UNIWERSYTET ŁÓDZKI

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS LODZIENSIS

FOLIA LITTERARIA

15

Maria Edelson

ALLEGORY IN ENGLISH FICTION OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

ŁÓDŹ 1985

UNIWERSYTET ŁÓDZKI

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS LODZIENSIS

FOLIA LITTERARIA
15

Maria Edelson

ALLEGORY IN ENGLISH FICTION OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

ŁÓDŹ 1985

Uniwersytet Łódzki
1985

Wydanie I. Nakład 265 + 85 egz. Ark. wyd. 14,9. Ark. druk. 13,25. Papier kl. V. 70 g, 70 × 100. Zam. 106/1173/85. E-9. Cena zł 150,—

Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego
Łódź, ul. Nowotki 143

ISSN 0208—6085

INTRODUCTION

WHY WRITE ON ALLEGORY IN ENGLISH TWENTIETH CENTURY FICTION?

The time when the prevalent attitude to literary allegory manifested itself in distrust and contempt is not very remote. Several generations of writers, critics and thinkers had contributed to establishing that attitude: Martin Luther, who considered allegory to be a „beautiful harlot", William Tyndale, Miles Coverdale, and William Blake, to whom it was a mere „daughter of memory", S. T. Coleridge, who thought it inferior to symbolism and W. B. Yeats, who was „bored by allegory", were some of the most notable opponents. As a corollary to so much opposition after its days of glory and reign in the literature of the Middle Ages and Renaissance, allegory gradually fell into disgrace and, until quite recently in the 20th century, it generally evoked decidely hostile responses. In 1947 Joshua McClennen wrote:

> One of the minor but striking differences between the sixteenth century and our own is to be seen in the change of attitude toward allegory. Allegory still continues to be used as a rhetorical device from time to time, but there is no voice to be heard in its praise[1].

The few commentators who wrote in favour of allegory, usually felt obliged to begin their analyses with apologetic remarks in its defence. Rex Warner's depiction of the situation of allegory presented in *The Cult of Power* is fairly typical of this approach: the writer notes that „most people's minds seem to turn away with a kind of distaste from the notion of allegory. And yet a great part of their

---

[1] J. McClennen, „On the Meaning and Function of Allegory in the English Renaissance", *Contribution in Modern Philology* April 1947, No 6, p. 1. [Biographical references are partly adapted to the rules of the English editorial norm. Zapisy bibliograficzne zostały podane zgodnie z angielską normą edytorską].

speech and action, most of their jokes, much of their entertainment, their pleasure, their complicated thought, their philosophy are allegorical"[2].

One of the reasons why Louis MacNeice shunned the term „allegory", when he gave the series of lectures on varieties of parable, was that he knew very well how „allergic" many people were to it[3].

Edwin Honig, one of the most influential authorities writing on the subject had the following remarks to make about the nearly universal indictment of allegory:

> There is a pervasive feeling against allegory, which, like most stubborn biases, springs from a mixture of distaste and half truths. The feeling is that allegory lends itself to polemical purposes and therefore turns inevitably into an exercise of subliterary fancies[4].

The deep-seated abhorrence towards the term „allegory" felt, according to Roy Mackenzie[5] and other critics, by the modern reader in the sixties stemmed from the firm conviction that literature belonging to the allegorical category can be of interest only in spite of the allegory contained in it, not because of it. The conviction was linked with the belief that allegory depended on mechanical translations of systems of ideas into pseudo-literary stories, which, in themselves, had little aesthetic value and, in fact, did not matter much since they were supposed to serve as mere sugar coating for otherwise not always easily digestible abstract notions.

Roy Mackenzie quite rightly pointed out that „the tacit assumption that all allegory is bad allegory"[6] was an injustice done to this category of literature. His was no longer an isolated opinion when he wrote it down in the sixties. The efforts of its defenders, as well as the growing number of allegorical works, soon brought about a great change in the evaluation of this kind of writing. In the words of Maureen Quilligan, it is „no longer necessary to apologize" for the critic dealing with the subject now. The interest in allegory has grown alongside with the growth of its esteem, and to-day one has to justify

---

[2] R. Warner, „The Allegorical Method", [in:] *The Cult of Power*, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia and New York 1947, p. 130.

[3] Cf. L. MacNeice, *Varieties of Parable*, Cambridge University Press 1965, p. 1.

[4] E. Honig, *Dark Conceit; The Making of Allegory*, a Galaxy Book, New York, Oxford University Press 1966, p. 3.

[5] W. R. Mackenzie, *The English Moralities from the Point of View of Allegory*, Gordian Press Inc., New York 1966, p. 257.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 260.

one's reasons for writing yet another book on the subject and thus adding to hat Stephen A. Barney calls a 'crowded court' [7].

The inevitable question, which arises at this point, concerns the reasons for writing the present dissertation on allegory in English fiction of the twentieth century. To answer this question it will be necessary to take a closer look at the 'crowded court'. An examination will soon reveal that most criticism dealing with the subject focuses on the nature of allegory. Among the critics who have made the attempt to answer the question of what allegory is and what it is not are Angus Fletcher, who produced the book *Allegory; The Theory of a Symbolic Mode* (1964); Northrop Frye, who wrote an important essay on „Ethical Criticism; Theory of Symbols" (in *Anatomy of Criticism*, 1957); Edwin Honig, the author of *Dark Conceit; The Making of Allegory*, 1966; and Maureen Quilligan with her book on *The Language of Allegory; Defining the Genre* (1979).

As can be seen from the titles quoted above, literary allegory is sometimes considered to be a mode of writing and, at other times, a genre. Not only theoreticians, but also critics writing on other aspects of the subject, the history of allegory, for example, feel it necessary to define allegory in order to give clearcut boundaries to their subjects. This is true, for instance, of C. S. Lewis, the author of *The Allegory of Love* (1936) dealing with the courtly love motif in the medieval and Renaissance literary works making use of allegory. C. S. Lewis devotes a chapter to a brief historical survey and his definition of allegory. Similarly, Edward A. Bloom's presentation of the development of the genre in his article on „The Allegorical Principle" (1951) begins with an exalanation of what is meant by the term.

Gay Clifford is interested both in the distinctive characteristics of allegory and its historical development, which is indicated by the title of her book *The Transformations of Allegory* (1974). Similar interests are reflected by a similar title chosen for the article "The Transformation of Allegory from Spenser to Hawthorne" (1962) by Peter Berek.

The history of allegory is what preoccupies John MacQueen very much; his booklet on *Allegory* (1970) has chapters devoted to Greek and Roman, biblical as well as medieval and modern allegory.

Also Louis MacNeice offers a historical survey of allegorical writing in his *Varieties of Parable* (1965). The book includes his lectures on Spenser and Bunyan, on the Romantics, on the Victorians as well as on "the contemporary world".

---

[7] Cf. M. Quilligan, *The Language of Allegory; Defining the Genre*, Cornell University Press 1979, p. 14.

Apart from those concerned with the nature and the history of allegory, other critics prefer to deal with selected kinds of allegorical writing, or limited periods of its development, or an individual writer-allegorist, or a specific aspect of allegory in general.

Rosamond Tuve's book on *Allegorical Imagery* (1966) concentrates, as its subtitle suggests, on "some medieval books and their posterity". And one of the most recent studies in the field is Stephen Barney's *Allegories of History, Allegories of Love* (1979) in which the author makes a distinction between what other critics call figural allegory and personification allegory and gives these categories a broader interpretation.

Numerous critical works are devoted to the heyday of allegory, in the period of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Some of the noteworthy studies have been produced by Paul Piehler, the author of *The Visionary Landscape* (1971) which examines medieval allegory, by David Aers who wrote on *„Piers Plowman"*; *Christian Allegory* (1975) and by Michael Murrin who concentrated on allegorical rhetoric in the English Renaissance in *The Veil of Allegory* (1969). Among the critics dealing with the period are also Joshua McClennen who contributed a study "On the Meaning and Function of Allegory in the English Renaissance" (1947), and Danilo L. Aguzzi writing on *Allegory in the Heroic Poetry of the Renaissance* (1955).

Among the allegorists who most frequently attract the attention of critics Edmund Spenser occupies a very important position; Harry Berger's *The Allegorical Temper* (1957) and A. C. Hamilton's *The Structure of Allegory in „The Faerie Queene"* (1961) may serve as examples of the ample research in the art of the great poet. Research has been also done in the allegorical character of various works by Shakespeare (e.g. A. D. Nuttal's *Two Concepts of Allegory* (1967) Samuel Johnson (for example Bernard Einbond's *Samuel Johnson's Allegory* (1966), Henry James (e. g. *„The Golden Bowl* Revisited", 1955, by Francis Fergusson), William Golding ("The Fables of William Golding", 1957, by John Peter) to quote only some examples.

Critical analyses of allegorical literature of other countries may often throw light on the nature of allegory in general and also on that of English allegory in particular. Criticism of Dante, of biblical parables, of Spanish, German and French allegories, for example, may be of great use in drawing conclusions about certain aspects of allegory practised in England.

A great deal is added to understanding allegory by studies which concentrate on particular problems or selected characteristics of the genre such as, for instance, the language of allegory (book by Maureen

Quilligan quoted above and "A Grammatical Approach to Personification Allegory", 1963, an article by Morton W. Bloomfield).

However interesting and valuable most of the criticism of allegory may be, it has to be noted that there exists an important gap in it: little has been written on the function of allegory in a literary work, on how its presence affects the structure of the work, and how allegory itself is influenced by the work. There are few critics who touch upon the problem, and those who give it some consideration are even fewer. Among the examiners of allegory noticing the problem is Ellen Douglas Leyburn who concentrates on the relation between allegory and satire in her book called *Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man* (1956).

The main purpose of the present dissertation, therefore, will be to examine the aesthetic implications of the presence of allegory in a literary work and especially the effects of combining allegory with different literary genres. A striking wealth of such combinations has been produced by the prose of the 20th century, which has been marked by a renewed interest in allegorical writing. The revived allegory of the 20th century differs considerably from that written previously since, in the course of time, it has undergone a number of important changes. As the author of *Transformations of Allegory* quite rightly says: „Any mode that survives over a long period is likely to take on very different shapes under pressure of the needs and expectations of different generations. With allegory the transformations are more than usually extensive"[8]. Because modern allegorical works constitute a category different from the ones of the past, it will be interesting to examine the nature of the differences and the direction of change.

Most historical studies make sweeping generalizations about allegory or deal with a particular period of its development. In one of the chapters of the dissertation I make an attempt to give a fairly comprehensive view of the history of allegory. I find it necessary to put together facts I have found and observations I have been able to make about the characteristics of allegory dominant at consecutive stages of its transformations in order to give a systematic and consistent survey of allegorical writing from the earliest times up to the present.

The historical survey will, no doubt, facilitate making a definition of the genre, since the essential features of allegory will become obvious when works generally agreed upon as allegorical are seen in a group. Although much has been written on defining allegory,

[8] G. Clifford, *The Transformations of Allegory*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London and Boston 1974, p. 6.

critics seem to be unable to achieve a consensus as to the meaning of the term „allegory". It will be necessary, then, to devote a chapter to the definition of the genre used in the dissertation, its justification, and reasons for rejecting other definitions. I cannot claim much originality here, but I hope to be able to add to the store of conclusions about the nature of the genre and to understanding it.

In dealing with the problems of allegory I shall concentrate on modern prose works rather than drama or poetry, mainly because the overwhelming majority of the twentieth century allegories belong to prose writing.

Realistic tendencies in English fiction have always been very strong. The requirements of faithfulness in presenting the physical world impose literary methods difficult to reconcile with the techniques of allegory which usually aims at making statements about moral, spiritual and philosophical problems and thus deals with abstractions. Because of this conflict of ends and means the presence of allegory in fiction may create tensions difficult to keep in balance. It will be therefore interesting to see how modern allegorists cope with the difficulty and what influence it has on their works.

In spite of various problems allegory makes its appearance in modern prose writing very frequently indeed. In fact, although it was severely criticized at certain periods of time, it never disappeared from the literary scene and, as Rousseau once noticed, it does seem to suit English tastes. Rousseau is quoted as saying to Boswell, when praising the *Spectator*:

> One comes across allegories in it, I have no taste for allegories, though your nation shows a great liking for them[9].

And in 1895 Frederick York Powell, while reading his paper later published as *Some Words on Allegory in England* (1910) tried to answer the question of why allegory had always enjoyed such great popularity among the English and he said:

> It were probably hard fully to answer. We are reticent. We exaggerate by understatement, we like to set forth our case without seeming to attack our adversary, to indulge in imagination without being flatly forced upon us that we are departing from the strictly practical. We dearly love literature with a purpose and we have tried to write it so often that we have sometimes succeeded gloriously in spite of

---

[9] Quoted after E. Ch. Heinle, *The Eighteenth Century Allegorical Essay*, Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University 1957, p. ii.

the absurd difficulty of the enterprise. The form in fact suits us, hence our excellence in it[10].

To include an opinion of a modern critic one might quote, for example, Steven Marcus, who connects Dickens's *Oliver Twist* „with a tradition of parabolic writing that has always commanded an important place in English literature"[11]. Since parable is, in fact, a variety of allegory, the remark may be applied to both.

The fact that allegory has such an important position in English literature makes it a very promising field of research. Interesting literary phenomena are created by allegory at the intersection of often conflicting literary tendencies with which it comes into close contacts: conventions of realistic prose, requirements of modern symbolism, new literary techniques used in the twentieth century, forms of various genres etc. Since this aspect of the situation of allegory remains rather neglected by critics, analysis of the subject becomes necessary. The present dissertation is an attempt to contribute to this analysis and through examining individual works representing the most typical kinds of modern allegory, to lead to conclusions about the general situation of allegory in 20th century prose writing in England. The analysis will begin with a modern personification allegory and move through specimens of allegorical writing in which the concentration of allegoricity gradually decreases (satirical allegory, fairy tale and other fantasy) towards a work exemplifying attempts to combine allegory with the realistic method.

What has been said above about the significance of allegory in English literature, the renewed interest and change in the genre observed in modern times as well as the problems created by combining allegory with various other genres of prose fiction, justifies, I hope, the fact that I have chosen to write the present dissertation on ALLEGORY IN ENGLISH FICTION OF THE 20TH CENTURY.

---

[10] F. Y. Powell, *Some Words on Allegory in England*, The Folcroft Press, Inc. 1910, p. 41.

[11] S. Marcus, *Dickens: from Pickwick to Dombey*, Basic Books, Inc. Publishers, New York 1965, p. 65.

Chapter I

ALLEGORY IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

It is impossible to trace the history of allegory back to its origin; we can only make assumptions and produce hypotheses. One of these consists in the belief that allegory is as old as the ability of man to tell a story and create metaphors. Man, whom Schopenhauer calls „a metaphysical animal" tried to express the visible and the invisible in myths. The mythopoeic approach connected reality with unseen forces by creating new entities believed to be real. Allegory contained the same kind of duplicity in the union of what can be seen with what is hidden, but it never identified fiction with reality. Allegory has always been a conscious „dark conceit" and the reason for this particular characteristic is of a very ancient motivation. It goes back to the practices of those who possessed esoteric wisdom, priests and prophets who were not willing to reveal their knowledge to the undeserving ignorant or to those who could have been angered by it and might have stoned the prophets. Wisdom was published in such a way that only the select could understand it. Besides, truth was (and is) often inexpressible otherwise than in an indirect way.

Pagan priests of Isis used hieroglyphic representations whose symbolic meanings could be interpreted only by few and, as Don Cameron Allen notices in his book *Mysteriously Meant*, „oddly enough, the modus interpretationis of the hieroglyphics in which the hierarchs concealed their learning was not unlike that of the allegories used by Moses, David, the Prophets, and Christ. The same type of metaphoric expression was also employed by the Apostles"[1].

The conviction that much of Christian symbolism was derived from ancient pagan methods and emblems gave rise to a number of

---

[1] D. C. Allen, *Mysteriously Meant; The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance*, The John Hopkins Press, Baltimore and London 1970, p. 116.

amateurish studies of the subject such as that by Thomas Inman[2] who took pains to relate various Christian symbols to pagan pictorial expressions of sexuality. Much serious and valuable research has been also done in the field. A fascinating study of ancient symbolism (as well as of early unorthodox Christians, Gnostics, Masons, and other secret societies) has been written by Harold Bayley[3]. The study contains interpretations of a number of words of different languages with the same syllables in them, and suggests that, originally, they were used to name certain deities or sacred phenomena in an oblique way resulting from the fear of being blasphemous or profane.

The desire to hide and disguise the sacred or the awesome manifested itself not only in graphic and pictorial representations then, but also in language. Early examples of veiled utterances related to the allegorical method were to be found in the Jewish practice of the *mashal*, which contained numerous literary devices such as riddle, fable, proverb, parable, and the *midrash* linked particularly with parable, all of which hide the truth in order to reveal it to the worthy.

Christ, when asked by his disciples why he spoke in parables, said to them:

> Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given. [...]
> Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand[4].

It was not only the *mashal* and *midrash* of rabbinic writings that contributed to the rise of Christian allegory; the use of typology in Palestinian Judaism had a far more influential role to play in its development. Narratives considered prophetic were interpreted by rabbis as typifying similar situations to come. They saw in the life of Ruth, for example, a prefiguration of Messianic events. The method was later adopted by Christians.

The Jewish typology and parable „competed" with the Stoic Hellenistic tradition of allegorizing. The two traditions originated the two basic types of allegory; Palestinian Judaism produced typological

---

[2] Th. Inman, M. D., *Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism*, J. W. Bouton, New York 1884.

[3] H. Bayley, *The Lost Language of Symbolism; An Inquiry into the Origins of Certain Letters, Words, Names, Fairy-Tales, Folklore, and Mythologies*, Barnes and Noble, Inc., New York 1951 (first published 1912).

[4] *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, The Gideons International, London 1956, p. 33, 34 (St. Matthew, ch. 13; 11, 13).

allegory which saw in actual (historical) or realistic and real events — types and figures of other situations, phenomena and persons. It has been variously called „allegory of theologians", „allegory of historians" or „allegory of history".

The Hellenistic tradition gave rise to personification allegory based on interpreting the literal in terms of abstractions; it is often referred to as „allegory of poets" or „allegory of love".

Personification allegory had its beginning in the allegoresis of ancient myths. According to Stephen Barney, „the first allegorist would be the man who respected the Old Gods, but turned mytography into fiction"[5]. Exactly the same explanation is offered by Roger Hinks:

> When the elaboration of critical standards had made it impossible for educated minds to accept a mythical statement as literally true, opinion was divided as to whether the legends of the gods and heroes were to be dismissed as mere fables, or were to be interpreted as figurative representations of reality. Epicurean doctrine decided for the former, or sceptical attitude; Stoicism preferred the latter, or moralizing interpretation[6].

Among those who practiced allegorizing interpretation was the Greek Theogenes of Rhegium who, as early as the 6th century B. C., allegorized Homer. Virgil's *Eneid*, too, was interpreted as a moral allegory by Macrobius and Fulgentius. Aristotle resorted to allegoresis at times, even though he ridiculed its extremities. Both the Sophists and the Cynics made use of it, but the Stoics gave allegoresis its important status and developed it considerably.

It was from the Hellenistic tradition that Alexandrian allegory took its beginning. In the first century B. C. Philo Judaeus, an Alexandrian philosopher, combined the Jewish gnosis with the Platonic, Stoic idea of God as an absolute, in order to expound his views of morals.

Origen followed both Philo and St. Paul who used figural allegory as a way of relating the Old to the New Testament. Origen believed that Scripture should not be interpreted in the literal, corporeal sense, whenever it contained things unworthy of God.

R. P. C. Hanson argues in *Allegory and Event* that the Alexandrian school exercised little influence on Christian allegory which had its sources in Palestine[7]. His argumentation, however, does not seem very

---

[5] S. A. Barney, *Allegories of History, Allegories of Love*, Archon Books, Hamden, Connecticut 1979, p. 39.

[6] R. Hinks, *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art*, The Warburg Institute, London 1939, p. 3.

[7] Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, D. D., *Allegory and Event; A Study in the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*, London 1959.

convincing since Origen who certainly followed the teachings of the school, was one of the first Fathers of the Church. As a matter of fact different traditions had geographically different areas of influence within the Christian Church: the Greek East preferred Alexandrian Platonist personification allegory, while the Latin West emphasized figural allegory, but both types of allegory were practised: the Rabbinic writings shaped Christian typology (with the difference that Christian typology was fulfilled), the Hellenistic allegoresis provided a justification for reading pagan great works in Christian, moral terms and led to personification allegory.

Both typology and personification allegory were soon synthesised in a system of interpretation: Tertulian's figural allegory served John Cassian as two senses (allegorical and anagogical) of his fourfold scheme and were combined with the tropological or moral sense based on the tradition of personification allegory, as well as with the literal sense. Cassian's scheme corresponds with the classification of the once popular Latin mnemonic:

Littera gesta docet,
Quid credis allegoria,
Moralis quid agas,
Quid tendas anagogia.

St. Thomas gave the fourfold scheme a more unified form by basing it exclusively on figural interpretation. Of some other Latin Church Fathers, Jerome opted for the threefold scheme (literal-tropological--mystical) like that of Origen, but St. Augustine chose the fourfold division; he interpreted the Old Testament according to history, aetiology, analogy, and allegory, and distinguished four types of allegory: of history, of facts, of discourse, of rites.

In the early period of scholasticism the question of universal symbolism was of utmost importance. For St. Augustine all created things were *quasi figurae* demonstrating the wisdom of God. St. Thomas Aquinas presented his views of universal symoblism in the *Summa Theologiae*.

St. Augustine, Hugh of St. Victor, St. Albert the Great, Peter of Poitiers and St. Thomas Aquinas may have differed about the classification of signs and symbols, all of them, however, believed that material things reflected the spiritual world.

Two basic kinds of symbolism were distinguished: symbolism of nature which treated the world as a book offering its meanings to careful readers, and typology which embraced the significations of Holy Scripture. St. Augustine started the process of unifying the

system and Hugh of St. Victor completed it by making the historical symbolism of Scripture a part of universal symbolism.

The ideas of the thinkers provided a background for the exegesis of Holy Scripture in the first place, enabled Christians to read as allegories Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, works of Homer, Virgil's *Eneid* and, in the course of time, to allegorize virtually any text. In the later Middle Ages allegoresis often led to excess; unrestrained allegorizers offered interpretations amazingly different from the literal meanings of the texts they commented on. For example a frivolous narrative of an unfaithful lover could be explained in terms of a biblical situation. Almost every object and every word of a text were made to mean something on the metaphorical level. In the gospel account of Christ on the sea of Galilee, different kinds of timber used in building the ship could be seen to stand for abstract qualities such as *humilitas* in the case of the cypress. F. W. Dillistone notes that in the 12th and the 13th centuries

> allegorical interpretations gained the greatest popularity of all. Allegory could also be used to build up edifying sermons and poems and plays. From the relative simplicity of the early Middle Ages we go forward to a period in which an intricate maze of allegorical correspondences takes shape, though the attempt is constantly made to hold the many detailed conceits within the one cosmic story of Creation, Fall, and Redemption. By the skillful use of allegory almost any details in the books of Nature and of Scripture could be interpreted as elemental symbols of the one majestic divine organic life[8].

Medieval culture is sometimes described as intensely bookish and clerkish since it was marked by fascination with the magic of language which led to looking for deeper and deeper meanings of words and concentrating on them as reflections of what medieval philosophers thought very real — the essence of all — the universals.

Scholars' allegoresis dominated the Middle Ages, but allegory was also written in that period. Even earlier, in the classical period, it was employed by writers occasionally, as when they turned to it to satirize particular people or events or when they wanted to show certain qualities in concrete shapes. Aristophanes (in *Birds* and *Clouds*), Aesop, Ovid (the description of the Palace of Sun and the House of Fame in the *Metamorphoses*) provide examples. However, it was a Christian writer, Prudentius, who was the first to use allegory as a central organizing concept of his narrative. His *Psychomachia* (c. 405) attained the fullest expression of early Christian allegory in

---

[8] F. W. Dillistone, *Traditional Symbols and the Contemporary World*, Epworth Press, London 1973, p. 51.

the Hellenistic tradition. It presented personified virtues and vices engaged in combat in the field of the human psyche.

A host of personification allegories followed *Psychomachia* throughout the Christian world. In England Boëthius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae* which contained personifications of abstract notions was translated into English by King Aelfred in the 9th century and had a great influence on Anglo-Saxon minds.

Ernest A. Baker says that „In the disposition to see the moral side of everything, inherited from Anglo-Saxon forefathers, the allegory found a congenial soil. Once implanted, it flourished amazingly"[9]. And, indeed, English medieval literature abounds in popular tales reinterpreted allegorically for didactic purposes, which, together with fables, legends, oriental tales and Holy Scripture, gave rise to numerous moral dictionaries, summae, specula — mirrors reflecting ideals and other collections of moral writings. One of the best known examples of moral tales was the compilation *Gesta Romanorum* of the 14th century (written, like many other works of those times, first in Latin, and then translated into English, in the reign of Henry VI). Apart from moral tales, exempla, there were also bestiaries which could be used for moral teaching. Bestiaries were especially useful in satirizing human vices and follies through stories about beasts; they continued the tradition of the classical beast-fable of Aesop and Phaedrus.

Stories from the Bible, which had a patently allegorical character were used extensively by preachers and made very popular by frequent repetitions. Recorded visions of the other world, initially understood literally, soon gained favour with allegorizers. Such visions flourished in the Middle Ages and they, no doubt, contributed to the development of the form of the medieval allegory, which more often than not had the framework of a dream (or) vision. In his classification of medieval allegories according to their structures, Winfried Theiss places the dream vision allegory in the first place of the four categories he distinguishes and which are:

1. Die Traumvision,
2. Der Spaziergang,
3. Allegorische Göttergespräche,
4. Tierallegorien[10].

---

[9] E. Baker, *The History of the English Novel, The Age of Romance; from the Beginnings to the Renaissance*, H. F. and G. Witherby 1924, p. 265.

[10] Cf. W. Theiss, *Exemplarische Allegorik*, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München 1968.

The dream vision framework and personification became the hallmarks of medieval allegory. These distinctive features determined the character of *Piers Plowman*, the important allegorical work written in the 14th century probably by William Langland. The narrator of *Piers Plowman* sees in his vision a „fair field full of folk" which is to symbolize earthly life. He also sees various objects, places and persons that stand for abstract notions and spiritual values. Personifications of abstractions, often very vivid and surprisingly physical such as Lady Meed, Reason, Conscience, Do-well, Do-bet, and Do-best, are related to the search for truth and the good life. Piers Plowman himself (associated also with Christ) is seen as a guide for those who seek high moral standards.

Chaucer's *The Boke of the Duchesse* (1369) also uses the conventional device of the dream vision. The poet sees in a dream a knight despairing after the loss of his lady. The device makes it possible for the poet to tell the story of *The Parlement of Foules* (1372—1386) in which birds meet on St. Valentine's day to choose their mates. Nature listens to their debates and makes decisions for them.

A love vision becomes the structural principle of two poems with a courtly love motif: *The Flower and the Leaf* and *The Assembly of Ladies* of uncertain authorship were written in the 14th century when love-vision poetry enjoyed the peak of its popularity.

Some critics also include medieval romances in the category of allegorical writing although not without doubts and reservations. James J. Wimsatt, for example, the author of *Allegory and Mirror* is well aware that „one might object that allegorical meanings are not explicitedly assigned to the romances by the writers. This is in general true, though specific allegorizations were not unknown in the romances, as when the hermit in the *Morte Darthur* interprets for Gawain one of his recent adventures"[11]. Wimsatt believes that, in spite of the lack of allegorical meanings assigned by the writer, one is entitled to interpret the romances as personification allegory by finding universal applications for their stories. It certainly is possible to find allegorical suggestions in the 15th century adaptations of Arthurian legends, *Morte Darthur* by Malory especially, because of the presence of certain motifs (e. g. the quest motif), character drawing limited to significant features, and moral implications.

Any review of medieval allegory has to include morality plays, which often combine personifications of abstractions with universalized

---

[11] J. I. Wimsatt, *Allegory and Mirror; Tradition and Structure in Middle English Literature*, Western Publishing Company, Inc., New York 1970, p. 219.

human types as in *The Castle of Perseverance* (c. 1400) and *Everyman* (15th cent.), *The Pride of Lyfe* (c. 1400) and numerous other plays.

Allegory permeated most literature written in the Middle Ages and it seemed to be a natural way of thinking in that period; it attained its peak of popularity in the 12th and the 13th centuries. But excessive allegorizing made the method appear pedantic and even ridiculous and, as a result, allegoresis lost much of its appeal especially where it depended on the detailed analysis of biblical and other religious texts ascribing often arbitrary meanings to them. No wonder that Reformers rejected the method of interpretation and insisted on the validity of Scripture in its literal level.

The change of attitude to allegoresis, and consequently to allegory, during the Renaissance was due to other causes as well. One such important cause was a change in the method of reasoning. The Middle Ages thinkers believed in analogy as a principle ordering reality: things and phenomena were arranged in a hierarchy of importance within related groups and had equivalents on the same levels in other groups thus creating a chain of being binding together different ideas, objects, and events.

Such ordering of the world continued to be valid also in the Renaissance, but gradually it gave way to a new way of thinking based on the inductive logic of Francis Bacon. Analogy which was the basis of mythology and symbolism, and of allegory in the Middle Ages, came to be replaced by the new Western mode of thought — the inductive method. Analogy, no longer considered scientific, was discarded. Science began to evolve towards specialization and differentiation disregarding the wider context of universe and universal knowledge. In *The Traditional Symbols and the Contemporary World* F. W. Dillistone supports the view that one of the reasons why medieval allegory declined was that the then system of symbolic correspondences became inadequate after the explosion of science which followed geographical discoveries. Another reason for the decline given by Dillstone was „the gradual shift away from the Platonic framework within which it was set"[12]. The process started in the Renaissance has led, according to Dillstone, to the replacement of the Christian system of symbols by the scientific symbolism we have today. A similar view is expressed by S. T. Cargill, when he says:

With the mental revolution usually described as the Renaissance, inductive methods of reasoning became more popular, but it was not until the philosophic activity of

---

[12] Dillistone, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

the eighteenth century and the industrial revolution of the early part of the nineteenth had made their mark on the world that inductive science made strides[13].

The change began in the Renaissance and has continued to deepen until modern times. It had to affect allegory, but the process was slow; medieval allegorical method lingered on although new tendencies marked the period of the Renaissance, and new allegories were written. If one accepts the fact of change in the character of allegory, it will be difficult to subscribe to the opinion that the genre not only lost its importance with the end of the Middle Ages, but also came to an end. The truth is that Renaissance allegory was different, but no less important. During the Renaissance allegory was simplified: its three non-literal senses (allegorical, tropological, and anagogical) became one — allegorical. This has to be associated with the fact that most allegories written in the period used moral personifications. Unlike medieval poets who wrote like analytical scholars about moral concepts exclusively, Renaissance poets took more interest in moral attitudes, and, consequently, in psychology. Another reason why personification allegory (as opposed to figural) dominated in that period was the interest taken in great classical literature and its classical allegoresis. Allegorization of Homer and Ovid inspired Renaissance men with a new enthusiasm for allegorical interpretations of classical works. They were also interested in Egyptian documents and thrilled by the mysteries of hieroglyphic writing, which appealed to their sense of the presence of hidden truths in veiled utterances. It was also for these reasons that mythology had a great appeal for them: there were many allegorizations (by Francis Bacon, for example) of classical mythology. Mythology became so „domesticated" that it served as a conventional field of reference for writers, poets, and thinkers. Mythological situations and characters came to be used particularly frequently by allegorists.

James Howell gave to his allegory a title written partly in Greek and called it: *Δενδρολογια, Dodona's Grove, or the Vocall Forest* (1650). The author says in „The Author's Aplogia Touching this Allegory" that he „hath under hieroglyphics, allegories and emblems endeavour'd to diversifie and enrich the matter, to embroder it up and down with Apologos, Essays, Parables and other flourishes; for we find this to be tne ancient'st and most ingenous way of delivering truth, and transmitting to posterity"[14].

[13] S. T. Cargill, *The Philosophy of Analogy and Symbolism*, Rider and Company, London [?] p. 21.

[14] [James Howell], *Δενδρολογια, Dodona's Grove, or the Vocall Forest*, London 1650, p. 8.

Classical references can be also found in the works by Stephen Hawes, who is the author of *The Passetyme of Pleasure, or History of Graunde Amoure and la Bel Pucel* (1509) and *Example of Virtue* (1512), two romance-allegories. *The Passtime of Pleasure* shows the development of an ideal knight; the spiritual process is reflected by the knight's experience of various personages and places. Among the places he visits are the Tower of Mars and the Temple of Venus, whose allegorical significance derives from the positions of the god and the goddess in classical mythology. In an article on the romance John M. King remarks that „This strangely perplexing poem captures the moment of transition to a new Renaissance mode of allegorical patterning"[15], based, according to him, on emblematic pageant allegory.

Both „emblematic pageant allegory" and classical allusions contribute to the character of *The Faerie Queene* (1589, 1596) by Edmund Spenser although its dominant features derive from the themes of the Arthurian romances. This great Renaissance allegory (of six books and a fragment of a seventh) resembles the poem by Hawes also because it deals with chivalric deeds and adventures. In the first book of *The Faerie Queene*, for example, the Red Cross Knight of Holiness (representing the Anglican Church) defends Virgin Una, who stands for the true (Anglican) religion and he has to oppose Archimago and Duessa (signifying the Catholic Church). Book Two tells of what befell Knight Guyon — the Knight of Temperance.

Personifications of moral ideas and attitudes are mixed in the poem with characters associated with events and people of the poet's day (e.g. Queen Elizabeth represented by Gloriana, the Faerie Queene, Belphoebe, and Mercilla). The topical references may have been well understood by Spenser's contemporaries, but they are often obscure or inaccessible to modern readers.

An important feature of *The Faerie Queene* (to be found also in other Renaissance writings) derives from the presence of numerous passages in which allegory seems to be put aside and Spenser lets himself be carried away by the beauty of the scene he describes, by his delight in the magic of language, or by human interest. Although Spenser allows more room for the details of the „surface" story and although characters in the poem strike the reader as much more real and psychologically interesting than those of nearly bare medieval allegories, still, intellect controls imagination in *The Faerie Queene*

---

[15] J. N. King, „Allegorical Pattern in Stephen Hawes's The Pastime of Pleasure", *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Georgia State University. Atlanta Ga., vol. XI, No 1, pp. 57—68.

and the poem with its layers of meanings indeed remains a „dark conceit".

An altogether different kind of „conceit" than that of *The Faerie Queene* organizes the structure of *Mother Hubberd's Tale* (1590) which is a beast fable whose main characters are an ape and a fox. Disguised as people, they behave in a most disreputable way thus compromising solidiers, parish priests, courtiers etc. Through this double disguise of people as beasts, who in turn are people, Spenser satirized the court and the Church of his times.

Ben Jonson's comedy *Cynthia's Revels* (1601) contains topical allegory which also ridicules some types of people at the court of Queen Elizabeth (Cynthia). So does his play *The Staple of News* (1625) dealing with the evils of his age exemplified by the characters of Lady Pecunia (riches) and Pennyboy (a spendthrift). Ben Jonson also wrote quite a number of masques in which allegory plays a considerable role.

A host of lesser known writers produced allegories such as „Allegory of His Love to a Ship" (1602) by Francis Davison and the satirical „Abuses Stript and Whipt" (1613) by George Whiter, which influenced the general character of allegorical writing of the period.

Morality plays continued to be written and acted: *Wyt and Science* (c. 1545) by John Redford; *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* (1579), *All for Money* (prod. 1578) by T. Lupton and *The Conflict of Conscience* (prod. 1581) by Nathaniell Woodes may serve as examples of what was produced in large quantities in that time.

Much of Renaissance writing, although not strictly allegorical, can be related to the genre. The existence of works such as Sir Philip Sidney's series of love sonnets *Astrophel and Stella* (publ. 1591) which contain allegorical elements, as well as the often strongly marked presence of allegorical element (which, however, did not become a controlling principle) in the poems and dramas of William Shakespeare (notably in *The Tempest*, 1611) reflect the Renaissance tendency to dilute allegory in a literary work.

As can be seen from this short review, Renaissance allegory served different purposes. Often it satirized or glorified real people and, as Jashua McClennen says, „it is clear that allegories with a contemporary reference were a real part of literature of the time"[16]. Sometimes allegory hid personal reflections, and emotional states. At other times it presented homiletic moralizing and religious instructions or presented moral and philosophical problems. As a rule the allegories

[16] J. McClennen, „On the Meaning and Function of Allegory in the English Renaissance", *Contributions in Modern Philology*, No 6, April 1947, p. 21.

tended to be elaborate and obscure, which resulted from the belief that the ancients, who were to be imitated, had used a thick veil of allegory to hide the truth from the profane. Medieval allegories were more transparent than those of the Renaissance, if only because they used names identifying notions represented. Renaissance allegorical characters also had names suggestive of their qualities, but often in a less direct way (e.g. when names of gods of the ancients were used). Besides, allegories of that period tended to be more developed on the „literal" level and that could make the reader doubtful of what was and what was not to be interpreted in a „double way".

Renaissance intellectuals often identified allegory with poetry since both had some deeper truth to convey through their surface texts, and thanks to this approach it was valued very highly. On the other hand, however, it ceased to be a way of comprehending reality, which it had been in the Middle Ages, and, instead, it came to be regarded as a (valuable, no doubt) device, a „conceit", a „dark veil" and an embellishment. The change in the attitude to allegory makes Paul Piehler infer that „Allegory as a serious genre waned in the fifteenth century [...] By the seventeenth century, a more strictly analytic approach to the phenomenal world made allegorizing seem trivial"[17].

It was almost exclusively moral personification allegory that was written during the Renaissance and figural or typological allegory played a rather insignificant role in that period, all the more so since allegoresis of the Bible found strong opposition among the Reformers.

Puritans of the 17th century also refused to favour man-created symbols and arbitrary allegoresis, but they were not hostile to the symbolism, which, according to them, existed in the world created by God, and they endeavoured to recognize and properly understand the signs of that symbolism. This fact, combined with their interest in the individual fate, led to linking the theory of predestination with the individual life, which, in the words of William Haller, the author of *The Rise of Puritanism*, „allowed the pulpit to make use of trope, similie and metaphor, of myth, allegory, fable and parable"[18]. Although the Puritans criticized the allegorization of the Scriptures, the traditions of pulpit preaching changed but little in the 17th century. The Puritan attitude to allegory was, in fact, ambivalent and paradoxical. There were numerous sermons, tracts and treatises which made use of allegory.

---

[17] P. Piehler, *The Visionary Landscape: A Study in Medieval Allegory*, Edward Arnold Ltd., London 1971, p. 9.

[18] W. Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism*, Columbia University Press, New York 1957, p. 124.

The dominant motifs of Puritan allegory were those of a journey, or of a battle; sometimes they centred upon an allegorical city, a castle, or a garden. The motifs and themes are suggested by the very titles of numerous Puritan tracts such as: *A Garden of Spiritual Flowers* (1609) by Richard Greenham, or *The Christian Warfare* (1604) by John Downame.

Some of the most frequently recurring Puritan themes appear in the important allegories by John Bunyan. *The Pilgrim's Progress from This World to That Which Is to Come* (publ. 1678) by Bunyan is a milestone in the development of allegory in England, but also his *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman* (1680) and *The Holy War* (1682) made their mark on the history of the genre. *The Holy War* is structured around the battle motif and *The Pilgrim's Progress* centres on the journey motif.

The Pilgrim's Progress is written in prose form and in a simple, often homely language, it tells the story of Christian's pilgrimage from the City of Destruction (the earthly life) to the Celestial City (heaven), during which he visits places such as the Valley of Humiliation, the Valley of the Shadow of Death, Vanity Fair and Doubting Castle, and encounters numerous personages, for example, Faithful, Hopeful, and Mr Wordly-Wiseman. The dialogues, which occupy a considerable part of the work, also appeal to the reader as very direct and unpretentious. Bunyan owed the directness and clarity of his message as well as many of his concepts to the Bible which was his inspiration. His allegory, like most other Puritan moral writing differed strikingly from the „fancy" allegory of Spenser. In spite of its spiritual message, *The Pilgrim's Progress* contains realistic detail and its characters often have distinct individual features. These facts, together with the presentation of types and abstract notions being personified bring Bunyan's allegory fairly close to the basic structure of the novel which has features related to Puritan „ordinariness' and individuality.

Of the same century as Bunyan, but of a different character and creed, was John Dryden, whose verse allegories set the tone for one of the two dominant varieties of allegory of the greater part of the next century — the Augustan Age and the Age of Doctor Johnson. The satirical poem by Dryden *Absalom and Achitophel* (1681) deals with a political issue of his time and through the biblical personages it presents the poet's contemporaries: Absalom is the Duke of Monmouth, Achitophel stands for Lord Shaftsbury and the third important character Zimri represents the Duke of Buckingham. Also *The Hind and the Panther* (1687) depicts real events; the first two parts of the

poem are devoted to the presentation of various religious denominations figuring as beasts and to the controversy between the Roman Catholic Church (the Hind) and the Church of England (the Panther); the third part satirizes a more mundane political scene of Dryden's time. Dryden's allegories could be found rather transparent by the reader familiar with their background, they are riddles to those who are unable to see through their topical references.

Topical allegories enjoyed a great popularity in the neoclassic literature of the 18th century. They usually reflected their authors' views of contemporary events and people and often were veiled attacks on personal enemies of the writers. As a rule they assumed a satirical tone. Alex Preminger explains why it happened so in the following way:

> More complex historical and political allegories tend to develop a strongly ironic tone, resulting from the fact that the allegorist is pretending to talk about one series of events, when he is actually talking about another. Hence there is a close connection between historical or political allegory and satire[19].

A satirical-allegorical picture of the problems of contemporary society constitutes the essence of *A Tale of the Tub* (written — 1696) by Jonathan Swift, published together with *The Battle of the Books* in 1704. The three brothers of the *Tale*, Peter, Jack and Martin stand for the Roman Catholic Church, the dissenters and the Anglican Church respectively. The different ways in which they use and wear their coats reflect different religious views and practices.

In *A Full and True Account of the Battel Fought Last Friday, Between the Antient and the Modern Books in St. James's Library* the „moderns" fight against the „ancients" in order to be recognized as superior to the latter. Goddesses Criticism and Dullness side with the „moderns" and Apollo with Pallas help the „ancients". Although the „ancients" seem to fight better, the battle is unresolved and the story ends in a dispute. Some conemporary authors are severely and maliciously criticised by Swift; Dryden, for example, is shown by him in a helmet nine times too large for his head which looks in it „like a Mouse under a Canopy of State" thus revealing the lack of a substantial brain.

A great part of Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (publ. 1726), so well known that it requires no summarizing, together with general references, contains satirical allegory based on topical allusions. Political parties, religious disputes, pseudoscentific research, the corruption of

[19] A. Preminger, *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton University Press 1965, p. 12.

moral standards of his own society are viewed by Swift through the satirical descriptions of the life in the imaginary land of Lilliput, in Brobdingnag, on the island of Laputa and in the country of wise horses where apelike Yahoos are also to be found.

Daniel Defoe, too, wrote satires (very different in tone from the allegorizing „serious reflections" in the third part of *Robinson Crusoe* set) abounding in references to his own society. In 1705 he published *The Consolidator or Memories of Sundry Transactions from the World in the Moon, Translated from the Lunar Language*. The story is an allegorical account of the Civil War and the Revolution ridiculing the extremities of the opposing parties. The Consolidator of the title is an engine with wings made of feathers, which can commute between the Moon and the Earth, and it stands for the English House of Commons (its members figure under the Consolidator's feathers).

Bernard de Mandeville's views of society in general were expressed allegorically in *The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vices, Publick Benefits* (first published in 1705 under a different title). The poem describes individual vices, which, paradoxically, can be made to work for the benefit of society.

Another sample of satirical writing is provided by Mary de la Rivière Manley's *Secret Memoirs and Manners of Several Persons of Quality of Both Sexes, From New Atlantis an Island in the Mediterranean* (1709). This satire full of malicious gossip and slander mixes personification allegory with „disguise" allegory: it has characters such as Astrea (representing justice), her mother Virtue and Intelligence together with, for example, Monsieur Ingrat, in whom a well-informed reader will recognize Sir Richard Steele, and Lord Tor-ton, whose real name is Torrington.

Eliza Haywood followed this example, and she, too, wrote of „the intrigues actual or suppositions, of living people as though they belonged to some kingdom of romance in the way they had been so triumphantly inaugurated by Mary Manley"[20]. And, indeed, even the titles of her *Memoirs of a Certain Island Adjacent to the Kingdom of Utopia* (1724—1725) and *The Secret History of the Present Intrigues of Caramania* (1727) have the flavour of Mary Manley's writings.

Tobias Smollett produced *The History and Adventures of an Atom by Nathaniel Peacock* (1769) which is a scalding satire on political life in Great Britain in the years 1754—1765. An atom in the pericranium of Nathaniel Peacock tells him how one thousand years ago

[20] W. and C. Jerrold, *Five Queer Women*, Brentano's Ltd., New York, London, Paris 1929, p. 201.

it was a part of the posterior of Fika-kaka, a Japanese dignitary. This enables Smollett to describe an imaginary Japan and make allusions to actual events, places and people. „Tartary", for instance, represents Russia, Pekin — Paris and Polhassan Akousti is Poland. The book swarms with characters such as Chief Scribie (the Secretary of State), Bupo (George I), Amazon of Ostrog (Maria Theresa), Fatzman (Duke of Cumberland), and Gio-Gio (George III). Intrigues, wars, strange and rather unsavoury customs, the stupidity of „Japan" reflect life in Smollett's England.

The abundance of topical satirical allegory in neoclassical literature is not surprising in view of the important position of satire and didactieism in the writings of the period. The other dominant type of allegory of the age was that which, in the form of *conte philosophique* or essay, expressed a truth or an intellectual belief — usually under the guise of personifications.

The 18th century allegories of this kind differed from medieval and Renaissance ones in many respects. The latter were regarded by neoclassical writers as too pedantic, too elaborate and artificial. Their „dark veil" hiding the truth made neoclassicists accuse them of obscurity. Simple, direct moral allegories were preferred by the 18th century writers, who believed that in the ancient times allegory disfavoured ambiguity for the sake of clarity. Small wonder that Bunyan was regarded by them a much better allegorist than Spenser. What they believed to be a return to the source consisted also in the fact that, unlike medieval and Renaissance writers, who presented contemporary scenes and clothes in their allegories, the 18th century authors often gave classical settings and classical robes to their characters.

Pictorial allegory shows the indebtedness of the 18th century to classical culture most clearly; it often reflects the interest of the age in the iconography of the ancients, old coins, hieroglyphs and emblems[21]. Whereas medieval pictorial allegory would have presented a scene rich in detail, that of the 18th century tended to be rather austere: it presented a single or a few figures dressed in classical attire, endowed only with the most necessary attributes and with speaking gestures.

Many literary allegories of the time resemble the pictorial ones, not only because of their simplicity and austerity, but also because they often describe a static scene instead of telling a story.

[21] Cf. H. F. Gravelot, C. N. Cochin, *Iconologie par figures ou traité complet des allégories, emblèmes, etc., à l'usage des artistes, en 350 figures*, reprinted by Meinkoff, Geneve 1972.

Mr. Spectator of the famous periodical of the beginning of the 18th century *The Spectator* (1711—1712) speaks directly about the connection between the allegory of his age and that of the ancient times. He says:

As some of the finest Compositions among the Ancients are in Allegory, I have endeavoured, in several of my Papers, to revive that way of Writing[22].

In keeping with the above statement, quite a number of the tales in *The Spectator* assume an allegorical character and the structure of the dream vision. This framework came to be used so often that many found it somewhat ridiculous. Swift, for example, said that the writer's sleep was no longer private. In dream visions presented by *The Spectator* a man would often be seen in contact with the world of personifications. „The mortal is often conducted on a tour of the region by a friendly guide, who does not, however, prevent his being tempted, endangered, or terrified before his final recognition of the »truth« which usually wakes him up. The scene of the encounter in the dream vision of *The Spectator* is ordinarily a plain, or green woods, or an expanse of road leading to a palace, or a building of some description"[23]. The allegorical apologues were contributed by Joseph Addison, Richard Steele and by Thomas Parnell. Joseph Addison who was the most prolific writer of them all is the author of one of the best known tales „The Vision of Mirzah" (No 159).

An old manuscript found by the narrator of the tale records Mirzah's experience on the hills of Bagdat, where he „fell into a profound contemplation". In this state of mind Mirzah sees the Valley of Misery and a Bridge in the midst of the Tide of Eternity. The Genius, who appears in the vision, explains the significance of the scene as well as that of the flights of birds hovering over the bridge. The birds are Envy, Avarice, Superstition, Despair, Love and other factors in human life preventing the multitude of people from easily crossing the bridge. Human life ends either on a happy island or under dark clouds. The allegorical meaning of the tale emerges from the narrative itself and even without the help of the Genius one perceives it immediately.

The simplicity and directness of such stories certainly contributed to their popularity. They were widely read and thus could fulfil the purpose their authors had set for them; they were used as vehicles

---

[22] *The Spectator*, IV, 275.

[23] D. Kay, „Short Fiction in *The Spectator*", *Studies in the Humanities*, No 8, Literature, The University of Alabama Press 1975, p. 62.

for moral and philosophical ideas, which was in keeping with the general belief in the need for moral content in literature[24]. The function of the early 18th century periodicals such as *The Spectator* and *The Tatler* (1709—1711) was expressly didactic. Allegorical tales and essays in them made it possible to educate and to entertain at the same time. Among the 18th century authors who enriched this kind of writing, apart from Addison, Steele and Parnell, were Jonathan Swift, David Fordyce, Samuel Johnson and Oliver Goldsmith.

Samuel Johnson's allegories share many features with other allegorical essays and tales of the time, but they also differ from them in the fact that they tend o avoid the dream vision convention, use a mock allegorical method sometimes and shun the employment of false analogies.

Moral stories by Johnson can be found in *The Rambler* (1750—1752) as well as in *The Idler* (1758—1760). *The Idler*, for example contains „Ortugal of Basra" (No 99) written to instruct and „Let No Man Hereafter Wish to Be Rich, Who Is Already Too Wise to Be Flattered" (No 66). The moral teachings of Johnson's essays result from his belief that a writer must instruct by pleasing and that allegory „is perhaps one of the most pleasing vehicles of instruction" (*The Rambler*, No 21).

Unlike most 18th century allegories, *The History of Rasselas, The Prince of Abissinia* (1759) by Johnson cannot be described as direct, simple and unambiguous. Small wonder there is no unanimity about the classification of the work: some critics believe *Rasselas* to be merely metaphorical while others insist on its allegorical character.

It is the story of Prince Rasselas, his sister Nekayah and wise Imlac, who leave their native land in search of happiness. They get to know people in different conditions of life, but nowhere can they find happiness. In accordance with Imlac's observation in *Rasselas* that the business of a poet is to examine the species, not the individual. Johnson presents type of people rather than individuals and rather than personifications of abstractions. This kind of attitude was also expressed by John Hughes who wrote an influential essey „On Allegorical Poetry" (1715) in which be maintained that allegory should be both visionary and typical.

[24] Joseph Warton, who suggested that William Collins's *Odes on Several Descriptive and Allegoric Subjects* should be published together with his own in a joint collection, wrote in an „Advertisment" to his volume (1746) that: „The Public has been so much accustom'd of late to didactic Poetry alone, and Essays on moral Subjects, that any work where the imagination is much indulged, will perhaps not be relished or regarded". (Quoted after Lonsdale, [ed.], *Gray and Collins; Poetical Works*, Oxford University Press 1977, p. 137).

