Foster Parenting in L.M. Montgomery's *Anne of Green Gables* and J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* Novels
- Representations of Parenting in Two Classic Children's Novel Series from the Early and the Late 20th Century

Anne-Maria Lakka
University of Tampere
English Philology
School of Modern Languages and Translation Studies
Pro Gradu Thesis
August 2009

Tampereen yliopisto
Englantilainen filologia
Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos

LAKKA, ANNE-MARIA: Foster Parenting in L.M. Montgomery's *Anne of Green Gables* and J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* Novels – Representations of Parenting in Two Classic Children's Novel Series from the Early and the Late 20th Century

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 112 sivua
Kesä 2009

Tämän tutkielman tavoitteena oli selvittää miten kasvattivanhemmuutta kuvaillaan L.M. Montgomeryn *Anne of Green Gables* ja *Anne of Avonlea* -kirjoissa sekä J.K. Rowlingin *Harry Potter* -sarjassa. Erityisenä huomion kohteena oli löytää yhteneväisyyksiä ja eroavaisuuksia kirjoissa esitetyistä lasten kasvatuksen kuvauksista sekä pohtia mahdollisia syitä näihin kuvauksiin.

Kummankin sarjan päähenkilö on orpo ja elänyt kasvattivanhempiensa hoivissa yksitoistavuotiaaksi asti. Vaikka molemmat ovat menettäneet vanhempansa vauvaiässä, sekä Anne että Harry olivat ilmeisesti kiintyneet vanhempiinsa Bowlbyn psykologisen kiintymyssuhde-teorian mukaan turvallisesti, koska voivat myöhemmin muodostaa turvallisia kiintymyssuhteita toisiin ihmisiin; uusiin kasvatti- tai adoptiovanhempiin sekä opettajiin, muihin aikuisiin ja ikätovereihinsa. Harryn kiintymyssuhde Dursleyhin näyttää kuitenkin olevan välttelevä.

Keski-ikäiset sisarukset, Cuthbertit, päättävät pitää Annen, vaikka halusivat alun perin adoptoida pojan. Matthew selvästi pitää Annesta ensi näkemältä ja haluaa tarjota tälle ”omalle tytölleen” kodin, mutta Marillan äidinvaistot heräävät vasta paljon myöhemmin. Anne saa kuitenkin jäädä Avonleaan, jossa sekä hänen fyysisestä että psyykkisestä hyvinvoinnistaan huolehditaan hyvin.

Orvolla Harrylla on useita äiti- ja isä-hahmoja. Weasleyt pitävät Harrya omana poikanaan ja tarjoavat tälle turvallisen perheilmapiirin sekä huolehtivat hänen perustarpeistaankin paremmin kuin Dursleyt. Velhomaailmassa ja Tylypahkan koulussa Harry saa vihdoin osakseen kunnollista huolenpitoa ja hänellä on ilmeisen läheinen ja lämmin suhde esimerkiksi Hagridiin, Dumbledoreen, Weasleyhin sekä erityisesti kummisetäänsä Siriukseen, toisin kuin verisukulaisiinsa Dursleyhin. Dursleyt pystyvät ilmeisesti epäämään Harrylta kaiken, koska eivät välitä tästä; oman poikansa, Dudleyn, he taas ovat pilanneet toteuttamalla tämän joka toiveen. Harry oppii nöyryyttä ja kieltäymystä, kun taas ylensyövä Dudley oppii vain itserakkautta ja nautinnonhimoa. Toisaalta Marilla pystyy kasvattamaan Annea hyvin, tosin Matthew'n avulla, vaikka välittääkin tästä. Vaikka Annen adoptiovanhemmat ovat ventovieraita, he ovat kuitenkin parempia vanhempia tälle kuin Harryn omat sukulaiset Harrylle. Annen vanhemmista toinen on ankara ja toinen pehmeä—Marillan ja Matthew'n erilaiset kasvatusmenetelmät tasapainottavat toisiaan. Myös Harryn velhovanhemmat edustavat pehmeitä arvoja, kun taas jästivanhempien kasvatusmetodit ovat ankarat.

Sekä Montgomery että Rowling pitävät kurinpitoa tarpeellisena, mutta eivät näytä hyväksyvän fyysistä tai psyykkistä kuritusta. Molemmat vaativat pehmeämpiä lapsenkasvatusmetodeja; sadassa vuodessa juuri mikään ei siis näytä muuttuneen. Kirjasarjoissa pyritään löytämään tasapaino puritaanisen ja romanttisen näkökulman, ankaran ja pehmeän kasvatustavan, välillä. Näin ollen sekä hemmottelu että kieltäminen ovat tarpeen, jotta lapsi kehittyy ”normaalisti”. Toisaalta sekä Anne että Harry haluavat kumpikin olla hyviä eli ihmiset voivat myös itse valita, millaisiksi he tulevat. Sekä kasvatuksella että luonteella on siis osuutensa, mutta voi olla, että luonne kuitenkin ratkaisee.

Avainsanat: parenting, children's literature, adoptive parenting, foster parenting, attachment theory.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

This thesis discusses foster parenting of the orphan protagonists in two different types of classic children's novels, realist and fantasy; L. M. Montgomery's *Anne of Green Gables*[1] published in 1908 and J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*[2] published in 1997. There is actually a hundred year gap between the times the novels depict; the beginning of *AGG* is set in about 1890 as McMaster (2007, 408) has established and the beginning of *Philosopher's Stone* is set in 1991.

The aim of this study is to examine how foster parenting is represented in the novels and, in particular, to observe similarities and differences in the representation of parenting in a children's novel from the early 20th century to a novel from the late 20th century and to propose possible reasons for these representations. I will also study *Anne of Avonlea*[3] and all the sequels in the *Harry Potter* series to obtain a fuller picture of the way the orphans are parented. Both are adults at the end of the last novels studied in each series (*AA* and *Deathly Hallows*). Parenting in this thesis will be examined via attachment theory as well as parenting models presented in adoption literature.

The subject of foster parenting in the *Anne* and *Harry* novels has not been studied very extensively before. However, the "awakening" of Marilla and Matthew, and especially of Marilla's mothering instincts, have been observed by several scholars[4]. Moreover, Alston (2008, 3) has studied family in mainly British but also in some American and Canadian children's literature, *AGG* included. Some aspects of family and parenting in *Harry* are studied in *Harry Potter's World – Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives*, edited by Heilman, in particular by Kornfeld and Prothro.

This study is relevant because of the increasing number of "unnatural" families (to borrow from Zipes 2006, 131); thus stories and studies of parenting and especially foster, adoptive, and step parenting are needed. It is relevant to study different family configurations (such as adoptive and foster families) as well as different ways of parenting in literature because the authors may attempt

[1] Henceforth abbreviated to *AGG*.
[2] Henceforth abbreviated to *Philosopher's Stone*.
[3] Henceforth abbreviated to *AA*.
[4] Doody (1997, 18), Gubar (2001, 65) and Devereux (2007, 367).

to improve reality through criticism of current parenting methods.

In essence, according to Hunt (2001, 271), "all fiction could be called fantasy" because it inevitably portrays a world that differs from pragmatic actuality. Nevertheless fantasy is generally described as portraying "some obvious deviance from 'consensus reality',... usually a change in physical laws" and *Harry* as fantasy belongs to "excursions into other, parallel worlds" (*ibid.*). However, the novel could be viewed as not so fantastic that it would not allow literal-minded readings in some sense, such as psychoanalytical. It is necessary for all fantasy worlds to have something in common with the actual world because, as Hunt (2001, 271) notes, "a total difference from the [actual] world would not be writable or comprehensible". Ryan (1991, 33) says that the Textual Actual World (TAW) is accessible from Actual World (AW), for example, if "both worlds respect the principles of noncontradiction and of excluded middle" meaning that the worlds are *logically compatible*. *Harry* fulfils this criterion. *Anne*, instead, seems to be also *physically compatible* with AW because it fulfils Ryan's requirement that the worlds "share natural laws" (*ibid.*). In addition, *Harry* as well as *Anne* fulfil Ryan's (1991, 45) requirement for *psychological credibility*; that "we believe that the mental properties of the characters could be those of members of AW" and thus "we regard the characters as complete human beings to whom we can relate as persons". At least the main characters in the *Harry* (and all in *Anne*) series do not seem to break the relation of psychological credibility; they are not unidimensional nor are their inner lives "rudimentary". Ryan (*ibid.*) says that psychoanalytical theories are "literally applicable as interpretive models" for texts that respect psychological credibility. Thus attachment theory is a valid interpretive model not only for *Anne* but also for *Harry*. The Dursleys, however, do not fit this requirement as they are exaggerated—parodies of real people—even though they do behave like real people could (and some do). Harry nevertheless fits the requirement of psychological credibility as do most of his other surrogate parents.

Both *Anne* and *Harry* are *Bildungsromane* following the protagonists' maturation process into adulthood. According to Cockrell, *Harry* is not only "a hero tale of the adolescent's journey to

selfhood", but "it is also a tale of the search for family and belonging" (2002, 21)—like *Anne*. While *Harry* is fantasy in genre and English, *AGG* is realistic (and may be seen as partly autobiographical) and Canadian. However, both stories have something in common with the fairy-tale "Cinderella". Grimes (2002, 102) says that just like in fairy tales, "wicked surrogates appear in the bildungsroman". In classic fairy tales, "the despised parents who discipline or ignore the child must be separated from the idealized parents who love and care for their offspring" because children cannot comprehend that both qualities exist in the same parents (Grimes 2002, 91). Thus children reading fairy tales or *Harry Potter* novels are able to detest "one set of parents, the disciplinarians, while remaining loyal to the beloved ones" (*ibid.*). The Dursleys are the evil version of the Potters. The evil stepmother portrays the part of the parent who disciplines and limits the child's freedom and this is the part the child wants to hate while the fairy godmother, in contrast, represents the part of the parent that is idealized, the provider of protection and sustenance (Grimes 2002, 92). Anne's foster mothers, Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Hammond seem to be examples of the Cinderella-like evil stepmothers (and Mrs. Blewett would be another example) while in *Harry*, Petunia is the archetypal evil stepmother. Zipes (2006, 131) says that stepparents and stepchildren need to deal with moral choices as they are placed in 'unnatural' (or 'undesirable') situations that may "lead to the undermining of their self-interests". In addition, he claims that "[i]t is extremely difficult to integrate oneself or to be integrated into a family or tribe with which one does not have kinship" (*ibid.*). However, even Zipes himself says that there are a number of "ways to live harmoniously in [these] 'unnatural' relations" (*ibid.*).

This thesis is divided into four main chapters. In the next chapter (2), I shall discuss orphans and adoption today and in the Victorian era. In chapter 3, I will discuss attachment theory and in chapter 4, I will concentrate on parenting and on how the orphan protagonist in each novel is parented. In the final chapter (5), I shall conclude how foster parenting is represented in the novels and what kind of similarities and differences exist between the representations of adoptive and foster parenting in the realist Victorian novel series and the contemporary fantasy novel series.

2 Orphans and Adoption – Real and Literary Orphans

Bowlby (1976, 85) says that if the child's 'natural home group' (mother and father) "fails for any reason, near relatives [have traditionally] take[n] responsibility for the child". According to Bowlby (1976, 132), "it may be supposed that in skilled hands adoption can give a child nearly as good a chance of a happy home life as that of the child brought up in his own home". Anne has no relatives but she is eventually adopted by Matthew and Marilla Cuthbert, middle-aged siblings. It seems that in her new home she is just as happy a she would have been in her own home—and materially, she is even better off living with the Cuthberts than with her own parents, Walter and Bertha Shirley, who were, according to Mrs. Thomas, "a pair of babies and as poor as church mice" (*AGG*, 38). Harry would have undoubtedly had a happier childhood with his own parents but as he is a hero, he must be free of parental control. As Grimes (2002, 93) says, Harry's "dead parents both abandon him to the mercy of a frightening world and free him to make his own adventures".

2.1 Anne and Harry as Literary Orphans

According to Mills (1987, 228), "almost every orphan novel... is about the search for family; the protagonist finds a home, finds loving and caring adults to whom he can belong". Mills (*ibid.*) observes that even though the Romantic child protagonist "ha[s] endured grief, loss, neglect, abuse, poverty, and friendlessness, [he/she] appear[s] absolutely unscathed and unscarred by these experiences". More importantly, Mills (*ibid.*) notes, "years of lovelessness have done nothing to temper these children's seemingly boundless capacity to give and receive love". According to Mills (1987, 230), "the innocent, unspoiled, Romantic child" shows no moral growth in these novels because "they already represent a kind of moral perfection". Thus the "[a]dult attempts at moral instruction are… almost invariably… wrong-headed and repressive" (*ibid.*). In *AGG*, this happens when Marilla, "ha[ving] plumed herself" for a "wholesome punishment" (Anne's apology to Mrs. Lynde), is dismayed to find "that Anne was actually enjoying her valley of humiliation—was revelling in the thoroughness of her abasement" (*AGG*, 64). In fact, Mills (1987, 230) observes, as the children remain essentially unchanged, others around them are changed enormously; "Anne

brings joy to Matthew and helps Marilla to mellow…". Three weeks after Anne's arrival Marilla says "…it seems as if she'd been here always. I can't imagine the place without her" (*AGG*, 77). Mills (1987, 235–236) says that while "[e]arly-[twentieth] century orphans compel love from others by giving it freely themselves; late-century orphans are compelled to give love by getting it unstintingly, even undeservedly, from their foster parents". While Harry is not loved by the Dursleys, he has a host of other parent figures who do love him—yet, he does seem to earn to be loved. Only Dumbledore seems to somehow fit Mills's description; he patiently loves Harry even though Harry is sometimes very angry at him and shouts at him (as teenagers may often do).

Mills (1987, 236) observes that love also "involves a willingness to administer parental discipline" which "is directed toward the child's moral growth, and moral growth is a critical component of maturity". According to Mills (1987, 237), while adults in the early-century orphan novels "learn to become more childlike", in the late-century novels "children learn to grow up". Harry, too, grows up, and learns to rely on himself—and he must as most of his primary parent figures die. This enables the teenage (or pre-teenage) reader to come to terms with the figurative dying (or "killing") of parents; young people must become independent and self-sufficient and learn not to rely on their parents anymore. Thus in the beginning, the parents need to be dead so that Harry is free to have adventures, later (some of) the new parent figures need to die so that he learns to rely on himself and becomes independent.

2.1.1 'Urchins, Orphans, Monsters, and Victims' – Orphans in the Victorian Era

Seelye (2005, 134) notes that "[t]he orphan… is a peculiar Victorian construct used to emphasize the horrors of being separated from the orderly comforts of middle-class society, a figure of helplessness, lacking the power to resist whatever outrages that are visited upon it". In Victorian culture, an orphan was "an outsider, a body without family ties to the community, a foreigner" (Peters 2000, 6). Orphans were "linked with other outsiders, Gypsies, criminals, and colonized subjects, none of whom were thought to be properly rooted within English society" (Cunningham

2003, 737). Orphans of both the poor and the middle class were distrusted because of their "unknown familial origins, combined with a suspicion of illegitimacy" (Peters 2000, 16). In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, "[a] large part of society still regarded adoptable children with a mixture of pity and suspicion…" (Berebitsky 2006, 30).

The suspicion towards orphans appears in *AGG* when Mrs. Lynde is astonished to discover that Marilla and Matthew are adopting an orphan boy. After all, he could set their house on fire like another orphan Mrs. Lynde has heard of. Yet it seems that a girl would be even worse than a boy since she is likely to be a poisoner. Thus Mrs. Lynde strongly disapproves of the idea of adopting an orphan – it is "an unheard of innovation" in Avonlea (*AGG*, 11). It is clear that, to Mrs. Lynde, the advent of an orphan poses a threat to the Cuthberts, if not to everyone in Avonlea. Marilla admits to having "had some qualms [her]self" concerning the adoption (*AGG*, 13). Matthew, however, who is so "terrible set on [adopting]" (and also on keeping Anne), does not seem to have any qualms (*AGG*, 13). The orphan is, nevertheless, an outsider, foreign, to both Marilla and Mrs. Lynde, as well as to Matthew. As Robinson (1999, 22) notes, Marilla insists on a 'born Canadian' to keep "the risks of foreignness at a minimum". In addition, "the newly adopted orphan will be given schooling, a family, and a home, all of which will help him overcome the remaining signifiers of difference" (*ibid.*). Barry (1997, 421) observes that "Anne comes 'from away' and is an unwelcome replacement to the expected [boy] child, like the changelings of Celtic lore". Therefore, Anne is not only an 'outsider' because she is an orphan and comes from Nova Scotia (on the mainland), but she is also not what she should be, a *he*. She is a 'changeling', a fairy-like girl left at the railway station instead of the expected boy.

Peters (2000, 18–19) says that the concept *pharmakon* "contain[s] simultaneously both the poison and the cure" and "the orphan plays a pharmaceutical function in Victorian culture: [it] embodies a surplus excess to be expelled to the colonies". These "surplus children" were exported between 1850 and 1950 from the mother country to the empire, for example Canada, as white settlers (Cunningham 2003, 737). Doody Jones (1997b, 425) notes that these "'imported' orphans…

were considered the lowest of the low, 'London street-Arabs,' in Marilla's slighting reference". Matthew had first wanted to adopt a "Barnardo boy" (*AGG*, 11–12) which alludes "to Dr. Barnardo and other charitable individuals and organizations in Britain that sent thousands of street children… to Canada and other parts of the Empire to be trained in some useful occupation" (Dawson 2002, 33).

Nelson (2001, 54) says that in the nineteenth century, "[i]n a nation largely without child labour laws or welfare benefits, orphans without class standing" usually went to the territories or worked as servants to earn their living. Thus in literature (that reflected the expectations of society), "[e]ven the waifs who are lucky enough to be adopted,… should expect to repay the benevolence shown them in a practical way..." (*ibid.*). Accordingly, Anne is expected to work at Green Gables. She contributes to the household mainly by doing daily chores and thus 'pays' for her upkeep. Nelson (*ibid.*) says, however, that various early twentieth-century (literary) orphans find that, in their new homes, "their real work is emotional" (instead of physical); "their task is nothing less than to heal the adult world". In *AGG*, it turns out, eventually, that also Anne's task is mainly emotional—Matthew 'awakens' and is able to 'father' (and dote on) someone. Similarly, Marilla's emotions are awakened by Anne;

> Something warm and pleasant welled up in Marilla's heart at touch of that thin little hand in her own—a throb of the maternity she had missed, perhaps. Its very unaccustomedness and sweetness disturbed her. She hastened to restore her sensations to their normal calm by inculcating a moral. (*AGG*, 66–67.)

When Marilla promises that Anne can go to the picnic,

> …Anne cast herself into Marilla's arms and rapturously kissed her sallow cheek. It was the first time in her whole life that childish lips had voluntarily touched Marilla's face. Again that sudden sensation of startling sweetness thrilled her. She was secretly vastly pleased at Anne's impulsive caress, which was probably the reason why she said brusquely:
>
> "There, there, never mind your kissing nonsense. I'd sooner see you doing strictly as you're told." (*AGG*, 78.)

Rubio (1992, 70) observes that Anne gives "Matthew and Marilla… a much fuller and happier life than they had before". In fact, the Cuthberts "grow younger and more human as the result of their

contact with Anne" (Rubio 1992, 72). It is also notable that it is Matthew who wishes to adopt and not Marilla; thus it is a man rather than a woman who has the impulse to adopt a child.

In reality, an orphan's lot in the Victorian era was tough. Both orphans and pauper children had been viewed as cheap labour since the eighteenth century, as Doody Jones (1997b, 422) remarks. Doody Jones (*ibid.*) explains that Montgomery was trying to change this attitude with her stories about children so that children would be valued simply for themselves. Throughout the nineteenth century, attitudes to children and child care slowly changed (Doody Jones 1997b, 425). Doody Jones (1997b, 426) says that Montgomery viewed "the child as a 'seer blest', gifted with spiritual knowledge lost in the bustle of socialization". In addition, because of the Romantic conceptualisation of the child, children were endowed with an innocence; "the poor child was innocent of the causes of his or her poverty" but poor adults were thought to be "reduced to destitution by their own misconduct" (Parliamentary Papers quoted in Peters 2000, 8).

2.1.2 Orphans and Adoption in the Modern Era

According to Kadushin (1970, 2), in earlier adoption history, "the emphasis in the codes and legal arrangements" was primarily concerned with parents' rights and interests. "More recent adoption legislation", however, views the protection of the child as paramount and the orientation set on supplying children for childless parents has become more concerned with offering parents for parentless children (*ibid.*).

The practice by which social workers selected the adoptive families and carefully "matched" parents and children was in extensive use especially during the period between 1930 and 1960 (Berebitsky 2006, 29). While single people were able to adopt before the 1920s, it appears that heterosexual married couples have been favoured since. Only rather recently single adoptive parents (mothers) seem to have become acceptable again. Instead, as Berebitsky (2006, 30) notes, today debates rage over gay and lesbian adoptions.

While there may be fewer full orphans today than before, the number of adoptions is hardly

declining (international adoptions, celebrity adoptions). Nelson (2001, 55) states that orphans "were much more common in real life [in the late nineteenth century] than is the case today" as adult mortality rates were high in the era but children might lose their parents to poverty (temporarily or permanently) as well as to death. According to Reynolds (2005, 26), families today (in the west) are normally described as 'nuclear', 'extended', 'lone parent' or 'blended' ("families comprised of parents and children from previous relationships") and children may experience more than one form of family, either successively or simultaneously. Adesman and Adamec (2004, 157–158) say that "[t]he two-parent biological family is no longer the norm for many children in our society" as "…many children now grow up with single parents, step-parents, adoptive parents, relative caregivers such as grandparents, foster parents, and in other types of family arrangements". Against this background, "adoptive families that exist at the beginning of the twenty-first century face similar, yet perhaps less unusual, challenges now than such families have in the past" because "there is more diversity in family structure and more social acceptance of such diversity [than before]" (Upshur & Demick 2006, 91). It may therefore be hoped, as Adesman and Adamec (2004, 158) do, "that adoption will become a more accepted way of creating a family than in past years, when some people thought adoption was embarrassing and a secret to be kept since it was perceived as so different from the standard way to form a family".

Unlike Anne, Harry is not adopted but instead unofficially placed in foster care with his only relatives. Harry's only legal guardian, however, seems to be Sirius Black. Sirius is Harry's godfather and he is the one who should (and would) take Harry after his parents' die but is unable to as he is sent to Azkaban prison. Thus Rowling uses the traditional solution that Bowlby (1976, 85) suggests (of near relatives taking responsibility for the child)—and it turns out to be the best solution in Harry's case because Dumbledore's protection charm is thus sealed effectively.

2.2 Adoption – History

According to Smith, Surrey and Watkins (2006, 148), "[a]doption is as old as recorded history".

Smith *et al.* (*ibid.*) note that "[w]hether or not adoption is considered 'normal' varies widely within different cultures, as does whether or not a culture grants equivalent kinship, legal, and inheritance status". Adoption has been used as a legitimate way to form families, settle disputes between families, guarantee inheritance and security in old age, and provide a 'better' life for offspring (*ibid.*). Anne is taken to 'ensure security in old age' as the expected boy was to work on the farm so that Matthew would not need to work so much. Kadushin (1970, 1) points out that adoption has served different purposes in different times and places. In ancient Greece and Rome, "adoptions were arranged to acquire an heir, to perpetuate the family name, and to give continuity to a family line" while in India, male children could be adopted for religious reasons (Kadushin 1970, 1–2).

Watkins (2006, 260) says that "[t]he history of adoption practice in the United States has been punctuated by different kinds of efforts to minimize differences between children and parents". By matching, Berebitsky (2006, 36) says, "[s]ocial workers attempted to create adoptive families that not only mirrored biological ones, but reflected an idealized version of them". Smith *et al.* (2006, 150) remark that likeness between parents and child was considered a virtue even though "biological offspring [may often] look quite different from at least one parent depending on how the genes are expressed". Hinojosa, Sberna and Marsiglio (2006, 114) say that "men tend to prefer children who are physically similar to them in appearance…". This may be partly due to men's desire for biological children or it may be rooted in the desire for children who look similar enough so that no one questions whether a biological link exists (*ibid.*). This, too, might in part explain the need for matching; if the parents looked like they could be the child's birth parents, then no-one had any reason to ask questions. Adesman and Adamec (2004, 80), however, say that whether the children are born to parents or adopted by them, parents and children are commonly very different in temperament. Anne and both of the Cuthberts do seem to be kindred spirits after all, although initially, Anne is exuberant and full of life while the Cuthberts are tranquil and quiet. Harry and the Dursleys are as unlike as possible in looks and in personalities even though Harry and Petunia are related. Harry is modest, generous, and unselfish while the Dursleys all seem very selfish and

unsympathetic (except for Dudley in *Deathly Hallows*, 38–39). In appearance, both Anne and Harry are unlike their adoptive/foster parents; Anne has "hair as red as carrots" (*AGG*, 57) but Marilla's hair is "dark… [with] some gray streaks" in it (*AGG*, 10) while Matthew has "long iron-gray hair… and a full, soft brown beard" (*AGG*, 14). Likewise, "Harry looked nothing like the rest of the family" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 9) and even Harry's parents were "as unDursleyish as it was possible to be" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 7). It is possible that Vernon dislikes Harry so intensely because he is noticeably different from the rest of the family; and, on top of this, the two have no biological connection.

