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ABSTRACT

The object of this thesis is an examination of repetitive character types in the works of James Matthew Barrie. It deals only with the characters found in more than one work, who are given new names.

The discussion begins with Barrie's experimental period of writing articles for newspapers and journals, and focuses on Barrie's concern for point of view as seen in his development of a characteristic narrator. This narrator originates as a device to give unity to collections of Kailyard articles, and develops into a thematic device and finally into the vehicle for Barrie's primary theme. This theme is found to be the problem of immaturity or childishness in individuals and in society as a whole.

The theme of childishness is then traced in Barrie's treatment of Barrie's immature masculine and feminine characters, and finally in the small group of female supporting characters Barrie relied upon as foils for his major characters.

This close range of characteristic traits shows that Barrie's primary concern was not intended to be in any way impressionistic; his concern was the expression, in his own idiom to be sure, of a narrow range of vital themes.
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INTRODUCTION

A. REPUTATION

James Matthew Barrie has been a literary enigma ever since his first days as a writer, when he was writing for the Nottingham Journal in 1883 and 1884. The temper of critical opinion about him is very strongly divided, Barrie enthusiasts tending to drool at the very mention of his name, detractors to snarl and foam.\(^1\) William Lyon Phelps, who falls into the former category, contended that "J. M. Barrie is the foremost English-writing dramatist of our time, and his plays, taken together, make the most important contribution to the English drama since Sheridan."\(^2\) The other category of critics is ably represented by Louis Wilkinson, who saw in Barrie only a "sterile charm," an utter failure whose example must be shunned by all writers: "In a curious and quite illuminating way he shows what comes of the kind of fancy that does not strike deep roots in heart or head."\(^3\)

As a writer of both novels and plays, Barrie is usually treated by the critics of each genre as a solitary attraction of dubious significance. Novel critics say he did his best work in the drama; drama critics find his plays subliterary or really only novels in dramatic form. Both groups finally throw up their hands, protesting that his appeal is due to his charm, or his magic, which is too
closely connected with his personality to yield itself to analysis. The result of this attitude has been a naive search through Barrie's works to ferret out the character of the author. Miss Cora Dolbee's article, "Margaret Ogilvy and Barrie's Heroines," illustrates the type of conclusion reached in this search. Reading Margaret Ogilvy as straight biography and autobiography, Miss Dolbee observes:

As Barrie grew older he and Margaret Ogilvy were more like brother and sister than mother and son. Each was deeply interested in every concern of the other. Evidently one was as surprised as the other to find that the Arabian Nights were not knights and equally resented paying the public library fee to read so unromantic a story.

The next step in this approach to Barrie's literary output is to label it the natural production of a playwright who never grew up, who wanted the security of his mother's love, wrote about and for her throughout his life, and without knowing it wrote about men as if they were monsters who could not appreciate the sentiments which pass between mothers and young sons. When we take this attitude, we are bound with Swinnerton to feel some repulsion for a Barrie whom we imagine to have been emasculated by mother-love, afraid to face the harshness of the real world, clinging to "whimsies, delicious fancies, nonsensical dreams, tender memories of play and young illusion, ... in the manner of a child's game."
This pseudoscientific psychoanalysis of Barrie through searching for self-confessions in his fiction is unfair to Barrie both as a human being and as an artist. Barrie himself emerges from such study as a pitiable victim of neuroses and fixations determined during his childhood; and whatever convictions he expressed in his works are denied validity since they are obviously the result of a neurotic view of life. Denis Mackail, who set the example for biographers of Barrie with his imposingly minute day-by-day- chronicle of Barrie's life, sent readers back to Margaret Ogilvy to find out how Barrie's neuroses had been produced:

Turn, if you please, to Margaret Ogilvy for the story of how he tried to take little David's place when Barrie was six and a half, and to make that grief-stricken woman laugh. No other hand could, or perhaps would, have written such pages, and no paraphrase could possibly be as poignant and revealing. Yet it is the story of how a mark was set on a child's soul as well as of the beginning of twenty-eight years of incessant and unalterable devotion. Here already, at six and a half, is the passage of what he won't afterwards escape or try to escape. Already his mother has let him be a little different from other boys, as she still thinks only of a boy who has gone.

Such an experience inculcates a harsh view of the real world on a lad, according to Mackail, who suggests that Barrie's literary works should be regarded as a means of escape.

Dixon Scott, a Scottish critic with a style as
whimsical as Barrie's own, suggests that Barrie was so afraid of the world that he turned his art into a child's game, depriving himself of any claim to being called a serious writer. Scott, of course, writing in 1913, was considering only Barrie's earlier works; he saw all those works as approaching a certain type of escape through fantasy—epitomized, for him at least, by the play Peter Pan. But is this all that can be said for the nature of the play? How did Barrie intend Peter Pan to be taken? Of all his works it most closely approximates "a child's game," to be sure. If it is but a child's game, why should it seem to exploit the minds of the children it entertains? As Swinnerton points out, it deceives at the same time that it entertains, and Peter Pan becomes intolerable when he says that "to die will be an awfully big adventure." When Peter asks whether the audience believes in fairies, "and poor over-excited tots thunder out their applause, we may ask whether Barrie was a human being or a demon. For Barrie himself never believed in fairies." Lady Cynthia Asquith, who for nearly twenty years served Barrie as secretary and close friend, makes this astute comment about Peter Pan as Barrie intended him to be interpreted: "Peter Pan isn't a boy.... He's a wish-fulfillment projection in fable form of the kind of mother—Barrie's an expert at her—who doesn't want her son to grow up." Lady Asquith
also recalls Barrie's favorite reaction to his play. It was that of a little boy who, favored by a seat in Barrie's box, and at the end asked what he had liked best, replied: "What I think I liked best was tearing up the programmes and dropping bits on people's heads."\(^{11}\) As Shaw provides a lecture as preface to published versions of most of his plays, Barrie writes a "dedication" for *Peter Pan*. But where Shaw philosophizes, Barrie writes a whimsical letter to the young sons of Llewelyn Davies, in which he ostensibly attempts to prove to himself that he wrote the play "in the usual inky way."\(^{12}\) And he attempts to prove to himself that he is the same author who wrote other plays, by promulgating a theory that people do not change during their lives but move from room to room of one life. All this, in Barrie's language, is to say that *Peter Pan* is a play after all, not a children's pantomime, written by an author who here had many of the same themes in mind that find expression in *Mary Rose* and *Dear Brutus*.

My purpose in this thesis is to arrive at a re-assessment of Barrie's art by an examination of an aspect of Barrie's art that has come to be part of what is now recognized as "the Barrie touch." This aspect was noted as early as 1897, by George Bernard Shaw, who wrote that Barrie "has apparently no eye for human character: but he has a keen sense of human qualities."\(^{13}\) Shaw's purpose was to denounce what he considered a cheap bid for
popularity. He saw Barrie as a dishonest artist who "makes a pretty character as a milliner makes a pretty bonnet, by 'matching' the materials"; it seemed to him that Barrie's only purpose was to please everybody, and Shaw was not to be done out of his allowance of "salutary self-torture."

Shaw's specific target was a one-act parody of Ibsen's Doll's House, Ibsen's Ghost, produced in 1891; and as far as Ibsen's Ghost and Barrie's other dramatic productions to 1897 are concerned, the charge is just.14

My purpose, however, is neither to condemn Barrie nor to praise him for his milliner's (or tailor's) technique of constructing characters out of qualities, but to examine his technique as it appears in Barrie's whole artistic output, in order to make a re-assessment of his art. Out of this examination emerges one characteristic theme which has long been recognized as a central problem in Barrie's works. It is the theme of arrested development in individuals and the implications of this for the nature of society as a whole; By examining Barrie's repetitive use of human qualities as he used them to illustrate this theme I hope to avoid being dragged into the whirlpool of criticism which leads critics like Dixon Scott merely to the conclusion that Barrie "never grew up," or in fact "grew downward to become a member of elf-land."15 Scott, of course was misled by Barrie's style; so thoroughly was he engulfed
that his comments on Barrie's works must be read with as many reservations as Barrie's own writings, in which a barrier of fantasy nearly always intrudes itself between the reader and the meaning. Barrie's "dedication" to Peter Pan, mentioned above, is a case in point. Lady Asquith calls attention to this peculiarity of Barrie's method of communication:

In talk, as well as in public speaking, he tended to wander in some entrancing borderland between fantasy and fact. For him the borderline between these two realms was never very clearly marked. Once when he had just told me some ostensibly autobiographical anecdote, a genuinely puzzled, even worried, expression came into his face. "I can't remember, now, whether the actual incident ever really took place," he said, wistfully.

He never invented, or even embroidered, deliberately to deceive, but the art of weaving fantasy with fact, always natural to him—the art which had made his fortune—had come to be his master as well as his servant.16

Throughout this thesis, when the matter of Barrie's intention is discussed, and his use of the fantastic is encountered, the question of sentimentality will arise. A common generalization concerning Barrie is that he is sentimental in not facing facts, in using fantasy to escape a harsh world or reality. This thesis offers an alternative explanation, for, as Sir Walter Raleigh notes, it is really not sentimentality to which one objects in Barrie: "It's far more often—for he has a cruel side—satire that doesn't quite come off."17 This will be seen
to be true in the early Kailyard sketches, in which Barrie burlesques life in the imaginary Scottish village of Thrums, and in the novels, where Barrie relies on the reader's awareness of his use of sentiment, as well as in the later plays, in which Barrie's bitter point of view is more readily apparent.

B. Life and Works

Although certain events in Barrie's life will be elaborated upon in succeeding chapters, a brief summary here may be of assistance, especially since Barrie often used members of his immediate family and close friends for frames upon which to build his characters—to say nothing of the use he made of his own experiences both as a child and as an adult.

Denis Mackail is the only man who has attempted a systematic biography of Barrie, but the result (The Story of J. M. B., London, 1941) is such a mixture of minute reporting, guesswork concerning Barrie's thoughts on all imaginable occasions, genuinely sentimental reveries, and irrelevant facts that it is nearly unreadable. At any rate, Barrie was born in 1860, in Kirriemuir, a small town in east central Scotland. He was the ninth child of a weaver, David Barrie, by his wife Margaret, who was the daughter of a stonemason. He attended Glasgow Academy and Dumfries Academy, living the while
with his older brother Alexander. He then went on to Edinburgh University, and obtained his M. A. degree in 1882. The next year he was appointed leader-writer and sub-editor for the Nottingham Journal. During the two years at Nottingham, Barrie wrote sketches and stories in his spare time; among these were the first of the sketches of life in Kirriemuir, which he called "Thrums." The stories of Thrums caught the attention of Frederick Greenwood, then editor of the St. James's Gazette, who published a number of them. Without any real encouragement from anyone, especially Greenwood, Barrie moved to London in 1885, and made his way by the production of sketches and stories. Sir Robertson Nicoll, a fellow Scot, saw to it that *When a Man's Single* was published serially in 1887-88. Thus began a long relationship between the two men during which the Kailyard writing became extremely popular. *Better Dead*, Barrie's first book and not much more than a practical joke, was published at his own expense. In the next three years he published *Auld Licht Idylls*, more Thrums sketches; *When a Man's Single* again, this time under Barrie's own name; *An Edinburgh Eleven*, sketches on his professors at Edinburgh University; *A Window in Thrums* (more Thrums sketches); and *My Lady Nicotine*, a series of sketches presumably by an addict of a pipe mixture called the "Arcadia Mixture."
His first real novel was published serially in 1891 in *Good Words*; this was *The Little Minister*. It was immediately secured for publication in book form, and Barrie was hired by the weekly paper the *Speaker*. At this time he began to experiment with plays; his first attempt was a collaboration with Henry Marriott Watson, Richard Savage, which failed dismally. He then did a one-act burlesque on Ibsen, *Ibsen's Ghost* (already mentioned), and a three-act farcical comedy, *Walker, London*. Both plays were successful, and established Barrie as a promising playwright. In 1892 the fiancé of Barrie's sister Margaret was killed by a fall from a horse given to him by Barrie himself—within three weeks of the coming marriage. Barrie blamed himself, and lived a good part of the year secluded with his sister, during which time he wrote *The Professor's Love Story*, which was produced in 1894. This was also the year of Barrie's marriage to Mary Ansell, the actress who had played the lead feminine role in *Walker, London*. Two years later both *Margaret Ogilvy* and *Sentimental Tommy* were published, the first a kind of tribute to Barrie's mother, and the second the first half of a four-volume novel. The second half was not completed until 1900, when it was published under the title *Tommy and Grizel*. The first part deals with the boyhood of Tommy Sandys, and the second traces his career as a fabulously successful writer of sentimental
books for sentimental women. His career is cut short by an ignominious death, but his reputation as a noble young man continues to soar. Much of Tommy's character is based on aspects of Barrie's own character, and Elspeth, Tommy's sister, bears a marked resemblances to Barrie's own sisters Jane Ann and Margaret. Barrie's care for his sister Margaret after her fiancé's death, for example, is transformed into a jealous sense of ownership in Tommy, and the result is an anatomy of sentiment akin to Meredith's The Egoist.

