

## The Social Impact on the Use of Language in Selected Novels by William Golding

Micheline Michel Magdy Baki \*

[michelinemichel\\_13@hotmail.com](mailto:michelinemichel_13@hotmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

In recent years, a large number of books and articles on William Golding have been published, in which various aspects of his works and the stories told in them are analyzed. Many of these studies focus on extra literary aspects, or delve into only some elements of the plots of this author's novels, the issues that are treated, or their social impact. These studies can be of great interest and add a relevant perspective to understanding the novels of William Golding. However, to have a global vision of the work of this author, it is necessary to analyze the most literary aspects of Golding's writings in detail. In this research, we will study how William Golding used language, some of the most frequent resources, and the strategies he employed to provoke different effects on readers through the choice of certain words and syntactic structures.

**KEY WORDS:** Literary style, English Literature, literary analysis, Nineteenth Century Literature, Language and literature

---

\* باحثة دكتوراة - معهد المعارف العالی للغات و الترجمة

William Golding was and will be the name we associate with a great English novelist. He is remembered even today as the pioneer of using colloquial expressions related to the characters drawn from various strata of the society of his times. Choosing William Golding for this study has a number of reasons. First, the fact that Golding's fiction has received very little attention at the level so, I shall explore in detail how the linguistic devices used in his novels contribute to their themes. The purpose of this study is to provide a linguistic explanation of certain significant themes in Golding's fiction. That is, such linguistic explanation intends to expand upon, reinforce, and enrich the previous literary appreciations of his work., to explore and elucidate not only '(the) what' but also '(the) how' of his fiction with the help of linguistic evidence. It is an analysis of the specific linguistic patterns which he has employed and exploited to create the intended meaning and puts across his message in a befitting manner. To put it differently, my primary aim would be to examine how Golding's style functions in his narrative fiction towards revealing the theme

of darkness and the characters' mind-style, and how it creates its world of meaning and discourse. These targets are achieved through the analysis of the ways in which meaning is patterned in the linguistic structures of the chosen texts. His work has a fair degree of universality about the values embedded in it. The style, therefore, is rich and creative and yet never loses its earthly touch. Linguistic deviations are used in creative works to attract attention to the finest expressions that have a native feel about them. The style exploits colloquialism and this gives the reader a false feeling that the norms of English language use have been violated but this is not true as it turns out to be very often. hopefully benefit those students following language and literature who also have interest in style and stylistics. It points out to ways in which to analyze texts using the levels of stylistic analysis employed in this work. Williams uses in his fiction was and continues to be unique and violable, and this why his works are studied and are often cited even to this day. This thesis aims at analyzing the functions of language and discourse in William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* and *The Inheritors* through the use of

the tools available in pragmatics. The components of pragmatics comprise, among other things, deixis, implicature, and speech acts.

*Lord of the Flies* is a story of a group of boys of different backgrounds, who are stranded on an island after their plane crashes. The boys were trying to come together to form a government of some kind, but that didn't succeed and they started to split. The boys in *Lord of the Flies* turned on each other because of a certain monster that was only a wild boar. Certain people in the two groups had different views about the monster. The story is allegorical, showing that evil is inherent in human nature.

*The Inheritors* again is allegorical as *Lord of the Flies*; and here too, the theme is that of evil in human nature. In *The Inheritors*, Golding goes back to the time when homosapiens are taking over from Neanderthal men. Golding refers to the Neanderthalers as "the people". They are shown as having strong primary sensations but they are unable to conceptualize or pattern their experience in art or ritual. "The people" have a simple piety;

they do not kill for food; and they live together amiably and unselfishly. But homosapiens (new men) eventually destroy the Neanderthalers (the people). Our ancestors are these new men; Golding attempts to establish in his novel that the primitive or pre-historic Neanderthalers are not ogres. The suppression of the people by the new men or homosapiens is certainly a stage in the evolution of the species to which we belong. However, this stage does not necessarily mark moral progress. The Neanderthalers are shown to be morally superior to the new men who destroy them. The relationship of the new men to the Neanderthalers is that of the fallen to the innocent. The new men are endowed with possessions and skills; they can conceptualise and can deceive themselves. The new men are clever, armed with reason and art, but they are capable of hate, crime and superstition at the same time. They are isolated from nature and even from each other by this ability, rendering them a dismal alternative to their predecessors. As a conclusion both *Lord of the flies* and *The Inheritors* pit two tribes against one another to demonstrate that man is not "a rational creature in control of his own destiny"

James Baker (19: 1988). Another example of similarity, one of the tribal leaders of the new men, in *The Inheritors*, is justifying the murder of the innocents just as the boys in *Lord of the Flies* justify their manhunt as just a game. Also, this is another example of Golding's combination of the darkness of man's heart into his novels. None of the characters take responsibility for his wrongdoings.