Berebitsky (2006, 39) notes that earlier, social workers were reluctant "to place children with couples who already had a biological child, worrying that parents would favor this child…". In *Harry*, this fear is not unfounded as the Dursleys do favour their own son. In addition, the Dursleys dislike Harry intensely. However, the feeling is mutual; in *Deathly Hallows* (35) Harry wonders, because of the awkward atmosphere upon final separation from his foster family, "[w]hat did you say to one another at the end of sixteen years' solid dislike?". The Dursleys would never even have liked to take Harry in in the first place and especially Vernon seems to be against keeping Harry. Petunia, however, knows it is necessary to ensure Harry's safety so she may feel (very deep down) some kind of a sense of duty or responsibility for her nephew. In *Order of the Phoenix* (737), Harry says Petunia "doesn't love me,… She doesn't give a damn…" but Dumbledore reminds him that she took him nonetheless: "She may have taken you grudgingly, furiously, unwillingly, bitterly, yet still she took you, and in doing so, she sealed the charm I placed upon you".

Skinner (1998, 11) notes that "[i]n folk-tales… relations between children and stepmothers are almost invariably fraught". This literary tendency seems to have a basis in reality as, according to a study by Daly and Wilson (quoted in Zipes 2006, 112–113), the genetic disposition of humans "explains why biological parents are more inclined to treat their children with more kindness and love than stepparents give their stepchildren". According to Daly and Wilson (quoted in Zipes 2006, 113), "parents often resent obligations to children who are not their own, and they generally will not

take time and spend energy in guaranteeing their survival, which may threaten their own genetic lineage" and thus nongenetic parents do not provide foster children "with the same care and love that they would provide their genetic children". Generally, step-parents do not "feel the same child-specific love and commitment as genetic parents, and therefore do not reap the same emotional rewards from unreciprocated 'parental' investment" (*ibid.*). According to Zipes (2006, 131), the fairy tale "'Cinderella' reveals and explores the propensity of stepparents or substitute parents to abuse, abandon, neglect, or kill their non-biological children". This tendency is related to a basic drive that humans have "to invest love, time, and energy in" biologically reproduced offspring to continue one's genetic inheritance (*ibid.*). The Cuthberts, however, love Anne and treat her as their own but of course neither one of them has any biological children. Yet the Weasleys, Harry's second foster family, are able to love him despite having biological children. The Weasleys, and especially Molly, seem to pity the orphan and take him into the family. Deavel and Deavel (2002, 60) note that the Weasleys "provide a sanctuary for Harry" whom they "effectively adopt" and treat with kindness from the beginning.

Wright (quoted in Zipes 2006, 135) notes that "in a high-MPI [male parental investment] species such as ours,… a female's ideal is to *monopolize* her dream mate—[and to] steer his social and material resources toward her offspring…". Accordingly, Petunia seems to detest Harry intensely; he, after all, competes with her own offspring for the same resources (parental love, attention, food) and therefore Dudley is now less well off because of the competitor. In addition, after Harry is left at the Dursleys' doorstep, Petunia has to take care of two one year-old infants. She may see Harry, the 'other', the foreign child, not only as competing with her own child for her and Vernon's attention (and resources) but views him also as a dangerous influence; Harry is her sister's, "the freak" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 44) witch's child and may rub off his freakiness on Dudley thus endangering his 'normality'. The Dursleys prefer to secure the well-being of their own child in lieu of their foster child by excluding him from their family; "everything" goes to Dudley while Harry is left with the leftovers—or very often nothing, especially as regards food and love.

Wegar (2006, 1) notes that "[a]doption challenges the dominant cultural belief that the best and strongest family relationships are necessarily based on blood". Thus "adoptive families at times grapple with community attitudes and cultural images that render adoption a 'second best' family form" (Wegar 2006, 6). Hinojosa *et al.* (2006, 111) say that earlier, parents were biologically related to their children in "the dominant cultural image of the family" but today, there is "evidence of a change toward more diverse family forms and a gradual attitudinal shift placing more value on the social aspects of family relationships and less on biological connections". Anne and Harry are both brought up mainly by people outside their own genetic lineage, though Harry only after 11 years of age. The significance of blood connection is nevertheless emphasized in *Harry* as it is the shared blood (of Petunia, Lily and Harry) that seals Dumbledore's magic.

Wegar (2006, 7) notes that attitudes towards adoption have begun to change. Yet despite the general positive attitude[1], Americans "also have serious concerns about adoption and in fact rarely choose to adopt" (*ibid.*). In addition, "the likelihood that adoption will be considered only a last option of forming a family" has increased because of advances in reproductive technologies—infertility is the most frequently cited reason for deciding to adopt (*ibid.*). Thus it seems that adoption is currently viewed with mixed feelings: on the one hand, people (in the States) avoid adoption until there is no hope of biological offspring and on the other hand, adoption is seen in a more positive light than before. In addition, 'celebrity adoptions' (by Madonna, Angelina Jolie and Brad Pitt, Meg Ryan, Michelle Pfeiffer, Tom Cruise and Nicole Kidman, among others) have made adoptions from Third World (and other) countries desirable or even 'fashionable'—or at least have put such adoptions in the headlines.

Expecting negative consequences is one feature connected with adoption; Wegar (2006, 3) mentions that "the dominant psychopathological explanatory model" usually "anticipat[es] harm rather than explor[es] benefits [of adoption]". According to Bowlby (1976, 129) "the ability to take some risks is essential for adoptive parenthood" but it is so also for natural parenthood. Marilla,

[1] According to the 2002 National Adoption Attitudes Survey, 63 percent of Americans hold 'a very favourable opinion about adoption'.

despite her "qualms", seems to understand this as she tells Mrs. Rachel "And as for the risk, there's risks in pretty near everything a body does in this world. There's risks in people's having children of their own if it comes to that—they don't always turn out well" (*AGG*, 13). Smith *et al.* (2006, 148) say that "[i]n North America, adoption has been constructed and understood within prevailing psychological models of human development that… support the idea that adoption places children at risk". Adoptees are generally believed to develop "more psychological problems than their non-adopted peers" and only recently it has been suggested that cultural beliefs could be behind the number of adoptive children referred to mental health facilities (*ibid.*). In fact, according to Adesman and Adamec, "many studies… show that adopted children have virtually no greater risk for emotional disorders than nonadopted children" (2004, 13) and "[m]ost adopted children are emotionally healthy individuals who grow up to be normal adults" (2004, 199). Anne certainly is 'normal' and Harry turns out much better than Dudley.

Upshur and Demick (2006, 91) say that being adopted surely makes the identity struggle of adopted persons more complex than that of persons who were not adopted. Wegar (2006, 3) explains, however, that contrary to the general assumptions, "a complex identity development is not necessarily harmful and might even be beneficial". According to Smith (2006, 251), psychological and scientific investigation refutes the idea that "not being reared by birth parents or putative 'loss' of birth parent attachment" leads to psychological problems. In addition, Adesman and Adamec (2004, 81) say that "[s]ome people seem to believe that many or most adopted children have severe problems with attachment or can't attach to anyone". However, according to several studies over a number of decades, "most adoptees… enjoy closely attached relationships with adoptive parents and families as well as high self-esteem, good adjustment, and successful development to adulthood" (Smith 2006, 251). This is true in *Anne* but not in *Harry*. Of course, it could be argued that there is a difference between adoption and fostering as the degree of commitment varies.

Smith *et al.* (2006, 154) note that having multiple mothers (birth and adoptive mothers; sometimes foster and orphanage mothers before adoption) "has been seen exclusively through the

lens of loss, given that our monocular view of child development is reliant on the child's relation with a single caretaker". However, Smith *et al.* (*ibid.*) observe that "[l]ooking cross-culturally and historically, this view needs to be supplemented by a vision of the child as being cared for by a nexus of adults, which can include birth and adoptive families, fathers and mothers, siblings and extended family, and institutions, including schools and religious communities as well as orphanages and foster families". Thus children can develop 'normally' even if they are raised by several parent figures—like both Anne and Harry, the fictional orphans, are.

According to Rothman (2006, 19), people become what they "are" as a result of the genes interacting with each other and with the environment. Yet the popular opinion views genes "as the real, ultimate causes, and environment as a variety of contributing or even complicating factors" (*ibid.*). Rothman (2006, 22) notes that while the term *adoption* "means taking a child and making that child one's own", people still tend to "distinguish between 'a child by adoption' and 'a child of one's own'"; thus "the otherness, the foreignness of the child and the parent, are continually reinforced in our language and in our thinking". Even transplanted embryos are 'adopted', "because the child that grows remains, in contemporary ideology, always 'other', always foreign" (Rothman 2006, 23). Rothman (*ibid.*) raises the question that if even the nurturance of pregnancy cannot make the baby one's "own", then how can other, later nurturance offered to an adopted child ever make that child one's own. This negation of nurturance shapes our understanding of adoption (*ibid.*). If we see genes as determinative, as *fate* ("inborn, inbred, predetermined"), then "[a]ll parents are helpless bystanders as the child's fate plays out" and all parents can do is offer nurture, supervision and protection but they will remain powerless: "[t]he child is what it is…" (Rothman 2006, 24). Zipes (2001, 182), for example, claims that left alone, Harry and his friends "would probably grow up and become dutiful and pleasant wizards and witches like the gentle and conscientious ones who teach in their school". In fact, according to Zipes, then, Harry and his friends would not actually need any parenting at all as they would turn out just fine left on their own. However, at least Harry seems to need some guidance as he has no real family of his own that would teach him and he often

seeks the advice of Dumbledore or Sirius. In *Harry*, Aunt Marge introduces the idea of genes as fate; as Deavel and Deavel (2002, 51) point out, she believes destiny determines how people act: "If there's something rotten on the *inside*, there's nothing anyone can do about it" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 24). Dumbledore, however, Deavel and Deavel (2002, 52) note, thinks that "...it matters not what someone is born, but what they grow to be!" (*Goblet of Fire*, 614–615). The view that parents are helpless bystanders appears also in *Anne*; as mentioned above, Mrs. Lynde is horrified when she learns that the Cuthberts are adopting and seems to think there is something wrong with all orphans.

Rothman (2006, 25) says that, earlier, adoption was discouraged because people believed "that children available for adoption were likely to have a history of mental illness or instability in their families and thus in their genes". In addition, in American thinking, intelligence and mental illness, and perhaps personality characteristics as well, are still viewed "as both genetic and class stratified" (*ibid*.). Rothman (2006, 27) concludes that "[o]n the one hand, we are our genes[; a]doptive parents take on someone else's blueprint and stand by, offering what help and support they can as the genes play out[—o]n the other hand, we are unique, individual, each our very own unpredictable self-made beings".

Overall, it seems that both environment and genes have a role in how people "turn out" so it does matter how (adoptive or foster) parents bring up their children. Yet, in the novels, no one seems to really 'change' either one of the orphans; they are guided by parent figures, yes, but not essentially changed. Anne becomes more tranquil and graceful, yet, as Nodelman (1992, 30) observes, "she manages somehow to age without becoming terribly different" even though in the novel "the grown-ups become more like children [and] the children become more like grown-ups". As for Harry, he has moral character (like his mother) from the beginning. Even though genes play a role (Harry looks very much like his father and, like him, is talented at Quidditch), he still realizes himself that he is not his father—and after seeing in the Pensieve what James did to Snape at the age of fifteen (*Order of the Phoenix*, 569–572), he does not want to be like his father anymore

(*Order of the Phoenix*, 576);

> For nearly five years the thought of his father had been a source of comfort, of inspiration. Whenever someone had told him he was like James, he had glowed with pride inside. And now … now he felt cold and miserable at the thought of him.

Harry is thus disillusioned; the father he idolized was only human after all. At some point, each child is usually disappointed to find out that their parents are not superhuman; Rowling therefore aids the child or adolescent reader to cope with this upsetting realization. In *Chamber of Secrets* (147), Harry is even convinced that he is the "Heir of Slytherin" because he has no knowledge of his family tree. Dumbledore, especially, guides Harry who learns important lessons from all his parent figures but essentially, even at seventeen, he remains the same modest, unselfish boy we first meet in *Philosopher's Stone*. Anne, too, remains essentially the same positive, modest and kind girl (although more subdued) we meet at Bright River Station in *AGG*.

3 Attachment Theory and Maternal Deprivation – *Anne* and *Harry* Psychologically

McMaster (2007, 408) observes that "[i]n real life, [Anne's] orphan's experience of alternating exploitation and rejection would be apt to produce a child crushed, withdrawn, resentful". However, "it is part of Anne's generous spirit that she doesn't blame people for her painful lot in life" (*ibid.*). Similarly, it is likely that a real child in Harry's place would develop serious psychological problems. Like Anne, however, he does not blame anyone for his destiny.

3.1 Theoretical Frame

In this thesis, parenting is examined via attachment theory and parenting models presented in adoption literature. Psychological tools are used (even though the novels are not psychological descriptions of human beings) because the characters may be seen to act in ways possible in real life—real persons in similar situations could act (psychologically) like the characters in the novels. As both novels are *Bildungsromane*, the narrative follows the protagonists' maturation process and their search for identity and, as orphan novels, their search for a home and family.

The classic psychoanalytic attachment theory was developed by Dr. John Bowlby (1907–1990) and it is "widely regarded as probably the best supported theory of socio-emotional development yet available" (Bowlby 2005, 31). Jeremy Holmes notes in his preface to *A Secure Base – Clinical Applications of Attachment Theory* (Bowlby 2005, xiv) that "[t]he past 25 years has seen an explosion of interest in attachment theory". Smith *et al.* (2006, 153) explain attachment simply as "the unfolding of a relational connection of trust and reliance over time".

According to Bowlby (2005, 5–6), "[p]arenting behaviour in humans is certainly not the product of some unvarying parenting instinct, but nor is it reasonable to regard it as the product simply of learning". Parkes, Stevenson-Hinde and Marris (1991, 1) say that human infants attach to their mothers (or other primary caregivers) in order to ensure survival. According to Parkes *et al.* (*ibid.*), attachment theory (and the research that produced it) implies that this first relationship lays the foundation for the expectations and assumptions that will influence all subsequent relationships.

Bowlby (2005, 10) notes that "[h]uman infants,… like infants of other species, are preprogrammed to develop in a socially co-operative way" but whether they do so or not depends greatly on how they are treated. A central feature of Bowlby's concept of parenting is that both parents provide the child or adolescent with a secure base from which to "make sorties into the outside world and to which he can return knowing for sure that he will be welcomed when he gets there, nourished physically and emotionally, comforted if distressed, reassured if frightened" (Bowlby 2005, 12). The role of the parent is to be "available, ready to respond when called upon to encourage and perhaps assist, but to intervene actively only when clearly necessary" (*ibid.*). The Cuthberts (in a cooperative effort) seem to manage well in offering Anne a secure base; Marilla nourishes Anne physically and Matthew emotionally. Dumbledore offers Harry a secure base at Hogwarts where he is nourished both physically and emotionally (as he is at the Weasleys, too).

3.2 Attachment Theory

Despite Bowlby's view that both mothers and fathers play a role in providing a secure base, attachment theory has been "somewhat maternocentric" (Bowlby 2005, xiv–xv). Recent work on the role of fathers in creating secure attachments[1] has shown that "paternal contributions are… vital to secure, stable, exploratory, balanced, verbally fluent attachment dispositions in adulthood" (Bowlby 2005, xv). Good-enough fathering seems to help "children to develop clarity of thought and to be able to face up to negative emotions without feeling overwhelmed" (Bowlby 2005, xv–xvi). In most families, the father's role differs from the mother's—"[h]e is more likely to engage in physically active and novel play than the mother and, especially for boys, to become his child's preferred play companion" (Bowlby 2005, 12). Fathers, too, need to be sensitive, but this usually "takes the form of praise, encouragement, and the capacity to sustain positive affect in their offspring" (Bowlby 2005, xvi). A "protective, challenging, 'you can do it' father" helps his child "to cope with curiosity-wariness conflicts" (*ibid.*). Matthew seems like an ideal father because he is not only encouraging but also sensitive. Yet even Vernon may be a "good enough" father to Harry.

[1] Grossman, Grossman & Zimmerman 1999; Grossman, Grossman & Zindler 2005.

Some children appear "to come through very unfavourable experiences relatively unharmed" (Bowlby 2005, 26). According to Bowlby (2005, xvi), the reflexive function appears to be a protective factor and thus "despite adverse childhood experience such as parental separation, bereavement or even neglect and abuse, [it] enables individuals to remain secure themselves…". The ability to talk about childhood trauma therefore "mitigates the long-term negative consequences" (*ibid.*). The term 'reflexive function' (developed by Mary Main) is used by Fonagy and Target (quoted in Holmes 2001, 45) "to capture the ability to think clearly and coherently about one's biography". Holmes (2001, 45) notes that "[t]he aim of therapy is not primarily to achieve specific 'insights' into oneself or one's past,… but rather to develop the capacity or function for self-awareness: to identify feelings, thoughts and impulses, to put them into words". 'Reflexive function', Bowlby (*ibid.*) says, "tap[s] into internal speech, or mental representation of experience that underlies this capacity for external interactive story-telling".

On the other hand, Kadushin (1970, 156) notes that, for children with adverse pasts, "the suppressive-repressive modes of coping were sufficient to enable the child to establish a satisfying relationship with the adoptive parents". Thus it seems that suppression (or 'forgetting') of negative experiences may allow formation of an attachment (that might not otherwise take place) and enables the child to begin a new life with his or her adoptive (or foster) family. This is what Anne does as she does not like to talk about her past but prefers to forget about it. Anne and Harry both have come through "adverse childhood experiences" relatively unharmed. Anne is a story-teller and has a vivid imagination which may be seen to have helped her to survive childhood trauma. In addition, as Gammel notes, Montgomery "had a way of simply ignoring what she did not like" (2008, 204)—much like her heroine does. Apparently Montgomery does not wish to "write about the darker side" in *AGG*, although she could if she chose to, as Waterston (1993, 36) notes. Before Anne came to P.E.I., she had encountered "[d]runkenness, meanness, unimaginative life, and undignified death", but she, like the author, "chooses to turn away from these sad and sordid realities by drawing an imaginative veil". Thus Montgomery is not ignorant of "the darker side" of life, it is just "not the

kind of story [she] want[s] to tell". (*ibid.*)

One "aspect of sensitive responding is allowing the young person to talk about the past" (Macaskill; Farmer & Pollock quoted in Farmer *et al.* 2004, 161) and Marilla responds 'sensitively' to Anne by encouraging her to talk about her past. Harry, in contrast, is not allowed to talk about his past or to ask questions about his parents while at the Dursleys. Zipes (2001, 181) calls all three of the Dursleys "sadists" and notes that "Harry is psychologically starved for love and affection—although he always appears chipper and perseveres". It does seem rather odd that Harry endures so well at the Dursleys—as does Anne, for that matter, at the Thomases and at the Hammonds. While Anne escapes from dreary reality (before Green Gables) to an imagined world with her storytelling, Harry escapes to Hogwarts from his relatives who refuse to acknowledge magic. Even though the Dursleys do not allow Harry to talk about his parents and his past, Harry develops no psychological problems. Neither is he made to forget his very negative experiences at the Dursleys. Thus while Anne chooses to 'forget', Harry may use the reflexive function to deal with his traumatic childhood experiences. Even though Anne, too, may use the reflexive function mentioned by Holmes (2001, 45) to identify her "feelings, thoughts and impulses, to put them into words", she does not really like to talk about her past.

Adesman and Adamec (2004, 71–72) note that while "children adopted as infants or young children form strong attachments to their new parents more easily than children adopted at older ages…, some older children find it hard to attach and others don't". Anne, for example, seems to form an attachment to Matthew instantly. In fact, both Anne and Harry seem to attach to new parent figures easily at the age of about eleven. The readiness with which older children attach to others depends on how resilient they are (Adesman & Adamec 2004, 72). Resiliency means here the "ability to function well despite past hardships" and a previous positive attachment to anyone ("a parent, relative, neighbour, or friend") enables some children to endure a difficult life (*ibid.*). In Harris and Bifulco's (1991, 259) study of depression related to loss of parent(s) in childhood, the group analysed as 'detached' emerged as the most resilient group. Harris and Bifulco (*ibid.*) found

that “mere exhibition of ‘independence’ may not be the quality of attachment style which increases risk of depression”. This special resilience may be related “to a theory from a different tradition, namely that certain hardships in childhood can ‘steel’ a psyche to cope better with later adversity provided they are not accompanied by other more damaging childhood experiences” (*ibid.*). Thus “lack of care, rather than loss of mother as such, underlay the association of early loss and depression…” (Harris & Bifulco 1991, 239). In addition, Adesman and Adamec (2004, 75) say that “the older the child is, the more time he needs to attach to a new parent”. Conversely, the younger the child, the more easily the attachment is formed (Adesman & Adamec 2004, 77) and yet this is not the case with Harry and the Dursleys.

“Attachment behaviour is any form of behaviour that results in a person attaining or maintaining proximity to some other clearly identified individual who is conceived as better able to cope with the world” (Bowlby 2005, 29). In childhood, the attachment figure is perceived as wiser and stronger but in adolescence, attachment is relinquished by attempting to combat the “continued tendency to see the parents as wiser and stronger” (Weiss 1991, 68). According to Weiss (1991, 71), children begin to relinquish their parents as attachment figures in early adolescence or possibly before; “young people experience intervals in which their parents are not seen as attachment figures and the young people therefore feel themselves emotionally isolated”. The process may be initiated by “sexual and social maturation”, by “increased capacity to recognize the limitations of the parents or displays by the parents of frailty”, by “the young person’s increasing self-confidence or increasing desire for independence”, or by “distancing and rejection initiated by the parent” (*ibid.*).

Smith *et al.* (2006, 153) note that in mother-infant bonding research, “adoptive mothers are told they cannot be ‘real’ mothers” because “‘[r]eal’ relationships that will ‘last’ are based on biological ‘blood’ ties and the bonding… can only occur immediately after birth”. Ainsworth (1991, 40) notes that a mother is said to have a *bond* to her child; it is not called “an attachment because a mother does not normally base her security on her relationship with her child…”. Adesman and Adamec (2004, 73), however, note that it is possible to be a good parent even without bonding—

what matters "is the sense of commitment to th[e] child, no matter what". It seems that Petunia has some kind of a sense of commitment (if not a bond) to Harry although she almost forgets it in *Order of the Phoenix*. In addition, it seems that bonding *can* take place later than immediately after birth; both Marilla and Matthew appear to bond with Anne—and Hagrid, Dumbledore, Sirius, and Molly, for example, with Harry.

According to Bowlby (2005, 139), "the pattern of attachment that an individual develops during the years of immaturity—infancy, childhood, and adolescence—is profoundly influenced by the way his parents (or other parent figures) treat him". The types of attachment are 'secure', 'anxious resistant', and 'anxious avoidant' (Bowlby 2005, 140) and each pattern, once developed, is likely to persist (Bowlby 2005, 142). Securely attached children "treat their parents in a relaxed and friendly way" while anxious resistant children "show a mixture of insecurity, including sadness and fear" and anxious avoidant children "tend quietly to keep the parent at a distance" (Bowlby 2005, 144). Anne and Harry seem both to be securely attached to their new families (and also to other parent figures); Anne treats the Cuthberts in a relaxed and friendly way—like Harry treats the Weasleys. Towards the Dursleys, however, Harry seems to be 'anxious avoidant' (if he is attached to them at all) as he tends to stay away from them as much as possible. In fact, "Uncle Vernon and Aunt Petunia usually encouraged Harry to stay out of their way, which Harry was only too happy to do" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 24).

