



TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

**«THE CONSTRUCTION OF LITERARY ARCHETYPES THROUGH
CHARACTER'S DISCOURSE IN TOLKIEN'S *THE LORD OF THE RINGS* (1954,
1955) »**

Autor: Juan José Buzón Bustillo

Tutora: M^a del Carmen Merino Ferradá

GRADO EN ESTUDIOS INGLESES

Curso Académico 2022-2023

Fecha de presentación 26/05/2023



FACULTAD DE FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS

UNIVERSIDAD DE CÁDIZ

Index

ABSTRACT.....	2
1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	5
2.1. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND LITERARY DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (STYLISTIC ANALYSIS).....	5
2.2. THE JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES	8
2.3. SCHEMA THEORY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONCEPTS.....	11
2.4. SOME APPROACHES TO CHARACTERIZATION: CULPEPER'S (2001) APPROACH.....	13
2.5. REGISTER ANALYSIS. CONRAD& BIBER'S (2009, 2019) APPROACH.....	16
2.6. SPEECH ACT THEORY.....	18
3. TOLKIEN'S THE LORD OF THE RINGS (1954, 1955).....	20
4. METHODOLOGY OF THE ANALYSIS.....	22
5. ANALYSIS.....	23
5.1. FRODO AS 'THE UNDERDOG HERO'.....	23
5.2. ARAGORN AS 'THE HERO'	29
5.3. GANDALF AS 'THE WISE OLD MAN'	33
5.4. GOLLUM AS 'THE TRICKSTER'	37
5.5. DISCUSSION.....	42
6. CONCLUSION.....	45
7. REFERENCES.....	46

ABSTRACT

Archetypal characters tend to be created and understood through the use of descriptive passages provided by the narrator in literary works. However, this is not the only way of understanding or creating these characters, as it is argued in Culpeper's (2001) approach. In this project we consider the hypothesis that character's discourse is also an element of crucial importance that helps in the creation and comprehension of the archetypes. We have examined the discourse of some of the characters in Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* (1954, 1955) since it is a fictional book with clearly archetypal characters, which is useful for our analysis. In this study, an analysis of the diverse linguistic features of their discourse is developed highly based on Conrad and Biber's (2009, 2019) approach to register analysis, Searle's (1969, 1976) speech acts theory and Culpeper's (2001) approach to characterization with the aim of evaluating our hypothesis and, if proved true, discussing how these features shape the archetype.

Key words: Archetype, *hobbit*, stylistics, Tolkien, register, Middle- Earth, discourse.

RESUMEN

Los personajes arquetípicos tienden a crearse y comprenderse mediante el uso de pasajes descriptivos proporcionados por el narrador en las obras literarias. Sin embargo, ésta no es la única forma de entender o crear estos personajes, como se argumenta en el planteamiento de Culpeper (2001). En este proyecto consideramos la hipótesis de que el discurso de los personajes es también un elemento de crucial importancia que ayuda a la creación y comprensión de los arquetipos. Hemos examinado el discurso de algunos de los personajes de *El Señor de los Anillos* de Tolkien (1954, 1955), ya que se trata de un libro de ficción con personajes claramente arquetípicos, lo que será útil para nuestro análisis. En este estudio, se desarrollará un análisis de los diversos rasgos lingüísticos de su discurso muy basado en el enfoque de Conrad y Biber (2009, 2019) sobre el análisis del registro, la teoría de los actos de habla de Searle (1969, 1976) y el enfoque de la caracterización de Culpeper (2001) con el objetivo de evaluar nuestra hipótesis y, en caso de resultar cierta, discutir cómo estos rasgos conforman el arquetipo.

Palabras clave: Arquetipo, *hobbit*, estilística, Tolkien, registro, Tierra Media, discurso.

1. INTRODUCTION

Archetypes have always been used in literature, and they can be found in many fields, since they are essential elements for the construction of stories, easing the understanding of characters, as well as helping their creation thanks to the comprehension of mental schemas. The understanding of these schemas in relation to archetypical forms relies on Culpeper's (2001) approach to characterization. Therefore, although the features that a specific character portrays and that makes him/her an archetypical character are usually described by a narrator, or explicitly presented in descriptive passages, we can find a different way in which an archetype could be constructed through the character's use of language, which may be highly related to pragmatics, especially in the performance of speech acts, conveying what the speakers wants to say, and the purpose behind his/ her speech.

There are some questions that are worth-considering in relation to the topic, since we need to discuss whether it is possible to create or understand an archetypical character just with his/her dialogues, or if it is completely essential to have explicit descriptions in order to identify an specific archetype. Thus, it is interesting to check if readers can understand archetypical characters in relation to the discourse they present, as it is possible to identify a character's features due to their use of specific linguistic cues or other elements present in their speech, which could help readers comprehend archetypical personalities or attributes more easily.

Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings (1954, 1955)*¹ is a world-renowned book that demonstrates the effectiveness of literary works. As it is a popular work within the epic fantasy novels genre, if not the most popular, Tolkien's trilogy represents an interesting source for a linguistic analysis. Therefore, *The Lord of the Rings (1954, 1955)*, as a novel highly influenced by Old English Literature and many myths and folklore, presents clear archetypical characters, whose discourse is the main focus of this project. Furthermore, since Tolkien was an English philologist, professor of English Language and Literature, as well as a member of the Inklings², we thought that analysing his work would have a deep significance due to its profound connection to literature and the English language, having in fact, diverse academic contributions in relation to literature, with translations of Old English poetry, academic essays

¹ Harper Collins' 2010 edition of *The Lord of the Rings* has been used as the source of our excerpts.

² Literary discussion group highly connected to Oxford University.

on Chaucer's works among many others. Furthermore, he as a linguist developed various fictional languages just as elvish and its variations: quenya or sindarin.

To carry out this study we will rely on diverse approaches and theories. We have considered Carl Jung's study of archetypes, so that we reach a further understanding of the main features and characteristics present in each of the archetypes found in *The Lord of The Rings* (1954, 1955). Moreover, we have considered Culpeper's (2001) approach to characterization, which lies upon cognitivism and understands language as a pragmatic device, mixing both humanized and de-humanized comprehension of characters. Thus, we place character understanding as a cognitivist and pragmatic process, focusing then on features of discourse that will ease character comprehension. Furthermore, to understand character's discourse we have considered Conrad and Biber's (2009, 2019) proposal on register analysis, as well as Austin's Speech Act theory. These approaches were to be considered since Culpeper's (2001) approach is partly pragmatic, now understanding that the characters will perform determined speech acts, which convey information about the character and his/her purposes.

The main purpose of this study is to identify whether characterization relies just on the existence of a narrative voice employing descriptive passages, or if it can be achieved just with the use of the character's discourse, not necessarily needing the use of explicit depictions of the characters. In this project, our hypothesis is that archetypical characterization is not dependent on narrative descriptions, thus, character's discourse is enough for an archetype to be established, thanks to the various features that lie within their discourse. Thus, we will check the essential role character's speech has in literary works in terms of characterization. If proved true, speech will be shaping the character due to the presence of determined features proper of the archetype, such as the words chosen, their inner-thoughts and struggles, or even their interaction with other characters, which will ease and help the understanding of archetypical mental schemas.

In order to prove our hypothesis, we will carry out a manual analysis of a corpus formed by a selection of excerpts from *The Lord of the Ring* (1954, 1955). The excerpts chosen are taken from four different characters of the novel, who are clearly archetypical, mostly participating by means of dialogues and who appear to present salient prototypical features in their speech. Specific linguistic cues and the performance of speech acts will be taken into account, so that

we can test whether these features play an essential role in characterization, thus, reaching a final conclusion on the hypothesis.

This study is divided into three main sections: a theoretical framework, an introductory section to Tolkien's work and the practical analysis of the selected corpus. In section 2, according to our index we find the theoretical framework, which gives an overview on those essential concepts for character's analysis in terms of archetypical constructions. After that, from sections 2.2. to 2.6. an introduction to some linguistics theories and proposals has been carried out, in order to understand those, the essential linguistic cues that construct the archetype within each character's discourse that will be mentioned in the analysis. Next, in section 3, an introduction to Tolkien's work is presented, where the characters used for the corpus are related to the archetypical constructions they are closer to. In section 5, which is dedicated to our analysis, we will explore some extracts of those dialogues that we have considered worth-analysing. After the analysis, in section 5.5. a general discussion of the results will be presented, where we will check which linguistic cues have been used, how they were used and if they do in fact support the construction of the archetypical counterpart of the character. Finally, in section 6 we present our conclusion, followed by section 7, which is dedicated to the references that have been useful for the elaboration of this project.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND LITERARY DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (STYLISTIC ANALYSIS)

Discourse Analysis was first introduced by Zellig Harris in 1952 as a way of analysing connected speech and writing, being his aims the analysis of linguistic and non-linguistic behaviour and the analysis beyond the level of the sentence (Paltridge, 2012).

However, there are different points of view on what discourse analysis is. On the one hand, Fairclough (2003) argued about an approach that was 'textually oriented' in opposition to others which are 'social theoretical oriented' (p. 2). On the other hand, there are other approaches that see discourse as a 'social construction of reality', discourse being deeply related to culture and society. In spite of the many existent points of view on Discourse

Analysis (DA), however, there are many aspects that are always considered worthy of study in all of them. Paltridge (2012) discussed about DA's main considerations:

Discourse analysis is also a view of language in use; that is, how people achieve certain communicative goals through the use of language, perform certain communicative acts, participate in certain communicative events and present themselves to others. Discourse analysis considers how people manage interactions with each other, how people communicate within particular groups and societies as well as how they communicate with other groups, and with other cultures. It also focuses on how people do things beyond language, and the ideas and beliefs that they communicate as they use language. (p. 8)

Then, DA focuses on the use of language, its functionality and how it is used in diverse situations, analysing elements in discourse such as power-relationships, register, style and many other aspects.

There are various fields that have had its influence or have been considered of importance in DA, such as Pragmatics. The union of these two fields have given rise to many approaches that consider both linguistic and non-linguistic cues of importance in discourse analysis. Furthermore, Pragmatics is considered important since discourse is to be understood in context, meaning "the physical context, the social context and the mental worlds and roles of the people involved in the interaction." (Paltridge, 2012, p. 39). Two of the pragmatic contributions that have been quite relevant in relation to the field of Discourse Analysis are Austin's (1962) *How to Do Things With Words* and Searle's (1969) *Speech Acts*.

