for example, in the indirect speech – creates confusion to locate which one is the agent and which one is patient. Analyzing linguistically, Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Mary Louise Pratt, in *Linguistics for the Students of Literature*, bringing the reference of the case grammar developed by Charles J. Fillmore, argue that Noun phrases or the otherwise known as participants, have certain roles to carry. Agent, Traugott and Pratt write,

“function is that of the doer responsible for an action or event taking place” (192). It has volition and must be animate. Mostly, it appears in the subject position.

Likewise, “patient can be characterized as the role of the being or the thing that is affected by the action or event, or that is simply present in it” (197), Traugott and Pratt summarize. Patient, one of the cases, remains passive and just becomes the participant, no matter the one is animate or inanimate. Patient becomes the inactive recipient of the effects unlike the experiencer in the string of action. In all the cases or situations, agency cannot be realized in the sentence level for the agency is more related to social, cultural and political aspect more than merely daily or trivial activities. Social, cultural and political agency travels in the wider level because of which they need a more critical and rigorous probing into the whole discourse. Thus, political, social and cultural agency has also to be examined.

Sociologically, in *1984*, agency is with Big Brother because of his ultimate power of decision making and creating the political discourse. Everyday activities are done by the other characters, yet the final power of formulating the routine of daily activities of every party member lies in his hand. Because of heavy control and regular surveillance, despite the physical enactments, Big Brother holds a firm grip on the lives of people, their thoughts and daily activities. Such a sociological aspect is downplayed by the language of the narrative.

In that wider lens, the actions are done upon the people and the party members. Even the members of Inner Party are molded as per the desire and political wish of the supreme leader. O’Brien, who works in the Ministry of Love, perpetrates violence as a part of correction methodology on Winston, Parsons and Ampleforth and others as he is supposed to correct the people’s activities. He seems to have individual volition but, from a broader perspective, he merely functions as a cog in a big and large

machine. All the activities and the results are as per the desire of the supreme leader and, in that sense, the characters like Winston seemingly become the patient, but not in an actual sense.

The most contested term agency has been accessed by many critics. Anthony Giddens in *The Constitution of Society*, a practical approach to agency, believes that “agency refers to doing” (10). That such doing brings certain consequences or results.

He posits:

The consequences of what actors do intentionally or unintentionally, are events which would not have happened if that actor had believed differently, but which are not within the scope of the agents power to have brought about (regardless of what the agents intentions were).

(11)

Certainly, and most obviously, the agency or the agent’s activities bring about the effects or results whether the desired ones or not. The results are essential to be projected as an agent. Giddens is of an opinion that ‘action’ and ‘effect’ are not only standards to examine into and prove one’s agency.

Moreover, he entails ‘control’ as the dimension of agency. Agent must have a certain degree of control over the act. Giddens summarizes:

What the agent does – as contrasted with the consequences ensuing from what has been done – in terms of phenomena the agent has more or less with in his or her control. In most spheres of life, and in most forms of activity, the scope of control is limited to the immediate contexts of action and interaction. (11)

More than having action, acting and consequences to be with an agency, Giddens believes that, one should have certain degree of control over the action. Not only the

free will but also the amount of control over the performance is essential otherwise one becomes like a machine that performs yet lacks the power to be controlled.

Likewise, Alessandro Duranti's definition of agency also stands in the similar lines. To avoid the potential vagueness and misinterpretation, he proposes a working definition of agency as:

Agency is here understood as the property of those entities (i) that have some degree of control over their own behavior, (ii) whose actions in the world affect other entities ( and sometimes of their own), and (iii) whose actions are the object of evaluation ( eg. in terms of their responsibilities of a given outcome). (453)

Duranti also concentrates on 'control', 'affect' (or consequences) and 'evaluation'. He adds evaluation as the new dimension which examines the performative aspect of any agent's work. That certain action of any entity which affects other entities, which can be probed into in terms of the responsibility, is because of the agentive property.

Duranti, exploring more on the dimension of agency, asserts that it is basically – performative / performance and encoding-in language.

Furthermore, Laura M. Ahearn, in "Agency and Language", evaluating the approaches of Practice Theory of Anthony Giddens and Anthropological explanations of Marshall Shalins and Bordeau, proposes a provisional definition of agency as:

"Agency refers to the socio-culturally mediated capacity to act' (28). For Ahearn, like other practice theorists, anthro-political theorists and linguistic theorists, agency belongs to the socio-culturally established and affirmed capability to perform. She focuses on the social, cultural validation of the agentive force.

In a broader way, Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mische, in "What is Agency", locate agency in terms of "the flow of time" (963). Synthesizing all sorts of

philosophical, social and anthropological interpretations and ideas, Emirbayer and Mische revisit human agency as:

A temporally embedded process of social engagement, informed by the past (in its habitual aspect) but also oriented towards the future (as a capacity to imagine alternative possibilities) and towards the present (as a capacity to contextualize past habits and future projects with in the contingencies of the moment). (963)

Emirbayer and Mische locate human agency in terms of temporal setting – past, present and future. Repetitious activities have affirmation to the past that affects actors’ ability “to recall, to select, and to appropriately apply the more or less tacit and taken – for – granted schemas of action that they have developed through past interactions” (975). Human agencies are choosy in their actions and activities as the behavioral pattern determines the iterated performances. Such performances shape the agentive dimension that works how the actors select, arrange and implement their action. Human agencies not only repeat the past events but are also capable enough to generate “new possibilities for thought and action” (984). That immense potentiality is related to the future and possibility.

Similarly, agents have the practical-evaluative dimension, which functions at present. Temporally it refers to the quality of being at present. “This exercise of situationality based judgment has been variously termed practical wisdom, prudence, art, tact, direction, application, improvisation and intelligence” (994). Finally, agreeing with Laura M. Ahearn, the perfect perspective comes from the triad approach of examining the agentive force – encoding in linguistic structure, agency encoded in larger spectrum of social-historical process and finally the combined approach.

More than that, designed and conceptualized by an English utilitarian scientist Jeremy Bentham, and philosophized with the critical inquiry by Michael Foucault, panopticon refers to that state of complete surveillance as “disciplinary mechanism” (*Discipline and Punish*, 199) which helps the rulers to be in a powerful position. Though initially devised only as a prison mechanism, later it was developed into a rigorous technique to control on human beings, not only on prisoners. The detrimonious use of panopticon has been common along with the invention of new technologies. The use of CCTV, surveillance cameras, recording mechanisms, telescreens and such other devices have been used in order to intervene into the very private life of common people. Because of such interventions, technologies have been (mis)used so as to affect human life and divert the human activities in someone else’s favor.

Panopticon is about being observed and visible to the others. To be visible to the others takes the secrecy away and reduces human beings into a regulated being with prescribed activities. Individuals cannot have free choices of one activity over the others. As Foucault believes that “visibility is a trap” (200), the very privacy remains no more and every event or activity becomes the matter of other’s interest. Individuality, subjectivity and identity all are excluded, and only remains a being with prescribed identities.

Began from the ancient time of plague stricken society’s strict regulatory scheme, discipline, according to Foucault, transgressed as surveillance in the form of “permanent registration” with the recording of “ the name, age, sex of everyone”(196). The same process of separating people into quarantine and supervision of slightest movement initiated and affirmed the “continues hierarchical figure” as “disciplinary mechanism” (197). Later on lepers were totally excluded from

society – “rituals of exclusion” began, more than patronizing tendency. The “practice of rejection, of exile –enclosure” of the lepers, to that of plagued ones is that of originating “a pure community” and “a disciplined society” (198), which furthers over the passage of time.

Later on, these two ways of controlling and regulating human subjects became a wide-spread and conjoined process together in the nineteenth century. The practice of rejection gets worse along with “binary division and branding” (199). Thus, panopticon, a prison concept, developed by Bentham, promotes hierarchy and stereotyping in the long run. The secular places like the “psychiatric asylum, the penitentiary, the reformatory, the approved school, and to some extent, the hospital” are regulated (199). Regulation becomes lucid and harsh.

Creating that ‘pure community’ and ‘disciplined society’ sustains the power relation to the involved entities. The rulers who control those “disciplined-mechanisms” and “discipline blockade” (200) improve the exercise of power by making it lighter, more rapid, more effective, a design of subtle coercion for a society to come” (209) . For Foucault, “ the power has its principle not so much in a person as in a certain concerted distribution of bodies, surfaces, lights , gazes; in an arrangement whose internal mechanisms produce the relation in which individuals are caught up” (202). Thus, for him, the management and proper control on bodies becomes the source of power that is sustained through disciplinary mechanisms like panopticon. He concludes that “the panoptic mechanism is not simply a hinge a point of exchange between a mechanism of power and function; it is a way of making power relation function through these power relations” (206). However, the power becomes the product or an invincible outcome of panopticon. Similarly, cultural critic Chris Barker, referring to Foucault, in *Making Sense of Cultural Studies*, contends



that “disciplinary technologies, which arose in a variety of sites, produce what Foucault called ‘docile bodies’ that could be ‘subjected, used, transformed and improved” (89). So, disciplinary mechanisms become the instruments to tame the human life.

That disciplinary mechanism, an extension of panopticon, the physical structure, sustains through different new techniques as the forms of “state-apparatuses”. Foucault believes that these state apparatuses are like state institutions. This coercive state institution is concerned with:

dust of events, actions, behavior, opinions – everything that happens; the police are concerned with those things of every moment ... with the police, one is in the indefinite world of supervision that seeks ideally to reach the most elementary particle, the most passing phenomenon of the social body (213).

Hence, Foucault comes to a conclusion that panopticon as a disciplinary system has been improved in the modern days along with the introduction and employment of new state – institutions that function as apparatuses to generate and sustain the power, by ripping off the privacies and enforcing more disciplines on the human bodies, converting them into ‘docile bodies’.

Regarding the state institutions and apparatuses, Louise Althusser more clearly advances his evaluation that every state is repressive in nature as sustained by police, army and such state-institutions, that “belongs entirely to the public domain” (1489) and functions “by violence” (1490). The methods of punishment, violence and discipline are the repressive approaches. This, for Althusser, creates a support to the ruling elite of the state, enriching them with more power and strengths. For him, such physical enforcement is backed up by the ideological apparatuses.

