The Best of the Whitesell Prize Competition 2004-2005

The Writing Center's Phyllis C. Whitesell Prizes for Expository Writing in General Education

2nd Edition, May 2005
The Writing Center @ Franklin and Marshall College
Lancaster, PA 17604-3003
717.291.3866

Preface

The Writing Center's Phyllis C. Whitesell Prizes honor excellent student writing in Franklin and Marshall's General Education curriculum. Each year the Writing Center invites submissions and awards a prize for the best essay written in a course that fulfills the First-Year Writing Requirement and for the best essay from a Foundations course. This booklet contains the prize-winning and honorable mention essays from this year's competition.

Named for the long-time Director of F&M's Writing Center, the Whitesell Prizes serve several goals. In addition to honoring both Phyllis's dedication to teaching writing and the achievements of the College's students writers themselves, the Whitesell Prizes seek to add to the vitality of the College's General Education curriculum by getting students to think of their intellectual efforts as ongoing enterprises (revision, often after the essay has been graded and the class is completed, is a requirement of the competition). Also, by involving faculty and Writing Center tutors in the judging of the essays—and by making this booklet available to the College community, the Whitesell competition hopes to foster a fuller awareness of the interesting work being done in our Foundations and First-Year Writing requirement courses.

My great appreciation goes to this year's Whitesell Prize judges. Prof. Robert Battistini, Prof. Barbara Nimershiem, and Writing Center tutor Melissa Hediger ('05) awarded the prize in Foundations. Prof. Maria Mitchell, Prof. Ken Krebs, and tutor Christine Corkran ('05) were the judges for the First-Year Writing Requirement competition.

Many thanks to Delia Meneely-Sepulvado ('07) for editing this booklet.

Daniel Frick
Director, Writing Center
May 2005

Table of Contents

Whitesell Prize Winner: First-Year Writing 1
Les Roles Place en Pierre: Male Homosexuality in Nineteenth-Century France
By Andrew Martin for Professor Maria Mitchell
HIS176: Gender In Modern Europe

Whitesell Prize Winner: Foundations 16
Language: The Window into the Life, Love, and Fate of a Character
By Joan Brumbaugh for Professor Lina Bernstein
MSS 129: Narrative And Self

Honorable Mention: First-Year Writing 27
The Boy Who Will Never Grow Up: An Examination of Alterity
By Alissa Butterworth for Professor Misty Bastian
ANT/WGS175: Invisible Worlds

Whitesell Prize Winner: First-Year Writing

Andrew Martin

HIS/WGS 176: Gender In Modern Europe

Professor Mitchell

Les rôles placé en pierre: Male Homosexuality in Nineteenth-Century France

Râblé, roux et velu : des paupières meurtries	*Stocky, auburn and hairy: bruised eyelids*
Sur d'étranges yeux verts, des éclats de metal	*Over strange green eyes, shards of metal*
Dans la voix soured et basse, instinctif, animal	*In the toneless and low voice, instinctive, animal*
Il est digne enfant de ces races pourries.	*He is a worthy child of these putrid races.*
Il a d'abord aimé les bougres d'écuries,	*He first loved the stable buggers,*
Les boys, les palefreniers, les lutteurs et le bal	*The boys, grooms, wrestlers and the soldiers'*
A soldats, puis le bouge, où le plaisir brutal	*Ball, then the brothel, where brutal pleasure*
S'achete au prix du sang des rouges soûleries.[1]	*Is bought for the price of blood from red binges.*
Modernité! Modernité!	*Modernity! Modernity!*
A travers les cris, les huées	*Through the shouting and the roars*
L'impudeur des prostituées	*The immodesty of whores*
Resplendit dans l'éternité.[2]	*Shines on into eternity.*

As the result of Enlightenment ideals during the Revolutionary period, the legal status of homosexual behavior changed dramatically in nineteenth-century France. Male homosexuals permeated France, and, according to Michael Sibalis, public actors—police officers, medical experts, and legislators—thrust these gay men into the political limelight. Subsequently, the contentious issue of male homosexuality came to the forefront of debate. In post-Revolutionary

[1] Jean, Lorrain, as quoted by Leslie Choquette, "Degenerate or Degendered? Images of Prostitution and Homosexuality in the French Third Republic," Historical Reflections 23 (1997), p. 224.

[2] Jean Lorrain, as quoted by Choquette, "Degenerate or Degendered," p. 228.

France, progressive ideals strayed from traditional Christian beliefs and afforded citizens, particularly male homosexuals, mastery over their own bodies. Although the French Revolution provided a significant step in the improvement of the lives of gay men, male homosexuality became increasingly stigmatized throughout the nineteenth century. Despite the absence of French law explicitly criminalizing sexual relations between consenting male adults, public actors in nineteenth-century France nonetheless employed a category of public offense against decency to curb male homosexuality. Moreover, public actors in nineteenth-century France regarded male homosexuals as degenerate and effeminate sexual creatures. In order to offer insight into this world of male homosexuality, I will examine history, laws and regulations, discriminatory views, subculture, and literature.

To highlight the degree to which post-Revolution legal changes represented a rupture with prior law, it is useful to discuss the origins and evolution of homosexual regulation and legislation; France has a history of repression of male homosexuality that stretches from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century.[3] Western laws controlling male homosexuality took root in the legal system of the Roman Empire; Roman law tolerated male homosexuality, provided that it did not inhibit one's civic duties, until the arrival of Constantine II in 342, at which time legislators began to establish restrictions.[4] During the Middle Ages, the Christian Church played a central role in the repression of male homosexuality by instituting canonical law in 1120. Compared to witchcraft and labeled one of the "sins of the flesh," male homosexuality became punishable by death through burning on the stake. During the Renaissance and the Reformation,

---

[3] George E. Haggerty, <u>Encyclopedia of Lesbian and Gay Cultures</u> (New York: Garland, 2000), p. 338.

[4] Scott E. Gunther, "The Elastic Closet: Legal Censure and Auto-Censure of Homosexuality in France" (New York: Diss. New York U P, 2001), p. 62.

French society conceived of homosexuality as "an abomination before God."[5] Enlightenment ideals of the mid-eighteenth century, however, encouraged a more rational approach to punishment, viewing homosexuality as "a socially unacceptable taste" that needed to be controlled. Thus, with a secular shift in perceiving homosexuality from sin to disorder, and with the installment of the Penal Code of 1791, legal discrimination against male homosexuals finally ceased, or so it seemed.