DA has been employed in many areas of study. One of these areas is literature, in which Literary Discourse Analysis is based on, however, it has been a complicated field to study in terms of DA. Maingueneau (2010) argues that the study of literature in the field of Discourse Analysis is highly controversial, for instance, many scholars consider that "true" Discourse Analysis should ignore literature, and analyse everyday conversations, since the study of literature is related to humanities and not linguistics. Thence, he adds that if literature is to be studied in the field, those who do so shall do it with a "stylistic" point of view (2010, p. 148). At the same time, Fischer-Starcke (2010) calls 'stylistics' to Literary Discourse Analysis, which she describes as:

[...] the linguistic analysis of literary texts and therefore as a linguistic discipline. Its goal is to decode literary meanings and structural features of literary texts by identifying linguistic patterns and their functions in the texts. Consequently, the term style means lexical and grammatical patterns in a text that contribute to its meaning. (p. 2)

Literary Discourse Analysis needs to consider both discourse activity and the setting where it takes place, meaning that the genre is of high importance, since “one must consider the whole network to understand the functioning of literary discourse” (Maingueneau, 2010, p. 150). In addition, Fischer- Starcke (2010) affirms that ‘stylistics’ is a linguistic discipline, but it also pursues the goal of literary studies. We can see that scholars find that there is a relationship between the linguistics aspects of a text and its genre, which could have specific literary meanings depending on it. Then, knowledge can be achieved through the linguistic study of diverse genres, due to the implicit variations when it comes to ‘literary meaning’ on each genre.

Nevertheless, in Literary Discourse Analysis there are other fields that have taken its importance, such as Cognitive Stylistics, which is based on the understanding of a text through cognitive processes of relation due to the existence of mental schemas. Semino and Culpeper (2002) define Cognitive Stylistics as:

a rapidly expanding field at the interface between linguistics, literary studies and cognitive science. Cognitive stylistics combines the kind of explicit, rigorous and detailed linguistic analysis of literary texts that is typical of the stylistics tradition with a systematic and theoretically informed consideration of the cognitive structures and processes that underlie the production and reception of language. (p. IX)

After taking into consideration many cognitive theories and approaches, it can be seen that they are of high concern for some fields of DA. Especially, for those fields that consider the comprehension of discourse, or even character understanding, a mental process. These fields of DA try to relate these cognitive theories to those linguistic cues present in discourse, which is the main basis for the creation of mixed approaches in terms of Literary Discourse Analysis.

2.2. THE JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES

Carl Gustav Jung (1954) has had much influence on modern psychology. He theorised about the individual psyche and how it could be divided in the conscious and the unconscious, being the unconscious a conditioning factor of the other. He later explained that there are similarities and even sameness of experiences among every individual and the way these experiences are represented in the individual's imagination, and exemplifies this with mythological motifs, which have become universal archetypes. Jung (1948) called these universal motifs 'archetypes', due to their value as what he called "primordial images" (p. 32-33), meaning a recurred image in the course of history. Then, Jung considered 'archetypes' to be characteristic motifs that have been recurrent in history, since they are images that have been recognizable for humans for many centuries.

Jung discussed in his work about these 'primordial images' or 'universal archetypes' 'the persona', 'the shadow', 'anima', 'animus' and 'the self', which have become of high importance in fields such as psychology or literature among others. These are formed from a series of attributes and features that have been established as characteristic of a type of individual or a part of the individual's psyche.

When it comes to archetypes, 'primordial archetypes' are said to be the fundamentals for the creation of other archetypes, meaning that the fundamental (universal) archetypes have suffered a development in the course of history, causing the development of other archetypes that are related to them. Hardanto, Natsir and Kunkara (2019) affirm that 'primordial' archetypes have developed into many other ones, which have become important in society:

There are five fundamental archetypes that are fundamental in humans, such as persona, shadow, anima, animus, and self. Furthermore, the archetypes developed into a big mother, wise old man, child, hermaphrodite, trickster or magician, mana, and hero. But the types of archetypes are not just that, they are innumerable out there. And in a person there are many types of archetypes, and also every archetypes in a person influences how he behaves and interacts with others. (p. 4)

Then, it can be seen that what was understood as 'primordial archetypes' are (as many scholars have argued) still in development and that they have gone through a process of ramification

throughout time. Many of these are found in myths or stories are derivations of these 'primordial' archetypes, such as 'the hero' or 'the wise old man', which are those that have been created as a variation of a primordial archetype; 'the wise old man' is part of the unconscious and is seen as a representation of the primordial archetype of the Self. The use of archetypes and Jung's theory are considered in many fields, such as psychology or sociology among others. However, it is worth-mentioning that one of the fields in which this theory can be applied is literature, especially when it comes to the use of primordial archetypes.

Primordial archetypes have appeared in many literary works throughout time, as well as other archetypes that have been developed thanks to the formers, such as 'the hero', 'the wise old man', 'the shadow' or 'the mother. A specific archetype has specific features, or is even related to a 'destiny' with archetypal 'plot structures' (such as the 'Cycle of the Hero'³). Thus, each archetype has a set of attributes and role in the plot that is part of the figure it resembles; for example, the hero shall be brave, a good leader and should perform a task heroically, since that is what the archetype of 'the hero' does.

Throughout the years Jung talked about the archetypes and related those primordial images ('the self', 'the anima/animus' or 'the shadow') to figures such as 'the wise old man', 'the hero' or 'the trickster'. Jung (1948)⁴ stated that the 'the wise old man', being a 'helpful spiritual entity', is presented when guidance or wisdom is needed, but cannot be mustered on one's own resources (p. 216). One of the most important characters in literature that suits this 'wise old man' is the wizard Merlin, who arranged the union of Arthur's parents and caused in that way the conception of the child that he would guide and give advice to.

Another of Jung's archetype is the figure of 'the trickster', who Jung (1954) describes to "often plays malicious jokes on people, only to fall victim in his turn to the vengeance of those whom he has injured." (p. 256) and is often related to 'the shadow', since it is considered one of its archetypal derivations. In addition, when discussing about others' behaviour towards 'the trickster' in one of the myths that originated this archetype, Jung (1954) affirmed that "Because of it he is deserted by his (evidently human) companions, which seems to indicate that he has fallen below their level of consciousness. He is so unconscious of himself that his body is not a unity, and his two hands fight each other" (p. 263), which demonstrates how this archetype

³ See Campbell's (1949) theory of the 'monomyth'

⁴ See in Collected works, Jung (1968)

was considered a divided individual with almost two personalities, one human and the other animal-like. This causes the human companions of the trickster to place him as a lower entity due to his unconsciousness, which is again the source of its evil deeds and cunning acts for his own benefit. Then, this archetype is usually rejected by others due to his divided personality and those malicious acts that characterise him.

Allison and Goethals (2012) later worked on 'heroism' and how it is constructed and, in their research, they managed to establish a set of traits that is part of the archetype of the hero, such as kindness, compassion, loyalty, being inspirational, leadership, determination and intelligence among others. Campbell (1949) argues that 'the hero' is usually unrecognized or disdained and that he lives in a world marked by symbolical deficiency, in which 'the hero' will complete some moral deeds (p. 79-80)

One variation of 'the Hero' archetype is 'the underdog hero'; however, it is not directly addressed by Jung, but has become one of the 'modern' derivations of the original archetype. 'The Underdog Hero' is loved "when they have an unlikely—but not impossible—chance to prevail" (Allison and Goethals, 2012, p.215), which shows how this archetype will lack some 'heroic' traits that would have made him a perfect hero. Allison and Goethals (2012) went further and discussed the qualities of this archetype and how it is 'heroic':

Successful underdogs derive their appeal from their resilience in attempting to overcome difficult situations. Underdogs who prevail over their circumstances and later achieve great success have earned our affection and admiration, and they are judged to be inspiring leaders and heroes. The underdog phenomenon is such a powerful part of our thinking that we anthropomorphically ascribe human traits of courage and strength to lifeless objects that resemble heroic underdogs. (p. 215)

'The Underdog Hero' is an archetype of inspiration of courage and perseverance. This archetype is one that seeks the empathy of the others and that through its perseverance he is capable of overcoming overwhelming tasks. Nowadays it is one of the most liked archetypes in literature, due to the empathy that it generates among readers, who feel some resemblance in these types of characters.

2.3. SCHEMA THEORY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL CONCEPTS

Schema Theory finds its origin in Bartlett's work *Remembering* (1932), however, further investigation has been carried out by other researchers, such as Minsky (1974) or Schank and Abelson (1977)⁵. Schema theory is based on the idea that individuals possess 'mental schemas' of specific concepts; these 'mental schemata' are used in the process of comprehension, since we interrelate that previous knowledge within a schema to the aspect that we need to 'understand'. Semino (1995) talked about the main tenets of Schema Theory and stated that:

The main tenet of schema theory is one that has become commonplace in cognitive psychology and beyond: that comprehension crucially depends on the availability and activation of relevant prior knowledge. In other words, we make sense of new experiences-and of texts in particular-by relating the current input to existing mental representations of entities and situations that we have experienced in the past. (p. 82)

Comprehension is then guided by the existence of previous 'schemas' in each individual's mind, which may contain details about other individuals, situations or any bundle of information that composes a 'schema'. Bartlett (1932)⁶ defines 'schema' "as an active organisation of past reactions, or of past experiences, which should always be operating in any well-adapted organic response" (p. 201), meaning that whenever there is any order or regularity of behaviour that can be recognized by the individual, a particular response is possible, but only because it is related to other similar responses which have been serially organised, yet which operate, not simply as individual members coming one after another, but as a unitary mass. Then, if applying 'schema theory' to literature, comprehension depends on the readers' previous knowledge and pre-constructed 'schemas', being the reader (as van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) argued) an active comprehender, who will infer information if possible due to previous knowledge.

Culpeper (2001) states that "Our schematic knowledge shapes how we view, remember, and make inferences about new information." (p. 64). It is this previous schema that helps with the inference of new data. However, if it relies on experiences, the inferences may be different

⁵ See Schank & Abelson (2013)

⁶ Seen in Bartlett (1995)

between individuals due to different experiences. This idea of reliance on past experiences boosted the development of other fields that talk about what could be called 'the social common knowledge'. The social cognition field does in fact consider this factor and Culpeper (2002) states that schema theory is going strong in this field. In Social cognition the concept of 'cognitive stereotypes' is considered, since there is a strong relationship between these 'stereotypes' and the mental processes that are involved in comprehension, since they ease the cognitive process of understanding.

Considering social cognition in relation to these 'cognitive stereotypes', Culpeper (2001) argues that researchers in the field "assume individuals are part of a common culture." (p. 72). Then, if individuals are part of the same culture, there are shared cognitive structures among individuals of a common cultural background, which may be used for inferring new data in similar ways, since the inferences will depend on the previous knowledge of the individuals, which is said to be very similar when talking about 'cognitive stereotypes'.

Cantor and Mischel (1979) in relation to 'personality prototypes' argued that "The prototype for a personality category is likely to contain, either in a feature list or a memory network, a large set of more or less associated qualities that together represent or exemplify the meaning of that personality category." (p. 188). Due to common previous knowledge about 'personality prototypes' the understanding of these 'prototypes' is easier thanks to inference. It can be seen that specific 'schemas' or ideas are shared by individuals of a similar background; individuals are capable of interrelating this prototypical knowledge that lies upon 'society' to daily life and provide a better understanding of similar elements. Cantor and Mischel (1979) concluded that "Having made this judgment, the perceiver can then proceed to structure his/her knowledge about the person around this particular category (type) and can embellish this knowledge by using the information contained in the category prototype." (p. 189). We could say that the main purpose of connecting previous knowledge to other aspects is to ease the comprehension of any social category the individual may encounter in his life.

