ALLEGORY AND SYMBOL
IN THE NOVELS
OF WILLIAM GOLDING

ALLEGORY AND SYMBOL
IN THE NOVELS
OF WILLIAM GOLDING

By

ROBERT JAMES HARRIS, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

October 1970

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE

MASTER OF ARTS (1970) McMASTER UNIVERSITY
(English) Hamilton, Ontario.

TITLE: Allegory and Symbol in the Novels of William Golding.

AUTHOR: Robert James Harris, B.A. (Leeds University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Maqbool Aziz.

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 104

SCOPE AND CONTENTS:

The thesis attempts, by a chronological examination of the novels of William Gerald Golding, to demonstrate the existence of a sequence of allegorical explorations of the basic nature of man. This, it will be argued, constitutes a unifying link between the novels of a type not noticed by other critics.

In addition, following a general consideration of the allegorical mode, it will be suggested that traditional conceptions of thenature of allegory limit unnecessarily the scope and function of the mode.

Finally, in an Appendix, the sixth novel, not a part of the sequence, will be briefly examined, and its relationship to the other five novels suggested.

TEXTUAL NOTE

Golding's six novels to date, all published by Faber & Faber of London, are as follows:

Lord of the Flies, 1954.

The Inheritors, 1955. (Fourth edition, 1965).

Pincher Martin, 1956. (Fourth edition, 1964).

Free Fall, 1959. (Second edition, 1960).

The Spire, 1964. (Second edition, 1964).

The Pyramid, 1967.

Where a later edition appears in parentheses, it is indicated that, owing to the unavailability of the first edition, that later edition was used in the preparation of this thesis, and that allquotations are from that edition.

In addition to the six novels listed above, Golding's principal works include a play, _The Brass Butterfly_ (London: Faber & Faber, 1958) and the collection of miscellenea to which reference is made in this thesis: _The Hot Gates and other occasional pieces_ (London: Faber & Faber, 1965).

PREFACE

A thesis dealing with the novels of William Golding, the subject of two other theses submitted to McMaster University in recent years, perhaps requires some justification.

Of these two theses, however, one, submitted by my namesake, Miss Harris, deals solely with the attitudes held towards the basic nature of man by, respectively, Golding and Camus. The second thesis, the work of Mr Gary E. Miller, is a fairly general critique of the four novels published by Golding before 1963, the year in which the thesis was written. Although Mr Miller devotes considerable space to a consideration of Golding's treatment of allegory, his definition and application of the term, as well as his apparent confusion as to the nature and function of literary symbolism, render his discussion of these areas somewhat inadequate.

It will be the contention of this thesis that Golding, ever a conscious artist, shows in the course of his writings an awareness of the potential flexibility of the allegorical mode, and that in his novels he is experimentally manipulating the device. The argument will begin with an attempted redefinition of the term, and will continue with an examination of the uses to which it is put in the five allegorical novels published by Golding to date. It will be suggested that these novels, (of which the most recent is <u>The Spire</u>), form a closely connected sequence of allegorical explorations of the

various aspects of the basic nature of man. The sequence, it will be claimed, reaches its natural conclusion in the final resolution of The Spire, the novel which offers, to a greater extent than any of its predecessors, a possibility of positive hope and redemption for man.

The sixth novel, The Pyramid, published in 1967, will be discussed briefly in an appendix.[1] This work, it will be suggested, while remaining primarily non-allegorical in tone and structure, does contain elements of parody of the earlier novels which link it with the allegorical sequence, though without making it part of that sequence. In its parodic elements, it will be suggested, lies the acknowledgement that all that can be achieved in the allegorical sequence has been done, and The Pyramid hence becomes rather more than a new and lighthearted departure from Golding's typical themes - it becomes, too, a valediction to a whole phase of his career, a phase in which he attempted and achieved a series of allegorical considerations of the basic nature of man.

My grateful acknowledgements are due, above all, to the supervisor of this thesis, Dr Maqbool Aziz, for his kind assistance and ready advice throughout the preparation of the work. My thanks are also due to Professor Graham Petrie, of McMaster University, for his help in formulating the topic in the initial stages, and to my friend Graham Turner, for his helpful comments and criticism throughout.

Hamilton, Ontario. July 1970

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Golding is not a mediaeval allegorist. Though a truism, the statement is rendered necessary by the impossibility, with the limited critical vocabulary available, of distinguishing between the different aspects of the allegorical form, and of appreciating the diverse uses to which it may be put. Noting the necessity of the distinction, Mr Miller evolves his own "working definition" of allegory, which is itself rather less than adequate:

> ... that literary device by which one or more abstract ideas are presented in a more familiar and more 'tangible' form (though not necessarily a concrete form), enriched by the use of imagery, suggesting certain universals by its symbols, and with the over-all [sic] purpose of making the original ideas clearer and more interesting by their reduction to simpler terms.[1]

Though Mr Miller elsewhere discounts what one might term the mediaeval 'sugar coating' theory of allegory, his definition, in practice, subscribes to it. Allegory, it suggests, is a means of disguising and clarifying. It implies, ultimately, that allegory is a means of telling a child an abstract story in 'tangible' symbols, with the purpose of effecting a positive influence on his attitudes and actions. But this too is the implication of the 'sugar coating' theory: 'clearer and more interesting' was the aim of the mediaeval theologians who, with purely didactic motivation, incorporated the device into their homilies.

Allegory at its best is very much more than this, and the

fallacy of the traditional idea that allegory is primarily an acceptable means of swallowing a moral pill is very much more basic than an error of degree: it is, in fact, one of kind. Its basic assumption is that allegory involves the act of disguising a fact, and because that fact is taken from the world of the reader, as opposed to that of the allegory, allegory is, of necessity, of relevance only to the extent that it reflects a positive and external judgement. The result of this critical commonplace has been that allegory has come to be regarded as a unique form of literature which, far from having an organic unity of its own, exists only, as it were, parasitically, as a means of expressing an external truth. Rather than the moral emanating from the literature, as an organic part of the work, allegory is foisted on to the moral, so that the moral is the central part of the work, the narrative trappings incidental.

The mediaeval use of allegory as narrative corollary to the theme of a sermon has led to the critical concept of allegory being an absolute, not a relative. A work is allegorical or it is not allegorical: a non-allegorical work with apparently allegorical elements may be symbolic in connotation, but it cannot be allegorical. This idea too, it will be suggested, is fallacious. Because an allegory is considered to have only one meaning it is a different form from symbolic literature which is pregnant with overtones. But again the argument rests on the inevitable association between allegory and mediaeval religion, - an association no more valid than that between poetry and rhyme.

A considerable body of creative writing has allegorical overtones to a greater or a lesser extent, and if one broadens one's concept of what constitutes allegory, accepting the form not only as an absolute, but also as a literary tendency, its literary potential becomes infinitely greater, and one's approach to certain types of literature becomes severely modified. For example, one may consider two novels of the eighteenth century, both the work of the same author, - Tom Jones and Jonathan Wild. Dr Kettle[2] distinguishes between them as representatives of two different types of writing: the picaresque Tom Jones elevates plot over pattern, while Jonathan Wild, by elevating pattern over plot, hence becomes a 'moral fable'. But the one novel remains a greater work than the other not because it is inherently preferable to elevate plot over pattern, but because the reader finds in Tom Jones an overall artistic unity lacking in Jonathan Wild.

Both novels, though 'unrealistic' in the most superficial use of the word, are far from escapist, and invite the reader to relate them to the real world. Yet there are important differences, the most significant of which concerns the didacticism of the two works. Jonathan Wild, in spite of the occasional splendid scene, such as the Count cheating at cards, or Wild's attempted seduction of Miss Snap, does not generally 'come to life'. The phrase is significant, for if the characters do 'come to life', they may be assumed to have taken on an identity of their own, and to live as fully realised human beings within the sphere of the novel. When, however, the scenes are two dimensional there is need of an external criterion, drawn from one's

moral position in real life. Certain ideas and attitudes are being clothed in fictional garb so that the reader, stripping off the allegorical coating, is able to absorb the lesson which Fielding wishes to teach him. Thus the two dimensional portrayal, combined with the use of the device of the intruding narrator, achieves a specific and primarily didactic effect: characters and episodes are not ultimately endowed with their own life, but are a means to a moral effect. If anything, one's genuine response to the novel is at variance with the imposed pattern, for although the pattern compels one to sympathise with Heartfree, one's spontaneous admiration is for the vigorous amorality of Wild and the Count. In Tom Jones, however, one responds genuinely to the plight of the hero, so that one's instinctive attitude is in harness with the attitude necessary to absorb the pattern of the novel. As a result, no conscious effort is required to apply an external morality to the novel with the probable effect of weakening both the novel and the morality; but, on the contrary, that external morality is organic in the novel so that the work of art in fact enforces the moral and the moral enhances the work of art. The overall result is an artistic unity lacking in Jonathan Wild.

Allegory proper, as this thesis has suggested, tends to be considered much in the same way that we have been considering Jonathan Wild. Certainly in such conventional mediaeval allegories as The Floure and the Leafe and The Assembly of Ladies, specific associations may be made between what is said and what is meant to such an extent

that the work itself loses any artistic independence outside the tradition in which it was written.

Allegory need not, however, be so limited. Though its purpose is normally didactic, specific associations may be tenuous or ambiguous, and, above all, subordinated to the artistic unity of the work. In The Pilgrim's Progress, the characters encountered by Christian on his quest are human, and at times attractive. Such meetings as that with Mr By-Ends attain a dramatic interest of their own, and the reader finds himself supporting Christian not because of the allegorical necessity of doing so, but because the movement of the book has brought about in him a unified response to Christian as man and as symbol. Constantly Bunyan relates rather homely details which assist in reducing the abstract attributes of Christian, and increasing the realism of his nature as a man. The relation, for example, of his domestic difficulties with his wife and children helps the reader to a response towards Christian not as an abstraction but as a human being. But the shift in emphasis by no means impairs the unity of the work. By a positive and approving attitude towards Christian as a man, the reader identifies with him as he makes his quest. He sees character in action in his various encounters en route for the Celestial City; he sees his own attributes isolated in the characters encountered by Christian; and those characters are not set up as straw men to be knocked down, but as subtle and often plausible advocates for their cause. It is part of the action of the novel that in reading it one is persuaded genuinely that one's worldliness is wrong. One is so

persuaded not because a lifeless Heartfree is defeated by characters many times more plausible and attractive than he, but because one has been, as it were, won over to the support of Christian by his moral and personal superiority to those with whom he conflicts. In other words, one willingly supports Christian, whereas in Jonathan Wild one rather grudgingly supports Fielding.

The point, above all, is that to regard allegory in a fundamentally different light from other genres of prose literature is inherently wrong. As with other forms of literature, the meaning of allegory is conveyed to the reader not by a purely mathematical process but by the result of the subtle interaction of the parts upon the whole. The nickname of 'Pincher' Martin has clear associations with thieving - or at least of taking for oneself whatever one can. This the protagonist of the novel does, as this thesis will illustrate in the appropriate place.[3] But while his soubriquet is 'Pincher' his real name is Christopher, or 'Christbearer', and this strange moral paradox is exemplified in the reader's complex attitude towards the figure. Though ostensibly portrayed as unpleasantly as any character in literature he is seen as Promethean, heroic, and brave in adversity. In short, he is both good and bad, as are people in real life, and our attitude towards Pincher Martin, whom we encounter in a novel, can be no less complex than our attitude to a person we meet in the street. Pincher Martin is a figure in a twentieth century allegory, he is a symbol, and he is a person. The three are not contradictory but complementary. The 'meaning' of Pincher Martin cannot be calculated

with pencil and paper, for it depends on an emotional response to Chris as man, as well as a semi-conscious appreciation of his role as symbol, and a rather more conscious understanding of the ends of the overall allegory.

In a sense, then, the most important aspect of a definition of allegory is the negative one. It is vital, when concerning oneself with a subject so surrounded by prejudice and misconception, to show just what that subject is not. To specify what allegory is, is neither so easy nor, perhaps, so important. To specify is to simplify, and the result is often to propound an indefensible generalisation such as the 'sugar coating' theory which this thesis has been discussing, and which, it has been suggested, is the result of associating all types of allegory with one genre - that of the mediaeval homily. Not unlike that other misunderstood literary mode, realism, allegory is possibly best understood as a whole when it is least understood in its component parts. The observations of Lukacs are germane to the argument:

> The characters created by the great realists, once conceived in the vision of their creator, live an independent life of their own; their comings and goings, their development, their destiny is dictated by the inner dialectic of their social and individual existence. No writer is a true realist - or even a truly good writer, if he can direct the evolution of his own characters at will.[4]

Lukacs's final sentence sums up the argument admirably. Allegory, as this thesis has suggested, is to be regarded as a potential organic whole to just the same extent as any other literary form, and the motivation of character and plot must come from within the book just as it must in a novel. To see the allegorist as a puppet master is to do an injustice to the form. Like any other art

form, the allegory must 'come alive', and convince the reader by its unity from within. The Pilgrim's Progress does this, for its symbols become characters in the way that this thesis will suggest that the symbols of Golding become characters. The result, for Golding, is a three dimensional aspect for his novels while the overall pattern remains in the firm control of the writer. The characters seldom seem 'cardboard', but are faced with real problems and dilemmas which, at the same time, become part of the consistent allegorical pattern of the novels.

So Golding's novels appear to give their characters a wide range of emotional freedom, so that they become 'people' as opposed to mere puppets. Yet the extent of Golding's control is not, it will be suggested, impaired at all. The thesis will argue a close allegorical link between Lord of the Flies, The Inheritors, Pincher Martin, Free Fall and The Spire which has not been apparent to critics simply because of the subtlety and flexibility of the allegory. It will be suggested that the allegorical theme of the five novels is a different aspect of the same thing - the nature of man - and that in the resolution of the discussion, in The Spire, a complete and three dimensional picture is achieved to an extent generally considered beyond the powers of allegory. The result must be a re-evaluation of the potential of allegory for complexity, and a dissociation of the ideas of allegory and mathematical equivalents, brought together originally by the use of the allegorical form as a means of illustrating a mediaeval sermon. But where the mediaeval

preachers were using allegory as an appendage to illustrate what to them was a moral certainty, Golding is using it to convey a belief which cannot be expressed in any other way. No one can state why men act the way they do, because no one understands completely the nature which makes them do so. But Golding, by examining extreme or improbable hypotheses in action stretches ad absurdum the characteristics which he has observed in men, and so is testing empirically, in the course of the allegorical novels, just what it is that makes man the way he is. The allegory, then, is not a way of explaining a fact - it is a way, - the only way, in fact - of finding out. This twentieth century empirical use of the form serves to expand the literary and philosophical uses of allegory, and it is from this aspect that this thesis will examine the theory and practice of allegory in the novels of William Golding.

CHAPTER TWO

Golding himself, in an expository lecture delivered at UCLA in 1962, and subsequently at other campuses in different parts of the United States, explained the basis of his first novel, Lord of the Flies, as being, specifically, an allegorical exploration of the nature of man. The lecture, revised and reprinted in Golding's miscellany The Hot Gates, and entitled "Fable"[1], suggests a clear association in the author's mind between the flaws traced in the boys on the island and certain assumptions common to them and to their former environment: for example, their "chauvinistic idiocies" led to the atrocities of Nazi Germany, with the result that those atrocities cease to be localised in one place, and explained by economic or political factors found in one place at one time, or even by the traditional idea of German militarism.

> One of our faults is to believe that evil is somewhere else and inherent in another nation. My book was to say: you think that now the war is over and an evil thing destroyed, you are safe because you are naturally kind and decent. But I know why the thing rose in Germany. I know it could happen in any country. It could happen here.[2]

In the new perspective granted the reader at the end of the novel, the chauvinism of the naval officer, shocked that British boys should become so degenerate, appears ludicrous. In fact, however, it merely reflects the ideas and attitudes of the boys themselves after their plane crash: it is the reader who has been brought to see the absurdity of the ideas. Of particular thematic importance is the close

association between Ralph, the apparently 'good' leader of the boys, and the naval officer[3], - a link which wrecks the reader's complacent support of the 'good' Ralph against the 'bad' Jack, illustrating for the first time something that is to become basic to Golding's work: that the necessity of choice, almost invariably foisted upon man, is not a simple decision, for man's simple mind is in conflict with his complex nature, so where he believes himself to be adjusting to a preferable system, he is, in fact, deceiving himself,-for no system can contain and satisfy man. In the choice between Ralph and Jack, the reader is only, as it were, indirectly involved. But this involvement of the reader is to become more and more direct as Golding's art matures.

The allegory is assisted by the continual parallels with R. M. Ballantyne's The Coral Island, not only in the three or four specific references to the book, but in the similarity of the names of the protagonists of either work. The analogies help suggest the essentially ludicrous nature of the Victorian imperialism and jingoism praised by Ballantyne, and portrayed in the novel as a series of inherently comic puerile gestures of patriotism or 'good breeding'.[4] Above all, The Coral Island functions, in terms of Golding's allegory, as a sort of objective correlative. That is to say, it provides an external criterion against which to judge the characters of the allegory. Its function is related to, though widely different from, that of the Bible in relation to The Pilgrim's Progress. To Bunyan, a whole code of certainties, of ideal living, could be found in the

Bible, which serves both as criterion for the actions of the characters of his work, and as a goal for his protagonist. In The Coral Island, however, Golding found something rather different. He found there a series of attitudes broadly accepted by the bulk of his complacent readers but not by himself, and in Lord of the Flies, he purposed to illustrate by allegorical analogy the fallacy of those attitudes. So while, for Bunyan, the Bible provided a reliable external commentary on the actions of The Pilgrim's Progress, The Coral Island, for Golding, constituted an unreliable one. So the analogies with Ballantyne in fact form an integral part of Golding's allegorical technique. As The Pilgrim's Progress relies for much of its allegorical effect on an unconscious or conscious association in the reader's mind with the absolute morality taught by the Bible, so does Lord of the Flies depend on an awareness in the reader of the ideas of The Coral Island, a comprehension of the widespread complacency which has resulted from such ideas, and a realisation of their basic fallacy.

