# A Cognitive Stylistic Analysis of Characterization in Golding's *Lord of the Flies*

**Ahmed T. Srieh**

**(Department of English, College of Languages, University of Baghdad)**

**ahmedthijeelsrieh@gmail.com**

**Prof. Mahdi I. Kareem al-Utbi, Ph.D.**

**(Department of English, College of Languages, University of Baghdad)**

**mik_alutbi@colang.uobaghdad.edu.iq**

## Abstract

Characterization is commonly known in stylistics to be the cognitive process in the readers' minds when comprehending a fictional character in a literary work .In one approach, it is assumed that characters are the outcome of the interaction between the words in the text on the one hand and the contents of our heads on the other. This paper is an attempt to understand how characterization is achieved by applying Culpeper's (2001) model which seems to be to present a method of analysis that is more objective and more systematic in analyzing characters. Two characters are selected for discussion; Ralph and Jack from Golding's (1954) *Lord of the Flies*. The novel talks about the corruption of human beings and the capacity of evil they have. The results show that Ralph and Jack are antithetical in many aspects; Ralph represents the rational civilized boy whereas Jack represents the savage brutal boy.

**Keywords***: Characterization, Cognitive Stylistics, Culpeper (2001), Jack, Ralph.*

تحليل اسلوبي ادراكي لخلق الشخصيات في رواية جولدنك "سيد الذباب"

أحمد ثجيل سريح (قسم اللغة الانكليزية،كلية اللغات، جامعة بغداد)

أ.د. مهدي عناية كريم العتبي (قسم اللغة الانكليزية، كلية اللغات، جامعة بغداد)

المستخلص:

يعرف مصطلح "خلق الشخصيات" في ادبيات علم الاسلوبية بأنه عملية ادراكية تحصل في عقول القراء عندما يطلعوا على شخصية خيالية في عملا ادبيا ما. حيث تفترض احد المناهج في علم الاسلوبية الادراكي ان الشخصيات هي نتاج التفاعل بين الكلمات في النص و المحتويات الخاصة بتحليلها في عقولنا. يمثل هذا البحث محاولة لمعرفة كيف تفهم عملية خلق الشخصيات وذلك من خلال تطبيق انموذج العالم كلبيبر(٢٠٠١) الذي يقدم طريقة تحليل اكثر موضوعية واكثر انتظاما في تحليل الشخصيات. واختيرت شخصيتان لغرض المناقشة هما "رالف" و "جاك" من رواية الكاتب جولدنك " سيد الذباب". تتحدث هذه الرواية عن فساد البشرية ونزعة الشر التي يمتلكها البشر. اظهرت النتائج ان الشخصيتين متضادتان في الكثير من الجوانب: حيث يمثل " رالف " الولد المتحضر العقلاني التفكير بينما " جاك " يمثل الولد الهمجي المتوحش.

**الكلمات المفتاحية** : *جاك، خلق الشخصيات ، رالف، علم الاسلوبية الادراكي ، كلبيبر (٢٠٠١)* .

**Introduction**

The topic of characterization has long been studied in literary studies and especially literary criticism. Nevertheless, the topic of character creation and interpretation in fiction attracts the attention of various disciplines and seems to be approachable from a multitude of perspectives (Culpeper & Quintanilla, 2017, p. 93). The problem with literary criticism is that the analysis is based on subjective judgments so that more objective and systematic method of analysis is needed. For this reason, Culpeper's model (2001) of Cognitive Stylistics will be used to bridge this gap. Cognitive Stylistics is a multidisciplinary approach that depends on cognitive psychology, social psychology, linguistics and stylistics (Culpeper, 2001, p.1). Culpeper's model has been tested on different types of texts and majorly on the characters of the Shakespearian plays. Hence, this study endeavors to take this model a step further and tests it on novel characters where the genre is slightly different. The following sections will elaborate on Review of Literature, Methodology, Data Analysis and Conclusions.

## 1. Review of Literature
## 1.1 Characters and characterization

Characterization is commonly known in stylistics to be the cognitive process in the readers' minds when comprehending a fictional character in a literary work. Accordingly, it is just like developing an impression of a character in one's head while s/he is reading based on the personal qualities, social and physical features of that character (Mclntyre, 2014, p.149).

Within this process of interpretation, the focus has to involve the language. As Van Peer (1988) states, characters formation is dependent on linguistic forms. Characters are what a reader infers from the text that describes, depicts and suggests the thoughts, utterances, feelings or actions of the character. Therefore, the way authors organize information will determine the type of impression one might form of a character. Eventually, this leads to more attention being paid to the text (p.9).