### **Sensor- Phenomena Analysis**

Human beings have the biological as well as mental capabilities to sense the situation around through the sense organs, mental process of observing and perceiving the circumstances around include thinking, knowing, realizing, understanding and so on. Winston, the candid fictional personality, of the narrative, thinks, realizes, hates, sees, and feels about the political and physical situation around him. His role remains as the sensor; someone who perceives the situation around reacts to it and formulates his own opinion. The conditions around him are of certain nature.

Lesley Jeffries, in *Critical Stylistics: The Power of English*, reading Simpson's socio-linguistic approach, believes that "Mental Cognition Process" includes Mental Cognition, Mental Reaction, and Mental Perception. Sensor or the participant of the situation perceives, recognizes and responds the condition to the certain phenomena or the situation. Sensor's responses are the backgrounds to probe into the amount of influence of the situation on that particular participant. In the social and political context of *1984*, Winston remains as a sensor and phenomena both throughout the narrative.

In a process of examining actions, events and states, the role of the participants, as per the Simpson's model, is that of thinking, knowing, realizing, and understanding and so on. Sensor senses the situation – either knows the state or collects the information, or realizes the actions and effects. Mainly related to mental association such activities are more psychological and physical – as a reaction to the physical or previous psychological states.

Social phenomena and political situation or the physical conditions make the participants reactive. These responses are associated with human emotions like feeling, liking, hating and so on. Sensor approaches the condition or the situation and

immediately collects the impressions that encourages for reaction. Psychological happening reflects the sensor's emotional acceptance and rejection.

Similarly, mental perception includes the employment of sense organs to approach the given situation. Active participant of the situation understands the cases as one finds it through one's senses like smelling, seeing, hearing, feeling and tasting. Perception is the foundation of empirical judgment and evaluation. Human understanding relies on perception. Participants' opinions are framed because of the perception, reaction and cognition.

Jeffries, citing Simpson, argues that in the level of language use and praxis, such mental processes can be easily identified. Sensor's role in the given phenomena can be easily probed. Sensor realizes the phenomena and responses (43). To be precise, the locational impressions and reflections affect the participant, and because of which, that particular participant of that event or situation becomes sensor, rather than an actor. Sensor is an experiencer, in another term.

### **III. Social Roles and Linguistic Representation: Agency – Goal Analysis in *1984***

“Power is in inflicting pain and humiliation. Power is in tearing minds to pieces and putting them together again in new shapes of your own choosing.” (*1984*, 247).

The narrative of *1984* maintains the logical tapestry of agency and goal in the novel from the very beginning to the end of it. The two ends of the category or the two participants are awarded in different roles as per their positions. Agency is with the agent, which might be grammatically present as well as absent as downplay of the language skips it. Agency is projected in the both ways socially and grammatically. Most of the times, agent comes clearly in the grammatical form, and is socially realized. But, sometimes the agent is socially felt but grammatically absent. In the novel, Winston is largely devoid of his agency in the social level.

Winston, in the beginning, is shown as the patient in the discourse of the ruler, Big Brother. As a civil servant in the Ministry of Truth, he has to maintain the truth of the government and create and recreate the truths. Being projected under the wide frame of the telescreen, the protagonist becomes a helpless creature. He carries out his everyday chores in a scheduled format under the strict surveillance of the government. The political panopticon, which he lives in, snatches away his social as well as political agentive qualities to a certain degree. As Foucault sums up that “visibility is a trap” (200), he is under the trap of his ruler, who follows everywhere through the use of devices like telescreen and hidden cameras. Such extreme condition of regular monitoring converts Winston into a being without any visible volition. He carries out his activities like a robot that is programmed to function in a certain fashion. The overall power of control is with the ruler, Big Brother. Personal choices and preferences are restricted, procedures to activities are prescribed and the family life is

programmed by the law. Wonderfully enough, history is created and recreated as per the new condition of the state and the ruler, erasing the displeasing past and facts. Everywhere spying eyes of the ruler are present.

Agency is much related to the power of decision making that affects the other entities and brings changes in the level of action. *1984* is the narrative of the effect on Winston because of the activities of the despotic ruler, in the political level. The large political discourse of ruler and ruling is controlled and maintained by the ruler who, being at a distance, projects himself through the images, postures and visuals, and because of which, he becomes able to sustain his power to rule. Such a political distancing with the caliber to be vigilant and control positions him in the pedestal of agent, reducing Winston, Julia and others into the shoes of patients or the goals. To be precise, the ruler is the actor and Winston is acted upon. Politically, the agentive property is in the hands of the ruler despite the novel maintains the aesthetic distance since the narration comes from the third person point of view.

As per the narrative is concerned, the third person point of view maintains the aesthetic distance. Although the narrative comes from the perspective of Winston, the narrator still maintains a distance. It seems as if the narrator is sure about the feelings of Winston, and he seems to be known of the critical condition that the ruler has created. The narrator, also, knows the latent intention of the ruler. Such a narrative vantage point makes clear about the agentive property of the discourse participants and, still holds a chance to downplay the role of agency in the linguistic level. The distance of the narrator to the ruler and other characters makes the narrative more credible and authentic, however, the trajectory projects from Winston's life.

A large corpus of narratology has been devoted on the study of the role of the narrators in the structure of the narratives. A critic of narratology, Goran Nieragden,

in “Focalization and Narration: Theoretical and Terminological Refinements”, evaluating the Mieke Bal and Gerrard Genette’s narratological classification, contends that “ an authorial, who is not a character at the same time and remains ‘outside’ the story is called a heterodiegetic narrator”(686). Nieragden appropriates Genette’s alternative to the traditional notion and classification of point of view and furthers that “the choice of center of perception/orientation within any given narrative has great significance for matters such as characterization, completeness, and reliability regardless of the narrative situation” (688). That is to say, the point of view of focus has a great value rather than who narrates from a distance. Similarly, Mieke Bal, in her *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, avers that “the subject of focalization, the focalizer, is the point from which the elements are viewed. That point can lie with a character (i.e. an element of the fable [story]), or outside it” (104). So, the point of focus may be on the character of the story or outside it. But, in the case of *1984*, the focalized one is Winston, as the narrator remains in the heterodiegetic situation.

The social location is the actual political dimension to affect the role of the participants. In the novel there are primarily two participants: Winston and Big Brother. Big Brother makes a constant observation on the people like Winston. The monitoring becomes the disciplinary mechanism, and shrinks the existence of Winston, to the larger extent, into the visibility of the ruler. As Foucault believes that “visibility is a trap”, Big Brother is the trapper where Winston is trapped.

Because of the role of the observer and the observed, the ruler stands on the top tier, providing the vertical power relations. That non-horizontal power relation creates the gap between the agent and the goal. Winston is not politically free to do in his own will, rather busies as per the demand of the political system.

In Oceania, the whole political discourse and disciplinary boundaries are the products of Big brother who closely observes the people. Social and political agency, in that large political context, hence, belongs to the discourse restrainer, Big Brother. All the social and political movements are under his direct control. Even the ministries serve his purpose of ascertaining the discourse. Ironically enough, they are named and they function otherwise. The Ministry of Truth creates the truths the way the ruler wants them to be. Winston and his friends are with no choice than following the commands of the ruler. Everywhere prevailing eyes of the ruler ensure whether the people are following the commands of the ruler or not. In fact, Winston, a civil servant in the Ministry of Truth, has to carry out his everyday work being under the trap of the visibility. The penetrating visibility scrapes off his private life for it extends up to his very private room. Winston lives a life of negotiated existence; he is not free anywhere.

Essentially, the political agenda setter and the forerunner of the discourse is the political leader who remains at the distance despite the very proximity established by the telescreen as medium. As being the agenda setter, Big Brother has the complete control over the discourse that is spreading. Anthony Giddens, in *The Constitution of Society*, believes that “[a]ction is a continuous process, a flow in which the reflexive monitoring which the individual maintains is fundamental to the control of the body that actors ordinarily sustain throughout their day to day lives.” (9) The control over the body of own is the fundamental quality of the agent. Their controlling is because of the reflexive monitoring that means the perception and understanding. Agent’s property is to assign the controlled directives and commands over the bodily functions and the rational choices. In most of the cases, controls over the actions are direct but in some of the cases it becomes an indirect approach. In this light of agentive quality,

Winston seems to be controlling his body: he gets up, does usual works and daily chores, dragging his torso through the streets of the town. But in the broader sense, he is controlled by Big Brother who is present almost everywhere. Winston is made to believe that big Brother is watching from every corner. Such a caution makes him aware of his activities, and performs accordingly. Being conscious of the surveillance, he sincerely concerns on his activities. Telescreens that frequently broadcast the directions and propaganda news are controlling the onlookers like Winston. The most powerful control is of the surveillance mechanisms rather their own will. Certainly, Winston is not acting according to his will. He is acting to the wants of the leader because of which the agentive property belongs to Big Brother.

In a contrast, from the reverse lens, despite the seemingly heavy control, as explained above, the narrative has conferred certain degree of agentive property on Winston which we cannot overlook at the cost of the enveloping power of control of the ruler. The text time and again, in a subtle way, affirms the social and political property on Winston.

Politically, from the aforementioned analysis, it seems that Big Brother holds the complete control but actually the ruler has a huge sense of fear in him that he has to employ and frequently make sure of people's thinking. Winston does not have any considerable amount of trust on the ruler. He regularly doubts even the existence of Big Brother, let alone the political change. Every moment that has been appropriate to him, he resists the regime thereby affirming his will and decisive power, agency.

### **I. Socio-political Analysis of Agency- Goal/ Patient**

The system of control in a social-political discourse establishes and, in long run, as a result, sustains the power on one entity or participant over the next. The fictional entirety of *1984* is the power projection of the state, by extension the ruler,



upon its people as agent and patient in a discursive framework. The repressive imposition of the social and state institutions as “discipline mechanism” and “discipline blockade” affects the people as patient who are impacted. The state control is revealed mainly in six prongs – Thought Police, rules and restrictions, intervention into private life, linguistic intervention, history and panopticon.

