國立臺灣大學外國語文學系

碩士論文

Department of Foreign Languages and Literature

College of Liberal Arts

National Taiwan University

Master Thesis

單身漢生活、田園懷舊與同性曖昧：

愛德華時期兒童文學中的男性居家氣質

Bachelor's Life, Idyllic Nostalgia, and Homoeroticism:

Male Domesticity in Edwardian Children's Literature

莫凡

Mok Fan

指導教授：古佳艷　博士

Advisor: Chia-yen Ku, Ph.D.

中華民國 101 年 6 月

June, 2012

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Without the great support of a number of people as follows, I would have not finished writing this complicated MA thesis in one year. Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson, along with Professor Moriarty and Sebastian Moran, are the ones I would like to thank first. My intense and endless passion for them (and their touching friendships) is the strongest motivation, which helped to sustain me when I had a hard time in thesis-writing.

Jean Watson (Woan-jiun Horng), my best and dearest friend in my writing career and my life, is the one to whom I would like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude. Without her brilliant suggestion, I might have not been inspired to explore the issue of homoeroticism in my thesis; without her encouragements, comforts and smiles, I could not have accomplished my thesis-writing so well and soon.

Professor Chia-yen Ku, my thesis advisor, is the one to whom I am deeply indebted and grateful. Her open mind, generous heart, tender guidance, admiring insight and great patience exceedingly helped me when I worked on my thesis. Also, many thanks to Professor Tien-yi Chao and Professor Feng-hsin Liu, my thesis examiners, for their warmth and kindness during my oral defense, and for their useful, detailed comments on my thesis.

摘要

本文始於我對維多利亞時期的中產階級家庭生活和女性氣質的密切關係的懷疑。近年來學者已研究過維多利亞中葉已婚男性的「居家男性氣質」（domestic masculinity），卻忽略了維多利亞末葉及愛德華時期的單身漢「男性居家氣質」（male domesticity），尤其是它在兒童文本裡的實例。在本文中，我試圖仔細分析 J. M. 巴利的《彼得潘》（1911）、肯尼斯・葛瑞漢的《柳林中的風聲》（1908），和碧翠斯・波特的《松鼠提米的故事》（1911）中，男性居家氣質表現的單身漢生活、田園懷舊氣息，與「同性曖昧」（homoeroticism）。我也會採用兩部影響深遠，與單身漢友情及男性居家氣質有關，具備同性曖昧潛質的系列故事來作爲參考對照：第一部是湯瑪斯・休斯的《湯姆・布朗》系列，包含《湯姆・布朗的學校生活》（1857）和《湯姆・布朗在牛津》（1861），融合了維多利亞時期的男孩冒險故事及中學學校故事。另一部則是亞瑟・柯南・道爾爵士的《福爾摩斯》（1887-1927），爲世界知名的偵探系列故事及「男性冒險故事」（male romance）。

爲了將成人小說如《福爾摩斯》與愛德華時期兒童文學對照，我將上述三文本置於「跨界小說」（crossover fiction）的類別，以互文性加以討論，以證明兒童文本仍存在如同性曖昧等成人議題。關於兒童文學和性別理論學者，我和他們在對童年、對維多利亞居家生活，和對男性友誼的評論看法上有共同點；然而，我也進一步分析愛德華時期的兒童文學作家將同性戀禁忌議題轉化爲同性曖昧暗示的方法。透過以雙重讀者爲作品目標，這些作家才能在書中強調同居單身漢的友情，以及對女性居家生活的排除。

關鍵字：同性曖昧；愛德華時期；兒童文學；互文性；彼得潘；柳林中的風聲；碧翠斯・波特；湯姆・布朗；歇洛克・福爾摩斯

Abstract

This thesis begins with my doubts on the close link between Victorian bourgeois domesticity and femininity. Recent scholars have studied "domestic masculinity" of mid-Victorian married men, yet they ignore "male domesticity" of late-Victorian and Edwardian bachelors, particularly when the cases come from children's texts. In this thesis I intend to dissect bachelor's life, idyllic nostalgia and homoeroticism in the representations of male domesticity in J. M. Barrie's *Peter Pan* (1911), Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* (1908), and Beatrix Potter's *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* (1911). I also adopt two far-reaching series featuring bachelor's friendship, male domesticity and homoerotic potentials as references. One is Thomas Hughes' *Tom Brown* series, including *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857) and *Tom Brown at Oxford* (1861), both fusing Victorian boy's adventure story and the public school story. The other is Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes* (1887-1927), the world-renowned detective series and male romance.

By juxtaposing adult fiction such as *Sherlock Holmes* with Edwardian children's literature, I put the above three texts into the crossover fiction category with intertexuality to evidence the existence of adult issues like homoeroticism in children's texts. With regard to scholars of children's literature and gender theory, I share with them the critical perspectives of childhood, Victorian domesticity and male homosociality; however, I further analyze the ways writers of Edwardian children's literature use to transform the tabooed issue of homosexuality into homoerotic hints. By targeting their texts at duel readership, they emphasize friendship of cohabited bachelors and exclude feminized domesticity in their works.

Keywords: homoeroticism; the Edwardian era; children's literature; intertexuality; Peter Pan; The Wind in the Willows; Beatrix Potter; Tom Brown; Sherlock Holmes

Introduction

> How is it possible for men to be together? To live together, to share their time, their meals, their room, their leisure, their grief, their knowledge, their confidences? What is it to be naked among men, outside of institutional relations, family, profession, and obligatory camaraderie?
>
> - Michel Foucault, 'Friendship as a Way of Life'

Domesticity has reputedly linked with womanhood and femininity in the British bourgeois society, at least for readers of our time: housewives did spring-cleaning, nannies took care of babies, and mothers told children bedtime stories. In contrast, men were "predisposed to [be] . . . only in public roles" (Johansen 7), while their private lives were neglected by the researchers.[1] Since the 1980s, nevertheless, scholars have begun to notice the historical proofs of "domestic masculinity," and to study men's identities in the household. For instance, Sarah Ellis's remarks (1839) that domesticity completed the Victorian males by evoking their emotional love and moral courage for family and establishing their authoritative status at home—an idyllic retreat from the industrialized, capitalized world (Greenblatt 1584-5)—are confirmed by John Tosh, and then by Jennifer Jean Kimble Fletcher and Ann Alston.

According to Tosh, Fletcher and Alston, domesticity in the early- and mid-Victorian eras (the 1830s to the 1870s) was the crystallization of masculinity, far from the synonym of femininity. Outside their home, the middle-class men were breadwinners, while at home they became tender husbands and loving fathers, who cared wives, nursed children, and led the prayer-reading rituals of family (30-1; 27-8;

[1] Though the study of Shawn Johansen focuses on the image of men in Victorian America, the similar concept of gendered spheres—the public sphere and the private one—can also be found in the Victorian Britain. Since Jennifer Jean Kimble Fletcher cites Johansen's views in her research of Victorian household men, I believe it is worth trying to do the same citation here.

17). Hence, “men were indeed vital to their homes . . . that nurturant, housekeeping men caused neither scandal nor subversion” (Fletcher 2). In other words, before the 1880s the ideal of masculinity, “domestic masculinity,” was in accordance with the ideal of domesticity.

This definition was changed, however, in the late-Victorian era (the 1880s to the 1890s), the “decades of sexual anarchy” (Showalter 3). While traditional gender constructions disintegrated, New Women emerged with feminism as sexually independent and highly educated, fighting for gender equality and campaigning for women’s suffrage. Capable of “male” jobs (telegraphy, clerical works and novel-writing), they earned their own living and had alternatives besides marriage, thus threatening the male hegemonic British society (Showalter 438; Dowling 38-9).

When New Woman rose, masculinity went downhill with the British Empire. The glory of the Empire faded after the Crimean war (1854-56) and the Indian Mutiny (1857), and finally extinguished with the defeats in the Second Afghan War (1878-80) and Boer Wars (1899-1902) (Kestner 4; Yeoman 157). Harassed by the ensuing military competitions with France, Germany and America, as well as by strikes of the working-class in the *fin-de-siècle* (Hunt 4), the backbone of the Empire, the bourgeois class, was shaken, so was the old “ideal of masculinity.”

Meanwhile, since the mid-Victorian era Darwinian biological researches destroyed what Evangelical Christianity had constructed: the symbolic role of father as the representative of God in this world, thus eroding the patriarchal authority (Tosh 147). As if echoing this destruction, the separation of two spheres of each sex became clearer, gradually driving father out of the domestic structure.[2] Colleen McDannell

[2] This was marked by John Ruskin (1871)’s famous lecture ‘Of Queen’s Gardens,’ in which he highlighted the models of masculinity and femininity: “[t]he man’s power is active, progressive, defensive. He is eminently the doer, the creator, the discoverer, the defender. His intellect is for speculation and invention; his energies for adventures, for war, and for conquest . . . By contrast, his ideal woman ruled over the home, securing its order, comfort and loveliness. She is passive and

notices that after the 1880s mother's intimate bedtime prayers replaced father's prayer-reading rituals (135). Meanwhile, James Stephen notes that when the bourgeois infant-nursing was secluded to servants or nannies since the *fin-de-siècle*, father who managed child-rearing with tenderness would be regarded as effeminate, thus the nursing father becoming few (273). At last, losing status at home, father could not participate in domestic affairs, and even the servants listened to only the orders of their mistress (Milne-Smith 807).

Together, the rise of New Woman, the decline of masculinity, and the gendered division of different spheres led to what Tosh called, men's "flight[s] from domesticity" (172), which is later revised by Milne-Smith as men's flights from feminized domesticity (797). With its all-male atmosphere extended for the upper-middle class set since public schools, universities, armies and professions, club became men's second and only home (Chudacoff 42). Regardless of the fact that coffeehouse had thrived in London during the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries, for men, club outdid coffeehouse in its prohibition of the female entrance.[3] With the exclusion of women, club "provided the emotional bonds of friendship as a substitute family" (Milne-Smith 798) for men through drinking, dining, card- or billiard-playing, and intimate talking. Men in club not only enjoyed sense of privacy and male domesticity but had possibilities to transform homosociality into homoerotic desire and even homosexual phenomena, which was not called attention to public until the trials of Oscar Wilde in 1895.[4]

Flights from feminized domesticity were often linked with the upper-middle class bachelors. Their increasing numbers in the Edwardian era (1901-1914)

---

intuitive, ruling by example and praise" (107).

[3] Notwithstanding the fact that the upper-class women would not enter coffeehouse, women of other classes remained its significant participants, and they were often welcomed in the coffeehouse auctions as purchasers. This proved that coffeehouse did not exclude women (Cowan 246, 249).

[4] The issue of homosexuality and Wilde's trials will be analyzed in the third part of Chapter 3.

suggested male silent protest to feminized domesticity. Showalter states that these bachelors, who would rather choose celibacy than sacrifice masculine freedom and male friendship to bind themselves with marriages, served as an unique existence to violate the normal bourgeois masculinity (25, 82). Katherine V. Snyder then indicates and Fletcher elaborates that through dining, cooking, nursing, housekeeping, or cohabitating with male friends, these bachelors created "male domesticity" in either bachelor's apartments or gentleman's clubs (20; 191-6). This new kind of domesticity emerged in the mid-Victorian adult fictions, such as Dickens' *Dombey and Son* (1848-9) and *David Copperfield* (1859),[5] and climaxed in the late-Victorian and Edwardian ones, like Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes* (1887-1927).[6]

Aside from fictions about male domesticity, "male romance" has also emerged since the 1880s and, according to Stephen Arata and Elaine Showalter, functioned against the sensitive works of decadent aesthetes and the flourishing heterosexual domestic novels by female novelists (92; 76-7).[7] Aiming at celebrating homosociality,

[5] *Dombey and Son* is about the wealthy business owner Dombey and his family. It celebrates the alternative household comprised of bachelors and male adventurers, proving the ineffectiveness of feminized domesticity (Fletcher 208-9). *David Copperfield* is about how David Copperfield, a bourgeois orphan, earns his own living and wins the social status. Before Copperfield gets married, he enjoys his bachelorhood by inviting friends into his lodging place for supper parties (Fletcher 194-5).

[6] *Sherlock Holmes* comprises four long novels and fifty-six short stories. The former includes *A Study in Scarlet* (1887), *The Sign of Four* (1890), *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (1901-02) and *The Valley of Fear* (1914-15), and the latter includes *Adventures of Sherlock Holmes* (1891-92, including *A Scandal in Bohemia*, *The Red-headed League*, *A Case of Identity*, *The Boscombe Valley Mystery*, *The Five Orange Pips*, *The Man with the Twisted Lip*, *The Blue Carbuncle*, *The Speckled Band*, *The Engineer's Thumb*, *The Noble Bachelor*, *The Beryl Coronet* and *The Copper Beeches*), *Memoirs of Sherlock Holmes* (1892-93, including *Silver Blaze*, *The Yellow Face*, *The Stock-broker's Clerk*, *The "Gloria Scott"*, *The Musgrave Ritual*, *The Reigate Puzzle*, *The Crooked Man*, *The Resident Patient*, *The Greek Interpreter*, *The Naval Treaty* and *The Final Problem*), *The Return of Sherlock Holmes* (1903-04, including *The Empty House*, *The Norwood Builder*, *The Dancing Men*, *The Solitary Cyclist*, *The Priory School*, *Black Peter*, *Charles Augustus Milverton*, *The Six Napoleons*, *The Three Students*, *The Golden Pince-Nez*, *The Missing Three-Quarter*, *The Abbey Grange* and *The Second Stain*), *His Last Bow* (1908-17, including *Wisteria Lodge*, *The Cardboard Box*, *The Red Circle*, *The Bruce-Partington Plans*, *The Dying Detective*, *The Disappearance of Lady Frances Carfax*, *The Devil's Foot* and *His Last Bow*), and *The Case Book of Sherlock Holmes* (1921-27, including *The Illustrious Client*, *The Blanched Soldier*, *The Mazarin Stone*, *The Three Gables*, *The Sussex Vampire*, *The Three Garridebs*, *Thor Bridge*, *The Creeping Man*, *The Lion's Mane*, *The Veiled Lodger*, *Shoscombe Old Place* and *The Retired Colourman*). Note that though *His Last Bow* and *The Case Book of Sherlock Holmes* were published in the Georgian era, the stories they relate are set in the historical time of the late-Victorian and the Edwardian eras.

[7] In the *fin-de-siècle* more than 40 percent writers in Britain and 75 percent novelists in America were

bachelor heroes and Arthurian chivalry through adventure and imperialism, male romance defended masculine supremacy as British masculinity declined with the Empire. Moreover, male romance internalized values for boys to build with a sense of responsibility for friends, society and country, as well as for men to rediscover their hidden boyishness, as Doyle's epigraph of *The Lost World* (1912), "[t]o the boy who's half a man,/ Or the man who's half a boy" reveals. With an emphasis on male bonding and an exclusion of female characters/addressees, male romance "represent[ed] a yearning for escape from a confining society, rigidly structured in terms of gender, class, and race, to a mythologized place elsewhere where men can be freed from the constraints of Victorian morality" (Showalter 81). Among the typical male romance, *Sherlock Holmes* was truly the most influential.

Similar to this shift in subject in adult fiction, changes in the concept of domesticity influenced children's literature as well. In the early-Victorian children's texts (for instance, Mary Martha Sherwood 's *The History of the Fairchild Family*),[8] family is portrayed as the center of the patriarchal and religious order children should obey (Alston 29). In the mid-Victorian ones (for example, Louisa M. Alcott's *Little Women*),[9] the importance of home and sibling affection is emphasized, yet parental control for children remains principal (Alston 38).

By comparison, the late-Victorian and Edwardian children's literature reveal an obsession with childhood. They not only set the child instead of parents as the center of bourgeois home but also construct the child as the playful, carefree and uncorrupted "Other," differentiated from the modern, industrialized, capital adults

---

women. No wonder their male counterparts felt threatened (Showalter 76-7). Moreover, Sandra Siegel also mentions that "the equation of 'decadent' and 'feminine' permeated thought across a wide range of late-Victorian intellectual disciplines" (Arata 92).

[8] Mary Martha Sherwood 's *The History of the Fairchild Family* (1818, 1842, 1847) is a three-volume didactic children's literature about how the children of the Fairchild family figure out their original sin and find redemption through etiquette and virtues.

[9] Louisa M. Alcott's *Little Women* (1868, 1869) is a popular text of children's literature. Its story accounts the domestic lives of the four March sisters and the moral influences from their mother.

(Briggs 168; Gavin and Humphries 4). Above all, the gendered characteristics have become commonsensical in the late-Victorian and Edwardian children's literature: boys are depicted as brave, wild and adventurous, while girls as tender, graceful and domestic. In boy's adventure story (for instance, Beatrix Potter's *The Tale of Peter Rabbit*),[10] which has thrived since the *fin-de-siècle* (Reynolds *Girls* 26), the major boy characters often struggle against their female tamers (particularly their mothers) so as to roam free for adventures; in contrast, the major girl characters can merely be limited to the roles of rearing, nursing or housekeeping.

Hence, the Edwardians celebrated the energetic boyhood, rather than the Victorian innocent girlhood. Leaders of boyishness in both Edwardian England and America, as well as the legislative protection of child welfare, emphasized this cult of boyhood.[11] Such cult was linked with nostalgia to the Englishness of the past, the idyllic country life and the stable social hierarchy of the Empire, for people to face the upcoming cruel World War I. These phenomena led to the "Old Boy nostalgia" for "pleasures lost forever" in male romance. Its nostalgic "boy-men" characters stick to the codes of masculinity ("good form") and the romantic male friendship, which they had learned in the public school, the university or the army under the influence of the revival of medieval chivalry (Gathorne-Hardy 289; Yeoman 160). Such chivalry, however, was not the replica of its medieval ancestor: whom the current knight

[10] *The Tale of Peter Rabbit* is Potter's picture book concerning the adventures of a boy rabbit Peter. The comparisons between Peter's three sisters (domestic, following Mother's order to gather the blackberries) and Peter (unruly and mischievous, neglecting Mother's warning and going into Mr. McGregor's garden), as well as Peter's punishment (becoming ill and caretaken by his mother) after the adventure is ended, clearly reflect the gendered characteristics since the late-Victorian era. For more information of this book, see Chapter 3.

[11] In England, though King Edward VII was about sixty when he ascended the throne, he was the acknowledged notoriously irresponsible, pleasure-seeking youth in Europe in his youthhood; even in old age, he was "often portrayed as boyishly arrested in his willfulness, his appetites, and his adventurism," let alone he "loved the costume of the military, loved to shoot, loved the tea party." Theodore Roosevelt, his American counterpart, was the youngest American president, who loved children's literature and boy's adventure, proved by his visit to England in 1910 to meet Rudyard Kipling and Kenneth Grahame (Lerer *Children* 254; Chassagnol 201; Wullschläger 109). In addition, the Edwardian government began to notice malnutrition and disease of the urban children. In 1906, free school meals were instituted, and school medical inspections started in 1907 (Lerer *Children* 255).

(gentleman) saved was not lady of the court, but of home: the Victorian mother and housewife, as Peter to Wendy in J. M. Barrie's *Peter Pan* (1911) and Watson to Mary Morstan in Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes*.[12]

Currents of the late-Victorian to Edwardian adult fictions and children's literature, as many scholars have proved, were similar. While male romance celebrates bachelor heroes through adventure, boy's adventure story also connects adventure with male homosociality and imperialism (Green 37; Dawson 59). In boy's adventure story, the early- and mid-Victorian boy-heroes, like the brave and emotional Tom in Thomas Hughes' *Tom Brown's Schooldays* (1857), are considered "the model of masculinity"—comprising both the ideal masculinity and "feminine ideal" (self-sacrifice and purity).

In contrast, its late-Victorian and Edwardian boy-heroes are exclusive of "feminine ideal," for the sake of public homophobia, as well as the re-emphasis of masculinity to re-assure the male supremacy over females and to oppose to the rising New Woman (Dawson 74; Reynolds *Girls* 52-5). In other words, the late-Victorian and Edwardian boy-heroes in boy's adventure story are gentlemanly "man-boys." Though they are wild and adventurous, they realize the ideal of Victorian gentlemanliness, and put it to the extreme through creating an all-male playground, as the underground home of Peter Pan and the Lost Boys in *Peter Pan* represents, which disallows the development of heterosexual relationship.

The different images of boy-heroes resulted in the Edwardian worship of Pan. As Jackie Wullschläger amplifies, this pagan god of arcadia represents "a playful, wild outdoor hero who never ages, combining in one image the delights of rural and childhood retreat . . . who is lord of a community of boy-animals rather as Peter Pan presides over the Lost Boys" (111). Coincidently echoing Wullschläger's statements,

[12] Both will be discussed with details in the second part of Chapter 1.

Seth Lerer evidences the link between the public fascination with Pan and an emphasis of bachelorhood, masculine adventure and male friendship in Edwardian adult fictions, which crystallize a symbolic return to the nostalgic, pastoral childhood (257-8). With such a return, major male characters in Edwardian adult fictions become "boy-men," who prefer the nostalgic, playful boyishness to feminized domesticity and heterosexual relationship, embracing an all-male community in nature. This worship and fascination of Pan was also explicit in many of Edwardian children's literature, particularly *Peter Pan*, Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* (1908) and Beatrix Potter's *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* (1911)—the three texts I would like to discuss in my thesis on their revelation of male domesticity through analyzing their representations of bachelor's life, idyllic nostalgia and homoeroticism.

Traditionally, children's literature was labeled as "safe" from eroticism, let alone homoeroticism. One of the two reasons is that adults consider the theme of sexuality inappropriate for child readers. In addition, domesticity has been associated with females, girls and femininity in both adult fictions and children's literature since the late-Victorian era. In Edwardian children's texts, male characters who reveal male domesticity with emotional intimacy may be marked as homosexuals if their homoerotic potentials are come up for discussion. Thus, the issue of homoeroticism is frequently skipped when scholars study Edwardian children's literature.

Hence, bachelor friendship and male domesticity in Barrie, Grahame and Potter's works have long been put into familial structure, especially by critics who view them as the books for the child only. Monique Chassagnol and Chris Routh mention the conventional father role of Peter Pan and the mother role of Wendy in *Peter Pan*. Bonnie Gaarden argues that in *The Wind in the Willows* Badger is a paternal arbiter, Rat a motherly helper, Mole a good child and Toad a naughty boy. Alston also confirms the Riverside family as the community where food and fondness

are shared by male animals, and Toad as a spoiled child needs guidance of other adult characters. With regard to *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*, scholars fail to note its implied homoeroticism but focus on its "shortcomings." Ruth K. MacDonald is confused with the marital discord of the chipmunk couple. Agreeing with MacDonald, Kutzer states Potter's peculiar arrangement of clothes for the animal characters. Judy Taylor, Joyce Irene Whalley, Anne Stevenson Hobbs and Elizabeth M Battrick even pin down disharmony of the personified animals and the natural landscape in this book.

Several scholarly works, nevertheless, attempt to cross the boundary, to see the adult issues, such as masculinity or eroticism, in *Peter Pan*, *The Wind in the Willows* or in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*. Lester D. Friedman and Ann Yeoman draw many comparisons between Peter Pan and Captain Hook. Jacqueline Rose demonstrates the Oedipal relationship between Peter and Hook. Marjorie B. Garber indicates the cross-dressing of Peter and the effeminate pirate garments of Hook.[13] David P. D. Munns even clarifies that the contemporary focus of *Peter Pan* in film adaptations is no longer the Peter-Wendy heterosexual relationship but the Peter-Hook homoerotic duo. All these critics, however, did not deeply explore the homoerotic possibilities between Peter and Hook through their mutual and different personalities, particularly their interactions with heterosexual relationship and domesticity. By studying them I believe that my own argument will complement these critics'.

Concerning *The Wind in the Willows*, Peter Hunt views it as Grahame's process of taming the working-class and solidifying the bourgeois and the aristocratic class. Robert Hemmings and Tony Watkins touch its representations of Edwardian nostalgia, yet they fail to probe into implied homoeroticism in the world of bachelor behind

[13] Though some argue that the reason that Peter is always played by an actress can be traced back to the Victorian pantomime tradition, in which the Principal Boy was always played by a woman, Garber reminds us that Peter remains to be played by an actress even long after such tradition was no longer popular as a theatrical vehicle, so there must be an alternative reason for it (177). For further information about pantomime, see the first part of Chapter 1.

nostalgia. Vigen Guroian illustrates how Grahame exalts friendship by shaping Pan as the god of friendship—"The Friend and Helper" (Grahame 115); nevertheless, he links their bachelor friendship with natural deity instead of the *fin-de-siècle* homoeroticism. Lois R. Kuznets is the first critic who almost sees its homoerotic possibility, pinning down Grahame's "attempts to repress the clash of sex" (175) in "fathering" nature. Perry Nodelman and Mavis Reimer also confirm "the desire to evade heterosexuality altogether" (153) in its Riverside Society of the British gentlemanly animals. Yet Kuznets, Nodelman and Reimer all fail to scrutinize over the text of *The Wind in the Willows* to explore more evidence to support their arguments. Jackie Wullschläger advances the above critics by making biographical reference of Grahame, who has great anxiety about sex and extreme preference to male homosociality; regrettably, she sees the homoerotic possibility in this book, but does not observe it and make a fresh start.

Regarding *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*, Wynn William Yarbrough is the only scholar whose criticism nearly hits the spot. He notices male domesticity in the cohabited life of Chippy and Timmy, the mass violence of other squirrels to the married Timmy, and the domestic discord among the chipmunk couple. Unfortunately, he overlooks homoerotic overtones in the Timmy-Chippy relationship, nor does he see men's flights from feminized domesticity in the violent scenes in which Timmy is bullied by the bachelor squirrels and Chippy bites his wife. Hence, my analysis of *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* may complement his views with an analysis of the homoerotic and homophobic nature in this book that no critic had ever explored.

If the above children's texts hide the homoerotic elements that recent critics ignore, did the Edwardians sense or discuss them? Daphne du Maurier, who was the daughter of Gerald du Maurier—the uncle of the Llewelyn Davies boys and the first actor of Captain Hook in *Peter Pan* the play, recalled his compelling performance.

She believed that “[a]ll the boys had their Hooks” (110), who “caught the essence of childhood fears and desires” (Wullschläger 128). This may be seen as contemporary audience’s discovery of the implied homoeroticism in *Peter Pan*. Regarding *The Wind in the Willows*, contemporary critics considered it “a contribution to natural history” (Wullschläger 170) as *The Times* commented, while A. A. Milne, the author of *Winnie-the-Pooh* (1926) and a great fan of *The Wind in the Willows*, adapted this book into *Toad of Toad Hall* (1930) as a children’s play. Yet none of them explore the possibility of homoeroticism in Grahame’s major work. As *Toad of Toad Hall*, *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* also gained popularity from child readers, and yet its homoerotic elements remained unknown except, in my opinion, probably to the author herself and her American readers. After Potter got married and lived in her rural retreat, she received no visitors unless they were from America, because her American fans “understood and liked an aspect of [her] writings which is not appreciated by the British shopkeeper” (Meyer 140). Since *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* originally aimed at the American child readers, for me, Potter might feel that her American fans could see or identify with the homoerotic implications that her British readers failed to grasp.

Are homoerotic implications in Edwardian children’s literature only the construction of contemporary critics or an actual reflection of Edwardian reality? If children’s texts are regarded as “crossover,” meaning having the hybrid child-adult readership, such a reflection may exist. Hence, I am about to prove that *Peter Pan*, *The Wind in the Willows* and *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* are so-called “crossover fiction,” and I will cite the criticism of Zohar Shavit, Rachel Falconer, Sandra L. Beckett and Kimberley Reynolds on crossover fiction to support my argument.

Though Shavit does not coin the term “crossover fiction,” it is she who first notes the ambiguity in the classic texts of Victorian and Edwardian children’s

literature, started from Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* (1865). Adult readers accept these texts for the sophisticated, deconstructive, satirical meanings between the lines, while child readers celebrate them for their elements of adventure and fantasy ("The Ambivalent" 77-8). For example, Carroll writes three different versions of the *Alice* story: the first one, *Alice's Adventures Underground* (1864), is for Alice Liddell, the archetype of Alice, with many hints of satire and parody; the second one, *Alice in Wonderland*, has the hybrid child-adult readership, raising hints in the first version to the dominant ones and provides sufficient sophistication for adult readers; the third one, *The Nursery "Alice"* (1890), is for the child aged below five, simplified by omitting all the satiric and parodic elements ("A Rejoinder" 200-1). According to Shavit, the three versions of *Alice* story prove that Victorian and Edwardian children's literature with dual readership must contain the ambiguous, ambivalent elements for the adult and the fantastic, adventurous ones for the child. This is a pioneering view of "crossover fiction" that Falconer, Beckett and Reynolds follow.

Defined by Falconer, crossover fiction is "ostensibly written for the child which adults should read too," and it "calls into question the boundaries which used to define children's fiction by prescribing what it should contain or exclude" (27).[14] She believes that the late-Victorian and the Edwardian children's texts, such as *Peter Pan*, *The Wind in the Willows* and the picture books of Beatrix Potter, were first meant for children and then adapted by adults, "heighten[ing] the reader's consciousness of the constructedness of both categories, children's and adult fiction" (28).

Similar to Falconer, Beckett goes further to divide crossover fiction into three kinds: the first one is the classic adult fiction with didactic overtones; the second one

[14] For instance, Myles McDowell (1976) declares that children's literature needs to be shorter, less complex in plot or profundity, having more dialogue instead of long descriptions, and more overly moralizing than adult fiction, while many crossover fictions, like J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series, can be served as the counterinstances (Falconer 27-8).

is popular fiction which contains the element of childhood or boy's adventure, including romance, fantasy or detective story, like Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes*; the third one is children's literature written for the hybrid child-adult readers, such as *Peter Pan*. This strategy is not only used to help children's literature escape the inferior status and have a seat in adult literature but to create the third addressee: censors, so that the "sophisticated, subversive texts sometimes are disguised as children's books to avoid censorship" (*Transcending* xvi). In other words, crossover fiction does not suggest the end of children's literature, as Jacqueline Rose claims, but reveals both the adult and child's desires for each other in the form of children's literature.[15]

Integrating the notions of Shavit, Falconer and Beckett, I believe fictions in the seventeenth to the nineteenth century written for adults and later adapted for children are different from crossover fiction since the *fin-de-siècle*, because the former suggests the process of adult instilling social rules and concepts into child readers. In the Edwardian era, however, children's book owned an individual category in bookstores, and children's literature was then divided into two: one for both the adult and the child, like *Peter Pan* and *The Wind in the Willows*, while the other is only for the child, like nursery rhymes and picture books. Yet even some picture books (for example, those by Beatrix Potter) which thought to be only for children in the Edwardian era have been recently recognized as crossover texts, let alone the long acknowledged Edwardian crossover fictions of Barrie and Grahame. In addition to Shavit, Falconer and Beckett, I find the stances of Kimberley Reynolds also support my ideas. Reynolds views that "many studies identify Victorian and Edwardian children's fantasies and adventure stories as vehicles for a range of desires or unorthodox ideas that did not find expression so readily in adult fiction" (*Radical* 16),

[15] Jacqueline Rose claims in her *The Case of Peter Pan or the Impossibility of Children's Fiction* (1984) that the author of children's literature "instead of asking what children want, or need, from literature . . . asked what it is that adults, through literature, want or demand of the child" (137).

and these stories may imply "a regressive desire to retreat from the demands associated with mature masculinity" (19), like what *The Wind in the Willows* shows through the arcadian descriptions. As Reynolds, Beckett also points out that the issue of sex, which tends to be used to differentiate adult literature from children's, has existed not only since the 1970s and 1980s, but already in Edwardian children's literature, such as Barrie's descriptions of the drunken fairies on the way home from the rituals of Dionysus (*Crossover* 263).[16]

Nevertheless, the above criticisms have deficiencies in the issue of homoeroticism. Reynolds does not fully explain what "a range of desires or unorthodox ideas" are in Victorian and Edwardian children's texts (even "a retreat from mature masculinity" seems not so dangerous and forbidden in adult fictions). Likewise, Beckett's example of *Peter Pan* about sexuality is too subtle to catch the homoerotic points in this work. The views of Shavit concerning how writers make their texts ambiguous to attract the hybrid child-adult readers are the most helpful for me; however, the issue I decide to scrutinize in Edwardian children's literature is not homosociality (for the child) or homosexuality (for the adult), neither do I attempt to explore the homosexual hints in fantasy or boy's adventure story, as Shavit insists that there must be the sophisticated messages for the adult between the lines. Instead, I would like to discuss homoeroticism, the same-sex friendship containing emotional co-dependence and physical intimacy and yet lacking sexual desire and sexual intercourse, in Edwardian children's literature, which I regard as crossover fiction and put into the homoerotic context.

To understand the British homoerotic context, one must first dissect the critical manifestations of the late-Victorian to Edwardian male friendship and bachelorhood.

[16] See "some unsteady fairies had to climb over [Peter Pan] on their way home from an orgy" (Barrie *Peter* 101-2), and such rituals of Dionysus traditionally are linked with revelry, drinking and sexuality.

Critics have spilled so much ink to confirm male homosexual tendency in these eras. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick cites several Victorian novels to prove their real focus as male homosexual bonding instead of heterosexual marriage. Elaine Showalter takes the decadent aesthetes, like Oscar Wilde, for example, to view the late-Victorian male decadence as the synonym of homosexuality. Stephen Arata casts a light on the homosexual theory of John Addington Symonds (1840-93), the first British homosexual writer who considers homosexuality in male romance (such as *Sherlock Holmes*) virtually equivalent to Victorian gentlemanliness instead of male decadence. Sean Brady researches male homosexuality by dissecting the ways in which Symonds and Edward Carpenter (1844-1929), two typical *fin-de-siècle* homosexuals, deconstructed traditional male roles to pursue male domesticity with their lovers.

On the other hand, some critics choose not to consider the late-Victorian and Edwardian intimate male friendship as homosexual. Peter Nardi claims that it was homophobia around the 1880s, rising from an emergent feminism and heterosexual hegemony, that discredited romantic male friendship and labeled it as homosexual (2). Homophobia made Edwardian men less liable to emotional disclosure and physical intimacy with male friends, while Edwardian women, traditionally reckoned as sentimental, affectionate, and full of motherly qualities, were allowed to maintain intimate friendship without being labeled as lesbians. Both Claudia Nelson and Carolyn W. de la L. Oulton cite Hughes' *Tom Brown's Schooldays* to highlight that Tom-Arthur's romantic male friendship, though it is of spiritual sublime and moral elevation, has been suspicious of implied homosexuality since the school reform movements in the 1870s and 1880s, for the homophobic public categorized the romantic homosociality and the sensual homosexuality into one (539-40; 35-36).[17]

[17] Oulton's argument is originally elaborated from John Chandos' observation of the homosexual phenomena in the Victorian public school (Chandos 301).

Different from the above critics, John Potvin notices that since the late-Victorian era the boundary between male homosexuality and homosociality has been shifting, due to homoeroticism, "a desire which must remain inarticulate . . . [and] cannot be validated" (8). Homoerotic male friendship at that time, however, was perceived and envisioned through photographic representations, in which two men either hugging each other, holding shoulders, or clapping the dog between them, yet never exchanging gazes or posing effeminate gestures, so as to avoid being labeled as a homosexual couple. This homoerotic friendship, though outside heterosexual marriages, is outside "the relationship of sin and crime [homosexual relationship]" (130) in the *fin-de-siècle*, echoing the medieval knight's brotherhood, and the public school friendship, comradeship in the army and clubmenship since the nineteenth century. This homoerotic friendship between men—without the sexual intercourse and sexual desire, though its depth of passion and intimacy in the relation may cause the viewers' homophobia—is what I would like to discuss in *Peter Pan*, *The Wind in the Willows* and *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*.

As for the above Edwardian children's texts, I differentiate those by the male authors (Barrie and Grahame) from that by the female one (Potter) in their treatment of homoeroticism. Authors of both sexes emphasize the intense male bonding through emotional release, physical attachment, or intimate cohabitation. However, *Peter Pan* and *The Wind in the Willows* justify the all-male societies (Lost Boys' underground home, the pirate ship, and the Riverbank Society) with an intentional exclusion of heterosexual relationship, and meanwhile celebrate the masculine activities (adventures, games, and battles) or masculine qualities (boyishness or gentlemanliness). In contrast, *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* is constructed with a frame of feminized domesticity and heterosexual marriage, which neither encourage nor allow the existence of the long-term romantic male friendship, and thus any

homoerotic phenomena between men are destined to return to the heterosexual "normalcy." As the above arguments reveal, the male writers of Edwardian children's literature are more idealized in building an all-male paradise and admiring the boyhood, youthfulness or Victorian masculinity, while their female counterparts present the Edwardian reality—the British homophobia, which largely restricted the development of the close male friendship in that era—in the children's texts.