Bowlby (2005, 1) notes that successful parenting results in "healthy, happy, and self-reliant" children while failure in parenting causes "anxiety, frustration, friction, and perhaps shame or guilt". According to Bowlby (2005, 2), studies have shown "that healthy, happy, and self-reliant adolescents and young adults are the products of stable homes in which both parents give a great deal of time and attention to the children". This is the opposite of how Harry's home life at the Dursleys is depicted. Smith (2006, 247) notes that *home* means "the security of an ongoing physical base tied to a primary emotional allegiance to parents, siblings, family, community, and even culture". To Anne, Green Gables is just such a home and to Harry, "[t]he [Hogwarts] castle felt

more like home than Privet Drive had ever done" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 126). Outside of Hogwarts, Harry's favourite place is the Burrow; "[t]he Weasleys were Harry's favourite family in the world…" (*Goblet of Fire*, 25). Still, "Hogwarts was the first and best home he had known. He and Voldemort and Snape, the abandoned boys, had all found home here …" (*Deathly Hallows*, 558).

During adolescence, "a secure home base remains indispensable… for optimal functioning and mental health" (Bowlby 2005, 137). Anne's secure base is clearly Green Gables. On returning home, after her visit to Miss Josephine Barry in Charlottetown, "Anne and Diana found the drive home as pleasant as the drive in—pleasanter, indeed, since there was the delightful consciousness of home waiting at the end of it" (*AGG*, 190). To Anne, "the kitchen light of Green Gables winked… a friendly welcome back" and she tells Marilla "…oh, it's so good to be back, … I could kiss everything, even to the clock" (*AGG*, 191). Harry, in contrast, never likes to return to the Dursleys from Hogwarts that seems to be his "secure base" to which he gladly returns every autumn. Harry's headmaster and most of his teachers are empathetic and provide him with the care and affection he never receives from the Dursleys.

A person who "is attached, or has an attachment to, someone means that he is strongly disposed to seek proximity to and contact with that individual and to do so especially in certain specified conditions" (Bowlby 2005, 31). The tendency to behave in this way is a persisting attribute of the attached person. Attachment behaviour, however, "refers to any of the various forms of behaviour that the person engages in from time to time to obtain and/or maintain a desired proximity." (*ibid.*) Attachment behaviour may be shown to a variety of individuals in different circumstances, but an enduring attachment, or attachment bond, is limited to very few (Bowlby 2005, 32).

According to Bowlby (2005, 30), the biological function of attachment behaviour is protection; "for a person to know that an attachment figure is available and responsive gives him a strong and pervasive feeling of security, and so encourages him to value and continue the relationship". Thus "[w]hilst attachment is at its most obvious in early childhood, it can be observed

throughout the life cycle, especially in emergencies" (*ibid.*). Attachment behaviour is triggered by not only "pain, fatigue, or anything frightening" but "also by the caregiver being or appearing to be, inaccessible" (Bowlby 2005, 91), or in the case of adolescents and adults, "whenever they are anxious or under stress" (Bowlby 2005, 4). Dumbledore is inaccessible (and distant) to Harry in *Order of the Phoenix*, which causes Harry to feel anxious and angry; he thus exhibits attachment behaviour. Harry feels bad "on the eve of his hearing" when he finds out that Dumbledore had "not asked to see him" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 111). Harry feels annoyed and hurt but he does not want to "sound highly ungrateful, not to mention childish", so he mentions nothing about this to the Weasleys or Hermione (*Order of the Phoenix*, 143). While Dumbledore saves Harry from being expelled, he does not look at Harry or talk to him at the hearing; "Harry glanced sideways at Dumbledore, seeking reassurance … Again, however, Dumbledore seemed oblivious to Harry's attempt to catch his eye" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 137), or even later on at Hogwarts (*Order of the Phoenix*, 413–414). As Harry feels what Voldemort feels, all the anger that he so suddenly feels is not really his own (*Order of the Phoenix*, 419; 438). Harry also feels rejected and disappointed—"ill-us[ed]"—when Dumbledore does not make him a prefect (*Order of the Phoenix*, 151–152). In addition to Dumbledore and the Weasleys, Harry seems to be attached to several other parent figures, including Hagrid, Sirius, McGonagall, and Lupin. In *Order of the Phoenix* (177), Harry had been relying on seeing Hagrid at the station—"seeing Hagrid again was one of the things he'd been looking forward to most … *He can't have left*, Harry told himself".

Anne seems to be attached to Matthew but also to Marilla, Mrs. Lynde, Miss Stacy, and Mrs. Allan. Anne, however, is not portrayed as showing any signs of attachment behaviour (except mourning after Matthew's death). She is, nonetheless, "in the depths of despair" when she believes she cannot stay at Green Gables (*AGG*, 28). Anne already seems to be attached to Matthew and Green Gables and she feels hurt by yet another rejection; Anne has been rejected before by Mrs. Thomas, Mrs. Hammond, and the asylum. Anne, after telling her history to Marilla, "sigh[s], of relief… Evidently she did not like talking about her experiences in a world that had not wanted her"

(*AGG*, 39).

Despite the Dursleys' treatment of Harry (or because of it), he seems to turn out well, unlike Dudley. Harry is self-reliant but also sympathetic and helpful to others in distress. The only thing we learn of Harry's life right after being brought to the Dursleys is that "he would spend the next few weeks being prodded and pinched by his cousin Dudley" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 18). Then nearly ten years are skipped, and the Dursleys' living-room "[is still] almost exactly the same as it had been", only the pictures of baby Dudley have changed to pictures of an older Dudley; "[t]he room held no sign at all that another boy lived in the house, too" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 19). Thus Harry is invisible. In addition, Dudley has two rooms in his use while Harry sleeps in "the cupboard under the stairs" that is full of spiders (*Philosopher's Stone*, 20) until he is given Dudley's smaller room. Harry is "Dudley's favourite punch-bag" but Dudley, who hates exercise, "couldn't often catch him" because Harry was very fast (*ibid.*). Vernon and Petunia do not seem to either mind or notice Dudley punching Harry as they do not interfere in any way. During his Occlumency lessons, Harry "…relive[s] a stream of very early memories … most of them concerning humiliations Dudley and his gang had inflicted upon him in primary school" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 520). Adesman and Adamec (2004, 205) note that children sometimes torment other children but "[b]eing bullied is not a normal part of childhood that should be tolerated". Thus the Dursleys should have interfered with Dudley's predilection for bullying others.

De Rosa (2003, 171) mentions Hagrid and Dumbledore as examples of the several father-figures Harry finds at Hogwarts "who nurture his psychological well-being": they "repeatedly praise Harry, protect him from difficult information that they believe he is not ready to process, and help him remember his parents through stories, pictures, and magical encounters". In *Half-Blood Prince* (462), Dumbledore praises Harry for obtaining Slughorn's memory; "Harry, this is spectacular news! Very well done indeed!! I knew you could do it!". Harry evidently values Dumbledore and Hagrid, De Rosa (2003, 171) notes, but "he finds the greatest emotional comfort when reunited with his godfather, Sirius Black". Sirius feels responsible for Harry (bound by his

duty as godfather but possibly also by his love for James) and seems glad to be able to fulfil his duty. Thus for Harry, Sirius is "[t]he true father or father-figure" (Alton 2003, 158). Harry seems securely attached to Sirius as he misses his godfather's company when they are apart and Harry also likes to keep in touch with Sirius—and would often like to hear his advice so he clearly values Sirius's opinions. After the Tournament, in the hospital wing, Harry "want[s] Sirius to stay. He did not want to say goodbye again so quickly" (*Goblet of Fire*, 619).

Mr and Mrs Weasley, too, view Harry "as good as" their own son (*Order of the Phoenix*, 85). It is at the Weasleys that Harry witnesses 'normal' family life and is surrounded in an atmosphere of security, love, and affection, and he receives comfort, help and encouragement from both Molly and Arthur. The Burrow is Harry's secure base outside of Hogwarts. De Rosa (2003, 178) notes that Harry's interaction with the Weasleys, while allowing him to return to childhood innocence, also tests him. "Harry's ability to respond empathetically and generously to [the Weasleys'] financial plight suggests a positive step toward crossing the threshold into mature adulthood"; he is able to show compassion despite "the immature and greedy behaviour he witnesses at the Dursleys" (De Rosa 2003, 178–179). The Dursleys have shown Harry by their own example how *not* to behave; he acts in an opposite way. Harry, for example, sympathizes with Ron (who does not have any money) as "he'd never had any money in his life [himself] until a month ago, and he told Ron so, all about having to wear Dudley's old clothes and never getting proper birthday presents" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 75). Harry also tells Ron, who fails to turn his rat yellow (and is annoyed), that he "think[s] the ends of Scabbers's whiskers are a bit lighter" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 80). In addition, at Hogwarts, De Rosa (2003, 180) claims, Harry must "realiz[e] that acting blindly or foolhardily can endanger [Gryffindor house], a philosophy not given any consideration [at] the self-centered universe at 4 Privet Drive". According to De Rosa (*ibid.*), "Rowling argues that full maturation means learning to see oneself in relation to others". It seems, however, that Harry has learned to take others into consideration already at home by observing the behaviour of his foster family; as proved by his ability to take Ron's feelings into consideration.

3.3 Maternal Deprivation

According to Bowlby (1976, 13), "an infant and young child should experience a warm, intimate, and continuous relationship with his mother"—or permanent mother-substitute, someone who steadily 'mothers' him. Both should find satisfaction and enjoyment in this relationship which is "varied in countless ways by relations with the father and with the brothers and sisters" and which is "now believe[d] to underlie the development of character and of mental health" (*ibid.*). The lack of this relationship is termed *maternal deprivation* and it may refer to mild or considerable ('partial' or almost 'complete') deprivation (Bowlby 1976, 14). The ill-effects of deprivation are "anxiety, excessive need for love, powerful feelings of revenge, and, arising from these last, guilt and depression" (*ibid.*). In addition, anxieties due to "unsatisfactory relationships in early childhood predispose children to respond in an anti-social way to later stresses" (Bowlby 1976, 15). Bowlby (1976, 21) says that studies show that when a child is deprived of maternal care, its "development is almost always retarded – physically, intellectually, and socially – and that symptoms of physical and mental illness may appear". The risk of this kind of an injury is shared by all children under the age of approximately seven (Bowlby 1976, 22). Neither Harry nor Anne is intellectually retarded even though both are physically underdeveloped—they are described as small and skinny. "There isn't a pick on [Anne's] bones" (*AGG*, 17) while Harry "had always been small and skinny for his age" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 20). Thus the protagonists seem particularly vulnerable and pitiable and arouse the reader's sympathy.

Ainsworth (1976, 202) notes that "there can be insufficiency of mother-child interaction without separation and without institutional placement": thus "[d]eprivation *can* begin at home". In infants and young children, deprivation or separation may cause "impairment of the capacity to form and maintain deep and lasting affectional ties" (Ainsworth 1976, 215). While neither Anne nor Harry has had friends before, they do not seem anti-social but instead rather social. Harry appears to like people (who treat him nicely) and he makes friends quickly at Hogwarts. Anne, too, likes Matthew (who in return simply adores her), Marilla (even though she is rather curt and strict with

Anne), and eventually the judgmental Mrs. Lynde, too. Anne is quick to 'fall in love' with Diana, Mrs. Allan, and Miss Stacy—and in *AA*, with Miss Lavendar (*AA*, 187–188). According to Bowlby (2005, 136), "the capacity to make intimate emotional bonds with other individuals … is regarded as a principal feature of effective personality functioning and mental health". So it seems neither Harry nor Anne has developed any personality disorders or other mental health problems because they are able to form and maintain deep emotional bonds.

3.4 Childhood Bereavement and Mourning

As a special class of separation, Ainsworth (1976, 216–217) mentions childhood bereavement; "[l]oss of one or other parent by death during early childhood is found to have occurred significantly more frequently in the case of mental hospital patients than in the general population". Ainsworth (1976, 217) continues that "loss of mother by death before the age of five is found as an antecedent in a number of different psychiatric disorders" but it appears most frequently in the case of depression. According to Ainsworth (1976, 218), Trasler believes that for a child under three years of age, "the disturbance attributable to separation can be transitory if the child is provided immediately with an opportunity for interaction with an individual mother-figure; but it tends to be more severe and lasting if instead he experiences the insufficient interaction characteristic of institutional care". From this viewpoint, both Anne and Harry are fortunate to be placed with individual mother-figures (in families) instead of being sent to orphanages.

According to De Rosa (2003, 175), Harry is "[g]uided by several sympathetic mentors who facilitate various magical 'reunions,' [and he] undergoes a difficult grieving process that 'reconnects' him with his parents". De Rosa (2003, 175–176) observes that Harry's "behaviour suggests that he very much desires parental love and approval, not the separation that typically occurs at this stage of adolescent development". Adolescents normally differentiate themselves from their parents during "the natural process of identity formation", but Harry "undergoes a process of identity formation fraught with conflict because his search for the truth about his parents

brings him closer to them, which in turn complicates his ability to create an identity separate from them" (De Rosa 2003, 175). According to De Rosa (2003, 176), the scene that most powerfully demonstrates Harry's yearning to reconnect with his parents takes place when Harry finds the Mirror of Erised and sees his family in the mirror. When Harry almost loses himself in his unresolved grief (De Rosa 2003, 176), Dumbledore tells him that "…this mirror will give us neither knowledge or [sic] truth. Men have wasted away before it,… It does not do to dwell on dreams and forget to live, remember that" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 157). De Rosa (2003, 176) calls Dumbledore Harry's mentor and notes that he "knowingly challenges Harry to realize that he cannot (ironically) live in a fantasy world and that returning to a childlike state of parental dependence threatens his development". Rather similarly, Marilla encourages Anne to forget about the imaginary worlds of Cordelia and other heroines (*AGG*, 27) and tells Anne to concentrate on her current task so that she may grow up to be a responsible person and not so feather-brained.

According to Bowlby (2005, 36), "several component responses widely regarded as pathological were found to be common in healthy mourning". These responses "include anger, directed at third parties, the self, and sometimes at the person lost, disbelief that the loss has occurred (misleadingly termed denial), and a tendency, often though not always unconscious, to search for the lost person in the hope of reunion". "The belief that children are unable to mourn can… be seen to derive from generalizations… made from the analyses of children whose mourning had followed an atypical course" often because either the child had never been given sufficient information about what had happened or else there had been nobody to sympathize with the child "and help him gradually come to terms with his loss, his yearning for his lost parent, his anger, and his sorrow". (*ibid.*) In *Anne*, mourning is not directly addressed. When her parents died, Anne was so young that she can have no recollections of her parents whatsoever and consequently does not seem to mourn them (at least, not anymore). However, Anne is told the truth about her parents' deaths by Mrs. Thomas while Harry goes through the process of mourning after finding out the truth about his parents' deaths bit by bit during his school years. According to De Rosa (2003, 176),

Rowling "knowingly depicts how mourning can lead to maturation and individuation". "Harry slowly achieves a deeper bond with his parents" through the "process of knowing and accepting": his grief reawakens "with each new piece of information about his parents" (De Rosa 2003, 177). According to De Rosa (*ibid.*), Dumbledore "defends Harry's acquisition of difficult information when he states": "Understanding is the first step to acceptance, and only with acceptance can there be recovery" (*Goblet of Fire*, 590).

Taub and Servaty (2003, 65) note that "Harry... grieves the deaths of his parents even though they died before he knew them" and he thus "has little if any actual memories of [them]". While "Harry cannot grieve actual, physical relationships with his parents, he can and does grieve the relationships he was never able to establish with them" (*ibid.*). However, Harry *is* able to maintain a continuing relationship with his dead parents: he "makes frequent references to his parents and actually interacts with them" (*ibid.*). Silverman, Nickman, and Worden (quoted in Taub & Servaty 2003, 66) "found that children with a continuing, though altered, relationship with their deceased parent appeared better able to cope with the death loss as well as other accompanying life changes". Harry has such a relationship, but only in adolescence—as a child he had no knowledge of his parents. Nonetheless, these new relationships seem to have a healing influence; as old wounds are reopened with each new piece of information when Harry learns the truth about his parents, he is able to work through his grief and accept the truth.

It appears that neither Anne nor Harry has suffered from 'maternal deprivation', at least not 'complete', after being separated from their parents, or maybe their foster mothers (new, permanent mother-figures) have given them sufficient opportunity for interaction—unless Anne and Harry are both unaffected by deprivation and separation (from their birth parents). Neither Montgomery nor Rowling seems to wish to represent the effects of maternal deprivation or of separation in their work, possibly because it might be too disturbing for the readers.

4 Families and Parenting

Bowlby (1976, 84) notes that "because a young child is not an organism capable of independent life[,]… he requires a special social institution [family] to aid him… in the satisfaction of immediate animal needs such as nutrition, warmth, and shelter, and protection from danger… [and to] provid[e] surroundings in which he may develop his physical, mental, and social capacities to the full… [in] an atmosphere of affection and security". Adesman and Adamec (2004, 5) note that in some ways adopted children do not differ from all other children; "[t]hey need love tempered with discipline" and "interested parents who listen but who don't let them run the entire show" and "[t]hey need to feel safe". The Cuthberts seem to manage these requirements but the Dursleys only discipline Harry and let Dudley 'run the show'.

4.1 The Family

'The family' is defined by traditional sociology "as the key institution responsible for rearing children to become mature adults able to undertake paid work in the formal economy" (Bernardes 1997, 4). According to Bernardes (1997, 113), "[t]he issue of 'good' or 'good enough' parenting is fraught with dilemmas" as "different age groups, historical periods, religions and cultures all have clearly different prescriptions about what a child should and should not be 'allowed to do'". Bowlby (2005, 14) says that parents use different techniques to influence their child's behaviour in one or another direction. These techniques include restrictive and disciplinary as well as encouraging techniques and the repertoire used varies greatly from parent to parent; from mainly helpful and encouraging to mainly restrictive and punitive (*ibid.*). Matthew and the Weasleys seem to be generally 'helpful and encouraging' while Marilla and the Dursleys are usually 'restrictive and punitive' (especially the Dursleys).

Smith *et al*. (2006, 153) note that before industrialisation, children had several caretakers "includ[ing] older siblings, apprentices living in the family, the extended family, and parents". In white colonial America, the way a child's character developed was considered to depend on the

father's, not the mother's, influence (Demos quoted in Smith *et al*. 2006, 153). When fathers started to work outside the home, apprentices left, too; thus families became more nuclear and the responsibility of child care was transferred to the mother (Smith *et al*. 2006, 153). At that point, "a little over a hundred years ago,… the relationship with the mother began to be thought of as significant, and then crucial, for the child's psychological development…" (*ibid.*).

Manlove (2003, 12–13) points out that "[i]n the eighteenth and early nineteenth century 'the child' was seen from a developmental point of view, as a creature of wayward tendencies to be carefully educated towards adulthood; and equally the free imagination was often frowned on as irresponsible and even socially dangerous". "[T]he pervasive Calvinist notion that children are fallen creatures of sin who have to be brought by teaching to salvation finally gave way…" in the 1860s to the idea of the pure child (Manlove 2003, 13). Both views, the sinful and the beautiful child, appear in *AGG*.

Alston (2008, 5) observes that, even if fictional families in children's literature have changed over the last 200 years, "the all-important, two heterosexual parent ideal" continues to be cherished. "While great changes have occurred in the constitution of family, ideals and dreams seem to have remained fairly consistent for the [past] 200 years... and probably for some time prior to that; we are, and perhaps always have been, almost obsessed with the family that, ideally, *should* exist" (Alston 2008, 12). According to Alston (2008, 21), even though the changes in the twentieth century are vast materially, there remains a cultural "tendency to yearn for a lost golden age of nuclear family values, to promote the family that eats and plays together with a father, a mother and their children". This powerful image of family is a cultural construct while the family itself "remains a slippery construct" (*ibid.*). Despite the "constant harking back to an ideal of the nuclear family", Alston (2008, 25) says, "there is in reality an increasing acceptance of alternative families". In *Harry*, both the Dursleys and the Weasleys represent the ideal nuclear family type while in *AGG*, Montgomery has chosen to represent a different kind of family.

Alston (2008, 11) observes that the (current) "lack of parental control may indicate a shift in

the position of the child in the family". The importance of children in families increased during the twentieth century (Alston 2008, 21) and attitudes towards the child changed: "instead of being seen as a working individual the child was increasingly seen as vulnerable…" (Alston 2008, 11). Hardyment (quoted in Alston 2008, 11) says that in the twenty-first-century, the child, rather than contributes to the family income, instead consumes products. Perhaps, if parental authority is really lacking in contemporary society, then it is in children's literature that family ideology can be best imposed on children, "to indoctrinate them with role models and to promulgate the family values which allow society to function in a specific way…" (Alston 2008, 11).

According to Alston (2008, 10), the family is "a central locus of power and we judge by family values and continue our family rituals as if being constantly observed, comparing our families to others, both real and imagined". Community opinion has a central role in both *Anne* and *Harry*. According to Kornfeld and Prothro, "the parents' prime directive [in *Harry*] seems to be to fit in and make no waves in their respective societies" (2003, 190). The Dursleys want no one to find out about Harry's wizarding background and "were proud to say that they were perfectly normal, thank you very much" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 7). In addition, Aunt Marge observes the Dursley family and enforces certain ideas, for example the need for physical punishment (hard methods) and the determinativeness of genetics. The Weasleys (or Molly mainly) do not want their own family to be caught for "Misuse of Muggle Artefacts" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 63). After the boys fly the Ford Anglia to school, Molly sends Ron a Howler telling him "I THOUGHT YOUR FATHER WOULD DIE OF SHAME, WE DIDN'T BRING YOU UP TO BEHAVE LIKE THIS, … YOUR FATHER'S FACING AN INQUIRY AT WORK…" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 69). The same desire to "make no waves" appears in *AGG*; Marilla tells Anne "you made a fine exhibition of yourself" and in front of, of all the people, Mrs. Lynde who "will [now] have a nice story to tell about [Anne] everywhere" (*AGG*, 60). Marilla, like even the brook that runs past Mrs. Rachel Lynde's house, wants to exhibit "decency and decorum" in front of Mrs. Rachel and the rest of the community (*AGG*, 7). Matthew, in contrast, does not seem to share his sister's concern about the

public (or Mrs. Rachel's) opinion concerning either themselves or Anne. Marilla, however, feels the need to conform to the society and its codes of conduct rather strongly. When Anne goes to Sunday school "with [her] hat rigged out ridiculous with roses and buttercups" (*AGG*, 72), Marilla is annoyed because people "would think [she] had no better sense than to let [Anne] go decked out like that" (*AGG*, 73).

Alston (2008, 14) says that children became more important to society in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Romantic writers (such as Rousseau and Wordsworth) illustrate "the increasing emphasis on the innocence of the child", and this coincides with "the emergence of the modern concept of family" (*ibid.*). While domesticity was not for all, as Alston (2008, 20), observes, the ideal (nuclear family) was nevertheless promoted—and "the nineteenth century… shaped our current beliefs of what families should be and how they should operate"—through Alcott's *Little Women* and Mrs Beeton's advice books, as well as by the example of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert. By the end of the nineteenth century, the nuclear family had become "the only satisfactory model of household management" (*ibid.*). Alston (2008, 26) says that even in the more modern children's fiction "the traditional family is depicted as desirable as it provides a foundational ideology to even the most unconventional of fictional families". Alston (2008, 31) notes that the "emphasis on how families should behave is still apparent in recent children's fiction, for specific systems of behaviour are often encouraged". "A bad family… simply reasserts notions of the dominant ideology; in deviating away from what is constructed as the norm it becomes other and… serves to promote the qualities of the 'good' traditional family" (*ibid.*). Thus Rowling may, by portraying the Dursleys as 'bad', accentuate the goodness of the Weasleys. Alston (*ibid.*) notes that in *Harry*, "the Dursleys are unfavourably compared to the Weasleys at every turn"; thus "constant comparison of families is still used to promote certain ideals in modern children's literature…". Alston (*ibid.*) observes that children's literature is very rarely written for children only and thus in children's texts, both parents and children are frequently preached to. Anne is better mannered than Mrs. Lynde, for example, and in *AGG*, Alston (2008, 32) observes "the adult is not

always right". Alston (*ibid.*) says that in modern children's literature "it is [equally] common to find children who are more polite than adults". Harry, for example, is more polite and has better manners than his foster parents, the Dursleys.

Trites (1997, 82–83) observes that family interrelationships have been central to numerous children's novels, including those by Montgomery. Trites (1997, 83) says, however, that "[t]he focus of these interrelationships… has often been the reproduction of mothering"; setting up a situation where girls "train to be mothers or to take on traditional roles within the family structure as a social institution". Thus while "[w]omen, as mothers, produce daughters with mothering capacities and the desire to mother", they "(and men as not-mothers) produce sons whose nurturant capacities and needs have been systematically curtailed and repressed" (Chodorow, quoted in Trites 1997, 83). Thus boys are taught not to nurture while girls are encouraged to do so.