In the course of his UCLA lecture, Golding's own ideas as to what constitutes his own allegorical theory seem to modify significantly. In the early stages he makes what this thesis has suggested is the rather facile and restricting correlation between fable (to use his word) and sugaring the pill. Then, towards the end of the lecture he remarks apologetically that Lord of the Flies is an imperfect fable because it is more than a sugared pill. But in his apology and partial self-justification lies the novel's primary

strength:

> I don't think the fable ever got right out of hand; but there are many places I am sure, where the fable splits at the seams and I would like to think that if this is so, the splits do not rise from ineptitude or deficiency but from a plenitude of imagination. Faults of excess seem to me more forgivable than faults of coldness, at least in the exercise of craftsmanship... May it not be that at the very moments when I felt the fable to come to its own life before me it may in fact have become something more valuable, so that where I thought it was failing, it was really succeeding?[5]

Interestingly, the development of thought apparent in the lecture suggests Golding coming to a more conscious awareness of the ends of his own art, and we remember once more the comment made by Lukacs and quoted above[6], that "No writer is a true realist - or even a truly good writer, if he can direct the evolution of his own characters at will."

So Golding's own testimony, albeit reluctant, supports the suggestion of this thesis that to hunt for exact equations and parallels for the symbols of the novel is a false critical approach. To see every action of Simon as Christlike, or every reference to Jack and Ralph as ironic reflections of their counterparts in The Coral Island, is to miss the subtlety of Lord of the Flies in much the same way as one misses the subtlety of Joseph Andrews by interpreting it primarily as a parody of Pamela. Both the individual symbols and the allegory which is the sum total of the symbolic parts transcend mathematical equations, becoming a means of reflecting the complex phenomenon which is the nature of man. As Golding himself expresses it: "The theme is an attempt to trace the defects of society back to the defects of human nature."[7]

Apart from such obvious symbols as the boys themselves, the conch, the fire, the spears and the act of hunting, the Beast and the Lord of the Flies, Piggy's specs and the naval officer, there is, throughout the novel, a consistent use of symbolic language and description. This device is vital as a means of clarifying and examining the contrast (both apparent and real), between the two camps, and of asserting by implication the theme of the novel. So after a passage where Jack's priority of hunting over rescue becomes apparent, a totally different passage shows Simon hunting, not pigs for sport, but fruit, to give to the littluns. Apart from vague Biblical analogies of Christ's altruism[8], the description of the landscape and the act itself are both symbolic in tone, and tend to highlight Simon's role in the allegory:

> Flower and fruit grew together on the same tree and everywhere was the scent of ripeness and the booming of a million bees at pasture. Here the littluns who had run after him caught up with him. They talked, cried out unintelligibly, lugged him towards the trees. Then, amid the roar of bees in the afternoon sunlight, Simon found for them the fruit they could not reach, pulled off the choicest from up in the foliage, passed them back down to the endless, outstretched hands. When he had satisfied them he paused and looked around. The littluns watched him inscrutably over double handfuls of ripe fruit.[9]

In terms of the allegory, Simon acts broadly as an external catalyst of the boys' nature. It has been noted above that Golding is using The Coral Island as an 'unreliable' criterion, and here, it may be suggested, he is employing Simon as a reliable absolute of good, in the way that the Bible, for Bunyan, was such an absolute. In other words, Simon is to be regarded by the reader in a fundamentally different way from the other boys. He is not, as it were,

a part of the allegory, for although he is a symbol in the allegorical novel, he is set apart from the general judgement: he is a tool of the writer, who is using him to heighten by contrast the basic savagery of the other boys.[10] Golding himself calls Simon a "Christ-figure"[11], and while his nature implicitly condemns the growing savagery of the others, his murder marks the moment when the boys finally eschew civilised values and Christian religion. Choir boys have become hunters and the ritual murder is prefaced by a parody of Christian Communion, as both Ralph and Piggy are symbolically initiated into the religion of the jungle:

> Jack stood up and waved his spear.
> "Take them some meat."
> The boys with the spit gave Ralph and Piggy each a succulent chunk. They took the gift, dribbling. So they stood and ate beneath a sky of thunderous brass that rang with the storm-coming.[12]

So Jack, enthroned as a diabolical High Priest, in offering the Host to the boys, involves them in the ritual murder that is to come. For Ralph this is the moment of complete realisation of the truth. Earlier in the novel he and Jack had exchanged glances, and, as he took Piggy's specs, "Not even Ralph knew how a link between him and Jack had been snapped and fastened elsewhere."[13] So Simon, in his absolute goodness, and in his final martyrdom, allegorically accentuates the basic link between Ralph the good and Jack the bad. In his external role in the novel, he shows that what one sees as good is, in fact, simply a less obvious, more sophisticated form of bad, and that circumstances can and do occur when disguised bad drops its pretence, and joins with its carnal brother in acts of evil.

The introductory chapter of this thesis suggested that this novel constitutes the first of a sequence of five allegorical explorations of different aspects of the nature of man. The links between the five novels will become more apparent in the discussions of the four books in the sequence published after Lord of the Flies. This first novel is, appropriately enough, primarily an exercise in, as it were, setting out the proposition. The allegory of the novel is descriptive rather than exegetical. That is to say, in Lord of the Flies, Golding is seeking not to examine why the boys act the way they do: he is simply attempting to illustrate just what constitutes the basic nature of man. The allegorical hypothesis is that certain characters are placed in a situation which will strain the characteristics which they possess to their utmost limits. The result will be that any pretences, or little hypocrisies permissible, indeed taken for granted, in civilised society will be stripped away by the process of continuous confined contact with others in a state where no laws or adults prevent one's basic nature from coming to the fore.[14] This, then, is the allegorical process of Lord of the Flies. As is common in Golding's allegory, an improbable situation is envisaged, with the purpose of stretching human nature to its logical end. In the later novels a more specific concern with some aspect of human nature will be seen to be taken. In Lord of the Flies the results of the savagery and cruelty inherent in man are examined and analysed.

Although the process is primarily descriptive, it will be of interest to examine the use made by Golding of the various symbols

in the novel, as a means of suggesting the control exercised by Golding over his characters and episodes, in spite of the three dimensional nature of the novel. That his controlling power is in no way diminished by the creation of fully realised characters and the failure to equate mathematically each incident with some external meaning or doctrine, reflects considerable credit on both Golding's allegorical theory and practice. Again it is important to emphasise the impossibility, in Golding's allegory, of doctrinal certainty. The very theory of the creation of improbable circumstances in which to test the extremes of human nature, implies a process of experimentation, and in a very real sense, Lord of the Flies is an experimental allegory. For the novel to succeed, the characters must be three dimensional, they must 'come to life.' If they do not convince, then the allegory has failed, for the reader, if he is to be led to an appreciation of the error of the theory of beneficence propounded by Ballantyne, must be more convinced as to the probability of the characters of Golding, than by the lovable boys on Ballantyne's island. Golding's task, then, is delicate. While exercising an overall control over the theme, and over the characters themselves, he must allow them to 'come to life' if his allegory is to succeed. The unity of response elicited by Fielding in Tom Jones, but not in Jonathan Wild is of paramount importance for the success of Lord of the Flies. Unlike its predecessors, it cannot succeed on one level and fail on another, for the narrative is so intertwined with the allegory that if it fails in the one, it fails in the other. The occasionally heavy and unmistakable symbolism[15] prevent it being

a mere narrative with no allegorical overtones, while a failure on the narrative level means that the allegory cannot convince in its portrayal of human nature.

A descriptive criticism of the symbolic devices employed in the course of the novel will illustrate at least this aspect of Golding's allegorical skill, and demonstrate the success of Lord of the Flies as a comprehensive introduction to the more concentrated nature of the later novels.

Of the symbols themselves, the conch is at once the most basic and the most straightforward, for its fate parallels and emphasises the fate of civilised values on the island. Gradual qualifications in the power of the conch, such as Jack's "... the conch doesn't count at this end of the island - "[16], and his rejection of the democratic values represented by the conch, until its violent end, dashed to pieces with Piggy, trace the decline, and final abandonment. of civilisation on a fairly obvious level of allegory. But to equate the conch simply with 'civilised' values is by no means adequate, for in the conch itself lie the seeds of its own destruction. A fragile object, as susceptible to violence as Piggy's specs, it is doomed to destruction from the first. For it is not the savagery which suggests the antithesis of civilisation to which it is vulnerable, but the violence which is a part of civilisation. The 'civilised' schoolboys who institute the convention of speaking only with the conch intend to defend that conch with the very means that they subsequently employ to destroy it:

Jack was on his feet.

"We'll have rules!" he cried excitedly. "Lots of rules! Then when anyone breaks 'em - "

"Whee-ch!"

"Wacco!"

"Bong!"

"Doink!"[17]

So that which is fragile and easily dashed to pieces is to be defended by those very means which can destroy it. The conch represents, then, not the civilisation which spawns naval cruisers and atom bombs, but those values which cannot survive in such a civilisation. It suggests those elements which distinguish civilisation from savagery. It is connected to the ancient Greek ideal of democracy, but also to the elements in civilised society which prevent people acting towards each other as the boys on the island do. The symbolic implication is not so simple as might at first appear: the conch is not the world which the boys have left behind them, but the values which, because they cannot survive in the microcosmic world of the island, cannot, by implication, survive in the adult world either.[18] In the adult, or 'civilised' world, the values represented by the conch form an ironic alliance with self-interest, and it is this alliance of convenience which enables them to survive. But when self-interest is channelled elsewhere - into violence, even cannibalism - the precarious alliance is shattered and civilised values go by the board.

Counterbalancing the conch is the Lord of the Flies[19], and the symbolic encounter of Simon with the head has been too adequately analysed by other critics for a lengthy exposition to be necessary here. Indeed, the symbolism of the scene is fairly self-explanatory:

"Fancy thinking the Beast was something you could hunt and kill!" said the head. For a moment or two the forest and all the other dimly appreciated places echoed with the parody of laughter. "You knew, didn't you? I'm part of you? Close, close, close! I'm the reason why it's no good? Why things are what they are?"[20]

The Lord of the Flies translates Beelzebub, "a devil whose name suggests that he is devoted to decay, destruction, demoralization, hysteria and panic".[21] More precisely, he suggests those forces which lead one, irrationally, to the worship of the animal within - the Beast; and in the use by Jack of the head as an offering, lies the implication that the forces represented by the head are the means to the ultimate savagery of beast worship. In the article cited above, Mr Epstein aptly mentions Joseph Conrad's Heart of Darkness, and one recalls the growth, under broadly analogous conditions, of the savage impulses of Kurtz, as he scrawls his desire to exterminate the brutes as a macabre postscript to his humanitarian, and apparently 'civilised' document, written in his days of apparent enlightenment. The test, in Conrad's novel, of Marlow, as he feels affinity not only with Kurtz, but with the dancing natives on the shore, is, in a sense, a relatively optimistic portrayal of that irrational force represented in Golding by the Beast. Marlow is only partially corrupted by the jungle, while Golding's boys experience the total reversion to primordial savagery suffered by Kurtz.

In both novels, the evil comes from within, and the important contrast is not between these two books, but between either of them and The Coral Island. The problem of evil is, of course, the main point of departure from Ballantyne made by Golding, and, allegorically,

this fact is central to an understanding of Lord of the Flies. It is reflected in the contrasting attitudes of the characters of the two novels towards, for example, hunting and superstition. The boys in Ballantyne's book hunt only for food, never for the fun of the kill, and when little Peterkin, alarmed at hearing a noise, asks Jack whether he believes in ghosts, he is quickly reassured:

> "I neither believe in ghosts nor feel uneasy," he replied. "I never saw a ghost myself, and I never met with any one who had: and I have generally found that strange and unaccountable things have almost always been accounted for, and found to be quite simple, on close examination."[22]

Jack's confidence in such matters is itself an implicit denial of the beast within, that unaccountable irrationality which is why it is "no go". Such parallels form the basis of one aspect of the allegory of Lord of the Flies, and the symbolic role of the head refutes the pious rationality of Ballantyne's boys: there is always something within which causes man to act the way he does. Golding, in the course of his lecture, cites Niemeyer's comments on The Coral Island: "Ballantyne's book raises the problem of evil - which comes to the boys not from within themselves but from the outside world."[23] It is this inner potential for evil which is emphasised by both Golding and Conrad[24] and the portrayal of this evil and its gradual emergence from the minds, or, as Golding is later to term it, the 'cellar' of the boys into the open, is the process of Lord of the Flies.

Allegorically, this thesis has suggested, the island of the boys constitutes a microcosmic version of the adult world. The boys, forced prematurely into the positions of power and responsibility

held normally by adults, are seen to manifest the same characteristics as their elders in positions of comparable authority in the outside world. The allegorical analogy is enhanced by Golding's treatment of the littluns on the island. In the society of the island, they fulfil broadly the role of youths of the age of Jack and Ralph in the adult world. Many of them not individualised, they represent, ostensibly, the prelapsarian world, untainted by experience, uncorrupted by power:

> They ate most of the day, picking fruit where they could reach it and not particular about ripeness and quality... Apart from food and sleep, they found time for play, aimless and trivial, in the white sand by the bright water. They cried for their mothers much less often than might have been expected; they were very brown, and filthily dirty.[25]

Their activities, then, appear, at first sight, similar to those related in The Coral Island, where Jack, Ralph and Peterkin, fortified by mutual affection and British amour-propre, have no desire to be rescued from their island paradise.

Golding in fact, however, is less idealistic than this. In a strange passage immediately following the idealistic description cited above, one of the littluns, Henry, is given power over Percival and Johnny in the same way that the older boys on the island were given power over him, and the adults in the outside world were given power over them. The episode becomes, in a sense, then, a microcosm within a microcosm. The reader is told: "Henry was a bit of a leader this afternoon, because the other two were Percival and Johnny, the smallest boys on the island."[26] His game of sandcastles (itself apparently an infantile war substitute) having been ended by the violence of two slightly older boys, Roger and Maurice, Henry walks

along the beach and finds a rotten bit of stick, crawling with insects:

> 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.[27]

The implication of the allegory is clear: as Ralph and Jack will be the successors of the adults of today, their successors in turn will be the generation represented in the novel by Henry. Corruption remains latent until given the power to operate, when it comes to the surface in all men. Little as Henry is, he is bigger than the insects he finds, and he sublimates his frustrated power lust by envisaging them as his slaves or soldiers, and he as their leader. The result, as Golding euphemistically remarked, is that he is "absorbed beyond mere happiness."

It gradually becomes apparent, then, as the novel progresses, that all the boys, though presented generally with a three dimensional appearance and a naturalistic delight in detail, are very much more than characters in a novel. The incident of the twig and the insects, for example, succeeds absolutely on both the narrative and the symbolic level, and the reader finds himself as much amused by it as disapproving. This reaction is part of Golding's allegorical technique of involving the reader in the novel, - a technique to be exploited to an even greater degree in the later novels. The reader is amused because the nature which is being portrayed is not only that of Henry, it is his own. The amusement stems from a semi-conscious recognition of this fact on the subjective level, and a conscious disapprobation

on the objective level. In other words, the allegory compels one to acknowledge one's own basic nature, and the subsequent narrative - as chaos and cannibalism set in - bring from one a realisation of the enormous potential for evil which is inside oneself. An apparently fragmented response thus becomes a unified picture of the disasters which can result from the nature of man being what it is. In Jonathan Wild, however, - another novel which this thesis has suggested evokes a fragmented response from the reader - one is never convinced that one's instinctive sympathy for the villains is wrong. Human nature is not on trial in the way that it is in Lord of the Flies; in Golding's novel an initial fragmented response is necessary for the allegory to have its full and immediate effect. The reader begins by identifying with the boys and associating himself with their apparently harmless games. Then, however, the allegorical hypothesis is stretched to its limits so that one is shown the reductio ad absurdum of the tendencies which one not only condones, but holds.

A similar process is used in the portrayal of Ralph, whose apparent role on the side of the angels is constantly belied by glimpses of his true nature. A sort of 'secret sharer' relationship with Jack, suggested above[26], is part of the psychological (as opposed to the pragmatic) cause of Jack's pathological hatred of Ralph, and at the end of the novel, it is ultimately this symbolic association which makes the final rift inevitable: "These painted savages would go further and further. Then there was that indefinable connection between himself and Jack; who therefore would never let him

alone; never."[29]

But long before the suggestion of affinity between Ralph and Jack, the former is presented somewhat equivocally. Immediately before his initial cruelty to Piggy, the reader is told that Ralph might "make a boxer"[30] were it not for an air of mildness, - exactly the combination which is to characterise him throughout the novel, as Golding traces the growth in him of the violent at the expense of the mild. After mocking Piggy with his detested nickname, "Ralph danced out into the hot air of the beach and then returned as a fighter-plane, with wings swept back, and machine-gunned Piggy."[31] The imagery of this passage leads on to the immediate disclosure that his father is a "commander in the navy." Here, Ralph is inextricably linked with the naval officer from the rescuing frigate, whose symbolic function has been clearly defined by the author:

> The officer, having interrupted a man-hunt, prepares to take the children off the island in a cruiser which will presently be hunting its enemy in the same implacable way. And who will rescue the adult and his cruiser?[32]

As the novel progresses, Ralph, like Marlow in Heart of Darkness, comes to understand better the darkest recesses of his own psyche. This new comprehension reaches its consummation in the ritual slaying of Simon, when Ralph will not accept the pragmatic assurance of Piggy of their innocence in the affair[33]. He knows of something within him with which he must come to grips, and that something, as he is well aware, is connected with his strange affinity with Jack.

