



PROJECT MUSE®

The Problem of Sex in J. M. Barrie's Fiction

Sarah Green

English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920, Volume 60, Number 2, 2017,
pp. 185-209 (Article)

Published by ELT Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/640315>

The Problem of Sex in J. M. Barrie's Fiction

Sentimental people, in her phrase, “fiddle harmonics on the strings of sensualism,” to the delight of a world gaping for marvels of musical execution rather than for music.

—George Meredith, *Diana of the Crossways*, 1885

SARAH GREEN
University of Oxford

LEONÉE ORMOND wrote in 1987 that “of all Barrie’s works, *Sentimental Tommy* is the most neglected.”¹ This is no longer entirely the case. Interest in Barrie, especially scholarship dealing with sexual subjects, has undergone a process of reinvigoration in the last thirty years. At the centre of this have been the novels *Sentimental Tommy* (1896) and its sequel, *Tommy and Grizel* (1900), in which Barrie represents the figure of the artist as a histrionic personality unable to “love.”² These novels have been recognised as among the most interesting treatments of artistic sexuality in the period. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick describes *Tommy and Grizel* as “an extraordinary, unjustly forgotten novel,” while Andrew Nash identifies *Sentimental Tommy* as “an important book in the literary representation of masculinity; that it remains out of print is absolutely scandalous.”³

But at the heart of this critical revival lies a persistent misreading. Tommy’s incapacity for what Barrie calls “love” has been widely read as a euphemism for sexual disinclination or impotence. This assumption is usually given a biographical source: Barrie himself has been assumed to have been sexually impotent or otherwise averse, as suggested by his wife’s claim during their divorce proceedings in 1909 that their fifteen-year marriage had been unconsummated.⁴ Thus R. D. S. Jack, who has done more than anyone to restore nuance to Barrie scholarship, describes Barrie’s wife as having had “an unsatisfactory manipulative alliance with an impotent, often cruel, celebrity,” and he subsequently reads Tommy’s failure as an “overt confession” of Barrie’s own “sexual problems.”⁵ Nash, too, concludes that the novels,

described as “an extended study of Tommy’s failure to desire Grizel,” were “clearly written out of the complexities of Barrie’s own marriage.”⁶ Sedgwick’s reading of *Tommy and Grizel* as written out of “male homosexual panic,” specifically “the male *compulsion to desire* women and its attendant deceptions of self and other,” is based on her conception of Tommy as “sexually irresolute.” Predictably this is traced back to what she calls Barrie’s “almost unconsummated marriage” (what “almost” means here is unclear).⁷

This euphemistic, biographically supported reading of Tommy’s failure to “love” has profoundly affected subsequent analyses of the novels and interpretations of Barrie’s thinking about both sexuality and art. It has obscured one aspect of his thought in particular. Throughout his early career in the 1880s and 1890s, Barrie ruminates on the difference between what he calls “love” and mere sexual passion. This essential distinction colours the vast majority of his late-nineteenth-century fiction. Although clearly valuing “love” as a higher ideal, he nevertheless agonizes about the part played by sexual passion, especially masculine sexual aggression, in the process of all creation, organic and artistic, portraying it as a necessary but potentially destructive force. These were, of course, common concerns of the day, but their presence in Barrie’s texts is obfuscated by a euphemistic reading practice that collapses the difference between the two concepts.

This new reading of the Tommy novels allows the word “love” to signify only what Barrie in those and previous novels claims for it. This way of reading elicits a very different consideration of artistic sexuality from those professed by Nash, Jack, and Sedgwick. Restoring Barrie’s own semantics suggests that his portrayal of the matter is far more ambivalent than has been supposed. Far from uncomplicatedly advocating a nonnormative creative masculinity, as Nash would have it, or, as Jack argues, championing his “own brand of feminist Darwinism” based on the acceptance of woman’s superior creative skills, Barrie’s novels deliberately enact a profound anxiety about the anti-sociality of both masculine sexuality and art.⁸ Sedgwick recognises this anxiety, but her doggedly psychological as well as euphemistic focus leads her to read Barrie’s characters flatly, as realist studies of “rounded, autonomous, imaginatively and psychologically invested” personalities, rather than as what Jack calls “types or humours ... naturally designed to represent kinds and ideas.”⁹ Barrie, as Jack has argued, sought above all to create fictions that worked as both realist and idealist texts, exploring not only psychological and social issues of the day,

but also wider, ultimate themes.¹⁰ That he allowed the latter to shape the former is crucial to the following reading.

This discussion begins by examining the difference that Barrie establishes between love and sexual passion in his early novels, before showing how he places this difference within a wider theory of human nature, in which sexual passion is both admitted as necessary and worried about as potentially destructive. The implications this has for Barrie's consideration of artistic sexuality in the Tommy novels are then analysed, revealing the potential dangers of euphemistic readings which erroneously seek meaning from beyond rather than within the text.

Love as Idealism

The late nineteenth century, like our own, regularly used the word "love" to indicate a wide range of emotional and physical experiences, including sexual passion. Barrie, however, is very clear in his early novels about his desire to distinguish "love" as a very particular phenomenon, distinct from mere physical desire. Love, as Barrie defined it, was a form of idealism. In romantic relationships, its highest form, it was possible only when both partners recognised a similar ideal of life, an ideal repeatedly juxtaposed against and so distinct from sexual passion. What is remarkable about this definition is that love requires not only the mutual attractiveness of both parties, but also a particular capacity in both, a desire for the world to be better than it appears and better in a particular way. This shared capacity is not only the precondition for Barrie's vision of a perfect romantic relationship (assumed always to result in marriage), but is also shown to have wider social benefits, since the idealist is impelled to strive for social improvement. It is within this conceptual context that Tommy's inability to "love" should be read.

Barrie's first full-length novel, *When a Man's Single* (1888), clearly defined this vision of a perfect love as requiring an idealizing capacity in both parties. The word "purity" is consistently used to suggest an ideal state that encompasses but is not limited to sexual chastity (which seems to include, as it often did in this period, sexual encounters within married love). Masculine love is explicitly defined as the desire for a feminine "purity," transcending mere sexual continence and extending to a fuller moral sense. The heroine, Mary Abinger, is described as a "pure-minded girl," and as such she is presented as the ideal object of virtuous masculine love.¹¹ Of her appearance the narra-

tor says, "it spoke first of purity, which can never be present anywhere without being felt." Barrie expands on this theme: "All men are born with a craving to find it, and they never look for it but among women. The strength of the craving is the measure of any man's capacity to love, and without it love on his side would be impossible."¹² It should be noted that even at this stage, the process by which "love" is achieved is distinctly gendered in terms of active male and passive female. Barrie, as Jack has shown, was fascinated by the Darwinian interpretation of human sexuality, and to a certain extent he accepted its basic tenets as truth, including the natural activity of man and passivity of woman.