All of these constructs of schemas are applicable to character formation, meaning that character types are also influenced by previous experiences or social constructs on archetypes and how they are used in literature. So, in the field of literature the process of understanding characters is said to be closely related to the cognitive processes of attribution of types to characters, in relation to similar features between our previous knowledge about the type of character and the character to be understood. In other words, the process of understanding a character is fully

related to the cognitive process of interrelating ‘mental schemata’ to individuals and similar experiences.

2.4. SOME APPROACHES TO CHARACTERIZATION: CULPEPER’S (2001) APPROACH

There are different approaches in the field of literary criticism that are focused on characterization. Culpeper (2001) makes a division of three different perspectives on the field, *humanising approaches*, *de-humanising approaches* and *a mixed approach*.

Humanising approaches “make the assumption either that characters are imitations or representations of real people, or — the more extreme view — that they are actually real people.” (Culpeper, 2001, p. 6). But, these approaches have been considered quite speculative by many scholars throughout the years, since thinking how a character would react or do is just pure speculation, it cannot be known whether a character might think or act in a determined way, so there are no foundations under those speculations.

Regarding de-humanising approaches Culpeper (2001) argues that “The general thrust of “de-humanising” approaches are to deny that characters are imitations or representations of real people, and to insist that they have a purely textual existence.” (p. 254). These approaches are focused on the functions of the character, not on their motivations or state of mind, which is achieved by purely ‘textualizing’ them. Then, it is to say that de-humanising approaches lack a psychoanalytic focus on characters, and the purpose of the character’s use of discourse, focusing only on its textual-functionality.

A mixed approach was developed to evade those problems each of the previous ones had. The humanising approach would require the use of psychological approaches, which are far from our knowledge, and de-humanising approaches would be essentially functional, and lack character interpretation. Using a mixed-approach would eradicate those problems the previous

approaches had, while analysing the aspects of discourse that are worth-studying. One of those mixed approaches is ‘Stylistic Analysis’⁷, which considers both cognitive and textual levels.

Semino (2002) includes the notion of ‘mind style’, that is, the way the world is conceptualized by the mind and its point of view. Semino (2002) stated that “mind style is to do with the linguistic construction of a particular conceptualisation of a textual world, it is best approached by combining the analysis of linguistic patterns with theories of cognition.” (p. 98). She shows how a combined analysis was seen as the best approach for an analysis of the sort. At first, the analyses of ‘mind style’ were purely lexical and grammatical, but Semino and other scholars explored the possibility of a mind style analysis in relation to cognitive theories. When Semino (2002) talked about ‘mind style’, she stated that at first all the analyses were essentially linguistic, using proposals such as Halliday’s (1985), but that a more complete understanding could be achieved by the inclusion of cognitive theories, which resulted in another mixed approach on literary criticism. (p.98)

Culpeper (2001) created a mixed approach, that focuses on both the character as an individual and the linguistic discourse used. In his approach Culpeper (2001) established a differentiation between bottom-up and top-down processes and how these processes worked for understanding new information or stimuli in our daily life, as well as the role these processes have in further comprehension:

Cognitive processes that are primarily determined by an external stimulus have been referred to as ‘bottom-up’ or ‘data-driven’ processes, while cognitive processes that are primarily determined by the application of past knowledge have been referred to as ‘top-down’ or ‘conceptually-driven’ processes. (p. 28)

This idea shows how Culpeper’s (2002) approach is highly related to cognitivism and how mental processes are involved in the understanding of previously known concepts.

These concepts that Culpeper (2002) defined can be related to ideas that are similar to those in ‘schema theory’ and to the role ‘prior knowledge’, which are considered essential when it

⁷ See Fowler (1986), Herman (1995), Leech (1969), Leech and Short (1981), Semino (1997), Short (1996), Simpson (1993), (1996), Toolan (1988).

comes to ‘character comprehension’. Culpeper (2002) states that “we should note that an impression of character may be shaped by prior knowledge about types of real people, as well as prior knowledge about types of fictional character” (p. 264). Culler (1975) discussed about this previous knowledge in relation to stereotypes and argued “When a character in a novel performs an action, the reader can give it meaning by drawing upon this fund of human knowledge which establishes connections between action and motive, behaviour and personality.” (p. 142-43). Then, it can be seen how similar this concept of ‘previous knowledge’ works in both ‘schema theory’ and Culpeper’s works on ‘character comprehension’.

In fact, Culpeper (2002) has his own vision on ‘social constructivist’ approaches, such as Van Dijk’s (1983), but clarifies why he has to modify his approach in order to use interaction between characters as part of the analysis. Culpeper (2002) created a diagram where he explains how the process of characterization might work in relation to his study of text comprehension.⁸

Culpeper’s approach is partly cognitivist, which justifies his concern in pragmatics, having a pragmatic view on language, meaning that there is a concern in the context, both physical and social. Culpeper (2002) justifies the use of pragmatic theories on his approach stating that:

Analysing how characters, or indeed people, perform their speech acts tells us much about their goals, how they perceive interpersonal relationships, and how they manage the social context. All this is very much the business of politeness.
(p. 237)

Still, Culpeper focuses on linguistic aspects of discourse. He pays attention to the implicit cues that are hidden in a character’s discourse, which give further information about the individual. He discusses about the importance of lexis and its richness, surge features to show affection, social markers and syntactic features among others.

All in all, we can see that there have been many approaches related to character understanding, but that a mixed approach is more appropriate to have a better view when analysing a text. Culpeper’s (2001) approach considers both the cognitive processes involved in character creation and/or understanding and the linguistic cues that are to be used by those characters. In relation to those cognitive aspects on characterization Culpeper is influenced by pragmatic approaches and theories, such as ‘Speech Act Theory’ and ‘Politeness theory’ among others,

⁸ See Culpeper (2002).

while still paying attention to linguistic aspects of discourse like lexical or syntactic cues, or even paralinguistic features.

2.5. REGISTER ANALYSIS. CONRAD & BIBER'S (2009, 2019) APPROACH

Biber and Conrad (2009, 2019) consider three different perspectives in their proposal for discourse analysis: register, genre and style, which are the main focus of their model. Biber and Conrad state that (2019):

The register perspective combines an analysis of linguistic characteristics that are common in a text variety with analysis of the situation of use of the variety. [...] core linguistic features like pronouns and verbs are functional, and, as a result, particular features are commonly used in association with the communicative purposes and situational context of texts. The genre perspective is similar to the register perspective in that it includes description of the purposes and situational context of a text variety, but its linguistic analysis contrasts with the register perspective by focusing on the conventional structures used to construct a complete text within the variety [...] The style perspective is similar to the register perspective in its linguistic focus, analyzing the use of core linguistic features that are distributed throughout text samples from a variety. (p. 2)

Then, it can be seen that the different perspectives on discourse analysis can focus on diverse aspects. However, in their work Biber and Conrad (2019) essentially focus on the analysis of register, which they define as “a variety associated with a particular situation of use” (including particular communicative purposes). The description of a register covers three major components: the situational context, the linguistic features, and the functional relationships between the first two components. Biber and Conrad (2019) claim that the linguistic features that are considered in register analysis are always functional, since they are used for specific purposes in the situational context of register. Moreover, they later argue that having a previous situational knowledge of the text to be analysed can be helpful, since it can give hints towards the understanding of mixing registers or other linguistic cues that tend to be related to specific characteristics. Biber and Conrad (2019) presented a list of the linguistic features that can be considered for register analysis, where they included word classes, verb features, vocabulary

features, noun phrases, diverse clauses or even special features of conversation among other elements proper of corpus in spoken English.

Later in their work Biber and Conrad (2019) apply their proposal to fiction, and argue that some scholars use discourse analysis in this field to analyse elements such as character and plot development. However, when talking about the use of register analysis on fiction they state that:

[...] fiction is one of the most complex varieties to analyze from a register perspective, because the author must create a fictional world and can choose to describe that world from many different possible perspectives. [...] choices are all stylistic choices. That is, their use is not associated with the real-life situational context of the writer and reader, but with the authors' preferences for how they want to tell their stories. The linguistic features do have functions, as illustrated in the text samples, but the variation concerns style, rather than register (p. 138-139)

This means that fiction is quite complex to be analysed. Nevertheless, fictional dialogues can be for sure analysed, considering that register is an essential of the use of speech in fiction books, and that character's word choice will have an impact on plot-development and the construction and development of the character. This means that despite a character's personality is previously planned by the author, a character's dialogue still has a primary function in the text, influencing other characters or even the reader, and also helping the reader to construct their own opinions and understanding of a character.

However, one of the most important parts of characterization is related to the individuals' performance of speech acts, which resemble and create essential archetypical attributes proper of specific characters. In fact, the use of specific speech acts is closely related to the establishment of a register, meaning that not only isolated linguistic cues form a register, but also how speech acts are used in discourse, the form they have, and the purpose behind their use.

2.6. SPEECH ACT THEORY

In his contributions Austin (1962) affirmed that there is more meaning behind what we literally say, creating a theory that explained how speech acts work and how they function. His theory stated that language is used to perform actions in our daily life, and that those actions that we want to carry out are resembled in the speech acts we perform in our daily life speech. Austin first included this theory in one of his works called *How to do things with words* (1962); then, his hypothesis was further developed by John Searle (1969, 1976). In fact, Searle (1969) ended up hypothesising that:

[...] speaking a language is performing speech acts, acts such as making statements, giving commands, asking questions, making promises, and so on; and more abstractly, acts such as referring and predicating; and, secondly, that these acts are in general made possible by and are performed in accordance with certain rules for the use of linguistic elements. (p. 16)

Austin (1962) made a distinction between performative and constative verbs depending on whether they bring out the act they represent or not. He established a difference between explicit and implicit performative verbs depending on the use and function the verb had and used various examples in *How to do things with words* (1962), where he took examples “of highly developed affairs, of the kind we shall later call explicit performatives, by contrast with merely implicit performatives” (p. 32). Then, he discussed about the existence of some ‘*felicity conditions*⁹’ that are some conditions to be accomplished, so that a speech act is efficient and appropriate in terms of communication. Austin (1962) developed what he considered the three main elements within a speech act: *the locutionary act*, *the illocutionary act* and *the perlocutionary act*. He separately discussed about each of these elements and stated that *the locutionary act* is “The act of 'saying something' in this full normal sense I call, i.e. dub, the performance of a locutionary act” (p. 94), meaning that it is just using the literal meaning of the actual words that appear in an utterance. *The illocutionary acts* are those “such as informing, ordering, warning, undertaking, &c., i.e. utterances which have a certain (conventional) force” (p. 108), meaning that they lie on the speaker’s intention when using specific utterances, whereas *the perlocutionary act* are “what we bring about or achieve by

⁹ See further in Austin (1962).

saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading.” (p. 108).

