

# **A WOR(L)D WITH MORE MEANINGS. WILLIAM GOLDING'S *LORD OF THE FLIES* BETWEEN ALLEGORY, FABLE AND MYTH**

**Andreia-Irina SUCIU**

*Vasile Alecsandri University of Bacău, Romania*

**Mihaela CULEA**

*Vasile Alecsandri University of Bacău, Romania*

## **Introduction**

### ***Context, genre and literary devices***

To establish a line of interpretation for William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954) one needs to contextualize its writing in the aftermath of World War II. Such a powerful context combined with Golding's style and creed of making from his novels an "intellectual response to particular targets" (Gindin 1988, 20) made the author tackle strong topics in *Lord of the Flies* as well. It is because of such aspects that two main issues – the fight for survival and the loss of innocence – marked the author's existence. Publishing the novel in 1954, in the context of the horrors of a

post-war world, Golding brought to the foreground the dark primitive forces that drive man when causing the death of the peers so as to gain utmost control – an ultimate sign of loss of humanism. Therefore, the book could never be seen as a mere Robinsonade (a story of the adventures of a person stranded on a desert island, according to Cuddon (2013: 613), or on some form of isolated space, we could add, given some of the postmodern rewritings), a “study in group psychology” (Claeys 2017: 457) or simply a coming-of-age novel. The book was rather seen as a dark adventure book bearing the marks of the aftermath of two world wars. In this undertaking, Golding started from the idea of the voracious desire of holding power over the others which leads to imminence of evil emerging in the human nature and then to extreme acts of violence (as it happened during the Holocaust).

James Gindin (1988: 21) finds more targets of Golding’s opprobrium and regards the novel as “an attack on the naïveté of Victorian confidence in English boys and in public schools, as well as on the whole Enlightenment doctrine about the progress and perfectibility of the human species.” This type of writing which has clear targets that it addresses is usually a satire and *Lord of the Flies* was interpreted by some critics as a dystopia, by others as an anti-Utopian satire (George 2008: 32) – the island is viewed in this interpretation as a microcosm of the human society and the children are representations of grown-ups; additionally, their involution is similar to the Fall of man which can be identified in the adults’ society.

The novel presents the process of creating a leader, accepting him as a decision-making factor within the group, coupled with the act of rising up to the level set by the responsibilities imposed by such a position, but also the hesitations and failings emerging when holding such a position, and, ultimately, the usurping of such a position by another leader. The novel becomes so much more interesting when its heroes are introduced under the figures of children. When they, representatives of innocence, are made to emulate the need for control, violence and ultimate lust for power in the world they inhabit, reduced metaphorically to the space of the island on which they are shipwrecked, the book ceases to be mere fiction and it transmits a bitter moral about the loss of humanism of mankind in general.

In terms of genre, some of the first discussions about the novel have oscillated between analysing to what extent the novel is mere fiction or fable. A fable, also called “apologue”, “exemplifies an abstract moral thesis or principle of human behaviour” (Abrams & Galt Harpham 2012: 9). Though, unlike in one of the most frequent forms of fable – beast fable – in *Lord of the Flies* animals are not the main characters (as in George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*). The fact that the novel conveys a moral lesson made many critics place the novel under the sign of fable. More or less transformed from their initial pattern, “fables teach a general principle of conduct by presenting a specific example of behaviour” (Kuiper 2012: 71).

Other theorists insist upon the realistic tone adopted by such works, on the existence of the topic of morality in such writings, and on abusive relationships developed by the characters being introduced in such texts:

“Fables are ironic and realistic in tone, often satirical, their themes usually reflecting on the common sense ethics of ordinary life: they dramatize the futility of relinquishing a small profit for the sake of larger (but hypothetical) future gains, of the weak attempting to take on the powerful on equal terms, the irony of falling into one’s own traps, etc.” (Childs & Fowler 2006: 82)

In fables (labelled by Kennedy et al. 2005: 60 as “a genre of didactic literature”), the writers start with a general idea, with a didactic value which is afterwards transferred and put as a thesis into the body of the fictional work. This thesis appears most of the times announced from the beginning or is introduced or reiterated at the end of the work. In Golding’s case, the nature of the apologue is made evident in Ralph’s reaction: “Ralph wept for the end of innocence, the darkness of man’s heart” (LF, p. 225), like a grim conclusion pervading throughout the rest of the twentieth century.

Modern and postmodern fables have brought great transformations of the initial pattern and though the main characters are not animals that acquire human attributes, the use of the moral point made at the end is preserved. Ian McEwan describes his own novel *Amsterdam* (1998) as a “contemporary fable” (apud Murfin

& Ray 2009: 162) and Golding's *Lord of the Flies* was also labelled as fable from the perspective of the moral purpose which the author of fables seems to have in mind from the moment he has the idea of a particular work. John Peter, in his study *The Fables of William Golding*, insists upon this idea of the present island fable (but one that is very distinct from the tradition set by Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*) as having as a main purpose and as a main pillar of its construction a pre-established thesis, a moral to be highlighted:

“Fables are those narratives which leave the impression that their purpose was anterior, some initial thesis or contention which they are apparently concerned to embody and express in concrete terms. Fables always give the impression that they were preceded by the conclusion which it is their function to draw, though of course it is doubtful whether any author foresees his conclusions as fully as this, and unlikely that his work would be improved if he did” (in Baker & Ziegler 1988: 249).