For Mary, "purity" is rooted in instinctive sexual idealism which, outside of marriage with a man equally "pure," requires sexual abstinence. Mary's first purpose as a "pure-minded girl" is to discourage and reject all sexual advances that are not driven by an idealism matching her own. She is the author of a blatantly autobiographical (and artistically bad) novel, "The Scorn of Scorns," in which the heroine slowly realizes that a suitor does not share her ideal of love, and spurns him accordingly. "Mary's idea of what love must be," the narration comments admiringly, "would have frightened some persons from loving her."¹³

Barrie is clear about the social as well as personal role that such idealism plays, as the "pure-minded" woman encourages and fosters virtue in others. Mary's "purity" is shown to involve a wider idealism, an expectation of extreme moral virtue in this world. "She had an exquisite love of what is good and fine in life," we are told, "that idealized into heroes persons she knew or heard of as having virtue."¹⁴ This idealism encourages those around her to conform to her expectations. Of the protagonist, Rob Angus, Barrie says "he was always finding himself taking for granted her purity to be something so fine that it behoved him to be careful." This effect is not confined to her lover: "Mary affected other people in the same way. They came to know that she was a very rare person, and so in her company they became almost fine persons themselves. Thus the natural goodness of mankind asserted itself."¹⁵ General recognition of the superiority of Mary proves that Rob Angus must himself be of superior moral quality. The notion that this high character is attained despite his humble origins, which happen to match Barrie's own, is in part the novel's *raison d'être*. A sexual and moral aristocracy triumphs over an economic one, as Rob not only successfully wins Mary, a colonel's daughter, but also has that colonel admit his daughter to be Rob's natural right. The penultimate chapter

ends with Rob shouting “you can’t have her, she’s mine,” to which the colonel replies sadly, “Yes, she’s yours.”¹⁶

In *When a Man’s Single*, Barrie concedes that the couple’s idealism, though clearly desirable, is an unusual occurrence. “With most men,” he writes, “affection for a woman is fed on her regard for them. Greatness in love is no more common than greatness in leading armies. Only the hundredth man does not prefer to dally where woman is easiest to win.”¹⁷ In Barrie’s next novel, such greatness remains an ideal, but the achievement of it becomes far more precarious. *The Little Minister* (1891) returns to the theme of moral and sexual “purity” as ideal and idealizing, a quality that morally enhances both oneself and others. Again, this idealizing power is shown to be the defining difference between sex, the mere passion of the body, and the altogether more noble emotion of love. But this time, absence of the obviously “pure-minded girl” from the *dramatis personae* means that the burden of providing this “purity” is given not to the woman, but to the man. In the relationship between the minister Gavin and the gypsy girl Babbie, Barrie dramatises not only the practical difficulty of telling “purity” from sexual passion, but also the ability of male purity proactively to encourage and foster the ideal of female purity.

As we learn from the introduction, the novel is concerned with a man’s struggle to recognise the difference between a passion driven by idealizing love and one fuelled by sexual appetite. Nash has perceptively shown how Barrie’s use of a narrator for *The Little Minister*, himself a character in the novel, renders the narrative voice fallible.¹⁸ This is, to a certain extent, true; yet his presentation of the distinction between idealizing “love” and physical passion is conceptually continuous with that of the novels that precede and follow. The narrator provides a definition of love very similar to that of *When a Man’s Single*:

How often is it a phantom woman who draws the man from the way he meant to go? So was man created, to hunger for the ideal that is above himself, until one day there is magic in the air, and the eyes of a girl rest upon him. He does not know that it is he himself that crowned her, and if the girl is as pure as he, their love is the one form of idolatry that is not quite ignoble. It is the joining of two souls on the way to God.

This might be the plot of *When a Man’s Single*. But in this case, another possibility is more fully considered:

But if the woman be bad, the test of the man is when he awakens from his dream. The nobler his ideal, the further will he have hurried down the wrong way, for those who only run after little things will not go far. His love

may now sink into passion, perhaps only to stain its wings and rise again, perhaps to drown.¹⁹

It must be said that the novel does not strictly follow this pattern. The drama with which Barrie maintained the attention of his readers in what was originally a serialized novel revolves around the question of whether Gavin would be able to discern which of these feminine types Babbie conforms to, a question far less easily answered than a simple, abstract division between “pure” and “bad” would suggest. This is exactly the predicament in which Gavin finds himself: faced with an inexplicable attraction to a strange gypsy girl, Babbie, it is his duty to determine whether she is pure and his attraction motivated by love, in which case he must marry her, or whether she is “bad” and his attraction unworthy of him, in which case it must be destroyed. For most of the novel he inclines to the latter interpretation and struggles to contain what he perceives as a sinful impulse. The novel abounds in allegorical dramatisations of this struggle in various registers: the battle of the alcoholic Rob Dow to keep himself sober; the effort of the doctor to avoid a popular but violent masculine sport; and eventually Gavin’s own bodily struggle against a violent storm. Like *When a Man’s Single*, *The Little Minister* was originally serialized in a Nonconformist religious journal (*British Weekly* and *Good Words* respectively). The theme of masculine moral struggle was popular with Nonconformist constituencies, to which Barrie himself as a Scottish Free Church man belonged.

Gavin decides at last that Babbie is essentially pure. But this act of decision is effected, not by any vow on her part, but simply because he recognises in her an ideal of love that he himself holds. It is typical of this novel of masculine struggle that the ideal should be of masculine rather than feminine virtue. “Oh, if I were a man,” she says, “I should wish to be everything that I am not, and nothing that I am. I should scorn to be a liar, I should choose to be open in all things, I should try to fight the world honestly. But I am only a woman, and so—well, that is the kind of man I should like to marry.” Gavin’s reaction to this is to cry “I am that man!”²⁰ Soon afterward, he tells the doctor that he means to marry Babbie, and on meeting her again kisses her. At this moment, importantly, the narration splits from Gavin’s perspective for the first time to look separately at Babbie. At once we see that, though she recognises Gavin’s love to be a noble emotion, she is not necessarily as pure as Gavin believes her to be. “Babbie had been kissed before,” we are told, “but never thus.” Her primary emotional reaction is shame:

“she had begun to know what love was, and the flash that revealed it to her laid bare her own shame, so that her impulse was to hide herself from her lover.”²¹ But she is also transformed by Gavin’s idealized love: “In the fairy tale the beast suddenly drops his skin and is a prince, and I believe it seemed to Babbie that some such change had come over this man, her plaything.... She became conscious vaguely that a corresponding change was taking place in herself.”²² Mary Abinger’s purity had allowed her passively to repulse sexually motivated advances until a suitable love presented itself. Gavin’s purity, as befits an active, masculine power, is able to create feminine purity, even where a very different conclusion could have been reached. In doing so Barrie suggests that Gavin takes on a role analogous to that of Christ, redeeming Babbie by taking on all responsibility for her possible sins. In the scene following the kiss, Gavin refuses to let Babbie walk home alone as she had come, though his being seen with her would end his religious career:

“Oh, why,” cried Babbie, beating her hands together in grief, “should you suffer for me?”