John Searle (1969, 1976) developed Austin’s theory with a focus on Austin’s illocutionary acts and identified five speech acts according to speaker’s intention¹⁰: *representatives* (they clarify the speaker’s belief), *directives* (They express the speaker’s desire of the hearer to do something), *commissives* (They express the speaker’s intention to do something), *expressives* (They express the speaker’s psychological situation, and their feeling towards something) and *declaratives* (They create an immediate change in some state of affairs).

Furthermore, Searle (1969) made another distinction between speech acts, considering the existence of direct and indirect speech acts. He distinguished between these two types of speech acts: the direct speech act is the one whose literal meaning is to be considered, since it represents what wants to be expressed, whereas, the indirect speech act communicates a meaning that is different from the literal meaning of the sentence, function and form are then not directly related. Then, a speech act will be either direct or indirect depending on the relationship between its locutionary and illocutionary acts.

The use of direct or indirect speech acts has often been connected to politeness, especially in terms of relationships between the speakers. So, the performance of these speech acts creates and is due to different power relations between those speakers who are familiar with each other or not. Then, the formality of the context or the social distance between speakers can be conditioned by the use of indirect or direct speech acts (Cutting, 2002, p.20)¹¹. Thus, the selection of speech acts will be dependent on other factors within discourse, as well as being used to maintain certain characteristics that appear in speech between speakers (for example, social distance and power relations among others). Austin’s (1962) and Searle’s (1969, 1976) contributions help to understand discourse as a malleable tool that consider form and functionality as ways of exchanging information, giving hints about the reasons behind the use of speech in determined ways.

¹⁰ See further in Austin (1976).

3. TOLKIEN'S *THE LORD OF THE RINGS* (1954, 1955)

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien was a philologist and is regarded as one of the most influential authors of the high fantasy genre, being his books tremendously influenced by his academic knowledge and interests. Tolkien's academic writings were not abundant, but of high importance in the academic field. However, he is mostly known as a literary author, and it is not until 1937 that his book *The Hobbit* got published, and was received almost instantly as a literary classic (McIlwaine, 2018, p. 16). After *The Hobbit*'s success, *The Lord of the Rings* was published in three different parts: *The Fellowship of the Ring* (1954), *The Two Towers* (1954) and *The Return of the King* (1955). Tolkien became highly influential, especially right after *The Lord of the Rings*' publication, which established the fictional world of Middle-Earth as a literary phenomenon.

The Lord of the Rings was written as a second part of *The Hobbit*, creating the basis for the legendarium of the Middle-Earth. Though having contributed to academic fields with works such as *Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics* (1937) or his essay "*Chaucer as a Philologist: The Reeve's Tale*" (1934) among others, Tolkien (1947)¹² stated in a letter to Stanley Unwin in relation to writing *The Lord of the Rings* that "It is written in my life-blood, such that it is, thick or thin; and I can no other." (p. 219), showing how it turned out to be the work of his lifetime and one of the most influential books of the genre.

The Lord of the Rings started as sequel, but developed in a story of far more importance. It tells the journey of Frodo Baggins, a hobbit who unexpectedly finds himself in the overwhelming task of destroying the One Ring¹³. Frodo and his companions will go on this journey for the sake of Middle-Earth¹⁴, but many difficulties will arise. Many of these companions have attributes that are developed throughout the books, such as bravery, wisdom, leadership and many others. At some point in *The Lord of the Rings* the story will be divided in different

¹² Compiled in Carpenter (1981).

¹³ It is one of the Rings of power present in Tolkien's book. This Rings of Power are "magical rings forged by Sauron and the Elven-smiths of Eregion in the Second Age" (Day, 2019, p. 317), which he used to control those who wore them thanks to the power of the One Ring, which was said to control them all.

¹⁴ "[...] perhaps the most richly imagined land in fantasy fiction, meticulously detailed in terms of its geography, wildlife, peoples, cultures, and, of course, histories." (Day, 2019, p. 248)

groups of characters, and there will be secondary stories related to the main task, such as saving companions or becoming the rightful king of a nation.

Tolkien's legendarium is known for its complexity, which means that there are plenty of characters and references appearing in his works. In *The Lord of the Rings* there are many characters that could be 'archetypical' or 'schematic', such as Aragorn, Frodo, Gandalf and Gollum.

Aragorn is the heir of Gondor; thus, he is seen as a leader, a guardian, a great warrior and is characterized as courageous and inspiring. As Duggan and Stotter (2005)¹⁵ state "The good heroes or heroines show compassion to people, animals, or plants that they encounter on their journey" (p. 375), which is shown to be characteristic of Aragorn throughout the books. It is due to the continuous demonstrations of these attributes and the fact that he worries about the safety of his people, which shows how he could be said to follow the schema of 'The Hero'.

Gandalf is a divine entity, one of the '*Maiar*'¹⁶, who arrived to the Middle-Earth to fight evil. He is protective, a guide for those who are lost, quite influential, highly persuasive for the sake of the good. When talking about the archetype of 'the wise old man' Ramaswamy (2014) saw "The archetypal Wise Old Man, as facilitator on the path of the hero's quest, helps the hero face and overcome or assimilate the negative force of the Shadow" (p. 133). In fact, Gandalf is seen as a symbol of guidance in the books, as many characters seek his advice and knowledge. Moreover, throughout the books Gandalf is protective towards the hobbits and functions as one of the leaders of the fellowship, providing moral support and indirectly guiding the fellowship in the right way, for the task to be accomplished.

Frodo is a kind and realistic *hobbit* that knows he is not capable of carrying on with the task of being the ring bearer. He is innocent and feels overwhelmed about the things he will have to overcome, feeling incapable of doing so. He feels he is not adequate and that it is too much for him, which already shows that he is not a 'standard' archetype of 'The Hero', but one of 'The

¹⁵ Compiled in Garry, J. (2017).

¹⁶ They are "The lesser angelic powers who descend from the Timeless Halls into Tolkien's world of Arda as servant of the more powerful Valar" (Day, 2019, p.236)

Underdog Hero’, who is characterized by the sense of incapability to complete the mission. Frodo, as Ramaswamy (2014) says, is not flawless, and could be considered an ‘Everyman’:

Tolkien, like Milton, believing in the Christian concept of humility and obedience as the hallmarks of true heroism, keeps his primary focus on Frodo, an archetypal Everyman, while retaining the traditional quest hero of romance in the form of Aragorn. (p. 54)

This shows that there are two different types of ‘heroes’, one that is said to be the classical archetype of a chivalrous one (Aragorn), and a more modern hero that feels tempted and is far from ideal (Frodo).

Gollum is quite a complex character, mischievous, evil, and a liar for his own benefit. The archetype of ‘the trickster’ is known for its evil deeds and double personality, which fits perfectly with the character, since Gollum will in fact start planning against Frodo and Sam in order to retrieve the One Ring. Gollum obsession and mental disorder due to the ring shows the source of hate towards those who interpose between himself and his desires. This idea is reinforced by Hardanto, Nasir and Kunkara (2019) who state that ‘the trickster’ is the major archetype in the character of Gollum:

This archetype is the major archetypes in Smeagol, it shown how cunning and sneaky he was to get the One ring. He would use any method as long he can get the ring. He began his plan when he knows Frodo want to destroy the One ring. Then, He started set up plans to stop that happen, Smeagol began to discussion with his Shadow (Gollum) and decide to kill Frodo and expelled Sam. (p. 11)

Then, this shows Gollum’s evil deeds and planning towards the hero, and also that he would do anything to achieve his goals. Ultimately, these are the most essential attributes of the archetype of ‘the trickster’, who is manipulative, selfish, and would do anything for his benefit.

4. METHODOLOGY OF THE ANALYSIS

In this project we will analyse a series of texts that have been extracted from Tolkien’s *The Lord of The Rings*. In fact, we will not be analysing whole chapters or sections of the book, but dialogues between characters throughout the novel, 79 different extracts in total, amounting to

6469 words. The extract used will be presented directly in the text with an indication of the page the excerpt has been taken from.

These extracts will be manually analysed, paying attention the specific cues present on each character's speech, thus establishing a functional and qualitative analysis of the extracts. Not all characters of the novel are easy to establish as a clear archetype, that is why I have selected some of the most influential and active ones throughout the story, so that the selected dialogues to be analysed are as rich in terms of content as possible. The selected characters, Gandalf, Aragorn, Frodo and Gollum are instinctively related to common archetypes, and whose discourse is highly influenced by their purpose in the story. Thus, they are characters that may be filled up of linguistic cues that resemble perfectly their archetypical attributes in discourse, thus, guiding the reader on the understanding of the character.

For the analysis of these extracts I will follow the register analysis proposed by Biber and Conrad (2009), as well as Austin (1962) and Searle's (1969) contributions to the speech act theory. Biber and Conrad's proposal will be considered to carry out the manual analysis, using the results of this analysis and the speech acts performed by the selected characters to establish whether discourse and communicational cues that are present in the dialogues resemble the archetypical figure the character represents, and if so, how discourse build up an archetypical character in novels are built up through dialogue, without the need of a narrator's appearance.

Grammatical, lexical and syntactical features will be discussed in order to establish a functional analysis that shows how discourse is used and the purpose, within it. At the same time, the most common speech acts used by the characters will be highlighted. Furthermore, we will be paying especial attention to specific linguistic elements, which may be used by various characters in different ways, or which may be used by just one of the characters.

5. ANALYSIS

5.1. FRODO AS 'THE UNDERDOG HERO'

Frodo is characterised for being the archetype of 'the underdog hero'; a figure usually full of self-doubts and of incapability on performing the task. This character is in charge of an almost impossible mission, to save the Middle- Earth from a menace so powerful that it could destroy

the world. This idea marks Frodo's sense of incapability, but his love for Middle-Earth and sense of responsibility makes him strong enough to keep on trying and finally carrying out the task. However, it is to keep in mind that he will be carrying a physical and psychological burden throughout the novel, which also will also have an effect on his discourse.