This assertion seems to be upheld by the author himself who in an interview declares that “the fabulist is always a moralist”, though he had opined in an earlier interview that “a novelist ought not preach overtly in a fable” (apud Dickson 1990: 2).

The novel can also be regarded as an allegory, so it involves at least two levels or layers of meaning (Cuddon 2013: 21–22): there is a primary, literal or surface-level meaning, in which characters and events have meaning in themselves (the adventures of a group of boys in an isolated space, thus even allowing its possible reading as a children's book), while a secondary meaning is also implied, of a moral, spiritual, economic, social or political type (in Golding's novel we can find most of them). The rich symbolism of the text is found here or is supported by this level, and a well-documented reader may find many correspondences between the world of the text and reality. Allegory thus invites a double reading, with words that depict or unveil different ‘worlds’ and the reader is challenged to look for hidden meanings behind the literal or surface-level meaning.

In the case of the text's allegorical dimensions, the discussion can be branched off in three directions:

The first perspective through which the novel can be analysed is that of the historical, political, religious, social allegory, mainly as a type of writing in which the characters which are introduced and the actions they perform go beyond the literal transmission of a typology and they also represent or "allegorize" historical, political, religious or social figures and/or events.

Firstly, William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* can be read as a political allegory: the two groups of boys (known as the biguns led by Ralph on the one hand and by Jack, on the other hand) stand for two different governments struggling for supremacy (Reiff 2010: 91) or simply for political groups which struggle for supremacy, with the common people (the littluns) being caught in between. On a larger level, the two leaders could stand for democracy, respectively totalitarianism – E. M. Forster says in the introduction to the novel (in Baker & Ziegler's casebook edition from 1988: 229) that there is an illustration in the novel of "dictatorship vs. democracy", with Jack standing for the former and Ralph for the latter.

Secondly, the novel can also be interpreted as a religious allegory, as it depicts the fall of man, projected on the background of the Eden-like space of the island; children are fallen angels – they have lost their innocence, they display the clear symptoms of corruption and cruelty; this paradisiacal setting becomes a fiery hell in the end, a nightmarish space in which the kids have visions of a "beast". In the end of the novel, Ralph is chased off the island, which can be taken as an allegorical fall from heaven and as a form of punishment. The reversed image of the Eden-like Island and the fire that must purge all evil can be significant components of this religious allegory. From a spiritual perspective, Golding may allude to the degraded humanism resulting from breaking God's commandments and the general principles of morality and goodness; to the loss of sympathy, kindness and good will in people that have lost their innocence; to the darkness of the human spirit succumbing to the dark forces of irrationality, passion, or instinct; to the dehumanizing effects of no longer pursuing (ethical) justice; to the loss of balance and temperance while being

dominated by passion, anger and irrational drives; to the beast-like facet of human nature when moral justice, order and regulations are ignored; to the weakened sense of fortitude and the suppression of others' courageous/brave drives; to the importance of and the loss of faith and hope in the face of danger or to the non-altruistic nature of people who have generally lost pity, kind-heartedness and spiritual largesse.

Thirdly, the novel can be seen as a social allegory, as it presents the fight between civilization (trying to promote and uphold the ideas of fair, empathic leadership, the necessity of law and order or the importance of human goodness, not excluding, but, on the contrary making the best use of the rational, the scientific, the intellectual side of human nature) and primitivism (with the savagery, the bloodthirstiness, the lust for power that it includes). It revives the savage man motif and also evokes the fight between social classes or groups in society, the abuse of the rich or important people in society over the poor or socially inferior ones, the battle for survival and the outcomes of the loss of rules and order in society, or the importance of social cohesion and communion.

b. The allegory of ideas, in which literal characters stand for abstract concepts, could be a second line of interpretation. Subsequently, the plot exemplifies an abstract doctrine or thesis. This type of allegory rests on the use of personification of abstract notions such as human qualities, vices, states of mind, ways of life, or types of character. In William Golding's novel, the characters have their own independent existence within the plot, but they also embody abstract concepts. For example, Ralph, Piggy and Jack represent ideas or concepts such as the liberal democratic tradition, reason and logical thinking, and respectively, dictatorial ways of thinking. Golding felt the need to complete the political perspective pictured through the conflict between Ralph and Jack with the psychological one and that is why Piggy's figure brings reason as an arbiter in between. At the same time, Ralph and Jack were seen as standing for the good and the evil inherent in the human being, with Ralph as a "godlike" appearance (due to height, strength and general appearance) and with Jack impersonating the satanic.