English allegory had changed considerably since the Middle Ages and when one comes across statements according to which „allegory as a serious genre waned in the fifteenth century"[25], or one which argues that „the publication of *The Faerie Queene* marked a kind of apogee in the history of allegorical rhetoric and also the end of allegorical tradition"[26] as well as one speaking of „eighteenth century England, where the allegories reached the pinnacle of their popularity"[27], one has to come to the conclusion that the critics must be writing of different kinds of allegory. Allegory moved away from generally accepted beliefs, doctrines, universals towards more individual approaches to ideas which suggest different possibilities of answering philosophical or moral questions and avoid presenting them in an „objective" way characteristic of medieval allegories; the classical simplicity of 18th century allegories and their transparency combined with an interest in the typical also emphasized the difference. More often than not they have the character of the exemplum and take a step towards symbolism.

„Symbolism" was a term very much in favour with the Romantics while allegory often evoked scornful responses. Already William Blake, a pre-Romantic poet, called it a „daughter of memory" thus emphasizing its mechanical character. Blake's visionary mystical poetry, however, based on the poet's private mythology has a pattern of interrelated meanings characteristic of allegory. Although not all the elements of his poems can be included in such patterns, as they often escape definition and their symbolism becomes obscure, Blake creates situations and personages demanding a double-level response (Los, for example in „The Song of Los" — 1795, represents time and light, and Orc is the eternal rebel against the imposed moral laws of Urizen). The situations in which they are involved sometimes have topical references (to the French Revolution, for example).

The discrepancy between theory and practice becomes much more striking in the poetry of the Romantic period. The Renaissance understanding of „memory" and „allegory" was forgotten and replaced by „imagination" and „vision". Romantics understood the word „allegory" to be limited to mechanical personification allegory and the exemplum and so they looked at it with contempt, although they often wrote a kind of allegory somewhat similar to that created by Edmund Spen-

[25] Cf. Piehler, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

[26] M. Murrin, *The Veil of Allegory; Some Notes Toward a Theory of Allegorical Rhetoric in the English Renaissance*, The University of Chicago Press 1969, p. 167.

[27] E. Ch. Heinle, *The Eighteenth Century Allegorical Essay*, Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University 1957, p. 94.

ser. As Michael Murrin puts it, „Ironically, one can say that allegory as a term died just as its meaning was being revived, for the Romantics were myth-makers and allegorists"[28].

S. T. Coleridge was one of those responsible for the growing prejudice against allegory as an inferior kind of writing based on „disjunction of faculties", on fancy (not imagination!) and thus being purely ornamental, arbitrary, artificial and mechanical. The Romantic indictment of allegory spread throughout the world and has persisted until our times. It finally destroyed the tradition of Christian symbolism and the order of the universe based on the system of analogy. Despite the severity of his criticism, S. T. Coleridge himself wrote what could be considered allegorical. *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (1798), for example, which tells the story of a sailor who has killed an albatross and has to undergo painful experiences as his punishment, can be interpreted as a symbolical-allegorical poem about sin, guilt, punishment, penance, and redemption.

A fairly typical Romantic allegory can be found in John Keats's *Lamia* (1819). „The allegory of the poem — for it is obviously allegorical"[29], as J. Bate assures us, has its most plausible interpretation in the version according to which the serpent woman Lamia stands for poetry and dreams and Appolonius represents analytic, unfeeling philosophy. When Appolonius makes Lycius, a young man in love with Lamia, see her true serpent nature, the young man cannot bear the destruction of his illusions and dies. Both attitudes to poetry represented by Lycius and Applonius seem to be unsatisfactory and incomplete. As is often the case with Romantic poetry *Lamia* can be interpreted from a number of points of view.

Not everything is unambiguous about Percy Bysshe Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* (publ. 1820), either. The intention of the poet, however, is suggested in the preface to the drama. Although Shelley declares his abhorrence of didactic poetry, he also makes it clear that the moral interest is central in *Prometheus*. Prometheus, the courageous and loving champion of mankind opposes the spirit of evil and hatred, Jupiter. Shelley himself says in the preface that „Prometheus is, as it were, the type of the highest perfection of moral and intellectual nature impelled by the purest and the truest motives to the best and noblest ends"[30]. Other characters must also be associated with moral principles: Prometeus's mother, Earth, his bride, Asia representing Nature, and Hercules embodying strength

[28] M u r r i n, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

[29] The editorial note [in:] G. B. H a r r i s o n, ed., e.a., *Major British Writers*, vol. II, Harcourt, Brace, and World Inc., New York 1959, p. 346.

[30] P. B. S h e l l e y, „Preface", [in:] *Prometheus Unbound*, p. 256.

help the hero to endure and to bring about the reign of love. The allegorical features of the drama are unmistakable; they are often present in other writings by Shelley beginning with his early philosophical poem *Queen Mab* written when he was eighteen.

Like *Lamia* and *Prometheus* many other Romantic poems were inspired by classical culture, but their motivations and effect differed from the poetry of the Renaissance or of the Augustan Age which were also linked with classical traditions. The poets of the Romantic period often used classical sources as well as oriental tales and biblical, historical or legendary motifs in order to create the distancing perspective which helped to evoke a romantic, mysterious, exotic and thrilling atmosphere. At the same time the Romantics managed to make their classical figures more human and individual by giving them richer personalities and emotional lives. The intensity of emotion was often combined with moral and philosophical problems. Nature, too, prov.ded a means for expressing the metaphysical. Romantic poets seldom offered definite solutions to the problems they dealt with. Instead, they tended to present them in a way inducing complex responses, which was certainly unlike the simple moral teachings of medieval allegory. Their ambiguity, wealth of descriptive detail, the psychological interest give them a symbolical appearance, but this fact does not exclude their allegoricity; wherever there is a consistent system of symbols, a patterning of layered meanings — symbolical poems become allegorical as well. One cannot but agree with Louis MacNeice when he writes that „all allegory involves symbolism, and in proportion as symbolism becomes developed and coherent it tends towards allegory"[31]. Romantic poetry provides numerous examples of symbolism becoming „developed and coherent".

Critics find allegorical elements in Romantic prose also. Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley's *Frankenstein, or the Modern Prometheus* (publ. 1918), for instance, is sometimes considered to have allegorical features. The topical satire by Thomas Love Peacock *Nightmare Abbey* (1818) describes contemporary figures and attitudes with the help of characters such as Mr. Flosky (Coleridge), Mr. Cypress (Byron) and Scythrop (Shelley) also in prose form.

Not in the mainstream of literature but with an important role to play in the development of the didactic novel, were the exemplary tales written at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. They continued the tradition of the didactic essays and tales of the earlier part of the 18th century magazines. Towards the end of the century Sunday Schools were founded and a rich literature of

[31] L. MacNeice, *Varieties of Parable*, Cambridge University Press 1965, p. 67.

moral tracts and instructive tales was provided for them. Among the first authors of such publications was Sarah Trimmer, who believed in modelling literature on „the parables and allegories of the Divine Instructor of Mankind", and Hannah More, who published *The Cheap Repository Tracts* in 1790, whose moral tales, according to Samuel Pickering, „on the simplest level, [...] were short novelistic parables illustrating the rewards of virtuous living"[32].

In 1799 the Religious Tracts Society was founded and by 1823 there had appeared 51 million tracts, most of which were exemplary tales. That the moral tales had a powerful impact on the development of the English novel is made evident by the fact that Hannah More herself wrote a didactic novel *Coelebs in Search of a Wife* (1809) which, in turn, influenced Walter Scott. The influence of instructive tales on the Victorian novel is undeniable. Instructive tales often of allegorical character (seldom of great literary merit) were produced in large quantities during both the Romantic and the Victorian periods. It is poetry, however, which sets the tone for the Romantic Movement and which determines the character of allegory of the time, the degree of its merging with symbolism making poets believe that they had nothing to do with allegory. Starting from the Victorian period English literature was dominated by prose writing and consequently most significant allegories were written in prose form. The focus of our attention from now onwards will be therefore on prose allegory.

Victorian prose literature combined the tendency to describe life in realistic terms with a strong didactic motivation deriving from the tradition of moral tracts. One other thing which Victorian prose owes to the exemplary tales of Sunday School teachings for the young was its interest in children which resulted in numerous stories for children as well as books about them.

Mrs (Margaret) Gatty is a typical Victorian writer of instructive tales for young readers. She based her collection of *Parables from Nature* (1855—1871), not unlike John Bunyan did with *The Book for Boys and Girls*, on observations from nature and moral teachings drawn from them as well as from the Bible. The parable Training and Restraining (with a motto: „Train up a child in the way he should go" -- Prov. XXII. 6) can be seen as an example of her method. It shows how garden flowers rebel against the „fetters" fastening them to their sticks and restraining them from natural growth and them are destroyed by rain and wind. The story ends with a little girl saying to her mother:

[32] S. Pickering, Jr., *The Moral Tradition in English Fiction 1785—1850*, The University Press of New England, Hanover, Hampshire 1976, p. 54.

[...] now, at last, I quite understand what you have so often said about the necessity of training, and restraint, and culture, for us as well as flowers, in a fallen world[33].

Oscar Wilde's poetic tales do not offer any such obvious moral conclusions and yet they are in the same tradition of moral parables as well as in the tradition of Andersen's fairy tales. Among the best known stories by Wilde are „The Happy Prince" (1888) and „The Rose and the Nightingale" (1888). Their main interest lies in their fantastic events and in their beauty, but it lies also in the power of love, sacrifice, charity, sympathy for the poor and the unhappy in an unfeeling world. Similar attitudes combined with fantasy characterize „The Young King" (1891), a less known tale by Wilde. The tale is an interesting example of parable containing personification allegory. Its young king about to be crowned, has a series of dream visions in which he sees a squalid place with poor weavers making the coronation robe for him, a slave made to dive for pearls which are to adorn the King's sceptre, and people digging in horrible places in order to find rubies for the king. Death and Avarice quarrel over them: Avarice refuses to give Death any of her diggers so Death sends first Ague, then Fever, and finally Plague who kill all of them. The young king, shocked by his vision, refuses to wear rich clothes during the coronation ceremony. The nobles and the bishop are annoyed by this, but they are silenced and awed when they see the king in the mystic light from the shrine.

The level of moral significance is, no doubt, important in the tale, but the elaborate surface story appears to matter even more than the ideas emerging from it; the aesthetic aspect dominates in tales by Oscar Wilde. This is also true, to a great extent, about George MacDonald's fairy tales which have allegorical implications. In tales such as „The Light Princess", „The Day Boy and the Night Girl" (written in 1879) or „They Key" in *Phantastes* (1858) the writer emphasizes the fantasy and wonder of the situation, and the layer of (not always clear) meanings of his tales seems to be almost accidental. Roger Lancely Green notes that:

In a way MacDonald's stories are allegories, just as *The Pilgrim's Progress* is: but, unlike the story of Christian's journey to the Shining City, we are not meant to be thinking all the time about what they mean — and certainly not try to work out what each person or adventure stands for[34].

---

[33] Mrs Gatty, *Parables from Nature*, T. Nelson and Sons, [?], p. 55.

[34] R. L. Green, *Introduction*, [in:] G. MacDonald, *The Complete Fairy Tales*, Schocken Books, New York 1977, p. 9.

The allegorical element cannot be disregarded, however. It is very strongly felt in „The Castle, a Parable" which tells a story of brothers and sisters living in a lofty castle without ever seeing their parents. „But Tradition said that one day — it was utterly uncertain w h e n — their father would come and leave them no more"[35]. In the meantime they were to obey their eldest brother, but they soon rejected his „tyranny", and, in spite of his rebukes, gave a great entertainment to guests from outside the castle. During the festivity a crash of thunder was heard and chaos followed. After the storm brothers and sisters repented and were forgiven. They learnt to love and understand one another much better now, turned their thoughts to noble things and sang hymns to their unseen father. „What was once but an old legend, has become the one desire of their hearts. An the loftiest hope is the surest of being fulfilled"[36].

The short synopsis clearly points to the religious message of the tale. MacDonald's writings are permeated with religious and mystical implications which go well with his narratives full of mystery and magic.

Charles Kingsley's *The Water Babies* (1863) provides another example of fantasy combined with moral imlpications. Young Tom, the hero of the book, escapes the cruelties of the world by becoming a water baby. In the river and in the sea he meets other water babies, various sea creatures and fairies, Mrs Bedonebyasyoudid and Mrs Doasyouwouldbedoneby; he visits places such as The Other-end-of--Nowhere, Waste-paper-land and the Island of Polypragmosyne. The fantasy of the book suffers from too frequent moralizing commentary, but without the moral aspect *The Water Babies* would lose an important dimension.

Louis MacNeice argues in *The Varieties of Parable* that Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* (1865) and *Through the Looking Glass* (1872) should also be included in the class of allegorical fantasy since they contain complex patterns of meanings suggested by the very constructions based on dreams and games. MacNeice maintains, and most readers would probably agree with him, that the fantastic stories of the Victorian period deal with reality, only it is the inner reality that they are true to, and they speak of it indirectly. Hence the popularity of stories written ostensibly for children. „In the Victorian Age what I call 'parable writing'", says MacNeice, „was better represented in children's books than in orthodox 'grown-up' poetry,

[35] G. MacDonald, „The Castle; A Parable", [in:] *The Cruel Painter and Other Stories*, Chatto and Windus, London 1905, p. 97.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 126.

drama or prose fiction"[37]. And yet prose fiction, too, often reflected the same creative impulse that gave rise to the stories: Dickens's writings, for instance, which tend to be parabolic, sometimes assume the character of fairy stories. *Great Expectations* (1860—1861) could be read in terms of the tale of a cruel witch (Miss Havisham), a beautiful princess with a heart of ice (Estella), ogres, monsters etc. The story of *Oliver Twist* (1837—1838) verges on fantasy and it has unmistakable features of parable. According to Steven Marcus: „Primarily *Oliver Twist* is a story in the tradition of Bunyan, the morality play and the homiletic tale — its subtitle is *The Parish Boy's Progress*"[38].

Dickens's sketches usually published in journals such as *Household Words* or *All the Year Round* are even more obviously allegorical. „The Child's Story" (1852) is typical of the writer's method and it begins like a fairy tale:

> Once upon a time, a good many years ago, there was a traveller, and he set out on a journey[39].

During his journey the traveller meets a child, then a boy, then a young man, afterwards a middle-aged gentleman, and finally an old man. Each of them leaves the traveller after a while and in the end we see him sitting in the company of the old man and watching the sun set. Needless to say the story is about the several stages of human life.

Also „Nobody's Story" (1853) has a clearly allegorical character. It tells of a man who „lived and died in the old, old way; and this is in the main, the whole of Nobody's story [...]. The story of Nobody is the story of the rank and file of the earth. They bear their share of the battle; they have their part in the victory; they fall; they leave no name, but in the mass. The march of the proudest of us leads to the dusty way by which they go"[40].

„Mugby Junction" (1866) shows a man at point of his life when he has to make moral choices and choose a way of living. One of the most popular stories by Dickens, „A Christmas Carol" (1843), which describes a sudden change in the character of the old miser Scrooge after his seeing three visions of Christmas of the past, of

[37] MacNeice, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

[38] S. Marcus, *Dickens: from Pickwick to Dombey*, Basic Books Inc. Publishers, New York 1965, p. 65.

[39] Ch. Dickens, „The Child's Story", [in:] *Christmas Stories*, MacDonald and Sons, London [?], p. 51.

[40] Ch. Dickens, „Nobody's Story", [in:] *Christmas...*, p. 81.

the present, and of the future, is yet another example of the use of personifications: the „real" Scrooge is confronted by the Spirit of Christmas.

The above are only a few selected examples; Dickens wrote many other stories of an allegorical nature and many of his novels were patterned on allegorical images which became commonplace in Viktorian literature. *Great Expectations, Little Dorrit* (1855—1857), *Bleak House* (1852), *Oliver Twist* may serve as illustrations of the use of the motifs of a journey, a choice of roads, life represented by the river or the sea, the opposition between light and darkness. These devices may lack originality, but in the hands of the great writer they acquired vividness and a new life.

It is not often that critics speak of Dickens's novels as allegories (or parables) although the presence of allegorical motifs in them has been generally accepted. It is usually the story, the characters, at the same time extraordinary and commonplace that draw the attention of the reader. Neither will most readers consider Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr.* Hyde (q. v. 1886) an allegory, although Frederick York Powell once spoke of it as „that most original, most philosophic, and most searching of modern allegories"[41]. Rather than see the story in terms of an allegory of the eternal struggle of evil against good in human nature, many readers prefer to focus their interest on the unusual case of Dr. Jekyll who changes his personality under the influence of a scientifically prepared potion, and becomes the repulsive Hyde, who gradually takes over the good part of the personality and destroys it.

The bordarline between allegory and non-allegory became less and less definite in the 19th century. Writers did sometimes use direct indicators of allegory, such as personifications of abstractions, dream visions, telling names of characters and places, but they were not always so helpful: along with works of a patently allegorical character, there was a whote range of writiugs with different degree of the presence of allegory. The shift from comparatively strict allegories towards a form in which the „surface" story was a much more elaborate structure than was necessary to convey an allegorical meaning resulted in the inclination of critics to speak of „allegorical element", or the „allegorical nature" of a work rather than of an allegory, and, preferably, to use the term „parable", all the more so since the word „allegory" came to be looked upon with disdain for a period of time.

[41] F. Y. Powell, *Some Words on Allegory in England*, The Folcroft Press Inc., (first published 1910), 1969, p. 41.

It has become increasingly difficult to distinguish allegory from what is not allegory in prose writing of the present century, especially in those works which insist on using the realistic method. In many cases works of modern fiction are interpreted as allegories by some critics, while others insist on reading them in 'merely' realistic-symbolical terms. It is particularly easy to see in the characters of a literary work using the realistic method of description, representations of types and attitudes to be found elsewhere (in literature and history), and thus interpret the work as figurative allegory. „Fictitious figuralism has survived as an important element in the tradition of the novel to our own day, as we can witness in Thomas Mann's *Dr Faustus*, a figural allegory of the decadent Faustian man, and in Günter Grass's *The Tin Drum*, a figural allegory of the Nazi superman [...] In contrast to the abstract tendency of personification allegory, the concrete tendency of figural allegory has been well recognized"[42]. But not only is figural allegory with its concrete „shell' often found in modern fiction; personification allegory in its contemporary version, is also sought for and discovered by critics, sometimes in most unexpected places. Small wonder that the tendency of critics to search for hidden meanings, even where they are absent, has often been ridiculed in parodies of pseudoscholarly allegorical interpretations carried to an extreme. On the other hand there are many supporters of the view that „all great literature is allegorical".

Among the prose works of the 20th century to which the term „allegory" has been most frequently applied are the philosophic stories by E. M. Forster such as „The Other Side of the Hedge" (1914). There are also the novels and short stories by T. F. Powys, who has some interesting ideas to convey through his homely fantasies. His best known allegory *Mr Weston's Good Wine* (1927) presents God himself coming in the person of Mr Weston to a village in order to punish the wicked and to help the deserving. C. S. Lewis wrote a series of books called *The Chronicles of Narnia* (1950—1956) addressed ostensibly to children, but containing serious religious thought. He is also the author of *The Pilgrim's Regress* (1933), an allegory of modern intellectual life, structurally based on Bunyan's work. Lewis's Perelandra trilogy (1938—1945) also contains strong element of allegory. G. K. Chesterton's fantasies, full of comedy and seeming madness, convey allegorically the writer's often paradoxical views. One of these views is on allegory itself and it may be as well to quote it here. He says in *The Poet and the Lunatics* (1929):

[42] T. K. Seung, *Curtural Thematics; The Formation of the Faustian Ethos*, Yale University Press 1976, p. 10.

I doubt whether any of our action is really anything but allegory. I doubt whether any truth can be told except in parable[43].

He tells his truths through most improbable stories such as *The Napoleon of Notting Hill* (1904) in which medieval life returns to contemporary London and *The Man Who Was Thursday* (1908) brimful of crazy adventures in which anarchists and policemen disguised as anarchists play the central roles.

William Sansom's collection of stories published under the title *Fireman Flower* (1944) also presents a world of fantasy, but his is a Kafkaesque fantasy which involves people in nightmarish situations revealing the bare facts of human existence with the help of the allegorical method.

Rex Warner, too, is sometimes compared with Kafka because of the character of his fantasies. He is interested in allegory as a critic and as a novelist; in his two best allegories *The Wild Goose Chase* (1937) and *The Aerodrome* (1941) Warner is concerned with problems of power, freedom, responsibility, and often contrasts the cold mechanistic, if efficient, world of rationality with the world of imagination and emotion.

Similar apprehensions about the development of society are reflected in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) which attracts interest as an antiutopia, or science-fiction, or a novel predicting the future, or satire, but is also dealt with in terms of allegory.

Some critics occasionally associate Joseph Conrad (and especially his *Heart of Darkness*, 1902) with allegory, but this is usually done with hesitation and resevations. James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922) and numerous short stories by D. H. Lawrence, such as „The Woman Who Rode Away" (1925), are included in the category much more boldly and with less doubt.

Of more centemporary writers discussed in connection with allegory there is Nigel Dennis, the author of *Cards of Identity* (1955), a novel which focuses on the modern problem of the loss of identity and presents it through the story of people who have come to believe that they are different persons, not themselves. And there is, of course, William Golding almost all of whose writings have been labelled allegories. The most outstanding of them *Lord of the Flies* (1954), *The Inheritors* (1955), *Pincher Martin* (1956), *Free Fall* (1959) and *The Spire* (1964) focus on the power of original sin and evil in the human heart.

---

[43] G. K. Chesterton, *The Poet and the Lunatics, Episodes in the Life of Gabriel Gale*, Cassell and Company Ltd., London 1929, p. 129.

Iris Murdoch's novels such as *The Bell* (1958) and *The Unicorn* (1963) are sometimes considered allegories, sometimes symbolical works and always meaningful, charged with philosophical and metaphysical problems set into stories of contemporary life.

In spite of the refusal of the author himself to accept labelling his three books as allegory, *The Lord of the Rings* (1954—1955) by J. R. R. Tolkien has undoubtedly enough internal evidence to put it in this class of literature: the mythical world of hobbits, elves, men, dwarfs and other beings created by Tolkien, points to a layer of carefully patterned meanings.

The recent stage of Doris Lessing's literary career shows her growing interest in non-realistic fiction and the literature of ideas. Her *Briefing for a Descent into Hell* (1971) explores, on the surface, a case of madness, but, at the same time, it is, as a blurb has it, „a shimmering fantasy, a mini-war-thriller, and an extremely tempting interpretation of the meaning of the universe". Insistent allegorical hints can be found in her *Canopus in Argos: Archives*, the series of five novels published during the period from 1979 to 1983.

Since the most representative examples of modern English allegory will be discussed in the ensuing chapters of the present dissertation, the stories and novels mentioned above, have been given only brief, general descriptions here. I hope, however, that the descriptions allow us to form an idea of what modern allegorists are interested in and what kind of fiction they write to express their ideas.

The intention of this chapter has been to make a historical survey of works generally (or often) described by critics as allegorical (wherever there have been serious doubts as to their character, differences in ways of classification have been made clear). The following observations can be made on the basis of the survey.

One of the most striking phenomena in the course of the history of the genre is the frequency with which it was pronounced dead. The most usual points in time when it was considered to die were immediately after the 13th century, after the 16th century, and after the 19th century. At the same time it was said to reach its peak of development in the Middle Ages, during the Renaissance, in the 17th and the 18th centuries. It was believed that:

> The vogue for the allegorical was certainly dwindling in the nineteenth century, when even the practitioners sought to disclaim their own employment of the medium or professed disapproval[44].

[44] E. A. Bloom, „The Allegorical Principle", *Journal of English History* September 1951, vol. 18, No 3, pp. 155—190.

The medium was believed to be completely exhausted and dead in the twentieth century, but according to discoveries made not so long ago, nearly all of the most important fiction written today is allegorical. And so it turns out that, in spite of frequent announcements on the demise of allegory in different periods of time, it has continued to be written and seems to have flourished at all times.

Secondly, one can also quite clearly see from the survey that the dominant kinds of allegory written in different periods of time tended to assume the dominant or popular literary forms of the periods: poetry, drama, dialogues, essays, tales, short stories, fantasies, novels. The kind of writing favoured by allegorists in the twentieth century is fiction: novels and short stories.

It was not only the „outer form" of allegory which caused differences. Its themes and techniques have been changing constantly as well and thus made it possible to distinguish several periods in the development of the genre.

It will also be observed that in spite of the differences between allegories of various literary periods, the works continued to share their basic qualities thus preserving the identity of the genre.

The above observations can lead to the conclusion that either the term „allegory" must mean different things to critics (especially since there are several dates of the death of the genre given) or that, if we deal with the same genre all the time, different shapes of allegory prove dramatic changes in the very nature of allegory; the comparison of early allegories with their modern counterpart especially, shows the long way the genre has come in the process of metamorphosis.

My view is that both alternatives hold true; critics are far from being united in their understanding of the nature of allegory, and allegory has indeed undergone important transformations in the course of its history. The survey given in the present chapter points to more frequent transformations than those suggested by Gay Clifford in her book on allegory[45]. In view of the divergences it will be necessary therefore to examine the nature of allegory more closely and to present the definition employed in further analysis.

---

[45] Cf. G. Clifford, *The Transformations of Allegory*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London and Boston 1974.

Chapter II

ALLEGORY DEFINED

One of the most frequently discussed problems connected with allegory is the question asked about its nature. As can be expected, answers given to the question go in very different directions, and there is a whole range of definitions of the term „allegory". A fairly wide selection of the definitions will be quoted in the present chapter to demonstrate the variety of critical approaches.

The controversy about the nature of allegory has its roots in two influential interpretations of the term each of which has had a great impact on English criticism throughout the history of allegorical writing: one by Quintilian and the other by S. T. Coleridge.

As for the term itself, it emerges from *The Republic* by Plato and Xenophon's *Symposium* that the earliest word used to denote figurative literary expression was *υπονια*. The term which replaced it *αλληγοϱια* (allos — „other", agoreuein — „to speak in public") was first employed by the stoic philosopher Cleanthes. It was also used by Plutarch, Cicero and Quintilian. Definitions of the term were given by Strabo and Longinus, but it was Quintilian's description of allegory that became binding for a number of generations of writers and rhetoricians. Quintilian wrote in *De Institutione Oratoria* (1st cent. A. D.) that allegory depended on inversion through presenting an idea in words different from, or opposing the idea (*aliud sensu, aliud verbis*) and that the figure was a continuous metaphor.

The majority of the Renaissance interpretations of the term, which developed after the medieval emphasis on typological allegory with its fourfold scheme gave way to a more simplified allegoresis (reduced to two levels only) and a growing interest in personification allegory, originated in Quintilian's definitions. Typically, Thomas Cooper explain-

ed allegory (in *Eliotes Dictionarie*, 1559) as „a figure called inversion, where it is one of woordes, and another in sentence and meaning"[1].

Similar definitions were given by Henry Cockeram, Edward Philips, Richard Sherry, George Puttenham and numerous other rhetoricians, authors of dictionaries and poets themselves.

Samuel Johnson's definition recorded in *A Dictionary of the English Language* in 1755 is on the same lines as the Renaissance ones. To him allegory was „a figurative discourse, in which something other is intended, than is contained in words literally taken"[2].

A great number of modern definitions of allegory are also indebted to Quintilian's; this becomes particularly obvious when they deal with allegory in terms of double meanings and extended metaphors.

The quality of allegory which was emphasized by S. T. Coleridge in his important and influential definition consisted in translating abstractions into concrete images. Coleridge wrote:

> We may thus safely define allegoric writing as the employment of one set of agents and images with actions and accompaniments correspondent, so as to convey, while in disguise, either moral qualities or conceptions of the mind that are not in themselves objects of the senses, or other images, agents, actions, fortunes and circumstances[3].

Largely because of the above and other opinions on allegory expressed by Coleridge, it came to be regarded more and more as a rather mechanical concretization of abstractions. It was precisely this quality that Frederick York Powell accepted as the most essential feature of allegory when he said (in 1895):

> I would define allegory for my purposes as a literary representation of qualities by beings and objects[4].

About the same time Edgar Baes, of another country, but of a related culture wrote of it as „un rêve conscient, coordonné, qui transforme une idée et lui en substitue une autre parallèle pour la

---

[1] T. Cooper, *Eliotes Dictionarie*, quoted after Joshua McClennen, „On the Meaning and Function of Allegory in the English *Renaissance*", *Contributions in Modern Philology*, April 1947, No 6, p. 3.

[2] S. Johnson, *A Dictionary of the English Language in which the Words are deduced from their Originals, Explained in different Meanings*, Printed for J. F. and C. Rivington, L. Davis, T. Longman e.a., London 1790.

[3] Quoted after E. Honig, „In Defense of Allegory", *The Kenyon Review* winter 1958, vol. XX, No 1, pp. 1—19.

[4] F. Y. Powell, *Some Words on Allegory in England*, The Falcroft Press, Inc., reprinted 1969, p. 22.

cacher, ce qui sera developpé par des examples" and as an „extension du symbole arbitraire"[5].

This fairly widespread view of allegory in England, and elsewhere as well, has led to focusing critical attention not only on the method of expression, but also on the subject matter: on personified or concretized ideas. Together with some other factors, the emphasis put on the content of allegory today often serves as the grounds for discussing allegory in generic terms. Maureen Quilligan however, chooses as the central argument for the generic interpretation of allegory its particular use of language as its „first focus and ultimate subject". She begins her book on *The Language of Allegory; Defining the Genre* with the statement that „allegory is, in fact, a class, a genre — a legitimate critical category of a prescriptive status similar to that of the generic term »epic«". Through its conscious concern with language „allegory [...] names the fact that language can signify many things at once [...] It does not name the many other things language means, or the disjunction between saying and meaning, but the often problematic process of meaning multiple things simultaneously with one word"[6].

By emphasizing the fact of the simultaneity of meanings of different levels of allegory, M. Quilligan strongly opposes the view, according to which in the operation of allegory there must be a „time lag" necessary for the reader to be able to translate one level of meaning into another.

The arguments which Gay Clifford is prepared to accept as conducive to generic interpretation are based on the contents or the subject matter of allegory rather than its language. She believes that although „Certain features of allegory could be seen as generic, the extended and extensive use of personification and personified abstractions and especially, the incorporation of commentary and interpretation into action", the features do not outweigh the fact that „essentially allegory is, like irony, a mode, and capable of subsuming many different genres and forms"[7].

The purpose of allegory consists, according to her, in the gradual revealing of certain generalizations about human experience and the world through appropriately shaped narratives, and the allegorist makes it clear from the very beginning of his narrative that it contains

[5] E. Baes, *Le Symbole et l'Allégorie*, Bruxelles, Hayez, L'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, 1899—1900, pp. 101, 106.

[6] M. Quilligan, *The Language of Allegory; Defining the Genre*, Cornell University Press 1979, p. 14, 26.

[7] G. Clifford, *The Transformations of Allegory*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London and Boston 1974, p. 5.

a series of generalized statements which should be seen by the reader as a part of the narrative while, simultaneously, their ideological function should be considered[8].

Gay Clifford is not the only critic who perceives difficulties in classifying allegory; Paul Piehler, for example, accepts allegory as a genre after much hesitation as he is aware that it is „not quite a genre really"[9]. Edwin Honig admits the possibility of dealing with allegory from different angles „in terms of form, genre-type, and style"[10].

Such a broad view, as represented by Edwin Honig, is rejected by Bernard Einbond who maintains with strong conviction that „allegory is not a genre" and that it „is properly called a form, for it is clearly a way ordering the matter of literature"[11].

However, Alex Preminger's definition given in *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* after a careful examination of the subject, leads to the conclusion that allegory „is thus not the name of a form or a genre, but a structural principle in fiction". According to Preminger, it is „a term denoting a technique of literature [...]. We have allegory when the events in the narrative obviously and continuously refer to another simultaneous structure of events and ideas, whether historical events, moral or philosophical ideas, or natural phenomena"[12].

Preminger's definition emphasizes the duplicity of denotation which is generally considered the most essential feature of allegory. Because of this feature allegory has often been associated with metaphor. C. Hugh Holman, for example, describes it as „a form of extended

---

[8] Reacting to the often excessive emphasis put on allegory as a means of concealing its concepts, many critics have found it necessary to underline its function of revealing truths. Augusta Walker, who, in contrast to Spenser, calls allegory „a light conceit", believes that it is „a simplification of a complex thing", that is always meant to lead, not to mislead (Cf. A. Walker, „Allegory: A Light Conceit", *Partisan Review*, vol. XXII, No 4, Fall 1955, pp. 480—490). Much of the heated argumentation and the quarrel itself seem quite unnecessary since there is no real opposition between the concealing and the revealing functions of allegory. Both concealing and revealing occur simultaneously and as Judith Dundas writes (in „Allegory as a Form of Wit", *Studies in the Renaissance* 1964, vol. XI, pp. 223—233) both the darkness and the light are at the heart of the poet's conception and both are equally important.

[9] Cf. P. Piehler, *The Visionary Landscape; A Study in Medieval Allegory*, Edward Arnold Ltd., London 1971.

[10] E. Honig, *Dark Conceit; The Making of Allegory*, New York, Oxford University Press 1966, p. 14.

[11] B. Einbond, *Samuel Johnson's Allegories*, Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbia University New York 1966, p. 32.

[12] A. Preminger, *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press 1965, p. 12.

metaphor in which objects, persons, and actions in a narrative, either in prose or verse are equated with meanings outside itself. Thus it represents one thing in the guise of another — an abstraction in that of a concrete image"[13].

To Edward Bloom it is „a literary mode which consciously presents at one and same time at least two different meanings"[14], one of which is literal, the other is of abstract significance. And Henry H. Remak finds it to be a „manner of speaking". In his opinion „...allegory is the conscious stylistic disguise of one thing as another, usually the substitution of a person, an image, or an event for a concept; the intentional, rational conversion of a specific abstraction into a specific concretion. Allegory, like metaphor, is no more and no less than a manner of speaking"[15].

A view on similar lines has been expressed by Angus Fletcher, the author of the book on allegory as a symbolic mode, who refers to it as a „protean device" and believes that „in the simplest terms, allegory says one thing and means another"; he takes it to be a process of encoding speech.

Numerous definitions bring to the foreground the fact that allegory often presents abstractions as concrete images. This characteristic feature is emphasized also by Chandler Rathfon Post, who takes it to be allegory's defining quality. Post speaks of allegory as a literary type and describes it in the following words:

I mean by allegory that literary type which crystallizes a more or less abstract idea by presenting it in the concrete form of a fictitious person, thing or event[16].

In our review of definitions of allegory Northrop Frye's opinion on the subject on which he is an authority, cannot possibly be omitted. Frye does not limit the field of reference of the term „allegory" to mere concretization of abstractions; he gives it a broader interpretation by including also works making use of analogous situations, similarity of persons, fictional creations echoing historical examples. He calls allegory a contrapuntal technique and says that it marks its presence „when a poet explicitly indicates the relationship of his images to examples and percepts, and so tries to indicate how a commentary

[13] C. H. Holman, *A Handbook to Literature*, The Odyssey Press, New York 1972, p. 13.

[14] E. A. Bloom, *„The Allegorical Principle", A Journal of English History Sept.* 1951, vol. 18, No 3, pp. 155—190.

[15] H. H. Remak, „Vinegar and Water; Allegory and Symbolism in the German Novella between Keller and Bergengruen", [in:] H. Rehder, ed., *Literary Symbolism*, University of Texas Press, Austin and London 1965, p. 37.

[16] Ch. R. Post, *Medieval Spanish Allegory*, Harvard University Press 1915, p. 3.

on him should proceed. A writer is being allegorical whenever it is clear that he is saying „by this I a l s o (*allos*) mean that"[17]. It is necessary then, that an allegorical work should contain interpretative signals indicating its generic membership.

Apart from the question of what kind of literary category should be alloted to allegorical writing, another important problem which preoccupies critics of this field is that of differences and similarities between allegory and symbol. Comparative examinations of allegory and symbol have been made in literary criticism ever since the Romantic period when the difference was felt to be an indicator of the essence of allegory and a standpoint from which to define it. It is S. T. Coleridge again who is to be held responsible for making the distinction a central problem connected with allegory. His examples of symbolical expression as parts representing wholes („Here comes a sail" for a „ship") and allegory which substitutes one term for another („Behold our lion" — meaning a person) have been extensively quoted to prove the validity of the opposition of allegory and symbol.

The well known book on allegory by C. S. Lewis distinguishes allegory as a mode of expression from symbolism which is described as a mode of thought. Lewis explains the creative processes producing allegory and symbol thus:

> The allegorist leaves the given — his own passions — to talk of that which is confessedly less real, which is fiction. The symbolist leaves the given to find that which is more real[18].

Chandler Rathfon Post describes the difference in picturesque terms by emphasizing the capability of symbolism to see „sermons in stones" and the skill of allegory revealed in building sermons from phantom stones.

More up-to-date criticism attempts to obliterate the differences and point out similarities and connections, instead. Rex Warner does it by reminding that „the two so often merge into each other. Indeed, in our common use of the words we seem to mean by a »symbol« merely a shortened or isolated allegory and by an »allegory« merely a sustained use of symbols which are contained together either in narrative or in description"[19].

---

[17] N. F r y e, *Anatomy of Criticism; four essays*, Princeton University Press 1973, p. 90.

[18] C. S. L e w i s, *The Allegory of Love*, Oxford University Press 1977, p. 45.

[19] R. W a r n e r, *The Cult of Power*, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia and New York 1947, p. 134.

A similar view is expressed by Louis MacNeice in his *Varieties of Parable* when he says that allegory and symbolism are very often so closely connected that it is difficult to separate them: developed coherent symbolism becomes allegory and allegory cannot do without symbolism. The modern tendency to bring symbol and allegory more closely together accounts for the dismissal of the problem of differences from the central field of analysis of the genre. Yet I shall find it necessary to return to the problem when the definition used by the present dissertation is presented.

In trying to answer the questions concerning the relations between allegory and symbol as well as the kinds of literary categories they should be ascribed to, critics are always faced with the basic task of defining the nature of allegory. The selection of definitions quoted above represents the most typical approaches to the problem. It can be seen that different qualities and aspects of literary allegory are brought to the foreground by them. Most often it is the double meaning of allegory which is emphasized, either with regard to the fact of 'hiding' or to the fact of 'revealing' a truth.

More often than not it is considered to be an extended metaphor presented in a narrative form; it is described as a set of ideas expressed in a set of events and characters, personifications of abstractions. Sometimes the fact that allegory creates hypothetical worlds is pointed out, at other times its intellectual structures presenting a rational world of purposefully selected elements are taken to be its most salient characteristic.

In view of such a variety of approaches to the nature allegory as well as to its relation to other literary forms, modes and genres, it becomes necessary for anyone writing on allegory to declare one's own attitude to the question.

The standpoint taken in the present dissertation is based on the belief that prescriptive approaches attempting to adjust practice to theory should be avoided, and that generalized comment ought to emerge from the analysis of actual developments in literary allegory.

Defining allegory in the narrow sense of personification of abstractions, and the rejecting all literary works generally considered as allegories unless they use the device, is one such example of a prescriptive approach. This limited definition has to be opposed also because there may be serious doubts as to whether personification allegory, in fact, is allegory at all. The dubious reader may feel that personifications hide nothing, they are what they represent, there is no double level of understanding involved, no „other speaking". It is on these grounds that the validity of the conviction that personi-

fication allegory is a bedrock, an ideal kind of allegory, is questioned by Ellen Douglas Leyburn who maintains that „the naming of an abstraction is contrary to the essential conception of concealment which is basic in allegory"[20]. Paradoxical as it may sound, the reservation is quite legitimate and it takes to task those who hold the view that only personification makes true allegory; they may find it necessary to defend not only the exclusive position of personification allegory, but also its very right to be included in the genre of allegorical writing. The right can be defended, however, first of all because it has a long literary tradition to support it, and because concretized abstractions cannot really be considered identical with abstractions themselves. The pseudo-human creatures hide nothing, but they do live their pseudo-human lives thus saving the double interpretation of the meaning of the narrative they are a part of. It can be argued, nevertheless, that, judged by modern standards, personification allegory is not particulary sophisticated and is far from being the highest form of allegorical writing. There is enough evidence to prove that this opinion is correct.

Prescriptive narrow approaches of the kind mentioned above made critics proclaim allegory dead at different points of its history, but reality has proved them wrong and works considered to be allegories by other critics, writers and readers have, as we saw in the previous chapter, continued to be written into our own day. The fact that they insist on referring to the works as allegorical shows that, in spite of all the differences, they must have certain important features in common with early personification allegory and that, in spite of their homogeneity, they constitute a group possessing qualities which distinguish them from other literary works. The definition of allegory, therefore, must be broad enough to include various kinds of allegories written throughout the history of literature.

In common critical practice the term „allegory" may be applied both to a work which makes use of the allegorical method of presenting literary material and to the method itself which is its organizing principle controlling the work. The term suggests the quality of the world created, of the characters, as well as the use of certain characteristic devices. While such terms as for example „second person narration" or „simile" have not acquired the power of distinguishing classes of literary works, allegory does possess it, and consequently works using the allegorical structuring principle are labelled „allegories". Basically, then, allegory is a mode of writing, but it is a

[20] E. D. Leyburn, *Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1956, p. 4.

mode capable of constituting a category of literary works. This class of works may be (and often is, also in this book) called a genre, provided one accepts the more liberal interpretation of the meaning of the term „genre". Liberal attitudes prevail in British and American criticism. Also in Polish criticism, which generally favours a more precise classification of literature, there is a tendency to relax the strict rules.

Classifications of genres offered by modern criticism have lost much of their former rigidity. Genres are often considered merely convenient (although not very precise) means of systematic categorization of literature. Sometimes it is, for example, the theme of a work which determines its genre (as in utopia), sometimes the attitude of the writer (as in a lyric), sometimes the „outer" form, the linguistic arrangement of material (as in a limerick). According to the authors of *Zarys poetyki* (Ewa Miodońska-Brookes, Adam Kulawik and Marian Tatara):

Pojęcie gatunku literackiego stosowane jako narzędzie opisu i interpretacji pojedynczych utworów czy procesów historyczno-literackich operuje całą listą kryteriów, które trzeba traktować i opisowo i historycznie. Są to tematyka, stosunek świata przedstawionego do świata pozaliterackiego, stosunek podmiotu literackiego do świata przedstawionego, kompozycja świata przedstawionego, jego podmiotowość lub przedmiotowość, konstrukcje czasowa i przestrzenna, system motywacji w nim obowiązujący, stopień zawartości, tonacja stylistyczna, formy wierszowe lub prozatorskie, funkcje i przeznaczenie, czasem sposób rozpowszechniania. Oto tylko najważniejsze[21].

The more liberal modern criticism, as illustrated by the above quotation, accepts a fairly wide range of qualities constituting literary genres. They fall into four major categories, those of theme, form, method and tone. The interplay between them decides about the general character of the work and the dominant one gives it its genre. Usually a literary work will have different possibilities of appearance within these categories, but only one such possibility in the dominant one. Thus drama, for example, may have different themes, tones and methods of presentation, but it cannot but use its particular form, that of dialogue. A utopia may be written in a prose form or in a form of poetry, it may be a drama or a novel; it may be optimistic, pessimistic or satirical; its method may cover a wealth of techniques, but its theme has always to be an imaginary society set as a model to follow. The special, constant quality must be regarded as its generic indicator.

---

[21] E. Miodońska-Brookes, A. Kulawik, M. Tatara, *Zarys poetyki*, Warszawa 1980, p. 58.

The constant of allegory is its method or mode: allegory may present various themes, it may be written in any form (prose, poetry, drama), it may vary in tone (satiric, lyric etc.), but it has no choice in the method of presentation, if it is to remain in the genre, it must use its special technique (device — method — mode, variously called by critics) summed up by its name derived from *allos* and *agoreuein*: it must speak of „the other" through „the given".

Maureen Quilligan, however, refuses to write of allegory in terms of translating from one level into another and thus separating them, and she has a very good reason for doing so. The essence of allegory, in my opinion, consists in the combination of the „surface story" with the world of significances in a particular vision which partakes of both the story and the meaning, but cannot be wholly identified with either of them. It is an attempt to bring into a literary text something that exists outside it and treat it as „extratextual", but indirectly made present in the text, be it a philosophical or moral belief, a real situation or even another literary work. The extratextual world is closely united with the fictional vision in a bond which creates a new entity whose main quality consists in the constant illumining of the „surface" text by the meaning and the other way round.

In fact, then, there are not merely two basic levels that one deals with in analysing an allegory, but three: the level of extratextual significances, the level of the surface story and the level of their union. The extratextual level and the surface story can be separated only artificially for purpose of analysis; the true appeal of allegory is its peculiar merging of two different worlds into a third, new one: the world of appearances and significances combined.

An allegory depends very much on individual parts which create the allegorical whole. Various elements of the story throw light on one another as well as on the elements of the ideological pattern. The same is true of the opposite direction, going from the relationships between significances to the story. The effect is a pattern of relationships between the two levels both of which determine the character of each other to the degree of merging, which, in turn, establishes the aesthetic value of the allegorical work.

An allegory, therefore, comprises ideally a self-contained, closed system of references between the elements of the two levels, each element being described by the whole and, at the same time, determining the character of other elements.

The multiple connections have led some critics to compare allegory to a s u s t a i n e d metaphor since allegory does not work through a single act, but it requires a number, or set of elements

as interrelationships and interdependences are its essence. Contrary to some beliefs, it is not necessary for a literary allegory to use a narrative form in order to present patterned relationships. Although, more often than not, it does, indeed, assume the form of narration, there exist also allegories whose sole aim is to describe a „tableau", an emblematic situation. This kind of „pictorial" allegory painted in words presents a scene — situation with the „events" beings relationships between different elements of the description. Here again we can see that an allegory does not appeal merely through its overall character, but that it requires an analytical approach since individual elements have to be examined in their relationships with other components in all its fields of reference.

The character of allegory can be seen very clearly in contrastive comparison with symbol. Contrary to some tenets of modern criticism, the old distinction between allegory and symbol proves useful in many cases. Even though separating them completely would be an extreme attitude, identifying one with the other (which is sometimes suggested as more rewarding in contemporary criticism) seems to me an equally extreme approach, albeit going in the opposite direction. I disagree with those critics who dismiss the distinction between allegory and symbol altogether on the grounds that often both are used in one work and they complement each other to the point of merging into each other. Precisely because there are similarities one has to be careful to see the differences. According to the authors of *Zarys poetyki* mentioned earlier, the nature of the difference is the same as that betwen metaphor and metonymy.

The „radiation" of significances and their fictional counterparts is characteristic not only of allegory, but also of symbol in which, as its name suggests, things and meanings are „thrown together", but there are important differences between their 'vehicles' and 'tenors' which prevent their indentification. Traditional criticism saw the differences mainly in the fact that symbol starts with the particular and moves towards the general whereas in the case of allegory the direction is opposite: allegory begins with ideas which are then embodied in images. Such an understanding of the working of allegory accounts for the indictment of it as a rather mechanical device, it also provides an explanation of the comparatively „facile" clarity of allegory as opposed to the less definable character of symbol. A collection of critical texts in *Allegorie und Symbol* demonstrates that this attitude was fairly typical of European approaches in general during certain periods of time.

Die einseitige Abwertung der Allegorie; die sich aus der vorher genannten Gegenüberstellung des Symbols und der Allegorie ergab, blieb lange unbeachtet und wurde erst im 20. Jahrhundert mit Recht kritisiert. Immer deutlicher erkennt man heute die geschichtliche Relativität des im 19. Jahrhundert als absolut Gesetzen Gegensatzes zwischen dem „echt" künstlerischen Symbol und der als kalt und trocken verschrierinen Allegorie[22].

Among the critics who defend allegory by ascribing depth and scope to it is Piehler who argues that medieval, at least, allegory had a visionary quality. His persuasive argumentation can be easily extended to cover great allegories of all times. All great allegories involve the vision of a union of the particular with the general. But allegory is a kind of statement about a phenomenon and implies the combination of a number of elements to produce a meaningful closed whole, while a symbol can be compared to giving a name to a phenomenon. A symbol is a single indivisible unit existing in an environment of what is not symbolic; it stands out separate from its context, but it cannot exist without its non-symbolical background. Thus symbol acts as a „reminder" of an extratextual phenomenon, while allegory tries to make it indirectly present in the work itself.

Allegory consists of interrelated elements with references to the implied; it is a self-sufficient, closed whole which needs no context within the literary work to set it off; unlike symbol, it must be based on a pattern of complexities created by parts of a whole.

An allegory may be more easily explicable than a symbol because of its mutually descriptive elements, but it, too, may be found ambiguous and complex, especially if it happens to be a modern work whose meanings are not readily discovered; B. Einbond's assertion that while a symbol has multiple meanings the tenor of an allegorical metaphor is fixed, must be rejected in view of numerous allegorical contemporary works which are interpreted in different ways.

Another comparison with symbol, unfavourable for allegory, suggests that allegory is arbitrary as it can choose almost any 'vehicle' for its 'tenor' while symbol is the only possible representation for the multiple meanings it stands for. This derogatory assumption is easily proven false by the obvious fact that any change of the allegorical vehicle will affect its tenor immediately and the allegory — the literary work will be altered since it exists in the union of the tenor and the vehicle.Where changes are introduced, different literary results will follow.

---

[22] Ed. B. A. Sörenson, *Allegorie und Symbol: Texte zur Theorie des dichterischen Bildes im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*, Athenaüm Verlag G.m.b.h., Frankfurt am Mein 1972, p. 266.

Comparisons with myth do not necessarily involve suggestions of the inferiority of allegory, yet they, too, demonstrate that their common features are another source of confusion in terminology: literary works believed to be allegories by some are often labelled myths by others.

That allegory is not to be identified with myth is pointed out both by a number of literary critics and anthropologists. In the book called *Before Philosophy* we find the following description of myth:

> Myth is a form of poetry which transcends poetry in that it proclaims a truth; a form of reasoning which transcends reasoning in that it wants to bring about the truth it proclaims[23].

The same characteristic of myth is underlined by Bronisław Malinowski when he says that:

> Myth as it exists in a savage community, that is, in its living primitive form, is not merely a story told but a reality lived. It is not of the nature of fiction, such as we read today in a novel, but it is a living reality, believed to have once happened in primeval times and continuing ever since to influence the world and human destinies[24].

Myths attempt to explain and to order the universe as well as man's place in it. Allegory has similar tasks, but unlike myth which shows what is believed to be reality, it builds hypothetical constructions, through which to speak of the real. Because they have so much in common, however, it has been very easy to allegorize primitive myths, to use ancient myths for modern allegorical purposes and to create private literary mythologies which are presented as if they were truth, but, even if their authors fully, or only half believe in them, the reader tends to receive such literary constructions in terms of allegory. Hence the distinctions between myth and allegory often become very subtle indeed and their justification can be found in the motivations of the writer or in the reader's approach to the matter. We shall see how ambiguous a literary work can be in this respect in the chapter dealing with J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*.

It is not always easy to separate allegory from satire, either. The problem, which arises here, does not result from the mutual interchangeability of terms sometimes observed in the case of „myth"

[23] H. and H. A. Frankfort, J. A. Wilson, T. Jacobsen, *Before Philosophy; The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1961, p. 16.

[24] B. Malinowski, *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays*, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, N. Y. 1954, p. 100.

and „allegory"; it is created by the fact that a satire can often be, and quite legitimately too, regarded as a part of the broader concept of allegory. It is quite obvious that not all allegory is satire, but the answer to the question whether all satire is allegory or not, requires a more careful consideration of the problem.

Indeed, there is a close connection between the two since both attempt to point through their texts to what is extratextual and thus create a world in between. Satire cannot be wholly identified as a variety of allegory, however, since, as we shall see in the chapter on *Animal Farm* in which the question will be discussed in more detail, not all satiric works use the method of „double speaking" consistently; some give up the indirect method of ridiculing a phenomenon or object for the sake of a more direct attack on the phenomenon or the object made laughable or contemptible with the help of such means as exaggeration, invective, unfavourable juxtapositions and purely verbal satirizing in which double level utterances are not used.