With the ratification of the Penal Code of 1791, a product of the French Revolution, France became the first country in Europe to remove the crime of male homosexuality from its laws. The legislative silence that began in 1791 continued well into the Napoleonic era. The Penal Code of 1810 "contained articles on rape and sexual assaults (#331-333), public offenses against decency (#330), the incitement of youths to debauchery (#334-335), and adultery and bigamy (#336-340)."[6] However, neither code mentioned male homosexuality. The Penal Code of 1832 made the first reference to statutory rape, a crime involving non-violent sexual acts with a minor. Not until nearly a century later, on August 6, 1942 under the Vichy government, did any discrimination between homosexual and heterosexual acts appear in French law.[7]

So, why *did* legislators refrain from passing laws against male homosexuality? According to Scott Gunther, the Penal Code's silence with regard to male homosexuality in 1791 "was more likely the result of an oversight as opposed to an intentional expression of tolerance."[8] Another possible interpretation of the legislative stillness suggests that, "In the minds of the legislators, [male homosexuality] remained of such a heinous character as to merit a certain

---

[5] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," p. 66.

[6] William A. Peniston, "The Police and the Subculture: Same-Sex Sexuality As Crime in Paris in the 1870s," Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History 26 (1999), p. 104.

[7] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," p. 108.

[8] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," p. 56.

rhetorical modesty."[9] A popular explanation for the omission of the crime of male homosexuality in 1810 involved the efforts of Jean-Jacques-Régis de Cambacérès, Napoleon Bonaparte's homosexual archchancellor who thwarted the actions of the homophobic French legislature. Whether the silence resulted from a secularization of criminal law, accidental omission, legislative reticence, or individual effort, all possible interpretations support the same conclusion: the absence of the crime of male homosexuality in the Penal Codes of 1791, 1810, and 1832 cannot be interpreted as expressions of widespread tolerance toward male homosexuality because they did not accurately reflect public opinion.[10] Moreover, statements from influential figures of the time imply that a desire to restrict homosexual acts existed and that the moral climate of French society would have readily accommodated a crime against male homosexuality.[11]

Although the *legal* basis for criminalizing male homosexuality disappeared in 1791, various forms of repression continued throughout the nineteenth century. Intolerant laws proved unnecessary to the degree that public figures exercised control through "discriminatory uses and interpretations of existing, nondiscriminatory laws."[12] In practice, this meant that police officials enacted new forms of inequity by surreptitiously investigating the lives of homosexual men. Not surprisingly, these officials invoked existing law concerning sexual morality and public indecency with greater frequency against homosexuals than against heterosexuals, particularly in

---

[9] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," p. 75.

[10] Arno Karlen, Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1971), p. 161.

[11] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," p. 95.

[12] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," pp. 2-3.

the second half of the nineteenth century.[13] Public actors across France expressed frustration with the impossibility of legally rendering punishment for cases involving homosexual acts.[14]

This distinctive era of ethics that began after the French Revolution gained strength through the First Consul (1799-1815), the Constitutional Monarchy (1815-1848), the Second Republic (1848-1852), and reached its peak during the coup d'état of Napoleon III in 1870. Throughout the early 1800s, correctional courts condemned sodomites who cuddled for offenses against decency on the same grounds as men and women who blatantly had sex in public.

Police monitored male homosexuals closely and collected as much information about their behaviors as possible. "Research, surveillance, and harassment [which existed outside the laws] were part of the police's attempt to maintain the social and political orders, as well as the sexual and gender orders of society."[15] Letters from the *Archives de la Préfecture de Police* in Paris suggest an omnipresent police control.[16] Police ministers often used internal exile as a swift way to deal with homosexual dissidents and troublemakers. Internal exile, an administrative measure at the minister's discretion, did not require approval by judges or law courts; thus, ministers circumvented legal safeguards.[17]

Upon encountering male homosexuals, police officers entered their names and addresses into a ledger in case they came into contact with them at a later date.[18] For many of the homosexual men whose names were entered, their initial contact with the police was their last; for others, it was the beginning of a series of harassments. The police questioned these men

---

[13] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," pp. 107-109.
[14] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," pp. 96-97.
[15] ---, "Pederasts and Others: A Social History of Male Homosexuals in the Early Years of the French Third Republic," (Rochester: Diss. U of Rochester P, 1997), p. 128.
[16] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," p. 68.
[17] Jeffrey Merrick and Bryant T. Ragan, Jr., Homosexuality in Modern France, (New York: Oxford U P, 1996), p. 88.
[18] ---, "Pederasts and Others," p. 106.

extensively, gathering further information about their friends and acquaintances. The police then investigated these men, either directly through interrogation or indirectly through interviews with family, friends, neighbors, or associates. Police officials frequently searched homosexual men's residences looking for letters, photographs, and other kinds of information useful in their research. In all of these cases, harassment led to arrest. The police arrested some homosexuals two or three times, occasionally releasing them after questioning, but other times detaining them without recourse to the laws; their primary concern was to find a way to identify the homosexual subculture as criminal.[19]

Most of the time, however, the police acted legally by sending male homosexuals on to the courts. The courts invariably convicted them, but of crimes other than male homosexuality: vagrancy, incitement of youth to debauchery, or sexual assault.[20] From the police's point of view, homosexual acts not only caused scandals that disrupted neighborhood life, but also led to all kinds of crimes, such as thievery, blackmail, assault, and murder.[21] The censure of neighbors gave the police the excuse they needed to survey and harass the subculture. Though "freed from the legal burdens of outlawry and infamy that had been theirs under the Old Regime,"[22] French homosexual men still felt forced by legal institutions to lead a clandestine existence. Members of the male homosexual subculture were easy targets for the police in the early years of the Third Republic.