c. From the perspective of a psychological allegory, characters are seen as illustrators of psychological processes and they outline a certain psychological profile. They foreground one or another psychological dimension which they are aware of or not, but in which they are clearly constant. Such interpretations follow Freud's theory of the id, ego and superego. And even if, apparently, Golding had not read anything from Freud before writing *Lord of the Flies*, in this novel Jack would represent the id (the evil, instinctual, brutal forces of the unconscious), Ralph the ego (a projection of man's good impulses), and Piggy the superego (man's reasoning faculties). The novel can be regarded as a study of the nature of the psychic in states of tension or utter fear, negotiation of positions or utter conflict. William Golding in an interview taken by James Keating (in Baker & Ziegler 1988: 211) posits that the children on the island "don't understand what beasts there are in the human psyche which have to be curbed." And thus, the book becomes a signal for what "demons", what markers of wildness and primitivism can emerge if drives are encouraged to the detriment of reason. Usha George synthesizes that, in terms of social psychology, the struggle from the novel renders how "intelligence (Piggy) and common sense (Ralph) will always be overthrown in society by sadism (Roger) and the lure of totalitarianism (Jack)" (George 2008: 32).

Dickson (1990: 12) posits that "the tension between realistic novel and allegorical fable" is established in the setting for the action: the space of the island, a space which is never identified geographically, with a rocky side facing the sea and a softer side facing the lagoon, a space of apparent wonders during the day and terror during the night, a space "where will and consciousness come together to escape the assaults of the unconscious" (Chevalier & Gheerbrant 1996: 546) constitutes an appropriate stage for the presentation of irreconcilable opposites in the human nature, "a universal, timeless backdrop for symbolic action" (id.). Dickson further identifies four ways through which the allegory is built (1990: 13–16): through the analogy with previous works of fiction (*Lord of the Flies* can be seen as an ironic treatment of R. M. Ballantyne's novel *The Coral Island* and there are direct references in Golding's novel to his predecessor's writing); through the treatment of the characters as allegorical agents marking the correspondence between a state of nature and a state of mind (the more time the boys spend on the island the more they

experience and feel the sinister and hostile aspects of the space, and the more they give in to sinister and hostile drives); through the comparison of an action or more actions with a extrafictional event or complex of events (at this level one can find analogies with historical or religious events); the manifestation of a state of mind in an action (through the action of pig hunting, the boys are presented in their gradual deterioration into savages).

Other interpretations have presented the novel as a “dark epiphany” (Reilly 1988: 138) while others have placed the novel on the territory of mythopoeia (Tiger 1971: 2) or myth – thus, Kirstin Olsen introduces the idea that *Lord of the Flies* is “a mythic novel [...] as abstract as it is possible for a work of fiction to be (Olsen 2000: 1). Golding himself mentioned in an interview that he prefers “fable” being used in relation to his novel instead of “myth”:

“Well, what I would regard as a tremendous compliment to myself would be if someone would substitute the word ‘myth’ for ‘fable’ because I think a myth is a much profounder and more significant thing than a fable. I do feel fable as being an invented thing on the surface whereas myth is something which comes out from the roots of things in the ancient sense of being the key to existence, the whole meaning of life, and experience as a whole” (in Baker & Ziegler 1988: 217).

Other interpretations have set the writing within the frames of satire as it unfolds as a general attack on matters outside the text – in this case universal concerns about mankind’s barbarity and inhumanity are raised, but also a particular historical occurrence (the Holocaust) is instantiated. Paul Crawford (2002: 6) regards Golding’s satire as a special one as it develops as a combination between “the fantastic and the carnivalesque modes in transgeneric attacks upon historical targets” (id.) Among these historical targets one can identify the Holocaust, National Socialism and the English class system. Crawford identifies in *Lord of the Flies* this special form of combination of the fantastic and the carnivalesque as being achieved through a special deployment of symbols and themes through which the author: (1) attacks English national identity, (2) exposes the poisonous nature of the English national system, (3) criticises religious dogmatism and authority, (4) lambasts the



world of depthless postmodern literature, literary criticism and biography, (5) intensifies a questioning of “truth-telling” (Crawford 2002: 7). At the same time, he identifies a special use of the fantastic in Golding’s novel as a marker of the postmodern playfulness which also anticipates metafiction.