Firstly, Thought Police is the secret security force that is assumed to spy and control people’s thought. The state propaganda of Oceania empowers Thought Police as the most dynamic force that is capable of intervening into any private life and scan out any thoughts and ideas against the state. “It was even conceivable that they watched everybody all the time” (2). Suspicion is in the level that it has created “black terror” (9) in him even if he sees his own office staffs. The completely unpredictable amount of suspicion has encouraged him to doubt on every person as “agent” (14), working for the state.

Even though police are supposed to be able to detect the mental musings, the pervasive discourse of Thought Police scares the people around as in the condition Winston is caught up. “He didn’t do so, however, because he knew that it was useless. Whether he wrote DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER, or whether ... bound to get you” (24). For people like Winston, it is made believe that Thought Police knows what they think about Big Brother.

The narrative furthers that the unrivaled capability of deciphering the human mind by the Thought Police may know what Winston thinks. Winston, as a part of self-awareness, predicts the possible future if he writes what blurs up in his mind as “the diary would be reduced to ashes and himself to vapor. Only the Thought Police would read what he had written before they wiped it out of existence and out of

memory” (35). As a result of long time teaching, Winston believes in the prolific intelligence of the Thought Police that it can even read from the burnt down papers.

Politically, power of the ruler sustains as the repressive force – Thought Police’s treatment becomes scary and coercive. It is supposed that “none who had once fallen into the hands of Thought Police ever escaped into the end. They were corpses waiting to be sent back to the grave” (97). And because of its pervasiveness and malign methodologies, the state as sustained, “nothing is efficient in Oceania except the Thought Police,” the narrator sums up as: “Whenever he may be, sleep or awake, working or resting, in his bath or in bed, he can be inspected” (265). The access of control or the power is such that there remains no more individual life; every time and everywhere one is watched. These all presences and powerful exercises of the Thought Police along with the surging discourses of their scary discipline blockade, have made the state, or the ruler, be acting upon the people. Big Brother creates that social and political agentive properties as he uses such repressive state apparatuses. The Thought Police is the most sophisticated repressive state institution that functions as per the wish and discourse of the ruler.

Even though such a scary state institution called Thought Police works so as to affirm and assure the political power of the ruler, Winston and Ampleforth are there to challenge it. Winston, even though fears, still does not give up writing in his diary and Ampleforth keeps writing poems. These two activities – keeping a diary and composing poems resist the political interference by the Thought Police. Their resistance affirms the individual agencies against the ruler’s force.

Secondly, the powerful social and political discourse sustains with the disciplinary rules that are implied on the grounds of military enforcement. These rules range from what to do, where to go to what to buy from where. The whole political

and social course of code of conduct is regulated and monitored by the political leader - Big Brother. The effective rules implementation rewards the ruler with power, there by having a control on the activities of the people, and thus, Winston, Parsons and others have to be affected as they live in the constrains.

Party members have to be much aware about what they should do – they are not supposed to buy from any shops they like. Limited options enervate the party members' decisive power on the actions that they perform. Rules are much strictly enforced so as to make people disciplined – or, in other words, control people and their movements. Restriction and banning over particular activity, reducing the value of free will, individual choices and preferences, swipes away the agentic property from the individuals. The imposition on selections and options upon the naïve person confers the decisive quality on Big Brother.

Very unlikely, just in opposition to the government expectation, the party members like Winston, Julia and others have ignored the restrictions. They have secretly traded razors and other items. As the rules are “not strictly kept”, the members have deliberately breached it that ensures their attempt of exercising free will.

Thirdly, these restrictions and limitations of choices are not only intended for public spaces like parks, shops, towns, streets, but they also encroach the very private life of individuals. The ruler's rules reflect who determines truly personal life such as marriage, sex, children, and so on. The compulsive restriction on sexual behavior and number of children very much shrinks the domain of private life. The instincts, from sexual to living, which are natural, have been falsified, and, are, thus, converted into adoptive and cultural. That forceful enactment of converting natural into disciplinary boundary of cultural exemplifies the control on human beings. It is as if the sexual

urge is sucked up by the cultural practice. “The terrible thing that the party had done was to persuade you that mere impulses, mere feelings, were of no account” (150). Party comrades are supposed to wither any sort of feelings so as to convert into docile bodies.

Along with sexual impulse, romance, hatred and affection all are eroded off. Every emotion as a binding force of intimacy is readily exempt from daily practices.

The narrator comments that:

In old days, he thought, a man looked at a girl’s body and saw that it was desirable, and that was the end of the story. But you could not have pure love or pure lust nowadays. No emotion was pure because everything was mixed up with fear and hatred. Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was blow struck against the party. It was a political act. (115)

Having certain emotion of love affection and romance has been described as the serious crime against the whole political system. “Desire was a thought crime” (62). It is an extreme form of control where individual wishes and desires are thoroughly scrutinized and denied.

In practice, regarding sexual behavior and instinct, the strictest prohibition was done with the formation of Anti-Sex league. The party’s “real, undeclared purpose was to remove all pleasure from sexual act” with the “permission” that “was refused if the couple concerned gave the impression of being physically attracted to one another” (60). Restricting the physical intercourse completely, “all children were to be begotten by artificial insemination (artsem, it was called in Newspeak) and brought up in public institution” (60). Such a control on human instinct and human nature of creating progeny brings the individual choice of creating a family to an end. The

power of controlling this large social institution affects Winston and other party members, whom they have to obey without any public protest; they're in helpless situation.

Though the rule exists as a heavy restriction, Julia and Winston frequently meet and do love making. No matter if there is such bondage on sexual and romantic activities; they are in life of romance. Julia's dress up and her love for cosmetics prove their rebellion against the regime. She believes that "[she] is going to be a woman, not a Party comrade" (130). Her celebration of her body and the desire to decorate it portray the importance of impulses, and there by their agency of creating it. The assertion of her depicts the latent will and desire. She reveals that "I am going to get hold of a real woman's fork from somewhere and wear it instead of these bloody trousers. I'll wear stockings and high-heeled shoes" (Ibid.). These remarks are the assertions of choices and the promotions of individuality, underscoring the government's restrictions and impositions. So, they still hold the agency with aggression in a certain level.

Fourthly, the extreme form of control and monitoring is the deliberate invention, introduction and implementation of new language – Newspeak, or double think. Instead of promoting the usual spoken language, new sort of language is invented employing party members in enriching it with new vocabularies, having a separate department in a particular Ministry – Ministry of Truth. Syme is one of the members of that political and linguistic project of empowering language as a lexicographer.

Converting language as a means of limiting human experiences to express, the state imposes a huge sense of control on people. Ruler is aware that language shapes our understanding and lexicons or the words are the tools. When the tools are made

less available, the people's understanding becomes limited. As a linguistic project, things, ideas and events are totally renamed in double think – Newspeak. To sustain the autocratic rule and cloud the people's quest of understanding more with subtle expressions, the Newspeak dictionary does not have any entry of the words like democracy, freedom and so on.

Syme, “a philologist, a specialist in Newspeak” (44) believes that “it is beautiful thing, the destruction of words” in order to “narrow the range of thought” that will “make thought – crime literally impossible because there will be no words in which to express it” (47). And because of “destroying; words – scores of them, hundreds of them, everyday” has cut “the language to the bone” (46). “The range off consciousness always a little smaller” because of heavy curtailing on the number of words – “the reduction in the number of verbs” (144), nouns and adjectives. The reduction in the number of words of these three major categories certainly weakens the language user's understanding and the perception.

American linguist Benjamin Lee Whorf, having the idea from his teacher Edward Shapir, hypothesizes that “the structure of any one's native language strongly influences or fully determines the world view he will acquire as he learns the language” (cited in Kay and Kempton, 66). That is to say, the nature of particular language affects the human thought of its users. In *1984*, by inventing and using new language, having the least number of words, avoiding all words that are related to freedom, justice, rebellion, the ruler attempts to limit the thought, consciousness and understanding of the people. That, in turn, secures the power position of the ruler, reducing the language users as the passive users of what is made available to use for expression.

Moreover, the cog of control is also on history – manipulation, deletion and addition is done in the existing history, so as to create new history. Ministry of Truth is employed solely for the same reason, where Syme and his cohorts engage into. In this same ministry Winston does rewriting of the history, in the records department. The department abolishes, annihilates and, in their own words, “vaporizes” the people and their history.

Under the demand and directives of Big Brother, the historical events are rewritten for own comfortable locations, and manipulated in such a way that facts are altered. Winston evaluates that “everything had been different then. Even the names of countries, and their shapes on the map had been different” (29). Politically everything is renamed and changed under the desire and dream of the ruler. People have to accept the altered history – at least altered in documents. The matter is not about just replacing one by the next content. Winston even believes that:

And if all others accepted the lie which the Party imposed – if all the records told the same tale – then the lie passed in to history and became truth. “Who controls the past” ran the party slogan “controls the future: who controls the present controls the past”. (31)

The changes – addition and deletion – that are made in the history are all oriented and intended to prize the ruler with the firm grip on disseminated reality. Newly established history restores the power of ruler to control the history as per the wish. “Reality control”, they call it in Newspeak, “double think” (31). Winston avers “the past, he reflected, had not merely been altered, it had been actually destroyed” (32), and “everything melted into mist” (33). The narrative version of the ruler has made everything changed.

When the history is completely destroyed, everything goes into “mist” and the past episodes only remain in the form of memory. Repressive strategies and methods even shake off that fragile memory. Thus, the erasing blurs the history as Winston remarks “[f]or how could you establish even the most obvious fact when there existed no record outside your own memory?”(32). The “memory holes” are used to scrape down the uneasy past, and the Ministry of Truth documents the required past events. So, the narrator believes that “[a]ll history was a scraped clean and reinscribed exactly as often as was necessary” (36). In fact, Big Brother extends his agency by creating the history.

Regarding language use and manipulation of history, the noticeable amount of reservation and resistance is found in Winston and Julia’s activities. No matter Winston practices the Newspeak in public and writing articles, he never has any kind of attachment to it. He, as a part of self-assertion against the detrimental government control, chooses old language to write in his diaries and in day to day communication with others. With Julia, he uses Oldspeak and even with Syme he prefers to talk in old language. That is to say, he still resists the government orders and enforcements.