## 1.2 The Ontology of Character

According to Eder et al. (2010) there are four major opinions with regard to the ontological status of characters none of which are without controversy:

1. Semiotic theories consider characters to be signs or structures of fictional texts.

2. Cognitive approaches assume that characters are representations of imaginary beings in the minds of the audience.

3. Some philosophers believe that characters are abstract objects beyond material reality.

4. Other philosophers contend that characters do not exist at all. (Eder et al. 2010, p. 8)

The position of number 2 in the list above is the only one that accommodates an audience. This point is very important because there were two conflicting opinions about a character in the literary-critical studies namely **humanizing (mimetic)** and **de-humanizing (non-mimetic)** approaches.

**Humanizing (mimetic)** approach treats characters as real people. This leads readers to  speculate of the motives , actions , thoughts , behaviours and intentions of characters in the same way as if they were real people the readers actually know. At the other end of the spectrum, **de-humanizing (non-mimetic)** approach regards characters as textual constructs. It refutes the notion that a character is a person or person-like , or in more strict sense, that they even exist at all, and considers them as mere actants that function only to support the plot ( Davies, 2017, pp. 29-30).

A mixed approach was proposed by Culpeper (2001, p. 9), drawing on Emmott's view (1997, p. 58) that when reading a narrative, we suppose the fictional world to be inhabited by individuals who behave psychologically and physically just like real people.

## 1.3 Inferring character

It is true that sometimes readers rely on their knowledge about real-life people to understand a fictional character, but we cannot claim that fictional characters are inferred exactly in the same way as real-life people (Margolin, 1983, p.9; Culpeper 1996). In this concern, Culpeper (1996, pp. 352-353) makes two distinct differences:

**First, the fictional character behavior is complete**.  This is in contrast to real life interaction where one would never have access to the complete set of behaviors of

the other person. In fictional world, the reader by completing the story will have seen the whole life of the character's behavior complete and finite (Margolin, 1993, p. 9; Culpeper, 2001, p. 145).

**Second, characters' behavior in fictional world has greater significance and more relevance.** The assumption that someone's personality can be inferred from his/her behaviors seems to be weak but in most literary texts there is additional weight put on this assumption. In other words, any action or behavior carried by the character has a communicative value between the author and his/her reader (Margolin, 1983, p.9; Culpeper, 2001, p. 145). In relevance theory of Sperber and Wilson (1995) this act "communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance" (p.260).

## 1.4 Cognitive Stylistics

Cognitive Stylistics as a discipline is the outcome of the interface between linguistics, literary studies and cognitive science. Cognitive Stylistics links the explicit, rigorous and the detailed linguistic analysis that is conventional in stylistic stream with the systematic and theoretical considerations represented by the cognitive structure and processes that are underlined in the perception and production of language (Semino & Culpeper, 2002, pp. ix-x).

**Readerly experience** is the object of study of Cognitive Stylistics. What is meant by Readerly Experience, on the one hand, is the product of the words on the page: those semantic, syntactic and phonetic aspects of text which stimulate and evoke complex thoughts and emotions in the mind of the reader; and, on the other, of the reader's cognitive faculties, which form her or his experience. Stockwell (2009) refers to this interface as *texture* (West, 2016, p. 110).

What is new about cognitive stylistics as Semino and Culpeper (2002) demonstrate is "the way in which linguistic analysis is systematically based on theories that relate linguistic choices to cognitive structures and processes" (p. ix). This in turn makes the relationship between texts on the one hand and the interpretations and responses on the other more rigorous and clear.

## 2. Methodology

## 2.1. Data

The data under analysis is Golding's novel (1954) *Lord of the Flies*.  The novel talks about a group of school boys travelling by airplane. The plane crashes and lands on an isolated island. The pilot dies and the boys are left alone to manage their own affairs. The boys' ages range from 6 years to 13 years. Those around 6 years are called the littluns while the older ones are called biguns. The most prominent characters among biguns are Jack and Ralph. Ralph and Piggy find a conch and summon all of the boys on the island. They voted for Ralph to be the leader until they be rescued. Jack was not satisfied and made his group of hunters under his leadership. The talk of beast in island overcame the boys' senses and spread fear among them. At that time, Jack left them making his on tribe and offered food and protection for those who would join him. Jack's tribe had become a group of savages who enjoyed killing and dancing around fire. Ralph and those who followed him were in danger of being killed, or they should submit to Jack. The plot of the story revolves around the corruption of human beings and the capacity of evil they have when they are left with a world of no rules .It reflects the clash between rational versus savage thinking, dictatorship versus democracy and more generally between good and evil. The good force was represented by Ralph and the evil force was represented by Jack.