Frodo is unsure about him being appropriate for the mission, showing one of the most common characteristics of the journey of 'the underdog hero', which is the reluctance towards the task. This sense of incapability can be seen in terms of the verbs used. There is a considerable number of modal verbs in his discourse. Frodo uses *wish*, *must* or *will* among other modal verbs to represent his self-doubts and fears, which can be seen in many instances, such as:

'All the same,' said Frodo, 'even if Bilbo could not kill Gollum, I *wish* he had not kept the Ring. I *wish* he had never found it, and that I had not got it! Why did you let me keep it? Why didn't you make me throw it away, or, or destroy it?' (p. 60)

Frodo constantly establishes his sense of fear as 'the underdog hero', who has self-doubts as the figure of a successful hero. This can be seen in the use of modal verbs that express those fears, wishing for the mission not to be on his hands, the most common ones being those that express necessity and prediction modal verbs. However, not only does he use modal verbs to express his rejection towards the task and his own fears, but to assert his sense of duty and responsibility, since he has now a mission that he has to success in, no matter what. This can be also seen in other parts of the book, when he says:

'This at least is plain: the evil of the Ring is already at work even in the Company, and the Ring must leave them before it does more harm. I will go alone. Some I cannot trust, and those I can trust are too dear to me: poor old Sam, and Merry and Pippin. Strider, too: his heart yearns for Minas Tirith, and he will be needed there, now Boromir has fallen into evil. I will go alone.' (p. 401)

In sentences such as "I will go alone" or "the Ring must leave them before it does more harm" he also gives emphasis to the action that he has to carry out, which gives a sense of importance and of difficulty to the task, which makes sense taking into account that for him as an 'underdog hero' the mission is overwhelming, and the fact that he is constantly reminding others that it is an impossible thing also shows his own opinion on the thing. He also uses modal verbs to make

promises to some characters of the books. These promises show his evolution showing that, in spite of feeling incapable of being ‘a hero’, he is still so committed to the mission, ideals and personal values that he does accomplish ‘heroic duties’ though feeling desperate. This can be seen in the following example:

‘You *must* trust me. I *will not desert* you. Answer truthfully, if you *can*. It *will do* you good not harm.’ (p. 689)

He uses these verbs to emphasize his desire of helping Gollum, and to reassure him that he is in no danger. Throughout the book Frodo tends to use these verbs not only to express his actions, but also to express his own feelings towards them.

Moreover, Frodo cannot believe the situation he has ended up in, and this boosts that sense of despair, which causes his need of avoiding the task, or to give some opinions on the future plans. This can be seen in the use of rhetorical questions, which he uses to complain about his current situation, showing at the same time a kind of regret for not throwing the Ring away, as in:

‘[...] Why did you let me keep it? Why didn’t you make me throw it away, or, or destroy it?’ (p. 60)

‘[...] Why did it come to me? Why was I chosen?’ (p. 61)

‘[...] If they fail, what then?’ (p. 397)

‘Will you not put aside your doubt of me and let me go? [...]’ (p. 668)

In terms of the lexis, Frodo is characterised by a use of words that resemble as well those feelings that tend to be attached to the archetype of ‘the underdog hero’: feelings of fear, almost obliged duty and pain. Frodo’s choice of words is marked by a relevant use of descriptive adjectives that represent his inner struggle. For example, in:

‘Will you not put aside your doubt of me and let me go? I am *weary*, and *full of grief*, and *afraid*. But I have a deed to do, or to attempt, before I too am slain. And

the more need of haste, if we two halflings are all that remain of our fellowship.’
(p. 668).

‘I *haven’t any courage* to keep up,’ said Frodo, ‘but I am not worried at the moment. [...]’ (p. 223)

In this excerpt *weary*, *full of grief*, *worried* or *afraid* are a direct demonstration of his own feelings, which can be easily related to the archetype related to the character. In fact, he does not only use adjectives to describe directly his state of being, but also to emphasize the implicit difficulty of the quest, using words such as *perilous* in “[...] I am not made for *perilous* quests.” (p. 61). However, other times he uses adjectives to either praise Gandalf, so that he takes the Ring and he gets rid of that burden, for example in “[...] You are *wise* and *powerful*. [...]” (p. 61), using *wise* and *powerful*; or to show compassion for Gollum, as in:

‘The creature is *wretched* and *hungry*,’ said Frodo, ‘and *unaware* of his danger.’
(p. 686)

‘No, Sam!’ said Frodo. ‘Do not kill him even now. For he has not hurt me. And in any case I do not wish him to be slain in this *evil* mood. He was great once, of a *noble* kind that we should not dare to raise our hands against. He is *fallen*, and his cure is beyond us; but I would still spare him, in the hope that he may find it.’
(p. 1019)

‘[...] We would go with you, if we halfling folk could hope to serve you, such *doughty* men and *strong* as you seem, and if my errand permitted it. [...]’ (p. 658)

He uses other adjectives such as *evil*, *noble*, *fallen*, *wretched*, *hungry*, *unaware*, *doughty* or *strong* to describe Gollum or other friends of the cause, showing his confidence on his friends, but also his empathy towards Gollum as a heroic figure.

It is curious that among all the characters to be analysed he is one of those who do use reduced forms and dispreferred structures, using contractions throughout his discourse if possible. This can be seen in the following samples with the use of *shan’t*, *didn’t* and *I’m*:

‘[...] I *shan*’t be able to close my eyes until you have finished the story for me.’
(p. 223)

‘Yes. Well no, I *didn*’t get him. He came to me, because he trusted me at first, I’m afraid.’ (p. 688)

The use of these contractions indicates the use of a more informal use of language, thus, establishing Frodo as a not ‘chivalrous’ hero, but more like an “everyday man” character. This characteristic “every-man” behaviour can be seen in his constant demonstration of doubts and fear, but also in some extracts where he directly declares his intention of surrender and of loss of hope, as in the following excerpt, where he use a *representative* speech act, stating his thought and desire to abandon all hope that is left:

‘Maybe not, Sam,’ said Frodo; ‘but it’s like things are in the world. Hopes fail. An end comes. We have only a little time to wait now. We are lost in ruin and downfall, and there is no escape.’ (p. 950)

Another element that represents ‘the underdog hero’ in relation to an ‘everyday man’ is the use of discourse markers, since the only characters that commonly use them are *hobbits*, who are sort of separated from the rest of Middle-Earth, living their happy lives in a very rural way. However, of all the *hobbits* who play an important role in the novel, Frodo is one of the two that use discourse markers the most, establishing him as a ‘closer’ character for the readers, who commonly consider ‘the underdog hero’ as a representation of themselves. This can be seen with the use of the discourse marker *well* in the following excerpts:

‘Yes. *Well* no, I didn’t get him. He came to me, because he trusted me at first, I’m afraid. I did not want him tied up like this. I hope it will be all right; but I hate the whole business.’ (p. 688)

‘*Against* delay. *Against* the way that seems easier. *Against* refusal of the burden that is laid on me. *Against* – well, if it must be said, *against* trust in the strength and truth of Men.’ (p. 397)

‘[...] Or, *well*, to have it destroyed. I am not made for perilous quests. [...]’ (p. 61)

In the last excerpts repetition can also be seen in the use of the word *against*, which indicates Frodo’s emphasis on his own opinions, which are at the same time affected by his fears and desperation, showing again attributes of ‘the underdog hero’.

In addition, at further stages of the novel, it can be seen that Frodo as ‘the underdog hero’ has gone through so much pain and so many difficult situations that he has succumbed to the Ring’s power, which is stated in:

‘I have come,’ he said. ‘But I do not choose now to do what I came to do. I will not do this deed. The Ring is *mine!*’ And suddenly, as he set it on his finger, he vanished from Sam’s sight. (p. 945)

In this excerpt he uses possessives as Gollum would do, which serves to establish a comparison between them, and to make their behaviour way closer than it used to be, which again, is representative of a “everyday man” who is no proper hero and does lack irrational bravery and a strong will. In fact, it shows how his language has shifted at some point, resembling his broken will, when using the word *mine* as Gollum would.

Moreover, Frodo is characterized by the use of *commissive* speech acts, which are those in which he expresses his intention to do something. This type of speech act can be seen in excerpts like:

‘[...] I will go alone. Some I cannot trust, and those I can trust are too dear to me [...]’ (p. 401)

‘I will not desert you. Answer truthfully, if you can. It will do you good not harm.’ (p. 689)

No matter how incapable he, the ‘underdog hero’, feels, he still desires and promises to go on with the task. However, sometimes this speech act is used to reassure other characters (like Gollum) that they are not in danger, or to get some reaction in his favour.

In addition, the other most common speech act in Frodo's discourse is the *expressive* type, where he gives information to the hearers about his psychological state, referencing his feelings towards a specific situation. These speech acts are essential for the understanding of Frodo's archetype since they represent his recurrent sense of incapability and fear towards the situation through the direct statement of his feelings. This can be seen in excerpts such as:

'For I know what I should do, but I am afraid of doing it, Boromir: afraid.'
(p.397)

'No, I am afraid,' said Frodo. 'Simply afraid. But I am glad to have heard you speak so fully. My mind is clearer now. (p.398)

'I haven't any courage to keep up,' said Frodo, 'but I am not worried at the moment. [...]' (p. 223)

In fact, these *expressive* speech acts he uses are essentially acts of 'lamenting' where he, as Ronan (2015) stated when talking about these *expressive* speech acts, "expresses his or her own misfortune, either at their own or somebody else's doing, the speaker is also the main observer" (p. 29). In fact, it is not complicated to see how Frodo is constantly expressing his misfortune in excerpts as the previously presented.

All in all, Frodo use of linguistic cues represent clearly his fearful behaviour, full of doubts and uncertainties. However, he still in some instances states that he will manage to accomplish the task, showing his determination though full of grief, pain, and hopelessness. All of these attributes proper of the 'underdog hero' are perfectly included in his discourse, which ultimately give continuous hints about his archetypal nature.