### **Allegorical dimensions of themes and symbols**

Most critics point out the fact that themes and symbols are the main pillars on which allegory is built in *Lord of the Flies*. Thus, one of the main themes – civilization vs. savagery/primitivism – occurring as a result of the choices the children make on the island in their fight to survive in the new more or less hostile conditions is, in fact, an allegorical rendering of mankind’s struggle between adhering to a civilized (non-violent, non-oppressive) and savage (violent, oppressive) attitude, between issuing a rational or, on the contrary, a violent response to a given context. Even if they are children, the characters are aware of the existence of two aspects of one’s life (when living within a community) – civilization, unfolding under the sign of order, respect, empathy as opposed to savagery, which is a product of disorder, inconsideration and selfishness. More than this, they circumscribe the idea of civilization to that of Englishness which would equate automatically with culture, education and some choices made within the frames of a cultural code (see quotation below). In one of the first episodes of the boys attempting to organize themselves, the reader can discover the mechanisms of harmonious group organization: positioning, acknowledging authority, turn taking in speaking, abiding by a code, wanting to act morally, collaborating, accepting or self-appointed responsibilities, offering support, accepting decisions – these could be, at any time, taken as a presentation of social communion and order as well as political collaboration and this is how Golding immerses the reader into the mechanisms of political allegory:

*“They assented. Piggy opened his mouth to speak, caught Jack’s eye and shut it again. Jack held out his hands for the conch and stood up, holding the delicate thing carefully in his sooty hands.*

*'I agree with Ralph. We've got to have rules and obey them. After all, we're not savages. We're English, and the English are best at everything. So, we've got to do the right things.'*

*He turned to Ralph.*

*'Ralph, I'll split up the choir – my hunters, that is – into groups, and we'll be responsible for keeping the fire going –'*

*This generosity brought a spatter of applause from the boys, so that Jack grinned at them, then waved the conch for silence." (LF, ch. 2, p. 42)*

In this regard of maintaining the tenets of civilization, the symbol of the(signal) fire represents for the boys their connection with the civilized world, the link that they strive to maintain. It offers them hope, while the loss of control over it brings mayhem:

*"We've got to have special people for looking after the fire. Any day there may be a ship out there." (LF, ch. 3, p. 42)*

Some children, Ralph to the largest extent, struggle not to let wildness emerge and dominate an educated individual and it is at this point that the symbol of the conch gains so much weight – the turn taking at speaking established by means of holding the conch represents an anchoring in order and morality for Ralph and he firmly stands by this norm they had established. Theorists introduce the conch shell as a symbol that coagulates crowds of people, gathering them under the authority of a leader so as to coalesce as a group or, on the contrary, it can have a menacing function when it transmits a signal from outside one's group – "it is audible over great distances and it induces terror", it is a "means of intellectual perception" (Chevalier & Gheerbrant 1996: 228); in the novel, it is a means of instituting a parliamentary kind of order, by waiting one's turn for speaking, but also claiming one's right to speak and granting power to the one that gained this right (more or less abusively) by possessing the conch. At the same time, it represents authority being usurped as long as some choose to ignore its previously mentioned functions. It is such moments that transform the conch into a bone of contention as speaking without holding it equates to breaking the equilibrium of the group; these are the moments

that the fight between good and evil, between morals and morality are brought by the author to the foreground and new themes such as violence and corruption are introduced:

*“There was a moment’s struggle and the glimmering conch jigged up and down. Ralph leapt to his feet.*

*‘Jack! Jack! You haven’t got the conch! Let him speak.’*

*Jack’s face swam near him.*

*‘And you shut up! Who are you, anyway? Sitting there telling people what to do. You can’t hunt, you can’t sing –’*

*‘I’m chief. I was chosen.’*

*‘Why should choosing make any difference? Just giving orders that don’t make any sense –’*

*‘Piggy’s got the conch.’*

*‘That’s right – favour Piggy as you always do –’*

*‘Jack!’*

*Jack’s voice sounded in bitter mimicry.*

*‘Jack! Jack!’*

*‘The rules!’ shouted Ralph. ‘You’re breaking the rules!’*

*‘Who cares?’*

*Ralph summoned his wits.*

*‘Because the rules are the only thing we’ve got!’*

*But Jack was shouting against him.*

*‘Bollocks to the rules! We’re strong – we hunt! If there’s a beast, we’ll hunt it down! We’ll close in and beat and beat and beat –!’” (LF, ch. 5, pp. 98–99)*

The idea of corruption is introduced not only at the level of the individual, but also at the level of the microcosm of the island: the symbol of the scar – the rip in the forest caused by the boys’ plane crash – mars/cripples/destroys the paradisiacal universe of the island from the very first moment of their violation of the territory and illustrates the idea of man’s destructive intervention in nature and the corruption he brings within.

The ultimate filth of the human mind and action is introduced through the strongest symbol in the novel, which is, of course, that of the *lord of the flies*. The syntagm is a translation from Hebrew of Beelzebub meaning “Prince of the Devils”, a representation of evil in Judaism and Christianity, as well. Gindin (1988: 24) also mentions two other translations of the syntagm – “*Lord of Dung*” or of human refuse – thus highlighting the fact that the symbol stands for the ultimate evil in humans.