To delve into homoeroticism and male friendship in the above three texts of Edwardian children's literature, I am going to adopt two works as my references: Thomas Hughes' *Tom Brown* series, including *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and its sequel, *Tom Brown at Oxford* (1861) and Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes*. They both had the possible impact or implications of intertexualtiy on the works or lives of Barrie, Grahame and Potter. The popularity of these two series among the Edwardian boys can be proved according to the statistics.[18] Since the *Tom Brown* series is a fusion of the Victorian boy's adventure and the public school story, and *Sherlock Holmes* belongs to both male romance for men and crossover fiction for boys, they would indeed influence the elements of game, battle and adventure in *Peter Pan*, the nostalgic all-male society in *The Wind in the Willows*, and the male protests against feminized domesticity in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes.*

In addition, homoerotic atmosphere between boys have existed in the mid-Victorian era. Thomas Arnold, the model of the headmaster in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, puts "the *bond*—the spirit of combination and companionship—*in evil*" (Chandos 284) in the six major sins of the public school life, and Hughes adds a footnote when he implies the homosexual relationship between the big boys and their effeminate followers in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*: "I can's strike out the passage;

[18] A survey (1908) of 800 boys in the British public schools showed that favorites books for boys all carried the qualities of boy's adventure story. These books included *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, *Treasure Island*, *Robinson Crusoe*, *Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*, *Coral Island*, and so on (Richards 8).

many boys will know why it is left in" (169). This may evidence the homoerotic desire in the public school, which had to remain undisclosed in the Victorian society, "where childhood was sentimentalized in art . . . [so] the juvenile sexuality was too dangerous for exposure to be tolerable" (Chandos 296). Because the *Tom Brown* series, nevertheless, is published in the mid-Victorian era instead of the homophobic late-Victorian and Edwardian era, the emotional friendship of its major boy characters did not arouse suspicion of homosexuality by contemporary readers, neither is such friendship condemned by other characters in the series. Hence, I cite the *Tom Brown* series as one of the references to understand the male homoerotic potentials in *Peter Pan*, *The Wind in the Willows* and *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*.

The impact of *Sherlock Holmes* and its author is clearer than the *Tom Brown* series on the above three Edwardian children's texts, due to the following evidence. First, the publication of this detective series crossed the late-Victorian, the Edwardian and the Georgian era (1911-27), and thus justifying Sherlock Holmes as a rational male hero and cocaine-addicted decadent aesthete, who craves for the emotional co-dependence and physical intimacy in the life of knightly adventure and male domesticity with his roommate, Dr. Watson. The lifelong friendship between Holmes and Watson, as W. W. Robson observes, is modeled by that between Rat and Mole in *The Wind in the Willows*. Moreover, Robert Baden-Powell, the famous Edwardian transvestite who enjoyed sharing residence with his best friend Kenneth McLaren (nicknamed as "the Boy") in the army, felt crazy for Peter Pan (representing eternal boyhood) and Sherlock Holmes (representing Victorian masculinity) and established the Boy Scouts to celebrate the male bondings between boys (Garber 170-1; Kestner 1-2). Above all, Doyle is the literary friend of Barrie and the member of the Allahakbars, the all-male cricket club Barrie founded in 1890, as well as the good friend of Oscar Wilde. Wilde is not only famous for his dandical attire (which Hook's

attire echoes) and his male decadence (which Holmes' decadence echoes) but also notorious for his trials of homosexuality, which aroused the British homophobia that Potter implies in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*. In a nutshell, the above evidence convince me that citing *Sherlock Holmes* as my references is a good approach to help me analyze the three texts of Edwardian children's literature I am going to discuss.

In the *Tom Brown* series, through Hughes' portraits of Tom-Arthur friendship in the public school and Tom-Hardy's at college, we see how "true 'manliness' could be achieved by adopting the traditional attributes of idealized femininity" in the context of "manly Christianity" (Martin 486). As the major supporter of "manly Christianity," Thomas Arnold, who shared strongly emotional intimacy with another schoolboy called Liscomb at Winchester (Chandos 298), claimed that "highly emotional friendships . . . could redeem boys from the naturally evil state of boyhood and induce an Evangelical passion for personal salvation" (Puccio 58-9). Thus, both Tom-Arthur and Tom-Hardy's friendship are regarded as the realizations of Arnoldian Christian brotherhood, of the "man-boy" essence.

However, Arthur's fear of being "called Molly, or Jenny, or some derogatory feminine nickname" (Hughes *Schooldays* 159) implies social hostility to effeminacy, which leads to homophobia. The homophobic hints are also clear in Tom's "roasting" by the bully Flashman, and Tom and East's bullying of "one of the miserable little pretty white-handed curly-headed boys, petted and pampered by some of the big fellows" (169). Apart from this, homoeroticism exists in Tom and Arthur's addressing each other's Christian name, their physical intimacy, and Tom's jealousy of Arthur's new friendship with Martin. Homoeroticism is more explicit in Tom and Hardy from addressing each other by surnames at first and by Christian names at last, their mutual affection with womanly tenderness, and Tom's urge of kissing Hardy. Hence, the Victorian request of boy's realization of masculinity "offered substitutive gratification

for the sexual desire that might otherwise be expressed in masturbation, sadism, or other prohibited sexual activities" (Harrington 17). Only through their intention of marrying each other's sister or cousin, the female version of her brother/cousin, can their implied homoeroticism be transformed into heterosexuality to forge their masculine identities in the homophobic Britain.

As the *Tom Brown* series, with Victorian bourgeois masculinity as its linchpin, *Sherlock Holmes* portrays both the masculine models and the homoerotic friends. Sherlock Holmes, the upper-middle class private consulting detective who has scientific rationalism, iron self-discipline, great diligence, mastery in martial arts, asexuality and patriotism, is immortalized as one of the two Victorian masculine paradigms. The other paradigm is Dr. Watson, who "personifies the virtues of middle-class manhood: loyal, honest and brave" (Kestner 14) as his assistant, biographer, comrade and best friend. Together, they become "boy-men," enjoying thrilling adventures through case-investigation. Meanwhile, they are also Victorian knights, who rescue damsels-in-distress of feminized domesticity from violent husbands, old-fashioned fathers and male gangsters, retrieving the order in bourgeois patriarchy and gender relations. Their cohabited living room at Baker Street 221B becomes a legend for their intense male friendship, resembling the cohabited house of Rat and Mole in *The Wind in the Willows*.

On the other hand, there is a high correlation between male decadence and Holmes' addiction to cocaine and morphine, through which he indulges in the bohemian stimulation to stop boredom when there is no case, as well as his passion for music, art and nostalgia, all countering his rational façade. In other words, Holmes is a fusion of the model of masculinity and decadent aesthete. Meanwhile, after

having an cohabited life with Holmes for eight years,[19] Watson regains his lost masculinity caused by his disability from defeats in the second Afghan War (Kestner 48; Yeh 80), and decides to leave the all-male 221B to marry Mary Morstan and to become a doctor in practice, solidifying his masculine social status as a bourgeois husband regardless of Holmes' objections. This decision not only suggests the incompatibility between homosocial adventure and heterosexual domesticity, like the contrast between Peter and Wendy in *Peter Pan*, but also implies homophobia in the *fin-de-siècle* and homoerotic overtones in their friendship.

Yet Holmes' adhesiveness to Watson is even stronger after Watson gets married. He not only expresses his affection through word and action but also requests Watson's company and obedience when there is a case. Hence, Watson is torn between the role as Holmes' homoerotic pseudo-bachelor friend and as a socially acknowledged husband-doctor, until Holmes "dies" in a duel with Professor Moriarty, Holmes' archenemy and alter ego in masculinity. With the death of Morstan and the symbolic resurrection of Holmes three years later, however, Watson returns to 221B, accompanying Holmes again in case-solving adventures at the expense of life danger and ruined reputation. Meanwhile, the resurrected Holmes becomes less rational and gallant,[20] yet more emotionally and physically dependent on Watson.

Their romantic friendship climaxed in *The Three Garridebs* when Holmes sees

---

[19] They have become roommates since January, 1881, in *A Study in Scarlet*. This first cohabitation is in danger after Watson's engagement in September, 1888, and ended three months latter after Watson's marriage, making their cohabited life almost eight years. Their second cohabitation, which I will explain in the following pages, starts from 1894 (Holmes' symbolic resurrection) to 1902 (Watson's second marriage), also eight years. Together they have cohabited for sixteen years.

[20] For his lessened rationality, see his frequent mistake-making in deduction in *The Empty House*, *The Norwood Builder*, *The Solitary Cyclist*, *The Disappearance of Lady Frances Carfax*, *Shoscombe Old Place* and *The Creeping Man*, and his romantic narratives in *The Blanched Soldier* and *The Lion's Mane*. For his lessened gallantry, he is transformed from a heroic rescuer to the rescued in *The Empty House*, *Black Peter* and *The Illustrious Client*, while the one who frequently takes gun, the symbol of masculinity, is no longer him but Watson (see Watson's remarks in *Thor Bridge*: "[Holmes] took little care for his own safety when his mind was once absorbed by a problem, so that more than once my revolver had been a good friend in need" (Vol II 649)).

Watson being shot by a criminal.[21] Understanding the unmanly emotional depth of Holmes to him, Watson, who no longer has to rely on Holmes for masculinity, then resumes his role as a heterosexual husband and doctor in practice. The ultimate leaving of Watson strikes Holmes so hard that he retires as a lonely beekeeper a year later. Though their friendship never ends,[22] their homoerotic adhesiveness is hindered by the Edwardian homophobia. Holmes fails to continue his detective career when he is no longer the masculine paradigm, and Watson attempts to transform his homoerotic desire into heterosexual one, as Timmy Tiptoes leaves Chippy Hackee and returns to his own wife in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes.*

Taking the above far-reaching crossover works as my references, in my thesis I will discuss male domesticity in Barrie's *Peter Pan*, Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* and Potter's *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*, through dissecting their representations of bachelor's life and idyllic nostalgia to explore homoeroticism. I largely share with scholars of children's literature, crossover fiction and gender theory a critical perspective of childhood, Victorian domesticity, cross-writing/-reading and male homosociality. My study is different from theirs, however, by analyzing how the authors of Edwardian children's texts transform the tabooed issue of homosexuality into the homoerotic implications in their works, in which they highlight male friendship in an struggling exclusion of feminized domesticity.

In Chapter 1 of my thesis I will make a disciplinary scrutiny over homoerotic desire and eternal youthfulness in Barrie's *Peter Pan*. I will begin with an overall view of the Edwardian cult of boyhood, along with the fashion of boy's adventure novel and the gender-constructed representations of domesticity, while never

[21] For the details concerning *The Three Garridebs*, see page 102, 104-5 and 132.
[22] After Watson gets married again and moves out, he still joins Holmes in case investigation in *The Illustrious Client*, *The Three Gables*, *The Mazarin Stone*, *The Creeping Man* and *His Last Bow*, occasionally visits the retired Holmes at weekends, and persists in publishing Holmes' cases during 1903 to 1926. Yet they no longer cohabit as before.

forgetting Barrie's perpetual boyishness and affectionate relationship with the Llewelyn Davies boys. To oppose to Rose's criticism about *Peter Pan* as "an adult projection of childhood" (Falconer 13), I will cite critics and Barrie's remarks on the changes of addressee in *Peter Pan* to prove its dual readership.

Peter Pan is a mix of nostalgic childhood (Pan the pagan god) and the ideals of Victorian gentlemanliness. In the second part of this chapter, I will interpret how he is shaped as both an eternal boy and the model of masculinity, along with his paradoxical attitude toward motherhood, his exclusion of heterosexual relationship with female characters, his revival of medieval chivalry in his interaction with Wendy (which shares resemblances with that between Watson and Morstan in *Sherlock Holmes*), and the incompatibility between boy's adventure and feminized domesticity, as Watson's dilemma between Holmes and Morstan.

Then I will provide a fresh look at homoerotic relationship between Peter and Captain Hook, which is seldom discussed by critics, from their pursuits and rebellions of the codes of masculinity, intentional imitation of each other, pirate's tradition of effeminacy, cross-dressing, and all-male societies where they stay as leaders. Homoerotic relationship of the other two enemy duos, including that between Tom and Flashman in *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and that between Holmes and Moriarty in *Sherlock Holmes* will be used as referential examples to support my arguments.

In Chapter 2, I will pin down the correlation between male friendship and gentlemanly leisure in nature by probing into implied homoeroticism in bachelor's homosociality and male domesticity in Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows*. In addition to the cult of boyhood, the Edwardian era was also notable for its cult of idyllic Englishness, in which the orderly social hierarchy was approached through the gentlemanly seclusion in country life. Together with biographical information of Grahame provided, such as his misfortune marriage, inspirations from his son, and

lifelong passion to nature, country life and homosociality, I attempt to solve the question that if *The Wind in the Willows* is a text for the child, and lead the focus to reading the homoerotic implications between its crossover lines.

Then I will interpret how Grahame creates the Riverside all-male society with Pan as the god of male friendship and an almost exclusion of female. I will categorize four major characters into three groups: Badger and Rat represent Victorian nostalgia, Toad symbolizes Edwardian adventurism, and Mole integrates the above two trends. Presenting Mole as the protagonist of *The Wind in the Willows*, Grahame provides a way to reconcile the Edwardian anxiety of changeability and theatricality with the Victorian serenity which a British gentleman like him prefers. In addition, I will apply Holmes-Watson friendship to unravel implied homoeroticism in Rat-Mole one, with Tom-Arthur and Tom-Hardy as references. My analysis will rest upon their male domesticity, emotional disclosure, and physical intimacy. Homoeroticism in their friendship is so clear that if we merely explain it as familial affection, like Alston and Gaarden claim, homoerotic potentials in *The Wind in the Willows* will be overlooked.

In Chapter 3, I will do a detailed survey of Edwardian men's flights from feminized domesticity by plumbing the depth of male domesticity in Potter's *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*. First, I will draw largely on Potter's biographical criticism, her letters, and scholarly researches to illustrate her ideas of domesticity, homosociality and nature. I will also compare and contrast Potter's style with/to Grahame's. Though both Potter and Grahame highlight domesticity in the English countryside, Grahame portrays his animal characters with Victorian gentlemanliness and idyllic nostalgia, while Potter does it with childlike rebellion and flights from feminized domesticity.

As I argued earlier, feeling repulsed by feminized domesticity, British men have viewed bachelor's houses or gentleman's clubs as their "second home" since the *fin-de-siècle*. Though *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* were traditionally reckoned as, like

Potter's other picture books, a work only for children, I will delineate Timmy Tiptoes' bullying by the bachelor squirrels because of his domestic nature and Chippy Hackee's escape from his wife to seek a bachelor's life, and trace these two episodes back to the Edwardian men's flights from feminized domesticity. Together, Timmy and Chippy establish an intimate homely life with male domesticity, and such life in the Edwardian context may be seen as belonging to only homosexual couples.[23]

Yet the Edwardian British society, in particular after Wilde's trials, was so homophobic that any male homosexual phenomena would be soon reported to the authorities (Brady 201). This is also reflected on the return to the heterosexual "normalcy" for Timmy and Chippy, not to mention Chippy's jealousy of Timmy's wife, as well as Chippy's getting cold after the forced reunion with his own wife as a symbolic punishment. As *Sherlock Holmes* implies Holmes' jealousy and gloominess about Watson's marriage, *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* presents how see how the Edwardian men protested against gendered construction. As the *Tom Brown* series describe Tom's imagined courtship with Arthur's sister and Hardy's marriage with Tom's cousin Katie, *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* depicts how the homoerotic emotion is transformed into the heterosexual one with homosexual desire constrained.

Essential in both gender theory and children's literature, my thesis strives to analyze the motif of homoeroticism by discussing Victorian and Edwardian gender constructions and intimacy in male friendship through the three Edwardian children's texts. My method has rarely been used in scholarly criticisms on children's literature, since critics often discuss either heterosexual or parental relationship in it. Above all, these texts had not been studied with the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes* as references in the area of bachelor's friendship, male domesticity and homoeroticism. I hope my thesis can prove this direction of study as workable and worth doing.

[23] I will discuss this issue with details in the second part of Chapter 3.

Chapter 1:

Eternally Boyish? Finding Homoeroticism in *Peter Pan*

"I want always to be a little boy and to have fun" (Barrie *Peter* 41-2)—this claim by Peter Pan, in fact, belongs to not only the protagonist and his author but the Edwardians, whose cult of boyhood can be dated back to the *fin-de-siècle* changes in the definition of masculinity and domesticity. In the late-Victorian era, separation of the gendered spheres, as I have demonstrated earlier, shaped home to be a warm refuge where "[w]omanhood waited and from which Man ventured abroad—to work, to war and to the Empire" (Davidoff and Hall 28). That means home was no longer where men revealed tender affection through participations of domestic affairs. The *fin-de-siècle* men, led away from domestic masculinity, thus accepted "a particularly tight equation between masculinity and adventure" (Dawson 63).

On the other hand, by the l880s boys after ten were not supposed to read girl's books, which were reckoned as inferior "childish tales with weak morality," but instead stories of "heroism and nobleness . . . [and] true manhood" (Young 6). Hence, boy's adventure story, such as Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island* (1883) and Mark Twain's *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1884),[24] have gained great readership of boys and men since the late-Victorian era, as I have stated in the introduction (Reynolds *Girls* 26). This public association of boyhood and masculinity was also reflected on the emergence of boy's military-style movements, especially Robert Baden-Powell's boy scouts in 1907. His attempt in *Scouting for Boys* (1908) of shaping "man-boys" by citing Sherlock Holmes in Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes* as the model of masculinity, whose positive qualities like scientific rationalism, iron

[24] *Treasure Island* is an adventure novel about pirates and the finding of gold, in which two pirates, Long John Silver (the pirate quartermaster) and Captain Flint, are so notorious that later Barrie mentions them in *Peter Pan*. *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* as the sequel to *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* is about Huck Berry's adventurous life along the Mississippi river.

self-discipline, great diligence, patriotism, and comradeship with Watson are strongly gendered as masculine in the late-Victorian and the Edwardian era (Kestner1-2).[25] Through this model Baden-Powell trains the bourgeois boys to master females, to tame the working-class, to reign the colonized, and to serve the Empire.

The integration of masculinity into boyhood resulted in two phenomena in the Edwardian literary fields: one is an adoration of the martyrized youth, the other is the omnipresent Pan. The worship of youthful martyrdom started with Walter Pater and Oscar Wilde, both as the *fin-de-siècle* aesthetes celebrating the beauty of youth by identifying youth with sacrificial heroes (Wullschläger 114),[26] and climaxed in Edwardian awareness of the upcoming World War I. As the heroic claim of Peter Pan in *Peter Pan* at the moment before drowning, "[t]o die will be an awfully big adventure" (132) reveals, death and cruelty of the war were romanticized to evoke young soldiers to sacrifice for Britain. Since they died in battle, they never entered the professional world of adult and thus forever kept youthfulness (Roberston 61-3).

Facing the fear of the Great War, which might lead everything to chaos, the Edwardians crystallized their nostalgia to Pan. Pan is the pagan god of the playful boyishness and the promise of the past Victorian harmony and security (Lerer 259). Moreover, Pan is also a coordinator of animal world and child world which excludes civilized, corrupted adulthood and feminized domesticity. Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* (1908), Frances Hodgeson Burnett's *The Secret Garden* (1911)[27]

---

[25] For Holmes' scientific rationalism, see his first meeting with Watson at St. Barts' laboratory, and his exact observation and logic in deduction (Kestner 31-2). For his iron self-discipline and great diligence, see his life of "Spartan habits" in *The Hound of the Baskervilles*, his frequent meal- and rest-skipping in *The Sign of Four* and *The Five Orange Pips*, and his tasting the poison as experiment in *The Devil's Foot*. For his patriotism, see his "adorn[ing] the opposite wall [of the living room] with a patriotic V. R. [Victoria Regina] done in bullet-pocks" (Vol I 604) in *The Musgrave Ritual*, and his victory over the German agent for the British government in *His Last Bow*.

[26] Pater's *Marius the Epicurean* (1885) recommends aestheticism by portraying a dandy poet who dies young, choosing the immortal youthfulness rather than ageing. Wilde's *The Happy Prince* (1888) is a fable of homosexual love between men by describing a golden statue of a young prince and a male swallow who brings him love and dies for him (Wullschläger 114).

[27] *The Secret Garden* as one of the classics of children's literature describes that Mary Lennex

and J. M. Barrie's *Peter Pan* (1911) all share a portrayal of Pan or Pan-like figures, yet Peter Pan remains the most popular and typical Edwardian representation of Pan. Together, the worship of martyrized youth and Pan constructed the cult of Edwardian boyhood. Through this cult the bourgeois men found a natural retreat of adventurous, boyish innocence in fictions. In this retreat they needed not to suffer scrapes from two major elements of adulthood: heterosexual relationship and feminized domesticity.

Does boy's adventure story, however, really exclude heterosexual relationship or feminized domesticity? Martin Green states that adventure in story often happens in "settings remote from the domestic and probably from the civilized" (23). Graham Dawson and Peter Hunt also point out the "home-beginning, home-returning" pattern of adventure story from the Arthurian romance to J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Hobbit* (1937) and *The Lord of the Rings* (1954-5), highlighting the significance of domesticity in the adventure structure (63; 27-8). Even *Peter Pan*, according to Jennifer Lee Geer, is a domestic adventure, in which the narratives of boy's adventure and feminized domesticity are inter-related (149). This domestication of adventure celebrates male superiority over female by realizing the mid-Victorian ideal of domesticity: girls are no longer the exclusions from boy's world but the models of good mother and housewife, capable of domestic affairs and child-rearing instead of adventure and battle (Reynolds *Girls* 94).

1.1 J. M. Barrie: the Adult Peter Pan

This mixture of Victorian domesticity and Edwardian boyishness can be found in the biography of J. M. Barrie (1860-1937), the Scottish author behind *Peter Pan*. As an adult with eternal boyishness, Barrie is an ideal and tragic crystallization of "boy-man," and his tragedy parallels his intense ambivalence with domesticity. His

---

ventures into her uncle's deserted garden and helps her cousin Colin reunite with her uncle. Mary's brother Dicken is depicted as a Pan-like "rural wanderer with supernatural powers" (Wullschläger 112) that helps him befriend with nature and animal.

first blow, the death of his elder brother David at thirteen when he was six, affected him so acutely that he imitated David in clothes and behaviors to comfort his grieved mother. Hence, he and his mother grew intimate, and his marriage in 1894 was held at his mother's house rather than his own. Through her storytelling for him about her girlhood and motherhood, Barrie's mother strongly influenced him to portray a young mother with children (the prototype of Wendy) instead of a heterosexual beauty in his works (Griffith 30). Nevertheless, knowing that he could never replace David as the favorite son of his mother, Barrie in his lifetime yearned for motherly affection (Yeoman 72).

In Edinburgh University, due to his five-feet height, his high-pitched voice and natural shyness, Barrie remained boyish. Furthermore, he loved fairy tales, cared children, and showed little interest in heterosexual interactions: these have homoerotic implications in the eyes of recent critics. Yet since Barrie's early adulthood did not cross the notorious 1895, the homophobic year when Wilde's trials took place, he was never suspected of homosexuality by his contemporaries.[28] To develop his masculinity, Barrie founded an all-male cricket club with his literary friends (including Doyle), and even married Mary Ansell, an actress who motherly nursed him when he caught pneumonia. His boyish and bachelor temperament, however, crippled his husband role. This marriage without a child and with the adultery of Ansell ended in 1901, and Barrie reflected his failed consummation in his novel *Sentimental Tommy* (1896)[29] and its sequel *Tommy and Grizel* (1900).[30]

---

[28] For example, Carol Mavor cites the comment of Pamela Maude on Barrie: "he was a tiny man . . . [who] talked a great deal about cricket . . . but the next moment he was telling us about fairies," concluding that Barrie was "ready to use the erotics of tininess to communicate with enchanting small people" (234). In addition, fairy is "as a slang term for a male homosexual , according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*" to describe men who dressed like women to do housework, to gossip and to dance (Mavor 174). However, since this dictionary appeared in 1895, the year of Wilde's trials, Barrie's boyishness might not have been considered homosexual.

[29] *Sentimental Tommy* is about Tommy, who is lost in the forest and forced to remain a boy forever. The difference between Tommy and Peter Pan is that Tommy passively accepts his fate of not

His childless life was altered when he met the middle-class Llewelyn Davies boys in Kensington Gardens in 1897.[31] His first publication about them, *The Boy Castaways of Black Lake Island* (1901), was composed of their photographs on holiday to play as pirates and Indians with him. As Jacqueline Rose states, this book reveals Barrie's intention of recalling his childhood innocence by preserving the boys' (30-1). Meanwhile, it also deepened the gap between Barrie and Arthur, the boys' father, whose paternal influence was gradually usurped by him.[32] Barrie's preconscious jealousy of Silvia, the boys' mother, also hints in his autobiographical novel *The Little White Bird* (1902). In this book the bachelor protagonist keeps battling with the boy's mother for the parenthood, and even claims that his novel can eternalize the boy's childhood innocence while she can not.[33]

The Little White Bird also brings about the first appearance of Peter Pan. In this book he is not, as later in *Peter Pan*, a boy, but a seven-day-old baby who, partly human and partly ornithic, flies to Kensington Gardens to have an immortal life. Nevertheless, his interaction with his mother and the opposite sex foreshadows the similar representations in *Peter Pan*. When he first returns home to find his mother, he is torn between maternal affection and boyish freedom, thus choosing not to wake

---

growing up, yet Peter actively *chooses* not to grow up (McGavock 40).

[30] *Tommy and Grizel* is a story about Tommy's failed marriage with Grizel, his puppy lover. As a famous Scottish writer (like Barrie), Tommy is portrayed by Barrie as an incompetent in both mental and sexual realms. Barrie claims that Tommy "[i]s a boy only. . . despite all he ha[s] gone through, he [i]s still a boy. And boys cannot love" (242). Eventually, Tommy fails to consummate with Grizel (neither did Barrie with Ansell), who dies then without a child.

[31] The Llewelyn Davies comprises the father Arthur, the mother Sylvia, and five sons including George, John/Jack, Peter, Michael and Nicholas. The three boys Barrie met in the Kensington Gardens in 1897 were George (aged four), Jack (aged three) and the infant Peter. Among them he was mostly fond of George and Michael, both dying in their youthhood.

[32] Wullschläger indicates that Arthur assumingly and intentionally left *The Boy Castaways of Black Lake Island* on a train out of jealousy after Barrie gifted him one of the two copies of this book (126).

[33] *The Little White Bird* describes the strongly affectionate relationship between Captain W, a childless bachelor writer, and a boy David, By sharing David with the nurse and even sleeping with David, he attempts to play the role as David's mother (Gavin 59). He knows, however, that even if he works so hard to win the boy's love, David will grow up to leave him. Thus, he not only tells David boy's adventure story to win on David, but also writes *The Little White Bird* to secure David forever in fiction—this is what David's mother fails to do—as a revenge against her.

his mother but instead flying back to the Gardens. When he returns, however, he finds his mother sleeping in the nursery with another baby, and he is barred outside the window. Apart from this, his first encounter of Maimie, the archetype of Wendy but younger as a four-year-old girl, is an innocent interaction without heterosexual temptation. This story of Peter was later individually published as *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens* (1906).

In 1904, the image of Peter Pan was formally shaped in *Peter Pan*, a play and pantomime. Pantomime is a form of Christmas play for the child with female-to-male cross-gendered roles, plots from popular stories or fairy tales, animal characters, extravagant sets, stage effects, fantasy settings, battles between child-heroes and villains, and the participation of audience (White and Tarr "Peter" 164-71). As I have briefly mentioned in the introduction, the role of Peter Pan has always been played by an actress, having a cross-dressing potential (Garber 165).[34] Apart from this, Tinker Bell as a fairy, Nana as an animal character, Neverland as a fantastic setting where child players had to do wire-flying, and Captain Hook as a major villain, all prove this play as a pantomime, not to mention audience's being required of clapping hands to resurrect Tinker Bell.[35] These elements of pantomime revived even after the play itself was published as a book in 1911.

The characters in *Peter Pan* also reflect people who are important to Barrie in his real life, such as Peter Pan (Barrie, George and Michael), Wendy (Barrie's mother and Margaret Henley[36]), Nana (Barrie's dog Porthos), Wendy's brothers and the Lost

[34] The issue of homoeroticism in the cross-dressing of Peter Pan will be further discussed in the third part of Chapter 1.

[35] In both *Peter Pan* the play and the novel, Hook drops some poison in Peter's medicine, which is later taken by Tinker Bell to save Peter. To save the poisoned Tinker Bell, Peter asks all children who dream of Neverland (in the play they were the child audience) to clap hands to revive her, and this succeeds.

[36] Margaret Henley, the daughter of the poet William Ernest Henley, was the friend of Barrie, who had been addressed by her as "my friendy." Since she could not pronounce the "r" sound very well, it eventually sounded like "my Wendy." Though she died at age five and never had chances to watch or

Boys (the Llewelyn Davies boys), Mr. Darling (Arthur), Mrs. Darling (Sylvia) and Captain Hook (Barrie). In addition, through these characters Barrie projects the Edwardian nostalgic cult of boyhood, Victorian gentlemanliness, and the eventual incompatibility between boy's adventure and feminized domesticity.

Since Barrie's affection to the Llewelyn Davies boys is intense and passionate, modern critics suspect that if Barrie is a pedophile, and some of them even point out that *Peter Pan* is not a book for children but a projection of adult's fetishized desire to child and childhood innocence. Jacqueline Rose, for example, sees "the absence of heterosexual sexuality in *Peter Pan* as a veiled code for Barrie's own obsession with young boys" (qtd. in Munns 221). She also indicates that in the first performance of *Peter Pan*, "[t]he audience was made up of London's theatre-going elite, and there was hardly a child among them" (Rose 32), to evidence that it is rather a play *of* the child for adult audience than a play *for* the child. Like Rose, James R. Kincaid also argues that Victorian and Edwardian children's texts, especially *Alice in Wonderland* and *Peter Pan*, are the vehicles of adult desire for children. For example, Hook and Peter are portrayed as "the complete pedophile and the perfect child" (285), the former being obsessed with the latter. This argument evidences the possibility of Barrie's pedophilia.

Nevertheless, several critics disagree with Rose and Kincaid. By citing the interview of Nicholas Llewelyn Davies, Jackie Wullschläger evidences that Barrie's interaction with these boys are neither pedophilic nor homosexual but asexual (123). Peter Hollindale also confirms that it is not pedophilia but asexuality that led to the friendship between Barrie and the Llewelyn Davies boys, who became the substitute for Barrie's lost, traumatic childhood. For Hollindale, it is the contemporary phobia of pedophilia that makes people suspect any affectionate friendship between adult and

read *Peter Pan*, her name-addressing to him inspired the character Wendy in *Peter Pan* (Garber 173).

child. (157, 155). Martha Stoddard Holmes broaches that Barrie in *Peter Pan* creates both the fictionalized child/childhood and the imagined adult/adulthood. Hence, the novel expresses not only adult desire for children but child desire for growing up and motherly love (139-40). Lester D. Friedman clarifies that it is improper to use modern perception of pedophilia to see Victorian and Edwardian bachelor's admiration of boyhood (222). Karen L. McGavock even states that *Peter Pan* the play is more for children than for adults when "some of the darker elements in the original version were deleted" and when women characters were shifted "from sexualized wives to mothers" (42). The most powerful views come from Donna White and Anita C. Tarr, who, as I have mentioned previously, put *Peter Pan* into the pantomime tradition to prove that *Peter Pan* the play has been children's entertainment at Christmas over a century, so is the book adaptation (164-7).

For me, I believe that Barrie, at least according to biographical information, is not a pedophile. Indeed, his fascination for boys echoes Lewis Carroll's obsession with girls. Similar to Carroll, who loved photographing naked little girls and yet "no evidence [showed] that he sought physical contact beyond a kiss or a hand to hold, or that he wanted any form of sexual fulfillment" (Wullschläger 40), Barrie expressed his sentiments for boys and yet never crossed the line into the sexual realm. His trouble, from his letter to George Llewelyn Davies we can see, lies in the Edwardian restrictions of emotional disclosure and physical intimacy between men and boys under the pressure of homophobia.[37] This is why he seems pedophilic while trying to motherly tending to the Llewelyn Davies boys.

Nevertheless, it does not mean that Barrie lacks sexual desire or fantasy to the boys. Peter Llewelyn Davies recalled Barrie's affections to his brothers George and

[37] Barrie once wrote a letter to George, stating that "more and more wishing you were a girl of 21 instead of a boy, so that I could say the things to you that are now always in my heart" (Birkin 242).

Michael were "a lot of the maternal, and much too, of the lover" (Birkin 235). Yet Barrie successfully transformed such desire and fantasy into his writing, as Carroll did in *Alice in Wonderland*. For instance, in *The Little White Bird* the bachelor protagonist, the fictionalized Barrie, once sends David's mother a photo of this boy being hanged on a tree. This scene reveals the implied sadism of Barrie on a little boy (Wullschläger 124). Nor can the homoerotic hints be forgotten in the scene when Captain W. (Barrie's projection) tells David "[i]t is what I have been wanting all the time" (*Little* 213) when they sleep on the same bed.

When it comes to *Peter Pan*, the homoerotic pursuit and imitation between Peter and Hook makes homoeroticism in Barrie's affections to the Llewelyn Davies boys even clearer, which I will discuss in the third part of this chapter. In fact, Barrie *did* have expectations of the retrieved childhood through these boys. As Carol Mavor dissects by citing Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's *Between Men* that woman is used by men as a vehicle to display male homoerotic desire, Barrie's "love for the boy (and boys) was actualized through a love for the mother" (Mavor 247). Through borrowing the Llewelyn Davies boys from their mother Sylvia and becoming their stepfather, Barrie made them his instead of hers. When I see Barrie's overly dependent relationship with them (particularly Michael), I discover his intense possessiveness.[38] Yet it is his refusal of conducting any pedophilic behaviors on these boys that makes their relationship merely homoerotic rather than pedophilic.

Moreover, concerning whether *Peter Pan* is a play/book for children, I would like to cite Falconer's statements to clarify that it has the crossover quality of hybrid

[38] For example, Wullschläger broaches that after Arthur and Sylvia died and Barrie became the boys' guardian, whenever Michael had nightmares, Barrie "used to sit through the night reassuring and consoling him, and Michael became passionately dependent on his guardian [Barrie]" (135). Even after Michael went to Eton in 1913, they two kept writing letters to each other every day to console Michael's loneliness. Before his death, Michael was a literary critic of Barrie and accompanied Barrie to see *Peter Pan*'s rehearsal. When Michael died of drowning at Oxford, Barrie was so grieved that Nico feared he might suicide to accompany Michael underworld (135-6, 140).

texts and audience (9). I observe that the addressee of *Peter Pan* keeps changing: Barrie addresses to readers as “you” (adult) in the beginning at London home, and then as “we” (child-in-adult) in the middle on Neverland, the nostalgic child playground, and lastly as “you”(adult) when the boys go to London and grow up. This evidences that Barrie addresses *Peter Pan* to both child and adult audience.

1.2 The Nostalgic and Gentlemanly Peter Pan

It is unlikely to analyze the nature of Peter Pan before we understand the mixed ideals of nostalgic childhood and Victorian gentlemanliness he represents. In Barrie’s first description of him in *The Little White Bird* and *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens*, Peter “escape[s] from being a human when he [i]s seven days old” (Barrie *Kensington* 29), becoming neither a boy nor a bird, integrating the capacity of both creatures, yet failing to be totally accepted by either (43). In *Peter Pan* the limbo image of Peter shapes him a mixture of not only a boy and bird but a boy and god. Ann Yeoman pins down Peter’s representation of two Greek Gods: Hermes and Pan. As Hermes, who is innocent yet cunning, deceitful yet playful shapeshifter and the ruler of dreams (36, 38), Peter lulls Wendy to the Neverland with sweet words, imitates Captain Hook to deceive the pirates to release Tiger Lily, and calls all children who believe in fairies to clap hands to revive the dying Tinker Bell.