Encouraging children to develop life skills, self-efficacy and "the management of appropriate levels of independence, for example tidying their own room, helping with household chores, [and] cooking…" is the responsibility of foster parents (Farmer *et al.* 2004, 165). Both Anne and Harry are encouraged in developing some of these life skills—both participate at least in household chores and cooking. Harry, for example, fries bacon for breakfast (*Philosopher's Stone*, 19–20) and "[has] had loads of practice [in 'Muggle cleaning'] with the Dursleys" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 91) while Dudley apparently is not required to do anything. Anne's duties include at least cooking and baking, keeping the fire, preparing tea, and setting the table, washing the dishes (*AGG*, 171), and "ha[ving] the breakfast ready" (*AGG*, 187).

According to Höjer (2001, 36), "[b]arnen i familjen behöver omsorg för att utvecklas och må bra, hemmet skall skötas, tvätt skall tvättas—alla de vardagliga syslorna är en del av omsorgen. För att kunna sköta ett arbete och vara en välfugerande samhällsanpassad individ måste man äta, sova och ha rena kläder. Omsorget är något vi inte kan leva utan."[1] Anne's previous homes are not

[1] My own translation: 'The children in a family need nurture for healthy development and well-being, the home needs to be cared for, the laundry needs to be laundered—all the daily chores are part of nurture. People must eat, sleep, and have clean clothes in order to be able to work and to be a well-functioning member of the community. Nurture is something we cannot live without.'

described in detail but Marilla seems to have high standards in housekeeping. Mrs. Rachel thinks "Marilla… swept the yard over as often as she swept the house": "One could have eaten a meal off the ground without overbrimming the proverbial peck of dirt" (*AGG*, 9–10). The kitchen is "so painfully clean" that it looks like "an unused parlour" (*AGG*, 10). As regards the Dursleys, Petunia, as well, keeps the home in immaculate condition. Her kitchen is "surgically clean" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 38) and, in *Half-Blood Prince* (49), on Dumbledore's arrival, she is "halfway through her usual pre-bedtime wipe-down of all the kitchen surfaces". Thus if nothing else, Petunia teaches Harry that cleaning and cooking are important.

4.2 Men and Women as Parents

4.2.1 Mothering

Höjer (2001, 6) notes that "[u]nder perioden runt sekelskiftet…, modern sågs som huvudansvarig för hemmet och barnen, hon var den som skulle skapa en god hemmiljö för barnen att växa upp i".[1] Not much has changed, as "women [still] feel themselves to be more responsible for childrens [sic] development, the 'outcome of upbringing', than men do" (Halldén; Bäck-Wiklund & Bergsten quoted in Höjer 2001, 232). Marilla does seem concerned about Anne's upbringing and takes full responsibility for it herself—she wants to manage without Matthew's help. Petunia, in contrast, is not concerned (in the least, it seems) about Harry's upbringing. She thinks Dudley is fine while Harry is beyond repair. In the Dursley household, neither one of the parents seems to take the responsibility for the children's proper upbringing; decisions seem to be made mainly together.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, "motherhood… was romanticized and glorified as woman's natural calling, and all 'normal' women were expected to possess maternal sensibilities" (Berebitsky 2006, 30). In *AGG*, however, it is Matthew whose 'maternal sensibilities' are more apparent and awaken almost instantly whereas Marilla's mothering instincts take longer to awaken.

[1] My own translation: 'Around the turn of the [previous] century…, the mother was seen as the person primarily responsible for the home and the children, she was expected to create a good home environment for the children to grow up in'.

As Gubar (2001, 53) mentions, several critics have noted "Montgomery's habit of setting up 'matriarchal utopia[s]' in place of more traditional family configurations". Kornfeld and Jackson (1987, 70), for example, say that in the fictional structure of matriarchal societies (feminine utopias), "girl[s] could learn to survive, by assimilating the proper values". Kornfeld and Jackson (1987, 74) add that "the matriarchal culture … gave [the] heroines the freedom of development they would not have found in a male world". The fictional mother in the nineteenth century "had to strike a careful balance between love and duty, nurture and reproof" (Kornfeld & Jackson 1987, 70). Mothers were expected to provide their daughters with "an example … of piety and grace, and to help them through the difficult task of reaching adulthood (*ibid.*).

Marilla does not "strike a balance" by herself, but her surplus of duty and reproof is balanced by Matthew's love and nurture. Thus although Marilla, the matriarch, might have been capable of 'bringing up' Anne alone, Anne nevertheless needs Matthew, too, who is noticeably softer and more indulgent than his sister. As Wood notes, Matthew is "a different kind of patriarch" (2007, 322), one that promotes "progressive patriarchy" (323). Wood (2007, 322) observes that the inclusion of Matthew in the narrative "is at least partially manipulative"; while Matthew is an inserted male voice, Montgomery subverts the demands of her culture by making Matthew a supporter of "progressive gender ideologies". Kornfeld and Jackson (1987, 71) observe that the authors of nineteenth-century female *Bildungsromane* were not able to deny, even in their utopian fiction, that in real life, "of course, men had all the economic power" but the authors evaded "the issue of male power… by removing fathers through death and war, and minimizing the direct influence of male benefactors". Thus, as Kornfeld and Jackson (*ibid.*) remark, "traditional masculine qualities" find no room "in this world of women". However, because "the ideal of motherhood transcended sexuality and is not necessarily considered to be a biological function, it is possible in these novels for a man to act as a mother" (*ibid.*), like Matthew does. Thus, as Kornfeld and Jackson (*ibid.*) say, both "[f]eminized men and women… could teach the blessed duties of benevolence and domesticity…". In the nineteenth-century female *Bildungsromane* the men have a

"curious role" as "traditional gender boundaries are frequently crossed by 'feminized' men, if not by 'masculine' women" (Kornfeld & Jackson 1987, 74). Thus the novels implicitly contain a deep critique of the male world of money and power, within their exaltation of the value of female nurture" (*ibid.*). In addition, as Kornfeld and Jackson (*ibid.*) note, "while spinsters often have positive roles and fulfilling lives, marriage (unlike motherhood) is not portrayed very positively". Thus it seems that in the nineteenth-century female *Bildungsromane*, if depicting husbands or fathers could be avoided, they were replaced by other male characters—as Montgomery did.

4.2.2 Fathering

Hinojosa *et al.* (2006, 114) observe that "[t]he adoptive child's age will affect the bonding process considerably, as older children may have experienced other men as fathers or may have had more time in which to construct an identity independent of any particular father". Anne has had other father figures before Matthew but this does not seem to affect the bonding as Anne tells him almost immediately "you and I are going to get along together fine. It's such a relief to talk when one wants to and not be told that children should be seen and not heard" (*AGG*, 19). Anne says later that she recognized Matthew as "a kindred spirit as soon as ever [she] saw him" (*AGG*, 34). While Anne is adopted when she is eleven years old, Harry is taken to the Dursleys when he is one year old. Although Harry is only an infant when he is separated from his parents, he still seems to cherish the memory of his late father although he does not remember either one of his parents (*Philosopher's Stone*, 27). Anne has no recollections of her parents whatsoever and after "Anne's History", her parents are never mentioned again (*AGG*, 36–41).

Miall and March (2006, 45) observe that understandings of fatherhood range "from breadwinner to moral leader to nurturer". The "mothering ideology that promotes women as *natural* nurturers, caregivers, and caretakers" still exists within the larger community while the father's role, on the other hand, is viewed as "more *learned* than instinctive" (Miall & March 2006, 45–46). Miall and March (2006, 46) note that fathers have been perceived as "family providers", and "the

different qualities they bring to parenting such as playfulness and discipline" have been emphasised. In both *AGG* and *Harry*, it is the father figure in the family who works outside the home. Matthew spends most of his days working in the fields (or doing other farm work outside) while Marilla and Anne stay mainly inside doing housework. The family roles and relationships are stereotypical in both the Dursley and the Weasley households; "the provider fathers" and "the nurturing mothers" (Kornfeld & Prothro 2003, 189). Mr Dursley is "director of a firm called Grunnings" while Mrs Dursley is a stay-at-home-mum (*Philosopher's Stone*, 7). Gailey (2006, 73) notes that according to "social work directives of the [1950s,]… a 'good adoptive mother'… [was] a stay-at-home mom". In this sense, Aunt Petunia seems like an ideal 1950s adoptive mother. Otherwise, as well, the Dursleys appear to be an ideal adoptive family (except that they already have Dudley—and hate Harry). The Weasleys, too, correspond to the patriarchal nuclear family ideal that would have signified the sought after normality to the 1950s social workers. Rowling thus seems to be criticising the 1950s ideology of the 'norm family' by presenting the family scenes as comic rather than by presenting the family members, particularly the Dursleys, as characters that could be taken seriously. The Cuthberts, however, deviate from this nuclear ideal because they are siblings living together—and thus they would not have been considered ideal adoptive parents (at least not in the 1950s)—and yet they are able to parent Anne successfully.

Wegar (2006, 9) notes that "the belief that fathers' contributions to child rearing are less important than mothers', and that women's parenting behaviour is more instinctual" is reflected in the literature on adoption. This view appears also in *AGG*—Marilla assumes the task of bringing up Anne and requires Matthew to keep his "oar" out of Anne's upbringing (*AGG*, 45):

> I'll make it my business to see she's trained to be [useful]. And mind, Matthew, you're not to go interfering with my methods. Perhaps an old maid doesn't know much about bringing up a child, but I guess she knows more than an old bachelor. So you just leave me to manage her. When I fail it'll be time enough to put your oar in.

Matthew, however, does meddle in Anne's upbringing on several occasions. And he seems to know something about parenting that Marilla does not; denying the child's heart's desire (constantly) is

not beneficial (neither is overindulgence either, of course) nor being too punitive or strict a parent. Matthew tells Marilla not to be "too hard on her…" when punishing Anne (*AGG*, 62). It is Matthew who tells Anne to apologize to Mrs. Lynde seeing as "It'll have to be done sooner or later, you know, for Marilla's a dreadful determined woman—dreadful determined, Anne. Do it right off, I say, and have it over" (*AGG*, 62–63). Matthew also tells Marilla firmly "I think you ought to let Anne go" to the concert when Marilla does not want to let her go (*AGG*, 124).

Adesman and Adamec (2004, 55) say that time, gifts, and love should be given to children but in moderation. Marilla and Matthew seem to disagree on the balance between discipline and indulgence. Even though Matthew indulges Anne, she is not overindulged or 'spoiled'. Matthew thinks about Anne after the concert at the White Sands Hotel (*AGG*, 220–221):

> Well now, I guess she ain't been much spoiled, … I guess my putting in my oar occasional never did much harm after all. She's smart and pretty, and loving, too, which is better than all the rest. She's been a blessing to us, and there never was a luckier mistake than what Mrs. Spencer made—if it *was* luck. I don't believe it was any such thing. It was Providence, because the Almighty saw we needed her, I reckon.

Anne could have been spoiled, however, if Matthew had raised her alone; without Marilla's more austere approach to parenting, she might have become utterly selfish and conceited like Dudley, having every one of her wishes fulfilled. Conversely, she could have become bitter and resentful had Marilla been her only parent. Thus the two siblings balance each other's shortcomings in parenting by the one being more competent in discipline and the other in emotional nurture. It seems that the old maid is, after all, not a better parent than the old bachelor—only different.

In *Harry*, the father figures seem to be more central (to Harry) than any of the mother figures. This may be due to Harry's gender and age; mothers are more important for young children and girls. Trites (1997, 100) observes that "the mother/daughter relationship… is the primary relationship for many girls" and, as Bowlby (1976, 15) notes, father is not as important as mother to a young child "and his value increases only as the child becomes more able to stand alone".

Hinojosa *et al.* (2006, 114) mention that adoptive fathers (and fathers in general) frequently "use 'naming' as a strategy to accelerate social bonding and father identity formation". This

"symbolic labeling" (*son*/*daughter*) allows men to "form and express thoughts and feelings about their adopted children" and to "think about the social roles and behaviours implied by the labels". Correspondingly, by naming themselves *father*, men "signal their intent to enact fathering behaviors and provide others, particularly the adopted child, with guidelines for the social interaction that will take place" (*ibid*.). Naming *son* or *daughter* does not take place in either one of the novels. Anne is just 'Anne' to both Matthew and Marilla while Uncle Vernon usually calls Harry "boy" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 223; *Chamber of Secrets*, 19) but he calls Dudley "my son" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 29). In *Deathly Hallows* (31), it is noted, when Vernon calls Harry "Oi! You!" that he had been addressed thus for sixteen years. Neither Matthew nor Vernon name themselves *father* in relation to the adopted or foster child. Nevertheless, they do appear to "enact fathering behaviors"—or rather "mothering" behaviours in Matthew's case while Vernon only disciplines Harry.

4.3 Parent Figures in *Anne* and *Harry*

Zipes (2001, 181–182) claims that the Dursleys "are so plainly uncouth and comical that they pose no great threat to Harry…". Kornfeld and Prothro (2003, 188), as well, observe the comical element and remark that "it is difficult to take [the Dursleys] terribly seriously" even though they are horrible because they are "one-dimensional characters" so as to read "more like farce than tragedy". The Dursleys are then exaggerated 'fairy tale' foster parents and thus they are not psychologically credible. Kornfeld and Prothro (2003, 189) claim that "[t]he scenes at both Harry's and Ron's homes read like theater of the absurd, reducing family life to slapstick comedy". Harry's caricatured foster parents, the Dursleys, may be so exaggerated because the novel is fantasy (or fairytale) in genre. "By depicting how things should not be", Lacoss (2002, 78) notes, "Rowling reinforces the notion of how they should be". Dentith (2000, 9) says that "many parodies draw on the authority of precursor texts to attack, satirise, or just playfully to refer to elements of the contemporary world". Cockrell (2002, 21) observes that "[t]he Dursleys are wonderful parodies of every child's most awful relatives: the brother-in-law who thinks you ought to go to military school, the aunt who

disapproves loudly of your hair and skirt length". To the reader, however, the Dursleys symbolize not only their "dreadful kin", their "own potential wicked stepmother", but also each child's actual parents when the parents are being "unfair" (*ibid.*). Pharr (2002, 57) says that "...the Dursleys stand as caricatures of cruelty, Dickensian figures given one more turn of the screw...". According to Pharr (*ibid.*), the Dursleys are "[n]ever really frightening but always nasty and absurd"; Rowling uses them as a way to gain real sympathy for Harry but also to preserve the easily accessible humour of the narrative. By abusing Harry, Pharr (*ibid.*) observes, the Dursleys "predispose him to identify with the abused". However, this identification could be dangerous: "Harry learns enough magic to wreak havoc on the family were he so inclined, but his Potter heritage calls him, instead, to go beyond the obtuse and angry Dursleys, to seek a more important fate" (*ibid.*). Both his power and his compassion derive "from the heroism and sacrifice of his parents" who died, however before Harry knew them as "living ethical guides"; thus while the Potter name serves as Harry's "entrée into the world of wizardry", "his childhood deprivations… serve as a gateway into empathy" (*ibid.*).

In *AGG*, in contrast, the new adoptive parents are almost 'too good to be true' (especially Matthew). Even Diana is not sent to Queen's to study and she is a biological daughter (*AGG*, 196) while Anne is a complete stranger to her adoptive parents. According to the view of the time, the Cuthberts do not owe this poor "orphan waif" anything—they are not morally (or legally) obliged to school her but they choose to do so anyway. As Lehnert (1992, 115) notes, "[t]here is never any question about [Anne] receiving a good education, perhaps even going on to a university". Anne is well educated even though she is not the boy to whom the Cuthberts "mean[t] to give… a good home and schooling" (*AGG*, 12). However, this may be due to Matthew and Marilla's Scottish heritage and does not mean that they had exceptionally 'modern' views on the education of girls. "Scots had a deeply ingrained respect for education" and wanted to offer the best possible schooling to "all their children without prejudice of social class" (Gammel & Epperly 1999, 90–91). Nevertheless, Marilla does say that "I believe in a girl being fitted to earn her own living whether

she ever has to or not" (*AGG*, 195). The Cuthberts thus promote Anne's educational attainment and success.

As Seelye notes (2005, 339), "[t]here is certainly an element of the marvellous in Anne's effortless pilgrimage through the turbulent passages of life, but it is not so much so as to strain our credulity". It is "the story of an attractive and basically happy young woman who is having a good time thanks to the loving generosity of her foster parents, yet is of sufficiently strong character to shoulder responsibilities when they come" (*ibid.*). Thus while Montgomery tries to improve reality by making Anne's "pilgrimage" effortless, by representing idealized versions of adoptive parents, Rowling uses parody in an attempt to improve reality by representing the Dursleys as horrible and evil foster parents; the opposite of what they are expected to be and how they ought to behave.

4.3.1 Anne's Parent Figures

Marilla is a 'no-nonsense' person; she does not approve of frivolous things, such as fashionable clothing, concerts or, in general, anything to do with having fun. To her, even sunshine is "too dancing and irresponsible a thing for a world which was meant to be taken seriously" (*AGG*, 10). Matthew is quiet and shy almost to a manic degree; "he was the shyest man alive and hated to have to go among strangers or to any place where he might have to talk" (*AGG*, 8). Matthew "is gentle, patient, relatively indulgent and something of a mediator" between Marilla and Anne (Dawson 2002, 39). He is the complete opposite of Anne who talks "nineteen to the dozen" according to Marilla (*AGG*, 77) and whose "tongue must be hung in the middle" according to Mrs. Spencer (*AGG*, 19). Despite the fact that their personalities are opposites, or possibly just because of it, Matthew and Anne become "the best of friends" (*AGG*, 157). Anne observes that "Matthew and I are such kindred spirits I can read his thoughts without words at all" (*AGG*, 118).

Doody (1997, 18) notes that Marilla "has the rudiments of emotional wisdom and a latent capacity for love". Yet at first she seems like a stern, cold, Victorian guardian that values orphans only for their usefulness, for the work they can do. Marilla's reason for the adoption (of a boy) is

clear: the benefit for her and Matthew. “Matthew is getting up in years, …—he’s sixty—and he isn’t so spry as he once was. His heart troubles him a good deal” (*AGG*, 11). Therefore, Matthew needs help running the farm; the Cuthberts want a child who is “old enough to be of some use in doing chores right off and young enough to be trained up proper” so a boy of “about ten or eleven” would be suitable (*AGG*, 12).

Brennan (1995, 249) remarks that “Matthew unexpectedly takes the high ground” when he and Marilla are discussing what to do with Anne. He wants to keep Anne (*AGG*, 30):

> “Matthew Cuthbert, you don’t mean to say you think we ought to keep her!”
> Marilla’s astonishment could not have been greater if Matthew had expressed a predilection for standing on his head.
> “Well now, no, I suppose not–not exactly”, stammered Matthew, uncomfortably driven into a corner for his precise meaning. “I suppose–we could hardly be expected to keep her.”
> “I should say not. What good would she be to us?”
> “We might be some good to her,” said Matthew suddenly and unexpectedly.

Doody Jones (1997b, 427) calls Matthew’s remark “revolutionary, an example of true Christian charity”. The reluctant Marilla surrenders completely to Matthew’s whim “only after she drives with Anne to see Mrs. Spencer about sending her back, and there she meets the horrible Mrs. Blewett, willing to take over the girl, her wiry limbs giving promise of bone-hard work” (Brennan 1995, 249). Matthew says “with unusual vim” that he “wouldn’t give a dog [he] liked to that Blewett woman” and Anne herself says that “[she]’d rather go back to the asylum than go to live with her [Mrs. Blewett]” (*AGG*, 44). Marilla now sees keeping Anne as “a sort of duty” (*ibid.*) but admits that she has “never brought up a child, especially a girl” and is afraid “[she]’ll make a terrible mess of it” (*AGG*, 44–45).

It seems surprising that the bachelor and the spinster nevertheless do know how to take care of a child and how to bring her up without “mak[ing] a terrible mess of it”. Mrs. Lynde, too, expects Marilla and Matthew to fail as parents. She thinks they “don’t know anything about children and they’ll expect him to be wiser and steadier than his own grandfather, if so be’s he ever had a grandfather, which is doubtful” (*AGG*, 13). Marilla, however, instantly becomes a stern and

demanding foster mother although she refuses to be called “Aunt Marilla” because she is not related to Anne and “do[es]n’t believe in calling people names that don’t belong to them” (*AGG*, 50). Marilla makes Anne learn her prayers and gives her chores to do. Matthew retreats to the background where he hovers and keeps an eye on how the two females get along, occasionally putting in his oar in Anne’s upbringing.

Waterston (1993, 65) claims that, at the end of the novel, “Anne has changed, is less voluble, less eloquent; she ends with a pat quotation (‘God’s in his heaven, all’s right with the world,’ [*AGG*, 245]) rather than with one of those passionate outbursts in which she used to assert not God’s will, or the world’s, but her own”. It seems that Anne has now become more like Marilla and Marilla has become more like Anne. Yet Anne has not changed essentially, as noted in 2.2, even though she is more self-controlled and serious than she used to be while Marilla is more lively and cheerful. Mrs. Lynde notices that “Marilla Cuthbert has got *mellow*” (*AGG*, 243).

Smith *et al.* (2006, 155) claim that “the dominant culture [today] generally warn[s] women that the task of becoming an adoptive mother may be difficult, confusing, and complicated… [r]arely is there encouragement that the process could be expansive in terms of one’s identity”. In fact, Smith *et al.* (*ibid.*) say that often both the mother and child grow as a mutual relationship that acknowledges and respects differences develops. Similar growth that takes place with Marilla and Anne does not take place in *Harry*, however, between Harry and Petunia. Dawson (2002, 43) suggests that “Marilla is perhaps Anne’s true kindred spirit” as “there is a kinship between the romantic, free-spirited young girl and the rigid older woman”. Dawson (2002, 43) notes that in the end, Marilla can fully express her feelings for Anne. After Matthew’s death, Marilla tells Anne she is sorry for always having “been kind of strict and harsh with [Anne] maybe—but [she] mustn’t think [Marilla] didn’t love [her] as well as Matthew did...” (*AGG*, 235). Anne, however, does not seem to mind Marilla’s strictness (in fact she may have had more strict foster mothers before) and she does not appear to suffer from Marilla’s austere approach (and Matthew, of course, softens Marilla’s strictness).

Doody (1997, 18) observes that Marilla's feelings for Anne awaken "after she hears the girl's account of the loss of her parents and her life of drudgery and baby care with Mrs. Thomas and Mrs. Hammond". She is moved to pity and sympathy (*AGG*, 40):

> Pity was suddenly stirring in her heart for the child. What a starved, unloved life she had had—a life of drudgery and poverty and neglect; for Marilla was shrewd enough to read between the lines of Anne's history and divine the truth. No wonder she had been so delighted at the prospect of a real home. It was a pity she had to be sent back. What if she, Marilla, should indulge Matthew's unaccountable whim and let her stay? He was set on it; and the child seemed a nice, teachable little thing.
>
> "She's got too much to say," thought Marilla, "but she might be trained out of that. And there's nothing rude or slangy in what she does say. She's ladylike. It's likely her people were nice folks."

Marilla seems to believe that genetics determine the way Anne speaks—her parents must have been 'nice' as she is 'ladylike' even though she lived only a few months with her biological parents. Marilla negates the influence of nurture—it is therefore nature that determines how children turn out. Yet she says Anne is "teachable" and could be trained out of talking too much.

Gubar (2001, 65) notes that Mrs. Lynde comments on Matthew's transformation after the advent of Anne "That man is waking up after being asleep for over sixty years" (*AGG*, 161). Marilla, likewise, "is transfigured by the girl's presence; at the touch of Anne's kiss, a 'sudden sensation of startling sweetness thrill[s] her,' and magical moments like this one gradually mellow her into a new and more affectionate person" (Gubar 2001, 65). Dawson (2002, 29) comments that Marilla is "a crusty, exacting spinster whose heart has withered for lack of a woman's normal accoutrements; that is, husband, children, and the giving and receiving of human affection". Anne, however, is able to thaw Marilla's heart. Anne is able to express 'human affection' even if she herself has not received it after her parents passed away.

Overall, the Cuthberts seem exceptional adoptive parents—considering the era and views held of orphans. They not only offer Anne a real home but also allow her schooling and leisure time. After she has completed her daily chores, she is able to play with her "bosom friend", Diana (*AGG*, 75). Yet Marilla tells Anne "You're not going to play all the time nor most of it. You'll have your work to do and it'll have to be done first." (*AGG*, 76). Although Nelson (2001, 59) notes that

Anne expects and is allowed only '"odd half-hours… for play" (*AGG*, 56), it seems to be the same amount of spare time any child in Avonlea has—as everyone has his or her own chores to do. In *AA*, St. Clair is late to school as he had had to help his "ma make a pudding for dinner" because his sister was ill (*AA*, 94) and one of Paul's "daily duties" is "get[ing] the cows for Mary Joe" (*AA*, 255). In addition, Doody Jones (1997b, 427) points out that "Anne… does not have to work any more than her friends do in Avonlea". "Without machines, the work of ordinary life was hard for everyone", as Doody Jones (*ibid.*) observes; "[c]hildren in their homes had to work, sometimes beyond their strength". Anne is also able to go to school every day and, as Doody Jones (*ibid.*) notes, Marilla and Matthew do not "hold the orphan back from school for the sake of work". It seems it would have been normal even for farmers' biological children to be held back from school when additional labour was (temporarily) needed (Doody Jones 1997a, 430).