The main theme in Golding's novels is that man turns back to his evil and primitive nature when something goes wrong. He often compares man to characters from the Bible to give a better picture of his descent. Golding also states that man is coward and has fear installed into him.

In the works of William Golding, the running theme is that man is wild at heart, often eventually reverting to an evil and barbaric existence. A significant argument that Golding proves again and again in many of his works is the cycle of man's rise to power, or righteousness, and his eventual fall from grace, sometimes comparing man to characters from the Bible to provide a more vivid image of his decline. This fall is symbolised in

various ways by Golding, ranging from the depiction of the attitude of the true primitive man to the reflection of the dishonest seaman in purgatory. In his first three novels, *Lord of the Flies*, *Pincher Martin*, and *The Inheritors*, Golding "employed traditional form and contributed to the impression that he was a deeply traditional thinker" (Baker xvi). "Many critics say that Golding 'employed traditional form' or as 'an old-fashioned Christian moralist'" (Baker xvii). Golding as a Christian is proved by his Christian symbols in his novels. In *Lord of the Flies*, the boys start to laugh at Simon, the nice boy, when he tries to tell them that there is no monster on the island. This is the same treatment that Christ had during his life. After the boys had killed the pig, they put the pig's head on a stick and Simon experienced an epiphany.

Another theme that William Golding discusses in his novels is man's ability for fear and cowardice. In *Lord of the Flies*, the boys are scared about being on an island alone without their parents. Once the boys start having fun and organizing

things, that fear goes away and the fear of the began to take its place.

Golding tries to help his notion of the weakness of man by illustrating that man has been wild since the beginning of his life. In the novel there is a struggle for power between two groups. This illustrates man's fear of losing control. The fear of the monster is natural, anyone would be scared of a monster, but the fear from losing power is installed. Golding uses this to show that any kind of uncontrolled fear adds to the weakness of man and eventually leads to the collapse of man. The primary fear in *The Inheritors* is the fear of monsters. The new tribe saw the Neanderthals as devils and killed them. In this book Golding wants the reader to know that fear makes men do things they will regret later on in life. Humans cannot control their fear, and this also supports Golding's theory that man is not in control of his own destiny.

Golding uses the symbol of island in many of his novels. The island is an important part of the novel because it suggests the isolation of man. The island, in *Lord of the Flies*, is a real



island; it represents life, the adult world, and the human struggle against loneliness. In *The Inheritors* the island is more like a metaphor. The Neanderthals cannot find anything common with the mainland because they are physically and mentally different from the new people. In *Lord of the Flies* and *The Inheritors* there are two tribes fighting against each other to demonstrate that man is in control of his own destiny.

William Golding's main theme is that man is evil and savage. When man grows up he becomes more savage at heart and changes because of his cowardice and his quest for power. Golding proves this by presenting opposite forces in many situations and showing his characters with struggling and involves them in scary situations. Golding suggests that age does not influence the loss of innocence, but it is induced by the person himself. It is proven that the evil side of man wins and man is a pathetic race and refuses to take responsibility for his wrongdoings. In other words, there's no doubt about the originality of William Golding as a novelist. He has not been

afraid to experiment with form or to attempt daring themes; for instance, life amid a predatory group of stranded boys in *Lord of the Flies*, the decline and death of man's immediate predecessors on earth in *The Inheritors*; The struggle for survival of a shipwrecked sailor in *Pincher Martin*; a man's attempt to trace his guilt and his subsequent fall from grace in *Free Fall*. In each of the novels, the manner is indirect, the symbols rarely clarified and the method of narration uncondescending and stringent. Golding is obviously striving to move behind the conventional matter of the contemporary novel to a view of what man or pre-man is really like when his façade of civilized behavior falls away” (Frederick 1962: 254)

Thus, it is the essence of man that stands out at the very heart of Golding's literature. It has often been believed that his conviction that man is bad by nature is at the core of Golding's works; therefore, creating evil produces honey in almost the same way as a bee. His novels therefore set out to investigate what he himself termed the awful sickness of being human; that is, to threaten man with the tragic truth of his own cruelty and desire.