The relationship of overlap similar to that between allegory and satire occurs also in the case of allegory and apologue. They are not identical, but it seems an exaggerated approach to contrast them in the way Mary Doyle Springer does when she refers to a number of novellas (in *Forms of the Modern Novella*) as apologues on the grounds that they avoid the bare-boned structure of the classic allegory and prefer to embody their messages in realistic detail so that the message is i m p l i e d by it while it would be e x p l i c i t in the classic allegory[25].

It is obviously a narrow definition of allegory that Mary Doyle Springer tacitly accepts in her book and thus excludes many of her apologues from the genre of allegory. However, many of the stories discussed by her have allegorical patterns of reference as the backbone of their construction, and the fact that their realistic detail is richer and the message not explicit does not change their basic character. Modern allegorists often try to meet the needs of the modern reader by providing a possibly realistic disguise for their messages and hidden meanings, but it is a well known fact that classic allegories were never completely bareboned, either. Realistic detail, then, combined with messages and philosophical ideas (in a smaller or greater degree) does not necessarily exclude a literary work from the category of allegorical writing. An apologue ceases to be an allegory when it lacks the pattern of relationships between two

[25] Cf. M. D. S p r i n g e r, *Forms of the Modern Novella*, The University of Chicago Press Ltd., 1975.

„levels" of meaning. Not all apologues are allegories, but most of the stories analysed by M. D. Springer could be safely put within the limits of the genre.

The problem of classification is made all the more complicated since a work labelled as an apologue by one critic may be called a fable or a parable by another. In dictionaries of poetics the three terms are often given very strict definitions with sets of distinct characteristics, but they are all rather loosely used by modern criticism to denote literary works with messages and implied meanings, most of the works being, in fact, allegorical.

This is how Margaret Walters distinguishes fable from allegory (underlining the close connection between them at the same time):

> In its elements of design at least, fable is obviously akin to allegory, with its precise correspondences between different levels of meaning. In the latter, however, the cross-reference between literal narrative and a body of abstractions is usually specific, sustained at length, and rather arbitrary. And while, as other critics have rightly pointed out, most fables use some allegorical correspondences [...] the more important fact to notice is the way the fabulist always tries to make his dramatic situation serve as an analogy at large. A fable really offers its individual story as an analogue, a metaphor, of an order to be found in a wider reality[26].

The understanding of allegory in the above passage is identical with that demonstrated by Mary Doyle Springer and it interprets the genre as frozen, incapable of change with patterns of strict correspondences excluding „unnecessary" detail and written more or less in the fashion popular in the times of Prudentius. At the same time, Margaret Walters presents fable as an extended metaphor which has, for centuries, served as a description of allegory. She also adds another term „analogue" to the list of labels for denoting literary works related to fables (and, without her intending to do this, also related to allegory).

C. H. Dodd, who makes a somewhat similar distinction between allegory and parable, also subscribes to a rather narrow view based on the false belief that allegory has an imposed character and that each detail in it must necessarily be interpreted as a separate metaphor. C. H. Dodd contrasts this ideal and practically nonexistent kind of allegory with the much more liberal parable:

> The typical parable [...] presents one single point of comparison. The details are not intended to have independent significance. In an allegory, on the other hand,

---

[26] Quoted after D. H. Richter, *Fable's End; Completeness and Closure in Rhetorical Fiction*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 1974, p. 70.

each detail is a separate metaphor, with a significance of its own. [...]
A further point of contrast between the parable and the allegory is that while allegory is merely decorative illustration of teaching supposed to be accepted on other grounds the parable has the character of an argument, in that it entices the hearer to judgement upon the situation depicted, and then challenges him, directly or by implication, to apply that judgement to the matter in hand[27].

The tendency to use the term „fable", not in the sense of a narrative with animals as its agents, but as a „moral tale" which can be identified with „apologue" as well as „parable" (not necessarily involving stated or implied analogy), to describe certain kinds of allegorical writing has led to rather arbitrary and confusing labelling of literary works. Thus, for example, William Golding's *Lord of the Flies* (1954) has been variously referred to as a myth, a fable, a parable, an allegory, an apologue and it has also been discussed in terms of a symbolical novel.

The definition of allegory with broader application which I use in the present dissertation, abolishes the seeming contradictions between allegory, fable, parable and other literary categories. The definition covers not merely one single type of allegory but a variety of allegorical works and avoids treating the genre as a monolithic category of uniform works. Allegory in literature, then, constitutes a class of works distinguished by its method of combining, through a closed self-defining sytem of correspondences, a pattern of implied elements with their „given" equivalents contained in its text. The method creates a vision which consists in patterns of meaningful interrelationships between, as well as within, both these two (sometimes more than two) planes being the essence of allegoricity.

Ideally, allegory is a closed system of patterns of relationships of ideas linked with particular images but, practically, allegorical works are never restricted to the system itself and they are usually asociated with elements which do not enter the system and which exist on one plane only. The presence of non-allegorical elements does not necessarily destroy its vision; a close allegorical system may exist within a larger context of a literary work.

That the genre of allegory includes different types of works is not a particularly revelational or revolutionary assertion: allegorical works have been divided into varieties, groups, types and classes ever since allegory began to be written. According to one of the Latin Church Fathers, St. Augustine, there were four kinds of allegory: allegory of

---

[27] C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of Kingdom*, Nisbet and Co. Ltd., London 1950, p. 18.

history (*historiae*), of fact (*facti*), of discourse (*sermonis*) and of rites (*sacramenti*). In modern times allegory is usually divided in two main types: allegory of history and allegory of love, more or less identical with Dante's allegory of theologians and allegory of poets respectively. From a different point of view, however, there may be many more than just these two kinds of allegory. For example in Gerd Birkener's study we find references to moral and homiletic allegory, erotic, psychological, biographical as well as normative and discursive allegory[28]. Edgar Baes preferred a division based on more formal criteria. He wrote:

Voilà trois sortes d'allégorie, de tromperie, d'équivoque et de double entente[29].

The criteria of division used by D. W. Bornemann to distinguish his three groups of allegory were based on the belief that

In dreifacher Weise kann die Allegorie auftreten: kindlich-spielend, volkstümlich-lehrhaft und tendenzion[30].

According to these criteria he separated witty allegories in the form of riddles from moral and political ones.

Another threefold division, represented by James I. Wimsatt for instance, takes into account historical varieties of allegory and notes the vitality of topical, scriptural and personification allegory.

Most of the divisions mentioned here classify allegories according to their themes, method or forms of appeal. Tzvetan Todorov distinguishes varieties of allegory determined by the degree of intensity of their allegorical quality. Here is how he sums up his analysis of the genre:

Résumons notre exploration. On a distingué plusieurs degrés de l'allégorie évidente (Parrault, Daudet) à l'allégorie illusoire (Gogol), en passant par l'allégorie indirecte (Balzac, Villers de l'Isle-Adam) et allégorie „hesitante" (Hoffmann, Edgar Poe)[31].

The various divisions of allegory show that it is possible to include in the genre a very wide scope of writings, indeed, and that personification allegory may be treated as one of the many varieties of

[28] Cf. G. Birkner, Metapher, „Allegorie und Autobiographie im Puritanismus", [in:] *Heilsgewissheit und Literatur*, Bd. 18, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München 1972.

[29] Baes, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

[30] D. W. Bornemann, *Die Allegorie in Kunst, Wissenschaft und Kirche*, Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Leipzig 1889, p. 10.

[31] T. Todorov, *Introduction à la Littérature Fantastique*, Editions du Seuil, Paris 1970, p. 78.

allegorical writing — not as its sole representative. It is quite clear from what has been written so far, I hope, that the view supported in this chapter is the one which favours the admittance of plurality within the genre.

Although all the divisions presented above are valid and useful (and in fact there may be many other kinds of allegory distinguished according to their form, theme, etc. — such as prose, verse, religious, psychological allegories to mention only some), I do not intend to look at modern literary allegories from the point of view of the theme, or the form or even the degree of allegorical element abstracted from their context. All these aspects of a literary work called allegory both determine and depend on the level of significances, as was suggested earlier in this chapter. Since the mutual permeating of the „levels" of allegorical vision is the focus of interest in my dissertation, the way in which the given world is combined with the „other" world of implications will be the basic criterion of distinguishing types of allegory in the present dissertation.

There are five main types of allegory in the division accepted here:

1. Literary works which present abstract notions as personified qualities, in meaningful narrative patterns, belong to p e r s o n i f i c a t i o n a l l e g o r y.

2. Those works which show events and people as exemplifying, or typical of more generally conceived situations and moral, philosophical etc. attitudes will be regarded as belonging to e x e m p l u m a l l e g o r y.

3. Narratives built on the principle of analogy with another situation, with other people (not belonging to the same class or category as in exempla) will be included here in p a r a b l e a l l e g o r y.

4. Literary works which present particular people, events, objects and places under the guise of other people, events, objects and places by renaming and masking them (most of these works, but not all, will be topical) will be called d i s g u i s e a l l e g o r y.

5. Finally, allegories which are built on the patterns of other literary (and not only literary) works, modelled on already existing narratives, called by E. Honig twice told tales, works in which the rendition of significances depends very much on juxtaposing, comparing, and contrasting the „given" world with another work — all such literary compositions I propose to term e c h o a l l e g o r i e s.

It almost goes without saying that such pure types of allegory are very seldom written; more often than not one deals with mixed

kinds in which elements of different varieties of allegory are intermingled.

From the discussion of divergent views on what is allegory and what is not, from the register of definitions presented in this chapter as well as from different approaches to methods of classifying literary works a number of conclusions can be drawn.

First of all we can see how difficult it is to determine the limits of allegory, all the more so since it may appear in varying degree. One is often faced with the problem of making decisions about the particular degree at which a literary work is still an allegory and at what next degree it ceases to be one. Needless to say there is much subjectivity involved in making such decisions.

As can be expected the decisions vary widely and they confirm the suspicion one might have after examining the survey of allegories made in the previous chapter that allegory indeed means very different things to different critics and that there exists much confusion in the field.

In view of the confusion as well as of the prevalent attitudes to the question, a sufficiently broad definition is required to include literary works most often considered to be allegories. The present chapter suggests that the definition should emphasize the constant qualities unchanged by the course of time and by the variety of interests and purposes of writers of allegory, changeable and heterogenous as they may be. Since the common denominator and the central characteristic feature of all allegorical works, according to the definition, consists in the method of presenting material which distinguishes the class of literature from other writings, it is the method that must be regarded as having the power of establishing a genre.

Similarities between allegory and other categories such as myth, apologues or satire may suggest that the genre, together with them, belongs to a wider class of literature whose concern with extratextual significances is particularly strong. The description and categorization of such literature lies beyond the scope of interest of the present book, even though allegory may be a part of it.

Many of the definitions quoted in this chapter, as well as divisions of allegory into types, have important things to suggest about the genre; not accepting them as a means of establishing the range of the genre does not necessarily mean condemning them as totally wrong or useless. The definition chosen here as binding, however, has the advantage over many other ones in that it concentrates on the aesthetic aspect of allegory and deals with the genre primarily as a literary phenomenon thus avoiding the (frequently made) mistake

of putting too much stress on its ideological implications and treating the literary form as a mere sugar-coating for them, as something superadded. The aesthetic aspect is also the main criterion of division of allegory into the five varieties discussed above: they have been distinguished here in consideration, first of all, of their literary functions. Such an approach seems to be well justified if allegories are to be interpreted as works of literature, not as philosophical treatises or documents.

We have seen from the discussion of the register of definitions that even where there is no disagreement about the meaning of the term „allegory" differences may exist in including particular literary works in the genre. This is especially true about modern allegories which freely enter relationships with other literary genres. The combinations with other genres tend to obscure the boundary lines of allegory, but they also help to reveal its true nature and provide useful information about its methods.

In the following chapters, therefore, my task will be to examine different kinds of allegory in combinations with other literary genres and, through analysing individual examples, to throw some light on the allegorical method and the general nature of the genre as practiced in the twentieth century.

The definition suggested in the present chapter points to what allegorical works of different times and of different kinds have in common; having thus established the essential similarities we may now proceed to examine the differences.

Chapter III

MODERN PERSONIFICATION ALLEGORY: *THE PILGRIM'S REGRESS* BY C. S. LEWIS

The title of the present chapter refers to C. S. Lewis's *The Pilgrim's Regress; an Allegorical Apology for Christianity, Reason and Romanticism* (1933) as an example of modern personification allegory. In spite of its modern content the book attempts to preserve the traditional form of allegory written in the times of John Bunyan and even of earlier allegorists. The use of such a form in the 20th century raises a number of questions, some of which the present chapter will endeavour to answer. The answers to the questions about the character of the form as used today, its effectiveness, the purposes and advantages of its uses as well as the drawbacks of personification allegory, will throw some light, I hope, on the nature of the change in allegorical writing and on the relationship of allegory with other literary genres.

If one were to indicate the dominant inter-genre relationship in *The Pilgrim's Regress* it would have to be that between allegory and — allegory. Paradoxical as it may sound, it is, nevertheless, the most salient fact about the construction of the book. As its very title directly suggests the book has to be read in reference to John Bunyan's allegory *The Pilgrim's Progress*; the title also suggests the nature of the indebtedness of *The Pilgrim's Regress* to its great predecessor. The comparison of the two titles makes one think of both similarities and possible contrasts between the books. And, indeed, it is both through similarities and through contrasts that *The Pilgrim's Regress* is linked with Bunyan's allegory.

A link is also to be found in the method of approach which C. S. Lewis recommended to the readers of both these allegories, although he did that in different places and at different times. In his essay on „The Vision of John Bunyan" (first broadcast by the B.B.C. and after-

wards published in *The Listener* in 1962) Lewis criticised the kind of reading of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (and of any allegory, for that matter) which would ignore the „surface story" and would solely be concerned with its meanings as soon as they had been discovered. He did not hesitate to regard such reading as an indication of stupidity. He wrote:

> This stupidity perhaps comes from the pernicious habit of reading allegory as if it were a cryptogram to be translated; as if having grasped what an image (as we say) 'means', we threw the image away and thought of the ingredient in real life it represents. But that method continually leads you out of the book back into the conception you started from and would have had without reading it. The right process is the exact reverse. We ought not to be thinking „This green valley, where the shepherd boy is singing, rephesents humility"; we ought to be discovering, as we read, that humility is like that green valley[1].

In view of what was said in the previous chapter I would add that one ought to be discovering at the same time that the green valley is like humility and that the truly correct process is in the simultaneously taking of two opposite directions, which create the particular allegorical vision.

What C. S. Lewis says about the working of allegory (as well as what he does not say) demonstrates that the philosopher in him gave way to the author of imaginative writings somewhat grudgingly. His interest in philosophy and his early ambition to obtain a fellowship in the field had something to do with it. „What is abundantly clear in Lewis's writings, both critical and imaginative, is the influence of his foundation in philosophy and Greek and Latin literature"[2], says Walter Hooper in the preface to his edition of C. S. Lewis's essays. This influence is clear also in Lewis's interest in allegory which makes use of ideas: Lewis was interested in it both as a scholar when he produced for example, his study *The Allegory of Love* (1936) and as a writer when he created works, apart from *The Pilgrim's Regress*, as diversified as *The Screwtape Letters* (1942), *Out of the Silent Planet* (1938), *Perelandra* (1943), *That Hideous Strength* (1945) and the seven books of *The Chronicles of Narnia* (1950—1956) all of which contain, in a greater or a smaller degree, allegorical elements.

In spite of his preoccupation with philosophical and religious concepts C. S. Lewis was too much of an artist to let his stories dwindle into mere ideological or moral discourses and he is quoted

---

[1] C. S. Lewis, „The Vision of Bunyan", [in:] *Selected Literary Essays*, Cambridge University Press 1969, p. 149.

[2] W. Hooper, „Preface" [to:] Lewis, *op. cit.*, p. XIV.

as saying that „you find out what the moral is by writing the story"[3]. Although ideas and reality (which is often identified with ideas by him) are essential to him, he would lead his readers to them through the world of fictions and images. This is how he wants Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* to be read and this is also how he wished his own *The Pilgrim's Regress* to be received by readers. He wrote in the preface to the book:

> To supply a 'key' to an allegory may encourage that particular misunderstanding of allegory which as a literary critic, I have elsewhere denounced. It may encourage people to suppose that allegory is a disguise, a way of saying obscurely what could have been said more clearly. But in fact all good allegory exists not to hide but to reveal; to make the inner world more palpably giving it an (imagined) concrete embodiment. [...] For when allegory is at its best, it approaches myth, which must be grasped with the imagination, not with the intellect[4].

To C. S. Lewis, then, both the images of *The Pilgrim's Progress* and those of his own *The Pilgrim's Regress* are „palpable" embodiments of conceptions. It will be interesting to see how Lewis's conceptions relate to those of Bunyan.

In Bunyan's allegory the journey of Christian from the City of Destruction to the Celestial Country makes concrete the idea of Christian life rewarded in heaven after death. The pilgrim's progress is from the physical world tainted with sin to that of ideal perfection. Lewis's pilgrim's regress begins with the protagonist straying from the true way initially open to him and it continues with his wanderings through different places until his return to where he started from; the return to Christianity after being preoccupied with numerous other beliefs, intellectual fads and fashions of Lewis's times.

The book has a semiautobiographical character. It was published in 1933 soon after the writer's conversion which took place in 1931. The idea of a return or „regress" in its title is explained by what Lewis himself says of this important event in his life:

> I gave up Christianity at about fourteen. Came back to it when getting on for thirty. Not an emotional conversion: almost purely philosophical[5].

---

[3] In E. Fuller „After the Moon Landings. A. Further Report on the Christian Spaceman C. S. Lewis", [in:] J. W. Montgomery, ed., *Myth, Allegory and Gospel: An Interpretation of J. R. R. Tolkien, C. S. Lewis, G. K. Chesterton, Charles Williams*, Benthamy Fellowship, Inc., Minneapolis 1974, p. 87.

[4] C. S. Lewis, „Preface" to *The Pilgrim's Regress*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan 1943, p. 13.

[5] Quoted after: S. J. Kunitz, ed., H. Haycraft, *The Twentieth Century*

Both the progress of Bunyan's pilgrim, Christian as well as the regress of Lewis's pilgrim, John are presented in the form of a journey characteristic of the traditional personification allegory; Lewis decided to employ personified ideas in his story and so he provided a fitting background for them.

John, a native of Puritania, begins his journey from that imaginary country. As a small boy he is taught by the Steward how severely the Landlord punishes those who do not obey his rules. The Steward may not mean what he says, but John is filled with fear of the black hole full of snakes and lobsters, which, he believes, will be his punishment for disobeying the rules. Needless to say it is the fear of hell that religious instructors instil in young people to make them obedient to God's laws, which forms the background of John's early experience of guilt.

Romantic dreams of happiness, beauty and perfection associate themselves with the image of the Island which John sees for the first time through a window in a wall. Yearning for the Island he goes into a wood and finds a brown girl instead. She assures him that „she is better than his silly Islands". John gives in to the blandishment of the girl, but sensual pleasures do not statisfy him for long and he escapes from the wood; his romantic longing for the Island still haunts him.

The Island is a symbol of the longing for the indescribable and unexplainable. While almost everything else in *The Pilgrim's Regress* has a very definite meaning, the Island is deliberately left without a precise reference because Lewis believes that „you cannot go on explaining away' for ever: you will find that you have explained explanation itself away. [...] It is no use trying to 'see through' first principles. If you see through everything, then everything is transparent. But a wholly transparent world is an invisible world. To 'see through' all things is the same as not to see"[6].

John's longing or „sweet desire" is based on the writer's own experience, which he tries to describe in his more directly autobiographical book called *Surprised by Joy*. He connects the longing with his experience of the „stabs of joy" evoked in him, for the first time, by the sight of a toy garden made by his brother:

Authors; A Biographical Dictionary of Modern Literature, The H.-W. Wilson Company 1955, p. 577.

[6] C. S. Lewis, „The Abolition of Man", [in:] J. L. Bradley, M. Stevens, ed., *Masterworks of English Prose; A. Critical Reader*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York 1968, p. 505.

It is difficult to find words strong enough for the sensation which came over me. Milton's „enormous bliss" of Eden (giving the full, ancient meaning to „enormous") comes somewhat near it. It was a sensation, of course, of desire; but desire for what? [...] and before I knew what I desired, the desire itself was gone, the whole glimpse withdrawn, the world turned commonplace again, or only stirred by a longing for the longing that had just ceased[7].

When John sees the Island through the hole in the wall again, it is far more distant than before. He decides, nevertheless, to devote his life, if necessary, to getting to it. At this point of the story, which is the beginning of book two, the narrator informs us:

Still I lay dreaming in bed, and looked, and I saw John plodding along the road westward in the bitter black of a frosty night[8]. [p. 34]

Thus begins the pilgrimage and series of encounters depicted in a series of episodes. The first important encounter is with Mr. Englightenment, who stands for nineteenth century rationalism and who can explain away belief in the Landlord by any number of methods. Next he meets Mr. Vertue, who must obey his rules though he does not know why. John gives up his companionship when a young woman Media Halfways invites him to visit her father. In his comfortable house in the city of Thrill, Mr. Halfways tells John that his Island exists only in his heart really. John is at first nearly convinced that while „the brown girls were too gross and the Island was too fine" [p. 44], the real thing was halfways, but he soon finds out the falsehood of the belief, especially when Media's brother Gus tells him that actually Media is a brown girl too. Gus takes John to his laboratory to show him a machine (a bus) which is an object of his ecstatic admiration. Gus eulogizes the machine:

She is a poem. She is the daughter of the Spirit of the Age. What was the speed of Atlanta to her speed? The beauty of Apollo to her beauty? [p. 46]

And he gloats over the „ruthless austerity and significant form" of the bus. He takes John to the city of steel houses, Eschropolis and there the pilgrim finds out much more about the spirit if the age apart from its fascination with the machine. He meets Clevers who introduce

[7] C. S. Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, Collins Fontana Books, London and Glasgow 1969, p. 18—19.

[8] All quotations from *The Pilgrim's Regress* are from the edition by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan 1943. Page numbers are given at the end of each quotation.

him to their 'topsy turvy' art, obscene and savage songs sung by Phally, and strange, meaningless speeches of Glugly. John cannot understand why the Clevers listen attentively to Glugly's „globol obd oogle ogle globol gloogle gloo" [p. 54] even after one of the Clevers, who has drunk a lot of „medicine" explains that „reality has broken down" [p. 54], and yet another, who has never been to war, tells him:

We lost our ideals when there was a war in this country [...] they were ground out of us in the mud and the flood and the blood. This is why we have to be stark and brutal. [p. 54]

And they do prove they can be brutal by beating up John when he makes a critical remark.

The Clevers and their ways of life are a distorting mirror for the life style of the artistic and intellectual twenties.

John finds it difficult to get out of the country of Zeitgeistheim; he is arrested by Mr. Enlightenment's son, Sigismund who represents a modern variety of rationalism labelled as Freudianism. As can be expected, Sigismund tells John that his dream Island is only a pretence to have his lust fulfilled. John is thrown into a pit at the feet of a Giant and tortured by jailkeepers in a most perfidious way: they speak of their prisoners and food in scientific terms of anatomy and physiology. Fortunately a beautiful and valiant virgin, whose name is Reason, comes to take him away from the dungeon. She plunges her sword into the heart of the Giant and he falls crumbling. „The Spirit of the Age became what he seemed to be at first, a sprawling hummock of rock" [p. 64].

Back on the road John says goodbye to Reason, but meets Mr. Vertue again and together they go to the Grand Canyon where they find Mother Kirk (who stands for „traditional Christianity") willing to help them cross the Canyon (Original Sin). John, however, refuses her help and lets himself be entertained by Mr. Sensible in his house. The pilgrim is almost seduced by his cultured worldliness yet he quickly discovers that Mr. Sensible is a parasite depending on others and leaves him without regret. Accompanied by Mr. Sensible's former servant Drudge (poverty) and Mr. Vertue he proceeds along the Canyon until he comes across a shanty of Mr. Neo-Angular, Mr. Neo-Classical and Mr. Humanist, three sons of Mr. Enlightenment of the City of Claptrap. Using their methods of persuasion (strict observance of religion, humanitarian f o r m s of behaviour and the refutation of „romantic illusions") they try to discourage John from looking for his Island. John is not particularly attracted by any of them, but strongly

feels the allure of a less comfortless mode of thought to be found in the tenets of the Broad Church represented in the story by Mr. Broad. Mr. Broad is „friends with everyone, agrees almost with everything and does not go on any pilgrimages". But John, haunted by the vision of the Island, must continue his. The next house he and Mr. Vertue stop at belongs to Mr. Wisdom and his daughter Contemplation. Mr. Wisdom's doctrine of the Absolute Mind impresses John, but drawn forth by his glimpse of the Transcendental, he is compelled to go on. He follows Vertue, who is now weak, pale and resentful. When he is on the point of leaving his companion a Man appears to say to them:

You will recover, if only you will keep together. [p. 142]

The Man gives John a hand and gets him right to the top of the rock which he and Vertue had been so painfully climbing. The path he now walks on is narrow and dangerous; without at first realizing it John begins to pray. Once again the Man (who is Christ) comes to help him. And so John, having accepted his existence, now comes to acknowledge it; he experiences the feeling of being Caught.

Above all it grew upon him that the return of the Land-lord had blotted out the Island: for if there still were such a place he was no longer free to spend his soul in seeking it, but must follow whatever designs the Landlord had for him. [p. 184]

The hermit whose name is History tells John that people have different romantic visions, not necessarily of islands, which lead them to the Landlord for the visions, the sweet desires are given by him. It appears then that there is really a divine element in John's Romanticism. He finally realizes that he is on the verge of becoming a Christian and struggles to escape, but Reason, the maiden with a sword, does not allow him to. And so he finally goes to Mother Kirk. She says when she sees him:

You have come a long way round to reach this place, whither I would have carried you in a few moments. But it is very well. [p. 168]

John is told to jump into a pool and after his doscent into the water and the earth again he sees the Island which, as his guide informs him, is what in Puritania they call Landlord's Castle. It turns out that to get to the Island they must go back eastwards. The regress

journey shows the familiar world in a completely different light, in its real shape.

John and his companion Mr. Vertue have to contend with two dragons so that John can be hardened by Isthmus Sadisticus and Vertue made more malleable by the heat of the other dragon Isthmus Mazochisticus. After undergoing the change „they went on their way singing and laughing like schoolboys. Vertue had lost all his dignity and John was never tired" [p. 196]. The last glimpse the narrator catches of them in his dream is when they reach the brook which they must cross before the nightfall (signifying death):

> And now they were already at the brook, and it was so dark that I did not see them go over. Only, as my dream ended, and the voice of the birds at my window began to reach my ear (for it was a summer morning), I heard the voice of the Guide, mixed with theirs and not unlike them, singing — [p. 197—198]

The singing of the song closes the narrative.

The narrator's personality makes no mark on the story as he does not really exist in it; apart from his function as a technical device to watch (in his dream) characters and report their activities to the reader. John the protagonist also seems to be preoccupied mainly with watching and listening while moving on forever to new places. He is an observer rather than a doer: most of the things occur to him because of the circumstances rather than his own involvement in the events. The impression he gives is that of passivity in spite of the frequent reminders of his overwhelming urge to look for the beautiful Island of his vision, which does not let him rest and stay in one place for long. He remains, exactly in the same way as many other visitors to imaginary worlds of literature, mainly a transmitter of information about the peculiar world described in the story, although we are made aware of important changes in his attitudes taking place somewhere below the surface story.

The question arises then why it is necessary for C. S. Lewis to have both the dreamer and the traveller to tell the reader about the imaginary journey. The sleeper is a part of the convention borrowed from Bunyan as well as from the traditional allegory in general and a wholly uninvolved reporter; John is there not only to lead to various people and situations, but also to choose from what they represent one by one until his return to Mother Kirk and, on a deeper level, return to Christianity. Like most medieval and Renaissance allegories, and like Bunyan's, the book by Lewis has the dream-vision as its framework. The narrator thus begins his account:

I dreamed of a boy who was born in the land of Puritania and his name was John. [p. 20]

And Bunyan's narrator opens his story in the following way:

As I walked through the wilderness of this world, I lighted on a certain place where was a Den, and I laid me down in that place to sleep; and, as I slept I dreamed a dream, and behold, I saw a man clothed with rags, standing in a certain place[9].

Bunyan does not allow his readers to forget the presence of the narrator and every now and then he inserts a line such as „I saw, moreover, in my dream". „Then I saw in my dream", „I beheld then that"; Lewis makes his story-teller less intrusive, nevertheless, there is an echo of Bunyan in phrases such as „Then I dreamed that once more a Man came to him" [p. 145], „my dream was full of light and noise" [p. 196], „and it was so dark that I did not see them go over" [p. 198].

Lewis's dream-vision, like that of Bunyan, is controlled by conscious logic: events of the narrative follow a chronological pattern, the appearances of characters and places are always rationally justified, there are no inexplicable events, appearances or disappearances of things and people, no unexpected and inexplicable metamorphoses of characters which could be produced by a dreaming mind. Lewis makes little use of the possibilities created by the fact that he narrates a dream; the sole reason why he adopts the technique seems to be the use of it by traditional allegory and by Bunyan in particular. He employs it without any of the modifications that a modern writer might possibly introduce.

What he does do fairly convincingly because of the dream convention (and that is because Bunyan did it too) is the frequent changing of scenes which allows him to introduce numerous characters and situations necessary to present the span of a life compressed into a relatively short narrative.

The incidents, scenes and episodes have little connection with each other except that provided by the presence of John and by their position in a temporal sequence. Each is a step forward in the direction of the final point to be reached by John. The direction of the movement represents the spiritual development of a modern Christian (the author himself, in a large measure).

---

[9] J. Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress; Romance*, J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., London 1948, p. 7.

Unlike Bunyan's narrator, who reports only what te actually sees in his dream, C. S. Lewis's seems to know much more about his hero than his dream contains. He knows, for example, the past of John though it is not enacted in the vision. The dream covers long periods of time, not presented directly, passing off-stage, so to speak: the narrator says, for instance, that after another year passed, John had to be taken to the Steward, or that he dreamed of John having little peace either by day or by night. He mentions frequent repetitions (not directly shown) of certain activities as in: „After that John was always going to the wood" [p. 30] and „sometimes he would talk to her about himself" [p. 30].

This method of relating events in retrospect without the immediacy of directly seen situations is much less „true to dreaming" than the method preferred by Bunyan and it increases the degree of artificiality of the account, especially in Book One which gives „the data".

If the structure of the plot and the dream-vision convention derive from traditional allegories, the description of the journey in *The Pilgrim's Regress* has, however, a modern flavour since the author included elements of contemporary life in it. Following the example of popular travel books he even provided a map complete with a railway system.

Most of the places Lewis's protagonist visits are associated with the past: farms with horses, cities with towers and turrets and inns could have been easily found in an allegory written centuries ago. Also many of Lewis's characters could be easily transferred to such a work: the virgin Reason seen with a sword and on the back of a stallion, and Mr. Halfways wearing flowing robes would not be incongruous in it. On the other hand, however, John visits the laboratory of Gus, the ardent admirer of machines and especially of a bus even though no buses or cars are ever seen on the roads of *The Pilgrim's Regress* and John makes all of his journey on foot. He does not use the railways represented on the maps of the lands he travels through, either. The story contains dragons, dwarfs, giants and hermits as well as houses made of steel, guns and pornography.

The setting appears to be a mixture of attributes of modernity and elements of the past. The effect of such a combination, partly justified by the dream convention, is to eliminate any suggestion of realism from the story almost completely and draw the reader's attention to the fantastic quality of scenes thus created and, as a result, to their significances.

Unfortunately the effect of such combinations may often be uniten-

tionally comic in the way that Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court* is comic. While this kind of humour is advantageous where satire is intended (as in the presentation of the Clevers), it does not seem to be in keeping with the more lofty aims of the book. The combination of the present with the past prevents *The Pilgrim's Regress* from acquiring too solemn tones, but at the same time, also from becoming a profound examination of human dilemmas.

The method used by C. S. Lewis, artificial as it may be, serves the purpose of explaining the implied background experience of his protagonist. Since the situations involving other characters serve the purpose of externalization of the inner experience, they acquire a decisive function in the narrative of the pilgrim's progress.

John himself is a kind of Christian Everyman (modern and converted); his fairly common name (and no surname) suggests his typicallity: he could be a John Smith. His name makes one think also of John Bunyan once again. Other characters, too, have names pointing to their dominant features. Sometimes the telling names are those of ideas as is the case with Mr. Enlightenment, Mr. Vertue and maid Reason. At other times they may be derived from a feature of satirized attitudes or phenomena; Glugly, Clevers, Mr. Sensible, Mr. Humanist provide examples. They may also have their roots in the names of real people or institutions and circumstances connected with them: such names are like those of Mr. Sigismund Enlightenment, Mother Kirk, the Swastici, Mussolinini and Herbert (Spencer), Benedict (Spinoza), Immanuel (Kant), Karl (Marx), which are the names of the four children of Wisdom.

The telling names say all there is to say about the characters since it is only the dominant feature, idea or attitude, seen in relation to the main theme of the book, which interests the writer; he never develops his brief sketches of characters into full portraits and sometimes is content with merely naming them. These flat characters are presented in a way which precludes the expectation of possible other features in this closed pattern of allegorical significances. People described in realistic fiction, even when few of their characteristics are actually presented, lead the reader to believe that there exist other unmentioned aspects of their personalities and one could try to imagine the missing elements of the portraits. One should not do such a thing while reading C. S. Lewis's allegory (or any other personification allegory for that matter) since his characters are not allowed to have any other features except the allotted ones, because they might blur or distort their meanings.

If details of appearance are mentioned in *The Pilgrim's Regress*

it is because they emphasize the allegorical significance of a character. And so, for example, the three sons of Mr. Enlightenment, Neo-Angular, Neo-Classical and Mr. Humanist are described as pale; Reason appears as stern and beautiful; it is difficult to tell the sex of the Clevers since boys look like girls and girls look like boys; Mr. Halfways's silver beard and flowing robes suggest his comfortable and aesthetically attractive life; the fact that for example the Mussolinini, met by Vertue in his wanderings, are dwarfs stands for Lewis's indictment of the ideology they represent.

Like the setting, the characters in *The Pilgrim's Regress* lack homogeneity: the maiden in the steel armour, the giant, dwarfs, brown girls of the woods and creatures such as dragons, all mix freely with a host of seemingly „ordinary" people — countrymen and citydwellers. The mixture of fantastic creatures with quasi-real people provides the flavour of a romance and it reminds us once again of *The Pilgrim's Progress* by Bunyan who gave his book the subtitle „romance" because he modelled it on the kind of stories to which Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* belongs. Dwarfs, giants, and dragons are also stock „characters" of fairy tales which usually contain deeper meanings, thus the presence of the fantastic beings in *The Pilgrim's Regress* contributes to an allegorical reading of the book.

The characters referred to as „quasi realistic" above, are, in fact, only a degree less fantastic than dragons and dwarfs since they exist merely as shadowy human figures. The pages of the book are crowded with such depersonalized one dimensional beings. In many cases they are not even shadows of real people, but of those inhabiting another imaginary world: one finds in them reflections of characters created by Bynuan in *The Pilgrim's Progress* and *The Holy War*. Lewis's Mr. Sensible (cultured wordliness), for example, may be considered a faithful imitation of Bunyan's Mr. Wordly Wiseman. They hold similar views and represent similar attitudes; both recommend „the easy way" to the pilgrims. Mr. Sensible says:

> Sense is easy, Reason is hard. Sense knows where to stop with gracious inconsistency, while Reason slavishly follows an abstract logic whither she knows not. The one seeks comfort and finds it, the other seeks truth and is still seeking. [p. 84]

Mr. Wordly Wiseman says nearly the same to Christian:

> it is happened unto thee as to other weak men, who, meddling with things too high for them, do suddenly fall into thy distractions, which distractions do not only unman men, as thine, I perceive, has done thee, but they run them upon desperate ventures to obtain they know not what. [...] why wilt thou seek for ease this way, seeing so

many dangers attend it? especially since, hadst thou but patience to hear me, I could direct thee to the obtaining of what thou desirest, without the dangers that thou in this way wilt run thyself into; yea, and the remedy is at hand. Besides, I will ade, that, instead of those dangers thou shalt meet with much safety, friendship and content[10].

Lewis's characters, then, are often derivative and they give the impression of not living their own, independent lives: to be fully understood they must be compared with those of Bunyan, because they owe so much to him. Much more lively and interesting are those characters created by C. S. Lewis that represent types of people of his own society. The Clevers, for example, may be a rather vicious image of the intellectual life of the twenties, but they are described with much vividness and ingenuity.

One may also admire the inventiveness with which Lewis combines his allegorical figures with notions or types they stand for: the combinations are often so natural and convincing that they seem the only possible ones. God, for instance, is represented by the Landlord, who sets rules to be kept by his tenants. When a tenant's lease is up, he receives a notice from the Landlord to quit. John's mother explains the situation to him when he is a little boy, and she tells him that anyone can be turned out without notice, but people may not break the lease by themselves because the Landlord would be angry. The allegorical presentation of man's life and death becomes less consistent and less plausible when Lewis gives a particular example of the act of dying: the somewhat unsavoury description of John's uncle, with his face being the colour of ashes, made to walk by his friends across a brook to the East, does not strike one as very fortunate when one remembers that the ashen faced uncle is a corpse.

Apart from such minor flaws, however, *The Pilgrim's Regress* demonstrates admirable skill in finding appropriate physical equivalents for Lewis's spiritual messages. And so the biblical account of Adam and Eve in Paradise, when „translated" by Lewis into his own images, becomes quite a persuasive story of two disobedient tenants who ignored the Lanlord's warning against eating certain apples too strong for their digestion. Mother Kirk tells the story in the following way:

for a time the young man and his wife behaved very well, tending the animals and managing their farm, and abstaining from the mountain-apples; and for all I know they might never have done otherwise if the wife had not somehow made a new acquaintance. This new acquaintance was a landowner himself. He had been born in the mountains and was one of our Landlord's children, but he had quarrelled

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 19—21.

with his father and set up on his own, and now had built up a very considerable estate in another country. His estate marches, however, with this country and as he was a great land-grabber he always wanted to take this bit in — and he has very nearly succeeded. [p. 80]

Original sin, which results from the fall of the first man, becomes, in Mother Kirk's story, the Grand Canyon made by the earthquake after the loss of their farm by the two tenants. All of their posterity find the chasm of the Canyon on their paths.

The reader's interest in this well known story lies exactly in Lewis's skilful matching of allegorical characters with biblical personages and situation. One cannot say, however, that interest in the narrative of his book is always kept unflagging. The general impression the reader receives from *The Pilgrim's Regress* is that of the flimsiness and thinness of the multitude of characters in the book. The emphasis seems to lie all the more forcefully, therefore, on their significances rather than their appearances: if characters become lifelike in places, their life comes, more often than not, from borrowed sources: from what they stand for or from what they resemble. Mother Kirk is interesting mainly because she is linked with „traditional Christianity" the Landlord potently overshadows the whole book because we know he represents God himself and Mr. Sigismund Enlightenment has some traits of a personality owing to his kinship with Freud. When Lewis's characters are mere personifications of abstractions with on particular reference to other people existing in reality, fiction or myth, they have clearly less appeal as literary creations. This can be illustrated by Drudge, Mr. Sensible's servant, who leaves his master to be a companion to John and Mr. Vertue and later joins the tribe of the red dwarfs Marxomanni. He can be summed up in the single word „poverty". Because so general, the word has a world of associations, but means little in the book since no particular aspects are indicated in it. The writer seems to depend too much on the reader as he leaves it to him to create the person and does not offer any particular wision of his own. It would be easy to change Drudge into a predicate and instead of saying that he accompanied John, write that John was poor. Such characters as Drudge obviously add little to the value of the narrative.

We can now infer from the observations made about the characters in *The Pilgrim's Regress* that, first of all, it is not necessarily true that allegorical character drawing is impaired by significances represented: C. S. Lewis's book demonstrates that characters are often s a v e d by what is behind them. It may be suggested that the value and interest of characters in his book depend very much on their

sources, and especially on Bunyan. The very fact of creating a variety of characters (personifications, types, caricatures, representations of attitudes and qualities) similar to that in Bunyan and meant to be seen in the light of comparison with Bunyan, enriches the characters considerably. Without the great counterpart and without their other „fields of reference" they would lose so much that the loss would be irreparable.

The construction of the plot of *The Pilgrim's Regress* also owes a great deal to its model. Lewis's narrator, like that of Bunyan, begins his account by giving reasons for the pilgrim's leaving his home. Christian escapes from the City of Destruction which is to be burnt down and, wishing to get rid of his burden (the world), he sets out on his journey to Mount Zion; John is pulled to the road by his „sweet desire" to pursue his vision of the Island. Both Christian and John have helpful companions during their pilgrimages: the former's is Faithful and, after his death, Hopeful, the latter has Vertue as his friend.

Both pilgrims stop at a number of places during their journeys, meet various people, get involved in a series of situations, have pleasant and painful experiences and both finally arrive at their places of destination by crossing a river (Christian and Hopeful) or a brook (John and Vertue).

The two allegories differ in details, naturally, but the overall patterns are almost identical. Both have episodic constructions. The string of episodes making up the plot of *The Pilgrim's Regress* consists mainly of encounters which can hardly be termed true adventures, unless merely seeing things and listening to people may be regarded as such. More dramatic moments, e. g. John's imprisonment and his rescue by Reason, his jumping into a pool at mother Kirk's bidding and emerging as a different man, or John and Vertue's contentions with dragons, occur relatively seldom.

The drama takes place below the surface of the story, where the most powerful enemies engage in the 'Holy War'. The map which Lewis has included in the book suggests a violent conflict presented graphically. Lewis says in the preface:

> The two military railways were meant to symbolize the double attack from Hell on the two sides of our nature. It was hoped that the roads spreading out from the enemy railheads would look rather like claws or tentacles reaching out into the country of Man's Soul. If you like to put little black arrows pointing South on the seven Northern roads (in the fashion of the newspaper war maps) and others pointing North on the six Southern roads, you would get a clear picture of the Holy War as I see it. [p. 14]

The plot itself, however, does not reflect the violence of the war which takes place behind the scene. On the scene itself events appear rather banal and their connection with the war is not immediately noticeable. Mother Kirk explains this as a part of the Enemy's devious scheming which prevents people from recognizing agents of evil in the silly, and the wicked that one comes across in one's ordinary humdrum life. When John naively remarks that he has never met any tenants of the evil landlord.

'Not the tenants in chief, my dear' said the old woman. 'And so you didn't know them. But you may have met the Clevers, who are tenants of Mr. Mammon; and he is the tenant of the Spirit of the Age, who holds directly of the Enemy [...] this is how business is managed', said Mother Kirk, 'The little people do not know the big people to whom they belong'. [p. 80]

The awareness of the hidden presence of the holy war, the allusions to Bunyan's work about it, add value to Lewis's allegory and indirectly provide an amount of tension and drama to the plot. The warfare motif which creates the hidden tension does not come to the foregorund since it is better left as a concept; paradoxical as it may sound, a detailed description of a war meant to represent an inner conflict might prove even less dramatic than a journey (which involves discoveries and transformations). In *The Allegory of Love* C. S. Lewis writes on the advantages and disadvantages of the two motifs and their use by Bunyan as follows:

While it is true that bellum intestinum is the root of all allegory, it is no less true that only the crudest allegory will represent it by a pitched batle. The abstractions owe their life to the inner conflict, but once they have come to life, the poet must fetch a compass and dispose his fiction more artfully if he is to succeed. [...]
The Pilgrim's Progress is a better book than *The Holy War.* It is not hard to see why it should be so. The journey has its sups and downs, its pleasant resting-places enjoyed for a night and then abandoned, its unexpected meetings, its rumors of dangers ahead, and, above all, the sense of its goal, at first distant and dimly heard of, but growing nearer at every turn of the road. Now this represents far more truly than any combat in a champ clos the perennial strangeness, the adventurousness, and the sinuous forward movement of inner life[11].

The quotation fully explains why the writer decided to leave the holy war theme in indirect suggestions only and bring the journey motif to the foreground of his narrative. The use of the motifs by Lewis stimulates motion on the spiritual plane as well as on the physical-

[11] C. S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love*, Oxford University Press 1977, p. 68—69.

-geographical level, but situations and dialogues do not develop into any larger complexity. The episodes are arranged so as to represent the movement of inner life or, more precisely, of thought: they constitute a series of examinations of various human attitudes which are rejected one by one until the right one is arrived at. Book One of *The Pilgrim's Regress*, significantly called „Data", provides a starting point for the process of logical reasoning and the book acquires the appearance of a mathematical proof in which the data are analysed and an appropriate conclusion drawn. Each episode in the story constitutes a closed unit which involves passing judgement on a value questioned: each a crisis in itself beginning with promise and hope and ending with disappointment when its truth is discovered. The episode with the brown girl described at the beginning of the story is typical. John finds her in the wood while looking for the Island, is seduced by her and forgets his „sweet desire" for a time. One day, however, he wakes up to find that

> The brown girl was still there and the appearance of her was hateful to John: and he saw that she knew this; and the more she knew it the more she stared at him, smiling. He looked round and saw how small the wood was after all — a beggarly strip of trees between the road and a field that he knew well. Nowhere was there anything that he liked at all. [p. 30]

Thus John is made to see through the false attraction of the brown girl and the reader is persuaded of the worthlessness of sensual pleasures.

The pattern of meeting, promise, testing and disappointment is repeated also in the episode involving Mr. Halfways. John is at first greatly impressed by exquisite food, beautiful surroundings, clothes and music, but his rapture soon „dwindles into technical appreciation and sentiment".

In such a pattern of episodes, in which characters are used as „exhibits" and situations as „proofs", the protagonist's role being to observe them, drama of events is not really needed. And since it is the spiritual development, the process of discovering truth which constitutes the basic pattern of the book, manifesting itself through the incidents that happen to the passive John, the reader becomes much more interested in „what will happen next" than in „what will John do". This suggests that his role in building up the plot is indeed rather limited: apart from his urge to search for the Island, his decisions and his initiative have little influence on the course of events. His presence in the story provides a linking element for its episodic construction, and his search for truth (the Island) as well

as the reader's, provide an even stronger binding factor and a motivation for the events on the physical and the spiritual planes. On the literal level the psychological motivation is often scanty: one does not, for instance, know how and why John ceases to be attracted to the brown girl, or precisely what in Gus and the Clevers repels him, what causes his disappointment with Mr. Halfways etc. These things just occur. The explanations and justifications exist objectively in other characters, situations and circumstances: John is not always presented as noticing their significances, or drawing conclusions, his reactions often are not directly and overtly stated; they have to be guessed at. That the psychological process of the search for truth is not to be looked for on the literal level results largely from the fact that inner experience is usually externalized: for example when the state of being deluded by false fashionable ideas and then freeing oneself from them by means of rational analysis is presented as imprisoning John by the Spirit of the Age and then rescuing him by Reason, a religious compromise between the demands of virtuous life and the enjoyment of it finds its concretization in the reconciling of the quarreling John and Mr. Vertue by the Man.

The emphasis put on the concrete situations obliterates the personality of the pilgrim almost completely and brings into the focus of interest the events, the setting and other people, as it is through them that John's behaviour is motivated.

Bunyan's pilgrim knows well where he is going and what he wishes to attain. The course of his journey, therefore, is certain. Lewis's pilgrim experiences romantic longings, indefinite desires and dreams, he is not quite certain what he is after and he has no laid-out road to proceed along. The course of his journey undergoes frequent changes, John often follows false directions before he finally finds the right one. The plot, accordingly, develops in a meandering line of events sometimes leading John astray, sometimes making him regress, but in spite of the wayward movements always bringing him closer to the goal. This introduces a new characteristic into this plot modelled on Bunyan: the sense of the lack of direction which one gets from the book is in keeping with the relativity and uncertainty of twentieth century literature and gives *The Pilgrim's Regress* a modern quality.

Not only is the sense of direction uncertain. The plot unfolds in a rather jerky manner as it may cover in a sweeping move long periods of time and then dwell on an arrested moment. On the spiritual level, however, it constitutes a systematic analysis of thought and experience.

The construction of *The Pilgrim's Regress* makes it possible to view the book in terms of a number of different types of literary writing. The romantic desires of John, the presence of the marvelous in the events (sudden transformations such as that of Mother Kirk into a crowned and sceptred queen, inexplicable appearances and disappearances as those of the Island, impossible phenomena as when men are hardened or softened by dragons) create a link with romances and fairy tales. The link is strengthened by the quest pattern of the plot. This motif, too, places *The Pilgrim's Regress* in the rich context of quest allegories. As Gay Clifford notes:

> The fundamental forms of allegory are the journey, battle or conflict, the quest or search, and transformation; i.e. some form of controlled or directed process. The control is provided by the object of the journey, combat, or quest: we interpret the significance of the 'motion' of the characters and of the forces affecting them in the light of knowledge about the direction in which they travel[12].

The book may be also interpreted as a spiritual biography and this fact, together with the topical allusions to Lewis's contemporary society binds the allegory with reality. Yet, again, the connection takes place on the spiritual level: the surface story does not aspire to create the illusion that it has much in common with what goes on in the real world. This is true both about what the story presents and about the method of presentation. Detailed descriptions, which exceed the needs of representing ideas and which make the imaginary world more palpable occur very seldom in the book. One such rare example of the use of the realistic method, that gives a scene more detail than necessary to convey an idea, is the description of the view John and Vertue admire when they find themselves at the cross-roads. So rare it is that it deserves quoting in full:

> It was a four-cross-road where they had been sitting, for the northern road, at which John looked with a shudder, was but a continuation of a road from the South. He stood and looked down the latter. To his eyes, long now accustomed to the dusty flats of the northern plateau, the country southwards was a rich counterpane. The sun had passed noon by an hour or so, and the slanted light frackled with rounded shadows a green land, that fell ever away before him, opening as it sank into valleys, and beyond then into deeper valleys again, so that places where now he stood, yonder were mountain tops. Nearer hand were fields and hedgerows, ruddy ploughland, winding woods, and frequent farm-horses white among their trees [p. 116]

---

[12] G. Clifford, *The Transformations of Allegory*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London and Boston 1974, p. 14—15.

The usual method of description employed by Lewis, however, depends on presenting the essential features and fairly bare scenery. As with characters, he often confines himself to merely naming a place. His names of places, such as „Valley of Wisdom", „City of Claptrap", „City of Thrill" and „Eschropolis", echo those in Bunyan's and other older allegories. So does the choice of the setting which contains valleys, hills, mountains, canyons, rivers, roads, farms and cities (even if it has an admixture of more contemporary scenery). The passage quoted above, though unusual as regards its relative wealth of detail, is very typical of Lewis's approach in another respect: the writer presents a panoramic view of the natural landscape and kaleidoscopic changes of the scenery. The kaleidoscopic view of vast space which seems to embrace the universe induces a more general interpretation of individual expriences presented against its background. This method, again reminiscent of Bunyan and the conventional setting of the traditional allegory, emphasizes the metaphorical significances of the work.

The examination of *The Pilgrim's Regress* reveals that there are few deviations from its model. Some characters and some scenes are clearly based on modern experience, but the whole has a timeless appearance. The layer of meanings, on the other hand, is related to modernity although the religious Christian ideas have their roots in a long tradition, present also in Bunyan. The basic principle of the structure of the book consists in constant comparison: comparison of *The Pilgrim's Regress* with Bunyan's and other older allegories, as well as the comparison of ideas with their concrete shapes within the work itself.

There are two main possibilities of relating a literary work to another: either it is a comment on its model and reinterprets it, or the model is used as an indirect comment on a situation newly created. The latter is the case with C. S. Lewis. By taking so much from Bunyan, the writer is able to show more clearly in the light of the material, both his personal experience and the ideological panorama of his times. Contrasts are no less illuminating than similarities. While Bunyan concentrates on the progress of Christian to a well defined end by his avoiding wordly temptations and pitfalls and makes morality a basic issue, Lewis, although he too passes moral judgements on what he describes, takes an interest primarily in philosophical and religious views. A comparison of the situations of the two pilgrims shows very poignantly the complicated circumstances of the modern pilgrim, his loneliness, need of a guide and his need for self-reliance in a world of uncertain relative values. His triumph

seems to be all the greater when he arrives at his goal and attains happiness as his reward.