4.3.2 Harry's Parent Figures

Kornfeld and Prothro note that the families in the non-Hogwarts world are represented as "comical, conventional, superficial, predictable" (2003, 191)—as 'stereotypical' but acknowledge that Rowling "still offers a compelling vision of the vital role that home and family play in the lives of young people coming of age" (2003, 196). Pharr (2002, 56) observes that instead of 'raising', 'tormenting' would be "the more appropriate verb for the Dursleys' treatment of Harry". According to Pharr (*ibid.*), the monstrosity of the Dursleys "is crucial in Harry's early development". The Dursleys' behaviour may influence Harry's development significantly but they do not seem to be exactly "monstrous"; the family scenes are comic and the Dursleys are exaggerated, satirical versions of evil stepparents.

Mr Dursley is "a big, beefy man with hardly any neck, although he did have a very large moustache" while "Mrs Dursley [is] thin and blonde and ha[s] nearly twice the usual amount of neck, which came in very useful as she spent so much of her time craning over garden fences, spying on the neighbours" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 7)—rather like Mrs. Lynde in *AGG* who, too, is

eager to keep an eye on fellow community members. It is interesting that being inquisitive (and gossipy or talkative) is not seen as such a major fault in adults (although, it seems, it is slightly criticized in the novels) but, especially in *AGG*, it is not to be tolerated in children (except by Matthew). In *Harry*, Dumbledore seems to be about the only one who thinks it is alright for children to ask questions.

"The Dursleys had a small son called Dudley and in their opinion there was no finer boy anywhere" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 7). "Mrs Dursley pretended she didn't have a sister, because her sister and her good-for-nothing husband were as unDursleyish as it was possible to be"; the Dursleys kept "the Potters [and their small son] away" as "they didn't want Dudley mixing with a child like that" (*ibid.*). Mr Dursley "didn't think he could bear it" "if it got out that they were related to a pair of –" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 11). Thus Vernon is ashamed of Harry's origins and never mentions his parents if he can help it. The Dursleys had sworn when they took Harry in to "stamp out that dangerous nonsense [magic]" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 31) and they do not want Harry to attend Hogwarts. Petunia becomes very nervous when she notes the address on Harry's letter ("The Cupboard under the Stairs"; *Philosopher's Stone*, 30); "how could they possibly know where he sleeps?" and is afraid that they are being watched (*Philosopher's Stone*, 31). That is why the Dursleys decide that Harry is "really getting a bit big for [his cupboard]" and that "it might be nice if [he] moved into Dudley's second bedroom" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 32). So the Dursleys only start to worry about keeping Harry in a cupboard once it is obvious that whoever is sending the letters knows where Harry sleeps.

The Dursleys behave as if they were doing Harry an enormous favour by allowing him to stay with them—they are of course, as Number Four, Privet Drive, or Petunia, to be more precise, is the secret to Harry being safe, out of Voldemort's reach, outside of Hogwarts—even though they neglect him and treat him like an outcast. Yet by not sending Harry to an orphanage, the Dursleys contribute not only to his safety but also to his mental health (or psychological well-being)—because, as Bowlby (1976, 79) says, a home, no matter how bad, is better than no home at all.

According to Reynolds (2005, 25), most people in the twenty-first century use the term 'family' loosely, to indicate also social and legal relationships and not only "those who related to us by blood or through marriage". Reynolds (*ibid.*) observes that "saying someone 'is family', connotes a special, insider relationship with members of a group, whatever their biological relationships". The social meaning of 'the family' is continually revised and reconstructed and currently, emotional ties—"how we feel about and interact with the people we live with"—are considered to be more significant than "a shared gene pool" (Reynolds 2005, 26). Accordingly, as Kornfeld and Prothro (2003, 192–193) note, in *Harry*, "[f]amily connections and loyalties are bound not by birth and genetics but by more enduring factors; the roles family members assume are determined less by age and gender than by actions and relationships forged among individuals". This view is presented in adoption literature, but it opposes the generally held idea. As Smith *et al.* (2006, 153) observe, "[r]elational connections based on love, empathy, mutuality, and commitment are not seen as strong enough… [to] 'hold' through time, geographic distance, conflict, or contact with biological kin". In the novel, although a blood connection exists, for Harry it is not as important (except as regards his safety) as these relational connections with magical parent figures.

Harry is, Miller (2001, 31) says, "stuck with an unpleasant family of relatives in a London suburb, a family who have at least put him up but are accorded no thanks at all for that". It may seem disturbing that Harry appears to be not in the least bit grateful to the Dursleys, seeing as they (or mainly Petunia) did not really have a choice when they took him in. However, Harry is (almost) an adolescent when we meet him—at an age most (real) children are difficult and "hate" their parents anyway. Adesman and Adamec (2004, 113) say that "[f]or many parents, raising a teenager is the most challenging aspect of parenthood" as teenagers may often test their parents' limits to their behaviour and think "that their parents are quite stupid and annoying".

Grimes (2002, 114) claims that Harry has three mothers (or mother figures); Lily, Petunia, and Molly. Grimes (2002, 96) notes that Lily returns to Harry when his need is most urgent (he hears her voice when he resists the Dementors and her spirit appears when he battles Voldemort);

thus she resembles “both the dead mother and the fairy godmother in ‘Cinderella’ and other stories, a supernatural woman who appears when she is most needed”. Grimes (*ibid.*) says that through tales like this, children are able to idealize their mothers and to trust that mothers, even if they are not physically present, will still care for their children.

Grimes (2002, 95) compares Petunia to “the evil stepmother in folk and fairy tales”, especially to the one in “Cinderella” because she, too, greatly favours her biological child over the surrogate and “starves little Harry to stuff her gluttonous son, Dudley”. Grimes (2002, 95–96) notes that evil stepmothers like Petunia “allow little children to feel justified in their sibling rivalry and to separate their love for their mothers from their anger at them”.

Molly Weasley, in contrast, “finds love and room for Harry even with all seven of her own brood to care for” (Grimes 2002, 116). “She is the poor woman... who takes in the foundling, the generous woman who is a foil to the insufferable Petunia Dursley and shows Harry what a mother’s love should be” (*ibid.*). Grimes (2002, 102) says that in maturation novels, there are equivalents for Molly, too, and not only for Harry’s enemies; according to Bettelheim (quoted in Grimes 2002, 102), “children learn from these surrogates… and other rescuers, that they will be helped in life, even when they feel alone and vulnerable”. Grimes (2002, 96) calls Molly “very much the prototypical mother” who provides Harry with “what he needs on his mission: a surrogate family and something that represents familial love and warmth”. Molly, for example, knits Harry a jumper (each) Christmas, as she does for her own children, and invites Harry to The Burrow during school holidays and thus protects Harry from the Dursleys (*ibid.*).

Grimes (*ibid.*) calls Professor Minerva McGonagall “the wise woman” who is, “[a]s head of Harry’s house,... the closest person the boy and his friends have at Hogwarts”; she is the omnipresent mother, “there to comfort but also to discipline”. Thus she is, in fact, a fourth mother figure although a distant one.

Kornfeld and Prothro (2003, 189) find “the lack of respect that Mrs. Weasley receives from her children” “[p]articularly disturbing”. According to them, this is displayed by the fact that “the

sweaters that she knits for Harry and her children are a standing joke throughout the series, eliciting derision rather than appreciation for the care and love that they represent" (2003, 189–190). Yet it seems that (at least) Harry appreciates the sweaters he receives from Mrs Weasley (of course his are not maroon, the colour Ron's are and which Ron dislikes), especially as they are much better than the gifts he receives from the Dursleys. In addition, the twins do wear their sweaters as do Percy and Ron. In fact, in *Philosopher's Stone* (149), George demands of Ron why he is not wearing his jumper and says "Come on, get in on, they're lovely and warm" (without irony, it seems) and the twins also force Percy to wear his.

As Grimes (2002, 114) notes, "Harry, the fatherless boy, has a plethora of father-figures, both positive and negative, one for almost every archetype". To some he looks for comfort and rescue, others he fears, but aims to please most of them (*ibid.*). According to Grimes (2002, 110), none of Harry's six father figures or surrogate fathers is "completely satisfactory". Harry yearns to know his father, James (*ibid.*), and although separated from him by death, Harry's feelings about James are not ambivalent (Grimes 2002, 111). Grimes (*ibid.*) explains that Harry "identifies with his father and sees him as his protector"; James is thus "both the father who deserts the child and the one who protects him...". According to Grimes (2002, 112), Vernon, "the first father figure Harry remembers", is the epitome of the bad father who strongly favours his own son, "treats Harry as a pariah" and strives "to stifle Harry and keep him from being his true self".

Grimes (2002, 92) considers Voldemort another father figure in Harry's life, a grandfather figure, like "the near-perfect Albus Dumbledore", the antithesis of the vile Voldemort. Dumbledore uses his powers solely for good and "assumes a paternal role in the orphaned Harry's life"; he "mentors Harry and his friends and serves as a role model" (Grimes 2002, 114). According to Grimes (*ibid.*), "Dumbledore is the idealized father, the dream of every child—the father who is godlike: omnipotent, omniscient, and benevolent, always on the side of good". It turns out, of course, that Dumbledore (like James) is not omnipotent or omniscient—he dies because his plans do not always succeed, because he does not know everything—but he also dies so that Harry can

finally stand alone and fulfil the prophecy. Hagrid and Sirius, too, are Harry's father figures who advise and guide him.

Despite all the parent figures, as Kornfeld and Prothro (2003, 188) point out, "Harry Potter is essentially alone in the world" and his only relatives have become his "unwilling guardians". Harry also seems to be the family scapegoat—Petunia still holds a grudge against her dead sister, Lily, for being their parents' favourite child. Petunia was jealous of Lily: "I was the only one who saw her for what she was – a freak! But for my mother and father, oh no, it was Lily this and Lily that, they were proud of having a witch in the family!". Petunia thus blames Harry not only for being a wizard, "*abnormal*", but also for being her sister's son. (*Philosopher's Stone*, 44.)

The Dursleys exclude Harry from the family. They do not treat Harry and Dudley equally and make it very clear to Harry that he is a burden to be suffered; not wanted nor loved and he is definitely not a member of the family. The Dursleys take Dudley somewhere for his birthday every year while "Harry [i]s left behind with Mrs Figg, a mad old lady [actually a Squib] who lived two streets away". Harry's birthdays, in contrast, are completely ignored. In addition, "[t]he Dursleys often spoke about Harry… as though he wasn't there – or rather, as though he was something very nasty that couldn't understand them, like a slug". (*Philosopher's Stone*, 22.) The Dursleys are also mentioned to treat Harry "like a dog that had rolled in something smelly" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 9). Hence it is no wonder that Harry says "It's not possible to live with the Dursleys and not hate them" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 150).

The Dursleys will not even leave Harry alone in the house—Aunt Petunia thinks they would "find the house in ruins" on returning home—nor in Vernon's new car: "That car's new, he's not sitting in it alone…" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 22). Harry has never even been to the zoo: if he was not at school, he was in "his cupboard or Mrs Figg's cabbage-smelling living-room" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 24). Harry finally visits the zoo because the Dursleys have to take him there on Dudley's birthday as Mrs Figg cancels. At the zoo, while Piers and Dudley eat "large chocolate ice-creams", Harry is allowed "a cheap lemon ice lolly"; and even that only because the vendor asks him before

the Dursleys can hurry him away (*ibid.*). In *Order of the Phoenix* (472), Harry glimpses an early memory of his own in which "Dudley [was] riding a new red bicycle, and his [Harry's] heart was bursting with jealousy". Otherwise, however, Harry does not seem to be very jealous of Dudley or of his possessions (no mention is made at least). It may be that he is so used to the unequal treatment that after ten years he does not care anymore. Or, like Anne, he is not jealous by nature.

According to Kornfeld and Prothro (2003, 188), the Dursleys not only "exclude [Harry] from family activities, [but they] lock him in his cupboard for prolonged periods of time, and worst of all, withhold from Harry the truth about his parents and himself". Taub and Servaty (2003, 66) note that "truthfulness and honesty" ("and developmentally sensitive reporting") are called for (and "of utmost importance") when telling children about the death of their parent(s) (or other deaths). "When a parent dies the surviving parent or other relative may not only provide the children with inadequate or misleading information but he or she may also indicate that it would not be appropriate for the child even to be distressed" (Bowlby 2005, 120). It seems that Petunia and Vernon have treated Harry in this way since they told him his parents died in a car crash and do not allow him to ask any questions. Aunt Petunia has lied to Harry about how he got the scar; "'In the car crash when your parents died,' she had said. 'And don't ask questions.' *Don't ask questions* – that was the first rule for a quiet life with the Dursleys." (*Philosopher's Stone*, 20). Thus by lying to Harry about his parents' deaths, and, what may be worse, by not allowing him to talk about the deaths, the Dursleys subject Harry to the risk of developing psychological problems. Harry, however, learns the truth (from Hagrid) and, once at Hogwarts, he has other adults (such as Dumbledore, Lupin, and Sirius) to talk about his parents with. Harry also sees his parents in the mirror of Erised (*Philosopher's Stone*) and in *Goblet of Fire* when his and Voldemort's wands duel and also in *Deathly Hallows* when he prepares to meet Voldemort for the last time.

Harry had "lived with the Dursleys almost ten years, ten miserable years, as long as he could remember" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 27). "He couldn't remember his parents at all. His aunt and uncle never spoke about them, and of course he was forbidden to ask questions. There were no

photographs of them in the house." At school, Harry had no friends because Dudley and his gang hated Harry "and nobody liked to disagree with Dudley's gang". (*ibid.*) Harry had "never had friends before Hogwarts, Dudley had made sure of that" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 174). Before Hogwarts, Harry is not able to speak to anyone about his parents or their deaths—his foster parents will not talk about them and he has no friends. He has led a lonely life, like Anne, until he enters the world of magic.

4.4 Animal Needs

4.4.1 Food and Gluttony in Children's Literature

According to Alston (2008, 110), "[f]ood is an important signifier of the development of the child character in children's fiction". Alston (*ibid.*) says that Anne has matured in consequence of her "initial experiences with desire and the inevitable repression that must follow". However, the family cannot banish the sexual entirely, it can only control the sexual; "in the same way food can be monitored but it has to be provided" (*ibid.*). Alston (2008, 111) notes that "McGillis, Daniel, Nikolajeva and Katz have all emphasised the link between sex and the oral gratification that comes from food in children's literature" and concedes that the emphasis on "gluttony and lack of resistance to temptation… point towards an expression of the sexual…". However, Alston (*ibid.*) says that "the cosy, food-related images… [for example, in] texts by Blyton and Grahame suggest a sense of self-indulgent desire, albeit one that is socially controlled". In *Anne*, the act of eating is not described but in Harry it is—almost to the extent of indecent gratification from food.

Alston (2008, 111) observes that "[t]he majority of adult females in children's literature are categorised by their ability to feed; the good woman feeds the child and is loved, whereas the bad woman seduces the child through food but later withholds it…". The identity of the mother in children's fiction is thus "constructed partly by the food she does or does not provide"; plentiful vs. miserly. Alston concludes that "if food represents the sexual, then this explains partly why it is so policed in children's literature, why good families are distinguished from bad by the type and

quantity of food that they consume". Thus "[f]ood, like desire, must be checked, and if there are to be any banquets and gorging then,… they should be confined within the rules, with the 'right' type of food under the proper rituals of dinner". The family thus represents "control and adherence to a certain way of life" directing "children to the conservative even when it seems at its most sensual, for the literature and the food it features remain policed by custom and tradition". (*ibid.*)

Alston (2008, 118) says that food can act "as a weapon because it is invested with power and control; while food empowers the adult when children accept it, when they refuse it, as they so rarely do in children's literature but frequently in reality, the children become empowered as they control what goes into their own bodies". According to Alston (*ibid.*), "[f]ood becomes a disciplinary tool as it can signify a reward for good behaviour, or children can be threatened with its withdrawal for bad behaviour, and the parental figures are judged by the quality and amount of food they give to the children". In *Harry*, "Aunt Petunia always feeds Harry less than Dudley, marking Harry's subordinate place in the pecking order of family" but "she [also] threatens to stop feeding Harry if he does not finish his chores" (*ibid.*). As so often happens in children's literature, Alston (2008, 119) says, "…the negative examples of poor and unsuitable food, and implicitly families, serves to accentuate the qualities necessary to make the good family"; thus "[t]he normative is again defined through the deviant, whether figured in food, fathers, mothers or family".

According to Alston (*ibid.*), "[f]ood signifies a sense of belonging" and observes that the types of food promoted in children's literature are often very conservative; children in the novels often "eat very traditional British food, the type of food that is considered wholesome – that mothers are supposed to put on the table". Mrs Weasley, for example, offers "wholesome British food" (Alston 2008, 123) and, as Alston (2008, 119) says, even in the late twentieth century texts endeavouring "to represent a multicultural society, there remains a certain unease about exotic, foreign food"—likewise, processed food, because it is not home-cooked, is often scorned and "it implies a bad family". Thus food, like the family itself, "remains largely unaltered, constantly promoting a specific ideal" (*ibid.*). Petunia usually prepares wholesome food but she does not

(always) offer it to Harry. The Weasleys, in contrast, portray "the perfect family that the families in the domestic texts of the late twentieth century fail to live up to" (Alston 2008, 123).

Labbe (2009, 93) notes that, in children's literature in the nineteenth century, "children eat, often sweet things, and often against the wishes of those who bring them up". Carolyn Daniel (quoted in Labbe 2009, 93–94) notes that the reality of "an extremely bland and restricted diet for children" recommended by the Puritan-influenced "child-rearing regime" was "complemented, in children's literature, by 'fictional feasting: copious quantities of rich, sweet, and … fat-laden foods … served to children who seem to have huge appetites'". However, as Daniel (quoted in Labbe 2009, 94) observes, although appetites were satisfied in literature, moral codes required punishment. Labbe (2009, 94) says that "[t]he Puritan discourses… regarded venial sins such as gluttony, sloth and greed as the precursors to mortal sins…"[1]. Gluttony, according to Webb (2009, 106), "can be linked with worldly desire, uncharitableness, envy, and malice"; "[t]he negative focus therefore is upon the self rather than external responsibilities, demands, and loyalties". The "desire to have things one's own way" opposes the wishes of the Church (which was integrally linked with State "in England certainly until the end of the nineteenth century") (*ibid.*). Labbe (2009, 101) says that "[w]hen food transmutes from nourishment for the child's body to a metronym for the child's body, eating is less about satisfying corporeal needs than about symbolizing moral needs". The Dursleys display a lack of morals and everyone in the Dursley household (save Harry) is intent on having one's own way. Dudley is gluttonous: "his five chins [were] wobbling as he ate continually" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 18). According to Labbe (2009, 94), "the 'voracious,' sinful child" was accompanied by "the Romantic ideal of the innocent, natural, pure and uncorrupted" child. The inherently vicious child, who eats too much, needs "loving and attentive… parents" to purge them of "the residue of Original Sin" through austerity (Daniel quoted in Labbe 2009, 94). Anne does not

[1] The Catholic Church deems the seven deadly (or venial) sins—pride, avarice (or greed), envy, wrath, lust, gluttony, and sloth (or acedia)—"capital" (or "cardinal") because they engender other sins, other vices (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1866). Deliberate and unrepented venial sin disposes man to commit mortal sin but venial sin does not break the covenant with God (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1863). While *mortal sin* destroys charity in the heart of man by a grave violation of God's law, *venial sin* allows charity to subsist, even though it offends and wounds it (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1855).

eat too much but Mrs. Lynde, the devout Presbyterian, still says that Anne is "full of original sin" (*AGG*, 146–147).

Webb (2009, 110) notes that being fat is "an outward symbol of dysfunctional personality, negative values, and general unlikeableness" while "the obese [male] figure" is often also demasculinized. Webb (2009, 113) says the "[t]he negative stereotyping of the fat child continues throughout the twentieth century right up to contemporary times..." and (2009, 114) names Augustus Gloop in Roald Dahl's *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* (1964) as an example. Webb (*ibid.*) observes that Mrs. Gloop "is in fact confounded by [her son's] habits, as she tries to find excuses for [his] eating problem, rather than seek out the underlying reasons for his extreme behaviour". Webb (*ibid.*) says that the similarity between Augustus and Dudley Dursley, who "is overweight, badly behaved, and spoilt by his parents: a thoroughly unpleasant person all told". Webb (*ibid.*) notes that Edmund (who is not fat but greedy) in C. S. Lewis's *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (1950), Augustus, and Dudley all have "an adult enabler" but the parents of the latter two "lack the appropriate attitudes in parenting, as demonstrated by overindulging their children, giving in to their greedy desires". Thus "[t]he parental lack of the exercise of discipline and social and moral training are symbolized by the child's greed" and the authors "use food as a device to expose the moral weaknesses of the children…" (*ibid.*). Webb (2009, 116) notes that parents are inclined to overindulge and spoil; to express feelings of love through indulgence. Rowling thus shows, through Dudley, the importance of saying 'no'; sometimes strict methods are needed and overindulgence is always condemnable.

4.4.1.1 Food and Nutrition in *Anne of Green Gables*

Marilla teaches Anne to become self-sufficient in doing household chores: to become a homemaker. She (eventually) manages to teach Anne to cook and to bake. The Cuthberts share all their meals with Anne and thus they all eat the same food (unlike the Dursleys and Harry). It seems that Marilla is even trying to fatten Anne because she is so skinny when she arrives at Green Gables. After

having lived at Green Gables for three weeks Anne says: “But I’m really very healthy for all I’m so thin. I believe I’m getting fatter, though” (*AGG*, 79). Marilla promises to “bake [Anne] a basket” for the Sunday-school picnic because Anne “can’t cook” yet (*AGG*, 78). Anne is also allowed to invite Diana over for tea and to serve “cherry preserves”, “fruit-cake and… cookies and snaps” with “raspberry cordial” (*AGG*, 102). When Anne returns from Aunt Josephine’s, Marilla has made her “a broiled chicken”; “I thought you’d be hungry after such a drive and need something real appetizing” (*AGG*, 191). If Marilla is stingy with dress material, she is generous with food; she shows her love and caring through food.

In *AGG*, gluttony itself is not described (although delicious sweets and foods are described, the actual eating/consumption of them is not) but instead greed is; Diana greedily drinks three “generous” tumblerfuls of the “very nice” raspberry cordial (*AGG*, 104). Punishment is imminent as the “cordial” turns out to be Marilla’s “three year old homemade currant wine” and, Mrs. Barry, thinking Anne “set Diana *drunk*” on purpose, refuses “to let Diana play with [Anne ever] again” (Montgomery 2007, 107). Marilla is indignant and says Mrs. Barry “would better punish Diana for being so greedy as to drink three glassfuls of anything” (*ibid.*). Greed is therefore condemned by Montgomery; children’s (natural) greed should be discouraged by punishment.

In *AGG*, the children are not ravenous but, as said, delicacies are nevertheless portrayed (not in abundance, however, possibly because of the Puritan views); the above mentioned offerings are described as well as “ice-cream” on the “Sunday-school picnic” (*AGG*, 77) and in Charlottetown (*AGG*, 189) and also Matthew’s “chocolate sweeties” are mentioned (*AGG*, 76). In *AA*, however, Davy seems to be constantly hungry and Marilla only allows “bread and butter between meals” but no “plum cake” that Davy craves for (*AA*, 132). Later, the narrator observes that “Marilla’s education had made great strides in the past six years; but she had not yet been able to rid herself of the idea that it was very bad for a child to have too many of its wishes indulged” (*AA*, 196). And quite right she is, of course, when Marilla’s methods of bringing up Anne and Davy (and Dora) are compared to the Dursleys’ way of bringing up Dudley (and Harry). It seems that Montgomery is

emphasizing the "too many" part, however, as Marilla initially did not seem to think children should have *any* of their wishes granted. The Dursleys, in contrast, give in to *every* one of Dudley's wishes.