What is artfully presented in *Lord of the Flies* is the idea of discovering, liking, wanting and taking/gaining control and power over things, people and situations. The desire for power is presented at the beginning of the novel in a rather ludic manner, or as a way of spending time on the island, becoming familiar with the space and taking control over it. Little Henry is described in his undertaking of knowing the nature around him and knowing his own strengths and abilities and giving him the impression of superiority:

“This was fascinating to Henry. He poked about with a bit of stick, that itself was wave-worn and whitened and a vagrant, and tried to control the motions of the scavengers. He made little runnels that the tide filled and tried to crowd them with creatures. He became absorbed beyond mere happiness as he felt himself exercising control over living things. He talked to them, urging them, ordering them. Driven back by the tide, his footprints became bays in which they were trapped and gave him the illusion of mastery. He squatted on his hams at the water’s edge, bowed, with a shock of hair falling over his forehead and past his eyes, and the afternoon sun emptied down invisible arrows.” (LF, ch. 4, pp. 63–64)

Later in the novel, this apparent childish play was transferred among the children and some (Jack in particular) started to exercise his power and authority over his peers, a power and authority gained by oppressing the weak: “Power lay in the brown swell of his forearms: authority sat on his shoulder and chattered in his ear like an ape.” (LF, ch. 9, p. 165). Kirstin Olsen identifies the means which Golding uses in the novel so as to render the process through which one seizes power: “physical force, knowledge, size, beauty, insight, currency (in the case of the island, the currency is pork), and friendship” (Olsen 2000: 3). This is the concoction that

the contemporary individual uses in order to gain control over the other on more levels than one and Golding managed to subtly identify and exploit all these variables in his novel, presenting different levels of the human nature and different aspects of their personalities which humans make use of: physical, intellectual, aesthetic, pragmatic, or social. The presentation of this mechanism creates for the author the opportunity for presenting two more themes: dehumanization and relationships – the control of the biguns over the littluns, but also the fight for control among peers, especially leaders (see Ralph and Jack) give way to behavioural processes that degenerate into lack of empathy, loss of innocence, disregarding of friendship and loyalty, betrayal, abuse and, ultimately, extreme violence and cruelty. The painted faces and long hair are the symbols through which Golding presents this degeneration – if painted faces are often part of children's game when imitating the re-creation of a savage world, the long hair that boys cannot eschew and that Ralph is very much disturbed by, follows progressively the boys' transformation into savages, their distancing from an orderly, civilized existence.

*“With a convulsion of the mind, Ralph discovered dirt and decay, understood how much he disliked perpetually flicking the tangled hair out of his eyes, and at last, when the sun was gone, rolling noisily to rest among dry leaves.” (LF, ch. 5, p. 82)*

However, Golding also introduces the weapons to fight all these: the themes of reason and emotion are used as a means of opposing man to nature, humanism to cruelty, civilization to primitivism. The novel develops also a plea for rational choices and organization of actions as such order can only lead to and/or secure safety and survival in extreme situations in particular or in everyday life in general: “How can you expect to be rescued if you don't put first things first and act proper?” (LF, ch. 2, p. 45). Additionally, the author introduces Ralph's (and his “lieutenant”s, Piggy) striving for maintaining responsibility and protection as a means of fighting savagery:

*“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 clamour rose among the savages. Piggy shouted again. ‘Which is better – to have rules and agree, or to hunt and kill?’*

*Again the clamour and again – ‘Zup!’*

*Ralph shouted against the noise.*

*‘Which is better, law and rescue, or hunting and breaking things up?’”*

*(LF, ch. 11, p. 200)*

It is at this point that another item used obsessively in the novel, Piggy’s spectacles, become such a strong symbol. If, at first, they seem to mark Piggy’s short-sightedness and add to his weaknesses (his plump figure, doubled by his asthma seem to make of him a weakling in a continuous fight for survival, control and power) they become in turn a symbol of his rationality, but also of the good use of science as they are used to lit up the fire. Either for their practical use or for their markedly rounding of the idea of clear thinking, the spectacles become an item which children fight over, which they steal and, ultimately, the enemy group destroys. In opposition, a symbol used as a way of bringing forth irrational fear and loss of reason is that of the dead parachutist – “an image of the adult world that suggests the destruction of the rational society envisioned by Ralph and Piggy” (Telgen 1997: 179).

Another way of fighting the negative side of man is by isolating evil – another symbol being Castle Rock, a smaller portion of land separated from the island, a rocky region where Piggy is killed and which stands for final moral decadence, but Golding seems to signal its isolation, separation from the initial paradisiacal space of the island in developing a new level for the allegory in the novel: isolation of violence and cruelty as a separation of man from such drives which need to be controlled even in extreme conditions.