The seemingly different characters of Lewis representing modern life styles do not, in fact, differ from those of the past: they are, as in Bunyan, either good folk or servants and agents of the Enemy. This suggests that the eternal conflict between good and evil has not changed much and that the Holy War goes on.

The strict dependence of *The Pilgrim's Regress* on other literary sources makes it rather different from the host of „echo" works which usually treat their models as starting points or fields of reference for their own themes.

Works which depend too much on other sources are not self-sufficient and self-sustained as they shine with reflected light: they cannot boast of much creative power of the imagination. Great allusive works (such as *Ulysses* by Joyce) are fairly liberal with their models. Too much dependence may often be a severely limiting factor (as was found by H. Fielding who gave up the idea of merely parodying Richardson's *Pamela* very early in *Joseph Andrews* and let his imagination move freely). In spite of its original attitude to contemporary thought, skill in combining abstractions with images, some satirical inventiveness and the interesting use of a symbol (the Island), the literary level of *The Pilgrim's Regress* relies too slavishly on its great predecessor.

The close link between Bunyan's work and *The Pilgrim's Regress* implies a close connection of the latter with personification allegory in general; there may be echoes of travel literature, romance, fairy tale and autobiography in *The Pilgrim's Regress*, but the book follows, more than anything else, the rules and regulations of personification allegory.

There are some advantages in writing a modern work in the form of personification allegory. Apart from the moral implications and aesthetic values which Lewis's work derives from its affinity with Bunyan, its particular allegorical form gives it transparency and clarity of meaning. The very presence of undisguised abstractions with their telling names, and settings that are extensions of their „personalities" makes problems discussed in the book more immediate to the reader. It facilitates the making of definite moral evaluations and correct distinctions between good and evil as presented by the book. Psychological laws do not apply to it as its main concern lies in moral and philosophical ideas; the purely literary interest rests in the interplay between ideas and their concrete shapes. The appeal of ideas depends very much on the bodies they acquire and the shapes

endowed with meanings become more interesting because of their associations with ideas. As we have seen in *The Pilgrim's Regress* the ideological level of an allegory can enrich it aesthetically.

While reading *The Pilgrim's Regress* one has the impression that the book is an imitation not only of Bunyan's work, but also of personification allegory in general. The reason lies partly in the fact that Lewis patterns his book on a story which happens to be also a personification allegory and partly in the fact that the very act of writing this kind of allegory today seems artificial, derivative and outmoded. If written today, personification allegories tend to look rather like pastiches and it is significant in this respect that Lewis's allegory should be patterned on one already in existence. Personification allegory is extremely rare in contemporary literature. It may be used for satirical purposes sometimes, usually in brief sketches, and it may appear in poetic drama. It seems best suited for expounding religious and philosophical ideas considered as detached from their presence in the concrete experience of an individual. It is avoided by sustained narratives of prose fiction for a number of reasons. First of all because it has a limited number of conventional devices and techniques which cause any new allegory to appear derivative. Secondly, because its characters are abstractions and modern readers prefer to be led to general concepts through concrete situations and beings. Abstractions are, by definition, simplified, flat alienated creatures to be interpreted unambiguously; the characters are predictable, events, to a large extent, forseeable and therefore not very exciting. The fact that there is a very narrow margin left for the reader's freedom in interpreting a personification allegory is one of the main causes of the frequent rejection of this kind of writing both by modern readers and by critics.

Northrop Frye notes that:

> The commenting critic is often prejudiced against allegory without knowing the real reason, which is that continuous allegory prescribes the direction of his commentary, and so restricts his freedom[13].

The observation refers to allegory in general, but it is particularly true about the reactions of critics as well as ordinary readers to personification allegory. Its correctness is confirmed by Gay Clifford who says:

---

[13] N. Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism*, Princeton University Press 1973, p. 90.

The idea that there are as many ways of reading a work of literature as there are readers is anathema to allegory. For these reasons, and others [...] when modern writers do use allegorical methods they do so in nervous or deliberately ironic ways[14].

Writers seem almost guilty about using personification allegory and so they often produce what looks like mock allegory or a burlesque, and when it is more serious in tone it tends to assume the character of a pastiche. It is for this reason that modern personification allegory is read in relation to that of the past and the nature of the connection constitutes one of the main aesthetic values of such an allegorical work. It is not surprising then that C. S. Lewis's *The Pilgrim's Regress* also reads as a pastiche of personification allegory, all the more so since it is frankly patterned on a work of the past. The book also provides evidence for the lack of popularity of personification allegory today by the fact that it is rather an exception, a rare kind of work in modern fiction, and mainly because it illustrates the numerous pitfalls and drawbacks of the traditional form of allegory when adapted to modern expectations and tastes.

In view of this position of personification allegory today it will be interesting to see what other possibilities there are for modern allegorists to find attractive literary forms. Leonard Freiberg characterizes their problem as follows:

The writer of allegory no longer uses personifications as characters; modern readers and spectators would be bored. His problem is finding concrete and specific representations — characters, incidents, milieu — for the abstractions and generalizations he wants to discuss and the metaphysical points he wants to make[15].

How modern allegorists cope with this problem, what forms they use for their allegories will be dealt with in the following chapters.

---

[14] C l i f f o r d, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

[15] L. F r e i b e r g, *Introduction to Satire*, The Iowa State University Press, Ames Iowa 1968, p. 205.

Chapter IV

ALLEGORY AS SATIRE: GEORGE ORWELL'S *ANIMAL FARM*

The union of allegory with satire is particulary close since they have a great deal in common. So much so that many critics see little difference between them. John MacQueen, for example, says:

> Allegory and satire are in fact intimately connected. It is surprising how often one gets a better understanding of an allegory by considering it as satire, and vice versa[1].

And Ellen Douglas Leyburn expresses a similar view in her book on *Satiric Allegory* when she writes that satire „seems always to have had a propensity toward allegorical form". She finds the connecting characteristics in „the indirection which is the essence of both satire and allegory, the element of expression without which they cannot exist" as well as in the fact that „the mainspring of both is the interplay of the general with the particular [...] When satire and allegory are vigorous and effective, both work in both directions from the individual to his general characteristics and also in reverse order from larger truths to personal manifestations of them"[2].

Mary Doyle Springer[3] finds that, although the distinctions between satire and allegory are useful and meaningful, she, too, would like them a little collapsed on the grounds that both have a didactic character and that, fundamentally, both are very serious literary genres, satire being, in the light of modern criticism, related to tragedy. Satire, like allegory, in an indirect way makes serious statements

---

[1] J. MacQueen, *Allegory*, Methuen and Co. Ltd., London 1976, p. 68.

[2] E. D. Leyburn, *Satiris Allegory: Mirror of Man*, Yale University Press 1956, p. 8—11.

[3] Cf. M. D. Springer, *Forms of the Modern Novella*, The University of Chicago Press Ltd., Chicago and London 1975, p. 98.

about the world with the difference that the satiric statements are negative.

The essential seriousness of purpose, the indirect method of expression, the interplay of the general with the particular do not exhaust the list of links between allegory and satire. The natural corollary of the fact that both aim at making statements or indictments based on conclusions drawn from observation, is their interest in ideas and hence their clearly intellectual character. Kingsley Amis's witty remark that intellectualism is the satirist's occupational disease could be equally well applied to the allegorist since he, too, is preoccupied with ideas.

Most of the opinions quoted here emphasize the similarities between allegory and satire. The essence of the similarities consists in the use of a created world with references both to a fictive story in its literal sense and the real world outside it. It is a triple vision of which one part is a combination of the two (or more) basic levels.

In the area of overlap both satires and allegories tend to pass judgements and by their preaching and teaching important truths, they acquire their didactic character; both point at ideals, even if satire does it in a doubly indirect way. They both not only refer through their fictive worlds to real phenomena, events, situations, and people (not necessarily particular ones), but also point to the very essence of humanity by presenting indirectly certain aspects of the human condition or of human nature and thus gain, apart from their allegorical or satirical meanings, a symbolical significance as well.

Few of the critics who write extensively on the links between satire and allegory attempt a definition of the differences. Conclusions about E. D. Leyburn's views of the matter can be drawn from her rather roundabout remarks and her comments on individual works. We read for example, that certain satiric portraits must be considered as non-allegorical since „they are more than themselves in what they represent, but not other than themselves"[4]. Such statement raises doubts, however: Are exaggerated characters identical with the ones satirized? Surely not. And if they are different, they are also „other", one might argue.

Also the difference pointed out by Leonard Feinberg, who says that „unlike the fable and allegory, satire does not teach a moral lesson or offer a desirable alternative to the condition it criticizes"[5] sounds rather unconvincing as a distinctive criterion since it does

[4] Leyburn, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[5] L. Feinberg, *Introduction to Satire*, The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa 1968, p. 3.

not make it impossible for satire to be included in the broader class of allegory as its variety, provided one did so on the grounds that both satire and allegory share the basic characteristic feature of the indirect method of presentation (as was done by Quintilian for example).

Where exactly do they meet then? What is the degree and area of overlap? If there is a valid difference between the indirect methods of presentation used by allegory and satire, what does it depend on? What does allegory gain by its connections with satire and what kind of allegorical writing makes the best use of it? These are the questions which we shall consider while examining George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, the best known modern example of allegory combined with satire.

Animal Farm has numerous references to real events, but, unlike such works as *The Consolidator* by D. Defoe, *The New Atlantis* by Mary de la Rivière Manley or *The Adventures of an Atom* by Smollett, it transcends its immediate connections with concrete contemporary situations. *The Consolidator*, for example, is a topical satiric allegory which must be read as a mere topsy-turvy account of real events distorted for the purpose of ridicule. This method of „translating" facts and people into a satiric allegory may be illustrated by Defoe's account of his own experience as the author of *The Shortest Way with Dissenters;* in the language of *The Consolidator* it begins as follows:

A certain author of those countries, a very mean, obscure, and despicable fellow of no great share of wit, but that had a very unlucky way of telling his story, seeing which way things were going, writes a book, and personating this high Solunarian zeal, musters up all their arguments as if they were his own, and strenuously pretends to prove that all the Crolians ought to be destroyed, hanged, banished, and the devil and all. As this book was a perfect surprise to all the country, so the proceedings about it on all sides were as extraordinary[6].

Being so much concerned with the temporal, *The Consolidator* has had only a limited, temporary impact and today its main value is found in its exemplifying the past history and literature of England.

Orwell's *Animal Farm* has a much greater affinity with Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, a satire containing, apart from the abundance of topical allusions, truly universal applications since it deals with the imperfections of man's nature which mar his morality and the institutions he creates. Swift looks at man from various angles

[6] D. Defoe, „The Consolidator or Memoirs of Sundry Transactions form the World in the Moon", [in:] H. Morley L.L.D., ed., *The Earlier Life and the Chief Earlier Works of Daniel Defoe*, Routledge and Sons, London 1889, p. 364.

and perspectives: he diminishes man to the size of vermin-like creatures, blows him up to a horrifying magnitude which reveals unsavoury physiological facts about the human body. He exaggerates, overdraws and makes people absurd. He reverses their roles and positions by contrasting them with animals in the description of the hippic utopia and ape-like, man-like Yahoos. Thus using various techniques and various levels of meaning, the writer shows mankind from different points of view. The book does not always give answers, but it helps to ask relevant questions about human beings of all places and times. In the course of time Swift's satire not only has not lost its value, but has acquired new significances.

Time will show if the widely read satire by George Orwell (the pen-name of Eric Blair), written in 1945 as a comment on contemporary life will also survive the evolutions and revolutions of literary criticism. The important assets of *Animal Farm*, its universal implications about some aspects of human nature as well as its technical achievements seem to promise that it may keep its place in the history of English literature.

In spite of the fact that *Animal Farm* is labelled by its subtitle as a fairy story it has a very close connection with reality as George Orwell saw it. On the surface the book is a story of farm animals which, inspired by the teachings of Old Major, a boar, revolt against cruelty, neglect and exploitation by the owner of the farm Mr Jones. The revolt takes place after a period of expounding Old Major's ideas by other pigs who, when their prophet dies, elaborate them into a system called Animalism. The animals expel Mr Jones, his wife and his tame raven Moses who used to preach on the rewards of afetrlife in Sugarcandy Mountain, the animal paradise. They take over the farm in order to run it collectively and since the pigs are regarded as the most intelligent of the animals, Napoleon, Snowball and Squealer become their leaders. They change the name of Manor Farm into Animal Farm and write the Seven Commandments of Animalism on a wall for everyone to see. The most important commandments state that all animals are equal and that they should have no dealings with human beings. Boxer the horse, Clover the mare, Muriel the goat, Benjamin the donkey, sheep, hens and other animals all work very hard in the fields while the pigs supervise them. Snowball organizes committees, conducts educational courses and plans the future development of the farm. Napoleon, in the meantime, „trains" some puppies for his own use, which is not clear at first. Squealer explains, interprets and justifies the state of things for the others to understand them properly.

Jones with the help of neighbouring farmers makes an unsuccessful attempt at recapturing the farm, but the humans are shamefully beaten in the Battle of the Cowshed while the animals suffer little loss since only one sheep is killed and Snowball wounded. The young vain mare Mollie, however, prefers to be with people and have comfort with little work even if it means lack of freedom, so she escapes from the farm.

The animals of the farm become divided on Snowball's project to build a wind-mill; some support it, others side with Napoleon who criticizes the plan. The dispute is ended by Napoleon's setting his secretely bred dogs, now ferocious beasts, at Snowball and forcing him to run for his life. Squealer proclaims him a traitor and a spy. After Snowball's disappearance Napoleon introduces new order on the farm: he does away with debates and most assemblies, the farm is to be controlled by a special committee of pigs, soon he announces that the wind-mill is to be built after all. The animals work very hard at it, but obtain little in return; they do not receive enough food. Napoleon decides to enter trade relationships with the neighbouring farms and thus the first contacts with people are established. Gradually other commandments are broken as well: the pigs move into the house and begin to sleep in beds. They never lack good food while other animals nearly starve and have to pretend to the outside world that they enjoy prosperity at the same time. When their wind-mill is destroyed by a storm, the disaster is blamed on Snowball's secret subversive activities. The animals are made to suspect that he is Jones's agent; four young dissenting pigs and three hens refusing to have their eggs sold outside the farm are forced to confess that they have acted under Snowball's influence and are slain by Napoleon's dogs immediately after the confession.

The song of the Rebellion „Beasts of England" comes to be replaced by songs praising the farm and eulogizing the leader. Napoleon, after having decided to engage in trade relationships with other farms, has various dealings with Mr Pilkington, Mr Frederick and other human beings. The farmers no longer fear the influence of Animal Farm on their own livestock and are willing to exchange goods with the animals. Mr Frederick, however, cheats Napoleon while buying timber from him. In the ensuing conflict he and his men destroy the wind--mill which has been painstakingly rebuilt by the animals after the storm. Fighting follows and the animals yet again win victory. The victory is celebrated for days and the pigs drink the whisky which has been found in the cellars of the farmhouse. The commandment

„No animal shall drink alcohol" has to be amended by the words „to excess".

There are other changes on the farm too: Napoleon becomes the first President of the farm now proclaimed to be a Republic, Moses returns to spread his old stories of Sugarcandy Mountain. Boxer, now old and tired, falls sick and is taken away by the knacker while Squealer persuades the animals that the horse will get excellent treatment at a hospital. Later he tells them that comrade Boxer has had a magnificent funeral.

In the course of years the farm seems to have become more prosperous but the animals work as hard as ever. Not so the pigs who enjoy luxury. They are now seen walking on their hind legs, wear clothes and Napoleon carries a whip in his trotter. Most of the Commandments of Animalism have disappeared from the wall and the one which has remained „All animals are equal" has been qualified by „But some animals are more equal than others". The pigs consider themselves the proprietors of the farm (which is Manor Farm again) and behave in exactly the same way as their human neighbours. This is clearly seen in the last scene of the book describing a party during which the pigs mingle with people and it becomes difficult to distinguish them from their guests.

Animal Farm is, in the words of a blurb on the cover of the book, „the history of a revolution that went wrong" and it is usually read as an attack on Stalin's leadership, on the bureaucratic and totalitarian corruptions of socialist ideals under his regime. And the book indeed refers to a concrete situation in a definite place and time; numerous topical allusions can be found in it. Stalin is represented by the dictatorial Napoleon, Snowball stands for Trotzky, the benevolent Old Major's teachings echo those of Lenin; Moses the raven represents the clergy, the fierce dogs are the police and sheep, hens and other animals typify ordinary citizens, workers. Capitalist owners are shown in the persons of the farmers such as Mr Jones, Mr Pilkington and Mr Frederick. Mr Frederick is the cruellest and the most aggressive exploiter of them all and in him Orwell depicts the Nazis.

The book suggests that a socialist system is by no means free from the dangers of limiting democracy by the totalitarian tendencies of tyrants in power, but it does not favour the capitalist system as some readers would have it. The last symbolic scene clearly equates corrupt leaders of the socialist society with capitalists. This message of the book is often missed by those critics who are only too eager to emphasize Orwell's hostility towards abuses of power in the Soviet Russia under Stalin's rule.

But *Animal Farm* has even more general ideas to offer. It can be read in many different ways and different layers of meanings can be found in it ranging from topical allusions to philosophical implications. As Tom Hopkinson says:

> It is manifestly an attack on Stalinism. It can be read as a lament for the fate of revolutions. It is also a profound and moving comment on the circumstances of man's life, forced to combine with others to get things done, but compromising with truth and honesty in every combination that he makes[7].

The opinions and attitudes expressed in *Animal Farm* have their roots in historical developments as well as in George Orwell's own experience and his interpretation of the events he witnessed. His bitter days at schools where he was usually in a position inferior to that of boys of wealthier families, his five years (1922—1927) of service in the Burmese police (described in *Burmese Days*, 1934) made him resent the injustice of the existing social hierarchy, imperial rule and authority. It is not surprising that he leaned towards democratic socialism, but his personal bitter experience during the Spanish Civil War in which he took an active part, as well as his critical stand on Stalinist politics prevented him from wholly identifying with any existing organization or institution. As G. S. Fraser says, Orwell „distrused doctrinaires of every kind; he distrusted all evasion of plain fact and straight feeling"[8]. He remains a socialist at heart, but one that would not subscribe to doctrines, labels, categorizations, systems and organizations. His socialism „insists on the possibilities of man's goodness. His socialist project is not the world of 1984, as many critics antipathetic to socialism have claimed. Orwell's Utopia, tinged by its author's optimism, is too permissive to seem possible, too idyllic to make sense in an industrial society. 1984 for Orwell does not represent the socialistic future, but what will appear if world socialism does not triumph"[9].

A careful reading of the two best known books by Orwell, *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) reveals his underlying conviction of the need for true socialism. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was written in a gloomy period of Orwell's life, after his wife's death when he himself was seriously ill and soon to die. The antiutopian

---

[7] T. Hopkinson, *George Orwell*, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1965, p. 29—30.

[8] G. S. Fraser, *The Modern Writer and His World*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1964, p. 157.

[9] F. R. Karl, *A Reader's Guide to the Contemporary English Novel*, The Noonday Press, New York 1962, p. 164.

vision of the pseudo-socialist state of the future strikes the reader as extremely pessimistic and despairing in tone. In the book England becomes Airstrip One, a part of Oceania controlled by the Inner Party representing the totalitarian state. Its hypocritical, devious, and cruel methods of governing aim at the complete submission of individuals to the state, at making them accept injustice, poverty and moral annihilation as the utmost good.

Animal Farm is far more cheerful in tone and many critics find its cheerfulness a rather unusual characteristic in Orwell's writings. Fraser, for example, says that „the book remains extraordinarily charming and readable and it makes a surprisingly gay reading"[10]. G. S. Fraser believes that, after its topical reference is forgotten, it might survive, as a children's story, a lively beast fable. Also Tom Hopkinson sees in *Animal Farm* „a delightful children's story" and he wonders:

> How was Orwell, a somewhat irritable man whose writings tended to overemphasize the gloomy aspect of every subject and experience he treated, able in this one book to achieve such admirable good humour and detachment which at once raises his satire on to a higher plane?[11]

Tom Hopkinson suggests that Orwell's fondness of animals had something to do with it, but an even more relevant motivation will be found in the well established tradition which requires that beast fables should convery their moral teachings through often amusing stories told in a conventionally light tone. One should not be deceived, however, by the surface gaiety of *Animal Farm*, underneath which there are allusions to problems which are far from light, to ills and dangers; the theme of the book is no laughing matter.

The choice of the form of the beast fable makes *Animal Farm*, almost automatically, an allegory since the beast fable is, by definition, „a story exemplifying a moral thesis, in which animals talk and act like human beings"[12], and most frequently it is also a satire since presenting human problems through animal behaviour dehumanizes people, usually belittles them, and thus ridicules or debases them. It is not very often that beast fables engage both men and animals in the same story, but when they do, interesting effects are achieved through comparisons, contrasts and similarities. Jonathan Swift used the device to the advantage of his satire when he wrote about the

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

[11] Hopkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

[12] M. H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, Reinhart and Company, Inc., New York 1957, p. 2.

Yahoos and intelligent horses in *Gulliver's Travels*. The device adds significance also to Orwell's *Animal Farm*.

Readers familiar with literary conventions and folk traditions usually have certain sets of associations connec ed with particular animals. One tends, for example, to ascribe to an eagle qualities of pride, power, independence, nobility, etc. while a goose would be considered silly as a rule, a fox — cunning, and a donkey-stubborn. Farm animals cannot usually boast of the air of noble dignity that a lion or an eagle may be believed to possess. At best, they are associated with what is homely, familiar, practical, with common sense, simplicity and hard work. And it is appropriate that Orwell should have chosen farm animals as the central „characters" in his fable since they are to represent a mass society of average common people.

The choice of the farm also suggests an organization of the community in which different functions are allotted and different positions are held. It seems a most suitable and lucky choice for embodying the theme of the book: such a choice allows him to avoid the artificiality and arbitrariness which flawed, for example, Defoe's *The Consolidator*.

The beginning of *Animal Farm* could very well open a typically realistic novel:

> Mr Jones, of the Manor Farm, had locked the hen-houses for the night, but was too drunk to remember to shut the pop-holes. With the ring of light from his lantern dancing from side to side, he lurched across the yard, kicking off his boots at the back door, drew himself a last glass of beer from the barrel in the scullery and made his way up to bed, where Mrs Jones was already snoring[13]. [p. 5]

But in the very next paragraph there is an abrupt departure from realism and the reader is informed that „the prize Middle White boar, had had a strange dream on the previous night and wished to communicate it to the other animals" [p. 5].

Orwell does not bother to find a way to make the story seemingly more probable since an attempt to do so would be rather futile. He does not invent any imaginary island or a country on another planet and a device to get there, neither does he remove the story in time. It is here and now in Orwell's contemporary England that the strange events take place and the book takes the fact for granted, without a word of explanation. The method seems to be very effective as it

[13] All quotations from *Animal Farm* are from the edition: G. Orwell, *Animal Farm, a Fairy Story*, Penguin Books in association with Secker and Warburg, Harmondsworth 1960. Page numbers are given at the end of each quotation.

response might make on the other farm animals. The pigs may have led others to believe in their intellectual superiority. The pigs, the dogs and the raven use their intelligence for morally discreditable purposes and the word „clever" comes to have rather disparaging connotations; the other animals, seen as naive, easily beguiled and helpless creatures, are morally superior to the clever ones. Thus stupidity and intelligence acquire ironic, ambiguous meanings, which enriches the satiric method of the book.

Benjamin the donkey, who „could read and write as well as any pig, but never exercised his faculty" [p. 30] seems to have as much intelligence as the pigs have (or even more), but he is not included among the clever ones. He never takes sides with factions and causes and says that no matter what the choice might have been „life would go on as it had always gone on, that is, badly" [p. 46]. He is, appropriately, introduced as the worst tempered animal on the farm. „He seldom talked, and when he did, it was usually to make some cynical remark" [p. 6]. There is a great resemblance between Benjamin (whose name suggests a favourite son) and Orwell himself who was generally suspicious of factions, causes and political shibboleths and who was a malcontent outsider. Orwell endows Benjamin with his own sympathy for the downtrodden, the oppressed innocents; the donkey „without openly admitting it, [...] was devoted to Boxer" [p. 7]. And it is one of the most moving scenes in the book when the usually taciturn Benjamin loses his stoic patience and shouts at the animals: „Fools! Do you not see..." [p. 103] when he perceives that his friend is being taken away in a horse knacker's van. Under the surface of cynicism and irritability there is his capability of love and his appreciation of goodness as well as the dormant potential to act against injustice. As a rule, however, Benjamin prefers to remain uninvolved, believing that any effort to change the bad world would be futile. He certainly does not believe that the hardworking, patient and passive animals will be able to change anything. His scepticism reflects that of Orwell who, fond as he was of working people, doubted their ability to control their fates. Orwell made a conscious choice to live in utter poverty while in Paris, he paid homage to the working man (e.g. in *The Road to Wigan Pier*, 1937), but he seemed unable to make real contact with workers and to truly understand them; his portraits of the common man are often unfavourable and show him as lacking intelligence and initiative. Richard Rees finds an unfavourable depiction of the working class both in *Animal Farm* and in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. He says:

What is pathetic and, one hopes, less realistic in both *Animal Farm* and *1984* is the helpless, inert and almost imbecile role which he attributes to the common man[14].

The „common animals" of Animal Farm let the pigs rule over them, obey their orders, accept their lies and passively, sheepishly watch. They seem to be unable, until almost the very end, to draw appropriate conclusions from separate occurrences which form evidence of the pigs' corruption. The very last scene of the book contains a suggestion of the possibility that truth is beginning to dawn upon the animals when they silently look „from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again" and find no difference between them. One cannot be sure that they will go on being submissive and passive after what they see.

The ambivalent and ambiguous presentaion of the animals: the clever leaders and their not-so-clever followers (later — subjects) can be discussed both as a satiric means producing irony and as an allegorical device conveying Orwell's judgement on the working class, the masses, the rulers, the oppressors and also, to a degree, on himself, an intellectual outsider apparently non-committed, but well aware where moral value is to be found.

The irony is heightened by the purposefully „objective" way of reporting events from the point of view of the masses rather than of the narrator or of the pigs. The narrator does not as a rule make comments, he merely reports, in a simple direct language, what the animals observe, presents facts as they might be seen by a not wholly intelligent viewer, without an attempt at interpretation; he lets the facts speak for themselves. The interpreting is left to the reader Orwell's presence is seldom felt in the book. He shuns directly voicing opinions, but his silence is most expressive since, as Wayne Booth points out:

By the kind of silence he maintains, by the manner in which he leaves his characters to work out their own destinies or tell their own stories, the author can achieve effects which would be difficult or impossible if he allowed himself or a reliable spokesman to speak directly and authoritatively to us[15].

The scene which takes place after the animals milk the cows for the first time can serve as an example of the method:

---

[14] R. Rees, *George Orwell, Fugitive from the Camp of Victory*, Secker and Warburg, London 1961, p. 88.

[15] W. C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 1961, p. 273.

'What is going to happen to all that milk?' said someone. [...] 'Never mind the milk, comrades!' cried Napoleon, placing himself in front of the buckets. 'That will be attended to. The harvest is more important. Comrade Snowball will lead the way. I shall follow you in a few minutes. Forward, comrades! The hay is waiting'. So the animals trooped down to the hayfield to begin the harvest, and when they came back in the evening it was noticed that the milk had disappeared. [p. 24]

Although the author abstains from commenting on the disappearance of the milk and the reader is not informed what conclusions, if any, are drawn by the animals from the incident, it is made obvious that Napoleon has to be blamed for it. The reader is invited to draw this conclusion from the evidence of the facts. Very often there is a discrepancy between the view taken of things by th reader and the understanding of them by the ignorant animals. The ensuing irony serves to enrich the significance of the book no matter whether one reads it as a satire or regards it an allegory.

Although the pigs are seen from the outside only, they get a great deal of attention both from the narrator and the other animals. They are, in fact, the principal characters of the book. They are the only „characters" in which a certain process of change can be observed. The change can be seen as a process of the corruption of initially good intentions, or as a gradual revealing of already existing flaws inseparable from their cleverness. That the latter is more probable and that the pigs' characters contain the seeds of what later comes into full bloom is suggested by the introductory description of the three most important pigs:

Pre-eminent among the pigs were young boars named Snowball and Napoleon, whom Mr Jones was breeding up for sale. Napoleon was a large, rather fierce looking Berkshire boar, the only Berkshire on the farm, not much of a talker, but with a reputation for getting his own way. Snowball was a more vivacious pig than Napoleon, quicker in speech and more inventive, but was not considered to have the same depth of character. All the other pigs on the farm were porkers. The best known among them was a small fat pig named Squealer, with very round cheeks, twinkling eyes, nimble movements, and a shrill voice. He was a brilliant talker, and when he was arguing some difficult point he had a way of skipping from side to side and whisking his tail which was somehow very persuasive. The others said of Squealer that he could turn black into white. [p. 20]

At first they venture only sly and relatively trivial attempts to get a little more (of milk, for example) than others, but gradually they commit more and more brazen acts. Driven by greed for power they resort to the use of terror and to shamelessly hypocritical propaganda until they get all the privileges and the other animals all toil, hardship, hunger and suffering. They come to the point where they can do

anything they please. The process of change is very rapid for the first breach of a commandment of Animalism by the pigs occurs on the very next day after the Commandments are written of the wall. From the very beginning the pigs consider themselves above the duty to work: „the pigs did not actually work, but directed and supervised the others. With their superior knowledge it was natural that they should assume the leadership" [p. 25]. Being clever they believe themselves entitled to have power over others, and having power means to them using it for their own selfish purposes. The book leads one to the conclusion that a benevolent power, just and altruistic, wielded for the sake of those ruled, is impossible or, at best, very difficult to achieve. It is this notion which points to the real source of Orwell's pessimism: his lack of belief in man's ability to overcome his own permanent deficiencies, in view of which the writer's distrust in particular political systems (which may prove temporary) becomes of only secondary importance.

The process of change which the pigs undergo depends on the intensification of their dominant distinctive features to the point where the features generate new qualities which make the pigs nearly identical with people.

The other animals remain unchanged in every respect throughout the story. Once presented, as all of them are when they come to a secret meeting at the beginning of the book, they stay true to their descriptions, never act in a way that cannot be predicted and add but little to their initially drawn portraits. They are flat characters also because their „personalities" are limited to one or two basic features only and can indeed be summed up in few words. The basic feature of Benjamin, for example, is his cynicism combined with his respect for goodness. Boxer is, above all, a thoroughly honest, simple and hardworking horse. Clover is described as „a stout motherly mare approaching middle life" [p. 6]. There is also Mollie, „the foolish, pretty white mare who drew Mr Jones's trap" [p. 7] and who loved sugar, ribbons and attention paid to her. There is Moses, Mr Jones's special pet who is a „clever talker" claiming to know of the existence of a mysterious country called Sugarcandy Mountain. The numerous unnamed animals such as sheep, ducks, hens, pigeons and the dogs trained by the pigs to be not only watchful, but also bloodthirsty, appear in packs, flocks and herds without being individualized at all. But even the ones that gain some individuality have to be considered as representations of types of human attitudes reduced to their essence. As S. J. Greenblatt reminds us:

The characters of a satirical animal story may be sly, vicious, cynical, pathetic, lovable, or intelligent, but they can only be seen as members of large social groups and not individuals[16].

Animal characters as representing essential features of some social groups must be what they are: generalized types with constant features. In accordance with this principle the characters of *Animal Farm* never really surprise the reader with what they do: their behaviour is a logical outcome of the motivating characteristics they are endowed with at the beginning of the story. One is not surprised to find that the raven Moses returns to the farm when the pigs adopt the ways of man and the situation no longer differs much from that of Jones's times.

In the middle of the summer Moses the raven suddenly reappeared on the farm, after an absence of several years. He was quite unchanged, still did no work, and talked in the same strain as ever about Sugarcandy Mountain. [p. 99]

Neither is the reader surprised to learn that the wanton, vain pretty Mollie, who loves a comfortable life, avoids hard work:

She was late for work every morning and excused herself by saying that she had overslept, and she complained of mysterious pains, although her appetite was excellent. On every kind of pretext she would run away from work and go to the drinking pool, where she would stand foolishly gazing at her own reflection in the water. [p. 41]

And it is in keeping with her inclinations that she lets the people of Mr Pilkington's farm persuade her to escape to them: her desire to eat sugar, to wear ribbons and draw an elegant trap overweighs all other considerations.

Clover „the motherly mare" is also unaltered by the course of time: she remains a thoroughly good creature, protective and helpful to others in all circumstances. Boxer works hard and with much devotion to the cause until the very end of his life. Benjamin never changes his cynical views, and neither does he change his faithful friendship for Boxer; the only unusual moment in his behaviour, the violent outburst of indignation at the sight of Boxer being taken away to a „hospital", only serves to confirm the depth of his attachment. After years of life on the farm „old Benjamin was much the same as ever, except for being a little greyer about the muzzle, and since Boxer's death, more morose and taciturn than ever" [p. 108].

---

[16] S. J. Greenblatt, *Three Modern Satirists: Waugh, Orwell, and Huxley*, Yale University Press 1965, p. 62.

To say that the pigs change does not mean that they are complex characters. As was pointed out earlier the change is that of degree rather than of quality. And the very change is their basic feature: the measure of corruption they undergo becomes the most salient aspect of the pigs' characters.

Such strictly controlled and selective character drawing is in consonance with the requirements of satirical writing. In the words of James Sutherland, it, indeed, „may be argued that the satirist is unable to create complete characters who respond freely to events and circumstances, because he is too much committed to his own satirical interpretation. [...] The satirist almost invariably tends to simplify, and what he gains in clearness and emphasis he is apt to lose in complexity"[17].

The limitations imposed on character drawing by satirical purposes are of the same nature as those necessitated by allegorical writing: hence there is no conflict, in this respect, between Orwell the satirist and Orwell the allegorist. There are, however, certain divergences in the methods of presenting the animal characters. Time and again we have seen that the writer uses a number of different technique to set the group of pigs apart from the other animals: the pigs are contrasted with the others by the change in their behaviour, by the fact that they are watched while the rest of the animals are the watchers, by the ironies of the discrepancy between the view of things taken by the pigs, the other animals, the narrator and the reader. The contrasts involve different attitudes which the reader is made to adopt. The „other" animals may be ignorant and pathetic, but they are not always seen in unfavourable light, they seldom strike one as contemptibly ridiculous. The author often seems to have a genuine sympathy for them and this fact means there is an absence of the satiric tone from some passages of the book. One such passage presents the animals immediately after the successful rebellion when, elated and filled with a sense of achievement, they survey the farmland which is to be theirs from now on:

But they woke at dawn as usual, and suddenly remembered the glorious thing that had happened, they all raced out into the pasture together. A little way down the pasture there was a knoll that commanded a view of most of the farm. The animals rushed to the top of it and gazed round them in the clear morning light. Yes, it was theirs — everything that they could see was theirs! In the ecstasy of that thought they gambolled round and round, they hurled themselves into the air

---

[17] J. Sutherland, *English Satire*, Cambridge University Press 1962, p. 119—120.

in great leaps of excitement. They rolled in the dew, they cropped mouthfuls of sweet summer grass, they kicked up clods of the black earth and snuffed its rich scent. Then they made a tour of inspection of the whole farm and surveyed with speechless admiration the ploughland, the hayfield, the orchard, the pool, the spinney. It was as though they had never seen these things before, and even now they could hardly believe that it was all their own. [p. 20]

If irony is to be associated with the passage, it is contained in the fact that the „glorious thing" will soon turn out to be not so very glorious, but the animals are unaware of the later developments of the situation. Taken out of the context of future events the scene would have no trace of irony in it at all.

It is even less likely that one should find satirical-ironic tones in the moving scene of Boxer's physical breakdown:

Late one evening in the summer, a sudden rumour ran round the farm that something had happened to Boxer. He had gone out alone to drag a load of stone down to the windmill. [...]
About half the animals on the farm rushed out to the knoll where the windmill stood. There lay Boxer, between the shafts of a cart, his neck stretched out, unable even to raise his head. His eyes were glazed, his sides matted with sweat. A thin stream of blood had trickled out of his mouth. Clover dropped at her knees at his side. [...]
'We must get help at once' said Clover. 'Run, somebody, and tell Squealer what has happened'.
All the other animals immediately raced back to the farmhouse to give Squealer the news. Only Clover remained, and Benjamin, who lay down at Boxer's side, and, without speaking, kept the flies off him with his long tail. [p. 101—102]

Although the satiric intent disappears through the direct appeal to the reader, the double meaning of the allegory persists since the scene may be transferred onto a human society and analogous situations in a perverted social system can be easily imagined. It is at places such as this that the beast fable sustains its allegorical character without necessarily being satirical. The satire of *Animal Farm* is, then, mainly directed against the oppressors, the exploiters of the „common animal" and the corruptions of the system they advocate. The difference in the attitudes of the writer to different animals can be found even in his use of telling names: on the one hand there are „Boxer", „Clover" and „Benjamin" for example, which do not evoke unfavourable associations; on the other there is, for instance, „Napoleon" which, with its suggestions of military authoritative leadership becomes ridiculous when given to a pig; „Squealer" associates itself with an unpleasant shrill voice and is most appropriate for the hypocritical propagandist.

Alongside the scenes in which satire is subdued there are passages in *Animal Farm* wholly dominated by the satiric intent, which limits the description in those passages to one dimension and diminishes allegorical significances. The mock-heroic description of the Battle of the Cowshed provides an example:

This had long been expected, and all preparations had been made. Snowball, who had studied an old book of Julius Caesar's campaigns which he had found in the farmhouse, was in charge of the defensive operations. He gave his orders quickly and in a couple of minutes every animal was at his post. As the human beings approached the farm buildings, Snowball launched his first attacks. All the pigeons, to the number of thirty-five, flew to and fro over the men's heads and muted upon them from midair; and while the men were dealing with his, the geese, who had been hiding behind the hedge, rushed out and pecked viciously at the calves of their legs. However, this was only a light skirmishing manoeuvre, intended to create a little disorder, and the men easily drove the geese off with their sticks. Snowball now launched his second line of attack. [p. 37]

The battle and the description of it go on for some time. The very length of the scene proves that the writer has been carried away by his story and its comic aspect. The narrative of the battle contains numerous details which have no bearing on the allegorical meaning of the book. (How could one interpret allegorically, for example, the pigeons muting upon the men's heads?). The battle scene has its „hidden" meaning only as a whole. Its allegorical point could be easily made by merely stating the fact that the animals won a victory. Because Orwell prefers to develop the incident into a lengthy narrative whose details cannot be related to either real or imaginary events in the human world, the emphasis of this relatively elaborate account is shifted from the allegorical meaning onto the satirical attitude.

There are some other instances in the book where the desire to make things comic or contemptible overweighs the allegorical purpose and „one level" narrative replaces the usual method. Such an instant occurs when the animals arrange a solemn funeral for the hams found in the house of Mr. Jones after his expulsion; the reader's attention is focused on the absurdity of the scene and not on its metaphoric meaning. Similarly, one does not search for hidden messages in the scene when Squealer writes inexpertly the Seven Commandments on the wall and one learns that

It was very neatly written, and except that 'friend' war written 'freind' and one of the 'S's was the wrong way round, the spelling was correct all the way through. [p. 23]

Comic scenes and descriptions which in themselves add only indirectly, if at all, to the allegorical significance of the book enrich its satirical aspect by building up an atmosphere in which the element of the ridiculous is made outstanding.

The incidents of the lack of overlap between satiric and allegorical purposes do not occur very often in *Animal Farm* and because they are relatively rare they demonstrate how easily satire and allegory can merge into each other. The occasional deviations from the union throw light on the nature of the differences between satire and allegory. Nowhere is the union seen more clearly than in the presentation of the atrocities committed by the pigs or caused indirectly by them. Starvation, hard work, terror, confessions of imaginary sins, self criticism, political purges, the cult of personality, propaganda which changes the interpretation of things in an arbitrary manner, unsuccessful enterprises, mismanagement and the failure to improve conditions of life blamed on often imaginary enemies are all presented in a way that is meant to amuse, but at the same time the reader is made only too well aware of the intention to suggest analogies between the farm and the Stalinist regime, which lead to conclusions about man and society in general.

The course of events escalates the misery of the oppressed and the abuse of power by the oppressors until the once homely pigs assume a terrifying aspect. The incidents pass through a complete circle and bring the situation of the farm animals to what it more or less was at the beginning of the book with the difference that Mr Jones has been replaced by the pigs headed by Napoleon. This course of events suggests that it is a vicious circle from which it is not easy to get out; oppression causes revolutions, but new leaders are soon corrupted by the power they have and become new oppressors.

The movement of events is very rapid, the full revolution of the circle takes place in only 120 pages (Penguin edition); incidents of several years crowd on one another and give the impression of a breathless pace. This impression is due also to the fact that, like character drawing, the plot of *Animal Farm* has been submitted to the strict selection of what is relevant to the theme and purpose of the book. Selective characterization and narration prevent *Animal Farm* from becoming verbose and diffuse. The concentration of a number of important events in a relatively short span of narrative is to the advantage of Orwell's satire, since duration collides with the essence of the appeal of a satirical work which depends on the intellectual grasping of the point made by the work. Once the idea has

been grasped there seems little point in elaborating it. What there is told of the history of *Animal Farm* in the book has a well grounded justification also in the fact that Orwell's satire indirectly needs to depict not only concepts but a process as well.

The selection of events serves the allegorical and satiric purposes simultaneously and only occasionally is the balance between them disturbed and emphasis comes to rest more heavily on one of them, without obscuring the other, however.

The allegorical significance of *Animal Farm* is greatly enriched by the variety of satirical devices used skilfully by the writer. The pivotal satirical technique of *Animal Farm* depends on the reversal involving contrasts and similarities between the community of animals and the world human beings. What begins as the difference between animals and people evolves into the contrast between the pigs identified with people, and most other farm animals. At the end of the story the farm animals are seen to be far more „human" creatures than people who resemble pigs. An additional dimension is added to the technique by the fact that it has certain affinities with that used by Swift when he reversed he roles of animals and people in the presentation of the intelligent horses and Yahoos.

Together with the central technique of inversion Orwell employs a whole range of other satirical means. He is not above using invective, which, cannot be considered a sophisticated method. It may, nevertheless, be quite effective when accompanied by other satirical devices and especially if, as in *Animal Farm,* it resorts to rather indirect „name calling". Such indirect invective is contained in presenting tyrannous, corrupt pseudorevolutionary leaders under the guise of pigs. The insult suggested by the comparison has no logical justification and it works on a purely emotional level, but, through the impact on the reader's attitudes, it may also influence the rational implications of the allegory. The juxtaposition of animal associations with human problems does not always produce insults, but it often leads to ironical conclusions about man. Both the invective and the mere juxtaposition may be used solely for the purpose of shaping readers' attitudes without implying the purpose and significance of presenting the object thus ridiculed and, in themselves, they cannot be regarded as allegorical methods. If they add to the allegory of a work it is only in an indirect way.

There can be no doubt about the use of the device of *reductio ad absurdum* for the purposes of allegory. The method has both emotional and intellectual appeal: it creates a situation which invites the reader to examine its levels of meaning. Orwell employs it for example

when he shows victims of excessive self-criticism and of public confession:

The three hens who had been the ringleaders in the attempted rebellion over the eggs now came forward and stated that Snowball had appeared to them in a dream and incited them to disobey Napoleon's orders. They, too were slaughtered. Then a goose came forward and confessed to having secreted six ears of corn during the last year's harvest and eaten them in the night. Then a sheep confessed to having urinated in the drinking pool — urged to do this, so she said, by Snowball — and two other sheep confessed to having murdered an old ram, an especially devoted follower of Napoleon [...]. [p. 73]

When Orwell makes the pigs write the absurd commandment: „All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others", the paradoxical statement serves to reflect the pigs' aim of hiding the truth of their betrayal of the ideals of Animalism, and of pretending they are still faithful to them. Unwilling to change the appearance of the language of the commandment, they create a language of appearances.

Paradox, *reductio ad absurdum* and exaggeration are at work in the frequently mentioned last scene of the party during which pigs look like people and people like pigs, neither of the comparisons being flattering. The scene, which is the crowning satirical effect of the book, sums up, in a symbolic way, the ideological tenets of the writer.

The exaggeration and distortion of satirical portraits in *Animal Farm* are often accompanied by understatement, which, contradictory as it may sound, serves to make the features under scrutiny even more emphatically distinct. When, for example, the writer says that while other animals starved and their rations were repeatedly reduced, „the pigs seemed comfortable enough, and in fact were putting on weight if anything". [p. 97], the reader is quite certain, knowing the context of the situation, that they enjoyed very good food and were indeed most comfortable at the cost of other animal's misery. Orwell thus skilfully suggests, by avoiding direct statement and withholding some information, that the pigs wish to hide the truth, and at the same time other facts and hints he gives, clearly point to where the truth is to be found. The effect of the device may be very forceful as in the ending of chapter nine in which the old overworked horse Boxer is treacherously sold to a knacker. Orwell does not say that the pigs received money from the knacker, but it becomes evident that this was the case from the following passage:

That night there was the sound of uproarious singing, which was followed by what sounded like a violent quarrel and ended at about eleven o'clock with a tremendous

crash of glass. No one stirred in the farmhouse before noon on the following day, and the word went round that from somewhere or other the pigs had acquired the money to buy themselves another case of whisky. [p. 107]

The writer often simplifies his story by reducing it to bare facts and telling details which add irony to a situation reported, as in the brief account of the first appearance of Napoleon's fierce dogs that kept close to him and „it was noticed that they wagged their tails to him in the same way as the other dogs had been used to do to Mr Jones" [p. 48].

The effect of irony contained in the attitudes of the narrator and the characters is often heightened by various other devices such as the pretence that the author takes things very seriously, while the reader is well aware that he speaks with his tongue in his cheek (as he does for instance in the already quoted mock heroic description of the Cowshed Battle). Irony can be detected in the very fact of telling a fantastic story as if it were happening in the real world of the reader. Irony in *Animal Farm* often merges into verbal parody, especially when Orwell concentrates on the abuses of the language for political purposes. Orwell's conviction, expressed in an essay, that political language „is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind"[18], finds its reflection in *Animal Farm* in the changes introduced into the Commandments, in the speeches by Squealer, in the slogans repeated by pigeons and by sheep, and in poems written to eulogize Napoleon. When the animals are encouraged to praise Napoleon („Under the guidance of our Leader, Comrade Napoleon, I have laid five eggs in six days", a hen would say, or „Thanks to the leadership of Comrade Napoleon, how excellent this water tastes!" [p. 80] a cow might remark), their praises parody the expressions of the personality cult. So does the poem, which begins as follows:

> Friend of the fatherless!
> Fountain of happiness!
> Lord of the swill-bucket! Oh, how my soul is on
> Fire when I gaze at thy
> Calm and commanding eye,
> Like the sun in the sky,
> Comrade Napoleon!

---

[18] G. Orwell, „Politics and the English Language", [in:] J. L. Bradley, M. Stevens, ed., *Masterworks of English Prose; A Critical Reader*, Holt, Reinehart and Winston Inc., New York 1968, p. 482.

The satirical techniques used by Orwell add to the impression of lightness of tone: his detached „objective" irony and understatement make *Animal Farm* much mellower in tone than *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, but the author's reserve and reticence often build up a curious atmosphere of menace. Hints, allusions, indirect methods of presenting the pigs create a sense of near danger cunningly, secretly and gradually brought about by the pigs.

In spite of its numerous comic effects, there is too much injustice, greed, hypocrisy, and exploitation in the surface story itself, for the book to be considered hilarious. The implications of the surface story make one even less inclined to chuckle over its pages.

The essential seriousness of purpose in satirical writing has been streesed by critics of different schools, by the Russian theoretician Makaryan, for example, who says that a great satirist fights to defend his ideals[19], and by an English critic John W. Tilton, who reminds us that „Satire, of course, has always been concerned with the discrepancy between the real and the ideal, between reality and illusion"[20]. Tilton distinguishes a category in contemporary fiction which he labels „cosmic satire", the concern of which is man's plight resulting from his situation in the universe. Modern satiric fiction seems to blame the situation of man on the universe rather than on his inability to cope with it. When one gets to the very heart of the satire of *Animal Farm* one finds, by penetrating the level of the beast fable criticism, the criticism of a particular leadership of a real society and the level at which the fate of revolutions is shown, that the writer points to the typical deficiencies of man which prevent him from creating the kind of perfect society that Orwell the socialist had a vision of. The discrepancy between the ideal vision and the reality as he interpreted it accounts for Orwell's often bitter indictments of man. *Animal Farm* has much in common with those satires which deal with the fate of man who acts under the illusions of greatness, nobility and decency, and who is constantly defeated by his stupidity, pettiness and vileness.

The attitude to man of the modern satirist is often ambivalent: critical and yet also understanding and sympathetic when the target of satire is found in the universe at large. Modern „cosmic" satire often tends to assume tragi-comic aspects and it acquires a far greater complexity of meaning and method than that of the satirical writing

---

[19] Cf. A. Makaryan, *O Satirie*, Sovietsky Pisatyel, Moscow 1967, p. 19.

[20] Cf. J. W. Tilton, *Cosmic Satire in the Contemporary Novel*, Associated University Press, London 1977, p. 18—19.

of the past. It has also more relevance to the existential problems of the reader himself.

Satire seems to have attained an important position in modern literature and Kingsley Amis has very good reasons to maintain that we are in for a new age of satire. One possible explanation of this fact is that satire suits the generally critical and often negative attitudes characteristic if the twentieth century ethos.

Great modern satire gains profundity and complexity by concentrating on significances of an allegorical nature. At the same time using a variety of techniques and tones adds interest, value as well as meaning to allegory. Although, as we can see in *Animal Farm*, certainly not all allegory is satire and not all satire is allegory, the degree of overlap is very great indeed and some satirical works can easily be allegorical in all their elements. In *Animal Farm* allegory tends to be somewhat obliterated only in those few passages in which Orwell displays sheerly satiric techniques, elaborates comic effects or works on building up an attitude. This fact points to the very nature of the difference between satire and allegory: the former depends very much on a particular kind of tone and attitude, while what matters most in the latter is the method of „double speaking". This double speaking about double meanings comes to be the dominant concern of the author in a number of places in *Animal Farm*. The method of allegory and the attitude of satire never contradict each other as attitude is inseparable from any literary expression, and on the other hand the double level method of expression helps to create satire. Both the method and the attitude are present in both satire and allgory with the difference that they will emphasize one or the other concern.

How close satire is to allegory may be seen in the fact that questions and doubts about the nature of satire are often similar to those raised about allegorical writing. Patrica Meyer Spacks draws our attention to the fact that it is possible to doubt (as is the case with allegory) that satire is a genre and to regard it as „a literary procedure, not a kind of writing, but a way of writing". She also points out a characteristic which is often found in allegory, too, namely that satire's „purposes are to some extent extraliterary"[21].

The fact that the method of writing is considered by some critics to be the distinctive feature of satire is another proof of its close affinity with allegory. The affinity is no less close also when the attitude

[21] P. M. Spacks, „Some Reflections on Satire", [in:] R. Paulson, ed., *Satire; Modern Essays in Criticism*, Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1971, p. 326.

is taken (as is done in the present book) to be the basic quality of satire.

Together with the close relationships there exist also divergences between allegory and satire and these divergences account for distinguishing satiric allegories from allegorical satires. The union with satire is most advantageous for certain kinds of allegory if only because there are no disadvantages. Limitations imposed by satire on character drawing and the plot structure do not impair allegory because they are of the same nature as those characteristic of allegory. Satirical techniques as we have seen in the analysis of *Animal Farm* can be used to convey persuasively an indirect negative statement, to debunk a falsehood, to criticize people and phenomena; an allegory which has such purposes often enters relations with satire. Since satire favours brief presentations of characters and kaleidoscopic changes of scene, satiric allegories tend to be written when writers wish to make critical comments on groups of people, on society. Hence there exists a wealth of satiric allegories dealing with social and political phenomena, more often than not with topical reference which does not preclude, however, implications concerning man in general. *Animal Farm* is a typical example in this respect.