And there lies Golding's firm belief in and conviction of the fact that man is a fallen being. He is in the grasp of original sin. His essence is sinful, and his condition is dangerous. In *Lord of the Flies* man's nature is anatomized under the superficial polish of modern civilization and we get stranded boys, marooned on a desert island, reverting to savagery. Thus, through scenes of savagery, the novel passes with growing impetus until, at the very end, pessimism about man is met by the end of innocence and the darkness of the heart of man. In *The Inheritors* Neanderthal man is depicted as innocent, yet is exterminated by homosapiens. Thus, from the thematic point of view, what we have in the two novels is an elaboration of Golding's pessimistic view of man and his fate. Golding has once spoken of the impact of World War II to an interviewer at the New York Herald Tribune asserting that the war is an evidence of man's innate and original evil and consequently is destined to be evil all his life long.

**Deixis:**

Crystal maintains that Deixis is:

A term used in Linguistic theory to subsume those features of language which refer directly to the personal, temporal or locational characteristics of the situation within which an utterance takes place, whose meaning is thus relative to that situation.

Crystal (1991: 96)

There are some words that cannot be understood in the language unless the physical meaning, especially that of the speaker, is established. Some words, for example, are: here, there, this, that, now, then; and pronouns such as: I, you, him, her, and them.

Some sentences of English are virtually impossible to understand if we don't know who is speaking about whom, where and when. Consider the following example given by Yule (1996: 130):

"You will have to bring that back tomorrow because they aren't here now."

This example is extremely vague. It contains a large number of expressions (you, that, tomorrow, they, here, now) which depend for their interpretation on the immediate physical context in which they were uttered. These are technically known as deictic expressions, which mean "pointing" via language. It is important to know at least who the speaker and listener are, as well as the time and location of the creation of the discourse, in order to understand these elements in a piece of discourse.

Person deixis means that any expression used to point to a person as (me, you, him, and them). Place deixis are words used to point to a location (here, there, yonder). Time deixis are used to point to a time such as (now, then, tonight, last week). All these deictic expressions have to be interpreted in terms of what person; place or time the speaker has in mind. There is a board distinction between what is marked as close to the speaker (this, here, now) and what is marked as distant (that, there, then).

## **Implicature:**

One of the principal subjects of pragmatics that deals with how utterance may be interpreted differently by the listener (or reader) is implicature. Grice was the first to systematically study cases in which speaker meaning differs from sentence meaning. He used the verb 'implicate' and the cognate noun 'implicature' as technical terms denoting "the act of meaning or implying something by saying something else" (Logic 5). Yule defines implicature as "an additional conveyed meaning" (Pragmatics 35). He goes one step further when he states that "implicatures are primary examples of more being communicated than is said" (36). Jones and Peccei, in a Language, Society and Power, argue that:

Implicatures lead the listener to Infer something that was not explicitly asserted by the speaker. However, implicatures operate over more than one phrase or sentence and are much more dependent on shared knowledge between the

speaker and hearer and on the surrounding context of the discourse (44).

In implicature, “speakers convey information not only by what they say, but also by what they do not say” (Geurts 1). According to Gazdar, in order to interpret implicatures, some essential cooperative principles must first be assumed to be in operation. He argues that "an implicature is a proposition that is implied by the utterance of a sentence in a context even though that proposition is not a part of an entailment of what is said" (38).

Grice identifies implicatures as follows:

For a large class of utterances, the total significance of an utterance may be regarded as advisable in two different ways; first one may distinguish, within the total signification. What is said (in a favored sense) and what is implicated: and second, one may distinguish between what is part of the conventional force (or meaning) of the utterance and what is not. Furthermore, what is non-conventionally implicated may be (or again may not be) conversationally implicated (Studies 41).