In Ralph, then, more than in any of his companions, is traced

the decline of order. Basically decent in normal terms, and with a heightened sensibility, he is aware of what is going on around and within him, and is similarly aware of his powerlessness to prevent it. He can ask Piggy "I mean... what makes things break up like they do?"[34] but cannot entirely grasp the fact that it is the basic nature of man which brings about the chaos. The profound truth, known only to the visionary Simon, escapes him.

Of all the allegorical figures, it is Ralph with whom we identify primarily, and it is when the cracks appear in Ralph that the reader feels most strongly the flaws in his own nature. The affinity ceases to be only between Jack and Ralph, - it comes to be between Jack and the reader, for Jack is an obvious example of the repressions of man come to the surface. All men have the potential for evil of Jack, and the point is emphasised at the end of the novel, when, from a new perspective, Jack becomes once more merely a tousle-headed English schoolboy.

The technique of the shifting perspective is common, in some form or another, to all five novels in the sequence, and it will be suggested that it is a vital part of Golding's allegorical technique. At present it suffices to say that in its new view of Jack and the other boys it shakes the reader's assumptions as to the physical nature of the boys, and as to their objective physical power. In questioning the reader's powers of objectivity it paves the way for the celebrated and subtle 'hole in the tree' section in the penultimate chapter of <u>The Inheritors</u>, and the device will be discussed more fully

later in the thesis.

There is a considerable amount more which could be discussed in the novel[35], but the aim of this chapter has been to suggest something of the skill shown by Golding in his fusion of narrative and allegorical elements. Of all the five works in the sequence it is this which appears most obviously to have a strong narrative element. And in a sense the allegory of Lord of the Flies might justly be defined as being, above all, expository rather than exegetical. It describes the effect of human nature, without either examining the psychological motivations for that nature, or isolating any specific aspects of that total nature. Instead, in this novel, is shown the way man would act, given a situation where his powers of concealment were able to go by the board. In the novels which follow, the nature of man is to be considered from different viewpoints and with different emphases, but the general introduction, which this novel constitutes - the setting out, as it were, of the proposition, - has been necessary. Now, the statement of effect having been made, it remains for Golding to examine the component parts of man's nature, as well as the reason why man is the way he is, and attempt to come to some definitive conclusion as to what he should do in life, and as to what his positive potentialities are. It is this that Golding is attempting to do in the novels which followed Lord of the Flies.

CHAPTER THREE

If not the science of anthropology itself, then the fact of Golding's interest in it is a key to the allegory of The Inheritors. The basis of the novel is an encounter between Neanderthal man and his successors. Golding, one may assume, was aware of the fallacious anthropology, yet persisted with the hypothesis, moulding it into an allegory which examines a number of suppositions concerning man as individual being and as part of society.

The passage quoted initially from H. G. Wells's Outline of History[1] is stylistically and thematically reminiscent of the tone of the penultimate chapter of the novel, where, in a celebrated shift in perspective, Golding adopts the pose of a distant, empirically objective narrator, describing the sole survivor of the Neanderthal race in terms reserved by scientists for beasts of a lower order[2]. But what Wells intended as a genuinely objective account of the pre-history of Homo Sapiens is shown by Golding to be a superficial and misleading approach. By adopting the antithesis of scientific method, Golding takes the reader into the very mind of Neanderthal man, and so tracing, allegorically not scientifically, the basis of his own theories concerning the basic nature of man.

The allegory lies primarily in the tracing, by the novel, of the seeds of the evil in man which came to the fore in Lord of the Flies. If that novel was concerned with a demonstration of the effect

of that evil, The Inheritors constitutes primarily an exploration of its cause. Sin, the novel suggests, lies not in the commission of acts reprehensible to Western society, but in the knowledge of wrongdoing. But the tragic irony is that knowledge accompanies advancement, and that with progress, individual and racial, comes corruption.

The idea of individual progress was a theme of Lord of the Flies, where a group of boys progressed, prematurely, to become the rulers of their society. With the growth of responsibility and power in them came the growth of evil; even in the little Henry, exercising delightedly his power over the insects, the inevitable process was observed. The idea is reiterated in The Inheritors, primarily in the development of little Tanakil, as her power over the captured Liku increases. A growing friendship between the two girls, - one Neanderthal, one an Inheritor - is concluded by the adults of the new race. When the idea of her superiority to Liku, and her power over her is accepted by Tanakil, her reactions are related to those of the English schoolboys on the island:

> Liku held on to the earth with hands and feet. Suddenly Tanakil began to scream at her like the crumple-faced woman. She picked up a stick, spoke in a biting sharp voice and began to pull again. Liku still held on and Tanakil hit her across the back with the stick. Liku howled and Tanakil pulled and beat.[3]

The element of cruelty, of suppressed violence, is common to the new people and to the boys in Lord of the Flies. It is lacking in the Neanderthals, and therein lies the significance for the allegory of the anthropological hypothesis: two races, apparently different in

their basic nature, are seen side by side. The one race is instinctively pure and good, the other evil and corrupt. The allegory examines the differences between the habits, customs and life-styles of the two groups of people, implying that in these differences lies the cause of the differences in nature.

The theme of racial progress, then, parallels that of individual progress observed in Tanakil, as well as in Lord of the Flies. The anthropological hypothesis thus enables the allegory to develop the theme of Lord of the Flies, as well as to explore the cause of what was apparent in the earlier novel. The hypothesis enables Golding to bring about the juxtaposition of two different life-styles, and invites the reader to consider why it is that while the Inheritors share the twentieth century corruption of the boys on the island of the previous novel, the Neanderthals appear basically good, and of a quite different nature from that of their inheritors, both within the novel and in the twentieth century.

Part of the technique of this allegory of contrast is to tell it not from a general Neanderthal viewpoint, but from the viewpoint of the simplest of all that race. Lok's companions regard him as both a buffoon and a simpleton. At the beginning of the novel, when he reports to Na the removal of the log bridge, she suspects him of having stolen it as a hoax, and his simplicity and impracticality are subsequently emphasised in contrast to Ha, the prospective successor of Mal, the leader. Ha is not only instrumental in replacing the bridge, but has "more pictures" (or

thoughts and ideas) than Lok. It is always Lok who provides the comic relief for the people, by his antics, and always "The people applauded him, grinning, half at Lok, half at the story."[4] The significance of the Old Woman's comment on the death of Mal that "Now there is Lok" becomes immediately apparent, for as a leader, Lok is hopeless.

It is to the judgement of this exceptionally simple Neanderthal, then, that the reader surrenders his own ideas. The allegorical significance of the emphasis on Lok's naivete is that Lok represents, in an exaggerated form, those qualities which distinguish his people from the Inheritors, and from the twentieth century. It is the characteristics for which the reader remembers Lok which the reader and his people have lost. In common with the other Neanderthals Lok has no possessions, no wife, no children. There is, in the Neanderthal tribe, no family unit except in that the tribe is one family unit. There is no external enemy against whom to protect the rest of the tribe before the coming of the new people, and no conception of the need to protect. Above all, there is no mental ability, among the members of the tribe, to deduce. Early in the novel, the relatively perceptive Fa cannot quite grasp a simple thought process which would have increased the fertility of the crops by moving them to a new place by the river, while Lok is completely defeated by the very suggestion:

> Lok belched at the patch and looked at it affectionately.
> "This is a good place."
> Fa frowned and munched.
> "If the patch were nearer - "
> She swallowed her mouthful with a gulp.
> "I have a picture. The good food is growing. Not here. It is growing by the fall."

Lok laughed at her.

"No plant like this grows near the fall!"

Fa put her hands wide apart, watching Lok all the time. Then she began to bring them together. But though the tilt of her head, the eyebrows moved slightly up and apart asked a question she had no words with which to define it. She tried again.

"But if - See this picture. The overhang and the fire is down here."

Lok lifted his face away from his mouth and laughed.

"This place is down here. And the overhang and the fire is there."

He broke off more shoots, stuffed them into his mouth and went on eating.[5]

It is in the combination of the possession of goods and the power of deduction, that the Inheritors and subsequent generations differ primarily from the Neanderthals. It is to these two factors, too, Golding's allegory implies, that the evil in men's mind may be traced. The possession of goods by an individual, to the exclusion of his fellows, constitutes an incitement to jealousy in the other, and a feeling of a need to defend those goods in the owner. Possessions, in other words, are symptomatic of an inevitable breakdown in the community, and necessitate an overall fragmentation of society. In the scenes in the new people's encampment, mistrust is seen to extend not from the one people to the other, but among the new people themselves. Marlan, who possesses Vivani, is seen to lose her to Tusmi, while the illicit sexual act witnessed by Lok and Fa is rife with images of violence and discord, - a contrast to the initially natural and harmonious sexuality of the Neanderthals. When the new people lose a baby, they replace it by stealing the infant from the Neanderthals, and at the end of the novel Tusmi is seen plotting the murder of his leader, Marlan.

All this evil stems from a breakdown in the overall unity of society, and a tendency to think in terms of oneself instead of ~~as~~ an overall and harmonious unit of which one is part. The process, the allegory suggests, is inevitable, and accompanies the development of the race. By the end of the novel, the influence of the new people, apart from physically destroying the Neanderthals, has also shaken their spiritual unity. There is a series of symbolic corruptions of the remaining representatives of the old which associates the novel, to a certain extent at least, with the 'Genesis' Creation myth[6]. Lok, even by his not fully appreciated experiences, is brought to an unconscious self-identification with the new people, so that quite early in the novel he can see but not understand that the familial ties of his race are breaking. After searching for Ha, Lok encounters the old woman:

> She was so close that Lok could see the drops that fell from her fingers and the twin fires reflected in her eyes. She passed under the rock and he knew that she had not seen him. All at once Lok was frightened because she had not seen him. The old woman knew so much; yet she had not seen him. He was cut off and no longer one of the people; as though his communion with the other had changed him he was different from them and they could not see him. He had no words to formulate these thoughts but he felt his difference and invisibility as a cold wind that blew on his skin. The other had tugged at the strings that bound him to Ha and Mal and Liku and the rest of the people. The strings were not the ornament of life but its substance. If they broke, a man would die.[7]

Gradually the corruption becomes more specific and accentuated, but remains the result of experience, not of temptation. The drinking of the mead differs from the taking of the apple by Eve in that it was an act not of disobedience, but of inexperience. Right until the penultimate chapter, when the coldly objective narrator tells the

reader how Lok discovered the "small, white bone"[8], Lok believed Liku to be alive. Yet the association with the new people comes long before this moment, - it comes, in fact, when Lok first shakily grasps the concept of the faculty of reason:

> Lok discovered "Like". He had used likeness all his life without being aware of it. Fungi on a tree were ears, the word was the same but acquired a distinction by circumstances that could never apply to the sensitive things on the side of his head. Now, in a convulsion of the understanding Lok found himself using likeness as a tool as surely as ever he had used a stone to hack at sticks or meat. Likeness could grasp the white-faced hunters with a hand, could put them into the world where they were thinkable and not a random and unrelated irruption.[9]

The corruption of the new people is thus, partially at least, imparted to Lok - a symbol of the inevitability of anthropological progress. It is not succumbing to temptation which has influenced Lok, for he has no conception of what is evil. It is simply the fruits of experience which have changed him, and shaken the fabric of his traditional existence. The moment of specific association, however, is the moment of Lok's realisation of reason, and the significance of this fact for the overall allegory is considerable.

It is not only the fact of owning possessions that brings about corruption, but also the faulty reasoning that accompanies those possessions. The knowledge of having something which others do not have, engenders the <u>idea</u> that those others will attempt to take it away. Since the idea may (as in the case of Marlan) be correct, the thought need not be wrong, but the combination of the potential of a man to take the possessions of another, and the realisation of this fact by the owner, leads to a totally fragmented society, and a

tendency to isolate the individual. It is through the false reasoning of the new people that the Neanderthals were about to fight with them, and, subsequently, that they were devils, that Lok and his people came to be destroyed. It was through their false reasoning that the power of Marlan, based on fear and superstition, came to be so great. From the power of Marlan, as well as through the fact of the jealousy of individuals among the new people for the safety of their possessions came the discords and murder which characterise the descriptions of their community. The Neanderthals, with no possessions and no power of reasoning, live in a totally harmonious society, with no conception of evil, no idea of self.

In the new people, then, the defensive and aggressive instincts emanate from the same factor - false reasoning. Aggression is the result of the apparent need to defend oneself. The idea that a defence against the Neanderthals was necessary led to the aggression which obliterated that race. It is these instincts which are explored in this novel, as it was these instincts which were described in Lord of the Flies. Both, ultimately, spring from the power to reason which has accompanied anthropological progress. Man's reason is inadequate. It is a partial gift only, and The Inheritors suggests that a little reason, like a little knowledge, is a dangerous thing. The fact is suggested by the allegory of the novel in two ways. It is suggested, as this thesis has argued, in the juxtaposition of the two contrasting races, the one without, the other with, reason; but it is also suggested in the celebrated shift in perspective which occurs in the

penultimate chapter of the novel.

In this section, there is a shift in narrative perspective, as the narration moves from the unsophisticated perception of Lok to the clinical tone of the scientist used by such as Wells in their anthropological researches. Lok ceases to be a sympathetic and at times tragic figure. He becomes, instead, a little red animal scuttling up a tree, referred to not as 'he', but in the third person neuter. On reading this passage, the reader is tempted to change his own attitude for quite illogical, external, reasons, and to associate himself with the new people. And therein lies the subtlety of the allegorical technique: by activating his hypothesis in a distant area, Golding comes as close as possible to inducing in the reader an attitude of false objectivity, - even of subjective support for a cause from which, in a more orthodox novel, he would feel himself to be alienated. Then the shift in perspective suddenly involves the reader, for the narrator assumes the coldly scientific tone which he himself might take, and there is a resultant, totally illogical shift in the reader's attitude. The allegorical technique of the novel thus demonstrates in action the fallibility of the thought process of man, suggesting the falsity of the instincts (notably, as has been suggested, those of defence and aggression) which emanate from that thought process. It was the false instincts of defence and aggression which characterised the catastrophes of Lord of the Flies, where a parallel shifting perspective technique involved the boys in the society of the reader, and the same device will be examined in regard

to the later novels. Basically, the theory behind the technique is that the reader should be involved in the novels, for the novels are about him and his nature, and the device of the dual perspective successfully makes him part of the works. This theory refutes the charge of 'gimmickry' sometimes levelled at Golding[10]. It is, in a sense, a trick, but the purpose of the 'trick' is very much greater than a cheap literary effect: it is to demonstrate in action the mental vulnerability of man, and the falsity of his ostensible objectivity. Wells, and others writing similar anthropological studies, write subjectively under the guise of objectivity, for the clinical style which characterises both the Outline of History and the penultimate chapter of The Inheritors, far from being objective, is a subjective rejection of the physically alien Neanderthals, as the earlier chapters of Golding's novel induce in the reader a subjective rejection of the blatantly cruel new people. The shifting perspective thus alienates the reader from the Neanderthals, with whom he has been sympathising, and associates him with the sadistic new people, - in both instances on purely external and physical grounds. In demonstrating the emotive nature of man's apparent objectivity, Golding has brought into question his capacity to lead, or to take any decision, and in this sense, The Inheritors has indeed traced the cause of the disastrous events of Lord of the Flies, justifying here his theme of the association of corruption and power. The aggression stems ultimately, then, from man's weakness. Associated from the very first with the need to protect one's possessions, it is associated, too

with man's mental weakness and instability. For as he resorts to violence and aggression as a means of defending his property in the light of his physical weakness, so does he show his aggression as a result of the mental weakness which invariably prevents his seeing and appreciating the events of his environment as a whole, and with a degree of objectivity. But this weakness is to be a major concern of the later novels - particularly Pincher Martin and Free Fall - and will be discussed when this thesis considers those novels. But it must be apparent that as Lord of the Flies, by portraying man as he is, begged certain questions as to why he is thus, leaving them to be answered by The Inheritors, that novel, by answering those questions, has triggered off a further series of problems as to the nature of the vulnerability of man and as to what his role in life, considering these weaknesses, should be. These questions are to become the concerns of the subsequent novels in the sequence, Pincher Martin, Free Fall, and The Spire.

