

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

GOLDING'S THE PYRAMID: A STUDY OF CLASS HIERARCHY

**A thesis submitted to the Central Department of English, TU,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in English**

by

Tara Mani Rai

**Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu
May, 20th 2006**

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

APPROVAL LETTER

This thesis titled "Golding's *The Pyramid: A Study of Class Hierarchy*" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Tara Mani Rai has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of Research Committee:

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head,
Central Department of English

Date:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I sincerely express my heart-felt gratitude, inexpressible in words to Dr. Abdhesh Thakur, a lecturer of English at Central Department of English T.U. for his invaluable directions and scholarly guidance in preparing this research work.. It is under his guidance that the present work is resulted in this form. His persistent and untiring encouragement, time to time suggestions have brought this thesis into its completion.

I am equally gratitude to Prof. Chandra Prakash Sharma, the Department Chief at Central Department of English T.U. for his vital suggestion in preparing this research work. I am also grateful to Pro. Dr. Shreedhar Prasad Lohani, Prof. Dr. Abhi Subedi for their kind attention and valuable suggestions in the preparation of this reasearch work. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, a reader of English at Central Department of English T.U of his constant suggestion and encouragement.

I express my grattitude to my parents Shivahari Rai and Maina Devi Rai for providing me an opportunity to study Masters Degree by facing different problems. I acknowledge the constant and untiring efforts of my friends Divaker Regmi and Ananta Adhikari. I would like to give thanks to Xcel Computer and Language Centre, Chabahil for helping me in typing this research work.

May 2006

Tara Mani Rai
Central Department of English
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Abstract

William Golding in his novel *The Pyramid* explores the conflict prevailing in the English society as an outcome of class hierarchy. The title *The Pyramid* itself refers to the pyramid of social hierarchy. This is because of the economic status; the conflict goes on and on. The struggle occurs between upper and lower middle class. The characters like Bobby Ewan stands for upper middle class whereas the characters like Oliver stands for the lower middle class. There is the tug of war between these two representatives of two distinct classes. Each of them struggle for the existence. It is the essence of Golding's *The Pyramid*, which has been discussed in detail in this research with a number of critical opinions that claim Golding as the most socio- realist novelist.

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION: GOLDING AND HIS WORK	1
The Pyramid	3
Critics on the Novel	5
II. THEORETICAL APPROACH	9
Emergence of State and Class Society	9
Surplus-value and Contradiction	11
Estrangement Effect	14
III. GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OF MARXIST CRITICISM	15
Some Important Marxist Literary Theorists	19
IV. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS	33
Music and Sex: The Other Aspects	38
V. CONCLUSION	45
Works Cited	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: GOLDING AND HIS WORK

William Gerald Golding (September 19, 1911) was born in St. Columb Minor, a village near Newquary in Cornwall. His father was a school teacher and his mother took an active part in the women liberation movement.

Since he had precocious and romantic love of history, it led him at the age of seven to begin to learn hieroglyphics so that he could write a play about Ancient Egypt. After Marlborough Grammar School, he went to Brasenose College, Oxford University. For two years, in accordance with his parent's wishes, he read Natural Science, then switched with relief to English, discovering and rejoicing in Anglo-Saxon literature, which has continued to be important to him. Leaving Oxford the following year with a B.A. and a diploma in education, Golding began his career as a social worker, in his spare time writing, acting and producing for a small London theater.

Golding was married in 1939 to Ann Brookfield, an analytical chemist, and, bowing to family tradition, became a teacher of English and philosophy at Bishop Wordsworth's school in Salisbury. The following year, he joined in the Royal Navy. When Golding resumed his post at Bishop Wordsworth's school, he also began writing again, publishing some reviews and essays and completing several novels. Though he had written poems he earned fame through novels. His first novel *Lord of the Flies* was published in 1954. At first it earned only a mixed critical reaction but soon it became very popular. It came to be regarded as a work of art. Golding got Nobel prize for it. A full-length movie has also been made from it.

This highly successful first novel was followed the next year, 1955, by the *The Inheritors*.

Golding's second and favorite novel has a theme similar to *Lord of the Flies*. It is a rather esoteric account, written in a simple, direct prose, of prehistoric men who think and communicate with one another by means of visual images. Thematically, the book is a companion novel to *Lord of the Flies*, but its limited range of action and unusual subject are simply not to everyone's taste. As a result, the second novel lies virtually ignored compared to the swell of popularity enjoyed by *Lord of the Flies*, which has sold well over one million copies and has been made into a motion picture.

Golding's third novel, *Pincher Martin*, published in 1956, tells of a naval officer floating in the Atlantic Ocean after his ship has been struck by a torpedo. The officer washes up onto a barren rock, where he eventually loses his mind and dies.

In 1958, Golding completed a play, *Brass Butterfly*. The next year saw the publication of his fourth novel, *Free Fall*. Its protagonist, Samuel Mountjoy, is imprisoned by the Nazis and is awaiting torture in what is colloquially known in most prisons as "the black hole." Mountjoy dwells on the events of his past, much as Pincher Martin did in the watery wasteland of the Atlantic. Golding takes us inside the minds of his solitary characters by way of the literary techniques known as the interior monologue. In 1964, Golding published *The Spire*, whose protagonist, the dean of a cathedral, devotes himself to the erection of a great spire, which is criticized by others as a folly. This was followed by *The Hot Gates and Other Occasional Pieces*.

The Scorpion God, which appeared in 1971, is a collection of three long stories, each set in a totally different historical period (ancient Egypt, prehistory and the Roman Empire). Golding's seventh full-length novel, *Darkness Visible*, published in 1979, deals with the subject of entropy – a theory that deals with the tendency of the universe moving toward increasing disorder.

His other novels are *Rites of Passage*(1980), *The Paperman*(1984), *Close Quarters*(1987), and *Fire Down Below*(1989). Short stories by him are *Miss Pulkinhern* (1960), *The Anglo Saxon*(1970) and plays chronological *The Brass Butterfly*(1958), *Break My Heart*(1962).

The Pyramid

The focus in Golding's *The Pyramid* is to show the class conflict inherent to society. The novel itself moves around three prime questions: Question of hierarchy, morality and music. Class conflict is very powerful in this novel. This novel describes Golding's strong hatred of the evil of social class. *The Pyramid* refers to the pyramid of social hierarchy. Bobby Ewan represents the upper middle class and Oliver Ewan represents the lower middle class. They are the main characters of the novel. The conflict between the two is for Evie Babecombe. Bobby Ewan is a doctor's son and he is very proud of it. He calls Oliver a 'slave'.

The Pyramid is not an elaborately structured book. There are certain connections of character and scene between them but the three episodes are neither tightly linked nor obviously 'programmatic'. Reading the earlier novels and knowing something of the author's concerns may be a necessary preparation before it appears anything more than a genial, low-keyed, realistic novel of life in a small town in thirties. Golding's the main concerns, however, are still all there, the concluding ironies as profound and challenging as before, yet they are completely integrated into the structure, tone and setting of the book, and in no way imposed upon it arbitrarily. It is as if 'myth' has been almost entirely incorporated in history' and truths of myth offered us from a basis of social realism.

Change and stasis, are at the centre of *The Pyramid*, the only novel Golding published during his social career. Although the books show the reader a town, which celebrates stasis, the text itself has undergone considerable changes of its own. The text contains three episodes. These episodes are distinct, yet considerable continuity is provided by the same

character's appearance throughout all the sections and, in particular, by Oliver, the book's first person narrator. Bounce Dawhish and Henry Williams are the other principal characters of the novel. Oliver plays the vital role through out the novel. He is character as well as the narrator.

The first section places the young Oliver in the small, stiflingly claustrophobic English town of Stillbourne. Many English place names do indeed end in 'bourne' but rarely with such neat metaphorical applicability as occurs in *The Pyramid*. In the same place is almost certainly Marlborough where Golding-lived during his own childhood and adolescence, just as Barchester in *The Spire* is recognizably, Salisbury, where Golding also lived for many years. The novel's first section is the clear example of the social snobbery. From the beginning of the book, we can see the conflict between two main characters: Oliver and Bobby Ewan.

A pyramid is an image for representing a class structure. This pyramid is *The Pyramid* of social class. Oliver's father is Stilbourne's chemist, and the family occupies an uneasy and never quite defined position within the social hierarchy. In the novel, the two boys desire for the same object, Evie Babbacombe. Although Oliver, Bobby Ewan and Evie Babbacombe are from different positions within the social pyramid, they do not neatly represent the lower, middle and upper classes. But the conflict between two boys can be seen due to their social hierarchy, the one between the upper and lower middle classes.