As far as history is concerned, Winston doubts many a times about the new invention. Since he knows the whole political functioning, he profoundly doubts on the new version of history. So, on his part, he tries to fill up that missed historical events with his memory. His memorization of his mother, sister and previous wife are evidences of it. Despite the warnings, he remembers the past events, and it serves as the resistance in an individual level that simultaneously dismisses the government’s project and invigorates the individual agency.

Finally, the surveillance has been the “discipline mechanism” to sustain the power of the ruler thereby constantly monitoring the life - events and activities – of



every person. Telescreens are fit in almost everywhere that have two functions – receiving the information about the vicinity that it occupies and sending the information – Big Brother’s message and state news. To an extreme, telescreens even dictate when to sleep, when to work and what to be done to the common people. This kind of encroachment, with compulsive directions, into the very private life subdues the role of people, and strengthens the role and power of the ruler. Ruler is, hence, able to dictate the very private activities, control them and do changes as per the wish – people have been passive followers, being impacted by the incidents in a social-political discourse – it makes the ruler an agent and the people like Winston a patient.

Michael Yeo, in “Propaganda and Surveillance in George Orwell’s Nineteen Eighty-Four: Two Sides of the Same Coin”, referring to Bentham, divides the surveillance into two kinds: Panoptical surveillance and surreptitious surveillance. Panoptical surveillance is to keep some one under the “visual trap” (Foucault, 200) because of which “the occupant avoids the behavior the detection of which would have penalty” (Yeo, 53). Citing Bentham, Yeo contends that panoptical surveillance is different from “the inspection principle” (Ibid. 54). It is direct observation and makes the participant realize that one is under the observation. Winston’s dwelling place the Victory Mansion, his office, and streets and almost everywhere there are either the posters of Big Brother’s eyes with scary slogan or the telescreen to observe the people’s activities are put.

Likewise, Yeo, conjuring Bentham, argues that the next form of surveillance is surreptitious surveillance – the self sensorship. Yeo avers:

surreptitious surveillance works not to prevent speech or action, as panopticism does, but to detect what people really think or believe by

surveillancing their speech and action when they are disinhibited in the (illusory) belief that they are in a private setting. (54)

Thus, this surreptitious surveillance is all about making oneself aware of being snooped despite one is not really under the surveillance.

Winston after getting into his own mansion , the Victory Mansion, the housing for the party members, grabs his recently bought diary, and is about to pour into his feelings and thoughts. Immediately, he withdraws his attempts of writing his feelings because he feels that he is under the snooping of the hypothetical Thought Police. In Big Brother's regime, even, thinking against him – that is to think freely about ruling and regime – is taken seriously.

Controlling has to do with capability. Agents must be capable of controlling their actions and other people's activities. That capability, commonly referred as the power, essentially functions as the agentive quality because without the power to control or that capability one cannot carry out the actions. Individual intervention if affects differently, it justifies the use of power. Agency lies in the actions that either create the social or political discourse or affect it any ways. If the actions don't affect in either ways, that action becomes valueless. Practically, such power is visible.

Giddens, referring to the agent as the perpetrator, concludes that:

Agency refers to not to the intentions people have in doing things but to their capability of doing those things in the first place (which is why agency implies: cf the Oxford Dictionary definition of an agent as one who exerts power or produces an effect). Agency concerns events of which an individual is the perpetrator in the sense that the individual could at any phase in a given sequence of conduct have acted differently. (9)

With reference to this definition, we can argue that the role that Big Brother is playing is that of the agent since his actions and decision are at the foundation of all the social changes and reforms. He determines the policies and the roles that one has to perform. He is that person who has the power to decide and bring changes in the lives of the people. It implies his power. His power affects the people like Winston, thus, confirming Winston as the patient or the goal of the whole political discourse. Hence, socio-politically, Winston remains at the edge of patient, being an obedient person, following every order broadcast from telescreen, as bound to the discourses disseminated by the ruler, the agent. Yet, Winston and Julia do not give up going against the party codes. Their resistance challenges the agency of the ruler and they establish their individual agency.

## **II. Linguistic Analysis of Agency- Goal/ Patient**

The narrative begins with the tired Winston returning back into his communal living of the Victory Mansion. The narrative projection of the characters is remarkable. The rampant presence of posters of Big Brother and constant warnings broadcast on ever present telescreen reduce the Mansion into a panopticon:

Outside, even through the shut window-pane, the world looked cold. Down in the street little eddies of wind were whirling dust and torn paper into spirals, and though the sun was shining and the sky a harsh blue, there seemed to be no colour in anything, except the posters that were plastered everywhere. The blackmoustachio'd face gazed down from every commanding corner. There was one on the house-front immediately opposite. BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING YOU, the caption said, while the dark eyes looked deep into Winston's own. Down at street level another poster, torn at one corner, flapped fitfully

in the wind, alternately covering and uncovering the single word INGSOC. In the far distance a helicopter skimmed down between the roofs, hovered for an instant like a bluebottle, and darted away again with a curving flight. It was the police patrol, snooping into people's windows. The patrols did not matter, however. Only the Thought Police mattered. (2)

In a closer analysis, this condition of the narrative has arrayed the “telescreen”, “voice from telescreen”, “Thought Police” in the position of subjective role that ensures the gravity and density of use of disciplinary mechanism into the life of the people like Winston. These technical assistances are for emboldening the power of Big Brother, the downplayed agent. Winston gets affected by all these activities regulated by Big Brother. Thus, it provides a lucid proof of the agentive quality of Big Brother, even though, he seems to be absent in the lexicons, but through telescreens he presents himself.

In the linear fashion, Winston remains as a target end of these sentences in which he has to act as a patient. Winston, as a living person, has a control on his activities of his daily activities of a kind, almost routinized activities as per the regulations, being under the surveillance of a large panopticon.

The similar horrible situation sustains further. Even the inanimate eyes of Big Brother scare the people like Winston. Inanimate eyes are personified and provided an agentive quality:

He picked up the children's history book and looked at the portrait of Big Brother which formed frontispiece. The hypnotic eyes gazed into his own. It was as though some huge force were pressing down upon you – something that penetrated into your skull, battering against your

brain, frightening you out of your beliefs, persuading you, almost to deny the evidences of your senses. (73)

The pronoun 'he' represents Winston who has, after maddening memory retrieval attempt, inspected in the children's book that enshrines the cover photo of Big Brother. The second sentence uses "the hypnotic eyes" of Big Brother as the agent that hugely impacted Winston like "some huge force". The look of the eyes has to be metaphorically compared with the trigger that passes into the skull or brain in such a way that it shakes off the old beliefs and prejudices in order to deny the senses of the onlookers.

Moreover, the condition of Winston worsens, as the narrative proceeds, when he falls into the romantic relation with Julia, a helping hand in the Ministry of Truth. The agentive property perpetually belongs to Big Brother, but because of the advantage of third person narrative, Winston is shown regularly working as a missionary functioning in a ritualistic way, under the forceful stray of the ruler.

In particular, narrator's description of the scene of Thought Police's surprising entrance into the supposed secret room of the hotel owned by Winston and Julia for their romantic meeting suffices to understand the continuous role of patient of Winston. The helpless scared and numbed character of Winston is pictured. A dominating voice rules the scenario, making Winston and Julia scared. I quote it at length:

"We are the dead", he said.

"We are the dead", echoed Julia dutifully.

"You are the dead", said an iron voice behind them.

They sprang apart. Winston's entrails seemed to have turned into ice.

He could see the white all around the irises of Julia's eyes. Her face

had turned a milky yellow. The smear of rouge that was still on each cheek bone stood out sharply, as though unconnected with the skin beneath.

“You are the dead” repeated the voice.

“It was behind the picture”, breathed Julia.

“It was behind the picture”, said the voice. Remain exactly where you are. Make no movement until you are ordered. (205)

This particular scene depicts how much deteriorating was the condition of Winston; he along with Julia, is bound under the subjective dominating pressure of the voice. The first remark by Winston – “We are dead” is echoed by Julia, too. They belong to that pronoun “we” who experience death – the numbness at the present because of possible would be punishment and inflicting torture. They are dead because they are surprisingly encroached by the Thought Police. Sudden invading with a motive of ill-treatment fears them of death. That invader’s representative is the “an iron voice” that retorts from behind. Thus, with a stretch, the voice – an administrative representation of Big Brother and the repressive apparatus of the state holds the agentive role that declaratively announces “you are dead”. The assertion with alert awards the voice with an agentive property of will and volition that can control since it holds the power to affect others.

The escalating condition continues as Winston, Parsons, and Ampleforth are put into the Ministry of Love, ironically a torturing jail. O’Brien, the officer of the Ministry of Love, conducts all the “disciplinary blockade” – “the enclosed institution, established on the edges of society, turned inwards towards negative functions: arresting evil, breaking communications, suspending time” (Foucault, 7). O’Brien carries out and regularly monitors the physical activities.

Kept in a prison, Winston receives multiple beatings and punishments by the prison security staffs. He receives all the harsh punishment laid upon him. The narrator seeing the pathetic condition of Winston, comments:

How many times he had been beaten, how long the beatings had continued, he could not remember. Always there were five or six men in black uniforms at him simultaneously. Sometimes it was fists, sometimes it was truncheons, sometimes it was steel rods, sometimes it was boots. There were times when he rolled about the floor, as shameless as an animal, writhing his body this way and that in an endless, hopeless effort to dodge the kicks, and simply inviting more and yet more kicks, in his ribs, in his belly, on his elbows, on his shins, in his groin, in his testicles, on the bone at the base of his spine. There were times when it went on and on until the cruel, wicked, unforgivable thing seemed to him not that the guards continued to beat him but that he could not force himself into losing consciousness.

(222)

Despite “he” comes as the subject of the first sentence, his all role was to receive the actions done upon him. He received all the punishment, all over his body. The “five or six men in black uniforms” of the second sentence are the agents who are “responsible for an action or event taking place” (Traugott and Pratt, 192). In the same manner, Winston, who is in the role of being “that is affected by the action or event” (Traugott and Pratt, 197), is the patient. The succeeding sentences replace the proper noun by the pronoun ‘it’ in the subject position. These ‘it’ are no other than torturing agents that affect Winston. By extension, ‘it’ refers to the doer – the same black uniformed person’s possessions and weapons. The fourth sentence, in order to highlight the

effects on the patient brings him into a subject position, despite he does not affect others like agents do. “There” comes as the subject that objectifies Winston’s bodily movements along with the effects on different anatomical locations.