The police force's increased pursuit of homosexuals throughout the nineteenth century climaxed during the Second Empire (1852-1870), at which time officials relied increasingly upon the testimonies of medical "experts." Through its dependence on these dubious

---

[19] Peniston, "Police and the Subculture," p. 107.
[20] Peniston, "Police and the Subculture," p. 105.
[21] Merrick and Ragan, Modern France, p. 133.
[22] Wayne R. Dynes, Encyclopedia of Homosexuality (New York: Garland, 1990), p. 424.

practitioners, French society writ large sought guidance to replace the order of pre-Revolutionary France.[23] In the 1860s, with the emergence of an era of explicit sexuality, led by psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud, experts of phrenology proliferated.[24] French doctors saw homosexuals as "fundamentally effeminate, classifiable freaks of nature—hermaphrodites, uranists, inverts, [and] unisexuals."[25] Doctor Ambroise Tardieu described the distinctive criminal characteristics of the male homosexual: an excessive development of the buttocks, a deformation of the anus, and obtuse dimensions of the penis. He described the appearance of male homosexuals with a pointed stereotype: "'les cheveux frisés, le teint fared, le col découvert, la taille serrée de manière à faire saillir les formes, les doigts, les oreilles, la poitrine charges de bijoux, toute la personne exhalant l'odeur des parfums le plus pénétrants, which translates into: curled hair, made-up face, open collar, belt pulled tight to give shape to the figure, fingers, ears, chest covered with jewels, the whole body reeking of the most pervasive perfumes.'"[26] This new approach toward psychiatric medicine came a shift in attitudes regarding male homosexuality.

By 1868, medical reports also emphasized the dangers homosexuality posed to the public order. According to French medical experts, "It was in the interest of both the person charged and of public order to put him [the homosexual] in an insane asylum."[27] Moreover, medical commentators saw homosexuality as a scourge on a nation suffering from a low birthrate; same-sex desire threatened reproduction.[28] Like other forms of sexual deviance, particularly

---

[23] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," p. 120.

[24] Bonnie G. Smith, Changing Lives: Women in European History Since 1700, (Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company, 1989), p. 340.

[25] Carolyn J. Dean, The Frail Social Body: Pornography, Homosexuality, and Other Fantasies in Interwar France (Berkeley: U of California P, 2000), p. 139.

[26] As quoted by Doctor Ambroise Tardieu, Robert Alrich, "Homosexuality," Contemporary French Civilization 7 (1982), p. 3.

[27] Gunther, "Elastic Closet," p. 123.

[28] Dean, Frail Social Body, p. 132.

masturbation, critics saw men's homosexual desire as the cause of the male body's enervation and hypersensitivity. Doctors argued, "Homosexuality drained the body of vital fluid and left the mind unfocused and distracted and thus incapable of fulfilling its reproductive function in the industrial age."[29] Furthermore, specialists saw male homosexuality as antisocial; since criminal and civil codes defined the family as the basic social unit, male homosexuality violated social order and gender norms.[30] In the opinions of doctors, the homosexual was a born criminal, fully capable of irrational acts such as theft, assault, and even murder. Well aware of the social and legal implications of their commanding views on homosexuality, French psychiatrists compelled the courts and the government to reassess how they dealt with homosexuals.[31]

Although the Constituent Assembly decriminalized male homosexuality in 1791, this change did not make it socially acceptable. Rather, male homosexuals were subjected to severe informal sanctions.[32] In France, during the latter part of the nineteenth century, traditional ways were called into question by radical social and political change, including industrialization, urbanization, socialism, and a growing military threat from Germany.[33] As France expanded its empire abroad, nationalism became increasingly synonymous with racial purity and masculinity. Since society generally viewed homosexual men as depraved, degenerate, sick or insane, it treated them as scapegoats for a national anxiety. The notion that male homosexuality posed a threat to society at large became well ingrained in political discourse.

---

[29] Dean, Frail Social Body, p. 133.
[30] Dean, Frail Social Body, p. 134.
[31] Antony Copley, Sexual Moralities in France, 1790-1980: New Ideas on the Family, Divorce, and Homosexuality (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 140.
[32] Karlen, Sexuality and Homosexuality, p. 161.
[33] Jeffrey Merrick and Michael Sibalis, Homosexuality in French History and Culture (New York: Harrington Park P, 2001), p. 247.

As illustrated above, the desire to restrict male homosexuality was not limited to licensed professionals; there also existed a *national* yearning to inhibit the political expression and assembly of male homosexuals. "Under the Third Republic, the daily press, freed of legal censorship and restraint, devoted more space than ever before to [homosexual] scandals, including…the trial of the Comte de Germiny in December 1876 for gross public indecency with an 18-year-old unemployed jeweller's aid in a *vespasienne* (street urinal)."[34] As illustrated by this court case, static homosexual stereotypes reinforced the concept of the ideal French citizen: a bourgeois, heterosexual man with a family, working diligently in one of the reliable trades. He was masculine, intelligent, patriotic, and disciplined.[35] French society perceived the male homosexual as the countertype of the normative male. While glorifying virility, French citizens devalued "feminine" characteristics such as emotion and sentimentality; society condemned homosexual men who violated gender norms.[36] Thus, regulatory discourses identified and constrained gay men who deviated from the accepted ideal of masculinity.

It is important to recognize, at the outset, that although the legal discourse on homosexuality began to change, old attitudes still prevailed; homosexuality was still seen as criminal and immoral.[37] Throughout the nineteenth century, homosexual behavior received tremendous attention from newspaper reporters, writers of fiction and poetry, and visual artists.[38] In iconographic representations of Parisian male homosexuals from the 1830s to the end of the

---

[34] ---, "Defining Masculinity in Fin-de-Siécle France: Sexual Anxiety and the Emergence of the Homosexual," Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History 25 (1998), p. 248.

[35] George Robb and Nancy Erber, Disorder in the Court: Trials and Sexual Conflict at the Turn of the Century (New York: New York U P, 1999), p. 28.

[36] Merrick and Sibalis, French History and Culture, p. 247.

[37] Copley, Sexual Moralities in France, p. 135.

[38] ---, "Homosexuals in the City: Representations of Lesbian and Gay Space in Nineteenth-Century Paris," Journal of Homosexuality 41 (2001), p. 149.

century, one can see a marked hostility toward gay men.[39] Reports "both explicitly and implicitly portrayed homosexual behavior…in such a way that it appeared as both symptom and cause of wide-reaching social and political change."[40] Most strikingly, callous news reports depicted homosexuals (much like Jews in the anti-Semitic press) as rootless foreigners. Such beliefs became commonplace in France by the end of the nineteenth century.

Especially during the Second Empire and the Third Republic, negative views of male homosexuals exhibited by legislators, police, medical "experts," and citizens petrified gays and forced them into a secret sexual sphere.[41] Although homosexual men could gather somewhat publicly and peacefully throughout the former part of the nineteenth century, they no longer had that option. Despite the *existence* of the male homosexual subculture, its members were forced to deny their legally irreprehensible emotional and sexual needs in order to avoid censure by the neighborhood, the criminal justice system, and medical professionals. The consequences of such repressive sexual morality catalyzed the development of a promiscuous homosexual subculture.[42] By the end of the Third Republic, Paris acquired a large, clandestine subculture.