Between the two Tommy books, however, Barrie adapted The Little Minister for the stage, with the melodramatic excursions of the serial novel eliminated. The result was a tightly structured play, and a smashing stage success.

Barrie again took an interest in the Ibsenesque problem play, this time seriously, in The Wedding Guest, which was staged in 1900. Like Tommy and Grizel it displays concern in problems of social behavior, in this case the obligations of a young man to a former mistress and the mother of his child. Quality Street, a play dealing with the failure of communication between the sexes at a more charming and pathetic level, was produced the next year.

The following year, 1902, saw Barrie's fancy develop in two directions. Both involved fantasy, but in The Admirable Crichton fantasy was mixed with acidity, whereas
in *The Little White Bird*, a precursor in quasi-novel form of the play *Peter Pan*, it was softened through its combination with an insufficiently delineated sentimental first person *persona*. The play *Peter Pan* (1904) represents the elaboration of the mother and lost-child motifs first explored in *The Little White Bird*. The point of view provided by the sentimental, old-maidish *persona* of the former work was sacrificed, and the play succeeded as an extravaganza for children and a sentimental spectacle for adults; the idea of Peter Pan as an aspect of mother-domination failed to come through. At any rate, *Peter Pan* marked the end of Barrie's exploration of worlds inhabited largely by children. The mother and child themes remained, but to be placed unmistakably in the context of the world of adults.

In 1908 *What Every Woman Knows* opened, to become another great success. The Meredithian theme of woman's superiority over man came through brilliantly in the first act, but became somewhat contrived as the play continued. Maggie Shand, the plain but witty heroine who blackmails an ambitious young Scottish law student into marrying her, makes him a successful politician, and fights off an aristocratic and beautiful rival in love, made the play. The character of Lady Sybil in this play illustrates Barrie's use of his acquaintance
with brilliant actresses and women of the aristocracy in making stage characters. The practice of utilizing these personalities reached a climax in his last play, The Boy David. Barrie attempted to build this play around the personality of an actress who fascinated him, Miss Elizabeth Bergner; the attempt to reconcile the personality of Miss Bergner, the Biblical basis for the play, and his final attempt to portray a child-like youth failed.

Barrie's tendency to infatuation was not new in 1936, however; it had begun with his romance with Mary Ansell, and never ceased until his death. It made him blind to his wife's growing dissatisfaction with their marriage, which culminated in divorce in 1909 and her subsequent marriage to her lover, Gilbert Cannan. The divorce marked the birth of a reputation for Barrie as a solitary artist who deliberately shunned society.

The play The Twelve-Pound Look (1910) seems to have been an effort to define his own responsibility in his ruined marriage. In this play the wife of an insensitive and ambitious lawyer meets her husband's former wife, who now supports herself as a typist. The curtain falls as the present wife begins to calculate the length of time required to save enough money to buy a typewriter herself.

Barrie's enthusiasm for the stage again dwindled;
he wrote little until *A Kiss for Cinderella* (1916), which turned out to be merely a warm-up exercise preliminary to *Dear Brutus*, which was produced in 1917, and *Mary Rose* (1920). *Dear Brutus* ran for a solid year, and with *The Admirable Crichton* has placed Barrie solidly in twentieth-century anthologies. *Mary Rose* embarrassed its audiences, however; again Barrie's audience failed to perceive his intention. The mother theme is elaborated—-at the cost of the mother, as usual in Barrie's works.

Almost twenty years passed before Barrie attempted to regain the stage, with *The Boy David*, which has been mentioned. During these years Barrie seems to have "run dry"; the inspiration provided by Miss Bergner came too late, and *The Boy David* wouldn't yield itself to Barrie's attempts to make it stage-worthy. The effort was too much for the seventy-seven year old Barrie, who had, because of ill-health, to give up his attempts to revise the play. *The Boy David* lasted a bit more than a month at His Majesty's Theatre, London; the audiences were so thin that the owner of the theatre asked Barrie to close the play. Barrie assented, and the announcement of the play's closing was released to the press. An immediate response was made by the public, now frantically attempting to obtain tickets—-but the play folded, the theater having already been let to the management of a musical.
The state of Barrie's health became increasingly worse throughout the spring of 1937, and he died June 19, 1937.

These facts of Barrie's life show, for one thing, that Barrie's own accounts of his life in *Margaret Ogilvy* and his other pseudo-autobiographical writings were not based strictly on fact. Barrie's entire family history is altered, for example, in *Margaret Ogilvy*, in which he presents himself as having only one sister, with no living brothers, and as an old bachelor at the time of writing. These distortions of facts severely restrict one's attempts to discover clues to Barrie's personal life from his writings. One can only say that Barrie seems to have thought himself the victim of an over-protective mother, and became vitally concerned with the ideas of mother-domination and childishness because of his awareness of his mother's potential influence on his life.

*Margaret Ogilvy* and Barrie's pseudo-autobiographical writings, therefore, yield little data for the biographer; on the other hand, they serve as important documents in the study of Barrie's treatment of characteristic themes. Perhaps I can make my approach in this thesis most explicit by quoting from Robert Penn Warren's essay on *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*: 
Without question there is an important relationship between . . . personal motivations and the poem finally created. The poem may very well represent, in one sense, an attempt to resolve such conflicts. The poem, read in this light, may give us a poignant chapter of biography, and as an image of human suffering and aspiration may move us deeply. But we may remember that the poem, even regarded in this light, is not merely an attempt to present the personal problem but an attempt to objectify and universalize it. And it is because of the attempt to objectify and universalize, that we can distinguish the themes as inherent in the poem as such from the personal theme or themes which remain irrevocably tied to the man. The personal experience may provide motivations and materials, but insofar as it remains purely personal it does not concern us in the present context.18

C. Pertinent Criticism

Attempts to deal critically with Barrie's characters have been half-hearted, consisting in massive generalizations about the origins of the characters. Indeed, critics have long been fascinated by the origins of Barrie's characters, and their appearance and reappearance in different works. Dixon Scott found a "masked meeting and medley of characters dead and unborn" in the play Quality Street, and noted that the setting and basic situation of the play had its origin in a sketch of Miss Ailie's and Miss Kitty's school in A Window in Thrums; that Phoebe's mischief-making is reminiscent of Babbie's mischief in The Little Minister; that the "S" chalked on George's waistcoat
comes from the brand Sentimental Tommy receives from schoolmaster Cathro in *Sentimental Tommy*; that Phoebe's "Oh, you sweet!" was also Grizel's characteristic exclamation in *Tommy and Grizel*; that the boy who cries because he is not caned by his teacher appears also in *The Little White Bird*.

But to Scott, this peculiar making-over of characters was not a technique but a symptom, and Barrie a schizophrenic whose personality had split "long ago, at the outset of his career," one side "a solemn aspirant tremendously aware of the dignity of Letters," the other side "an incurable lover of the pretty and prankish."

Cora Dolbee, in 1918, developed Scott's idea that Barrie's technique was the symptom of a diseased mind, and advanced the theory that all of Barrie's heroines represent his mother. Among these characters she listed Margaret Dishart, Jean Myles, Jess McQuumpha, Miss Thing, Columbine, Kate Ommaney, Mrs. Dowey, and Babbie Dishart. Her evidence was, of course, Barrie's *Margaret Ogilvy*, which she interpreted as strict autobiographical fact. The rest of Barrie's female characters, all of those who seemed less interesting, Miss Dolbee decided had not been derived from Barrie's mother. Among these inferior characters she listed Lillian Gleason, Mrs. Page, Emily Ross, Phoebe, Lucy
White, Leonora, and Mrs. Torrance in The New World. Miss Dolbee followed every suggestion offered by Margaret Ogilvy to the last absurd detail, never once suspecting Barrie was pulling the leg of his reader. Like many of Barrie's feminine characters, Miss Dolbee lacked a sense of humor, and so could not perceive the likeness between Margaret Ogilvy and the type of Scottish humor it represented, extending from John Galt's Annals of the Parish through all of Barrie's own early works. Margaret Ogilvy is a part of the same humorously exaggerated world Barrie created in his journalistic period, a world which is preserved in Auld Licht Idylls, When a Man's Single, A Window in Thrums, and The Little Minister. 22

Ernest A. Baker was the next to systematize Barrie's characters; he found only two "notable characters" in Barrie's works, Barrie's mother and Barrie himself. 23 Grizel, Wendy, and Mrs. Shand were cited as examples of the first type, which he characterized as "womanly women, Philistines, Scots moralists, tender-hearted and caustic mothers, lovers and wives." The second type were "men of imagination who never grew up," among them Peter Pan, Tommy Sandys, and Rob Argus. At the same time, however, Baker recognized Meredith's influence on Sentimental Tommy: Tommy is an egoist like Sir Willoughby Patterne, 24 and Grizel
is used as a foil, representing "noble strength on fire." Baker could not see The Little White Bird or Peter Pan, however, as anything more than romances for children, and attributed this difference to Barrie's split personality—"there was a part of James Matthew Barrie that never grew up."26

The first one to see Barrie as an artist concerned with the theme of the infantile character was Sir Walter Langdon-Brown, who was not a critic at all but a psychologist.27 Langdon-Brown saw Barrie as the victim of a mother fixation, but argued that "a man confronted by obstacles which may appear overwhelming and crushing to the outsider, can turn them to advantage and make something fine out of his very difficulties. A satisfied man is not likely to be an artist."28 Langdon-Brown's purpose in discussing Barrie's works, Mary Rose in particular, was to find in them "a revelation of the workings of the unconscious mind,"29 but in so doing he established a critical point of view which enabled him to discuss Mary Rose as an attempt at the transcendence of a personal problem. The key to Langdon-Brown's discussion was Barrie's use of certain character traits; he found that the infantile traits of certain characters fell into a pattern, symbolized most clearly by the figures of Peter Pan and Mary Rose, but also present in Tommy Sandys (Peter Pan between the ages
of twenty and thirty), the narrator of *The Little White Bird* (Peter Pan in middle age), Mr. Coade in *Dear Brutus* (Peter in advanced middle age), Mr. Morland in *Mary Rose*, and Lob in *Dear Brutus* (Peter Pan retreating from death). He also noted a similarity between Mr. Darling and Captain Hook in *Peter Pan*, and somewhat incautiously labeled the combination a father image, toward which the mother-fixated boy is naturally hostile. Mary Röse is also a regressive personality, retreating at crucial points in her development, first at the dawn of puberty, and again when she is faced with the role of motherhood. In *Mary Rose* the problem of the regressive girl merges with the problem of the mother who in turn attempts to keep her child from growing up. Langdon-Brown's vital contribution here is that Barrie can be seen in a new light: that Barrie was not using his writing as a means of withdrawing into his own mother's womb, but that he was very much aware of the sickness represented by his own family relationships, and used his own problems as a structural element in his writing.

Denis Mackail's monumental critical biography, published two years later, in 1941, follows Dixon Scott and Cora Dolbee in its uncritical use of Barrie's supposedly autobiographical writings in reconstructing his character, but for sheer mass of information it is very useful. In his day-by-day account of Barrie's
life, Mackail attempted to keep track of Barrie's wandering characters, and supplied Barrie's real-life character sources whenever he was able. Mackail's interest in Barrie was ultimately personal, however; literary borrowings or relationships he left unexplored. One finds in Mackail, for example, the facts pertinent to Gilray's potted chrysanthemum in an early St. James's article: it had originally been a cheese, belonging to Barrie's friend Gilmour, which Barrie was to have turned at intervals. Barrie, of course, forgot to turn the cheese, and it spoiled. But it was revived for the St. James's article, appeared many years later in The Greenwood Hat, and was transformed for When a Man's Single into a tacky oil painting which needed to be protected from the dust.30

After Mackail's book, the only significant contributions to the study of the problem (or to Barrie studies in any area, for that matter) have been Cynthia Asquith's Portrait of Barrie, a record of the years she spent as Barrie's secretary,31 and George Blake's monograph on Barrie's relation to the Kailyard school of Scottish writers.32
CHAPTER I

GROWTH OF A NARRATOR

The characters examined in this thesis comprise a severely limited group selected from Barrie's entire literary output: they are the characters who appear in more than one place, but are given new identities in different places. Thus Tammas Haggart, for example, who figures in many of the Thrums novels and stories, is eliminated from this study because he is merely a stock figure. This study is less an analysis of character than an examination of a small number of themes which are central in Barrie's writing from his days as a contributor to the Nottingham Journal to his last days as an established playwright. These themes are largely instrumental in determining Barrie's characters. Therefore my method in studying Barrie's characters is not purely arbitrary but suggested by Barrie's method of writing. As I have already indicated, his approach to the problem of creating a character, either for a story or a play, was that of a milliner: he selected from a stock of characteristics; in some cases, when the character was complex, it had only an additive structure, with perhaps no vital center.
I.