So, the linguistic analysis exposes how the narrative establishes the agentic quality of the ruler even though the narration focuses on Winston. The three phases of narrative – the description of daily events, the narration of the meeting between Julia and Winston, and their exposure, and, finally, the presentation of Winston’s pathetic condition in the prison stay – depict the escalated condition of Winston. During all these three states, Winston is relegated into the case of ‘goal’ or ‘patient’ who becomes a passive observer or the silent receiver of all the actions commanded by Big Brother, and moderated by his missionaries.

Contradictory enough, despite these three incidents, in almost all other cases of linguistic assertion, the narrative focalized is Winston Smith who has a complete linguistic agency because of which he becomes able to establish his subjectivity in the novel. Even though, the political porch is heavier on the ruler’s side, from the point of view of focalization, the narrative seems to promote the linguistic agency on Winston.

To a particular extent, the agentic caliber of Big Brother is established, yet the linguistic agency of Winston simultaneously approaches in between. His efficiency of language use, and the caliber establish his voice. Politically or in a larger context, he is not heard but in the level of expression, he has a complete performative hold on language use. This has shaped his consciousness and self.

For instance, that very “smallish, frail figure” (1) of Winston “set[s] his feature into the expression of quiet optimism” not only because “it was advisable” (4), but also because he finds himself expressed into the diary. Drinking the permitted liquor the Victory Gin, he keeps himself expressing about his thoughts or ideas that shape



his whole understanding of the society and the political situation. Though being hesitant, he:

[had] his pen slid voluptuously over the smooth paper, printing in large neat capitals –

DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER

DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER

DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER

DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER

DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER

Over and over again. (16)

This exhibits, in a true sense, Winston's latent thought against his ruler who forcefully intervenes and rules the political scenario. He expresses his anger in the sophisticated manner in a diary – a pure linguistic phenomenon of self-expression and identity. It explores the huge amount of emotional resistance of Winston.

In another particular scenario, when Syme, Parsons and Winston met, in a tiffin break, the narrative provides the perspective of Winston, who stays quiet, yet mostly undergoes into a solemn thought of all the changes and social-political phenomena. "He meditated resentfully on the physical texture of life. Had it always been like this?"(54). Such a grave thought strikes in him after he listens to the ironical announcement on telescreens of Ministry of Plenty. The narrative at the time of letting Syme and Parsons speak, gives a huge space to Winston's thought that sufficiently voices his individual thought and lets linguistic space confirmed. Not only that the narrative sufficiently goes into the mindset of Winston but also he is voiced in an agentive structural position that, in the evenings, sits down to comprehend his position and compose about his condition, remembering from the past.

Structurally, the narrative focus does not only provide the subjective focus on Winston as he jots down about his hopes, memories and serious disagreement with the ruler, it also projects him with his independent activities of volition like strolling the town and falling in with the girl of his own office, going against the forcefully adopted rules. The narrative portrays him as a party member who even seriously doubts the ideology of the party that he works for.

From initial to the end of the novel, the narrative comes from the perspective of Winston. The weak and ulcer patient of middle age maintains his diary, visits town, engages in talk and possesses extreme doubt on the political system he lives in with. The most part of the narrative gives space to him. As the narrative precedes ahead, the advantage of third person limited point of view falls on him. Being a focalized one, the narrator highlights him. While strolling down the street, he is projected as such “[h]e kicked the thing into the gutter, and then, to avoid the crowd, turned down a side street to the right. Within three or four minutes, he was out of the area which the bomb had affected” (77). Like many other sentences, these sentences entail Winston in the subjective position. “He”, the third person singular male pronoun, refers to Winston who has been lazily performing his activities. The narrative comes from a distance, yet it highlights the role of Winston’s activities. The linguistic agency survives more as the second chapter unfolds. He helps Julia, gets the information about her interest in him. The section reads:

He readjusted his spectacles on his nose, sighed, and drew the next batch of work toward him, with the scrap of paper on top of it. he flattened it out. On it was written, in a large unformed handwriting:  
I love you.

For several seconds he was too stunned even to throw the incriminating thing into the memory hole. (98)

Tacitly, these lines project the agency of Winston. “He” refers to Winston who has just read the note of Julia, and is reacting now. As usual day at his office, he put the papers, to vaporize, into the “pneumatic tube” and gets ready to read the paper note (99). In the sentence, “he” becomes subject with volition, not about political, but who acts upon “it”, the patient, the note given by Julia to Winston. Likewise, the narrative pays a huge space for him, and because of all that Winston gets linguistic affirmation and subjective role. That very subjective role enforces his identity and agency, in other words.

In conclusion, both Linguistic as well as socio-political analysis of the novel signify the relationship between the ruler and the ruled in the form of agent and patient. The ruler holds the social cum political power because of which he can bring any desirable changes in the lives of the people. Even with the creation of modern version of the panopticon, he commands over the daily activities of the people. Such a control and monitoring convert people’s lives into public lives, and them as docile bodies like automation, away from the individual political will and rational. Even the people like Winston are forcefully kept away from practicing individualism and free will in an explicit manner, appearing in the role of goal in the public arena, they are not truly in the position of goal since they have certain degree of personal judgment, caliber and performance. The very attempt of breaching the normative boundaries of the political discourse and the emotional appropriation of anti-state movement along with every possible rebellious activity assure their agency. The text, thus, parallelly projects the agentive capacity on both sorts of participants – one in a direct and another in an indirect way. If the state enforcement as exhibits the world of betrayal

and dissolution, the counter agentive power of the people incubates the regeneration of hope and promise with in it.

Unlike the very socio-political scenario and dynamics of relations where the significant amount of agentive force is prescribed to the ruler and certain degree of agency is with the ruled ones, the linguistic analysis concludes that the writer has given a profound voice to the people. The focus of the narrative is on the people like Winston as the narrative pivots around him; letting him enjoy the subject position from the initial to the ultimate. The linguistic domain, few times, in an indirect way, asserts the political access and luxury of the ruler, yet the major linguistic location is on the characters Winston Smith and Julia. The advantage of such focus is that their agency travels into the linguistic arena, which, thus, tacitly exposes the very counter current of the social and political encroachment in their life – promoting a chance of individual will and hopes – exposing the avenue of optimism.

Thus, the detailed analysis of agency-goal in the political cum linguistic respects concludes that the text has given agency on two opposing participants – the ruler and the ruled one, which carries the intention of the writer. Orwell, during the mid of the last century, when the communism was in an extreme with Lenin in Russia and growing socialism in Europe, projects through the novel that even amid the would be brutal and autocratic regimes, the people would still have chances to go against the exploitative and propagandist government, showing the silver lining in the dark clouds.

#### **IV. Participants and Events: Sensor – Phenomenon Analysis in *1984***

Human beings understand, know, think and realize as the result of taking part in the certain situation or discourse. It is all about mental cognition. Along with such mental cognition, the person within the discourse shows the emotional responses like hating, liking, and so on. Not only emotional reaction, the person even senses the discourse like hearing, feeling, seeing and so on. These three ways of mental cognition, mental reaction and mental perception all establish the relationship between the event and the person, the sensor.

Paul Simpson, in his *Language, Ideology and Point of View*, in “Encoding Experience in Language: the system of transitivity”, evaluates that “sensing ... are ‘internalized’ and such are quite different in quality to the ‘externalized’ process of doing and speaking” (84). He furthers with the categorization as “[m]ental processes may be more delicately defined as perception processes (‘seeing’, ‘hearing’), reaction processes (‘liking’, ‘hating’) and processes of cognition (‘thinking’, ‘understanding’)” (ibid.). These classifications are based on the entire process of understanding the phenomena.

The fictional tapestry of *1984* engraves a discourse; a linguistic discourse of the Big Brother regime, reducing Winston into sensor of all that discourse. Winston is in the position of reacting being who is compelled to react, not to act, as per the condition. His activities and responses are no other than his mental cognitions, mental reactions and mental perceptions. The whole social and political situation has been the phenomenon.

There are the sub-categories of Mental Cognition process – cognition, reaction and perception, having two participants – sensor and phenomenon. These three sub-categories are functional in the novel in an either way. Since the whole spectrum of

the discourse is dominated and regulated by the political leader and his cohorts, the people like Winston are bound to react, not to respond to the situation. The most dominant sensing of the characters like Parsons, Ampleforth, Winston and such others is the mental Cognition Reaction, they react to the situation in multiple ways like hate, like and have emotional feelings.

First of all, the process begins with realization or Mental Perception. As the narrative unwinds, the central character, Winston finds himself amidst the penetrating eyes of Big Brother. He sees them all throughout Victory Mansion, in his working station – the Ministry of Truth, and where not.

As most of the narrative locates, Winston finds being seen by his ruler from each nook and cranny as he finds the “dark eyes” (1984, 2) of Big Brother observing him. Whenever he climbed the Victory Mansion or turns the coin’s head or sits in his office’s working station, all over or around him, he finds himself being seen by the eyes of Big Brother:

On each landing, opposite the lift shaft, the poster with the enormous face gaze from the wall. It was one of those pictures which are so contrived that the eyes follow you about when you move: Big Brother Is Watching You, the caption beneath it ran. (1)

Not only in the Victory Mansion, Winston has seen Big Brother watching him in his office as a matter of regular surveillance but also the office staffs are watched by the ruler directly. The horror has been such that Winston even sees the eyes of Big Brother watching at him from the inscription of the coin too:

He took a twenty-five-cent piece out of his pocket. There, too, in tiny clear lettering, the same slogans were inscribed, and on the other face

of the coin the head of Big Brother. Even from the coin, the eyes pursued you. (24)

This regular observation from Big Brother has given him an impression of being watched. The telescreen even produces commands and he hears to the voice coming from the distance, “enveloping” (24) him.

