Literary Analysis of Shirley Jackson’s The Lottery

Posted on October 3, 2018

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/literary-analysis-of-shirley-jackson-s-the-lottery/

Introduction

Shirley Jackson’s “The Lottery” unsettles readers because collective violence is presented through the language and rhythm of an ordinary community event. Children gather, neighbors exchange small talk, and officials prepare slips of paper as though the village were organizing a picnic, election, or seasonal ceremony. Only gradually does the ritual’s purpose become visible. Jackson’s central subject is not simply one irrational custom but the social machinery that allows harmful traditions to survive. Bureaucratic procedure, inherited symbols, euphemistic language, conformity, gender hierarchy, and divided responsibility all make the lottery appear normal. The villagers do not need to be uniformly enthusiastic for the institution to continue; they need only keep participating and treat refusal as abnormal. This is why the story remains more disturbing than a tale about openly evil people. Its violence is enacted by neighbors who otherwise seem familiar. Jackson asks readers to consider how communities can convert deliberate choices into routine procedures until moral responsibility becomes difficult to see, even though the final outcome depends on ordinary people repeatedly choosing to cooperate (Jackson, 1948; Kosenko, 1985).

Procedure, Tradition, and the Black Box

The black box and Mr. Summers’s administrative role give the ritual an appearance of legitimacy. The box is old, damaged, and may not even be the original object, yet villagers resist replacing it because they imagine continuity with the past. Other elements of the ceremony have already disappeared, revealing that tradition is being preserved selectively rather than faithfully. The community keeps the lethal result while forgetting songs, gestures, and explanations that once accompanied it. Mr. Summers reinforces this selective continuity through lists, household categories, procedural reminders, and orderly drawing. The villagers become absorbed in whether the process is performed correctly instead of asking whether it should exist at all. Procedure thus narrows moral attention. No single official needs to express personal hatred toward the victim because administrative competence itself carries the ritual forward. Jackson shows how institutions can make violence seem impersonal by dividing it into manageable tasks: prepare the box, call the names, draw the paper, identify the marked household, and enforce the outcome. Formal order does not make the result just; it can instead conceal who remains responsible for maintaining it (Arendt, 2006; Jackson, 1948).

Conformity and the Appeal to Tradition

Old Man Warner provides the story's clearest verbal defense of the lottery, relying on age and repetition as substitutes for evidence. He treats the ritual's longevity as proof of wisdom and dismisses communities considering abolition as foolish or dangerously misguided. His reasoning combines an appeal to tradition with a slippery-slope assumption that abandoning the lottery will produce social disorder. Jackson offers no evidence that the ritual causes agricultural abundance or stability, making Warner's certainty a demonstration of how inherited sayings can replace causal explanation. Social conformity reinforces his position. Villagers who appear uneasy continue to participate because everyone can observe who attends, who draws, and who hesitates. Dissent therefore carries a social cost before it carries any physical danger. Reports that other villages have ended their lotteries do not generate organized debate; they are absorbed as gossip. The institution survives because each doubtful individual can assume that everyone else sincerely supports it. Jackson thus portrays conformity not as simple agreement but as a coordination problem in which fear of isolation prevents private doubt from becoming collective opposition (Asch, 1955; Jackson, 1948).

Tessie Hutchinson, Gender, and Conditional Resistance

Tessie Hutchinson's position exposes both victimization and the weakness of conditional resistance. She arrives casually, jokes with neighbors, and does not object to the lottery until her household is selected. Her later claim that the process is unfair is valid in the larger sense that the entire ritual is unjust, yet her earlier participation shows how normalized systems encourage people to ignore harm while they imagine themselves safe. Jackson does not imply that a victim must have opposed the institution perfectly in order to deserve protection. Instead, Tessie's fate demonstrates how weak solidarity becomes when each household treats danger to others as someone else's problem. The lottery is also structured through patriarchal family units: men normally draw for households, women are formally represented through husbands, and Bill Hutchinson participates in revealing Tessie's marked paper rather than protecting her. Women nevertheless join the crowd and participate in the violence, so hierarchy and complicity coexist. Tessie can be both a prior participant and a present victim. Membership in a harmful institution does not guarantee protection when that institution ultimately requires someone to be excluded and destroyed (Jackson, 1948; Whittier, 1985).

Language, Children, and Distributed Responsibility

Language and childhood show how the community reproduces violence across generations. The word "lottery" normally suggests a desirable prize, while villagers speak of drawing rather than openly naming an execution. This euphemism creates moral distance by making the result seem like the

outcome of chance instead of a human decision. The black mark appears to select the victim, but people designed the procedure and choose to enforce it. Children gathering stones at the beginning provide even more disturbing foreshadowing. Their behavior resembles ordinary play until the ending reveals that they are preparing tools for communal killing. The young are not sheltered from the institution; they are trained into it before they have the language or power to question what adults define as normal. Jackson's foreshadowing therefore mirrors the village's moral blindness. Evidence of violence is present throughout the story, but familiar expectations prevent both first-time readers and villagers from interpreting it accurately. On rereading, the stones, nervous jokes, hesitation around the box, and desire to finish quickly become signs that routine can coexist with suppressed knowledge of harm (Bandura, 1999; Jackson, 1948).

Conclusion

"The Lottery" remains powerful because it reveals that ordinary procedure and social familiarity are not evidence of moral legitimacy. The black box survives through repetition rather than proven value, Mr. Summers turns killing into administration, Old Man Warner converts longevity into justification, and the villagers distribute responsibility so widely that each person can imagine having only a small role. Tessie's late protest exposes the fragility of solidarity, while the children show how institutions reproduce themselves by teaching the next generation what not to question. Jackson does not argue that every tradition is harmful. Customs can preserve memory, identity, and cooperation. Her warning concerns practices protected from ethical evaluation precisely because they are familiar. The story therefore asks readers to examine purpose, evidence, beneficiaries, costs, and power rather than accept "we have always done it this way" as an argument. Its final stoning is shocking, but the deeper horror is the long sequence of ordinary choices that makes the stoning possible. Jackson's village is frightening because no monster is required; collective cruelty can emerge when routine replaces reflection and conformity replaces responsibility (Jackson, 1948; Oehlschlaeger, 1988).

Works Cited

1. Jackson, Shirley. "The Lottery." *The New Yorker*, 26 June 1948.
2. Oehlschlaeger, Fritz. "The Stoning of Mistress Hutchinson." *Essays in Literature*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1988, pp. 259–265.
3. Kosenko, Peter. "A Reading of Shirley Jackson's 'The Lottery.'" *New Orleans Review*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1985, pp. 27–32.
4. Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. Penguin, 2006.
5. Bandura, Albert. "Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1999, pp. 193–209.
6. Asch, Solomon E. "Opinions and Social Pressure." *Scientific American*, vol. 193, no. 5, 1955, pp. 31–35.
7. Whittier, Gayle. "The Lottery as Misogynist Parable." *New Orleans Review*, vol. 12, no. 1, 1985,

pp. 49–56.