Critics on the Novel: The Pyramid

The following review of literature will show that *The Pyramid* is one of the remarkable novels based on social class as well as class conflict. This short review will help us understand the novel clearly by the different commentaries on Golding's work.

The title "*The Pyramid*" has traditional image for representing a class structure. It consists of three long short episodes. Two of the three sections, which comprise the book, appeared separately in different publications: the first was published in the *Escarpment in the Kenyan Review* (June 1967). *The Pyramid* indeed is very far being the work of a pessimist or cynic, and it is perhaps significant that Golding dedicates it for his son David. But in this novel the conflict between upper and lower class remains Golding's great theme. The novel reflects his experiences in the theater after he left Oxford.

This review provides a general bird's eye view of the novel because it selectively records and analytically summarizes the earliest reactions, the development in critical perspective in the course of time, and also the most recent responses to a particular theme. The brief history of Golding criticism suggests that instant judgments are highly fallible and they always have been. *The Pyramid*, for instance, was regarded as an almost naively simple, transparently 'easy' novel by some of its first readers. But subsequent commentators such as Auril Henry and David Skilton have persuasively demonstrated its elaborateness and subtlety.

Kevin MC Carron says that change and stasis are at the centre of *The Pyramid*, the only novel Golding published during this phase of his career. He says:

A pyramid is a traditional image for representing a class structure, and *The Pyramid* is clearly a novel about social class. Whereas most of not all of Golding's novels express a single imagination and a single literary intention of a kind not usual in modern writing. *The Pyramid* discerningly broke the pattern of common allegorical (or fabulous or mythical) form and turned out to be a low keyed realistic novel of growing up in a small town the sort of book H. G wells might have written if he had been more attentive to his style.(30)

Peter Kemp commenting on William Golding's work says, "*The Pyramid* offers an unusual mix of blur and precision, novelette's cliché and imaginative power"(375). Edward

Albert writes, "*The Pyramid* is the novel, which includes the theme of ancient Egypt and it deals with man's instinct to destroy what is good. Evil is apparent everywhere and the good is almost impossible to achieve" (25).

The Pyramid won high praise from Marxist Seymour-Smith who called it "a subtle and complex work and Golding's finest novel so far... Golding is without doubt a master, now perfecting his own way of coping with reality" (30). While suggesting that the story is deceptively ordinary and plot-less but contains hidden depths, he seems to experience a sense of relief that Golding is giving his readers a more traditional and accessible kind of novel. Another reviewer, Fredrick R. Karl says:

The *Pyramid* is set in the thirties in a Barsetshire village, the world of Golding's childhood and the social background is fully sketched, the dreadful English scheme of things at the time a scheme accepted social snobbery as to elevate it to an instinct (24).

As he describes that *The Pyramid* reflects the childhood of Golding and the social background he was brought up. Social snobbery too seems to be surfaced at the front.

R.J Rees makes comment "There is something almost Dickinson about the characters and the book has a strong comic element. Anyone who thinks of Golding, as a gloomy and apocalyptic writer should certainly read it as more than an account of pessimism" (73). John Wakemen opines, "In fact, it is an allegory, a subtle but very complex one resuming the themes of freewill and the conflict between science and art, an attempt to trace always defects of society back to the defects of human nature" (569).

Another reviewer, Andrew Sandres says:

Golding's *The Pyramid* (1967) was followed by that what appeared to be an abstention from fiction an abstention broke in 1979 by *Darkness Visible*. All Golding's opening scenes, suggestions and sentences are disconcertingly striking. None is more so than that of *Darkness Visible*, a compelling evocation of intense fire storm in the London blitz out of which walks a fearfully burned hold. (597-98)

This is the way Andrew minutely Judges Golding's opening scenes, suggestions and sentences as striking ones. He drags the darkness visibility of London.

David Daiches remarks, "*The Pyramid* chronicles the human cost of a sterile contain tortured moral vision. According to Virginia Tiger, "*The Pyramid* is such a book which shows the men's heart meanness" (15).

Philip Redpath says, "*The Pyramid* chronicles the human cost of a sterile Bourgeois society. It shows the class struggle between upper middle class and middle lower class"(210). M.C Carron in this reference says and comments upon the characters of novel:

Although Evie, Oliver and Bobby are all from different position within the social pyramid, they do not neatly represent the lower, middle and upper classes. Within *The Pyramid*, the social differences between the two boys symbolize perhaps the most bitterly disputed demarcation line within the English class system, the one between the upper and the lower middle class. (30-31)

S.J. Boyd says, "Golding's later novels, especially *The Pyramid* makes abundantly clear his deep bitterness act and hatred of the evils of class" (10).

Thus, in *The Pyramid*, William Golding wants to portray the human nature and he comments upon human being and he attacks those who are influenced by social snobbery.

William Golding is able to emphasize the brutally destructive effects of English system.

Besides the factors like evils, moral evils he has succeeded to show class hierarchy inherent to the society.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL APPROACH

Emergence of the state and class society

In the primitive phase of social evolution, the epoch of barbarians, people lived in small kinship groups working together for their common necessities. There was no class division, no exploitation and no need of state. Later the production in all branches increased and a tendency to produce more than to be consumed grew. There was nothing like state, class and exploitation: an age often termed as a Primitive Communism'. "There was no state, no special apparatus for the systematic application of forces and the subjugation of people by force" says Lenin (State 6).

With the increase of production in all branches, human labor produced more than they consumed and this led to the necessity of new labor forces for which slaves were kept as their disposal. So the earliest known class society can be seen in this master-slave relation that developed. Fredric Angel's summing-up in this regard is as follows:

With its increase of the productivity of labor and therefore of its wealth and its extension of all field of production was bound in all general historical condition prevailing to bring slavery in its train. From the first social division of a labor arose the first great cleavage of society in to two classes: Masters and slaves, exploiters and exploited. (194)

And by this division of society into the classes of exploiters and exploited, the society has entangled into an insoluble contradiction within itself that it has split into irreconcilable opposite which it is powerless to exorcise. Slave-owners and Slaves- this was the first important class division. The former group not only owned all the means of production, the land and the implements, but also owned people. State had to play a role to manage and

maintain the affairs and hold class antagonism in check. But ironically it became an apparatus for them to manipulate the production mechanism and to help coerce the exploited class.

During early slavery system, the state defended the slave-owners who were only recognized as the citizens with full right. Slaves were not regarded as human beings. Roman law regarded them as 'chattels' which meant movable property owned by particular owner. Even since the advent of class society, the exploitation has been constant, only its form changed. Marx and Lenin write in *Manifesto of Communism*:

The history of hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another carried on a uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or in common ruin of the contending class.(32)

Thus with but the change in form, the society continued to be more and more conspicuously divided into exploiters and exploited. In the place of slave owners the feudal lords began to exploit the overwhelming majority of peasant serfs. Later, with the development of trade, the world market and money circulation, a new class arose out of the debris of feudal society, i.e. the capitalist class. Lenin maintains it in *state*:

The owners of capital, the owners of land, the owners of mills and factories in all the capitalist countries constituted and still constitutes an insignificant minority of the population who have complete command over the labor of the whole people, and consequently command, oppress and exploit the whole mass of laborers, the majority of whom are proletarian wage workers who procure their livelihood in the process of production only by the safe of their own workers hands, their labor power.(9)

A small aristocratic population of landlords, factory owners and tycoons are continuing with the hated legacy of medieval feudal lords in the existing social system of today. They determine the worker's wage, affect the judiciary of nation, interfere in the police of government and sit pretty on the carefully manipulated situation. We can notice different scales of capitalist maneuver from local to global level. The instance of global level maneuver is the free market slogans desperately being hoisted by the technically advanced countries, process of economic globalization and offer of WB loans as a Hosbon's choice to poor countries. The major bulwarks of this system in global level are America, Britain and their entire energy to curb the proletarian's rebellion escalating in various parts of the world and the frantic governments of the enslaved countries of Asia and Africa are prostrating to those superpowers.