4.4.1.2 Food and Nutrition in *Harry Potter*

In *Harry*, gluttony is actually described but not punished (this may be, of course, because it is a twentieth and twenty-first century novel series and not a nineteenth century one). Especially all the Hogwarts feasts (and often normal meals, too) are described in rich detail and Ron's way of eating (or devouring), in particular, is detailed. In *Goblet of Fire* (160), Ron says "'Aaah, 'at's be'er'… with his mouth full of mashed potato". In *Order of the Phoenix* (188), Ron "seized the nearest plate of chops and began piling them on to his plate" and "eat[s] roast potatoes with almost indecent enthusiasm". His "mouth was packed to exploding point again" so he could not apologize to Nearly Headless Nick (*Order of the Phoenix*, 189). In *Half-Blood Prince* (156), Ron speaks "between frenzied mouthfuls of gateau". Harry, too, is "suddenly ravenous" in *Prisoner of Azkaban* (73) and "help[s] himself to everything he could reach and began to eat". Ravenous children and bountiful offerings of food thus appear also in modern children's fiction even though, today, children are unlikely to follow bland and restricted diets, except, of course, unless they are on a diet (like Dudley in *Goblet of Fire*). Rowling thus does not seem to support the Puritan ideas as punishment is no longer required for self-indulgence in food. On the other hand, though, Dudley's gluttonous desire for food is condemned. But while he is eventually put on a diet, he is neither 'eaten' (while Harry and Ron are almost eaten in *Chamber of Secrets* by Aragog's descendants) nor punished. Neither does Harry manage to purify the Dursleys. Harry does, however, manage to 'purify' Voldemort by the Christ-like sacrifice of his own life. Like Lizzie in Rossetti's "Goblin Market", he does not die. Labbe (2009, 100–101) observes that Rossetti's Eucharistic narrative "show[s] what can be done with the image of the body meant to be eaten and yet not consumed". Lizzie, "a new Christ", sacrifices herself but "yet live[s] to tell the tale to her children" (Labbe 2009, 101). Labbe (*ibid.*)

says that “Lizzie embodies a self-aware purity that allows her to use her body to transform the poison of the goblins’ fruit into its own antidote”; she allows her own body to work “as a kind of melting pot for the juices that will sate and redeem Laura”. Labbe (2009, 94) observes that “the pure sister Lizzie… heal[s] the fallen sister Laura’s moral wounds…”. Lizzie offers herself to be “eaten” by her sister; “Eat me, drink me, love me” (Rossetti 1865, 25 ll. 470). Similarly Harry offers himself to be, not consumed or eaten, but killed by Voldemort to save others in *Deathly Hallows* (563–564), and lives to tell the tale.

According to De Rosa (2003, 167), “[t]he Dursleys do little to satisfy Harry’s physical hunger” and they even “deprive *Harry* of food when the Smeltings nurse demands that *Dudley* go on a diet”. Aunt Petunia gives Harry smaller portions; she “seemed to feel that the best way to keep up Dudley’s morale was to make sure that he did, at least, get more to eat than Harry” (*Goblet of Fire*, 30). While “[t]he Dursleys had never exactly starved Harry,… he’d never been allowed to eat as much as he liked. Dudley had always taken anything that Harry really wanted, even if it made him sick” (*Philosopher’s Stone*, 92). Often, Harry is also sent to bed without supper. However, in *Chamber of Secrets* (21), Harry is fed “three times a day” with “small amounts of food” when Vernon imprisons him. Aunt Petunia passes Harry “a bowl of tinned soup” through the cat-flap fitted to his bedroom door—“[t]he soup was stone cold” but as Harry’s “insides were aching with hunger”, “he drank half of it in one gulp” (*Chamber of Secrets*, 22). Thus Harry’s deprivation at his relatives’ house is emphasized to gain the sympathy of the reader.

The Dursleys (unlike the Cuthberts) are stingy when it comes to anything—“they complained how much Harry cost them to keep” while in reality, they do not seem to spend much money on Harry’s food or clothing (*Philosopher’s Stone*, 58). They do provide him with shelter, but (for the first ten years) in a cupboard. Even though the Dursleys eventually allow Harry to move from the cupboard to a real bedroom, they often banish him to his room and, as Lacoss (2002, 78) observes, he has “little contact outside his nuclear foster family”. It seems, in fact, that Harry has very little contact with the Dursleys, too; thus he is truly excluded and his loneliness is emphasized.

The Dursleys only give Harry Dudley's old clothes and it seems that Harry eats less nutritious food, as mentioned, than the Dursleys themselves eat. During the Dursley–Mason dinner party, for example, Harry is sent to his room with his "pitiful supper" of "two slices of bread and a lump of cheese" while the others will be eating "[a] joint of roast pork" and "pudding: a huge mound of whipped cream and sugared violets" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 13). The emphasis on this striking injustice arouses the readers' sympathy but, it seems, also justifies Harry's estrangement from the Dursleys and again amplifies the impression that Harry is completely alone in the world. He is separated not only from his birth parents but also from his foster parents. The Dursleys thus seem to display their lack of caring (and love) for their nephew with lack of food but show their love for Dudley by overindulging him (giving him food but also material things in abundance).

While Harry's Muggle relatives do not feed him enough, the magical personae greatly improve his nutritional situation. Like Marilla, (many of) the new parent figures seem to show their caring for the orphan by providing food. De Rosa (2003, 167) notes that Hagrid (upon his arrival at the cottage to which the Dursleys have taken Harry to evade the Hogwarts letters) "immediately gives Harry… a chocolate birthday cake and sausages" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 40); "offers Harry a hamburger after their first trip to Diagon Alley" (66) and "continues to physically nurture Harry throughout the series". Yet it must be said that most of Hagrid's offerings are inedible like the "rock cakes" he always so eagerly offers to Harry, Ron and Hermione (*Half-Blood Prince*, 216).

The Weasleys, despite being poor, always have plenty of food to eat—even for guests: "…the two tables were groaning under dishes and dishes of Mrs Weasley's excellent cooking…" (*Goblet of Fire*, 57). A quick breakfast at the Weasleys consists of "half-a-dozen bacon sandwiches each" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 40). In *Chamber of Secrets*, De Rosa (2003, 168) notes that Mrs Weasley, "aware that the Dursleys 'were starving him',… nourishes Harry to excess" as she "tried to force him to eat fourth helpings at every meal" (37) and "conjured up a sumptuous dinner which included all of Harry's favourite things, ending with a mouthwatering treacle pudding" (53). Molly shows her caring (like Marilla) by providing food, sumptuous meals, to her own family but also to

Harry, the poor, starved orphan who has become like family.

At Hogwarts, Harry receives enough to eat and gains some weight (although Mrs Weasley still seems to think he is too skinny and needs to eat more). As De Rosa (2003, 168) notes, all students are more than adequately nourished at Hogwarts. On his first night at the castle, "Harry's mouth fell open" as "[h]e had never seen so many things he liked to eat on one table: roast beef, roast chicken, pork chops and lamb chops, sausages, bacon and steak, boiled potatoes, roast potatoes, chips, Yorkshire pudding, peas, carrots, gravy, ketchup, and, for some strange reason, mint humbugs" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 92). The puddings, too, are abundant and described sumptuously; "Blocks of ice-cream in every flavour you could think of, apple pies, treacle tarts, chocolate éclairs and jam doughnuts, trifle, strawberries, jelly, rice pudding …" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 93). Thus the Victorian tendency to feast in fiction is still strong even though hardly any English or Canadian children are likely to be forced to follow a strict and bland diet of the austere "traditional nursery upbringing" that Daniel (quoted in Labbe 2009, 93) mentions. In addition, the types of food presented are traditional British cooking —thus the diet is wholesome and what a good mother should offer.

4.4.2 Shelter and Clothing

4.4.2.1 Shelter and Clothing in *Anne of Green Gables*

The Cuthberts offer Anne adequate shelter as she has a room of her own—whereas "the desired and expected boy" would have slept on "a couch in the kitchen chamber" but despite it being "neat and clean, it did not seem quite the thing to put a girl there somehow" (*AGG*, 29). Since "the spare room was out of the question for such a stray waif", Marilla puts Anne in "the east gable room" (*ibid.*). While Anne is lucky enough to have a room, it is not a very welcoming one; "[t]he whitewashed walls were so painfully bare and staring…" and "[t]he whole apartment was of a rigidity not to be described in words, but which sent a shiver to the very marrow of Anne's bones" (*AGG*, 29–30). The room seems like Marilla at first; unsympathetic and unwelcoming. As Dawson (2002, 39)

notes, initially, Marilla is “crusty and difficult to get along with”. Later, however, when Anne has settled in, “the whole character of the room was altered”—“It was full of a new vital, pulsing personality…” (*AGG*, 133). Eventually, Anne’s room becomes a “sweet and dainty… nest” full of all kinds of ‘girly’ decorations she has put up; the “dainty apple-blossom wallpaper” is “adorned with a few good pictures” from Mrs. Allan, a photograph of Miss Stacy, and “a quaint, gilt-framed mirror with chubby pink cupids and purple grapes” (*AGG*, 212). The change in the room may echo the change in Marilla. She transforms significantly, as Dawson (2002, 43) says, “from a woman initially described as a person ‘with angles and without curves’, a woman ‘of narrow experience and rigid conscience’ [*AGG*, 10]… to one that comes to love [Anne] as her own flesh and blood”. Devereux (2007, 366–367) notes that “Marilla is rewarded for taking in a child whom she initially regarded as ‘a sort of duty’ [*AGG*, 42] and came to see as ‘dearer to her than anything on earth’” (*AGG*, 151).

Anne is “garbed in a very short, very tight, very ugly dress of yellowish gray wincey” when she meets Matthew at the Bright River station (*AGG*, 15). Despite this, Anne does not like the dresses Marilla makes for her because, although they are “neat and clean and new” and “good, sensible, [and] serviceable” (*AGG*, 67), they are plain. Anne seems very ungrateful, as Marilla observes; “I should think you’d be grateful to get most anything after those skimpy wincey things you’ve been wearing” (*AGG*, 68). Anne, however, “just love[s] pretty clothes” but has “never had a pretty dress” in her life (*AGG*, 17). Matthew, Anne’s ‘fairy godmother’, however, changes that as he provides her with “a lovely soft brown gloria” dress with puffed sleeves for Christmas (*AGG*, 162). Montgomery, when fulfilling Anne’s dream of puffed sleeves had in mind her own unfulfilled childhood longing after bangs that were all the rage in the era. Montgomery (2007, 289) wrote in her journal in 1911 that it “was unwise and unjust on their [her grandparents’] part” not to allow her bangs because “it would not have done me or anyone any harm to have [them]… and it would have saved me many a bitter pang”. Matthew is like Montgomery’s own father who “understood a child’s heart [well]” and “always wanted [Maud] to have any innocent thing [she] desired” (*ibid.*). Mrs.

Lynde thinks to herself about Matthew's idea of having the dress made for Anne (*AGG*, 161):

> It'll be a real satisfaction to see that poor child wearing something decent for once. The way Marilla dresses her is positively ridiculous, that's what, and I've ached to tell her so plainly a dozen times. I've held my tongue though, for I can see Marilla doesn't want advice and she thinks she knows more about bringing children up than I do for all she's an old maid. But that's always the way. Folks that has brought up children know that there's no hard and fast method in the world that'll suit every child. But them as never have think it's all as plain and easy as Rule of Three—just set your three terms down so fashion, and the sum'll work out correct. But flesh and blood don't come under the head of arithmetic and that's where Marilla Cuthbert makes her mistake. I suppose she's trying to cultivate a spirit of humility in Anne by dressing her as she does; but it's more likely to cultivate envy and discontent. I'm sure the child must feel the difference between her clothes and the other girls'.

Through Mrs. Lynde, Montgomery seems to demand that parents understand their children's individuality and choose parenting methods to suit each child. Mrs. Lynde is also worried that Anne will only become jealous and unhappy because of Marilla's methods. Anne, however, does not seem envious at all at the other girls or even very discontent even though she would like to wear lovely clothes. Instead, she says mournfully "I'd rather look ridiculous when everybody else does than plain and sensible all by myself" but comments on a more bright note about the dresses Marilla has made for her: "…fortunately I can imagine that one of them is of snow-white muslin with lovely lace frills and three-puffed sleeves" (*AGG*, 68).

After the gloria dress Marilla surrenders, however—even though she tells Matthew "You'll just pamper Anne's vanity, Matthew, and she's as vain as a peacock now" (*AGG*, 162)—and starts to make Anne's dresses in the latest style. Thus Matthew does not need to go to Mrs. Lynde again to have dresses made for Anne. Matthew also accessorizes Anne; he buys her a "little blue velvet" cap "that [is] all the rage, with gold cord and tassels" (*AGG*, 186) and a string of "pearl beads" (*AGG*, 213). Miss Josephine Barry, too, sends Anne "a pair of the daintiest little kid slippers, with beaded toes and satin bows and glistening buckles" for Christmas (*AGG*, 163). So far Anne has only had boots "with copper toes" (*AGG*, 157). Now, however, Anne's two 'fairy godmothers', Matthew and Miss Josephine, have provided her with lovely, fashionable items—that do seem to be more exquisite than most farmers' daughters would ever have had—and the reader sympathizes with the orphan who has had nothing and is contented when Anne is finally rewarded. All these

'lovely' things seem to make up for years of deprivation and poverty—years in which Anne had to resort to her imagination to make life bearable. Similarly, Harry wears badly-fitting clothes, too, until he enters the magical world and receives his inheritance.

4.4.2.2 Shelter and Clothing in *Harry Potter*

The Dursleys neglect Harry by withholding necessary food but also by denying him "clothing, shelter, and educational opportunities" (O'Brien quoted in De Rosa 2003, 166). All Harry has to wear at the Dursleys are old hand-me-downs from Dudley;

> Perhaps it had something to do with living in a dark cupboard, but Harry had always been small and skinny for his age. He looked even smaller and skinnier than he really was because all he had to wear were old clothes of Dudley's and Dudley was about four times bigger than he was. (*Philosopher's Stone*, 20.)

However, as De Rosa (2003, 166) says, when Harry enters the wizarding world, the neglect is countered: Harry is able to buy "well-fitting clothes with his inheritance; he mingles in the Gryffindor common room without Dudley's bullying; and he sleeps in a comfortable four-poster bed in a dormitory room that he shares with supportive peers".

Since the Dursleys do not buy Harry any clothes, Aunt Petunia even dyes him a grey school uniform for "Stonewall High, the local comprehensive" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 28) of "some of Dudley's old things" and claims "It'll look just like everyone else's when I've finished" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 29). Luckily, Harry never has to wear the uniform which, to him, looks like "bits of old elephant skin" (*ibid.*). While Dudley is sent to "Uncle Vernon's old private school, Smeltings" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 28), Harry would attend the local school—again the foster parents try to minimize the cost for their ward's upkeep. Dudley is offered the best schooling possible (cost is apparently not an issue) but Harry would receive education in a 'free' school. The difference in the way the Dursleys treat the two boys is emphasized; only the very 'best' schooling opportunities will do for Dudders while it matters not where Harry goes or what he learns (if anything).

4.4.3 Protection and Safety

4.4.3.1 Protection and Safety in *Anne of Green Gables*

Anne's safety is never in real jeopardy after the Cuthberts decide to keep her. Marilla and Matthew save Anne from continuing a life of drudgery by keeping her instead of handing her over to Mrs. Blewett. Matthew also protects Anne: he tells Marilla not to punish Anne too severely. Emotionally, the most difficult episode for Anne is likely to be the Haunted Wood episode[1].

Twice Anne's physical safety is threatened because of her own aptitude for getting into scrapes. As Elaine "the Lily Maid" she almost drowns (*AGG*, 179–181) and she could have died had she fallen down from the other side of the roof when she was dared into "walk[ing] the ridge-pole of Mr. Barry's kitchen roof" (*AGG*, 149). These are events the Cuthberts could not have prevented, however, unless they kept a constant eye on Anne.

4.4.3.2 Protection and Safety in *Harry Potter*

"Once at Hogwarts, Harry never… desire[s] to return 'home'" (De Rosa 2003, 165) to Privet Drive although at least the Dursleys have managed to keep him alive and safe from Voldemort. While at Hogwarts, as De Rosa (*ibid.*) observes, Harry's life is constantly threatened by Lord Voldemort but "Rowling repeatedly alludes to Hogwarts's safety": the Headmaster's presence at Hogwarts ensures that each student is safe and the school itself is well protected. The protective spells put on Hogwarts are referred to, for example, in *Order of the Phoenix* (469) when Snape tells Harry: "…the walls and grounds of Hogwarts are guarded by many ancient spells and charms to ensure the bodily and mental safety of those who dwell within them". Yet, as Deavel and Deavel (2002, 58) point out, "Harry is primarily protected by the love of his parents and by the help of his friends". Thus Harry is not protected by spells only—but by love, as well.

Hagrid seems to be a central figure in the protection and safety of Harry (especially in *Philosopher's Stone*). Hagrid rescues Harry for the first time on the night Lily and James Potter are murdered by Voldemort and Hagrid fetches the orphaned infant from his destroyed home. Ten years

[1] See subsection 4.7.1.

later, Hagrid rescues Harry again, this time from the Dursleys who refuse to let Harry go to Hogwarts. It is Hagrid who tells Harry that he is a wizard and that he will attend Hogwarts.

Dumbledore is another character who, possibly the most effectively, contributes to the safety and protection of Harry. Pennington (2002, 90) claims that "Harry and his friends have virtually no power; they are controlled and guided by the Hogwarts instructors at virtually every stage of their quest". Pennington (2002, 91) also says that when Harry and his friends "are truly tested by the great forces of darkness, they remain passive, with Dumbledore, that noble knight, coming to the rescue". It is true that Dumbledore saves Harry's life several times (in almost every book). However, it seems that, usually, Dumbledore is actually working 'behind the scenes'—offering support and assistance when needed but not actively taking part himself—as Zipes (2001, 180) says, "Professor Dumbledore is Harry's spiritual father… who operates behind the scenes to guide and help Harry". Dumbledore commonly only provides the tools for Harry to fight his own battles. In *Philosopher's Stone*, Dumbledore rescues Harry and destroys the stone (before Voldemort can kill Harry) but in *Chamber of Secrets*, Dumbledore's phoenix brings Harry the Sorting Hat that contains the sword of Godric Gryffindor. This time, as Griesinger (2002, 471) notes, "[w]hat saves Harry… is not his mother's love but his own love for Dumbledore" because "[n]othing but [real loyalty to Dumbledore] could have called Fawkes to [Harry]" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 244). In *Prisoner of Azkaban* (288), Dumbledore tells Hermione and Harry to use the Time-Turner to go back in time "to save more than one innocent life" (Sirius, Harry, and Hermione from the Dementor's kiss and Buckbeak from execution). In *Goblet of Fire* (589), after the last task, Professors Dumbledore, Snape, and McGonagall rescue Harry from "Moody's" office. In *Order of the Phoenix*, Dumbledore arrives just in time to the Ministry of Magic to save Harry (and others) from the Death Eaters (710) and Harry from Voldemort's attack (717). In *Half-Blood Prince*, Dumbledore saves Harry from the Inferi (538–539) but Harry, in turn, helps him back from the cave (539–540). In *Deathly Hallows* (566), Dumbledore appears at "King's Cross" to Harry not as a ghost but as 'real' to tell Harry it is all right to go back—and suggests, in fact, that he would do better by returning (578).

Sirius, Harry's godfather, Grimes (2002, 112) notes, "…befriends Harry primarily through correspondence" but when Harry really needs him, he appears, often as Snuffles, the dog. Sirius therefore symbolizes the animals that in mythology help abandoned children—these animals, however, are usually female but "the animal who comes to Harry's rescue is male, a father figure" (*ibid.*). As mentioned, father figures seem to play a more central role than mothers in the *Harry Potter* series. In *Goblet of Fire*, Sirius is worried about Harry; his "eyes [are] full of concern" (291) and he tells Harry to "keep [his] eyes open… – and [to] concentrate on keeping [him]self out of trouble" (354). Sirius eventually comes to stay near Hogwarts and says he is "[f]ulfilling [his] duty as godfather" (*Goblet of Fire*, 452); he reckons "things are getting fishier" (453) after Harry's "last letter…" so "[he] want[s] to be on the spot" (452). Sirius tells Harry (and Ron and Hermione) "not to go leaving Hogwarts without permission, [as] it would be an ideal opportunity for someone to attack [Harry]" (*Goblet of Fire*, 463). Later, he wants Harry to swear that he "won't stray out of bounds again" (*Goblet of Fire*, 496–497) and writes that "…[his] priority is to ensure [Harry's] safety" (530). In *Order of the Phoenix* (706), Sirius comes to Harry's rescue to the Department of Mysteries and is killed by his own cousin, Bellatrix Lestrange (710). Thus he, too, like Harry's parents, sacrifices his own life to save Harry.

Severus Snape, for his part, works behind the scenes to ensure Harry's safety. Snape has agreed to Dumbledore's plan of protecting Harry for Lily's sake—thus his own love for Harry's mother compels him to shield Harry (*Deathly Hallows*, 544–545). But yet Snape cannot overcome his hatred towards James—Harry is too much like his father—so Snape does seem to genuinely hate Harry. Of course Snape's role, because of the eventual plot twist, requires him to do so.[1]

4.5 Psychological Well-Being and Emotional Support: Love, Attachment, and Approval

Buehler, Rhodes, Orme and Cuddeback (2006, 532) say that "[o]ne of the strongest correlates of positive child adjustment is feeling accepted and cared for by parents"[2] and thus "foster children

[1] See also 4.7.2.
[2] According to a 2002 study by Khaleque and Rohner.

[especially] need to feel accepted and valued by their foster parents…"[1]. In *AGG* and *Harry*, the birth parents are dead but the first parents the orphans remember do reject them. When Mrs. Thomas is widowed, she and her children go to live with her mother-in-law who does not want Anne (*AGG*, 39). After that, Mrs. Hammond takes Anne but once widowed, "...divided her children among relatives and went to the States" while Anne went to the asylum (*ibid.*). The Dursleys, on the other hand, constantly reject Harry and treat him as an outcast. Buehler *et al.* (2006, 531–532) note that recent studies in developmental psychology[2] show how important emotional security is for children. Neither Anne's nor Harry's foster homes (the Thomases, the Hammonds, or the Dursleys) seem ideal as regards emotional security or psychological well-being. However, neither child seems to be exceedingly insecure but displays instead what could be called 'normal' insecurities of adolescence.

4.5.1 Psychological Well-Being and Emotional Support in *Anne of Green Gables*

Clarkson notes, in her Foreword to *L.M. Montgomery and Canadian Culture* (in Gammel & Epperly 1999, x) that "Matthew and Marilla… represent Canadians at their most characteristic – repressed, silent, and strictured, but decent, open-hearted, and capable of adapting to circumstances". The Cuthberts, "a traditional bachelor and spinster", suddenly became parents and "became loved by someone outside their 'family'" (*ibid.*). Moreover, they are able to reciprocate that love. McMaster (2007, 407) states that "Anne desperately craves approval" having been "[d]eprived of love… for the first eleven years of her lonely, starved childhood". Anne tells Diana "[n]obody ever has loved me since I can remember" (*AGG*, 110). Especially Matthew seems to be able to express his love and approval to Anne. Seelye (2005, 340) observes that Anne "carries on a casual, one-on-one relationship with her foster father, Matthew, who obviously adores her…". Unlike Matthew, Marilla does not express her love in words but "…she had learned to love this slim, gray-eyed girl with an affection all the deeper and stronger from its very

[1] Ginsberg quoted in Buehler *et al*. (2006, 532).
[2] Davies, Harold, Goeke-Morey & Cummings 2002; Garbarino 2002.

undemonstrativeness" (*AGG*, 192). Thus "Anne herself had no idea how Marilla loved her" and "sometimes thought wistfully that Marilla was very hard to please and distinctly lacking in sympathy and understanding. But she always checked the thought reproachfully, remembering what she owed to Marilla" (*ibid.*). The reader thus learns that Anne is good as she, despite being treated rather harshly, nevertheless appreciates the fact that Marilla agreed to keep her.

After Matthew's death, Marilla is finally able to express her feelings to Anne (*AGG*, 235). Thus although Marilla does not praise or "spoil" Anne like Matthew, she nevertheless loves Anne. Marilla says "I love you as dear as if you were my own flesh and blood and you've been my joy and comfort ever since you came to Green Gables" (*ibid.*). This scene shows that Montgomery (although not a feminist) was using interdependency, as discussed by Trites (1997, 83), who says that "some feminists have incorporated the strengths of traditional femininity into their politics… by continuing to embrace the importance of interpersonal relationships, so that feminist children's novels often focus on networks of relationships and how human interdependency can succor the child…". Trites (1997, 83) calls attention to the difference between "interdependency" and "dependency"; while dependency involves "a hierarchical model with one person more dependent on (and therefore less powerful than) another; interdependency involves a mutual dependency that emphasizes equality". According to MacLulich (2007, 393), the Cuthberts "quickly find that Anne fills a void in their lives". Thus while Anne is dependent on Marilla and Matthew, they, too, are dependent on Anne; Matthew says "…the Almighty saw we needed her…" (*AGG*, 221) and she is Marilla's "joy and comfort" (*AGG*, 235). Marilla relies on Anne especially after Matthew dies and her eyesight begins to fail.