The similarities between the god Pan and Peter are more than those between Hermes and Peter. In *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens* Peter has “the goat on which he now rides round the Gardens every night playing sublimely on his pipe” (171). In *Peter Pan* the book Wendy’s first impression of Peter in dream is that he sits “on the foot of her bed and play[s] on his pipes to her” (16). Yet they resemble in other aspects. Both Pan and Peter are a fusion of human being and god—or specifically, the figures of eternal boyhood. As I have amplified in the introduction, Pan is a naturally playful, adventurous, arrogant god of animal instinct, crystallizing idyllic pleasures

and nostalgic childhood (Chassagnol 201-2; Yeoman 42-3). Likewise, the illiterate yet immoderate Peter clothes himself in skeleton leaves, and leads the Lost Boys (who wear the skins of bears) to have thrilling adventures on the Neverland—the natural, uncivilized, imaginary playground for the child. They both hold the ambiguous status between childhood and adulthood, between deity and humanity, accepted by other groups besides human beings (animals for Pan and fairies, mermaids and birds for Peter) yet never really belonging to one of them (Kavey 78).

Their similarities, however, do not end up here. Pan is viewed by his mother as a monster in infanthood and thus forsaken, while Peter, though he actively flies away from his mother for refusing to grow up, is barred by the window and his newly-born brother when he flies back to reunite with her. Their deprivation of maternal love results in their failure in establishing normal heterosexual relationship (Stephens 208). Pan's courtships of nymphs, Syrinx and Pitys, only make them transform into a reed and a pine to escape him. By comparison, Peter's unconscious desire for retrieving lost maternal love also hinders any heterosexual development with female characters (Wendy, Tinker Bell and Tiger Lily), notwithstanding the fact that they all love him.

Though Peter Pan rejects growing up, he maintains not merely boyishness but the ideal of masculinity: Victorian gentlemanliness. His Victorian gentlemanliness is marked first by his resistance to heterosexual relationship and his embrace of an all-male life of adventure. For example, Tiger Lily as the leader of the redskins is a New Woman, who reveals not feminized domesticity but masculine leadership, courage and toughness. She once boards "the pirate ship with a knife in her mouth" for an assault, and decides that "she must die as a chief's daughter" (Barrie *Peter* 118) when she is held captive and about to be drown by pirates. Hence, Peter saves her not because of her female identity but of the pirates' violation of fair play. As a figure of Victorian gentlemanliness, assumingly superior to the opposite sex and the colonized,

Peter emphasizes his male supremacy, as Graham Dawson and Kimberly Reynolds explain (74; 52-5). Thus, he will not love a woman and leader of the colonized redskins whose masculinity is equal to him.

He acts more gentlemanly before Tinker Bell. The furniture of Tink's private room reveal her as an aristocratic lady in the seventeenth century, in contrast with the Victorian housewife or mother (like Wendy).[39] Aside from this, a fairy like her, as mermaids who flirt at Peter, is traditionally reckoned as a sexy figure. Her relationship with Peter implies Barrie's deliberate repression of sexuality. For example, Peter threatens to draw out her curtains to allow all the boys to see her in négligé, and she comforts the tearful Peter after she drinks the poison from Hook to save him. Peter, however, treats her as a lady than a woman of motherhood and domesticity, the ideal image of female he desires, thus failing to understand her love to him and her jealousy of Wendy, and even forgetting her after she dies.

This exclusion of heterosexual relationship reminds me of Holmes, the-late Victorian and Edwardian masculine paradigm whose asexuality is evident in *Sherlock Holmes.* Among the females he encounters, New Woman figures—Mary Morstan, Irene Adler and Violet Hunter—he appreciates most. Nevertheless, he treats them with polite yet unemotional attitude, not just out of gentlemanly chivalry but above all, due to his asexuality.[40] Adler, an American adventuress who defeats Holmes in *A Scandal in Bohemia*, wins his respect so much that he addresses her as "the woman" and keeps her photo as remembrance; however, he simply views her as a worthy opponent instead of a sexy woman. Hunter, "a brave and sensible girl . . . [and] quite exceptional woman" (513) who then becomes a headmistress of a private school in

[39] For example, her couch is called a "Queen Mab," and "her mirror [i]s a Puss-in-boots," and her "wash-stand [i]s Pie-crust," her carpet is "of the best (the early) period of Margery and robin" (Barrie *Peter* 106). These furniture were often used by the aristocratic lady in the seventeenth century.

[40] For Holmes' asexual attitude to Morstan, see his jealousy to the marriage of Watson and Morstan in the third part of Chapter 3.

The Copper Beeches, does not arouse his further interest after the case is closed. Both Peter and Holmes' indifference toward heterosexual relationship are to maintain their masculinity intact and superior, not overpowered by females. The major difference is that Holmes rejects all the possibilities of heterosexual affection and feminized domesticity, preferring to bachelor domesticity with Watson, while Peter dares not to touch heterosexuality, and holds an ambiguous attitude toward feminized domesticity, which is showed in his relationship with Wendy.

Unlike Tiger Lily or Tinker Bell, Wendy is a motherly figure of feminized domesticity. Before Peter comes to the Darlings' home, she and her two brothers, John and Michael, role-play as their parents. Later, she sews the lost shadow of Peter back on him, and tells bedtime stories for the boys on the Neverland. These scenes confirm her symbolic role of mother and housewife, reducing her heterosexual attraction and emphasizing her motherly affection (Routh 68). However, Peter, though ignorant of the amorous implications from Tiger Lily and Tinker Bell, is aware of the possible development of sexuality in his father- mother/housewife role-playing with Wendy in the underground home, and is scared of it. It is after she reluctantly accepts their conjugal relation as make-believe that he has a "sign of relief," reassuring her (and probably himself) that his feelings for her are simply "those of a devoted son" (Barrie *Peter* 145). He is not, as Yeoman presumes, a purely asexual boy (111). He desires motherhood; however, he also senses the existence of sexuality in adult's world, and yet chooses to repress it and stay in eternal boyhood. This makes Peter similar to Barrie, who pours his probable sexual fantasy into his affection for boys on the Neverland, the fictionalized Llewelyn Davies boys, through his writings, and stays incompetent in the married life.

This conscious resistance to heterosexual relationship leads to Peter's other quality which marks his Victorian gentlemanliness: his adherence to medieval

chivalric code of honor. His insistence on fair play first marks this code. For example, he refuses to kill a sleeping pirate; he rescues Tiger Lily from two pirates because "it [i]s two against one that anger[s] him" (Barrie *Peter* 119); he invites Hook to pick up the sword instead of attacking the armless nemesis. In addition, this chivalric code is also lucid in his courteous attitude to females and the highlighted rescues of Wendy, his damsel-in-distress, even at the expense of his life. For instance, he elegantly bows to Wendy like a gentleman when they first meet; he urges Wendy to escape by kite, whereas himself left on the Marooner's Rock to be drowned; he only cares about saving Wendy from pirates when the other boys are also held captive. These chivalric acts reflect Edwardian "Old Boy nostalgia," which I have remarked in the introduction, as a revival of medieval chivalry.[41] However, different from its medieval counterpart, the late-Victorian and Edwardian knight rescued not a lady of the court but a woman of Victorian feminized domesticity. No matter in the warm underground home or in their adventure on the Rock and the pirate ship, Wendy persists that every boy needs to "rest[] on a rock for half an hour after the midday meal" (Barrie *Peter* 117), to follow dinner table etiquette, or to go to bed at the regular hour, behaving more like a bourgeois housewife than a courtly lady. Peter's rescue of her only solidifies her feminized domesticity and confirms his heroic masculinity instead of engendering the romantic relationship of a medieval lady and a knight.

Similar emphasis on chivalric code can be found in *Sherlock Holmes*. In *The Sign of Four* Mrs. Forrester, a friend and employer of Mary Morstan, compares this case to a romance, with the elements of a lady, a great amount of treasure and the

[41] Robert Baden-Powell had arranged "the 'Code of Chivalry' to include such elements as 'Honour, Self-Discipline, Courtesy, Courage, [and] Selfless Sense of Duty' . . . all parts of 'scouting's cult of masculinity" (Kestner 70). Peter Pan's acts listed here meet Baden-Powell's claim of chivalric code.

gangsters,[42] while Morstan adds that Holmes and Watson are like "two knight-errants to the rescue" (Vol I 188). Later, when Watson leaves to chase the dangerous gangsters with Holmes, he sees Forrester and Morstan standing by the half-opened door with hall-light flowing from the house, and feels that "[i]t [i]s soothing to catch even that passing glimpse of a tranquil English home" (167-8). Here the image of bourgeois feminized domesticity counters masculine adventure, the lady asking for help (Morstan) representing the former while the Victorian knightly gentlemen and "boy-men" (Holmes and Watson) the latter.

Yet eventually Peter refuses growing up. In *Peter Pan* Barrie attempts to integrate two opposite child images, a domestic angel (Wendy) and a brave adventurer (Peter), by portraying an underground home of Victorian feminized domesticity on the Neverland, the symbol of eternally boyish adventure (Heath 99; Geer 153). However, as Claudia Nelson indicates, "Peter's true enemy is Wendy, with her maternal desires that threaten to force him into interminable tedious games of house" (170). In this imaginary family Peter's role-playing as father is so perfect that he addresses Wendy as "old lady," the Victorian way of calling a bourgeois mother, and tells her that "there is nothing more pleasant of an evening for you and me when the day's toil is over than to rest by the fire with the little ones [the boys] near by" (Barrie *Peter* 144). With her help, Peter even enjoys a new kind of adventure, named "pretending not to have adventures . . . [such as] doing nothing on a stool" (110).

The blood of thrilling adventure, nevertheless, remains in his veins. By sawing the Nevertree, a great tree growing in the middle of the house, with the boys to have

[42] Morstan's father, a British captain, once set free of several gangsters who stole a great amount of Indian treasure by having a share with it; however, he then died in an accident and left Morstan a penniless orphan, since his share was secretly taken by his partner. Years later, the partner's second son intends to have an appointment with her to return Captain Morstan's share to her and tells her the truth of her father's death. Not ascertaining if there is danger in this appointment, Morstan asks Holmes and Watson to accompany her and to solve the whole mystery of the hidden treasure.

more room to play, Peter demonstrates his refusal of adulthood and insistence on eternal boyhood (Yeoman 110-1). As Linda Roberston pins down, "[w]ith the advent of the war [First World War], [Peter] signifie[s] the seductive lure of combat as 'great adventure,' promising death for a glorious cause as preferable to the prosaic of indignities of adulthood and ageing" (51). In the Marooner's Rock scene, Peter, along with his legendary remark, "[t]o die will be an awfully big adventure" (Barrie *Peter* 132), is romanticized as a young martyr and boy adventurer. Refusing to be trapped in the mundane bourgeois life (becoming a man), "[h]is rebellion against modernity, urbanity and domesticity . . . offer[s] a fantasy that allow[s] adults a release from lives constrained . . . into an imaginary world of adventure" (Roberston 61).

Peter's preference to adventure finally brings about the leaving of Wendy and the boys, who choose to grow up by flying back to the London nursery, away from him, adventure and the Neverland.[43] He passionately claims, "I want to be a little boy and to have fun" (Barrie *Peter* 158), and intensely repulses being adopted as other boys by Mrs. Darling, Wendy's mother, by crying out "[k]eep back, lady, no one is going to catch me and make me a man" (230). The above two lines climax the incompatibility between boy's adventure and feminized domesticity.

Such incompatibility also explains why among all the bedtimes stories Peter loves "Cinderella" most. Like the prince who is eager to find a lady whose foot suits the glass slipper, Peter always looks for a girl who fits in his idealized image and gender-stereotypical role of mother, no matter it is Wendy, Wendy's daughter Jane, or Jane's daughter Margaret. Through this he temporarily balances his need of feminized domesticity and his wish for eternal boyhood without having any heterosexual

[43] In Chapter 11, after Wendy tells her story of the Darling family, Peter tells his own tragedy about his abandonment by his mother. This scares Wendy and her brothers, who imagine that their parents may abandon them as well if they do not return quickly. The Lost Boys, with Wendy's promise that Mrs. Darling will adopt them all, fly back with the Darling children, too.

relationship. Yet his searching process is not one-directional but mutual. Wendy also finds the idealized fusion of eternal boyishness and Victorian masculinity in Peter, as Cinderella finds her prince. The only difference is that according to the narrator, girls like Wendy tend to grow up to accept the ordinary bourgeois men as their husbands, while boys like Peter forever believe and thus forever seek their idealized image of mother, of feminized domesticity.

As *Peter Pan, Sherlock Holmes* also presents the similar incompatibility between boy's adventure and feminized domesticity in Watson's dilemma of choosing between Holmes and his two wives. As I have demonstrated, Holmes is not only the best friend of Watson but the late-Victorian, Edwardian and Georgian masculine paradigm, while Watson is a retired and disable army doctor from the battle of Maiwand, one of the major British defeats in the nineteenth centuries, in the second Afghan War. Watson's loss of masculine privileged status is then represented in his wounded shoulder and leg, his defeat in battle, his discharge from the army—the all-male space he has stayed, and his financial problems caused by his unemployment (Kestner 22-3). This frustrating situation is changed, however, after he befriends with Holmes. He joins Holmes as the late-Victorian knights to retrieve stability for the bourgeois society, earns personal reputation by publishing Holmes' cases, and has strong comradeship through the cohabited life and thrilling adventures with Holmes. It is Holmes who saves Watson from his crisis and helps recover Watson's masculinity.

Nevertheless, after Watson regains his lost masculinity, he marries Morstan, the damsel-in-distress he rescues in *The Sign of Four*, and starts a medical practice. His first marriage and medical profession lead to a full recovery from his physical

disability of shoulder and leg,[44] and solidify his masculine social status as a bourgeois husband; however, they also drift him apart from Holmes, from bachelorhood and masculine adventure (Yeh 106). Then the conflict Watson has to face between male adventure and feminized domesticity does not cease but arises, since Holmes always requests his sheer company and pure obedience in case investigation, not caring that he has a wife and a new job.[45] Meanwhile, Morstan never appears when Holmes visits Watson for the case-solving adventures. This implies the incompatibility between male adventure and feminized domesticity.

Not until the symbolic death of Holmes in *The Final Problem* in 1891 does Watson retrieve his socially acknowledged identity of husband-doctor. With the death of Morstan before the "resurrection" of Holmes in 1894, however, Watson moves back to 221B to live with his friend, discarding feminized domesticity and re-embracing male adventure. Yet as Peter Pan, who always seeks the ideal image of mother and feminized domesticity while enjoying male adventure, Watson always has a dream of establishing a bourgoeis feminized home. This results in his second and eternal moving out for a new wife and a resumption of medical practice in 1902,[46] suggesting that male adventure and feminized domesticity can never be coexistent.

The conflicts of male adventure and feminized domesticity in the case of Peter Pan and Watson reveal the same dilemma of the late-Victorian and Edwardian men in the gendered spheres of British bourgeois society. Though their roles as the (pseudo-) bourgeois husbands and the masters of the household are solidified by the women

---

[44] Watson's wound from the Afghan war is kept mentioned in his pre-married cases (*A Study in Scarlet*, *The Sign of Four* and *The Noble Bachelor*) but never in his post-married ones. This recovery from disability may be seen as a piece of evidence for his retrieval of masculinity.

[45] In *The Boscombe Valley Mystery*, *The Man with the Twisted Lip*, *The Stock-broker's Clerk* and *The Crooked Man*, whenever Holmes visits Watson, Watson leaves his wife and job to go wherever with him. Watson only subtly protests in *The Naval Treaty*; however, when Holmes ironically replies, "[o]h, if you find our own cases [of patient] more interesting than mine—" (Vol I 717), he shrinks and agrees to accompany Holmes in case investigation.

[46] Details of Watson's twice marriage can be found in the third part of Chapter 3.

figures, male adventure or male friendship keep drawing them back into an all-male space. Thus, male homoerotic pursuits become the only solution to this dilemma.

1.3 The Homoerotic Duo: Peter Pan and Captain Hook

Recent critics and film adaptations begin to shift the focus of *Peter Pan* from son-mother relationship between Peter and Wendy to homoerotic relationship between Peter and Hook (Munns 220). However, in most cases they either simply compare and contrast the representations of masculinity of Peter and Hook,[47] or discuss the cross-dressing of Peter and the pedophilic possibility of Hook.[48] Seldom do we find in-depth analyses dealing with the issue of homoeroticism in the novel. Thus, I will discuss homoeroticism in the deadly yet mutually appealing relationship between Peter and Hook in *Peter Pan*, and to compare it with two examples of homoeroticism from *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and *Sherlock Holmes.*

To begin with, there will be no Hook if *Peter Pan* does not come out first as a play: Barrie created this pirate captain only because he needed time to change the scenes (Friedman 188-9). Andrew Birkin, the biographer of Barrie, charts that Barrie "didn't need a villain because he already had one: Peter Pan" (White and Tarr *J. M. Barrie* 207), whose dark nature is not dissimilar to Hook's. For example, in *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens* Peter buries lost (probably alive) babies in the Kensington Gardens so that their parents only find their tombs. To this, the narrator comments, "I do hope that Peter is not too ready with his spade. It is all rather sad" (177). Before I explore the dark side of Peter and Hook, let's first have a look at representations of masculinity in *Peter Pan.*

Both Peter and Hook reveal distinct masculinity in their appearances and behaviors. Peter crows with cockiness when he is satisfied with his victory or

[47] Critics such as Chassagnol, Friedman, Roberston and Yeoman discuss masculinity in *Peter Pan*.
[48] Critics such as Garber, White, Tarr and Rose discuss homoerotic traits of these two major characters.

cleverness, and the act of crowing traditionally signifies masculine pride and valor. Cock is also an euphemism of penis, the crystallization of masculinity (Friedman 202). Peter acts as a capable leader to the boys on the Neverland. Not only does he order them "in his most captaincy voice" (Barrie *Peter* 95) to build the little house for Wendy and to hide in the lagoon when pirates approach, but ask them to respect him as a father in their underground home of English domesticity. Apart from crowing and leadership, Peter owns virtues of a Victorian gentleman, like persistence in fair play, paying courtesy to women and coming to their rescue. In contrast, Hook reveals masculinity through his "phallic symbolism . . . the iron hook . . . [and] the big cigar" (Wullschläger 128). As a pirate captain, Hook's identity is so powerful that pirates, though they are suspicious, obey his order of releasing Tiger Lily when they hear his voice imitated by Peter. Moreover, Hook is not a man of humble origin as other pirates. His aristocratic breeding is implied in his royal name "James,"[49] his attendance at Eton in his youthhood,[50] and his crazy adherence to "good form."

The masculinities of Peter and Hook, however, are of very different nature. Peter's proud crowing, bird-like flying, clothes of skeleton leaves, and total illiteracy signify his being boyish, instinctive, animalistic and natural. Though he learns the gentleman's etiquette "at fairy ceremonies" (Barrie *Peter* 37), he never enters social circles of gentlemen in London. That reveals his social and sexual immaturity. In contrast, Hook's upper-class background, his Eton-education, his seventeenth-century royal attire, his elegancy in manners, and his taste all portray him as a cultural and corrupted figure, since he deliberately chooses a pirate life to rebel against "good

[49] Barrie indicates that "Hook [i]s not his true name. To reveal who he really [i]s would even at this date set the country in a blaze" (*Peter* 185). This evidence of Hook's royal blood explains why the narrator would call Hook's first name "James."

[50] In *Peter Pan* the book Barrie just mentions that Hook "ha[s] been at a famous public school" (185). In Barrie's speech to Eton students in 1927, however, he confirms that Hook once studied at Eton and then becomes a pirate (McGinnis, n. pag.).

form" he has learned from family and school.

The other way to observe the corruption of Hook is to compare him with Mr. Darling, his double.[51] In spite of his royal name "George," Mr. Darling is a mundane British bourgeois man, who cares more about his fame and property than his children. For instance, he boasts his knowledge of stocks and shares in the beginning of *Peter Pan*, and yet almost abandons Wendy in her infanthood because "she [i]s another mouth to feed" (8). Also, he acquires so great vanity under the spotlight for "sadly" living in the kennel to office and at sleep after his children leave. In other words, he is portrayed as a ridiculed version of Edwardian masculinity, and thus fails to win respect from his family. For example, he never gets the kiss of Mrs. Darling, which she chooses to give to Peter, her true idealized image of masculinity. He dares not to drink his medicine and tricks Michael to take it. He has deep contempt of feminized domesticity, symbolized by Nana, the dog nanny.[52] Above all, his immaturity in the role of a husband and father leads to his eager craving for motherhood, childish jealousy of Nana, and his complaints that his children do not love him.[53] The case of Mr. Darling evidences that Edwardian masculinity goes downhill to a superficial, capitalized and corrupted state. This state undermines his masculine authority in the family (Adams 85-8).

Hook shares many similarities with Mr. Darling. Like Mr. Darling, he is a "child" or an immature man who craves for motherhood as Peter does. In *Peter Pan*, at the Mermaids' Lagoon when Hook tells his pirates that the mother Neverbird will

---

[51] In the first performance of *Peter Pan* the play, Gerald du Maurier, the brother of Sylvia Llewelyn Davies, played both the roles of Hook and Mr. Darling. From then on, these two roles have been doubled in performance (Garber 179-80).

[52] For instances, he forbids Nana to accompany his children in the night nursery, which then causes Peter's breaking through and the children's flying away. He even tries to persuade his wife to close the window, which she leaves open for the children to fly back.

[53] For example, he addresses his wife as "mother," cries out that he needs to be coddled, begs his wife to "play [him] to sleep . . . on the nursery piano" (Barrie *Peter* 220), and refuses to adopt the Lost Boys at first because he thinks that they "treat him as a cypher in his own house" (227).

never desert her eggs even if the nest falls into the water, "[t]here [i]s a break in his voice, as if for a moment he recall[s] innocent days" (122). Such craving leads to his kidnapping of Wendy as a revelation of a son-mother relationship than a heterosexual one as traditional pirates would do. Like Mr. Darling, Hook feels gloomy that "[n]o little children loves [him]" (Barrie *Peter* 187), and thus almost jealously kills his bo'sun Smee, who tends to win admiration of children.

Hook, however, chooses to fly from social responsibility an Eton graduate should take and from feminized domesticity, to live in his pirate ship, an all-male space. Meanwhile, in the character of Hook there are reminiscences of the Restoration era (the late seventeenth to the early eighteenth centuries),[54] the golden time of pirate: his nostalgia for the past era of purely gentlemanly masculinity, the era which was not invaded by feminized domesticity (Roberston 66). These flights and reminiscences make his level of masculinity different than Mr. Darling's. Nevertheless, as his hook is not his true right hand, his masculinity is inferior to Peter's, no matter how hard he aspires to the ideal of "good form."

My above comparisons and contrasts between Mr. Darling and Hook explain why I disagree with the arguments of Rose and Kincaid, who both argue the pedophilic relationship between Hook and Peter. Indeed, Hook and Mr. Darling are always played by the same actor in stage production of *Peter Pan*, and the Darling children do help Peter kill Hook, the double of their father (Rose 35). This is clear in John's comment on Mr. Darling, who sleeps in the kennel when they three return, "[h]e is not so big as the pirate I killed" (Barrie *Peter* 223). Yet Hook remains different from Mr. Darling, and the intensely mutual appeal between Peter and Hook never exists between Peter and Mr. Darling. Because of this mutual appeal, I suppose

[54] The evidence is his attire, "associated with the name of Charles II," and his "strange remembrance to the ill-fated Stuarts" (Barrie *Peter* 77). I will explain with more details in the following pages.

that between Peter and Hook there is a homoerotic bonding, which I am going to explore in terms of three aspects: their mutual imitations, their mutual education, and their mutual attractions.

Concerning the mutual imitations between Peter and Hook, it is better to trace back to the prototype of these two characters: the author himself. As I stated in the first part of this chapter, biographical information shows that Barrie, along with the Llewelyn Davies boys, are the origin of Peter; nevertheless, in *The Boy Castaways of Black Lake Island* photos reveal that Barrie role-played as Captain Swarthy to force the boys to walk the plank (Wullschläger 126). I assume that Peter and Hook are two sides of a coin, and this is probably why Barrie views them both as the protagonist and the antagonist, rather than the hero and the villain. Moreover, Peter and Hook are alike not just in their desires for maternal love but in their dark nature.

Their first mirrored dark element is narcissistic, cruel tyranny. Readers, especially children, may be impressed and terrified by the cruelty of Hook, including his cold-blooded killing of Skylights, and his command of whipping the boys before they walk the plank. Peter, nevertheless, is no less narcissistic and cruel than Hook. His arrogant tyranny is first revealed by his asking John to answer him with "[a]ye, aye, sir" (Barrie *Peter* 66), which has been traditionally used by sailors or pirates to address their captain, making John one of the boys who "serve under [him]" (66). When the boys "seem to be growing up, which is against the rules, Peter thins them out" (72) to fit them into the hollow trees to the underground home. In this way, he represses their sexuality, maturity and manhood. They are prohibited from dressing like Peter, from talking about mothers, from questioning Peter's authority,[55] and from complaining his new adventure of pretending not to have adventures. His tyrannical

[55] Tinker Bell, jealous of Wendy, fakes the order of Peter to ask the Lost Boys to shoot Wendy down, and they do it without any doubt or hesitation.

image is particularly explicit in the following passage, in which the pirates approach the lagoon while the boys are taking rest:

> "Pirates!" he cried. The others came closer to him. A strange smile was playing about his face, and Wendy saw it and shuddered. While that smile was on his face no one dared address him; all they could do was to stand ready to obey. The order came sharply and incisive.
>
> "Dive!" (Barrie *Peter* 117)

Peter here is not dissimilar to Hook. They are both arrogantly dignified: Peter crows whenever he considers himself clever, while Hook is proud of his royal blood and aristocratic breeding, viewing other pirates as his social inferiors. Their narcissism, therefore, leads to their further imitation of each other.

The other common dark element in their personality is their unsociability, which results in their style of leadership. Tyranny can not win sheer loyalty and love from anyone, and Peter tastes its bitter consequence when the Lost Boys are about to leave the Neverland with the Darling children. At that moment they "really scarcely care[]" (Barrie *Peter* 157) him, only fearing "if Peter [i]s not going he ha[s] probably changed his mind about letting them go" (158). Though they implore him to help while the redskins are assaulted by pirates, "almost immediately they repeat[] their good-byes to Peter" (168) and leaves him lonely in the underground home after they think that the redskins have won. In the end of the story, Peter is truly alone,[56] alone in his own worlds of make-believe and adventures. Likewise, Hook suffers from loneliness, "confid[ing] to his faithful bo'sun the story of his life . . . long and earnestly" (82) with a heavy sigh, and often "communing with himself on board ship

[56] There is no sign of the coming of new Lost Boys on the Neverland, while Peter lives with Tinker Bell in the little house he and the boys once built for Wendy; after Tinker Bell dies, he is alone.

in the quietude of the night . . . because he [i]s so terribly alone" (185). Eventually, most of the pirates are killed, and Smee, his trusted bo'sun, wanders around the world bragging that "he [i]s the only man that James Hook ha[s] feared" (209). This is a ironic and tragic footnote on Hook's lonely life and death.

Sharing these dark elements, Peter and Hook imitate each other. Chassagnol and McGavock discuss on this and explain it in terms of a contrast of childhood (Peter) and adulthood (Hook) (210; 46), neglecting its implied narcissistic homoeroticism. In the Mermaid's Lagoon, Peter's imitation of the voice of Hook is so brilliant that Smee and Starkey take the command and release Tiger Lily. This imitation destroys Hook's masculine pride and authoritative captaincy:

> "I am James Hook," replied the voice [of Peter]. "captain of the *Jolly Roger*."
>
> "You are not; you are not," Hook cried hoarsely.
>
> . . . "If you are Hook," [Hook] said almost humbly, "come, tell me, who am I?"
>
> "A codfish," replied the voice [of Peter], "only a codfish."
>
> "A codfish!" Hook echoed blankly; and it was then . . . that his proud spirit broke. He saw his men [Smee and Starkey] draw back from him.
>
> "Have we been captained all this time by a codfish?" they muttered. "It is lowering to our pride" (Barrie *Peter* 124-5).

With the ridiculous and funny tone, the narrator implies how similar these two characters are. Peter, notwithstanding his innocent boyishness and Victorian gentlemanliness, owning the same egocentric leadership as Hook, convinces the pirates that their captain was an incompetent codfish. Likewise, later when Hook

plans to poison Peter, he goes down into Slightly's tree to where Peter sleeps.[57] Since Peter has thinned the Lost Boys to fit in the hollow trees to prevent them from growing-up, these trees are not only the passages into the underground home but also the symbol of eternal childhood. Thus, Hook goes down into Slightly's tree is a symbolic imitation of Peter, implying his reversion of the irreversible process of growing up, as if he has regained his youthhood.

The focus of Peter-Hook relationship then proceeds to their mutual education. In *Peter Pan* Hook is portrayed as a "boy-man," similar to his pirates. Pirates are traditionally reckoned as "boy-men who spend their lives playing games, dressing up in costumes, and living by their own rules . . . most closely resemble older Peter Pan" (Friedman 195) than the orthordoxical masculine figures. Frankly speaking, they belong to an alternative group whose masculinity is unstable because of their incompatibility with the bourgeois society of heterosexual domesticity and moral integrity, living in an all-male isolated space (the pirate ship) and defying the authorities on land. For Hook, being a pirate captain suggests a deviation from the Victorian codes of gentlemanliness he has learned from Eton.

This deviation, however, is neither definite nor thorough. Despite his cruel tyranny, his resistance to fair play (such as biting Peter and assaulting the redskins),[58] his insistence on "[d]own with the King" (190)—all seriously breaking patriotism, the core of the codes, Hook is still troubled by his maddening passion for "good form," the codes of masculinity. This is obvious in the following passage:

---

[57] Hook can fit in Slightly's tree because Slightly is growing up by drinking too much water, and he secretly rebels the order of Peter, to make the tree to fit in him instead of he fitting in the tree. Thus, his tree is bigger than others', and Hook can go down to poison Peter.

[58] In the battle at the Mermaids' Lagoon, when Peter sees that he is higher on the rock than Hook, he "g[i]ve[s] the pirate a hand to help him up" (Barrie *Peter* 128), so that they can fight fairly; however, Hook bites him and claws him by hook twice, which suggest an act of code-breaking. In the battle with the redskins, pirates used to follow the unwritten rules (so did redskins) that the redskins attacked first and then they attacked and defended in turn; nevertheless, this time Hook treacherously assaults first, breaking their mutual rules of battle and the codes of honor.

> "I am the only man whom Barbecue feared," he urged; and Flint himself feared Barbecue."[59]
>
> "Barbecue, Flint – what house?"[60] came the cutting retort [of his own].
>
> Most disquieting reflection of all, was it not bad form to think about good form?
>
> His vitals were tortured by this problem. It was a claw within him sharper than the iron one . . . (Barrie *Peter* 186).

This passage reveals the inner struggle of Hook, who fails to escape the shadows of his school learning. No matter how many great pirates he has defeated, it is trivial compared to "good form" (true masculinity) he forever craves for after he discards it, and his iron hook (fake masculinity) twitches because of this. Hence, he controls himself not to kill Smee, who tends to win on children, since "to claw a man because he is good form" (188) violates the codes of masculinity and turns him into bad form. This explains why his pirate ship is anchored at Kidd's Creek, the harbor Barrie names after Kidd instead of more notorious pirates, such as Blackbeard or Bartholomew Roberts.[61] Unlike Blackbeard and Roberts, who enjoyed pirate life without any sense of guilt, Kidd was a privateer who reluctantly became a pirate captain and claimed his innocence even at the day of hanging.[62] Hence, I believe that

---

[59] Barbecue and Flint are characters from Stevenson's *Treasure Island*. Barbecue, also called Sea-Cook or Long John Silver, is the fictional antagonist who has a parrot on his shoulder and lost one leg while serving in the Royal Navy; he is the quartermaster under the pirate Captain Flint.

[60] Here "house" means the house of public school. Hook's self-question implies that defeating Barbecue means nothing. Since Barbecue is a pirate without gentlemanly breeding, this victory brings no glory and satisfaction to the pre-Etoner as Hook.

[61] Bartholomew Roberts (1682-1722), nicknamed as "Black Bart," was a pirate captain who not only defeated the Royal Navy and cruelly hanged the governor but loved to dress in aristocratic attire and led his pirates with strict regulations, such as forbid them to gamble, to fight, to drink after 8 P. M. and to have women on the ship. Blackbeard (1680-1718), the nickname of Edward Teach, was the most legendarily terrible pirate captain who sometimes killed followers without reason and burned his own beard in battle to create a horrible image before his victims.

[62] Privateer is a captain who marauded ships of other country, and this marauding is officially permitted by the government with one condition that this captain must hand in part of his loots to the

Hook echoes Kidd in that he is a pirate who has inner struggle of "good form."

As a "boy-man," Hook is indignant at Peter, whose impertinently cockiness in the self-unawareness of childhood innocence and whose Victorian gentlemanliness in sense of fair play symbolize the "good form" he desires and fails to grasp. In their final duel, when Peter, instead of stabbing him, allows Hook to pick up the sword, and tells Hook, "I'm youth, I'm joy . . . I'm a little bird that has broken out of the egg," Hook "with a tragic feeling that Peter [i]s showing good form" (206). Yet in this last battle Hook drops the sword while seeing his strange-colored blood, the symbol of his royal blood, and Peter's good form; at this moment, he finally recalls his previous image as an Etoner and his school learning of the codes, as he throws himself into the sea to meet a glorious death. Starting from jealousy but ending in a modeling on Peter's codes of masculinity, Hook sticks to "good form." The narrator shows his sympathy to Hook by renaming him "James" in the end of his duel with Peter Pan.

Compared with Hook, Peter is described as a "man-boy," who learns the boyishness of code-breaking from his destined opponent. Portrayed as a seemingly innocent, heartless, eternal boy, Peter also represents, as I have discussed earlier, Victorian gentlemanliness. This quality prevents him from acting out of the codes of masculinity. Nevertheless, as other boys,[63] he aspires to be a pirate to enjoy code-breaking, since pirates is the romanticized group against all laws and true to its own. After pirates are defeated, Peter and the boys all dress the piratic clothes and behave like the code-breaking pirates. This makes him less gentlemanly and more childlike. In his final duel with Hook, instead of stabbing Hook, Peter kicks Hook

---

government. In William Kidd (1645-1701)'s case, he as a Scottish captain originally only wanted to maraud the non-English ships; however, lacking of food and water supply, his sailors compelled him to maraud even English ships, or they would lead a mutiny. When Kidd returned to England, his aristocratic sponsors all betrayed him by disowning him, bringing about his hanging.

[63] For instance, John agrees to go to the Neverland when he knows that there are pirates. Moreover, John and Michael almost join Hook's crew if their patriotism is not aroused.

while Hook jumps into the sea; hence, Hook dies with satisfaction after seeing the bad form of Peter. After Peter tastes the freshness of wearing Hook's garments, he attempts to bar the window of the Darling's house to prevent Wendy from returning to her mother, which is what he does not dare to do on the Neverland.[64]

With their mutual imitations and their mutual education, Peter and Hook are, as my observations reveal, attracted to each other with implied homoeroticism. Peter's homoeroticism can be seen in his cross-dressing in the pantomime tradition, which means that this character has always played by an actress. According to Elizabeth Howe, until 1660 women have not been allowed to be on stage and all the female characters have been played by boy actors (19-21). Since the Restoration era actress has worn the breeches to play the male role and reverse the traditional gender construction, thus being popular in Britain. The "Principal Boy" (male protagonist) in pantomime inherited female-to-male impersonation, thus leading to the cross-dressing of Peter Pan since 1904. Moreover, Donna White and Anita C. Tarr argue that since the Edwardian laws banned children under fourteen from performing after 9 P. M., the role of Peter could only be played by an actress (*Peter* 164, 167).

However, Marjorie B. Garber disagrees with White and Tarr. She claims, "why, long after pantomime faded as a theatrical vehicle, did the boy Peter remain a woman in Britain?" (177). The femininity of Peter on stage is so virtually disturbing that the child audience would go to the dressing room to confirm Peter's gender.[65] If we consider this with the fact that Hook has always been played by a man, it is easy to notice homoeroticism in their relationship when *Peter Pan* the play was adapted into

[64] When the Lost Boys attempt to stop Wendy from leaving, Peter insists that "[h]e would keep no girl in the Neverland against her will" (Barrie *Peter* 155), asking the redskins and Tinker Bell to guide her on her way home.