Surplus-value and contradiction

So appropriation of the value of working people is the sole supporting base for capitalism to thrive. The value of labor power is determined by the amount of labor necessary for its production or in another word, by the amount needed for the workers to subsist. But in the hand of capitalist, the labor power employed in the course of the day produces more than they require for sustenance. The difference between the two values is appropriated by the capitalist. Angels writes in an introduction to Marx's Wage Labor and capital:

In our present day capitalist society, labor power is a commodity, a commodity like any other, and yet a peculiar commodity. It has namely a peculiar property of being a value creating power, a source of value, and, indeed, with suitable treatment a source of more value than it itself possesses. With the present state production, human labor not only produces in one day a greater value than it itself possesses and costs. With every new scientific discovery, with every new technical invention, this surplus of its daily product over its daily costs

increases, and therefore the portion of labor day in which the worker works to produce the replacement of his day's wage decreases: consequently, on the other hand, that portion of the labor day in which he has to a present of his labor to the capitalist without being paid for it increases.(148)

Howsoever, sophisticated and systematic, capitalist society can't last permanently. Its collapse is inevitable because this very paradigm bears the seed of collapse that is 'contradiction'. A majority of social members who are involved directly in the production process are disinherited from their rightful claim of profit share. A handful of overfed capitalists, who don't work appropriate an overwhelming amount of profit as surplus-value. The workers, the real claimants, are provided minimum possible of wage that keeps them from dying. But the mass working class majority under a heap of ideology can't understand this at least consciously because the entire system of education and culture is so contrived as to save the illusion. Honest work is emphasized as a way to salvation from depravity. This kind of toxic ideology is imposed through religion and philosophy so as to paralyze their spirit of questioning. Vulgarity of all kinds is let loose in the name of freedom so as to deviate common mind from revolution. Hence, the avarice of capitalism is responsible for various complicated angst and ills of modern working men.

One way or the other in his individual and social behavior, this angst is manifest. Of course, it has been variously contrived or wrongly interpreted as insanity, hedonism, buffoonery and various kinds of deviation. The values produced by the workers being appropriated by the owners of the means of production will bring about slow and sure irreconcilable cavity between the "haves and have-nots." This increasing cavity bears the seed of revolution. Two basic classes, around which other sub-classes are grouped, are opposed to each other in a capitalist system, the owners of the mean of production will bring about slow and sure irreconcilable cavity between the "haves and have-nots. Necessity and utilities, the

two conditions for producing and marketing of the goods is never being considered. Marx's criticism of capitalism is not focused on workers exploitation in the main; he saw free oligarchy of capitalist of capitalism in society itself. The anarchy of production in the long run causes an appalling antagonism between the two classes. F. Engels says in this way about contradiction in *Anti-Duhring*:

The contradiction between social production and capitalist appropriation reproduces as the antagonism between the organization of production in the individual factory and the anarchy of production in the society as a whole.(307)

As "the production dominates the producer", things start to fall apart in a capitalist society. So the capitalist system has in itself a fatal danger that boomerangs on itself finally. In communist Manifesto, Marx and Fredric Engels say, "The development of modern industries, therefore cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletarians are equally inevitable" (*Manifesto 19*).

Estrangement Effect

The state of affair that defines workers as proletariats is victimization of estrangement effect. It refers to the world created by reduction of a worker's right to this production. The estrangement of a worker from his production in the form of commodity leads to a problem in his relation to other human beings and nature both, for Marx is that man does not experience himself as an active agent in his grasp of the world, but that the world remain strange to him. It is essentially an instance of experiencing the world and oneself passively, respectively as the subject separated from the object. This phenomenon is in society and especially where workers are exploited by non-workers, but capitalists have liked to explain the fact away merely as a consequences of increasing rationalization and specialization of life process.

CHAPTER III

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OF MARXIST CRITICISM

Since class hierarchy is closer term to Marxist criticism and this research paper is undergoing Marxist point of view, it will be prevalent to give a survey of Marxist literary theory.

Marxist criticism, in its diverse forms, grounds, its theory of economic and cultural theory of Karl Marx (1818-1883) and his fellow thinker Fredrich Engles (1820-1895) on the three main points. The first is: the "material production" of the society largely determines the evolving history of humanity, of the social relations, of its institution, and of its ways of thinking or its overall economic organization. Second, historical changes in the social class structure, establishing in each era dominate and subordinate classes that engage in a struggle for economic, political and social advantages. Third claim is that human consciousness is constituted by an ideology, the belief, values and ways of thinking and feeling through which human beings perceive and recourse to which they explain what they take to be reality. An ideology is the product of the position and interest of the particular class. In any historical era, the dominant ideology embodies and serves to legitimize and perpetuate, the interest of the dominant economy and social class of the time.

Karl Marx was the most advanced economic, sociologist and supreme ideologist who formulated the most revolutionary and scientific theory. His theories disprove the bourgeois economic, political and social system establishing the philosophy of proletariat, i.e. the movement of those who do not furnish material things but work, against those who possesses the abounding amount of wealth without labor. This emancipatory movement initiated by Marxism at abolishing the concentration of wealth in the hands of tiny minority by seizing the political and legal power from the hands of bourgeois class. Marxism as a political theory

advocates class struggle of the proletariat against the ruling struggle until the political power is seized and socialist emancipatory society is established. This brought a significant change in bourgeois ideology. It challenged the old viewpoint of philosophy itself. Marx himself stated clearly that philosophies have only interpreted the world in various ways: The point is to change it, explained life and world from a quite different perspective, this theory aims at intensifying the inevitable problem of change brought considerable change in the concept of art and literature as well.

Literature, from a Marxist point of view is treated as the reflection of the socio-economic life. When we talk of the socio-economic life of a society, we can find distinct classes in struggle for the economic political as well as social advantages and 'a history is series of class struggle between the classes' (Communist Manifesto).

Although Marx and Engels have not left any systematic works entirely centered on art and literature, they have raised some basic questions about them to their discussion about "base" and "Superstructure." So, the interpretation of the relevance of Marx's theory to literature is a matter of dispute not merely between Marxists and non-Marxists [Sociologist literature critics, philosophers] but has been and still the subject is bitter controversy between these claiming to be Marxists"(slaughter 21). Therefore, we find contrary views about art and literature put all efforts and bringing newness in theoretical production. Even so they all agree on the point that "literature can be properly understood within a framework of social reality (Forgacs 167).

Marxist criticism examines how far a literary work embodies ability in altering human existence and leads it in the path of progress, prosperity and emancipation. Marxism, aims of revolutionizing the whole socio-economic life establishing new political system led by proletariat. Orthodox Marxist literary theory strongly insists that a work of literature should reflect the class relations and be committed to the cause of working class. A writer's success

or failure should be judged on the basis of his works which exhibit his insight of the socio-economic situation of the era. It demands the authors to produce reality objectively with special attention to class divisions, the exploitation of the lower class by the upper class. So, literature instead of rendering outward superficial appearance of reality, should explore the inner cause. But it is not so easy task. In order to capture reality, successfully, an author needs to have deep intellectual power and penetrating vision of the historical forces of the period. Outward, superficial depiction of the things like that of naturalism and modernism which bracket off all the inner causes can never lead to reality. Literature, for Marxist critics, should be an auxiliary in spreading ideology of working class.

Marxist literary criticism analyses literature in terms of the historical conditions which produce it ; and it needs, similar to be aware of its own historical outside it. As a matter of fact, it was quite safe and rather conventional to treat literary works as something referring to a reality outside them. For Marx, the external reality is prior to ideas in the mind, and that the material world is reflected in the mind of man and translated into forms of thought.

According to Rene Wellek, the most influential critic of the 20th century, refuses to recognize any of the new trends in criticism as aboriginal. He observes that much of the criticism written today cannot be accepted as he writes, “we are surrounded by survivals, leftover throwbacks to older stages in the history of criticism.” In the same essay, he argues that the new trends of criticism, of course have also roots in the past, are not without antecedents, and are not absolute original (Wellek 115). According to Wellek in the beginning Marxist criticism was rather unorthodox. Frans Mehring (1846-1916) and George Plekhov (1856-1918) from Germany and Russia respectively were early less Orthodox Marxist critics who recognized the autonomy of artistic creation of certain extent. As Wellek states:

They were very much unorthodox from the point of view of later soviet dogma. Both Mehring and Plekhnov recognized a certain autonomy of art and think of Marxist criticism rather as an objective science of the social determinates of a literary work than as a doctrine which decides aesthetic question and prescribe subject matter and style to author. (wellek 115)

Wellek discusses about the development of Marxist theories and states that even in Soviet Russian Literature was given certain autonomy till the "socialist Realism" was imposed in 1932, and the authors were demanded to reproduce reality objectively i.e. accurately "Socialist Realism" not only prescribed the recipe but also asked the authors to be socialist realist. Literature was directly intervened in accordance with political interest. The writers were openly demanded to use their art for spreading socialism.

Ramon Seldon, on his discussion about "Soviet Socialist Realism" states that "the doctrine expounded by the union of Soviet Writers (1932-34) were a codification of Lenin's pre-revolutionary statements as interpreted during the 1920 (Seldon27).

Soviet intellectual literary scenario was highly dominated by linguistic and literary theory known as Russian Formalism immediately before and after October Revolution. As stated by David Lodge:

The focus of Russian formalist upon the medium rather than the message of literary artifacts brought it into conflict with the official ideology of the post Revolutionary Russia and under Stalin it was suppressed. Most of its exponents were silenced, or forced into exile. (Lodge 15-16)

Professor Seldon is of the view that the theory of art and literature propounded by Soviet Socialist writers against formalist theories was found upon the nineteenth century tradition of Russian Realism. So it was not aboriginal. He explicitly states that, "The

combination of nineteenth century aesthetics and revolutionary politics remained the essential recipe of Soviet theory" (Seldon27).