Perhaps one of the most obvious of these additive characters is Mrs. Page in the one-act play, *Rosalind*, which was first produced in 1912. Mrs. Page is a middle-aged actress who plays the part of Rosalind in *As You Like It* on the London stage. Wearied of the perpetual battle to keep up her youthful appearance, she retreats each year to a lonely cottage to revel in middle-aged comfort and dumpiness. A very young and naive college boy, who has worshipped and dated her as Beatrice the actress, comes upon her while she is enjoying her vacation, and out of curiosity she pretends she is her own mother. Eventually she tells him who she really is, in an attempt to disillusion him, but she is summoned back to London, and resumes her role as Rosalind; the young man's illusions are thus returned to him, and they frolic off the stage to London. The basic device, that of the mature woman donning for a time the characteristics of her youth, had been used ten years earlier in *Quality Street* to make up the character of Miss Phoebe Throssel. Both Phoebe and Mrs. Page, when assuming their youthful identities, are characterized by moods of wild gaiety and devilry, that switches suddenly to sadness and pathos.

In her attempt to disillusion the young man,
however, Mrs. Page assumes part of the character of Pantaloon in Barrie's play of the same name, produced in 1905: She has no real personality of her own, she says, but is forced by her public to assume whatever feeling is called for: "I am their slave and their plaything, and when I please them they fling me nuts."¹ In the next sentence she offers another explanation, which had once belonged to Kate Ommaney, a cast-off mistress in The Wedding Guest (1900). She had become a harum-scarum, she explains, chiefly through good-nature, but "thoughtless follies laid her low, Charles, and stained her name."² What the thoughtless follies had been, one can only guess, since no other reference is made to them in this play. The whole explanation, however, belongs to Mrs. Ommaney and was inserted twelve years later into the character of Mrs. Page.

Another characteristic, this time from the character of Tommy Sandys in Tommy and Grizel, is laid on the pile when Mrs. Page tells Charles, "Home became a less thing to me than a new part. Charles, if only I could have been a nobody."

Finally, when Mrs. Page resumes the character of Rosalind, she repeats the Pantaloon motif, but with a twist: "They are my slaves and my playthings, and I toss them nuts."³ Charles skips
out with her, exclaiming, "Oh, you dear, motley's the only wear." Here she foreshadows a character not yet created, the Lob of Dear Brutus. She is still a type of aging clown, a Pantaloon, but she is not a dog to the public her master. She sees the public as beings inferior to her, and toys with them as she performs; she enjoys giving her public a deluded sense of pleasure: "Oh my public, my little dears, come and foot it again in the forest, and tuck away your double chins."  

The play Rosalind, then, is not comprised so much of characters as it is of themes, which Barrie makes his dramatic agents embody. None of these themes is fully developed in Rosalind, and yet together they form the substance of the play.

This will be observed to be true of Barrie's plays in general, for his earlier characters serve as reservoirs from which Barrie drew to make subsequent characters for new pieces. Mr. Fairbairn (The Wedding Guest, 1900), it will be seen, becomes a part of the personality of a number of characters who follow him, and who are conceived as having similar regressive characteristics, including such seemingly different characters as Peter Pan (in the play by the same name, produced first in 1904) and Lob, the instigator of the action in Dear Brutus. John Purdie, in the same
play, will be seen to display characteristics common not only to Fairbairn and his descendants, but also characteristics of the Tommy Sandys type, which may be observed in Barrie's portrayal of Paul Digby (The Wedding Guest, 1900), Harry Sims (The Twelve-Pound Look, 1910), and John Shand (What Every Woman Knows, 1908).

The traits Barrie used to create new characters, and the relationships of these characters, as they become more complex, will be seen (in later chapters) as an index of Barrie's increasing concern for the implications of the characters he pictured as they related to the society which produced them.

A. Journalistic Experimentation

The present chapter is devoted to a discussion of Barrie's development of a narrator in his early journalistic writing, his subsequent use of this narrator in longer prose works, and the relationship of the character traits of this narrator to Barrie's characteristic themes as he brought them to full development in his plays.

Barrie's early journalistic writing, which provided him with a field for experimentation, centered around the problem of point of view. Such titles as "How to Make Love to an Actress. By One Who Knows How," "Reminiscences of an Umbrella," "My Husband's Book,"
and "Every Man His Own Doctor," titles appearing in the bibliography around 1885, suggest the nature of this experimentation and the early interest in problems of self-knowledge.

This early work was to provide the basis for Barrie's subsequent development of a story-telling persona, the use of which was an essential part of Barrie's prose writing. The persona thus developed in the early articles and collections illustrates a singular thematic development which can be traced even into Barrie's play-writing; the development of this narrator is, then, significant both from technical and thematic standpoints; indeed, when Barrie began writing for the stage he was freed from the complexities involved in objectifying his point of view through the use of a story narrator, and was able to devote his attention to the development of theme within an objective framework supplied by the stage itself.

In writing about his early experimental writings, Barrie made this significant statement concerning his development of a point of view:

I note one odd thing about his early articles /Barrie is using the third person to refer to himself; he signed the articles of this period "Anon," and later used that name when referring to himself as a young struggling writer/, that they are mostly written, though anonymously, as the experiences of himself.
This is a sure sign that he was still groping for a method. By and by he nearly always assumed a character, writing as a doctor or sandwich-boardman, a member of Parliament, a mother, an explorer, a child, a grandsire, a professional beauty, a dog, a cat. He did not know his reason for this, but I can see that it was to escape identifying himself with any views.  

Barrie soon learned that the narrator of a story has to be treated artistically as part of the story, not as an extension of himself. And he became quite aware that the character of the narrator functions as a means of thematic definition whereby the author "can disentangle his own prejudices and predispositions from those of his characters and evaluate those of his characters dramatically in relation to their own frame."  

A look at two collections of Barrie's early stories, all of which appeared between 1886 and 1891, should demonstrate this initial search for a point of view. The stories Barrie included in The Greenwood Hat (1930), originally published individually in 1886 and 1887, are the earliest. Barrie reprinted them not because they were better than the rest of his early work; he admitted that they were mere "bubbles," and used them because of their significance to him as a history of his youth. "A Rag of Paper," for example, he reprinted because it was favorite of Frederick Greenwood, who had been the editor of the St. James's Gazette.
The narrator of the piece is a "convalescent," who is confined to a wheelchair above a busy but dingy London square. To divert himself he has conceived the project of watching the progress of a tattered piece of newspaper being blown about by the wind, and has made a wager with his doctor "that this morsel of paper will outlive the Administration." The narrator finally wins the bet, and he concludes the piece. Barrie's characteristic approach to "things" is already evident in this insignificant piece--the paper itself merely becomes the occasion for Barrie to make a few derogatory remarks about the government--and more important, to present a character.

In "Love Me Never or For Ever," Barrie made his narrator an author of a book by the same name--in three volumes--who writes a letter to the paper, inadvertently revealing that he is a sentimental fellow and that his book must be perfectly awful, for no one has bought a copy, and he is the only one who borrows it from the library. He overhears two gentlemen discussing its contents as they look at the cover in the shop--they agree that with such a title it must be the work of a young woman. The author is embarrassed by his book's reception, and decides that he is going to write no more novels: "Such encouragement as I have received has not been sufficient to make me try again." This
Milquetoast type was to become a favorite character with Barrie; later he even adopted it as a pose for himself. But from Barrie's memoir printed with the story in *The Greenwood Hat*, it is clear that he did not intend the article to be a self-portrait at all when he wrote it; at that time he was a young professional writer for the newspapers, but not a novelist of any kind—besides, "Anon knew no authors in those days."

A quite similar persona appears in "The Saddest Word", like the author of "Love Me Never or For Ever" he is a timid, romantic, and thoroughly insignificant young man. He records an incident that occurred on a train trip to London: five young women board his compartment and carry on a conversation in the language of the deaf-and-dumb, which he understands. Their conversation consists of a discussion of romantic words, among them "Never," "Nevermore," "It Might Have Been," and "She Never Told Her Love"—all oddly reminiscent of the title *Love Me Never or For Ever*. The young man suddenly breaks into the discussion, claiming that they themselves, in saying that he is "quite harmless," have said "the saddest words a broken-hearted young man can have applied to him on his journey to London to seek his fortune." After which he withdraws, harmlessly. In this sketch the romantic young man who wants to be "a favorite of the ladies" is based on the same framework
as the author of *Love Me Never* or *For Ever* but he is fully aware of the ridiculous figure he cuts.

A Milquestoast appears again in "Was He a Genius?" This time it is a writer-in-lodgings, who wonders if he is a genius, and thinks he is, but is so timid that he has to hide what he has been writing about himself when he hears the footstep of his fellow lodger on the stair. The laugh, of course, is on the deluded fellow who thinks he is pre-eminent as a writer, and yet can't get out of "Grub Street," whose essay himself is merely vain wishful thinking.

The last of the Greenwood Hat stories, "From St. Pancras to the Bank," is Barrie's story of his transition from impecunious leader-writer to "literary hand" in comfortable circumstances. He based it on the fact that his friend Gilmour had done all his banking for a time, but gave it up when Barrie's finances became too complicated. But the "literary hand" makes himself out to be a perfect idiot, to whom the matter of opening a checking account is too frightening to think about, and who presumes to write the essay as a guide for others who are in the same situation: "I propose to show how the affair can be brought to a successful issue by describing my own adventures; and I may add as a guarantee of good faith that my cheque-book is lying before me as I write."
In each of these *Greenwood Hat* stories Barrie was utilizing the device of a Milquetoast narrator, each quite similar to the others.

The second selection of interest in the examination of Barrie's early narrators is found in *Two of Them*, an unauthorized edition printed in America in 1893. It is doubtful that all of the stories were written by Barrie; those of interest for the sake of their narrators, however, may be found in Garland's bibliography and were originally published between 1889 and 1891.\(^\text{12}\)

The narrators of these stories distinguish themselves as being incapable of seeing themselves as they really are. Among them, the narrator of "The Fox-Terrier Frisky" tells the least about himself. One is merely given to know that he lives in a rented room and lives alone. The sketch concerns his adventures with a dog which he had stolen—-but he cannot admit to himself the nature of his actions. The dog had fallen out of a carriage, and the coachman had come back to look for the dog. But the narrator had snatched up the dog and taken it home, and destroyed the collar. This is how the narrator tells it:

> About a month ago I saw in the street an open carriage containing a fox-terrier. In its efforts to express its contempt for a passing car, the dog barked itself over the side of the carriage on to the
curbstone. Next moment I saw the carriage draw up, and the coachman alight as if to look for something. What this something was I never discovered, for I had picked up the poor little dog and gone home with it. There was a collar round its neck with some writing on it, which I did not think myself justified in reading. To this collar I subsequently took a dislike, and I destroyed it. I have since thought that the dog may have belonged to the owners of the carriage. Thus strangely did I become the owner of a fox terrier, which, as one may say, came unsolicited to my door.

His neighbor and landlady, evidently aware of the fact that the dog has been stolen, threatens to expose him, but he thinks of starting proceedings against the neighbor, and convinces himself that his landlady has stolen a dog herself, and intends to expose her if she attempts to blacken his good name.

A mental process the reverse of that indulged in by the dog thief gives the point of view of the narrator of "The Wicked Cigar." This narrator is a Milquetoast comparable to those found in the Greenwood Hat collection, but he has convinced himself that he is a villain, and that he achieves his villainy by smoking cigarettes: "That tobacco fires us to villains there can be no doubt. I think that is why I smoke. All the villains I know smoke." He goes on to say, however, that smoking is also the means whereby authors manage to get inside the minds
of their villainous characters, and he proceeds with a list of authors and the characters they have produced by smoking. The sketch becomes, of course, a commentary on sentimental authors and their melodramatically conceived villains, through the presentation of the character of an absurd narrator.

Another writer appears in the sketch, "The Result of a Tramp in Surrey." Like the dog thief in "The Fox-Terrier Frisky," he has impure motives but cannot admit them, and thus presents himself in a ludicrous light. He has taken a walk with two other journalists, intending to write an article about the humorous behavior of the other two. One of the others, however, gets his article written first, and the narrator writes an article to upbraid his friend for abusing their friendship, with the self-righteous comment, "I thank my conscience that I, at least, am not the kind of man who would make an article out of his friends." 15

The final article in this discussion of Barrie's journalistic experimentation with the use of narrators points toward his later work, in fact being incorporated later into the structure of The Little White Bird. Entitled "The Inconsiderate Waiter," the sketch is the account of a long-time member of a London club who is so concerned with good form that he has lost contact
with the world of other people:

Frequently I have to ask myself in the street for the name of the man I bowed to just now, and then, before I can answer, the wind of the first corner blows him from my memory. I have a theory, however, that those puzzling forces, which pass before I can see who cut the coat, all belong to club-waiters.16

The narrator prefigures a type which Barrie was to develop later as a Peter Pan in middle age, but as yet Barrie was concerned only with the humorous picture of the old man drawn against his will into a relationship with a social inferior. Barrie's technique was rather blunt yet, and he somewhat awkwardly forced the narrator to make comments on himself that reveal Barrie's own point of view, rather than let the persona speak for himself:

Until William forced his affairs upon me, that /there is no antecedent; he means that he knew nothing of the private life of waiters/ was all I did know of the private life of waiters, though I have been in the club for twenty years. I was even unaware whether they slept down-stairs or had their own homes, nor had I the interest to inquire of other members, nor they the knowledge to inform me. I hold that this sort of people should be fed and clothed and given airing and wives and children, and I subscribe yearly, I believe, for these purposes; but to come into closer relation with waiters is bad form; they are club fittings, and Williams /sic/ should have kept his distress to himself or taken it away and patched it up, like a rent in one of the chairs.17

Barrie was attempting to make his persona reveal the
latter's own character, so that editorial comment by the author would be unnecessary, but in so doing gave the persona dialogue which could only be justified if the persona had a greater self-awareness than he actually possesses. These items of dialogue are indicated by italics in the above quotation.