Animal Farm does not offer a remedy for the ills it attacks, it does not go beyond pointing to their sources, mechanisms and effects. Saying this is not a criticism. In fact most great literature shows and interprets the world without instructing the reader about what he should do to improve things. If one were to criticize a satirical allegory on the grounds of its negative moral attitude, the criticism would be justified only when assumptions about generally accepted values (such as goodness, honesty, peace, friendship etc.) are attacked or questioned. *Animal Farm* does not do this.

One of the reasons why the book by Orwell is so widely read today is that both allegory and satire enjoy a renewed popularity in modern literature. This fact provides another explanation of why the union of allegory with satire is so fruitful and so successful. Because the two have so much in common their union is very natural and almost complete. To modern allegory, which chooses to assume the forms of other literary genres as its clothing, satire is a kind of dress that is very becoming, very fashionable, and fits like a glove.

Chapter V

ALLEGORY, ALLEGORESIS AND THE FAIRY STORY; J. R. R. TOLKIEN'S *THE LORD OF THE RINGS*

In the subtitle given to *Animal Farm* George Orwell called his book a fairy story, but it is most unlikely that J. R. R. Tolkien, himself an author of fairy stories, would have approved of such a use of the term. He wrote in his essay „On Fairy Stories":

> There is another type of marvellous tale that I would exclude from the title „fairy story", again certainly not because I do not like it: namely pure 'Beast-fable'. [...] The beast fable has, of course a connection with fairy stories. [...] But in stories in which no human being is concerned; or in which the animals are the heroes and heroines, and men and women, if they appear, are mere adjuncts, and above all those in which the animal from is only a mask upon a human face, a device of the satirist or the preacher, in these we have beast-fable and not fairy story[1].

The different applications of the term 'fairy story' by Orwell and by Tolkien provide yet one more example of the lack of agreement about literary classifications. Descriptions and definitions of fairy stories range from those which include nearly all fantasy to ones which, like Tolkien's, specify strict and relatively narrow boundaries for the genre, and which sometimes go as far as to embrace only stories about fairies.

Most dictionaries of literary terms distinguish the fairy story from the fable (the beast fable included) often emphasizing, as is done in *Słownik terminów literackich*[2] by S. Sierotwiński, the dominance of the wonderful and the fantastic in it. Tolkien insists that, in spite of its fantastic character, the presence of a human hero is a necessary

---

[1] J. R. R. Tolkien, „On Fairy Stories", [in:] *Tree and Leaf*, Unwin Books, London 1972, p. 20.

[2] Cf. S. Sierotwiński, *Słownik terminów literackich*, Wrocław 1970, p. 48.

element in a fairy story and, in this respect, his opinion is almost identical with that expressed by W. H. Auden, who believed that:

A fairy story, as distinct from a merry tale, or an animal story, is a serious tale with a human hero and a happy ending[3].

Both Auden and Tolkien would probably accept the view held by John Buchan who maintains that:

The true hero in all the folk tales and fairy tales is not the younger son or the younger daughter, or the stolen princess, or the ugly duckling, but the soul of man[4].

Tolkien would have, however, some reservations about the field of reference of fairy tales: to him, they tell not only „the truth of the heart", but also the truth of the universe expressed through stories of e.g. the ugly duckling and fairies which are not to be considered as mere vehicles of those truths. Fairy stories, according to Tolkien, must touch on or use 'Faërie' which „contains many things besides elves and fays, and besides dwarfs, witches, trolls, giants, or dragons: it holds the seas, the sun, the moon, the sky, and the earth, and all things that are in it: tree and bird, water and stone, wine and bread, and ourselves, mortal men, when we are enchanted"[5].

Tolkien attempted to elucidate the term ‚Faërie' by identifying it with 'Magic' „of a peculiar mood and power", capable of creating what he called 'Enchantment'. The world of Euchantment — the realm of Faërie — is a secondary world created or rather, to use Tolkien's expression, „sub-created" by people who are driven to do so by an impulse to reach for the impossible: to name the mystery of the universe, to satisfy „certain primordial human desires [...] to survey the depths of space and time [...] to hold communion with other living things"[6].

The origin of folk fairy stories goes back, and here most critics agree for once, to times immemorial. Certain motifs, such as in the story of Cinderella, occur in different languages and cultures, they exist in numerous versions which must have developed from one

---

[3] W. H. Auden, „A Fairy Story" — Introduction to *Tales* by Grimm and Andersen, Random House, Inc., quoted after: N. A. Brittin, *A Writing Apprenticeship*, Holt, Reinehart and Winston, New York 1967, p. 102.

[4] J. Buchan, *The Novel and the Fairy Tale*, Oxford University Press 1931, p. 7.

[5] Tolkien, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

source and been spread throughout the world by migrating peoples. There is an undeniable affinity between fairy stories and myths, which points to the same creative impulse behind them. According to some theories fairy tales are „degenerated" myths, but Tolkien argues that „There is no fundamental distinction between the higher and lower mythologies. Their peoples live, if they live at all, by the same life, just as in the mortal world do kings and peasants"[7].

Fairy tales as well as myths were called into being in an act of „sub-creation", they contain Faërie and, fantastic as they may seem to the modern reader, originally they were meant to be understood literally.

To J. R. R. Tolkien myth and fairy story (also literary fairy story) are a way of naming Truth, of giving a shape to it and thus sub-creating it. He said:

> By so naming things and describing them you are only inventing your own terms about them. And just as speech in invention about objects and ideas, so myth is invention about truth. [...]
> Indeed only by myth-making, only by becoming a sub-creator and inventing stories, can Man aspire to the state of perfection that he knew before the Fall. Our myths may be misguided, but they steer however shakily towards the true harbour[8].

Literary fairy stories, if they are to succeed, have to keep within the boundaries of the World of Enchantment and so they often use the stylized motifs of popular folk fairy tales, re-arranging their elements in patterns which suit the purposes of the writer. J. R. R. Tolkien's fairy story consisting of three books, *The Lord of the Rings* is rooted in his private mythology expounded in *The Silmarillion* (published posthumously in 1977). It took 12 years to write the epic fairy story and several years had passed after its completion before the first part *The Fellowship of the Ring* was finally published in 1954. The second volume *The Two Towers* followed soon afterwards, but nearly a year had elapsed before the last part *The Return of the King* appeared.

The Lord of the Rings was conceived as a sequel to *The Hobbit* (1937) a book of adventure in which dwarves (as Tolkien would have the word spelt), wizard Gandalf, dragon Smaug as well as hobbits, small people with fur on their feet play important roles. *The Hobbit* was clearly a children's story designed to amuse young listeners first (his

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[8] H. Carpenter, *J.R.R. Tolkien; a Biography*, Unwin Paperbacks, London 1978, p. 151.

own children and then young readers. It lacks the profundity, mystery and grandeur which make *The Lord of the Rings* a completely different work in spite of certain links between this fairy epic and *The Hobbit*. In the preface to *The Lord of the Rings* Tolkien wrote:

It is in fact, not a book written for children at all, although many children will, of course, be interested in it, or parts of it[9].

The writer believed that fairy stories should be read by adults as „a natural branch of literature" having far more to do with reality than is commonly believed, even though it centres on fantastic adventures.

Possibly because of the fact that fairy stories have become relegated to children's libraries, most writers of the genre prefer not to speak to adult audiencies directly, but their books written ostensibly for children often appeal to grown up readers as well. Tolkien decided he disliked talking down to children, and frankly chose to address his epic to adult readers as well as to those young readers who would be likely to enjoy his work.

On the surface, *The Lord of the Rings* is about elves, dwarfs, wizards, orcs, trolls, people, hobbits and other creatures. Hobbits live uneventful but pleasant and peaceful lives guided by practical common sense. Yet it is some of those peaceloving hobbits (Frodo, Pip, Merry and Sam) that get involved in most unusual adventures. Frodo comes into the possession of the Ring of power which has been made by Sauron, the evil Lord of Mordor. The only way to prevent Sauron from recovering the Ring, and thus to save the inhabitants of Middle-earth from the danger of his tyranny and vileness, is to destroy the Ring by casting it into the fire of Mount Doom. Frodo accepts the difficult task and together with eight companions (one wizard — Gandalf, two men — Aragorn and Boromir, one elf — Legolas, one dwarf — Gimli and the three other hobbits) sets out on a long and dangerous journey. In the meantime other inhabitants of Middle-earth, the people of Rohan and of Gondor, fight battles against Sauron, who threatens to spread his evil influence beyond his realm. Occupied by the war, Sauron fails to find the Ring-bearer and Frodo succeeds in reaching Mount Doom and finally destroying the Ring. The destruction of the Ring implies the ruin of Sauron. Peace and happiness are restored to Middle-earth, for a time at least. Elves whose power has gone together with the disappearance of the One Ruling Ring, must leave Middle-earth,

[9] J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Fellowship of the Ring*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London 1957, p. 7.

as must the wizard and Frodo after completing their mission, but other hobbits can now go on living their peaceful simple lives in their beloved Shire. Men grow in power after the return of their exiled king Aragorn and it is to them that the Fourth Age of Middle-earth will belong; the hird Age is over.

The emphasis put on the element of the marvellous with its imaginery beings, fantastic story and wonderful phenomena, is very strongly felt indeed. So much so that *The Lord of the Rings* often appeals to the reader solely because of its wonderful adventures and creatures: numerous details of description and incidents have no other purpose than creating the fairy story atmosphere and no other meaning than the literal. For example the family ties and feuds of the hobbits Frodo and Bilbo; the love motif involving Eowyn, the proud and valiant lady of Rohan and Aragorn and Faramir; as well as much of what happens during minor incidents of Frodo's journey, have little to offer in the way of implied meanings.

Yet even the brief synopsis given above, makes it clear that *The Lord of the Rings* is not a mere fantastic tale of adventure, but that it is also what Tolkien himself calls a „good and evil story" and his mythology, which he expounded in *The Silmarillion* and out of which grew *The Lord of the Rings*, proves that the writer was preoccupied with the truth contained in the mysteries of the universe. *The Lord of the Rings* attempts to reflect that truth in its story which is the reason why many critics regard Tolkien's fairy epic as an allegory.

The Lord of the Rings eludes easy classification and categorization; there are doubts as to whether it should be included among children's books or not; whether one may consider it a trilogy or not (Tolkien wrote it as a continuous narrative and his publishers divided it into three volumes and gave a different title to each), and also whether the epic can be regarded as allegorical or not. There are different approaches to this matter. Burton Raffel, for instance, believes that, „provided one takes allegory in its loose sense, *The Lord of the Rings* is indisputably allegorical"[10]. Among the critics who go to the other extreme is Patricia Meyer Spacks who maintains that „*The Lord of the Rings* is by no means allegorical"[11]. The majority of Tolkien's critics, however, are much more cautious: they are inclined to accept the kind of view represented by Edmund Fuller when he writes:

---

[10] B. Raffel, „*The Lord of the Rings* as Literature", [in:] N. D. Isaacs, R. A. Zimbardo, ed., *Tolkien and the Critics*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, London 1968, p. 244.

[11] P. M. Spacks, „Power and Meaning in *The Lord of the Rings*", [in:] *Tolkien and the Critics*, p. 95.

rather than say it is an allegory [...] I will say it has allegorical possibilities and suggestions underlying the face value of the narrative[12].

We can detect in this statement a rather vague feeling that, although one cannot pin it down, some allegorical element is present in the fairy story. A similar feeling makes Neil D. Isaacs speak of „the frequent and tantalizing clues for allegory"[13] in Tolkien's work.

Tolkien himself, however, categorically denied the presence of allegory in his work. Time and again he said about *The Lord of the Rings*:

It is not about anything but itself. Certainly it has no allegorical intentions, general particular or topical, moral, religious or political[14].

Moreover, the writer often expressed his cordial dislike for allegory „wherever he smelt it" and he patiently explained, as when he wrote of his story „Smith of Wootton Major", that „There is no allegory in the Faery, which is conceived as having a real and extramental existence"[15].

Yet, in spite of Tolkien's strictures on allegory, the book provides frequent examples of mechanisms of allegorical evocation at work.

The very theme of the eternal conflict between good and evil, which is at the heart of most allegorical writing, suggests the possibility of such interpretation. More often than not the theme connects with religious beliefs. Tolkien, who was a committed Christian (Catholic), could not speak of the creation of a cosmos without the God he believed in, and so, although never directly mentioned or seen in *The Lord of the Rings*, God is present in Tolkien's cosmology. The writer gives the reader to understand that it is the divine power, to be identified with Good, that controls the fates of Middle-earth creatures in the way that God controls the lives of people according to Christian beliefs. The presence of God is felt in Gandalf's comment on Bilbo's finding the Ring:

---

[12] E. Fuller, „The Lord of the Hobbits: J. R. R. Tolkien", [in:] *Tolkien and the Critics*, p. 31.

[13] N. D. Isaacs, „On the Possibilities of Writing Tolkien Criticism", [in:] *Tolkien and the Critics*, p. 5.

[14] Quoted after: R. J. Reilly, „Tolkien and the Fairy Story", [in:] *Tolkien and the Critics*, p. 136.

[15] Quoted after: Carpenter, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

Behind that there was something else at work, beyond any design of the Ring-maker. I can put it no plainer than by saying that Bilbo was meant to find the Ring, and not by its maker. In which case you Frodo also were meant to have it[16]

The presence is often felt as an active influence on the events and on the decisions made by the characters of the story. The good influence and the evil force are engaged in a war which continues to be fought throughout the three books and reaches the point where the agent of evil, Sauron is defeated, but evil does not disappear from Middle-earth.

The theme of good and evil is made more specific by centering *The Lord of the Rings* around the idea of the corrupting effects of power. The bearer of the Ring power must not yield to the temptation of using it and, when faced by vicissitudes, hardship and pain, has to rely on his own resources such as his courage and endurance.

This extremely difficult task, which implies both having power and giving it up, and accepting it in order to destroy it, is undertaken by a hobbit, who thus gains, in spite of his limitations, a special aura of dignity and an important position among the creatures of Middle-earth: although forces of good support him, he is responsible for the success of the undertaking.

The story of the hobbit Frodo is an account of the struggle of the common man to preserve his freedom and democracy and his fight against those obsessed with the desire to have absolute power. The trilogy contains allusions to the dangers of the Fascist totalitarian system especially when Tolkien presents the new order established in the Shire by Sauron's servants and when he describes Sauron's Isengard.

On another level the fairy story is an account of man's struggle against his weakness which he may believe to be his power. There is in this struggle of man against his power which would destroy him a reflection of the attitude of Christ who did not use his divine power and did not give in to the devil's tempting him and who deliberately chose suffering by accepting the limitations of man's nature in him.

The presentation of the theme of good and evil is accompanied by symbolic language which stresses the spiritual value of the images invloved. This is clearly seen in Tolkien's use of light and darkness which have very obvious moral associations. It can also be seen in the employment of meaningful names: the name of evil Sauron associates with „saurian", that is reptilian qualities, he is the Lord of

[16] Tolkien, *The Fellowship...*, p. 65.

Mordor which suggests „murder". Sauron is often referred to as the „Enemy" which echoes the name given to the devil by Christian believers. The place where the fate of Middle-earth is decided is appropriately called Mount Doom. The name of the little people, „hobbits", may stem from „rabbits" denoting creatures living like hobbits in holes in the ground, as well as from „Babbit", a widely accepted name for an average man with somewhat narrow views. The Murky Wood is called „murky" because dark and wicked trees grow in it and, possibly, because of its associations with Norse mythology. These are anly some of the many instances of how carefully the writer chose names for his characters and the places he described, and endowed them with significance.

The possibility of interpreting *The Lord of the Rings* in terms of allegory is reinforced by the frequent use of characters, places and objects that stand for something more than they are in themselves. Thus the Ruling Ring has to be associated not merely with magic power, but also with powerful evil:

It belongs to Sauron and was made by him alone, and is altogether evil. Its strength [...] is too great for anyone to wield at will, save only those who have already a great power of their own. But for them it holds an even deadlier peril. The very desire of it corrupts the heart. If any of the Wise should with this Ring overthrow the Lord of Mordor, using his own arts, he would then set himself on Sauron's throne, and yet another Dark Lord would appear. And this is another reason why the Ring should be destroyed[17].

Another example is provided by Tom Bombadil. Tom seems to be, at first, just a merry, pleasant fellow, but the four hobbits, who are his guests for a while, soon realise that there is more to Tom Bombadil than meets the eye. To Frodo's question about Tom, Goldberry, his lady answers:

He is as you have seen him [...] He is the Master of wood, water, hill[18].

And Tom Bombadil himself says:

Don't you know my name yet? That is the only answer. Tell me, who you are, alone, yourself and nameless? But you are young and I am old. Eldest, that's what I am. Mark my words, my friends: Tom was here before the river and the trees; Tom remembers the first raindrop and the first acorn. He made paths before the Big People, and saw the Little People arriving. Tom was here before the seas were

---

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 281.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

bent. He knew the dark under the stars when it was fearless — before the Dark Lord came from the outside[19].

Tom is the only character in the book on whom the Ring has no effect whatsoever: it cannot make him invisible and he can still see Frodo when the hobbit puts it on his finger and becomes unseen by all the others. Tom Bombadil is beyond good and evil in the same way in which nature, which he represents, is beyond morality.

It is in the passages like ones quoted above that Tolkien most directly speaks about the implications of his story. The meanings are suggested also by the usual devices employed in allegorical writing: the plot steered towards significant solutions, characters drawn in such a way as to emphasize the phenomena or ideas they represent, and the setting endowed with spiritual as well as material qualities.

Being a fairy story the epic has little in common with realistic novels as regards its contents; it uses, nevertheless, their method of presentation. But character drawing, although convincing within the boundaries set by the logic of the fantastic world, is severely limited and psychological analysis almost non-existent. If one does interpret the epic in terms of regular novels, as not only readers but some critics are apt to do, one cannot fail to notice those limitations which serve to shift the emphasis from the analysis of characters onto the situation presented and its significance. Thus the limited use of the realistic method only helps to stress the fact that the trilogy contains certain philosophical and moral statements. Tolkien insists that, although the characters contain universal qualities, they are individuals above all, but he is also quoted as saying that, for example, Tom Bombadil was initially intended to represent the spirit of the vanishing countryside of Oxford and Berkshire[20], and that the hobbits stand for English people. H. Carpenter thus records the writer's interpretation of the hobbits:

The hobbits do not owe their origins merely to personal parallels. Tolkien once told an interviewer: 'The Hobbits are just rustic English people, made small in size because it reflects the generally small reach of their imagination — not the small reach of their courage or latent power'[21].

Such remarks surley point to the „meaning" of the characters and encourage the reader to search for what they represent, and not be satisfied with their individual features.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 142.

[20] Cf. Carpenter, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 142.

An allegorical reading of *The Lord of the Rings* is made possible not only by these interpretative signals, but also by the complex structure of *The Lord of the Rings*. The contribution of its structure to the allegorical character of the fairy epic is very significant, if not decisive.

The Lord of the Rings has a kind of structure which enables the reader to view the epic in terms of a number of literary genres and modes. Its method of presentation may associate it with the technique of the novel, but rather than to a realistic novel *The Lord of the Rings* can be compared to a medieval romance, a lay, since it is largely a story of heroism and chivalry. One could, of course, talk of Frodo in terms of heroism, but it is the figure of Aragorn, much greater in stature both physically and spiritually, that dominates the romance of the story. When we first meet him, he is a strange-looking, weather-beaten man called Strider by some, and Ranger by others, and there is nothing about him to suggest that he is also Elessar, Isildur's heir of Gondor, the rightful king in exile, apart from a certain feeling of mystery evoked by his description. Gradually we discover more about Aragorn. He turns out to be a great warrior and leader. When Sauron is finally defeated, Aragorn may at last be crowned as King of Gondor. He is seen in splendour and glory during the crowning ceremony:

> [...] when Aragorn rose all that beheld him gazed in silence, for it seemed to them that he was revealed to them now for the first time. Tall as the sea-kings of old, he stood above all that were near; wisdom sat upon his brow, and strength and healing were in his hands, and a light was about him. And then Farmir said: 'Behold the King!'
> And in that moment all the trumpets were blown, and the king Elessar went forth and came to the barrier, and Hurin of the Keys thrust it back; and amid the music of harp and viol of flute and the singing of clear voices the King passed through the flower-laden streets [...][22].

The romantic story of Aragorn is enriched by associations with the 'courtly love' motif, in which the lover has to undergo various ordeals and prove his valour in order to win the favour of his lady. And so Aragorn fights against Sauron not only because Sauron represents evil, and not only because he wishes to regain Gondor and Arnor, but also because he loves Arwen, daughter of Elrond, ruler of elves in Rivendell. When Aragorn fights in the battle of Pelennor Fields he unfurls the standard of Arwen. Arwen will become a mortal woman if she

---

[22] J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Return of the King*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London 1957, p. 246.

marries a man, but she is willing to pay the price because Aragorn deserves it.

The Lord of the Rings abounds in descriptions of battles and fighting. Below is a characteristic example:

Great was the clash of their meeting. But the white fury of the North-men burned the hotter, and more skilled was their knighthood with long spears and bitter. Fewer were they but they clove through the Southrons like a fire-bolt in a forest. Right through the press drove Theoden Thengel's son, and his spear was shivered as he threw down their chieftain. Out swept his sword, and he spurred to the standard, hewed staff and bearer; and the black serpent foundered. Then all that was left unslain of their cavalry turned and fled far away[23].

The description, like many others in Tolkien, has the flavour of medieval narrative, for example of Layamon's *Brut*. It also makes one think of old English and Norse epics. Descriptions of this kind occupy a large portion of the third part of the trilogy (the vary titles of some of its chapters suggest this; they are „The Muster of Rohan", „The Siege of Gondor", „The Ride of the Rohirrim", „The Battle of the Pelennor Fields"). Characteristically, few women appear in the fairy epic. Of the few, Arwen and Galadriel — the elf queen, belong to the world of romance, but Eowyn, the proud and stern lady of Rohan, is of the old sagas. She dreams of great heroic deeds:

'I am of the House of Eorl and not a serving woman. I can ride and wield blade, and I do not fear either pain or death'.
'What do you fear, lady?' he [Aragorn] asked.
'A cage', she said. 'To stay behind bars, until use and old age accept them, and all chance of doing great deeds is gone beyond recall or desire'[24].

Eowyn disguises herself as Dernhelm and fights valiantly in the battle of the Pelennor: she destroys Nazgûl, but is, herself, wounded badly.

The similarity between the description of battle scenes in Tolkien's story and those in Anglo-Saxon and Norse epics is to be found not only in the kind of scenery chosen, or its paraphernalia (swords, spears, horses etc.), but also in the stern, noble, dignified tone of the language, which often has the simplicity and vividness of *Beowulf* for example. Stylistic devices such as the frequent use of repetitions, the cataloguing of names and the rhythm also bear resemblance to Old English poetry. We can observe this for instance in the sentence:

---

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 114.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

The king mounted his horse, Snowmane, and Merry sat beside him on his pony: Stybba was his name[25].

which echoes certain lines from „Deor's Lament".

Another example of literary devices which help to create the tone and the atmosphere of Old English narratives is provided by Tolkien's habit of referring to horses and weapons, to which his warriors are greatly attached, almost as if they were persons. Thus the proper names of King Theoden's horse, Snowmane, Gandalf's horse, Shadowfax, Aragon's sword, Anduril and Frodo's, Sting acquire a particular importance. To make the affinity even more apparent, the names of people and the vocabulary of Rohan are based on Old English. In the language of this country of horsemen many words begin with „eo" — and „eoh" in Old English means „horse"; „Eowyn" stands for „delight in horses". The name of Theoden derives from OE words denoting king or prince; such geographical names as „Riddermark" and „Isengard" come from OE „ridda" (rider) + OE „mearc" (boundary) and OE „isen" (iron) + OE „geard" (court) respectively. Occasionally the Rohirrim speak in their own language and then one is inclined to agree with John Tinkler who argues that „the language of Rohan not only 'resembles' Old English, it is Old English"[26].

The analogy between Tolkien's work and OE and Norse epics lies also in the kind of fantastic invention. In *Beowulf*, for example, we find the following mention of imaginary creatures which resemble those in Tolkien:

Thence monstrous births all woke into being jotuns and elves, and orken-creatures, likewise the giants who for a long space warred against God[27].

The motif of the ceremonial giving gifts to deserving knights, servants, or vassals characteristic of old epics finds its reflection in *The Lord of the Rings* in the act of giving gifts by Tom Bambadil, by Galadriel, or by Elrond to aid or to reward the brave and the deserving.

A further analogy is seen in the documentation of the three books: Tolkien often identifies his characters by naming their parents and sometimes older ancestors, as is done in Norse sagas and Old English epics. He also provides his trilogy with outlines of the history of Middle-earth, tables of chronological dates, family trees and maps.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[26] J. Tinkler, „Old English in Rohan", [in:] *Tolkien and the Critics*, p. 169.

[27] *Beowulf*, modernised version in S. Helsztyński, *Specimens of English Poetry and Prose*, Warszawa 1973, p. 7.

This documantation is partly due to a sheer delight in making a fantastic world look real, but to some extent it imitates the detailed description of places, characters, family trees and accounts of historical events that are so typical of Norse epics.

It is also the presence of the pagan ethos alongside the Christian outlook that brings *The Lord of the Rings* close to Norse sagas in which the „hero operates under the shadow of fate; his struggle is doomed to find failure — the dragon at last in some encounter will win. His courage and will alone oppose the dark forces of the universe"[28]. The third age of the history of Middle-earth ends in victory and hope apparently — and yet, when Gandalf says that after the Ring is destroyed, Sauron will be „put out of reckoning", Elrond observes wistfully that it will only be so for a while. Elsewhere Gandalf remarks:

Other evils there are that may come; for Sauron is himself but a servant or emissary[29].

His awareness of how impossible it is for them to defeat evil completely is clear when he says:

We should seek a final end of this menace, even if we do not hope to make one[30].

The sense of futility of man's struggles emerges from Gimli's conversation with Legolas:

'[...] The deeds of Men will outlast us, Gimli'.
'And yet come to naught in the end but might-have-beens. I guess', said the Dwarf[31].

The pessimistic belief contained in the mythology of the Norse sagas that the world is doomed to a final catastrophe is obliterated in Tolkien's books by Christian hope and the conviction that the power of good is greater than that of evil, as well as by the certainty that the ultimate outcome of evil deeds often serves good. The combination of the pagan ethos with Christian beliefs is not unlike that in many Scandinavian and Old English epics.

Whatever may be the mythological explanation offered by Tolkien in his *Silmarillion* the reader of *The Lord of the Rings* tends to asso-

---

[28] Spacks, *op. cit.*, p. 86.
[29] Tolkien, *The Return...*, p. 155.
[30] Tolkien, *The Fellowship...*, p. 280.
[31] Tolkien, *The Return...*, p. 149.

ciate the evil power represented by Sauron with the Christian notion of evil, and the controlling power of good with God.

There is no strict connection between the Bible and the fairy epic by Tolkien; there are, however, certain analogies, of which the most apparent is the one between Frodo's plight and Christ's suffering. When Frodo is presented as the Ring-bearer, who undergoes physical pain as well as spiritual torment before he finally fulfills his mission on Mount Doom, the reader is reminded of the Cross-bearer and his torment. As he progresses towards the mountain Frodo becomes more and more like a disembodied spirit, he seems to grow almost transparent and there is a strange light about him.

In a similar way Gandalf partakes of the Christ figure, especially when he fights the deadly fight against Barlog and is pulled by him into the abyss of Khazad-Dûm. When he emerges from it after a very long time, his return seems like rising from the dead:

> There he stood, grown suddenly tall, towering above them [...]. His white garments shone [...].
> They all gazed at him. His hair was white as snow in the sunshine; and gleaming white was his robe; the eyes under his deep brows were bright, piercing as the rays of the sun; power was in his hand. Between wonder, joy, and fear they stood and found no words to say.
> At last Aragorn stirred. 'Gandalf!' he said. 'Beyond all hope you return to us in our need!' [...].
> 'Gandalf', the old man repeated, as if recalling from old memory o long disused word. Yes, that was the name. I was Gandalf'[32].

Aragorn is another character with affinities with the Christ figure. A great lord and king, he first appears as an ordinary man, who suffers a great deal more than is the share of an ordinary man. Before Saruman is overthrown and Aragorn's kingdom is restored, he has to descend into the hell of the oath-breakers: he bids the dead to follow him in order to fight against Sauron. Aragorn is also a healer: he alone can cure Eowyn and Faramir of their mortal wounds. When the Enemy is defeated Aragorn Elessar sits on his throne in glory.

Neither Aragorn, nor Gandalf, nor Frodo are to be identified with Christ, but the analogies give the three characters new dimensions. They are related to the biblical themes of good, grace and redemption and have a bearing upon the interpretation of *The Lord of the Rings* as a whole. In view of the fact that the Bible itself abounds in varieties of allegory, it is not surprising that biblical analogies in Tolkien's work contribute to its allegorical character.

---

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 97—98.

One of the most frequent devices employed to suggest the hidden meaning in allegorical writing, especially in that of the Middle Ages, is the use of the dream-vision. The dream vision does not become the structuring principle of the plot of *The Lord of the Rings*, but Tolkien often uses both dreams and visions in order to give glimpses of the true significance of certain events. Hobbits, who are ordinary creatures with no supernatural potency at all, usually experience prophetic dreams and visions by the agency of those who possess magic power, elves and Tom Bombadil notably. Because of Tom Bombadil the four hobbits, who are his guests, experience a vision of remote past times:

> The hobbits did not understand his words, but as he spoke they had a vision as it were of a great expanse of years behind them, like a vast shadowy plain over which there strode shapes of Men, tall and grim, with bright swords, and last came one with a star on his brow. Then the vision faded, and they were back in the sunlit world[33].

During the night spent in the house of Tom Bombadil, Frodo has a dream of what is going to happen in the future:

> In the dead night, Frodo lay in a dream without light. Then he saw the young moon rising; under its thin light there loomed before him a black wall of rock, pierced by a dark arch like a great gate. It seemed to Frodo that he was lifted up, and passing over he saw that the rock-wall was a circle of hills, and that within it was a plain, and in the midst of the plain stood a pinnacle of stone, like a vast tower but not made by hands. On its top stood a figure of man[34].

Such allusions to the past and the future make the present more meaningful as it comes to be seen in the context of the otherness beyond hobbit (human) grasp. In a way similar to that of medieval dream-vision allegories, visions presented in Tolkien's fairy story help its characters to discover certain truths; they also help the reader to understand the idea of *The Lord of the Rings*.

In addition, various magic objects have the power to enable those who wield them to see things hidden from ordinary eyes. When Frodo puts the Ring on his finger, he is able to see what is distant in time as well as in space. He catches glimpses of the past and the future in the Mirror of Galadriel. The crystal ball, Palantir, allows those that gaze into it to communicate with Sauron and learn his mind. It is in this way that the reader, too, gains a deeper and vaster insight (in space and in time) into the world presented.

[33] Tolkien, *The Fellowship...*, p. 57.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 138.

„In journey as in dream vision the traveller is an instrument whereby systems can be explored"[35], says Gay Clifford in *The Transformations of Allegory*. The journey motif serves to structure the narratives of numerous allegories such as those by Dante, Langland, Bunyan and Spenser. The motif of a journey undertaken by a hero who has a mission to fulfill makes *The Lord of the Rings* a quest story. Frodo, its quest hero, gets to know the world and himself on the way to Mount Doom; his is a journey into the heart of darkness not only in a literal, physical sense, but also, inevitably, in a spiritual one. The presence of a quest story in numerous romances and fairy tales usually makest it easy to allegorize them; thus it is the quest story of *The Lord of the Rings* that adds to the allegorical character of the epic.

Apart from the analogies mentioned above, there are others in *The Lord of the Rings* (one could, for example, discuss the parallels between the trilogy and Rudyard Kipling's *Puck of the Pook's Hill* and make an interesting analysis of their literary associations). Yet, more than anything else, *The Lord of the Rings* is a fairy story and must be seen in the context of other tales of the world of Faërie, Magic and Enchantment shared by literature as well as by folklore. The Magic and the Enchantment of *The Lord of the Rings* emanates from the mysterious and beautiful elves, Magic is present in the old forest with its wicked trees, in the dark pasages of Moria, the ancient dwelling of dwarves; it is associated with wizards and people, who are often like the knights and princes of songs. To the four hobbits this world seems a wonderland in which they are the only accountable creatures. Tolkien writes about them in such a way that the reader takes them for granted and tends, paradoxically, to identify his attitudes with theirs rather than with those of the people described in the fairy epic. The people, on the other hand, are filled with wonder when they see the hobbits. One of the riders of Rohan (to whom hobbits are haflings) exclaims in amazement when he hears Gimli, the dwarf and Eomer talk about them:

Haflings! But they are only a little people in old songs and children's tales out of the North. Do we walk in legends or on the green earth in the daylight?

Aragorn replies to this:

---

[35] G. Clifford, *The Transformations of Allegory*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1974, p. 23.

A man may do both [...] For not we but those who come after will make the legends of our time. The green earth, say you? That is a mighty matter of legend, though you tread it under the light of day[36].

Remarks like these, apart from creating the atmosphere of Enchantment, seem to imply that fairy tales contain forgotten truths of the world of the past, or of one that still exists, but is no longer seen. The connection of fairy tales with myths, which did deal with reality in their characteristic way, accounts for the general conviction that fairy stories are, in spite of their fantasy, relevant to real life, too. Fairy tales contain moral teachings and conclusions of spiritual value which means that their characters tend to be rather schematic types such as wicked stepmothers, cruel witches, beautiful princesses kept prisoner by sorcerers, brave knights, who free the princesses, win their favours and marry them, poor youngest brothers who seem to be simpletons, but turn out very clever and, in due time, become successful and wealthy. The events and situations in which they are involved point to values and meanings. The limitations and simplifications of Tolkien's character drawing mentioned earlier, as well as the kind of characters and the emphasis put on the eventful plot with its numerous ramifications, are largely due to the fact that *The Lord of the Rings* is a fairy story. And because they can be ascribed both to fairy stories and to allegorical tendencies it becomes obvious that the fairy story and allegory have a great deal in common.

In literary stylized fairy stories, philosophical and moral possibilities are used much more consciously. This is true about a great number of fairy tales by Andersen, of whom Louis MacNeice says in *Varieties of Parable* that „many of his stories are more patently allegorical than almost any writing of the time"[37]. It is also true about many other stories written ostensibly for children (the first book written in English for young readers, *The Book for Boys and Girls* by John Bunyan, was, significantly, allegorical). Allegorical qualities will be found in such varied books as *Le Petit Prince* by A. de Saint-Exupery, the *Chronicles of Narnia* by C. S. Lewis, and *The Mouse and his Child* by Russell Hoban, to mention only some examples.

The fact that stories for children and fairy tales are more often than not allegorical does not mean that everything in them is subordinated to allegory; the dominant motivation behind them is usually

---

[36] J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Two Towers*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London 1957, p. 37.

[37] L. MacNeice, *Varieties of Parable*, Combridge University Press 1965, p. 74.

the impulse to create an imaginary world with extraordinary, magic events taking place in it. George MacDonald, an author of fairy tales, said of his writing:

> You may make of it what you like. If you see anything in it, take it and I am glad you have it; but I wrote it for the tale[38].

This statement, which emphasizes the importance of the literal level and allots a secondary role to possible allegorical messages, can be applied to a good number of fairy tales and children's stories produced by other writers as well. It also helps to explain why J. R. R. Tolkien objected to critics interpreting *The Lord of the Rings* as an allegory.

Allegory, however, may enter a fairy story in spite of its author's intentions, because allegorical features are natural in this form of writing. It is, of course, possible to find non-allegorical fairy stories, but they are not typical and as a rule tend to be less effective. The deeper meanings of allegorical fairy stories help to create the aura of enchantment and magic, since they bring the reader close to the heart of the mystery of the world around him. Without the allegorical element fairy stories would lose much of their appeal. Readers find it natural to look for deeper meanings in fairy stories because they have been accustomed to do so by the long tradition of folk fairy tales. They are inclined to approach *The Lord of the Rings* in a similar way if only because it uses traditional motifs.

Behind the figure of Gandalf, for example, is a host of wizards of other fairy stories. Wizardry belongs to those beings that represent supernatural forces of divine origin; they use their magic power either for good purposes or, when they are corrupt and degenerate, for evil ones. In *The Lord of the Rings* Gandalf belongs to the former and Saruman to the latter. Apart from the wizards there are other characters in Tolkien's work who have supernatural powers such as Sauron, the evil Lord of Mordor who was originally a Maia (one of „Those with Power of a lesser degree than that of the Valar") and Barlog whose name means „Demon of Might".

Most of the other creatures in *The Lord of the Rings* are associated with natural forces as they do in numerous folk tales and fairy stories. Tolkien's elves are, like so many other elves, beings linked with delicate beauty and the mysteries of nature, even though they may lack the trickiness and malignity often ascribed to those creatures.

[38] R. L. Green, „Introduction" to *The Complete Fairy Tales* of George MacDonald, Schocken Books, New York 1977, p. 9.

Dwarfs make one think of underground caves, hidden treasures of the Earth, tree roots, rocks and stones. Ents are shepherds of trees and they themselves look like trees. Some of the fairy folk of Tolkien are considered friendly, others hostile and malign (Orcs and Trolls, for example).

The clear distinction between good and bad characters, and phenomena, so characteristic of fairy stories, divides Tolkien's world into the two opposing categories of agents of good and agents of evil. The human hero in traditional fairy stories often has to make a choice between the one and the other. Needless to say it is his opting for the former, his intelligence, skill, courage and perseverance, as well as his good intentions and motivations, which cause the character to be assisted by the forces of good and rewarded eventually. Obstacles created by evil agents are overcome by the good and worthy, and evil defeated or punished. This moral pattern has been preserved by Tolkien and enacted by the charactrs of *The Lord of the Rings.*

The distinction between good and evil covers not only the characters of fairy stories, but also inanimate objects which are often associated with moral and spiritual values. Hence the variety of magic possessions of fairy beings such as rings, mirrors, rods, stones etc. which can either ensure health, long life, happiness, beauty, fulfilling wishes, or may cause unhappiness, illness, ugliness, poverty, temporary sleep as well as a degrading metamorphosis. *The Lord of the Rings* makes extensive use of both kinds of magic attributes (such as the Phial of Galadriel, the starglass, the seeing stone Palantir, or the Rings of power). The use of magic objects is often accompanied by ritualistic gestures, acts or words of spiritual value and power. This may be illustrated by the fact that power is ascribed to a kiss in many traditional fairy stories; Snowwhite, The Sleeping Beauty and the Prince turned into a frog are freed from their spells because they are kissed by their lovers. *The Lord of the Rings* does not differ from folk fairy tales in this respect either and so for instance, the touch of Aragorn's hands has a healing power, Saruman's voice lures and beguiles, The Ruling Ring of Power has to be cast in the fire of Mount Doom so that Sauron can be defeated.

Also places mentioned in fairy tales usually assume particular spiritual significance: castles, gardens, towers, forests, mountains and rivers are related to the moral and spiritual experience of the fairy hero. It is not surprising, therefore, that the settings of *The Lord of the Rings* have similar implications. Places usually reflect the dominant qualities (good or bad) of the characters associated with them. Thus Hobbits' holes in the ground are cosy, simple and practical,

just like their owners. Mordor is a dark, desolate and horrible place. Isengard, where the clever, but corrupt wizard Saruman lives, is as cold, hard though well built place. The description of Isengard clearly alludes to the spiritual qualities it represents:

> Here through the black rock a long tunnel had been hewn, closed at either end with mighty doors of iron. They were so wrought and poised upon their huge hinges, posts of steel driven into the living stone, that when unbarred they could be moved with alight thrust of the arms noiselessly [...]. The roads were paved with stone-flags, dark and hard; and besides their borders instead of trees there marched long lines of pillars, some of marble, some of copper and of iron, joined by heavy chains [...]. Shafts were driven deep into the ground; their upper ends were covered by low mounds and domes of stone, so that in the moonlight the Ring of Isengard looked like a graveyard of unquiet dead. For the ground trembled. The shafts ran down by many slopes and spiral stairs to caverns far under; there Saruman had treasuries, store-houses, armouries, smithies, and great furnaces. Iron wheels revolved there endlessly, and hammers thudded. At night plumes of vapour steamed from the vents, lit from beneath with red light, or blue, or venomous green[39].

The description makes use of images opposing not only good and evil, but also the unnatural and the natural, the unnatural being equated with evil.

The numerous conventional devices of the traditional fairy tale used by Tolkien in *The Lord of the Rings* point to the moral and spiritual meaning of the work. *The Lord of the Rings* owes much of its character to its connections with other literary and extra-literary sources. The parallels, analogies and similarities between Tolkien's fairy epic and the Bible, Norse sagas, OE epics, romance, dream visions, quest stories and fairy tales, do not create a consistent system: *The Lord of the Rings* is not patterned on any other single work in the way that, for example, J. Joyce's *Ulysses* is on Homer's *Odyssey*. The presence of the analogies, however, is suggestive enough. The very fact that a book is patterned (even in a limited way) on another book or story gives it a field of reference. It shows how certain types of situations are repeated and, in this way, adds new layers of meaning to the book, makes it more general in appeal. *Alice in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass* by Lewis Carroll provide examples of how a sense of the presence of hidden meanings is achieved by giving the form of a game of cards or a game of chess, and that of a dream to the stories. In *The Lord of the Rings* it is not only the very presence of the patterns of analogies, but also the

---

[39] Tolkien, *The Two Towers*, p. 159.

kind of patterns that determine the meaning; the models are nearly all allegorical in nature and so in this way, too, *The Lord of the Rings* partakes of that character, thus becoming a perfect example of a work whose form creates meaning: it acquires the basic characteristics of an echo allegory.

The intricate pattern of analogies is an important reason why *The Lord of the Rings* often undergoes allegorical interpretation, but the most important of all is its use of fairy story motifs of myth and Faërie. J. R. R. Tolkien, however, warns against treating his myth and fairy story as a translation of his idea of the universe and prefers to emphasize the „applicability" to reality of his writing. Both myth and fairy story have their roots in the real pattern of the universe and the writer believed that his mythology contained underlying reality. Of the tales that constitute it he said that they arose in his mind as „given"things and he confessed:

> [...] always I had the sense of recording what was already „there", somewhere: not of „inventing"[40].

Accordingly *The Lord of the Rings* was to him a record of a particular phase of the history of the universe, an example of its pattern, but the epic was not meant to present particular elements of the pattern in the abstract and therefore, as he pointed out in a letter about *The Lord of the Rings*, was not an allegory.

In spite of the writer's frequent remonstrances and refutations of allegory, readers often find the temptation to allegorize *The Lord of the Rings* irresistible. Fairy stories which have their roots in myths once believed literally real speak of basic human and natural facts, interpret and evaluate them because the myths to which they are related dealt with basic human situations and the natural environment. Literary fairy tales making use of traditional fairy tale motifs and mythology have a similar character; they tend to be schematic and general. The set of expectations that the reader has been taught by long tradition to have about fairy stories, makes him seek deeper meanings in them so that the choice of the form of the fairy story in itself almost becomes an interpretative signal of allegory. To some critics, to Werner Spanner[41] for example, the features which make allegorization of fairy tales possible, are a part of its definition. And, when writing on the origins and the nature of fairy tales Max Lüthi notes that „Fairy tales are unreal, but they are not untrue; they reflect

---

[40] Quoted after: Carpenter, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

[41] Cf. W. Spanner, *Das Märchen als Gattung*, Otto Kindt, Giessen 1939, p. 6.

the essential developments and conditions of man's existence"[42]. By imitating folklore motifs, literary fairy stories acquire this peculiar quality of being both unreal and true, too.

Tolkien enjoyed „sub-creating" his imaginary world so much that he half-believed in it, yet he lacked the complete belief of myth-makers. The mythopoeic imagination requires the kind of belief that Christians have in the stories of The Old Testament: to them the stories are reality while non-believers may regard them as mythology not very different in nature from ancient Greek or Egyptian myths, for example. Mythologies are visions of the universe no longer believed to be true. Tolkien certainly did not believe that the creatures he described such as hobbits, elves and dwarves, ever existed. His biographer H. Carpenter said that:

When he wrote *The Silmarillion* Tolkien believed that in one sense he was writing the truth. He did not suppose that precisely such peoples as he described, „elves", „dwarves" and malevolent „orcs", had walked the earth and done the deeds that he recorded. But he did feel, or hope, that his stories were in one sense an embodiment of a profound truth[43].

This surely describes an attitude that an allegorist might have towards his invented story.

If, then, *The Lord of the Rings* (as well as *The Silmarillion*) was written as a literary, conscious „imitation" myth used to express the truths the writer believed in, his work must be regarded as capable of allegorization.

Tolkien's comments on his tales are often contradictory: at one time he says that he recorded the given while writing them and did not invent things, at another time he states that myth is invention about truth. If his fairy story rooted in his mythology is to be read as an invention about truth, it presents a hypothetical picture of that truth at work in a hypothetical world presented in a way which suggests that though it has not, it might have existed. In a letter to Stanley Unwin, hispublisher, Tolkien wrote:

Even the struggle between darkness and light [...] is for me just a particular phase of history, one example of its pattern, perhaps, but not The Pattern; and the actors are individuals — they each, of course contain universals or they would not live at all, but they never represent them as such[44].

---

[42] M. Lüthi, *Once Upon a Time: On the Nature of Fairy Tales*, Frederic Unger Publishing Co., New York 1970, p. 70.

[43] Carpenter, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 206.

If one were to treat *The Lord of the Rings* as a phase of hypothetical history and „an example of its pattern", one would be faced with two choices: since the sub-created world is by no means real, it has to be interpreted either as a pure exercise in creating fantastic constructs, with imaginary entities and cosmological systems called into being by delight in making things, or as an expression of a moral vision presented in terms of the fantastic, of a literary „artificial" myth. There is, indeed, a great amount of creative enjoyment at work in *The Lord of the Rings*, the tale and its peoples are important on their own right, but Tolkien did not write it for the sake of merely creating extraordinary things and events. Even if he had not insisted time and again on the Truth contained in myths, fairy tales and in his own writings, there is enough evidence in *The Lord of the Rings* to show that a coherent, consistent moral pattern structures his work in a functionally important way. The character drawing, mutual relations between the characters, events and setting show that, if they do not e m b o d y ideas and attitudes (in the way that personifications do), they r e p r e s e n t them. There are numerous pointers to the „inner truth" of the narrative. *The Lord of the Rings* could be accepted as a depiction of a „phase in history" provided one accepted *The Silmarillion* behind it as real history. However, in view of what has been said of Tolkien's mythology being sub-created and reflecting what is „created", that is real, and in view of numerous echoes of other sources, other myths — one cannot regard it as history, or even mere hypothetical history. Even if Tolkien half-believed in his cosmology and even if members of his fan clubs might half-believe in it, to most readers the story of *The Lord of the Rings*, its mythology, its Faërie constitute a mental invention with applicability to reality. Readers cannot regard it as real and naturally are inclined to approach *The Lord of the Rings* in the way that most myths of the past have come to be approached once they lost their appeal on the literal level and began to be allegorized. *The Odyssey* by Homer serves as the most outstanding example of gods and their deeds turned into allegories. A myth to a non-believer tends to be an allegorical expression of an underlying truth, and so is Faërie using a sub-created world.

The traditional fairy story's meaning has becomme obliterated and its vision reduced to a combination of the split levels of the fantastic narrative and of significances. A literary, stylized fairy tale involves an even more obvious separation between its message and the narrative. Its „truth" can be identified with the story only as a literary truth, not literal.

The Lord of the Rings is not, most certainly, the kind of allegory

which was written in the Middle Ages, and which was strict, limiting, and limited to its system of symbols that excluded the possibility of developing the surface story independently of the system. *The Lord of the Rings* can be considered as a work of allegorical character only in the „loose sense" of the modern open allegory which allows of multiple interpretation, and is less strict about the subordination of the literal level to the ideas contained in the story.

It is possible that J. R. R. Tolkien opposed allegory so much because, like many other writers among his contemporaries, he had a rather narrow view of it and understood it to be always like the personification allegory his friend C. S. Lewis created in *The Pilgrim's Regress*. Tolkien's comments on his own work are often illuminating and any analysis of his writing must take them into account, but it must also be remebered that, in the words of C. S. Lewis „An author doesn't necessarily understand the meaning of his story any better than anyone else"[45].

Tolkien's repudiation of allegory understood as a purely mental construct with „the purposed domination of the author" over his reader must have been caused by his conviction that any conscious didacticism or dominant conception could ruin the magic of his fairy story. Clyde S. Kilby recalls how Tolkien, after reading a paper which argued that *The Lord of the Rings* was based on the manner of Christ's redemption of the world, said:

> Much of this is true enough — except, of course, the general impression given [...] that I had any such 'schema' in my conscious mind before or during writing.

And the critic comments on the incident:

> It was against this ticketed didacticism that Tolkien found it necessary to make his disclaimer. I think that he was afraid that the allegorical dragon might gobble up the art and the myth[46].

But Tolkien need not have feared that. The art of „sub-creation" must be seen as the primary aspect of *The Lord of the Rings*, and this is only in keeping with the function of the fantastic in the fairy story in general. The allegorical implications are in the background of the narrative of *The Lord of the Rings*, but they cannot be ignored

---

[45] Quoted after: C. S. Kilby, *Mythic and Christian Elements in Tolkien*, [in:] W. Montgomery, ed. J., *Myth, Allegory and Gospel, An Interpretation of J. R. R. Tolkien, C. S. Lewis, G. K. Chesterton, Charles Williams*, Bethany Fellowship, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota 1974, p. 123.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

as the system of belief behind the story makes its presence sufficiently palpable. Even if Tolkien did not plan consciously to expound a schema while he wrote *The Lord of the Rings*, the narrative has to be related to the schema which, as the publication of *The Silmarillion* has proved, the writer had created: *The Lord of the Rings* is an expression of that schema. Tolkien may have had no allegorical intent, but the mechanisms of allegorical evocation, the clues for deeper meanings, to be found in his fairy epic entitle the reader to search for it.

The example of J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* demonstrates how natural it becomes to combine allegory with the fairy story since messages concerning the truth of man's condition belong to its essential features; fairy tales, sometimes in spite of their writers' intentions, invite allegoresis.

The combination of allegory with the fairy story makes for a most satisfying aesthetic experience since it appeals to the sense of beauty, to the imagination of the reader, to his emotions and also to his intellect as well as to his very soul.

Due to their character fairy stories are most advantageous disguises for those kinds of allegory which aim at conveying to the reader moral visions of the nature broader than religious, metaphysical truths, spiritual values. They are best suited to the need of speaking indirectly of the order of the universe and man's position in it; they are vehicles for truths about human life, birth, marriage and death, about man's dreams, visions, longings, about his happiness and his tragedies, about good and evil, the beautiful and the ugly in man's soul. Moral, religious and philosophical patterns imposed on the basic facts of life may structure fairy stories into particular visions of the world such as Tolkien's. The advantages of combining allegory with fairy stories are mutual: fairy stories gain depth of wisdom and thus avoid becoming mere displays of imaginative invention; allegory, by entering the world of Faërie, itself takes on some of its magic and enchantment. Truths told by fairy tales remain mysteries even if one gets very close to their hearts. „Unreal" fairy stories which are „not untrue" should indeed, as Tolkien suggests, be treated seriously because they are related to the ancient wisdom man has acquired through ages of experience.