## 2.2 Research method

For any scientific research there must be a methodology that is rigorous, replicable, transparent and retrievable. Therefore, a qualitative approach is followed with the help of the model of Culpeper (2001) to analyze two characters namely "Ralph" and "Jack" in Golding's *Lord of the Flies*. Culpeper draws on Dijk and Kintsch's (1983) model of discourse comprehension, and uses its levels (*surface structure*, *text base*, *situation model*, and *prior knowledge*) to present a bottom-up and top-down model of characterization. He (2002, pp. 260-72) explains the process of characterization as instantiated by information created from *character propositions* (text base)—taken from *character speech forms* (surface structure)— and interpreted by readers depending on the pre-existing *character information* (prior knowledge) stored in their memories. Eventually, this will lead to *character impression* (situation model). The character impression involves inferences about the character's beliefs, emotions, traits, goals and social relationships (Culpeper, 2001, p. 36).

Moreover, Culpeper does not neglect the role of context to make his model more rational, and so can overcome the difficulties that might arise from literary texts and how readers can process them. The theoretical background of Culpeper model is very rich drawing on conversation structure, literary studies especially literary criticism, narratology, social theories, and linguistic theories among others. The next sections will tackle the items of Culpeper's model that are used in this research divided into three major headings; Explicit Cues, Implicit Cues, Authorial Cues.

## 2.2.1 Explicit Cues: Self-presentation and Other-presentation

Others-presentation is triggered when a character or a person is describing someone else, and Self-presentation occurs when a person or a character is talking about himself. A typical example of the former type is to be found in a job reference while the latter is found in personal advertisements (Culpeper, 2001, pp. 167-168). Other-presentation is also called 'altero-characterisation'. It can be considered as self-presentation because of the fact that highlighting certain information of others may reflect the speaker/writer's own self (Eder et al., 2010, p. 33).

## 2.2.2 Implicit Cues

Implicit cues are those which are not obvious but have to be inferred. If someone talks fast, for instance, that would tell nothing explicitly but may indicate, by way of assumption in appropriate context, that this person is an extrovert (Culpeper, 2001, p. 172).

## 2.2.2.1 Conversation Structure

Conversation structure was widely studied by, the pioneer in conversation analysis, Sacks who examined the structure of naturally occurring conversations. The framework produced by sacks et al. (1974) and later on by Brown and Levinson (1987) proved to be useful to character analysis in a number of studies (such as Herman 1991, and Bennison 1993). Conversation structure is important in revealing the power relations among characters. For example, during a lecture the teacher has more turns,

allocates turns, his/ her turn is lengthy in contrast with students'. This reflects the social power of teachers over students (Culpeper, 2001, pp. 172-173).

Short (1996, pp. 205-206) provides a useful checklist to elicit the power distribution among characters, that is more powerful than the other methods produced. He argues that a powerful speaker's speech is marked by most turns, the longest turns, control topics and who talks and when, initiates conversational exchanges and interrupts others. The following checklist of Short (1996, pp. 219-220) will be applied to highlight some aspects about a character's personality:

- Who has the more turns? [ in cases of two characters only , the number of turns will be  more or less equal ]
- Are the turns equal in length, or does a character has longer turns than the other?
- Are the patterns of initiating turns roughly equal for each character, or are there significant disparities?
- Who takes the respond position, are there disparities?
- Is there one character who allocates turns?
- Is there any interruptions? Who interrupts who, and why is that?
- Who controls topics, and is there a significant pattern of topic-control?
- Are there any differences in the usage of terms of address, or other markers which show power and /or solidarity and which character uses them?
- Are there any other interesting or odd turn-taking patterns?

## 2.2.2.2 (Im)Politeness

Politeness, as generally defined by many scholars (e.g., Leech,1983, p.82, Brown & Levinson, p. 1987:1, Lakoff, 1989, p. 102) is a linguistic strategy to promote and maintain harmonious communication and social relations. Moreover, Leech (1983, p. 105) argues that people tend to avoid conflictive situations in normal circumstances. However, this case is not always valid as researchers (such as Lakoff 1989, Penman 1990) demonstrate that the language of courtrooms, for instance, is marked by its aggression. So that, the distinction between being polite or impolite is a matter of intention whether it is used to support or attack someone's 'face' (one's public image related to self-esteem, reputation and prestige) ( Culpeper, 2001, p. 246).