[65] Pauline Chase, Barrie's goddaughter, played Peter at 1909, remembered that once a 6-year-old audience appeared in her dressing-room to make sure that Peter was a boy rather than a girl by asking if she can whistle (she whistled then) and what did she think about kissing (she answered, "rotten") (Garber 166-7).

the book version. In addition, I discover that the breeches the cross-dressed actress wore since 1660 symbolized effeminacy in the Victorian and Edwardian era. This may be why when Peter pretends Wendy by dressing her cloak, no pirate discovers his pseudo-female role until he reveals his true identity.

Aside from the cross-dressing of Peter, I find homoeroticism in the effeminate garments, temperament and behavior of Hook. The effeminate attire, including feathered hats, wigs, waistcoats, silk stockings, beeches, and lacy garments, were popular among British aristocracy in the Restoration era; pirates, either intended to model the upper-class or to mock aristocracy, imitated this effeminate style (Garber 180). Since pirate captains did not need to do manual labor (sailing or cleaning the ship, for example), they could spend more time than their subordinates on dressing in effeminate finery. Many notorious pirate captains, from the real ones (Bartholomew Roberts and "Calico Jack" Rackham) to the fictional ones in films (Captain Jack Sparrow in *Pirates of the Caribbean* series) wore and wear effeminate garments. Thus, dressing up belongs to one of the pirate traditions, implying their transgressive deviance against the authorities on land and, paradoxically, their taste (or precisely, their pseudo-royal temperament) as well. Why, however, the effeminate-dressed pirate captains could sustain their masculine leadership? Since these garments belong to the aristocratic men in the Restoration era, and have not been seen as effeminate until the Victorian era, when black suits and sticks symbolized masculinity instead.

Hence, we may understand why Hook, who dresses like Charles II, reveals the homoerotic overtones in the Edwardian context. Barrie's narrations of the garments and appearance of Hook lucidly echo this pirate tradition and homoerotic implication:

> . . . his hair was dressed in long curls, . . . and gave a singularly threatening expression to his handsome countenance. His eyes were of the blue of the forget-me-not, and of a profound melancholy . . . .

> He was never more sinister than when he was most polite . . . . In dress he somewhat aped the attire associated with the name of Charles II, . . . (Barrie *Peter* 76)
>
> The man was not wholly evil; he loved flowers (I have been told) and sweet music (he was himself no mean performer on the harpsichord); and let it be frankly admitted, the idyllic nature of the scene stirred him profoundly (174-5).

"In the dark nature there [i]s a touch of feminine, as in all the great pirates" (125) is the narrator's comment on Hook, and this explains the homoerotic potentials of this pirate captain. He is a man, yet his masculinity is imperfect, signified by his cut-off right arm (by Peter) and his hook as replacement. To solidify his masculine status and self-confidence, he pursues the codes of masculinity; meanwhile, he fears to be devoured by femininity, the female crocodile which has eaten his right arm.[66]

In addition to transvestism, Peter and Hook both carry the second homoerotic overtone: they are leaders of all-male societies. As I have stated in the introduction, Howard P. Chudacoff depicts that gentleman's club was a second home for most *fin-de-siècle* men (42). Club lives enabled them, whose masculinity was in crisis, to exclude female interference and to establish male bonding. All-male groups in this novel—the underground home of Peter and the boys, and Hook's pirate ship—share similarities with Victorian and Edwardian gentleman's clubs. Though Wendy and Tinker Bell also live in the underground home, the former sews as a bourgeois mother, and the latter behaves as an airy fairy, both failing to develop heterosexual relationships with Peter. Similar to Peter and the boys, pirates traditionally also disallow female intrusion on an all-male pirate ship. Under their affectionate

[66] Though Hook always mentions that crocodile as "it," the following lines prove its female identity: "When [redskins] have passed, comes the last figure of all, a gigantic crocodile. We shall see for whom she is looking presently" (Barrie *Peter* 78).

male-bonding lies “the implication of homoerotic desire . . . that goes far beyond camadarie” (Turley 127). Hence, they almost kill the captive Wendy to wash away misfortune and keep this ship homosocial. Moreover, the statistics I have cited in introduction show that since the *fin-de-siècle* gentlemen have been fascinated with boy’s adventure story, whose qualities including games, battles and adventures mark lives of the boys and pirates in *Peter Pan*. Above all, as gentleman’s clubs offered bachelors an alternative domesticity and homosocial atmosphere which provided opportunities for men to enjoy homoeroticism, so do the underground home and the pirate ship, in both accesses to the heterosexual relationships of the mother-craving boys and pirates are hindered. Not only Peter, boys and Hook but pirates like Smee and Starkey pine for motherhood.[67] Their lack of heterosexual desire enables homoerotic relationship more likely to develop, particularly between Peter and Hook.

The last yet most powerful evidence of homoeroticism in Peter-Hook relationship is their passionate eagerness to meet, to kill, and to have each other. Forcing the boys to leave Hook to him in an open fight, Peter is excited rather than angry at this male grown-up. He swears “Hook or me this time” (182, 196) before their final duel; however, “[h]e [i]s frightfully happy” (182) while saying this, and he wears a “strange smile on his face” (205) while claiming that “this man is mine” (205). On the other hand, Hook is passionate to destroy Peter, his mirrored image and alter ego. Both Hook and the narrator express the emotion of Hook with implied homoeroticism, such as “[m]ost of all, . . . I want their captain, Peter Pan” (82) “I want Peter Pan, who first gave the brute [the female crocodile] its taste for me” (83), “[i]t [i]s Pan he want[s], Pan and Wendy and their band, but chiefly Pan” (165), “[i]t

[67] Often sitting by the sewing machine on the pirate ship, Smee whispers to Wendy, “I will save you if you promise to be my mother” (Barrie *Peter* 191), implying his desire for motherhood. Starkey shares the same desire when his hat becomes the new nest of the mother Neverbird, and when he ends in being “captured by the redskins, who ma[k]e him nurse for all their papooses” (209).

[i]s Peter's cockiness . . . ma[k]e[s] [Hook's] iron claw twitch, and at night it disturb[s] him like an insect" (165, 167), "[h]is hand sh[akes], but it [i]s in exultation rather than in shame" (176) while he drops the poison into Peter's medicine.

It is not coincidence that Peter does not have such strong feelings to any other men, neither does Hook to any other boys. This fact enhances their homoerotic relationship. One of the two most homoeroticism-implied scenes is their climbing to the Marooner's Rock:

> Neither knew that the other was coming. Each feeling for a grip met the other's arm: in surprise they raised their heads; their faces were almost touching; so they met . . . . But Peter had no sinking, he had one feeling only, gladness; and he gnashed his pretty teeth with joy . . . . He gave the pirate a hand to help him up.
>
> It was then that Hook bit him (127-8).

Through sensual proximity, genuine gladness and Peter's helping hand, between two enemies there is a strange intimacy. Hook's biting at Peter Pan hints his desire to devour him and integrate ideal masculinity into himself.

The other famous homoerotic scene echoes the desire of Hook's devouring and integration into Peter Pan. It is Peter's second and ultimate imitation of Hook. After Hook and the pirates are defeated, all the boys get on pirate attire and start behaving like sailors. Yet none of their imitation of the pirates can compare with Peter's. He calls himself "Captain Pan" and treats them "as dogs, and they dare[] not express their wishes to him . . . [i]nstant obedience [i]s the only safe thing" (213). Peter's imitation, however, is not limited to the level of title and behavior. He even wears "some of Hook's wickedest garments," has "Hook's cigar-holder in his mouth," and bends his forefinger "threateningly aloft like a hook" (213). Despite his ostensible scornfulness to Hook, by inheriting his effeminacy (Hook's garments) and erotic phallicism

(Hook's cigar and hook) Peter homoerotically integrates Hook into himself.

From then on, Peter and Hook are mingled into one. In *Peter Pan*, after the pirates are defeated, Peter refuses to sleep with other boys in the pirates' bunks but "f[a]ll[s] asleep by the side of Long Tom" (211). This can be seen as Hook's piracy and tendency to male adventure instill into Peter's personalities. Though Peter eventually takes off Hook's garments, re-dresses his original clothes of skeleton leaves, and seems to forget his nemesis, he finally chooses to leave feminized domesticity (regardless of his eternal craving for it) by allowing Wendy to return to London home, living alone (after Tinker Bell dies) in the small house the boys once built for Wendy instead of the underground home, the symbol of Victorian bourgoeis family, and enjoying male adventures afterwards. These prove the integration of Hook into him, which becomes the theme in the sequel, *Peter Pan in Scarlet* (2006).[68] Thus, Peter does not have to remember Hook, who is like him and unlike him, understands him and yet repulses him, passionate to see him and maddening to kill him. Hook will be forever his one and only deadly, homoerotic alter ego.

After interpreting the Peter-Hook homoerotic relationship, I am going to compare it with two homoerotic enemy duos: Tom Brown and Flashman in *Tom Brown's Schooldays,* and Sherlock Holmes and Professor James Moriarty in *Sherlock Holmes.* I believe that the intertextuality between *Peter Pan* and these two references is not coincidental but correlating. For example, Flashman in *Tom Brown's Schooldays* resembles Hook. They are both older than their archenemies, their class enables them to study in the public school (Flashman at Rugby and Hook at Eton), both are the

[68] *Peter Pan in Scarlet* (2006), written by Geraldine McCaughrean, is the official sequel of *Peter Pan.* In this sequel Peter and other characters (Wendy, John, the Lost Boys) who transform themselves from adults to children go to find the treasures Hook once hid on the Neverpeak. In the journey Peter is served by Ravello, the circus master and the alias of Hook, who escaped the female crocodile. By persuading Peter to wear his old pirate garment and copying his hair style, Ravello (Hook) makes Peter a small version of Hook, inheriting his characteristics as a tyrannical, arrogant pirate captain.

leaders in the all-male societies with homoerotic overtones, and both are bullies who dare not to play fair. With regard to *Sherlock Holmes*, apart from Doyle-Barrie friendship and the resemblance among Oscar Wilde (another friend of Doyle), Hook and Holmes in their dandical decadence, which I have stated in the introduction, there are many similaries between Hook and Moriarty. They both receive high education, acquire masculine leadership in the criminal organizations and yet also have homoerotic potentials. Due to the fact that both the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes* get published earlier than *Peter Pan* and remain popular in the Edwardian Britain, I am convinced of their correlation of intertextuality with *Peter Pan*.

Rugby, the main setting in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*, is "a womanless, male 'paradise' where boys can revel in seeming autonomy and completeness" (Hall "Muscular Anxiety" 333). To be more precise, women at Rugby are confined into the traditional roles of feminized domesticity, such as matrons or the family members of the headmaster, thereby preventing any possible development of heterosexual relationship at school. This exclusion of female participation in everyday life, however, evokes homoerotic overtones among male students. Compared with Tom, who is the new-comer of gentleman class, Flashman is older, bigger and wealthier. Tom loves the adventurous and athletic life, while Flashman prefers to bully weak boys than to play fairly on the sports ground, failing to "[translate] his sexual energy into socially acceptable forms" (Harrington 16) and breaking the codes of masculinity.

Tom and Flashman, nevertheless, share some similarities in homoeroticism. When Flashman and his followers press Tom against the mantelpiece to "roast" Tom, Flashman even "draw[s] [Tom's] trousers tight by way of extra torture" (Hughes *Tom Brown's Schooldays* 135), implying sadism in this symbolic rape scene (Hall "Muscular Anxiety" 339; Harrington 16). Later, when Flashman dares not to play fair, he harms his own head in the fight with Tom and East, and eventually drops out of

school because of his unintentional drunkenness. Though Flashman never appears in the later part of the book, his characteristics are mingled into Tom's, like Hook's into Peter's. For example, Tom reveals a strong homophobia by bullying an effeminate boy whom the narrator, as I have mentioned in the introduction, implies as a homosexual prostitute of the powerful old boy like Flashman (Hall 340; Puccio 63-4).[69] Tom later even establishes homoerotic friendship with Arthur, his "angel in the house."[70] Conclusively, from the homoerotic aspect Tom and Flashman mirror each other, regardless of the former's ideal masculinity and the latter's moral insanity.

As Tom and Flashman, Holmes and Moriarty in *Sherlock Holmes* share similarities in many aspects. They both have the advantage of height.[71] Both are from the upper-middle class.[72] Both are the authorities in their own fields—the former is "the last court of appeal" (Vol I 333), while the latter "the Napoleon of crime" (740). Their careers, a rational detective versus a math professor, both mark masculinity. Moreover, both are compared by the narrator as an omniscient spider.[73] Above all, they strikingly resemble each other in homoeroticism. Both do not marry and instead develop the intimate friendships: Holmes with Watson, his roommate, comrade, biographer and best friend; Moriarty with Colonel Sebastian Moran, his "chief of staff" (Vol II 176) and "the bosom friend of [him]" (Vol I 771).[74]

---

[69] Mavis Reimer (1995) states that *Tom Brown's Schooldays* in addition to the Arnoldian moral narrative, there is a hint of "homosexual activity . . . [as] the ultimate betrayal in the schoolboy honor code" (Martin 490). John Addington Symonds even points out that "[e]very boy of good looks had a female name, and was recognized either as a public prostitute or as some bigger fellow's 'bitch'" (94).

[70] The Tom-Arthur homoerotic friendship will be explored with details in Chapter 2 and 3.

[71] Holmes is "over six feet and so excessively lean" (Vol I 11); Moriarty is "extremely tall and thin" (741).

[72] As for their social status, Holmes recalls his ancestors as "country squires" (Vol I 683), while Moriarity "is a man of good birth and excellent education" who teaches math in many universities.

[73] In *The Cardboard Box* Holmes "love[s] to lie in the very centre of five millions of people, with his filaments stretching out and running through them, responsive to every little rumour or suspicion of unsolved crime" (Vol II 357). Moriarty in *The Final Problem* is "like a spider in the centre of its web, but that web has a thousand radiations, and he knows well every quiver of each of them" (Vol I 740).

[74] In the 2011 movie adaptation *Sherlock Holmes: A Game of Shadows* (2011), directed by Guy Ritchie, friendship between Moriarty (starring Jared Harris) and Moran (starred Paul Anderson) is compared to that between Holmes (starring Robert Downey Jr.) and Watson (starring Jude Law). When Holmes is tortured by Moriarty in a German arsenal, Moran attempts to hunt down Watson under the command of

Holmes and Moriarty mirror each other, so do their intimate friends. Both Watson and Moran are the notable shooters in the Afghan War,[75] and both reveal strongly emotional intimacy before their friends. When Holmes "dies" with Moriarty under the falls of Reichenbach in *The Final Problem*, Watson mourns Holmes by publishing the cases of adventures they had together; however, the death of his best friend "has created a void . . . which the lapse of two years has done little to fill" (737)[76]. On the other hand, though his boss can no longer pay him salary, Moran insists on chasing Holmes for three years to avenge Moriarty, finally falling into the trap and getting caught by Scotland Yard in *The Empty House*.

In other words, Moriarty is the embodiment of the dark side and the alter ego of Holmes, as Hook to Peter and Flashman to Tom. With so many similarities listed above, an intense death-drive lay in the relationship of Holmes and Moriarty.[77] In their first confrontation, Moriarty tells Holmes that "[i]f you are clever enough to bring destruction upon me, rest assured that I shall do as much to you" (743), and Holmes replies that he would "cheerfully accept the latter" (743) if he can achieve the former. In his last words to Watson, Holmes emphasizes that "no possible conclusion to it [his detective career] could be more congenial to [him] than this [dying with Moriarty]" (754). Such desires to be destroyed by their counterparts reflect the same narcissistic homoeroticism as in the relationship of Peter and Hook. The ending of Holmes and Moriarty, two figures of masculinity—falling into the waterfalls, the

---

Moriarty. At the moment Watson accidentally collapses the room which prisons Holmes by cannon, both Moran and Watson forget each other, rushing to save their professor and detective. Moran, always detached with dark humour, suddenly becomes outrageous when he digs Moriarty (harmed but alive) from the debris, swearing to kill Watson and the wounded Holmes in the later drastic chase in the forest, though eventually he fails. This adaptation deepens and elaborates homoerotic friendship between Moriarty and Moran in *The Final Problem* and *The Empty House*.

[75] Watson as a retired army doctor often carries a revolver in his case-solving adventure with Holmes, while Moran as a famous hunter and sniper twice intends to kill Holmes with the air gun of Moriarty.

[76] Holmes symbolically dies in 1891, while he resurrects and reunites with Watson in 1894. This mourning remarks by Watson, however, are from his publication of *The Final Problem* in 1893, so he mentions it as "two years" instead of "three years."

[77] "Mors," the root of "Moriarty," means "death" in Latin.

symbol of femininity (Kestner 115) —also mirrors the ending of Hook: devoured by the female crocodile in the sea.

Notwithstanding the death of his nemesis, the "resurrected" Holmes is no longer a perfect masculine paradigm. Having integrated some dark elements of Moriarty, he enhances his "boy-man" qualities of bohemianism and preference to adventure, turning from a law-defender to a law-breaker.[78] Though he breaks laws for justice instead of moral degradation, his self-comment, "I have always had an idea that I would have made a highly efficient criminal," (Vol I 914) marks his potential in criminality, which he seldom unlocks before he "dies" with Moriarty. When their characteristics integrate, there is no need for Moriarty to exist. Yet Holmes forever remembers his nemesis and alter ego.[79] Their deadly relationship with implied homoeroticism accompanies Holmes from his climax of detective career to the end.

In a nutshell, the cult of boyhood, the fashion of boy's adventure story and the revival of chivalry codes of masculinity lead to homoerotic overtones in the all-male spaces. The concept of homoeroticism emerges in Victorian and Edwardian crossover fictions, not only *Peter Pan* but also *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and *Sherlock Holmes.* In the next chapter I will shift my focus to another classic of Edwardian children's literature and crossover fiction, *The Wind in the Willows,* to analyze its homoeroticism in male domesticity and gentlemanly leisure in nature by probing the friendship of the four major male characters.

[78] For example, Holmes steals in *Charles Augustus Milverton* and *The Illustrious Client,* housebreaks in *The Bruce-Partington Plans, The Retired Colourman, Charles Augustus Milverton, The Disappearance of Lady Frances Carfax* and *The Illustrious Client,* and releases good criminals in *The Three Students, The Sussex Vampire, The Devil's Foot, The Abbey Grange, Charles Augustus Milverton, Shoscombe Old Place* and *The Three Gables.*

[79] For example, Holmes still mentions Moriarty in *His Last Bow*, which relates the last case of Holmes in 1914, twenty-three years after the demise of Moriarty in 1891.

Chapter 2

Only Nostalgic? Homoerotic Male Domesticity in *The Wind in the Willows*

In the previous chapters, I have made some critical surveys of the Edwardian links between the cult of boyhood and the worship of Pan. Such links shape boy-Pan into two images: one is adventurous in children's playground with innocence and fantasy, while the other is delightful in rural retreat with animals and nature. Both images are intentionally exclusive of heterosexual relationship. If Barrie's Peter Pan represents the former, the four animal major characters—Mole, Rat, Badger and Toad—in Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* highlight the latter. Like Barrie, Grahame strives to integrate Victorian nostalgia and Edwardian adventurism into his works, creating a world of male domesticity with an exclusion of heterosexual amorousness. What differs Grahame's text from Barrie's is that death and cruelty exist on the Neverland, while the Riverbank society in *The Wind in the Willows* is serene, stable and arcadian.

Many critics agree that arcadia is a male dream of nostalgic childhood, and Pan is the god of the all-male arcadia.[80] In the Edwardian era, people began to miss the orderly, peaceful Englishness of pre-World War I era. Thus, the Edwardian writers like Kenneth Grahame, Frances Hodgson Burnett and Beatrix Potter expressed their desires to return to the idyllic childhood in countryside,[81] to pursue the "rural simplicity, traditional stability" and to protest against "the impact of industrial, urban, capitalist culture" (Watkins 167). Apart from this, as I have broached in the introduction, since the late-Victorian era women and femininity have been viewed as the synonym of sensitivity, emotionalism, and even hysteria, while men and

[80] These critics include Peter Hunt, Lois R. Kuznets, Seth Lerer and Jackie Wullschläger.
[81] As for Burnett, see her *The Secret Garden*, briefly mentioned in note 27 in Chapter 1. Concerning Potter, I will discuss her writing style and works in Chapter 3.

masculinity have been labeled as rationality, perseverance and courage. Hence, British men flew from feminized domesticity to two major all-male domestic spaces: gentleman's clubs in reality and arcadian worlds in fiction. The Riverbank Society in *The Wind in the Willows* belongs to the latter category as a bachelor paradise with childhood memory free of heterosexual problems.

As John David Moore states, "in children's literature it is adult who gives us children's Arcadia . . . childhood becomes Arcadia only when recaptured in adulthood" (47), the Edwardian nostalgia brings men back to their childhood in the pastoral spaces of male domesticity. In *The Wind in the Willows* nature "is not red in tooth and claw, but a nurturing, idyllic, cozy world" for one to "escape the pressure of adult responsibilities" (Philip 99). Meanwhile, most male characters are not wild beasts but child-bachelor animals, who pursue sensual pleasures through wandering in the woods, playing by the River, and chatting with friends. Enjoying the invariable natural rhythms with sincere friendships, they are the fictionalized Edwardian "old boys," among whom Grahame found his place.

2.1 Kenneth Grahame: The Gentleman of Idyllic Friendship

Kenneth Grahame (1859-1932) in all his lifetime craved for an arcadian past, a warm home surrounded by peaceful nature. It is not only because that he was born in the mid-Victorian era, the most stable period of the Empire, in a rich Edinburgh family, but due to his tragic childhood. His mother died at childbirth when he was five. After three years his father flew overseas and later died in France, while sending the children to live with his grandmother. These two tragedies intensified Grahame's longing for home and sadness for the loss of home, which then became the theme of *The Wind in the Willows*. Yet Grahame did have compensation. The house of his grandmother at Cookham, Berkshire, was surrounded by idyllic gardens, orchards and the Thames. Roaming along the river since childhood comforted him in his years at St.

Edward's school (the public school) at Oxford, for the pastoral landscape and the primeval Thames brought him sense of home and of nature (Green 43).

His dream of maintaining this arcadian retreat through entering Oxford University, however, was shattered when his uncle refused to provide him financial support. Grahame instead worked at the Bank of England, one of the most conservative, stable institutions. This vocation then haunted him for twenty-nine years, yet it was also his "haven which ensured financial security and superficial conformity" (Wullschläger 168). Without it a bourgeois man like him would be deprived of social respects, like the penniless gentleman Toad.[82] This emphasis of the bourgeois financial security also makes the nostalgic world of animals in *The Wind in the Willows* constructed by not rural farmers but bourgeois gentlemen, particularly the down-to-earth Mole (Moore 59). Nevertheless, Grahame's free soul needed to escape, escaping from this conservative vocation. As Mole takes a holiday and meets Rat by the River, so did Grahame seek leisure in holidays and stimulate creativity through homosociality. He not only travelled to Italy, having had a great passion to the southern Europe ever since (Hunt xii), but also developed many genuine friendships in the intellectual and artistic societies. It was a real pleasure for him to spend time rowing and chatting with his male friends, particularly Arthur Quiller-Couch.

Yet nothing can fully express his idyllic nostalgia except writing. In his first book *Pagan Papers* (1893) Grahame described Pan as a desexed, solitary wanderer by the Thames, who talks with animals and nature, as well as lures busy urban men to the mythical countryside by piping. This image of Pan not only echoes the thriving Neo-paganism since the *fin-de-siècle*[83] but reveals what Grahame longed for.

---

[82] The links between sense of security, social status and money on Toad will be discussed in the second part of this chapter.

[83] Neo-paganism, according to W. F. Barry's criticism for the *Quarterly Review* in 1891, is a widely spread movement which has something to do with the late-Victorian decadence and the decline of the Empire. The literary and social descents led to the public reminiscence of the Greek paganism, which

Likewise, in his *The Golden Age* (1895) he recreated his idealized, Thames-side village life at Cookham by using metaphors of Greek mythology to portray the lives of some orphans in a country house of their relatives. In its sequel *Dream Days* (1898) Grahame kept romanticizing his childhood and disclosing his desire of non-growing up, as later Barrie did in *Peter Pan*.

His successful publication brought him an unexpected consequence: Elspeth Thomson, one of the fans of *The Golden Age,* fell in love with him. Through their love letters in baby-talk tone Grahame revealed his uncertainty for heterosexuality and husbandly duties, probably due to his twenty-year London bachelorhood (Green 227). They got married in 1899; however, during their honeymoon at St. Ives, the fishing village of Fowey, Cornwall, since none of his bachelor friends liked his bride, Grahame left her ashore and went rowing with them. From then on, he preferred male companionship to the married life, and Elspeth's love to social life at Kensington drives this unfortunate couple more apart in life style (Wullschläger 157, 162). Even after the Grahames moved to the countryside, they continued "lived in separate parts of the house . . . with this nocturnal separation of the sexes" (Green 304). They both pinned all the hopes on their only son Alastair, whose right eye was blind and the left one squint. Nevertheless, Grahame neglected Alastair's handicap and kept training his son to fulfill his own dream—attending Oxford, until this doomed child committed suicide on the railway track as an undergraduate of Oxford in 1920.

Dull married life had hindered Grahame's publication for eight years, yet it did not hinder his imagination. *The Wind in the Willows* came from a bedtime story for Alastair during 1904-5 as both a father-son link and Grahame's reminiscence of his own childhood. Encouraged by Alastair and Constance Smedley,[84] Grahame reflamed

---

was opponent to the modern Christianity (Hallet 163-4).

[84] Smedley was a journalist of the American magazine *Everybody's* who visited Grahame at Cookham

his creativity and published *The Wind in the Willows* (1908). This work shows Grahame's nostalgia for the romanticized, ordered, idyllic Victorian past and his fear of the modern, riotous, technophilic Edwardian present (Lerer 265): the cautious Mole, the poetic Rat and the patriarchal Badger belong to the former, while the theatrical Toad represents the latter. Moreover, Grahame also wished for an escape from marriage to have a faraway adventure, just like the globe-travelling of Sea Rat (especially to Italy) in *The Wind in the Willows*. For Grahame, only through story-writing, -telling and -reading could he reconcile his nostalgia and his wish.

Aside from his love to Alastair, his unhappy married life, and his longing for gentlemanly leisure and overseas adventures, Grahame writes *The Wind in the Willows* under the influence of Alfred Lord Tennyson, the most notable Victorian poet laureate. Like Grahame, Tennyson is "essentially a poet of the countryside" (Greenblatt 1112), conducting poetry of rural serenity and of reminiscing friendship. Like Grahame, Tennyson reveals "his emphasis on the corrosiveness of female sexuality" (Gilbert 864) in the four idylls published in 1859: "Vivien," "Guinevere," "Enid," and "Elaine."

Above all, the Arthurian chivalric codes of loyalty, friendship and honor intensely influenced both Tennyson and Grahame in the Victorian bourgeois context of domesticity. Hence, they both developed strong homoerotic friendships in real life and wrote about male intimacy in their works (Machann 207,213). In his long poem *In Memoriam A. H. H.*(1849) Tennyson compares himself to a heartbroken widower, viewing Arthur Hallam, his deceased best friend, as "[d]ear as the mother to the son,/ More than my brothers are to me" (Greenblatt 1145). Moreover, in his poem "Ulysses" (1842) Tennyson transforms the ending of heterosexual family in Homer's *Odyssey* into the homosocial, masculine adventures under sail and, above all, shows

(Grahame moved his family back to Cookham in 1906), trying to persuade him to resume writing.

his death wish to reunite with Hallam in Elysium, as Odysseus reunites with Achilles in Hades (Rosenberg 313).[85] Likewise, in Chapter 12 "The Return of Ulysses" in *The Wind in the Willows* Grahame makes an allusion to the restoration of order and homecoming of Odysseus. Nevertheless, his focus is no longer the heterosexual relationship (as that between Odysseus, Penelope and the suitors) or the father-son relationship (as that between Odysseus and Telemachus) but the heart-stirring gentlemen's friendship between the four major characters.

Like *Peter Pan*, *The Wind in the Willows* is ambiguous in its readership. Most Edwardian critics like H. L. Nevinson and Arthur Ransome think of this book as meant for adults, since the animal characters are more like nostalgic young men than real animals. Recent critics, however, have different notions. Mary Haynes and Bonnie Gaarden use the domestic structure to prove that this book is meant for the child. Peter Hunt considers that this work "epitomizes the *adult's* ideas of the children's book" (12) and attempts to discuss the importance of social hierarchy in its animal world. Tess Cosslett believes that its animal characters can be "identified as members of a leisured, masculine elite. But their protected, irresponsible, sexless existence also corresponds to a version of childhood" (174).

In my opinion, *The Wind in the Willows* partly aims for children because it originates from the bedtime stories to Alastair, describing the childish, adventurous Toad as the original hero.[86] This book is not *merely* for children, however, since the vital figure is not Toad, though he remains the most popular character among child

[85] For homoerotic friendship between Tennyson and Hallam, John D. Rosenberg evidences it by doubting why all the letters between them two were destroyed by Hallam's father and Tennyson's son after they died. Aside from this, no hints of homosexuality is found in the *Memoir* (1897) of Tennyson, edited by Tennyson's son, because this work was published after Wilde's 1895 trials in the homophobic British society (305).

[86] The adventures of Toad is also the part first created (on his story letters to his son in 1907 when Alastair was sent to have a holiday with a governess) before Grahame began to design the whole plot of *The Wind in the Willows*. In addition, Wullschläger pins down the similarities between Toad and Alastair. Toad is a naughty boy with passing fancy and hot temper, while Alastair, when he walked with his governess in Kensington Gardens, tended to kick and slap other children (158).

readers. For Grahame, the core of *The Wind in the Willows* is friendship, symbolized by the River. John David Moore broaches that “Grahame's ideal animal is the urban bachelor, the man of leisure, the old boy, the tourist in the country who has decided to stay, bringing the misogynous values of the men's club into the rural cottage”(52). Rat, the gentleman of homosociality, male domesticity, and nature (especially the River)-loving, is the real vital figure among the four major characters, for he represents the ideal masculine image Grahame has been desiring to own.

Apart from this, friendship between Mole and Rat is the most genuine, most intimate among many friendships in *The Wind in the Willows*. Mole, as Neil Philip broaches, is “a fantasy image of Grahame” (99), due to his bourgeois life of financial security and his pursuit of homosociality in the Riverbank society. Compared with Mole, Rat is both the idealized Grahame and his best friend, leading him into the world of carefree male friendship, which is, as Neil Philip and Jackie Wullschläger both agree, what Grahame values most in his lifetime (103; 155). The archetype of Rat is Arthur Quiller-Couch, a rowing-lover who “often had the author [Grahame] to stay at his house” at Fowey (Flood, n. pag.). It was also at Fowey, Grahame rowed with Quiller-Couch and other Cornwall friends, abandoning his newly-wedded Elspeth ashore. Above all, it was also the daughter of Quiller-Couch whom Grahame dedicated to the first edition of *The Wind in the Willows*. These pieces of evidence make Quiller-Couch more likely the archetype of Rat, and also make Rat and Mole, the friendly duo, rather than the self-conceited Toad, the center of this novel. In other words, male domesticity and homoerotic intimacy in the Rat-Mole cohabited life marks *The Wind in the Willows,* as that in the Hallam-Tennyson friendship marks *In Memoriam* and “Ulysses.” They also make *The Wind in the Willows*, like *Peter Pan,* not just a text intended for children or adults but as one of the classics of crossover fiction among Edwardian children’s literature.

2.2 Victorian Nostalgia vs. Edwardian Adventurism

To understand nature and friendship, the very spirits of *The Wind in the Willows*, I first dissect how Grahame depicts his Pan, since it is the piping and whispers of Pan through the reeds echoing the title of this book. As "the Friend and Helper" (Grahame 115) of animals, Pan appears as a gentle male deity of nature and friendship, unlike Barrie's aggressive, adventurous, wild Peter "Pan" (Guroian 89-90). Though Lois R. Kuznets delineates that Grahame intends to "father" nature by portraying Pan as a male god who protects an all-male animal society (175-6), I believe that instead of "fathering" nature, Grahame "mothers" Pan, providing Pan a sense of male domesticity. For instance, when Pan appears, the author still addresses Nature as "she,"[87] while Pan "with kindly eyes that [are] looking down on [Mole and Rat] humorously," and Portly sleeps between his hooves, "as a child that has fallen happily asleep in its nurse's arms" (Grahame 115). In the introduction I have stated that the equality of femininity and domesticity since the *fin-de-siècle* gradually drove men away from the domestic sphere; hence, the gentle way of nursing and protection offered by Grahame's Pan can be viewed as an alternative domesticity—that is, male domesticity. This "motherly" image of Pan makes him not only a patron of nature and friendship but of bachelor friendship in male domesticity. Hence, it explains why it is Mole and Rat who find Portly, the lost baby of Otter, rather than Otter himself: Otter is a married man, while Mole and Rat are the cohabited bachelor friends with an intense male bonding.

The protection of Pan for Portly suggests a link between childhood and the spirit of nature, the supernatural, and mythical deity. Elizabeth Hale argues that childhood innocence and unsocialized animal instinct make Portly closer to nature

[87] It comes from Chapter 7 "The Piper at the Gates of Dawn" that Nature "seem[s] to hold her breath for the event [the emergence of Pan]" (Grahame 114).

than the socialized Mole and Rat. To evidence her argument, she cites that while the awestruck Mole and Rat forget everything about Pan after they discover Portly, Portly wakes up and cries bitterly at the disappearance of Pan (201-4). Yet I disagree with Hale's argument. Truly, forgetfulness is the bliss Pan gives to animals after they meet him; however, for adults slip of memory and sense of loss bring nostalgia. Portly's slight awareness of Pan implies that only child can help adults retrieve their nostalgic memory of childhood. Hence, among them three only Rat, the representation of nostalgic idyll and intimate friendship (Wullschläger 162-3), hears the messages of Pan through reeds and then dreams about Pan.

Grahame's Pan implies Victorian nostalgia, yet Grahame expresses not merely his preference to the Victorian past but his anxiety to Edwardian adventurism. Mole, the fictionalized Grahame, faces two different trends on his friends: Badger and Rat represent Victorian nostalgia, while Toad signifies Edwardian adventurism. As Seth Lerer clarifies, *The Wind in the Willows* starts on the home-leaving of Mole and his acquaintance with Rat by the River—the bourgeois social space since the late-Victorian era.[88] The plot moves onto Edwardian adventurism through Toad's gipsy carriage-riding, and shifts back to the mid-Victorian country house of Badger and male domesticity in the Mole End, juxtaposing the Edwardian technophilia and theatricality through Toad's adventures and the Victorian nostalgia of Mole and Rat on Pan's island (265). In the end, Grahame mingles these two trends through taming the riotous, working-class Wild Wooders and highlighting the home-returning/-retaking of Toad. This ending retrieves nostalgic Victorian past and keeps Edwardian dreams of adventure in poetry and storytelling.

[88] The river-rowing is a fashion for the middle-class in Britain since the 1880s, represented in Jerome K. Jerome's *Three Men in a Boat* (1889), describing the misadventures of three youths on the Thames. Grahame in *The Wind in the Willows* probably replays Jerome's river-rowing scene on his Mole and Rat (Lerer 265), or more likely, uses his own experience of rowing with Arthur Quiller-Couch at Fowey.

Badger is, as Hunt and W. W. Robson point out, an old English aristocrat, who owns a Victorian country house, acts in courteous yet reserved manner, and holds patriarchal authority (66; 128). Though Badger lives underground as Mole, he is different from the lower-middle class Mole since he does not participate in any manufacturing, business or professions.[89] His home is inherited from the ancient "city of people" (Grahame 62), hinted at Roman Empire, symbolizing his royal lineage and aristocratic breeding. In addition, the country house of a Victorian gentleman is a "stately home" to suit the rank of its owner, but it also provides comfortable and private spaces for close friendship rather than only luxurious rooms for showing off (Girouard 15-6). The home of Badger, with a kitchen mixed of *Beowulf* heroism and Victorian homosociality,[90] a food-filled storeroom, and a big and ancient hall, along with the gentlemanly spaces and furniture (such as armchairs and study) provided, meets all the requirements of a Victorian country house, and reveals the social status of its owner.