Barrie was to become much more subtle, and much more of an artist; but this article again shows Barrie's constant experimentation with the narrator as story element.

It may be said of these articles that they have only one character, a narrator, who reveals an imperfect knowledge of himself, which if not the theme of the story is an essential element in presenting the theme.

B. Merger Within Major Theme

1888, 1889, and 1890 saw the publication of three full-length books by Barrie, each made up primarily of articles already published: Auld Licht Idylls, A Window in Thrums, My Lady Nicotine. As Barrie became more experienced in joining articles together, he relied more on the use of a narrator as a technical device to hold his material together; since none of the collections had a plot, the use of a narrator to
provide thematic unity was necessary to rescue the books from being classified as miscellaneous short stories. *Auld Licht Idylls* consists of random stories of life in the village of Thrums; the narrator tells all but one of the stories. *A Window in Thrums* is also told by a schoolteacher, although not the same one. In addition to a more consistent point of view, an additional degree of unity results from the fact that all the stories concern the life of one family. *My Lady Nicotine* grew from a solitary newspaper article (*St. James's Gazette*, November 19, 1886) into another plotless collection of stories, this time a collection of reminiscences of a London pipe smoker.

*Auld Licht Idylls* was a deliberate exploitation of the picturesque elements of humble Scottish cottage life. Barrie was writing for the *Nottingham Journal* when he began these sketches; he stumbled on the idea while writing conventional copy. In *Margaret Ogilvy* he recalls the beginning of an idea which would eventually make him famous:

In my spare time I was trying journalism of another kind and sending it to London, but nearly eighteen months elapsed before there came to me, as unlooked for as a telegram, the thought that there was something quaint about my native place. A boy who found that a knife had been put into his pocket in the night could not have been more surprised.18

*Auld Licht Idylls* confirms Barrie's comment; the
entire collection depends exclusively upon the reader's taste for "quaintness" as an end in itself. However, the village of Thrums is not modelled on the Kirriemuir of Barrie's own childhood; his pictures of Thrums actually grew out of his mother's reminiscences of her own youth, which she passed on to Barrie as story material.\textsuperscript{19}

The schoolmaster narrator is Scottish; but he has been to England, and writes in good English style, usually being careful to explain Scottish words that slip into the narrative. In the first chapter he identifies himself, and sketches his surroundings. He is snowed in, completely isolated not only from the outside world but from the few houses in the glen that make up the village of Thrums. He shows no desire, or at any rate no eagerness, to tell a story. He attempts merely to draw a picture of homely serenity; his only companions are his hens, his cat, pheasants and robins who come to his garden for food, and a sparrow. The scene is reminiscent of the robin red-breast passages in Thomson and Burns. Each noun is carefully weighed down by an adjective, in a somewhat artificial manner: "starving sparrow . . . little black breast . . . forlorn hop l . . . hilarious bantam-cock . . . low-roofed kitchen . . . drowsy
cat . . . timid pheasants . . . fortnight-old newspaper . . . well-smoked ham . . . wriggling worm . . .
garish fly . . . savoury breakfast . . . terrified bird . . . crumbling gravestones . . . grey old kirk," and so on. 20 The pace of the language is extremely slow; and it is further embellished with extensive alliteration. The schoolmaster has been awakened by "the shivering of a starving sparrow; with a quiver of his little black breast the sparrow bobbed" through the network of wire to "hop around the henhouse." He can see only one farm in the distance, and says, "The schoolhouse, I suppose, serves similarly as a snowmark." 21

In this first chapter, the schoolmaster presents himself as a gentle old fellow, concerned with the minutiae of daily existence, a conscious stylist who employs obvious and artificial techniques of prose-writing. Keeping in mind that he is writing for an English audience "out in the world," he polishes his style as best he can, in an antique manner.

The first chapter, however, is like nothing else in Auld Licht Idylls; the tales the schoolmaster tells do not conform to the carefully controlled idiom of the first chapter. They rather reflect his old-maidish character, and the effects of his physical remoteness and his spiritual separation from the
world outside. Whatever intention Barrie may have
had to write a book in the tradition of Galt's
Annals disappears after the first chapter. In the
rest of the book the narrator is Barrie's own
creation, and his presence determines the point of
view even when he tends to become a colorless
observer. As an old-maidish fellow, he loves to
gossip about his neighbors, and the stories he tells
are strung together by his processes of recollection
and association, and are characterized by his
sentimental reflections on the nature of the homely
relations he is permitted to observe from his school-
house.

But while the narrator is a gossip, there is
no indication that he stretches the facts in order
to tell quaint stories; he is just as naive as the
rest of the Thrums citizens. He is part of the
action, and the reader must be able to judge for
himself the probability of the stories he tells:
whether, for example, an elder of the church would
be dismissed because his wife has broken the Sabbath;
whether a neighbor would inspect the elder's garbage
in order to prove the violation; or whether village
women would follow a man to the post office and
snatch a letter from his hands to keep him from
violating the Sabbath.
Auld Licht Idylls, then, reveals Barrie attempting to use the technique he had developed in writing single articles in unifying a collection of articles already written; but the original sketches were experimental, written over a period of three years, and subjected to very little revision before publication together as Auld Licht Idylls; the inconsistencies in Barrie's treatment of the narrator is therefore not surprising.

In A Window in Thrums, however, Barrie managed to keep the character of the narrator consistent, and the stories all concern events in the lives of the family with whom he lodges. He suffers from loneliness, but it is a different kind of loneliness from that suffered by the narrator of the Idylls: whereas the Idylls narrator suffered from his isolation from the world, this schoolmaster suffers from a sense of being left out, and so he sentimentalizes about the goodness of the love he is allowed to glimpse from his vantage point in the McQumpha attic. This is why he is not able to see the nature of the relations between the members of the McQumpha household objectively; in fact, he almost worships the relationships he is not allowed to share:

You must walk softly now if you would cross that humble threshold. I stop at the door. . . . I was a lonely man . . . the attic was the place for me.

This family affection, how good and beautiful it is. Men and maids love, and after many years
they may rise to this. It is the grand proof of the goodness in human nature, for it means the more we see of each other the more we find that is lovable.22

However, people die, and the narrator, wishing to preserve memories of treasured friends, makes the material objects associated with them symbols for those he loves. He describes, at the beginning of the book, the McGumpha house as he remembers it, with a round unsteady table in the main room, the four books lying at equal distances on it, the six chairs (two patched but too frail to be used), and so on, each object valued for the familiarity with the McGumphas which it attests. The quaintness of the picture created by the narrator is immediately apparent; it is important to notice, however, that the narrator never intends to exploit that quaintness himself, but remains a part of the story he tells. At no time is he more perceptive than the characters by whom he is surrounded. He does not see, for example, the quaintness of Jimsy Duthie's attempt to write and print an imitation of *Paradise Lost*, and treasures the "shabby brown covers" as a momento of the simple human goodness of the almost illiterate printer and amateur author. The narrator's naive apology for the appearance of Duthie's work merely betrays his own sentimentality:
He could print correctly, but in the middle of the book there are a good many capital letters in the middle of words, and sometimes there is a note of interrogation after "alas" or "Woes me," because all the notes of exclamation had been used up.23

The third collection Barrie made of his articles was My Lady Nicotine. This time the narrator is the only point of focus; like the narrators of Auld Licht Idylls and A Window in Thrums he is sentimental and naive, but since he is a Londoner he is more readily judged by the reader, and since he is not surrounded by other characters he is more obviously the book's center of focus. Barrie's technique of revealing his character to the reader is a systematic application of the technique used in the single articles; he is incapable of seeing himself as he really is. Again the book is merely a plotless string of reminiscences; the lack of plot, however, is essential to this kind of fictitious autobiography, since the narrator is presented as having no self-awareness whatever. The device used to exploit his lack of self-knowledge is his pipe mixture; by means of this he misinterprets himself throughout the book: A timid fellow with nothing to say, he manages to convince himself that he is a profound fellow after all.

Barrie's memoir of his mother, Margaret Ogilvy (1896), is distinguished by the similarity of its technique of presentation to that found in the early
sketches and collections; Barrie as narrator presents himself in the same ludicrous light, not consistently, to be sure, but often enough so that the picture of his relationship with his mother is definitely quaint.

It was Margaret Ogilvy that started the critics off on the relationship between Barrie's works and his biography; his writing, after Margaret Ogilvy, now and again returns to the subject of this relationship, as if in response to the popular conception of his own relationship to his works. The theme appears in connection with Sentimental Tommy in the last chapter of Tommy and Grizel; Tommy had been an Egoist of the sentimental type, a child-man, but the critics persist in reading his character from his books. One critic labels Tommy "the Perfect Lover," and proceeds to build up his own sentimental conception of Tommy's character:

As he died seeking flowers for her who had the high honor to be his wife, so he had always lived. He gave his affection to her, as our correspondent Miss (or Mrs.) Ailie McLean shows, in his earliest boyhood, and from this, his one romance, he never swerved. To the moment of his death all his beautiful thoughts were flowers plucked for her; his books were bunches of them gathered to place at her feet. No harm now in reading between the lines of his books and culling what is the common knowledge of his friends in the north that he had to serve a long apprenticeship before he won her."

None of this, of course, is true to the facts of Tommy's life; the facts, Barrie implies, will never be known, primarily because they will be concealed by all involved.
The proper sphere of the critic is not the personality of the author anyway, but what he writes.

Barrie had started writing, it must be remembered, with the assumption that some method of dissociating himself from his characters and their viewpoints was necessary, and the development of all his early work points to a progressive refinement of his ability to do so, the device of the self-revealing narrator being his principal tool. This problem of dissociating oneself from one's characters can be traced also into Barrie's stage technique; the stage was the ultimate answer to his problem, of course, since every character in a play must be viewed objectively by the audience (unfortunately, Barrie's audiences did not do this very effectively).

At any rate, Barrie used the device of the self-deceiving narrator again in *The Little White Bird*, which was to provide the basis for the play *Peter Pan*. The relevant fact here is that it is the narrator's dream, which he uses to escape from reality, that becomes the content of the play, and the author of the escapist dream becomes a character in the play, Mrs. Darling, whose character as a child-mother has already been discussed. Just as the theme of *The Little White Bird* is Captain W's escape from reality, the theme of *Peter Pan* is the universal escape from reality by a childish society, in which the dominant mother plays the role of dream-originator. The old-maidishness of the middle-aged child-man merges
in *Peter Pan* with the sterility and the childishness of the child-mother; the ultimate desire of each is to retreat from responsibility, to return to original innocence and its freedom.\(^\text{25}\)

I have attempted to trace in this chapter the growth of the theme of childishness from Barrie's early experimentation with technique. Concerned with the problem of point of view in his early article writing, Barrie created *personas* which were to become important structural elements in the unification of subsequent story collections. His increasing facility with such unification has been noted in three collections Barrie made of these articles, *Auld Licht Idylls*, *A Window in Thrums*, and *My Lady Nicotine*, in each of which the character of the narrator becomes more important. Barrie's ostensibly autobiographical *persona* in *Margaret Ogilvy* has been seen to display the same characteristics as previous narrators, who were not intended to be autobiographical; exploitation of quaintness makes *Margaret Ogilvy* suspect as autobiography.

Finally, I have shown that *The Little White Bird*, the last of Barrie's early novels, looks backward in narrative technique, but forward in theme; in it Barrie used essentially the same *persona* he had used before, but utilized him to illustrate the theme of childishness which was to become central in his subsequent work.
CHAPTER II

THE THEME OF CHILDISHNESS: FEMININE CHARACTERS

The characters and characteristics treated in this chapter are all involved in Barrie's treatment of the problem of maturity. Some of his characters refuse to grow up, and others refuse to let their children grow up, and so the immature personality is perpetuated. For the purpose of analysis I have divided the characters first according to sex, then according to the manner in which immaturity is displayed. Barrie's immature feminine characters either (1) tend to become socially passive, often tied to their parents, like Margaret Fairbairn in The Wedding Guest, or (2) they become mothers who overprotect their children or husbands, like Moira Loney in Little Mary. (3) Sometimes both tendencies are fully developed in the same character, as is the case with Mary Rose Morland in Mary Rose.