The relevance of (im) politeness in literary studies is that one can be enabled to infer some characteristics that increase understanding of personality as well as social relationships from the choices made in interaction between characters (Culpeper, 2001, p. 247). In this study the model of impoliteness produced by Culpeper (1996) will be used because it is sensitive to the data under analysis. Culpeper draws upon Brown and Levinson (1987) framework of politeness by providing opposites to the super strategies they produced. In his model, Culpeper (1996, p. 356) lists strategies of face attack acts that stand in opposition to Brown and Levinson's (1987) face threatening acts (FTAs) as follows:

i. **Bald on record impoliteness**: attack is made directly without mitigation or minimization.

ii. **Positive impoliteness**: it is meant to damage the positive face wants of the addressee.

iii. **Negative impoliteness**: used to damage the hearer's negative wants.

iv. **Sarcasm or mock politeness**: involves using politeness but not sincerely for the sake of irony causing offence to the hearer indirectly.

v. **Withhold politeness**: when there is no sign of expected politeness during any interaction resulting consequently in impoliteness situation. In other words, the absence of politeness where it should be leads to impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996, p. 356).

## 2.2.2.3 Lexis

Reasonably, the lexical items used by someone are of great value for shaping people's impression about him/ her. For instance, being formal in speech may give the impression that someone is rather 'pompous' or 'aloof', whereas informal lexis may indicate that this person is 'down to earth'. However, the research on the relationship between personality and lexical items is not an easy task but seems to be patchy (Culpeper 2001:182).

## 2.2.2.3.1 Keywords

Finding a keyword of a character may reveal something of importance about his/her personality. The frequency of occurrence might be useful in determining a keyword but some results seem to be meaningless such as 'the' which is common between characters and tells nothing about this character. Enkvist (1964, 1973) emphasized the fact that 'style-markers' emerge when there is a significant differential "between the densities of linguistic features in a text and the densities of corresponding linguistic features in a *contextually* related norm" (as cited in Culpeper, 2001, p. 199).

### 2.2.3 Authorial Cues

Authorial cues are those in which the character has no power of choice over them and come directly from the author. In contrast with some cues which are taken to be under the character's control like free direct speech in plays and films that allow the impression that the character has the power of choice over them (Culpeper & Quintanilla, 2017, p. 105).

### 2.2.3.1 Proper Names

Proper names are not used only to refer to individuals, but also have a kind of sense. The majority of English first names reflect the gender of the name bearer though there are a few exceptions such as 'Terry'. In a research conducted by Joseph Kasof (1993), he found out that both surnames and names connote impressions about the name bearer's intellectual competence, ethnicity, age, race, social class and other attributes (p. 140). Culpeper's research on Shakespeare's plays showed that he has three naming strategies, viz.: names denoting historical figures (e.g. *Cleopatra, Antony, Macbeth*), names of nationality markers (e.g. *Silvia* or *Lucetta* from Italy) and names with conceptual implications (e.g. *Shallow, Anthony Dull* or *Silence*) (Culpeper, 2001, pp. 230–231).

### 2.3 Data Analysis
### 2.3.1 Explicit Cues: Self-presentation and Other-presentation

In this section the speeches of the characters under analysis about them and others in the presence or absence of the other characters will be discussed to highlight some traits about their personalities.

### I.    Presentation of the Self

Presentation of the self will be confined to what the characters under analysis say about themselves in the presence or absence of others.

First, Piggy and Ralph found a conch and blew it to assemble the other boys on the island. After the gathering, the boys talked about the need for a leader to manage their affairs until they be rescued.

> "I ought to be chief," said Jack with simple arrogance, "because I'm chapter chorister and head boy. I can sing C sharp."(Golding, [1954] 2001, p.15)

Jack wanted to claim the position but the qualifications he produced seemed to be irrelevant. Being the head boy of a choir didn't mean that he was suitable to lead the other boys. In the presence of all of the boys on the island, he used the modal verb 'ought to', which is used for obligation, as if he had the authority to command them. Moreover, the narratorial clue highlighted the bossy and arrogant tone that Jack had.

Second, Jack and his followers murdered Simon and Piggy without hesitation or any feeling of remorse. At last, Ralph was running from the other boys. He was chased as if he was a prey to be hunted.

> "'Cos I had some sense." (Golding, [1954] 2001, p. 168)

Ralph was alone, wounded and hiding in the forest. Panic overcame his senses but he realized the reason why he was not a member of Jack's tribe; simply because he had common sense.

## ii.    Presentation of others

This section will be devoted to discuss how the characters under analysis talk about others in the presence or absence of the other characters.

First, Ralph and Jack led an expedition to the top of the mountain to investigate whether there was a beast as the twins claimed or there was no beast. They saw a figure moving and fled to the beach. After that, Jack accused Ralph of cowardice and not being fit to lead them.