After the success of Russian Revolution Marxism drew much attraction in politics. It spreads not only in Asia but also in Europe and America. According to Wellek, American intellectual activities were much influenced by Marxism during 1930s. Gramille Hicks and Bernard Smith were too early Marxist critics from America. Similarly, Edmund Wilson and Kenneth Burke were Marxist for certain period of their development. Later especially after Second World War, Marxist political as well as intellectual activities were much discouraged in American and they gradually fell in shadow. However, some activities on Marxism are still going on with various perspectives.

Some Important Marxist Literary Theorists

Theodor Adorno, Marx Herkheimer, and Herbert Marcuse belong to Frankfurt School. The Negative Knowledge model, in Marxists theories, was developed by Theoder Adorno. Lukacs was strong anti-modernist as well as anti-naturalist. Adorno criticizes Lukacs for appreciating only the dialectical totality in a classical realist work and criticizes the formal laws of literature and argues that the reality in the real world is formless.

The negative knowledge model argues that Proust and Joyce make use of the interior monologue to expose the way reality is. Interior monologue or stream of consciousness as literary technique was much criticized by Lukacs. But Adorno emphasizes that "The Interior monologue, far from cutting the literary work off from, reality can expose the way reality actually is" (Forgace 188). However, according to David Forgaces, Adorno by negative knowledge "doesn't mean non-knowledge. It means knowledge which can undermine and negate a false or reified condition" (Fargacs 189). Adorno says that literary work does not give us neatly shaped reflection and knowledge of reality but works within reality to expose its contradictions. As stated by Forgacs, Adorno "opens up modernist writing to Marxist

theory by showing that a different kind of relationship between the text and reality is possible" (Forgacs 190).

Seldon observes that in contrary to the soviet socialist realists or Lukacs who totally rejects the modernist writing and refuses to recognize the writers like Joyce, Beckett etc. as writers and their works as literary work. Adorno is of the opinion that art and reality are not alike. Inverting the reflection theory of Lukacs he claims that "art is set apart from reality; its detachment gives it its special significance and power." (Seldon 34). Seldon observing the theory of Adorno in contemporary literary theory states that for Adorno "literary unlike the mind doesn't have a direct contact with reality." (Seldon 34). So, Adorno gives implicit value to the works of Proust, Kafka, Beckett, and Joyce then Lukacs.

Raymond Williams is a dominant Marxist literary theoretician. Though he doesn't believe in structuralist and post-structuralist theories, he positively responds to the late 20th century development in art and literature. He does not approve the general concept that realist novels have seized to exist and literature has made departure from reality. In his penetrating work, "The long Revolution", Williams examines the various aspects of literature.

As Williams believes in art affinity to reality, he disproves the idea that any art activity is purely creative or an artist creates something entirely new. To explore the question of authenticity of his creativity he traces the discussion back to ancient time and examines how Plato and Aristotle had treated fellow are either art as imitation. In his opinion, all theoretical development at that "Modification", "transvaluations", "developments" or "interpretation" of the ideas set forth by these ancient philosophers. Different theories of imitation and creation have brought into effect in order to explore the relation between art and reality." Of course; there are many others who hold similar view. In the contrary, art has been denounced as false, fictitious, romantic, illusion, emotional irrational etc. They think that

it is fantasy not inspiration that works in creation of art, whereas there is some who claim that material for art is ordinary every day reality.

Williams again and again insists that art like another communication is social activity and it can't be set apart from reality. It is obviously a part of social organization. Further, he agrees that is fatally wrong to:

Assume that political institution and conventions are of a different and separate order from artistic institution and conventions. Politics and art together with separate order from artistic institution and conventions. Politics and art together with science, religion, family life and the other categories we speak of as absolutes, belong in a whole world of active and interacting relationships, which is our common associative life. (Williams 39)

Each activity should be studied in relation to the whole, the abstraction results in suffering. For Williams, "it is not that the realist tradition has disappeared in the modern fiction but what has actually disappeared is the integration between individuals and society and the detailed description of the physical circumstance in favor of rendering impression. There has been polarization of styles. The earlier novels were objective realist and the moderns are subject impressionist i.e. the personal and social novel. According to him a social novel generally offers the accurate observation and description of the general life, the aggregation; just the contrary, the personal novels offer the "accurate observation and description of personal units" however, none of them are perfect portrayal of reality i.e. life as "the way of life is neither aggregation nor unit but a whole invisible." (Williams 280). Contemporary novelists are not about to apprehend the reality that personal experience is formed on the background of general way of life, as each individual is a unit of society. Their attempt to separate an individual from the society neglecting the impacts of socio-economic as well as political situation on him is erroneous.

Williams divides art into three categories as representational i.e. the one that represents reality I realistic as the second that represents reality "modified by the artists subjective emotional reaction to it" and offers reality in organized, idealized, caricatured from the artist personal vision, and the third naturalistic which directly expresses purely aesthetic experience, his artistic vision, and the realistic is the one Williams values. As he thinks that no human experience is entirely subjective or objective. It is both because we can't see things as they are apart from any reaction, it is inseparable process so it is wrong to relate science to object or physical reality and art to subject "...the conscience is part of reality in the part of consciousness in the whole process of our living organization" (Williams 23). There has been another shift to technique and subject in the 20th century. It is generally thought that realist novels have ceased to appear; however, Williams doesn't agree with it and insists that the contemporary novels still hold to reality. As he says:

It is not only that there is still a concentration contemporary theme; in many ways elements of everyday experience are more evident in the modern novel than in the 19th century novel through the disappearance of certain taboos. (Williams 277)

Lucian Goldmann, born in Rumania and resided in France, is recognized as an influenced socialist and critic. He builds up his theoretical promise on the ground that a society comprises of different classes of people, ranging from the reactionary to the revolutionary; all having their own world out-look. David Forgacs discusses Goldman's theory and genetic model as "it is centered on the origins, caused and determines." [Forgacs 183] of literary production. According to him, Goldmann is of the opinion that literary works are not the expression of "the author's self but of the social class of which the author is member." (Forgacs 184). In some way, they are the collective products. He believes that

language is only a medium of expressing worldview of his class, which is already in existence.

Marx and Angles were of the view that the struggle between the bourgeois and proletariat engendered by the capital labor relation may change the economic and social being of the proletariat and create solution for changed consciousness. Goldmann emphasized the close relation between 'base' and 'superstructure'. "According to which literary structures simply correspond to economic structure." (Seldon 39). He entirely rejects the view point that claims literature having been created by "the individuals of specific gift."

Cliff Slaughter's Marxism ideology and literature is quite a valuable work for the study of Marxist literary theories. The book presents a long discussion about Goldman's theory of literature. In this essay, The Hidden structure. Goldmann, Slaughter argue that Goldmann shares nearly similar ideas to Lukacs on certain fundamental question about literature. According to him, they came to the same conclusion about the question "of the social, economic and political," Slaughter further states that in Goldmann's opinion.

The structure of the world vision of a social group was postulated as homologous with the structure of the universe of given literary works. The social groups whose life situation and historical role necessitated a comprehensive vision would normally be found to be social classes. The form of the literary work would be structured in a manner congruent with the relations between whole and part, history and function etc. in world vision of classes were not conceived as Fraud, but rather in a constant process of destruction and restructuration as the social group found if necessary to comfort and adopt to or overcome the new problems constantly thrown up by social life [Slaughter 154] Goldmannn argues that the creator of a work is the social class itself. In the Hidden God. Goldmann observes that "...in the modern world form the 17th century onwards artistic, literary and philosophical works have been associated with social classes and closely linked with the consciousness which each has

itself" [Slaughter 155]. Thus, for Goldmann precise knowledge of the classes and class is highly essential for the proper interpretation of literary works written mainly after 18th century.

Describing the feature of realistic novels, he observes that the 19th century tradition of realistic novel is replaced by psychological novels and the apprehension erosion of psychological states, the consciousness of characters, has been its fundamental characteristic. As it is already stated that he doesn't think that the new trend has completely abandoned the association to reality. He observes that "...realism as an international in the description of these states [i.e. psychological states], has not been widely abandoned" (Williams 277).