5.2. ARAGORN AS 'THE HERO'

Aragorn is characterized by his bravery, leadership and any warrior-like feature, such as mental strength or patience. He is a protective man and heir of Gondor. All in all, his archetypal role is highly related to the traditional hero, which is one of the knighthoods and chivalry. He, as 'the hero' is known for his sense of leadership, which can be seen in many linguistic cues

throughout his discourse. However, his most notable dialogues can be related to this attribute are characterised by the use of rhetorical questions, which he uses to encourage to battle, or to show irony when some of his acts are doubted by others. All of these can be seen in the following excerpts:

‘Nonetheless day will bring hope to me,’ said Aragorn. ‘Is it not said that no foe has ever taken the Hornburg, if men defended it?’ (p. 537)

‘What do you fear that I should say to him? Did I not openly proclaim my title before the doors of Edoras? Nay, Gimli [...]’ (p. 780)

Furthermore, Aragorn does put himself in high status in the use of speech. He constantly remarks his position as heir of the throne of Gondor, as well as using all the names that he has been given or things he has achieved, which functions as an assertion of his political ‘dominance’ and power as a known warrior, which is a characteristic that only he possesses, establishing himself as ‘a hero’. This can be seen in many instances throughout the book:

‘I am Aragorn son of Arathorn; and if by life or death I can save you, I will.’ (p. 171)

‘I am Aragorn son of Arathorn, and am called Elessar, the Elfstone, Dúnadan, the heir of Isildur Elendil’s son of Gondor. [...]’ (p. 433)

‘[...] And when all this land is clean of the servants of Sauron, I will hold the oath fulfilled, and ye shall have peace and depart for ever. For I am Elessar, Isildur’s heir of Gondor.’ (p. 789)

‘[...] I am the lawful master of the Stone, and I had both the right and the strength to use it, or so I judged [...]’ (p. 780)

In addition, Aragorn uses honorifics when talking with those in power, establishing a relation of respect towards their position and validity as leaders and warriors. This shows how Aragorn as ‘the hero’ still follows the code of knighthood, respecting others’ social charges, always showing proper manners at all times in those places that require them. Then, honorifics appear frequently in his speech as *master* or *lord* in:

‘[...] Men shall pitch my tents upon the field, and here I will await the welcome of the *Lord* of the City.’ (p. 816)

‘[...] Yes, *Master* Gimli, he saw me, but in other guise than you see me here. [...]’ (p. 780)

‘Nay, *lord*,’ said Aragorn. ‘There is no rest yet for the weary. The men of Rohan must ride forth today, and we will ride with them, axe, sword, and bow. We did not bring them to rest against your wall, *Lord* of the Mark. And I promised Eomer that my sword and his should be drawn together.’ (p. 518)

Being known for his abilities as a warrior and leader in both battle and reign Aragorn is well constructed as an archetypical hero. That is why in terms of lexis it can be seen that he uses verbs that are quite related to war conflicts such as *press*, *defend*, *prevail* or *fight*:

‘[...] which should not be while this war is *fought*. I will not enter in, nor make any claim, until it be seen whether we or Mordor shall *prevail*. Men shall pitch my tents upon the field, and here I will await the welcome of the Lord of the City.’ (p. 861)

‘Nonetheless day will bring hope to me,’ said Aragorn. ‘Is it not said that no foe has ever taken the Hornburg, if men *defended* it?’ (p. 537)

‘We must *press* our Enemy, and no longer wait upon him for the move.’ (p. 780)

Moreover, Aragorn’s heroic behaviour is represented by a constant use of commands throughout the book. He is constantly using imperatives as a way of either commanding others or encouraging them, as in:

‘Come!’ said Aragorn. ‘This is the hour when we draw swords together!’ (p. 533)

‘Then let us defend it, and hope!’ said Aragorn. (p. 537)

Aragorn's discourse is marked by a continuous use of war-related lexis, which is related to his warrior part of himself being 'the hero'. This can be seen when he uses words as *tents*, *field*, *axe*, *bow*, *sword* or *armour*:

'[...] Men shall pitch my *tents* upon the *field*, and here I will await the welcome of the Lord of the City.' (p. 861)

'[...] The men of Rohan must ride forth today, and we will ride with them, *axe*, *sword*, and *bow*. We did not bring them to rest against your wall, Lord of the Mark. And I promised Eomer that my *sword* and his should be drawn together.' (p. 518)

'[...] The eyes in Orthanc did not see through the *armour* of Théoden [...]' (p.780)

Aragorn is marked by knighthood, which is highly resembled in his speech, since among all the characters being analysed he is the only one that uses extremely formal words proper of an older use of English, as *nay*, *jest*, *nigh*, *ere* or *ye*, which resemble his knighthood and differentiates him from the rest. The usage of this words can be seen in:

'[...] *Nay*, Gimli,' he said in a softer voice, and the grimness left his face, and he looked like one who has res so in sleepless pain for many nights. '*Nay*, my friends, I am the lawful master of the Stone [...]' (p. 780)

'[...] 'Neither shall we,' said Aragorn. If this be *jest*, then it is too bitter for laughter. [...]' (p. 882)

'[...] Angbor the fearless rides before them. If we set out in two days more, they will draw *nigh ere* we depart [...]' (p. 881)

'[...] I deem that the City will be lost *ere* ten days be gone.' (p. 780)

'[...] Now I go to Pelargir upon Anduin, and *ye* shall come after me. And when all this land is clean of the servants of Sauron, I will hold the oath fulfilled, and *ye* shall have peace and depart for ever. For I am Elessar, Isildur's heir of Gondor.' (p. 789)

All in all, Aragorn is marked by a use of knightly and heroic speech. Through the use of specific lexis and commands his warrior-like spirit, sense of leadership and his noble background are perfectly represented in his discourse, which helps on the character's construction.

5.3. GANDALF AS 'THE WISE OLD MAN'

One of the most common linguistic features used by Gandalf who represents the archetype of 'the wise old man' is the use of rhetorical questions throughout the books, as it happens with Aragorn, either to give an advice/order (through the use of an indirect speech act) or to complain about someone's behaviour or attributions in the dialogue. This use of rhetorical questions ultimately creates some sense of advice to correct their behaviour or decisions. There are many instances in which Gandalf uses this device, such as:

“Let you? Make you?” said the wizard. ‘Haven't you been listening to all that I have said? You are not thinking of what you are saying.’” (p. 60)

‘But listen, Saruman, for the last time! Will you not come down? Isengard has proved less strong than your hope and fancy made it. So may other things in which you still have trust. Would it not be well to leave it for a while? To turn to new things, perhaps? Think well, Saruman! Will you not come down?’ (p. 582)

In these examples, it can be seen how he emphasises the lack of sense in others' dialogue, thus, making them rethink about what they said; or as a way of convincing others. However, in other instances he uses it as a way of indirectly commanding or convincing others, which shows his sense of counselling leadership and guidance, attributes typical of 'the wise old man', as in:

“But your people must not be both unarmed and shepherdless,” said Gandalf. ‘Who shall guide them and govern them in your place?’” (p. 518)

Gandalf uses an indirect speech act (using the form of a question, with the purpose of slightly commanding) by asking who shall guide their fellowmen, and implicitly saying that only a specific character shall be the one guiding them, while using a rhetorical question.

However, Gandalf as ‘the wise old man’ does not only command by using rhetorical questions. He also uses the imperative form many times in his discourse, which shows how he though always trying to be cooled down, sometimes loses his temper because of the gravity of the matter in hands. This shows his concern towards the future of the Middle-Earth, and his decision to make others act favourably for the cause. The use of the imperative can be seen in these excerpts:

‘Do not tempt me! For I do not wish to become like the Dark Lord himself. Yet the way of the Ring to my heart is by pity, pity for weakness and the desire of strength to do good. Do not tempt me!’ (p. 61)

‘Do not throw your life away rashly or in bitterness,’ he said (p. 816)

‘Therefore be silent, and keep your forked tongue behind your teeth.’ (p. 514)

In other instances, he uses the imperative form to express he is certain about somethings, as in the following excerpt where he by means of the command expressed intends to let others know they are safe and that they can rest, since he is certain they are not in danger at that moment:

‘Sleep again, and do not be afraid!’ said Gandalf. (p. 748)

Gandalf is also characterised by the use of modal verbs in his discourse, which he uses either to give advice, commands or to implicitly suggest ideas to others. He uses verbs such as *will*, *shall*, *should* or *must*. This can be seen in many dialogues throughout the book. For example, in:

“‘You *will* be needed here, for other things than war. Your father loves you, Faramir, and *will* remember it ere the end. Farewell!’ “(p. 816)

‘[...] We *shall* be hard put to it. We *should* be very hard put to it, even if it were not for this dreadful chance.’ (p. 51)

‘[...] but soon I *shall* not be. I am not coming to the Shire. You *must* settle its affairs yourselves; that is what you have been trained for. Do you not yet understand? My

time is over: it is no longer my task to set things to rights, nor to help folk to do so.
And as for you, my dear friends, you *will* need no help. [...]' (p. 996)

Being Gandalf an example of the archetype of 'the wise old man' he is fond of his companions and when in need, he always tries to cheer them up, or at least, to show that there is still hope. This is why it can be seen in his discourse that there is a constant use of nouns that are usually related to personal attributes or concepts related to human existence, as *pity*, *mercy*, *wisdom*, *malice*, *desire*, *authority*, *pride*, *despair*, *strength*, *courage*, which he uses to either encourage others, or talk about others flaws. This can be seen in extracts such as:

'*Pity*? It was *Pity* that stayed his hand. *Pity*, and *Mercy*: not to strike without need. And he has been well rewarded, Frodo. Be sure that he took so little hurt from the evil, and escaped in the end, because he began his ownership of the Ring so. With *Pity*.' (59)

'It is *wisdom* to recognize necessity, when all other courses have been weighed, though as folly it may appear to those who cling to false hope. Well, let folly be our cloak, a veil before the eyes of the Enemy! For he is very wise, and weighs all things to a nicety in the scales of his *malice*. But the only measure that he knows is *desire*, *desire* for power.' (p. 269)

'*Authority* is not given to you, Steward of Gondor, to order the hour of your death,' answered Gandalf. 'And only the heathen kings, under the domination of the Dark Power, did thus, slaying themselves in pride and *despair*, murdering their kin to ease their own death.' (p. 853)

'[...] And therefore he is now in great doubt. For if we have found this thing, there are some among us with *strength* enough to wield it. [...]' (p.879)

'Not all is dark. Take *courage*, Lord of the Mark; for better help you will not find. No counsel have I to give to those that despair. Yet counsel I could give, and words I could speak to you. (p. 514)

Furthermore, we have to consider that Gandalf, being ‘the wise old man’, is regarded as a good advisor who knows what to do, what to say and how to say it. Then, if Gandalf is characterized by his counselling nature and the importance of those counsels for kings and queens, we also have to consider that he uses a formal register in many conversations, especially in those where he talks to ‘superior’ characters in a hierarchy of political power. This is why the use of honorifics is quite common in his discourse, with the use of *lord*, *Steward of Gondor*, *Lord of the Mark*, *Lord and Steward of Minas Tirith*. He also uses syntactic constructions typical of the customs of Middle-Earth, using the construction ‘*son of...*’ when addressing or naming high-status characters. All of these features can be seen in the following extracts:

‘Concerning this thing, my *lords*, you now all know enough for the understanding of our plight, and of Sauron’s. (p. 582)

‘The wise speak only of what they know, Gríma *son of Gálmód*. A witless worm have you become. Therefore be silent, and keep your forked tongue behind your teeth. I have not passed through fire and death to bandy crooked words with a serving-man till the lightning falls.’ (p. 514)

‘Authority is not given to you, *Steward of Gondor*, to order the hour of your death,’ answered Gandalf. [...]’ (p. 853)

‘Hail, *Lord and Steward of Minas Tirith, Denethor son of Ecthelion!* I am come with counsel and tidings in this dark hour.’ (p. 754)

‘Not all is dark. Take courage, *Lord of the Mark*; for better help you will not find.’ (p. 514)

Gandalf’s speech is marked by a constant use of descriptive adjectives, either to show an aggressive behaviour towards those aligned with the dark side, to give a sense of protection to those in fear, or to praise those who fight against evil. He uses adjectives such as *fool*, *pitiabile*, *afraid*, *safe*, *miserable*, *witless*, *forked*, *unarmed* or *shepherdess*. Some instances where we can see the use of this descriptive adjectives are:

‘I did not give you leave to go,’ said Gandalf sternly. ‘I have not finished. You have become a *fool*, Saruman, and yet *pitiabile*’ (p. 583)

‘Well, let folly be our cloak, a veil before the eyes of the Enemy! For he is very *wise*, and weighs all things to a nicety in the scales of his malice.’ (p. 269)

‘A *witless* worm have you become. Therefore be silent, and keep your *forked* tongue behind your teeth.’ (p. 514)

‘But your people must not be both *unarmed* and *shepherdless*,’ (p. 518)

‘Sleep again, and do not be *afraid!*’ said Gandalf. ‘For you are not going like Frodo to Mordor, but to Minas Tirith, and there you will be as *safe* as you can be anywhere in these days.’ (p. 748)

‘[...] Treachery, treachery I fear; treachery of that *miserable* creature. But so it must be. [...]’ (p. 815)

Then, it can be seen how Gandalf uses his lexis according to the effect he wants to cause on the hearers. Sometimes he will represent the Dark Lord as *wise*, which establishes the task as a serious and difficult thing, and he wants to emphasise the gravity of the situation for his companions to be self-aware of their strengths and weaknesses and prepared for what has to come. In other instances, he uses these adjectives to calm his companions and make them feel safe, as it can be seen in the use of *safe*. But, the most common use of descriptive adjectives is when Gandalf describes negatively those malicious beings marked by evilness, which can be seen in his use of adjectives such as *forked*, *miserable* or *witless*.