“You are mine,” Gavin answered. Babbie gasped. “And if you act foolishly,” he continued, “it is right that I should bear the brunt of it. No, I will not let you go on alone; you are not fit to be alone. You need some one to watch over you and care for you and love you, and, if need be, to suffer with you.”²³

Love, in Barrie’s novels, is not a wayward passion, but an idealized and idealizing contract with serious religious implications. For men, it implies heavy responsibilities.

It is this active, masculine capacity for ideal and idealizing love, as well as its shouldering of moral and sexual responsibility, that is deliberately missing from Tommy’s relationship with Grizel. *Sentimental Tommy* and *Tommy and Grizel* were not, like Barrie’s previous novels, serialized in a Nonconformist journal; they were promised instead to the American *Scribner’s Magazine*.²⁴ The result is a far more cynical, though by no means entirely hopeless, presentation of his favourite themes. Tommy’s defining characteristic is a lack of stable identity: “most conspicuous of his traits,” we are told, “was the faculty of stepping into other peoples’ shoes and remaining there until he became someone else; his individuality consisted in having none.”²⁵ Barrie calls Tommy’s impulse toward constant becoming his “sentimentality.”

This sentimentality is deliberately defined against the idealism championed in his previous novels. It originates, as he shows, in what might be called a “negative” idealism, the desire to avoid unappetising

truths. As a poor child in London, Tommy picks up the habit of make-believe from his mother as a way of dealing with unpleasantness. In the opening chapter he is shown as a very small child carrying out his mother's desire that they should not appear as poor as they are: "my mother says I ain't hungry," he shouts to a neighbour frying fish.²⁶ His mother simultaneously writes letters to people in her hometown of Thrums bragging of her supposedly luxurious life in London and comforts her starving children with tales of this same town as a fairy-land, which Tommy then brags about to other children. He is repeatedly shown using this make-believe to comfort his sister: "Elspeth had begun to whimper, and even Tommy—but by a supreme effort he shouldered reality to the door."²⁷ In his preparatory notebooks, Barrie kept returning to this "negative" idealism as a distinguishing feature of the sentimentalist. "He preferred misery to be kept out of sight," he writes in one note, and then again: "True sentimentalist one who wont look unpleasantness in face—half convinces himself they are not there."²⁸ Idealism alone, we are now shown, though perhaps temporarily improving a situation, is not enough. Tommy's lack of *positive* idealism means that he is unable to discern between roles, taking them all on indiscriminately. "It's easy to you that has just one mind," he says to Grizel, "but if you had as many minds as I have—!"²⁹ As Nash puts it, "the sentimentalist is essentially solipsistic and amoral."³⁰

Among other roles, Tommy finds that he is able to enter into the rhetoric of ideal love lauded in the previous novels and even persuade himself for a time that he feels it: but only for a time. In *Tommy and Grizel*, this capacity for aping love becomes emblematic of Tommy's centreless, amoral personality: his claim that "love is a series of thrills" indicates this approach to love as a game rather than a solemn state with serious consequences.³¹ A profound irony is established between Tommy's ability to exploit the rhetoric of ideal love in both his life and writing and his inability actually to "love," to experience ideal love in the sincere, quasi-religious manner that it requires. It is this failure to embody an active, masculine role in love, rather than sexual impotence, that is signalled by the narrator's repeated references to Tommy as a "boy." "He was a boy only," we are told, "and boys cannot love. Oh, is it not cruel to ask a boy to love?"³²

Nash is therefore right when he says that Tommy's sentimentalism is "identified as taking him far away from contemporary ideals of manliness," though there is no reason to assume that this implies a "failure of male sexual desire." He is also, to a certain extent, right when he

echoes Sedgwick in saying that “Tommy pretends to fall in love with Grizel in a desperate response to conform to the social structures of successful masculinity.”³³ But it is important to acknowledge that it is not only the novel’s characters, including Tommy, but also the moral rhetoric in which the novels themselves are cast that construct and idealize this “normative masculinity.” It is the narrator who cries “Poor Tommy! He was still a boy, he was ever a boy, trying sometimes, as now, to be a man.”³⁴ This narrator, like most of Barrie’s narrators, is distinct enough to be fallible. But it is surely no coincidence that this basic masculine ideal of active, positive moral idealism in love is shared by all of Barrie’s novels, however interested he may be in deviations from it.

Though it is true, therefore, that “it is not really Tommy’s sentimentality which proves so disruptive but the pressure exerted upon him to reject it and to embrace socially prescribed norms,” yet this claim needs to be heavily qualified by the recognition that these are norms that the novels, and Barrie’s previous novels, portray in a very positive light, representing deviations from them as not only unfortunate, but also dangerous.³⁵ Barrie, as the next section will show, constantly depicts these gender ideals as determined, not by a system of social normativity, but by a scientifically supported conception of human nature. In his early novels, Barrie represents the sexual behaviour of his characters as animated by an infallible, though regrettable, Darwinian sexual logic, involving masculine sexual aggression and feminine sexual yielding. His novels worry about the social implications of this sexual logic, since such Darwinian impulses threaten to break out of their prescribed context. If Barrie’s novels argue that some social adaptation is needed in order to accommodate what is good in Tommy, it is nevertheless against a strong sense of the potential danger of his deviant masculine sexuality, though this deviance is not in the direction that Nash implies. In the next section, we will see that the dangerousness of Tommy’s sentimentalism, both to himself and others, and especially in love, is understandable only within the context of Barrie’s wider sexual logic, of which ideal and idealizing love is only a part.

Masculine Sexual Aggression: The Man Who Never Came?

If Barrie defines love as an idealizing force, it stands to reason that he does so against a background of reality, of acknowledged truth about the world that is as immovable as it may be distasteful. Jack has persuasively shown that the mutual claims of realism and idealism informed all Barrie’s formal choices, primarily stemming from the influ-

ence of his Edinburgh University teachers, David Masson (*belle lettres*) and Alexander Campbell Fraser (philosophy). This rhetorical method aimed “not to avoid the real but to offer a simpler perspective from which the original, complex issue may be re-examined” and was adopted in response to an Edinburgh-based Christian humanism reconciled to a Darwinian universe. Masson and Fraser were “two Christian Darwinians singing from the same literary and psychological hymn-sheet in order to prioritise the very kind of imaginative, idealistic art their young student aspired to produce.”³⁶ Their influence can potentially be seen in everything that Barrie wrote.

But Jack overstates Barrie’s acceptance of Darwinian principles when he calls him a “disciple of Darwin.”³⁷ In support of this claim, he cites an episode at the beginning of Barrie’s first published book, *Auld Licht Idylls* (1888), in which the narrator observes a patently Darwinian battle between a weasel and a moorhen. The narrator suggests that nature frequently affords such spectacles: it is “only another fierce struggle among the hungry animals for existence: they need no professor to teach them the doctrine of the survival of the fittest.”³⁸ Jack reads this as a profession of Darwinist faith; but in doing so, he ignores the episode’s continuation.³⁹ Having noted that the battle between weasel and moorhen is an unavoidable part of nature, the narrator nevertheless intervenes, telling how he saved the moorhen despite having acknowledged that the weasel would starve without his meal. Barrie shows a harsh Darwinian world, however rational, being tempered by the idealizing spirit of love and pity.