The novel introduces fear, in general, and the fear of the unknown, in particular, as the main engine driving the characters and the action of the entire novel towards a climax. At the beginning of the novel, we recognize and admit the

authentic nature and amplitude of the fear experienced by children on a desert island: low fear of loneliness (the typical boarding school education had accustomed British boys to enduring separation from their parents), moderate fear of unknown dangers (caused especially by the exotic space which was outside their geographical and biological knowledge), raised fear of not being rescued (the prospects of them being deserted on the island for a longer period of time, or, possibly, for all time in the future, drives children on the edge of extreme behaviour. It is from this perspective that the symbol of the beast is used as a metaphorical externalization of man's inner darkness. It is not the peril of an exotic creature from the island, threatening children's lives, that Golding presents like in adventure story, but rather man's inner instinctual savagery. His fears, suggests Golding, are sometimes triggered by his own inner drives: "He still says he saw the beastie. It came and went away again an' came back and wanted to eat him –." (LF, ch. 2, p. 35)

### **Characters as vectors of allegory**

Introducing the classical story of the shipwreck on a desert island, but making the main characters be children was Golding's triumph. Such a story is perfectly credible and the portraying of mankind becomes so much more striking as it is known that children emulate grown-ups. It obvious therefore that the book is an allegorical presentation of the adults' world and the portrayal becomes so much more horrific when it is projected on the background of their loss of innocence.

Kirstin Olsen in her study on Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (Olsen 2000: 2) asserts that when they are alone and powerless, children tend to engage in some play roles through which they assume the power they lack around: mother, father, teacher, police officer, king, queen, and hero. At the same time, besides these roles, the children on the island also embody typologies that we are bound to have encountered in any group, functioning at any level of society (be it within the family, in school, or at work): the whiner and the brave, the rational leader and the abusive leader, the protector and the bully, the loyal friend and the traitor.

The book presents progressively the transformation of scared and honest children into fierce and cheating marauders/raiders/looters, with some voices trying to make themselves heard: Piggy is the voice of reason (the voice of parents or other relatives, teachers, educators, tutors, mentors, etc.), bearing the values of civilization. His physical weakness (he has asthma, he is short-sighted and has a weak bladder) only manages to emphasize his rationalism (but also makes him be seen by some interpreters as an exponent of a minority, as it is the case of Tiger (1971: 60)):

*“Life,” said Piggy expansively, “is scientific, that’s what it is. In a year or two when the war’s over they’ll be traveling to Mars and back. I know there isn’t no beast – not with claws and all that, I mean – but I know there isn’t no fear, either.” (LF, ch. 5, p. 90)*

He rationally and morally demonstrates an unflinching belief in activating and directing humans’ constructive efforts and this is translated in his insistence on giving the word to the one who holds the conch at a particular moment. Additionally, Golding’s emphasis on making him the ultimate exponent of civilization is proved by an unyielding desire to put his inventiveness to good use, but also physically through the way in which his hair grows:

“He was the only boy on the island whose hair never seemed to grow. The rest were shock-headed, but Piggy’s hair still lay in wisps over his head as though baldness were his natural state and this imperfect covering would soon go, like the velvet on a young stag’s antlers. ‘I’ve been thinking,’ he said, ‘about a clock. We could make a sundial. We could put a stick in the sand, and then –’” (LF, ch. 4, p. 67)

Except Jack (Merridew) and Percival (Wemys Madison), one of the littluns, the other boys do not have last names. Piggy, Ralph, Simon, Sam and Eric and so on are only given their Christian names in an act which may transmit the idea that Golding created archetypes. But there are other critics who clearly identify as targets of Golding’s satire not only typologies, but also historical figures.



In a historical line of interpretation which draws the analysis closer to the mechanisms of satire, Jack was seen as a “wily strategist” (Telgen 1997: 178) or straightforwardly as Hitler (Leighton Hodson apud Crawford 2002: 18) or, we may add, as the dictator or torturer figure, analogies which were made possible through the identification of his decisions such as that of turning the choir into a group of hunters. The etymology of Jack’s last name may also be relevant and intended so by the author as “Merridew” comes from old Welsh and it means “lord”; he has close by his side the faithful Roger (seen as concentration camp guard):

“Jack stood up and took the conch. ‘So this is a meeting to find out what’s what. I’ll tell you what’s what. You littluns started all this, with the fear talk. Beasts! Where from? Of course we’re frightened sometimes but we put up with being frightened. Only Ralph says you scream in the night. What does that mean but nightmares? Anyway, you don’t hunt or build or help – you’re a lot of cry-babies and sissies. That’s what. And as for the fear – you’ll have to put up with that like the rest of us.’” (LF, ch. 5, p. 88)

Jack also has what could be called a first lieutenant in the person of Roger, a boy whose cruelty is pathologic:

“Here, struck down by the heat, the sow fell and the hunters hurled themselves at her. This dreadful eruption from an unknown world made her frantic; she squealed and bucked and the air was full of sweat and noise and blood and terror. Roger ran round the heap, prodding with his spear whenever pigflesh appeared. Jack was on top of the sow, stabbing downward with his knife. Roger found a lodgment for his point and began to push till he was leaning with his whole weight. The spear moved forward inch by inch and the terrified squealing became a high-pitched scream. Then Jack found the throat and the hot blood spouted over his hands. The sow collapsed under them and they were heavy and fulfilled upon her. The butterflies still danced, preoccupied in the center of the clearing.” (LF, ch. 8, pp. 148–149)