Owning a country house does not mean owning the gentlemanly merits, yet Badger is a perfect Victorian aristocrat in his manners. He "hates Society, and invitations, and dinner" (Grahame 33), just like Grahame desired to escape from the social Elspeth. However, he is courteous and generous to those who seek his help. He welcomes the almost frozen Mole and Rat, who are lost in the Wild Wood, into his house, mends Mole's wound, provides them hearty meals and offers them beds to sleep. He also kindly takes in two young, working-class stray hedgehogs, and sends a servant to accompany them to find the right way to their mother. He is, nevertheless,

[89] Simon Gunn argues that in the Victorian era both the aristocratic and the bourgeois class owned properties; what differentiated them is a link of the latter to manufacturing, trade and professions (14, 23).

[90] Badger's kitchen is described as "a place where heroes could fitly feast after victory" (51) and "where two or three friends of simple tastes could sit about as they pleased and eat and smoke and talk in comfort and contentment" (52). The former image reminds me of the similar scenes in *Beowulf*, while the latter is the very scene of Victorian male homosociality and male domesticity.

also steady and reserved, revealing a typical English character. He has great self-control of his own temper, "not seem[ingly] surprised or shocked at anything" (53); this differs him from other gentlemanly animals, who all tend to get agitated or passionate.[91] His attitude toward friends is warm but controlled, "greeting them all in his quiet, simple way" (59) when they come and "bidding them a hasty good-bye, push[ing] them hurriedly through the opening" (64) when they are about to leave.

The last element that marks his aristocracy is his patriarchal authority, reflected on both his mention of Rat as "my dear little man" (49) and his strong sense of duty for friends and his powerful leadership in the animal world. Gaarden describes Badger as a paternal arbiter, protecting the stray Mole in an authoritative manner (44) by telling him, "I'll pass the word round to-morrow, and I think you'll have no further trouble. Any friend of *mine* walks where he likes in this country [the Wild Wood], or I'll know the reason why!" (Grahame 63). His aristocratic mentality is also reflected in his naïve attempt to single-handedly retake the Toad Hall with only his stick, the symbol of Victorian gentleman, since he believes the inferior (the working-class Wild Wooders who have occupied the Toad Hall by violence) will fear a superior like him. Hunt also relates that Badger is a fatherly protector that "Grahame is searching, for Grahame was deprived of his own father in childhood" (67). This is obvious in his paternal lecture trying to convert the naughty, arrogant Toad many times in the name of Toad's father, his old friend, and his attempt to "take Toad seriously in hand" (Grahame 54) by commanding Mole and Rat to lock Toad from indulging in the motor car, the symbol of Edwardian technology. Mark Girouard defines mid-Victorian

[91] For example, Rat is anxious about the upcoming battle of retaking the Toad Hall, keeping murmuring to himself and allotting weapons to his friends (though Badger, who is so calm that he even sleeps hours before the battle breaks out, attempts to decline). Otter, who also belongs to the middle-class (lower than Rat and higher than Mole), "thr[o]w[s] himself on the Rat with an embrace and a shout of affectionate greeting" (Grahame 57) when he finds Mole and Rat in Badger's house. Mole is often excited as well, crying "O my!" or "hurray!" anytime he is surprised or happy. Toad is the least socialized among them, and his childishness prevents him from hiding his feelings and emotions (he then becomes the one who sheds tears most in the whole book), totally opposite to Badger.

aristocracy as "the natural head of his parish or district . . . To him the poor man should look up for protection; those in doubt or difficulty for advice; the ill disposed for reproof or punishment; the deserving, or all classes, for consideration and hospitality" (4-5). Badger meets such a definition of the aristocrat, similar to Mycroft Holmes in Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes*.[92] This reveals Grahame's Victorian nostalgia in *The Wind in the Willows.*

Another representative of Victorian nostalgia is Rat, the upper-middle class gentleman of male domesticity, homosocial leisure, and idyllic nature. Girouard also indicates that "to a Victorian gentleman his house was a temple not of taste but of domestic virtues, its privacy only accessible to his family and friends" (15), and this remark can be perfectly adopted to depict the house of Rat. Rat lives in "a nice snug . . . bijou riverside residence" (Grahame 4), where he and Mole later cohabit to have carefree chats in the armchairs by the fireside. Aside from this, though Rat has at least one servant,[93] he is fond of doing "small domestic jobs about the house" (34), and even ready to prepare dinner for Mole at the Mole End.[94] No wonder Lerer calls Rat as "a man of the house" (270), confirming his Victorian male domesticity.

Living as a nostalgic gentleman bachelor by the River, Rat, unlike the secluded Badger, enjoys the warm homosocial leisure in the Riverside community. I have

---

[92] Mycroft Holmes, the elder brother of Sherlock Holmes, earns 450 pounds a year and works in Whitehall. As Badger, Mycroft tends to shun the society by going nowhere except his home at Pall Mall Street (where the London upper-class lived), Whitehall, and the Diogenes Club (where the unsociable gentlemen gather to read periodicals in the cozy atmosphere with conversations prohibited). As Badger has authoritative leadership over other animals, Mycroft excels Sherlock in intellect and deductions, representing the British government to a large extent. As Badger expresses generosity and protection to the poor and the vulnerable, Mycroft also zealously introduces men who get troubled to Sherlock for private consulting in *The Greek Interpreter.* Both Badger and Mycroft are reserved, solemn and steady, never to impersonate or disguise like Toad (as a washwoman) and Sherlock (as a beggar, an old man/woman, a clergyman, etc.).

[93] In Chapter 11, when the four major characters gather in Rat's house to plan how to retake the Toad Hall, Toad says, "[s]urely I hear[] the chink of dishes on a tray! Supper's here at last" (194). When Toad is jealous of Mole and wants to win the praises of Badger too, "the bell r[i]ng for luncheon" (205) so that he has no time to argue. These two episodes reveal the possibility for Rat, an upper-middle bachelor, to have at least one servant to cook for him.

[94] I will analyze this dinner-prepared scene with details in the third part of this chapter.

delineated the fundamental links between male homosociality and the River in *The Wind in the Willows*, and Rat, claiming that "it [the River]'s my world, and I don't want any other" (7), is the very crystallization of friendship in the whole book. Not only does his intimate friendship with Mole mark *The Wind in the Willows*,[95] his enjoyment of "messing about in boats" (2) to chat with other animals are also notable. Even after Otter finds Rat and Mole in the underground country house of Badger, Rat and Otter soon"[with] their heads together, eagerly talk[] river-shop, which is long shop and talk that is endless, running on like the babbling river itself" (59). These scenes of homosocial leisure echo the late-Victorian gentlemanly clubmenship. With femininity and feminized domesticity excluded, gentleman's clubs highlighted "the virtues of homosocial fellowship . . . supplying 'the comforts of a home' and a 'happy family' with male companionship" (Gunn 93), like the Riverside community, where Rat remains its member and soul.

Yet none can be compared with Rat's love of idyllic nature, which crystallizes his Victorian nostalgia. In *The Wind in the Willows* the changes of season both parallel with and generate the storyline. In spring animals do house-cleaning (the working- or the lower-middle class) or row with friends (the upper- and middle-class), while in winter they rest at cozy homes. Though most of the animals follow this "animal etiquette" (54), Rat is the one who closely follows the rhythm of nature. He loves to wander in the woods, to row on the River, and to admire the landscapes. This makes him the only one among four characters who has an emotionally outburst of tears while he hears the voices of Pan in the reeds, and even transforms his sentiments to nature into idyllic poetry and songs.

With the above three elements, Rat fits in the very image of the British upper-middle class gentleman of Victorian nostalgia, like Sherlock Holmes in Doyle's

[95] I will discuss the Rat-Mole intimate friendship in the third part of this chapter.

Sherlock Holmes.[96] This, however, does not mean that the desire for change and adventure finds no place in Rat's blood, as Holmes is also a fusion of Victorian gentlemanliness, domesticity and Edwardian adventurism, theatricality.[97] Though Rat extremely disgusts the randomness and adventure-centeredness of Toad, later when he is tempted by the calls of faraway adventure, symbolized by the migratory swallows and Sea Rat, he wavers as well.[98]

Like misfortunes in marriage evoked Grahame's old desire for going to the southern Europe, it was "family troubles" (Grahame 148) the caused Sea Rat to embark faraway adventure. He has been to Norway, Sicily, Venice, Corsica, Devon and Cornwall, all being full of myths, legends or fairy tales. Sea Rat implies a dream for Victorian and Edwardian British men, who had been bound by the strongly conservative social values for so long and envied the relaxation and peace they may find overseas. Here Rat meets the test that every *fin-de-siècle* men would face: to fly from domesticity, or not? He almost yields to his inner desires for adventure, if Mole

[96] Like Rat, Sherlock Holmes is also an upper-middle class gentleman of homosocial domesticity and nostalgic nature. His cohabited living room with Watson at Baker Street 221B becomes a legend for intense male friendship, similar to Rat's cohabited house with Mole. His nostalgic nature reveals through his admiration of rose in *The Naval Treaty* and his retirement in the country house of Sussex for beekeeping in *The Lion's Mane*. More details about the comparisons between Rat and Holmes will be presented in the last part of this chapter.

[97] For Holmes' theatricality, see the following examples. He admits that he "can never resist a touch of the dramatic" (Vol I 732) in *The Naval Treaty* when he secretly puts the retrieved naval treaty (the client asks him to find) in the breakfast plate of the client, who then almost passes out because of shock and happiness. The similar things happen again in *The Mazarin Stone* when he slips the retrieved stone into the pocket of Lord Cantlemere (his client) and jokingly claims that his client is the criminal who stole the stone. Moreover, with a three-year fake death he comes to visit Watson through pretending an old bookseller in *The Empty House*, and then suddenly reveals his own identity that shocks his friend into a coma.

[98] Critics like Hunt and Wullschläger highlight the Victorian nostalgia of Rat that wavers under the enchanting affect of Sea Rat (63-4; 162), yet they ignore that Rat has sensed his own changes before he meets Sea Rat. In the beginning of Chapter 9, at the moment of summer yielding to autumn Rat feels restless and senses the call of going south even at night in bed. His encounter of the field-mice, who as the working-class must be busy and unable to accompany him, evokes his dissatisfaction at lacking friendship at this time. Then he meets the swallows, who are migratory and glad to share with him the beautiful scenery they have seen in the South. These two encounters, along with the chilly, withered landscape along the River, finally vibrate the heart of Rat. Since he preconsciously longs for leaving the River to the outside world, his path comes cross then with Sea Rat the wayfarer, thus he getting enchanted by the adventure stories told by the latter.

does not appear in time to stop him. Rat's failure in home-leaving not only echoes his previous statement to the migratory swallows, that he will never abandon his friends and warm home to venture for troubles and changes outside, but implies Grahame's own struggle between marital duties and masculine adventures. Unlike Bilbo in J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Hobbit* (1937) and Frodo in *The Lord of the Rings* (1954-5), both going out for adventures and returned home then, Rat is "rooted to the land, and whoever [goes], he stay[s]" (140), sticking to Victorian nostalgia in the end.

Toad is a charismatic figure of Edwardian adventurism. As Humphrey Carpenter and Hunt both chart, he is an Edwardian nouveau-riche (164; 69). Though his house [i]s dated from the fourteenth century, Toad only emphasizes its "every modern convenience," like having the "[u]p-to-date sanitation" and its proximity to the post office (Grahame 124). He is more like an Edwardian nouveau-riche than a Victorian gentleman who cares noble ancestry, past glory, and social responsibilities. Moreover, as Gaarden and Robson both mention, Toad is a naughty child, the fictionalized Alastair (47; 137). His world is anarchic, his temper uncontrollable, and his life only for endless adventures. This is why Badger, a Victorian aristocrat with patriarchal authority, severely attempts to convert him in the name of his father, just like Grahame wanted to teach the naughty Alastair to become an ideal child who would get admitted to Oxford.

For me, there are five elements of Edwardian adventurism that can be found in Toad. First, he has no innate gentlemanly dignity. An upper-class gentleman like Badger remains smart and solemn, even after he has patrolled the boundaries of the Toad Hall for days and returned as muddy and tousled. By comparison, Toad's social status and self-confidence is superficially built on his clothes, money and possessions. For examples, when he runs away from jail by cross-dressing as a washwoman, most people fail to reckon him as a gentleman. When he finds in horror that he has left all

the money, pocket-books and keys in the jail in his waistcoat, the clerk of train station does not allow him to board the train to the Toad Hall. When he knows from Rat that the Toad Hall is taken by the Wild Wooders, he collapses and sobs, "I am an animal again" (Grahame 188).

Apart from this, instead of behaving modestly as Badger and Rat, Toad tends to show off. He used to brag his adventure stories in the banquet with friends. Even after he retakes the Toad Hall, he designs to glorify his victory by speeches and songs, if Badger and Rat have not dissuaded him. This tendency of swank brings about his incapability of developing congenial and reciprocal friendship, symbolized by his falling into the River twice.[99] Unlike Badger and Rat,[100] Toad only remembers his own goal but ignores, deceives and forgets his friends.[101] This is why Rat piercingly comments that "[y]ou don't deserve to have such true and loyal friends, Toad" (194).

Furthermore, Toad is never a domestic, nostalgic Victorian gentleman like Badger and Rat, but a passionate "boy-man," always venturing outside to try new things. Badger criticizes that Toad never attempts to mend the broken tiles or cracked walls of the Toad Hall, but "up and out of doors . . . to roam about and get one's living in" (61), and Toad is clearly uninterested in doing housework or cooking, which both Rat and Mole often do. Unlike his gentlemen friends, whose living tempo echoes the

[99] The first time is in Chapter 1 "The River Bank" when Toad learns rowing unsuccessfully, refuses to listen to Rat's advice, and falls into the River then. The second time is in Chapter 12 when he walks with Mole, Rat and Badger into the hole in the Riverbank, which leads to the secret passage to the Toad Hall, he is the only one among them who slips into the water and needs friends to help him out. Since the River in this book symbolizes friendship, these two scenes implies Toad's incapability of developing congenial and reciprocal friendship.

[100] Badger carries out duty for friend by watching the Toad Hall with Mole for the prisoned Toad, and plans every tactic to take the Toad Hall back from the Wild Wooders for the returned Toad. Likewise, Rat reveals touching friendship by entering the dangerous, snowy Wild Wood to seek the stray Mole, and to accompany Mole to the Mole End rather than to his own Riverside home when Mole is homesick.

[101] For example, Toad refuses to be converted by Badger, Mole and Rat. To force Toad to quit the motor-car mania, they three sleep in turn with him in his bedroom to prevent him from running away to drive the car. Yet Toad one day pretends that he is almost sick to death, and the anxious Rat rushes to find the doctor, so that Toad escapes and steals a motor-car. This stealing makes Toad prisoned then. After his adventures are ended with Rat's rescue to him, all Toad wants is to brag his prowess and luck, and admits that he "ha[s] forgotten all about [Mole and Badger]" (Grahame 194).

natural rhythm, Toad never admires idyllic nature. Even when he roams in the woods or by the River, he merely sings songs to brag his own merits rather than observes, appreciates and enjoys the beautiful landscapes around him. Neither domesticity nor nostalgia found a place in his life.

Aside from this, a Victorian gentleman would lead a stable, ordered life, while Toad prefers boundary- and rule-breaking. Unlike other gentlemen characters who do not want to step into the Wild World, to treat the working-class as equals, and to allow females to enter their all-male community,[102] Toad steps into the human world, meets the working-class (the gaoler, the engine driver and the gipsy), and even encounters several women (the gaoler's daughter, her aunt, and the barge woman) in his adventures. Toad's rule-breaking behavior also expresses in his technology mania, which leads him to steal a motor-car and gets himself in jail.

This tendency to anarchy is derived from his capriciousness, untrustworthiness and instability in terms of gender identity and social status. From rowing, carriage-riding to motor-car driving, Toad changes his passion too quickly to learn any skill. Capriciousness also causes him easy to give and to break promises, so that he will never be a man of his word.[103] The cross-dressing of Toad is an extreme piece of evidence of his capriciousness. Unlike the homoerotic cross-dressing of Peter and Hook in *Peter Pan*, the cross-dressing of Toad by wearing a gown, an apron, a shawl and a bonnet of a washwoman is the most serious reversion of both social hierarchy and gender. Such reversion happens because Toad is the gentleman who impersonates as a lower-class woman, thus successfully avoiding suspicions from the prison guards

[102] Rat once tells Mole that "[b]eyond the Wild Wood comes the Wild World [human world] . . . I've never been there, and I'm never going, nor you either, if you've got any sense at all" (Grahame 8-9). And both Rat and Badger are used to command the working-class (the field mice or the Wild Wooders) to serve them. Moreover, all the animal gentlemen mentioned in the book, perhaps except Otter, who may get a wife but she never appears, are bachelors. These examples may prove the conservatism of Victorian upper- and middle-class gentlemen.

[103] For instance, Toad vows before Badger never to drive the motor-car again, yet he withdraws his vow when Badger asks him to repeat what he promised in front of Mole and Rat.

and running away from jail. Hence, his cross-dressing not only implies the aristocratic and bourgeois contempt for the working-class, but "confounds the supposedly natural order between gender and natal sex, inviting questions about masculinity and femininity that necessarily destabilize these categories and reveal their constructed nature" (Flanagan 13). Yet Toad is not Sherlock Holmes, whose graceful cross-dressing as an old woman in order to spy is not detected by the criminal.[104] Regardless of his lack of Victorian gentlemanliness, the feminine disguise of Toad remains comic to men and unconvincing to women. Neither Badger nor Rat cross-dress or pretend as anyone not belonging to their own classes, while Toad cross-dresses and shames himself by doing it.[105]

Lastly, Toad is never a reserved Victorian gentleman. Badger and Rat are warm but often rational, while Toad, by comparison, is helplessly emotional. He tends to get excited while bragging, get ecstatic while driving, get depressed while behind the bars, get flustered while his plan fails. Above all, he cries like a child when he gets into troubles. Particularly, when Rat tells him the Toad Hall was taken, Toad's tear comes like summer tempests and overflows on the table (Grahame 185). This element, along with the four elements stated above, proves Toad as a childish nouveau-riche and "boy-man" of Edwardian adventurism.

The relation between Victorian nostalgia and Edwardian adventurism, however, is not absolutely opposite. For instance, even Badger, a solemn aristocrat, sometimes behaves as a "boy-man," resembling the pirates in *Peter Pan.* He approves Toad's usage of vulgar English, such as "we want to *learn* them [the enemies, the Wild

[104] In *The Mazarin Stone* Holmes pretends as an old woman with a parasol to follow Count Negretto Sylvius, the criminal who has stolen the crown diamond. His pretension is so brilliant that even after they two confront in Baker Street 221B, the Count is still too surprised to believe this.

[105] Before the battle of the Toad Hall retaking, Badger sends Otter to disguise as a sweep to spy the Wild Wooders rather than disguises in person. Nor does Rat, yet Mole once cross-dresses as a washwoman and successfully deceives the Wild Wooders. The issue of cross-dressing of Toad and Mole will remain important in the last part of this chapter.

Wooders]" instead of "to *teach* them" (201). He also reveals his childlike nature by telling his friends, "I'd have done the whole thing [the retaking of the Toad Hall] by myself, only I didn't want to deprive you fellows of the fun!" (201). Compared with Badger, Rat represents more as a "boy-man," having more struggles between Victorian nostalgia and Edwardian adventurism. Among all the friends of Toad, Rat probably understands Toad most, and yet he, whose and Toad's life philosophy are poles apart, still calls Toad "the best of animals . . . [s]o simple, so good-natured, and so affectionate" (19). Rat often complains the behaviors of Toad before Mole and Badger, but he never wants to convert Toad until Badger insists and Mole follows.

As Toad loves adventures, Rat is also enthralled by the adventure stories of Sea Rat, whom he almost journeys to follow. Furthermore, Rat is remembered in tales not as a domestic Victorian gentleman but as "the gallant Water Rat, a terrible fighter" (225), since he valiantly swings swords and two pistols (unlike the conservatively stubborn Badger, who believes hundreds of enemies can be defeated simply by a gentleman stick) in the battle of the retaking of the Toad Hall. Actually, there is a small Toad, Edwardian adventurism, in Rat's soul; he projects the image he wants to become and dares not to become onto Toad. This is why in the last chapter Rat's "heart ble[e]d[s] as he notice[s] the trembling lip of the poor disappointed Toad" (220) in the episode that he and Badger refuse Toad's request of singing the last self-bragging song. He also tells Toad, "[p]lease don't think that saying all this [converting Toad] doesn't hurt me more than it hurts you" (220), and even accusingly asks Badger, "*I* feel like a brute; I wonder what *you* feel like?" (220). After Toad is converted to a proper gentleman, no longer a naughty child, no one can substitute Rat to have adventure without considering social values; this becomes his greatest loss.

Rat sympathize and envy the childish Toad, but Toad as a "man-boy" still cares his own social status, just like Peter Pan. The great gap between his image as a

wealthy gentleman and an ugly, lower-status animal in his adventures marks the ambivalence—in other words, the element of crossover fiction—in this book. When the bargewoman "c[a]n't tell a real gentleman when [she] s[ees] one" (225), Toad shouts to her, "don't you dare to talk to your betters like that! . . . I am a Toad, a very well-known, respected, distinguished Toad!" (167). He also grinds his teeth with rage when he hears the speech and song made by the Chief Weasel (the leader of the Wild Wooders), his alter ego (Gaarden 52), to mock his ungentlemanliness.[106] Though free spirit always bounces in his heart, Toad at the end of the book pretends that he takes advice of his friends—learning to behave like a real gentleman—and seems converted in the banquet of celebrating the Toad Hall's retaking. Yet he does this only to prevent himself from being despised and abandoned by his friends. In his private room he still sings the self-bragging song, and "heave[s] a deep sigh" (Grahame 223). Toad, as Peter Green first broaches and Gaarden then agrees, is after all an innate Edwardian adventurer, and will never be thoroughly converted (248; 53).

How to perfectly integrate Victorian nostalgia and Edwardian adventurism? The narrator provides his solution through Mole. Neil Philip points out that Mole is Grahame in reality and the protagonist of *The Wind in the Willows*, which the author almost titles as *Mr. Mole and His Mates* (99-100). As a self-content lower-middle class bachelor,[107] like Haynes observes (122), Mole has not been bathed by the warm elite friendship until he enters the Riverside upper-middle class community and,

[106] The Wild Wooders represent the same Edwardian anarchy as Toad does; the only difference is that the former are the working-class and the latter is the gentry class. The Wild Wooders sleep and eat at irregular hours, make dirty jokes and sang vulgar songs of self-bragging and mockery (of the upper- and middle-class). These acts are similar to Toad's recklessness, arrogance and debauch, and this explains why their leader, the Chief Weasel, is the alter ego of Toad.

[107] Mole's class can be seen through his home, manner and speaking. His gentlemanly house belongs to the late-Victorian style (which will be further analyzed in note 114), yet he has no servant and needs to do house-cleaning by himself. In addition, there is no other bedroom for guests, and no distinction between the kitchen and the living room. As for his manner and speaking, Mole tends to be excited and emotional, crying "[o] my!" or shedding tears like the childish Toad, unlike the reserved Badger and Rat. Also, he accepts cross-dressing, unlike Badger and Rat disgust such class and gender changeability. Thus, Mole is proved to be from the lower-middle class.

above all, cohabits with Rat in idyllic domesticity and nostalgic nature. With Rat, Mole does housework, makes meals, fishes, rows, and feels awestruck before Pan. Gradually, he is transformed into a typical Victorian gentleman.

Nevertheless, in the veins of Mole there is also the blood of adventure, shaping him as a "boy-man," too. When Toad invites Mole and Rat to have a carriage-riding journey together, Mole feels excited and agrees. After Rat warns Mole of the danger in the Wild Wood, Mole insists on going there alone and thereby gets lost. It is also Mole who suggests Rat to transform the desire for the overseas adventure into poetry. It is Mole as well who volunteeringly cross-dresses as a washwoman to spy the hostile Wild Wooders. After the fugitive Toad is rescued and sheltered, Mole is the only major character who actively listens to the adventure stories of Toad, and listens eagerly.

In other words, Mole is not merely a Victorian gentleman but an Edwardian adventurer. Through Mole Grahame reconciles Victorian nostalgia with Edwardian adventurism, providing story-telling and story-listening as the substitutive way for British men to enjoy adventure instead of really flying from their cozy households. In the end of *The Wind in the Willows*, the four major characters walk together in the tamed Wild Wood—especially Rat and Toad, one symbolizes Victorian nostalgia while the other Edwardian adventurism, walk side by side. This suggests that the dilemma between these two different aspects has been resolved.

2.3 Bachelor Friends and Male Domesticity: Rat and Mole

As I have argued earlier, Grahame prefers to be a homosocial pseudo-bachelor than a married man. Like John Ruskin's 'Of Queen's Gardens' I cited in the introduction, Victorian and Edwardian men stereotypically expected females to be "passive and intuitive, . . . securing [home's] order, comfort and loveliness" (107) as meek housewives. Hence, many (pseudo-)bachelors, including Grahame, abhorred

femininity and feminized domesticity (Hunt 86-8), which they saw as the opposite of masculine rationality and gentlemanliness. In *The Wind in the Willows* when Toad proudly tells gaoler's daughter his splendid house and its furnishings, only "the linen-presses" (124) impresses her most. In addition, Mole also warns Toad if he does not stop motor-car mania, he will end up in a hospital and "being ordered about by female nurses" (94).[108] Above all, Toad is wrathful at those who address him as a woman when he cross-dresses, reinforcing the traditional gender binary and the hegemonic masculinity (Flanagan 143). The above examples prove the acknowledged links between females and domesticity, which was trivial, tiresome and troublesome to British gentlemen, in the late-Victorian and the Edwardian era.

However, New Woman arose "to go to college, to live alone, to travel, to have a profession, to belong to a club, . . . and to go to theatres without masculine escort" (Showalter 39) at the *fin-de-siècle*. No matter how British gentlemen accused New Woman of abandoning female duties and having nervous disorder,[109] they have felt the gender hierarchy challenged, the male superiority threatened, and the glorious Empire declined since New Woman emerged. In *The Wind in the Willows* the bargewoman's descriptions of her husband can be seen as the emergence of New Woman and the downfall of masculinity: "he's such a fellow for shirking his work and leaving the barge to me . . . he's gone off with the dog, to see if they can't pick up a rabbit for dinner somewhere . . . I don't trust him" (165-6). It is she who steers the tiller, while Toad is ordered by her to wash clothes, totally reversing the gender roles.

---

[108] The history of British nurse can be traced down to the Crimean War (1853-6), when Florence Nightingale (1820-1910) tended to the wounded soldiers. She claimed that every British women had nursed children or invalid in her lifetime, proving that women had potentials to become the professional nurses. This claim, along with her lifetime devotion to nursing, made a strong association between femininity and nursing. Thus, since the mid-Victorian era nursing has been publicly believed to belong to women's duties, not men's (Newsom Kerr 149).

[109] Doctor T. Clifford Allbutt (1895) points out that by the 1890s the enhanced number of New Woman led to the increased number of patient, who had neurasthenia and hysteria in England (210-31).

When men failed to find the women whom fit their standards to marry, the number of bachelor increased.[110] As misogynists, these (pseudo-)bachelors kept their living spaces purely male since the *fin-de-siècle*. As I have charted in the introduction, Amy Milne-Smith delineates that the *fin-de-siècle* gentleman's clubs symbolized flights from feminized domesticity of British (pseudo-)bachelors (797). Simon Gunn also indicates that in the Victorian era female participation in the bourgeois clubs can only be allowed when women were invited, while in the upper-class clubs it was never allowed, so as to protect the club's all-male reputation (92). With a severe exclusion of women, gentleman's clubs, along with their resemblance—bachelor's apartments, provided men surrogate domesticity through intimate homosociality, forming the so-called male domesticity (Snyder 19-20).

In *The Wind in the Willows* the two most important settings for domesticity are not heterosexual households but the homosocial ones. The Riverside all-male community is referred to as the gentleman's clubs, while Rat's house, where Mole and Rat cohabit, is a typical bachelor's apartment. From this we can see Grahame's "desire to evade heterosexuality altogether" (Nodelman and Reimer 153), which implies homoeroticism, as I have mentioned in the introduction. Such desire leads to his emphasis of intimate male friendship of male domesticity in *The Wind in the Willows*. Among the four major characters Badger is the most reserved, Toad the most self-conceited, and thus Rat and Mole turn out to be not only a friendly duo but the homoerotic pair of friends.

Many critics who view *The Wind in the Willows* as the classic of "children's literature" insist that Rat-Mole relationship should be put in the familial or

[110] Katherine V. Snyder relates that from 1890 to 1920 the proportion of the unmarried American men over fifty-five highly increased, while at the same time the numbers of men and women at England became unequal. This may be seen to evidence the increase of the number of bachelor at the *fin-de-siècle* (21).

hierarchical structure. For example, as I have mentioned in the introduction, Bonnie Gaarden views Rat as a caring mother, who leads the good-child Mole into a cohabited life of domesticity (46). Wynn William Yarbrough almost touches the issue of homoeroticism when he mentions the paragraph that Mole holds Rat's paw under the blanket while they sleep in the carriage of Toad, asking Rat to go home (Rat's home) together; nevertheless, for him this scene reveals only the dilemma between adventurous thrill and domestic warmth, and he fails to further probe the homoerotic implications in Rat-Mole friendship (68). Even Peter Hunt dissects this book only with an emphasis of class, about how "the lower middle classes represented by Mole . . . the nouveau-riche perhaps represented by Toad . . . [and] the working classes of the Wild Wood" are tamed into order and peace by "the deeply conservative figures of Rat and Badger [as the upper- and middle-class]" (77).

Though Patrick Chalmers comments that Grahame "never made intimate friendships with his fellows" (Philip 102), I firmly believe his comment is incorrect. Grahame had great preference to the men's societies of intellect and arts, where he enjoyed warm male homosociality. Yet his lifelong friendship with Arthur Quiller-Couch, the prototype of Rat, might hint their friendship is not homosocial but homoerotic, since he even abandoned his wife ashore *during the honeymoon* for rowing with Quiller-Couch and other Cornwall friends. Regardless of the fact that Grahame never intimately cohabited with any of his male friend, either as a bachelor or as a married man, it does not mean that he had not *considered* the possibility of such intimate, domestic cohabitation; otherwise, he and Quiller-Couch will not become the prototype of Mole and Rat. As I have briefly discussed in the introduction and will further analyze in Chapter 3, homophobia in the British society after Wilde's 1895 trials was so strong that any gentleman who preferred intimate bachelor friendship to heterosexual marriage could be suspected as a homosexual and reported

to the government. This may be why Grahame had no choice but to continue his unfortunate marriage and to project his longing for intimate, cohabited friendship through *The Wind in the Willows*. In the following paragraphs I am going to discuss homoerotic male domesticity in *The Wind in the Willows*, focusing on Rat-Mole friendship, and compare it with Tom-Arthur, Tom-Hardy and Holmes-Watson ones.

More than "love at first sight," Rat appeals to Mole before first sight. Before they meet, Mole has sensed a friendship's calling, calling him away from home for a holiday (Guroian 89). After Mole sees the River, the symbol of friendship, he is "bewitched, entranced, fascinated" (Grahame 3) and thus, considering Rat's house in the bank opposite "a nice snug dwelling-place" (4). When they finally meet, Rat soon asks Mole to row with him, and "Mole's whole heart [goes] out to it [Rat's boat] at once" (4-5). They roam on the River, socialize with other animals, and have picnic together. Even after Mole rashly capsizes the boat, Rat does not blame him, but invites him to cohabit.[111] This invitation makes Mole "brush away a tear or two with the back of his paw" (15). Then Mole, totally forgetting all his possessions and even his own home, cohabits with Rat, and views the house of Rat as their perpetual home.[112] This appeal-at-first-sight friendship heavily implies homoeroticism.

Similarly, Tom adapts homoerotic relationship with Arthur in *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and with Hardy in *Tom Brown at Oxford.* When the dormmates sneer at the timid Arthur, who comes to Rugby as a new boy, Tom throws one of his boots at them to protect Arthur. From then on he follows Arthur everywhere like a bodyguard, or as his other friend East jealously comments, "like a hen with one chick" (Hughes

[111] Rat's affectionate friendship with Mole is more obvious if this event is compared with the similar one between Rat and his old friend Toad. When Toad in Chapter 11 rows a boat of Rat to the Toad Hall, which Toad tries to retake from the Wild Wooders, and gets the boat sunk because of the enemies' attack, Rat wrathfully accuses Toad of ruining his nice boat.

[112] For instance, during the carriage-riding with Toad, Mole once asks the homesick Rat to "go back to our dear old hole [Rat's house] on the river" (Grahame 26) with him.

Schooldays 167). Likewise, Tom is curious about Hardy before they acquaint. The cooler Hardy is to him, the more "he ma[k]e[s] up his mind to break ground himself" (*Oxford* 41), and he finally achieves his goal through entering Hardy's room. After they befriend, Tom feels that "[a]ll the companionship of boating and cricketing . . . won't keep him from many a long hour of mawkishness" (49), while only Hardy can evoke his "bursts of womanly tenderness" (65) and capture him deep into the toil of friendship (66). Thus, I agree with Carolyn W. de la L. Oulton that homoeroticism is implied in their appeal-at-first-sight friendship (36-7).

On the other hand, Rat and Mole resemble more to the detective and his biographer in *Sherlock Holmes*, as Robson claims, "Mole is . . . Dr. Watson to Rat's Sherlock Holmes" (127). Watson as a retired, wounded army doctor is introduced to Holmes to share the rent of Baker Street 221B. While no man dare agree to cohabit with someone who asks a colleague to taste poison, whips dead bodies for experiment, and keeps his own vocation and background unknown to his acquaintance,[113] Watson agrees. This reveals amazing chemistry between Holmes and Watson, and begins Watson's sixteen years of cohabitation, nineteen years of case investigation, and lifelong friendship with Holmes. Meanwhile, Holmes also feels the strong magnetism Watson exudes. When Watson earnestly admires his exact deductions in their first case, *A Study in Scarlet*, Holmes, who often mocks inspectors or clients, "flush[es] up, . . . [being] sensitive to flattery on the score of his art as any girl could be of her beauty" (33). This comparison of Holmes to a girl and Watson to a suitor, along with the intense react of Holmes to the admiration of Watson, is really homoerotic. Hence, their friendship also starts at first sight and continues with homoeroticism, as

[113] In the first weeks of their cohabitation, Watson "endeavour[s] to break through the reticence which [Holmes] show[s] on all that concern[s] himself" (Vol I 2), and finally figures out that Holmes is a private consulting detective. And he eventually knows the family background of Holmes seven years later in *The Greek Interpreter.*

Rat-Mole friendship and friendships in the *Tom Brown* series.

As I have cited in the introduction, Jennifer Jean Kimble Fletcher states that in mid-Victorian era "nurturant, housekeeping men caused neither scandal nor subversion" (12); at the *fin-de-siècle* the British bachelors created male domesticity in the independent domestic retreats (191-6). Cohabitation of two men is the first step to male domesticity. In *The Wind in the Willows*, before they cohabit, Mole does spring-cleaning, the representation of mid-Victorian domesticity (which Peter also asks Wendy to do in *Peter Pan*), while Rat brings English traditional homemade food to have a picnic with Mole by the River. After they cohabit, Rat "ma[k]e[s] a bright fire in the parlour, and plant[s] Mole in an arm-chair in front of it, having fetched down a dressing-gown and slippers for him, and t[ells] him river stories till suppertime" (15). In the unfortunate carriage-riding journey, Rat and Mole also plan to "go to an inn and find comfortable rooms" (31) to wait until the broken carriage is ready. In the Wild Wood the stray Mole hides "in the deep dark hollow of an old beech tree, which offer[s] shelter, concealment — perhaps even safety" (38) from the coldness and dangers outside, and later Rat stands guard by his side. Above all, Mole and Rat not only clean the dusted Victorian Mole End[114] but prepare supper with the help of some field-mice, enjoying the domestic chats at that night.

In other words, wherever Mole and Rat go, they turn there a friendly retreat with warm male domesticity. Though they have independent rooms in Rat's house, they share one room for a naked sleep in the house of Badger, sleep side by side in two bunks in the Mole End, and have physical intimacy in the carriage of Toad.[115] As

[114] Seth Lerer states that "the Mole End is decorated in the fashions of the late Victorian . . . Garibaldi was everywhere in English homes after he [Garibaldi] visits the country in 1864. The infant Samuel at prayer was a favorite image of Victorian piety . . . the Queen was everywhere, especially after the spate of statues, portraits, and medallions appeared in honor of her Jubilee in 1887" ("Style" 59-60). And the "Gothic lettering" words of "Mole End" (76) at the front door also suggest Victorian nostalgia.