Barrie’s sexual logic is similarly shaped by an acceptance of the truth of Darwinian battle. But his Darwinism is not as enthusiastic as Jack suggests. Rather than triumphantly portraying a Darwinist world, his novels celebrate the essentially Christian values that improve upon this brutality, as the battle of the sexes is crucially tempered by an ideal and idealizing love. Such a guarded compromise between religion and science was by no means original, yet its recognition is vital for reading the accumulative significance of violence, especially masculine violence, in Barrie’s texts. In the novels, a keen consciousness of the necessity of Darwinian brutality, of male sexual aggression and female submission, for the continuation of the species only makes plain the equal necessity of Christian idealism. His novels are deeply apprehensive about the potential of such brutal passions, of sexuality unchecked by love, to overstep their narrow field of usefulness and become destructive.

For all its idealized picture of love, *When a Man's Single* recognizes and worries about the requisite aggression at the heart of all love relationships. Having accepted Mary as the object of his love, Rob is then faced with the inevitable problem of how to court a woman whose sexual purity is her main attraction. While Mary is certainly impressed by Rob's determination, his ability, and his kindness, it is not these that eventually win her, but rather his sexualized forcefulness. When another suitor comes on to the scene, we are told that "when two men are in love with the same young lady one of them must be worsted. Rob saw that it was better to be the other one." A turning point in their relationship occurs when Rob orders Mary to put on a shawl on a cold night:

"How dare you, Mr Angus?" she exclaimed.

Rob's chest heaved.

"You must do as you are told," he said.

Mary looked at him while he looked at her, but she did not take off the shawl again, and that was the great moment of Rob's life.⁴⁰

In the final scene, when Rob finally confesses his love to Mary, it is deliberately shown that the moment could potentially have been a violent one. "I am not going to give you up now," Rob said, passionately, and he looked as if he would run away with her at that moment." Of her father he says, "I shall compel him to consent."⁴¹ Luckily for everyone, actual aggression is not needed. But it is characteristic of Barrie to signal how aggressive masculinity could have overstepped its mark here.

The potential for destructive sexuality is more dominant in *The Little Minister*. When Gavin first sees Babbie, she is dancing in a wood at night. Just before she appears, he has been thinking of an old legend of that place: "how once on a time it was a mighty wood, and a maiden most beautiful stood on its confines, panting and afraid, for a wicked man pursued her."⁴² Both Nash and Jack have noted that, when Babbie appears singing and Gavin chases after her, a deliberate parallel is drawn with this legend. But neither discusses the sexual violence implied here. When Gavin chases Babbie, she is not fleeing from a potential rapist like the maiden, but goading him flirtatiously: "she tripped on, but often turning her head beckoned and mocked him, and he forgot his dignity and his pulpit and all other things, and ran after her."⁴³ Yet the aggression that her flirtatiousness has called forth is the same sexual aggression, we are invited to recall, that drove the "wicked man" to chase the maiden. Potential sexuality in a woman has

invoked potential brutality in a man, and it is how these potentialities are then negotiated that gives Barrie his main theme.

Despite his “littleness,” Babbie eventually learns to value Gavin’s masculine strength which, manifested as moral determination rather than physical aggression, is more useful than destructive. But Barrie insists that their relationship contains a potential violence that we are nevertheless actively encouraged to question. Babbie’s flirtatious taunting frequently calls out an unpriestly aggression in Gavin: after she calls him a “little man” in front of his congregation, he says “if I had not found Christ, I would have throttled that woman. You saw how she flouted me?”⁴⁴ This is given a disturbing literalness when the man to whom he says this, Rob Dow, takes him at his word, kidnapping and attempting to murder Babbie in an attempt to free his minister from her seductive clutches.

Further, as Jack points out, “all versions of novel and drama [referring to Barrie’s dramatisation of the novel] make some reference to Babbie’s desire to be physically humiliated.”⁴⁵ He could have added, “and Gavin’s too-eager willingness to comply.” In defining her ideal husband, as quoted previously, Babbie introduces an alarming desire that he control her, with physical violence if necessary:

“He must understand me.”

“I do.”

“And be my master.”

“It is his lawful position in the house.”

“He must not yield to my tempers.”

“It would be weakness.”

“But compel me to do his bidding; yes, even thrash me if—”

“If you wont listen to reason. Babbie,” cried Gavin, “I am that man!”⁴⁶

Jack, reading Barrie as a thoroughbred Darwinian, refers to this as “Babbie’s apparently strange but allegorically necessary enthusiasm to be thrashed.”⁴⁷ But the novel immediately draws attention to this strangeness and the potentially worrying nature of this revelation: “Here the inventory abruptly ended,” we are told, “and these two people found themselves staring at each other, as if they had heard something dreadful.”⁴⁸ The further developments of their relationship are marked not only by Gavin’s assumption of power, but also Babbie’s initial shock and fear at this too-literal manifestation of her fantasy. “Since when have you taken command of me?” she demands as he orders her not to

walk home alone, to which he replies: "since a minute ago, when you let me kiss you." We watch as "she made a last effort to free herself from bondage," and may question whether love should be represented as a violent capture.⁴⁹ However ideal their eventual love, Barrie not only makes it clear that it owes its practical manifestation to masculine aggression, but also that such aggression could have had quite another conclusion had Gavin been a different man.

The Tommy novels, especially *Tommy and Grizel*, are again more cynical in this matter than *The Little Minister*. The characters of both Tommy and Grizel are formed to indicate the potential tragedy of a world in which this "love" is circumvented by the long-term, intergenerational destruction that Barrie sees as resulting from untrammelled Darwinian sexuality. Both are the children of relationships driven by sexual passion rather than love. Grizel's mother had been seduced and left pregnant by a man who in reference to this abandonment is called "the man who never came." At the time of the story she is, as befits "fallen" women in Victorian novels, alcoholic, insane, and making a living as a prostitute; and she is referred to by the inhabitants of the town as the Painted Lady. Tommy's parents are given a more elaborate backstory. His mother, Jean, is engaged to the meek Aaron Latta when Tam Sandys arrives. A scene occurs in which Tam, coming across the pair in the woods, compels Aaron to change the words "Jean Latta," which he had written with a stick on the ground, to "Jean Sandys." After this act of domination, Jean lets Tam take her away and seduce her: "without a look ahint me," she tells Tommy, "away I went wi' my master, and I had no more will to resist him—and oh, man, man, when I came to mysel' next morning I wished I had never been born!"⁵⁰ Aaron marks this event by carving on a stone the words "Here lies the manhood of Aaron Latta, a fond son, a faithful friend and a true lover, who violated the feelings of sex on this spot, and is now the scunner of God and man."⁵¹ Though Jean manages to persuade Tam to marry, they have a miserable, violent life, and one of Tommy's earliest memories is his mother's great relief on the occasion of his father's death.