Homosexual men sought sexual adventure in the streets, squares, and parks of Paris, and often risked arrest for public indecency. One of the best-known places for cruising was the Tuleries Garden, where Parisian gays went for centuries to meet other men and sometimes to have sex with them at night in the bushes or under the trees. The principal cruising spot of the time was the Elysian Fields, a wooded parkland along the Place de la Concorde. Irritated Parisians frequently complained to the police about the "hideous leprosy"[43] that infected the

---

[39] Merrick and Sibalis, French History and Culture, p. 251.
[40] Merrick and Sibalis, French History and Culture, p. 249.
[41] Merrick and Ragan, Modern France, p. 122.
[42] Merrick and Ragan, Modern France, p. 142.
[43] David Higgs, Queer Sites: Gay Urban Histories Since 1600, (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 17.

Elysian Fields every evening. Male homosexuals often went down to the Seine River to ogle at men who commonly bathed there naked. Changes to the urban landscape during the nineteenth century created new cruising sites; public urinals installed in the Paris streets provided hundreds of additional spots for sexual acts. Rapidly multiplying along the streets, parks, and squares, "these *vespasiennes*…were free-standing structures of sheet-metal that usually had room for three to six men."[44] The behavior of homosexuals in such places as public toilets, steam baths, and public parks did not command much sympathy. Rather, police and medical "experts" only strengthened their account of male homosexuals as criminals.[45]

In the 1880s and 1890s, "as gender anxiety reigned and naturalism gained force in art and literature,"[46] a few strident voices of opposition emerged refuting common homosexual stereotypes. André Gide, one of the most prominent figures on the French literary scene during the late nineteenth century, reflected on the nature of male homosexuality in his work. He used male homosexuality as a background against which to analyze systems of dominance and power embedded in French society. Gide, offended by the medicalization of homosexuality that characterized French discourse during the Third Republic, hoped that his defense of male homosexuality would convince others that gay men were not sick.[47] Determined to challenge the stereotypical perception that all homosexual men were effeminate in appearance and degenerate in physique, Gide published *Corydon* in 1924. This work constituted his most public statement on the question of male homosexuality. He defended male homosexuality as respectable by associating it with ideals revered in France: marital valor and familial reproduction. Gide's critics attacked him because they could not tolerate his assertions; they could not accept the

---

[44] Higgs, Queer Sites, p. 19.
[45] Copley, Sexual Moralities in France, p. 100.
[46] ---, "Homosexuals in the City," p. 152.
[47] Merrick and Ragan, Modern France, p. 206.

suggestion that homosexuality could be healthy, or that homosexual men could be honorable. Gide "hoped that by subjecting to rational critique the 'hypocrisy, lies, and misrepresentations' about homosexuality that circulated in wartime and postwar French culture, truth would triumph over prejudice."[48] Predictably, he failed to convince his audience; his strategy of "subversive appropriation" proved more problematic than persuasive.[49]

Moreover, Gide emphasized the innate existence of male homosexuality and posited that human nature was as varied as the natural world. The essence of Gide's argument may be summarized:

> Homosexuality is natural; it is part of the manifold creation. Moreover, it can be demonstrated to have a productive cultural value and can take its rightful place among the possibilities of human existence. The opposition is not between nature and culture, but between the true and the artificial.[50]

Gide believed that there should be a discourse for the other, the male homosexual, despite the dominant discourse of the male heterosexual. Although heterosexuality was the predominant form of power and sexuality, he did not see it as inherently better than another version of sexuality.[51] Gide found it dangerous to confine male homosexuality to a private sphere. According to Gide, public actors in France did not effectively maintain the moral order by restraining the homosexual subculture; they only made matters worse.

Although France had no laws criminalizing sexual relations between consenting male adults after 1791, public actors in nineteenth-century France employed a category of public offense against decency to curb male homosexuality. The absence of the crime of male homosexuality in the Penal Codes of 1791, 1810, and 1832 were not expressions of widespread

---

[48] Merrick and Ragan, Modern France, p. 221.
[49] Merrick and Ragan, Modern France, p. 220.
[50] André Gide, as quoted by Lawrence R. Schehr, The Shock of Men: Homosexual Hermeneutics in French Writing (Stanford: Stanford U P, 1995), p. 11.
[51] Schehr, Shock of Men, p. viii.

tolerance toward male homosexuality because they did not accurately reflect public opinion.

Public figures controlled the gay subculture by invoking nondiscriminatory law in a discriminatory fashion. Police officials stealthily inspected the lives of homosexual men in an attempt to maintain the social, political, and gender orders of society. These officials more frequently invoked law concerning sexual morality and public indecency against homosexuals than against heterosexuals, especially in the second half of the nineteenth century. Though legally freed from persecution, French homosexual men were compelled to lead a furtive existence. Police officials and medical professionals preyed on male homosexuals during the early years of the Third Republic. Doctors viewed homosexuals as freaks of nature and criminals who perpetrated theft, assault, and even murder. French psychiatrists convinced the courts and the government to re-evaluate how they handled the question of male homosexuality.

Although the Constituent Assembly decriminalized male homosexuality in 1791, members of French society nonetheless treated gay men as aberrant sexual creatures. French citizens glorified virility and abhorred "feminine" characteristics, such as emotion and sentimentality; they rebuked homosexual men who defied gender norms. Regulatory discourses isolated and repressed gay men who infringed upon the accepted ideal of masculinity. Despite the *existence* of the male homosexual subculture, its members could not express their modest affections because they feared censorship by a rigid society. "All of these discourses—of the neighborhood, the criminal justice system, and the medical profession—worked together to curtail the freedom of the men who made up the male homosexual subculture of nineteenth-century France."[52]

---

[52] Merrick and Ragan, Modern France, p. 142.

Works Cited

Aldrich, Robert. “Homosexuality.” Contemporary French Civilization 7 (1982): 2-16.

Choquette, Leslie. “Degenerate or Degendered? Images of Prostitution and Homosexuality in the French Third Republic.” Historical Reflections 23 (1997): 205-228.

---. “Homosexuals in the City: Representations of Lesbian and Gay Space in Nineteenth-Century Paris.” Journal of Homosexuality 41 (2001): 149-167.

Copley, Antony. Sexual Moralities in France, 1790-1980: New Ideas on the Family, Divorce, and Homosexuality. London: Routledge, 1992.