(1) One of Barrie's first experiments with the immature feminine character was Babbie, the heroine of The Little Minister (1891). She first appears disguised as a gypsy, dancing in the moonlight of a forest clearing with rowan-berries in her hair; the gleefulness and elusiveness she displays are all the character she has.
There is no attempt, on Barrie's part, to judge her, but that he intended her to be immature is fairly certain from her admission, when she consents to marry Gavin Dishart, that she had never been a woman until then. But when Barrie revised *The Little Minister* for the stage (the play was produced in 1897), he gave Babbie a line of baby-talk ("Dos oo not? Poo, poo soldier!") and made her the daughter instead of the fiancé of Lord Rintoul. She loves Gavin, but she doesn't want to have to leave her father, and even apologizes to her father for Gavin's intrusive love for her: "Father, I am so sorry this has occurred. I love him so much, father, I really do--but--but I love my dear sweet darling father best. . . ." Like Mary Rose, whom Barrie was to create twenty-three years later, Babbie is afraid to leave her garden of Eden to become an adult.

Miss Kitty and Miss Ailie in *Sentimental Tommy* (1896) reveal Barrie's first use of another kind of immature female, the spinster. Their garden of Eden is not their original habitat, but a world which they have had to create themselves in order to remain children. This world is their blue-and-white room. Their creation of this room corresponds to the myth-making of Captain W, the narrator of *The Little White Bird*. Like Captain W, they are sterile and
old-maidish, and the world they create for themselves is sterile and pretty. For the play *Quality Street* Barrie changed the names of the sisters, making them Phoebe and Susan Throssel. Phoebe (who had been Miss Kitty in *Sentimental Tommy*) desires so strongly to return to her childhood that she disguises herself in the clothes of her youth, pretending to be her younger sister. She protests to Susan, "Ten years ago I went to bed and I woke with this cap on my head. It is not fair. This is not me, Susan, this is some other person, I want to be myself."\(^7\) The character she assumes, of course, is innocent and wild and gleeful like Babbie and Mary Rose, and literally out of contact with reality.\(^8\)

Every one of Barrie's infantile characters resents the intrusion of the adult world; Babbie and Mary Rose resent the lovers that take them away from their fathers, and Phoebe resents the years that have taken away her childhood. In the play *The Wedding Guest* (produced in 1900) this resentment is made the basis of a social problem. Margaret Fairbairn marries Paul Digby, and his former mistress and the mother of his child appears at their wedding. Margaret, as her aunt tells her, is psychologically only ten years old:

Aunt Janet. You were ten when your mother died, and your father has kept you at that--like a stopped clock.
Margaret. Well, Paul likes me at ten.
Aunt Janet. We all like you at ten, but--9

Margaret wants to remain in an environment in which she is protected; she wants to remain gleeful forever; the night before her wedding, she confesses, she was full of glee and blew kisses to her wedding gown—and then a cold chill fell on her heart and she was afraid. This protective environment, however, is the product of her father's own childish retreat. When he is faced with a problem, he merely wishes it out of his life, and looks for the bright side. Margaret can only do the same, and when she is warned of the possibility that Mrs. Ommaney (Paul's former mistress) may have another fit, she cries, "No, no, we must look on the bright side. We must hope for the best, Don't tremble—what can I do to make you happy again?"

In attempting to make Mrs. Ommaney happy, Margaret is displaying one of the characteristics of the immature and smothering mother, which will be discussed later. She feels motherly only in a childish way; and when she learns that Mrs. Ommaney's child is illegitimate, she can only recoil in repugnance, and has no more pity. When she finds out that her Paul is the father of the baby, she hates him: "A betrayer of woman . . . I am going back to my father."12

The emotions of the infantile personality, then,
are only toys, and Margaret and those like her must
remain in an environment suitable to them.

Mary A., the heroine of *The Little White Bird*
(1902), suggests the nature of the environment
Margaret Fairbairn would require after her marriage:
Mary A. and her husband live in a house that is not
a real house at all, but "a tiny house made by putting
up boards between two regular houses." Mary A. is
one of the most absurdly humorous of Barrie's pictures
of the regressive characteristics of infantile women;
her character consists entirely of enumerations of her
childish actions, since she never appears in person
in the novel. She sells her beloved doll's-house in
order to get married, but the narrator buys it back
for her, so it remains part of her household. None
of the furniture in her house is real; she has made
it all out of packing boxes and slipcovers; the bag
hanging from the ceiling contains no chandelier. She
has pawned her watch, fittingly enough, since she lives
in an atmosphere as obviously timeless and childish
as the Neverland of Peter Pan's.

Another infant-wife, Alice Grey, appears in
*Alice—Sit-by-the Fire* (produced in 1905); she is
older than Mary A., having two teenage children, but
she has the same character. She is "pretty and gay," and according to Barrie's stage direction, "It will
be years before either of them is as young."

There is a hint in the character of Alice Grey of the other side of the feminine infantile personality—she is afraid that her child Amy knows too much of the world. Alice Grey is not a real mother, of course, but a child-mother, just as Mr. Fairbairn had been a child-father, and her mothering consists only in protectiveness. She too has her own world, like Peter Pan, Babbie, Phoebe, and the rest; her world is India, where all the officers are in love with her and she stays forever young and desirable; she and her husband don't even know their children at the beginning of the play, having left the children for India some ten years before. Like Sentimental Tommy, Alice Grey is incapable of real love; her love for her children is merely sentimental, and she slaps her son when he lets her know that he thinks her quite old.

A steady growth in complexity of relationships can thus be seen in Barrie's conception of the girl who will not grow up. At first she appears by herself, dancing in the wood, but soon she becomes related in a number of directions; the development of these relationships makes it clear that Barrie was becoming increasingly absorbed in portraying the infantile
personality as a diseased state.

(2) The other aspect of the infantile feminine personality, the tendency to smother-love, was first explored by Barrie in his Thrums sketches, written during his early journalistic period. *A Window in Thrums*, published in 1889, is made up of a collection of these sketches; it is basically a humorous book, intended for London readers. Part of the humor derives from the fact that Barrie's London readers revelled in its pathos, not suspecting that the little world of Thrums never existed anywhere. Another part of the book's humor derives from that of John Galt's *Annals of the Parish*, ostensibly a record by a somewhat senile retired parson of the memorable events in his parish during his fifty-year career. Barrie used a schoolmaster for a narrator, but the author's point of view is equally important as that of Parson Balwhidder; the point is that it is in his eyes that Jess McQumpha is such a lovable old woman. Properly seen, Jess is an object of comedy, and the pathos developed by the narrator rather ludicrous. At any rate, her story provides some of the characteristics Barrie later developed—for she, too, is a childish woman, quite vain even though she is a hunchback and an invalid, and she loves her children in a way that makes it difficult for them to grow up. The narrator
here shows his eccentricity—he has fond dreams concerning the future of Jess's son and daughter after her death—he never thinks of the possibility of marriage for either of them (he is an old-maidish bachelor, which type appears later in this thesis), but looks forward to the day that James (the son) will take Leeby (the daughter) to London to make a cozy home for her there. James goes to London alone, however, and so becomes a villain in the schoolmaster narrator's eyes—the schoolmaster wallows in the pathos of the repentant son's return from London after mother, sister, and all have died. Margaret Dishart, the mother of Gavin Dishart in The Little Minister (1891), although a minor character, is a similar smother-mother to her little Gavin. Here again the narrator's point of view must be kept in mind: he's a schoolmaster like the one in A Window in Thrums, and is hardly an objective observer since he has been hopelessly in love with Margaret for a quarter of a century. 15

Margaret Ogilvy (1896), supposedly a factual memoir of Barrie's own mother, is in the same tradition as the Thrums material; that is, the character of Margaret Ogilvy Barrie is rendered with the same intentions as were Jess McQumpha and Margaret Dishart. As a matter of fact, Barrie uses, as
character traits of his mother, exactly the same character traits that he had previously given to Jess McQumpha and Margaret Dishart.

On the other hand, that Barrie was the victim of an overprotective mother, no one attempts to deny; but given the nature of Barrie's Kailyard writings, one must not attempt to find the facts of his life with his mother in the pages of Margaret Ogilvy. The soundest approach to the problem presented by this book is that expressed by Blake in his study of Barrie's early writing and its relation to the Kailyard school:

Whether or not Margaret Ogilvy amounts to a positive act of indecency is still a proper subject of debate. Here we must take the detached line and see that the Barrie trick of holding out his characters at arm's length, as it were, and making them perform their antics to our sardonic, even sadistic, delight was an early symptom of his instinctive sense of theatre. . . . everybody else was a marionette, floodlit but capable of the most amusing antics. He saw himself in the same light, to be sure.18

Like Jess McQumpha, Margaret Ogilvy demonstrates "a quaint unreasonableness"17 which is presented as a source of humor. Like Jess she is often ill,18 has the same vanity about her appearance,19 and her favorite reading material is the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John.20 But the reason for Margaret Ogilvy's inclusion in this
discussion is not her identify with Barrie's Kailyard characters, but her classification as a child-mother. Like all members of this family of Barrie's characters, she treats men as if they were children, and at the same time is something of a child herself; in Barrie's words, "there was never a woman who knew less about herself than she." Moira Loney, Mrs. Darling, and the rest of Barrie's child-mothers, are descendants of Jess and Margaret Ogilvy. Moira Loney, who appeared in Little Mary (produced in 1903), is "an old-fashioned little girl of twelve, very earnest and practical and quaint and with all the airs of an experienced mother." She is so motherly, in fact, that having no children of her own, she has to resort to mothering the children of neighbors. She keeps them in boxes hung on the wall, and her one desire is that they should not grow up. To the smallest child she says, "Baby, do you know why I love you the best of them all? It's because you're my littlest. . . . Golden curls, the baby's own, the day I have to cut them off, that day, Baby, I shall die." Her grandfather, who has written a three-volume work on rejuvenating English society through a reform of eating habits, selects Moira to carry out his ideas, and she makes a name for herself by persuading several prominent families
to eat less. But Moira's nature is thwarted, and at the end of the play she returns to her role as mother—Lord Carlton proposes marriage, and she accepts, so that she can mother him: "I have so longed to mother you, lord, ever since I saw you in the shop; I can't do without mothering you." To the audience of 1903, of course, the topic of the play concerned the participation of women in politics, and Moira seemed to be merely one of Barrie's charming heroines visualized through Scottish mists of sentiment.

Moira's war-time double appeared in A Kiss for Cinderella, first produced in 1916. Her name was Miss Thing (reminiscent of Moira's mysterious Little Mary), she was twelve years old, and she kept babies in boxes; but this time the babies were war babies, the tiniest a little German girl. The play is by far the worst Barrie published.

After Moira, the next child-mother to appear was Mrs. Darling, in Peter Pan—in which Barrie intended not only the mother, but all the characters, to be childish: "All the characters, whether grown-ups or babes, must wear a child's outlook on life as their only important adornment. If they cannot help being funny they are begged to go away." It is because Mrs. Darling is a child-mother that Mr. Darling, her husband, remains a little boy; and it is despite her
efforts that Wendy eventually succeeds in growing up. According to the stage directions, when Wendy was two years old, Mrs. Darling had exclaimed, "Oh, why can't you remain like this forever!"27

(3) It is in *Mary Rose* (produced in 1920), as I have indicated, that both aspects of the regressive female are equally developed. Mary Rose, like Margaret Fairbairn, has been kept from growing up through the influence of her father. At the age of eleven, while vacationing with her parents, she disappeared for a period of twenty days on a tiny island. When she reappeared she knew nothing of her absence; her parents consulted doctors, who insisted it had never happened. (This would seem to be a crack at current medical attitudes toward mental illness.) Her mother says, "our girl is curiously young for her age--as if--you know how just a touch of frost may stop the growth of a plant and yet leave it blooming--it has sometimes seemed to me as if a cold finger had once touched our Mary Rose."28 When the first scene begins, Mary Rose is eighteen, and has just been asked to marry Simon. But she is hiding in the apple tree outside the drawing room window, where Simon has proposed to her; he has asked her to climb down with him so that they may enter her parents' home together, by the front door, in order to ask her father.
for his consent. But she is frightened, and remains in the tree; she is frightened of Simon now that he has become a man. Instead of climbing down with Simon, she climbs back into her nursery-like room by the window. Many years later her son escapes the nursery and becomes a man by climbing out the window and down the tree, and running away to join the navy.

Like Margaret Fairbairn, Mary Rose resents her lover's intrusion in her childish world, and tells her father, "It's all Simon's fault." Later she says she hates Simon for wanting to take her away from her daddy, and wants to know if he won't let her go on playing games after they are married. She wants to go back to her island on her honeymoon, but Simon doesn't let her go until they have been married four years and their baby is a couple years old. She disappears again, this time for twenty-five years; again she can't remember being away, and wants to see her two-year-old son. She continues in this state until her death, when she comes back to the house as a ghost, still looking for her baby. Harry, her son, comes back from the navy to see the old house, and she attempts to kill him because she thinks that he has taken away her baby. As Langdon-Brown said, "Here we have the symbol of the all-powerful mother who would keep the man as a child and rob him of the
power he had painfully acquired. As the curtain closes Harry muses, "I wonder if what it means is that you broke some law, just to come back for the sake of that Harry?"