The novels do not quite repeat this pattern of destructive sexual passion. Rather they explore in the context of late-Victorian credulity concerning inherited characteristics the ongoing repercussions that such a genesis might have on the temperaments of Tommy and Grizel and the disastrous implications for their relationship. These implications are, as is to be expected, heavily gendered. For Grizel, they consist largely in a propensity to both ideal love and sexual passion, a combination

which, if activated, will destroy her as it destroyed her mother. Unlike Jean, the Painted Lady is said to have loved “the man who never came” in the ideal sense, but to have been corrupted by him into sexual passion, an outcome to which Barrie apparently supposes feminine love, as essentially passive, to be naturally vulnerable. “I wanted so to be good,” she says, “but—It is so difficult to refuse when you love him very much, don’t you think?”⁵² When she dies, her love letters to “the man who never came” are discovered, and are described, without irony, as having been “written in an ecstasy of the purest love.” As in previous novels, this “pure” love has a social function, instructing the young of Thrums in romantic idealism: “They alone have passed the Painted Lady’s memory from one generation to another, and they have purified it, so that what she was died with her vile body, and what she might have been lived on, as if it were her true self.”⁵³

In *The Little Minister*, Barrie had suggested that masculine love was vulnerable to corruption in ratio to its original nobility. As quoted earlier, “The nobler his ideal, the further will he have hurried down the wrong way, for those who only run after little things will not go far.”⁵⁴ The same is shown in the Tommy novels with regard to feminine love, since Grizel and her mother’s capacity for loving leaves them all the more vulnerable to sexual corruption should that love be misplaced. Grizel is told after her mother’s death that there is a “bad thing in her blood” that she must resist. Still a child, she tells the doctor about the danger of which she has been warned:

They don’t become wicked in a moment, he learned; if they are good to begin with, it takes quite a long time to make them bad ... the way the men do it is this, they put evil thoughts into the woman’s head, and say them often to her, till she gets accustomed to them, and thinks they cannot be bad when the man she loves likes them, and it is called corrupting the mind.⁵⁵

This view of the “fallen woman,” which also produced Barrie’s play *The Wedding Guest* (1900), relies on a Darwinian concept of female sexuality as essentially yielding, what Barrie in his notebooks called “womans [*sic*] slavish feelings.”⁵⁶

Tommy’s parents had not had any such capacity for ideal love. His inheritance from both of them suggests the full brutality of a Darwinian sexual encounter: aggression, or what the novels call “masterfulness” from his father and yielding weakness from his mother. Beginning in early childhood, the combination of these qualities compounds his sentimentality, portrayed as both an indiscriminate yielding to impulse, “the impulses that so easily mastered him,” and a desire to control and

be admired by those around him. As a child, though hardly unsympathetic, Tommy is described as “leering” and “a swaggerer” during sentimental episodes. When posing as a juvenile criminal in order to take advantage of a charity dinner, the narration says “tonight Tommy was master.”⁵⁷ His mother tells him her history and begs him to repeat a daily prayer: “O God, keep me from being a magerful [masterful] man!” He does so, but when she is no longer listening adds, “but I think I would fell like it.”⁵⁸

Even when they are children, Tommy’s friendship with Grizel involves a desire to bully her into admiring him: “though Grizel spurned his overtures, this only fired his pride of conquest.”⁵⁹ Though attracted, she instinctively resists these attempts, particularly refusing, in their elaborate games, to play the part of the seduced woman to his masterful character, said to be “a torment to single women.”⁶⁰ After her mother’s death, she quickly connects her fear of Tommy with her dread of the “masterful man.” Told that she will know such a man “if she likes him and fears him at one breath, and has a sort of secret dread that he’s getting a power over her that she canna resist,” she confronts Tommy:

“I believe—I think—you are masterful,” she gasped.

“Me!” he retorted indignantly.

“Now,” she proceeded, too excited to heed his interruptions, “now I know why I would not kiss your hand, now I know why I would not say I liked you. I was afraid of you.”⁶¹

Tommy’s reaction to this demonstrates the Darwinian masculine aggression that he harbours alongside his more sympathetic qualities:

“Were you?” His eyes began to sparkle, and something very like rapture was pushing the indignation from his face. “Oh, Grizel, have I a power over you?”

“No, you have not,” she cried passionately. “I was just frightened that you might have. Oh, oh, I know you now!”

“To think o’t, to think o’t!” he crowed, wagging his head, and then she clenched her fist, crying, “Oh, you wicked, you should cry with shame!”⁶²

Though Tommy’s tendency toward make-believe stems from his mother, it is his father’s aggression that drives his desire to “master” people and provides continuity between his desire to be admired and his relationship with Grizel.

Barrie, like his close friend George Meredith, associated sentimentality in the Tommy novels, despite its negative idealism, with sensuality. Meredith writes that sentimentality came from “the grossly material,

not at all the spiritual." It "springs from the former," he says, "merely and badly aping the latter—fine flower, or pinnacle of flame-spire, of sensualism that it is, could it do other?"⁶³ As an adult, Tommy's sentimentality, among other incarnations, takes the form of flirtation with London society women, "athirst for a new sensation." With them, his sentimentality allows him to be masterful without consequence: "It allowed them to go to a certain length, while it was also a reason why they could never, never exceed that distance; and this was an ideal state for Tommy, who could be most loyal and tender so long as it was understood that he meant nothing in particular."⁶⁴

It should be noted that this "nothing in particular" implies a lack of ideal love and marriage, rather than a lack of sexual interest. This potential sexuality is illustrated in Tommy's fascination with a barmaid, whose attractiveness to him is instigated by his coarser friends, who "had hinted such dark things about her."⁶⁵ Tommy's ability to feel sexual desire was important to Barrie, as his notebooks reveal, though he was uncertain about whether this desire should be extended to Grizel. One entry states: "T can be fond of Grizel, no passion, can only have passion without love (as for a sister)."⁶⁶ Tommy can, Barrie implies, experience physical desire, but not in conjunction with affection (he is careful, even in this note, to distinguish between the use of the word "love" to mean affection, "(as for a sister)," and the concept of ideal love expressed in his novels). In other notes he is less certain about Tommy's lack of sexual desire for Grizel. In a note headed "Grizel," he considered making this relationship much more overtly sexual than it eventually was. "Grizel," he writes, "tells T has vowed to God not to let him do hot-blooded ~ to her—asks him not to make her do them, afraid he cd conquer her."⁶⁷ In the novel, this aspect of their relationship is left ambiguous.

It is true that Grizel is also described as masterful: the doctor calls her "the most masterful little besom I ever clapped eyes on."⁶⁸ Her strength of will, surely inherited, as Jack says, from her masterful father, is almost tiresomely insisted upon, and reproduces Gavin's moral strenuousness.⁶⁹ But this does not mean that "Barrie intends us to see both characters as potentially dominant, and locked in a struggle for power," as Ormond finds; nor simply is this "the rivalry-in-understanding of the hero and heroine" described by Jack.⁷⁰ When Tommy and Grizel meet as adults, it is gender that ultimately decides the outcome of any romance between them. As a woman, Grizel's moral masterfulness does not have the power to redeem Tommy, as Gavin's did Babbie.