All in all, in Gandalf’s speech there are several linguistic features that characterize him as an archetypical ‘wise old man’; his discourse is marked by a characteristic use of linguistic cues that represent his sense of leadership, caring attitude, counselling behaviour and wisdom.

5.4. GOLLUM AS ‘THE TRICKSTER’

Gollum can be considered as one of the most interesting characters in the book, due to his dual personality, which is divided into Gollum, the de-humanised side of the character corrupted by

the evil arts, and Smeagol, the hobbit-like side of Gollum, who is slightly human but still affected due to all the years under the Ring's malice. This malice and experiences he went through had a big effect on the development of his personality, which is shown in his speech.

The archetype of 'the trickster' is characterised by his deeds to achieve what he wants, while playing "jokes" on others, to later succumb because of his acts. However, I will focus my attention on the understanding of the archetype and its dual nature, which is known to have a bestial side, and a division of personalities. Then, I will pay attention to those linguistic cues that represent Gollum's dual personality and relation to the bestial side, and to those that show how he manipulates others to get what he wants.

In terms of lexis, Gollum is characterised by using words that put others in a higher position, so that they feel pity about him, thus manipulating their opinion about him, so that he appears to be harmless. This can be seen in his constant use of the word *Master* when talking to Frodo:

'I don't know. I can't help it. *Master's* got it. Sméagol promised to help the *master*.'

'Yes, yes, to help the *master*: the *master* of the Precious. But if we was *master*, then we could help ourselves, yes, and still keep promises.' (p. 633)

This extract reflects how he does not only use it to talk to Frodo, but also when talking to himself, which represents the corruption and relates Gollum to 'the shadow' archetype (which is highly related to the archetype of 'the trickster'). Gollum's dual personality is obviously presented in his use of the personal pronoun *we* when he refers to himself or the use of *us*, which is constantly present throughout the book, for example in:

'It hurts *us*, it hurts *us*,' hissed Gollum. 'It freezes, it bites! Elves twisted it, curse them! Nasty cruel hobbits! That's why we tries to escape, of course it is, precious. *We* guessed they were cruel hobbits. They visits Elves, fierce Elves with bright eyes. Take it off *us*! It hurts *us*.' (617)

'Wicked masster!' it hissed. 'Wicked masster cheats *us*; cheats Sméagol, gollum. He musstn't go that way. He musstn't hurt Preciouss. Give it to Sméagol, yess, give it to *us*! Give it to *uss*!' (p. 943)

Furthermore, Gollum's manipulative nature, one of the most important features of this character, can be seen in the use of adjectives he uses to be pardoned, for instance, *nassty*, *cruel*, *nice*, *little*, *tired* or *thirsty*:

'[...] They won't hurt us will they, *nice little* hobbitses? [...]' (p. 614)

'[...] Don't hurt us with *nassty* cruel steel! [...]' (p. 944)

'*Tired* he is, *thirsty* he is, yes *thirsty*; and he guides them and he searches for paths, and they say sneak, sneak.' (p. 714)

'*Nassty*, *nassty* shivery light it is – sss – it spies on us, precious – it hurts our eyes.' (613)

However, he does not only use adjectives for other to feel pity, but also when talking to himself to express his plans of manipulation or his hatred towards others in the Middle- Earth. This is clearly represented by using adjectives as *filthy*, *terrible*, *fierce*, *wicked* in the following excerpts:

'Wicked masster!' it hissed. '*Wicked* masster cheats us [...]' (p. 943)

'We guessed they were cruel hobbits. They visits Elves, *fierce* Elves with bright eyes. Take it off us! It hurts us.' (p. 617)

But he's got you, you *nassty filthy* little sneak!' (726)

'Dwarves, Men, and Elves, *terrible* Elves with bright eyes.' (p. 616)

In addition, Gollum's bestial part and de-humanised side can be seen through the presence of ungrammaticalities in his discourse, which are prominent. The most common grammatical mistake is the incorrect use verb forms in terms of the subject, as well as the use of plural forms incorrectly, this can be seen in the use of *hobbitses* instead of *hobbits* or the use of *ourselves* or the incorrect construction *we was* in the following extracts:

‘They won’t hurt us will they, nice little *hobbises*?’ (p. 614)

‘Yes, yes, to help the master: the master of the Precious. But if *we was* master, then we could help *ourselves*, yes, and still keep promises.’ (p. 633)

In terms of syntactic cues repetition it is evident in Gollum’s discourse, which as Nagy (2006) says “Repetitiousness, the automatism of language, reflects Gollum’s deterioration into a state of control by corporeal drives and conditioned reflexes.” This repetition is ultimately showing his deterioration and de-humanization; it can be seen in the constant use of specific words and chunks, such as *precious*, *gollum* and *master*, which he constantly used in his speech, for example in the following extracts, repeating the word *nasty* and *precious* in different points of the book, showing it is a recurrent repetition in his discourse:

‘Ach, sss! Cautious, my precious! More haste less speed. We musstn’t rissk our neck, musst we, *precious*? No, *precious* – gollum!’ He lifted his head again, blinked at the moon, and quickly shut his eyes. ‘We hate it,’ he hissed. ‘Nassty, nassty shivery light it is – sss – it spies on us, *precious* – it hurts our eyes.’ (p. 613)

‘No, sweet one. See, my *precious*: if we has it, then we can escape, even from Him, eh? Perhaps we grows very strong, stronger than Wraiths. Lord Sméagol? *Gollum* the Great? The *Gollum*! Eat fish every day, three times a day, fresh from the sea. Most *Precious Gollum*! Must have it. *We wants it, we wants it, we wants it!*’ (p. 633)

In this last extract, the repetition of the syntactic construction *we wants it* is evident, showing again the desperate behaviour and childish side of Gollum. Moreover, the presence of hissing sounds can be seen throughout the book, which shows a de-humanised use of language with animal-like sounds. His discourse is full of ungrammaticalities and mispronunciations, which ultimately show a loss of humanity. Gollum is as a bestial individual, which can be seen in the constant use of contractions, which does not necessarily establish him as a ‘beast’ (since Frodo is also recurrent on their use). However, the use of contractions establishes Gollum in a ‘lower status’ in comparison to other characters, whose archetype tends to be wiser or chivalrous, as in:

‘[...] She’ll get the other. O yes, Shelob will get him, not Sméagol: he promised; he won’t hurt Master at all. But he’s got you, you nasty filthy little sneak!’ (726)

This ‘lower status’ is established with the use of *won’t* or *She’ll* in the extract among others throughout the book. Moreover, when analysing Gollum’s use of speech acts it can be seen that there is a prominent use of *directives*, especially when it comes to begging, for example in:

‘Don’t kill us,’ he wept. ‘Don’t hurt us with nasty cruel steel! Let us live, yes, live just a little longer. (p. 944)

He uses it to put himself in a lower position in terms of power, thus making others feel pity for him, pity that he’ll later use in his favour, when performing *commissive* speech acts as in:

‘Yess, yes indeed,’ said Gollum sitting up. ‘Nice hobbits! We will come with them. Find them safe paths in the dark, yes we will.’” (p. 615)

‘We will swear to do what he wants, yes, yess,’ said Gollum, still twisting and grabbling at his ankle. ‘It hurts us.’

‘Swear?’ said Frodo.

Sméagol,’ said Gollum suddenly and clearly, opening his eyes wide and staring at Frodo with a strange light. ‘Sméagol will swear on the Precious.’ (p. 618)

Gollum’s relation to the archetype of ‘the trickster’ is in fact easier to establish, due to the “monologues” present in the book, where he talks to his other personality, explicitly stating his own plans and inner struggle, which is commonly established with the use of *representative* speech acts, used to commit him to what he says. *Representatives* are present throughout the whole novel in Gollum’s discourse, however, one of the most evident ones is:

‘Yes, yes, to help the master: the master of the Precious. But if we was master, then we could help ourselves, yes, and still keep promises.’

‘But Sméagol said he would be very very good. Nice hobbit! He took cruel rope off Sméagol’s leg. He speaks nicely to me.’

‘Very very good, eh, my precious? Let’s be good, good as fish, sweet one, but to ourselves. Not hurt the nice hobbit, of course, no, no.’ (p. 633)

In this extract, it can be seen that he claims that if he had the Ring and be master of it, he could then kill Frodo and Sam, whereas his other personality Sméagol concludes saying that, because they are good, they won't hurt the hobbits. This exemplifies the use of *commissive* speech acts, where Gollum commits himself to the truth of the proposition.

All in all, it can be seen that Gollum, among all the characters analysed is the less human one, characterized by his double personality and changing perspectives and feelings. However, he, as 'the trickster', is ultimately known for his manipulating attitude and constant use of lies and shaping his discourse for him to get what he wants. After having analysed all the previously discussed linguistic cues it can be seen that his speech is representative of 'the trickster' archetype.

5.5. DISCUSSION

Throughout the analysis in the previous sections we have found how each of the characters uses specific linguistic cues that help creating their archetype, and how even though using the same linguistic cues, some of the characters employ them in different ways to express or achieve different things, thus modelling their use according to their archetype.