Ralph is the type of responsible, protective leader, taking on his role of provider, planner, and protector:

*“We need an assembly. Not for fun. Not for laughing and falling off the log’ – the group of littluns on the twister giggled and looked at each other – ‘not for making jokes, or for’ – he lifted the conch in an effort to find the compelling word – ‘for cleverness. Not for these things. But to put things straight.’*

*He paused for a moment.*

*‘I’ve been alone. By myself I went, thinking what’s what. I know what we need. An assembly to put things straight. And first of all, I’m speaking.’*

*He paused for a moment and automatically pushed back his hair. Piggy tiptoed to the triangle, his ineffectual protest made, and joined the others.*

*Ralph went on.*

*‘We have lots of assemblies. Everybody enjoys speaking and being together. We decide things. But they don’t get done. We were going to have water brought from the stream and left in those coconut shells under fresh leaves. So it was, for a few days. Now there’s no water. The shells are dry. People drink from the river.’”*  
(*LF*, ch. 5, pp. 84–85)

From a religious standpoint, children become fallen angels. From the same perspective, they are also the members of a community that kills their saviour (Piggy) or aim to kill him (Ralph), evoking the story of Jesus Christ.

They could also be taken as the members of two different parties with the democratic and protective Ralph as one of the leaders and the abusive and violent Jack at the other end.

*“They walked along, two continents of experience and feeling, unable to communicate.*

*‘If I could only get a pig!’*

*‘I’ll come back and go on with the shelter.’*

*They looked at each other, baffled, in love and hate. All the warm salt water of the bathing pool and the shouting and splashing and laughing were only just sufficient to bring them together again.” (LF, ch. 3, p. 56)*

The two groups of boys are individualized by the “costumes” (the wearing of war-paint on their faces (a black and green or white and red mask of paint or clay), garlands or black caps (the ones they had had from their singing in the choir) and the rituals they have – blowing the conch or waving a spear or sticking pig-heads on a spear and uttering “incantations”: “Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!”;

*“Before the party had started a great log had been dragged into the center of the lawn and Jack, painted and garlanded, sat there like an idol. There were piles of meat on green leaves near him, and fruit, and coconut shells full of drink.” (LF, ch. 9, p. 164)*

Kirstin Olsen synthesizes the roles played by the characters and the manner in which they interact:

*“In at least one kind of situation, the novel says, politics (Ralph) fails, science (Piggy) and spirituality (Simon) are murdered, power (Jack) and cruelty (Roger) prevail, and the ordinary decent fellow (Samneric) cannot do anything to change the course of events.” (Olsen 2000: 20)*

### **Conclusions**

The novel is one of the strongest commentaries on the existence of evil in the human nature and its manifestation in some individuals in certain circumstances. Its strength comes from the fact that it was “so finely attuned to contemporary sensibility” (McCullen in Biles & Evans 1978: 204). Golding’s thesis is that the inherent evil in the human nature will emerge when given propitious conditions: danger, fear, disorder, abuse, etc. – in other words, “civilization is simply a veneer over bestiality” (Reilly 1988: 138). This can lead to decadence of human nature, to loss of identity (“What are we? Humans? Or animals? Or savages? What’s grownups going to think?” (LF, ch. 5, p. 98) through dehumanization.

This is the large backdrop onto which the allegory develops; its main frame, that of the individual's behaviour as part of a community is meant to encompass various levels of human development. Children are small individuals that experience the same emotions and feelings, tensions and dilemmas that grown-ups would have in a similar situation, and Golding's grim presentation of such a group is supposed to be a reprimand on the adult world:

*"The boys' society represents, in embryo, the society of the adult world, their impulses and convictions are those of adults incisively abridged, and the whole narrative is a powerfully ironic commentary on the nature of Man, an accusation levelled at us all." (John Peter in Baker & Ziegler 1988: 252)*

Golding himself declared that the novel is "an attempt to trace the defects of society back to the defects of human nature. The moral is that the shape of a society must depend on the ethical nature of the individual and not on any political system however apparently logical or respectable" (quoted in Epstein's study in Baker & Ziegler's critical edition 1988: 299).