Finally, having discussed the nature and end of the allegorical technique of The Inheritors, it is opportune to answer one important comment on the novel, which, in its implications, suggests a very basic misunderstanding of the fundamental theory and practice of Golding's allegory. Certainly one would acknowledge a clear parallel between the allegory and the 'Genesis' Creation myth, but a certain amount of qualification becomes necessary when one reads the specific associations made by Mr Peter Green. Mr Green, in the course of his criticism of the novel, comments that "Lok and Fa thus become

anthropological analogues of Adam and Eve; but it is Man himself whom Golding identifies with the serpent"[11]. Such statements, in their simplistic nature, illustrate the modern misconceptions of the nature of allegory criticised in the introductory chapter of this thesis. As has been argued, and as Golding himself has realised[12] the specific associations of mediaeval homiletic allegory are neither desirable, nor, indeed, possible, in twentieth century allegory. If one equates Lok with Adam, Fa with Eve, and Man with the serpent, as Mr Green does, there is little to be gained either by writing or by reading The Inheritors, for 'Genesis' is a quite adequate source. Whereas homiletic associations had the purpose of motivating the listener to certain actions, Golding's allegory simply aims to show man what he is. If this could be done by exact parallels with other works, Golding's novels would be unnecessary. Anyway, pursuit of Green's thesis to its logical conclusion ties one up in certain critical difficulties. For example, it is demonstrably untrue that Lok's encounter with the new people is analogous to Adam's encounter with the serpent, just as it is false to suggest an analogy between the Adam/Eve and Lok/Fa relationships. There is no anthropomorphic tempter among the new people, and Lok's fall is the result, as this thesis has argued, not of a conscious act of sin comparable to the pride and disobedience of Adam and Eve, but an inevitable result of experience. Mr Green's criticisms appear to emerge from the common association between allegory and mathematics which has for so long resulted in allegory coming to be considered as a second rate literary form. Faced with an

apparent piece of allegory, such as The Inheritors, the modern critic can only hunt for restricting parallels, and consequently force the work into a pattern to which it does not conform. To force Golding into any pattern is to miss the subtlety and originality of his work.

The issues raised by The Inheritors are, as has been argued, explored more specifically in the allegories of the later novels. This thesis will proceed to examine those novels, and trace the thematic and technical links between the works in the development of the assertion that the five novels, in their use of allegory and in their major concerns, constitute a sequence of explorations of the nature of man.

CHAPTER FOUR

Golding's third novel, Pincher Martin, constitutes a further development and increased concentration in Golding's allegorical technique. Never a popular success by Golding's standards, the novel is probably too concentrated to enjoy the wide following of Lord of the Flies, both as book and film.

Again the allegorical technique is not one of obsessive identification and association. Rather, the broad allegorical pattern is aided by details, both symbolic and naturalistic, which illustrate the reality of the mind and world not only of Christopher Martin, but of mankind. That mind and world are paradoxical, and the allegory similarly so. Pincher Martin is villain and hero, his world desirable and odious, his attitudes contrary and confusing, his needs gregarious and individualistic, his desire exceeding his performance, his mind at odds with his body. But more than allegorising and exploring the nature of Martin, the novel examines, again in allegory, the creation and evolution of the human race, from the creature crawling out of the sea to the being with some power of thought and action. The precise nature of the allegorical details, and their apparent naturalistic bent enables the allegory to come to life, and its protagonist to assume the proportions of a realistic character. The convincing nature of the portrayal of the boys in Lord of the Flies has already been likened to the allegorical success of the characters of The Pilgrim's

Progress, and a similar three dimensional portrayal is achieved in the case of Christopher Martin.

For all his posturing, at times both ludicrous and pathetic; and in spite of the thematic necessity of his being portrayed as a villain and a murderer, Martin is, in a very real sense, a hero. Peter Green makes the point well:

> Now Mr. Golding makes it quite clear that Pincher's struggle for survival is not intended to be seen as heroic, but rather as egotistical, in the Hobbesian sense. He is clinging with fierce desperation to his own small, mean pattern of existence. He refuses to acknowledge the cosmic chaos of death. Yet, paradoxically enough, it is just at this point that Pincher - like Milton's Satan - breaks away from his creator's original intention...
>
> Indeed, Christopher Martin is more than an individual sailor, suffering on a specific rock: he is a mythic symbol of man's steadfast endurance. He is the much-travelled, long-enduring, crafty Odysseus, spewing the salt water from his lungs, battered yet surviving. He is Ajax defying the lightning. 'Why drag in good and evil', he cries, 'when the serpent lies coiled in my own body?... I am Atlas. I am Prometheus.' He is Lear in his madness and defiant to the end. He sums up every quality that distinguishes man from the beasts.[1]

Yet for all that, Martin is presented, as Green immediately observes, as "one of the nastiest characters ever to appear in fiction."

The answer lies in the opening comments of this thesis on the subject of the potential complexity of the allegorical form, as well as in Lukacs's remark that good writers are not in full control of their characters. While exercising an overall control over the nature of the character, the writer can well afford to let that character develop naturally and show the attributes of a person rather than of a symbol. Milton's Satan is a good analogy, for one can argue from the text of Paradise Lost that constant ironic qualifications and tinsel images render the popular conception of

Satan as hero of the opening books quite false. But whether or not this is so, the fact remains that Satan as hero *is* a popular conception and that for it to have become so there is inevitably something in the portrayal of the character to make it so. If (as seems probable) the popular conception is alien to Milton's intention, then the work has attained a new level of richness for the reader by forging an unintentional, and hence natural link with his mind. For the reader too has something of the fallen angels in him, and if he too is rallied by Satan's speech at Pandemonium, and impressed by his magnificent appearance, his control over his defeated troops need not be taken on trust - it is demonstrated in action.

The reader's sympathy and admiration for Pincher Martin stems from a similar source. Martin's determination in adversity, his mental application and his endurance all link him with the reader as a slave of the instinct of self-preservation. In this ambivalent attitude towards a protagonist envisaged by Golding as totally unsympathetic, the reader is again involved in the allegory. This time he is associated with a character whose past life illustrates a nature of absolute egocentricity, yet whose constant vulnerability prevents that egocentricity from holding sway.

The basis of the allegory of the nature of man is, in this novel, an examination of the nature of this vulnerability implied but not explored in *The Inheritors*. The consideration of this facet of human nature is to be continued in *Free Fall* and in *The Spire*, in greater profundity, as Sammy Mountjoy tries to come to grips with this

aspect of his nature, and Dean Jocelin hesitantly succeeds in doing so. In Pincher Martin, however, the allegory is descriptive rather than exegetical. As in Lord of the Flies, an aspect of man's nature is being described: the novel shows that man is weak, both physically and mentally, but no attempt is made to specify what in particular it is in man's nature that makes him so. To find this is to be the aim of Sammy Mountjoy, but Christopher Martin, stranded on his rock in the Atlantic Ocean, can only dimly perceive the fact of his vulnerability; its cause is no part of the novel.

On both the narrative and the allegorical levels, Martin's transcendent egocentricity is the basis of the novel. Allegorically, the egocentricity implies a determination to be self-sufficient, to use but not need other people. The action of the allegory is to show the folly of the assumption of self-sufficiency either mentally or physically. The rock symbol, and the helpless gropings of the drowned man provide a parallel, which illustrates man's physical vulnerability, to the flashed sequences from the protagonist's past life, which imply his mental vulnerability.

The vulnerability is seen as being connected to the dualism between body and mind which is constantly emphasised throughout the novel. As early as the second page, in the passage generally interpreted as the moment of physical death, the dualism which caused Golding to rename the American edition of the novel The Two Deaths of Christopher Martin is implied.

> But the man lay suspended behind the whole commotion, detached from his jerking body. The luminous pictures that were shuffled before

him were drenched in light but he paid no attention to them. Could he have controlled the nerves of his face, or could a face have been fashioned to fit the attitude of his consciousness where it lay suspended between life and death that face would have worn a snarl. But the real jaw was contorted down and distant, the mouth was slopped full. The green tracer that flew from the centre began to spin into a disc. The throat at such a distance from the snarling man vomited water and drew it in again. The hard lumps of water no longer hurt. There was a kind of truce, observation of the body. There was no face but there was a snarl.[2]

Martin's body has ceased to function; only his mind continues, and the mind becomes the puppet-master of the various parts of his body. His egocentricity guides him through a new evolutionary process, from the earliest motions of the evolving animal to the relative sophistication of a still weak and vulnerable man. Early in the novel "He began to think swimming motions but knew now that his body was no longer obedient"[3], and later, "He saw his seaboot stockings and thought his feet back into them."[4] When he sees himself as "Like a limpet!"[5], Martin implicitly acknowledges the dualism: the limpet, stationary, clinging mindlessly but instinctively to the rock, becomes an effective symbol of his own real state. In his subsequent reliance upon the limpets as he undergoes the process of climbing the rock, are suggested his own absurd vulnerability, and the impossibility of his performing, independently, even the simplest actions.

The constant allegorical exploitation of the gap between the aspirations of Martin's mind and the paltry nature of his bodily achievements[6] is closely related to the mediaeval allegorical concept of the eternal spirit imprisoned in the earthly body. The idea, (again to be examined in Free Fall and The Spire), qualifies significantly the mediaeval idea of man's heavenly nature, while still acknowledging

his mental aspirations in the sphere of earthly achievement. Nevertheless, in the decline into irrationality and madness of Martin's mind, is symbolised the mental vulnerability of man argued in The Inheritors. His aspirations, such as they are, are a sign not of an eternal spirit, but of the pride of Lucifer. For this novel, in its exploration of man's physical and mental vulnerability, treats that vulnerability in a manner which relates it to the mediaeval concept of the Great Chain of Being.[7] This idea, which places man in a Janus-like position, looking upwards to the angels, whose heavenly spirit he shares, and downwards to the carnality of the animals, is, of course, integrally related to the idea, discussed above,[8] of the body as the prison-house of the soul. This mediaeval concept sums up surprisingly accurately Golding's awareness of the vulnerability of man, and in the course of Pincher Martin he is presenting a twentieth century version of the idea. His allegorical basis is not orthodox theology, but observations of life. The fragmentation of body and mind, exploited by the allegory, emphasises the vulnerable nature of man. Both on the rock and in the reminiscences of his former existence, Martin's aspirations to self-sufficiency appear absurd. For coupled with man's need to preserve his identity and assert his self-sufficiency[9] is a constant need for, and reliance upon, other people. Martin is the twentieth century Renaissance man - confident, Machiavellian, above God, ("On the sixth day he created God."[10]). Yet his relationships with Nat and Mary especially are tinged with an awareness of that need. By allegorically isolating his protagonist, by

placing him in a symbolic situation where absolute self-sufficiency is necessary in order to survive, Golding is testing empirically the assumption of man's power, and illustrating allegorically man's weakness. The novel exploits the two conflicting facets of man's nature, - this individualism, at times reaching the ludicrous heights of self-deification, as in "I am Atlas. I am Prometheus", and his animalic herd instinct. Both attributes, the novel comes to suggest, are imperfect, for as man is incapable of survival without the help of others, so is he incapable of perfect and harmonious communion with other members of the race.

It is Nat, whom he has recently attempted to murder, for whom Pincher Martin cries when initially stranded on the rock[11], and when, at the end of the novel, he cries out "I'm so alone! Christ! I'm so alone!"[12], his wheel has turned full circle. In the meantime he relives his relationships with others, in particular with Nat, with Mary, and with his producer, and the reader is shown how he repeatedly makes the mistake of assuming their need of him, while denying that he has anything more than a pragmatic use for them. Reflecting on his meeting with Nat at Oxford, "His mouth was open in astonishment and terror. 'And I liked him as much as that!'"[13] The hate for the ascetic, ethereal Nat emanates from his friend's love for Mary, as he takes from Martin a major boost for his ego:

> She eats into his existence like acid. Understanding nothing of the values which give her life its quality (the unity of Mary and Lovewell) he can only seek to break her will; he fails to do so in the desperate car journey in which he threatens that she will be 'burst and bitched', and earns only her contempt and loathing.[14]

A fruitful relationship with Mary could have fulfilled an unacknowledged need in Pincher Martin, but his failure to attain her merely alienates him further from human intercourse. In literal terms, the climax of that alienation is the attempted murder of his best friend, while symbolically it is his psychic existence on the rock. By his 'pinching' Christopher Martin has alienated himself from humanity, forcing himself into a situation of exaggerated individualism, and the allegory of the novel explores the incapacity of man to live alone.[15]

Once again, then, Golding's allegory has functioned as a means of forcing a trait in human nature to its logical conclusion, and has analysed that nature in the light of the resultant reductio ad absurdum. In Pincher Martin's case, a tendency towards individualism and egocentricity is forced to become an absolute by an allegorical hypothesis which places him in a situation of complete mental and physical isolation. As the hypothetical situation of Lord of the Flies takes the nascent cruelty of schoolboys to each other to its logical extreme, so does Pincher Martin use man's claim of self-sufficiency as a reason to expose the pathetic nature of that claim. Martin's whole life has been based on an ethos of competition; his literal creed is one of 'eat or be eaten' and in this his own philosophy becomes the logical extension of the traits of the new people of The Inheritors, and the antithesis of the group identification of the Neanderthals, to whom the concept of individualism is beyond perception.

The aim of self-sufficiency is embodied in Martin's constant search for individuality, as well as in his tendency to see the world

in terms of 'eating'. In terms of the recurrent 'eating' image, Martin is associated both with the Deadly Sin of Greed[16], as well as with the maggots of the Chinese box:

> "We maggots are there all the week. Y'see when the Chinese want to prepare a very rare dish they bury a fish in a tin box. Presently all the lil' maggots peep out and start to eat. Presently no fish. Only maggots. It's no bloody joke being a maggot. Some of 'em are phototropic. Hey, George - phototropic!"
> "What of it, Pete?"
> "Phototropic. I said phototropic, miss."
> "Finish your maggots, Pete and let's go."
> "Oh, the maggots. Yes, the maggots. They haven't finished yet. Only got to the fish. It's a lousy job crawling round the inside of a tin box and Denmark's one of the worst. Well, when they've finished the fish, Chris, they start on each other."
> "Cheerful thought, old man."
> "The little ones eat the tiny ones. The middle-sized ones eat the little ones. The big ones eat the middle-sized ones. Then the big ones eat each other. Then there are two and then one and where there was a fish there is now one huge, successful maggot. Rare dish."[17]

Subsequent references in the course of the novel to people 'eating' each other implies a world of individual units, each trying to be the big maggot for fear of being eaten. In the remark that "eating with the mouth was only the gross expression of what was a universal process"[18] lies the significance of the image. In the ultimate irony of the novel - that Pincher's closest approach to heroism was in the attempted murder of Nat - the symbol recurs, and in his acknowledgement that he was not the biggest maggot lies the final statement of man's failure as an individual being:

> His mouth screamed in rage at the whiteness that rose out of the funnel.
> "And it was the right bloody order!"
> Eaten.[19]

Martin, having conceded, as it were, that he was not the biggest maggot, can no longer continue with his symbolic mental existence, and

that existence ceases.

His idea of a competitive and individualistic universe necessitates that he have such tangible boosts as his naval identity disc and a mirror, ("How can I have a complete identity without a mirror?"[20]). Yet the allegory ironically undercuts these assertions. Martin's first vision is of a man in a jam-jar, at the mercy of the water, and his own vulnerability reflects the model. His physical weakness, emphasised in his pathetic evolution from the water on to the rock, and his feeble attempts to construct a 'dwarf' to signal his plight, - even his naming of the different parts of the rock by such 'civilised' names as the 'Red Lion' and the 'High Street' - imply his need of others as a boost for his vulnerable self.

If the jam-jar symbol illustrates that part of the allegory which implies man's physical weakness, the use of the 'cellar', as Martin fights off madness, implies his mental instability. Golding himself has explained the psychological aspects of the symbol; answering the criticisms of Mr John Peter, he replied, in a private letter:

> The cellar in Pincher Martin represents more than childhood terrors; a whole philosophy in fact - suggesting that God is the thing we turn away from into life, and therefore we hate and fear him and make a darkness there. Yes, very confused but surely legitimately confused because at that depth these aren't ideas as much as feelings. Pincher is running away all the time, always was running, from the moment he had a persona and could say 'I'.[21]

In Pincher's disturbed state, then, both God and his childhood terrors (or rather the terrors of his whole past - the attempted rape, the attempted murder, the motor cycle accident, the application for a

commission, the scenes with Pete and Helen), previously conveniently ignored, force their way into his conscious mind.[22] The scenes precipitate his ultimate concern with God, making all the more powerful his insistence that God is a mere extension of the mind of man. The thesis of God made in the image of man, while denying divine Creation, acknowledges that in man which traditionally associates him with the angels and lifts him above the animals. It places him at the head of the Great Chain of Being. Mankind, in Pincher Martin, usurps its place, falsely claiming self-sufficiency, and the action of the allegory is to illustrate the folly of this assumption. Therein lies the irony of the cry "I am Prometheus" for, though juxtaposed with his claim for deification in "I am Atlas", it makes Pincher Martin "an incarnation of fallible, torturing and tortured, ordinary man, fighting his individual, courageous, haphazard, improvising fight against God, against the rocks, against the sea."[23] In its demonstration of the true position of man on the Great Chain of Being, and in its comment on the torture of thenusurper, Pincher Martin comes close to the Faust legend, where man, for a physical corollary to his supposed mental infallibility, condemns himself to eternal damnation. This is what Pincher Martin has done. His rock is an existentialist hell: he has sought to follow the dictum of Milton's Satan that

> The mind in its own place, and in itself
> Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heav'n. -

but has failed. His failure demonstrates the weakness of man's aspiring mind, for Martin's mind literally fails to make his hella a heaven, and in the process of trying that mind collapses and madness ensues.