Frodo is a clear representation of 'the underdog hero', which can be seen in his speech. He is characterized by a constant feeling of fear, incapability and many other overwhelming feelings. This is resembled in his use of lexis, which is clearly representing his own feelings. Moreover, in order to differentiate Frodo from an archetypical 'hero', not only his fears are represented, but also his 'every-day' man attitude, which helps the reader to feel empathy towards him, and to understand him as a representation of themselves. This is achieved when Frodo uses contracted forms in his speech, which is only typical in those characters who are either corrupted, or who are not as chivalrous, but more rural-like. This manages to establish Frodo as a 'closer' character for the reader, whose fears and personality are easier to understand when considering him as an imperfect hero. The very special use of rhetorical questions is worth-mentioning, which (even though not being used only by Frodo) serve Frodo to either reject the Ring or to complain about situations, which emphasises his child-like behaviour and his status as an 'underdog hero'. However, Frodo is still a 'derivation' of a hero, which means that he still needs hero-like features. Frodo's commitment to the task is the perfect representation of that heroic side. This is resembled in various instances where he uses modal verbs as *must* to

express he will do the task, no matter what it takes. It must be said that the use of modals is not exclusive for this use, since at other moments he uses them to express fear or other feelings.

After having analysed Aragorn's speech as 'the hero', it is notable that many of the features to be found in his speech help the reader on constructing the archetype. Aragorn as 'the hero' is supposed to be following the code of knighthood, being a noble warrior and good leader as the heir of a throne. This knighthood is well constructed through the use of earlier versions of the English language, which gives readers a sense of knightly speech, proper of noblemen of times past. Furthermore, the hero needs to be an almost perfect character and a good leader, which is perfectly represented in his use of the imperative form for commanding others, even though at some instances he states that he wishes not to command. Moreover, he always presents himself either with honorifics or with other titles that put him in a high position, with a good reputation, which shows that warrior-like powerful behaviour proper of a hero. In fact, he does not only establish his power by doing this; he also uses honorifics to address others, which establish him as a well-educated hero who knows how to deal with others in a conversation. 'The hero' archetype is implicitly considered a flawless warrior, who will surpass any problem he encounters in his travels; this idea of a warrior-like hero is present in his lexis, where he uses both verbs and nouns highly related to war and battles, which he also uses to give directions and giving commands.

In Gandalf's speech as 'the wise old man' there are various features that help the reader on constructing the archetype. Gandalf, as other characters do, commonly uses rhetorical questions, however, he does not use them as Frodo would. Instead of employing them to represent his inner feeling or desires, he utilizes them as a way of guiding others, giving advice or even making other characters think about their decisions. In fact, many times he uses rhetorical questions to indirectly give orders, and slightly command others. Furthermore, Gandalf as 'the wise old man' knows pretty well how much power he has, and if encountering others who are against him he uses imperative forms, which show how he uses that wisdom and power with those who get in his way or who do not listen to his advice. Considering that 'the wise old man' is a source of wisdom, it is notable that Gandalf's lexis is characterised by a frequent use of words related to personal attributes and even human experience, which he exerts to either give advice or encourage others.

Gandalf's role is one of the advisor of the fellowship, getting in contact with leaders of specific reigns and areas, meaning that as 'the wise old man' he needs to shift his manners and sound convincing if possible, treating others as they would like to be treated, that is why the use of honorifics throughout his discourse is an important feature, since it shows how 'the wise old man' shapes his discourse to have an specific effect on the hearer. As it has been clarified before, he is characterized by his 'advising-nature', which can be seen as well in the use of specific modal verbs, which he uses to give different possibilities and "plant" some ideas on others' mind, especially in the use of *should*, *shall* and *must*.

After having analysed Gollum's speech, it is noticeable how the archetype of 'the trickster' is perfectly reflected in many instances throughout the book. Gollum, as the trickster, is characterized by an almost bestial side represented by his dual personality. This feature is highly represented by the continuous ungrammaticalities that can be found in his speech, with a significant variety of mistakes in the use of nouns, plurals or verbs among others; this relates Gollum to his bestial side, as well as when talking to himself resembling the trickster's dual nature. Repetitions of specific syntactic structures or words is also one of the features to be found in Gollum's speech, which shows his deterioration as a human-side, thus making evident his animalistic counterpart. Furthermore, Gollum is highly manipulative, and plans against the *hobbits* secretly; this manipulative nature is seen in those instances where Gollum uses honorifics just with Frodo, who is the one he wants to take control of. Moreover, Gollum's use of lexis tends to put himself in lower positions, so that the others feel pity for him. By doing this he may look weak in order to control others' actions, but in other instances (especially when he talks to himself) he shows an aggressive attitude with a shift in the lexis, which turns to be negatively connoted.

Considering these fictional characters that have been analysed we can assert that their individual use of speech is highly related to the construction of their archetypical counterpart. Both Frodo and Aragorn demonstrate in their speech heroic features, with slight differences that separate each other as an 'underdog hero' and a 'chivalrous hero'. Gandalf's features represent his wisdom and guidance, whereas, Gollum indirectly shows his dual nature thanks to the diverse features in his discourse. After having analysed the discourse of these characters, it is evident that features present in their speech are essential for character construction and understanding.

6. CONCLUSION

The hypothesis that was previously presented in the study has been confirmed after analysing the selected excerpts of *The Lord of the Rings* (1954, 1955). After having focused on four characters of the books, who seemed to be highly influenced by archetypes and later analysing the use of each of their speeches, it has been proved that there is in fact a relation between character understanding, character construction and the use of specific linguistic cues in speech.

On the one hand, similar linguistic features have been found in different character's speeches, however, the use and purpose of their use shifts depending on each of the characters, which already reveals that depending on the archetypal personality we find that the same linguistic feature can be used in different ways and with different aims. Then, if certain linguistic elements can be used in a variety of ways, but each character 'decides' how to use them, it can be concluded that there are specific features that construct different archetypes depending on the use given to these features and how they are understood in relation to the character. This can be seen, for instance, in the use of rhetorical questions which, as it was discussed in the previous sections, helps in the understanding of the archetypes, even if they serve different purposes depending on the character that uses them.

On the other hand, each of the characters that have been analysed does in fact possess particular features that are related to the archetype's personality, finding for example Gollum as a bestial and dual creature, which is seen in his use of plural pronouns, among other features. It has also been proved that not only lexical, grammatical and syntactic elements play an important role in character comprehension, but also that other aspects such as how speech acts are performed contribute to the understanding of characters, allowing the reader to comprehend their inner thoughts and the way in which they manipulate discourse to have specific effects which reflect their main intentions, essential for archetype comprehension.

Moreover, considering that we used Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* (1954, 1955) as the corpus of analysis, we now can reassure that even in books where there are less dialogues (in comparison to descriptive passages) the construction of archetypes is highly influenced and guided by character's use of speech, thus proving that even in short dialogues there is an

important presence of features that emphasise and create those archetypical attributes of a specific character.

To summarize, we have proved that character's discourse plays an essential role in characterization and in the understanding of literary archetypes. Now we can conclude saying that character's discourse does in fact shape our view on characters, and that it is not necessary to have the inclusion of a narrator in literary works to comprehend or create an archetypical character.

7. REFERENCES

Primary sources

Tolkien, J. R. R. (2010). *The Lord of the Rings*. HarperCollins.

References

Austin, J.L. (1965). *How To Do Things With Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955* (Oxford, 1975; online edn, Oxford Academic, 3 Oct. 2011).

Bartlett, F. C., & Bartlett, F. C. (1995). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge university press.

Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2019). *Register, genre, and style*. Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, J. (2008). *The hero with a thousand faces* (Vol. 17). New World Library.

Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypicality and personality: Effects on free recall and personality impressions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 13(2), 187-205.

Carpenter, H. (1981). *The letters of JRR Tolkien* (Vol. 140). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Catherine, M. (2018). *Tolkien: Maker of Middle Earth*. Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

Culler, J. (1975). *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Culpeper, J. (2001). *Language and Characterisation: People in plays and other texts*. Routledge.
- Culpeper, J. (2002). A cognitive stylistic approach to characterisation. *Cognitive stylistics: Language and cognition in text analysis, 1*, 251-278.
- Culpeper, J. (2014). *Language and characterisation: People in plays and other texts*. Routledge.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Day, D. (2019). *An Encyclopedia of Tolkien: The History and Mythology That Inspired Tolkien's World*. Canterbury Classics
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Psychology Press.
- Fischer-Starcke, B. (2010). *Corpus linguistics in literary analysis: Jane Austen and her contemporaries*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Garry, J. (2017). *Archetypes and Motifs in Folklore and Literature: A Handbook: A Handbook*. Routledge.
- Goethals, G. R., & Allison, S. T. (2012). Making heroes: The construction of courage, competence, and virtue. *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 46, pp. 183-235). Academic Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. (London, Edwards Arnold).
- Hardanto, E., Natsir, M., & Kuncara, S. D. (2019). An Analysis of Smeagol's Character Influenced by the One Ring in Lord of the Rings: Return of the King Film Using Jung archetypes. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni dan Budaya*, 3(1), 106-120.
- Herman, V. (1995). *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays*. London: Routledge.
- Jung, C. G. (1954). Von den Wurzeln des Bewusstseins: Studien über den Archetypus. *Psychologische Abhandlungen*, 9.

- Jung, C. G. (1968). *The collected works of CG Jung volume 9, part I: The archetypes and the collective unconscious*. Translated by RFC Hull, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Leech, G.N. (1969). *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G.N. and Short, M. (1981). *Style in Fiction*. London: Longman.
- Mangueneau, D. (2010). Literature and discourse analysis. *Acta linguistica hafniensia*, 42(S1), 147-158.
- Minsky, M. (1974). *A framework for representing knowledge*. M.I.T.A.I. Laboratory.
- Nagy, Gergely. (2006) "The 'Lost' Subject of Middle-earth: The Constitution of the Subject in the Figure of Gollum in The Lord of the Rings." *Tolkien Studies: An Annual Scholarly Review* 3, pp. 57-79.
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse analysis: an introduction*. Bloomsbury.
- Radin, P., Kerényi, K., Jung, C. G., & Thunder, C. (1954). Der göttliche Schelm: ein indianischer Mythen-Zyklus.
- Ramaswamy, S. (2014). Archetypes in fantasy fiction: A study of JRR Tolkien and JK Rowling. *Language in India*, 14(1), 621.
- Ronan, P. (2015). Categorizing expressive speech acts in the pragmatically annotated SPICE Ireland corpus. *Icame Journal*, 39(1), 25-45.
- Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (2013). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Psychology press.
- Schank, R., & Abelson, R. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language* (Vol. 626). Cambridge university press.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23.
- Semino, E. (1995). Schema theory and the analysis of text worlds in poetry. *Language and Literature: International Journal of Stylistics*, 4(2), 79–108.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/096394709500400201>

- Semino, E. (1997). *Language and World Creation in Poems and Other Texts*. London: Longman.
- Semino, E., & Culpeper, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Cognitive stylistics: Language and cognition in text analysis* (Vol. 1). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London: Longman.
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.
- Simpson, P. (1996). *Language through Literature: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Toolan, M.J. (1988). *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. Academic Press.