While gifts that parents give to their children may (or may not) elicit derision in the *Harry* series, the gifts that Anne receives from Matthew are warmly appreciated (although admittedly none of these gifts are homemade but rather expensive, like Sirius's gifts to Harry). While Matthew's gifts are 'vanity' products, Mrs Weasley's sweaters protect against the cold. Yet Matthew's gifts are equally given from the heart and express his love and care for Anne—and they may in fact have a

significant impact on Anne's psychological well-being as Marilla is so set against all things unnecessary. The indulgent Matthew extravagantly buys Anne "chocolate sweeties" (*AGG*, 76)—"[c]andy was usually homemade in the Maritimes of Anne's day" (Barry *et al.* 1997, 210)—and brings Anne a string of "pearl beads" (*AGG*, 213). The strict Marilla disapproves of candy: "It'll ruin her teeth and stomach" (*AGG*, 76) and complains, too, about all the other things that Matthew buys Anne (*AGG*, 214):

> …there is no use in saying anything to Matthew nowadays. Time was when he would take my advice, but now he just buys things for Anne regardless, and the clerks at Carmody know they can palm anything off on him. Just let them tell him a thing is pretty and fashionable, and Matthew plunks his money down for it.

Bernardes (1997, 117) notes that it seems common "to give gifts to children on their birthdays and perhaps have some kind of party". Gift giving "speaks of the intimacies inside families and the kinds of relationships with people outside families", and not just on birthdays but also on national holidays—at Christmas, for example, gift giving is considerable (*ibid.*). In addition, the (family) rituals involved are directed towards persons and things that are highly valued (Cheal quoted in Bernardes 1997, 117). Matthew's gifts signify that Anne is 'highly valued' and thus his gifts may contribute to Anne's psychological well-being—especially as in her life before Green Gables she had apparently nothing and had probably never received any gifts—although this is never mentioned. In any case, Anne wears an asylum dress on arrival and tells Matthew she has "all [her] worldly goods in [her old carpet bag]" (*AGG*, 16).

Indeed, Matthew and Anne (*AGG*, 157):

> …were the best of friends and Matthew thanked his stars many a time and oft that he had nothing to do with bringing her up. That was Marilla's exclusive duty. As it was, he was free to "spoil Anne"–Marilla's phrasing–as much as he liked. But it was not such a bad arrangement after all; a little "appreciation" sometimes does quite as much good as all the conscientious "bringing up" in the world.

Matthew, it seems, understands that children also need 'spoiling'—occasional merriment and frivolous things (that Marilla is inclined to forbid)—and that it is not enough to give children only

what they necessarily need in order to survive (such as decent clothes, food, and shelter). The 'bringing up' mentioned above seems to mean the Puritan way of ridding the child of Original Sin. Matthew's methods of parenting thus complement Marilla's austere methods. The above passage shows quite well Montgomery's views on child rearing and her attempts, via her texts, to change attitudes towards children; from "to be seen but not heard" to children having their own voice (and opinions); a change from the Puritan view to the Romantic view. MacLulich (2007, 394) observes that "[s]ocial criticism entered [Montgomery's] work principally when she protested against the overly strict and repressive way that adults sometime treated children".

While Marilla is proud of Anne but she is "not going to tell her so", Matthew always seems to encourage Anne and says: "I was proud of her and I did tell her so 'fore she went up-stairs" (*AGG*, 165). At school, Anne strives to do her very best; "She wanted to 'pass high' for the sake of Matthew and Marilla—especially Matthew"; Anne wants to "see Matthew's kindly brown eyes gleam with pride in her achievement" (*AGG*, 209). The Cuthberts do seem to encourage Anne in her studies—especially Matthew who had told Anne "that she 'would beat the whole Island'" (*ibid.*). Matthew says to Anne, after she passes the entrance examination to Queen's (and ties in the first place with Gilbert), "Well now, I always said it,… I knew you could beat them all easy" (*AGG*, 211). Matthew also tells Anne that he is proud of her after she wins the Avery scholarship (and Anne is sorry for not being a boy) (*AGG*, 232):

> "Well now, I'd rather have you than a dozen boys, Anne," said Matthew patting her hand. "Just mind you that—rather than a dozen boys. Well now, I guess it wasn't a boy that took the Avery scholarship, was it? It was a girl—my girl—my girl that I'm proud of."

Matthew seems to be more proud of his girl than he would be of a "useful" boy. In fact, "[i]t is Matthew who enables Anne to achieve stylish beauty and the rounded shape of maturing womanhood", as Waterston (1993, 32) notes. Matthew asks Mrs. Lynde to buy nice dress fabric for Anne and asks Mrs. Lynde to make the dress "in the new way", with puffed sleeves, after he notices that the dresses Marilla makes for Anne are different from the other girls' dresses (*AGG*, 161). It

may be that by making Matthew, the male parent, the indulging one that Montgomery proposes the need for a softer approach to upbringing children with more authority, since it is the male voice only, as Wood (2007, 322) observes, that was "truly legitimize[d] and authorize[d]" in the era. This may be Montgomery's reason for having a central male character in the first place whereas in Rowling's novels, male characters play more important roles than female characters.

4.5.2 Psychological Well-Being and Emotional Support in *Harry Potter*

De Rosa (2003, 171) notes that Harry's belief that the most surprising thing about life at the Weasleys "was the fact that everybody there seemed to like him" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 37) "affirms his sense of psychological well-being while he lives with these individuals". The Weasleys treat Harry (almost) like a family member, in stark contrast to the Dursleys who exclude him. As a rule, the Dursleys never take Harry on family vacations or day trips or anything. They do not allow him to stay at home alone, nor do they want to take him with them. When, in *Order of the Phoenix* (45–46), the Dursleys finally leave Harry alone in the house for one evening, Uncle Vernon locks him in his bedroom; Harry is told not to leave his room nor "to touch the television, the stereo, or any of [the Dursleys'] possessions" nor "to steal food from the fridge". Before the Quidditch World Cup, "Harry had never been camping in his life; the Dursleys had never taken him on any kind of holiday, preferring to leave him with Mrs Figg…" (*Goblet of Fire*, 73–74). This exclusion could affect Harry's psychological well-being negatively because he is constantly rejected by his own "family". In addition, the Dursleys never celebrate Harry's birthday. They completely ignore "Harry's twelfth birthday"—"Of course, his hopes hadn't been high; they'd never given him a proper present, let alone a cake..." (*Chamber of Secrets*, 9). As children normally receive gifts on their birthdays (and may also have a party) (Bernardes 1997, 117), it would be normal to expect the Dursleys to celebrate their nephew's birthday but since Harry is not 'valued' by them, they tend to overlook his birthdays. According to Cheal (quoted in Bernardes 1997, 117), gift giving is generally directed towards highly valued persons. Even when the Dursleys remembered Harry's birthday, "his

birthdays were never exactly fun" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 36). The Dursleys' gifts to Harry include such comically poor gifts as "a coat-hanger and a pair of Uncle Vernon's old socks" (*ibid.*). For Christmas, they send him "a fifty-pence piece" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 147) or "a toothpick and a note telling him to find out whether he'd be able to stay at Hogwarts for the summer holidays, too" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 158). The Dursleys' "all-time low" Christmas gift to Harry "consisted of a single tissue" (*Goblet of Fire*, 357). These poor gifts emphasize the inequality with which the Dursleys treat their two "sons". The Dursleys' refusal to acknowledge Harry's birthdays strengthens the impression that Harry is not valued, he is not a member of the family.

In the magical world, in contrast, as De Rosa (2003, 166) notes, Harry "encounters nurturing adults who acknowledge him" such as Mrs Weasley, Hagrid, Professor McGonagall, and Sirius. In *Philosopher's Stone* (147), Harry is surprised to find "a small pile of packages at the foot of his bed" on Christmas morning; 'Will you look at this? I've got some presents!' to which Ron says 'What did you expect, turnips?'. Harry, unsurprisingly, receives his 'best' gifts from the magical personae; Hagrid gives him Hedwig the owl for his birthday (*Philosopher's Stone*, 62–63), McGonagall presents him with a Nimbus 2000 (*Philosopher's Stone*, 122), Sirius sends him a Firebolt (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 315), and Dumbledore gives him the Peverells' "Invisibility Cloak" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 148). In addition, Mrs Weasley gives Harry "a Weasley jumper" every Christmas and also sends him treats, such as "a large box of home-made fudge" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 147), "a large plum cake" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 159), "a dozen home-baked mince pies, some Christmas cake and a box of nut brittle" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 165) or "a large quantity of home-made mince pies" (*Goblet of Fire*, 357). Fred says "Harry's [jumper] is better than ours" and that "[s]he obviously makes more of an effort if you're not family" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 149). Thus Harry, at this stage at least, is not considered as exactly family by the Weasleys even though he receives a jumper as a sign of belonging. On Harry's seventeenth birthday, however, the Weasleys give him a watch, a traditional gift for a wizard "when he comes of age" (*Deathly Hallows*, 97). Although it "isn't new like Ron's", it seems to be more valuable still to Harry:

> ...Harry got up and hugged her [Molly]. He tried to put a lot of unsaid things into the hug and perhaps she understood them, because she patted his cheek clumsily when he released her, then waved her wand in a slightly random way, causing half a pack of bacon to flop out of the frying pan on to the floor. (*Deathly Hallows*, 97.)

The watch had actually belonged to Molly's brother Fabian so, although not exactly a family heirloom, the watch nevertheless seems to mean more to Harry than a new one would as it is passed on to him, one who is not a blood relation, like a heirloom.

Sirius is indulgent towards Harry: he gives lavish gifts to Harry and thus contributes to Harry's psychological well-being. Sirius seems to be a similar figure to Matthew in *AGG*; comforting, caring, and someone Harry can talk to. Whenever he is troubled, Harry wishes to see Sirius or to write to him or to talk to him (via the Floo network if not face-to-face). Harry also often talks to Dumbledore or McGonagall if he needs advice but when he feels in the need of the advice of a parent, he prefers Sirius. In *Order of the Phoenix*, "Harry star[es] into the fire, wishing more than anything that Sirius's head would appear there and give him some advice about girls" (407). In addition, after "the dream in which he had been Voldemort" Harry "wished very much that he could have talked to Sirius" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 519–520). When Harry's scar hurts in the *Goblet of Fire* (25), he needs someone to talk to as he cannot talk to the Dursleys;

> What he really wanted (and it felt almost shameful to admit it to himself) was someone like – someone like a *parent*: an adult wizard whose advice he could ask without feeling stupid, someone who cared about him, who had had experience of Dark Magic…
> And then the solution came to him. It was so simple, and so obvious, that he couldn't believe it had taken so long – *Sirius*.

In fact, Harry would have liked to live with Sirius "…it would have been the next best thing to having his own father back… Harry couldn't help feeling miserable when he thought of the home he might have had, and the fact that it was now impossible" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 313).

Hagrid, too, advises Harry who is worried about going to Hogwarts without any knowledge of magic; "Just be yerself" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 66). He thus tells Harry to trust himself—that he is fine the way he is and there is no need to pretend he is someone else. In *Goblet of Fire* (623), Hagrid tells Harry "No good sittin' worryin' abou' it… What's comin' will come, an' we'll meet it

when it does". Thus worrying is of no use but it is better to face the inevitable future with courage and not run away from Fate. Hagrid also tries to talk to Harry about Sirius's death but Harry "could not bear to discuss the thing…" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 752). In *Philosopher's Stone*, Hagrid gives Harry a cake for his eleventh birthday and takes him shopping for school supplies in Diagon Alley. Thus Hagrid takes the place of a parent, especially in *Philosopher's Stone*. In later books, his role as a parent is complemented by other characters but Hagrid always remains in the background even though his role is not as central as before.

Dumbledore is a comforting, grandfatherly figure (more than a headmaster) to Harry; "…Harry respected him. You couldn't help trusting Albus Dumbledore, and as Harry watched him…, he felt really calm for the first time since the Dementor had entered the train compartment" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 71). In *Prisoner of Azkaban* (311), Harry knows that "Dumbledore wouldn't laugh – he could tell Dumbledore" that he thought he saw his father across the lake the previous night. Dumbledore takes Harry seriously and does not hurt his feelings. Dumbledore understands children's feelings even if it is a long time since he himself was one. In fact, the reason why Dumbledore never left school is that "to a wizard such as [he], there can be nothing more important than passing on ancient skills, helping hone young minds" (*Half-Blood Prince*, 414). He thus values children. In *Goblet of Fire* (506), Harry "fe[els] much calmer" (and his scar stops hurting) once he is "in Dumbledore's office [and] know[s] he would shortly be telling [Dumbledore] about the dream". Dumbledore does not reprimand Harry for looking into the Pensieve in his absence, instead he says: "Undoubtedly I did not fasten the cabinet door properly. Naturally, it would have attracted your attention" (*Goblet of Fire*, 518–519). He may have meant for Harry to have a look in—or in any case, he does not deem curiosity a sin but says, nevertheless, that "we should exercise caution with our curiosity" (*Goblet of Fire*, 520). Harry also expects to be reprimanded when he confesses to having fallen asleep in Divination but Dumbledore merely says "Quite understandable" (*ibid.*).

After Dumbledore's death,

> …Harry saw very clearly… how people who cared about him had stood in front of him one by one, his mother, his father, his godfather, and finally Dumbledore, all determined

> to protect him; but now that was over. He would not let anybody else stand between him and Voldemort; he must abandon for ever the illusion he ought to have lost at the age of one: that the shelter of a parent's arms meant that nothing could hurt him. There was no waking from his nightmare, no comforting whisper in the dark that he was safe really, that it was all in his imagination; the last and greatest of his protectors had died and he was more alone than he had ever been before. (*Half-Blood Prince*, 601.)

Harry thus feels abandoned and lonely after he realizes that he has lost all the major parent figures in his life (excepting Hagrid and the Weasleys). But at the same time, Harry has learned that he can stand on his own two feet—that he has grown up, in fact, and does not need parents to protect him anymore. This is something the reader, too, should realise and accept.

Harry should have experienced psychological well-being as a child but instead he experiences psychological trauma: he is psychologically abused by Dudley's verbal and physical bullying, by his aunt and uncle's constant comments of his abnormality and by their demands for his 'invisibility" (De Rosa 2003, 170). Petunia calls Lily "a freak" and says "[she] knew [Harry]'d be just the same, just as strange, just as – as – *abnormal*…" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 44). And yet she took him in to be raised 'as her own'. During the Masons' visit, Vernon demands Harry to stay "in [his] bedroom, making no noise and pretending [he is] not there" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 10). According to De Rosa (2003, 170), Aunt Marge is responsible for "the most brutal emotional abuse" when she makes her "crude and fierce remarks" about Harry's parents (in *Prisoner of Azkaban*). Deavel and Deavel (2002, 51) say that the Dursleys base their mistreatment of Harry "upon their dislike (and Aunt Petunia's evident jealousy of) Harry's mother and father, who" in Uncle Vernon's opinion, were "weirdos,… and the world's better off without them…" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 46). Deavel and Deavel (2002, 51) continue that the Dursleys' assessment of James and Lily, "wrong though it is, is not nearly as bad as their treatment of Harry from before the time he can be accountable for his actions—simply because he is his parents' child". In *Order of the Phoenix* (39), Harry, for the first time, "fully appreciated that Aunt Petunia was his mother's sister"; she "had never in her life looked at him like that before. Her… eyes… were not narrowed in dislike or anger…".

In civilized society, Lacoss (2002, 78) says, many of the Dursleys' actions would be considered child abuse. It is taken for granted that parents take care of their children [or foster children in Harry's case] but parents may in fact give even more than they should, particularly "in this age of designer clothes and highpriced sneakers" (*ibid.*). The Dursleys appear to give Dudley anything he wants. Lacoss (*ibid.*) notes that while young readers probably "relate to Harry's feeling of not fitting in", they are likely to recognize that his home life at the Dursleys is quite extreme. In contrast, the Weasley family reflects, in Lacoss's (*ibid.*) view, a "normal" family in which "the parents love and support their children even when they've misbehaved, there is always plenty of food, and each child has his/her own space, albeit small". While the children do not have designer clothes, they (including Ron's friends) know that the parents love them (*ibid.*). Deavel and Deavel (2002, 60) say that the Weasleys "are the primary model of a functioning family in the series". To De Rosa (2003, 171), too, Molly and Arthur Weasley "represent the series' model parents who have nurtured their children's emotional health, evident from their good-natured, caring, and autonomous dispositions". Only Percy strays after he joins the Ministry (the power-hungry Percy is a 'prat' anyway, in Fred and George's view) but he comes to his senses in *Deathly Hallows* and rejoins the family. Percy confesses to having been "an idiot,… a pompous prat" (his own words) and a "Ministry-loving, family-disowning, power-hungry moron" (Fred's words) (*Deathly Hallows*, 487). It seems Percy was tired of being poor and ashamed of his parents who are not influential people.

De Rosa (2003, 171) notes that the Weasleys and several father-figures Harry encounters at Hogwarts offer him the psychological nurture that he was deprived of at the Dursleys and that he needs in order to succeed at the later trials that "truly test his ability to transition into an adult world". After Cedric's death, Mrs Weasley "appropriately care[s] for and comfort[s]" Harry when she whispers to him (Taub & Servaty 2003, 67): "It wasn't your fault, Harry" (*Goblet of Fire*, 620). Molly also hugs Harry like a mother; she "…bent down, and put her arms around Harry. He had no memory of ever being hugged like this, as though by a mother" (*ibid.*). Molly, or "Mrs Weasley" as Harry always refers to her, is the closest thing to a real mother that Harry has. The Weasleys come

to take the place of Harry's family at the opening of the Triwizard Tournament. Harry thought "[h]e had no family – no family who would turn up to see him risk his life, anyway"—"[t]he Dursleys couldn't possibly be here, could they? … Then he saw Mrs Weasley and Bill standing in front of the fireplace, beaming at him" (*Goblet of Fire*, 534).

> 'Surprise!' Mrs Weasley said excitedly, as Harry smiled broadly, and walked over to them. 'Thought we'd come and watch you, Harry!' She bent down and kissed him on the cheek. …
>
> 'This is really nice of you,' Harry muttered to Mrs Weasley. 'I thought for a moment – the Dursleys –'
>
> 'Hmm,' said Mrs Weasley, pursing her lips. She had always refrained from criticising the Dursleys in front of Harry, but her eyes flashed every time they were mentioned. (*Goblet of Fire*, 535.)

Thus Molly is careful not to hurt Harry's feelings in case he cares about the Dursleys, or not to undermine their authority in Harry's eyes, and therefore does not criticise his foster parents.

4.6 Moral Education and Role Models

According to Bettelheim (quoted in Black 2003, 543), the process of identification with the hero in a story "is very important for a child's moral development". The child "see[s] the advantages of moral behavior through the tangible details of the story, which are much more meaningful than the 'abstract ethical concepts'… that might be lectured at [him]" (*ibid.*). In both *AGG* and *Harry*, in addition to parent figures, also the school via its teachers participates in the moral education of the orphans. Miss Stacy and Professor McGonagall in particular seem to take this duty seriously and both act as role models for their students by representing high moral standards. According to the English ideal, schools had "not only educational but also moral responsibility for students" and "with this duty went the equivalent of parental authority" (*West's Encyclopedia of American Law*). *In loco parentis*, 'in the place or position of a parent' (OED), is "[t]he legal doctrine under which an individual assumes parental rights, duties, and obligations without going through the formalities of legal adoption" (*West's Encyclopedia of American Law*).

4.6.1 Moral Education in *Anne of Green Gables*

In *AGG*, the characters mainly responsible for Anne's moral education (other than Miss Stacy) are Marilla and Mrs. Lynde but also Mrs. Allan. Marilla is always eager to inculcate morals: "If you'll be a good girl, you'll always be happy, Anne. And you should never find it hard to say your prayers" (*AGG*, 67). McMaster (2007, 409) says that, for Marilla, the green hair dye incident offers "a heaven-sent opportunity to moralize": "'Well, I hope you'll repent to good purpose,' said Marilla severely, 'and that you've got your eyes opened to where your vanity has led you, Anne'" (*AGG*, 175). Anne often cites Mrs. Lynde's 'morals'. After being disappointed because Diana did not join the Queen's class, she says (*AGG*, 196):

> …But we can't have things perfect in this imperfect world, as Mrs. Lynde says. Mrs. Lynde isn't exactly a comforting person sometimes, but there's no doubt she says a great many very true things.

Marilla says that "Nobody has much of a chance to go wrong in Avonlea with Rachel to oversee them" (*AGG*, 202). Anne admits that "[she] really want[s] to be good; and when [she is] with [Marilla] or Mrs. Allan or Miss Stacy [she] want[s] to do just what would please [them] and what [they] would approve of. But mostly when [she is] with Mrs. Lynde [she] feel[s] desperately wicked and as if [she] wanted to go and do the very thing [Mrs. Lynde] tells [her she] oughtn't to do" (*ibid.*). Marilla confesses that "Rachel often has that very effect on [her, too]" and thinks that "she'd have more of an influence for good… if she didn't keep nagging people to do right" (*ibid.*). However, Marilla concedes that "Rachel is a good Christian woman and she means well. There isn't a kinder soul in Avonlea and she never shirks her share of work" (*ibid.*).

For Anne, Mrs. Allan and Miss Stacy are role models. Waterston (1993, 32) says that these two ladies "change the essential pattern of Anne's growing up"; the latter by her kindness (the liniment cake incident) and the former by her encouragement (Anne's competent stage performance). Mrs. Allan says that Anne's liniment cake is "just a funny mistake that anybody might make" (*AGG*, 144). She does not think, as Anne fears, that Anne is trying to poison her. "Mrs. Allan… is both role model and kindred spirit" to Anne (Waterston & Rubio quoted in

Epperly 2007, 354) who becomes more conforming and restrained (Epperly 2007, 354) after befriending Mrs. Allan. Anne says "I'm trying to be as much like Mrs. Allan as I possibly can, for I think she's perfect" (*AGG*, 167).

In Miss Stacy, who is "a bright, sympathetic young woman", Anne "f[inds] another true and helpful friend" (*AGG*, 154). "Anne expand[s] like a flower under this wholesome influence and carrie[s] home to the admiring Matthew and the critical Marilla glowing accounts of school work and aims" (*ibid.*). Miss Stacy encourages Anne to study and apparently tells Marilla Anne would do well in college. Marilla tells Anne Miss Stacy has said Anne is "bright and diligent" (*AGG*, 195). Miss Stacy also advised the girls that "[they] couldn't be too careful what habits [they] formed and what ideals [they] acquired in [their] teens, because by the time [they] were twenty [their] characters would be developed and the foundation laid for [their] whole future life" (*AGG*, 193). The teacher thus attempts to form the moral character of her students and to guide them into the right direction.

4.6.2 Moral Education in *Harry Potter*

In the *Harry Potter* series, Dumbledore and McGonagall as well as other teachers at Hogwarts are responsible for Harry's moral education. In addition, the Weasleys may be seen to educate Harry morally while the Dursleys, like the Malfoys, set an example of how not to behave and treat others. The Malfoys think that being pure-bloods not to mention rich and having a high social position makes them better than every one else. Even Narcissa Malfoy's given name (derived from Latin *narcissus*) suggests 'narcissism', defined as a "[m]ental disorder characterized by extreme self-absorption, an exaggerated sense of self-importance, and a need for attention and admiration from others"; "narcissism is characterized by an unusual coolness and composure, which is shaken only when the narcissistic confidence is threatened, and by the tendency to take others for granted or to exploit them" (Encyclopædia Britannica Online). In addition to Narcissa, also Lucius and Draco seem to fit the depiction of a narcissistic person remarkably well, especially as regards "unusual

coolness and composure" as well as their inclination to exploit others. Draco's cronies, Grabbe and Goyle always do his bidding.