[115] In the underground home of Badger, Mole and Rat, sleeping in two different beds in the storeroom of Badger, "shake off their garments in some thirty seconds, tumbl[ing] in between the sheets in great

I have cited in the introduction, Kimberley Reynolds delineates that many Victorian and Edwardian children's literature are "[the] vehicles for a range of desires or unorthodox ideas that did not find expression so readily in adult fiction" (*Radical* 16). If we view *The Wind in the Willows* merely as a story for the child, homoerotic implications in male domesticity may fail to be detected.

The display of male domesticity also appears in the *Tom Brown* series, though not as clearly as *The Wind in the Willows*, since Tom and his friends are gentleman's children and have matrons and cooks to do chores for them. The closest scene is that in *Tom Brown's Schooldays* Tom and Arthur sit together in their dormitory after supper, reading the Bible, while Tom sometimes comforts the homesick Arthur. In *Tom Brown at Oxford* Tom and Hardy also smoke and chat in Hardy's room, reminiscing the family and early life of Hardy.

In *Sherlock Holmes* representations of male domesticity are explicit. As Jacqueline A. Jaffe charts, in Baker Street 221 B, "a setting reminiscent of the best men's club," Holmes and Watson "behave as if they had always lived together, smoke, read, eat, and carry on a conversation" (38). The living room they cohabit provides domestic comforts and shelters them against the dangerous London criminal world outside (Arata 147). As a male "angel in the house," Watson minds the house in *A Study in Scarlet*, *A Scandal in Bohemia* and *The Beryl Coronet*, receives visitors and opens telegrams for Holmes in *The Sign of Four* and *The Second Stain* when his friend is out for case-investigation. Meanwhile, Holmes also plays lullaby by the violin to comfort the tired Watson to sleep in *The Sign of Four*, makes breakfast and dinner for Watson in *The Sign of Four* and *The Priory School*, takes the homoerotic

joy and contentment" (Grahame 56). In the carriage of Toad, Mole even tenderly holds Rat's paw under his own blanket while they sleep, and further details will be provided in page 99.

Turkish bath with Watson in *The Illustrious Client*,[116] and even sleeps with Watson in the same room or on the same bed several times.[117] Thus, they two "quickly assume the air of an old married couple" (Arata 146), and their homoerotic representations of male domesticity prove what I have stated in the introduction, that *Sherlock Holmes* addresses to not only boy readers but the adult ones as well.

Male domesticity includes housework and food. In *The Wind in the Willows* Rat "scribble[s] poetry or d[oes] other small domestic jobs about the house" (34) in winter, and, Mole, who regularly does spring-cleaning in the Mole End, also "busie[s] himself with household matters" (157) after he cohabits with Rat. Aside from housework, food is a way to evaluate the worth of a Victorian and Edwardian housewife, for domesticity lies in the proper, homemade food (Alston 108). Yet in *The*

---

[116] John Potvin unfolds that homoeroticism lies in the popularity of Turkish baths since the Victorian era. Taking a Turkish bath implies that a man allows his body exposed before other men, enhancing close friendship through the same-sex physical touching. Thus, "London's West End Turkish baths precariously and seamlessly allowed the homosocial, homoerotic and even the homosexual to coexist, differentiated only slightly by various degrees and acts of intimacy and uses of vision" (106). From this viewpoint, Holmes and Watson's taking Turkish baths together may imply homoeroticism as well. Noted that Holmes does not prefer to Turkish baths at first (he criticizes Watson for taking expensive Turkish baths instead of English baths in *The Disappearance of Lady Frances Carfax*, the story in which the case happened in 1901), and yet he changes his attitude and takes Turkish baths with Watson in 1902 in *The Illustrious Client* (the story in which the case happened merely three months after the homoeroticism-climaxing *The Three Garridebs*), and Watson comments that "[i]t was over a smoke in the pleasant lassitude of the drying-room that I have found him less reticent and more human than anywhere else" (Vol II 513). This comment may hints the existence of homoeroticism in their friendship in the body-exposed bath rooms.

[117] In *The Man with the Twisted Lip* Holmes tells Watson "[m]y room at The Cedars [the house of his client] is a double-bedded one" (Vol I 356), though later Holmes sits on the ground instead of sleeping with Watson to ponder the case he investigates for the whole night. In *The Speckled Band* they "engag[e] a bedroom and sitting-room at the Crown Inn" (416) when they investigate a case, and later stay here for one night (and share one toothbrush) after the case is solved. In *The Missing Three Quarters* Watson also "engage[s] a front room and purchase the necessaries" (1001), waiting for Holmes to return from case-investigation. The most homoerotic scene is in *The Valley of Fear*, in which they not only share one bed again but have the following queer dialogue:

> . . . We slept in a double-bedded room . . . I was already asleep when I was partially awakened by his entrance.
>
> "Well, Holmes," I murmured, "have you found anything out?"
>
> He stood beside me in silence, his candle in his hand. Then the tall, lean figure inclined towards me. "I say, Watson," he whispered, "would you be afraid to sleep in the same room with a lunatic, a man with softening of the brain, an idiot whose mind has lost its grip?"
>
> "Not in the least." I answered in astonishment.
>
> "Ah, that's lucky." he said, and not another word would he utter that night (Vol II 222-3).

Wind in the Willows both Mole and Rat (especially Rat) are good at table-setting and meal-preparing, mingling the housewife merit with everyday practice of gentlemen in male domesticity. In the carriage-riding journey with Toad, it is Rat who "clean[s] last night's cups and platters, and got things ready for breakfast," and Mole who goes "to the nearest village . . . for milk and eggs and various necessaries" (27). After they return to the Mole End, Rat also collects food from cellar and cupboard, asks a field-mouse to buy homemade food from the shops, and makes the supper with Mole and other field-mice. After the Toad Hall is retaken, Rat also volunteeringly helps Toad set the table and prepare supper. Hence, *The Wind in the Willows* is regarding not merely nostalgic childhood in food consumption but implied homoeroticism with a symbolic integration of the housewife merit into male domesticity.

Representations of male domesticity through housework and food may be absent in the *Tom Brown* series, yet they dominate *Sherlock Holmes*. In *The Cardboard Box* the yearly closure of London clubs forces Watson to go nowhere but 221B, echoing Milne-Smith's researches of the yearly closure for house-cleaning in gentleman's clubs (813).[118] In *The Musgrave Ritual*, Watson, who can not tolerate the mess Holmes makes any longer, pleads Holmes to "employ the next two hours in making room a little more habitable" (Vol I 605). Here Watson asks Holmes to clean the living room like a virtuous helpmate begs her lazy husband,[119] implying homoeroticism in their cohabitation of male domesticity.

With regard to food, though Holmes and Watson are gentlemen, their meals are not all made by Mrs. Hudson, their landlady. Judith Flanders pins down that the

[118] According to Milne-Smith, the yearly closure of gentleman's clubs for cleaning was in the late summer to all autumn, and most upper-middle class fled to the countryside or overseas to escape the heat, while those who did not have enough money (Watson, for example) felt a sense of loss when they temporarily lost clubs to provide them domestic warmth and homosocial pleasure (813).

[119] The word "helpmate" is often referred to not only a partner but partner in marriage, meaning a wife. Holmes recalls Watson as "an ideal helpmate" (Vol II 539) in *The Blanched Soldier*, implying homoeroticism in their intimate friendship.

Victorian and Edwardian bachelors sometimes feed themselves by "cook[ing] small suppers over the fire to avoid the unpleasant and expensive food" (261-2), and this exactly describes male domesticity of Holmes and Watson. Watson never cooks, yet Holmes is not only good at cooking but fond of preparing meals for Watson, as Rat for Mole. In *The Sign of Four* he makes a nice dinner with oysters, grouse and white wines for Watson, and jokingly comments, "Watson, you have never yet recognized my merits as a housekeeper" (Vol I 197). He also makes a hot chocolate for Watson as breakfast in *The Priory School*, angling with Watson to make "a dish of trout for [their] supper" (Vol II 716) in *Shoscombe Old Place*, and reads a domestic magazine to study the condition of boiled eggs in *The Problem of Thor Bridge*. Portraying Holmes as a Victorian housewife who often makes meals for the husbandly Watson, the above examples reveal homoerotic intimacy in male domesticity between Holmes and Watson, quite similar to that between Rat and Mole.

Homoeroticism in male domesticity leads to the tendency of cross-dressing. Unlike female-to-male cross-dressing, which provides heroines freedom that they have been socially restricted to obtain (Miller 51),[120] male-to-female cross-dressing often humiliates male characters, since female clothes lessen their masculinity. It is worth noticing, however, that only with humor and humiliation can male-to-female cross-dressing not be labeled as a symbol of homosexual in the homophobic society, where effeminacy through transvestism have been reckoned as one of the homosexual phenomena since the late-Victorian era (Flanagan 139). While cross-dressing as a washwoman transforms Toad into a laughingstock, who deceives the prison guards but gets mocked by the bargewoman, the cross-dressing of Mole into the same

[120] The notable example is Irene Adler, an adventuress, actress and the most famous female antagonist in *Sherlock Holmes*. She cross-dresses in her male walking clothes, passing by Holmes and Watson without being recognized by Holmes as his adversary. *A Scandal in Bohemia* thus becomes the only case that "the best plans of Mr. Sherlock Holmes [are] beaten by a woman's wit" (Vol I 262).

washwoman dress Toad has worn to spy on the Wild Wooders, the lower-class enemies of Mole, is perfect. The enemies recognize Mole not as a gentleman but as "my good woman" (Grahame 202). Aside from this, neither does Mole feel ashamed of his temporary female identity, nor does Badger criticize his impersonation but praises him instead. This implies that homoerotic male domesticity helps Mole cross the gender boundary to be a male housewife, like the domestic Holmes, whose cross-dressing as an old woman is so brilliant that he successfully deceives the eyes of the opponent, as I have discussed previously in this chapter.

The most homoerotic part in Rat-Mole male domesticity, nevertheless, is their changes of name-addressing. After they meet, Mole soon addresses Rat as "Ratty." Rat, however, insists on calling Mole "my young friend", "old chap/fellow", or "Mole"; he does not intimately address the nickname of Mole until Mole gets lost in the dangerous Wild Wood. What is interesting is that Rat finally calls his friend "Moly" (39-40) when he enters the forest to seek Mole, yet he resumes addressing his friend "the Mole" or "[p]oor old Mole" (44) after he finds Mole, and only addresses Mole's nickname once again later,[121] while Mole keeps calling Rat "Ratty." Their different attitudes to name-addressing show that the upper-middle class gentleman like Rat is expected to be reserved, not tending to expose emotion as the lower-middle class Mole does. It is also Rat's reserve that makes this emotional revelation, addressing "Moly," more cherished, more touching, and more homoerotic.

In the *Tom Brown* series the similar changes of name-addressing exist. Isabel Quigly notes that the Victorian and the Edwardian schoolboys addressed one another by surname, while their Christian names were reserved only for the most intimate

[121] The second time in *The Wind in the Willows* that Rat calls Mole "Moly" is in Chapter 11 when Rat, Badger and Toad know that Mole cross-dressed to spy before the enemies. In great shock and worry Rat is afraid that Mole might disclose the plans of retaking the Toad Hall, crying "O, *Moly*, how could you?" (204). This example also proves that only with great emotion can a reserved gentleman like Rat address Mole's nickname.

friends, family members and their future spouses (73). In other words, friends who addressed each other by their Christian names might imply their pseudo-couple homoeroticism. In *Tom Brown's Schooldays* Arthur at first addresses Tom's surname "Brown," yet Tom asks Arthur, "[w]hy don't you call me Tom?" (171). This moment begins the intimacy in Tom-Arthur friendship, which climaxes when Arthur has a fever and by his bedside Tom finally calls him "Geordie," the nickname of his Christian name. The same phenomenon also happens in Tom-Hardy friendship in *Tom Brown at Oxford*. Tom and Hardy do not address each other "Tom" and "Jack" until in the last one-ninth of the book. Interestingly, from that moment Tom never writes any letter to Arthur. This implies that Tom's intimate friendship with Hardy replaces that with Arthur. Hence, shifting from surname to Christian name, the homoerotic, emotional bond between major male characters is proved.

Changes of name-addressing between friends in *Sherlock Holmes* develops slowlier and seems more reserved. Though Holmes and Watson never address each other by nickname or Christian name, there are still many forms of name-addressing between them, and such forms become more intimate as the plot unfolds. When they acquaint in *A Study in Scarlet*, Holmes simply calls Watson "Doctor"; however, Watson soon addresses Holmes by surname, or calls him "my dear Holmes/fellow." Yet reticence of Holmes disallows him from quickly revealing intimacy before Watson, as Rat before Mole. Years after they befriend, he finally calls his friend "Watson", and not until Watson gets married with Mary Morstan does Holmes often affectionately address his friend as "[m]y dear Watson/fellow" or "my boy."[122] In some stories during their second cohabitation after 1894, such as *The Devil's Foot* and

[122] In the cases happened before Watson gets married, such as *A Study in Scarlet*, *The Speckled Band*, *The Beryl Coronet*, *The Sign of Four* and *The Noble Bachelor*, Holmes calls Watson "Doctor" or "Watson." In the post-marriage cases, including *A Case of Identity*, *The Boscombe Valley Mystery*, *The Crooked Man*, *The Naval Treaty*, *The Copper Beeches*, *The Red-Headed League* and *The Final Problem*, Holmes begins to address Watson as "my dear Watson/fellow" or "my boy."

The Three Garridebs, Holmes even addresses Watson as “my Watson.” Regardless of English reserve, which prevents Holmes and Watson from addressing each other by Christian names, Doyle comments that if there is a limbo for characters in the novel, “*Sherlock and his Watson may for a time find a place*” (*Sherlock* Vol II 511). The author’s comment confirms intimate male bonding of Holmes and Watson, as if to put them in a pseudo-couple category through addressing Holmes by his Christian name “Sherlock” and mentioning Watson as “his Watson.” The changes of name-addressing implies homoeroticism in Holmes-Watson friendship.

The Wind in the Willows, nevertheless, is not simply a book of male domesticity but of a struggle between male domesticity and Edwardian adventure, and such that struggle is often regarding the difference in social hierarchy. The moderate Mole starts with spring-cleaning, yet he also wants to “[h]ang spring-cleaning!” (1), revealing his anti-domesticity and longing for adventure. By comparison, Rat is a domestic gentleman with a spirit of an adventurer (or fighter), as I have explained. When their needs are incompatible, power struggle breaks out.

Since Mole belongs to the lower-middle class and Rat the upper-middle one, Rat often wins in the power struggle. When they first meet, Mole tends to follow the order of Rat, unpacking and packing the lunchbox for Rat; however, jealousy of Rat’s graceful sculling, Mole as a “boy-man” “jump[s] up and seize[s] the sculls so suddenly” (13), wishing to gain power of control from Rat, turning the nostalgic rowing into a reckless adventure. Nevertheless, Mole’s poor skill of rowing capsizes the boat and almost drowns himself, and he eventually needs Rat’s rescue, which implies that social hierarchy in their friendship can not be easily altered. Yet Mole attempts the second time later by entering the Wild Wood alone, regardless of Rat’s warning and dissuasion. Again, it is Rat who rescues him from this rash adventure and takes him to the domestic shelter, the house of Badger. Intriguingly, Mole’s third-time

try is unintentional but victorious. In Chapter 9 he successfully (and forcefully) stops the sleepwalking, spellbound Rat from joining the faraway adventures of Sea Rat, persuading Rat to stay for their cohabited life of male domesticity.

Major male characters in the *Tom Brown* series are from the same class, so there is no apparent power struggle. In *Sherlock Holmes*, however, the power struggle due to social hierarchy is serious. Holmes is from the upper-middle class, while Watson is a middle-class gentleman.[123] Their different social statuses lead to subtle power struggle between them. In *The Dying Detective* Watson insists on curing the "dying" Holmes through claiming that "[l]et him be my master elsewhere, I at least was his in a sick room" (Vol II 431); however, Holmes wins this power struggle.[124] Sighing, "[t]o the last gasp he [Holmes] would always be the master" (435), Watson unwillingly obeys the instructions of Holmes then. In other words, the desire of "boy-man" for adventurous case-investigation in Holmes overpowers the motherly/wifely wish for domestic nursing in Watson.

After power struggle ceases, homoerotic hero-worship emerges. Both Holmes and Rat are the rational figures with physical prowess that is worthy of hero-worship from their friends.[125] For instance, the calm Rat carefully observes the tracks of the

---

[123] Holmes, studied at Cambridge, is a descendent of a country squire, revealed in *The Greek Interpreter*. Though he does not work at Whitehall as his brother, he displays his upper-middle class temperament through taste of music and artistry, which I will provide further information in the third part of Chapter 3. In contrast, Watson attended public school, played rugby, acquired a medical degree from the University of London, and joined the Afghan War as an army doctor. In his years with Holmes, he becomes a clubman, a married doctor who practises at the West End, and a lifelong biographer of Holmes. These all suggest Watson's social status as a middle-class gentleman.

[124] In *The Dying Detective* Holmes pretends infected by the virus sent by the criminal Culverton Smith. To set a trap to catch Smith, Holmes asks Watson to fetch Smith to "cure" his "disease." Yet Watson, who does not know Holmes' extremis was fake, insists on curing him in person or by other doctors. They two have a key-grabbing battle in Holmes' bedroom. Eventually, Holmes wins by locking the door to prevent Watson from leaving until the hour Smith is at home.

[125] I compare two paragraphs of hero-worship as follows. The first one is Mole's admiration to Rat while Rat finds out the house of Badger in *The Wind in the Willows*, and the second one, cited from *The Red-Headed League* and *The Speckled Band* in *Sherlock Holmes*, is Watson's admiration to Holmes:

> "Rat! . . . you're a wonder! . . . You argued it out, step by step, in that wise head of yours . . . I've read about that sort of thing [deduction] in books, but I've never come across it before in real life . . . If I only had your head, Ratty—" (48-9)
>
> ". . . it was the lust of the chase would suddenly come upon him, and that his

lost Mole; with pistols and a stick, he discovers Mole in the Wild Wood; then, through deducing that the door-mat which nearly stumbles Mole is on the trapdoor of Badger's home, Rat finds a domestic retreat for Mole and himself. This rescue-and-deduction scene seems similar to the descriptions of Holmes' exact deductions and battles with criminals by pistol or martial arts in *Sherlock Holmes* (Riley and McAllister 144-5).

Such hero-worship generates co-dependent intimacy, revealing through sheer loyalty, emotional disclosure and physical closeness. Though these revelations may not hint "a coded, secret discussion of homosexuality" (Nodelman and Reimer 153), they are definitely homoerotic. Two perfect examples can be found in *The Wind in the Willows*. One is the episode of Mole, Rat and Toad's carriage-riding. Though Mole pines for going with Toad, he claims, "I'll always stick to you, Rat," (23) when Rat disapproves this journey. Because he is "fond of the Mole, and would do almost any thing to oblige [Mole]" (24), Rat then yields to go with them. One night, the homesick Rat and the guilt-ridden Mole share a secret talk while they sleep in the carriage:

> . . . [Rat] added pathetically, in a lower tone: "I think about it [the River]—all the time!"
>
> The Mole reached out from under his blanket, felt for the Rat's paw in the darkness, and gave it a squeeze. "I'll do whatever you like, Ratty," he whispered. "Shall we run away to-morrow morning, quite early—*very* early—and go back to our dear old hole on the river?" (26)

This dialogue reveals so deep intimacy that it is more like between lovers who are planning to elope than between friends.

---

brilliant reasoning power would rise to the level of intuition, until those who were unacquainted with his methods would look askance at him as on a man whose knowledge was not that of other mortals . . . I had no keener pleasure than in following Holmes in his professional investigations, and in admiring the rapid deductions, as swift as intuitions, and yet always founded a logical basis . . ." (Vol I 278, 397-8)

The other example is the episode of Mole's home-returning. Mole senses the call from his Mole End on his way back to the River with Rat, and wants to return; however, Rat, who walks far ahead, fails to hear what he says and just asks him to catch up. "But even under such a test . . . [Mole's] loyalty to his friend st[ands] firm. Never for a moment d[oes] [Mole] dream of abandoning [Rat]" (73). Instead of just going home or asking Rat to accompany him to return home, Mole silently follows his friend for a while and paroxysmally cries in tears at last. The good-natured Rat then insists on accompanying Mole to find the Mole End, while Mole, knowing that how Rat loves the Riverside home, eagerly dissuades him:

> " . . . It's too late, and too dark, and the place is too far off, and the snow's coming! And—and I never meant to let you know I was feeling that way about it [having homesickness]—it was all an accident and a mistake! And think of River Bank, and your supper!"
>
> "Hang River Bank, and supper too!" said the Rat heartily. "I'll tell you, I'm going to find this place [the Mole End] now . . . so cheer up, old chap, and take my arm . . ." (75).

After they go to the Mole End arm-in-arm, Rat encourages the moody Mole by finding food and making supper for him, and they have a one-night sleep side by side in the bunks, as I have mentioned earlier. I believe that no other *children's* literature will never produce an intimate friendship warmer and more homoerotic like this.

The similar homoerotic intimacy appears in the *Tom Brown* series. In *Tom Brown's Schooldays* the ice-breaking moment of Tom-Arthur friendship is that Tom "put[s] his arm round his [Arthur's] neck," comforting Arthur, who "look[s] up with the great tears in his eyes" (171) and pours his homesickness before Tom. When Arthur gets fever and and almost dies, Tom by his bedside soliloquizes, "[o]h God, can I bear to lose him?" (222), and Arthur also admits that Tom has been "[his]

backbone . . . at Rugby, and [has] made the school a paradise to [him]" (226). In *Tom Brown at Oxford* when Hardy's father reconciles between Tom and Hardy, he points out homoeroticism in their friendship before Tom: "I drew out of [Hardy] that he loves you as David loved Johathan" (220).[126] The scene of reconciliation between Tom and Hardy as follows also flows homoerotic intimacy: "Tom rushe[s] across to his friend, dearer than ever to him now, and thr[o]w[s] his arm round his neck; and if the un-English truth must out, ha[ve] three parts of a mind to kiss the rough face which [i]s not working with strong emotion" (221). Tom's urge of kissing Hardy implies homoeroticism through physical intimacy, as Oulton argues (36-7)

In *Sherlock Holmes* representations of growing intimacy exist as well. After Watson gets married, Holmes constantly mentions of Watson's importance in an affectionate way, such as "I am lost without my Boswell" (Vol I 243);[127] "[i]t makes a considerable difference to me, having someone with me on whom I can thoroughly rely" (306); "[w]e have shared this same room for some years, and it would be amusing if we ended by sharing the same cell" (914), and even "[q]uick, man, if you love me!" (Vol II 439). Holmes also develops physical attachments to Watson, including holding his hands in *The Bruce-Partington Plans*, clapping him on the shoulder(s) in *Charles Augustus Milverton* and *His Last Bow*, covering his mouth in *The Empty House*, and putting hands on his knees in *The Problem of Thor Bridge*. The most homoerotic scene is *The Three Garridebs*: when Holmes almost sheds tears after

[126] In *The Book of Samuel*, David was the kingship rival of King Saul's son, Jonathan; however, David and Jonathan were best friends. Jonathan loved David as himself, giving David all his processions, even warned David to escape when his father was going to kill David. After Jonathan died, David mourned him so deeply that he even said, "your love to me was wonderful, wonderful than the love of woman" (2 1:26). The traditional interpretation was that they relationship was platonic and homosocial, while many Victorian writers, like John Addington Symonds or Oscar Wilde, believed it to be romantic and even homoerotic (Oulton 42-3).

[127] "Boswell" is originally referred to James Boswell (1740-1795), who was the biographer of Samuel Johnson, the editor of *A Dictionary of the English Language*. Holmes here compares Watson to James Boswell, admiring Watson to publish his cases.

Watson gets shot, his emotional release extremely touches Watson.[128]

On the other hand, Watson also stands loyal for Holmes even when Holmes is hunted down by Moriarty,[129] or when Holmes breaks the laws for the greater good.[130] Concerning emotional intimacy, Watson nurses the "dying" Holmes by claiming "[a] sick man is but a child, and so I will treat you" (Vol II 431) in *The Dying Detective*, as well as accompanies the ill Holmes to convalesce in *The Reigate Puzzle* and *The Devil's Foot*, though nursing has been reckoned as women's duties since the mid-Victorian era (Newsom Kerr 149). When Holmes is "resurrected" in *The Empty House*,[131] Watson is so shocked that he faints before his friend. Joining the dangerous experiment with Holmes, Watson saves Holmes from the deadly poison in *The Devil's Foot*.[132] When Holmes is seriously wounded by the criminal in *The Illustrious Client*, Watson by his bedside cries out, "I'll go and thrash the hide off [the criminal] if you give the word" (528). Intriguingly, in *The Dancing Men* Watson even as a Victorian

---

[128] I cite the original paragraph as follows:

> "You're not hurt, Watson? For God's sake, say that you are not hurt!"
>
> It was worth a wound—it was worth many wounds—to know the depth of loyalty and love which lay behind that cold mask. The clear, hard eyes were dimmed for a moment, and the firm lips were shaking. For the one and only time I caught a glimpse of a great heart as well as of a great brain. All my years of humble but single-minded service culminated in that moment of revelation . . .
>
> His face set like flint as he glared at our prisoner [the criminal] . . . "If you had killed Watson, you would not have got out of this room alive" (Vol II 624-5).

This above episode of Holmes' emotional release in this case is often cited by Sherlockians to prove Holmes' homosexual love for Watson. Yet I view Holmes-Watson friendship as merely homoerotic instead of homosexual because of this episode: if Holmes has been sexually intimate with Watson, Watson would not be so surprised and touched when Holmes here reveals strong emotion for him.

[129] In *The Final Problem* Watson ventures with Holmes to travel to the Continent to escape Moriarty, who yet keeps chasing them to Europe. When Holmes advices Watson to go back to London for safety, Watson insists on accompanying him to the end as "an old campaigner as well as an old friend" (Vol I 749). The pure loyalty Watson displays for Holmes is similar to (and even more than) Mole for Rat.

[130] In *Charles Augustus Milverton* and *The Bruce-Partington Plans* Watson risks being caught as a thief by breaking laws with Holmes to catch the criminals.

[131] Doyle intended to end Holmes' life in *The Final Problem* by writing that Holmes self-sacrificingly falls into the Reichenbach Falls with Moriarty; since numerous readers protest, however, Doyle yielded to write *The Empty House* to "resurrect" Holmes. In this story Holmes tells Watson that he never fell into the waterfall with Moriarty, merely pretending to be dead and hiding overseas for three years to draw out the rest followers of Moriarty (including Moran).

[132] In *The Devil's Foot* Holmes tests the poisoned powder with Watson to study how this powder evoked the illusion of victims and drove them crazy to death. When Holmes and Watson are both affected by the illusion and almost dead, it is the tortured face of Holmes that gives Watson energy and sanity to rescue Holmes and himself from the poisoned smoke.

husband asks his wife to maintain the domestic economics has his checkbook locked in the drawer of Holmes, who owns the key to it.

Unlike heterosexual or homosexual love, intimate friendship allows two friends to have their own social circles. In *The Wind in the Willows* Mole has other companions to spend time with, and Rat has Otter. When Otter affectionately hugs Rat at the house of Badger, Mole is good-natured to allow Otter and Rat share the Riverside gossip. He is not jealous of Otter because he knows the married Otter only has clubmanship with Rat, and such clubmanship can never overpower his cohabited friendship of male domesticity, emotional intimacy and physical closeness with Rat. It does not mean, nevertheless, that homoerotic jealousy does not exist in Rat-Mole friendship. When the enthralled Rat is about to follow Sea Rat to have overseas adventures, Mole "drag[s] him inside, thr[o]w[s] him down, and h[o]ld[s] him" (157), regardless of Rat's protest, and then locks the door. After Rat recovers from the magnetism of Sea Rat, Mole relaxes for knowing that "the fit, or attack, ha[s] passed away, and ha[s] left [Rat] sane again" (158). Jackie Wullschläger criticizes that here Rat, "held back by his responsibility toward friends and his everyday life, is Grahame after marriage" (162). How can there be no hint of homoeroticism, however, if Rat-Mole friendship is compared to the marital duties as a sweet burden for Rat? Mole's dissuasion of Rat from leaving is also powerful and natural, as if he is not just a cohabited friend but the better half of Rat, viewing Sea Rat as his love rival.

Jealousy in intimate friendship is also notable in both the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes.* In *Tom Brown's Schooldays* after Martin joins the Bible-reading of Tom and Arthur, when "Arthur t[akes] to [Martin] so kindly that Tom c[an]'t resist slight fits of jealousy" (204). Even when the fevered Arthur tells Tom that "[y]ou can't think how often I've been thinking of old Martin since I've been ill"(224), Tom feels "a pang of jealousy" (224), and then sounds out Arthur's views to Tom by

praising Martin as the true friend of Arthur. Discovering the jealousy of Tom, the sensitive Arthur soon answers, "[n]onsense, Tom, he [Martin] never could have done for me what you have" (229) to comfort Tom. This echoes the remarks of Henry R. Harrington I have cited in the introduction, that the Victorian boys' realization of masculinity in the *Tom Brown* series "offered substitutive gratification for the sexual desire" (17). More homoerotic than that is in *Sherlock Holmes*. Jealous about the engagement of Watson and Mary Morstan, which he directly disapproves, Holmes keeps making subtle sarcasm even after Watson gets married.[133]

In spite of jealousy, both Rat-Mole friendship and Holmes-Watson one do not end in bitterness. The Rat-Mole homoerotic friendship leads to a happy ending through story-telling. Gaarden and Hunt claim that after the battle of retaking the Toad Hall, Rat as the friendly mentor of Mole is replaced by Badger, who views Mole as a trustworthy assistant (46; 58). Yet I disagree with their views, since I find evidence to prove that Rat-Mole friendship remains as homoerotic and intimate as ever. After the Toad Hall is retaken, "the Mole and the Water Rat sit[] in wicker chairs out on the lawn, evidently telling each other stories; roaring with laughter and kicking their short legs up in the air" (Grahame 217), while Badger in an arm-chair reads the morning paper alone. This shows that even if Badger adapts a trusted comradeship with Mole, only in Rat-Mole friendship homoerotic intimacy can be found. Such intimacy stands firmer when they two share adventure stories, integrating the Edwardian desire for adventure into their cohabited life of Victorian male domesticity.

Likewise, in *Sherlock Holmes* though Holmes retires at Sussex after Watson re-marries and resumes his medical practice, they use story publication as the means to maintain their intimate and lifelong friendship. After Watson publishes *The Three Garridebs* (1924), the case climaxing their homoerotic emotional release, Holmes

[133] Such jealousy will be further discussed with details in the third part of Chapter 3.

publishes *The Blanched Soldier* (1926) and *The Lion's Mane* (1926), the only two cases recorded by himself. These two case-stories not only adopt gothic and romantic narrative, which Watson prefers and Holmes once abhorred, but focuses on intimate male friendship instead of heterosexual love.[134] It is worthy of thinking why Holmes publishes these two simple cases; for me, he does this for revealing his emotions for his best friend to see. Hence, Holmes and Watson bath in the symbiotic, homoerotic friendship by telling the past adventure stories, and cohabit happily ever after in spirit.

All in all, the idyllic, gentlemanly friendship, combined with the worship of Pan and boyishness, brings about confrontations and reconciliations of Victorian nostalgia and Edwardian adventurism in *The Wind in the Willows*. In the nostalgic, pastoral, homosocial Riverside community, homoerotic male domesticity thrives with an misogynous exclusion of females. The Rat-Mole friendship celebrates this concept through the representations of intimacy with emotional release and physical touches, largely echoing those in the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes*. In the third chapter I will move onto another classic of Edwardian children's literature and crossover text, *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*, to dissect its discussions of the *fin-de-siècle* flights from feminized domesticity, its representation of homoerotic male cohabitation, and its hints of the Edwardian homophobia.

[134] In *The Blanched Soldier* the client James M. Dodd asks Holmes to find his lost military comrade and best mate, whom he address by Christian name and with whom he develops the friendship "which can only be made when one lives the same life and shares the same joys and sorrows" (Vol II540-1). This case largely reflects Holmes-Watson friendship. In *The Lion's Mane* the gloomy, reserved Murdoch, "for a year or more . . . has been as near to McPherson as he ever could be to anyone" (679). Later, Murdoch even sacrifices his love for Maud Bellamy, the lady they both woo, by acting as a go-between for McPherson and Bellamy. Joseph A. Kestner assumes that Bellamy acts as an exchange of homoerotic male friendship between Murdoch and McPherson (199), while I believe Murdoch's surrender of Bellamy to his friend may partly echoes that Holmes finally and reluctantly allows Watson to marry twice and to move away from their cohabited room.

Chapter 3

Flight from Family? Male Cohabitation

in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*

"[A] woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction" (2)—this remark by Virginia Woolf is a true portrayal of not merely Beatrix Potter but all British women. In the previous chapters I have traced the Edwardian cult of boyhood back to the late-Victorian all-male societies or gentleman's clubs, which resulted from men's flights from domesticity. Yet it was also in the late-Victorian era that New Woman rose with feminism. To protest against male domination and to promote values of independence, they called for female celibacy (Jeffreys 96) and even lesbianism, which emerged in the form of "Boston marriage" but seldom caught attention (Gardner 87).[135] Meanwhile, *Girl's Own Paper* (1880-1956) was published to help female readers reconcile emotional needs and rational potentials.[136] Thus, men accused New Woman, who did male jobs without sacrificing femininity, of the rising rate of male unemployment and a challenge to male authority (Reynolds 146).

In the late-Victorian era, nevertheless, three fourth of British women remained working at home, ruling the household and ruled by men (Flanders 13). Girls received a different education from boys: when their brothers were socialized in the public school, they were taught by governess at home. These girls were supposed to devote themselves to their families rather than to knowledge and a profession, meaning that their learning can only be a pastime or for practical use in social circles. Meanwhile,

[135] Coined by Henry James in his novel *The Bostonians* (1886), "Boston marriage" is referred to the cohabitation of two single New Women, who support each other in life and career with financial independence. Whether their cohabitation is involved with homosexuality or merely romantic friendship remains unknown to the current researchers, yet their intimacy is clear by sharing emotional co-dependence. Hence, Boston marriage is acknowledged as one of the representations of lesbianism (Gardner 87).

[136] For example, in this periodical girls were taught "not to reject traditional feminine characteristics; purity, obedience, dependence, self-sacrifice and service are all presented as desirable qualities . . . However, the image of feminine womanhood was expanded to incorporate intelligence, self-respect and . . . the potential to become financially independent" (Reynolds *Girls* 140).

the older girls, even the upper-middle class ones, were responsible for taking care of younger siblings in the nursery because girls "could not be spared" (Flanders 98), having to manage housekeeping even at their own leisure. Florence Nightingale, who rebelled against the wish of her family to become a nurse, intensely claimed that it was unfair for men to view women as their intellectual inferiors. She asked: how could women learn any serious knowledge under the burden of domestic duties that men were not required to shoulder? (406, 408). Her remark precisely describes the predicament of Beatrix Potter, the most notable Edwardian woman author with a heart that cherished not only domesticity but also nature and freedom.

3.1 Beatrix Potter: Domesticity, Nature and Freedom

Born in Bolton Gardens in Kensington, Beatrix Potter (1866-1943) spent two thirds of her life fighting against her conservative parents in their London home. Her mother Helen enjoyed city life and the upper-middle class social activities, while her father Rupert, a wealthy barrister who never practiced, frequented gentleman's clubs, where he felt at ease to spend time with the Liberal friends (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 10). Meanwhile, Rupert was also an amateur photographer and countryside artist, influenced by his friends: John Millais, a Pre-Raphaelite, and Randolph Caldecott, a successful illustrator. As a girl who loved reading and painting, Potter undoubtedly merited the propensity of her father, while Millais[137] and Caldecott[138] also had a great impact on her style of illustration.

Nature, however, influenced her more than her father and his friends did. The Potters often spent summer holidays in Dalguise House and the Lake District before

[137] Millais encouraged Potter to keep working on painting, praising her, "plenty of people can *draw* , but you and my son John have observation" (Linder 418).

[138] The soft borders of Potter's pictures in children's books were influenced by the unframed drawings of Caldecott. The style of her animal characters also owed greatly to those in the paintings of Caldecott (Chandler 294). Nevertheless, the paintings of Caldecott often focus on the idyllic countryside, while those of Potter are realistic, and animals in her books have dangers to fall prey to human beings or predators (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 46).