Walter Benjamin was a free thinker. He was primarily a literary critic than a Marxist; therefore, he was not pre-occupied by Marxist theories of economic, social or philosopher. However; Cliff Slaughter, he got "convinced that the proletarian revolution was the only solution to humanity's crisis, and yet he found the communist parties' prescriptions to writers and artist to be a very opposite of revolutionary and thus destructive of any development in literature and art.: (Slaughter 170). As a result he was treated with hostility by the communist as well as by Nazis and he lived in isolation until he committed suicide in Sep. 1940. Slaughter in Marxism, ideology and literature discusses Benjamin's theory under quite an appropriate title "Against the stream: Walter Benjamin. Discussing his concept about art and literature Slaughter states" Benjamin directed his polemical writings against all those who drew from Marx's prognoses only the conclusion that writers should take the side of working class in conceiving their subject matter, demonstrating some automatic progressiveness of the productive forces which must be victorious against the production relations. To imagine that a commonsense adoption of "progressive" themes within existing literary forms constitutes a revolutionary line in art and literature was considered by Benjamin to be a pure nonsense" (Slaughter 174).

Benjamin argues to resist the influence of bourgeois art such as cinema, telephone, radio; TV etc revolutionary have to "become producer in their own artistic sphere." (Seldon 37). Seldon says that Benjamin "rejects the idea that revolutionary art is achieved by attending to the correct subject-matter." (Seldon 37) Benjamin is of the opinion that revolution in art can be achieved by revolutionizing the "technique" itself. He emphasizes, "the artist needs to revolutionize the artistic forces of production of his time and this is the matter of technique. Nevertheless, the correct technique will arise in response to the complex historical combination of social and technical changes." (Seldon 37). He did not agree with the cultural policies of the communist parties as he rigorously opposed politicizing of art. He believed that it was not sufficient to appropriate the conquests of the art and literature of the part.

George Lukacs, who is the most significant and influential Marxist literary critic in the 20th century, born in Budapest, Hungary on 13th April 1885, was of bourgeois origin. In his early life, he was attracted to revolutionary activities. He joined a student's club named Revolutionary Socialist Student of Budapest, which inaugurated his life long Marxist political and intellectual career when he was student. He read several books of Marx and Engle's and was deeply impressed by the economic and political principle of Marxism. He studied the Marxist ideology. He read Marx's capital and communist Manifesto with youthful enthusiasm. Lukacs early hatred of capitalism was strengthened by his association to the revolutionary youths in Budapest and the reading of Marx and Engles as well. He rejected his father's financial business to devote himself to the political and intellectual activities. He was interested to read the works of a number of writers Hungarian French, German, English etc and to analytical study to literature. He wrote many critical books as well as theoretical ones.

The Bolsheviks seized power in Russia in October 1917, under the leadership of Lenin and established the government of the proletariat for the first time in the world history. Lukacs who was observing keenly the Russian revolutionary movement was greatly inspired

by its success soon, he joined the "communist party of Hungary" established on November 16, 1918 and devoted himself in the revolutionary activities. The Hungarian Soviet Republic was established in the following year, and Lukacs was also included in the new government. Later the "Communist party and social Democracy party" were merged and the "Hungarian socialist party" was formed. But the union between the revolutionaries and bourgeois could not work at all. On 1st August 1919 the communist party was banned in September, because of the growing pressure on the communist activities, Lukacs left Hungary for Vienna. Between the years 1920-21, he became the editor of "Communisms" a radical left review published their in. He was being quite frustrated from the politics and decided to engage himself in theoretical works. Despite his active politician life, Lukacs is better known as a Marxist literary theoreticians than a politician.

Lukacs' major argument in his work is that literature reflects reality outside it. Lukacs believed in "reflection theory." Lukacs who received the full thrust of Aristotelian concept of mimesis. The class struggle as already known within the term of Marxist theory. This story refers to how reality appears belong with the class conflict in various levels.

A leading theorist of Marxist criticism in England is Terry Eagleton. Eagleton has expanded and elaborated the concepts of Althusser and Macherey in his view a literary text is a special kind of production in which ideological discourse described as any system of mental representations of lived experience is reworked into a specifically literary discourse.

Ramon selden in his book, *literary Theory* observes Eagletons' view that:

Like Althusser criticism must break with its ideological prehistory and became a 'science'. The central problem is to define the relationship between literature and ideology. Because in his view texts do not reflect historical reality but rather work upon ideology to produce an 'effect' of the real. (42)

Hence, Eagleton means that the text may appear to be free in its relation to reality, but it is not free in its use of ideology here refers not to conscious political doctrines but to all those systems of representation which shape the individual's mental picture of lived experience.

In *Marxism and Literary Criticism* Eagleton writes:

Ideology is not in the first place a set of doctrines, it signifies the way men live out their roles in class. Society the values, ideas and images which tie them to their social functions and so prevent them from a true knowledge of society as a whole. (15)

Here, he means that any work of art should show a man making sense of his experience in ways that prohibit a true understanding of his society, ways that are consequently false.

Eagleton rejects Althusser's view that literature can distance itself from ideology; it is a complex reworking of already existing ideological discourses. As he writes:

In any society ideology has a certain structural coherence. Because it possesses such relative coherence [...] and since literary texts 'belong' to ideology, they too can be the object of such scientific analysis. A scientific criticism would seek to explain the literary work in terms of the ideological structure of which it is part, yet, which it transforms in its art; it would serrate out the principle which both ties the work to ideology and distances it from it (18).

Eagleton means that literature and ideology both are the object of scientific interpretation. Because science gives us conceptual knowledge of a situation; where as art gives us the experience of that situation, which is equivalent to ideology.

He argues that such attempts to disengage art and culture from socio-economic determinants lead them to unprivileged humble position. Art becomes nothing more than

production of any other commodity. Regarding the anti-representationalistic nature of modern and post modern art, Eagleton views:

If art no longer reflects, it is not because it seeks to change the world rather than mimic it, but because there is in truth nothing there to be reflected, no reality which is not itself already image, spectacle, simulacrum gratification fiction. (387)

Here he means that in contemporary society truth itself has been subjected to power and performativity instead of reason. Nevertheless, the attempts to disintegrate art from reality erase the influence of history on present and create art on culture devoid of all political and historical contents in nothing more than metaphysical illusion which can never be successful. For him the vital fault of modernism in bracketing off the real social world, establishing a critical negating distance between itself and the ruling social order in its bracketing off the political forces which seek to transform that order.

In, *literary theory: an introduction* 1983, Eagleton discusses that in the present world of nuclear power everything has been politicized, and literature is not exception to it. It has been in the literary theories from the earliest time. Regarding the history of modern literary theory he observes that it is part of the political beliefs and ideological values. He further writes that it is not an independent phenomenon, so pure literary theory devoid of all historical, social and sexual relevance is entirely impossible. As he writes that literary theory without any relevance to socio-economic situation is only "an academic myth". According to him, "literary theory has most particular relevance to this political system. It has helped wittingly or not to sustain and reinforce its assumptions" (196).

Regarding the utility of studies, he observes "perhaps literary criticism and literary theory just mean any kind of talk about an object not the method, which distinguishes and delimits and discourse" (197). Nevertheless, the object or literature itself is not stable. As he states, "The unity of object is as the unity of the method" (197). Therefore, attempts to put

boundaries to the study of literature, whether it is in terms of method or its object is liable to be misleading. In Eagleton's view the relations between literature, literary criticism or its theory and politics is inseparable. As he writes:

... all criticism is in some sense political [...] socialist criticism and feminist criticism are of course, concerned with developing theories and methods appropriate to their aims: they consider questions of the relations between writing and sexuality or of text and ideology, as other theories in general do not. (212)

A common accusation of Marxist approaches to literature is that they are insufficiently attentive to the form of literature. There is also a residual suspicion among Marxists that the aesthetic and the political are somehow antithetical- that to 'tell the truth' in literature is to refuse the excesses, the performativity, the exuberance of poetry.

In his book, *The political unconscious Narrative as a socially symbolic Act* (1981), Fredric Jameson, remarks that this suspicion is itself the product of a capitalist culture which has appeared to split the poetic and the political. As he writes:

... one of the determinants of capitalist culture, that is, the culture of the western realist and modernist novel, is a radical split between the private and the public, between the poetic and the political [...]. We have been trained in a deep cultural conviction that the lived experienced of our private existence is somehow incommensurable with the abstractions of economic science and political dynamics. Political in our novels, therefore is according to Stendhals's canonical formulation, a 'pistol shot in the middle of a corner'. (69)

Here, Jameson renews earlier debates within Marxism concerning the relative merits of classic realism and modernism. In place of 'Lukacs' rejection of modernism as an anti-political aestheticism, Jameson thinks modernist texts for their repressed political contents.

In the same book his argument is that narrative provides complex resolutions to the more basic contradictions of history. In his readings of Conrad, the literary modes of impressionism and romance are seen as resources against the rationalization and reification of 19th century capitalist society. For him the literary text in its potential to resolve real contradictions on the level of symbol is both a figure of ideology and also an emancipatory ideal literature transcends the real, even if only symbolically.