Dean, Carolyn J. The Frail Social Body: Pornography, Homosexuality, and Other Fantasies in Interwar France. Berkeley: U of California P, 2000.

Dynes, Wayne R. “France.” Encyclopedia of Homosexuality. Ed. Warren Johansson. Rev. ed. 1 vol. New York: Garland, 1990.

Gunther, Scott E. “The Elastic Closet: Legal Censure and Auto-Censure of Homosexuality in France.” Diss. New York U, 2001.

Haggerty, George E. “France.” Encyclopedia of Lesbian and Gay Cultures. Ed. John Beynon. Rev. ed. 2 vols. New York: Garland, 2000.

Higgs, David. Queer Sites: Gay Urban Histories Since 1600. London: Routledge, 1999.

Karlen, Arno. Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1971.

Merrick, Jeffrey and Bryant T. Ragan, Jr. Homosexuality in Modern France. New York: Oxford U P, 1996.

Merrick, Jeffrey and Michael Sibalis. Homosexuality in French History and Culture. New York: Harrington Park P, 2001.

Peniston, William A. "The Police and the Subculture: Same-Sex Sexuality As Crime in Paris in the 1870s." Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History 26 (1999): 104-111.

---. "Defining Masculinity in Fin-de-Siécle France: Sexual Anxiety and the Emergence of the Homosexual." Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Western Society for French History 25 (1998): 247-256.

---. "Pederasts and Others: A Social History of Male Homosexuals in the Early Years of the French Third Republic." Diss. U of Rochester, 1997.

Robb, George and Nancy Erber. Disorder in the Court: Trials and Sexual Conflict at the Turn of the Century. New York: New York U P, 1999.

Schehr, Lawrence R. The Shock of Men: Homosexual Hermeneutics in French Writing. Stanford: Stanford U P, 1995.

Smith, Bonnie G. Changing Lives: Women in European History Since 1700. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company, 1989.

Whitesell Prize Winner: Foundations

Joan Brumbaugh

MSS 129: Narrative And Self

Professor Bernstein

Language: The Window into the Life, Love and Fate of a Character

Love. Countless writers have used it as their subject in countless works of literary art. Each writer carefully chooses the exact words to use to paint a picture of the love story and its main characters. Jane Austen and Gustave Flaubert are no exceptions. The language used to depict the characters of both Elizabeth in *Pride and Prejudice* and Emma in *Madame Bovary* offers a glimpse into the minds and hearts of each woman. The statements and moods expressed in these protagonists' words also serve to give the reader a thorough understanding of their thought processes and characters. Both Elizabeth and Emma are faced with romantic settings in which they contemplate love and are subsequently forced to make a decision concerning their reaction to a man. The reader's understanding of each woman's response to the man is broadened by deliberately selected language. This language supplies an understanding of the characters, and therefore, ultimately, an understanding of the fate of each woman's marriage.

The character of Elizabeth in *Pride and Prejudice* is fully developed through the story, especially in regard to her view and affection towards Mr. Darcy. In the beginning of the novel, when Elizabeth is first acquainted with Darcy at a ball, she is disgusted by his description of her as being "tolerable" and by his speaking of her in a negative light as being "slighted by other

men" (Austen 13). His treatment of her results in Elizabeth's adopting a negative opinion of him. This opinion is subsequently evidenced during the following ball at Netherfield. When Darcy requests to dance with her, Elizabeth declines with such determination that even Sir William cannot persuade her to recant. When asked how she can so willingly give up a chance to dance with such a partner, she "looked archly, and turned away" (Austen 27). The description of Elizabeth's reaction to Darcy's comment and her resulting action against his request give a glimpse into the character of Elizabeth. She is strong-willed and determined, and her judgment of Darcy stays with her. This observation about her lasting judgment of Darcy is supported by the statements that pass between Darcy and Elizabeth during her stay at Netherfield during Jane's sickness. Elizabeth's response to Darcy's comment, "My good opinion once lost is lost forever" (Austen 57) is condescending and acrimonious: "'*That* is a failing indeed!'–cried Elizabeth. 'Implacable resentment *is* a shade of character. But you have chosen your fault well'" (Austen 57). Elizabeth's tone resembles one of an accusing judge, and her use of the word 'failing' discloses her opinion that his character is made lacking by his arrogant prejudice. There is irony in this scene, however, because Elizabeth is judging Darcy on his refusal to reexamine and redefine his opinion of another, while she is guilty of the same fault.

The readers' understanding of Elizabeth's character is made more complete through her discourse with Mr. Collins following his asking for her hand in marriage. To Collins' proposal, Elizabeth says, "'I am very sensible to the honor of your proposals, but it is impossible for me to do otherwise than decline them'" (Austen 104). Such a response declining societal establishment is considered preposterous, and to Collins' remarks to that end, Elizabeth goes on to say, "You could not make *me* happy, and I am convinced that I am the last woman in the world who would make *you* so" (Austen 105). This discourse supports the perception that Elizabeth is a

determined and strong woman. It also, however, reveals Elizabeth's ideals of love. Elizabeth refuses to simply settle for a husband out of an obligation to become established in society. Her idea of successful love is one in which both people make each other happy through a mutual understanding of each other. Elizabeth sees and understands that she and Collins are too different to ever reconcile their opposite personalities and make each other happy. Elizabeth stands on the foundation of her strong will and refuses to marry. The perception of Elizabeth's character is hewn from her reactions to various circumstances, and it reveals a strong-willed, persistent woman who believes that marriage should be founded on a successful relationship. Elizabeth is also shown to egotistically believe that her perception of people and situations is impeccable.