> "He's like Piggy. He says things like Piggy. He isn't a proper chief."
> Jack clutched the conch to him.
> "He's a coward himself."
> For a moment he paused and then went on.
> "On top, when Roger and me went on—he stayed back."
> "I went too!"
> "After."
> The two boys glared at each other through screens of hair.
> "I went on too," said Ralph, "then I ran away. So did you."
> "Call me a coward then."

> Jack turned to the hunters.
> "He's not a hunter. He'd never have got us meat. He isn't a prefect and we
> don't know anything about him. He just gives orders and expects people to
> obey for nothing. All this talk—". (Golding, [1954] 2001, p. 112)

In this conversation, Jack tried to manipulate the other boys to make him the leader by providing distorted version of facts that supported his goals. He was eager to have the chance to destroy Ralph's image as a leader listing a number of flaws in Ralph's leadership. Jack presented Ralph as a coward leader who could not protect them. He hated Piggy and enjoyed torturing him for being unable to hunt or swim. Moreover, Piggy and Ralph were advocates of civilization so that they were against Jack's rationale. The optimal priority for Jack was hunting pigs despite the fact that logically speaking being rescued should have been the one and only goal for him. Hunting was not everything; boys could still live on fruits and concentrate on the signal fire and building shelters on the beach but Jack was preoccupied with savage acts that reflected his ill-natured personality.

Second, Ralph was confused with the current situation and could not figure out the reason why things started to collapse down. He discussed the matter with Piggy who seemed to share with him the same view. At that time Jack was no longer with them, he formed his own tribe.

> "I'm scared."
> He saw Piggy look up; and blundered on.
> "Not of the beast. I mean I'm scared of that too. But nobody else understands
> about the fire. If someone threw you a rope when you were drowning. If a
> doctor said take this because if you don't take it you'll die—you would,
> wouldn't you? I mean?"
> "'Course I would."
> "Can't they see? Can't they understand? Without the smoke signal we'll die
> here? Look at that!"
> A wave of heated air trembled above the ashes but without a trace of smoke.
> "We can't keep one fire going. And they don't care. And what's more—" He
> looked intensely into Piggy's streaming face.
> "What's more, *I* don't sometimes. Supposing I got like the others— not caring.
> What 'ud become of us?"
> Piggy took off his glasses, deeply troubled.
> "I dunno, Ralph. We just got to go on, that's all. That's what grownups would
> do."
> Ralph, having begun the business of unburdening himself, continued.
> "Piggy, what's wrong?"
> Piggy looked at him in astonishment.

> "Do you mean the—?"
> "No, not it . . . I mean . . . what makes things break up like they do?"
> Piggy rubbed his glasses slowly and thought. When he understood how far
> Ralph had gone toward accepting him he flushed pinkly with pride.
>  "I dunno, Ralph. I expect it's him."
> "Jack?"
> "Jack." A taboo was evolving round that word too. Ralph nodded solemnly.
> "Yes," he said, "I suppose it must be." (Golding, [1954] 2001, p. 125)

Jack's departure resulted in many troubles, the number of boys decreased and the rest of them could not maintain and fetch the fire for long time because most of the biguns had joined Jack's tribe. Ralph and Piggy were discussing the current situation where everything was going from bad to worse. They were preoccupied with being rescued by keeping the fire going. On the other side, Jack and his followers were having fun by hunting. At last, Ralph and Piggy reached a realization that Jack was the main reason for splitting the boys into two groups; those who wanted to be rescued led by Ralph and those who enjoyed hunting like savages following Jack. It could be seen that Jack was presented as the source of evil who led to the miserable situation they were in.

## 2.3.2 Implicit Cues

Implicit cues are not explicitly expressed and have to be inferred by the reader/ hearer. The next sections will focus on these aspects of texts to highlight some hidden information about the characters.

## 2.3.2.2 Conversational structure

This section deals with the structure of conversation between characters to highlight the power distribution among them. By doing so, some traits about their personalities will be uncovered. The checklist of Short (1996) will be adopted. Before applying the checklist of Short (1996) some notes have to be mentioned. First, the roles of speaking are governed by a rule; whoever holds the conch has the right to speak without being interrupted except by Ralph. Second, everyone has the right to speak if he has the conch. Third, the more powerful speaker should be Ralph, the one who was elected leader by most of the boys except the choir boys led by Jack.

First, Jack and his group of hunters went to have fun leaving Ralph and Simon working alone to build shelters on the beach.

> *Ralph* "…we want shelters. Besides, the rest of your hunters came back hours
> ago. They've been swimming."
> "I went on," said Jack. "I let them go. I had to go on. I—"
> *Ralph*, "You wouldn't care to help with the shelters, I suppose?"

