While many scholars interpret “Death and the Goose Boy” as an allegory of a poor boy who succeeds when a rich man cannot, I think there may be a simpler way to interpret the tale. Akinola-King et al and Barnes et al both assert that the Goose Boy died willingly, pointing to Death in the tale asking the boy several days after the Greedy Man dies whether he wants to leave. Neidorf and Straw disagree with this assessment, removing the boy’s agency in dying to provide a stronger focus on a passing “from one life to another” where “he was taken [by Death] into a realm where he could be King” (1). All of these scholars seem to agree that the story carries a positive message, despite their differences in the boy’s agency, but Hooper et al present a vastly different interpretation: “he actually went to Hell, but that was where he was more happy” (1). While the text does not offer a lot of proof that this interpretation can work, they offer an insight that should be kept apart from the hellish cast when they say “by creating Death in the story made it seem less saddening than just saying the poor boy drowned himself” (1). This observation offers an entry for another perspective: perhaps the purpose of the tale is not to create a classist allegory but is instead a way to cope with an unexpected death by drowning.