## References and notes:

- Abrams, M. H., and Geoffrey Galt Harpham. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, 10<sup>th</sup> ed., Boston, Massachusetts, USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2012.
- Baker, James R., and Arthur P Jr. Ziegler. *William Golding's Lord of the Flies. Casebook Edition. Text, Notes and Criticism*, New York: Penguin Group, 1988.
- Biles, Jack, and Robert Evans (eds.). *William Golding: Some Critical Considerations*, Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1978.
- Chevalier, Jean, and Alain Gheerbrant. *Dictionary of Symbols*, London: Penguin, 1996.
- Childs, Peter, and Roger Fowler. *The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms*, London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2006.
- Claeys, Gregory. *Dystopia. A Natural History. A Study of Modern Despotism, Its Antecedents, and Its Literary Diffractions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Crawford, Paul. *Politics and History in William Golding: The World Turned Upside Down*, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 2002.
- Cuddon, J. A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition, Oxford: Wiley & Blackwell, 2013.
- Dickson, L. L. *The Modern Allegories of William Golding*, Tampa: University Press of Florida, 1990.
- George, Usha. *William Golding: A Critical Study*, New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors (P) Ltd, 2008.
- Gindin, James. *William Golding*, London: Macmillan, 1998.
- Golding, William. *Lord of the Flies*, London: Faber & Faber, 2011, abbreviated as *LF* for quotations from the text.
- Kennedy, X. J., Gioia, Dana, and Mark Bauerlein. *Handbook of Literary Terms*, New York: Pearson Longman, 2005.
- Kuiper, Kathleen. *Prose. Literary Terms and Concepts*, New York: Britannica Educational Publishing in association with Rosen Educational Services, 2012.
- Murfin, Ross, and Supryia M. Ray. *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*, 3rd ed., Boston, Massachusetts: Bedford's/St Martin's, 2009.
- Olsen, Kirstin. *Understanding 'Lord of the Flies'. A Student Casebook to Issues, Sources and Historical Documents*, Connecticut and London: Greenwood Publishing Group, Westport, 2000.
- Reiff, Raychel Haugrud. *William Golding: 'Lord of the Flies'*, New York: Marshall Cavendish Benchmark, 2010.
- Reilly, Patrick. *The Literature of Guilt. From 'Gulliver' to Golding*, Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 1988.
- Telgen, Diane (ed.). *Novels for Students. Presenting Analysis, Context and Criticism on Commonly Studied Novels*, vol. 2, Detroit: Gale Research, 1997.
- Tiger, Virginia Marie. *An Analysis of William Golding's Fiction*, PhD thesis, 1971, available at <https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/831/items/1.0101815>, accessed on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2020.

## XÜLASƏ

### Çoxmənalı dünya (söz). Uilyam qoldinqin “*Milçəklər kralı*” əsəri alleqoriya, təmsil və əfsanə arasında

**Andreia İrina SUCIU**

*Vasile Alecsandri University of Bacău Universiteti, Rumıniya*

**Mihaela KULEA**

*Vasile Alecsandri University of Bacău Universiteti, Rumıniya*

Uilyam Qoldinqin bizi cəmiyyətin, iqtisadiyyatın, siyasətin, elmin və mədəniyyətin, və ümumilikdə əxlaqi dəyərlərin dilemmaları ilə qarşılaşdırən “*Milçəklərin kralı*” əsəri (1954) mürəkkəb (əxlaqsız) insan təbiətinin alleqoriya vasitələrinin köməyi ilə hər zaman aktual təsviridir. Romanın əsasını təşkil edən alleqorik mexanizmlərə xüsusi vurğu ilə məqalə, ilk növbədə, romanın yazılmasını kontekstuallaşdırır, alleqoriya, təmsil və ya əfsanə sərhədləri arasında onun janrını müəyyən edir, sonra isə bəzi əsas alleqorik istiqamətlərini tarixi, siyasi, sosial, dini, psixoloji alleqoriya kimi və yaxud bu hekayənin parabolik quruluşunun rünləri qismində çıxış edən mövzuların, simvolların və personajların alleqorik rolları ilə ideyalar alleqoriyası kimi təhlil edir.

**Açar sözlər:** “*Milçəklərin kralı*”, alleqoriya, təmsil, əfsanə, əxlaqsızlıq (pislilik), qaranlıq, mədəni deqradasiya, insanın təbiəti

## РЕЗЮМЕ

**Мир (слово) со множеством значений. Произведение «Повелитель мух» Уильяма Голдинга между аллегорией, басней и мифом**

**Андрея-Ирина СУЧИУ**

*Университет Василе Александри в Бакэу, Румыния*

**Микаэла КУЛЕА**

*Университет Василе Александри в Бакэу, Румыния*

Проводя нас через дилеммы общества, экономики, политики, науки или духовности и морали в целом, «Повелитель мух» Уильяма Голдинга (1954) – это всегда злободневная актуализация сложной (падшей) природы человека с помощью инструментов аллегии. С особым акцентом на аллегорические механизмы, лежащие в основе романа, статья в первую очередь контекстуализирует написание романа, устанавливает его жанр между границами аллегии, басни или мифа, а затем анализирует некоторые основные аллегорические измерения повествования как историческую, политическую, социальную, религиозную, психологическую аллегию или как аллегию идей, с аллегорическими ролями тем, символов и персонажей в качестве столпов этой параболической повествовательной конструкции.

**Ключевые слова:** Повелитель мух, аллегория, басня, миф, порок, тьма, нравственная деградация, природа человека