Alone, his mind can sustain his dead body only momentarily. At the end of the novel, seconds after the beginning, it capitulates, and all that is left is a drowned sailor who "didn't even have time to kick off his seaboots."[24]

This novel, then, though of considerable allegorical significance itself, in its assertion and demonstration of the basic mental and physical vulnerability of man, serves primarily to pave the way, as it were, for the two culminating allegories of the sequence, Free Fall and The Spire. Martin, through whose perception the novel is told, is physically and mentally incapable of analysing his past in the way that Sammy Mountjoy sets out to do. He can only recall what has happened to him, and what he has done in his past life, and such deductions as there are to be made, must be made by the reader, in the light of his understanding of the protagonist past and present.

As with Golding's earlier allegories, the process is dependent upon the situation being inherently improbable: it must be a hypothesis which accentuates and isolates a single tendency in man. In this case the details of Martin's vulnerability, and the dualism between his body and mind are isolated to give an impression of overall fragmentation, - the antithesis, in fact of the harmony of the Neanderthals of The Inheritors. For Martin is the Inheritor of the Inheritors, and in him their tendencies of defensive aggression and of false reasoning are accentuated and exaggerated. But with the emphasis of the allegory having shifted to a consideration of man's fundamentally ambivalent and

Janus-like place on the Great Chain of Being, a new perspective on the nature of man is opened up, and this perspective is to be explored in greater detail in the two final novels of the sequence, as a final resolution is approached, concerning man's potential role in the world, and the possibility of his approaching a harmonious existence of the type which ended in the days of pre-history, with the death of Lok.

CHAPTER FIVE

The allegorical technique of Golding's fourth novel, Free Fall, in a sense develops those techniques employed in the earlier novels. Lord of the Flies, The Inheritors, and Pincher Martin are all, among other things, allegorical explorations of the basic nature of man. It is as though Golding is presupposing certain conditions, of necessity improbable, placing a hypothetical figure or figures in the midst of those conditions, and demonstrating in allegorical form the actions and emotions which man would follow and experience. The technique, broadly, is to extend the conditions possible in life, to examine the logical conclusion of the characteristics which men evince in their day to day existence. The very improbability of the situations is a vital aspect of the allegory, for in its apparent absurdity it demands and obtains a degree of objectivity from the reader, who is thus free to pass a judgement on the character exposed before his eyes. To show a character behaving badly in a probable situation is to elicit from the reader those characteristics which he himself might show in similar circumstances. It would be to show him a mirror in which he could see everyone's face but his own. But it is the reader too who is condemned, and only by attaining a degree of objectivity can he pass, however unwittingly, a judgement on himself, unvitiated by a conscious or unconscious justification of the protagonists' actions.

The successive novels suggest, first, a development, then an

increased unity in Golding's vision, as he passes from a consideration of effect (Lord of the Flies), to cause (The Inheritors) to a combination of the two in Pincher Martin. The development is continued further in Free Fall. In Lord of the Flies cause is not considered. The reader is simply shown a degeneration in the apparently civilised, and a return to a state of savagery. Anthropological considerations, though suggested in the performance of the savage rites by Jack and his hunters, do not constitute a major theme of the novel. The novel does not invite the reader to consider why the boys should revert to savagery - it simply shows him that they do, and one must interpret the book as, above all, an exposition of the basically animalic nature of man.

The Inheritors, by returning to a hypothetical era of pre-history, examines the moment of corruption in mankind, equating that corruption with the materialistic and intellectual advancement of the new people. The subtle device of the dual perspective ultimately distances the reader from the Neanderthals, and associates him with their successors, so that their sins and atrocities become his. By seeing initially from the perspective of the hunted animal, one is forced, not into objectivity, but into false subjectivity, as one takes the side of the doomed. Only at the end is the reader unmistakably associated with the Inheritors, and sees, as do they, the last Neanderthal, Lok, as a strange, impersonal animal, to be destroyed. The device has compelled the reader to judge, as objectively as possible, the sins of man, before showing him that the sins of the new people are the sins of his race, and of himself.

In Pincher Martin, the allegory advances into the psyche of an individual unmistakably to be associated with the new people. The novel in a sense combines the interests of its two predecessors, being concerned both with cause and effect. Christopher Martin has all the sophistication which, The Inheritors suggests, causes corruption, and is suddenly stripped of the trappings of 'civilisation' so that he returns to a natural, even primordial state. Images of evolution associate him clearly with the idea of development, and his physical development, as he crawls from the sea, parallels his mental development, as he examines his past life and seeks to come to grips with his own reality. The conclusion of the mental process, of the inadequacy of man both as group animal and as individual, is confirmed by Chris's impotence on the rock, and the novel ends with his physical and mental decay.

It will be profitable to consider the allegory of Free Fall in the light of Golding's conclusions concerning the nature of man, as evinced in the earlier novels. Pincher Martin, though reflecting allegorically both the cause and the effect of the protagonist's plight, places a decided emphasis on the effect. The relationships with others - with Mary, with Nat and with the producer, especially, - are not treated in detail, but as the rather confused thoughts of a drowning man. The picture, in short, is one of impressions, with the resultant emphasis on the relationships as effect rather than as cause. One can examine the flashed early relationships with Nat and Mary as the cause of the attempted murder, but can go no further back to

consider the cause of the early attitudes. This is what Sammy Mountjoy, narrator of Free Fall, is attempting to do. He has passed from the Neanderthal state to that of the new people, and in his exploration of his past he attempts to come to grips with the moment he lost his freedom. The novel, by its narrator's assertion of the forces of determinism, becomes an exposition of the vulnerability of the individual to external forces, as well as a consideration of the nature of guilt in mankind.

The dualistic (as one may term it) structure of the novel constitutes a structural analogue to the allegorical scheme, which suggests the possibility of choice between two alternatives. Ironic associations, parallels and contrasts occur throughout the novel. Sammy free and Sammy fallen, Minnie and Beatrice[1], dream and reality, the verger and the Nazi psychologist, Rowena Pringle and Nick Shales, Johnny Spragg and Philip Arnold, Ma and Evie, sex and art as the centre of being, - all these and many more dichotomies appear in the course of the novel. Choice and commitment, truth and the communication of truth are the allegorical bases of the work, and by a greater systematisation than is apparent in any of the earlier novels, Golding is able to probe into the cause as well as the effect of the nature of man, and to examine more specifically than was possible in Pincher Martin the role of man both as individual and as group animal.

Choice is presented as a necessary part of human existence, but a simple choice between right and wrong is envisaged as impossible, for man is seen as a more complex entity than previously. In childhood,

Sammy's relative simplicity is illustrated symbolically by his passivity. For truth he is dependent on the two inveterate liars, Ma and Evie, and on the ignorant superstitions of Rotten Row. But at this moment, truth as an objective fact is irrelevant to the subjective truth of the emotions. When Evie tells Sammy that her uncle is in the suit of armour in the antique shop window, or when Ma tells him his father is the Prince of Wales, whether this is true or not is unimportant. The stories are accepted passively, as part, in a sense, of the person who tells them. Sammy, as his mother observes, knows Her to be a "sodding liar"[2], but listens to her contradictory stories in the spirit in which he allows himself to fantasise about Rotten Row and the General's garden. At this stage in Sammy's development there is no choice to make: he is passive in the way that the littluns of Lord of the Flies are passive. But with age comes awareness, and the necessity of choice.

The key lies in Beatrice. His initial interest in her aroused (significantly) by his wounded pride at the praise lavished on Philip Arnold by the art mistress for a portrait of Beatrice drawn, in fact, by himself, Sammy devises, some years later, a plan to accost her on her way home from training college. He hesitates at a red stop light, and his decision to cross the light and pursue her symbolises his free decision to yield up his liberty. The decision is as free as his choice of paths at the beginning of the novel[3] but its consequences are dire. The symbolism of the stop sign need hardly be elaborated, and the strength of its command, ignored by Sammy, reinforces the idea of the

the initial free will, subsequently lost. Sammy's choice was not between gravel paths where one meant no more than another, but involved a positive act of disobedience - in other words, an act of commitment. The result of crossing the stoplight is that Sammy ceases to function as an individual, surrendering his freedom of choice to Beatrice. But with this involvement comes no true unity of flesh and spirit, for man is as inadequate as a group animal as he is as an individual, as Pincher Martin has already shown. Sammy exchanges imperfect individuality for imperfect subjection and domination (for his paradoxical union with Beatrice involves both these apparent opposites.) In his attempt to seduce Beatrice he threatens madness. Madness, in Pincher Martin, is the final symptom of fragmentation between body and mind, and between different parts of the mind. In Free Fall it again symbolises fragmentation, but this time a fragmentation in the union of two people. The cause of the fragmentation is the impossibility of true communication, and it is this failure to communicate which the novel envisages as the primary symbol of the failure of man as group animal. It drives man on to cruelty in an attempt to breach the gap between individuals, and to achieve a fusion which is always beyond the reach of man.

> Once a human being has lost freedom there is no end to the coils of cruelty. I must I must I must. They said the damned in hell were forced to torture the innocent live people with disease. But I know now that life is perhaps more terrible than that innocent medieval misconception. We are forced here and now to torture each other. We can watch ourselves becoming automata; feel only terror as our alienated arms lift the instruments of their passion towards those we love. Those who lose freedom can watch themselves forced helplessly to do this in daylight until who is torturing who? The

obsession drove me at her.

But, of course, once she had got over her fear and we were bound so closely together by lovemaking, there would be no end to the brightness of the sunlight future.[4]

But it was not to be, for "I was not wise enough to know that a sexual sharing was no way of bringing us together."[5] Seduction and abandonment follow, then the marriage to Taffy, a character of whom Sammy tells the reader little more. He describes the idyllic first meeting, through the ludicrous YCL, but little of the relationship after the wedding. But the existence of Sammy's book constitutes in itself a refutation of the fact that the union between husband and wife was as perfect as Sammy would have one believe. The relationship has not, ultimately, brought him to happiness any more than it has released him from his bonds. The quest which forms the crux of the book testifies to the unfulfilled nature of his life.

But true fulfilment is impossible in the human being. This, basically, is the assertion allegorised in the course of the novel. The complexity of man's nature forces him into a degree of individualism while its weakness drives him into a fruitless attempt at union with others. The result of the failure is frustration. It is this need for others which drives Christopher Martin to the attempt to murder Nat, whose marriage to Mary has driven the protagonist to a realisation of the folly of his egocentricity. Man cannot live without others - a fact demonstrated by the allegorical solitude of Pincher Martin, as well as by Sammy Mountjoy's frustrated craving for Beatrice. In Pincher Martin the allegorical method is to place the hero in a position where communication with others is physically impossible; in Free Fall, on

the other hand, Sammy Mountjoy is, as it were, alone in a city. Only in the days of innocence and freedom is there true communication. Ma's lies become irrelevant when little Sammy, afraid of the dark, does not need to explain why he has come to collect his mother from the pub. Again, when Sammy lies in hospital, it is not the verger, who talks incomprehensibly of the High Church, nor Father Matts-Watt, who can say little at all, who does the right thing, instinctively, for the injured boy; instead, it is Ma:

> She had little enough to bring me, for what has a woman to spare who even borrows an iron? Yet she had taken thought and found what she could. There was a pedestal by the head of the bed and she had placed there a handful of rather dirty fagcards - my cherished kings of Egypt.[6]

The death of Ma leaves in Sammy the need for a new person with whom to identify, and his search takes him not only to Beatrice and Taffy, but also to the Communist Party. But the quest is false, for Sammy's interest in politics is influenced by his rationalist teacher, Nick Shales, a man whom he admires but whose creed he disbelieves; while he is driven to the Communists by the fact that his divinity teacher, Rowena Pringle, whose beliefs but not whose person, he admires, has a nephew in the Blackshirts.[7] The search for identity in a society which the pragmatic Philip Arnold can see is little more than a cloak for the baser natures of men, is doomed. Sammy's account, told apparently without deliberate irony, exposes the Party as being not a harmonious, Neanderthal whole, but a group of self-seeking Inheritors:

> There was a certain generosity in being a communist; a sense of martyrdom and a sense of purpose. I began to hide from Beatrice in the uproar of streets and halls. There was a meeting at the Town Hall in which a local councillor was going to give his reasons for joining the party. The decision had come down from above. He was a business

man, so by remaining "closed" he could never hope to be in a better position, that is, one of governmental trust. There was no reason why his faith should not be capitalized emphasis mine there and then.[8]

But man's nature is such that he feels obliged to conceal his political affiliations from Beatrice, and the fact that Sammy's communism stems from his schoolday affection for Nick Shales brings about the ironic situation that Nick and Beatrice are, in effect, struggling for supremacy over Sammy's being. Both, ultimately, are rejected by the marriage to Taffy, and the apparent success of the union symbolises the fallacy of systematisation and of the necessity of choice, which the dualistic structure of the novel implies is the lot of man. The original choice was necessitated by the rift between the systems of Nick and Rowena, which resulted in a personal and irrational choice of the system Sammy liked the less. Only at the end of the novel does he grope towards a realisation of the fallacy of choice: ultimately, both systems, though contradictory, co-exist, and in the co-existence of irreconcilables is implied the absence of any all-embracing system whatsoever:

All day long the trains run on rails. Eclipses are predictable. Penicillin cures pneumonia and the atom splits to order. All day long, year in, year out, the daylight explanation drives back the mystery and reveals a reality usable, understandable and detached. The scalpel and the microscope fail, the oscilloscope moves closer to behaviour. The gorgeous dance is self-contained, then; does not need the music which in my mad moments I have heard. Nick's universe is real.

All day long action is weighed in the balance and found not opportune nor fortunate or ill-advised, but good or evil. For this mode which we must call the spirit breathes through the universe and does not touch it; touches only the dark things, held prisoner, incommunicado, touches, judges, sentences and passes on.

Her world was real, both worlds are real. There is no bridge.[9]

The scenes in the Prisoner of War camp crystallise the new

realisation. Paradoxes and complexities abound. The interrogator, Halde, though fulfilling the symbolic role of Satan tempting Christ, is a civilised and humane man, almost Christlike himself. Although "The man had the body of a saint", he confesses "I have taken you up to a pinnacle of the temple and shown you the whole earth."[10] The torture to which he condemns Sammy is a form of self-torture playing on that weakness of the human mind suggested both by this novel and by Pincher Martin. This weakness brings out another central paradox in Sammy: the conflict between sex and art as the centre of his being. His concern, in the cell, for his privates, reinforces his earlier attempts to become one, physically, with Beatrice, before realising that a sexual sharing was not a means to unity. This novel too is concerned with the mediaeval allegorical concept of the Great Chain of Being, and here Sammy becomes closely connected with Christopher Martin. In Martin's case, physical and mental limitations confined and mocked his aspirations, but in Free Fall the paradox is even more specific. Man, for all his artistic potential (and Sammy's artistic ability is very much more central to his character than were Martin's declamations and singing on the rock) is constantly held back by his affinity with the animals, the strength of which affinity provides a continual check to his artistic inclinations. Sammy has yielded up his artistic individuality for sex, and the fact of this makes the character a convenient symbol with which Golding is able to explore the paradox.

Free Fall, then, continues the allegorical exploration of the nature of man begun by its three predecessors in the sequence. In many

ways it complements and expands what was merely suggested in Pincher Martin. In the earlier novel the protagonist's egocentricity is taken, for the most part, as a fait accompli, and in spite of a number of early scenes with Mary, one is faced, for the most part, with a series of results, rather than causes, of that egocentricity. But in Free Fall Sammy Mountjoy is specifically seeking to find the particular point in his past existence when he became what he is today. He dismisses childhood venalities as the work of another person, dating his present state from the moment he surrendered his individuality to Beatrice, vowing to sacrifice everything to attain her. His headmaster's parting warning is proven to be true:

> "I'll tell you something which may be of value. I believe it to be true and powerful - therefore dangerous. If you want something enough, you can always get it provided you are willing to make the appropriate sacrifice. Something, anything. But what you get is never quite what you thought; and sooner or later the sacrifice is always regretted."[11]

It is true because man's nature will not be fitted into a system. Both the rationalism of Nick and the apocalyptic vision of Miss Pringle have their place in the world, because man himself is irrational, unpredictable. In surrendering himself to Beatrice, Sammy submits himself to an external force, thereby systematising himself. But in a universe which defies systematisation the results of that enslavement are not what Sammy expects.

The allegory, then, is concerned with the reason man forms the way he does. This involves an exploration of his basic nature of the type undertaken in Pincher Martin, but emphasising the causes rather

than the results. The story has a more obvious narrative pattern than its predecessor, but the names of characters and places - Mountjoy, Beatrice, Evie, Paradise Hill, Rotten Row - deliberately detract from the novel's 'realism', and, together with the apocalyptic passages (most notably the opening paragraph), place it firmly in the realms of allegory. Again, the deliberate systematisation, the dualism and the 'artificiality' of the novel make it the servant of the overall allegory.