In fact, the voice that Winston hears commands the situation and the conditions around him. The voice, having a powerful command upon the people dictates and gives directives: “Thirty to forty group!!” yapped a piercing female voice. “Thirty to forty group! Take your places, please. Thirties to forties” (28). The excessive access of the monitoring mechanism is up to bed, where from the early morning commands resonate from a distance, targeting the particular group. A female voice directs whom to wake up at what time. The receiver of the commands has to follow as per the instruction.

Wonderfully enough, the morning ritual named as the Morning Jerk, like an early morning yoga or the physical exercise session, calls on the each individual using the long distance speaking device arranged into each section of the each landing of the Victory Mansion. Winston, being the follower of the command, becomes the sensor of the entrapped situation of the Physical Jerks:

‘Smith!’ screamed the shrewish voice from the telescreen. ‘6079 Smith W.! Yes, YOU! Bend lower, please! You can do better than that. You’re not trying. Lower, please! THAT’S better, comrade. Now stand at ease, the whole squad, and watch me.’

A sudden hot sweat had broken out all over Winston’s body. His face remained completely inscrutable. Never show dismay! Never show resentment! A single flicker of the eyes could give you away. He

stood watching while the instructress raised her arms above her head and—one could not say gracefully, but with remarkable neatness and efficiency—bent over and tucked the first joint of her fingers under her toes. (33)

In this particular scenario, the commanding voice is “shrewish” that is telecast, which means the nagging voice with complaints to the listener. That is to say, the voice has been imparting negative impression to Winston, the listener or the sensor, in a broader way. He feels “dismay” but because of the fear of penalty of showing it, he deliberately wears the “completely inscrutable” appearance. The voice that Smith hears scares his life out of him, and immediately he comes to attention.

Similarly, the mental perception becomes the primary force for him to react to the given situation and condition. He likes, dislikes, and hates the situation or the phenomenon, or at least Big Brother. In a confidential conversation with O’Brien, Winston reveals his reaction as:

You are improving. Intellectually there is very little wrong with you. It is only emotionally that you have failed to make progress. Tell me, Winston – and remember, no lies; you know that I am always able to detect a lie – tell me what your true feelings towards Big Brother?  
I hate him. (261)

The whole mental reaction of “hate” has been sustained from the very initial as he dashes off in his diary that “DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER” (16). Winston’s emotional reaction of hatred towards Big Brother is reflected in many a ways. It sustains from very beginning to the almost end when he, under the heavy force, accepts that “[h]e loved Big Brother” (275). Like Parsons and others, Winston always, emotionally, hates the phenomena that he is trapped in despite he wears “the



expression of quiet optimism” (4). It is out of compulsion that he fakes his emotional appearance.

The most importantly, Winston and his fellow workers at the office, are turned into sensors as the phenomena around them becomes phenomenal during the Two Minutes Hate. The moment intensely affects them, who are in the Ministry of Truth. The scene heralds along with “a hideous, grinding screech...burst from the big telescreen at the end of the room” (10). The sound on the telescreen has affected too much on the audience as the “noise that set one’s teeth on edge and bristled the hair at the back of one’s neck” (Ibid.). These unusual bodily gestures are the sudden emotional reactions against the content on the telescreen.

The series of pictures and videos along with the speeches are unfolded on the screens that vehemently affect people, and as a result, they express their certain reaction. As the “primal traitor” Goldstein is projected on to the cast, “[t]he little sandy-haired woman gave a squeak of mingled fear and disgust” (10). Like Winston, that little sandy-haired woman, Julia and the office staffs, reacts to the content of the broadcast. She fears and disgusts. It is her reaction to the phenomena – the screen play, thus, being a sensor. Like this particular episode, there takes place Two Minutes Hate each day, and Julia reacts accordingly.

Likewise, “Winston’s diaphragm constrained. He could never see the face of Goldstein without a painful mixture of emotions” (11). Emmanuel Goldstein’s speech and opinions have affected Winston, and is cooked up with a complicated situation of mixture of emotions as a reaction. Not only Julia and Winston, but also the other attendants of the room feel alike. The scene goes:

Before the hate was proceed for thirty seconds, uncontrollable exclamations of rage were breaking out from half the people in the

room . . . the sight or even the thought of Goldstein produced fear and anger automatically. He was an object of hatred more constant . . . (12)

The “uncontrollable exclamations of rage” were the reactions - mental reactions, emotional reactions in a more subtle way, toward the image of Goldstein, the vicious leader of the prohibited and treacherous group called the Brotherhood. A character, Goldstein is created as a part of propaganda mechanism in order to promote liking on Big Brother at the cost of hating him. The propaganda has been such influential that even the name and picture of Goldstein “produce[s] fear and anger automatically” among the people for everybody “hated and despised” (12) him.

During the second half of the Two Minutes Hate, “the whole group of people like an electric current” turned “against one’s will into a grimacing, screaming lunatic”(13). It rose almost to madness since the “frenzy people were leaping up and down in their places and shouting at the top of their voices in an effort to drown the maddening bleating voice that comes from the screen” (12). People converting themselves into a state of frenzy is the superlative reaction to the screen. The screen’s voice is covered up by the people and their effort to shout is a reaction, more physical than mental.

Psychologically, they process the phenomena as they hate the displayed persona. Categorically, every person attending that mandatory Two Minutes Hate program is a sensor that perceives and reacts to the content of the cast. While a defiler is projected, people mentally react with fear, anger and hatred. Such mental reactions are physically manifested with unruly behaviors like bouncing, shouting and such other uncontrollable bodily activities. Even though such reactions are physical, primarily they are psychological:

The phenomena is such an influential – less natural but more pretention – that one can observe the emotional reaction in the countenances of the participants. “The little sandy-haired woman had turned bright pink, and her mouth was opening and shutting like that of a landed fish. Even O’Brien’s heavy face was flushed. He was sitting very straight in his chair, his powerful chest swelling and quivering as though he were standing up to the assault of a wave. The dark-haired girl behind Winston had begun crying out “Swine! Swine! Swine” and suddenly picked up a heavy Newspeak dictionary and flung it at the screen. It struck Goldstein’s nose and bounced off; the voice continued inexorably. In a lucid moment Winston found that he was shouting with the others and kicking his heel violently against the rung of his chair. (13)

These all physical reactions are bound to the emotional aspect of the person. The face converting into ‘bright pink’ is just the exposure of emotional discomfort that one has as a result of mental reaction of anger. Winston flushes because of the complex emotional response – more hatred and suspicion. The dark-haired girl shouting and throwing away the book against the screen lucidly exposes her mental reaction of anger and hate. Winston seems unaware of his own physical activities as a response since he is much engrossed with the emotional responses against the visual. His emotional response of hate and anger reveals through his uncontrolled and automated bodily movements. Being in a group, he unconsciously does as others do for his emotional intensity just reveals that very way. This all ensures the position of sensor of Winston and his co-workers. This happens as everyday phenomena.

These all extreme physical reactions still reverberate with more psychological reflections and reactions. The narrator carefully observes that mental process of the people as it goes:

A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness, a desire to kill, to torture, to smash faces in with a sledge hammer, seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current ... and yet the rage that one felt was abstract, undirected emotion which could be switched from one subject to another like the flame of a blow lamp. (13)

The ecstasy of the event or phenomenon is not sensed as a joyful feeling – mental reaction rather as a “hideous” one that propels the strong sense of disdain among the people. The staffs undergo through an extreme reaction of destructiveness, even mentally – violent response.

It has promoted indignation and rage amongst the people. They are more abstract and psychological. Indignation, hatred and fury are all the results of the situations as well as the reactions against the situation or phenomenon. Ultimately, at the end of Hate ritual, Winston’s true psychological reaction is expressed.

Thus, at one moment Winston’s hatred was not turned against Goldstein at all, but on the contrary, against Big Brother, the Party, and the Thought Police; and at such moments his heart went out to the lonely, derided heretic on the screen, sole guardian of truth and sanity in a world of lies. (13)

The emotional fluctuation visible among people has led them to have a deep aggression against the projected defiler – the traitor of the Party and the whole world in a way. The boosted hatred is intended to promote love towards Big Brother instead.

Propaganda scheme is plotted in such a fashion that people are compelled to be obedient to Big Brother, letting their hatred against the fictional vicious character.

Immediately after the projection of Goldstein, the telescreen displays Big Brother with all enchanting macho appearance, unlike the “sheepy” look of Goldstein. It relaxes the audience with a “deep sigh of relief from everybody, hostile figure melted into the face of Big Brother, black-haired, black-mustachio’d full of power and mysterious calm” (14). The same little sandy-haired woman, who has thrown the dictionary on the face of Goldstein out of anger, pushes herself to the screen as if to stay in Big Brother’s lap. Her two opposite reactions as a sensor are because of the phenomena of display.

Not only sandy-haired little woman, but also all audience “broke into a deep, slow, rhythematical chant of “B – B! ...B – B!...B – B!” over and over again... in moments of overwhelming emotions” (15). This emotional response has been because of the pleasing effects of the displayed content – phenomena. The effect has been intense along the song which “ was sort of hymn to the wisdom and majesty of Big Brother, but still more it was an act of self-hypnosis, a deliberate drowning of consciousness by means of rhythmic noise”(15). Winston’s confusion created by the early display is replaced with horror. Such horror is because of the emotional reaction, which is all about the disdain against Big Brother.

In the same manner, the sensor-phenomena end is conspicuously projected in the case of Julia, too. She has sour reactions to the phenomena that she has been in. In particular, she hates the way she is, among others, in the Department of Fiction, as enforced by the Party. So, “[s]he hated the Party, and said so in the crudest words, but she made no general criticism of it. Except where it touched upon her own life she had no interest in Party doctrine” (120). Her appearance to Winston, in Charrington’s

rented room, is more associated with Mental Perception. Winston looks at her and gets impressed because of the heavy use of the cosmetics on her face. She applies her cosmetics and appears before him. When he “turned round, and for a second almost failed to recognize her” (130). He does not only engage his eyes to get in to the circumstances, even enjoys the fragrance of her body. Because of all these unexpected unusual and party banned activities, Julia takes her as a free woman who does not care the rules and regulations of any kind.