Like Barrie's characteristic persona, his immature feminine character type has its origins in his earliest work; also like the persona, this type shows a growing complexity of conception, becoming a part of Barrie's increasingly cynical world view. Babbie of The Little Minister had shown only vague indications of an infantile character; but Barrie built on her slender characterization the conception of his later regressive females: Margaret Fairbairn, Mary A., Alice Grey, Phoebe Throssel, and finally Mary Rose.

Barrie's conception of Mary Rose, however, has been shown to have a second root in his treatment of the type of the immature mother, who will not let her children grow up. Jess McQumpha and Margaret Dishart, the earliest of Barrie's protective mothers, influenced his portrayal of his own mother in Margaret Ogilvy; Barrie became increasingly concerned with the type of the over-protective mother as a diseased state, as has been shown in the discussion of the characters of Moira Loney, Mrs. Darling, Miss Thing, and Mary Rose. In Mary Rose the two aspects of the immature feminine character merge into one character; the regressive girl may not only become an over-protective mother, but she is both at the same time.
CHAPTER III.

THE THEME OF CHILDSHINNESS: MASCULINE CHARACTERS

Barrie's immature masculine characters develop along lines analogous to those of his immature feminine characters: (1) they may retreat into childhood, in which case they become more and more like Peter Pan; or (2) while becoming active socially, they may approximate the type exemplified by Sentimental Tommy Sandys. That is, they represent a fusion of the immature type (which shows its immaturity by retreating from responsibility into social conformity) and the Egoist type (whose surface appearance as a "solid citizen" is peeled away, in Barrie's hands, to reveal the comic character underneath).

(1) "We must have the courage to turn our backs on it!" is the battle-cry of the immature male, Peter Pan genus. When faced with a problem, he retreats. Mr. Fairbairn, father of Margaret in The Wedding Guest (1900), is Barrie's first representative of this group, the characteristics of which are roughly analogous to Barrie's passively immature feminine type. Mr. Fairbairn's relationship to his daughter can be seen in his advice to this friend Gibson: "I brought Margaret up wisely, Gibson--eh? Janet thought I kept her a child too long, but see how splendidly
it has turned out. Don't look for troubles and you
won't find them. If they are in front of you, walk
around."\(^1\) To Margaret he says, "Always look on the
bright side, Margaret. . . . Be calm. Take it easy.
Think of something else. . . . Don't look at it and
you will forget."\(^2\)

This type is incapable of facing social responsi-
bility. Paul Digby has tried to tell Fairbairn of
his past before his marriage to Margaret, but Fairbairn
has refused to listen; after Margaret's discovery of
Paul's past and her subsequent return home, he can
only push the blame off on Paul: "You--villain! My
poor child! Oh, the horror of it! Oh, the awfulness!"\(^3\)
As an overgrown Peter Pan, Mr. Fairbairn can protect
his position only by turning in hate upon the intruder
Paul Digby. He tried to keep the cast-off mistress
Kate Ommaney out of his life by making it a matter of
principle: "I don't know that kind of woman. I never
know them. I have always avoided them like the
plague."\(^4\) One can only surmise that Mr. Fairbairn is
himself the offspring of an overprotective child
mother, and that because of her influence he has
never known what Barrie would call "a womanly woman"
such as Kate Ommaney. Fairbairn thinks he can turn
his back on Mrs. Ommaney by sending her, with her
child, to Australia; and when she seems to accept
his proposal he at once resolves to take the blame for
the entire problem. Like Mr. Darling in *Peter Pan*,
he revels in his magnanimity—until he finds that she
will not go, and is thus forced to retreat into his
former helplessness, to "toddle" back to the table.\(^5\)

Lord Carlton, who has been mentioned in relation
to Moira Loney in *Little Mary*, explains to Moira what
may be taken as Barrie's attitude toward English
society (he is talking about his son, who he explains
is rather like himself):

Lord Carlton. . . . he is still at school
playing marbles or the like, and presently
he will go to Oxford to play more marbles,
or I may send him into the Army to play more
marbles there.

Moira. (amazed) But won't he tire of
marbles?

Lord Carlton. Oh, yes, we tire of them,
but we go on playing.

Moira. But when he gets married?

Lord Carlton. They will both play.\(^6\)

Barrie had already published *The Little White Bird*
(1902); in this book Barrie created the figure of Peter
Pan, at once his best-known and least understood
character. In the novel (if *The Little White Bird*
may be called a novel) Peter Pan is created by the old-
maidish bachelor Captain W__, himself an image of the
genus Peter Pan in a sterile middle age. Peter
originates, then, as the wish-fulfillment projection
of a mother-father, and serves as a mirror for all
immature adults of their own failure to reach maturity.
"His age is one week, and though he was born so long ago he has never had a birthday, nor is there the slightest chance of his ever having one. The reason is that he escaped from being a human when he was seven days old; he escaped by the window and flew back to Kensington Gardens."\(^7\) This is, like Barrie's description of Mary Rose, a mythical treatment of the psychological history of all his infantile characters, who retreat from "being a human" into some world of pre-Fall innocence. Barrie tells his readers, "He \(\textit{Peter Pan}\) played without ceasing, while you often waste time by being mad-dog or Mary-Annish."\(^8\) One of Peter Pan's characteristics, of course, is that he needs a play-mother, to whom his relationship at times appears almost foetal: he says to Maimie Mannering, an infant he has found in the Gardens, "I love you . . . because you are like a beautiful nest."\(^9\) As might be expected, Maimie responds to Peter's declaration of love and proposal of marriage just as Mary Rose was to do eighteen years later--she would marry Peter if he would let her go back to her mama at any time.\(^10\)

Peter appears as a mother's wish-fulfillment in Peter Pan (1904) and the transcription of the play (which includes the special-performance sequel), Peter and Wendy (1911). Mrs. Darling first meets Peter by dreaming of him, but "he did not alarm her,
for she thought she had seen him before in the faces of many women who have no children. Perhaps he is to be found in the faces of some mothers also."

Peter's flight from the real world, like the flight of Mr. Fairbairn and the others, is a selfish flight; this is the reason he must be mothered by a play-mother. To the child-mother he is irresistible, because he is so weak. Related to this selfishness is his cleverness, a special quality in Peter Pan which relates him to Sentimental Tommy and Barrie's treatment of Egoism after the manner of Meredith, of which I shall have more to say later. It is Peter's cleverness which enables him to be captain of all lost boys, and which identifies him with Captain Hook; according to a stage direction, Peter "can imitate the captain's voice so perfectly that even the author has a dizzy feeling that at times he was really Hook."$

After Hook dies in the jaws of the crocodile, Peter in fact becomes Captain Hook himself, after having Wendy sew a suit for him "out of some of Hook's wickedest garments." The feud between Hook and Peter had been only a contest of "good form" after all, not real moral issues. But this matter of "good form" takes one back to the "adult" level of the play and Mr. Darling. He too is concerned about good form, just as Mr. Fairbairn had been. Baldly stated, good form is nothing more than the
ability to preserve appearances. Mr. Fairbairn had been worried lest the servants find out about the scandal in which his family had become involved; similarly, Hook "had been at a famous public school; its traditions still clung to him like garments, with which indeed they are largely concerned. . . . above all he retained the passion for good form." Mr. Darling's concern for good form makes him childishly worried about what others think of him—he even worries when he thinks his dog doesn't admire him. Like Mr. Fairbairn, he finds himself responsible for family scandal; and it is his fault. But he is more fortunate than Fairbairn; his mea culpa shows the best possible form in his childish society: "it was magnificent. Soon the meaning of it Mr. Darling has been living in the dog's kennel as penance leaked out, and the great heart of the public was touched. Crowds followed the cab, cheering it lustily; charming girls scaled it to get his autograph." 

Mr. Coade, in Dear Brutus (1917), shows Barrie working with the same type of character in middle age; according to the stage direction he has "a gentle smile for all; he must have suffered much, you conclude incorrectly, to acquire that tolerant smile." According to the Barrie formula that smile is no more than a proof of his good form, and of the fact that Coade has successfully avoided taking his part in human life, has avoided
becoming a human being.

Coade shares the Peter Pan character with Lob in the same play; as Langdon-Brown noted, Lob "is Peter Pan grown old; this is the final stage of the boy who would not accept a man's burden." Like Peter, Lob is timeless and ageless, "the villagers say they remember him seventy years ago looking just as he does now"; also like Peter, he "is very small, and probably no one has ever looked so old except some newborn child"; like Peter, he needs to be loved and to get whatever he wants. But above all, he is "the most obviously frightened when the somber wood is revealed"—his retreat from life and death are one.

(2) Peter Pan, as I have indicated previously, has a side which allows him to become an active member of society; that is, his retreat from maturity and adult concerns takes a special form; he becomes an Egoist, according to the design set forth by George Meredith:

You may as well know him, the Egoist, out of hand, as a gentleman of our time and country, of wealth and station; a not flexible figure, do what we may with him; the humour of whom scarcely dimples the surface and is distinguishable but by very penetrative, very wicked imps, whose fits of roaring below at some generally imperceptible stroke of his quality have first made the mild literary angels aware of something comic in him, when they were one and all about to describe the gentleman on the heading of the records baldly (where brevity is most complimentary) as a gentleman of family and property, an idol of a decorous island that admires the concrete. Imps have their freakish wickedness in them to kindle detective
vision: malignly do they love to uncover ridiculousness in imposing figures. Wherever they catch sight of Egoism they pitch their camps, they circle and squat, and forthwith they trim their lanterns, confident of the ludicrous to come. So confident that their grip of an English gentleman, in whom they have spied their game, never relaxes until he begins insensibly to frolic and antic, unknown to himself, and comes out in the native steam which is their scent of the chase... our squatting imps grow restless on their haunches, as they bend eyes instantly, ears at full cock, for the commencement of the comic drama of the suicide. If this line of verse be not yet in our literature,

Through very love of self himself he slew
let it be admitted for his epitaph. 21

Barrie, it may be noted, first met George Meredith in 1886, after Meredith inquired of Greenwood about the author of an article in the St. James's Gazette. Barrie took the opportunity to go to Meredith's home to meet the great man, and thus began a friendship between the two which lasted over twenty years, during which period Meredith tried to become a kind of father to Barrie, giving him advice and the affection he could not give his own sons. 22 Under these circumstances it is not surprising to find direct borrowings from Meredith's works in Barrie's.

Tommy Sandys, as he appears in Tommy and Grizel (1900), was Barrie's first example of the Meredithian Egoist in his own writing. Tommy, however, exhibits one characteristic which marks him the prototype for a special form of Egoism; as the narrator of Tommy and Grizel
expresses it, "I see all that was wrong with Tommy was that he could not always be a boy."23 Just as Peter Pan's ultimately selfish retreat into himself is his chief attraction for immature women, Tommy Sandys' fear of committing himself to social obligations becomes his sign of success in a society which rewards childishness. He retreats into fantasy, which takes the form of moralizing and sentiment, and as a result his moral judgment is as childish as that displayed by Mr. Fairbairn in The Wedding Guest. That is, Barrie's special form of Egoism is the result of a selfish withdrawal from responsibility which exhibits itself in a melodramatic point of view. This moral point of view, unfortunately, is highly prized by a childish society, which does not possess the Comic Spirit necessary to detect this form of Egoism.

Only a few of the characters of Tommy and Grizel are able to see Tommy as he really is, because his essential immaturity is hidden beneath his "frozen face";24 Aaron Lotta and Dr. Gemmell both see beneath this surface, however, and in both cases Barrie utilizes Meredith's imps. In a conversation with Tommy, Aaron Lotta assumes the role of a Meredithian imp himself; Mrs. McLean has read Tommy's latest book to him, and he tells Tommy: "She fair insistit on reading the terrible noble bits to me, and she wept they were so sublime; but the
sublimier they were the mair I laughed, for I ken you, Tommy, my man, I ken you."\textsuperscript{25} And later, when Tommy has decided to marry Grizel in order to take care of her and help her regain her sanity, Dr. Gemmell accuses him of revelling in the sense of nobility of his decision, and accuses him of being merely sentimental; Tommy replies, "If I am Sentimental Tommy through it all, why grudge me my comic little strut?"\textsuperscript{26} As he explains further to Gemmell, he himself is aware that he is playing the chief role in a comic drama: "I so often emerged triumphant from my troubles, and so undeservedly, that I thought I was especially looked after by certain tricky spirits in return for the entertainment I gave them. My little gods I called them, and we had quite a bowing acquaintance. But you see at the critical moment they flew away laughing."\textsuperscript{27} But Tommy has not yet begun "insensibly to frolic and antic," and thus is not yet a fit victim for Meredith's imps. He must cease to see the comic side of his activities in order to give the imps the opportunity to enjoy his downfall. Lady Pippinworth at last manages to make him unconscious of his comic aspect, and stout Tommy Sandys runs off after her, consumed with desire, only to stick on a fence and hang himself, a comic suicide at last.