Jameson views that narrative is a 'socially symbolic act' also show how Marxist readings need not read literature merely as a reflection of its particular context. It is not a matter of learning something of the historical context and then reading the text off against that as a form of 'background'.

Jameson refutes the idea that historical subtext is 'extrinsic' to the work, something which he, not the text, brings to bear upon it. As he writes:

A definition we think of as paradoxical only because such theoretical strategies have tended to be situated as oppositional to one another. Formal patterns in the work are read as symbolic enactments of the social within the formal. (Jameson 77)

Jameson's readings are thus attempts to combine heuristic with deductive procedures. His initial approach to the work is a moment description of its formal and structural properties. It is deductive in so far its hunt for formal contradictions are motivated by its aims of transcending the purely formalistic; it stimulates intention of relating these contradictions to history as the subtext of the work. And such contradictions will enable a political analysis in its widest sense. Jameson draws upon such Marxist theorists as Althusser and Macherey (structuralist Marxists) and Sartre and Lukacs (Hegelian Marxists) and combines their approaches with those of psychoanalysis, structuralism and post structuralism.

Within these parameters, Marxist approaches to literature are surprisingly varied, and there is no programmatic way of 'applying Marxist ideas. Of course, Marxist critics will

continue to discuss such issues as class struggle, co modification, alienation of labor and so on, but their shared concerns have not entailed that Marxist readings are always identical in approach, or even that their conclusions will be the same.

CHAPTER IV

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

Golding's novel *The Pyramid* deals with class conflict which seems to be the dominant factors of the novel. Besides this, there are other aspects like sex and music, renunciation and loss.

The Pyramid shows how English society is influenced by the class system. Throughout the novel, William Golding has succeeded to show the real and brutally destructive effects of the English class system. He wants to expose the English society which is very much influenced by the evils of class. Philip Redpath says that *The Pyramid* chronicles the human cost of sterial bourgeois society (210) and S.J Boyd comments that *The Pyramid* makes abundantly clear Golding's deep bitterness at and hatred of the English society and of evils of class (10).

The novel is set in the thirties in a Barsetshire village, the world of Golding's childhood and social background is fully sketched. After leaving Oxford, Golding spent sometime working in the theater. *The Pyramid* is the reflection of that experience. William Golding participating in the Second World War and experiencing the post war situations sees a very bitter but essential truth of human nature.

The Pyramid is not an elaborately structured book. There are certain connection of character and scene between them but the three episodes are neither tightly linked nor obviously 'programmatic'. Reading the earlier novels and knowing something of the author's concern may be a necessary preparation before it appears anything more than a genial, low-keyd, realistic novel of life in a small town in thirties. Golding's the main concerns, however, are still all there, the concluding ironies as profound and challenging as before, yet they are completely integrated into the structure, tone and setting of the book, and in no way

imposed upon it bitterly. It is as if 'myth' has been almost entirely incorporated in 'history' and the truths of myth offered us from a basis of social realism. The text contains three episodes. These episodes are distinct, yet considerable continuity is provided by the same characters' appearance throughout all the sections, and in particular by Oliver, the book's first person narrator. Bounce Dawlish and Henry Williams are the other characters of the novel. Oliver plays the vital role throughout the novel. He is a character as well as the narrator.

The first section plays the young Oliver in the small stiflingly claustrophobic English town of Stilbourne. Many English place names do indeed end in "bourne" but rarely with neat metaphorical applicability as occurs in *The Pyramid*. Stilbourne is almost certainly Marlborough, where Golding lived during for many years. The novel's first section is the clear example of the social snobbery. From the very beginning of the book, we can see the conflict between two main characters. Oliver and Bobby Ewan.

A pyramid is an image for representing a class structure. This pyramid is *The Pyramid* of social class. Oliver's father is Stilbourne's chemist, and the family occupies an uneasy and never quite defined position within the social hierarchy. In the novel, the two boys desire for the same object, Evie Babbacombe. As Oliver, Bobby Ewan and Evie Babbacombe are from different positions within the social pyramid, conflict can also be clearly seen because of class hierarchy.

Oliver's desire for Evie Babbacombe, the daughter of the caretaker of the town hall, is complicated by the similar desires of Bobby Ewan, whose father is the doctor. While Oliver goes to the local grammar school, Bobby goes to a boarding school. The social snobbery between these two families can be seen from the novel. As an adolescent, Oliver thinks back to an exchange between himself and Bobby as children, "you're my slave. No, I'm not. Yes, you're my father's doctor and yours is only his dispenser" (23).

She is one of the characters who seems to be the most suppressed due to lack of economy. She is accustomed to have any kind of job because of her compulsion. She needs money rather than the pleasure whereas the pleasure is determined by the money. No one is alienated from the influence of materialistic world. The change can be seen into the character Evie Babecombe that Oliver points at:

After a week, Evie came into the dispensary complaining of a headache and my father fixed her up with something. That evening when Mrs. Babecombe came to the steps of the Ewan's house, the two ladies left together, laughing and chattering like old friends. It was a remarkable change, and went still further.

(44)

Further the conflict can be seen as almost the climax which is the result of economical status. One who is suppressed tries his or her best to come against the person who is the exploiters. Being irritated, Oliver takes the action against Bobby Ewan:

That was why I pushed him off the wall into the Ewan's cucumber frame, where he made a very satisfactory crash. Not surprisingly we drifted apart after that, and what with school and motorbikes and careful parents, the most we ever did was to snipe at each other with our air guns, aiming always to miss. (23)

In fact, the people change themselves unknowingly due to the impact of capitalistic mode of production, commodities or the materials influence easily to the person that can be observed in Evie Babecombe

In the beginning, the relationship between Evie Babbacombe and Oliver is very remarkable. Evie Babbacombe works in doctor Ewan's reception room. Oliver and Evie love one another and develop physical relationship. Evie Babbacombe attracts all the boys. She is Stilbourne's object as Oliver says:

She was our local phenomenon, and every male for miles round was aware of her.

Perhaps it was not breathlessness of perpetual sex that kept her lips always apart and averted, but her nose, so inadequate for breathing through, yet so perfect for partness. (16)

Oliver's sexual escapades with Evie allow him to transcend the class barriers, but in doing so he uses Evie in a way that diminishes her unique human identity. Their relationship appears a straightforward one. Oliver is consumed with lust for her. *The Pyramid* is brilliantly comic in its depiction of the young and lustful Oliver. But when Oliver contemplates having to marry Evie, he thinks only of the social status. From the very beginning of the novel, we can find the social snobbery through different characters. They become enemy against their own friends. In *The Pyramid*, social class indicates man's social, educational and all aspects of life. Oliver says, "...we were neighbors, and I did not like him. I only envied him his boarding school, his perspective promotion to crane wall, and most of all, his red motor bike" (14).

Oliver doesn't like Bobby Ewan because of the social status. Ewan has red motor bike which stands for higher class. This makes Oliver desperate which led him to be more passionate lover. He sometimes thinks that love affair doesn't remain long because of economic show. Oliver is very much low compared to Ewan. The language and properties shown by Ewan make Oliver more frustration. This leads Oliver more passionate towards Evie because she was target of Ewan, too. They accelerated the meeting more. Oliver himself says in this context:

I grabbed her wrist and lugged her off the rise of the bridge, down to where the pier was set, half on land, half in water. The sodium light was out of sight. She had stopped laughing and I had started trembling again. The only light came from Evie, her three black plums so close to me against the pier but now with no hair smeared across them, no trickling rain, and the exhalation of mysterious perfume constant and maddening. I

pressed against her, my loins stirring, my body burning. I got all the kisses I wanted. I got more kisses than I wanted. I didn't get anything else. (49)

Oliver's relationship with Evie Babbacombe is not so clear or good. He loves her for his pleasure and he fulfills his desire by giving her torture. Evie herself is responsible for bringing torture and suffering on herself. The first section on the one hand the social conflict between two families can be seen. Oliver's father is Stilbourne's chemist and Ewan's father is Stilboutne's doctor. Social class influences these two families. Oliver doesn't like Ewan and his family because they always dominate Oliver and his family. Ewan's father treats Oliver's father as his own slave. This is not only because of academic status rather socio-economic status. Ewan's father is more hypocritic; he sends his son to boarding school providig a red moterbike. These objects show that Ewan's father is highly influenced by social snobbery.