The mental cognition process of great realization is prevalent among the party members like Winston and Julia. The mental perception and mental reactions have been all the solid base for the foundation of mental cognition of thinking, realizing, knowing and understanding. The political system, by large, has been the whole phenomenon that the characters like Winston and Julia are sensing as the sensor in the various layers. That constrained and limited boundaries of living a public and even a private life, escalated the condition of which the party-members are aware of.

Winston realizes:

We are dead. Our only true life is in the future. We shall take part in it as handfuls of dust and splinters of bone. But how far away that future may be, there is no knowing. It might be a thousand years. At present nothing is possible except to extend the area of sanity little by little. We cannot act collectively. We can only spread our knowledge outwards from individual to individual, generation to generation. In the face of the Thought Police, there is no other way. (161)

Winston, not being evaluative to any particular scenario but being thoughtful to the whole process of social and political occurrence, comes to the point of realization that the party members are not less than mere “dust” and “splinters of bone”. The

realization of future is that it cannot be even speculated as the people are snatched away from their sanity and willingness. The realization even furthers that “[y]ou will never have anything to sustain you except the idea” (161), which is even uprooted by the rulers.

The formidable sensor-phenomena tapestry appears as the scene of love-making and private meeting gets intervened by the voice that comes behind the picture of the wall of the rented room of Charrington’s hotel, a supposedly private area free from the spying of the Thought Police. Close inspection into the scene explicitly exposes the sensor- process- phenomena. The encroachment results as:

They sprang apart. Winston’s entrails seemed to have turned into ice. He could see the white all-round the irises of Julia’s eyes. Her face had turned a milky yellow. The smear of rouge that was till on each cheek bone stood out sharply, almost as though unconnected with the skin beneath. (205)

When the iron voice asserted the death, Winston and Julia’s physical reactions reveal their emotional reactions too. The sudden intercession into the room where they – Julia and Winston – are enjoying the private life creates the havoc. The couple gets startled, and is threatened to death. That fearful scenario propels a situation of horror among them. “ Even in his terror it was as though he could feel the pain in his own body, the deadly pain which nevertheless was less urgent than the struggle to get her back to breath”(207). He, as a sensor, feels the pain, the mental perception. The pain was like a complex feeling of pain with surprise.

That very sudden change into the atmosphere or the phenomena is notable because the persons have got their moods changed immediately in an unexpected way. Such a sharp swerve in the mood from romance into the terror makes Winston

feel so sad and chilling pain even with the “cold face of a man of about five-and-thirty” (208), the owner.

Then, imprisoned Winston, like Parsons, Ampleforth and other convicts, undergoes through severe physical punishments and tortures. Such tortures make him feel the pain in different ways. The suffering is explained as:

There was a dull aching in his belly. It had been ever since they had bundled him into the closed van and driven him away. But he was also hungry, with a gnawing, unwholesome kind of hunger... he still didn't know, probably never would know, whether it had been morning or evening when they arrested him. Since he was arrested, he had not been fed. (209)

The punishment inflicted upon his body has made him sense it in different ways. He is not given the food to eat and is starved to deteriorate his physical condition. He, hence, feels dull pain in his belly. Such is an example of emotional pain and dullness in his tummy. He feels hunger in him. It all is mental perception. During the prison stay, he feels such perceptions in him. The extreme condition of punishment affects his bodily movements and aches on every part. Physical control has been promoted as the prisoners are squeezed into a narrow confinement since physical pain sustains the terror. Winston feels afraid as the physical punishment is multiplied. This punishing inculcates the mental perception which leads to the Mental Cognition process – thinking. “More dimly he thought of Julia. Somewhere or other she was suffering perhaps far worse than he” (220). Such a frantic attempt of memorizing process shows his deteriorated condition.

Moreover, the violent and extreme punishment like the use of “hypodermic syringe” does not only affect his mental perception but also disturbs the mental



cognition. The primary objective of all that inflicting torture and imprisonment is to alter the attitude (mental reaction and cognition) of the persons about the ruler. The effect of the torture is slowly visible in Winston as his mental cognition withers. The mental cognition process of memory is in such a way that “[h]ow many time he had been beaten, how long the beatings had continued, he could not remember” (222). Human existence is the matter of sense because the proper perception forms the proper understanding in the form of memory. O’Brien, thus, says to Winston that “[r]eality exists in the human mind, and nowhere else” (231). But, that mind is where he is frequently attacked.

The punishment comes to an extreme form because of which Winston forcefully accepts the false ideas. His early understanding and knowledge are changed. In order to change the mental cognition process, O’Brien affects through mental perception. In a very pathetic scene, in which Winston finds hope in O’Brien, he agonizingly performs:

He felt very cold, he was shaking uncontrollably, his teeth were chattering, the tears were rolling down his cheeks. For a moment he clung to O’Brien like a baby, curiously comforted by the heavy arm round his shoulders. He had the feeling that O’Brien was his protector, that the pain was something that came from outside, from some other source, and that it was O’Brien who would save him from it. (232)

It is the feeling of the pain, torture and punishment. He feels “very cold” as a result of the physical pain. The fear is transported along with the sense of terror and, because of this, finds “comfort” to be around the arms of O’Brien whom he suspects now, though he had a trust on him. And this time, after being captured, “O’Brien had tortured him to the edge of lunacy” (234). Extreme torture has eroded off the normal

temporal and spatial understanding or realization of Winston. In an exchange of conversation between Winston and O'Brien, after being physically mistreated, Winston expresses his confusion of the duration of his stay. Understanding, realization and knowing associated with Mental Cognition that Winston holds are too loose after being exposed to the physical maltreatment.

In order to shake off the previous mental cognition and impose brand new ideological discourse, Winston's understanding is problematized with physical means and brutal oratory. O'Brien weakens Winston's understanding of self as:

You must imagine that posterity will vindicate you, Winston.

Posterity will never hear of you. You will be lifted clean out from the stream of history... Nothing will remain of you: not a name in a register, not a memory in a living brain. You will be annihilated in the past as well as in the future. You will never have existed. (236)

This threat of life by O'Brien functions as a phenomena of explanation of potential existence of Winston that immediately incurs realization in Winston as he thinks "[t]hen why bother to torture me... with a momentary bitterness" (236). The twinge of life pinches him a lot. Succeeding physical torture of "a blinding flash of light" that "flattened him out" into "a large patch of emptiness" that clear up his memory to an extent because of which he accepts that he does not possess the mnemonic qualities.

The level of realization goes up to the level of self-existence along with the existence of Big Brother. Deluded Winston does doubt sufficiently on the existence of Julia as O'Brien brainwashed him. O'Brien delusions him, away from his past understanding or perception of his self that he exists as a human being. Apprising Big Brother's existence, O'Brien relegates Winston's existence which makes Winston feel "helplessness" (240). The conversation goes:

“Does Big Brother exist?”

“Of course he exists. The Party exists. Big Brother is the embodiment of the Party.”

“Does he exist in the same way as I exist?”

“You do not exist,” said O’Brien. (240)

This particular scenario of O’Brien’s confusing retort affects Winston in such a way that it awakens the very sense of doubt on his own existence. He starts shivering mentally and pondering deeply. Despite O’Brien’s forceful iteration, Winston silently realizes his own existence. Being naive and helpless in front of the Inner Party members and punishers, he does not respond. He confirms to himself that:

“I think I exist,” he said wearily. “I am conscious of my own identity. I was born and I shall die. I have arms and legs. I occupy a particular point in space. No other solid object can occupy the same point simultaneously. (240)

Physically and psychologically, Winston attempts to assure his own existence to himself. He believes that his power of thinking justifies his existence. Physically, he has all his body parts in their proper places, having certain physique and body structure. The physical mass of body has occupied certain space which cannot be covered by any other content. Such ideas justify his existence, Winston believes, yet he has to accept O’Brien who denies the existence of Winston.

Winston is treated in the hands of O’Brien and, because of which, he understands O’Brien in a better way. However, Winston feels “frightened” as he is kept in a mirror enclosure of a chamber. His own reflection scares him very much. The scary prison stay has stolen all his appearance and withered his youthful vitality. His own reflection is frightening. Whenever he proceeds towards the mirror: “he was

frightened. A bowed, grey-colored, skeleton like thing was coming towards him. Its actual appearance was frightening, and not merely the fact that he knew it to be himself” (251). As Winston moves ahead towards the mirror, he notices a frightening being on the reflection. His appearance changed into grey color unlike his previous body tints. Because of all these unexpected huge changes, Winston’s mental cognition – of perceiving oneself – changes. The pathetic appearance of Winston, he supposes is because of the mistreatment of O’Brien. So, he charges O’Brien – “[y]ou reduced me to this state”, and in response to Winston’s blame, O’Brien assures that “you reduced yourself to it” (253). In fact, the whole ruling system is behind all that physical degradation.

Finally, Winston gives up all his hope of living a life of accuracy and perfect memories since he is frequently pressurized under the huge yoke of physical torture. His realization, as a sensor, is changed because of the phenomena – the circumstances of punishment and tortures. Finally, after endeavoring the horrible treatments of physical twinges, he accepts:

The past was alterable. The past never had been altered. Oceania was at war with Eastasia. Jones, Arson and Rutherford are guilty of the crimes they were charged with. He had never seen the photograph that disproved their guilt. It had never existed; he had invented it. He remembered remembering contrary things, but those were false memories, product of self-deception. (257)

In a remarkable turn of events, though seems through violence and force, Winston realizes just opposite to what he used to realize in the beginning of the narrative. For him, past had never been the matter of change – it happened and done, and only remains in memory and history, he used to suppose. But, now realizes that “past was

alterable” but under the regime of Big Brother it “never had been altered”. To an opposite, he accepts what he used to doubt – from the alteration of the historical facts to the existence of Big Brother, labelling all those past doubts, fears and charges as self-deception.