Potter reached fifteen. Hence, Potter had opportunities to venture into the wild with her young brother Walter Bertram, collecting, observing and drawing insects, plants and animals in nature (Golden 16). Yet after the Potters returned to London, Potter could not go to the boarding school as Bertram, but she was instead allowed to develop friendship with only her female cousins. Her best companion and friend was Annie Carter, her governess who was only three years older than her. Two years of intimate friendship between Potter and Carter brought "probably the happiest time that [Potter] had ever known" (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 17).

Their happy years suddenly ended when Carter left the Potters to marry Edwin Moore, an engine driver, in 1885. Yet Potter kept visiting her married best friend, whose children adored her and the pets she carried to play with them. This enduring friendship led to an unexpected result. In 1893, Potter first created the story of Peter Rabbit on several illustrated letters to amuse the ill Noël Moore, Carter's five-year-old son. These letters got published as *The Tale of Peter Rabbit* (1902), and its great success launched Potter's career as the author of twenty-three books.

The appeal of nature to Potter implied her rebellion against her parents and her desire to escape their London home for freedom (Kutzer 8). Also, writing offered a personal space for her to shun parental authority. To guard her private comments on politics, news and daily observations from her parents, she even wrote a coded journal, which was decoded by Leslie Linder and published in 1966. As a woman, she was compelled to supervise housekeeping at home; her study on fungi was rejected by the Linnean Society in 1897 as well, only because ladies were disallowed to step into scientific community. Nevertheless, she finally got financial independence after becoming one of the most famous authors of children's picture books.

Falling in love with her editor Norman Warne, Potter decided to engage with him in 1905. However, her parents intensely objected their marriage. They thought

that Warne as “a mere tradesman” (Meyer 136), whose class did not suit their daughter. As possessive parents, they expected her to tend them at home and take them to the country houses on holidays (MacDonald 6-7). Warne died of leukemia three months after the engagement, and the grieved Potter bought the farm Hill Top in the Lake District. Whenever she spared time, she fled from the domestic routines at her London home to Hill Top farm, regardless of the frequent protests of her parents. She got true freedom when she married a solicitor William Heelis in 1913.[139] Leading a secluded life with Heelis in her second farm in Sawrey, Potter enjoyed her married life in the country and no longer had to get freedom via writing and illustrating, so she seldom returned to her publication projects after she got married.

Regardless of preference to depicting domesticity in the English countryside, as well as uses of human clothes on animal characters to blur the distinction between human world and animal one, Potter and Grahame share few similarities. Tess Cosslett states that Grahame portrays his animal characters with Victorian gentlemanliness, employs Romantic allusions to create idyllic nostalgia, and highlights characters’ instinctive pursuits of delicious food, comfortable home and warm friendships. In contrast, Potter illustrates her animal characters as childlike but rebellious, desiring to fly from domesticity for adventures, in spite of threats of ubiquitous dangers of falling prey to predators or human hunters (161).

Potter likes to observe her pets and to transform them into the animal characters of her books. For instance, Peter is her pet rabbit, and Chippy Hackee is the chipmunk of her cousin (Potter *Beatrix* 256). During the years of living with her parents, she also photographs the landscapes in the north countryside, especially her Hill Top farm, and brings them back to her London home for illustration (Meyer 138). Thus, the

[139] This time the Potters still objected her marriage until Bertram came back, admitting to his parents that the reason he wandered away from home for eleven years was that he had married a daughter of a wine merchant. Finally, the Potters reluctantly withdrew their objection (Meyer140).

nature world and animals in her books are more realistic than those in Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows*. This is why she criticizes Grahame for overly humanizing animals without exact depictions (Potter *Beatrix* 450).[140]

As I have delineated in the introduction, in the Edwardian era Potter's picture books were considered as stories for the child. Settings in her picture books are often seen from the perspective of childlike, naughty and adventurous animals. Her tones are sarcastic, yet also comic and light, to appeal to child readers. Moreover, her stories display such strong morals that rebellious child animals eventually get punishment (illness, for example) (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick108). This encourages parents to buy her books for their children. Meanwhile, the Edwardian adult readers loved her stories due to nostalgia through her illustrations of the idyllic childhood, domesticity and countryside;[141] however, they unfortunately neglected the sophistication between the lines or among pictures (Kutzer 2).

Recent critics attempt to explore the complex, ironic elements in her picture books. The most notable critic is M. Daphne Kutzer (2003), who indicates how Potter rebelled against her parents for freedom through her works, such as Peter Rabbit in *The Tale of Peter Rabbit,* Squirrel Nutkin in *The Tale of Squirrel Nutkin* (1903), Tom Kitten in *The Tale of Samuel Whiskers*; *or, the Roly-Poly Pudding* (1908), and so on. All these animal protagonists are mischievous boys who dare resist the domestic restrictions set by their mothers to have fun and adventures (7, 28, 42, 97). The views of Kutzer is later supported by Mandy L. DeWilde (2008), yet partly disagreed by Wynn William Yarbrough (2007), who cites many pieces of evidence of conservatism

[140] In a letter Potter criticized that "Kenneth Grahame ought to have been an artist . . . did he not describe 'Toad' as combing his *hair*? A mistake to fly in the face of nature. A frog may wear galoshes; but I don't hold with toads having beards or wigs! So I prefer Badger" (*Beatrix* 450)

[141] Katherine R. Chandler mentions that Potter's "characters' clothing evokes the Victorians: the bloomers, waistcoats, and pinafores were conventional apparel of the previous century. Additionally, Potter's plots, while about animals, are usually centered in or near the home and imply a concluding moral—characteristics of Victorian domestic interests and didacticism" (288).

in Potter's blood inherited from her father, to prove that she was not altogether rebellious in the theme of her works.[142] Though the above critics give the insightful observations, they fail to reconcile Potter's representations of rebellion with those of conservatism. In contrast, by viewing conservatism as the frame of her works, while inside such a frame Potter's rebellion remains their essence, I attempt to reconcile the above two representations with an analysis of her most ignored work, *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* (1911).

Three peculiarities highlight the differences of *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* from Potter's other books. First, its animal characters, from squirrels, chipmunks to a black bear, are all North American species rather than native species of the British isles. Second, it contains no child characters. Lastly, it is about unhappy marriage and homoerotic cohabitation. Though this book was a great commercial success in Edwardian America, to whose readers this book is dedicated, recent critics severely comment it as "the least satisfactory of Potter's books" (Lear 237) and criticize Potter's attempts to cater to American child readers and her insufficient understanding of the animals she draws.[143]

Most criticism focuses on the above peculiarities of *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*. Ruth K. MacDonald is confused by the marital discord of the chipmunks (Chippy Hackee and his wife), which is contrary to the harmonious domestic life of the squirrels (Timmy and Goody); however, she attributes this only to Potter's uncertainty about child readers and the vaguely defined audience of this book (77-8).[144] Kutzer

---

[142] For example, Potter voted for Tory, "support[ed] hierarchy, marriage and children as ultimate goals for women, and against women's suffrage" (Yarbrough 96).

[143] Except Chippy Hackee, a character based on the pet of her cousin, Potter had no models of animals in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*. The eastern grey squirrels were from Midwestern American, and it was unlikely for Potter to see them around Hill Top (Lear 237). Thus, She studied specimens in the London Zoological Gardens (MacDonald 74-5), consulted references in the National History Museum (Hallinan 82), and checked the book of Rowland Ward, a taxidermist (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 144).

[144] Potter was unfamiliar with American child readers, nor did she have further interest in children after

follows the views of MacDonald, and further points out the strange arrangement of human clothes on chipmunks and squirrels. She wonders why Timmy, Goody and Mrs. Chippy Hackee wear clothes, while Chippy and other male squirrels remain naked, and why is Timmy sometimes in his red jacket and sometimes not (130-1). Judy Taylor, Joyce Irene Whalley, Anne Stevenson Hobbs and Elizabeth M Battrick indicate that Potter clothes Timmy and Goody, because she is uncertain about how to draw Chippy and his wife, both are American species rather than British; for them, clothing makes *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* "an uneasy book, the only one in the series where not all the animals fit naturally into the background" (145). Since the above critics do not further investigate the alternative explanations to the issue of human clothes, they fail to detect implied homoeroticism among Victorian and Edwardian (pseudo-)bachelors. They both note that Chippy prevents Timmy, his cohabiting partner, from leaving by over-feeding Timmy to be too fat to get away from the tree hole. Nevertheless, they only regard this over-feeding as an amusing design, not trying to dissect homoerotic possessiveness of Chippy in this cohabited friendship.

Wynn William Yarbrough is the only critic I find whose analysis of *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* almost hits the spot. He notices the nursing and caring of Chippy to Timmy after the latter falls into the tree hole Chippy lives in and points out their negligence in their husbandly duties to cohabit together (120). Nevertheless, since Yarbrough compares them with Peter and his cousin Benjamin in *The Tale of Benjamin Bunny* (1904), he fails to see homoerotic overtones in Chippy-Timmy friendship. Neither does Yarbrough explain the mass violence of other squirrels to the married Timmy in terms of the Edwardian context as men's resistance to domesticity.

---

the Moore children, for whom she wrote illustrated story letters, grew up. Meanwhile, the dedication of *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*, "For Many Unknown Little Friends, Including Monica" reveals a lack of clearly defined audience. Even Monica was merely a school friend of Potter's young cousin who asked her for this dedication, and she did not know this girl (McDonald 78; Kutzer 129).

Nor does he view the domestic discord between Chippy and his wife (she mentions that Chippy has bit her) as men's desire for female exclusion and all-male domesticity. In other words, Yarbrough interprets the above two examples simply as the collective violence to the singular male or violence in marriage (133-4). My analysis of *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* as follows will advance the arguments of the above critics by dissecting the adult themes of this book, such as Timmy's feminized domesticity and Chippy's flights from feminized domesticity, homoerotic male cohabitation, and their eventual returns to heterosexual households under the pressure of homophobia.

Notwithstanding the shared elements of personification of animal characters and English domesticity in nature, *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* is considerably unlike Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* in the issue of homophobia. Though the narrator allows female presence in *The Wind in the Willows*, female characters remain "invisible" in the animal gentleman's club—the Riverside all-male society, and only emerge in the human world.[145] Moreover, in *The Wind in the Willows* male domesticity and emotional intimacy in bachelor friendship arouses no suspicion or opposition, and there is no homophobic pressure that compels animal bachelors to get married. In contrast, Potter illustrates *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* with a frame of feminized domesticity. This frame, which protects heterosexual marriage rather than male friendship, frustrates homoerotic male cohabitation of major characters. Thus, I claim that the shadow of homophobia dominates *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*.

The homoerotic hints in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* can be proved with biographical information of Potter, first from her conflicts between conservatism and rebellion, between Victorian domesticity and Edwardian adventurism, and then from

[145] Otter, who has a son Portly, is the only male character in the Riverside Society who is definitely a married man. However, he is not the major character, and his wife never appears or gets mentioned in the story. The female characters who emerge in the book, including the washwoman, the gaoler's daughter and the bargewoman, are all human characters instead of animal members in the Society.

her parental prohibition of her development of close homosociality and her intimate friendship with Annie Carter. With regard to the conservative Victorian domesticity, Potter remained a filial daughter in all her life. Unlike Bertram, who achieved independence by going to the public school and then Oxford, Potter as a Victorian woman could only be confined at home (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 49-50). Even after she got married, she had to journey from Sawrey to London to tend to her ill father till he died in 1914, and bought a house at the Lake District for her mother, whose health she kept an eye on, until her mother's death in 1932 (28-9).

Potter's adhesiveness to marriage is strong as well. She had "an old-fashioned notion that a happy marriage is the crown of a woman's life" (Lane 68), and this notion led to her escape from parents to husband, from domesticity into another domesticity. After she got married, she had to help Heelis nurse his brother Arthur, aside from her favorite sheep farming (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 29, 31). Hence, her creativity waned as she busied in the domestic routines; she only published a few picture books, which were reckoned not as good as her previous ones.[146]

Yet rebellious Edwardian adventurism remained in her veins, revealing through her grievance against her parents. Her mother Helen is social but authoritative and demanding, who "would not suffer dirty or mischievous children very gladly" (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 45) and thus "tried to keep [Potter] as a semi-invalid far too much" (Lear 443). This led to the complaints of Potter against Helen in her own coded journal. Perhaps this is why in many of her picture books (as those Kutzer mentions in page 110) she compares herself to a naughty boy animal who often ignores the warnings of Mother to have adventure. Compared with Helen, Rupert is

[146] The picture books she published after her marriage are *Appley Dapply's Nursery Rhymes* (1917), *The Tale of Johnny Town-Mouse* (1918), *Cecily Parsley's Nursery Rhymes* (1922) and *The Tale of Little Pig Robinson* (1930). Most of them were collected and edited from her old inspirations before marriage, implying that her creativity was on the wane after she got married.

more a person of “intelligence and literary and artistic taste, and not without a sense of humor” (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 37). Potter resembles her father, so that they went to the galleries and discuss arts together, and his sketches and photographs inspired some of her picture books. However, according to Potter’s cousin Caroline, Rupert “was very proud of [Potter] and her books but like many fathers of his time, did not realize that she had the right to her own life” (Lear 443).

Potter wanted a life in which she could fulfill her ambition first as a scientist and then as an author. The only way to achieve her goals was to have financial independence. In 1890 when Potter was bored with domestic routines, which her mother compelled her to do, she attempted to fly from domesticity by earning sufficient money. With the support of her brother she began to draw Christmas cards for publication to earn funds (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 49-50). In addition to this, since the Potters lived near Natural History Museum, Potter often visited there alone and studied zoology and botany on her own. After the Linnean Society rejected her paper on fungi, she poured her energy in drawing illustrations. Even under the attack of the demise of her fiancé, she insisted on sparing a day or two each week working on her picture books at Hill Top farm, where she retired from parental control and tedious housework.

In other words, the life of Potter is a mix of Victorian femininity and feminism. She had stayed at home to do domestic routines and to tend to her parents for more than half of her life, and she kept playing the role as a farmer and housewife after she got married. Nevertheless, she showed great enthusiasm and talent in the “masculine” realms, like zoology and botany, and she will be forever remembered as a notable author, not just a certain Mrs. William Heelis. Her picture books ostensibly have the domestic frames, focusing on the child-parent relationships and familial routines;

however, in her books she instilled her will of rebellion against conservative parents and her pining for flights from feminized domesticity.

As for friendships with other women, since Potter's parents restricted her development of close friendship, Annie Carter, her governess, remained her only friend besides her female cousins. Though they were not bachelors, their intimate friendship was based on the leisured activities that the common women might not do, including having literary discussions, roaming in the park, and going out for art exhibitions. I believe, when Carter left her for a husband, the devastated Potter might see how intense homosociality was hindered by heterosexual relationship. And I assume, the dissuasion of Chippy to Timmy from reuniting with Timmy's wife in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* can be seen as a projection of her feelings to Carter's marriage and leaving. Nevertheless, since Edwin Moore was often not at home, Potter could still spend some time with Carter and the Moore children, who then became Potter's godchildren and one of whom was even named after her Christian name.[147]

Apart from *The Tale of Peter Rabbit*, which was from her letter to Noël Moore, several of her picture books are inspired by her illustrated letters to the children of her best friend, including her favorite *The Tailor of Gloucester* (1903) (for Freda in 1901), *The Tale of Squirrel Nutkin* (for Noël in 1897 and Norah in 1901), *The Tale of Mr. Jeremy Fisher* (1906) (for Eric in 1893), and *The Tale of Samuel Whiskers; or, the Roly-Poly Pudding* (for Freda in 1906) (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 109, 111, 126; Potter *Beatrix* 150). If Carter did not suggest Potter to publish these letters, Potter will never earn the immortal reputation as an author of children's picture books (*Beatrix* 50). Potter even sent one of the early copies of *The Tale of Johnny Town-Mouse* (1918) to Carter for sincere gratitude and a remembrance of their

[147] There are eight children of Edwin Moore and Annie Carter: Noël, Eric, Marjorie, Freda, Norah, Joan, Hilda and Beatrix. Potter is the godmother of the Moore children, and the youngest girl Beatrix is named after "Beatrix" Potter (Potter *Beatrix* 99).

friendship. Even after she married, Potter kept corresponding with Carter, showing her concerns to the declined health of her best friend (*Beatrix* 252). Their friendship might be one of the warmest in the female literary field.

Truly, there is no specific evidence of homoeroticism in the Potter-Carter intimate friendship. However, as I have argued earlier, the close female homosociality was less suspected of homosexuality than the male one in Victorian and Edwardian England, since emotional intimacy is gendered as a quality of femininity. In my opinion, Potter transforms her friendship with Carter into the male cohabited bonding between Timmy and Chippy because intimate friendship between cohabited (pseudo-)bachelors tends to engender struggles and clashes. Friendship hindered by marriage is easier to arouse sympathy from readers.

Hence, we can consider *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* a book which acquires dual readership with its sophistication. Child readers may view the wives of Timmy and Chippy as the figures of mother. Thus, when they see that the ill Chippy is wrapped around with a blanket by his wife after he returns home, they may think of this merely as a motherly figure tending to her childish husband. In contrast, teen and adult readers may understand Potter's coded message between the lines and among the pictures, figuring out homophobia in such a compelled return from homoerotic cohabitation to heterosexual marriage. In other words, instead of presenting warm, easygoing domesticity as she does in her previous picture books, in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* Potter leads readers into the Edwardian homophobic world, where homoerotic men struggle against the Victorian gendered construction of domesticity and end in failure. Her efforts make this book one of the crossover texts among Edwardian children's literature.

3.2 Flights from Feminized Domesticity

I have mentioned the debate between conservative domesticity and rebellious flights from domesticity in the works of Potter; the former is proposed by Wynn William Yarbrough and the latter by M. Daphne Kutzer and Mandy L. DeWilde. In the following I am about to observe Potter's representations of conservatism and rebellion in her works by analyzing stays in and flights from feminized domesticity in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes.*

Since colors have been gendered, characters who wear in red in Potter's books, such as the sisters of Peter, Jemima Puddle-Duck, Mrs. Tiggy-Winkle and Mrs. Tittlemouse, are either mild daughters or motherly housewives, representatives of Victorian feminized domesticity. Hence, Timmy Tiptoes, a major male character, is notable because he wears a red jacket, unlike Peter Rabbit, Tom Kitten and Johnny Town-Mouse who all wear blue ones. This probably implies that Timmy is a bourgeois married man of feminized domesticity. Timmy owns a snug nest on the top of the tree and makes a store of nuts with his wife Goody, who is dressed in pink. This reflects a harmonious marriage and domestic life.

A life of feminized domesticity, however, does not thoroughly cover the potentials of Timmy in male domesticity. When he collects nuts with his wife, his unclothing of red jacket hints such potentials. In contrast, Goody does not take off her clothes as the sisters of Peter Rabbit do when they start gathering blackberries in *The Tale of Peter Rabbit*. Her clothing emphasizes her sexuality as a mature woman and thus differs her from these girl rabbits. However, her clothing also highlights her husband's unclothing, which later foreshadows his literal "fall" into a world of pure male domesticity through homoerotic cohabitation.

The other scene which hints Timmy's male domesticity is that he is bullied by a group of bachelor squirrels. Since they do not establish the families of bourgeois feminized domesticity, which clothing and nut-collecting symbolize, these bachelor

squirrels neither wear clothes nor remember where they hide the collected nuts. Hence, they end in fights when they "f[i]nd some nuts that d[o] not belong to [them]" (Potter *Tale* 16). The bachelor squirrels signify the *fin-de-siècle* working-class mob, raising strikes against the bourgeois class and its feminized domesticity.[148] Falsely accused of stealing the nuts of bachelor squirrels, Timmy is chased, taken and brutally thrown upside down into a tree hole for incarceration. Kutzer questions the inconsistency of Timmy's clothing in these scenes: his red jacket seems gone when he is stuck in the tree hole but it re-appears after he is at the bottom of that hollow tree (131). For me, that jacket is always on Timmy and it just *seems* disappear because it does not cover the lower part of Timmy's body. Kutzer's viewpoint, however, evokes me to ponder why Potter chooses not to present Timmy's red jacket in the picture. The disappearance of Timmy's red jack, I believe, implies his loss of middle-class dignity under the working-class riots of the bachelor squirrels, similar to Toad's loss of his gentleman's suit when he escapes from prison by cross-dressing in *The Wind in the Willows.* The reappearance of Timmy's red jacket suggests the retrieval of his social status when he enjoys male domesticity by cohabiting with Chippy in this hollow tree, virtually a bachelor's apartment or a gentleman's club.

Unlike Timmy, Chippy Hackee is like one of the deviant *fin-de-siècle* gentlemen and "boy-men," so tired of heterosexual relationship that they sometimes retired to their "second home" for a break (Chudacoff 42), as I have delineated in the introduction. His goal is to set up an all-male space that excludes female presence and resembles the late-Victorian and the Edwardian bachelor's apartments or gentleman's clubs. This reminds me of two models of clubman in Potter's life. One is her father

[148] Peter Hunt claims that since the late-Victorian era the bourgeois class has been "shaken by major strikes, such as the Dock Strike in London in 1889, and the Engineers' Strikes of 1897." Therefore, both Liberal and Conservative parties began to "placate the demands of the increasingly powerful working class and to attract their votes" (4).

Rupert, who often spent time in a gentleman's club called "the Reform," where he lingered long to chat with his Liberal friends (Meyer 127). The other is her husband William Heelis (nicknamed "Willie"), a solicitor and adept golfer who preferred to stay in the golf club with Dr. Parsons. And Heelis-Parsons friendship inspired Potter to depict friendship between Johnny Town-Mouse and Timmy Willie in *The Tale of Johnny Town-Mouse* (Taylor, Whalley, Hobbs and Battrick 158).

The hollow tree where Timmy and Goody store their nuts is also the home of Chippy and his wife. In this story the tree hole that stores the nuts is compared to a "money-box," so the stored nuts crystallize stability of bourgeois feminized domesticity. Ironically, it is also these nuts that destroy the already problematic marriage of the chipmunk couple. Flooding into the passages and sitting-room of their house, the nuts disrupt their last domestic peace. Mrs. Chippy Hackee later tells Goody, "my husband . . . has run away and left me" (Potter *Tale* 36). In fact, what Chippy, who is hostile to his wife, actually plans is to fly from both feminized domesticity and heterosexual marriage altogether.[149] This is why he becomes the only animal major character who remains unclothed in the whole story. After his wife leaves the nuts-flooded house to search for him, Chippy secretly returns and leads a carefree life of male domesticity. Intriguingly, the tree of feminized domesticity (the storeroom of Timmy and Goody and the home of Chippy and his wife) now turns out to be a residence of a male animal, and later becomes, after Timmy falls in, a cohabited home for Chippy and Timmy, two *fin-de-siècle* bourgeois pseudo-bachelors.

In the third part of the second chapter, I have stated the representations of male domesticity in the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes*, mentioning episodes such

[149] When Goody advises Mrs. Chippy Hackee to go into the tree hole to find Chippy, the latter answers, "Yes, I could . . . but my husband, Chippy Hackee, bites!" (40) This reveals the hostility of Chippy to her in their marital life.

as Tom's nursing of the fevered Arthur or Holmes' preparing meals for the hungry Watson. In *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*, homoeroticism in the representations of male domesticity is even more apparent, since Chippy displays strong possessiveness. When Timmy wakes up from his fall, he finds himself "tucked up in a little moss bed" with ribs broken, and Chippy appears to "hope[] he fe[els] better" (Potter *Tale* 30). When Chippy hears Timmy's coughs and groans, he even lends Timmy a night cap, trying to prevent his friend from catching a cold. Here Potter again does not illustrate Timmy's red jacket, the symbol of feminized domesticity, because this is a scene where feminized domesticity is overpowered by homosocial male domesticity.

What transforms their homosociality into homoeroticism is the way in which Chippy reacts to the heterosexual tendency of Timmy. When Chippy hears of Timmy's description of his fall into the tree hole and the forced separation from Goody, he "laugh[es] and chuckle[s]" (32), disclosing his contempt for heterosexual marriage, as Holmes does in *Sherlock Holmes*.[150] Ignoring Timmy's cry, "but how shall I ever get out through that hole unless I thin myself? My wife will be anxious!" (Potter *Tale* 32), Chippy keeps feeding Timmy with nuts, making him too fat to get out of the tree hole. By forcing Timmy to stay with him, Chippy achieves homoerotic male cohabitation he desires. Meanwhile, Timmy's wish to reunite with Goody may suggest his own homophobia. Such representations of homophobia is similar to Watson's dilemma between his homoerotic friendship with Holmes and his heterosexual marriage with Mary Morstan in *Sherlock Holmes*.

The most homoerotic scene occurs at the moment when Goody and Mrs. Chippy Hackee find their husbands singing inside the tree:

---

[150] Holmes in *The Sign of Four* remarks against heterosexual marriage, claiming that "love is an emotional thing, and whatever emotional is opposed to that true cold reason . . . I should never marry myself, lest I bias my judgment" when Watson is engaged to Mary Morstan (Vol I 235).

Down below there was a noise of nut crackers, and a fat squirrel voice and a thin squirrel voice were singing together—

"My little old man and I fell out,
How shall we bring this matter about?
Bring it about as well as you can,
And get you gone, you little old man!
… For the diddlum day
Day diddle dum di!
Day diddle diddle dum day!" (Potter *Tale* 38, 40)

The part "[m]y little old man and I fell out . . . you little old man" is a poem in Andrew Lang's *The Nursery Rhyme Book*. It reads: "[m]y little old man and I fell out;/ I'll tell you what 'twas all about:/ I had money, and he had none,/ And that's the way the row begun" (268). In the original version, this nursery rhyme describes the financial clashes between two men; in the Potterian version, however, the clashes are about homoerotic friendship in male cohabitation. As Holmes wants Watson to live with him rather than to go out for a wife, Chippy also wants Timmy to stay, while Timmy, who grows fatter, has no choice but to cohabit with him. Though Chippy sings "get you gone" with Timmy, since that they do not know their wives are listening outside, Chippy actually does not want to get his friend out but wishes this cohabitation to last forever.

Likewise, the part "For the diddlum day . . . diddle dum day" can be traced back to an American folksong, Jake Heggies' "The Leather-Winged Bat," inspired by an old English song collected by Francis Child and published in the late-Victorian era in *Child Ballads*. The poem reads,

Hi, said the little old leather-winged bat,
I will tell you the reason that,

The reason that I fly in the night:

I've lost my heart's delight.

High-oh day-oh diddle-oh dum,

High-oh day-oh diddle-oh day

High-oh day-oh diddle-oh dum

Diddle Diddle dum! Dah day oh...[151]

Hi, said the woodpecker sittin' on the fence,

Once I caught me a handsome wench,

She got sassy and from me fled,

and ever since then: my head's been red!*

Hi, said the bluebird as he flew,

Once I caught me a young girl, too,

She got sassy and wanted to go--

So I tied a new string to my bow.*

Hi, said the robin as he flew,

When I was a young man, I'd court, too,

If a one didn't love me, the other one would,

Now, don't you think my notion's good?*

The original song was often sung by woodpeckers and miners in the Victorian era. It focuses on their courtship for the girls, their failures, and their mutual comforts by

[151] The part "High-oh day . . . Dah day oh…" will be repeated thrice after the following stanzas, so I marks it as "*" whenever it is repeated.

singing. Hence, it suggests an all-male atmosphere. This to a certain extent echoes male homoeroticism in Timmy-Chippy relationship, probably explaining why Potter adapts this song in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes.*

Together, Timmy and Chippy cohabit with male domesticity. Such cohabitation in Edwardian context can be seen as an euphemism of homosexual relationship.[152] This definition of cohabitation may explain why Potter narrates Timmy and Chippy as "a fat squirrel and a thin squirrel" (38) instead of a squirrel and a chipmunk. Thus, male domesticity in the late-Victorian and the Edwardian era almost belonged to male homosexual couples only (Brady 200-1).[153] Since there is no further evidence of homosexuality in Timmy-Chippy relationship, at least I can make sure homoeroticism in their cohabitation, which the homophobic British society then could not endure.

3.3 Homophobia: A Return to Heterosexual "Normalcy"

To dissect the representations of homophobia, which eventually causes the separation of Chippy and Timmy at the end of *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*, I first explain the coinage of homosexuality and the origin of homophobia in Britain. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the sexual intercourse among men was not called "homosexuality" but "sodomy," and the British sodomites had been convicted of death penalty until 1861 (Foldy 81). Meanwhile, not until 1892 in Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* had the term "homosexuality" entered English, though it was coined in 1869 by Hungarian writer Karoly Benkert and used in the Continent (Brady 11; Showalter 171). From 1861 to 1892, therefore, there was only "sexual inversion" instead of homosexual phenomena, and it was hard to identify whether a man did a

[152] For example, when Edward Carpenter, one of the homosexual pioneers in Britain, cohabited with his working-class lover Merrill in 1898, all his friends considered male domesticity with absence of women was against nature, for the Victorian beliefs suggested that men needed wives or females to manage domestic affairs for them.

[153] The Victorians and the Edwardians' definition of wife was an "female valet, who is to wait upon him. . . live for the sole purpose of seeing him well-fed, well-lodged, and well-pleased" (Flanders 232). This evidences inevitability of female presence in households at that time. This is why in note 152 Carpenter's friends viewed his life of male domesticity with Merrill as being against nature.

homosexual act through his conversation, writing or photograph with other men (Brady 11).

Even after the term "homosexuality" is introduced into Britain, at first it was merely categorized as an insanity or a disease, which could be cured while being discovered in the early period (for example, when men preferred to cross-dressing) (Foldy 83). Apart from this, despite the Criminal Law Amendment Act (1885), which "prohibited any male person from committing in public or private . . . any act of indecency with another male person" (Arata 56), the parliament had been unwillingly to enact the specific punishment of such "indecency" until the 1895 trials of Oscar Wilde.[154] Hence, the definition of sexual relationship among the Victorian aristocratic and bourgeois men remained vague before the late-Victorian era, which brought about its popularity in some spaces in the West End of London (Kaplan 19). As I have indicated in the previous chapters, these spaces included the Turkish bath houses and the gentleman's clubs (particularly "Molly clubs"),[155] where people celebrated male decadent aesthetes before the doomed 1895.

Oscar Wilde (1854-1900) was the most famous decadent aesthete, due to not only his claim, "art for art's sake" but his tragic end of imprisonment and exile for sexual indecency, thereby making male decadence "a *fin-de-siècle* euphemism for homosexuality" (Showalter 171). Intriguingly, Doyle, regardless of his (and Holmes') reputation as a Victorian masculine paradigm, was a friend of Wilde,[156] and even

---

[154] This may be because the Victorian sexologists viewed sex between men as a natural aberration instead of a crime (Brady 14).

[155] The Victorian "Molly clubs" in London could be traced from the early eighteenth century. In "Molly clubs" dozens of cross-dressed men danced, kissed, caressed, hugged, and had sexual intercourse (with) one another. They sometimes walked on the streets (the Strand, the Quadrant, Holborn, Charing Cross, Fleet Street, etc.) to challenge the conventional gendered construction and tempted the male passers-by (Kaplan 20-1).

[156] Doyle and Wilde met in 1889 for writing stories for *Lippincott's Monthly Magazine* and became friends. In 1890 Doyle published *The Sign of Four*, a story noted for Holmes' misogynism and jealousy for Watson's engagement, while Wilde published *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, his classic homoerotic work of celebrating male beauty as superior to femininity (Arata 144).

among the few who dared defend Wilde after Wilde was imprisoned (Arata 219). Thus, as I have broached in the introduction, representations of male decadence can be found in the characteristics of Holmes in *Sherlock Holmes*. For instance, he "loath[es] every form of society with his whole Bohemian soul, . . . alternating from week to week between cocaine and ambition" (Vol I 239).[157] He plays the Stradivarius violin in *A Study in Scarlet, The Sign of Four* and *The Mazarin Stone*. He attends musical concerts or operas with Watson in *A Study in Scarlet*, *The Red-headed League*, *The Hound of the Baskervilles* and *The Red Circle.* As the offspring of Vernet, the French artist, he displays an artistic taste in *The Hound of the Baskervilles* and *The Valley of Fear*. Also, he uses "art for art's sake" to describe his detective career in *The Copper Beeches*, *The Valley of Fear*, *Black Peter*, *The Red Circle*, *The Dying Detective*, *Thor Bridge* and *The Retired Colourman*. These clues add homoerotic overtones to Holmes and his friendship with Watson.

In 1895, however, Wilde's relationship with Lord Alfred Douglas brought about his fall. In Wilde's trials, Sir Edward Carson (Queensberry's attorney) blurred the boundary between literary works (Wildes' letters and *The Picture of Dorian Gray*) and reality by linking effeminate aestheticism of Wilde with homosexuality. He described Wilde as a corrupted, decadent old man who seduced innocent youths. Though Wilde defended the justice of homosexuality by tracing back to its Biblical and Hellenistic origin,[158] the public was persuaded by the words of Edward Carson,

---

[157] Dick Riley and Pan McAllister indicate that the Victorian male decadence was symbolized by opium, morphine and cocaine (86-9). Watson witnesses that Holmes thrice a day uses cocaine and morphine in *The Sign of Four*, and complains Holmes' addiction in *A Scandal in Bohemia* and *The Engineer's Thumb*. In *Missing Three-Quarter* Watson states that he has helped Holmes quit the drug mania, yet he knows that "the fiend [addiction] [i]s not dead but sleeping" and "the sleep [i]s a light one and the wakening near when in periods of idleness" (Vol I 988). In fact, Holmes resumes his cocaine addiction later in this case.

[158] Wilde claims that "[t]he love that dare not speak its name in this century is such a great affection . . . as there was between David and Jonathan, such as Plato made the very basis of his philosophy, and such as you find in the sonnets of Michelangelo and Shakespeare. It is that deep spiritual affection that is as pure as it is perfect" (Kaplan 224). John Addington Symonds in his "A Problem in Greek Ethics"

which led to both the two-year incarceration of Wilde and the turn-of-the-century homophobia in Britain (Kaplan 226-7).

Wilde's trials left such a great homophobic impact on Britain that the literary works concerning homosexuality, including the memoir of Tennyson, of Symonds, and Carpenter's series *Love's Coming of Age*, were edited before or withdrawn from publication.[159] What is worse, as I have stated in the introduction, romantic male friendship without homosexuality, which had aroused no suspicion, was publicly disallowed after 1895, since any emotional disclosure or physical intimacy between men was then interpreted as a sexual one (Nardi 2). Without the blood link family members provided, close male friends hardly maintained their friendship if one of them got married. Apart from this, having emotional and physical intimacy with a wife would be more acceptable than with a same-sex friend (Nardi 120-1).

With the above studies in homosexuality and homophobia, in the following pages I am going to analyze the collapse of homoerotic cohabitation in the inevitable return of Chippy and Timmy to heterosexual relationship in the Edwardian homophobic context. I will also provide the similar representations of homophobic returns to heterosexual life or of British men's rebellion against this gendered construction in the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes* as references.

In *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*, the animal that plays the role of the *fin-de-siècle* public is the birds. Birds fly across the forest to spread the news not only of the working-class riots (crying, "[w]ho's-been-digging-up *my*-nuts?" (18, 22, 24, 56)) but of homoerotic scandals. Without a bird to tell Mrs. Chippy Hackee that Chippy has

---

(1873) shares the similar views with Wilde (Brady 176-7).

[159] The omission of evidence of homoeroticism in the Tennyson-Hallam friendship in Tennyson's *Memoir* (1897) is described with details in note 85. John Addington Symonds' *Memoir* was also prevented from being published by his family after he died until 1984 (Brady 194). Edward Carpenter's *Love's Coming of Age* (1894) was withdrawn by his publisher in 1895, due to the public react from Wilde's trials (1895), and not republished until 1906 and renamed as *The Intermediate Sex* (203).

stayed in the tree home with Timmy, Timmy and Chippy will not be discovered. When their cohabitation is unfolded, Timmy and Chippy react differently. Timmy attempts to recover his identity as a heterosexual husband by kissing Goody through the tree hole. On the other hand, though the thin Chippy hears the voice of his own wife, he chooses not to come out of the tree but to "stay[] below and chuckle[]" (42), merrily watching the fat Timmy failing to get away from the tree hole to reunite with Goody. Hence, we can see homophobia in Timmy and homoerotic resistance to heterosexual marriage in Chippy.