Elizabeth's character undergoes a transformation in the second book of the novel. However, she responds to Darcy's profession of love for her with an ardent rebuke spawned by her misconception of him. Her scathing accusations of his hurting the lives of both Wickham and Jane through his avarice and class-discrimination cause him to leave her presence shocked and wounded. Her satisfaction with her own judgment is short-lived, however, as Darcy answers her statements in a letter that provides a second perspective on the situations that she feels she has so expertly judged. Elizabeth's reaction is somewhat uncharacteristic: "She grew absolutely ashamed of herself.—Of neither Darcy nor Wickham could she think, without feeling that she had been blind, partial, prejudiced, absurd" (Austen 201). The tone of this description of Elizabeth's thoughts is quite different than any preceding it, and this description marks the first time that Elizabeth's analytical eye is turned on herself. Such a change in the language reflects the large change beginning to occur in her character. Upon further thought and introspection, Elizabeth states:

> "How despicably have I acted!" she cried.—"I, who have prided myself on my discernment!—I, who have valued myself on my abilities! who have often disdained the generous candour of my sister, and gratified my vanity, in useless of blameable distrust.—How humiliating is this discovery!—Yet, how just a humiliation!—Had I been in love, I could not have been more wretchedly blind. But vanity, not love, has been my folly.—Pleased with the preference of one, and offended by the neglect of the other, on the very beginning of our acquaintance, I have courted prepossession and ignorance, and driven reason away, where either were concerned. Till this moment, I never knew myself." (Austen 201-202)

Elizabeth's language is as scathing as it ever was, but the object of her language now is herself. This passage shows Elizabeth's finding her core, which initiates a significant change in her views of herself and others. It also shows a turning point in her story in which her personality and character begin to change along with those views. An example of the radical change in Elizabeth's personality and in her views of others is shown in her discourse with Wickham at her home in Longbourne. When Wickham asks if Darcy has changed, Elizabeth responds by saying, "When I said that [Darcy] improved on acquaintance, I did not mean that either his mind or his manners were in a state of improvement, but that from knowing him better, his disposition was better understood" (Austen 226). The language and tense used by Elizabeth in this statement is important to note. Elizabeth's words, "his disposition was better understood," are said in passive voice, showing that his disposition was better understood by *her*. Darcy has not changed; rather, it is Elizabeth's understanding of him that has changed.

The transformation in Elizabeth's viewpoint is also seen in her thoughts as she experiences Pemberly Estate. Elizabeth views a hill out of different windows, each of which

provide a different perspective of the same hill. From the house, the hill looks steep, though a walk through the grounds brings Elizabeth to the same hill, which, she realizes, is not nearly as steep as she had originally perceived. The hill signifies Darcy in her mind, and Elizabeth realizes that a judgment should be withheld until multiple perspectives and closer proximity are attained. Elizabeth had originally judged Darcy by a single vantage point and thought him to be arrogant and rude. When she draws closer to him and views him from different sides, however, Elizabeth realizes that Darcy is actually a benevolent, upright, and caring person. When Elizabeth views a painting of Darcy in his house, the description of her thoughts is very telling of her change of heart:

> There was certainly at this moment, in Elizabeth's mind, a more gentle sensation towards the original, then she had ever felt in the height of their acquaintance…as she stood before the canvas, on which he was represented, and fixed his eyes upon herself, she thought of his regard with a deeper sentiment of gratitude than it had ever raised before; she remembered its warmth, and softened its impropriety of expression. (Austen 240)

The word "gentle" is used, and it shows Elizabeth's heart as warm towards Darcy, an exact opposite to the animosity that she harbored against him at the start of the novel. As Elizabeth thinks back to remember Darcy's face, she sees it for its "warmth" whereas, in the beginning of the novel, Elizabeth saw only egotism and arrogance. The change in Elizabeth's perception of Darcy has completely transfigured by this point in the story, though that transformation was only accomplished through a change in her perception as a precipitate of her own self-analysis. To Darcy's second proposal, Elizabeth "immediately, though not very fluently, gave him to understand, that her sentiments had undergone so material a change, since the period to which he

alluded, as to make her receive with gratitude and pleasure, his present assurances" (Austen 346). Elizabeth understands both herself and Darcy, and she thereby realizes that their union would be one in which they would make each other happy. Therefore, for the same reasons that she denied Collins' marriage proposal, Elizabeth accepts Darcy's.

The character of Emma in *Madame Bovary* is also fully developed throughout the novel. Her story, like Elizabeth's, is one impacted by love, though in a much different context. Emma, like Elizabeth, is a strong-willed and determined woman, an observation supported by her ability to manipulate her husband Charles throughout the book. The first glimpse into her heart and personality is given in the description of Emma's studies at the convent when she was young:

> If she loved the sea, it was because of its storms. She never enjoyed the greenness of the grass save as a meager accompaniment of ruins. Objects she valued merely for the profit, as it were, that she could draw from them, and rejected as useless everything that did not at once contribute to the consummation of her heart—for she was by temperament sentimental rather than artistic, and engaged in the pursuit not of landscapes but of emotions. (Flaubert 32)

Emma acquires a mental construct of love in her mind by adopting the scenes in the romance novels she reads as an attainable reality. She yearns for a life filled with the kind of passion described in her books, and her life becomes centered on the pursuit of such happiness, as exemplified in the description of her music lessons: "The ballads which she sang at her music lessons…mild compositions which, through the childish simplicity of their style and the defects of their musical expression, gave her glimpses of the seductive fantasy world of sentimental realities" (Flaubert 33). The language of these passages shows Emma to be highly sentimental and addicted to the passion of love of which she has no conception. The word choice in the two

passages suggests with the words ‘consummation’ and ‘seductive’ that there is a propensity for illegitimate love for the sake of passion. The phrase, “gave her glimpses of the fantasy world of sentimental realities” (Flaubert 33) also depicts a second significant aspect of Emma’s character: Emma mixes fantasy with reality, and, thus, judges her world by an unattainable hybrid of both.

Emma, like Elizabeth, analyzes people and her surroundings. Her analysis, however, instead of being based on her own implacable judgment, is based on scenes from the novels she reads. She therefore becomes dissatisfied and bored with the setting that Charles provides. In one of her reflections, she centered her thoughts around the question, “Why was it not her fate to lean upon the balcony of a Swiss chalet or hide her melancholy in some Highland cottage, with a husband dressed in a black, long-skirted velvet coat, soft leather boots, a pointed hat, and ruffles at his wrist?” (Flaubert 36). It is interesting to note that the scenes Emma longs for are not scenes that her provincial life has ever enabled her to see. She covets things that she has never experienced but covets them nonetheless because they are the settings of the passionate love stories that she aspires to emulate. Charles bores her because he is not the proverbial knight that she longs to have come and sweep her away to a passionate life of luxury. Instead, Charles’ conversation is described through Emma’s eyes as being “flat as a city pavement trodden by all men’s thoughts dressed in the clothes of every day” (Flaubert 36). Emma’s expectation of a husband is a man who “should be all-knowing, should excel in multiple activities, be capable of initiating his wife into the violence of passion, the refinements of life, and all the mysteries of existence” (Flaubert 36). There is irony in these thoughts concerning Charles because, while she expects him to know how she is feeling, she does not communicate with him enough to give him an indication that she is dissatisfied. Charles, as a doctor, is also capable of a variety of medical

activities, but Emma overlooks these because they are not the sorts of activities entertained by the men described in her love stories.