As this thesis has suggested, the allegory need not have constant and complete associations so that every action and character in the novel can be calculated to 'mean' something. The allegory is of man's nature, and its sum argument is that this nature is complex, beyond absolute classification and systematisation. The symbols which appear in the course of the novel, then, serve generally as false paths open to the individual, for each one proves to be either inadequate or else completely fallacious. Miss Pringle preaches a doctrine which the young Sammy finds acceptable, but which he rejects because of his dislike of his teacher. Nick Shales preaches an unacceptable doctrine which Sammy affects to follow for admiration of Nick. Ultimately, however, the 'fallen' Sammy comes to appreciate the fallacy of both doctrines, and to accept their co-existence in an irrational universe. Beatrice is a false way, because the individualistic tendencies of man prevent him from ever entering into perfect harmonious union with another. He can only go with that person into a temporary phase of frustration, domination, and subjection. The Communist Party,

ostensibly a movement towards political brotherhood, transpires to be a guise for further individualistic selfishness. Halde, the character in the novel with most in common with Sammy[12] has surrendered his high intellectual and humanitarian principles to become the tempter of Christ, and even he cannot communicate properly with Sammy. He claims an ability to comprehend the nature of Sammy:

> "I shall explain you to yourself. No one, not a lover, a father, a schoolmaster, could do that for you. They are all inhibited by conventions and human kindness. It is only in such conditions as these, electric furnace conditions, in which the molten, blinding truth may be uttered from one human face to another."[13]

But his claim is mistaken, for the reader has already seen the mistrust and misunderstanding which have studded their conversations.[14] Sammy understands that in some way, Halde made him 'see', - but really it was the application of the psychological technique of self-torture which did that. Halde, in his profound understanding of the complex vulnerability of the mind of man, simply enabled Sammy to do that thing which seems more and more to lie at the root of Golding's work - he enabled him to 'make a heaven of hell, a hell of heav'n'. The boys on the island and Christopher Martin on his rock all did so, and now one sees both Sammy Mountjoy and Beatrice Ifor doing the same. The implication is clear: the mind, as a shifting entity, unpredictable and kaleidoscopic, can dominate both the individual and his environment. There is no true objective vision available to man, for his reasoning is based of the facts as they are sifted through his strange and unreliable mind. It is thus that the Inheritors saw falsely the nature of the Neanderthals; it is thus that Pincher Martin sees everything

through the jaundice of his own egocentricity; it is thus that Sammy free can accept the lies of his mother and of Evie without question, while Sammy fallen can accept neither truth nor lies. Above all it is thus that the reader can, through a shift in the perspective of any of the novels, change his view of the characters and events of that novel. For even what is said and done there is not an objective fact: rather it is a facet in the mind of the reader, whose mental link with the characters of the allegory is thus demonstrated in action. It is in the mind where Golding centralises the nature of man, and it is in the mind that he is seen as both complex and vulnerable, compatible neither with himself nor with others.

CHAPTER SIX

The allegorical technique of *The Spire* continues the consideration, begun in the earlier novels, of the basic nature of man, and of the cause of his vulnerability and equivocations. It has been suggested that as early as *Pincher Martin*, Golding was concerned with the mediaeval proposition of man's Janus-like nature, looking both towards the spirituality of heaven, and also towards the purely physical and carnal nature of the animals. In *Free Fall*, the tensions between the two tendencies were examined in the ambiguous nature of Sammy's love for the spiritually named Beatrice - in his desire for spiritual unity with her, and in his false use of sex as a means to attaining it. In *The Spire*, set in mediaeval England, and exploring the apparent spirituality of a priest, the discussion reaches its height, and, at once, its conclusion. In *Pincher Martin*, the rock allegorically suggests modern man, alienated from his society and compelled to reflect upon his past actions and motivations: the conclusion of the reader is that he is one of the 'new people', for in his corruption and self-seeking he is associated both with the Inheritors of the Neanderthal legacy, and with the Machiavellian new people of the Renaissance. The situation in *Free Fall* is more specifically contemporary than in *Pincher Martin*, and the novel becomes an instrument through which to examine allegorically what it is that causes men to act like Chris or Sammy. The conclusion, tentative that it is, is that it lies in a surrender of man's individual liberty (however tenuous that

liberty might be) for an obsession, because the individualistic traits found in men prevent a complete subordination of self to any other person or idea. Pincher Martin has suggested the fallacy of absolute individualism; Free Fall, that of absolute subjection. This is the background to The Spire. In this culmination of the discussion, Golding returns specifically to the middle ages - to an undefined time between the Crusades and the Reformation - to consider man in an ostensibly stable era of faith, - an era before Machiavelli and the seventeenth century School of Night, - and certainly before the age of alienation and introspection of Sammy Mountjoy and the twentieth century.

The proposition of the allegory is that a man who has devoted his life to his religion, putting it before marriage and friends, is given a beatific vision. The result of this is that he has a spire built against the recommendations both of engineers and colleagues, which causes him to ignore not only secular things but also such other aspects of his religion as confession and services. The novel explores his motivation, mental attitudes, and more secular characteristics, to suggest a conflict not only between obvious antitheses such as pride and faith (as sex and art conflicted in Sammy Mountjoy) but also a rift in the very foundations of that faith. His faith becomes, in fact, not the antithesis of his secular characteristics, but a sublimation of them. As Free Fall extends the allegorical considerations of its predecessor, Pincher Martin, by tracing effect back to cause, so does The Spire transcend Free Fall by considering the nature of the conflict accepted in the earlier novel. In Free Fall, the nature of the rift is

not examined: it is seen, in broadly mediaeval terms, as the result of man's equivocal position on the Great Chain of Being. In The Spire, however, Golding takes his reader into that period where the Great Chain concept was literally accepted, and, using it as a basis for his explorations, examines the very nature of man's ostensible spirituality. With the aid of certain twentieth century psychological implications the allegory suggests that that spirituality is simply a means of indulging secular desires in a socially acceptable manner, and in a way that satisfies the conscience of the individual.

This perception, and the discussion of the idea with its relatively positive final affirmation marks the culmination of this period of Golding's work. In a fairly steady progression from Lord of the Flies, Golding, beginning with the conventional premise of the basic savagery of man, has traced this savagery through his subsequent novels, associating it first with material and intellectual advancement; then, in Free Fall, suggesting how it conflicts with man's spiritual attributes to make him, as it were, fall between two stools; and now examining the very nature of the conflict itself, to question the reality of man's traditionally accepted spiritual link with the angels.

The suggestion of the complexity of man's nature is apparently refuted by the repeated terminology of the war inside Jocelin between his 'devil' and his 'angel'. Nevertheless, before accepting the ostensibly simple dualism of the conflict, associating it with the ideas of the mediaeval Morality Plays, it is necessary to recall the technique of one of the earlier novels, The Inheritors. Though not told in the first

person, the greater part of the novel is related from the viewpoint of the Neanderthal Lok: the reader is led to see things the way Lok sees them, and is compelled to deduce for himself that, for example, the gift of the twig is in fact a poisoned arrow intended to kill him. Similarly The Spire, while maintaining, for the most part, a modern style and idiom (in spite of the occasional phrase such as "I never came up against beldame") does contain a considerable amount of mediaeval terminology, and in fact conveys the ideas and concerns of the middle ages in easily comprehensible form. But, again like The Inheritors, the reader must not associate Golding with his persona, for the persona, while remaining sufficiently omniscient to read the minds of most of the other characters, is, for the greater part of the novel, the perception of Jocelin himself. So when the reader is told of the war inside Jocelin between his angel and his devil, it is Jocelin, in effect, who is telling him, and the narrative technique becomes the expression of the mediaeval dualistic concept of the devil as tempter of the flesh, attempting to assert domination over God and the spirit.

The ostensible point of view of the narration, then, is not that of Golding. His is a second, and rather more elusive point of view. Golding, as overall controller of the allegory, is manipulating his protagonist in such a way as to distance him from the reader, so that the reader is able to see the gap between Jocelin's viewpoint and that of the norm. It is as though The Pilgrim's Progress were related from the viewpoint of, for example, Mr Worldly-Wise. So when Jocelin describes his inner conflicts, the reader, while understanding exactly

what he means, can see beyond his perception to a profounder understanding of his basic nature than he has himself. Very far from being at opposite ends of the spectrum, devil and angel are, in fact, closely interlocking. To Jocelin the devil is associated with the lust he feels for Goody Pangall, which sets her up as a rival obsession to the spire. The angel is the heavenly inspiration which leads him to do what must be done. It is part of Jocelin's development in the course of the novel that he comes, in part at least, to recognise his error, and to acknowledge that "There is no innocent work."[1] Far from being a noble mission from which Goody Pangall constitutes an ungodly distraction, the spire, as Jocelin comes to realise, was originally formulated in his mind as an acceptable sublimation of his lust. In his final encounter with the master builder Jocelin reveals that he arranged for Goody's marriage to Pangall because he knew of the man's impotence, and to allay the nausea he would have felt at the prospect of Goody being touched by another man:

> '... The trouble is, Roger, that the collarage knew about him - knew he was impotent I mean - and arranged the marriage. It was her hair, I think. I used to see it, blowing red about a thin, pale face. After that, of course not. But later when she stood by the pillar looking across at you, it seared into my eye. Then she bewitched me.[2]

From the first, the phallic implications of the spire symbol are plain, and appropriately it is at the ritual murder of Pangall that the concept of the fusion of angel and devil becomes most specific. There is a model of the spire, and as the workmen advance on Pangall, one of them holds it obscenely between his legs, so that in the one symbolic action, angel, devil, spire, phallus, Christianity, paganism, Pangall, Jocelin, Goody and murder all become one. All Jocelin's

attributes and desires are fused, thus, to form the symbol of the spire, and from this point on there can be no question of a simple dichotomy between angel and devil. The two merely constitute variant sublimations of the same basic drive. Even earlier than this, however, the desire for the spire is specifically associated with the desire for Goody, and with Jocelin's frustrated sexuality. As he sleeps, the devil within him takes the form of Goody, and the imagery of the account is ecclesiastical; the spire, far more than being an artificial appendage temporarily placed between the legs of an uncouth labourer, is a part of Jocelin, and that spire is being erected not by the angel, but by the devil.

> Only Satan himself, rising out of the west, clad in nothing but blazing hair stood over his nave and worked at the building, tormenting him so that he writhed on the marsh in the warm water, and cried out aloud. He woke in the darkness, full of loathing. So he took a discipline and lashed himself hard, seven times, hard across the back in his pride of the angel, one time for each devil. After that, he slept a dreamless sleep.[3]

This use of the mediaeval concept of the war between angel and devil for the soul of man thus constitutes an interesting variation on Golding's allegorical techniques to date. Here he is using an allegory within an allegory, and the use of the simplistic and dualistic mediaeval form, - not as a technique for the reader to accept, but as one for him to reject - epitomises the complexity of Golding's own, twentieth century allegory. As has been constantly argued, Golding's technique is not one of mathematical identification and correlation, and here, in the climactic novel in the allegorical sequence, is a demonstration of the fallibility of the mediaeval technique. Golding's allegorical subject is the nature of man, and the nature of man is not a lesson to be

explained by allegorical pictures, as from a mediaeval pulpit. It is a subject which, if it is to be dealt with at all, must be dealt with allegorically - as hypothesis in action, as it were - because it is a subject which, in its complexity, defies description. The nature of man cannot be conveniently divided into a war between good and bad, for the existence of good and bad in life may be taken for granted. What is needful in the twentieth century - and this is Golding's intention - is to examine the nature of that good and bad. In The Spire he is considering what it is in man that makes him 'good', and surrender the secular life for the sake of the religious; and in this novel, Jocelin is used as a means of questioning whether the devil of the world and the angel of the heavens are not, in fact, different aspects of the same thing. Golding is considering the question begged by the mediaevalists. In an age when Christian belief is no longer common to reader and writer, the psychological and sociological motivations of the man of religion may justly be examined, rather than accepted. To this end, Jocelin's religion is stripped away and seen to be false. His angel becomes his devil, his Vision of the spire is false, his prayers are left unanswered, his Holy Nail is the gift of a mercenary bishop who prefers to send a fake relic rather than money. On one level, The Spire is a novel about self-deception, and in that self-deception it is refuting the mediaeval acceptance of the Christian absolutes of right and wrong. The allegory of the novel thus specifically questions both the mediaeval theory and practise of allegory, and its philosophic and religious bases.

Another means of suggesting the complexity of human nature is in the allegory's deliberate confusion of the Christ-figure. In the earlier novels, Golding had used a Christ-figure, - or at least a faultless character to stand apart from the action while still being, to a certain extent, involved in it. This figure was used as a means of internal criticism of the other characters, both by contrast and by providing a passive appearance of accepting the atrocities perpetrated on him by them. Simon, in Lord of the Flies, Nat, in Pincher Martin, and, in a different but related way, Lok, in The Inheritors, are such characters. The practice was discontinued in Free Fall, however, where Halde, in some ways the successor of these figures, has attributes not only of Christ the Messiah, but also of Satan the tempter. The nature of Halde leads on to the technique of The Spire. Men are part angel, part devil, and Golding's techniques now far advanced from that of the early novels, no longer requires an absolute within the novel but apart from its judgement. Rather, his subtlety enables the reader to examine the ironic gap between Jocelin's aspiration and his reality without any direct comparison from outside. He clearly shares with Halde certain attributes of Christ, and in his conscious iterations of Biblical phrases he shows his awareness of the fact.[4] But he is also cast in the role of devil. Roger Mason tells him: "I believe you're the devil. The devil himself."[5] Again, his obsession with the height of the spire is at times too close for coincidence to the Temptations in the Wilderness. Constant references to the 'pinnacle' associate the novel with Halde's parody of the Temptations[6], and the concern with the four statues of

Jocelin makes the spire a part of the sin of pride for which Satan was expelled from heaven. In particular, Jocelin is often referred to in terms of bird imagery[7], and the wings of the birds parallel the soaring aspirations of the Dean. In his obsession with the spire, like Sammy Mountjoy in his obsession with Beatrice, and like Christopher Martin in his obsession with himself, Jocelin has lost his sense of proportion; and in mediaeval terms, a sense of proportion is an awareness of one's proper place on the Great Chain of Being. To lose that sense of proportion is, in mediaeval theology, to commit the mortal sin against the Holy Ghost, for in one's pride one places oneself beyond the saving grace of God by losing one's fear of him; just as in absolute despair, one loses one's love of God. In mediaeval theology, then, the sins of pride and despair are interpreted as unforgivable because, in taking the sinner out of the reach of God, they cannot be repented. It is the sin of pride which Jocelin has committed, but, though he is seen to have alienated himself temporarily from his God the process of the later part of the novel is one of reclamation by purging.

So Jocelin is envisaged by the novel as being part angel, part devil. To complicate the issue further, other characters have similar attributes, and the reader soon comes to realise that what is apparent in Jocelin is only an obvious manifestation of what also exists in the other characters. This is in keeping with Golding's mature use of allegory: in Lord of the Flies, for example, there is a basic difference between the nature of Simon and that of the other boys. They are to be

judged by different criteria - or rather, Simon is not to be judged at all, but is simply to be used as a yardstick by which to judge the others. Now, however, in Golding's maturity, all the characters are part of the allegory, and must stand and fall by their part in that allegory, not by any allotted function.

Golding is moving, in other words towards the technique of Tom Jones, and away from that of Jonathan Wild. The analogy holds good only in the one sphere, of course, but it does demonstrate that in the best allegory one is persuaded which attitude to take not by the didactic intrusions of the author (and Simon, though dramatised, is basically just such an intrusion) but by the demonstration of the superiority of character in action. The introductory chapter made the same point about The Pilgrim's Progress: because the reader is impressed by Christian as a character he supports his point of view, and so is won over to Bunyan's argument by the character and not by the author. The techniques of these allegorical works of past centuries are, of course, quite simplistic in relation to what Golding is considering, but the basic theory of plot and theme unified by the use of character in action is common to all.

In The Spire there is no simple consideration of the nature of Jocelin: other characters, most notably Roger Mason and Goody Pangall, are included in the allegorical web. Mason, in spite of his cynicism and his adultery with Goody Pangall, has certain attributes of the Christ-as-carpenter tradition. He is the simple craftsman, uncorrupted, and enjoying a harmonious relationship with his wife

unparalleled by any couple in Golding, before succumbing to his desire for Goody Pangall - a result of the deceit of Jocelin in keeping him from working at Malmesbury. As he shows Jocelin the lack of foundations of the cathedral, it is his turn to echo the words of Christ to the storm on Lake Galilee, and to perform a miracle:

> 'The earth's creeping!'
> He put his hands to fend off and somewhere the master builder was shouting.
> 'Still!'
> And marvellously all the noise died away so there was nothing left but the high, mad ringing of tension. As it died, the master builder shouted again.
> 'Still!"Still!" I said! Get stone, anyxstone - fill the pit!'[8]

Similarly, Goody Pangall, who appears in Jocelin's dream as Satan, has certain attributes of the Virgin Mary - her sweet nature is in keeping with the mediaeval Catholic iconic tradition, and her function as wife to the impotent Pangall is a clear and deliberate association with the Blessed Virgin of the Catholic Church. Again, in being the subject, with the spire, of Jocelin's thoughts, she fulfils the same dual function of Virgin and temptress: her association with the spire has already been suggested, and in making her the subject of his secular devotions, Jocelin is unwittingly the subject of one of Golding's most poignant ironies.

The overall point of the allegory is clear: it repeats and emphasises one of the themes of Free Fall: in human nature a simple dichotomy is not possible. As Sammy Mountjoy could not adequately accept either the system of Rowena Pringle or that of Nick Shales at the expense of the other, nor can Jocelin distinguish clearly between religious and secular: they are not different ideas, but the same ideas differently

channelled. Adoration of the spire is not the antithesis of adoration of Goody Pangall - one is not secular, the other religious - they are both the same thing, a combination of good and bad becoming primarily bad when they come to be an obsession, just as Sammy's relationship with Beatrice comes to be bad when it involves the surrender of his own individuality.