It was through his discovery that the Egoist is psychologically a child that Barrie made Tommy Sandys
uniquely his own, and gained the psychological basis necessary for his vision of a society composed of children. Every book Tommy wrote, one must remember, was an instant hit with the English public, and every book was sentimental, melodramatic—and childish. The outline of the book he was planning just before his death shows him beginning to reveal himself in his true light; he has become incapable of seeing the comic aspect of his childishness, and the book represents his serious wish for a mode of life. The book was to have been a "reverie about a child who is lost, and his parents search for him in terror of what may have befallen. But they find him in a wood singing joyfully to himself because he is free; and he fears to be caged again, so runs farther from them into the wood, and is running still, singing to himself because he is free, free, free. That is really all, but Tommy Sandys knew how to tell it." 28

Tommy Sandys' projected book appeared two years after the publication of Tommy and Grizel, as the reverie of the narrator of The Little White Bird (1902). Again, Barrie presents the reverie as a means of escape from adult life, this time for Captain W__, who has previously been discussed in this thesis.

Paul Digby, the young man with a shady past in The Wedding Guest, also owes his character to Barrie's adaptation of Meredith's Egoist. Like Tommy Sandys (on
whom Barrie was working at the same time), Digby is an artist, but he lacks the sense of humor which makes Tommy a sympathetic figure to the reader who watches him attempting to fight off his inevitable doom. Paul is completely unaware of the humorous picture he presents, and therefore does not struggle against his nature; his actions are merely the symptoms of the fact that he has not become an adult, capable of facing his responsibilities as a human being. The fact that none of the other characters in the play find his actions humorous is in turn a symptom that society in general is no more grown up than he is. It is his habit of retreating from responsibility which makes him, when Mrs. Ommaney and the baby pose a threat to his marriage, take "a sudden dislike" to his surroundings and decide to "go away tomorrow to a beautiful country called Switzerland." Barrie used the fact that no one but Mrs. Ommaney sees the regressive nature of his attempt to leave her behind as a symptom of a society's regressive tendencies.

John Shand, the mock-hero of What Every Woman Knows (1908), is another member of the Tommy Sandys family, but illustrates the kind of psychological absurdity Barrie was capable of creating in his pursuit of a theme. At the beginning of the play Shand demonstrates a fiery determination to win success, coupled with a monstrous pride, but no sense of humor. He is
an impoverished student of law, and since he cannot afford his own lawbooks he breaks into the house of the Wylie family at night to read theirs. The Wylie brothers catch him, get him to tell his story, and advance him money for his schooling in exchange for his promise to marry their spinster sister Maggie. In order to determine his character, one of the brothers asks him if he is "serious-minded," and Shand answers, "I never laughed in my life." Naturally, he is described as having a wooden face; he will be a prime target for Meredithian imps if he becomes successful as a politician. He does become successful, and thinks he has done it all alone, but Maggie Wylie has made his success for him without his being aware of it. Maggie is too plain for him, as Grizel was for Sentimental Tommy and Laetitia was for Sir Willoughby, and so Shand falls in love with Lady Sybil; "he who has been of a wooden face till now, with ways to match, has gone on flame like a piece of paper; emotion is in flood in him." According to the well-used formula, he is now ready to show himself up, to provide the imps some sport, and he does--Maggie arranges it that John can spend one week with Lady Sybil, during which time he discovers that he can't stand Lady Sybil, and that he will be ruined politically if he doesn't have Maggie to help him. His political speeches, once so brilliant (they had all been rewritten by Maggie), now
pound on "with a wooden leg." This is the natural end of the road for his character, and a rather good touch to finish off a wooden copy of the accomplished Sir Willoughby, but Barrie gave the play a happy ending, and in order to save Shand forced him to grow a sense of humor at the end. Like Sandys and the rest, Shand is supposed to be only a boy (the chief symptom is his selfishness), but Barrie failed this time to relate Shand's supposed immaturity to his pride and his sentimental notion that he is a noble character. Unlike Barrie's other Egoists, Shand is not a sympathetic character, and therefore the psychological validity of the immature Egoist is marred.

The type appears again in 1910 in the one-act play, The Twelve-Pound Look. Here Barrie returned to his old idea that characters do not change (especially to provide a happy ending). He took no chances on having his Harry Sims misinterpreted: according to the stage direction, Harry Sims is "you," and "it is that day in your career when everything went wrong just when everything seemed to be superlatively right." Barrie's treatment of the immature Egoist, like his treatment of other types, became more complex as he explored its potential through usage. We find it again in Dear Brutus (1920), one of the most complex of Barrie's plays in conception of character. John Purdie,
according to the stage directions, "is aware of intellectual powers beyond his years," and "he has made one mistake in his life [his marriage] which he is bravely facing."

To Joanna Trout, who brings out the passion in him so that he "begins insensibly to frolic and antic," he says, "I always was a strange, strange creature. I often think, Joanna, that I am rather like a flower that has never had the sun to shine on it nor the rain to water it!" But when he is given his Midsummer Night's chance to redeem his one mistake, he becomes bored with Joanna and declares to his new paramour (his wife of the first act, whom he had found so dull): "I don't know, Mabel, whether you have noticed that I am not like other men. All my life I have been a soul that has had to walk alone. Even as a child I had no hope that it would be otherwise. I distinctly remember when I was six thinking how unlike other children I was. Before I was twelve I suffered from terrible self-depreciation; I do so still. I suppose there never was a man who had a more lowly opinion of himself." And just as in the first act, he betrays his childishly sentimental nature, which bursts out into melodrama: "Yes, yes, my dear, let me leave nothing untold, however it may damage me in your eyes. Your eyes! I cannot remember a time when I did not think of love as a great
consuming passion; I visualised it, Mabel, as perhaps few have done, but always as the abounding joy that could come to others but never to me. I expected far too much of women; I suppose I was touched to finer issues than most. That has been my tragedy."

Like Mr. Darling, John Shand, Mr. Fairbairn, and above all Sentimental Tommy, when Purdie has been discovered in a compromising situation, he takes all the blame to himself, and manages to play the role of a noble lover suffering for his love. But the effect of his noble act (actually a mode of retreat itself, for his assumption of passion is only the easiest way out of a tight spot) is brilliantly deflated by his statement to his mistress in the first act, "We must be brave and not mind her Purdie's wife," reminiscent of Mr. Fairbairn's battle-cry, "We must have the courage to turn our backs on it!" Like Mr. Fairbairn, who had avoided contact with those he recognized as real women, Purdie assiduously avoids Mrs. Dearth, another "womanly woman" on the lines of Mrs. Ommaney.

Purdie is given one chance to make himself over, but he muffs it, like most of the rest of the Dear Brutus characters; he resolves nobly never again to act the fool, but realizes that he is too weak to change, and becomes again the character he has
always been.

The growth of John Purdie's character out of both sides of Barrie's repertoire of immature masculine characters shows Barrie developing an ever-increasing cynicism; Tommy Sandys, Peter Pan, and Mr. Fairbairn had been treated kindly, in what Meredith would have called the true Comic Spirit. But Barrie's version of the Egoist was so universally misunderstood—that is, his audiences were even more like children than he had expected—that he had to make the type more easily recognized in order to escape being labelled a writer of mere healthy fantasies for children. Paul Digby, John Shand, Harry Sims, and John Purdie are the result of this new approach.
CHAPTER IV.

WOMEN AS SUPPORTING CHARACTERS

In his elaboration of the general theme of immaturity Barrie developed formulae for the portrayal of not only the many social ramifications of the childish character, but also a small group of supporting characters to be used as foils. This group, composed entirely of women, falls into three groups, the naming of which reveals their customary sub-ordinate position in relation to the characters discussed in the previous chapter: (1) one group consists of women who are unattractive and yet possess hidden qualities of character; (2) the second group consists of women of fine and generous natures who are victimized by immature men and become social outcasts; (3) the third is made up of totally worthless women who are yet devastatingly attractive. The women of this last group are the ones who achieve positions of rank in society—a symptom for Barrie of the psychological immaturity of society as a whole.

(1) The earliest instance of Barrie's use of the first of these types, the worthwhile but unattractive woman, may be found in A Window in Thrums
(1889) in the character of Leeby McQumpha, the daughter
of Jess. Leeby devotes her entire life to the care
of her mother, and seems to have no desire for personal
fulfillment. According to Mackail, who is undoubtedly
correct in his assumption, Leeby was based on Jane
Ann Barrie, one of Barrie's sisters, who spent her
life caring for their mother.¹ In A Window in Thrums
Leeby is portrayed as "a dumb stock! in society,
regarded by most as a rather stupid, unobservant,
and spiritless creature. But underneath she is
extremely intelligent and capable (her capability,
it should be noted, is reserved for the area of
material objects and household duties). Like Jane
Ann she is of frail constitution, and dies before her
mother—a rather remarkable coincidence, Mackail notes,
since Jane Ann did not die until six years after A
Window in Thrums was written.² She appears also in
Margaret Ogilvy, in which she plays an identical role.³

The type appears again in The Professor's Love
Story (1894) in the person of Lucy White. She is the
secretary of Professor Goodwillie, a man so engrossed
in his research that he doesn't know with whom he is
in love. The action of this thoroughly unbelievable
play consists in Goodwillie's slow discovery that he
has been in love with the unpretentious Lucy White
for some time, and that he could never do without her.
She appears to be oblivious to the intrigues being carried on by her rival for the professor's attentions, but actually is only concealing a fine knowledge of the situation and the professor. The characterizations of both the professor and Miss White, however, are dull in themselves, the play's interest being derived from the humor and irony of the situations being presented; Barrie's sense for stage effects, at least, did not fail.

Maggie Wylie, who saves John Shand in *What Every Woman Knows* (produced in 1908), was Barrie's fullest development of the type of the woman with hidden virtues. Like her predecessors she is "plain in appearance," has "a resolute manner," yet speaks softly. She is intelligent—she knows far more law than her lawyer husband—and has a sense of humor. This sense of humor, always an important character trait to Barrie, is the point on which the play turns, and yet it is not an integral part of the play; it remains a mechanical device, in that John Shand is a completely humorless character until the end of the play, when he is suddenly endowed by Barrie with a sense of humor in order to create a mechanically contrived happy ending.

Barrie's additive use of characteristics is not controlled sufficiently by the psychological mechanism supposedly in force (that of the Egoist), and *What*
Every Woman Knows, like The Professor's Love Story, was successful primarily because of Barrie's sense for situation.

The matter of charm and its relation to Maggie Wylie's character is never settled—does she have charm, or is she merely dangerous? In the opening scene she discusses charm authoritatively: "It's a sort of bloom on a woman. If you have it, you don't need to have anything else; and if you don't have it, it doesn't matter what else you have. Some women, the few, have charm for all, and most have charm for one. But some have charm for none." Her brothers seem to find her charming, and the more perceptive characters are pleasantly surprised to discover her astuteness, and John Shand is finally forced to realize that he needs her and is enabled to laugh at himself. But her charm still remains a question.

Barrie, I believe, saw the difficulty and attempted to attribute charm to Maggie by finally giving Shand the ability to laugh, and asserting through Maggie that Shand could indeed be fond of her if he had a sense of humor. But the sense of humor itself is foreign to Shand, as I have indicated, and Maggie remains merely a frightfully capable creature. Indeed, this practical capacity of Leeby,
Lucy, and Maggie has a function related to Barrie's conception of the dominating mother, for in Maggie, its most fully developed representative, it only forces the child-man to admit his incapacity, rather than permitting him to achieve full stature as a man. Therefore the type remains ambiguous, admirable for the services it performs, but somewhat disquieting when fully developed and its implications uncovered.

(2) The second group of feminine supporting characters in Barrie's writings, those of a generous nature who have been victimized by immature men and made social outcasts, comprise some of Barrie's most sympathetic characters; the fact that Barrie relied on such a specialized character type is a symptom not only of the concentrated range of his characters, but of his repetitive use of certain stock situations.

The Painted Lady was the first such woman, appearing in Sentimental Tommy as the mother of Grizel; she and Grizel have been abandoned by her lover, and have come back to Thrums to look for him. Her loneliness has left her emotionally scarred; she has periodic "fits," and wanders in the Den, looking for her lost lover near the Cuttle Well. In her loneliness she has been driven to become a prostitute, with regular customers in the tiny village. Finally, for want of medical attention, she dies of tuberculosis,
and leaves her daughter a homeless orphan. She does not appear as a character in the novel, her story being related by the children, Tommy and Grizel. The Painted Lady has repeatedly warned Grizel about the danger of falling into the hands of a "magerfu' man," because that is how she had been ruined and had lost her self respect. Therefore her history is in a way repeated in Grizel's story; Tommy Sandys is a masterful man, and Grizel becomes his victim, even though she knows all the while that Tommy is incapable of returning her love. She too loses her mind, repeating the actions of her mother before her.