According to Grice, the theory of conversation starts with a sharp distinction between what someone says and what someone 'implicates' by uttering a sentence. The traditional sense of the word and relational mechanisms of disambiguation and relation fixing decide what someone said; what she/he implicates is associated with the existence of some rational principles and maxims governing conversation (setting aside "conventional implicature" which we discuss below). What is said has been generally understood by the literal substance of the utterance; what is involved, the inference, what is (intentionally) conveyed, but not said, by the speaker, by the non-literal. Grice provides the following example:

Suppose that A and B are talking about a mutual friend, C, who is now working in a bank. A asks B how C is getting on in his job, and B replies: "Oh quite well, I think; he likes his colleagues, and he hasn't been to prison yet." What did B say by uttering "he hasn't been to prison yet"? Roughly, all he literally said of C was that he hasn't been to prison up to the time of utterance. This is what the conventional sentence meaning plus contextual



processes of disambiguation, personification of vague expressions and reference fixing provide. But, normally, B would have implicated more than this: that C is the sort of person likely to yield to the temptation provided by his occupation (Logic 43).

According to Grice, to find out if a clear conversational meaning is present, some substantial facts are required. The conversational sense of the words, the Cooperative Concept and its maxims, the context of an utterance, some understanding of the past and some information exchanged by the participants of a conversation are these facts. He argues:

To work out that a particular conversational implicature is present, the hearer will rely on the following data: (1) the conversational meaning of the words used, together with the identity of any reference that may be involved; (2) the CP and its maxims; (3) the context, linguistic or otherwise, of the utterance; (4) other items of background knowledge; and (5) the fact (or supposed fact ) that all relevant items falling under the previous headings are available to both participants and both participants know or assume this to be the case (Logic 50).

Levinson comments on the basis on which implicatures are generated as follows: “for implicatures are not semantic inferences, but rather inferences based on both the content of what has been said and some specific assumptions about the cooperative nature of ordinary verbal interaction” (104). This implies that implications should not be produced from separate utterances, but from the meaning of the conversation between the participants in the conversation and the mutual experience. Thus, as Peccei argues, “implicatures are inferences that cannot be made from isolated utterances; They are dependent on the context of the utterance and shared knowledge between the speaker and the reader” (30). Horn shows the importance of implicature in relating what is said to what is communicated. He argues that “in the Gricean model, the bridge from what is said (the literal content of the uttered sentence, determined by its grammatical structure with the reference of indexical resolved) to what is communicated is built through implicature” (1).

Moreover, Bach argues that “in implicature one says and communicates one thing and thereby communicates something else in addition. Implicature, however, is a matter of saying something but communicating something else instead, something closely related to what is said” (126). Horn stresses the role of some basic cooperative principles in interpreting implicatures. He argues that “to interpret implicatures some basic cooperative principles must first be assumed to be in operation” (1). Brown and Yule define implicatures and summarize the important points in Grice’s proposal. They show how implicatures are not only derived from the literal meaning of an utterance but from the utterance’s specific context and the conversationalists’ awareness of the cooperative principle and its maxims:

Implicatures are pragmatic aspects of meaning and have certain identifiable characteristics. They are partially derived from the conventional or literal meaning of an utterance, produced in a specific context which is shared by the speaker and the hearer, and depend on recognition by the speaker and the hearer of the cooperative principle and its maxims. For the analyst, as well as the hearer, conversational implicatures

must be treated as inherently indeterminate since they derive from a supposition that the speaker has the intention of conveying meaning and of obeying the cooperative principle. (33).

According to Korta and Perry, Grice distinguishes what the speaker says from what he implicates by an utterance. Implicature refers to what the speaker suggests, implies or communicates beyond what he says. Grice makes a further distinction between traditional implications, created by the conventional interpretation of such terms, and non-conventional implications within implications. Within non-conventional implicatures, Grice distinguishes between conversational implicatures, affected by other factors, as conversational principles and maxims, and non-conversational implicatures (35). Levinson argues that “while the conventional implicature like but, even, therefore and yet, convey meaning regardless of the context, the conversational implicature, what is implied (unsaid or meant) varies according to the context of the utterance” (127). Thomas shows the difference between conventional and conversational implicatures. They are similar

because they each express an additional dimension of an utterance's meaning, but they vary due to their reference to the utterance's context. She argues:

They have in common the property that they both convey an additional level of meaning, beyond the semantic meaning of the words uttered. They differ in that in the case of conventional implicatures the same implicature is always conveyed, regardless of context, whereas in the case of conversational implicature, what is implied varies according to the context of utterance (57).