The result of Emma's idealized standard is a misconception of people, including her husband. An example of another is the Duc de Lavardiere, a man Emma sees at the ball that she and Charles attend:

> At the far end of the table, alone among all these women, an old man crouched over his well-filled plate, a napkin tied round his neck like a child, and gravy slobbering over his lips. His eyes were blood-shot, and he wore his hair in a little queue bound with black ribbon…Emma's eyes kept turning of their own accord in his direction. She gazed at his pendulous lips as though he were something august, something out of the general run of nature. (Flaubert, 43)

The description of the scene and Emma's reaction to the Duc shows Emma's skewed perception of the ideal man. Emma's judgment of the Duc should have been one of disgust because of the gross and sloppy eating habits that he displays at a fancy ball. Her view is skewed, however, because he is just like the characters in her books of romance. He is royalty, and ,therefore, Emma's eyes look past the gravy that he has slobbered all over his face, and she sees something "august" and magnificent. His vulgarity is undermined in Emma's perception by his status in society; "He had lived at Court and lain in a queen's bed!" (Flaubert 42).

Upon her return home, Emma broods with such thoughts and descriptions of her setting as

> …a tedious countryside, a half-witted, middle-class society, an unceasing round of mediocrity…Did not love, like Oriental blooms, need carefully tended earth to grow in, and a special climate? Moonlit sighs and lingering embraces, tear-stained

> hands at parting, burning desires and languorous tenderness—such things could have place only on the balconies of noble mansions where leisure marks the passing of the days, in boudoirs with silken blinds, deep-piled carpets, flower-filled bowls and beds raised high in stepped recesses: could go only with the sparkle of jewels, the shoulder-knots of liveried footmen. (Flaubert 52-53)

Emma is looking to fill her heart with the passion that she has read about. Her language in describing the ideal scenes of life is that of the books themselves, and the descriptions can only be manifestations of the settings of her love stories because she has never experienced such a life as to be able to comment on its efficacy in making her happy. This description of the ideal life is in the same style of description as the preceding descriptions that Emma offers. Her thought process remains the same, showing that Emma, unlike Elizabeth, never undergoes a self-analysis. Her problems of perception go unrectified because she never contemplates that her dissatisfaction with her life is a result of her own idealistic mindset. Never does Emma entertain the thought that she is to blame for anything that happens in her life. Instead, she turns to scapegoats on which she projects her anger. Emma blames Charles for a love life that is devoid of the idealistic events that fill the novels she reads. She blames God for her life devoid of the pleasures and adventures of the rich: "She kicked against the pricks of God's injustice; would lean her head against the wall and weep, envious of those who knew tumultuous days and nights of dance and domino and all the desperate joys which come with arrogant pleasures—but not to her!" (Flaubert 59). Emma does not understand herself, a fact made evident by her constantly chasing after possessions and other men in her pursuit of happiness. Her ideals are skewed by her inaccurate idea of a successful marriage, and a lack of self-contemplation keeps her in ignorance of herself and on what love should be founded. She looks to fill the position of the

heroines of her books by engaging in affairs with Rodolphe and Leon, and she looks to emulate the royalty of the idolized characters by adorning her house with their objects of grandeur. Emma is never content where she is, and she never sees her life as being complete because of her lack of self-understanding, caused by blindness from her true self by her idealistic view of the life and love that she feels that she should have.

Both Elizabeth and Emma have stories that exemplify the fact that self-understanding is crucial for a successful marriage. After a period of extensive self-analysis, Elizabeth changes the way that she views the people and setting around her and subsequently realizes that she loves Darcy. Her love is made deep by her understanding of herself. The successful love that she and Darcy share at the end of the novel is a result of both Elizabeth and Darcy understanding themselves and subsequently curbing their blinding prejudices. Emma, however, undergoes no such introspection and no such change in perception and view. The marriage between Emma and Charles is a failure because it is not rooted in a mutual self-understanding. Without looking into herself and finding and eradicating her prejudices against those who do not fit the descriptions in her books, Emma will never be content in marriage or in love. When she cannot find the love that she wants in her marriage, she looks to affairs to fill the yearning void inside of her. Time and again, however, Emma is disappointed in not finding the passionate, fulfilling, successful, and idealistic love that she seeks. Emma refuses to give up her idealistic view of what life should be, and thereby dooms her marriage from the beginning. The language and description of each character serve to give the reader a picture of each woman's mindset, thereby exemplifying why her marriage was a success or a failure. Elizabeth was able to escape her mindset and judgments about love, whereas Emma was not. Elizabeth's introspection led to a more thorough understanding of herself, which then allowed her to see her faults and rectify them. Emma never

looked inside herself, and her lack of self-analysis left her faults unsolved and her life unhappy. A relationship of love must be entered from a position of self-understanding in order for it to succeed.

Honorable Mention: First-Year Writing

Alissa Butterworth

ANT/WGS 175 Invisible Worlds

Professor Bastian

The Boy Who Will Never Grow Up: An Examination of Alterity

Pirates, Indians, sword fights and mermaids: J.M. Barrie's *Peter Pan* embodies the ultimate boyhood adventure. Born of make-believe games and fantasies, the pantomime play as well as the novels *Peter Pan* and *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens* speak to the magical world of the imagination and the wonders of childhood. Although Barrie's works have long been regarded as staples of children's literature, they also speak of alterity, alienation, and the ultimate isolation of the main character, Peter. Comparisons between the world of fairies and mortals, as well as between the world of children and adults (or of the magical versus the mundane), highlight the liminality of Peter and his position. Tied to a state of imagination and magic but born with a human body, Peter cannot become anything but a liminal creature; ultimately, his liminality is his attraction, as well as his curse. Through pairings of alterity, Barrie laces his children's tale with an examination of isolation: that of a little boy who can never grow up and never belong.