The need to express a cosmic pattern, or even a part or an aspect of it, to talk of the infinite and the inexpressible results in the use of allegory, which is very different from that used in satire as it lacks its particularity and precision. Allegory in the fairy story is, like its subject, elusive and without sharply delineated boundaries, the natural corollary of which is that critics often prefer to speak

of the „allegorical character", „allegorical elements" and „allegorical suggestions" of fairy stories rather than call them allegories, especially since allegory appears in them in varying measure and in different shapes.

Literary, poetic fairy tales enjoy an increased popularity in modern times. This is partly due to the fact that contemporary readers are somewhat surfeited with naturalistic writing, and to the emphasis put by fairy tales on spiritual values as well as their relevance to what is universal. The basic qualities of fairy tales are also the basic qualities of great novels: when everything else is put aside, the metaphysical values which remain are the same in both fairy tales and in all great fiction. John Buchan maintains that they are closely related; he believes that „only so far as the novel is a development of and akin to the folk and fairy tale does it fully succeed"[47]. The belief in the importance of the structural function of fairy tale motifs in shaping a truly great novel proves this critic's high esteem of the fairy story This esteem is shared by numerous writers of today, who have chosen fairy tales as means of expressing their way of seeing the world. Very often they use fairy tales overtly for allegorical purposes. Sometimes they believe they rewrite stories of ancient origin, or use their motifs in new forms for purposes other than allegorical, but, by following the traditions of folk and fairy stories, by imitating their structures, the writers endow their own works with complex mechanisms of allegorical evocation which are contained in their sources.

From the reader's point of view it matters little if a literary fairy story has been written as an allegory purposefully, or if its allegorical character is independent of the writer's intent. In both cases the interpretative response remains the same. Allegoresis is a legitimate method of interpreting litrary fairy story patterned on traditional fairy tales, which themselves have undergone allegorization.

---

[47] Buchan, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

Chapter VI

VARIETIES OF ALLEGORY AND VARIETIES OF FANTASY: TWO SHORT STORIES: „THE OTHER SIDE OF THE HEDGE" BY E. M. FORSTER AND „THE LONG SHEET" BY WILLIAM SANSOM AND TWO NOVELS: T. F. POWYS'S *MR WESTON'S GOOD WINE* AND *THE AERODROME* BY REX WARNER

The Lord of the Rings has a separate chapter devoted to it, and not only because of its connections with myths and fairy tale motifs which may raise doubts about the allegorical character of J. R. R. Tolkien's work yet which render it capable of allegorization. An even more important reason for dealing with *The Lord of the Rings* separately, not in the present chapter, is in the fact that being a fairy story *The Lord of the Rings* differs from other kinds of fantasy considerably as it creates a world of its own which, on the level of the narrative, has no connection with the real world. As Stanisław Lem says in *Fantastyka i futurologia*, the universe of the fairy tale is ontologically closed and the „standard" world cannot smoothly turn into the world of fairy stories[1]. Because of this quality the fairy tale is often exluded from the literature of the fantastic which exists in contrast and comparison with reality. W. R. Irwin goes as far as to say that most traditional fairy tales are anti-fantasies. He believes that „a matter is within the range of he fantastic if it is judged, whether on the basis of knowledge or of convention, to be not only outside „reality", but also in knowing contravention of reality"[2]. Fantasy, in other words, presents an imposible situation as if it were a part of reality.

---

[1] Cf. S. Lem, *Fantastyka i futurologia*, Kraków 1970.

[2] W. R. Irwin, *The Game of the Impossible: a Rhetoric of Fantasy*, University of Illinois Press, Chicago 1976, p. 8.

Eric S. Rabkin includes the fairy tale in fantasy, but he does not regard it as „true fantasy"[3]. Whether considered, as by Eric Rabkin, to be merely related to „true fantasy" and therefore fantastic or, as by Louis Vax[4], to be a part of the „Féerique" and therefore different from the „Fantastique" although contained, like the other, in the genre of the „Merveilleux", the fairy tale is thought to be definitely other than fantasy proper. If it is included in fantasy, critics use the term „fantasy" in the broad sense of the word.

To avoid multiplying labels for literary categories I propose to use the term in application to the broad class which contains fairy tales as well as science-fiction and stories depicting impossible situations, but, acknowledging the fact that there exists a separate group of fantastic works which twist reality into strange shapes, as well as the fact that fairy stories cannot be identified with them, I discuss the two groups in two different chapters. The focus of interest of the present chapter will be on fantasies which collide with reality, cannot be absorbed with it although their writers describe them persuasively as real.

According to Rabkin:

Fantasies may be generally distinguished from other narratives by this: the very nature of ground rules, how we know things, on what basis we make assumptions, in short, the problem of human knowing infects Fantasies at all levels, in their setup, in their methods, in their characters, in their plots[5].

The description emphasizes the intellectual approach of the reader to the content of the fantastic world, which demands a change of perspective in his interpretation of it and destroys the order, the rules and the conventions he is accustomed to. The attitude of the reader, the way in which he responds to a fantasy is very important in the definition given by Tzvetan Todorov to whom the essence of that attitude is in „hésitation". He says:

Cette hésitation peut se résoudre soit pour ce qu'on admet que l'événement appartient à la réalité, soit pour le qu'on décide qu'il est le fruit de l'imagination ou le résultat d'une illusion; autrement dit, on peut décider que l'événement est ou n'est pas[6].

---

[3] Cf. E. S. Rabkin, *The Fantastic in Literature*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey 1977, chapter I.

[4] Cf. L. Vax, *L'art et la litérature fantastique*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1963, p. 5.

[5] Rabkin, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[6] T. Todorov, *Introduction à la littérature fantastique*, Editions de Seuil, Paris 1970, p. 165.

Paradoxically, „true fantasies" must not destroy their link with reality in the way that fairy stories do by creating separate worlds; fantasies constantly refer the reader to reality by disrupting it, contradicting it, by questioning it, while fairy tales, in spite of their inner „truths", are simply not directly concerned with it.

Even within the range of fantasy limited by the exclusion of the fairy tale there is no uniformity of the fantastic element used in different works. The fantastic is, like so many other literary phenomena, liable to variation and assumes different forms and various degrees of „density" in science-fiction, utopias and anti-utopias; stories of the supernatural, the marvellous (provided it is not believed to be real), the strange; writings presenting non-existent and impossible facts, developments and characters. Not all the variations of the fantastic suit the purposes of allegory.

To associate allegory with the fantastic will be unacceptable to the followers of Tzvetan Todorov, who believe sthat the fantastic implies „une manière de livre, qu'on peut pour instant definir négativement: elle ne doit être ni 'poetique' ni 'allégorique' "[7]. According to Todorov allegories direct the attention of the reader to their content, which belongs to the real and thus has little to do with fantasy. Such intepretation of allegory, however, disregards the rights of the „surface" story which, in itself, may be fantastic even though related to a pattern of statements dealing with reality.

Todorov's choice of the hesitating attitude of the reader and the characters within a literary work as a distinctive mark of fantasy can be accepted as binding exclusively for „pure" fantasies whose sole concern is „the game of the impossible", and whose main interest is inventing impossibilities for their own sakes. This pure or „true" fantasy is of no use to allegory which has messages to convey.

Selected short stories by E. M. Forster and W. Sansom, *The Aerodrome* by Rex Warner and T. F. Powys's *Mr Weston's Good Wine* have been chosen by me to represent in this chapter four typical varieties of fantasy which coexist with allegory.

E. M. Forster's short story „The Other Side of the Hedge", one of his „fantasies" as he calls his *Collected Short Stories* (published in 1914) is fanstastic because it tells of impossible, non-existent things in a matter-of-fact way, as if they could happen to anyone; it uses various ordinary elements of reality and its narrator speaks to the reader as if he, together with the reader, were a part of that reality, but the fact that he shows no signs of wonder or surprise at the

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

strange situation he gives an account of, makes the story even more extraordinary. The opening sentence contains all these features:

My pedometer told me that I was twenty five; and though it is a shocking thing to stop walking, I was so tired that I sat down on a milestone to rest[8].

An instrument called a pedometer used to record the number of steps taken and thus to estimate the distance one has travelled does exist, but it is not likely to estimate the age of its user. Yet to the narrator this a most ordinary function of the device. The narrator also implies that it was one's duty to be on the road and ceaselessly walk on, year in, year out. He speaks about it as a natural thing to do while not doing it is generally considered as shocking.

Nowhere in the story is there an indication that it is to be read as a dream or that the narrator is insane. On the contrary, it is told in a most straightforward and coherent way. The fact that it is told in the first person establishes a more personal contact with the reader and adds to the impression that the narrator expects to be fully understood by his audience, which is pulled into the unusual situation and invited to accept it as real. This, of course, cannot be done and what follow are the tension and the „hesitation" in the approach of the reader to the story.

The narrator, whom we do not know by name, proceeds to tell us how he, tired and oppressed by the monotony of the road, rested lying with his face turned to the hedge at the side of the road. Tempted to find out what is on the other side of the hedge, even though he reminds himself:

[...] we of the road do not admit in conversation that there is another side at all[9],

he pushes his way through it and falls into a deep pool. He is rescued by a friendly looking elderly man. The traveller finds out from him that the pleasant green place does not lead to anywhere and that the people of the place do not try to advance continually, to learn, to expand, and to develop, as travellers on the road do. What the people do means nothing but itself. The traveller-narrator thinks it to be all wrong, even though he finds that the people on the other side of the hedge are very happy. He praises the merits of the road:

---

[8] E. M. Forster, „The Other Side of the Hedge", [in:] *Collected Short Stories*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth 1965, p. 34.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

The road sometimes doubles, to be sure, but that is part of our discipline. Who can doubt that its general tendency is onward? To what goal we know not — it may be to some mountain where we shall touch the sky, it may be over precipices into the sea. But it goes forward — who can doubt that? It is the thought of that that makes us strive to excel, each in his own way, and gives us an impetus which is lacking with you[10].

The traveller speaks ardently in praise of the road, but when he looks at it and sees it dusty, monotonous, with brown crackling hedges on either side, he is rather disquieted at the sight.

When he sees a man returning to the hills with a scythe over his shoulder and a can in his hand, he takes the can of beer from him and feels very drowsy after he drinks of it. Before he sinks into an unconscious state, he recognizes in the man his brother whom „he had had to leave by the roadside a year or two round the corner"[11] and hears the old man say:

This is where your road ends, and through this gate humanity, all that is left of it — will come in to us[12].

The short story by Forster is very short indeed. Nevertheless it abounds in fantastic details such as the distance of the road measured in years, the road itself which seems to be a way of life for the travellers, dusty and empty though it is strewn with things dropped by the walkers, dust settling on things and turning them into stones, the disappearance of travellers left behind, the marchers themselves who feel compelled to walk frantically forward, and the mysterious, beautiful and peaceful place on the other side of the hedge. The fantastic details are used purposefully to convey the message of the story. That there is one, the reader is made aware of at the very beginning of the narrative: when one learns that the traveller is 25 because he has walked a certain section of the road, one cannot help thinking of it as „the road of life", all the more so since the road as a representation of life is one of the traditional motifs of allegory.

The details which follow the introductory description are consistent with this interpretation. We soon find out that the road in the story does not stand for an individual life, but for that of humanity at large: crowds of people who believe in progress press forward hoping that it will take them SOMEWHERE. Forster does not share their belief: numerous hints and telling details reveal how dull and bare the road

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 38.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

is, even though the traveller praises it. Instead of taking people forward the road doubles so often that it hardly advances at all. The desire to walk is associated with the frenzy and hurry of civilization, science, the spirit of emulation, belief in progressive development. The other side of the hedge appears very attractive. Even the hedge, brown and parched on the side of the road is green there. The natural landscape with its hills, cool waters, meadows, trees, stars, the scent of hay, songs of birds, breathes peace. People living there do not spoil the beauty of the landscape; their life and work are in harmony with nature. This, we find out, is the place humanity left ages ago, seized by the desire to „walk", but will return to it eventually. The traveller can attain this happy condition by giving up his race. The stopping of his pedometer at the age of 25, the appearance of his brother who left the road some time ago, now seen with a scythe which makes him like a pictorial image of death, and the strong drink which the traveller takes at the end of the story, all make the reader think of the narrator giving up his life, life on the road.

The ideas which emerge from the story point to the futile efforts of mankind to achieve an unknown goal, which brings about a lot of „sound and fury signifying nothing" coupled by the loss of the spiritual values of simple natural life which can be rediscovered only when materialistic and overintellectualized attitudes are given up.

E. M. Forster speaks as a humanist who often warned against the consequences of complete industrialization, of too much pragmatism and materialism. In his essay on „Mr Forster's Good Influence" G. D. Kingopulos says that

> In his earlier work, Mr Forster is precariously poised between forms of resistance and escape — a flight to the Mediterranean world, to „the other side of the hedge" or to the terminus of the celestial omnibus. But Forster is not an escapist willing to „shut himself up in a Palace of Art or a Philosophic Tower". His slighter works of fantasy must be regarded as attempts to organize and bring to a focus certain intuitions which at first derive from books, and later from experience and from travel. They attempt to open windows for enclosed and regimented men, and to evoke intuitive or childlike memories, as in dreams, of other levels of existence[13].

„The Other Side of the Hedge" emphasizes the need for „other levels of existence" very strongly indeed. All the significant details make the fantastic story most transparent and the clarity of ideas remains intact owing to the absence of irrelevant detail: each phrase is related to the suggested meaning of the story. The characters represent large

[13] G. D. Klingopulos, „Mr Forster's Good Influence", [in:] B. Ford, ed., *The Modern Age*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1961, p. 248.

number of people and because of this fact they have no individual features and no names. Miss Eliza Dimbleby is an exception: she has her full name though she is only briefly mentioned as „the great educationist" who swept past the resting traveller-narrator exhorting him to persevere. The effect of such singling out of the indomitable pursuer of learning is ironical.

Irony is often present in the discrepancy between the real values of things and those professed by the narrator, as for example, when he speaks of the Transvaal war in terms of advance, but it never obscures the direct indictment of humanity and progress. „The Other Side of the Hedge" is an obvious allegory. „Nearly all E. M. Forster's short stories are frankly didactic"[14], says Rex Warner, and the teaching which emerges from his story may serve as an illustration of the statement.

The theme of the story concerns humanity in general, the fantastic form enables the writer to concentrate on the essential aspects only, to arrange them in synthetizing patterns; paradoxically, the fantastic form makes the presentation more truthful and convincing. The overriding idea controls the use of the fantastic in Forster's story to such extent that the reader is never allowed to disregard it and take interest in the strange „sub-created" world for its own sake. Even the very strangeness of the world has a role to play in directing the reader's attention to the strangeness of the real world which people are so much accustomed to that they no longer notice it.

The philosophical problems viewed from a humanist's stand preoccupy Forster in most of his writings, in other short stories as well as novels. The ideas seem to affect the form of the novels which generally tend to follow the rules of realism, *Howard's End* (1900), *The Longest Journey* (1907), *Where Angels Fear to Tread* (1908), *A Passage to India* (1924); their realism often gives way to symbolism which brings them closer to poetry. The concentrated symbolism of „The Other Side of the Hedge" ordered into a system results in an allegory.

A similar kind of fantasy has served William Sansom to structure his short story „The Long Sheet" (1944) around a similar theme pertaining to philosophical problems. The difference in the use of the fantastic lies in the fact that while E. M. Forster has created a strange, impossible world whose existence cannot be justified in realistic terms, because it is a surrealistic vision, William Sansom invents in „The Long Sheet" a universe which might be best described in terms of the Absurd.

[14] R. Warner, *E. M. Forster*, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1964, p. 8.

Sansom has written a number of novels, but his reputation largely rests on his short stories. „The Long Sheet" belongs to the collection of his short stories published under the title of one of them — *Fireman Flower* (1944). In most of these the writer juxtaposes bits and fragments of reality in a jigsaw which is all awry; the details are physically possible albeit strange. The accumulation of these details, by its sheer quantity, creates a new quality, that of the fantastic, alien and often menacing. As T. O. Beachcroft says „William Sansom [...] is a master of atmosphere, with a very distinctive flavour of his own. He has a great gift of evoking sensations in words, that have not only a visual but almost a tangible effect, and he often uses these powers to build up moods, often of a terror"[15].

The oppressive atmosphere usually results from the presence of a hidden threat, from an unexplained and incomprehensible situation created out of seemingly humdrum and ordinary (when seen separately) fragments of reality. The juxtaposing of numerous strange situations is accompanied by equally strange motivations behind the events, or a complete lack of any motivation at all. Needless to say, the omissions are purposeful and so is the general atmosphere to which they contribute. The reader is inclined to think that although the events presented by Sansom are just possible, the people in his stories must be mad to take part in them and to treat them as absolutely normal. Hence the total effect consists of the impression that in Sansom's stories crazy things happen to mad people in an insane world. Their behaviour is absurd in a way similar to that in modern drama of the Theatre of Absurd, Beckett's or Pinter's plays. The peculiar quality of the world is also the reason why William Sansom's early writings have often been described as Kafkaesque[16].

„The Long Sheet" presents a number of captives to whom their captors have promised freedom on the condition that they wring dry a long wet sheet. The windowless steel box of their prison is divided into cubicles separating the captives into groups. Each group in their cubicle approaches the task of wringing the sheet dry in a different way. It proves a very difficult task because the warders fill up the cubicles with hot steam of let in flocks of saturated birds which splash water onto the sheet. So some of the captives do not even attempt to tackle it.

---

[15] T. O. Beachcroft, *The English Short Story II*, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1964, p. 36.

[16] For example by A. Burgess in *The Novel Now*, Faber and Faber, London 1971, p. 112.

The immensity of the task had long ago disheartened them. Their minds were not big enough to envisage the better future. They had enough. They had their breeding and their food. The state of life held no interest for them. Vaguely, they would have preferred better conditions. But at the cost of toil and thought — no. These people were squalid and small. Their desire had been killed by a dull acceptance of their impotence[17].

In another cubicle there were „those who sought outside". They set about the task in a normal businesslike manner, keeping working hours, being punctual, and taking rest when they thought they deserved it.

Like so many who live within a steady comfortable routine, they allowed the routine around the work to predominate in importance above the work itself[18].

Room two housed five individualists of whom one had an instinctive fear of the sheet, one was a fumbler, another tried tricks and petty deceptions in order to avoid work; there was also a good worker among them who would, nevertheless let the sheet absorb moisture when his task was nearly fulfilled. The fifth man was a simple fellow who applied his whole body to the task of wringing the sheet and who did get it dry, but somehow nobody even noticed that.

Only in one cubicle did the whole group apply themselves to the job methodically, efficiently and with good will and faith.

Gradually these people achieved their end. In spite of the steam, in spite of the saturated birds, in spite of the waterous contagion seeping through from the room of the defeated, in spite of the long hours and the heat and the squared horizon of rusting steel — their spirit prevailed and they achieved the purity they sought. One day, seven years later, the wet gray sheet dawned a bright white — dry as desert ivory, dry as marble dust[19].

But when they reminded their warders of the promise of freedom, their guards soused their sheet with water and

'You already have it', they answered. 'Freedom lies in the attitude of the spirit. There is no other freedom'. And the skylights silently closed[20].

These forceful lines close the narrative at its culminating point. They leave little doubt about the meaning of the story: the five groups

[17] W. Sansom, „The Long Sheet", [in:] *Fireman Flower*, The Continental Book Company, Stockholm, London 1949, p. 143.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 146.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 146.

of captives represent human attitudes to freedom and show how much or how little importance different people attach to it. The lines also throw light on the meaning of freedom.

Like the story by E. M. Forster, „The Long Sheet" has practically no details outside the allegorical pattern and it is limited to the bare structure of the narrative determined by the allegorical purpose. The nameless people mentioned in the short story exist only as embodiments of features characteristic of certain types of human behaviour and attitude. Sansom makes his story even less concrete than Forster does his because he frequently uses generalizing commentary when he depicts different approaches of the captives to the question of freedom. The generalizing comments tend to move the story away from the physical world, but they are useful interpretative indicators.

The kind of fantasy represented by „The Long Sheet" helps to focus the attention of the reader on the abstract notions conveyed by the narrative. The strange prison exists in an undefined place and in unspecified time. It is never explained who the captors and the captives are because the information would be not only irrelevant, but also limiting as regards the applicability of the story. Neither is the reader informed why the captors wish the prisoners to work on their long sheet. The captors take on an almost supernatural character because of their absolute power over the captives. Like some divine creatures they look at them from above, also literally, through the skylights. They make one think of forces controlling human fate.

The situation is thus reduced to the very essence of the human condition; those concrete details which are given in the story, such as the wet sheet, the saturated birds, the steel cubicles of the prison symbolically represent different circumstances of man's life and his ways of dealing with them.

Modern readers have grown accustomed to being on the lookout for hidden meanings in stories which are purposefully made unreal, strange or absurd. The elimination of realistic detail and of elements not directly connected with its ideas directs the reader's attention to the meanings of „The Long Sheet" almost automatically.

The fantasy of surrealism and of the Absurd in modern allegories has a function similar to that of medieval personification allegories which disclosed their meanings in a direct way; it openly places the ideological structure in the foreground of the narrative and makes the presence of a message recognizable immediately.

The fantastic also serves to raise interest in the ideas of the story by displaying the inventiveness of the writer in creating the extraordinary situation.

In the allegorical novel by T. F. Powys *Mr Weston's Good Wine* (1927) fantasy occupies a much stronger position without, however, obliterating its allegory. Anthony Burgess is not the only critic to see the book as an outstanding native example of allegory[21]. And indeed T. F. Powys is one of the most consistent and deliberate adherents to this kind of writing in 20th century English fiction; having once discovered, through the publication of *The Left Leg* (1923) where his true strength lay he took, as R. C. Churchill writes, „the true, allegorical path that was to lead to his most inspiring work"[22] — *Mr Weston's Good Wine*.

Mr Weston's Good Wine combines allegorical messages with the kind of fantasy which involves the supernatural freely interfering with the 'natural' order of the world.

The supernatural element especially when associated with a divine power poses a problem to the critic of fantastic literature since he has to take into account the writer's own attitude to the miraculous, supernatural phenomena he describes. To the writer who believes miracles and supernatural occurrences are possible in the real world, they are not fantastic, while a non-believing reader may consider them impossible and therefore fantastic. Whatever attitude to the supernatural Powys, who was an unorthodox and even heretical Christian, might have had, fortunately he avoids direct identification of the miracles performed by Mr Weston as God's on the narrative level, though they will be seen as such on the allegorical plane. Mr Weston is a very thin disguise for God, there are numerous allusions almost directly pointing to his real nature and many people in the novel itself suspect he is God, but the narrator clearly wants us to see Mr Weston „objectively" as a wine merchant. The narrator writes of Mr Weston and his firm as if they were really existing when he thus introduces Mr Weston's partner, Michael:

> This gentleman had risen to high distinction in the firm, having once, by his strength and courage, quelled a mutiny that arose amongst the workers in Mr Weston's bottling department — a mutiny that, had it been successful, would have entirely ruined the wine merchant's vast business, whose ramifications were everywhere[23].

---

[21] Cf. Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[22] R. C. Churchill, *The Powys Brothers*, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1962, p. 21.

[23] T. F. Powys, *Mr Weston's Good Wine*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1957, p. 18.

The partner stands, of course, for angel Michael and the mutiny alludes to the revolt of the angels against God. The connection between Mr Weston and God is obvious yet they are presented as originators of two separate „stories" in the novel, which the allegorist Powys uses so that they throw light on other, but one of them is fantasy and the other is believed by many to be true.

The fantastic story begins when Mr. Weston arrives first at Maidenbridge and next at Folly Down. Mr. Weston and his partner Michael hope to sell some of their wine to the villagers of Folly Down. We get to know a number of the inhabitants of the village. There is, among them, Luke Bird who preaches sermons to beasts and fowls and who is in love with Jenny Bunce, a healthy and pure maiden, daughter to the owner of the Angel Inn. The innkeeper would let Luke marry his daughter only if his well were filled with wine instead of water. The innkeeper is inclined to blame all misfortunes on the Almighty, but the Reverend Nicholas Grobe does not even believe God exists after the death of his wife in a terrible accident, Mr Grobe's daughter Tamar, who runs free and wild in the fields with no one to look after her, dreams of having an angel for her lover. The lover of her dreams looks very much like the picture on the sign of the Angel Inn. Among the villagers there are also two mean and lustful sons of the Squire; they have ruined the reputation of many a girl, the Kiddle sisters, Ada, Phoebe and Ann being their recent victims. Mrs Vosper, who hates her sex and loves to see girls disgraced and suffering, is only too willing to act as a procuress and help men to seduce young maidens. Mr Vosper, her husband, is a good man who has no idea of his wife's doings. There is also Mr Meek the shopkeeper, Mr Grunter the church sexton, Mr Pring the stone-cutter and other villagers who represent the community of Folly Down.

Strange things begin to happen to these people or are witnessed by them when Mr Weston comes to visit the village. To begin with they see a huge sign in the sky (ostensibly an electric contrivance) advertizing Mr Weston's wine; all the clocks in the village stop at seven and these occurrences make some villagers think of Eternity and the Last Judgement. But they are not exceedingly surprised; they find the occurrences strange and awesome, but by no means impossible. When Mr Grunter tells a group of men that „eternity has begun", they are somewhat taken aback, but soon accept the fact.

No one in the room appeared to be the least surprised that, though the clock had ceased to tick and time was stopped, all should go on exactly as before. [...]

Indeed, the word spoken by Mr Grunter had been but a word, and Eternity, for all the company knew to the contrary, might be as pleasant to live in as Time[24].

When words: „I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I, the Lord, do all these things"[25]. are heard spoken with Mr Weston present, and the men do not know who utters them, they feel a little uneasy and suspect the words came from a picture on the wall. Similarly, Mr Grunter's reaction at the sight of Tamar's body being taken by two stars to the skies shows no symptoms of shock or amazement:

Two shining stars fell upon the earth. These stars moved as winged beings to Michael and, taking Tamar from his arms, rose with her into the skies. Mr Grunter nodded approvingly[26].

Tamar had drunk of Mr Weston's wine and after having been wed to Michael she was taken by the angel to the oak-tree bed, the meeting place of village lovers. She was killed by lightning while in the arms of Michael.

Mr Weston sells his dark wine also to her father, the Reverend Nicholas Grobe, who drinks it and dies gratefully.

The merchant has two different vintages of his good wine, which „is as strong as death and as sweet as love"[27] as he himself says. He explains the difference between the two vintages to Grobe:

'[...] when I describe the wine that I am offering you as new, I do so but to contrast this vintage with our oldest and strongest wine, many pipes of which we always store in bond, but only deliver when a very special request is made'.
'A dark wine of a high price, I suppose?' said Mr Grobe. 'Yes, a deadly wine', replied Mr Weston in a low tone. [...] 'I prefer to sell this lighter kind [...] and this new wine can be drunk at all times without a chance of a headache'[28].

The sweet light wine is willingly drunk by people in love, like Luke Bird, but the unhappy, disappointed and tired, like Mr Grobe, prefer the dark vintage. Mr Weston's good wine stands, of course, for love and death which is also a kind of love giving forgetfulness and peace.

Mr Weston fills the well of Luke with wine and the young man can finally marry Jenny Bunce, and together with her drink the wine of love for the rest of his life. Evil doers do not drink of the wine. Mrs Vosper is severely punished for her hatred and spite; she is seen

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 112.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 242.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 119.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 178.

to die in torment after the roaring lion which Mr Weston has brought in the back of his car, drags her away. The two sons of the Squire are so terrified by the lion that they decide to marry the Kiddle sisters. Thus the wicked are punished, the naughty — warned, the good — rewarded and when things have been settled, Mr Weston takes a last loving look at Folly Down, burns his car so that the lion, his „old enemy" as Michael refers to him, can disappear in the element of fire and then Mr Weston himself and Michael vanish in the smoke.

Mr Weston's Good Wine is generally accepted as the best work by T. F. Powys and, although it betrays certain flaws such as a degree of morbidity in the descriptions of decaying bodies, an ambiguous attitude to sex and sentimental moments verging on the ludicrous, the book contains more than enough to merit its reputation as a minor masterpiece. David Holbrook's assessment of the achievement of T. F. Powys is well justified when he writes:

> At his best, however, Powys's originality resides in his recasting certain traditional English forms of word-art for the purpose of dealing with our twentieth century experience. He recreates something of the essence of the English rural tradition, and adapts a mode derived from Bunyan, the Psalms, the Liturgy and the Bible, Herbert, ballads and folksongs, something of Shakespeare's drawing the language of ordinary people as in *A Winter's Tale*, and something of the pre-Christian tragic view [...].
> In *Mr Weston's Good Wine* Powys's modes are the servants of a poetic, metaphorical inquiry into the most troubling aspects of human life, chiefly those which relate to man's attempts to explain the meaning of his life 'before the worms have him'[29].

Mr Weston's Good Wine is a peculiar fantasy: not only does it reverse the relation between fantasy and reality by giving the appearance of the fantastic to what is real and the other way round, but it also mixes carefully drawn realistic details with fantasy in such a way that the extraordinary story acquires a very solid shape. The book begins with the following sentence:

> A Ford car, of a type that is commonly used in England to deliver goods in rural districts, stood, at half past three in the afternoon, before the Rod and Lion Hotel at Maidenbridge upon the 20th November 1923[30].

Unlike the story by W. Sansom for example, which takes place in an unspecified temporal and spatial setting, Powys's book begins at an exact moment in time and at a definite place. The world of the novel

[29] D. Holbrook, „Metaphor and Maturity: T. F. Powys and Dylan Thomas", [in:] B. Ford, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 422.

[30] Powys, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

is most familiar to a 20th century man; it is a world of cars, electricity, express trains; people in it live in conditions recognizable as real; Mr Weston, an extraordinary personage, wears ordinary clothes, drives an ordinary car and has an ordinary business. The villagers are busy with their daily concerns, work on their farms, gossip, drink beer, make love, deal in cattle, dig graves, write sermons, all according to their inclinations and position in the community. Even their speech based on the Dorset dialect sounds real. As Holbrook noted, the atmosphere of the village renders the spirit of English traditional rural life very convincingly and it provides the book with an additional link with reality. Realistic detail makes the fantasy of the book very homely; on the other hand, fantasy gives the ordinary village life the quality of a folk or of a fairy tale.

The fantastic creeps into the book almost unnoticed and at first it can pass for merely the strange. Mr Weston's only unusual feature in the first description of the character, is his hair „white like wool". Soon we find, together with the inquisitive boy Tom Burt who peeps into the back of his car, that there is something horrible in it. Later in the book it turns out to be the roaring lion of punishment. When Miss Gipps passes by, she feels „a strong interest and almost an affection" for Mr Weston. On the way to Folly Down Mr Weston's car runs over a little girl, but at the driver's bidding she stands up laughing, unharmed and happy. The car turns an extremely dangerous corner of a street at high speed and is on the top of a hill in no time. This makes the stonecutter, Mr. Pring mutter in amazement: „If t' ain't the Devil, 'tis God"[31].

The mere accumulation of such strange details is sufficient to make one pause to think, but soon things that cannot be explained in realistic terms at all begin to happen too. We have examples of this when all the clocks in the village stop, when „One that could not be seen" speaks to the jolly company at the inn and calls himself the Lord; when Michael, Mr Weston's partner tells Tamar he is the angel from the inn's signboard; when Luke's well is filled with wine and, at the end of the book, when Tamar's body is lifted toward heavens by two stars. The fantastic element is escalated so that the reader is made to accept more and more incredible events until he finds himself accepting what cannot be.

It is an interesting and significant fact that precisely those strange, extraordinary phenomena direct the reader's attention to the allegorical meaning of the story. For instance the turning of water to wine cannot but be associated with the wedding at Cana and lead to asso-

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

ciating divine powers with Mr Weston and, eventually to identifying him with God.

All the strange and fantastic details become „justifiable" if one detects the influence of Mr Weston's divine nature in them; it becomes natural that Miss Gipps should be so fond of him, that the little girl miraculously survives the accident, that Mr. Weston is able to see Folly Down live through different seasons in a moment, that „he possessed in a very large degree a poet's fancy, that will at any moment create out of the imagination a new world"[32]. It becomes clear that Mr Weston's „prose poem divided into many books" is the Old Testament. There are numerous other elements in the book which support an allegorical interpretation; unusual events, strange coincidences and miracles serve to emphasize the most salient features of characters and situations which, by being made to stand out from the more normal background, draw attention to their meanings. Character drawing is centered on those features which represent types of human attitudes and behaviour pertaining to the capacity of giving and receiving love or, in terms of the story, the features which show whether a person is likely to be Mr Weston's customer and drink of his wine. The reactions of characters to Mr Weston throw light on the true nature of the gentleman as well as on themselves. As types they usually can be described in a single sentence; Luke Bird, for instance, is a natural evangelist overflowing with love — especially for Jenny Bunce; Mr Grobe is a faithless pastor whose faith has been destroyed by his grief; Tamar is a passionate and ecstatic mystic of a lover; Mrs Vosper — a woman driven by the desire to cause destruction and suffering, and so forth.

There are other devices in the book which provide interpretative signals, such as the use of telling names of places especially („Folly Down" which suggests „human folly" seen from above, the „Rod and Lion Hotel" linked with the idea of punishment and hell, the „Angel Inn" with its redemptive connotations). There is also the arrangement of incidents whose sole motivation is often to be found in the realm of fantasy *cum* allegory, and the development of the plot pointing to correct moral choices and demonstrating the price of a wrong choice.

Interpretative signals will be also found in the numerous allusions to the Bible and religious matters. The hints often add to the comedy of the book. Powys seems to enjoy speaking with his tongue in his cheek, which he does very frequently. The disguise of Mr. Weston and his partner becomes a source of amusement owing to the complex allusions which often compare Mr Weston to God, speak of him as if

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

he was God, but then we are reminded that he is, of course only Mr Weston, and at the same time we know that on the allegorical level he is God after all: the complexity of the comic implications can be seen for instance in the following passage:

'We do our best' — Mr Weston was speaking at a later board meeting — 'to gain their attention. We have sent agents all over the world to shout hell to them and eternal damnation and a fire burning in the lake of time, naturally supposing that such merry tales ought to make people drink'[33].

Or in Mr Grunter's remark:

'Words and names', he said, 'though they be different, do all mean the same [...] and sometimes folk in heaven as well as folk on earth forget what they be called, and if a name bain't God or Eternity, 'tis Weston'[34].

In spite of its comedy and the comic aspect of Mr Weston himself, who is somewhat too short and a little too vain to conform to the conventional image of God, the book is a serious morality in which the virtuous receive love from God and the wicked are taken by the Devil on the Day of the Last Judgement. We can see, however, that very different people drink of Mr Weston's wine, which suggests the author had rather unorthodox views about the virtues and vices of man, as well as about God. He seems to imply that, though God may mean different things to people, as long as they are able to share love, they have goodness in them. The concept of God which emerges from the book is as unconventional as his disguise — Mr Weston. It appears, for example, that Mr Weston avoids churches: when Michael wants to take him to one, he says:

'I have never been inside one before', said Mr Weston. Michael looked a little surprised.
'I only like to go', remarked Mr Weston, 'where my good wine is drunk. In a condemned cell, in a brothel, in the kennels of a vast city our wine is drunk to the dregs, but in a church they merely sip'[35].

Powys's God, and his morality, show little regard for „moral" institutions and the sins committed against them, since what really matters to him is the ability to love. Death is often seen as a manifestation of

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 51.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 111.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

God's love and thus something desirable. Mr Weston himself would like it to be his share; he says:

'I long to die. I long to drink my own dark wine'[36].

Elsewhere he remarks:

'There are some people', said Mr Weston aloud, 'who, I believe, envy my position in the city where I live, but they are wrong to do so, for I would willingly exchange all that I am with any simple child that lives and dies in these gentle valleys, and is then forgotten'[37].

The depiction of God as tired of his burden of eternity and longing to die is surely contradictory to the generally accepted view of the Deity, but it is in keeping with the fascination with death which creates an undercurrent of the story.

The only thing which Powys's tolerant and understanding God never forgives is hatred and the purposeful destruction of other people's lives, but how much people themselves are to blame for their deeds and how much God is responsible for what happens is not clear from the book. The reason lies in the writer's own uncertainty about how the problem should be settled. The fact, however, does not do much harm to the novel for it remains a many-facetd imaginative piece of writing in which apparently contradictory suggestions, moods and tones are successfully combined into an almost flawless harmony. It is both profound and playful, comic and serious, fantastic and very down to earth, incredible and very real, not particularly moral, when judged by the standards of conventional morality, and deeply moral at the same time, and, by the same token, irreverent and blasphemous as well as truly religious. In view of its richness, one readily forgives the flaws — a certain lack of consistency, a somewhat morbid attraction to death, rather too carnal love between Tamar and the Angel.

The book fascinates with its poetic vision. The poetry, comedy, and fantasy mingled with the familiar are all almost inseparably connected with the allegorical implications of the book. Almost but not quite, since there are passages in *Mr Weston's Good Wine* in which fantasy, poetry or comedy as such overweigh allegorical implications and the writer concentrates on descriptions of natural scenery, life in the village or fantastic events. On the other hand allegorical significance comes too close to the surface of the story sometimes and there are instances (this happens more often towards the end of the book) when it abandons its disguise altogether. This results in rather perplexing

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 234.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

inconsistencies which occur, for example, when Mr Weston speaks of his divine power in a direct way:

'I remember', said Mr Weston, 'the day when I made death. It was the eighth day, and I saw a gathering of people in the plains, and, though all seemed to be happy, all were sad [...]'[38].

Or when he asks Luke Bird if he would like to listen to his reciting a chapter of his work, and then stands up and repeats „in a very fine manner the One hundred and fourth psalm"[39].

Also when Powys makes Mr Weston's lion disappear in fire, which, Mr Weston says, is the lion's element, this sounds strange and unjustified in the context of the surface story even though it is a fantastic story; fantasies should have their logic too.

On the whole, however, allegory and fantasy complement each other in *Mr Weston's Good Wine* and the novel proves that fantasy may be a most expressive vehicle for the metaphysical and moral problems of an allegory.

While love is the central theme and value in *Mr Weston's Good Wine* it is only a part of the pattern of life presented in Rex Warner's *The Aerodrome* (1941) even though the book's subtitle announces it as „a love story". The novel was written during the Second World War and that particular period of history had a very strong influence on the ideas expressed in the book. It tells of an imaginary aerodrome ruled by discipline, rationality, efficiency, unquestioning obedience to the superiors' orders. The ideology of the aerodrome has a strong flavour of Nazi Fascism. The Air Vice-Marshal's address given to new recruits explains its ideological tenets, the chief of which requires that supermen should be formed out of airmen:

Your purpose — to escape the bondage of time, to obtain mastery over yourselves, and over your environment — must never waver. You will discover, if you do not know already, from the courses which have been arranged for you, the necessity for what we in this Force are in process of becoming, a new and a more adequate race of men[40].

Contrasted with the aerodrome is the nearby village which represents a muddle of disorder, emotional entanglements, and lack of rationality as well as not-very-moral conduct and yet it is the village, not the inhuman aerodrome, which both the writer and the reader will prefer,

---

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 234.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 214.

[40] R. Warner, *The Aerodrome; a Love Story*, The Bodley Head, London 1966, p. 187.

because, in spite of muddledom and weaknesses, it is human, it has love, poetry and beauty.

We get to know both these worlds through a complicated story which begins with its narrator Roy being informed on his 21st birthday that the Rector and his wife, who have brought him up, are not his parents. Before he has time to recover from the shock, Roy accidentally overhears the Rector mention in his prayers a murder he has committed by causing the death of his friend Antony because they both loved the same woman. Soon after this revelation the Rector is killed during the annual Agricultural Show in an accident caused by Roy's drinking companion, a Flight-Lieutenant from the Aerodrome, who uses live instead of blank ammunition while demonstrating a new machine gun. To the list of misfortunes is added the Aerodrome's taking over the village for the purpose of control. The Air Vice-Marshal, who comes to take part in the funeral of the Rector, encourages Roy to join the Air-men and both the Rector's widow and the Squire's sister, who appear to know the Vice-Marshal quite well, support the plan. There are great changes in the village under the Air-men's rule. The Squire cannot bear them and dies soon after the Rector's funeral. The Flight--Lieutenant replaces the Rector and becomes the new „padre" of the village. In this capacity he weds Roy and his beloved Bess. The honeymoon does not last long for Bess's mother tells Roy that he and Bess had the same father„ the Rector, even though he denied it. Overcome by another discovery Roy goes to Bess only to find her in the arms of the Flight-Lieutenant. Bess and Roy part in anger and Roy finally decides to become an airman. The Aerodrome changes him gradually: he accepts its ideology as well as the philosophy of the Air Vice-Marshal and learns to plan coldly and be unfeeling. The Flight-Lieutenant undergoes a change in the opposite direction: under the influence of the village he has become sensitive to nature, beauty, love and fidelity. He is passionately in lowe with Eustacia, Roy's mistress, and he treats his job of acting as a „padre" quite seriously, preaching the old values of the village. This causes his arrest during a religious service. The Squire's sister who tries to defend him is shot dead by the Air Vice--Marshal. It soon turns out that she was the Flight-Lieutenant's mother.

In the meantime Bess, left by both her lovers, suffers from depression and despair. When Roy learns of her state he takes the medical officer of the Aerodrome to examine her. The doctor is able to remove her sense of guilt by disclosing to her that she and Roy had different fathers after all. The visit to the village, the pub and to Bess causes the recovery of Roy's old self. His now frequent visits to Bess speed up her return to health. Eustacia, who is pregnant by Roy, but realizes

that he will never love her, attempts to escape from the Aerodrome together with the Flight-Lieutenant. However, they are overtaken by the Air Force police and killed on the road. Roy now renounces the Aerodrome and wishes to leave it. This, naturally infuriates the Air Vice-Marshal. During the crucial conversation which follows, with Doctor Faulkner and the Rector's widow present, it emerges that the Vice--Marshal is Antony whom the Rector thought he had killed, as well as the former lover of the Rector's wife and the Squire's sister. The relentless Vice-Marshal orders the guards to keep Roy, the Doctor and the Rector's widow in a locked room while he himself has to go to a conference. His plane, however, crashes and he is killed in the crash. With his death the whole organization of the Aerodrome collapses. Roy remarries Bess and they live in the village which has returned to its old ways. But not quite: the experiences people have gone through have made them wiser. Roy has learned how wrong it is to attempt to make man free by taking away his freedom, to rid him of his sins and crimes by criminal methods. The book ends with the following lines:

'That the world may be clean!': I remember my father's words. Clean it was and most intricate, fiercer than tigers, wonderful and infinitely forgiving[41].

The complicated story is so rich in events that it becomes rather difficult to give a short summary ot it. There are two main reasons for introducing the complications into the book: one is the need to keep up the reader's interest in the narrative, the other, more legitimate, connects with the writer's wish to render the confusion and entanglements of the life in the village. It could be argued, however, that different methods could be used to achieve these ends; as it is, some critics complain that the complications serve merely „to keep the story bubbling", that they have little to do with realism and probability. The accumulation of secrets, coincidences, unexpected dramatic turns of the plot all tend to obliterate the realistic method of description used in the book. A. L. McLeod prefers not to speak of realism in reference to *The Aerodrome* and he describes Warner's novel as „an amalgam of diverse forms of prose fiction, making use of quasi--realism and symbolism conjoined in consummate artistry"[42]. R. Karl is not so favourably inclined to *The Aerodrome* when he says that in the novel „certain scenes are life-like but involve people who are barely real; or else scenes are unlife-like and involve people who are

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 302.

[42] A. L. McLeod, *Rex Warner; Writer; an Introductory Essay*, Wentworth Press, Sydney 1964, p. 22.

real"[43]. The criticism implied by this remark derives from the assumption that „The first rule of the allegorical novelist should be to construct a persuasive surface then project from it"[44]. To F. Karl and many other critics this means: convincing in terms of realism. Yet Warner himself says in the „Author's Note":

I do not even aim at realism[45].

If Warner achieves realism it is partly contained in his method and mostly in the 'inner truth' of his story which Angus Wilson refers to in the Introduction to the book as „realism of a very frightening kind"[46] because it reveals chilling facts about human nature. On the narrative level the plot of the novel is hardly possible and certainly not very probable. The characters of *The Aerodrome* are simplified to their essentials. Many of them, as we have seen in other allegories, do not get known by their proper names. Those that represent attitudes and functions connected with their positions in the society tend to be referred to functionally as, for example, the Flight-Lieutenant, Air Vice-Marshal, the Rector, the Squire etc., while characters endowed with more individual features, who consciously or instinctively refuse to be identified with inhuman systems and doctrines, have Christian names such as „Roy", „Bess", „Eustacia" and surnames such as „Dr Faulkner". Apart from Roy, and Bess to a degree, we get no inkling of what is going on in the minds of the characters. Sometimes their behaviour throws light on this, (e.g. the change of the character of the Flight-Lieutenant is indicated by his approach to religious duties and the villagers), but it is usually the ideas they represent that explain the characters. The depiction of the villagers gains some life thanks to the fact that it is so firmly rooted in the rural traditions of England, which have associations with definite features. Warner's characters may reflect convincingly certain aspects of real people, but they do not appeal to the reader as individuals in their own rights, directed by individual impulses, independent of the overall idea of the novel. They are often exaggerated, limited, or quaint because shaped by the allegory of the book.

The behaviour of the characters, even of the more life-like ones, has to be dictated by questions of meaning if allegory is to preserve

---

[43] F. R. Karl, *A Reader's Guide to the Contemporary English Novel*, Noonday Press, New York 1962, p. 268.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[45] Rex Warner's „Author's Note", [in:] Warner, *The Aerodrome*...

[46] A. Wilson, „Introduction" to Warner, *ibid.*, p. 10.

its form. The narrative, therefore, is highly selective as regards the kind of events described. Even mischances and accidents are not accidental. The Flight-Lieutenant 'potted' the Rector because he was supposed to behave in an irresponsible way (meant to demonstrate his freedom and superiority). The Air Vice-Marshal is killed in an aeroplane crash which has strong symbolical implications: the head of the Air Force is destroyed by a part of its machinery because it has been previously sabotaged by the Flight-Lieutenant, his son and initially one of his most devoted officers. The aeroplane crash corresponds with the crashing to the ground of the Vice-Marshal's flights of intellectual planning, and of his doctrine which proves self-destructive in the long run.

The conflict between the efficient dictatorship of the aerodrome and the befuddledom, slackness and complacency which go with more freedom and democracy has to result in dramatic events such as the violent death of the Air Vice-Marshal, the killing of the Squire's sister in the church, the shooting of the Rector, and the death of the Flight-Lieutenant and Eustacia. Perhaps there are too many happenings which detract the reader's attention from the central conflict and from the allegorical intent of the novel; the muddle depicted by Warner unfortunately penetrates the form of his book. The selection of the k i n d s of incidents does not always go with selectiveness in number.

The occasionally unjustifiable departures from the realistic method, as well as the usually necessary limitations of realism are not sufficient, by themselves, to include *The Aerodrome* in the category of the literature of the fantastic. What gives the book the right to enter the category is the fact that it does not portray a real, existing world; *The Aerodrome* presents an antiutopian vision of an imaginary society, imaginary although it is English. The story takes place somewhere in England and probably in a not very distant future (machine guns, aeroplanes and other paraphernalia point to the twentieth century). The governmental organization of the Air Force spreading its power over the English countryside is an invention although a very credible one. The device of creating an imaginary social system seen at work in a society, community, organization or an institution places *The Aerodrome* in the class of science fiction. Anti-utopias (and utopias) as well as most varieties of technological SF belong to that particular kind of fantasy which has the appearance of realism; they present hypothetical worlds that could possibly exist provided certain scientificelly conceived conditions were fulfilled. As Stanisław Lem points out in his *Fantastyka i futurologia* these hypothetical worlds are not ontologically different from ours. This fact makes it fairly easy to

speak of the realism of SF novels although they describe non-existent and unverifiable worlds. The fantastic worlds of science fiction removed from us in time, place or dimension, are described as if they were only temporarily inaccessible; they are built on the assumption that potentially they belong to the sphere of human experience. Darko Suvin defines science fiction as „a meta-empirical and non-naturalistic, that is, an estranged literary genre which is not at the same time metaphysical"[47].

Hypothetical worlds often appear in literary works of ideas, and their intellectual character creates favourable conditions for introducing allegory. *The Aerodrome* is a typical example of a literary hypothetical construct based on a system of ideas. The book expresses in an indirect manner the writer's views on his society, on the dangers of doctrinaire ideologies, on the need for democracy and individual freedom in social systems.

Angus Wilson reminds us in the „Introduction" to *The Aerodrome* that some of the tenets of the Air Force ideology were very dear to young people in England of the nineteen twenties and thirties; they, too, were scornful of the complacency and confusion in the lives of their elders and longed for life controlled by their own wills, for „clarity, independence and beauty". Wilson speaks for his generation, to which Rex Warner also belonged, when he says:

> By 1941 some inkling of the death of the spirit that lay behind this siren song of a clean aesthetic society, unencumbered by muddled human emotion, had reached all but the most blind of us[48].

The Aerodrome depicts the intellectual process in which the rejection of the disorderly life of excessive indulgence, and the lure of the ideology of the clean society, are followed by the discovery of the dangers of a false inhuman ideology and a qualified return to the old values. The literary synthesis of the conflict of ideas and values persuades the reader to accept the writer's views. *The Aerodrome* gains its persuasive power through its artistic achievement in rendering the atmosphere of the English countryside and traditional life, an ambience which is both very strange because meta-empirical and very real since it has references to historical facts. The persuasiveness is also heightened by the frequent use of poetic language of symbolical value. Thus the descriptions of nature have an important func-

---

[47] D. Suvin, *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction; On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press 1979, p. 20.

[48] Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

tion in rendering the idea of the novel. When Roy, the main character of the novel is introduced, he is seen drunk lying with his face in the mud. He finds this position quite pleasant when he recalls:

The mud smelt good, and I pressed my right cheek down flat upon it, seeing with my left eye the dim shapes of trees, like giants guarding beneficiently the field of a dream, at the upper end of the meadow, and beyond the trees a few small stars, jolly in the immense darkness. Oh, I could have cried for joy and peace[49].

Everything in the scene stands in opposition to the Vice-Marshal's ideals of cleanliness, self-control and discipline; the close contact with the earth gives Roy peace and content. The Vice-Marshal's ideals are as detached from life as his aeroplane flights are detached from the earth, even though they have wide scope and clarity of vision. When Roy joins the Air Force he is no longer moved by the „familiar sight of the ground", and regains the abilility to see the beauty of the countryside only after he finally renounces the ideals of the Vice-Marshal and again is willing to love, to suffer and possibly to err. He looks back with shame at his attitude while in the Air Force:

I had lost touch with the country where I had been bred, looking down on it from the sky with a kind of contempt, indifferent to the changes of climate and seasons, the rising and falling of the ground, except in so far as these things affected the readings of my instruments or the immediate purpose of the hour. Now I thought with longing and with shame for my neglect of them, of the meadows whose soil I had not touched for so long[50].

Characters' attitudes to nature and the country reflect symbolically their beliefs and outlooks on life in general; they clarify the allegorical message of the novel.

The Aerodrome makes its meaning clear not only through the use of symbolic scenes, a highly selective portrayal of characters and the illustrative choice of events, but also by the use of the most direct kind of interpretative indication — the commentary which usually accompanies the significant incidents of the story. Thus the ideology of the Air Force is expounded and commented on by the Vice-Marshal himself:

Science will show you that in our species the period of physical evolution is over. There remains the evolution, or rather transformation, of consciousness and will,

---

[49] W a r n e r, *The Aerodrome...*, p. 13.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 260.

the escape from time, the mastery of the self [...]. But this discipline has one aim, the acquisition of power, and by power — freedom[51].

Roy's analysis of the organization removes the splendour from the Marshal's plans to create a race of supermen:

We in the Air Force had escaped from, but not solved the mystery. We had secured ease for ourselves, discipline, and satisfaction. We had abolished inefficiency, hypocrisy, and the fortunes of the irresolute or the remorseful mind; but we had destroyed also the spirit of adventure, inquiry, the sweet and terrifying sympathy of love that can acknowledge mystery, danger and dependence[52].