Homophobia versus homoerotic cohabitation—which one will win? At this moment, two factors appear as "Deus ex machina" to retrieve and solidify the orderly bourgeois heterosexual society. One is "a big wind," which "bl[o]w[s] off the top of the tree . . . and let[s] it rain" (44), opening a hole for the heterosexual reunion of Timmy and Goody. As Katherine R. Chandler points out, Potter delicately designs her pictures, which "often supply additional information or forecast where a story is headed" (294). Though there is only one line to depict this heterosexual reunion ("Then Timmy Tiptoes c[o]me[s] out, and [goes] home with an umbrella" (Potter *Tale* 44), in the picture Potter hides unorthodox ideas that may arouse the resistance from Edwardian adult readers, the homoerotic jealousy of Chippy to Goody Tiptoes, by portraying that he stares at the back of the reunited couple.

Devastated by the leaving of his roommate, Chippy insists on staying in the raining, broken tree for another week, regardless of his wife, who holds a broken umbrella to wait him outside. However, the second "Deus ex machina," a large bear, approaches the tree, forcing Chippy to escape with his wife. The design of the wind and the bear in this story implies not merely how vulnerable male homoerotic cohabitation becomes but how powerful the British homophobia is, as the hostile attitudes of the public to Wilde reveal.

As Wilde was imprisoned for homosexuality, homophobia brings about punishments in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes.* The home-returning Chippy catches a cold, wrapped up in a white sheet and caretaken by his wife. This reminds me of Peter Rabbit in *The Tale of Peter Rabbit*, who also ends in catching a cold, wrapped in a red handkerchief and tended to by his mother. Nevertheless, in the last picture Chippy remains unclothed and the umbrella of his wife remains broken, both symbolizing inharmonious relationship. This scene implies that Chippy still desires for another flight from feminized domesticity, so that his marriage may never get fixed. In contrast, the bourgeois marital life of Timmy and Goody restores its solidification through nut-gathering/financial support and children-rearing. This recovery of heterosexual home is also reflected in the scene that Timmy fastens the nuts-storing tree (where he and Chippy cohabited) with a padlock, hinting that he homophobically locked up his male homoerotic desire (if any) aroused by Chippy.

In the *Tom Brown* series homophobic returns to heterosexual relationship can be found as well. Because this series were written in the mid-Victorian era, however, when sense of resistance to feminized domesticity and heterosexual marriage was underdeveloped, major male characters (Tom, Arthur and Hardy) accept heterosexual relationship instead of resisting it. In *Tom Brown's Schooldays* when Tom meets the mother of Arthur at Arthur's sickbed, he notices that her "calm blue eye . . . was his friend's over again," and can not help "wondering if Arthur's sisters [are] like her" (232). When Tom departs, her "deep loving look . . . [i]s like a spell upon him" (235), who then murmurs something, runs back to his dormitory, and has an erotic dream of Arthur's sister. This scene transforms the Tom-Arthur homoerotic emotions into the heterosexual ones by implying Tom's wish of marrying Arthur's sister. By transferring the angelic image of his intimate male friend to a female counterpart, Tom reforges his masculine identity, and thus his relationship with Arthur was viewed

as healthy, noble and temporary in the homophobic British society (Puccio 70; Maureen 495-8).

The same transformation of homoerotic affections into heterosexual ones also emerges in *Tom Brown at Oxford.* Despite the intense passion in Tom-Hardy friendship, as I have previously discussed, they had to return to the heterosexual frame: Hardy engages with Katie, the cousin and the female version of Tom, and Tom also marries Mary (Oulton 37). From the congratulating letter Tom sends to Katie, homoeroticism is lucid: "I shall not go without seeing you and dear old Jack. You mustn't mind me calling [Hardy] Jack . . . [since] you have got the best fellow in England" (Hughes *Oxford* 529-30). Yet Tom does not hold back his homophobic returns; instead, he buries his homoerotic friendship with Hardy in memories after he gets married, so as to play the role as a Victorian gentleman and husband.

Compared with the *Tom Brown* series, *Sherlock Holmes* was published and is set in the historical time in the late-Victorian and the Edwardian eras. Thus, it focuses more on British men's protests against gendered construction. Such protests were staged through creating an all-male space and resisting a homophobic return to heterosexual "normalcy." In *The Sign of Four* when Watson tells Holmes his engagement with Mary Morstan, Holmes "g[i]ve[s] a most dismal groan" and claims, "I fear[] as much . . . I really cannot congratulate you" (Vol I 235), since that he knows heterosexual marriage will lead to the leaving of Watson for good, destroying the homoerotic atmosphere in their cohabited 221B. Indeed, in *A Scandal in Bohemia,* months after Watson gets married, Watson admits that his "marriage ha[s] drifted [Holmes and him] away from each other . . . the home-centered interests . . . [are] sufficient to absorb all [his] attention" (239), as Holmes has feared.

Holmes, however, does not give up dissuading his friend from heterosexual marriage in *The Noble Bachelor*. Weeks before Watson gets married, Holmes subtly

ironizes the upcoming wedding of Watson. When they investigate a case of the missing of an aristocrat's fiancée, Holmes comments before Watson, "perhaps you w[ill] not be very gracious either, if, after all the trouble of wooing and wedding, you f[ind] yourself deprived in an instant of wife . . . thank your stars that we are never likely to find ourselves in the same position" (466-7). For me, this sarcastic remark implies that Holmes darkly wishes Morstan may also disappear before the wedding. Nevertheless, since Watson does not get the message, Holmes can do nothing but to play his violin "to while away these bleak autumnal evenings" (467), which reveals his sadness of failing to stop Watson from moving out for a stable, married life.

In *The Blue Carbuncle*, two years after Watson gets married, Holmes makes a second try. When Holmes checks a hat of unknown owner, he intentionally compares its owner to Watson by stating, "[w]hen I see you, my dear Watson, with a week's accumulation of dust upon your hat, and when your wife allows you to go out in such a state, I shall fear that you also have been unfortunate enough to lose your wife's affection" (380). Again, this deduction implies the dark wish of Holmes that Morstan's love to Watson may wane, and his hope that Watson may come back to live with him. Watson, however, again fails to understand. The above examples of Holmes' jealousy and resistance to Watson's marriage are homoerotic and similar to that of Chippy to the reunion of Timmy and Goody. This may be why they are elaborated in the film adaptations.[160]

[160] In the movie *Sherlock Holmes* (2009), Holmes (starring Robert Downey Jr.) points out that Morstan has been engaged with another man, to dissuade Watson (starring Jude Law) from marriage. After this method fails, Holmes hires a female gipsy fortune teller to describe the mundane life without thrills Watson will have if he chooses marriage instead of case-cracking adventures. In its sequel *Sherlock Holmes: A Game of Shadows* (2011), Holmes and Watson argue the advantages and disadvantages of marital life on their way to Watson's stag party. Watson focuses on the bliss and duties in heterosexual domesticity, while Holmes insists that he would rather die alone than choose the boring married life. Homoeroticism in this sequel is even clearer than the first one, since Holmes reluctantly becomes Watson's best man, sends him to marry, watches him and Morstan happy together with a heart-broken expression, and later finds a chance to throw Morstan into the river on their honeymoon train with an excuse of protecting her from the assault of Moriarty.

Though Holmes' protest against heterosexual relationship is abruptly ended in *The Final Problem* when he "dies" with Moriarty at the Reichenbach Falls, he retrieves what he has lost when he "resurrects" in *The Empty House.* Since Morstan died before Holmes "resurrects," the greatest obstacle in his friendship with Watson is removed, resulting in the resuming of male cohabitation. In *The Norwood Builder*, months after Holmes resurrects and returns to London, he asks Verner, a young doctor and his distant relative, to buy the practice of Watson, so that Watson can sell the practice and come back to live with him. This reveals the homoerotic adhesiveness of Holmes in his long partnership with Watson.

With emotional and physical intimacy revealed, as I have delineated in page 101-2, their friendship climaxes when Holmes unfolds his "depth of loyalty and love which lay behind the cold mask" (Vol II 624) in *The Three Garridebs*, the case in which Watson is shot by a criminal.[161] Watson is touched by Holmes' emotional revelation, yet he may worry how the post-Wildian homophobic public will interpret the deep emotions between them two. I assume, this is why two months later Watson gets married again and to resume his medical practice. He chooses to transform his homoeroticism into heterosexuality, as what Timmy, Tom and Hardy do.

The second leaving of Watson strikes Holmes so hard, as the leaving of Timmy strikes Chippy, that he even openly describes his feelings in *The Blanched Soldier*,[162] that "[t]he good Watson had at that time deserted me for a wife, the only selfish action which I can recall in our association. I was alone" (539). He also depicts his suffering without Watson by his side in *The Lion's Mane*, that "[a]n occasional week-end visit was the most that I ever saw of [Watson] . . . Ah! Had he but been with me, how much he might have made of so wonderful a happening and of my eventual triumph

[161] See the third part of Chapter 2.
[162] The story in *The Three Garridebs* happens in 1902, while *The Blanched Soldier* is published by Holmes in 1926, twenty-four years after Holmes' climaxed emotional revelation to Watson.

against every difficulty!" (673-4) Thus, a year after Watson gets re-married, Holmes retires as a lonely beekeeper at the countryside. Regardless of their everlasting friendship, their cohabitation of male domesticity and homoerotic intimacy is forever impeded by the Edwardian homophobia.

In short, I have analyzed Beatrix Potter's *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* first by discussing the late-Victorian gendered spheres of two sexes, which influenced the emergence of New Woman and the flights from feminized domesticity of the *fin-de-siècle* men. Then I state how such flights end in homoerotic male cohabitation in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*. However, due to the homophobic impact of Wilde's trials, male cohabitation, either in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes* or in the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes*, can not escape the fate of compelling returns from homoerotic friendship to heterosexual "normalcy" of Edwardian Britain. The homoerotic overtones of Potter's book, nevertheless, make it a classic crossover text among Edwardian children's literature, similar to Barrie's *Peter Pan* and Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows.*

Conclusion

"How is it possible for men to be together?" (Foucault 136) —this remark I cited in the introduction is also the question I asked in the thesis. After the drastic change of the definitions of masculinity, the gendered spheres of two sexes, and the "scandalous" Wildes' trials of homosexuality, how did the Edwardians view homoeroticism in intimate friendship of (pseudo-)bachelors, which is outside the familial and marital bonds?

In the introduction I pinned down the late-Victorian shifts of the definition of domesticity as feminism emerged and masculinity declined, which brought about the gendered division of different spheres and ended in men's flights from feminized domesticity. The representation of such flights, male domesticity in bachelor's cohabited apartments or gentleman's clubs, was reflected not only in boy's adventure school story like the *Tom Brown* series and "male romance" like *Sherlock Holmes*, but in the classic crossover texts in Edwardian children's literature, such as *Peter Pan*, *The Wind in the Willows*, and *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes.* Adopting John Potvin's notions of homoerotic friendship, the sinless relationship with deep intimacy and free of homosexual desire or intercourse, I juxtaposed these three texts of children's literature with the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes* as "crossover" references.

In my previous discussions of these texts, I first discussed homoerotic desire in *Peter Pan*. I started dating back to the Edwardian cult of boyhood by linking it with the author J. M. Barrie, who replayed his nostalgic reminiscence and his ideals of Victorian gentlemanliness on the Llewelyn Davies boys in reality and on Peter Pan in fiction. Then I analyzed how nostalgic and gentlemanly Peter is, as well as how incompatible boy's adventure and feminized domesticity are on the Neverland. I also compared my analysis with that of the dilemma of Dr. Watson between Sherlock Holmes, his adventure partner, and Mary Morstan, his wife of Victorian domesticity

in *Sherlock Holmes.* At last, I dissected homoerotic relationship between Peter and Captain Hook, and compare it with that between Tom and Flashman in *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and that between Holmes and Moriarty in *Sherlock Holmes*. By doing so I proved that the Victorian revival of chivalry codes and the Edwardian cult of boyhood eventually led to the exclusion of femininity in all-male spaces and, above all, the implied presence of homoeroticism in Victorian and Edwardian crossover fictions.

Then I interpreted homoerotic male domesticity in *The Wind in the Willows*. Its author Kenneth Grahame as the gentleman of idyllic friendship portrays an all-male pastoral retreat of gentlemanly animals. I unraveled how Grahame strives to integrate Victorian nostalgia (through Badger and Rat) and Edwardian adventurism (through Toad) into Mole, the protagonist and the alter ego of the author. Finally, I shed new lights on Rat-Mole friendship by delving into their cohabited life of male domesticity with an exclusion of heterosexuality. I also compared their homoeroticism in the emotional and physical intimacy with that in Tom-Arthur friendship and Tom-Hardy one in the *Tom Brown* series and in Holmes-Watson one in *Sherlock Holmes.* By working on this I evidenced that the Edwardian idyllic, gentlemanly, nostalgic friendship results in crystallizing a purely male community with homoerotic male domesticity, which is clearly reflected in Victorian and Edwardian crossover fictions.

Lastly, I explored homoerotic male cohabitation in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes.* According to biographical information of the author Beatrix Potter, the *fin-de-siècle* homophobia brought a great pressure to those who wanted to fly from feminized domesticity or traditionally defined gendered space of home to enjoy homoerotic cohabited friendship. Then I delineated the clashes between bourgeois feminized domesticity and the working-class bachelorhood, as well as how Timmy Tiptoes is forcedly transformed from a heterosexual husband to a homoerotic pseudo-bachelor in his cohabited friendship of male domesticity with Chippy Hackee. Lastly, echoing the

Edwardian homophobia aroused by the 1895 trials of Oscar Wilde, the similar homophobia leads to the failure in the homoerotic friendships in *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes*, the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes*: Chippy and Timmy are destined to return to their heterosexual families, Tom and Hardy have to transform their homoerotic desires into heterosexual engagements, and Holmes endures the acute pain of seeing Watson marry twice and leave him for good. With efforts I tried to prove how homoerotic male cohabitation was formed and how it was meant to be destroyed under the homophobic stress in the *fin-de-siècle* Britain, and this phenomenon can be found in Victorian and Edwardian crossover fictions.

The above discussions and analyses summarize my thesis. Nevertheless, I understand that many issues may be left behind when I choose the issue of homoeroticism to interpret bachelor's life, male domesticity, and idyllic nostalgia in Edwardian children's literature. For instance, what is the main difference between *Peter Pan* as the play, the book, and the film adaptations, despite the emphasis of homoerotic relationship between Peter and Hook?[163] How does Potter reflect the *fin-de-siècle* gentlemanly friendship in her other works with no hints of homoeroticism, such as *The Tale of Jeremy Fisher* and *The Tale of Johnny Town-Mouse* (the latter was published beyond the Edwardian era)? Issues listed above may be worthy of critical attention. Even so, I believe my method of studying bachelor's life, idyllic nostalgia and homoeroticism in the representations of male domesticity in Edwardian children's literature by relating it to the *Tom Brown* series and *Sherlock Holmes* as crossover references may provide some contributions to the academia, to the studies of popular culture, and to those who are truly interested in these texts.

[163] Though these film adaptations (Disney's *Peter Pan* (1953) and Steven Spielberg's *Hook* (1991)) are not Edwardian, they reflect and elaborate the hints of homoeroticism in Barrie's *Peter Pan*, as Ritchie's *Sherlock Holmes* and *Sherlock Holmes: A Game of Shadows* do for Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes*.

Works Cited

Adams, Michael C. C. *The Great Adventure: Male Desire and the Coming of World War I.* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1900. Print.

Allbutt, T. Clifford. "Nervous Diseases and Modern Life." *Contemporary Review* 67(1895): 210-31. Print.

Alston, Ann. *The Family in English Children's Literature.* New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Arata, Stephen. *Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin De Siècle.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. Print.

Barrie, J. M. *The Little White Bird*. Ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912. Print.

---. *Peter Pan.* Elisa Trimby. Illus. London: Puffin, 2002. Print.

---. *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens.* Arthur Rackham. Illus. Mineola, N. Y.: Dover, 2008. Print.

---. *Tommy and Grizel.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913. Print.

Beckett, Sandra L. *Crossover Fiction: Global and Historical Perspectives.* New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.

---. *Transcending Boundaries: Writing for a Dual Audience of Children and Adults.* New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Birkin, Andrew. *J. M. Barrie and the Lost Boys: The Love Story That Gave Birth to Peter Pan.* New York: Potter, 1979. Print.

Brady, Sean. *Masculinity and Male Homosexuality in Britain, 1861-1913.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.

Briggs, Julia. "Transitions (1890–1914)." *Children's Literature: An Illustrated History.* Ed. Peter Hunt. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. 167-91. Print.

Carpenter, Humphrey. *Secret Gardens: A Study of the Golden Age of Children's*

Literature. London: Allen and Unwin, 1985. Print.

Chandler, Katherine R. "Thoroughly Post-Victorian, Pre-Modern Beatrix." *Children's Literature Association Quarterly* 32.4 (2007): 287-307. *Project Muse.* Web. 5 Dec. 2010.

Chandos, John. *Boys Together: English Public Schools 1800-1864.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1984. Print.

Chassagnol, Monique. "Masks and Masculinity in James Barrie's *Peter Pan.*" John Stephens, ed. *Ways of Being Male: Representing Masculinities in Children's Literature and Film.* New York: Routledge, 2002. 200-15. Print.

Chudacoff, Howard P. *The Age of the Bachelor: Creating an American Subculture.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1999. Print.

Cosslett, Tess. *Talking Animals in British Fiction, 1786-1914*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. Print.

Cowan, Brian William. *The Social Life of Coffee: the Emergence of the British Coffeehouse.* New Haven: Yale UP, 2005. Print.

Davidoff, Leonore and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class 1780-1850.* London: Hutchinson, 1987. Print.

Dawson, Graham. *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire, and the Imagining of Masculinities.* London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

DeWilde, Mandy L. "Victorian Restriction, Restraint, and Escape in the Children's Tales of Beatrix Potter." *Diss*. Grand Valley State U, 2008. *ProQuest Information and Learning.* Web. 24 Aug. 2011.

Dowling, Linda. "The Decadent and the New Woman in the 1890s." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 33.4 (1979): 434-53. *JSTOR.* Web. 13 Dec. 2011.

Doyle, Arthur Conan. *The Lost World.* Charlottesville: U of Virginia Library, 1998. *EBSCOhost.* Web. 15 Oct. 2011.

---. *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories.* 2 vols. New York: Bantam, 1986. Print.

du Maurier, Daphne. *Gerald, a Portrait*. London: Gollancz, 1966. Print.

Ellis, Sarah. *The Women of England, Their Social Duties, and Domestic Habits.* London: Fisher, 1893. Print.

Falconer, Rachel. *Contemporary Children's Fiction and Its Adult Readership.* New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Flanagan, Victoria. *Into the Closet: Cross-dressing and the Gendered Body in Children's Literature and Film.* New York: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Flanders, Judith. *Inside the Victorian Home: A Portrait of Domestic Life in Victorian England.* New York: Norton, 2004. Print.

Fletcher, Jennifer Jean Kimble. "Household Men: Masculinity and Ideal Domesticity in Victorian Fiction." *Diss*. U of California Riverside, 2004. *ProQuest Information and Learning.* Web. 10 Dec. 2010.

Flood, Alison. "First Edition of *The Wind in the Willows* Sells for £32,400." *TheGuardian.* N.p., 25 March 2010. n. pag. Web. 17 Feb. 2012.

Foldy, Michael, S. *The Trials of Oscar Wilde: Deviance, Morality, and Late-Victorian Society.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1997. Print.

Foucault, Michel. 'Friendship as a Way of Life', in *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth, The Essential Works of Michel Foucault, Volume One.* Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: The New Press, 1997. 136-40. Print.

Friedman, Lester D. "Hooked on Pan: Barrie's Immortal Pirate in Fiction and Film." Allison B. Kavey and Lester D. Friedman, eds. *Second Star to the Right*: Peter Pan *in the Popular Imagination.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2009. *National Taiwan University Liberary.* 188-218. Web. 11 Dec. 2010.

Gaarden, Bonnie. "The Inner Family of *The Wind in the Willows*, Response to 'The

Inner Family', Response to Cynthia Marshall." *Children's Literature* 22 (1994): 43-56. *Project Muse.* Web. 5 Dec. 2010.

Garber, Marjorie B. *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing & Cultural Anxiety.* New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Gardner, Carol Brooks. "Boston marriages." *Encyclopedia of Gender and Society*. Jodi O'Brien, ed. Vol. 2 Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, 2009. 87–88. Print.

Gathorne-Hardy, Jonathan. *The Old School Tie: Phenomenon of the English Public School.* London: Viking, 1971. Print.

Gavin, Adrienne E. "Intangible Children: Longing, Loss, and the Edwardian Dream Child in J. M. Barrie's *The Little White Bird* and Rudyard Kipling's '"They."'" *Childhood in Edwardian Fiction: Worlds Enough and Time.* Adrienne E. Gavin and Andrew F. Humphries, eds. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. *Palgrave Connect.* 53-74. Web. 15 Nov. 2010.

---. and Andrew F. Humphries. "Worlds Enough and Time: The Cult of Childhood in Edwardian Fiction." *Childhood in Edwardian Fiction: Worlds Enough and Time.* Adrienne E. Gavin and Andrew F. Humphries, eds. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. *Palgrave Connect.* 1-22. Web. 15 Nov. 2010.

Geer, Jennifer Lee. "The Fantasy of Home: Victorian Children's Fantasy Fiction and the Domestic." *Diss*. U of Virginia, 2002. *ProQuest Information and Learning.* Web. 23 June 2011.

Gilbert, Elliot L. "The Female King: Tennyson's Arthurian Apocalypse." *PMLA* 98.5 (1983): 863-78. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 Mar. 2012.

Girouard, Mark. *The Victorian Country House.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1979. Print.

Golden, Catherine. "Beatrix Potter: Naturalist Artist." *Woman's Art Journal* 11.1 (1990): 16-20. *JSTOR.* Web. 4 Dec. 2010.

Grahame, Kenneth. *The Wind in the Willows.* Illus. Les Morrill. New York: Bantam,

1982. Print.

Green, Martin. *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980. Print.

Green, Peter. *Kenneth Grahame: A Biography*. London: World, 1959. Print.

Greenblatt, Stephen, et al. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature.* New York: Norton, 2006. Print.

Griffith, John. "Making Wishes Innocent: *Peter Pan*." *The Lion and the Unicorn* 3.1 (1979): 28-37. *Project Muse.* Web. 10 Dec. 2010.

Gunn, Simon. *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class: Ritual and Authority in the English Industrial City, 1840-1914.* Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000. Print.

Guroian, Vigen. *Tending the Heart of Virtue: How Classic Stories Awaken a Child's Moral Imagination.* New York: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.

Hall, Donald E. "Muscular Anxiety: Degradation and Appropriation in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 21 (1993): 327-43. Print.

---, ed. *Muscular Christianity: Embodying the Victorian Age.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 1994. Print.

Hale, Elizabeth. "Truth and Claw: The Beastly Children and Childlike Beasts of Saki, Beatrix Potter, and Kenneth Grahame." *Childhood in Edwardian Fiction: Worlds Enough and Time.* Adrienne E. Gavin and Andrew F. Humphries, eds. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. *Palgrave Connect.* 191-207. Web. 15 Nov. 2010.

Hallet, Jennifer. "Wandering Dreams and Social Marches: Varieties of Paganism in Late Victorian and Edwardian England." *Pomegranate* 8.2 (2006): 161-83. *EBSCOhost.* Web 3 Sep. 2011.

Hallinan, Camilla. *The Ultimate Peter Rabbit: A Visual Guide to the World of Beatrix*

Potter. New York: DK, 2002. Print.

Harrington, Henry R. "Childhood and the Victorian Ideal of Manliness in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*." *Victorian Newsletter* 44 (1973): 13-7. Print.

Haynes, Mary. "*The Wind in the Willows*: A Classic for Children?" *International Review of Children's Literature and Librarianship* 4.2 (1989): 115-29. Print.

Heath, Michelle Beissel. "Playing at House and Playing at Home: The Domestic Discourse of Games in Edwardian Fictions of Childhood." *Childhood in Edwardian Fiction: Worlds Enough and Time.* Adrienne E. Gavin and Andrew F. Humphries, eds. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. *Palgrave Connect.* 89-102. Web. 15 Nov. 2010.

Heggie, Jake. "The Leather-Winged Bat." *Three Folk Songs.* N.p. *Songs of America.* Web. 1 Apr. 2012.

Hollindale, Peter. "A Hundred Years of *Peter Pan*." *Children's Literature Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. Heather Montgomery and Nicola J. Watson, eds. Houndmills: Macmillan, 2009. 153-64. Print.

Holmes, Martha Stoddard. "Peter Pan and the Possibilities of Child Literature." Allison B. Kavey and Lester D. Friedman, eds. *Second Star to the Right*: Peter Pan *in the Popular Imagination.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2009. *National Taiwan University Liberary.* 132-50. Web. 11 Dec. 2010.

Howe, Elizabeth. *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama 1660-1700.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. Print.

Hughes, Thomas. *Tom Brown's Schooldays.* London: Dent, 1949. Print.

---. *Tom Brown at Oxford.* Bristol, England: Synapse, 2004. Print.

Hunt, Peter. *The Wind in the Willows: A Fragmented Arcadia.* New York: Twayne, 1994. Print.

Jaffe, Jacqueline A. *Arthur Conan Doyle.* New York: Twayne, 1987. Print.

Jeffreys, Sheila. *The Spinster and Her Enemies: Feminism and Sexuality, 1880-1930.* North Melbourne: Spinifex Press, 1997. Print.

Johansen, Shawn. *Family Men: Middle-class Fatherhood in Early Industrializing America.* New York: Routledge, 2001. Print.

Kaplan, Morris B. *Sodom on the Thames: Sex, Love and Scandal in Wilde Times.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2005. Print.

Kavey, Allison B. "'I Do Believe in Fairies, I Do, I Do': The History and Epistemology of Peter Pan." Allison B. Kavey and Lester D. Friedman, eds. *Second Star to the Right*: Peter Pan *in the Popular Imagination.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2009. *National Taiwan University Liberary.* 75-104. Web. 11 Dec. 2010.

Kestner, Joseph A. *Sherlock's Men: Masculinity, Conan Doyle, and Cultural History*. Brookfield: Ashgate, 1997. Print.

Kincaid, James R. *Child-Loving: the Erotic Child and Victorian Culture.* New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Kutzer, M. Daphne. *Beatrix Potter: Writing in Code.* New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Kuznets, Lois R. "Kenneth Grahame and Father Nature, or Whither Blows *The Wind in the Willows*?" *Children's Literature* 16 (1988): 175-81. *Project Muse.* Web. 10 Dec. 2010.

Lane, Margaret. *The Tale of Beatrix Potter*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1986. Print.

Lang, Andrew, ed. *The Nursery Rhyme Book.* N.p.: Harvard University, 1897. *American Libraries.* Web. 31 Mar. 2012.

Lear, Linda. *Beatrix Potter: A Life in Nature*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2007. Print.

Lerer, Seth. *Children's Literature: A Reader's History, from Aesop to Harry Potter.*

Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2008. Print.

---. “Style and the Mole: Domestic Aesthetics in *The Wind in the Willows*.” *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* 43.2 (2009): 51-63. *Project Muse.* Web. 10 Dec. 2010.

Linder, Leslie, ed. *The Journal of Beatrix Potter 1881-1897.* London: Warne, 1966. Print.

MacDonald, Ruth K. *Beatrix Potter.* Boston: Twayne, 1986. Print.

Machann, Clinton. “Tennyson's King Arthur and the Violence of Manliness.” *Victorian Poetry* 38.2 (2000): 199-226. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 March 2012.

Maureen M. Martin. “ ‘Boys Who Will Be Men’: Desire in *Tom Brown’s Schooldays.*” *Victorian Literature and Culture* 30.2 (2002): 483-502. *JSTOR.* Web. 16 Aug. 2011.

Mavor, Carol. *Reading Boyishly: Roland Barthes, J. M. Barrie, Jacques Henri Lartigue, Marcel Proust, and D. W. Winnicott.* Durham: Duke UP, 2007. Print.

McDannell, Colleen. *The Christian Home in Victorian America, 1840-1900.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994. Print.

McGinnis, Rachel. “The Real Life and Fictional Characters Who Inspired J. M. Barrie’s Captain Hook.” *Literary Traveler: Explore Your Literary Imagination.* N. p., 24 June 2009. n. pag. Web. 17 Jan. 2012.

McGavock, Karen L. “Cult or Cull?: *Peter Pan* and Childhood in the Edwardian Age.” *Childhood in Edwardian Fiction: Worlds Enough and Time.* Adrienne E. Gavin and Andrew F. Humphries, eds. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. *Palgrave Connect.* 37-52. Web. 15 Nov. 2010.

Meyer, Susan E. *A Treasure of the Great Children’s Book Illustrators.* New York: Abrams, 1997. Print.

Miller, Elizabeth Carolyn. *Framed: the New Woman Criminal in British Culture at the*

Fin de Siècle. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2008. Print.

Milne-Smith, Amy. “A Flight to Domesticity? Making a Home in the Gentlemen’s Clubs of London, 1880-1914.” *Journal of British Studies* 45.4 (2006): 796-818. *JSTOR.* Web. 17Aug. 2011.

Moore, John David. “Pottering about in the Garden: Kenneth Grahame's Version of Pastoral in *The Wind in the Willows*.” *The Journal of the Midwest MLA* 23.1 (1990): 45-60. *JSTOR.* Web. 10 Dec. 2010.

Munns, David P. D. “ ‘Gay, Innocent, and Heartless’: Peter Pan and the Queering of Popular Culture.” Allison B. Kavey and Lester D. Friedman, eds. *Second Star to the Right*: Peter Pan *in the Popular Imagination.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2009. *National Taiwan University Liberary*. 219-42. Web. 11 Dec. 2010.

Nardi, Peter M, ed. *Men’s Friendship.* Newbury Park: Sage, 1992. Print.

Nelson, Claudia. *Boys Will Be Girls: The Feminine Ethic and British Children’s Fiction 1857-1917.* New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1991. Print.

---. “Sex and the Single Boy: Ideals of Manliness and Sexuality in Victorian Literature for Boys.” *Victorian Studies* 32.4 (1989): 525-50. *JSTOR.* Web. 23 Aug. 2011.

Newsom Kerr, Matthew L. “Fevered Metropolis: Epidemic Disease and Isolation in Victorian London.” *Diss*. U of Southern California History, 2007. *ProQuest Information and Learning.* Web. 24 Dec. 2011.

Nightingale, Florence. “Cassandra.” *The Cause: A Short History of the Women’s Movement in Great Britain.* Ray Strachey. London: Virago, 1978. Print.

Nodelman, Perry. and Mavis Reimer. *The Pleasures of Children’s Literature.* 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2003. Print.

Oulton, Carolyn W. de la L. *Romantic Friendship in Victorian Literature.* Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2007. Print.

Potter, Beatrix. *Beatrix Potter’s Letters.* London: Warne, 1989. Print.

---. *The Tale of Timmy Tiptoes.* New York: Warne, 1988. Print.

Potvin, John. *Material and Visual Cultures beyond Male Bonding, 1870-1914: Bodies, Boundaries and Intimacy.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Print.

Philip, Neil. "Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows:* A Companionable Vitality." *Touchstones: Reflections on the Best in Children's Literature.* 3 vols. Perry Nodelman, ed. West Lafayette: Children's Literature Association, 1985. 96-105. Print.

Puccio, Paul M. "At the Heart of *Tom Brown's Schooldays*: Thomas Arnold and Christian Friendship." *Modern Language Studies* 25.4 (1995): 57-74. *JSTOR.* Web. 16 Aug. 2011.

Quigly, Isabel. *The Heirs of Tom Brown: The English School Story.* London: Chatto and Windus, 1982. Print.

Reynolds, Kimberley. *Girls Only?: Gender and Popular Children's Fiction in Britain, 1880-1910.* Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1990. Print.

---. *Radical Children's Literature: Future Visions and Aesthetic Transformations in Juvenile Fiction.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Print.

Richards, Jeffrey, ed. *Imperialism and Juvenile Literature.* Manchester, England: Manchester UP, 1989. Print.

Riley, Dick and Pam McAllister. *The Bedside, Bathtub & Armchair Companion to Sherlock Holmes.* New York: Continuum, 1999. Print.

Roberston, Linda. " 'To Die Will Be an Awfully Big Adventure': Peter Pan in World War I." Allison B. Kavey and Lester D. Friedman, eds. *Second Star to the Right*: Peter Pan *in the Popular Imagination.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2009. *National Taiwan University Liberary.* 50-74. Web. 11 Dec. 2010.

Robson, W. W. "On *The Wind in the Willows.*" *The Definition of Literature and Other Essays.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982. Print.

Rose, Jacqueline. *The Case of Peter Pan or the Impossibility of Children's Fiction*. London: Macmillan, 1984. Print.

Routh, Chris. "Man for the Sword and for the Needle She.": Illustrations of Wendy's Role in J. M. Barrie's *Peter and Wendy.*" *Children's Literature in Education* 32.1(2001): 57-75. *Project Muse.* Web. 30 July 2011.

Ruskin, John. *Sesame and Lilies*. London: George Allen, 1871. Print.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire.* New York: Columbia UP, 1985. Print.

Shavit, Zohar. "The Ambivalent Status of Texts: The Case of Children's Literature." *Poetic Today* 1.3 (1980): 75-86. *JSTOR.* Web. 14 Mar. 2012.

---. " 'The Ambivalent Status of Texts': A Rejoinder." 2.1(1980-1):199-201. *JSTOR.* Web. 14 Mar. 2012.

Sherlock Holmes. Dir. Guy Ritchie. Perf. Robert Downey Jr., Jude Law, Rachel McAdams, and Mark Strong. 2009. Warner Bros., 2010. DVD.

Sherlock Holmes: A Game of Shadows. Dir. Guy Ritchie. Perf. Robert Downey Jr., Jude Law, Jared Harris, and Paul Anderson. Warner Bros., 2011. Film.

Showalter, Elaine. *Sexual Anarchy: Gender and Culture at the Fin De Siècle.* New York: Viking, 1990. Print.

Snyder, Katherine V. *Bachelors, Manhood, and the Novel, 1850-1925.* U of California, Berkeley, 1999. *Cambridge Books Online*. Web. 9 July 2011.

Stephen, James. *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography.* London: Longman, 1849. Print.

Symonds, John Addington. *The Memoirs of John Addington Symonds.* Ed. Phyllis Grosskurth. London: Hutchinson, 1984. Print.

Taylor, Judy, Joyce Irene Whalley, Anne Stevenson Hobbs and Elizabeth M Battrick. *Beatrix Potter 1866-1943: The Artist and Her World.* London: F. Warne, 1987. Print.

Tosh, John. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1999. Print.

Turley, Hans. *Rum, Sodomy, and the Lash: Piracy, Sexuality, and Masculine Identity.* New York: New York UP, 1999. Print.

Watkins, Tony. "Reconstructing the Homeland: Loss and Hope in the English Landscape." *Aspects and Issues in the History of Children's Literature.* Maria Nikolajeva, ed. Westport: Greenwood, 1995. 165-72. Print.

White, Donna and Anita C. Tarr, eds. *J. M. Barrie's* Peter Pan *In and Out of Time: A Children's Classic at 100.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2006. Print.

---. "*Peter Pan* and the Pantomime Tradition." *Children's Literature Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends.* Heather Montgomery and Nicola J. Watson, eds. Houndmills: Macmillan, 2009. 164- 72. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own.* London: Hogarth, 1929. *A Project Gutenberg of Australia eBook.* Web. 25 May 2012.

Wullschläger, Jackie. *Inventing Wonderland: The Lives and Fantasies of Lewis Carroll, Edward Lear, J. M. Barrie, Kenneth Grahame and A. A. Milne.* New York: Free Press, 1995. Print.

Yarbrough, Wynn William. "Boys to Men: Performative Masculinity in English Anthropomorphic Children's Tales." *Diss.* U of Louisiana, 2007. Print.

Yeh, Joseph Yun-kai. "*Thou Art the Man*? Masculinity Reconstruction in Poe's and Doyle's Detective Stories." *Diss.* Tamkang U, 2005. Print.

Yeoman, Ann. *Now or Neverland: Peter Pan and the Myth of Eternal Youth: A Psychological Perspective on a Cultural Icon.* Toronto: Inner City, 1998. Print.

Young, Charlotte M. *What Books to Lend and What to Give.* London: National Society's Depository, 1888. Print.