Throughout both versions of Peter Pan, Barrie emphasizes the distinct worlds of fairies and mortals, specifically of children. His fairies occupy a plane separate from but parallel to that of humans. For example, their houses are "the colour of night" (Barrie 1910:59); proper human houses are the color of day, and no human has yet been proven able to see the color of night in

the daytime. Although separate, the fairy world is also inextricably linked to that of humans. Fairies exist "wherever there are children." Although Barrie's fairies are attracted to children, they live in places "where [children] are not allowed to go" (Barrie 1910:55). Essentially, fairies exist in places where adults forbid children to venture. They inhabit the dark recesses of Kensington Park where stodgy nurses do not allow children to play for fear of accidents or of fairy mischief. Perhaps fairies are so closely tied to youth because children ultimately create them; "when the first baby laughed for the first time, its laugh broke into a thousand pieces, and they all went skipping about, and that was the beginning of fairies" (Barrie 1987:29). Further, as the creators of the liminal world in which fairies exist, children possess the power to destroy it. Whenever a child declares his disbelief in the existence of fairies, "there is a fairy somewhere that falls down dead" (Barrie 1910:29). Barrie expertly parallels the world of fairies and the world of mortals, specifically that of children; although attracted to each other, they can never truly exist in the same plane. In fact, children are responsible for both the genesis and destruction of the fairy world that exists so closely to, and yet separate from, their own.

Barrie also examines the alterity between the world of children and the world of adults. Childhood carries with it a connotation of the magical and the imaginary—qualities that Barrie interprets as unattainable in the mundane world of the mature adult. Both children and adults are alien to each other. Mrs. Darling engages in the invasive practice of organizing her children's thoughts after they fall asleep: "occasionally in her travels through her children's minds, Mrs. Darling found things she could not understand" (Barrie 1987:7). She cannot comprehend the magical, whimsical adventures and schemes she encounters there because she has long since committed the crime of growing old. In her maturity she vainly strives to reconnect with her youthful past by invading her children's minds. Likewise, when the Darling children escape to

Neverland, they pretend to be adults in an effort to connect with a world that they do not yet understand. Their ritualistic game of house mimics the mundane activities that they believe are a part of being grown up (Barrie 1987:111). However, adults cannot hope to truly understand the childhood from which they have departed, just as children cannot hope to grasp the true nature of adulthood until they have experienced it. Barrie displays the schism that exists between childhood and adulthood: no person can truly bridge the gap and have a grasp on both the magic of childhood, and the pragmatism of maturity. Once a man departs from childhood, "the iron bars are up for life," and "there is no second chance" to retain the magic he once possessed (Barrie 1910:76).

Wendy tries to overcome the gap between childhood and adulthood twice, and dually fails. When in Neverland, she organizes a household, playing the part of the mother (Barrie 1987:111). In doing so, she tries to embrace a role that comes with the maturity that she does not yet possess. She again tries to breach the gap between childhood and adulthood when Peter visits her in old age. Wendy sees Peter in his eternal youth, and part of her yearns to be able to fly with him again, but she cannot remember how (Barrie 1987:189). Her inability to fly symbolizes the loss of her childhood; she can no longer attain the magic in which she once reveled. Barrie uses Wendy to display the alterity that exists between children and adults, and also the isolation of a person's child self from their adult self. In order to mature, a person's own childhood must become alien to him.

Barrie ultimately uses the alterity between children and adults, as well as that between mortals and fairies, to underscore the role of greatest other in all of the tales, Peter himself. Solomon Caw calls Peter a "Betwixt and Between" (Barrie 1910: 29)—literally, one who fits nowhere. Not fully human, but not fully supernatural either, Peter dooms himself through his

refusal of ordinary life to an eternity of liminal existence. He longs to be a real boy, but does not initially possess the knowledge, or the desire to become one. At first, Peter wishes to remain among the birds and fairies. It is only after he realizes he is no longer a bird (all children are birds before they are born) that he desires to return to his human life (Barrie 1910: 26). However, he finds that he can not return to his home because he has "lost faith in his power to fly" (Barrie 1910:26). Similarly, he cannot become a fairy because of his human roots. Humans shun him, shown in the moment when he finds his own mother cradling another child in his place (Barrie 1910:76). Likewise, as he escapes to Kensington Park, he is shocked to find that "every fairy that he [meets flees] from him" (Barrie 1910:25). Not accepted among the fairies, he is also "only half human." (Barrie 1910:15); even children see him as other in comparison to themselves. When Peter asks Maimie to marry him (another example of children playing an idealized version of maturity), she refuses because she knows and understands his liminal state (Barrie 1910:115). Indeed, he "is not quite like the other boys" (Barrie 1987:101). Unlike his comrades, Peter views death as a grand adventure and sees the world through eternally youthful, and, thus, eternally idealistic eyes.

It seems fitting that Peter should think of death as "an awfully big adventure" (Barrie 1987:101), as he shares a long association with it. He appears as other to mortals, both adult and child, because of his ties and similarities to the dead. Peter becomes, in essence, a "[doorway] to death" (Purkiss 2000:274). Mrs. Darling remembers stories from her youth in which Peter accompanies dead children to the afterlife "so that they should not be frightened" (Barrie 1987:8). Peter is the prepubescent ferryman of a juvenile version of the River Styx, leading children safely across the waters (he takes the Darling children on a flight over a vast ocean) to the afterlife. Once there, he becomes king. Peter also digs graves for children who find

themselves lost in Kensington Gardens after the gates close (Barrie 1910:126). Although contemporary interpretations of Peter, such as the animated Disney film, ignore such macabre undertones, Barrie deliberately links Peter to death. Indeed, he "[hopes] that Peter is not too ready with his spade" (Barrie 1910:126) to dig graves for children who may not yet be ready for them. Thus, Peter's abduction of the Darling children takes on a darker connotation: the forlorn little boy who never belongs may be all too eager to have new playmates.

Despite his dark connections, Peter elicits sympathy. The pathos of his situation and his being a child who belongs neither to one world or the next generate much of his popularity. Although young readers and audiences revel in the magic of Peter's exploits, they cannot help but feel sorry for him. Even Wendy, the catalyst for the Darling abduction, pities Peter aloud because he is motherless. The decision of the Lost Boys to be adopted by the Darlings exemplifies the appeal of the Peter Pan story: children wish to have grand and wonderful adventures, but only if they can return to the safety of the human world afterward. Through the viewing or reading of Barrie's tales, children are transported to a magical realm where pirates and Indians exist, but they can always return home. However, unlike the lost boys, the Darlings, or the audience, Peter cannot resume his place in the mortal world because he rejects it. Barrie's Peter becomes the embodiment of a child's ideal fantasy, while also exemplifying a child's worst nightmare: to die can be wonderfully adventurous, but only if it is make-believe.

Works Cited

Barrie, J.M.

1910 *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Barrie, J.M.

1987 *Peter Pan*. New York: New American Library.

Purkiss, Diane

2000 *At the Bottom of the Garden: A Dark History of Fairies, Hobgoblins, and Other Troublesome Things*. New York: New York University Press.