Four years after the publication of Sentimental Tommy, the Painted Lady was used as the basis for the character of Kate Ommaney, in The Wedding Guest. She was Paul Digby's mistress, but she saw that he was growing tired of her, and left him, even though she was pregnant by him. She now comes back, just as he is about to be married, not to look for him, but "for a fool's reason—because I had been here before—an eternity ago."7 Like Mary Gray (The Painted Lady), who had returned to the Cuttle Well, she comes back to the Lover's Seat and wanders near it all day, then goes back to her rented room and talks to herself in the looking glass—and her face is "not the face of a sane woman." She is attended by a maid, Jenny,
who, like Grizel, relates her demented actions—she alternates between wild suspicion and sweetness, then thinks that her lover is with her, and finally falls asleep, exhausted. The symptoms of psychosis are exactly those of Mary Gray—and like Mary Gray, Kate is herself again when she revives. But Kate Ommaney tells how she has become the woman she is now:

"Until we met I had been a good woman. I had sat to other painters before I knew you [Paul Digby]; I had been a popular enough model. I was a harum-scarum, I suppose, but no harm had come of it." 8

She left Digby, she reveals, because of her love for him; she had pitied him, and refused to become a burden to him. She had, however, made him promise not to marry, in order that she might have some source of self-respect, "derived from feeling she would have a part in his fame, if nothing else." 9 In her encounter with the Fairbairn family, Kate does recover her self-respect; while the childish Fairbairns display only repugnance for her, and a selfish desire to escape from her and her responsibility she represents, she is still capable of showing magnanimity. Bitter and vindictive as she is, when Paul and Margaret leave the stage, she flings two handfuls of rice after them, "half cynically, yet with a generous impulse." 10 While
she shares the mental distress of Mary Gray, who was after all a rather melodramatic figure, Kate Ommaney is made a part of Barrie's social picture based on the immaturity of society as a whole; and she undoubtedly owes her existence to an insight into the family relations problem gleaned from Ibsen's treatment of the theme.

In 1910 Barrie staged a one-act play, *The Twelve-Pound Look*, with a character named Kate—who displays the same characteristics as Kate Ommaney, only this time she is the former wife of a successful politician. Her husband had treated her as a bit of property; she discovered the impossibility of her marriage; and she determined to leave her husband, which she did as soon as she had scraped together enough money to buy a typewriter with which to support herself. At the time of the play her husband has been remarried for some time, and is about to be knighted. He calls for a typist to type his letter of appreciation for the great honor, and Kate appears. Her clothes are seen to be worn, but "her eye is clear; and in odd contrast to Lady Sims, she is self-radiant and serene." The sense of humor which she displays, and shares with Kate Ommaney of *The Wedding Guest*, is an integral part of her character.

The psychological basis of the play was
conceived with the kind of unity lacking in *What Every Woman Knows* (in which Barrie had done violence to his essential conception of Shand's character by suddenly giving him the ability to laugh at himself at the end; Maggie's character remains unpleasantly ambiguous, as has been noted in the discussion of her character); as a result the plot follows strictly the outline of the fall of an Egoist as Meredith had prescribed in the first chapter of *The Egoist*.

(3) The third group of characteristic females, the worthless yet attractive ones, originates in the character of Lady Pippinworth in *Tommy and Grizel*. She is a symptom of the reversed values of society, as her name itself declares. Her type is sought after by the immature, and Tommy Sandys is the least mature of all—therefore the awful suitability for her role in the novel, which is to rouse Tommy's passion to such a state that he will lose his sense of humor completely, and fall victim to his own love of self. She had "no sense of humor, and was rather stupid, so it was no wonder that the men ran after her."\(^{12}\) Her appearance itself is another testimonial to her utter worthlessness as a real woman—she is the thinnest woman Tommy has ever seen, with a figure resembling that of a telegraph pole; the "secret of her charm" lies in the very absurdity of her existence expressed
by her air of "helpless disdain." In a society which worships worthlessness, it is the privilege of the utterly worthless, according to Barrie, to be perfectly assured of their high value.

Tommy is attracted to Lady Pippinworth by the challenge she represents: she has a "reputation for having broken many hearts without damaging her own." The contest between the two, Lady Pippinworth and Tommy, becomes a top-of-the-mountain struggle, with the approbation of society going to the winner of the selfish and destructive child's game. The very fact that Lady Pippinworth reveals to Tommy that her intention has been to wait until he cared for her a great deal, and then to break him completely by telling him that she had destroyed the manuscript, fires his own socially-organized passion, and he becomes another of Lady Pippinworth's conquests.

Lady Mary Lasenby, in The Admirable Crichton, is another woman who is highly prized by society, yet who is not what she seems to be. Her appeal is similar to that of Lady Pippinworth; she is bored with life and tired all the time. Like Lady Pippinworth, she is highly sophisticated. But her sophistication, also like Lady Pippinworth's, is a specially cultivated product of an immature society; her apparent sophistication merely conceals her child-
ishness. The social values demonstrated by Lord Loam's household at the beginning of the play are, as Lord Loam says, artificial. But at the same time they are in a sense natural: they are the natural result of civilization. Barrie uses the island to reveal the real Lady Mary behind the apparent Lady Mary; the real Lady Mary is only a child. Crichton forbids her to go across the dangerous Black Gorge, and, "like a naughty, sulky child," she refuses.

Crichton: Frown at me, Polly /Lady Mary's name while she is on the island/; there, you do it at once. Clench your little fists, stamp your feet, bite your ribbons—
(A student of women, or at least of this woman, he knows that she is about to do these things, and thus she seems to do them to order. Lady Mary screws up her face like a baby and cries. . . .)

The island is Barrie's utopia, the dream of society based on natural superiority. It is not, however, like Mary Rose's island, a place to which one retreats—that function, in The Admirable Crichton, is fulfilled by "The Other Island," which is England.16

In 1908 London playgoers saw another worthless but attractive lady, whose surname was almost the same as Lady Mary's: Lady Sybil Lazenby, the woman who rouses John Shand's passion in What Every Woman Knows. She, too, is a child at heart; this time Barrie gave her an "impediment in her voice" which made her pronounce
her r's as if they were w's. She, too, appears to be sophisticated; she is always sleepy and indolent. Her first name seems to be significant as well as her last, indicating the aura of the mysterious with which these women invest themselves. Lady Sybil herself believes that there is more to her than meets the eye:

Comtesse. Don't you love a strong man, sleepyhead?
Sybil.  (preening herself). I never met one.
Comtesse. Neither have I. But if you did meet one, would he wake you up?
Sybil.  I dare say he would find there were two of us.18

Lady Sybil thinks she wants to be tamed; she thinks she wants to love "like Mary Queen of Scots, who said of her Bothwell that she could follow him round the world in her Nightie."19 But when she meets John Shand and mutual passion is aroused between them, one finds that her passionate desire is not to be tamed by her "strong man," but to break his strength; and when his weakness is revealed, she tires of him and wants to escape. The myth of the grand passion, then, is merely the surface of an essentially selfish, immature, destructive drive.

In Dear Brutus (1917), two characters were drawn from this same pattern: Joanna Trout and Lady Caroline Laney. When her affections are not engaged, say the stage directions, Joanna "has a merry face and figure,
but can dismiss them both at the important moment, which is the word 'love'. Then Joanna quivers, her sense of humour ceases to beat and the dullest man may go ahead. "\textsuperscript{20} Jack Purdie is her John Shand--both of them rather dull men after all--and once they can consummate their passion in the magic wood, each of them has had enough of the other. Lady Caroline has Lady Sybil's impediment, and immediately catches the eye of the richest man around, who encloses her in fetters of affluence. The lightest of elements, she rises to the top of society.

These three groups of supporting characters serve to fill out Barrie's picture of society. They serve as an index of the society's values, and indicate that Barrie's concern is wider than the mere family circle. Members of these groups, as I have indicated, are not significant as characters themselves, but they exist for the relationships they have with others. They are significant because of what other characters (primarily men) think of them. They exist as exercises to test ability of their male companions to distinguish between appearance and reality. The problem of self-realization as a dramatic theme is reserved for Barrie's primary characters, the immature men and women.
CONCLUSION

In this examination of Barrie's repetitive use of character traits in relation to the theme of immaturity it has been amply demonstrated, I believe, that Barrie was a writer of children's fantasies only in the sense that he wrote for a society which he came to see as composed of men and women who have failed to grow up, whose values are those of Mr. and Mrs. Darling, who are brave enough to turn their backs on the responsibilities of life.
NOTES TO INTRODUCTION


16. Asquith, p. 76.
17. Quoted in Asquith, p. 5.


22. Each of these books except *The Little Minister* was made up of Kailyard articles previously printed in the *Nottingham Journal* and the *St. James's Gazette*.


30. Mackail, p. 121.

31. See note 10.

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. See Herbert Garland, A Bibliography of the Writings of Sir James Matthew Barrie (London, 1928). There is no complete guide to the period of Barrie's activity between 1884 and 1891, but Garland's work is sufficient to give one an idea of the scope of Barrie's writing, and does give first-publication data for a good share of the stories now definitely known to be by Barrie; it also includes all stories printed in private editions, even though some were probably not written by Barrie. The problem which Garland faced in trying to assign authorship in doubtful cases becomes evident when one attempts to trace the first appearance of the stories printed by Barrie himself in The Greenwood Hat two years after Garland's bibliography.

Barrie acknowledged as his own only the stories which he later worked into book form: Auld Licht Idylls, A Window in Thrums, My Lady Nicotine, and The Greenwood Hat.


12. "The Family Honor," "A Lady's Shoe," "Is It a Man?", and "Woman and the Press" are not to be found in Garland's bibliography, and from the style and content, were not written by Barrie.


15. Two of Them, p. 103.


17. Two of Them, p. 39; italics mine.


19. Margaret Ogilvy, pp. 264-265.


23. A Window in Thrums, p. 75.


25. At the end of The Little White Bird the narrator gives his book to Mary A., who comments, "How wrong you are in thinking this book is all about me and mine; it is really all about Timothy." (p. 284) And Timothy is a wish-fulfillment projection of Captain W_'s.
NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO


7. Plays, p. 299.


15. When Barrie revised the book for the stage he omitted the whole framework of the narrator and his relation to Margaret and Gavin Dishart; all that remained was the Gavin-Babbie-townsfolk plot.


18. Margaret Ogilvy, p. 276.

19. Margaret Ogilvy, p. 276.

21. Margaret Ogilvy, pp. 266, 286.

22. Margaret Ogilvy, p. 261; Sentimental Tommy, which appeared the same year as Margaret Ogilvy, shows Barrie already working with the theme of the mother and its result projected in a wish-fulfillment child. Reddy is such a child, and Barrie addresses mothers who have lost their babies (Sentimental Tommy, p. 54) in a manner that foreshadows the warnings to mothers in The Little White Bird, not to come back expecting their children not to have grown up.


27. Plays, p. 194.


32. Plays, p. 1148.
NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE


3. Plays, p. 263.


5. Plays, p. 268.


8. The Little White Bird, p. 156.


10. The Little White Bird, p. 204.


15. Peter and Wendy, p. 197.

16. Sir Walter Langdon-Brown, Thus We Are Men (New York, 1939), p. 139. The assertion is furthered by a meeting Langdon-Brown had with Barrie: "The only time I had the pleasure of meeting Barrie I mentioned the idea that Lob was Peter Pan grown old. He said: 'That's good; how did you find it out?' I replied: 'My wife told me.' 'She must be a remarkable woman,' was his comment."

17. Plays, p. 1001.


20. *Plays*, p. 1920. Barrie was very careful to structure the relation of the play, its audience and its characters; according to the stage directions the two chief characters are Darkness and Light; the flowers on stage are instructed by the moonshine, which has a menacing smile for the dwellers in darkness; and Lob is the moonshine's confederate in the house. (*Plays*, p. 995) Translated from Barrie-esque, this seems to mean that the play is about appearance and reality. The author (moonshine) has made his characters (flowers) behave in such a way as to show the dwellers in darkness that they are like the characters in the play (the flower metaphor applies both to the characters and the audience). Lob is his agent in this action.


29. *Plays*, p. 239.


33. Barrie may have been trying to make his conception of this type of character more easily understood by his audience, who, it must be admitted, had not an easy time understanding his earlier exemplars of it.
35. See again footnote 20.
37. Plays, p. 1010.
38. Plays, p. 1026.
40. Plays, p. 1014.
NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR


3. For some reason Barrie never mentions her name in Margaret Ogilvy; throughout the book he refers to her merely as "my sister." As I have indicated previously, there is also consistent suppression of fact in reference to his own history; nowhere does he even imply in the book that he has any human relations with anyone other than his parents and this sister. There were actually seven other living children in the family besides Barrie.


5. Plays, p. 674.


16. Each act, it should be noticed, is given a title:

   I. Loam House, Mayfair
   II. The Island
   III. The Happy Home
   IV. The Other Island
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