At the very end of the narrative, walking down the street with a huge sense of seriousness, Winston looks at the same picture of Big Brother and realizes the hidden smile in it along with some more mysteries. The scene is captured as:

He gazed up at enormous face. Forty years it had taken him to learn what kind smile was hidden beneath the dark mustache. O cruel, needless misunderstanding! O stubborn, self-willed exile from the loving breast! Two gin-scented tears trickled down the size of his nose. But it was all right, everything was all-right, the struggle was finished. He had own the victory over himself. He loved Big Brother. (275)

A surprising realization has finally tossed up in him – an outcome of complete brain-wash and physical thrashing. Despite he accepts the altered and dehumanized realities crated by the ruling elite, he has a complete experience of sensor – from mental perception to mental cognition. Thus, from the very beginning of the narration to the end, he remains as a sensor, always sensing the phenomena.

But, in a larger context, the whole scenario and lives are under the scrutinizing eyes of Big Brother who remains away, yet observes the people and their activities. The iron voice that comes behind the curtain, the harsh sounding voice which commands from the bed and the unflagging pictures of Big Brother are the metaphorical presences of him. His observation, as per disseminated, regulates every activity of each person. In that situation of regulation, the whole life and all the

circumstances going around are the matters of phenomena for Big Brother, where he becomes the sensor.

His act of observation is the part of Mental Perception. This Mental Perception becomes the source to Mental Reaction and Mental Cognition, according to the complete Mental Process. The gazer or the onlooker completely controls the phenomena, unlike to that of the people, who have been sensors during the phenomena of broadcasting. People are sensors but cannot have a control on phenomena, rather are guided by the phenomena itself. Unlike that, in the case of Big Brother, he becomes an observer or the sensor of yonder, yet controls the phenomena. In that sense, in the whole stretch of sensor-phenomena, Big Brother is highly influential.

Thus, in a closer connection to the panoptic surveillance and agentive force, the sensor-phenomena analysis simultaneously affirms the power of sensor that the ruler holds like in the agency-goal's discursive relationship. The sensor-phenomena analysis attests that, in such totalitarian regime, rulers hold the strong position to sense the whole phenomena around them. In other words, agency remains with the person who controls the phenomena and becomes the sensor, simultaneously holding the rein of panoptic surveillance. The text's dual assertion of sensor does not only validate the singular force. It equally projects the quality of sensor on Winston as well as on the ruler. And, because of such dual assertion, the text simultaneously highlights the power of both participants which concludes that, like agency-goal relation, the writer wants to bedeck the people with critical insights because of which they can challenge the dyspotic ruling mechanism. It even asserts that people's mental cognition cannot be withered even though the ruler employs all his might. So, the textual politics is to exhibit the unflagging mental cognition of the people even though

the ruler becomes a gazer and intends to strip people off their subjectivity. Therefore, sensor-phenomena analysis reveals how the power of human understanding and reaction helps them not to be misled any more in the manipulated state of propagandist ruler. Thus, this text promotes a sense of hope in that world of loss, darkness and betrayal, where the promise and delivery are linguistically cheated.

## **V. Textual Politics and Role Relations: Hope amid the Hopelessness in *1984***

To come to the conclusion, probably the most famous political fiction of the last century *1984*, possesses a tremendous amount of hope and enthusiasm even during the ruling system of political autocracy. On the very literal level, the fictional world portrays the gloomy scenario where the politics delimits the people and reduces them into inactive and inert forces. The political decisive power remains with the ruler whereas the people are resisting to their best against the detrimental presence and encroachment of the politician.

Orwell's writing's inherent politics, hence, is not to forecast the bleak and depressing world rather is to exhibit how the source of hope and light of resistance remains in that almost frustrating socio-political scenario. The minute and comprehensive examination of the text, with the appropriate use of critical discourse theories assist in finding that, especially the ideas from Paul Simpson's role relation analysis are heavily credited.

In a closer examination and role-relation scrutiny, it is clearly revealed that the narrative of *1984* equally supplies the bifurcated roles on both ruler and ruled ones. In a very clear political and social setting and formation, role of agency is conferred to Big Brother who holds a reign of social as well as political discourse. Ruled ones are tightened up with the ubiquitous presence of the telescreens and constantly monitoring cameras along with frequent commandments on broadcast. The supposed presence of the intelligence bureau called Thought Police pushes the life to the extreme. It seems the spectacle of life freezes under the strict control of the ruler. Moreover, the political projects like the invention and forceful implementation of new language with very few selected lexicons has shrunked the perception and understanding of the people. History is rewritten with a purpose of glorifying the new



rule called English Socialism. These activities are to establish and recognize the agentive force of the ruler who holds the power to decide. In this stretch of agency-goal relation, the agentive property goes to the controller of those activities and discourse controller – Big Brother, whereas the effect is upon the people like Parsons, Winston Smith, Ampleforth, Oligvy and so on, making or converting them as patients.

However, the political agency remains at the hands of the ruler, the novel, simultaneously exhibits the certain amount of agentive quality on the people, like Winston and Julia. They are voiced in the narrative as the narrator shades light on Winston. The narrative linguistically recognizes Winston's agency. Not only that, Winston, no matter how strict the regime behaves, dares to do some activities that challenge the ruling system – maintains the personal diary amongst the terror of Thought Police, engages into a romantic affair with Julia, collects the razor blades even though they are scarce and open-heartedly supports the concepts of Goldstein and the Brotherhood, the state defiler and his underground and banned political league. These anti-ruling system activities and the linguistic agency conferred on Winston establish the counter-current against the agentive functioning of the ruler. The hopeless future of democratic values of individual freedom sustained by the political agency of the ruler, hence, inherently carries the hope of individual freedom with the repeated rejection and rebellion by the people. And because of this, Winston finds hope in Proletrats (Proles), the social elites, apart from party members.

In the same manner, sensor-phenomena analysis maintains the role of sensor on both parties – the ruler and the ruled ones. The ruler, Big Brother remains yonder and observes the activities of the people, using a telescreen. The category of mental perception – observation functions, making the people's performance and reactions as phenomena. The observer or the sensor, from a distance, observes on the phenomena,

and controls the phenomena to an extent. Surprisingly, the narrative locates the role of sensor much on Winston, Julia and the others. They are compelled to be in front of the telescreens, and have to have prescribed facial reactions to the delivered content on the screen. No matter what are they supposed to wear as the facial expression, they are free to react mentally and have cognition. Being in front of the screen, they become sensor of visualizing and hearing to the screen, yet they have varied mental cognition. Winston and Julia, no matter how they appear to the screen, have a huge amount of dissatisfaction and doubt on the ruler. Their mental recognition or understanding is interrogative that they significantly deny the condition they are in.

The narrative projects Winston and Julia into the people with brilliant intellect because their mental recognition has conferred them into sensors with reasoning and rationality which is beyond the ruler's expectation of them as phenomena. More than the mere sensors with mental perception, the brilliant mental reaction and cognition have made them have the situational understanding, which as a result, enables them to be revolutionist. Winston's acceptance of the very false ideas like "slavery is freedom" is only a pretention. He has not accepted it with his heart. Julia adores the physical beauty and emotional attraction, opposite to the party prescription, just because of her sharp mental cognition. That is to say, the novel equally confers the roles of sensor to the ruler and the people in general, and Winston and Julia in particular. Such a dualistic positioning fundamentally shapes the currency of the politics of the writer.

To be precise, by rendering the roles of agency and sensor on the both kind of participants, the novelist has cleverly emphasized on the idea of possible future of totalitarian regime where the chance of oppression and liberation are immutably potential. Contextualizing the burgeoning communist regimes during the aftermath of

the Second World War, Orwell speculates would be totalitarian regimes that would appear to be highly authoritative and exploitative of their people, using the sophisticated state institutions and modern inventions. At the same time, most importantly, he shows how the ray of hope surges along with the role that people play as resistance and rebellion, having their accurate understanding despite their false acceptance. Thus, Orwell's literary success lies not in portraying the hopeless world of modern panopticon, but in the projection of the rays of hope and possible chances of revolution in that world of totalitarian regime and bleak future.

### Works Cited

- Assimov, Isaac. "Review of 1984". *The New Worker*. Web. 14 Aug 2016.
- Ahearn, Laura M. "Agency and Language." *Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights* (2010). 28–48. Web.
- Althusser, Louise. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus." Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001. 1483-1507.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.
- Barker, Chris. *Making Sense of the Cultural Studies*. London, California and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2002.
- Duranti, Alessandro. "Agency in Language." Ed. Alessandro Duranti. *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. 451-473.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa and Mische, Ann. "What is Agency?". *American Journal of Sociology*, 103:4 (Jan. 1998), 962-1023.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin, 1991. Print.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984. Print.
- Jeffries, Lesley. *Critical Stylistics: The Power of English*. Palgrave Macmillan: London, 2008. Print.
- Kay, Paul and Kempton, Willet. "What is the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis?." *American Anthropologist*, 86, 65-79. 1984. Web.
- Lowenthal, David. "Orwell's Political Pessimism in '1984'." *Polity*, 2.2 (1969): 160-75. 04 Jan. 2010 Web. 10 Aug 2016.

- Luckhurst, Roger. "Nineteen Eighty Four and the Politics of Dystopia". *Discovering Literature: 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. British Library, 25 May 2016. Web. 12 August 2017.
- Nieragden, Goran. "Focalization and Narration: Theoretical and Terminological Refinements". *Poetics Today* 23.4 (Winter 2002). 685-697.
- Orwell, George. *1984*. New Delhi: Adarsh Books, 2005. Print.
- Paden, Roger. "Surveillance and Torture: Foucault and Orwell on the Methods of Discipline." *Social Theory and Practice*, 10. 3 (Fall 1984): 261-71. 08 Aug 2016. Web. 11 Aug 2016
- Resh, Robert Paul. "Utopia, Dystopia, and the Middle Class in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Boundary*, 24.1 (Spring 1997): 137-76. 31 Jan. 2014. Web. 12 August 2016.
- Simpson, Paul. *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge. 1993. Print.
- Storey, Jeniffer, Catriona Mulholland, William Simpson and, Matthew Hammer. "Zamyatin and Orwell: A Comparative Analysis of *We* and *1984*":1-19.23 (March 2012). Web. 12 Aug 2016.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Mary Louise Pratt. *Linguistics for the Students of Literature*. San Diego: Harcourt, 1980.
- van Leuween, Theo. *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 2008.
- Yeo, Michael. "Propaganda and Surveillance in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Two Sides of the Same Coin." *Global Media Journal* 3.2 (2010): 49-66.