He gives his motivation for his choice of the values represented by the village:

Yet I began to see that this life, in spite of its drunkenness and its inefficiency, was wider and deeper than the activity in which we were constricted by the iron compulsion of the Air Vice-Marshal's ambition. It was a life whose very vagueness concealed a wealth of opportunity, whose uncertainty called for adventure, whose aspects were innumerable and varied as the changes of light and colour throughout the year[53].

Roy hopes that his experience of the Air Force and the village will help him to avoid some of the blunders committed by both sides. It was also the hope of Warner's generation, which had experienced an intense preoccupation with politics, the desire to change the world, to rid it of pettiness and stagnation, and then learned the danger of Fascism. Yet the book is not merely an allegorical representation of the evolution of attitudes of a generation in English history. When, at the end of the novel, Roy speaks of the Vice-Marshal's and the Rector's two powerful personalities, he considers them in terms of lasting principles. He says:

[...] it seemed to us that between those two enemies there was something binding and eternally so[54].

Such general implications of *The Aerodrome* make one accept A. A. De Vitis's assertion that Warner's „allegorical method lends an archetypal and universal quality to modern events"[55].

---

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 188.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 302.

[55] A. A. De Vitis, „Rex Warner and the Cult of Power", [in:] A. L. McLeod, ed., *The Achievement of Rex Warner*, Wentworth Press, Sydney 1965, p. 67.

Rex Warner's novel contains allegorical suggestions concerning the most general existential problems of man; in less general terms, it shows two opposing approaches to life and society (which have their roots in the frequently reviving opposition between the ancient traditions of rural England and institutions of modern civilization which spoil the moral and social order as well as the natural beauty of the English countryside); from a still narrower point of view, it deals with the prevailing ideas and life-styles of the 20's and the 30's. The rather loose allegory, lacking any single definite meaning, is accompanied by a story whose incidents cannot always be submitted to strict allegorical interpretation: very often only the general atmosphere and meaning of a scene matters, not its details. And it is easy to imagine some of the incidents in *The Aerodrome* replaced by others provided they are of the same nature and kind. This fact leaves a fairly broad margin for the elaboration of the details which make the fantastic world more palpable. The realistic method and the firm connection with reality characterize most contemporary allegories which describe hypothetical worlds. They usually have some formal or structural links with reality (travel in space or in time, discoveries of remote islands and planets etc.) which create the illusion of the continuity between the fantastic and the real worlds. They are inquiries into the actual and possible developments of the real order, yet, because they are hypothetical constructions, they must be, by their very nature, detached from the real world and allow us to see not only „here and now" situations, but also strange new ones. In this way allegories like *The Aerodrome* as well as books like *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley, *Nineteen Eighty-four* by George Orwell, Evelyn Waugh's *Love Among the Ruins*, E. M. Forster's story „The Machine Stops" and numerous others, imply a comparison between the imagined world and ours. They speak of man's place in society, the political role of the individual, his dependence and his freedom within the complex systems of technological civilization. Allegorists who seek to express their views on such matters will often turn to science fiction and especially to utopias and antiutopias, since allegory combined with this kind of literature serves well the need of analysing a hypothetical social structure and the ideas behind it, thus revealing its mechanisms and values. As Darko Suvin says, „Any significant S-F text", and he includes utopias and anti-utopias as a subgenre of science fiction, „is thus always read as an analogy, somewhere between a vague symbol and a precisely aimed parable"[36].

---

[36] Suvin, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

What Darko Suvin says about science fiction could very well be applied to most other significant works which make use of the fantastic: they tend to be, in varying degrees symbolic or allegorical. There are, of course, works of the fantastic whose main (often sole) motivation is in creating amazing impossibilities and absurdities; such literature aims at arousing the reader's curiosity and amazement, at puzzling him. This is a legitimate motivation, but a rather limited one. The ingenuity of stories such as the one which an aged young woman sits on a soft stone and speaks without uttering a word etc., or such as Münchhausen's tall tales told by Bürger, are very impressive, but their dazzling inventions risk monotony by failing to sustain their attractiveness. A pure fantasy based on a series of shifts of the „ground rules" (especially if of one kind only) remains a *jeu d'esprit*, interesting because of its conception, but when the conception is made the basis of a lengthy narrative it often becomes rather dull. Pure fantasies (and it is usually the more succint ones) may be valuable literary achievements, but the stature of a fantasy enriched by what we often describe as meaning tends to be more highly regarded. It is true that ideas embedded in a fantasy take away some of the dominance of the fantastic element, but at the same time, allegory contributes to its weight and intellectual complexity, as well as to its logical coherence. On the other hand, the fantastic form is advantageous to allegory, as it allows the author to shape the story and characters more freely in order to suit the allegorical ideas: the form provides the allegorist with a wide range of possibilities to choose from. The four examples discussed above show now different allegorical messages are conveyed by different degrees and kinds of the fantastic.

Modern literature, and English literature in particular, abounds in works which combine the fantastic with allegory. Among the writers who have produced such works are G. K. Chesterton, Charles Williams, C. S. Lewis, Nigel Dennis, Mervyn Peake and host of others. They use the fantastic in varying measure and kinds — sometimes it depends on the surrealistic element, sometimes on a change of familiar perspectives of time and place, at other times it introduces the supernatural of a Kafkaesque nightmare, incredible metamorphoses and paradoxical turns of events. Sometimes it is completely merged with allegory so that one becomes the other; at times there are wide margins outside the area of overlap. As we have seen, the narrative detail overweighs the allegorical purpose in *The Aerodrome* and *Mr Weston's Good Wine*, while the stories by Forster and Sansom are very strict allegories which remind one of medieval allegorical visions: their narratives are subordinated to their ideological patterns and only

seldom stray from them. The important difference between the medieval allegories and modern Kafkaesque and Backettian visions lies in the fact that the former used predictable personifications, while the latter employ the fantastic which gives them more variety, imaginativeness and artistic freedom.

Fanstastic literature depends on „sub-creating" new worlds and where a new world is cerated one cannot but take interest in its order and meaning. It is not surprising therefore that allegory which makes use of this literature tends to concentrate on philosophical and existential problems. These problems are at the heart of the stories by Forster and by Sansom, and they emerge from the consideration of religious and socio-political matters in the novels by T. F. Powys and Rex Warner. And so different kinds of allegories, using as their vehicles different forms of the fantastic, have the important fact in common that they point to the most general philosophical questions, which will always be of great interest to man. While pure fantasy is, in the words of W. R. Irwin, „a diversion; it rarely has been and rarely will be the main occupation of writers for the main taste of readers"[57], fantasy *cum* allegory will have a much greater appeal.

The intellectual appeal is combined with the emotional aspect which heightens the effectiveness of fantastic allegories. This efectiveness is achieved by diverse techniques and devices which the literature of the fantastic has to offer, often aided by humour, paradox, touches of realism. Allegorical works using the fantastic often oscillate between the allegorical intent and the delight in fantasty, and this creates a kind of tension which is most advantageous to a literary work.

---

[57] Irwin, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

Chapter VII

ALLEGORY AND REALISM: *PINCHER MARTIN* BY WILLIAM GOLDING

Rex Warner's critic, Frederic R. Karl objects to the writer's method which did not allow him to sustain the realistic level in an allegorical work. The critic believes that „the realistic level [is] so necessary for allegorical projection" because, according to him, „in an allegorical work, if people fail to engage the reader, then the theme, despite its importance, degenerates into the obvious"[1]. This belief leads Karl to make a similar criticism in reference to William Golding's novels when he says that „Golding is an allegorist whose allegory pre-empts the realistic level; often only the allegory is of interest"[2]. Behind criticisms of this kind is the assumption that an allegorical work can and should be fully realistic at the same time.

Much of the argument of the present chapter stems from the conviction that the combination of fully developed realistic mimesis with a complete and consistent allegorical pattern is not possible, that, in order to maintain its allegorical character a literary work using the realistic method and content must limit its realism in one way or another. Where there is no encroachment on realism, allegory will be thwarted. The underlying conviction of the present chapter contradicts Karl's suggestion that the more realism, the better an allegory. It is only partially, therefore, that I can agree with Frederic R. Karl or with Paul Brodtkorb's opinion[3] that to work on the allegorical level, a work of art has necessarily to work on the realistic level equally well.

---

[1] F. Karl, *A Reader's Guide to the Contemporary English Novel*, Noonday Press, New York 1962, p. 265—266.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 259.

[3] Cf. P. Brodtkorb, Jr., „Art Allegory in *The Marble Faun*", [in:] *Publications of Modern Language Association in America*, vol. LXXVII, 1962, pp. 254—267.

I would modify it by saying that the work has to obey the logic and the rules of its own text and these do not a l w a y s have to be realistic, even when the realistic method and content are aimed at.

The combination of allegory with realism poses a serious problem to modern writers who wish to give their novels levels of significance of a symbolic or allegorical nature and, at the same time, strive to attain realistic mimesis. The dilemma cannot be solved satisfactorily, because the presence of allegory must make itself felt to be perceived, and this is often achieved by deviations from the realistic norm. The best a writer can do is to seek a compromise in the largest possible degree of overlap of the allegorical and the realistic planes.

The degree of overlap in William Golding's novels is sufficient to justify the discussion of his literary output in terms of both allegory and realism, but it certainly does not permit a critic to label the novels as specimens of typically realistic writing.

William Golding has written a number of important novels. It is his first novel, *Lord of the Flies* (1954), however, which is his most highly regarded book; it made his name and it gained him the reputation of a writer interested in discussing, through aesthetic means, moral and philosophical problems. The book has accustomed critics to regard William Golding as a writer of the kind of literary works sometimes called „parables" or „myths" and, at other times, „fable" or „allegory". Indeed, all his novels contain messages about the „darkness visible" in human nature and lead to generalizations about man.

In *Lord of the Flies* Golding shows how a group of boys, survivors of an aeroplane crash on an uninhabited coral island, gradually turn into murderous hunters, driven by their evil instincts to kill the better among them. They are no different from the grownups engaged in the war at that time. The microcosm of the boys' society reflects the destructive forces working in the adult world; it also points to the evil side of human nature (original sin) which causes man's destruction or the loss of his paradise.

In *The Inheritors* (1955) Golding examines the circumstances in which man loses his innocence and succumbs to evil. By showing how the innocent Neanderthal men give way to *homo sapiens*, whose intelligence enables him to do both good and evil things, Golding suggests that evil cannot be separated from man's intelligence, his ability to understand and to know; man has tasted the fruit of the tree of knowledge, which is knowledge of both good and evil.

The dual nature of man, and the often dual value of his deeds, becomes the central theme of *The Spire* (1964) which tells of a medieval priest obsessed by the desire to have a spire built onto his

church which stands on unstable ground. In order to achieve this noble end he does not hesitate to commit sins. He does much harm to other people, causes suffering, but the church with its spire does stand as if held up by a miracle.

Golding concerns himself with the predicament of a man who has to come to terms with his dual nature and make moral choices in *Free Fall*. The main character of the novel, Samuel Mountjoy, probes his memories of his past experiences in search of the exact moment when he made his wrong choice and committed himself to his 'free fall'.

Moral concerns are at the heart of Golding's later books, *The Pyramid* (1967), *Darkness Visible* (1979) and *Rites of Passage* (1980).

Pincher Martin, which will be analysed in the present chapter, was the second novel by Golding, published in 1956. Its narrative presents a castaway sailor, who desperately tries to save his life by clinging to a bare rock in the middle of the Atlantic, but only succeeds in adding to his suffering. Tortured by hunger, thirst, cold, physical pain and memories of his selfish life, he finally has to let go of his body and mind, and is destroyed by „the black lightning".

Whether one interprets Martin's plight as a physical experience or as hallucinations of a drowning man, the meaning of the book remains unchanged: on the metaphoric level, it depicts man's tenacious desire to keep hold of his identity, which makes him affirm it by the utmost greed and the destruction of others.

The brief look we have taken at the contents of Golding's novels proves that his themes are often extraordinary and even eccentric. Like most other books by Golding, *Pincher Martin* presents a situation which is perhaps possible, but not necessarily typical or even probable: the situation presented in the novel of a sailor dying on a lonely rock in the ocean can by no means be described as an ordinary familiar experience. And, like other books by Golding, *Pincher Martin* makes the situation important in itself just because it is so unusual. The writer as a rule chooses extreme situations distanced by their temporal and spatial settings. The choice of a fairly isolated community of medieval times, a couple of Neanderthal men living in primeval forests, a group of boys who find themselves on a desert island because of a war raging in unspecified future times, confirms Golding's preference for separating his characters from the complexities of social intercourses and from social rules which are responsible for the dominance of superficial conventional behaviour over the natural instincts of individuals.

Writers who wish to probe the depth of a personality often resort to devices isolating their characters from their social context. Joseph Conrad, for instance, tested the value of his heroes in various extreme, often dangerous situations, involving the confrontation between men and the elemental forces of the sea; his sea novels present clear-cut portaits of characters drawn against the background of nature rather than society.

The removal of characters from familiar places and familiar times draws the attention of the reader to their basic, universal qualities, to their essences. There is no need to give a reminder that placing emphasis on the basic qualities of men constitutes a basic characteristic of allegorical writing.

The isolation and loneliness of Pincher Martin are far greater than those of any other characters in Golding's novels: he is cut off from other people both physically and spiritually. Towards the end of the novel he cries out in despair:

I'm so alone! Christ! I'm so alone!

and he knows very well why it is so:

Because of what I did I am an outsider and alone[4]. [p. 165]

Martin's experience on the rock reduces him to his essential drives, instincts and desires; the bareness of the rock makes his personality bare too. The flashbacks presenting him in his various social roles acquire new meanings when seen in the light of his behaviour on the rock.

The unusual setting of the novel connects with not-so-very-usual events. At the beginning of the book Christopher Martin's ship has been just torpedoed and he is introduced when fighting ferociously for his life, on the point of drowning:

He was struggling in every direction, he was the centre of the writhing and kicking knot of his own body. There was no up or down, no light and no air. He felt his mouth open of itself and the shrieked word burst out. „Help!" [p. 5]

To make swimming easier he tries to inflate his life belt, kicks off his sea boots and, noticing a rock sticking out from the water, he climbs it and clings to it from now on tooth and nail. What follows is a des-

[4] All quotations from *Pincher Martin* are from the edition: W. Golding, *Pincher Martin*, Penguin Books in association with Faber and Faber, Harmondsworth 1962. Page numbers are given at the end of each quotation.

perate struggle for survival. Martin uses all the powers of his intelligence to find some drinking water, something edible, a way to protect himself from excessive cold, to ease his pain and to prevent himself from going mad. He patiently makes a dwarf of stones with a tinsel mask to attract the attention of passing ships, drinks stagnant rain water collected in a crevice of the rock, eats limpets, moves with difficulty his swollen, stiff and hurting body, and continues to be. His wandering mind evokes pictures of his past which show him using people as a means of succeeding in his career, of getting a good position and profit, of dominating over others. He remembers how he was an actor and used the director's wife to secure good roles for himself. He thinks of his friend Nathaniel, whom he both liked and secretly hated not only because Nat was a thoroughly good man, but also because a girl Martin wanted for himself preferred his friend. Unable to get her in any other way Martin raped her, but still could not claim her as his. The hatred he felt for Nat made Martin wish to kill him. He found an opportunity to do so during the war when they both were sailors on board a war ship. Seeing Nat pray in a very precarious position Martin gave orders for a sharp turn intending to make him fall into the sea, but exactly at that moment the ship was hit by a torpedo.

Martin's past can be reconstructed from the brief glimpses flashing through his delirious mind; the narrative concentrates mostly on a painstakingly detailed presentation of Martin's physical and mental sensations experienced between the destruction of his ship and his death. The passage quoted below is typical of Golding's meticulous care in concretizing descriptions:

> The point of the needle in his eye was blunted but instead of enduring anything rather than its stab he had continually to rub one foot over the other or press with his body against the slab of rock in an effort to shut off the chill on that side, only to find that the other side required attention more and more insistently. He would heave the globe of darkness in which he most lived off a hard, wooden surface, rotate it, and lay the other hemisphere down. There was another difference between this night and the last. The fires had died down but they were still there; now he had the time and the strength to attend to them. The stiffness had become a settled sense of strain as if his body were being stretched mercilessly. The rock too, now that he had a little strength to spare, was forcing additional discomfort on him. What the globe had taken in its extreme exhaustion for a smooth surface was in fact undulating with the suggestion of prominences here and there. These suggestion became localized discomforts that changed in turn to a dull ache. Allowed to continue, aches became pains, then fires that must be avoided. So he would heave his thigh away or wriggle weakly only to find that the prominence was gone and had left nothing but an undulation. His thigh would flatten down again and wait in the darkness for the discomfort, the ache, the pain, the fire. [p. 62]

Martin defends himself from the mere idea of dying. He is obstinately holding on to his body and proclaims himself a victor. Yet certain doubts creep into his mind little by little. The rock he is on reminds him of a decaying tooth in his own jaw and panic seizes him when the comparison occurs to him. He asks himself:

How the hell is it that this rock is so familiar? I've never been here before — [p. 114]

The conscious centre in him shirks from examining the similarity. It urges him to use his intelligence to preserve his identity. Even when at the end of his struggle he hears a voice and sees a face [God's] asking him if he has had enough, he tries to believe it is a figment of his own imagination; to explain it away by his fever and mental disturbances:

He tried to laugh up at the bloodshot eye, but heard barking noises. He threw words in the face.
„On the sixth day he created God. Therefore I permit you to use nothing but my own vocabulary. In his own image created he Him". [p. 179]

In spite of his refusal to give up and the overwhelming urge to preserve his ego, the merciless mercy of the 'Presence' puts an end to his struggle and destroys him.

When the dead body of Martin is found, a man who examines the circumstances of his death assures another that the sailor had not suffered much before he died. He says:

Then don't worry about him. You saw the body. He didn't even have time to kick off his seaboots. [p. 190]

This unexpected ending (characteristic of Golding's writing technique) gives a new perspective to the whole story. Remembering that Martin kicks off his seaboots at the beginning of the book and seeing that they are still on the legs of his dead body, we realize that either Martin's imagined experiences were contained in a brief moment of dying, or that his soul refused to leave his body and held fast to it obstinately even after its physical death. In both cases Martin's conscious ego, „the centre", creates his „heaven" and his sham life, by magnifying the teeth in his mouth into the rocks.

The final revelation of what has really happened in the book makes its narrative even more removed from the realistically typical, from the quotidian, and the experiences of a character placed in an unusual situation are made even more unusual by the suggestion that they

have been invented by the character himself. Thus the narrative of *Pincher Martin* includes the book in the category of romance which deals with the possible rather than the probable.

By choosing an unusual, extreme situation and developing an extraordinary plot out of it, a romance writer is able to bring out significant features of his characters and the circumstances they are in. There exists, therefore, a natural link between romance and allegory which is also interested in emphasizing selected qualities. When writing on the nature of romance as distinguished from the realistic novel, Albert Cook convincingly argues that:

> They are two different strategies for representing appearance and reality. In a novel, each observation reproduces the contours of behaviour as a reality which is also appearance; each points to the further reality of the overall plot. In romance, the archetypal plot of the book is shown to be underlying reality, the secret process of life's mere appearance [...] A romance tends to be allegorical. And however complex the figures are in allegory, they remain single, rather stiff and abstract[5].

Cook suggests that, by assuming the allegorical character, romance, too, is peopled with „single, rather stiff and abstract" figures. His remarks could certainly be applied to Christopher Martin whose portrait tends to be both exaggerated and simplified. It is exaggerated in the sense that the dominant quality of the character has been blown up to monstrous dimensions, and simplified because little else, apart from the dominant quality, matters or even exists in this personality devoured by greed.

Significantly, Martin was offered during his acting days the role of the vice Greed in a morality play, because the role suited his personality perfectly. The director of the company, somewhat drunk on the occasion, says to Christopher Martin:

> 'Darling, it's simply y o u! Don't you think, George?'
> 'Definitely, old man, definitely'.
> 'Chris-Greed. Greed-Chris. Know each other'.
> 'Anything to please you, Pete'.
> 'Let me make you two better acquainted. This painted bastard here takes anything he can lay his hands on. Not food, Chris, that's far too simple, He takes the best part, the best seat, the most money, the best notice, the best woman. He was born with his mouth and his flies open and both out to grab. He's a cosmic case of the bugger who gets his penny and someone else's bun. Isn't that right, George?'
> 'Come on, Pete. Come and lie down for a bit'.
> 'Think you can play Martin, Greed?' [p. 109]

---

[5] A. C o o k, *The Meaning of Fiction*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit 1960, p. 242—243.

The question Pete the director asks at the end of the quotation suggests half jokingly that Martin is not merely a greedy individual, but greed itself. One could very well say that not only in the morality play, but also in the whole of the book Greed plays the role of Martin; in the course of the narrative, greed and suffering, or the suffering of greed, develop into something larger than the person incorporating them and become almost disembodied, which goes well with the fact that the drama of survival takes place in the mind of the character and is an invention of his intelligence and imagination. At the end of the book Martin becomes reduced to his voracious will and a pair of claws which, both in spiritual and in physical terms, symbolize greed:

> There was nothing but the centre and the claws. They were huge and strong and inflamed to red. They closed on each other. They contracted. They were outlined like a night sign against the absolute nothingness and they gripped their whole strength into each other. [p. 184]

Everything that Martin, the incarnation of greed, does, everything that happens in the book is subordinated to the idea of demonstrating the workings of an insatiate desire to possess and „to eat". Centred around this single feature Martin may be considered a „flat" character, but there is a wealth of shades and hues in the depiction of the feature which make the portrait fascinating. The wealth of detail in the portrait exceeds the needs of driving the idea home to the reader, it transcends the needs of allegory, but it also makes it more convincing. It makes the book terrifyingly real. Martin's greed and human greed in general is a most destructive power; Martin himself admits that he „climbed away from the cellar over bodies of used and defeated people, broke them to make steps" [p. 180]. The using of others for selfish greedy purposes is often spoken of in terms of eating. Martin sees the activities of mankind as a universal eating of people by people:

> The whole business of eating was peculiarly significant. They made a ritual of it on every level, the Fascists as a punishment, the religious as a rite, the cannibal either as a ritual or as a medicine or as a superbly direct declaration to conquest. Killed and eaten. And of course eating with the mouth was only the gross expression of what was a universal process. You could eat with your cock or with your fists, or with your voice. You could eat with hobnailed boots or buying and selling or marrying and begetting or cuckolding. [p. 80]

The vision of the world dominated by greed is expressed by the symbolical image of the Chinese dish of maggots which is prepared

by burying a fish in a tin box and letting maggots eat it up. When nothing is left of the fish, the maggots begin to eat one another:

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 was a fish there is now one huge successful maggot. Rare dish. [p. 124]

There is an almost direct suggestion in the book that Pincher Martin is such a „huge successful maggot". Pete, who often acts as if he were Martin's conscience, asks of him:

[...] Have you ever heard a spade knocking on the side of a tin box, Chris? Boom! Boom! Just like thunder". [p. 125]

The noise made by the spade digging up the tin box is purposefully compared to thunder which at the end of the book represents the approaching annihilation of Martin. It cannot be avoided no matter how fiercely „the successful maggot" defends himself against it.

There was a recognizable noise away beyond the waves and in the clouds. The noise was not as loud as the sea or the music or the voice but the centre understood. The centre took the body off the slab of rock and bundled it into a trench. As it fell the eye glimpsed a black tendril of lightning that lay across the western sky and the centre screwed down the flaps of flesh and hair. Again there came the sound of the spade against the tin box. [p. 182]

Pincher Martin's greed is both the reason and result of his fear of death. When Nat mentions the possibility of Martin's death, he reacts with fury caused by panic and refuses to admit the possibility.

The overwhelming desire to dominate, to possess, and to use others comes from the need to assert his identity, the proof of existence, opposing heaven which would be, in the words of Nat, „sheer negation, without form and void". In the vicious circle he is in, Martin is both greedy because afraid of the final annihilation and also afraid that death will put an end to his greedy „eating" of others. And so, when drowning, he desperately clutches his sailor's identity disc as he clutches his own self, even though his obstinate struggle puts him in a most torturous condition; human greed becomes equated with life in him.

The stamina with which Martin endures his suffering and his indomitable will to survive do not, then, make him a hero since they come from wrong motives and basically from fear of death. And yet his endurance may evoke a grudging kind of admiration and fascination, similar to those one responds with to Milton's Satan or Conrad's

Kurtz. Pincher may also perhaps evoke pity because his „technique of dying into heaven", his endurance, is so wrongly used; and can one not feel compassion seeing so much suffering? „The black lightning" at the end of the book does when it comes to release Martin from himself.

The greed of Pincher Martin, and the greediness of man in general, is not shown as wholly contemptible, for there is a tragic aura about it[6], and almost a kind of pathetic greatness in the defiance, the power of the ego. Pincher calls himslf Prometheus at one place in the narrative, and though he is a distorted image of Prometheus, there is an obvious analogy. Pincher does not suffer for all humanity, but for his own ego, nevetheless his pain is immense (his surname „Martin" echoes the word „martyr"). Prometheus stole fire from the gods and was punished by them severely; Martin (called „Pincher" not only because it is a common nickname for sailors, but also because it is a colloquial word for „thief") steals from other people and he attempts to steal from God when he makes the tremendous effort to prolong his life and wills himself not to relinquish his identity. Like Prometheus he rebels against God and he shouts blasphemously:

I spit on your compassion! [p. 182]

He tries to steal from God the divine power to create and caricatures Genesis, by inventing a warpped replica of the universe; the formulates thoughts and changes them into sham facts. His will creates his 'life', a mock heaven of pain and agony that is his hell and his punishement. He even creates his 'God' whom he „permits to use nothing but his own vocabulary". And he is a martyr of his own faith; his first name „Christopher" (Christbearer) suggests that he has 'stolen', together with divine power, the terrible cross for himself. It is a self-imposed meaningless martyrdom that he has chosen.

What Pincher Martin so intensely enacts in the book, the power of greed, is according to Golding, an integral part of human nature in general, but Martin exceeds all imaginable limits in his voracious appetite to live. When he asks the thunderous presence if the others did not want to live, he gets the answer:

There are degrees. [p. 179]

---

[6] The article in *Times Literary Supplement* (October 23, 1959, p. 608) „Bending Over Backward' quotes Golding as saying that Pincher is a fallen man, „fallen more than most", and suggests that in spite of the writer's intentions perhaps, the character also represents ordinary human beings and acquires some heroic qualities.

Martin blames God for making him what he is, he asks the divine presence:

Yet, suppose I climbed away from the cellar over the bodies of used and defeated people, broke them to make steps on the road away from you, why should you torture me? If I ate them, who gave me a mouth? [p. 180]

This question, the question of responsibility for sin and of free will is important for other people — not only for Martin, and his situation is comparable to man's condition in general; the difference is that of degree, not of quality. Golding suggests that the desire to live, expressed by the need to dominate and use others, came with the moment man was bent upright and made the hybrid of an animal and a thinking being, with the moment he became *homo sapiens*. The idea echoes the concepts presented in other books by Golding, *The Inheritors* and *Lord of the Flies* notably, which associate man's fall from innocence, his original sin with the wakening of his conscious thought, his intelligence. Thus evil instincts have become inseparable from human nature, from his conscious ego, as demonstrated in another book by William Golding, *The Spire*. The predicament of Pincher Martin is an intensification of man's normal plight.

It does not lie within the scope of the present chapter to answer the question about the responsibility for the predicament. Golding himself does not enlarge upon the subject although he suggests that there is an explanation, but not „in the vocabulary of Pincher Martin", who is obsessed by greed. It also remains rather a theological question whether the fact that, in spite of Pincher Martin's rebellion, greed, defiance, and pride, there is a compassionate movement of the black lightning towards him, releasing him from his own clutching claws, is supposed to be interpreted as salvation. If it is, it would, then, be given to Martin in spite of his will[7]. He prefers rescue to salvation; he wants his identity, even if that means suffering. He rejects the „sheer negation" of heaven which is „a sort of black lightning destroying all we call life" [p. 63]. Martin says to God: „I have created you and I can create my own heaven". [p. 180] and he insists that he prefers it, but

The lightning crept in. The centre was unaware of anything but the claws and the threat. It focused its awareness on the crumbled serrations and the blazing red.

---

[7] J. Bowen in the article „One Man's Meat" (*Times Literary Supplement*, August 7, 1959, No 2997, supp. VII—XIII, interprets the end of Martin's struggle as „surrender and „an individual act of will", but there is no evidence in the book to support this interpretation.

The lightning came forward. Some of the lines pointed to the centre, waiting for the moment when they could pierce it. Others lay against the claws, playing over them, prying for a weakness, wearing them away in a compassion that was timeless and without mercy. [p. 184]

Thus annihilation, death, assumes (not unlike the death symbolized by Mr Weston's dark wine in the book by Powys) the form of the utmost love, freeing men from the „bondage of flesh".

Albert Cook says that „romance tends to be theological allegory"[8], and *Pincher Martin* could serve as a proof of his thesis, since the book contains implications concerning central religious beliefs. However, William Golding's ideas open vistas on philosophical and existential problems which transcend Christian outlooks.

Discussing *Pincher Martin* in terms of the meanings of allegory and romance should not obscure the role of the realistic techniques used by Golding in the book. Although the (imagined, as it turns out) setting and the delineation in bold lines of the character of Martin, as well as his experience of dying which cannot be verified precisely, are indeed removed from the scope of ordinary experience, the narrative of the book is supported by an overwhelming quantity of very vivid detail whose persuasieve power gives the situation presented a most convincing appearance of reality. This is a striking feature of Golding's method, one that cannot be missed or ignored, and many of his critics feel compelled to emphasize it as his unique achievement. V. S. Pritchett, for instance is impressed by the „power of his overwhelming detail of the physical world"[9] and Nigel Dennis states:

Much of Mr Golding's strength has always been in his impassioned close-ups of the shapes and textures of solids[10].

The critics, however, tend to underline Golding's presentation of „shapes and textures of solids" which, in my opinion, is only of secondary importance since what really matters most is not the physical world, but Martin's reactions to it, his sensations, thoughts, desires and fears. The book is in fact a most detailed analysis of the processes taking place in his conscious and sometimes half-conscious mind. It is, almost wholly, narrated from his point of view, and the details of „shapes and textures of solids" which emerge from the narrative

---

[8] Cook, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

[9] V. S. Pritchett, „Secret Parables", *New Statesman*, 2 August, 1958, vol. LVI, No 1429, p. 146—147.

[10] N. Dennis, „The Dream and the Plumb Line", *The New York Times Book Review*, April 19, 1964, vol. LXIX, No 16, p. 1.

are modified by what Martin feels and thinks (in fact, he invents them, of course). And so, for instance, the 'burning water', 'the choking welter', 'hard water', the air which feels like a cold mask and the shaking universe of the description on the first page of the book are endowed with their qualities by Martin's responses to the circumstances he is in. The passage clearly focuses the attention of the reader on Martin rather than the element he fights against:

When the air had gone with the shriek, water came in to fill its place — burning water, hard in the throat and mouth as stones that hurt. He hutched his body towards the place where air had been, but now it was gone and there was nothing but black, choking welter. His body let loose its panic and his mouth strained open till the hinges of his jaw hurt. Water thrust in, down, without mercy. Air came with it for a moment so that he fought in what might have been the right direction. But water reclaimed him and spun so that knowledge of where the air might be was erased completely. Turbines were screaming in his ears and green sparks flew out from the centre like tracer. There was a piston engine too, racing out of gear and making the whole universe shake. Then for a moment there was air like a cold mask against his face and he bit into it. Air and water mixed, dragged down into his body like gravel. Muscles, nerves and blood, struggling lungs, a machine in the head, they worked for one moment in an ancient pattern. The lumps of hard water jerked in the gullet, the lips came together and parted, the tongue arched, the brain lit a neon track. [p. 5]

Thus the realism of the description relies mainly on the persuasive presentation of the sailor's physical and psychological states which are readily accepted by the reader as the most probable ones in the given circumstances. After the initial struggle against the water and after finding the rock, Martin goes through various stages of exhaustion, pain and fever, but at all times he is determined to be rescued and keep „the thread of life unbroken". He tries very hard to preserve sanity and talks aloud naming, explaining things and telling himself what to do next.

Although the novel reads on the surface as a narrative of Martin's struggle for survival, the 'gimick' ending reveals that it is also about his fight to keep up his cunning self-deception which creates the appearances of life. The danger of having the self-deception destroyed, which Martin fears more than anything else (for that would mean the loss of his identity) is constantly present, and adds much tension and irony to the meaning of the narrative[11].

[11] Martin almost succeeds in convincing not only himself, but also the reader, who has to be very careful not to miss the real meaning of the story; some early reviews of *Pincher Martin* show that their authors were indeed misled into believing that the narrative was a mere factual account of a man's struggle to keep himself alive. The title *Two Deaths of Christopher Martin* given to the American

Pincher has to remind himself intermittently of the presence of his body and its functions in order to pretend it is on the rock. Sometimes his intelligence makes mistakes in making up his environment as when, for instance, he sees a red lobster in the water, sometimes he comes very close to the full realization of his state, but always explains it away as a symptom of madness and escapes from it in a hurry.

Provided one accepts the overall situation of the extended life of a conscious ego as possible, the details of Martin's behaviour on the rock and within his mind, together with the close-ups of his immediate surroundings will be seen as its faithful representation.

Paradoxically, the flashbacks of Martin's real (not imagined) life are far less convincing since they lack substance and present shadowy figures. Martin's behaviour in the flashbacks lacks psychological justification and his motives, if given, are not analysed. The full motivation emerges from Martin's responses to his experience in the ocean.

The meagreness of detail, a certain vagueness and a highly selective approach to character drawing make C. B. Cox voice the opinion that in the flashbacks Martin behaves like a medieval caricature of vice rather than a real man[12]. Such presentation of the main character, selective, exaggerated and lacking concrete detail would be in keeping with the allegorical purpose of Golding's book; it points to those qualities in Pincher Martin which, indeed, make him an epitome of greed almost in its pure form.

In spite of their important allegorical generalizing functions the flashbacks add also to the realistic aspect of the book. To begin with their presence seems quite natural considering the disturbed state of Martin's mind. The insubstantiality of these glimpses of past experiences and the snatches of conversations have their rational explanation in the fact that they are, after all, memories of a suffering man, whose thinking is not always lucid and tends to be more and more hallucinatory.

An even more important contribution of the memories to the realistic aspect of the book consists in providing Pincher's tortured attempt at survival a (however general) spatial and temporal framework which allows us to see the character in the context of a particular period in history and of a particular society. Without such a framework Martin could easily be associated with a background of almost

---

edition of the book provides a useful hint as to the meaning of the book, but it also removes some of its symbolic impact.

[12] Cf. C. B. Cox, „William Golding's Pincher Martin", *The Listener*, March 12, 1964, vol. LXXI, No 1824, pp. 430—431.

any time and any place; he would be, like a character in a drama by Beckett, even more readily seen as the representation of a human attitude.

The dual character of Golding's writing, in which literary techniques both add to and infringe upon realism, is reflected also in the construction of the plot of *Pincher Martin*. The plot has a kind of conclusion called a „gimmick" ending by the writer himsefl. It depends on an abrupt shift of perspectives changing, at the last moment, the total significance of the novel.

James Gindin, who has written an interesting chapter of his book *(Post War British Fiction; New Accents and Attitudes)* on „»Gimmick« and Metaphor in the Novels of William Golding", argues that such endings limit or contradict the range of reference and meaning of the novels. Of the 'gimmick' ending of *Pincher Martin* he says:

> The dimension of time has been removed and the microcosmic metaphor is but an instantaneous, apocalyptic vision. In the ultimate sense this revelation enhances the microcosm, compresses all the issues into a single instant of time. But the revelation, in fact, makes the situation too complete, too contrived, seems to carry the development of the microcosm to the point of parodying itself. One can accept the struggle of forces on the rock as emblematic of a constant human struggle, but when the dimension of time is removed, when the struggle is distilled to an instantaneous flash, one immediately thinks of parody in which the struggle was not significant at all[13].

Gindin's assumptions and conclusions, however, raise doubts. First of all there is no evidence in the book that the mental struggle for survival took place in an instant; it could last for a period of time in the already dead body of the sailor (the references to the ruinous state of the body might support the interpretation). Secondly, even if Martin's futile suffering were to be contained in a moment, the removal of the dimension of time does not necessarily diminish the apocalyptic vision but, on the contrary, it can add poignancy to it. The ending makes the situation indeed contrived but not wholly unjustifiably so. Extraordinary as it is, it could be explained by the experiences of people on the verge of dying who are said to be able to recall their past lives in a brief moment. Golding, like Ambrose Bierce in his well known story, „An Occurrance at Owl Creek Bridge", changes the condensed vision of the past into a vision of the (imagined) future. And if the ending is seen as making the struggle for survival look insignificant, is it not meant to be seen that way? After

---

[13] J. Gindin, *Post War British Fiction; New Accents and Attitudes*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1962, p. 201.

all the writer compares Martin to the successful maggot that used all its strenght and cunning in order not to be eaten and eat others but had to be 'eaten' in the end too.

The ending adds a number of implications to what Gindin calls Golding's metaphor; it reveals the monstrosity of an egoistic greedy will, it by no means contradicts the meaning of the metaphor, but takes the reader a step further on the course established by the narrative and gives human greed its ultimate expression. It is, in fact, a powerful „punch line" for the book.

There is, however, another aspect of the 'gimmick' ending, disregarded by Gindin; on the level of the construction of the plot the ending eludes the allegorical pattern of the book. Until the very last section of the book, the general layout of the narrative can be consistently interpreted in terms of the emblematic presentation of greed. Yet the final section [14] which contains the revelations, introduces Captain Davidson and Mr Campbell who talk about finding Martin's corpse. Their conversation contains the important piece of information concerning the circumstances of Martin's physical death, and questions about the meaning of life and death and about the possibility of preserving one's identity after death. The ending is related to the theme of the book as well as to its plot, but it belongs to a plane different from Martin's story which reflects an arranged pattern of ideas expressed allegorically. Campbell and Davidson exist outside the pattern and have to be understood as characters conceived on the realistic level only. Thus the narrative acquires a realistic tag-ending, itself being both allegorical and realistic to a degree.

The validity of the criticism of Golding's method which is said to allow allegory to pre-empt the realistic level, appears to be contradicted by quite a number of examples of techniques which bring out in strong relief the realistic aspect of the book: one could object to the „gimmick" ending, for example, or the accumulation of descriptive detail, on the grounds that they obscure the allegorical intent of the novel. Yet neither the attitude condemning *Pincher Martin* for not being strictly realistic, nor the one which accuses Golding of spoiling his allegory, is justified, especially if one takes into consideration the fact that the book creates and obeys its own rules and regulations, which require particular techniques.

Pincher Martin has a carefully wrought, complex structure in which all elements are connected with others in multiple relationships. Very often, individual phrases charged with meaning can be fully understood only when examined in the light of passages occurring at other places in the book, sometimes quite remote places. Nothing is acci-

dental in *Pincher Martin*. The very choice of Martin's name as well as the names of the two secondary characters of some importance, Nathaniel and Mary Lovell, has implications relevant to the theme of the book; Christopher Martin's name has been explained earlier in this chapter, Nathaniel's associates itself with the disciple of Christ in whom Jesus saw „nothing false", according to St. John's gospel, and Mary Lovell seems to be a fitting name for the pure virgin whose devotion to Nat Christopher Martin so bitterly resents and envies.

Neither is it fortuitous that Martin should be an actor. Not only does it allow us to see Martin in the role of Greed from a morality play and view the character as a personification of vice, but it also helps to justify his extraordinary power to enact his own inventions (his own drama) on the stage of his mind as if they were real. Martin is an actor who is a „doer" attempting to imitate the supreme doer of all, but, playing this role he fails to convince himself, his own audience, of the reality of his makebelieve experience on the rock, and he resorts to the last possibility of pretence:

There was still a part that could be played — there was the Bedlamite, Poor Tom, protected from knowledge of the sign of the black lightning. [p. 162]

The pretended madness is supposed to justify inconsistencies in the world Martin has created. At least he tries to persuade himself that it does:

A man must be mad when he sees a red lobster swimming in the sea. And guano is insoluble. A madman would see the gulls as flying lizards, he would connect the two things out of a book and it would come back to him when his brain turned no matter how long ago and forgotten the time when he read that — [p. 163]

Afraid to yield to nothingness, to become nothingness, his consciousness projects modes of being without which it will disintegrate into nothing, and without which the projections will not be possible. The situation is rendered by the image of mirrors reflecting one another:

He examined the thought of the days. They were a recession like repeated rooms in mirrors hung face to face. [p. 125]

Later, when Martin sees himself in a hallucination we read:

The hallucination sat on the rock at the end of the trench and at last he faced it [...] When he was near, he looked up from the boots, past the knees, to the face, and engaged himself to the mouth.

'You are a projection of my mind. But you are a point of attention for me. Stay there'.
The lips hardly moved in answer.
'You are a projection of my mind'.
He made a snorting sound.
'Infinite regression of better still, round and round the mulberry bush. We could go on like that for ever'. [p. 177]

This visualisation of self-sustained existence is paralleled at the end of the book by the image of the claws gripping each other.

Parallels, comparisons and connections of this kind occur throughout the whole book. A careful reader will detect, from the very beginning of the story, numerous hints at Martin's life-in-death condition which connect with facts given much later. There is, for instance, more than meets the eye in the comparison of himself to a dead body that Martin makes on finding himself unable to speak at first:

He made a sound and only then found how ruinous an extension of flesh he carried around him. The sound began in the throat, bubbled and stayed there. The mouth took no part but lay open, jaw lying slack on the hard oilskin collar. The bubbling increased and the made the teeth click. Words twisted out between them and the frozen stuff of his upper lip.
'Like a dead man!' [p. 29]

The full realization of the meaning of the comparison is possible only after Martin's real situation is understood.

It is not often that Martin allows himself to think of his death, all the more so since deep in „the centre" of his consciousness he knows it for a fact. He prefers not to finish the sentence:

I must have a beard pretty well. Bristles, anyway. Strange that bristles go on growing even when the rest of you is — [p. 114]

Allusions to death are repeated again and again, as when Martin admits that he is afraid to sleep because he knows that

[...] sleep was a consenting to die, to go into a complete unconsciousness, the personality defeated, acknowledging too frankly what is implicit in mortality, that we are temporary structures [...]; [p. 83]

when he says that he does not like his voice falling dead at his mouth like a shot bird; or when he finds himself recovering from falling into „a gap of not-being";

Then I was dead. That was death. I have been frightened to death. Now the pieces of me have come together and I am just alive. [p. 153]

and when after the „resurrection" he expresses his determination not to die again. At the end of chapter 11 Martin finds himself examining the similarity between his teeth and the rocks:

His tongue felt along the barrier of his teeth — round to the side where the big ones were and the gap. [...] He stared at the sea and saw nothing. His tongue was remembering. [...] It touched the rough edge of the cliff, traced the slope down, trench after trench, down towards the smooth surface where the Red Lion was, just above the gum — understood what was so hauntingly familiar and painful about an isolated and decaying rock in the middle of the sea. [p. 159]

The passage contains an allusion, which is, in spite of its hallucinatory character, almost a statement of facts. All the allusions become parts of a completed whole when the virtually direct information is finally given.

The network of meanings is made even more complex by numerous analogies and echoes within the book itself. Martin's desperate attempts to escape death and the loss of his identity, expressed in hallucinatory visions of his climbing out of deep dark tunnels, wells or cellars, have to be compared with his memory of an experience in his childhood which showed his terror of the dark cellar. And both these situations reflect a more general pattern of human behaviour. „Pattern repeated from the beginning of time, approach of the unknown thing, a dark centre that turned its back on the thing that created it and struggled to escape" [p. 164].

Golding leads his reader to similar generalizing conclusions when he points, for example, to the analogy between the spade thundering against the tin box with the maggot, and the thunder threatening to destroy Martin's illusory life. The similarity between the rock Martin is on and a tooth goes well with the analogy between „the successful maggot" that has eaten the others and is then to be eaten, and the situation of Martin who has „eaten" others and is now on „a single point of rock, peak of a mountain range, one tooth set in the ancient jaw of a sunken world" [p. 25] as if to be devoured by it.

Apart from such similarities, reflections and echoes within the text itself, there are analogies also between the content of the book and an external „context". Frequent comparisons of this kind are made when the main character is set against some heroic mythological figures. Martin calls himself Ajax, who was a hero second only to Achilles in strength and valour; Prometheus, who rebelled against the gods; and

Atlas, another rebel, who has to support the heavens on his shoulders as his punishment. These analogies, as well as the ones between Martin's situation and Christ's suffering and God's creating of the universe, suggest the immensity of suffering and effort of the rebellious Martin in his attempt to create and keep his own world.

The analogies, however, are qualified by comparisons made between the main character and, for example a maggot, a limpet or a pair of lobster's claws which emphasize the unheroic aspect of Martin's personality.

The multiple, often seemingly contradictory, meanings emerging from the interaction of different elements is one of the most salient features of *Pincher Martin*. The image of mirrors reflecting one another used in the book to describe the state of Martin's consciousness can also represent the underlying principle of the intricacies of the structure of the novel. In view of such a structure it is not surprising that a great part of the images in *Pincher Martin* acquire symbolical functions. The central symbol is the box with maggots, but all add to the significance of the novel. When, for example, Martin clutches his sailor's identity disc, the scene is symbolic of his fear of having his conscious personality dissolved; the vision of faces which he uses as steps to climb out of the tunnel symbolizes Martin's attitude to other people; the lobster claws stand for his obstinate greed etc.

The extensive use of symbols and the often metaphoric language contribute to the poetic aspect of *Pincher Martin*. The language of the book reflects the duality of Golding's method of presentation which contains both realism and allegory: it is both very direct and matter-of-fact when the writer gives detailed reports of Martin's activities, and highly metaphoric and complex when significances are emphasized. The sentences of the „reports" are often very short and simple; they have the appearance of objective statements. Objective as they may seem, they all revolve around Martin's experience and his interpretation of it. These features are illustrated by the following possage in which most sentences begin, typically, with the pronun „he":

> He climbed down the rock again to where he had prised off the limpet. He made a wry face and pushed his doubled fists into the damp cloth over his belly. He hung on the little cliff and began to tear away the blobs of red jelly with his fingers. He set them on the edge of the cliff and did not look at them for a while. Then he turned his one and a half eyes down to them and inspected them closely. [p. 59]

Along with this kind of reporting narration there are numerous passa-

ges charged with intense emotion and endowed with implied significances such as the following:

The waves were each an event in itself. A wave would come weltering and swinging in with a storm-light running and flickering along the top like the flicker in a brain. The shallow water beyond the Safety Rock would occur, so that the nearer part of the wave would rise up, tripped and angry, would roar, swell forward. The Safety Rock would become a pock in a whirlpool of water that spun itself into foam and chewed like a mouth. The whole top of the wave for a hundred yards would move forward and fall into acres of lathering uproar that was launched like an army at the rock. [p. 181]

The realistic descriptions are not incompatible with the more poetic ones; on the contrary, together they strenghten the general stylistic effect of the book. The same can be said of various techniques used in *Pincher Martin:* realistic and allegorical devices both serve to render the writer's particular vision. We have seen how all elements are subordinated to this purpose, how they fit together in the pattern of the book and create a consistent whole. On its own terms the book works most effectively and so it should be read on its own terms, even though they are not necessarily always those of realism or of allegory exclusively. Blaming William Golding for not observing strictly the rules of realism or allegory means measuring his book's value against standards which are not really applicable to it.

Golding's art depends on merging the realistic method with his allegorical pattern in such a way that, although the two pull in different directions, there is a large area of overlap. The area of overlap is not free from tensions either. The combination of often conflicting elements generates a third quality which borrows from both realism and allegory (in its pure, ideal form), but cannot be fully identified with either.

The so-called shortcomings of the realistic method are often necessary to signal the presence of allegory. If they were removed from the book and replaced by complete mimesis how should one know the book is meant to be also an allegory? What right would one have to look for messages and hidden meanings in it were it to be a mere naturalistic account of a man's experience, an Alexander Selkirk's story perphas?

On the other hand, subduing allegory in places and the apparent limiting it by the realistic method gives, contradictory as it may sound, the ideas presented in *Pincher Martin* more persuasive power and, as is the case with the „gimmick" ending, adds new significances, which may transcend the allegorical pattern. The paradox of limiting abstract implications for the sake of abstract implications points to the fact

that ultimately it is prose charged with significances that Golding is interested in. The writer himself maintains that „originally he thinks in metaphor". His metaphors, however, are far from ethereal. Nigel Dennis, who is also a writer of allegory, understands well the nature of Golding's writing and his achievement. He says that William Golding's artistic method „consists basically of trying to rise to the heights while keeping himself glued to the ground"[14]. The outcome of the attempt „to have the best of both worlds" is a new literary entity of a hybrid nature. Bern Oldsey and Stanley Weintraub have similar remarks to make about *Lord of the Flies* when they write:

> Golding's characters, like his setting, represent neither fictional reality nor fabulistic unreality, but rather partake of both the naturalistic and the allegorical at the same time. As a result, they emerge more full bloodied than Kafka's ethereal forms, more subtly shaded than Orwell's animal-farm types, and more comprehensibly motivated than Bunyan's ciphers[15].

Their remarks can be applied to *Pincher Martin* equally well.

Mixing allegorical elements with realism and introducing realism into an allegory are by no means new literary procedures. As many critics will remind us, all great literature contains an element of allegory and, on the other hand, allegories are never entirely allegorical. Usually, however, there is a strongly felt dominance of either allegory or realism in literary works and William Golding manages to achieve a certain balance between the two. This fact makes him markedly different from 'traditional' allegorists, but he is not an exception among modern writers of allegories who often use similar techniques. William Golding's successful method makes him a most representative writer of modern allegory. In C. B. Cox's words:

> Golding has mastered the art of writing a twentieth-century allegory. In contrast to the medieval audience, the general reading public today does not believe that correspondences exist between the material and spiritual world, and they do not automatically expect every incident or object to have symbolic importance. No conventions of allegory exist, and the writer cannot introduce colours, animals, flowers, or any of the other emblems which were available for the medieval writer. In these circumstances many novelists have given objects an arbitrary symbolic meaning [...] This type of allegory can fully succeed only if the litteral sense is dramatically coherent in its own right, as in Camus's *The Plague*. There are other methods of writing twentieth-century allegory of course, as in Kafka's use of fanciful situations to explore psychological and religious experience; but if

---

[14] Dennis, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

[15] B. Oldsey, S. Weintraub, „Lord of the Flies: Beelzebub Revisited", *College English*, March 1965, vol. 26, No 6, pp. 90—99, p. 93.

a story based on real life is used, then there must be no unlikely situations or fanciful embroidery[16].

It must be also stressed that, as the case of *Pincher Martin* demonstrates, the closest a typical modern allegory aiming at possibly the fullest realism gets to it is through romance using the realistic method of presentation. Romance provides the necessary means of distancing the character and situation presented and, at the same time, keeps the story within the limits of possibility. The realistic method of presentation gives the book its persuasive power and prevents the distancing effects from going too far.

That allegory restricts realism considerably, when the two are combined, is fairly obvious. What may not be so obvious is the fact that allegory also has to pay its price for the union because, although it gains certain freedoms in using its vehicles and patterning them, its needs must be somewhat diluted and less definable. So when allegory and realism come into contact they both seem to lose something, but what they gain is worth the loss. The tensions created by the relationship add to the wealth of meaning and although the „surface realism" of a literary work suffers, its „inner truth" will be made more profound. When an allegory is not a fantastic work, a fairy tale, a satire, or a personification allegory, but a possible story, albeit unusual, it deals with things that could really happen to a real man and it is therefore more relevant to real life. This type of modern allegory forces the reader to change his perspective when viewing reality and ideas: instead of applying given ideas and truths to real life, which, for example an allegory using the fantastic, encourages him to do, he would be inclined to take into consideration the possible implications of reality as he experiences it and draw his conclusions about it.

