

Why Is It Called To Kill A Mockingbird

Introduction: The Mystery Behind a Beloved Title

Harper Lee’s *To Kill a Mockingbird* is one of the most celebrated novels in American literature. Since its publication in 1960, it has been studied in classrooms, adapted into an Academy Award-winning film, and cherished by millions of readers. Yet, for many, the title itself sparks an immediate question: **Why is it called *To Kill a Mockingbird*?** The phrase is poetic, evocative, and carries a weight that hints at deeper themes. Readers often expect a literal story about mockingbirds, but the novel delivers something far more profound. In this article, we’ll explore the origin of the title, its symbolic meaning, and how it encapsulates the novel’s central messages about innocence, morality, and the destruction of goodness. By the end, you’ll understand why Harper Lee chose this simple yet powerful phrase to define her timeless masterpiece.

The Mockingbird as a Symbol of Innocence

To grasp the title’s significance, we first need to understand what a mockingbird represents in the novel. Early in the story, Atticus Finch, the moral compass of the book, tells his children: *“Shoot all the blue jays you want, if you can hit ‘em, but remember it’s a sin to kill a mockingbird.”* This line is the key to unlocking the title. Miss Maudie Atkinson later explains why: *“Mockingbirds don’t do one thing but make music for us to enjoy. They don’t eat up people’s gardens, don’t nest in corncribs, they don’t do one thing but sing their hearts out for us.”*

Thus, the mockingbird symbolizes pure, harmless innocence. It gives only joy and takes nothing in return. To kill such a creature is not only cruel—it is a sin against nature and morality. In the context of the novel, this metaphor extends to human beings who embody similar qualities of innocence and vulnerability. The title *To Kill a Mockingbird* therefore foreshadows the tragic destruction of these innocent characters by the forces of prejudice, ignorance, and injustice.

Who Are the Mockingbirds in the Story?

Harper Lee populates her novel with two primary “mockingbirds”: Tom Robinson and Boo Radley. Both are gentle, harmless beings who become victims of a society that fails to protect them. The title asks us to reflect not only on their fates but also on our own moral responsibilities.

Tom Robinson: The Innocent Victim of Racism

Tom Robinson, a Black man living in the fictional town of Maycomb, Alabama, during the 1930s, is accused of raping a white woman, Mayella Ewell. Despite overwhelming evidence of his innocence—including his crippled left arm, which makes the crime physically impossible—an all-white jury convicts him. Tom’s only “crime” was helping Mayella out of pity, a gesture that crossed the rigid racial lines of the Deep South.

Tom is the epitome of the mockingbird. He is a hardworking, kind, and harmless man who brings no harm to anyone. Yet, because of the color of his skin and the lies of the Ewell family, he is destroyed. His death—shot while trying to escape prison—is the ultimate sin of killing a mockingbird. The title questions the society that allows such an injustice to occur.

Boo Radley: The Reclusive Guardian

Arthur “Boo” Radley is another mockingbird. Mistreated and isolated by his family, he becomes a phantom in Maycomb’s imagination. Children tell scary stories about him, but the truth is far gentler. Boo secretly leaves gifts for Scout and Jem, mends Jem’s torn pants, and ultimately saves the children from an attack by Bob Ewell.

Boo is the purest form of the mockingbird—he has never hurt anyone and has only tried to give small, quiet joys. Yet, society shuns him because he is different. At the end of the novel, Sheriff Tate decides to protect Boo from the public scrutiny that would follow the revelation that Boo killed Bob Ewell in self-defense. Tate says, *“Let the dead bury the dead... Bob Ewell fell on his knife.”* This decision echoes the title: Boo, an innocent mockingbird, must not be destroyed by the town’s curiosity. The title reminds us that protecting innocence is a moral imperative.

The Context of the Title’s Creation

Harper Lee wrote *To Kill a Mockingbird* during the early years of the Civil Rights Movement. The nation was grappling with racial tensions, legal segregation, and a growing demand for equality. Lee’s novel, set decades earlier, served as a commentary on the persistent sin of racism. The title, “To Kill a Mockingbird,” was not just about the story’s characters—it was a critique of a society that systematically destroys innocence.

Lee was also influenced by her own childhood in Monroeville, Alabama. The mockingbird is a common bird in the South, known for its beautiful song. By using this familiar creature, Lee made the metaphor accessible. The title’s gentle, almost poetic sound contrasts sharply with the violence and ugliness it describes. This contrast is intentional, forcing readers to sit with the discomfort of witnessing innocence destroyed.