On the other hand, Oliver suffers from Evie Babbacombe. He wants to get pleasure, but doesn't love her with any sensible commitments. The contest develops into a situation, as Paul Riceour says:

This education of the feeling of impurity by the language which defines and Legislates is of capital importance. Because of it, it is no longer only the action, the gesture, the rite which is symbolic; the pure and the impure themselves, as representations create for themselves a symbolic language capable of transmitting the emotion aroused by the sacred. The formation of a vocabulary of the pure and impure, which would exploit all the resources of the symbolism of stain is thus the first linguistic and semantic foundation of the "feeling of guilt" and first of all; of the confessions of sins. (37)

Oliver and Ewan fight for the same object. They compete to get their objects. William Golding makes an ugly statement when he says, “life is Lavatory” (91) where everybody dies for money, power, wine, music and sex.

Music and Sex: The Other Aspects

Music is the theme of the second section, in which the Stilbourne operatic society’s performance turns out to be a grim and very funny parody of art:

Though Evie sang and was maddeningly attractive, she would never have been invited to appear not even as a member of the chorus. Art is meeting point but you can go too far, so the whole thing had to rise from a handful of people round whom an invisible line was drawn. Nobody mentioned the line, but everybody knew it was there, the Sos rose from a vein that wandered through society beneath the surface. We had no ritual except mayoral processions. We had no eloquence, no display; we were our own tragedy and did not know we needed catharsis. We got our shocked purging from The News of the World. (114).

In the second section of the novel, the production is used to further Oliver’s understanding of the complexity of life and the impoverishment of lives, including his own, which are locked into debilitating notions of what constitutes ‘acceptable’ behavior. The initial letters of the Stilbourne operatic society spell an ironic message; ironic because there are no souls to save in Stilbourne. William Golding has made music one of the most important aspects of Stilbourne. *The Pyramid* and in an interview with James Baker, Golding explained that the book has a musical structure. It is based on a Sonata form, with the middle section as a Scherzo, or a comic commentary on the rest of the piece.

Stilbourne seems very much like Marlborough in the 1920s and 1930s and the characters are clearly based on real people known to Golding in those days. William Golding

himself says that there is something almost Dickensian about these characters (qtd. In R.J.Ress 141).

The book's principle preoccupations are present in the second section class, music and sex. These three issues influence all the sections of *The Pyramid*: Pyramids are tombs where there is nothing but horror and suffocation. Man has become merely a creature rather than a human being. Evie Babbacombe betrays Oliver in the first section. So Imogen Grantly replaces Evie Babbacombe as Oliver, focus of desire Oliver wants to make Imogen Grantly his object. But the show's director, Evelyn's De Tracey, shows Oliver Imogen's fundamental mediocrity, and also the limitations and the spiritual and intellectual deadness of Stilbourne. Golding's comment on Imogen's character shows the immoral world of the Stilbourne:

She is a stupid, insensitive, vain woman. She has a neat face just enough sense to keep smiling. Why, you are three times as-never let her know your calf love. It would just go to feed her vanity. And insolent, the pair of them. Not ten Guinness's worth, a hundred, a thousand. (145-46)

At the end of second section, Oliver is able to understand that music has played the negative role in the society. This is an outcome of an aesthetic materialistic world. Oliver finally understands the music and gives it up. He then feels the betterment on the career as industrial chemist. At the end of his first Oxford term, Oliver comes back to Stilbourne. He says, "Evie was gone, Imogen Married; and I was a proper student with a proper sense of values and duty and therefore no worries" (112). It is obvious that Oliver now wants to reform his life.

The third section describes Oliver, now middle aged and prosperous and is returning to Stilbourne. The chapter is heavily retrospective, dwelling principally on the young Oliver's relationship with his music teacher, Bounce Dawlish. In this episode it is the stifling of sexuality for music which produces tragedy of music teacher, Bounce Dawlish, who teaches

music as she inherited it, as boredom and torture. "It is necessary to musicians if they will not be cruel to themselves and nothing is crueler than the position for playing the violin" (168). However, this section opens with images of progress and of progress and of success.

As Oliver looks at Henry's inscription on Bounce's tombstones "Heaven is music (212), the grim irony of it forces him to acknowledge that, contrary to everybody's beliefs he had always disliked her. The narrative perspective in this chapter is the most sophisticated, combining Oliver's youthful memories with an adult's understanding. This double voice is particularly good effect as Oliver remembers the occasion when Bounce walked, virtually naked' into the town square, in a doomed and pathetic bid to gain Henry's attention. Oliver remembers Dawlish's regret upon music and musician. "Don't be a musician Kemmer, my son; Go into the garage business if you want to make money. As for me, I shall have to slave at music till I down dead" (193).

Oliver is a success and he has renounced his musical gifts for a prosperous career *The Pyramid* is somewhat lifeless prose style perfectly complements Stillbourne life, and makes it clear that Oliver is one of the town's most representative citizens. He has not, appearances to the contrary, escaped from Stilborne: the town has made him a man who will never pay more than a reasonable price.

The way in which the violence of parental love can permanently influence lives is a major theme of all three episodes. In each episode Oliver meets somebody who needs and reaches out for love, but in each case he is unable to respond. He uses Evie; he laughs at De Tracey; and he admits, over Miss Dawlish's grave, that he is glad she is dead. As he stands over her tomb at the end of the book, a 'successful' adult visiting the scenes of his youth, the image of her 'pathetic unused body' rises up before him as a kind of 'Psychic-ear-test' before which nothing survived but revolution and horror childishness and atavism, as if it could

make its own bid for honesty-crying aloud. "I never liked you! never" (213). Oliver narrates her tomb like this:

I put my hands through her hair; feeling the fragility of her head and neck; and a great surge of love came over me, protection, compassion, and the fierce determination that she should never know such lost Solemnity but be a fulfilled woman, a wife and mother The ton of marble, the harp, the stone chips, the immortals, white marbles surround, the organ thundering out from the south transept-

CLARA CECILIA Dawlish

1980-1960

-and amid the thunder of the organ, the three words in smaller letters, written almost between my feet:

Heaven is Music.(212-213)

Oliver is unable simply to reject her as a horror and sinks into a contemplative numbness in which he does not know 'to what my feelings had reference nor even what they were.' Mystery remains the only relation between the sources of power, harmony and destruction. But Bounce's dead body, like 'Golding's Pharaoh's, like the spire, is a solid object with a solid history.

Oliver, the scientist in *The Pyramid* stands by the grave of his old music teacher and becomes aware of forces in his nature beneath his adult veneer of reason and civilisation. This scene functions in the novel as a total structure. Oliver before a music teacher's grave cries: "I was afraid of you, and so I hated you. It is a simple as that. When I heard you were dead I was glad" (214)

Oliver, on the one hand, is worried about his music teacher Bounce Dawlish's death because she was his old and the respectable music teacher, and on the other hand, he hates her dead body because she was also an ugly music teacher. So she was both respectable and

ugly woman. Mr Dawlish is very responsible for it. He symbolizes the modern greedy man. He Sells his wife to youths to get more and more money. Henry William is such a man who gets pleasur from Dawlish but being an evil creature he exploits her cruelly. William Golding wants to hate these two kinds of men- one who sells his wife for getting money and the other who buys other's wife and kills her. Golding calls them evil wild beast.

Why does Henry William exploit Bounce Dawlish? This is one of the most important questions to be discussed about. But the answer is very easy one; man is a fallen being. And this is the horror of human existence, the answer that is easy. He is gripped by original sin; his nature is sinful and his state perilous as Peter Kemp writes in "The Terrible Disease of Being Human" (375). On the other hand, modern man is tortured not by any other creature but by modern man himself as Lucky is tortured by Pozzo in Samuel Beckett's play *Waiting for Godot* (1953). The master-servant relationship between Pozzo and Lucky is once more repeated in Beckett's drama, *Endgame* where Hamm, the master, is tortured by Clov, the servant. The master tortures the servant and sometimes the other way round. One is tortured by the other, in the uncertainty of time, place and of their lives. Not only that but modern man has lust for money, woman, wine and prestige also.

In this way, each of the three episodes culminates in a display of post-lapsaria nakedness. Oliver Mounts, Evie, the local beauty, on an open ridge in full view of his father's binoculars. Evelyn de Tracey, procedure of the local opera, when asked by Oliver for further produces a sheaf of photographs of himself dressed as a ballerina. Bounce Dawlish, the respectable ugly music teacher, walks Smiling and naked into the street. Ant it is all written in a light, almost inconsequential style. All what happens in the novel happens due to the cause of social snobbery, sexual violence, and avarice for money passion for music so on. Oliver battles with all these experiences. Besides, Imogen Grantley and Bounces Dawlish suffer by Evelyn de Tracey, producer of the local opera and Mr. Bounce and Henry William.