The best man can hope for is a fusion, however imperfect it must of necessity be, between all aspects of life. This is the end of the allegory, and the most positive end of any of Golding's serious novels to date. Concepts of individual fragmentation and the need for unity have been major themes of his novels since Pincher Martin, and the first real approach to the problem comes in The Spire. Christopher Martin, in his confused reminiscences, could not even grasp the entire problem, while Sammy Mountjoy, only too aware of the problem, had only vague notions of the answer, when, in the Nazi Prisoner of War camp, he was enabled, following his interviews with Halde, to "see"; but at the end of that novel, in his final visit to Rowena Pringle, he could grasp no more than that a fusion was necessary: he himself could not perpetrate that fusion. In The Spire, however, Jocelin undergoes a purgative process: he does, in fact, lose his life to save it. In his new humility, his back as weak as his spire, he seeks forgiveness, first from Anselm, then from Roger Mason, for his false vision and for the unscrupulous measures which resulted from that vision; and at the end of the novel he is rewarded with a second, and beatific, vision:

> There was a cloud of angels flashing in the sunlight, they were pink and gold and white; and they were uttering this sweet scant for joy of the light and the air. They brought with them a scatter of clear

leaves, and among the leaves a long, black springing thing. His head swam with the angels, and suddenly he understood <u>there was more to the appletree than one branch</u>. [Emphasis mine.] It was there beyond the wall, bursting up with cloud and scatter, laying hold of the earth and the air, a fountain, a marvel, an appletree; and this made him weep in a childish way so that he could not tell whether he was glad or sorry. Then, where the yard of the deanery came to the river and trees lay over the sliding water, he saw all the blue of the sky condensed to a winged sapphire, that flashed once.

He cried out.

'Come back!'

But the bird was gone, an arrow shot once. It will never come back, he thought, not if I sat here all day. He began to play with the thought that the bird might return, to sit on a post only a few yards away in all its splendour, but his heart knew better.

'No kingfisher will return for me.'

All the same, he said to himself, I was lucky to see it. No one else saw it. At last he got to his feet and went out by the sideway to the close.[9]

The kingfisher of the vision represents a significant change from the aspiring and dominating eagle and raven of the earlier imagery. In its flashing beauty it implies a glimpse of harmony which, though ephemeral, enables Jocelin to enact the final gesture of humility in his interview with Roger Mason. An appreciation of the harmony of the world cannot be lasting, because under normal circumstances that harmony is beyond the reach of man. Nevertheless, the vision of an overriding beauty associating the overtly religious with the secular is finally glimpsed by Jocelin. With the bird he sees an appletree, and begins to appreciate the complexity of the vision. In its purely Biblical context the symbol may be interpreted as implying such a fusion as that which Jocelin is able, briefly, to grasp. In its association with anthropomorphic God and Devil it recalls a time when life and religion were not divorced utterly but were a part of the same thing. Eden before the Fall was a place of complete harmony, and the fragmentation of experience may be dated

initially from the temptation of Eve. Hence the appletree, by recalling both the harmonious prelapsarian era and the actual moment of the Fall, symbolises both the possibility of an harmonious existence and the vulnerability of that harmony. In terms of the novel's symbolism, the spire itself has already come to be seen not as a simple construction, but as a complex entity, twisted and anything but direct, but above all, an obsession:

'Reservations, connivances. The work before everything. And woven through it, a golden thread - No. Growth of a plant with strange flowers and fruit, complex, twining, engulfing, destroying, strangling.'

And immediately the plant was visible to him, a riot of foliage and flowers and overripe, bursting fruit. There was no tracing its complications back to the root, no disentangling the anguished faces that cried out from among it; so he cried out himself, and then was silent.[10]

Then Father Adam came close and began to unravel things. He pulled and unravelled but got nowhere because all things were so mixed and the evil plant grew among and over them all.[11]

But the shift of emphasis brought by the vision implies more than a movement towards beauty, away from images of rotting and overripeness. It brings to Jocelin the realisation that "there was more to the appletree than one branch." In other words the appletree is a symbol of harmony not only in Biblical terms, but also in terms of the novel's own symbolism. For Jocelin, by concentrating all his energies on one branch of the tree of life, has attained a warped view of the whole. To him:

The earth is a huddle of noseless men grinning upward, there are gallows everywhere, the blood of childbirth never ceases to flow, nor sweat in the furrow, the brothels are down there and drunk men lie in the gutter. There is no good thing in all this circle but the great house, the ark, the refuge, a ship to contain all these people and now fitted with a mast.[12]

In the beatific vision, however, the sense of harmony and the appreciation of beauty have come through the purging of the obsession. It is a way inaccessible to Sammy Mountjoy, whose very act of writing his autobiography testifies to the fact that he has not been purged of the effects of his infatuation. Jocelin comes to the profound acceptance of the fact that there is "no innocent work", and the acknowledgement that "Wow - I know nothing at all."[13] The transient flash of the kingfisher, by showing Jocelin the possibility of a complete fusion only partially within his grasp has led him to a new humility based on a realisation of man's true and vulnerable place on the Great Chain of Being. The true glimpse of the kingfisher replaces the delusion of the eagle, suggesting to Jocelin the limits, as well as the extent, of man's spiritual potentiality. He achieves the profound wisdom necessary in order to accept humbly the equivocations inherent in his own nature, and having achieved this realisation, the climax of his mental development, it is only left for him to die.

Man must come to terms with his nature - must accept his rightful place on the Great Chain of Being, in order to come to an appreciation of the happiness which is to be found in the world. That happiness comes in part from a successful use of the elevated potential of man for understanding. Obsession destroys that understanding, as the obsessive pride of Satan, the obsessive curiosity of Eve, destroyed their understanding; and as the obsession of Jocelin, until purged, destroyed his understanding of the harmony of life. The visionary glimpse of appletree and kingfisher gave to Jocelin a new gratitude and humility, and in his humbling of himself came his moral and intellectual exaltation.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The five novels published by Golding between 1954 and 1964 form a compact sequence of allegorical discussions of the nature of man. To summarise briefly the stages of the progression: Lord of the Flies, the most straightforward in tone and theme, portrays man as basically animalic and instinctively savage. The possibility of environmental influence is symbolically dismissed by the fact that the boys are in the pre-adolescent stage, and glimpses of the evil characteristics in even the littluns suggest that the instinct is always there, waiting to be brought to the surface by a change of circumstances, and particularly by an elevation to political power. The novel examines, in short, the effect of the Fall, without any serious exploration of its cause.

The Inheritors, by its anthropological juggling which telescopes whole centuries to enable the Neanderthals to encounter and be destroyed by, their successors, traces the cause to the sociological and intellectual advancement of the new people. As in the Creation myth, clothes become a symbol of the shame of sexuality and of the perception of evil - a perception beyond the understanding of Lok and Fa and their people. The Neanderthals do not aspire to the ability to think, and it is in their thought that the sin of the new people lies. Man's thought, which he regards as an absolute and objective fact, is, in fact, purely subjective, and based on quite false premises. It is this false reasoning which leads the new people to destroy the old, and thought, as increased

sophistication occurs, becomes confused with the instinct to protect ones possessions. The Neanderthals, living communally, as they do, have no such instincts. The moral for the twentieth century is clear; in modern sophistication, the aggressive instinct, initially defensive, is predominant. One takes it for granted, but one does so wrongly, for it is based not on subjectivity's subordination to intellectual objectivity, but on emotional subjectivity itself. Then the weakness of human reason is demonstrated in action in the hole-in-the-tree section.[1] The overall end of the allegory is a demonstration of the mental fallibility of man, who, unbeknown to himself, bases his thoughts not on intellectual reasoning but on false instinct.

Pincher Martin links the two previous novels in that it associated Chris's vulnerability with his cruelty. Vulnerability is not the sole cause of cruelty, but the two are connected. Whereas the Neanderthals have nothing to protect, the cruelty of the new people emanated from their desire to protect their possessions from the Neanderthals and from each other. In Lord of the Flies, the boys are in both physical and (through their assumption of adult responsibility) moral danger, and again their cruelty comes to the fore. Cruelty and vulnerability, then, are the two main characteristics examined in the first two novels, and they are explored again in Pincher Martin, but here primarily as fragmented parts of a whole. It is the first specific consideration of the theme of fragmentation, and they are seen to make the individual unfit for success either as individual or as group animal. Chris cannot stand alone, and nor, as one gathers, can he achieve a

harmonious relationship with others. The novel suggests no solution, it merely shows the protagonist struggling and failing to maintain his individuality in an extreme of isolation.

Free Fall goes a stage further, as the protagonist, more perceptive than Martin, sees his own dilemma and can grasp the negative solution that man is too complex to be fitted into a system, but that in his very complexity lies the root of the problem. He can trace his fall to his surrender of self to Beatrice, and can acknowledge but not fully comprehend, the complexity of the merging of his sexual and spiritual feelings for her. The novel emphasises man's failure as a group animal just as Pincher Martin concentrates, though not exclusively, on his failure as an individual. In the pair of novels both sides of the coin are discussed and examined and man's failure is shown as complete.

But it is neither Christopher Martin nor Sammy Mountjoy, but Dean Jocelin in The Spire, who achieves a degree of harmony which, Golding seems to be suggesting, is man's best hope for fulfilment and happiness in the world. Jocelin attains a fleeting vision of harmony through humility: in his repentance of his sin, he is given a glimpse of the Promised Land, which, like Moses, he can only see, not enter.

In The Spire, then, Golding makes his most positive statement concerning the nature and potential of man, and the novel constitutes the natural culmination of its four predecessors. The allegorical technique common to the five novels is not easily isolated and defined, because what it represents is a complex entity itself, not a simple moral lesson to be cloaked in narrative guise. In mediaeval allegory it is generally

possible to isolate each element and equate it with a specific meaning. With Golding's allegory this cannot be done. The contrasting use of the two types of allegory in The Spire makes that clear, for the mediaeval allegorical device of the internally warring angel and devil is clearly intended as a comment on the inadequacy, for Golding's purposes, of that genre. Golding's allegory is the working out in action of certain hypotheses concerning the nature of man. The action is not intended to be true to life - quite the reverse, for the concerns of the allegory are, generally unbeknown to him, also the concerns of the reader. In examining the nature of man Golding is also examining the nature of the reader and so the reader ceases to be the judge of the characters - rather, he becomes the characters, and unqualified to judge them objectively. Indeed, one of the comments on man's inadequacy is, as has been suggested, the fallibility of his supposed objectivity, so Golding, in the allegory, acknowledges and asserts the impossibility of objectivity: he shows the reader the subjective concerns of the characters and demonstrates that the judgement of the reader is based too on his own prejudices and emotions.

The basic technique of the allegory involves the extension ad absurdum of either plot or character, so that the reader attains a degree of detachment from the novel. This is achieved by improbability in Lord of the Flies and Pincher Martin, by chronological distancing in The Inheritors and The Spire, and by a disruption of the time sequence and a deliberate dualistic systematisation imposed on Free Fall. In none of these novels (with the trick exception of The Inheritors) does the reader

become closely involved with the characters, yet the characters all bear, to an exaggerated degree, the mental features of the reader. The characteristics to be considered are isolated from the other attributes and taken to their logical extreme in a series of hypothetical instances, with the result that the characters are led into actions and situations which the reader, following a subjective, not an objective code, must simultaneously sympathise with and condemn. By this dual reaction, which he feels for Christopher Martin, for Sammy Mountjoy and for Dean Jocelin, the reader is, as it were, putting himself on the rack, and acknowledging his own faults as they are shown, in exaggerated form, in others. This is why the very improbability of the situations is an integral part of the allegory: it allows the characteristics of man to be strained to their utmost limits while remaining recognisable to the reader as his own.[2] By this means, Golding is enabled to have his cake and eat it: he is able to distance the reader from the characters and at the same time associate him with them. The idea is common to all five novels in the sequence (though within those five novels the last three form a particularly homogeneous group), and in the last of the five, The Spire, skill and subtlety of technique match the allegorical theory and the result is a consummately artistic novel, Golding's most perfect work to date.

The growth of Golding's maturity as an allegorist since his first novel is remarkable. The shift in perspective, integral to the allegorical technique of modifying the reader's viewpoint, (the limitations of the reader's powers of reasoning being, as suggested, integral to the allegory)

is common, in some form or another, to all five novels. A different view of Jack or Lok recalls to the reader the fact that he has been misled by Golding into regarding them in a way alien to the manner in which he would normally consider them. By this means he is forced to acknowledge the fallibility of his own view of what has been happening, and to accept the subjective nature of his concept of reality. In Pincher Martin, the effect of the final chapter is to emphasise the fragmentation of the individual which lies at the heart of the novel, and a conclusion which appears, at first sight, to be aesthetically questionable, in fact comes to be seen as integral to the book as a whole. The new perspective of Free Fall, though primarily negative, is yet important to the theme of the folly of systematisation, emphasising the basic assertion of the impossibility of a simple choice between alternatives. In The Spire, the appearance of the Visitor, the interview with Alison, and the ensuing events, help close the gap between the reader's perception and that of Jocelin. It emphasises the folly of Jocelin's obsession, and leads to his final beatific vision, and the perception of the harmony which he can appreciate but not keep.

Golding has always asserted his determination to write only what has not been written before, and in his development of a twentieth century allegorical technique he has successfully advanced the scope of the English novel in a way unique among contemporary writers. His writing is not didactic - a moral truth enclosed in a sugar coating - but a scientific, or empirical allegory. It is, in effect, an experiment, and an experiment not only in form but in human nature. It is a way of

telling what cannot be told directly. The mediaeval preacher can as easily say 'drunkenness is wrong' as demonstrate it by an allegorical sermon. His purpose in telling the story is to motivate action by initially obtaining the listener's attention. With Golding this is not the case; drunkenness is one result of what human nature is: what Golding is seeking to do is to define the very bases of that nature, and the only way he can attempt this is by the allegorical method. It is empirical because he is seeking to show in action what he cannot tell in words. The protagonists of two of the novels are seen trying to find this out for themselves, and the reader learns from their partial or complete failure to do so. In The Spire, the protagonist is brought to a realisation of his own nature and limitations from outside, and the reader is shown, by the same means, the ideas of human nature propounded by the novel. The allegorical technique of Golding thus shows what it cannot explain to character and reader alike.

To attempt an assessment of the likely path of Golding's future career would be futile. It would appear, however, that the phase of his writings which concluded with The Spire is complete. A brief consideration of his most recent novel, The Pyramid, appears elsewhere in this thesis[3], but it seems to have taken him away from the allegorical tradition into a field which involves both idyllic country scenes and mild social comment. What will finally evolve certainly cannot be determined, but for the sequence of five alone, it seems probable that history will come to consider William Gerald Golding as a noteworthy writer. He has had the courage to revive and reshape a dead allegorical tradition, and apply it

to his own needs, and to those of his century. The result has been a sequence of novels, unique of their kind, which will continue to be read with interest not only for what they succeed in doing, but also for what they intend to do. Though not invariably successful in sustaining the interest of the reader, Golding deserves the highest praise for his innovations in the form both of the novel and of the allegory. In his fusion of the two forms, in a way broadly acceptable to the twentieth century, he has performed a major service to more than one branch of prose literature. With this in mind, it seems reasonable to suggest that Golding will come to be accepted as the major writer of the mid-twentieth century. From a contemporary point of view he is certainly the most interesting.

APPENDIX

The publication, in 1967, of Golding's sixth novel, marks the end of an era in that writer's career. It suggests no further concern with the nature of man, and in its detachment from the allegorical techniques of the previous five novels it has no place in this thesis. It is, in a sense, an exploration of man's sexuality rather in the way that The Spire is an exploration of his spirituality, but the tone is no more allegorical than that of, for example, Here We Go Round the Mulberry Bush[1], a lighthearted and unpretentious novel dealing with the same themes as The Pyramid, in an equally entertaining manner.

The allegorical tone of the earlier novels is, for the most part, replaced by an idyllic tone of country life. There is an element of social comment in the relationship between Olly, the hero, a poor dispenser's son, and Robert Ewan, the arrogant son of the village doctor; and also in the fact that Olly was to go to Oxford in an era when that University was a place for such as Robert Ewan rather than for poorer boys. Such comment, however, is generally latent and never of the same intensity as the concerns of Lawrence, with whose writings this novel has been compared. Such tragedy as there is is commonplace - the urbanisation of Evie Babbacombe on her return from London, the distress and madness of the old spinster, Bounce, at her unrequited love for the rather unscrupulous Henry Willings, and never of more than immediate significance. The novel is not allegorical, but a picture of

village life as it is. Even the initial frontispiece citation, from the Instructions of Ptah-Hotep: "If thou be among people make for thyself love, the beginning and end of the heart."[2] - does little more than suggest the broad concerns of village life, - family and sexual relationships. The novel does trace different types of love - physical, marital, ascetic, frustrated - but constitutes no new exploration of the theme. The novel, in short, is not one of any major significance.

Nevertheless, there is in the novel an apparent tendency to parody the episodes and concerns of the earlier works as if in acknowledgement that the phase of Golding's career which brought those works is now over. For example, Olly, whose lust for Evie Babbacombe forms the basis of the first part of the novel, is a musician as Sammy Mountjoy is an artist, yet the conflict between sex and art which was basic to Sammy's character and dilemma is totally absent here, except in the fact that Olly, in the frustration which results from his lust, smashes his piano. Again Evie recalls (in name at least) the compulsive liar of the schooldays of Sammy Mountjoy, and in her seduction of Olly she plays a broadly Paradisal role of woman as temptress - a comic archetype quite basic to the novel. In the scene of the amateur operatics there are clear parodic elements of the events of Lord of the Flies.