Literary and Thematic Significance of the Title

The title *To Kill a Mockingbird* is not merely descriptive—it is a thesis statement for the entire novel. It encapsulates the major themes of innocence, justice, morality, and empathy. Let’s explore these themes in detail.

Innocence and Its Fragility

The novel portrays innocence as something precious and fragile. Scout and Jem start the story as naive children who believe the world is fair. Their journey forces them to confront the cruel reality of prejudice. The mockingbird symbolizes both the literal innocence of Tom and Boo and the childhood innocence that is lost when the children witness injustice. The title asks us to consider: What happens when we kill that innocence—either in others or in ourselves?

Justice Versus Injustice

Atticus Finch’s defense of Tom Robinson is a central legal and moral battle. The jury’s verdict is a clear violation of justice, and Tom’s death is the tragic result. The title reinforces the idea that killing a mockingbird—committing an injustice against an innocent—is a sin. It challenges readers to question systems that fail to protect the vulnerable.

The Moral Duty to Protect the Helpless

Throughout the novel, characters grapple with their responsibility to protect the mockingbirds. Atticus takes on Tom’s case knowing he cannot win, but he does it because it is the right thing. Miss Maudie and Heck Tate both act to shield Boo from harm. The title calls on us to recognize these moments and to reflect on our own duty to defend the innocent.

Why “To Kill a Mockingbird” and Not Another Bird?

You might wonder why Lee chose the mockingbird specifically. Why not a robin, a sparrow, or a blue jay? The answer lies in the bird’s unique characteristics. Mockingbirds are known for mimicking the songs of other birds, but they do so without aggression. They are not pests; they are harmless creators of beauty. In contrast, blue jays are sometimes considered aggressive and territorial. As Atticus says, shoot blue jays if you want—but not mockingbirds. The mockingbird’s inability to harm makes it the perfect symbol of pure innocence. Its destruction is therefore the ultimate moral transgression.

Additionally, the mockingbird is a Southern bird. By anchoring her symbol in the local environment, Lee roots the novel in its regional setting while making the metaphor universal. The title resonates with anyone who has ever seen a defenseless creature suffer needlessly.

How the Title Reflects the Novel’s Structure

The title’s placement at the book’s opening might puzzle first-time readers. Only after finishing the story do they fully understand its meaning. Lee uses a framing device: the first chapter introduces the Finch family and the legend of Boo Radley. The title subtly hints at later events. The novel is structured as a series of events that culminate in the destruction of innocence: Tom’s trial and death, and Boo’s emergence as a savior. The title acts as a thread that ties these two narratives together.

By calling the novel *To Kill a Mockingbird*, Lee also invites readers to think about their own society. The phrase is a call to recognize the “mockingbirds” in our own lives—people who are harmless, gentle, and vulnerable—and to protect them from harm.

Common Misconceptions About the Title

Some readers assume the title refers to a literal act of bird killing in the story. However, no mockingbird is actually killed in the novel. The only bird-related action is when Scout remembers Atticus’s advice and refuses to shoot a mockingbird. The title is purely metaphorical. Another misconception is that the title encourages violence against birds. In reality, it does the opposite: it condemns violence against innocence.

There is also a myth that Lee originally named the book *Atticus*. While she did consider other titles, her editor likely helped shape the final choice. The power of *To Kill a Mockingbird* lies in its ability to evoke both a specific image and a deep moral question.

The Enduring Power of the Title

More than six decades after its release, the phrase *To Kill a Mockingbird* remains embedded in our cultural lexicon. It appears in discussions about justice, empathy, and the protection of the weak. The title has been referenced in movies, songs, and political speeches. It has become shorthand for the destruction of innocence and the failure of society.

Lee’s choice of words was deliberate. The title is simple but profound. It does not give away the plot, yet it encapsulates the novel’s soul. When readers finish the book and reflect on the title, they feel its weight. It is not just a name—it is a lesson.

Conclusion

So, **why is it called *To Kill a Mockingbird*?** Because the title captures the novel’s moral heart: the sin of destroying innocence. Through the characters of Tom Robinson and Boo Radley, Harper Lee shows us two mockingbirds of the human world—gentle, harmless souls crushed by prejudice and fear. The title is a gentle reminder of our responsibility to protect the vulnerable and to question the systems that allow such sins to occur. It is a call to empathy, to justice, and to the recognition that some things should never be destroyed. In the end, the title is not just about a bird; it is about what it means to be human.