Instead, her feminine passivity in love predominates: “into his manner there crept a certain masterfulness, and instead of resisting it she beamed.” As with Gavin and Babbie, this moment of acknowledged love is portrayed as one of potential feminine “fall,” in which the male determines the outcome: “The birth which comes to every woman at that hour is God’s gift to her in exchange for what He has taken away, and when He has given it He stands back and watches the man.”⁷¹ Tommy, as we know, lacks the moral strength necessary to redeem Grizel to ensure that this moment of potentiality has a positive outcome, and so what could have been “greatness in love” becomes a spectacular “fall.” Though aware that they are at cross purposes, and desperate not to hurt her, he nevertheless finds himself enjoying the range of parts that love allows him to play. The effect is the same as that of a sexual seduction, which, because of Grizel’s original idealism, drives her into an insanity in which she believes herself to be fallen like her mother and to have given birth to an illegitimate child.

Tommy and Grizel presents in excruciating detail the potential destructiveness of masculine aggression in all its forms, immediate and intergenerational, to the romantic relationship of which it is nevertheless inevitably a part. In doing so, it effectively performs Barrie’s ambivalent theory of human nature as driven both by the realism of biological impulse and the idealism of humane love, as well as his fear of what the loss of this balance would entail. Reading Tommy’s inability to “love” euphemistically as a failure of sexual desire only (as Jack, Nash, and Sedgwick do) obscures this wider scope of sexual signification. In practice, this has usually (with the exception of Jack) led to a displacement of emphasis onto the issue of Tommy’s personality, a critical preoccupation that has mimicked the narrator’s ironic submission to the hero’s masterfulness, rather than taking up the novels’ invitation to question what such submission entails. It has also distorted readings of the relationship between Tommy’s sexuality and his artistic temperament, as well as the implied relationship between the artist and society. What are the consequences of non-euphemistic readings for interpretations of Barrie’s thinking about art and the artist in the Tommy novels?

Art & the Artist

Critical investigation into Barrie’s thinking about art and the artist has so far largely focused on the parallels between Tommy’s embodiment of artistic values in the Tommy novels and the characteristics

that Barrie portrays as typical of women. Just as Grizel's strength of will reproduces Gavin's moral strenuousness, Tommy's sentimentality reproduces the changeable character of Babbie, "this girl who was a dozen women in the hour, and all made of impulses that would scarce stand still to be photographed."⁷² Like her, he yields to every impulse, a characteristic inherited, as we have seen, from another woman, his mother. Throughout his work, Barrie represents feminine yielding, whether to impulse or to male sexual "masterfulness," as essential to the process of creation, artistic as well as organic. This yielding, portrayed as being at the heart of feminine character both good and bad, gives Barrie's women a relationship with make-believe that is for the most part absent from his men. For many of them, especially Babbie, make-believe allows a certain form of power, one involving manipulation and persuasion rather than open aggression. The play *What Every Woman Knows* (1908) represents the epitome of this theme in Barrie's writing, illustrating the old adage that "behind every great man is a great woman."

Barrie describes the ability to cajole as a quality making women generally "cleverer" than men; but this advantage is often enjoyed to the detriment of their sexual "purity." This is particularly true of female artists, always actresses for Barrie. Late-nineteenth-century artistic theories commonly claimed drama as the only art at which women could succeed, as the actress's art involved a perfecting of the make-believe that was natural to all women. For example, George Moore's 1893 essay, "Sex in Art," states that, while "women do things more easily than men," nevertheless they "do not penetrate below the surface, and if they attempt to do so it is but a clumsy masquerade in unbecoming costume. In their own costume they have succeeded as queens, courtesans, and actresses."⁷³ As he increasingly became a dramatist, Barrie became fascinated by the ambiguous sexuality of the actress, expressing this most fully in the one-act play *Rosalind* (1912). "I would have been a darling of a wife," the actress Mrs. Page says sadly, "but they [the public] wouldn't let me. I am only a bundle of emotions."⁷⁴

Jack has read Barrie as championing a "feminist Darwinism," in which women are acknowledged as being creatively superior to men and so better adapted to the modern world.⁷⁵ But Barrie's repeated coupling of feminine creativity with excessively yielding sexuality indicates a different application of Darwinist science to gender. It suggests that Barrie considered art to be connected not so much with femininity as with primitive, Darwinian sexuality. The Tommy novels confirm

this hypothesis. Tommy's unstable personality is certainly similar to those of Barrie's women; yet the artistic values that he represents are directly connected, not only to his yielding to self, but also to his "masterfulness" of others. As a man, it is this aspect of his artistic temperament that is particularly dangerous. This connection must be taken into consideration in any account of Barrie's thinking on art, sexuality or gender.

The Tommy novels repeatedly claim that Tommy has "the artistic instinct,"⁷⁶ that he is an artist by temperament as well as eventually by trade. Occasionally, this refers to a formal aesthetic sense, such as when he fails a scholarship essay-writing exam because he forgets in his search for the right word actually to write the essay. But claims of artistry also often attend episodes in which sentimental surrender to impulse leads to his mastering of an audience. Tommy enjoys yielding to his sentiment: after the episode in which he poses as a juvenile delinquent, the narrator quips: "he and the saying about art for art's sake were in the streets that night, looking for each other."⁷⁷ These moments of artistic yielding are, importantly, matched by Tommy's artistic desire to gain admiration from his audience, and this process is represented as an "imperious" taking by force clearly connected to sexual masterfulness. "I am his slave myself," admits the narrator reluctantly;⁷⁸ and it is likely that Barrie intended Tommy to have a similar effect on readers: "you are supposed to like him," he wrote to Quiller-Couch, "against your better judgment."⁷⁹ One may wonder if Barrie intends his readers, here, to reflect also upon their relationship to the text that they are reading and the author behind it.

The Darwinian sexuality that underpins Tommy's artistic sentimentality reflects contemporary anxieties concerning the connection between art and sex and the artist's relationship to society. Grant Allen had, in his deliberately provocative 1894 article "The New Hedonism," argued that "everything high and ennobling in our nature springs from the sexual instinct." "To it," he continues, "we owe the entire existence of our aesthetic sense, which is, in the last resort, a secondary sexual attribute." In support of this, he not only cites Darwin, but suggests that this source is so well known as to almost go without saying: "I need not elaborate this point; Darwin has already made it familiar to most of us."⁸⁰ Barrie would not have agreed with Allen's wholehearted advocacy of sex, but Allen's association of the artistic temperament with Darwinist sexuality is echoed in the Tommy novels. Where Allen and Barrie most differ is in their conception not of art but of society.