Aiming at a possibly convincing presentation of character the writer has to deal with individual personalities. This, combined with the simultaneous tendency to generalize, results in the fact that these personalities tend to impersonate certain human features or moral attitudes rather than abstract notions such as „freedom", „spirit of the age", for example. More often than not allegories-romances present characters standing for types of human behaviour and aspects of essential human nature. As such they fall into the category of the exemplum. Writers choosing the form of the exemplum using romance *cum* realism are usually interested in man's condition and his moral

---

[16] C. B. Cox, *The Free Spirit: A Study of Liberal Humanism in the Novels of George Eliot, Henry James, E. M. Forster, Virginia Woolf, Angus Wilson*, Oxford University Press, London, New York, Toronto 1963, p. 172.

dilemmas and often take a religious view of the matters. Golding's attitudes and their expression in *Pincher Martin* is a typical example in this respect.

The writer of this kind of modern allegory creates in his work a world of objects and ideas analogous to the real one and describes imaginary situations as if they were „history", making it point towards situations that exist universally. The „history" of his allegory appears to typify a general truth and it thus acquires the character of a quasi-typological allegory.

Objections to considering *Pincher Martin* and works of a similar kind as realistic are well grounded since these works use only some of its possibilities. But, in view of certain encroachment of allegory by realism, and in view of the fact that their basic features depend on the overlap of allegory and realism, is one entitled to regard them as allegories? The answer to the question must be affirmative if one takes into consideration the fact that they do still contain patterns of correspondences between the ideational and the 'physical' levels, that the patterns are consistent meaningful wholes and, finally, that it is the significances that give the works their most distinctive qualities. Even the „gimmick" ending of *Pincher Martin*, which provides a realistic framework for its allegorical implications does not destroy them.

A modern allegory which like *Pincher Martin* attempts to absorb a measure of realism may not necessarily appeal to modern readers and critics who prefer literary works to be either decidedly realistic or exclusively (that is as far as it is possible) allegorical. But criticising allegories on the ground that they are not entirely realistic[17] is as wrong as rejecting realistic novels because of their not being complete allegories would be. Having chosen their own literary conventions and rules, modern allegories of *Pincher Martin's* class are what they must be.

[17] W. Allen in his book on English and American novels *Tradition and Dream* (Phoenix House, London 1964) calls this a weakness when discussing Golding's novel but he makes a cautious remark that it is „perhaps inevitable in allegorical fiction" [p. 291].

CONCLUSION

The opposition between the requirements of realism and those of the allegorical method is crucial among the conflicting forces pulling modern prose allegory in different directions. The example of William Golding's *Pincher Martin* demonstrates that a fully mimetic representation of life in a work of fiction is incompatible with allegorical purposes, since it is exactly the deviations from the realistic method and content, that, together with other interpretative signals, determine the non-literal character of the work. Although an allegorical work may contain aspects of reality and may use realistic and even naturalistic details of presentation, it cannot, in its total effect, be orientated towards recording „a slice of life". Realistic tendencies and an allegorical vision can co-exist in a literary work only in a mutually limiting relationship, which, however, is compensated for by creating new aesthetic values; the tensions between the colliding purposes may easily damage the structure of the work but, when used skilfully, they greatly add to its significance. Including a relatively considerable measure of realism (the realistic method) in allegorical writing, and keeping a delicate balance between them, is an important achievement of twentieth-century allegorists. If realism of presentation cannot be complete, it is because they concentrate on the spiritual and philosophic realities of the human condition, and thus endow their writings with „the inner truth".

The fact that the inner truth of man's life and the universe as seen by writers will be found in most modern allegories, and the realistic method in many, but a full mimesis in none, determines the choices which modern writers have to make in selecting suitable forms for their allegories. Since attempts at incorporating allegory in a work of fiction imitating life can at best result in romance, or a work of similar type with limited, if not impaired realism, most modern alle-

gorists have resorted to non-realistic genres thus avoiding the dilemma of the difficult combination. We have seen, for example, that, although Rex Warner creates a very convincing picture of some aspects of the traditions of the English rural life, basically his book tells about a non-existent fantastic (if not impossible) England; George Orwell may have made most penetrating observations concerning real political situations when he wrote *Animal Farm*, but his work is above all a satiric beast fable. J. R. R. Tolkien's books which contain allegorical possibilities are fairy stories. E. M. Forster, William Sansom, as well as G. K. Chesterton, have produced allegories as nightmare fantasies. T. F. Powys has created a world beyond ordinary human experience in *Mr Weston's Good Wine*, C. S. Lewis changes abstract notions into physical beings when he chooses the form of personification allegory for his *Pilgrim's Regress*. In addition romances of the kind represented by W. Golding's books come close to the fantastic since they exist at the borderline of realism and fantasy.

Contrary to some current beliefs about realistic tendencies dominating in allegorical writing of today, it may be stated that modern allegory operates mainly through the use of the fantastic. The reasons why it does so lie not only in the fact that this allows it to escape the rules of realism, but also in the traditionally strong position of fantasy in the history of English literature. This position has been even strengthened in our times by the literary activities of those writers who wish, rather than to report and depict reality, to shape (or distort) it according to their own needs or to create their own worlds. Where a world is created, there must be behind it, in spite of its fantastic character, a logical plan or concept; there must be a reason why a particular imaginary order is chosen. A fantastic world cannot be fanciful: it is determined by the idea it incorporates, by its philosophical substructure. The reader of a fantasy is interested in finding its *raison d'être* and almost automatically searches for significances and meanings. And, unless what he reads is a fantasy for fantasy's sake, a pure „game of impossibilities", he usually finds them.

This characteristic of the literature of the fantastic is in keeping with the requirements of allegory in which ideas, philosophical substructures, meanings and significances are indispensable components. Thus fantasy is a natural ally of allegory. It has always been, in fact; after all, the personifications of the traditional allegories were also fantastic creations. The entities personifying abstractions have been replaced today by the equally non-existent beings of fantasies.

It is interesting to note that many of the fantastic allegories are written as stories for children ostensibly but, nevertheless, they appeal

to grown-up readers, just as, on the other hand, many allegorical stories written for mature audiences make good reading for children. This literary phenomenon is closely connected with the fact that the allegorical backbone must always be a fairly simple, if not schematic, structure, and, in spite of the obscurities and disguises of modern allegory, its ultimate moral message must be clear and direct, no matter how elaborate the fantastic element of the work is. Yet creating a fantastic world is an exciting intellectual game, and it often happens that an allegorist using such a world will get carried away by it and be absorbed by the „pure" fantasy of his creation. Also in the combination of allegory with the fantastic there are, apart from the areas of overlap, certain areas where the overlap does not occur. And here, too, tensions are created: the allure of pure fantasy and the rigours of allegory may be sometimes at variance.

A successful fusion of allegory and fantasy makes it possible for the writer to achieve numerous literary effects: there are many different kinds and techniques of fantasy and, as a result, allegories different both in kind and in the degree of intensity in the presence of their romance element.

The presentation of a number of works in the previous chapters makes it obvious that modern allegory has changed its nature drastically and differs greatly from that written in the early stages of its development. The main change consists in the fact that predominantly it uses other literary genres to convey its ideas (more often than not they are genres related to the fantastic) and has abandoned some of its traditional devices. The type of the „traditional" allegory using personifications or conventionally established symbols, which left little doubt about their meaning, as well as the type of those allegorical works which contained explanatory commentaries on their messages, have practically ceased to be written in modern times. The few „traditional" allegories produced in the twentieth century only serve to demonstrate how out-of-date such works are in our time. One cannot help viewing them in relation to their forerunners, and tends to read them as conscious stylizations, pastiches or parodies which indeed they often happen to be.

The allegorical writing of the distant past had its own set of devices which separated it generically from other kinds of literature; one knew fairly well what to expect in a work labelled „allegory". It the course of time, starting from the Renaissance, the direct, obvious and distinctive features of personification allegory began to be rejected and an increasing merging with other literary genres took place. What distinguishes allegory from other writings today is not

so much its special devices (although they have a role to play) used in the surface story, as its most essential quality consisting in its characteristic method of simultaneously conveying messages and visions so that mutual penetration of „levels" takes place.

The presence of allegory in other literary genres implies that if allegory uses the genres for its purposes it is also used by them in order to create a depth of meaning and increase their aesthetic range. Allegory has thus lost its decidedly dominant position it had in those literary works which it entered in the past, and tends to exist always in a more balanced symbiosis with other literary kinds and techniques of writing. In terms of genological theories allegory may indeed have suffered a loss, but only the purists among literary theoreticians might feel regretful since allegorical writing, in spite of the transformations it has undergone, has gained in aesthetic value while preserving its distinctive technique of „other speaking". Limiting allegory's distinctive characteristics to the technique itself and depriving it of its apparatus of literary devices has been compensated by the greater possibilities allegory now has in assuming different literary forms.

The combination of allegory with various other kinds of writing involves finding a meeting point for often conflicting tendencies: both the areas of overlap and the divergences between the tendencies may add to the interest of a literary work, both may have important roles to play if used purposefully and measured carefully.

Allegory as written today is a compromising genre which has to give up certain things in order to achieve others in return for its concessions. This give-and-take relationship that allegory has with other literary modes today places it in a most delicate and precarious position, endangering the balance of a work, whose rewards, however, are worth taking the risk.

Various literary forms assumed by modern allegory provide an additional means of disguise for it: not only are certain messages, statements and concepts concealed in its literary construction, but also the very form of allegory becomes hidden by the forms of other genres. Allegory today seems to pretend it is something else and this fact is only in keeping with the essential characteristic of the genre, the „dark conceit"; in a sense, modern allegory has become allegory of form. The paradoxical nature of allegory which attempts to reveal its message while hiding it in an intricate structure, has never been so poignantly obvious as today when a double concealment both of the content and of the form takes place.

Modern allegorists shun easy answers and avoid making their works too transparent, so only seldom do they use such direct interpretative signals as personifications to expound their ideas. Readers cannot expect to be led to ready solutions, they must find them themselves and determine for themselves if a literary work is an allegory or not, as well as how it should be interpreted. The allegorist, however, wishes his messages to be read properly and to ensure this he does provide his work with hints and clues which throw light on its significances. The analysis of a number of allegories in previous chapters points to the most frequent and typical interpretative signals used in modern allegory.

One of the most direct signals found in modern allegorical writing, related to the personification seldom used today, is the use of telling names, which indicate concepts and values represented by characters and places. Unlike the names of personifications, however, they are seldom direct and often ambiguous. Equally significant is the lack of any name for a character or a place: the device draws the reader's attention to the general and the esential represented by them.

Presenting characters as depersonalized types rather than individuals, emphasizing their dominant qualities, points to the qualities themselves and gives the literary work a more abstract character. Also exaggerated portraits of characters, endowed with unusual, striking physical or psychological features, often suggest that the writer wishes to make a moral comment on the character and is not interested in merely presenting people's behaviour.

In modern allegories the setting is often unspecified, it could belong to any place or to no place which helps to distance the situation presented from the familiar scene. This is often achieved also through isolating the setting by physical removal from the world of ordinary experience. In many cases the choice of the kind of setting acquires symbolical associations thus adding to the significance of the work. Often elements of the setting will have traditionally ascribed emblematic value (ship, roads, islands).

The temporal situation also frequently tends to be vague, or distant when made more specific. The impression the device creates is that of timelessness. Sometimes the present tense is used to denote the eternal relevance and validity of the truths presented.

If not altogether impossible the plot of an allegory will usually be rather improbable, as even ostensibly realistic accounts contain the element of the extraordinary. The plot may tend to be episodic or fairly static, since the stress is not so much on the development of an exciting story as on a situation reflecting a complex of relationships.

Mary Doyle Springer, who discusses the signifying features of apologue in her *Forms of the Medern Novella*, finds their relative plotlessness, by which she means that things happen in a story bound in time sequence, not by plot necessity, a characteristic feature of all literature of ideas[1]. It is quite natural that this should be so in allegories whose events are often motivated not by the psychological impulses of characters, but by hidden meanings.

Another limitation which the critic finds in what she calls „apologues" is the „relative lack of dialogue". The analysis of the allegories presented above cannot confirm her observations in this respect, however; allegorical novels use dialogue extensively, as any other kinds of novel might use it. Shorter prose forms of this kind do not use it in the same degree and they often prefer straightforward narration, but, then, this is probably true about most short fiction, not only allegories or apologues. What is interesting and characteristic about the dialogue in certain types of allegorical writing is that it is in fact simulated dialogue, since it does not present an exchange of views or a confrontation of personalities, but divides into roles the task of expounding an idea or explaining a phenomenon: one character asks suitable questions which enable the other to give the necessary information. Such dialogue often reminds one of a catechism, or the questions and answers exchanged by a guide and a group of tourists.

Sometimes, instead of making characters their mouthpieces, allegorists prefer to speak through their more impersonal narrators and provide generalizing commentary or explanatory remarks which are, in fact, interpretative statements.

Allegorical stories often convey their central ideas through a key symbolical scene or device which is usually made emphatically prominent in a literary work. Its importance may be stressed by linking the title of the work with it (*Lord of the Flies*, „The Long Sheet" etc.). Titles of allegories are the first important means of giving the reader clues about their ideational content which prepares him for the double reading; more often than not they bring into the focus of interest the crucial allegorical agents determining the pattern of correspondences presented (*Mr Weston's Good Wine*, „The Long Sheet", *Lord of the Flies*) or the place which stands for an intellectual system or a way of life (*The Aerodrome*, „The Other Side of the Hedge"). Characters and their activities are less frequently emphasized by the

---

[1] Cf. M. D. Springer, *Forms of the Modern Novella*, The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., Chicago and London 1975, p. 40.

titles of allegories, which is not surprising in literary works not primarily concerned with character drawing.

The significance of a place, a scene, an object or, sometimes, a character, which irradiates the whole of an allegory, is often stressed by means of repetition and if the meaningful images themselves do not recur a number of times, frequent references to them usually suggest their important role throughout the work.

The style of the narrative of an allegory employed to corroborate its meaning often has a densely metaphoric character and serves as an indicator of the presence of non-literal implications. The allegorical texture of the narrative draws the reader's attention to the writer's conception controlling his creation. Is it sometimes described as poetic. And as Rex Warner maintains that:

> There are occasions when poetry is „truer" than prose; there are occasions when prose is „truer" than poetry; and sometimes the truth of both seems to be evident at once. [...] The allegorist, writing in prose, is concerned with both truths, but particularly with what we have called the truth of poetry. For, beyond statements and judgements, he aims at the extension of the understanding[2].

The style which reflects the „truth of poetry" is bound to be ambiguous and as Maureen Quilligan[3] points out, its complexity is reflected by the tendency to adopt the mechanism of punning expressions which convey a number of meanings simultaneously.

A very important device used by allegory which is also a most helpful interpretative signal, is that of analogy. Analogy as a structuring principle has gained a widespread application in modern allegorical writing: most of the allegories discussed in the present dissertation make use of it as a part of their composition when they repeat the patterns of other works (in part or in whole), or when they make frequent references to them. Allegories may be modelled on single and particular literary sources, on several works or on a type-group. Thus, for instance, C. S. Lewis's *Pilgrim's Regress* has to be seen in the context of Bunyan's allegory and *Animal Farm* by George Orwell must be read in reference to a particular type of the beast-fable; J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* echoes numerous fairy tales, myths, OE epics, Norse sagas and creates a mosaic of analogies with literary (and oral) traditions. William Golding's *Pincher Martin* is a parodic re-working of Genesis, *Lord of the Flies* by the

---

[2] R. Warner, *The Cult of Power*, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia and New York 1947, p. 147.

[3] M. Quilligan, *The Language of Allegory; Defining the Genre*, Cornell University Press 1979.

same author revisits Ballantyne's *Coral Island*. T. F. Powys's *Mr Weston's Good Wine* makes use of biblical references and James Joyce's *Ulysses has the patterns* of the *Odyssey*.

Analogy between one work and another does not necessarily make the imitative work an allegory. Many a story, for example, uses *Romeo and Juliet* motifs. As long as there is only a certain overt comparison made, for instance by a way of saying that two lovers are in a situation as romantic or tragic as that of Shakespeare's couple, the work with literary echoes cannot be considered an allegory. It becomes one when analogy emerges in the process of revealing the meanings, and when there are indicators leading to generalizing couclusions concerning the links between the analogous structures; the analogy emphasizes then the occurrence of certain archetypal situations, or types of human behaviour and attitude as well as repeated patterns of the vicissitudes of fate etc.

Neither can a parody of a text be considered an allegory as its sole purpose rests in ridiculing the text and its value depends on how skilfully this is done; an allegory uses another text to strengthen its own. They illumine each other and generate a vision which partakes of both, but cannot be wholly identified with either.

Maureen Quilligan finds that the difference between allegorical writing and parodies depends on the attitude of the author „rewriting" a story, which she calls a „pretext". She says:

> The difference, of course, is that the impact of allegory is to reveal the privileged status of the pretext, while a parody aims at undermining the value of the original text, providing a true criticism, not commentary[4].

Analogy brings allegory close to what Stephen A. Barney[5] and other critics call „allegory of history" based on typology in which one event is supposed to foreshadow another. Such allegories emphasize the basically unchanging nature of man through demonstating the repetitive situations men find themselves in, and their reactions to these situations. Because of this characteristic allegories based on analogy tend to be parables. Apart from drawing the reader's attention to the essential and the general in human nature, allegories built on parallels with other works have the advantage of creating aesthetic effects through the use of contrasts and similarities. This can be clearly seen in the example of James Joyce's *Ulysses* (as well as in Golding's

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 136.

[5] S. A. Barney, *Allegories of History, Allegories of Love*, Archon Books, Hamden, Connecticut 1979.

Pincher Martin to a smaller degree) where the device of juxtaposing heroic deeds or momentous, grand events with a humdrum or base life produces an ironic comment on the latter. Leopold Bloom's story viewed through the story of his great model appears to be even more unheroic. While irony is achieved where contrast is present, forceful statements emerge from the presentation of similarities as is demonstrated by J. R. R. Tolkien's fairy story *The Lord of the Rings*.

The surface story of an allegory using analogy may allow us to see the prototype story from a new angle, but basically it is itself determined by its model hidden within its structure. The „twice told tale" analogy allegory is thus a rather special case in allegorical writing: its ultimate meaning emerges not through reflections of a hidden pattern of ideas in the narrative, but through reflections of a hidden pattern of references to another work found in the surface story.

There are no strict rules concerning the use of interpretative signals by modern allegory and they occur in different combinations and with varying density, which do not always allow one to distinguish between a literary work described as „allegorical" and one that has to be regarded an „allegory". The existence of a number of kinds of allegory established by its methods of „dissembling" or of „other speaking" does not make things any easier. The generic change which has taken place in modern allegory, its surrender of an apparatus of distinctive devices, has also contributed to the obliteration of its character since the structures of most allegories written today tend to be enveloped by the literary genres they are incorporated in and thus become rather diffused. It must be also remembered that together with allegories and works of allegorical character there exist also literary works which use allegorical elements only marginally. It is not surprising, therefore, that in view of this situation many critics prefer to speak of the „allegoricity" or the „allegorical character" of a work instead of labelling it an allegory; they often avoid the term altogether and use such ones as „apologue" or „parable" which seem to be less definite (even though they should not be). The awareness of the fact that an allegory must create a closed system of correspondences and meaningful interrelationships, and that its presence is marked by interpretative signals, is sometimes of little help in borderline cases about which it is difficult to decide whether their allegorical features, or the literary structures of genres which envelop them should be regarded as dominant.

By assuming relatively subdued roles in literary works modern allegory has considerably weakened its system of correspondences to the benefit of the total effect of the literary constructions and, in

this way, has moved towards the character of the symbolical novel whose narratives lead to general conclusions about man's condition through the presentation of individual experience. The symbolical novel's metaphysical values have their impact on the reader as a whole which is ostensibly a part of a larger context, (the real or a fantastic world) whose existence outside the work is implied by the writer. An allegory combined with such a narrative assumes much of its character. Also the fact that there is a far wider margin for what is not allegory in it contributes to increasing the strength of appeal of an allegorical work as a whole rather and not only as a pattern of elements. This acquisition of the mechanism of a symbolic construction by allegory shows how very exaggerated indeed the old distinction between allegory and symbol is in fact; the two have much in common and there is no real opposition between them. In fact, they are often complementary. With the boundary between allegorical and symbolical writing thus obliterated, the old feud between those who believed symbolism superior to allegory and allegorists has lost much of its edge.

Modern allegory which conveys meanings not only through patterns of correspondences, but appeals to the reader also through wholes in the way symbolical novels to through their use of metaphysical values, has thus acquired another „level" of significance; in a way, it has made a full circle by returning to the medieval multiplicity of significance; it is possible to view it as a modern version of the medieval fourfold scheme which did not stop at the literal and allegorical levels but invited search for tropological and anagogical senses. And so, although allegory of the twentieth century has undergone a number of important transformations, since its early stages of development, it reaches back to its past and in spite of all change preserves its continuity.

Like its medieval counterpart, modern allegory satisfies certain vital needs of its readers; while in the Middle Ages readers expected allegorical writing to elucidate and make ideas palpable through concretization, the reader of our times favours allegory for its complexities, its depth of meaning combined with intricate literary forms and, as we have seen in the previous chapters, combining allegory with other literary genres indeed offers ample opportunity for making a literary work aesthetically rich both as regards its form and its meaning.

Louis MacNeice believes that the interest in what he calls „parable writing" dominates the literature of the twentieth century. He says:

In the twentieth century, it seems to me, realism in the photographic sense is almost played out and no longer satisfies our needs. The writers who do seem

pertinent are those like Kafka, Samuel Beckett and William Golding who, in their very different ways, practise some kind of what I have called parable writing[6].

And although this may be an exaggerated statement since „photographic realism" still has a role to play in contemporary fiction, it certainly serves to support the view that allegory has recovered the status it enjoyed centuries ago, that, once again, like in the Middle Ages, it occupies an important position in literature.

[6] L. MacNeice, *Varieties of Parable*, Combridge University Press 1963, p. 26.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TEXTS

Addison J., Steele, R. *Selected Essays from* „The Tatler", „The Spectator" and „*The Guardian*", The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., Indianapolis and New York 1973.

Beowulf, (modernized version), [in:] S. Helsztyński, *Specimens of English Poetry and Prose*, Warszawa 1973.

Bunyan J., *The Pilgrim's Progress*, J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., London 1948.

Chesterton G. K., *The Poet and the Lunatics; Episodes in the Life of Gabriel Gale*, Cassell and Company Ltd., London 1929.

Collins W., „Odes on Several Descriptive and Allegoric Subjects", [in:] R. Lonsdale, ed., *Gray and Collins; Poetical Works*, Oxford University Press 1977.

Defoe D., The Consolidator or Memoirs of Sundry Transactions from the World of the Moon", [in:] H. Morley, ed., *The Earlier Life and the Chief Works of Daniel Defoe*, George Routledge and Sons, London 1889.

Dickens Ch., „The Child's Story", [in:] *Christmas Stories*, Mac-Donald and Sons, London [?].

Dickens Ch., „Nobody's Story", [in:] *Christmas Stories*, MacDonald and Sons, London [?].

Forster E. M., „The Other Side of the Hedge", [in:] Forster E. M., *Collected Short Stories*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth 1965.

Gatty, Mrs., *Parables from Nature*, T. Nelson and Sons, [?].

Golding W., *Pincher Martin*, Penguin Books in association with Faber and Faber, Harmondsworth 1962.

[Howell, James], *Δενδρολογια, Dodona's Grove, or the Vocall Forest*, London 1650.

Johnson S., *The Rambler*, The Yale University Press, New Haven and London 1969.

Lewis C. S., „The Abolition of Man", [in:] J. L. Bradley, S. Martin, ed., *Masterworks of English Prose; A Critical Reader*, Holt, Reinehart and Winston, Inc.. New York 1968.

Lewis C. S., *The Pilgrim's Regress; An Allegorical Apology for Christianity, Reason and Romanticism*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan 1943.

Lewis C. S., *Surprised by Joy*, Collins Fontana Books, London and Glasgow 1969.

MacDonald, G., „The Castle; A Parable", [in:] *The Cruel Painter and Other Stories*, Chatto and Windus, London 1905.

New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, The, The Gideons International, London 1956.

Orwell G., *Animal Farm: a Fairy Story*, Penguin Books in association with Secker and Warburg, Harmondsworth 1960.

Orwell G., „Politics and the English Language", [in:] J. L. Bradley, M. Stevens, ed., *Masterworks of English Prose; A Critical Reader*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., New York 1968.

Powys T. F., *Mr. Weston's Good Wine*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1957.

Sansom W., „The Long Sheet", [in:] *Fireman Flower*, „The Continental Book Company, Stockholm, London 1949.

Tolkien J. R. R.. *The Fellowship of the Ring*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd:, London 1957.

Tolkien J. R. R., *The Return of the King*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London 1957.

Tolkien J. R. R., *The Two Towers*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London 1957.

Warner R., *The Aerodrome; a Love Story*, The Bodley Head, London 1966.

LITERARY CRITICISM: THEORY, HISTORY

Abrams M. H., *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, Reinhart and Company, Inc.. New York 1957.

Adams D. K. *Studies in Allegory in Works of Charles Dickens*, Ph. D. disseration Evanston, Illinois 1953.

Aers D., *Piers Plowman; Christian Allegory*, St. Martin's Press, New York 1975.

Aguzzi D., L., *Allegory in the Heroic Poetry of the Renaissance*, Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University 1959.

Allen W., *Tradition and Dream*, Phoenix House, London 1964.

Auerbach E., *Mimesis. Rzeczywistość przedstawiona w literaturze Zachodu* (translated from German by Z. Żabicki), Warszawa 1968.

Baes E., *Le Symbole et l'Allégorie*, L'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Bruxelles 1900.

Baker E., A., *The History of the English Novel*, H. F. and G. Witherby, London 1929.

Barnet S., Berman M., Burto W., *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*, Little Brown and Company, Boston, Toronto 1960.

Barney S., A., *Allegories of History Allegories of Love*, Archon Books, Hamden, Connecticut 1979.

Beachcroft T. O., *The English Short Story*, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1964.

"Bending Over Backwards", *Times Literary Supplement*, October 23, 1959.

Berek P., *The Transformation of Allegory from Spenser to Hawthorne, Amherst College Honors Thesis*, No 10, Amherst, Massachussetts 1962.

Berger H., *The Allegorical Temper; Vision and Reality in Book II of Spenser's „Faerie Queene"*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1957.

Berger M., *Real and Imagined Worlds; The Novel and Social Science*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachussetts and London, England 1977.

Birkner G., „Metaphor, Allegorie und Autobiographie im Puritanismus", [in:] *Heilsgewissheit und Literatur*, Bd. 18, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München 1972.

Bloom E. A., „The Allegorical Principle", *E. L. H., A Journal of English Literary History* September 1951, vol. 18, No 3.

Bloomfield M. W., „A Grammatical Approach to Personification Allegory", *Modern Philology*, February 1963, vol. 60, No 3.

Blotner J. L., *The Political Novel*, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City N. Y. 1955.

Booth W. C., *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 1961.

Bowen J., „One Man's Meat", *Times Literary Supplement*, August 7, 1959, No 2997 (supp. VII—VIII).

Braybrooke N., Coombes H., e. a., *Theodore; Essays on T. F. Powys*, Saint Albert's Press 1964.

Brodtkorb P., „Art Allegory in 'The Marble Faun'" Publications of Modern *Language Association of America* 1962, vol. LXXVII.

Brown R., „Parable and Allegory Reconsidered", *Novum Testamentum, an International Quarterly for New Testament and Related Studies* 1962, vol. V.

Brum U., *American Thought and Religious Typology*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N. J. 1970.

Buchan J., *The Novel and the Fairy Tale*, Oxford University Press 1931.

Burgess A., *The Novel Now*, Faber and Faber, London 1971.

Camp L. S. de, *Science-Fiction Handbook, The Writing of Imaginative Fiction*, Hermitage House, New York 1953.

Carpenter H., *J. R. R. Tolkien; a Biography*, Unwin Paperbacks, London 1978.

Churchill R. C., *The Powys Brothers*, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1962.

Clifford G., *The Transformations of Allegory*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London and Boston 1974.

Cook A., *The Meaning of Fiction*, Wayne State University Press, Detroit 1960.

Coombes H., *T. F. Powys*, Burleigh Ltd., Bristol 1960.

Cox C. B., *The Free Spirit; A Study of Liberal Humanism in the Novels of George Eliot, Henry James, E. M. Forster, Virginia Woolf, Angus Wilson*, Oxford University Press, London, New York, Toronto 1963.

Cox C. B., „William Golding's *Pincher Martin*", *The Listener* March 19, 1964, vol. LXXI, No 1824.

Dennis N., „The Dream and the Plumb Line", *The New York Times Book Review* April 19, 1964, vol. LXIX, No 16.

Dodd C. H., *The Parables of Kingdom*, Nisbet and Co. Ltd., London 1950.

Dooley D., J., *Contemporary Satire*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, Limited, Toronto, Montreal 1971.

Dundas J., „Allegory as a Form of Wit", *Studies in the Renaissance* 1964, vol. XI.

Eile S., *Światopogląd powieści*, Wrocław 1973.

Einbond B., *Samuel Johnson's Allegories*, Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University 1966.

Elliott R. C., *The Power of Satire: Magic, Ritual, Art*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey 1960.

Federman R., ed., *Surfiction; Fiction Now... and Tomorrow*, The Swallow Press Inc., Chicago 1975.

Fergusson F., *„The Golden Bowl* Revisited", *The Sewanee Review* 1955, vol. LXIII.

Fergusson F., „Three Allegories: Brecht, Wilder, and Eliot", *The Sewanee Review* 1956, vol. LXIV.

Fineberg L., *Introduction to Satire*, The Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa 1968.

Fisher R. M., *„The Flower and the Leaf" and „The Assembly of Ladies"; A Study of Two Love-Vision Poems of the Fifteenth Century*, Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University 1955.

Fletcher A., *Allegory; The Theory of a Sybmolic Mode*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London 1970.

Foote T., „Middle-Earth Genesis", *Time*, October 24, 1977.

Foster D. W., *Christian Allegory in Early Hispanic Poetry*, The University Press of Kentucky, Lexington 1970.

Fox R. C., „The Allegory of Sin and Death in *Paradise Lost*", *Modern Language Quarterly* 1963, vol. 24.

Fraser G. S., *The Modern Writer and His World*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1964.

Frye N., *Anatomy of Criticism; Four Essays*, Princeton University Press 1973.

Gardner J., *On Moral Fiction*, Basic Books Inc., Publishers, New York 1977.

Giannantonio P., *Dante e l'allegorismo*, Leo S. Olschki Editore, Firenze 1969.

Gindin J., *Post War British Fiction; New Accents and Attitudes*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1962.

Gray R., *Kafka's Castle*, Cambridge University Press 1956.

Green R. L., „Introduction", [in:] G. MacDonald, *The Complete Fairy Tales of...*, Schocken Books, New York 1977.

Greenblatt S. J., *Three Modern Satirists: Waugh, Orwell, and Huxley*, Yale University Press 1965.

Haller W., *The Rise of Puritanism*, Columbia University Press, New York 1957.

Hamilton A. C., *The Structure of Allegory in „The Faerie Queene"*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1961.

Harrison G. B., ed., *Major British Writers*, Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., New York 1959.

Hassan I., *Radical Innocence: Studies in the Contemporary American Novel*, Princeton University Press, N. J. 1961.

Hayman D., Rabkin E. S., *Form in Fiction*, St. Martin's Press, New York 1974.

Heinle E. Ch., *The Eighteenth Century Allegorical Essay*, Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University 1957.

Holbrook D., „Metaphor and Maturity: T. F. Powys and Dylan Thomas", [in:] B. Ford, ed. *The Modern Age*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1961.

Holman C. *A Handbook to Literature*, The Odyssey Press, New York 1972.

Honig E., *Dark Conceit; The Making of Allegory*, a Galaxy Book, Oxford University Press 1966.

Honig E., „In Defense of Allegory", *The Kenyon Review*, Winter 1958, vol. XX, No 1.

Hooper W., „Preface", [in:] C. S. Lewis, *Selected Literary Essays*, Cambridge University Press 1969.

Hopkinson T., *George Orwell*, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1965.

Hunter W., *The Novels and Stories of T. F. Powys*, Gordon, Fraser at St. John's College, Cambridge 1930.

Irwin W. R., *The Game of the Impossible: a Rhetoric of Fantasy*, University of Illinois Press, Chicago 1976.

Isaacs N. D., Zimbardo R. A., ed. *Tolkien and Critics*, University of Notre Dame Press, London 1968.

Jerrold W. and C., *Five Queer Women*, Brentano's Ltd., New York, London, Paris 1929.

Karl F. R., *A Reader's Guide to the Contemporary English Novel*, The Noonday Press, New York 1962.

Kay D., „Short Fiction in *The Spectator*", *Studies in the Humanities* 1975, No 8, The University of Alabama Press.

King J. N., „Allegorical Pattern in Stephen Hawes's 'The Pastime of Pleasure'", *Studies in the Literary Imagination* Spring 1978, vol. XI, No 1.

Klingopulos G. D., „Mr Forster's Good Influence", [in:] B. Ford, ed., *The Modern Age*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1961.

Kunitz J. S., Haycraft H., ed., *The Twentieth Century Authors; A Biographical Dictionary of Modern Literature*, The H. -W. -Wilson Company 1955.

Lem S., *Fantastyka i futurologia*, Kraków 1970.

Lévéque P., „Aurea Catena Homeri; une étude sur l'allégorie grecque", [in:] *Annales Littéraires de l'Université Besançon*, vol. 27, Paris 1959.

Lewis C. S., *The Allegory of Love*, Oxford University Press, New York 1977.

Lewis C. S., „Preface", [in:] *The Pilgrim's Regress*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan 1943.

Lewis C. S., „The Vision of Bunyan", [in:] Lewis C. S., *Selected Literary Essays*, Cambridge University Press 1969.

Leyburn E. D., *Satiric Allegory; Mirror of Man*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1956.

Lüthi M., *Once Upon a Time; On the Nature of Fairy Tales*, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York 1970.

Makaryan A., *O Satirie*, Sovietsky Pisatyel, Moscow 1967.

Marcus S., *Dickens: from Pickwick to Dombey*, Basic Books Inc. Publishers, New York 1965.

Mackenzie W. R., *The English Moralities from the Point of View of Allegory*, Gordian Press Inc., New York 1966.

MacLure M., „Allegories of Innocence", *The Dalhousie Review*, The Review Publishing Co., Ltd., Summer 1960, Halifax N. S., vol. 40, No 2.

MacNeice L., *Varieties of Parable*, Cambridge University Press 1965.

MacQueen J., *Allegory*, Methuen and Co. Ltd., London 1976.

McClennen J., „On the Meaning and Function of Allegory in the English Renaissance", *Contributions in Modern Philology*, April 1947, No 6.

McCormick J., „Rex (Ernest) Warner", [in:] J. Vinson, ed., *Contemporary Novelists*, St. James Press, Ltd., London 1972.

McLeod A. L., *Rex Warner: Writer; An Introductory Essay*, Wentworth Press, Sydney 1964.

McLeod A. L., [ed.], *The Achievement of Rex Warner*, Wentworth Press, Sydney 1965.

Miodońska-Brookes E., Kulawik A., Tatara M., *Zarys poetyki*, Warszawa 1980.

Montgomery J. W., ed., *Myth, Allegory and Gospel; An Interpretation of J. R. R. Tolkien, C. S. Lewis, G. K. Chersterton, Charles Williams*, Bethany Fellowship Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota 1974.

Murrin M., *The Veil of Allegory; Some Notes Toward a Theory of Allegorical Rhetoric in the English Renaissance*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 1969.

Newiger H. —J., *Metapher und Allegorie; Studien zu Aristophanes*, C. H. Becksche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München 1957.

Nuttal A. D., *Two Concepts of Allegory; A Study of Shakespeare's „The Tempest" and the Logic of Allegorical Expression*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1967.

Olderman R. M., *Beyond the Wasteland: A Study of the American Novel in the Nineteen-Sixties*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London 1972.

Oldsey B. S., Weintraub, *„Lord of the Flies:* Beezlebub [*sic!*] Revisited", *College English*, March 1965, vol. 26.

Owen D. L., *„Piers Plowman", A Comparison with Some Earlier and Contemporary French Allegories*, London University Press, London 1912.

Patch H. R., *The Other World according to Descriptions in Medieval Literature*, Octagon Books, New York 1970.

Paulson R., [ed.], *Satire: Modern Essays in Criticism*, Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1971.

Peter J., „The Fables of William Golding", *The Kenyon Review*, Autumn 1957, vol. XIX, No 4.

Pickering S., *The Moral Tradition in English Fiction 1785—1850*, The University Press of New England, Hanover, New Hampshire 1976.

Piehler P., *The Visionary Landscape; A Study in Medieval Allegory*, Edward Arnold Ltd., London 1971.

Post Ch. R., *Medieval Spanish Allegory*, Harvard University Press, Cambrdige, Mass. 1915.

Powell F. Y., *Some Words on Allegory in England*, The Folcroft Press Inc., 1969.

Prichett V. S., „Secret Parables", *New Statesman* 2, August 1958, vol. LVI. No 1429.

Preminger A., *Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press 1965.

Quilligan M., *The Language of Allegory; Defining the Genre*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London 1979.

Rabkin E. S., *The Fantastic in Literature*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J. 1976.

Rahr P., *Image and Idea*, Blue Ridge Mountain Press, Parsippany, N. J. 1949.

Rees R., *George Orwell, Fugitive from the Camp of Victory*, Secker and Warburg, London 1961.

Rehder H., ed., *Literary Symbolism; a Symposium*, University of Texas Press, Austin and London 1965.

Richter D. H., *Fable's End; Completeness and Closure in Rhetorical Fiction*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 1974.

Ross D. S., *Literature and Philosophy; an Analysis of the Philosophical Novel*, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York 1969.

Saintsbury G., *The Flourishing of Romance and the Rise of Allegory*, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London 1897.

Schlauch M., „Symbolic Figures and the Symbolic Technique of George Bernard Shaw", *Science and Society*, vol. XXI, Winter 1957.

Scholes R., *The Fabulators*, Oxford University Press, New York 1967.

Scholes R., Rabkin E. S., *Science Fiction: History, Science Vision*, Oxford University Press, New York 1977.

Seung T. K., *Cultural Thematics; The Formation of the Faustian Ethos*, Yale University Press, Hew Haven and London 1976.

Shelley P. B., „Preface" to 'Prometheus Unbound', [in:] G. B. Harrison, ed., *Major British Writers*, Harcourt, Brace and World Inc, New York 1959.

Sierotwiński S., *Słownik terminów literackich*, Wrocław 1979.

Singleton S., „Dante's Allegory", *Speculum: a Journal of Medieval Studies* January 1950, vol. XXV, No 1.

Slote B., *Myth and Symbol; Critical Approaches and Applications*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln 1963.

Sörensen B. A., ed., *Allegorie und Symbol; Texte zur Theorie des dichterischen Bildes im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*, Athenäum Verlag GmbH, Frankfurt am Mein 1972.

Spanner W., *Das Märchen als Gattung*, Otto Kindt, Giessen 1939.

Springer M. D., *Forms of the Modern Novella*, The University of Chicago Press Ltd., Chicago and London 1975.

Steinman L. M., „Shelley's Skepticism; Allegory in 'Alastar'", [in:] *E. L. H.*, Summer 1978, vol. 45, No 2.

Sutherland J., *English Satire*, Cambridge University Press 1962.

Suvin D., *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction; On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press 1979.

Theiss W., *Exemplarische Allegorik; Untersuchungen zu einem literarhistorischen Phänomen bei Hans Sachs*, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München 1968.

Thiébaux M., *The Stag of Love; The Chase in Medieval Literature*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London 1974.

Tilton J. W., *Cosmic Satire in the Contemporary Novel*, Associated University Press, London 1977.

Todorov T., *Introduction à la Littérature Fantastique*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris 1970.

Tolkien J. R. R., „On Fairy Stories", [in:] *Tree and Leaf*, Unwin Books Ltd., London 1972.

Tuve R., *Allegorical Imagery; Some Medieval Books and Their Posterity*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J. 1977.

Vax L., *L'art et la littérature fantastique*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris 1963.

Walker A., „Allegory: A Light Conceit", *Partisan Review*, Fall 1955, vol. XXII, No 4.

Warner R., „The Allegorical Method", [in:] *The Cult of Power*, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia and New York 1947.

Warner R., *E. M. Forster*, Longmans, Green and Co., London 1964.

Wellek R., Warren, A., *Theory of Literature*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1966.

Wheelwright P., *Metaphor and Reality*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington 1962.

Wicker B., *The Story-Shaped World; Fiction and Metaphysics: Some Variations on a Theme*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, Indiana 1975.

Wilson A., „Introduction", [in:] Warner R., *The Aerodrome*, The Bodley Head, London 1966.

Wimsatt J. I., *Allegory and Mirror; Tradition and Structure in Middle English Literature*, Western Publishing Company, Inc., New York 1970.

Wolfson H. A., *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1956.

OTHER WORKS

Allen D. C., *Mysteriously Meant; The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance*, The John Hopkins Press, Baltimore and London 1970.

Bayley H., *The Lost Language of Symbolism; an Inquiry into the Origin of Certain Letters, Words, Names, Fairy Tales, Folklore and Mythologies*, Barnes and Noble, Inc., New York 1951.

Bornemann D. W., *Die Allegorie in Kunst, Wissenschaft und Kirche*, Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Leipzig 1889.

Bouvy E., *La Gravure en France au XVII-e siècle, La Gravure de Portaits et d'allégories*, Paris et Bruxelles, Les Editions G. van Oest 1929.

Brewster P. G., „Symbolism and allegory in card and board games", [in:] *Southern Folklore Quarterly* December 1959, vol. XXIII, No 4.

Cargill S. T., *The Philosophy of Analogy and Symbolism*, Rider and Company, London [?].

Chydenius J., *The Theory of Medieval Symbolism*, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum XXVII 2, Helsingfors 1960.

Diel P., *Le symbolisme dans la mythologie grecque; étude psychanalytique*, Payot, Paris 1952.

Dillistone F. W., *Traditional Symbols and the Contemporary World*, Epworth Press, London 1973.

Drummond J., *Philo Judaeus; or the Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion*, Williams and Norgate, London 1888.

Ferguson G., *Signs and Symbols in Christian Art*, A. Zwemmer Ltd., London 1954.

Frankfort H., Frankfort H. A., Wilson J. A., Jacobsen Thorkild, *Before Philosophy; The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man*, Penguin Books Ltd., Harmondsworth 1961.

Gravelot H. F., *Iconologie par figures ou traité complet des allégories, emblèmes etc. à l'usage des artistes, en 35 figures*, Meinkoff reprint, Geneve 1972.

Hanson R. P. C., *Allegory and Event; A Study in the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*, London 1959.

Hinks R., *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art*, The Warburg Institute, London 1939.

Ilg A., *Allegorien und Embleme*, Gerlach and Schenk, Wien 1882.

Inman T., *Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism*, J. W. Bouton, New York 1884.

Johnson S., *A Dictionary of the English Language in which the Words are deduced from their Originals, Explained in different Meanings*, Printed for J. F. and C. Rivington, L. Davis, T. Longman e.a., London 1790.

Malinowski B., *Magic, Science and Religion and Other Essays*, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, N. Y. 1954.

Rehlender G., *Decorative and Allegorical Compositions; One Thousand Sketches of Symbols, Allegories, Vignettes, Chimeras, Emblems, Initials, Ornaments, Trophies, Heraldy and Other Decorations etc.*, Hessling and Spielmeyer, New York 1845.

Ripa C., *Baroque and Rococo Pictorial Imagery*, Hertel Edition reedited by A. Maser, Dover Publications Inc., New York 1971.

ALLEGORIE IN DER ENGLISCHEN PROSA DES ZWANZIGSTEN JAHRHUNDERTS

(Resümee)

Den Gegenstand der Abhandlung bildet, wie es der Titel besagt, die Allegorie in der englischen Prosa des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine besondere Berücksichtigung finden in der Darstellung Verbindungen der Allegorie mit verschiedenartigen Literaturgattungen, wie auch die sich aus diesen Verbindungen ergebenden ästhetischen Konsequenzen. Die Zweckmäßigkeit einer Arbeit dieser Art erläutert die Einleitung (*Introduction*, S. 3—9, wo auf Lücken in der historischen Darstellung der Allegorie hingewisen und die Bedeutung dieser Gattung in der englischen literarischen Tradition betont wird.

1. Kapitel, betitelt *Allegorie in historischer Perspektive* (*Allegory in Historical Perspective*, S. 10—39, bietet eine historische übersicht über die Entwicklung der Allegorie und behandelt die Änderungen, denen Form und Inhalt der Gattung unterlagen. Die Erörterungen dieses Kapitels beginnen mit der Besprechung des Ursprungs der Allegorie, darauf folgt die Schilderung der typologischen Allegorie und der Personifikation. Weiterhin werden die die Entwicklung der Allegorie kennzeichnenden Begleiterscheinungen charakterisiert: eine Auflockerung der ursprünglich strengen ästhetischen Satzung in der Epoche der Renaissance, das Aufblühen der topischen-satirischen und philosophischen Allegorie in 18. Jahrhundert, ein Entwicklungsrückgang in der Zeit der Romantik und erneutes Aufblühen in der moralisierenden Prosa des Viktorianischen Zeitalters (in der Literatur für Kinder), die Mannigfaltigkeit der Formen im 20. Jahrhundert. Es wird weiterhin darauf hingewiesen, daß in der Entwicklung dieser Gattung mehrere Etappen zu unterscheiden sind, und das ist der Umstand, der die anerkannte, allgemein geltende Einteilung der Allegorien in „traditionelle" und „moderne" als widersprüchlich erscheinen läßt.

Der dargestellte Entwicklungsabriß macht es möglich, die ständigen Eigenschaften der Gattung herauszubekommen, deshalb geht er dem Kapitel 2 voran, das die Definition der Allegorie bringt (*Allegory defined*, S. 40—59). Für die Aufstellung einer entsprechenden Definition sprach der Umstand, daß es eine Vielzahl verschiedenartiger Definitionen gibt. Kapitel 2 behandelt die drei Definitionsebenen, die sich in der Allegorie nachweisen lassen: die außerhalb des Textes liegende Ebene der Sinngehalte, die Erzählungsebene und die Ebene der Zusammenhänge zwischen den vorigen. Die letztere ist die Grundebene, die es möglich macht, die Allegorie als Dichtung zu betrachten. Die Allegorie bildet ein geschlossenes System von einander bestimmenden Elementen innerer Sinngehalte und ihrer „äußeren" Form. Dieses Charakteristikum unterscheidet die Allegorie von Dichtungen anderer

Art, wie Satire, Parabel, Märchen u.a. Das Auftreten eines geschlossenen Systems von Sinngehalten bedeutet jedoch nicht, daß keine Elemente von außerhalb des Systems dabei sind. Die Allegorie funktioniert also auch in einem breiteren literarischen Kontext. Die Definition der Allegorie als eines Systems von Zusammenhängen zwischen Sinngehalten und Elementen der Form macht es möglich, diese als Literaturwerk und nicht als philosophischen Abhandlung zu betrachten. Je nach der Art der Zusammenhänge zwischen den Elementen können folgende Arten der Allegorien unterschieden werden: 1) Allegorie-Personifikation, 2) Allegorie-Exemplum, 3) Allegorie-Parabel, 4) Allegorie als „Verkleidung", 5) Allegorie als Echo andersartiger Dichtungen.

3. Kapitel handelt von der modernen Allegorie-Personifikation (*Modern Personification Allegory*, S. 60—82). Der Analyse wird die moderne Allegorie am Beispiel der Dichtung von C. S. Lewis unterzogen. Dort findet Verwendung die heute kaum noch gebrauchte, auf das Prinzip der Personifikation sich stützende Komposition mit solchen charakteristischen Mitteln, wie die Traumbildkonvention, das Motiv der Reise, das der Wegewahl oder des Kampfes zwischen dem Guten und dem Bösen.

Das Thema des 4. Kapitels ist Allegorie als Satire (*Allegory as Satire; George Orwells' „Animal Farm"*, S. 83—108). Hier werden Ähnlichkeiten und Unterschiede zwischen Mitteln und Zielsetzungen der Allegorie und der Satire am Beispiel der repräsentativen modernen satirischen Allegorie untersucht. Es werden weitgehende Ähnlichkeiten festgestellt. Die Tatsache jedoch, daß die Satire vor allem die Einstellung zur dargestellten Welt zu beeinflussen anstrebt, und die Allegorie die Vermittlung von Behauptungen sich zum Ziel stellt, entscheidet darüber, daß in der satirischen Allegorie Bereiche auftreten, die entweder ausschließlich der Allegorie oder ausschließlich der Satire dienen.

5. Kapitel handelt von Allegorie, Allegorese und Märchen (*Allegory, Allegoresis and the Fairy Story: J. R. R. Tolkien's „The Lord of the Rings"*, S. 109—134). Es enthält Erwägungen, die die Frage der Grenze zwischen Allegorie und Allegorese in einer Dichtung, oder die Konvention des Märchens zugrunde liegt, betreffen. Tolkien selbst hielt sein episches Märchen nicht für eine Allegorie, aber solche Motive wie der von den Gestalten repräsentierte Kampf zwischen dem Guten und dem Bösen sowie der Aufbau der Fabel, wofür andere Dichtungen (oft vom allegorischen Charakter) das Modell lieferten, begünstigen die allegorische Interpretation der Dichtung *The Lord of the Rings*.

6. Kapitel, in dem die mit verschiedenen Formen des Phantastischen verbundenen Allegorien behandelt werden (*Varieties of Allegory and Varieties of Fantasy: Two Short Stories 'The Other Side of the Hedge' by E. M. Forster and 'The Long Sheet' by William Sansom and Two Novels T. F. Powys „Mr Weston's Good Wine" and „The Aerodrome" by Rex Warner*, S. 135—163), demonstriert, wie sich die philosophischen Gehalte in der Novelle von Forster mit phantastischen Verformungen der Wirklichkeit verbinden und wie die Verbindung der die körperliche Verfassung des Menschen betreffenden Gehalte mit einer Welt aussieht, in der die Elemente des Wirklichen eine Welt des Absurden bilden. Der Roman von Powys unterordnet die Elemente des Übernatürlichen den Gehalten moralischer und metaphisicher Natur, und das Buch von Warner kreiert eine Welt vom Bereich der science fiction.

Im 7. Kapitel, dan Allegorie und Realismus zum Thema hat (*Allegony and Realism: „Pincher Martin" by William Golding*, S. 164—187), wenden die Folgen untersucht, die sich aus der Verbindung realistischer Tendenzen des Romans mit den Erfordernissen der Allegorie ergeben. Bei der Analyse des Romans *Pincher Mar-*

tin kommt die Autorin zum Schluß, daß eine vollständige Verbindung des mimetischen Realismus mit der Allegorie wegen gegenseitiger Einschränkungen nicht möglich ist.

Im abschließenden, den Schlußfolgerungen gewidmeten Teil der Arbeit (*Conclusion*, S. 188—198) erläutert die Autorin Änderungen in der zeitgenössischen Allegorie (Rückritt von starrer Konvention, dem symbolischen Roman ähnliche Entwicklung) und weist auf die am natürlichsten wirkenden und am häufigsten auftretenden Verbindungen der Allegorie mit anderen Literaturgattungen. Sie behandelt weiterhin die wichtigsten, in der Allegorie des 20. Jahrhunderts am meisten verwendeten Interpretationssygnale, wobei die Verwendung der Analogie eine besondere Berücksichtigung findet. Hervorgehoben wird auch der Umstand, daß die Allegorie in ihrer modernen Form eine Stelle in der englischen Literatur und Kritik eingenommen hat, die an jene im Mittelalter erinnert.

Die letzte Position der Arbeit bildet *Bibliographie* (*Bibliographie*, S. 199—206).

CONTENTS