> The SOS, laid to rest after the last performance, would wake and lick its wounds. There were many; for after a performance, few of the cast would speak to each other again. With diabolical inevitability, the very desires to act and be passionate, to show off and impress, brought to full flower the jealousies and hatreds, meannesses and indignations we were forced to conceal in ordinary life.[3]

There are certain circumstances when characteristics which society

demands that one conceal, will come to the fore. Those circumstances exist in Lord of the Flies, and, on a smaller scale, in The Pyramid. Yet the events of the operatics add nothing to the events of the earlier novel; if anything, they are a downscaling of the significance of the boys on the island, for after the operatics the wounds gradually heal, and the whole thing begins again.

The answer may lie in the achievement of The Spire, and the return to Dean Jocelin of his sense of proportion. With his return to normality comes a vision of harmony, and the awareness of the continuity of life in all circumstances. If the vision came to Golding as it came to Jocelin, the idyllic tone of the novel and the parodic elements of the earlier novels suggested in the individual scenes might be interpreted as combining to express an awareness of the harmony achieved by Jocelin. Until The Spire, the novels ended without resolution, but with an awareness of the immense problems facing mankind. In The Spire the clouds cleared somewhat, and with Jocelin's realisation that there was more to the appletree than one branch came a return to a sense of proportion to a degree hitherto unknown in Golding. Possibly Golding concluded that he, too, had lost his sense of proportion, and that whatever man's faults were, he did have one major saving grace, - and that saving grace was the very fault for which he had been arraigned in the earlier novels - a faulty power of reason. Without that power of absolute reason, man remained blissfully unaware of what was happening within and around him. He was unaware of his potential for evil, of the conflict between heavenly aspiration

and carnal desire. And in spite of all his weaknesses, he struggled on, as happy as he knew how to be, and not knowing how much happier he might be were his basic nature not what it was.

If this awareness came to Golding in the course of the composition of The Spire, his most optimistic novel at that time, it is reasonable that he should modify his theories and techniques in the book which followed that. Accordingly, characters are seen getting over what, in the earlier novels, constituted a major barrier to human happiness. It is as though, in Jocelin's vision, Golding has realised that the glimpse of the Promised Land is all that man can achieve, and has accordingly shifted his themes from an attempt to show man his weaknesses to an attempt to show man his strengths - oblivion, resilience, insensitivity to the ills administered to oneself. In that case, The Pyramid becomes, to a greater extent even than The Spire, a statement of the potential of man to survive and be happy. Only Bounce, left alone to die, remains as testimony of the approach of the earlier novels, as, deserted by one and all, she enacts her mindless eccentricities right up to the grave.

FOOTNOTES

PREFACE

[1] See below, pp. 91-94.

CHAPTER ONE

[1] Gary M. Miller, The Novels of William Golding Unpublished thesis, McMaster University, 1963. pp. 8-9.

[2] Arnold Kettle, An Introduction to the English Novel (London: Hutchinson, 1951), Vol. 1, pp. 40-59.

[3] See below, pp. 41-53.

[4] George Lukacs, Studies in European Realism (London: Hillway, 1950), p. 11

CHAPTER TWO

[1] William Golding, The Hot Gates and other occasional pieces (London: Faber & Faber, 1965), pp. 85-101.

[2] Ibid., p. 89.

[3] See below, p. 25.

[4] R. M. Ballantyne, The Coral Island (London: Nelson, Undated). For example, (p. 27), Jack had "a cotton pocket-handkerchief, with sixteen portraits of Lord Nelson printed on it, and a union-jack in the middle." Ralph, alarmed while searching the island, relates (p. 50) "For myself, having forgotten my club, and not having taken the precaution to cut another, I buttoned my jacket, doubled my fists, and threw myself into a boxing attitude."

[5] The Hot Gates, pp. 99-100.

[6] See above, p. 7.

[7] E. L. Epstein (ed.) Lord of the Flies (New York: Capricorn, 1959), p. 189.

[8] Including a possible reference to the miracle of the Feeding of the Five Thousand (Matthew, XIV xv-xxi)

[9] William Golding, Lord of the Flies (London: Faber & Faber, 1954), p. 71.

[10] A similar case is that of Nat in Pincher Martin. Halde, in Free Fall, is a refinement of the same technique. See below, p. 75.

[11] The Hot Gates, p. 97.

[12] Lord of the Flies, (Faber, 1954), p. 184. All future references, except where otherwise stated, are to this edition.

[13] Ibid., p. 91.

[14] Other literary examples include Jean-Paul Sartre's Huis-Clos, King Lear, and Ben Jonson's Volpone. Of these the latter two reinforce the theme by animalic image-patterns, just as Lord of the Flies suggests man's animal tendencies. Kenneth Muir (Arden Paperback, London: Methuen, 1967 edition, p. lx) observes that King Lear contains 133 references to 64 animals.

[15] For example in the encounter between Simon and the head, Lord of the Flies, pp. 177-8.

[16] Ibid., p. 186.

[17] Ibid., p. 44.

[18] In Freudian terms the conflict is analogous to the vulnerability of the Super-Ego to the Id; the control of the Id by the Ego being only tentative.

[19] As the Id counterbalances the Super-Ego.

[20] Lord of the Flies, p. 177.

[21] E. L. Epstein (ed.) Lord of the Flies (New York: Capricorn, 1959), p. 190.

[22] The Coral Island, p. 64.

[23] The Hot Gates, p. 88.

[24] By Conrad also in the cases of Tuan Jim, Charles Gould, Nostromo, Razumov, etc.

[25] Lord of the Flies, pp. 74-5.

[26] Ibid., p. 75.

[27] Ibid., p. 77.

[28] See above, p. 15.

[29] Lord of the Flies, p. 226.

[30] Ibid., p. 15.

[31] Ibid., p. 16.

[32] Epstein, op. cit. p. 189.

[33] Lord of the Flies, p. 193.

[34] Ibid., p. 173.

[35] Most notably little specific mention has been made of the symbolic characterisations of Jack and Piggy.

CHAPTER THREE

[1] William Golding, The Inheritors (4th ed.; London: Faber & Faber, 1965) p. 7.

[2] For example, Ibid., pp. 216-8.

[3] Ibid., p. 162.

[4] Ibid., p. 33.

[5] Ibid., pp. 49-50.

[6] For a discussion of this aspect of the novel, see below, pp. 38-40.

[7] The Inheritors, p. 78.

[8] Ibid., p. 218.

[9] Ibid., p. 194.

[10] For example, see James Gindin, "'Gimmick' and Metaphor in the Novels of William Golding" Postwar British Fiction (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1962) pp. 196-206. Reprinted in William Nelson (ed.) William Golding's Lord of the Flies A Source Book (New York: Odyssey Press, 1963) pp. 132-140. Hereafter referred to as Source Book.

[11] Peter Green, "The World of William Golding" Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Literature, 32 (1963), 37-57. Reprinted in Source Book. p. 160.

[12] See above, pp. 12-13.

CHAPTER FOUR

[1] Peter Green, "The World of William Golding" Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Literature, 32 (1963), 37-57. Reprinted in Source Book, p. 183.

[2] William Golding, Pincher Martin (4th ed.; London: Faber & Faber, 1964), p. 8.

[3] Ibid., p. 21.

[4] Ibid., p. 34.

[5] Ibid., p. 36.

[6] Most obviously in the comic catastrophe of the building of the dwarf.

[7] For a more detailed treatment of this subject, see A. O. J. Lovejoy, The Great Chain of Being.

[8] See above, p. 45.

[9] Examples of Martin's attempts include the reading of the naval identity disc and the desire for a looking-glass.

[10] Pincher Martin, p. 196.

[11] Ibid., p. 13.

[12] Ibid., p. 181.

[13] Ibid., p. 183.

[14] Mark Kinkead-Weekes and Ian Gregor, William Golding A Critical Study (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1968), p. 128.

[15] An analogue with Cain is possibly intended (Genesis IV ix-xv). It is worth noting that in Free Fall Sammy Mountjoy constantly perceives the same impossibility of communication in his relationship with Beatrice, and the idea is treated more fully in Chapter Five, below. Sammy discounts Martin's assumption that sex is the key to this harmony.

[16] This association (p. 119), occurs through his acting. The acting itself is of thematic relevance, and is a literary commonplace for deceit. Examples include Sergeant Troy in Thomas Hardy's Far From the Madding Crowd, and all the evil characters in Tom Jones, (Blifil's false piety, Bellaston at the masque, etc.) Pincher Martin also contains

allusions to Hamlet (pp. 135-6) and King Lear (p. 190).

[17] Pincher Martin pp. 135-6.

[18] Ibid., p. 88.

[19] Ibid., p. 186.

[20] Ibid., p. 132.

[21] Quoted by John Peter in Postscript to "The Fables of William Golding" Kenyon Review, XIX (Autumn, 1957), 577-92. Reprinted in Source Book, p. 34.

[22] In Freudian terms they may be equated with the negative, destructive part of the Id - those memories, individual and racial, which, in abnormal mental circumstances, become the source of guilt feelings and neuroses. Literary analogies include Pope's Cave of Spleen as well as Christ's Harrowing of Hell, where one's darkest thoughts are defeated by an external Messiah figure.

[23] John Bowen, "Bending Over Backwards" Times Literary Supplement, 3,008 (October 23, 1959), 608. Reprinted in Source Book, p. 58.

[24] Pincher Martin p. 208.

CHAPTER FIVE

[1] William Golding, Free Fall (2nd ed.; London: Faber & Faber, 1960) An obvious parallel occurs on p. 35 and p. 248.

[2] Ibid., p. 12.

[3] Ibid., pp. 5-6.

[4] Ibid., p. 115.

[5] Ibid., p. 118.

[6] Ibid., p. 69.

[7] Ibid., p. 95

[8] Ibid., p. 125.

[9] Ibid., pp. 252-3.

[10] Ibid., p. 136 & p. 147 respectively.

[11] Ibid., p. 235.

[12] And, incidentally, with the saintly Simon and Nat of the earlier novels. For further discussion of this aspect of Golding's allegorical technique, see below, p. 75.

[13] Free Fall, p. 144.

[14] Ibid., see, for example, p. 135 and p. 139.

CHAPTER SIX

[1] William Golding, The Spire (2nd ed.; London: Faber & Faber, 1964) p. 222.

[2] Ibid., p. 213.

[3] Ibid., p. 65.

[4] Ibid., e.g. p. 67: 'I am about my Father's business.' p. 141: 'Now you shall have me always with you.' p. 156: "If David could not build the temple because he had blood on his hands, what is to be said of us, and of me?" (In mediaeval typological Biblical exegesis, David, as well as being the ancestor of Christ, was also his type.)

[5] Ibid., p. 123.

[6] Free Fall, p. 147.

[7] The Spire, e.g. pp. 23, 24, 70, 101, 105, 106, 107, 111, 133, 155. Raven and eagle - proud and powerful birds of prey - are the most predominant birds in the image cluster. Included in these references are references to birds flying past Jocelin as he is on the spire. Jocelin's climbing the spire is a related symbol of aspiration, for as he elevates himself physically, he appears less and less willing to take any heed of the words of those below. Again, the nose on his statue is envisaged as a 'beak' - a subtle manifestation of two related aspects of Jocelin's pride - his statue and his proud bird-like nature. Mediaeval bird allegories of the human hierarchy are numerous: one of the most celebrated is Chaucer's Parlement of Foules, where the birds of prey represent the nobles, the worm-fowl the bourgeoisie, the seed fowl the agricultural class and the water fowl the merchants. To appreciate the prevalence of this form of literature in the middle ages is vital for the understanding of the significance of the bird of prey association, and of its final replacement with the kingfisher.

[8] Ibid., p. 81.

[9] Ibid., pp. 204-5.

[10] Ibid., p. 194.

[11] Ibid., p. 203.

[12] Ibid., pp. 106-7.

[13] Ibid., p. 222 & p. 223.

CHAPTER SEVEN

[1] See p. 36, above.

[2] It is of interest that the improbability of the situations - integral as that improbability is to the allegory - is enhanced by the fact that all five novels in the sequence have close literary parallels. The effect of this is to make them appear more as literary 'set pieces' than as naturalistic works. The close relationship between Lord of the Flies and The Coral Island has been demonstrated throughout Chapter Two (pp. 10-27, above), and the fact that the idea for The Inheritors came from H. G. Wells is clear from the frontispiece of that novel. Pincher Martin is rich in literary allusions - Dorling's Pincher Martin, Bierce's "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge" and, of course, Paradise Lost, are but three. Free Fall, in its theme as well as its confessional technique, is closely related to Camus's La Chute (a relationship examined in some detail by Sholagh Harris, Golding and Camus: A Critical Comparison, Unpublished thesis, McMaster University, October 1965, pp. 84-127); while The content of The Spire gives the impression of leaning heavily on the ideas of Ibsen's The Master Builder.

[3] See below, pp. 91-94 for a discussion of this novel in the Appendix.

APPENDIX

[1] Hunter Davies, Here We Go, Round the Mulberry Bush (London: Heinemann, 1965).

[2] The Pyramid (London: Faber & Faber, 1967). p. 9.

[3] Ibid., p. 124.

A GUIDE TO THE BOOKS CONSULTED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS THESIS

A. Works by William Golding.

For a guide to the major works of Golding, see above, p. (iii).

B. Criticism of Golding.

Baker, James R. William Golding A Critical Study. New York: St Martin's Press, 1965.

Kinkead-Weekes, Mark and Ian Gregor. William Golding A Critical Study. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1968.

Nelson, William. (ed). William Golding's "Lord of the Flies" A Source Book. New York: Odyssey Press, Inc. 1963.

Talon, Henri. "Irony in Lord of the Flies", Essays in Criticism, Vol. XVIII, July 1968, pp. 296-309.

In addition, the following two unpublished theses from McMaster University have been consulted:

Harris, Shelagh. Golding and Camus: A Critical Comparison. 1965.

Miller, Gary R. The Novels of William Golding. 1963.

C. Related and General Criticism.

Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Ellman, Richard and C. Feidelson, Jr. The Modern Tradition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Fletcher, Angus. Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Freud, Sigmund. Totem and Taboo. Translated by James Strachey. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1950.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Honig, Edwin. Dark Conceit: The Making of Allegory. New York: Galaxy Books, 1966.

Kettle, Arnold. An Introduction to the English Novel. Vol. 1. London: Hutchinson, 1951.

Lewis, C. S. The Allegory of Love. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

Lovejoy, Arthur Oncken. The Great Chain of Being. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Lukacs, George. Studies in European Realism. London: Hillway, 1950.

MacNeice, Louis. Varieties of Parable. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Trousson, Raymond. Le Theme de Prometheo Dans La Litterature Europeenne. 2 Vols. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1964.

Vickery, John B. (ed). Myth and Literature. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Wellek, Rene and Austin Warren. Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1956.

D. Related Creative Writings to which Reference is Made.

Ballantyne, R. M. The Coral Island. London: Nelson, n.d.

Bierce, Ambrose. "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge". In The Collected Works of Ambrose Bierce. Vol.II. New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1909. pp. 27-45.

Bunyan, John. The Pilgrim's Progress from This World to That which is to come. London: Nathaniel Ponder, 1678. Reproduced: London: Noel Douglas Replicas, 1928.

Camus, Albert. La Chute. Paris: Gallimard, 1956.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. The Parlement of Foules. In Chaucer's Minor Poems, Part I. Edited by Frederick J. Furnivall. London: N. Trubner & Co., (for The Chaucer Society). n.d.

Conrad, Joseph. Heart of Darkness. London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1902.

-------- Lord Jim. London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1900.

-------- Nostromo. London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1904.

-------- Under Western Eyes. London: Methuen, 1911.

Davies, Hunter. Here We Go, Round the Mulberry Bush. London: Heinemann, 1965.

Fielding, Henry. The History of the Life of the Late Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great. London: Routledge & Sons, n.d.

--------. The History of Tom Jones A Foundling. New York: Random House, 1950.

Floure and the Leafe, The and The Assembly of Ladies. D. A. Pearsall (ed). London: Nelson, 1962.

Hardy, Thomas. Far From the Madding Crowd. London: MacMillan, 1902.

Ibsen, Henrik. The Master Builder. Translated by Michael Meyer. London: Hart-Davis, 1961.

Milton, John. "Paradise Lost" in Poetical Works. Douglas Bush (ed). London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Pope, Alexander. "The Rape of the Lock" in Poems of Alexander Pope, Vol.II. Geoffrey Tillotson (ed). London: Methuen, 1940.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. Huis-Clos. Paris: Gallimard, 1945.

Shakespeare, William. The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

--------. King Lear. Kenneth Muir (ed). London: Methuen, 16 th edition, 1967.

ERRATA

(iii) l.15 miscellenea] miscellanea

(vi) CONTENTS becomes p. (i).

3 l.11 hence]

10 l.1 UCLA] University of California at Los Angeles

17 l.21 Jonathan Wild] Jonathan Wild.

18 l.15 abandonment.] abandonment,

28 l.18 and]

30 l.23 impracticality] impractical nature

44 l. 16 parallel,] parallel
vulnerability,] vulnerability

47 l.22 after "... a major boost for his ego", add a period, and, in a new sentence: "As two critics of Golding observe:"

51 l.17 thenusurper] the usurper
l. 25 hella] hell

71 l.5 The Spire] The Spire

83 l.14 by,] by

84 l.2 ones] one's

91 l.8 unpretensious] unpretentious

97 Chapter Two, FN 7: Add: "Quoted in Epstein's Afterword, from Golding's responses to a questionnaire from his American publisher."

101 l.21 The] the

103 l.13 et al. (ed).] (ed.)