"We want meat—"
"And we don't get it."
Now the antagonism was audible.
"But I shall! Next time! I've got to get a barb on this spear! We wounded a pig
and the spear fell out. If we could only make barbs—"
"We need shelters."
Suddenly Jack shouted in rage.
"Are you accusing—?"
"All I'm saying is we've worked dashed hard. That's all." (Golding, [1954]
2001, p. 42 my addition in italics)

This conversation revealed the type of leader Ralph was; he set priorities and participated in fulfilling them but the others were not subjected to his leadership. For instance, Jack and his group of hunters did what they liked paying no attention to the responsibilities they had. The conversation between Jack and Ralph seemed to be an argument rather than a discussion; they both interrupted each other, which was odd knowing the fact that Ralph was more powerful in terms of position and should be followed. Even though Jack was not cooperative with Ralph and did not follow his orders, he did not show any feeling of embarrassment or promised to take his responsibilities seriously.

Second, Jack and his tribe transformed into a group of savages with painted faces. Ralph, Piggy and the twins came to bring back Piggy's glasses and to remind Jack and his tribe of the signal fire which represented the hope to return home. Piggy's glasses were important because there was no other means to lit a fire other than the lenses of the glasses.

"You pinched Piggy's specs," said Ralph, breathlessly. "You've got to give
them back."
"Got to? Who says?"
Ralph's temper blazed out.
"I say! You voted for me for chief. Didn't you hear the conch? You played a
dirty trick—we'd have given you fire if you'd asked for it—"
The blood was flowing in his cheeks and the bunged-up eye throbbed.
"You could have had fire whenever you wanted. But you didn't. You came
sneaking up like a thief and stole Piggy's glasses!"
"Say that again!"
"Thief! Thief!
*Piggy,* "I got this to say. You're acting like a crowd of kids."
The booing rose and died again as Piggy lifted the white, magic shell.
"Which is better—to be a pack of painted Indians like you are, or to be sensible
like Ralph is?"
A great clamor rose among the savages. Piggy shouted again.

"Which is better—to have rules and agree, or to hunt and kill?" Again the
clamor and again— "Zup!"
Ralph shouted against the noise.
"Which is better, law and rescue, or hunting and breaking things up?" (Golding,
[1954] 2001, p. 162 my addition in italics)

From the above excerpt a great deal of information was shown. The conversation did not run smoothly; it was filled with interruption, and lacked the communicative value because the respond did not suit the speech of Ralph and Piggy. Moreover, there was no place for reason whatever Ralph and Piggy might have tried. What was surprisingly misunderstood by Ralph and Piggy was that Jack and his followers were no longer a group of civilized boys and could not be persuaded by reason and common sense values. Though Ralph's speech showed his rational personality but the power of his words had no effect and was devoid of authority. On the other hand, Jack was the legitimate chief by the current situation without the conch or voting since the new system went with the most savage and had nothing to do with the other qualifications.

## 2.3.2.3 (Im)Politeness

This section is devoted to pin down the super strategies of impoliteness proposed by Culpeper (1996) to highlight important information about the characters' personality. Table 1 will elucidate about the frequency of these strategies in Ralph's and Jack's speeches throughout the novel.

**Table1**: *Frequency of Impoliteness Strategies in Ralph's and Jack's discourses.*

| Super strategies | Ralph | Jack |
|---|---|---|
| 1) Bald on record Impoliteness. | 6 | 9 |
| 2) Positive Impoliteness | 13 | 22 |
|    a) Snub, ignore the other. | 2 | 4 |
|    b) Excluding others from an activity. | 1 | 2 |
|    c) Disassociation from the other. | | 1 |
|    d) Be disinterested, unsympathetic and unconcerned. | | 1 |
|    e) Use inappropriate identity markers. | | |
|    f) Seek disagreement. | 1 | 1 |
|    g) Make the other feel uncomfortable. | 1 | 5 |
|    h) Use taboo words. | 7 | 8 |
|    i) Call the other name. | 1 | |
| 3) Negative Impoliteness | 4 | 11 |
|    a) Frighten | | 2 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| b)  Condescend, scorn or ridicule. | 2 | 4 |
| c)  Invade the other's space. | | |
| d)  Explicitly associate the other with negative aspect | 2 | 2 |
| e)  Put the other's indebtedness on record. | | 3 |
| 4) Sarcasm or Mock Politeness. | | |
| 5) Withhold Impoliteness. | 3 | 2 |
| Total | 27 | 44 |

Table 1 shows that Jack used the strategies of impoliteness more than Ralph did, especially those of positive impoliteness that are aimed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. Jack's usage of impoliteness was clear evidence about his ill-natured and savage personality whereby no attention was paid to the others self-esteem and feelings. Ralph's usage of impoliteness strategies was not always aimed at damaging the others' faces; knowing that he was a leader, there might be impoliteness strategies spotted intended to keep order. It was also shown from the table above that there was no example of sarcasm or mock politeness. It might be due to the fact that all of the characters were boys aging from 6 years or less to 13 years and were not able yet to reformulate the language and initiate messages that serve their goals.