If we talk about peace, harmony, love, honesty, and beauty, we will be outdated. On the contrary, if we talk about theft, exploitation, corruption, Smuggling, girl trafficking, drugs addiction, prostitution, pollution, frustration and sex perversion, then we will be a modern man. A Modern man is he who has lost his selfhood and human identity. Every thing is branded. The transaction between money and morality, subjectively and objectively, pain and pleasure, sex and frustration, naturalness and unnaturalness, construction and destruction, business and relief is tightly fused in the mind of modern creature.

There is monetary world where a man is consciously changed by the social being. Music seems to be the source of money but it leads to the destruction.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Class hierarchy caused by economic status has been developed in the thesis. It is difficult to rupture the class hierarchy forever because it remains making linear hierarchy. However, the space between classes, from the society must not be left much and should try to make a classless society. The conclusion focuses on the radicals of the society.

Karl Marx says, “The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways, the point is to change it.” (qtd. Seldon, 24).

Numerous scholars and critics have commented on William Golding’s *The Pyramid* in their own ways. Since it is a work of literary art, no interpretation is enough to reveal its thematic aspect completely. Kevin MC Carron feels that *The Pyramid* is a traditional image for representing a class structure and says, “*The Pyramid* is very clearly a novel about social class (30). Martin Seymour Smith says, “the novel is a complex and subtle work and Golding’s finest novel and the story is deceptively ordinary and plot less but contains depth” (30). Fredrick R. Karl comments that the novel portrays “The world of Golding’s childhood and the social background and says that social snobbery is man’s instinct; Philip Redpath states, “The novel chronicles the human cost of a sterile bourgeois society” (210), and S.J. Boyd argues that the novel is about “The hatred of the evils of class” (10). The different criticism on this text has broadened the horizon of the possible meanings of the novel. In this connection, my study of this novel as the social class and the inevitable radicals has been relevant.

Golding’s *The Pyramid* deals with class or social snobbery. Bobby Ewan in this novel represents the upper middle class and hates Oliver who represents lower middle class. Bobby Ewan treats Oliver as a slave. He calls him in dominate language. He thinks that Oliver must

respect him as his father does to Ewan's father. There is class conflict between Bobby Ewan and Oliver. But all the conflicts end with the understanding of how society is moving around the class evils. What is inherent into human instinct is that he or she always seeks to come into power. Man commits crime for it. He destroys the position or hates the possessions of the higher classes' people. Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, the most popular novel has also the conflict for power and 'popular' fiction, a distinction which existed much less sharply in the middle nineteenth century. Many modern novels conclude wide horizons of the external world to the inner Private world of the mind and the emotion, obscurity, and a certain kind of intellectual and social snobbery.

William Golding's *The Pyramid* gives us that entire modern world's crisis. The readers can judge these things best, for they are most aware of the tastes, habits and sensibilities of their Contemporary world. *The Pyramid* consists of three episodes and continuity is given by same characters. Oliver, Bobby Ewan, Evie Babbacombe, Captain Wilmot Evelyn De Tracy, Imogen Grantly, Henry William and Bounce Dawlish are the main characters in the novel. Oliver, the first person narrator provides continuity throughout all three sections All the characters are somehow responsible for their suffering. The first section shows the conflict between Oliver and Bobby Ewan. They fight each other due to the cause of class hierarchy. Bobby Ewan is very much influenced by his social snobbery. In the second section also Oliver finds Imogen Grantly but later finds that she is also a prostitute or immoral. In the third section, he adds relation with his music teacher, Bounce Dawlish. Modern novel explores the hidden social realism after a great impact of French revolution. It's the French revolution which gave a great lesson that no totalitarian remains more. Some of the mist people always want to keep the rest under the power and power and the others always want to destroy the barriers. This conflict goes on and on. The modern novels have included the social realities; exploring the sensibilities and motives of characters. The modern

thinking is changed, for as the old percepts were broken down and man's world became more mechanized and more urban following the industrial revolution and other revolutions in science, the role of the individual and of the industrial artist in society also changed. Two questions predominated: what man's real nature, and how did man relate to the external world? The romantic poets were perhaps the first to record the particular disassociation, or 'alienation', of modern man.

One result of this new pre-occupation on the part of modern novelist with man's inner experience, this self-consciousness, was that a distinction arose between 'highbrow' and 'low brow' between 'serious' favor of a successful career as an industrial chemist. Later, Oliver grows his intimacy with his music teacher Bounce Dawlish and he regrets his past where he was responsible for defilement, sin and guilt. He loses his respectable music teacher and regrets about that. The book's principal preoccupations are all present in the second section. But now Oliver, the adolescent son of the chemist, battles with his disparate experiences: social snobbery, sexual violence. Therefore the third section is overwhelmingly concerned with the issues of renunciation, loss and regret.

William Golding has presented very serious scene at the end of the novel. As the Oliver stands over Bounce Dawlish's tomb, he looks at Henry's inscription on Bounce's tombstone "Heaven is music". This particular situation makes Oliver sad and full of disgust for present social order.

Thus, Golding's prime aim is to present a bitter but realistic world picture with a vision of human nature and also of the nature of the society and of the world. Optimistic vision is shown at the end through renunciation and realization. Oliver, Golding's mouthpiece character, comes across various things either knowingly or unknowingly but later he realizes how the world is moving, he here also he finds that she is respectable ugly music teacher. Thus in each section Oliver meets somebody who is incest, immoral, stupid, insensitive and vain.

William Golding makes his deep bitterness and hatred of the class. In this novel, Evie Babbacombe, Imogen Grantly and Bounce Dawlish are not evil characters but the English society makes them conscious so. They are motivated by the outer looks as well as the materialist world. They are compelled to be incest later which is the game played by the higher people. What is fact is that the higher class people control the mostly lower people using them with their money. On the other hand, the lower people also run after money, which made them slave.

Oliver narrates the episodes himself. He is the main character of the novel. In the book's first and second section, he is callow youth and does not know the reality of his society. Bobby Ewan, the upper class youth and doctor's son, hates Oliver. Oliver, represents the lower middle class youth and is a chemist. William Golding has made him his mouthpiece. Other's role in the third section goes a transformation: he suffers in the beginning and later he becomes aware of the facts. His parents steer him relatively harmlessly from music to chemistry. He renounces his own possession for music in understanding how social snobbery is hiding social realities. He is more optimistic at the end of the novel because he has now become a scientist leaving the music and insect.

Works Cited

- Arnold Josthon. *The Novels of William Golding*. Columbia: Missouri, 1980.
- Boyd, Stephen J. *The Novels of William Golding*. Brighton Sussex: Harvester Press, 1988,
revised, 1990; New York: St. Martins Press 1988.
- Carron, M.C. *William Golding: Intertextuality and Evil*. London: Feber, 1950
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. London: Longman, 1983
- Edward, Albert. *History of English Literature*, New York: St. Martin, 1980
- Forgacs, David. *Marxist Literary Theory Modern Literary Theory*. Ed. Ann Jefferson and
David Robry, London: Bastford Ltd., 1986.
- Golding, William. *The Pyramid*, London: Feber, 1967.
- Jamson, Fredic. *Marxism and Form: Twentieth Century Dialectical Theories of Literature*.
Princeton: Princeton Universtiy Press, 1971.
- Karl, Fredrick. *The Fiction of William Golding*, New York: St. Martin, 1962.
- Kemp, Peter. *Contemporary Novelists*. New York: Tweyne, 1991.
- Kermode, Frank. *The case for William Golding*. The New York Review of Books: Tweyhe,
1954.
- Lukacs, George. *The Historical Novel*. Trans. Hannah and Stanby Mitchell, 2nd Ed. London:
Merlin, 1965.
- Marx, Karl and Fredick Engels. *Selected works*. vol.1, Moscow progress publishers 1969.
- - - *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1975.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital*. Ed. F. Engels. New York: The Modern Library, 1963.
- Mchery, Pierre and E, Balibar. *Literature as an Ideological Form; Modern Literary Theory*.
Ed. Phillip, Ria and Parrical Wough, London: Bastford, 1989.
- Nelson, Cary. *Marxism and Interpretation of Culture*. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Redpath, Phillip. *William Golding: A structural Reading of his fiction*. London: Vision, 1986.

Sandres, Andrew. *The Short Oxford History of English History*. London: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Seldon, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literature Theory*. New York : Harvestwheat Sheaf, 1989.

Slaughter, Cliff. *Marxism, Ideology and Literature*. London: Macmillan, 1980.

Smith, Seymour. *Spector*. London: Feber, 1967.

Tiger, Virginia. *William Golding*. Longon: Calder and Boyars, 1974.

Williams, H. Shaw. *Marx's Theory of History*. London, Hutchinson and Co. Ltd., 1978.

Williams, Raymond. *The long Revolution*. London: Walton Street Oxford, Ox 26 DP, Oxford University Press,1977.