## REFERENCES

- Aichison, Jean. (1991). *“Language Change: Progress or Decay?”* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Alexander, L.G. (1994). *“Longman English Grammar Practice”*. Essex: Longman.
- Barber, Charles. (1999). *“The English Language: A Historical Introduction”*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, Roger T. (1993). *“Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice”*. London: Longman.
- Blake, N.F. (1996). *“A History of the English Language”*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Blakemore, Diane. (1990). *“Linguistic Form and Pragmatic Interpretation: the Explicit and the Implicit.”* In Hickey, ed., pp. 28-51.
- Golding, William (1955). *“The Inheritors”*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Golding, William. *“Lord of the Flies”*. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich (1955), London: Faber and Faber (1954).
- . *“The Inheritors”*. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich (1956), London: Faber and Faber (1955).
- Grice, H.P. (1975) *“Logic and conversation”*. In Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds) *“Syntax and Semantics”* vol.3. New York: Academic Press. Reprinted in Grice 1989.
- Grice, H.P. (1989) *“Studies in the way of Words”*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grundy, Peter. (1995). *“Doing Pragmatics”*. New: York: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. (1971) *“Linguistic function and Literary style: an enquiry into the language of William Golding's The Inheritors”*. In Chatman, S. (ed) *Literary Style: A*

- Symposium. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Reprinted in Weber, J. (ed) 1996. *The Stylistics Reader*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *“Principles of Pragmatics”*. London: Longman.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. and Michael H. Short. (1981). *“Style in Fiction”*. London: Longman.
- Leggett, Glenn. (1981). *“Essentials of Grammar and Composition”*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1992). *“Pragmatics”*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992
- Trudgill, Peter and J.K. Chambers eds. *“Dialects of English: Studies in Grammatical Variation”*. London: Longman, 1991.

## ملخص

في السنوات الأخيرة ، تم نشر عدد كبير من الكتب والمقالات عن وليام جولدنج، حيث يتم تحليل جوانب مختلفة من أعماله والقصص التي يتم سردها فيها. كما تركز العديد من هذه الدراسات على الجوانب الأدبية الإضافية ، أو تتعمق فقط في بعض عناصر حكايات روايات هذا المؤلف ، أو القضايا التي تمت معالجتها ، أو تأثيرها الاجتماعي. يمكن أن تكون هذه الدراسات ذات أهمية كبيرة وتضيف منظورًا ذا صلة لفهم روايات وليام جولدنج. ومع ذلك ، للحصول على رؤية عالمية لأعمال هذا المؤلف ، من الضروري تحليل الجوانب الأدبية لكتابات جولدنج بالتفصيل. في هذا البحث ، سوف ندرس كيف استخدم وليام جولدنج اللغة ، وبعض الموارد الأكثر شيوعًا ، والاستراتيجيات التي استخدمها لإثارة تأثيرات مختلفة على القراء من خلال اختيار كلمات معينة وتركيبات نحوية. يعكس الأدب ثقافة المجتمع ويظهر ذلك في الأعمال الأدبية لويليام جولدنج. حصل وليام جولدنج على جائزة نوبل للأدب. تهدف لغة جولدنج لجعل الاتصال الشفوي غني في النصوص الأدبية. بالإضافة إلى ذلك ، أسلوب جولدنج يختلف عن المؤلفين الآخرين لأنه يمتلك مهارات استثنائية في الكتابة مثل: الدهاء، قوة الخيال، و تجاربه في الحياة. و يخط جولدنج الخيال بالحقيقة و رواياته عبارة عن تجاربه المنعكسة أو التفاعلية.

تضع تلك الدراسة المحاوله لتحليل النصوص الأدبية لجولدنج في المستويات اللغوية المختلفة تحديداً المستوى المتعلق بالأفتراضيه و البراجماتية و الإشارة في النصوص الأدبية.

تعتبر رواية "أمير الذباب" تجربة جولدنج اثناء الحرب و تجربة تدريسه للأطفال الصغار لمدة عشر سنوات. أما رواية "الورثة" فكانت الروايه الثانيه لجولدنج



وكانت المفضلة لديه من بين الروايات الأخرى و كانت تعبر عن مخاوفه من انقراض القبائل البدائية على يد المتحضرين من البشر.  
الكلمات المفتاحية: الأسلوب الأدبي ، الأدب الإنجليزي ، التحليل الأدبي ، أدب القرن التاسع عشر ، اللغة والأدب.