It is also important to note that more than one strategy has been detected in some examples where the explanation permits.   To crystalize these ideas some of the examples from the table will be selected as follows:

> Piggy leaned dangerously.
> "Careful! You'll break it—"
> "Shut up."
> Ralph spoke absently. (Golding, [1954] 2001, p. 9)

Ralph used bald on record impoliteness against Piggy whom he recently met, but the narratorial clue showed that the intention of Ralph was not to insult Piggy since his speech was produced absently. Even though it was an impolite behavior on the part of Ralph, his intention was not to insult or degenerate Piggy.

> "You're talking too much," said Jack Merridew. "Shut up, Fatty."
> Laughter arose. (Golding, [1954] 2001, p. 14)

Jack exploited a bald on record impoliteness strategy to directly cause offence to Piggy. The intention of Jack was obvious to insult Piggy in front of the other boys and laugh at him. At the same time, Jack's reply was aimed to make Piggy feel uncomfortable (positive impoliteness) by mocking his physical appearance in front of the other boys.

## 2.3.2.4 Lexis

The type of lexical items produced by characters reflects a great deal of information about them and shapes the readers' impression about their personalities. However, it is not an easy task to determine which lexical items are related to the personality of the character but, as Culpeper (2001, p.145) claims, everything the character says is taken to be very valuable and reflective. However, there are many textual cues that can be found in Ralph's speech to prove that he is preoccupied with the world of civilization and wants to be rescued. At the same time, there are many textual cues that confirm Jack's obsession with hunting and having fun by practicing savage rituals. To prove the abovementioned observations, Table 2 will include the most frequent keywords in Jack's and Ralph's discourses.

**Table 2**: *Frequency of Keywords in Jack's and Ralph's discourses.*

| Keywords | Ralph | Jack |
|---|---|---|
| *Fire* | 74 | 12 |
| *Rescue* | 23 | 2 |
| *Hunt* | 4 | 17 |
| *Hunting* | 5 | 13 |
| *Pig(s)* | 9 | 25 |

Table 2 shows that the most frequent keywords in Ralph's discourse are *'fire'* and *'rescue'* and the most frequent keywords in Jack's discourse are *'hunt, hunting'* and *'pig(s)'* . These keywords reflect the priorities and preferences set by each character where Ralph is more concerned with being rescued and getting back home whereas Jack is more obsessed with hunting pigs and having fun. The keyword *'fire'* represents the hope for the boys to be rescued so that Ralph always emphasizes the importance of maintaining the fire while for Jack fire is important to make feast and dance around it like in the savage rituals. The keywords *'hunt, hunting'* and *'pig(s)'* for Jack denote his life-style where he traces a pig-run, hunt it, kill it and make a feast.

One note worth mentioning is that the few occurrences of keywords in one character's speech in comparison with the other are sometimes used to denote disapproval and anger and not necessarily to share the same interests. For instance, Ralph's complaining about Jack's obsession with pigs "I was talking about smoke! Don't you want to be rescued? All you can talk about is pig, pig, pig!" (Golding, [1954] 2001, p. 45). And Jack's reaction towards the talk of fire and being rescued "Rescue?

Yes, of course! All the same, —" (Golding, [1954] 2001, p. 44) and "You and your fire!" (Golding, [1954] 2001, p. 44) to express his disinterest in such a talk.

## 2.3.3 Authorial Cues: Proper Names

The indication of the characters' names will be taken in consideration on this section.

- **Ralph**: the name is a Christian name. The name bearer is an English boy of around 12 years. It has no other clear indication which means that the story is about ordinary people in general. Though Ralph was elected leader, he was called just by his name till the end of the novel.

- **Jack Merridew**: it is also a Christian name for an English boy almost in the same age as Ralph. What is significant about Jack's name is his last name; he was the only one who carries a father's name. From the beginning, Jack demanded that the other boys should call him by his father name saying that the others' names are "Kids' names … Why should I be Jack? I'm Merridew." (Golding, [1954] 2001, p.14) which meant that Jack was a different character even in the smallest details. When Jack made his own tribe he was called "chief" by his followers and his name was associated with taboo and invisible danger for those who did not join his tribe.