Whereas Allen finds the root of “family and social affections” to lie, like art, in sex, Barrie portrayed civilised society always as a fragile thing, supported by proper regulation of sexuality; in this he was more like his much-revered Carlyle. But he was more cynical even than Carlyle about the artist’s position in this fragile society.⁸¹

A closer model to Barrie’s of the artist’s position within society can be found in another provocative publication that made waves in mid-1890s Britain. *Sentimental Tommy* was published one year after Max Nordau’s popular *Entartung* was first translated into English as *Degeneration*. This notorious polemic had represented the majority of contemporary artists as an “anthropological family” of “higher degenerates,” whose art, potentially able to communicate this degeneration to vast audiences, should be considered a social danger: “Books and works of art exercise a powerful suggestion on the masses,” he wrote; “if they are absurd and anti-social, they exert a disturbing and corrupting influence on the views of a whole generation.” Nordau’s description of the “higher” degenerate is in many ways very similar to Barrie’s descriptions of Tommy’s artistic temperament. “The degenerate,” writes Nordau, “is incapable of adapting himself to existing circumstances. He therefore rebels against conditions and views of things which he feels to be painful, chiefly because they impose upon him the duty of self-control, of which he is incapable on account of his organic weakness of will.”⁸² He also emphasises both the degenerate’s submissiveness, “the exceeding ease with which they can be made to yield to suggestion,” and his desire to dominate the attention of others: “he cannot endure that others should ignore him.”⁸³ Barrie does not wholly reproduce Nordau’s arguments in the Tommy novels; but the closeness of Nordau’s degenerate personality to Tommy’s artist temperament, together with Barrie’s increased emphasis on heredity in those novels, suggest that he intended them to be recognisable as an engagement with contemporary debates about the artist in society.

The connection between the artist and Darwinian sexuality is ominously made in the scene of Tommy’s first meeting with Grizel—charged with significance, referring both to the primordial scene of Tam Sandys’s mastering of Aaron Latta (and Jean) and the love-tragedy already written. Tommy knocks down a boy who he believes to be teasing his sister, but who is actually teasing Grizel. It is noteworthy that this meeting owes itself to an act of chivalry, an attitude that protects women from excessive masculine aggression, just as it is significant that such an attitude is said to be unnatural to Tommy: “it cannot be

pretended of him that he was the boy to squire all ladies in distress." Tommy soon begins to enjoy mastering and humiliating the boy just as his father did Aaron, and here the narration tells us that, "being an artist, Tommy had kept his best for the end (and made it up first)."⁸⁴ The scene concludes by suggesting a connection between Tommy's artistic wish for admiration and his future sexual masterfulness:

When it was all over Tommy looked around triumphantly, and though he liked the expression on several faces, Grizel's pleased him best. "It ain't no wonder you would like to be me, lassie!" he said, in an ecstasy.

"I don't want to be you, you conceited boy," retorted the Painted Lady's child hotly, and her heat was the greater because the clever little wretch had read her thoughts aright.⁸⁵

It is no coincidence that Barrie chooses this moment to call Grizel "the Painted Lady's child."

In *Tommy and Grizel*, the beginning of Tommy's career as a writer is deliberately described as a sexual awakening. He starts as amanuensis to a writer of cheap romance, whose female characters entrance him. His own first book is written in the rhetoric of ideal love: entitled "Letters to a Young Man About to Be Married," the narrator tells us that it soon becomes commonly referred to as "Sandys on Women." It is this rhetoric, he quickly realizes, that allows him to flirt effectively with society ladies, a proficiency that is explicitly connected to his artistry: "Your books are move one in the game of making love to us" he imagines them saying.⁸⁶ These episodes demonstrate not only the curious mixture of excessive (masculine) masterfulness and excessive (feminine) yielding that forms the artistic temperament, but also, significantly, a weighting in the male artist toward dangerous masterfulness. Nash is right to describe Tommy's artistic temperament as producing "a socially-dissident sexuality."⁸⁷ But it is that of an aggressive as much as passive masculinity.

In the Tommy novels and elsewhere in Barrie's work, this consternation about the artist is balanced against a relatively positive view of art itself. If the artist is motivated by the same primitive urges that produce the Darwinian sexual encounter, the male impulse to master and the feminine to submit, still make-believe itself, for Barrie is closely allied to the kind of idealism which produces ideal love in its purest form. It functions in the novels as both a damaging and healing power: if it leads Tommy nearly to the ruin of Grizel, we must remember, it also allowed him to comfort his sister when they were poor children in London. From the Tommy novels onward make-believe increasingly

meant for Barrie a space, usually a literal space such as a garden, island or wood, within a novel or drama in which potentially damaging, anti-social forces could be explored, negotiated and perhaps even come to terms with. Movement between this space and the “real” world distinguishes all his most successful dramas: *Quality Street* (1901), *The Admirable Crichton* (1902), *Peter Pan* (1904), *Dear Brutus* (1917), and *Mary Rose* (1920).

In *Tommy and Grizel*, this fantasy space may simply be the condition of childhood. Women, it is claimed, are attracted by boyishness in men because it reminds them of “some early, beautiful stage in the world’s history when men and women played together without fear.”⁸⁸ This fantasy of a world without Darwinian sex, what Claudia Nelson calls the common Victorian, and particularly Nonconformist, “idealizing of childhood as a refuge from the excesses of adult masculinity,” is what Barrie appeals to when he describes Tommy’s artistic sentimentality as boyishness: “in the wild spirit that mastered him he seemed to be the boy incarnate.”⁸⁹ And it is in this fantasy—perhaps we might even deduce in art itself—that Barrie tentatively suggests Tommy and the artist may exist without strife. “In a younger world,” the narrator says, “where there were only boys and girls, he might have been a gallant figure.”⁹⁰ But it must be acknowledged that this suggestion is made always with full awareness that such peaceful relations between the artist and society are, like those (in Barrie’s view) between men and women, as impossible as an eternal sexual immaturity. In 1900, Barrie wrote this to Quiller-Couch: “I have a small book and a play in my mind but not much on paper. The world will be younger in them than in Tommy.”⁹¹ Barrie’s most famous work, *Peter Pan*, can be read as an exploration of the possibilities and limitations of precisely this fantasy world.

Notes

Acknowledgment: Research for this article was funded by the Arts and Research Council. “The Man Who Never Came? The Problem of Sex in J. M. Barrie’s Fiction,” an early version, is published under a CC BY license.

1. Leonée Ormond, *J. M. Barrie* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1987), 55.
2. J. M. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy: The Story of His Boyhood* (London: Cassell, 1896); *Tommy and Grizel* (London: Cassell, 1900).

3. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (1990; New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), 198. Andrew Nash, "Trying to be a Man": J. M. Barrie and Sentimental Masculinity," *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 35.2 (1999), 124.
4. For more on this episode of Barrie's life, see Lisa Chaney, *Hide-and-Seek With Angels: The Life of J. M. Barrie* (London: Hutchinson, 2005), 272–79. There is a long biographical tradition of attempting to find in Barrie's elusive sexuality the key to his personality and life. Janet Dunbar finds the answer in an arrested sexual development caused by an oppressive mother; Andrew Birkin in a passionate but (probably) chaste love for both Sylvia Llewellyn-Davis and her five sons; and Piers Dudgeon in a sublimation of sexuality into a pathological desire to dominate and manipulate. These very different interpretations of Barrie's personality nevertheless agree in reading his novels biographically, as expressions of sexual frustration, an approach that this article avoids. I prefer Chaney's biography for its relatively unpartisan treatment of Barrie's sexuality. See Janet Dunbar, *J. M. Barrie: The Man Behind the Image* (London: Collins, 1970); Andrew Birkin, *J. M. Barrie and the Lost Boys* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979); Piers Dudgeon, *Captivated: J. M. Barrie, the du Mauriers, and the Dark Side of Neverland* (London: Chatto & Windus, 2008).
5. R. D. S. Jack, *Myths and the Mythmaker: A Literary Account of J. M. Barrie's Formative Years* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010), 240, 237, 40.
6. Nash, "Trying to Be a Man," 119; Nash, "Regionalism, Representation and the Art of J. M. Barrie," in his *Kailyard and Scottish Literature* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), 80.
7. Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 183, 198, 182, 195. Italics are Sedgwick's.
8. Jack, *Myths and the Mythmaker*, 174.
9. Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet*, 198; Jack, *Myths and the Mythmaker*, 55.
10. See Jack, "Filling the Research Gaps: Beyond Freud and the Kailyard," in *Myths and the Mythmaker*, 31–78.
11. J. M. Barrie, *When a Man's Single* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888), 99.
12. *Ibid.*, 103.
13. *Ibid.*, 104.
14. *Ibid.*, 103.
15. *Ibid.*, 272.
16. *Ibid.*, 279.
17. *Ibid.*, 104.
18. See Andrew Nash, "From Realism to Romance: Gender and Narrative Technique in J. M. Barrie's *The Little Minister*," *Scottish Literary Journal*, 26.1 (June 1999), 77–92.
19. J. M. Barrie, *The Little Minister*, 3 vols. (London: Cassell, 1891), I: 7.
20. Barrie, *The Little Minister*, II: 95, 97.
21. *Ibid.*, II: 136.
22. *Ibid.*, II: 140–41.
23. *Ibid.*, II: 145–46.
24. For more about Barrie's relationship with Charles Scribner and the publication of the Tommy novels, see Andrew Nash, "A Phenomenally Slow Producer": J. M. Barrie, Scribner's, and the Publication of *Sentimental Tommy*," *Yale University Library Gazette*, 74.1–2 (October 1999), 41–52.
25. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy*, 187.
26. *Ibid.*, 1.
27. *Ibid.*, 100.
28. J. M. Barrie Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University: GEN MSS 1400, Notebook 13 (Box 23, Folder 735), notes 73, 74; Notebook 16 (Box 23, Folder 738), note 127.
29. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy*, 380.
30. Nash, "Trying to Be a Man," 122.
31. Barrie, *Tommy and Grizel*, 188.

32. Ibid., 395.
33. Nash, “Trying to Be a Man,” 117, 119, 121.
34. Barrie, *Tommy and Grizel*, 117.
35. Nash, “Trying to Be a Man,” 123.
36. See Jack, *Myths and the Mythmaker*, 37–75, 31, 64.
37. Ibid., 97.
38. J. M. Barrie, *Auld Licht Idylls* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888), 6.
39. Jack, *Myths and the Mythmaker*, 42.
40. Barrie, *When a Man’s Single*, 201, 216.
41. Ibid., 278.
42. Barrie, *The Little Minister*, I: 71–72.
43. Ibid., I, 75.
44. Ibid., I: 93.
45. Jack, *Myths and the Mythmaker*, 195.
46. Barrie, *The Little Minister*, II: 96–97.
47. Jack, *Myths and the Mythmaker*, 197.
48. Barrie, *The Little Minister*, II: 97.
49. Ibid., II: 139, 141–42.
50. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy*, 113.
51. Ibid., 68. The OED identifies “scunner” as a Scots word meaning “a nuisance, a pest, a good-for-nothing.”
52. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy*, 217–18.
53. Ibid., 393.
54. Barrie, *The Little Minister*, I: 7.
55. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy*, 391.
56. Beinecke, GEN MSS 1400, Notebook 12 (Box 23, Folder 734), note 386. For more on Barrie and the “fallen woman” genre, and *The Wedding Guest* in particular, see Anna Farkas, “The odd, odd triangle: Barrie’s Metatheatrical Critique of the Victorian Dramatic Tradition,” in *Gateway to the Modern: Resituating J. M. Barrie*, Valentina Bold and Andrew Nash, eds. (Glasgow: Scottish Literature International, 2014), 17–26.
57. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy*, 291, 9, 14, 81.
58. Ibid., 116–19.
59. Ibid., 187.
60. Ibid., 307.
61. Ibid., 403, 404.
62. Ibid., 404–405.
63. George Meredith, *Diana of the Crossways: A Novel* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1885), 24.
64. Barrie, *Tommy and Grizel*, 27, 33.
65. Ibid., 23.
66. Beinecke, GEN MSS 1400, Notebook 16 (Box 23, Folder 738), note 133.
67. Ibid., Notebook 16, note 45. The symbol “~” represents an authorial manuscript flourish, regularly used to represent “things” or “so on.”
68. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy*, 399.
69. Jack, *Myths and the Mythmaker*, 267.

70. Ormond, *J. M. Barrie*, 78; Jack, *Myths and the Mythmaker*, 252.
71. Barrie, *Tommy and Grizel*, 151, 157.
72. Barrie, *The Little Minister*, II: 155–56.
73. George Moore, “Sex in Art,” in *Modern Painting* (London: Walter Scott, 1893), 220–31.
74. J. M. Barrie, *Rosalind*, in *The Plays of J. M. Barrie*, A. E. Wilson, ed. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1942), 801.
75. See R. D. S. Jack, “Barrie and the Extreme Heroine,” in *Gendering the Nation: Studies in Modern Scottish Literature*, Christopher Whyte, ed. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995), 137–67.
76. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy*, 295.
77. *Ibid.*, 90.
78. *Ibid.*, 323, 214.
79. Letter from J. M. Barrie to Arthur Quiller-Couch, 19 January 1896, in *Letters of J. M. Barrie*, Viola Meynell, ed. (London: Peter Davies, 1942), 9.
80. Grant Allen, “The New Hedonism,” *Fortnightly Review*, 55.327 (March 1894), 384, 385.
81. For more about Carlyle’s vision of art and sex in a fragile society, see Herbert Sussman, “The Condition of Manliness Question: Thomas Carlyle and Industrial Manhood,” in his *Victorian Masculinities: Manhood and Masculine Poetics in Early Victorian Literature and Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 16–72.
82. Max Nordau, *Degeneration* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1895; originally published as *Entartung*, 1892), vii, 23, viii, 22.
83. *Ibid.*, 25, 26.
84. Barrie, *Sentimental Tommy*, 146.
85. *Ibid.*
86. Barrie, *Tommy and Grizel*, 401.
87. Nash, “Trying to Be a Man,” 121.
88. Barrie, *Tommy and Grizel*, 82.
89. *Ibid.*, 72. Claudia Nelson, *Boys Will Be Girls: The Feminine Ethic and British Children’s Fiction, 1857–1917* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991), 148.
90. Barrie, *Tommy and Grizel*, 117.
91. Letter from J. M. Barrie to Arthur Quiller-Couch, 27 December 1900, in *Letters of J. M. Barrie*, 9.