## Conclusions

The model of Culpeper (2001) has been conducted and the conclusions reached are as follows:

1- Authorial cues: it was obvious from the proper names used in depicting the characters under analysis that Jack was somehow alienated from the other boys since he was the only one who had a father name.

2- Explicit cues: self-and-other-presentation examples show that Jack and Ralph are antithetical in many aspects. Jack presents himself as the leader because he can sing C sharp and hunt. He is comfortable with living in an isolated island, hunting pigs and dancing around fire with painted faces. He enjoyed practicing power over the others giving no chance for others to express their opinions or talk about anything related to the world of civilization. On the other hand, Ralph presents himself as the one who has common sense. He is a sensitive person who tries to defend others,

making rules to distribute the work among the boys and giving the chance to speak for everyone. He wants the boys to be civilized and not to be savages focusing on the chances that might make them be rescued like living by the beach and maintaining a signal fire.

3- Implicit cues: the implicit cues revealed the following:

- In conversation structure: by utilizing Short's (1996) checklist, it was found that the power distribution between Jack and Ralph was not easily distinguished; at some points Ralph was the most powerful speaker and at others Jack was the most powerful one. During the first chapters, Ralph was the elected leader who gave orders, though not necessarily fulfilled, and Jack was the one responsible for hunters. Though Ralph was higher in rank, Jack's actions remained wild disregarding Ralph's authority. After the talk of beast, Jack had made his own tribe and offered food and protection for those who would join him. At that time, Jack managed to persuade most of the boys to become his followers and eventually became the chief forcing others to cope with his savage life-style.

- (Im) politeness: after applying Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness, it was found that Jack used 44 impoliteness super strategies while Ralph exploited 27 super strategies. The results show that Jack is vulgar with others and tend to act with violence. He disregards other's feelings and humiliates the weak whenever he has the chance. On the other hand, most of Ralph's impolite behavior is intended to keep order. He criticizes others for being undisciplined and lazy. He persuades them to maintain the signal fire and abide by the rules of civilized people.

- Lexis: the most frequent words in Ralph's speeches are "fire "and "rescue" while Jack's frequent words are "hunt, hunting" and "pig(s)'. Those words represent the preferences and priorities set by each character. Ralph is preoccupied with being rescued by maintaining the fire which symbolizes the hope for them. On the other hand, Jack is obsessed with hunting pigs and making feasts which represents his savage life style.

To sum up, the application of Culpeper's (2001) model revealed that Jack and Ralph are antithetical in many aspects. Ralph is a rational civilized boy. His actions are governed by common sense values and the rules of the grown-ups. On the other hand, Jack is a savage brutal boy who is driven by his instincts like an animal. He pays no attention for others' feelings and enjoys torturing the weak ones.

# References

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness**.** *Journal of Pragmatics*, *25*(3), 349-367.

Culpeper, J. (2001). *Language and characterisation: people in plays and other texts*. Harlow: Longman Press.

Culpeper, J. V. & Fernandez Quintanilla, C. (2017). Fictional characterisation. In M. A. Locher, & A. H. Jucker (Eds.), *Pragmatics of Fiction* (Vol. 12, pp. 93-128). (Handbooks of Pragmatics; Vol. 12). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Eder, J., Jannidis, F. & Schneider, R. (2010).Characters in fictional worlds: an introduction. In J. Eder, F. Jannidis & R. Schneider (Eds.), *Characters in Fictional Worlds: Understanding Imaginary Beings in Literature, Film and Other Media* (pp. 3–64). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Emmott, C. (1997). *Narrative comprehension: A Discourse perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Golding, W. ([1954] 2001). *Lord of the Flies (e-book).* Available from http://www.penguinputnam.com

Kasof, J. (1993). Sex bias in the naming of stimulus persons. *Psychological Bulletin, 113* (1), 140-163.

Lakoff, R. T. (1989). The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, *8*(2-3), 101-130.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman Press.

Margolin, U. (1983). Characterization in narrative: Some theoretical prolegomena. *Neophilologus*, 67, 1-14.

McIntyre, D. (2014). Characterisation. In P. Stockwell & S. Whiteley (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Stylistics* (pp. 149-164). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peer, W.  (1988). *The Taming of the text: Explorations in language, literature, and culture*. London: Routledge.

Sanchez-Davies, J. (2017). *Understanding characters: a cognitive stylistics of the communication of experience* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)**.** University of Nottingham, England.

Semino, E. & Culpeper, J. (2002). *Cognitive stylistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. Harlow: Longman.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

West, D. (2016). *Cognitive stylistics.* In V. Sotirova, (Ed.), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Stylistics* (pp.109-21). London :Bloomsbury University Press.