Lucius is a Roman given name derived from the Latin *lux* (*lucis*), meaning "light" (Encyclopædia Britannica Online) but it also resembles Lucifer; 'the morning star' or 'the rebel archangel'; which is currently used mainly in the phrase "as proud as Lucifer" (OED). Lucius is certainly proud and vain but also selfish, arrogant, and an unfaithful servant of Voldemort; he denounced his master as soon as Voldemort lost his powers (when the killing curse on Harry backfired). The surname Malfoy may be a combination of *mal* (from Old French *mal-* adverbial prefix (or from classical Latin *male* 'ill', 'badly'; *malus* 'bad', 'of uncertain origin'); as a prefix it denotes 'ill', 'wrong', 'improper(ly)') and *foy* (from French *foi*, meaning 'faith, allegiance, homage') (OED), thus Malfoy means *bad faith* or *unfaithful*. 'Draco' means a stellar constellation but also 'lizard' and 'dragon'; originally the Greek *drakon* signified 'any large serpent' (Encyclopædia Britannica Online). His name, therefore, is appropriate for the House of Slytherin—a snake. Like Dudley, Draco has been spoiled by overindulgence. Harry thinks, in *Chamber of Secrets* (27), that next to Draco, Dudley "look[s] like a kind, thoughtful and sensitive boy".

Deavel and Deavel (2002, 60) note that "next to Harry's parents, the Weasleys provide the most powerful illustration of how parents form the character of their children through example and sacrifice". According to Deavel and Deavel (2002, 61), "the Weasleys have chosen to sacrifice their status within the wizard world and the economic interests of their family rather than to compromise moral principles" as they do not accept the myth that wizards are better than Muggles. The choices and character of Mr and Mrs Weasley earn them the respect of not only Dumbledore but also "the respect and emulation of their own children, Harry included" (*ibid.*), except for the power-hungry Percy. The Dursleys, on the other hand, teach Harry by their own example and lack of morals, how *not* to behave.

At school, Harry learns "about the concepts of duty, responsibility, and loyalty" (Alton 2003, 151). According to Pinsent (2005, 18), morality is "a very important theme of the school

story"; qualities "such as leadership, friendliness, and concern for others" that "make for good relationships in a small community", are praised while qualities like "dishonesty, telling tales, and snobbery", that could break relationships, are censored. At Hogwarts, Alton (2003, 152) notes, "many of [the teachers] serve as role models for proper behaviour, with Professor McGonagall as the ultimate example of propriety as well as discipline: 'It's one o'clock in the morning. *Explain yourselves*'" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 177). Black (2003, 542) notes that "[s]tudents don't wiggle and giggle in the back rows of her classes…". In *Prisoner of Azkaban* (69), Harry approaches McGonagall, who beckons him, "with a feeling of foreboding; Professor McGonagall had a way of making him feel he must have done something wrong". In *Goblet of Fire* (337), she says, "in a disapproving voice" (rather reminiscent of Marilla's): "The Yule Ball is of course a chance for us all to – er – let our hair down". Professor Snape, in contrast, as Alton (2003, 152) observes, "acts as an anti–role model, with his favouritism of Draco Malfoy and the [rest of the] Slytherins and his grudge against Harry". Remus Lupin, as Deavel and Deavel (2002, 53) say, "covers for Harry after he dangerously sneaks out for a good time in the nearby magical village,…[but] Lupin's reprimand is tougher than punishment". He reminds Harry of his parents' sacrifice: "Don't expect me to cover up for you again, Harry… Your parents gave their lives to keep you alive, Harry. A poor way to repay them – gambling their sacrifice for a bag of magic tricks" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 213). Hagrid wants to discuss Hermione with Ron and Harry in *Prisoner of Azkaban* (202) as "[s]he's in a righ' state… Bin feelin' lonely" after the boys have not been "talkin' to her". He advises the boys "…I gotta tell yeh, I thought you two'd value yer friend more'n broomsticks or rats. Tha's all" (*ibid.*). Hagrid thus teaches Harry and Ron to value friendship more than material things.

Alton (2003, 152) says that "Dumbledore is kind, charismatic, and very powerful" and "appears to be extremely knowledgeable about all aspects of the world… and he also exhibits a highly moral character". According to Deavel and Deavel (2002, 54), "Dumbledore commands Harry's respect and loyalty because he is virtuous" and "[h]e is virtuous precisely because he acts according to a 'higher law' of moral standards". Dumbledore never lies; he tells Harry "...I shall

answer your questions unless I have a very good reason not to, in which case I beg you'll forgive me. I shall not, of course, lie" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 216). In *Goblet of Fire* (626), Dumbledore tells the students "It is my belief,… that the truth is generally preferable to lies…". Thus in *Harry*, as in *Anne*, lying is condemned (at least by parent figures). Dumbledore teaches by his own example not to lie. However, to Harry, "[l]ying to Hagrid wasn't quite like lying to anyone else" (*Goblet of Fire*, 396). So Harry himself does not wholly disapprove of lying in some instances.

Deavel and Deavel (2002, 57) say that the Weasleys "are Harry's family—and families most shape the character of children" and "teach the deepest lessons"; so the Potters and the Weasleys, by their examples and sacrifices, prepare their children, particularly Harry, "to make virtuous choices themselves". By saving Pettigrew, Deavel and Deavel (2002, 59) note, "Harry chooses to follow his father's example rather than to indulge his own desire for revenge"—he "act[s] with the courage and virtue that characterized his father". Griesinger (2002, 473) says that "Harry has [thus] chosen mercy over judgment, the impenetrable magic of grace". Harry has a forgiving nature.

Zipes (2001, 178–179) notes that Harry "does not curse; he speaks standard English grammatically, as do all his friends; he is respectful to his elders; and he has perfect manners". In this sense, the Dursleys seem to have raised Harry well—how they have managed to accomplish it is another matter. It must be admitted that even Dudley seems to behave well in front of his elders (except for his own parents), he behaves especially well in front of Aunt Marge—but only because there is something in it for him as he receives "a crisp twenty-pound note", for example, for hugging her (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 22). Nevertheless, he is polite to the Masons and welcomes them as his father has instructed him to. Thus it does seem that both of the boys have been trained in manners, to some extent, at least.

4.7 Discipline: Rules and Consequences

Kadushin (1970, 194) notes that disciplining "is a significant aspect of the role of the parent, who... socialize[s] the child to the ways of the group by explicit education, identification with parental

behaviour, positive rewards for conforming behavior, and so on". According to Kadushin (1970, 197), the adoptive parent of an older child faces "the problem of discipline almost immediately" as "[s]ome activities need to be discouraged [and] some behavior needs to be changed". Thus the adoptive parent has limited time to learn which approach yields optimum results (*ibid.*). Sometimes it is inevitable to use negative sanctions and punishments (Kadushin 1970, 194) but according to Adesman and Adamec (2004, 39), whenever possible, rewards should be used as motivators rather than punishments. However, Adesman and Adamec (2004, 92) say that "[m]ost parents ignore good behaviour and complain about bad behavior, when the fact is that praising good behaviour is very effective". Furthermore, as Adesman and Adamec (2004, 39) say, "noncorporal punishments work best, and spanking should not be the routine, primary form of punishment for any child". Instead, "[e]ffective limit setting can be established and reinforced using behavioural techniques without relying upon physical punishment" (Adesman & Adamec 2004, 42). As "effective punishments for school-age children" Adesman and Adamec (2004, 107) suggest 'time-outs'; "[b]eing made to stare at a blank wall is a benign but effective form of negative reinforcement or punishment".

Anne's and Harry's parents, Marilla and the Dursleys, are rather strict, Harry's to excess, even. To set rules and routines and to enforce them is good parenting (Adesman & Adamec 2004, 39) but the Dursleys seem to go too far with Harry's punishments. Of the Cuthberts, Marilla is the strict parent who punishes Anne when needed. Neither Marilla nor the Dursleys seem to praise good behaviour. Yet both Harry and Anne seem to be inherently good from the beginning although at least Anne learns, via discipline and rules, to be even 'better'. As Anne matures, she becomes less absorbed in her own imagination (and thus less forgetful) and she talks much less than before. In the beginning, Anne is exuberant and prone to getting into all sorts of scrapes but by the end of *AGG*, she is almost boringly sedate. As Waterston (1993, 33) observes, in the end, "Anne and Avonlea subside into mutual respect for each other". She is thus successfully socialized into the ways of the Avonlea community. Harry, even as an adolescent, is able to recover from the distressing events of his childhood possibly because he has new parent figures at Hogwarts who seem to do a better job

at parenting than the Dursleys. However, before Hogwarts, Harry has experience of only Mrs Figg as a caretaker to compare to the Dursleys. The Dursleys' strict approach to parenting Harry may be beneficial, too, though, as mentioned—at least it is better than their approach to parenting Dudley.

4.7.1 Rules and Consequences in *Anne of Green Gables*

Marilla and Matthew teach Anne that actions have consequences: rule-breaking or bad behaviour leads to punishment but they also give her love and affection (or rather Matthew does). Marilla sets limits for Anne, she has a curfew, for example, although she does not always remember it (*AGG*, 78). To teach Anne not to let her imagination run wild, Marilla makes Anne "go through the Haunted Wood" (*AGG*, 134) and insists that "[t]here are no such things as ghosts, Anne" (*AGG*, 135). However, to Anne, "her terror [i]s very real" and she asks "Oh, Marilla, how can you be so cruel?" (*AGG*, 135–136). Åhmansson (2007, 376) says that this scene is "[t]he most momentous 'disciplining' episode" in *AGG* "describing childish terror and adult insensitivity"; "the punishment… [Marilla] forces Anne to undergo is… nothing short of mental child abuse". However, this episode is depicted in a way that makes it (slightly) unclear what the author's attempt was; to encourage such methods as Marilla's or to discourage them. It seems more likely that it is the latter because Montgomery was, on the whole, apparently attempting to change views on children and upbringing and would thus infinitely prefer Romantic Matthew's softer approach to Puritan Marilla's severe approach. However, on the one hand, the narrator seems to be opposed to the "adult insensitivity" but on the other hand, the method seems to work rather well in the novel, because after "the shock treatment", as Åhmansson (2007, 376) notes, Anne never lets her imagination run wild again.

Lehnert (1992, 115) says that in *AGG*, "the adults… are not represented as perfect, intimidating role models for the children, but are depicted realistically, sometimes even as weak and unfair". For example, Marilla wrongly accuses Anne of stealing her amethyst brooch and, unfairly, demands a confession (*AGG*, 81–82). Later, however, when Marilla learns the truth, she does

apologize to Anne: "…I was wrong—I see that now. I shouldn't have doubted your word when I'd never known you to tell a story" (*AGG*, 87). According to Åhmansson (2007, 370), "[a]t the end of the nineteenth century lying had become a cardinal sin for a child to commit in the eyes of people in general". It was viewed as "an incurable vice" (Åhmansson 2007, 372) and thus "[t]ruthfulness… became the ultimate test of a child's breeding and prospects in general" (371). Secretiveness was viewed as "a kind of lying in reverse" and children were expected to confess their faults promptly and to tell their parents everything (*ibid.*). This may be why Marilla reacts so strongly to Anne "taking" the brooch; she thinks Anne is lying when she tells her she did not lose the brooch. In Marilla's Puritan view, it seems, vanity is a sin (almost) comparable to lying. Marilla thinks, for example, that were she to tell "Anne just what Miss Stacy had said about her; that would have been to pamper vanity" (*AGG*, 195). She also tells Anne who asks her whether "[her] hair will really be a handsome auburn when [she] grow[s] up": "You shouldn't think so much about your looks, Anne. I'm afraid you are a very vain little girl" (*AGG*, 66).

The unfair Mrs. Lynde presents the view that adults are far superior to children. She tells Marilla, while Anne is present, how ugly Anne looks: "Well, they didn't pick you for your looks, that's sure and certain,… She's terrible skinny and homely, Marilla" (*AGG*, 57). When Anne, "her face scarlet with anger", pronounces that she hates Mrs. Lynde and tells her she is "a rude, impolite, unfeeling woman", Mrs. Lynde expects an apology (*ibid.*). Marilla agrees but says "…we must make allowances for her. She's never been taught what is right. And you *were* too hard on her, Rachel" (*AGG*, 59). Marilla thus scolds Rachel for speaking her mind. Montgomery implies here that adults, too, should monitor what they say, and not only children.

Neither Matthew nor Marilla use corporal punishment although it was a common practice in the Victorian era—both in schools and homes—there were even "advice books" for spanking (Gammel & Epperly 1999, 111). Marilla wonders how she should punish Anne for her outburst at Mrs. Lynde: "The amiable suggestion of the birch switch—to the efficiency of which all of Mrs. Rachel's own children could have borne smarting testimony—did not appeal to Marilla. She did not

believe she could whip a child" (*AGG*, 59). Thus Marilla is not weak in the sense that she does not need to resort to physical punishment because she finds other means of disciplining Anne. Mr. Phillips, Anne's first teacher in Avonlea, whipped a boy but the "father came down to the school and dared Mr. Phillips to lay a hand on one of his children again" (*AGG*, 103–104). Here again Montgomery seems to be trying to change views on child rearing as physical punishment is opposed strongly in the narration. In *AA* (27), Anne says:

> 'I could *never* whip a child … I don't believe in it *at all*. Miss Stacy never whipped any of us and she had perfect order; and Mr. Phillips was always whipping and he had no order at all … Don't you think it's a cruel, barbarous thing to whip a child … *any* child?' 'Well', said Gilbert slowly, torn between his real convictions and his wish to measure up to Anne's ideal, 'there's something to be said on both sides. I don't believe in whipping children *much*. I think, as you say Anne, that there are better ways of managing as a rule, and that corporal punishment should be a last resort. But on the other hand, … I believe there is an occasional child who can't be influenced in any other way and who, in short, needs a whipping and would be improved by it.'

Curiously, Montgomery does not seem to condemn physical punishment in all cases, as suggested by Gilbert and the fact that Anne "actually whipped one of her pupils [Anthony Pye]" although she "feel[s] ashamed, repentant, and bitterly mortified" afterwards (*AA*, 97). It is later noted that the "whipping [Anne] gave him was 'just as good as a man's'" (*AA*, 100) and that this form of punishment actually "agreed" with Anthony—it earned Anne his respect (*AA*, 130). Thus corporal punishment, in Montgomery's view, could be necessary but also beneficial in some instances.

In Victorian fiction, possibly the most common (non-corporal) punishment was withholding food; as Seelye (2005, 134) notes, a frequent punishment that "so many long-suffering children in Victorian fiction" share is "being sent to bed with nothing for supper but bread and water". Seelye (2005, 334) remarks that "although Anne makes a number of very embarrassing and occasionally painful blunders as a young girl, she is seldom punished beyond being sent to her room without supper". In addition, Seelye (2005, 335) states, "one or another of the Cuthberts usually relents, often because it turns out Anne was entirely innocent of the act for which she is reprimanded". In fact, Marilla carries "well-filled tray[s]" of food up to her room when she is told to "stay up there until she's willing to apologize to Mrs. Lynde" (*AGG*, 62). While Anne is sent to her room, she still

receives food to eat (not only bread and water) but Davy in *AA* (80) is sent "to bed without his supper… so often". Sometimes he remains "without any supper" (*AA*, 63) but sometimes he receives, instead of dinner, "a plain tea of bread and milk" (62). Marilla needs to resort to slightly harsher methods with Davy as he does not seem to learn his lessons as easily as Anne does. Marilla is exasperated with Davy's incessant questions, too, as she had been "brought up" to believe that "children should be seen and not heard" and thinks that "it was just as good a way as all these new fangled notions for training children" (*AA*, 231). The narrative also criticizes "the evil habit of bribing people to be good" to which Marilla has stooped with Davy (*AA*, 172). Unlike Anne, Davy objects to being good; he complains about the necessity of "being good in this world" (*AA*, 173). This may suggest, especially as Dora is a perfect angel, that boys do not want to nor do they need to be good (at least not 'masculine' boys like Davy—as the 'feminine' and sensitive Paul is naturally good, it seems) while girls need to (and many may want to) be good.

Matthew hardly ever seems to deem it necessary to punish Anne, at least not severely. When Anne is sent to her room after her outburst at Mrs. Lynde, he tells Marilla "…don't be too hard on her… You're—you're going to give her something to eat, aren't you?" To which Marilla replies, indignantly, "When did you ever hear of me starving people into good behaviour?" "She'll have her meals regular, and I'll carry them up to her myself" (*AGG*, 62). Later on, when Marilla's brooch is missing, Matthew is "a miserable man" "between his sense of justice and his unlawful sympathy with Anne"—he thinks "it's pretty rough not to let her go to the picnic when she's so set on it" (*AGG*, 86). Today, withholding food (or using it as a reward) is not recommended because of the risk of the child developing an eating disorder. Adesman and Adamec (2004, 39) explain that "most nutritionists and psychologists now say it's best to avoid using food as a punishment or a reward, because it may set up an unhealthy emotional attitude toward eating". Thus it may not be advisable to use food as a reward or punishment in children's literature either.

At school, Anne is punished by being made to "go and stand on the platform in front of the blackboard for the rest of the afternoon" (*AGG*, 95). This seems to be the sort of 'time-out'

Adesman and Adamec recommend. Later, however, when Anne arrives late to school after dinner, Mr. Phillips punishes Anne by making her sit with a boy, Gilbert Blythe. Mrs. Lynde does not believe it a "modest" punishment and she thinks the teacher was wrong to punish only Anne as others arrived late, too (*AGG*, 99). Mr. Phillips also ridicules students; he had said to Anne "[she] was the worst dunce he ever saw at geometry and laughed at [Anne's] spelling" (*AGG*, 137). This belittling and humiliating in public could possibly have serious psychological consequences. Anne, however, does not seem affected by her unfair teacher's methods—at least not in the long term, possibly because her new teacher Miss Stacy is, in contrast, encouraging, or because of the emotional support Anne receives from Matthew believing in her.

Seelye (2005, 13) suggests that the central struggle in "American novels [among which he includes *AGG*] aimed at young female readers" is the attempt of an adolescent woman "to gain maturity and ascendancy over the terms of the world, an adversarial bildungsroman…". Seelye (2005, 331) remarks that in most of these novels, "the need to control tempers, to curb enthusiasms, to fit however one can into the dominant social pattern" is emphasized. Anne, especially during her first months (and years) in Avonlea seems to stumble upon these requirements often. Anne has difficulties with controlling her temper (if anyone comments on her hair); she is furious at Mrs. Lynde and retaliates by telling her exactly what she thinks of her ("stamping her foot on the floor"): "I hate you—I hate you—I hate you… You are a rude, impolite, unfeeling woman!" (*AGG*, 57). Later, Anne cracks a slate on Gilbert's head after he calls her "Carrots" (*AGG*, 93). Anne, however, has "never been taught what is right" as Marilla herself says and thus, Marilla thinks, "…we must make allowances for her" (*AGG*, 59). Anne learns quickly, however; as she herself claims "That's one good thing about me. I never do the same naughty thing twice" (*AGG*, 82). According to Seelye (2005, 337), Anne also "needs to rein in her imagination, which takes hold of her attention to such an extent that she often makes mistakes that irritate her foster mother…". Anne is therefore scolded often but eventually she does "get over her feather-brained ways" (*AGG*, 200) and manages to fit into 'the dominant social pattern' mentioned by Seelye (2005, 331).

4.7.2 Rules and Consequences in *Harry Potter*

The Dursleys' treatment of Harry amounts to abuse and excessive punishment. As De Rosa (2003, 168) observes, Petunia severely punishes Harry who "pretends to cast a spell that would ignite the Dursleys' hedge" by "imposing such an unreasonable number of chores on [him that it] amounts to abuse". Petunia also "aimed a heavy blow at his head with the soapy frying pan" which Harry ducks (*Chamber of Secrets*, 13). De Rosa (2003, 169) observes that "[w]hen Harry inadvertently ruins the Dursley–Mason dinner party…, Uncle Vernon… literally treats him as a prisoner". He "paid a man to fit bars on Harry's window" and "fitted the cat-flap in the bedroom door" through which Harry could be fed (*Chamber of Secrets*, 21). The Dursleys "let Harry out to use the bathroom morning and evening. Otherwise, he was locked in his room around the clock" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 21–22).

Dolores Umbridge's disciplinary methods are similar to the Dursleys' methods with Harry. Umbridge seems to care more about her kitten plates and doilies than her students even though, superficially, she appears to be friendly and auntie-like (*Order of the Phoenix*, 239). Umbridge's methods, however, consist of inflicting pain, as her given name suggests—*dolorous* means "[c]ausing, attended by, or affected with physical pain; painful; severe, acute" (OED). In detention, she makes Harry write with a quill that uses his own blood as ink and tells him to keep on writing until "the message… *sink*[s] *in*" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 240). She is thus evil, like Voldemort. In addition, she constantly creates new educational decrees to suit her own ends and wants to control everything that goes on at Hogwarts; she is made the "Hogwarts High Inquisitor" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 275) and establishes her own "Inquisitorial Squad" to police the school (551).

Harry has "moral character", as Griesinger (2002, 464) observes, and he "is informed as to the proper and improper, legal and illegal, uses of magic" from his entrance into Hogwarts. The students are disciplined for inappropriate use of magic so "[t]here are definite moral and ethical ground rules" and consequently the students, including Harry, learn that there are consequences for rule breaking (*ibid.*). Harry has probably learned this already at the Dursleys who, however, seem to discipline him even when he does nothing wrong so he could possible be very confused. The

Hogwarts rules include Mr Filch's comically long "list of objects forbidden inside the castle… compris[ing] some four hundred and thirty-seven items…" (*Goblet of Fire*, 162). However, in *Half-Blood Prince* (287), Hermione asks Ron "And when has anyone ever paid attention to what Filch has banned?" Another school rule is "that the Forest in the grounds is out-of-bounds…" (*Goblet of Fire*, 162) and Dumbledore reminds the students of this each year. Cheating is not tolerated, either; in *Order of the Phoenix* (625), Professor McGonagall says "…I must warn you that the most stringent anti-cheating charms have been applied to your examination papers", and in case anyone does manage to work their way past the charms, Umbridge has ordered that "cheating will be punished most severely". Thus the students' behaviour is guided and controlled in many ways.

Alton (2003, 152) notes that "[w]hile the students must answer to Dumbledore, their professors, and their housemasters, they have far more freedom than they would enjoy in the outside world: for example, Hogwarts has no apparent curfew, and students can remain in their house common room studying or socializing as late as they please". However, the students are not allowed to wander around the castle or grounds at night. In *Order of the Phoenix* (351), the DA group has to finish shortly after nine "or risk being caught and punished by Filch for being out of bounds" so there is a curfew by which students must return to their house common room. Alton (2003, 152) says that the students "usually attend most of their classes without complaint and pay attention in class…". Yet Harry, Ron, and Hermione seem to keep up discussions during many of their classes—and the two boys never seem to take any notes. Thus Rowling may suggest that it is acceptable to ignore teachers and teaching—but may also describe the reality in many classrooms.

While many of the adults in *Harry* are not represented exactly realistically, some of them are still, as in *AGG*, weak and/or unfair—and not intimidating role models. Even Dumbledore is not right all the time; he himself confesses: "I make mistakes like the next man. In fact, being – forgive me – rather cleverer than most men, my mistakes tend to be correspondingly huger" (*Half-Blood Prince*, 187). Dumbledore says in *Order of the Phoenix* (737) that Harry was "neither as happy nor as well-nourished as [he] would have liked" but Dumbledore's master plan of keeping Harry safe at

his relatives succeeded nonetheless as Harry was "alive and healthy" when he arrived at Hogwarts.

While role models need not be fair and strong, 'evil' characters still often seem to be unfair and/or weak in *Harry*. These evil (and detestable) characters are represented in particular by Snape, Umbridge, and the Dursleys. The latter two seem to be opponents that Harry eventually defeats and they are unfair but strong. However, all the 'evil' characters are not the fairy tale type of "black or white" characters (like Umbridge, Petunia, and Vernon appear to be) so that a character would be either wholly good or wholly evil. Snape, for example, has his major faults but is revealed to be a knight in shining armour nonetheless. "Snape was Head of Slytherin house, and generally favoured his own students before all others" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 94). He gives detention to Harry and Ron and takes away "[f]ifty points from Gryffindor" even though it was Harry and Malfoy who cursed each other (*Goblet of Fire*, 262–263). Snape also hurts Hermione's feelings as he "see[s] no difference" in her appearance when Malfoy's curse hit her by accident and elongated her teeth by several inches (*Goblet of Fire*, 263). In addition, Hermione learns quickly to jinx without speaking, "a feat that would surely have earned her twenty points for Gryffindor from any reasonable teacher,… but which Snape ignored" (*Half-Blood Prince*, 170). While Snape is thus described as unjust and even spiteful, he is still a man of principle and he keeps his promise to Dumbledore—he seems to be "Dumbledore's man through and through" like Harry (*Half-Blood Prince*, 326). In the end, Snape is revealed to be, not exactly a 'kindred spirit' to Harry, but nevertheless a protector, as Lacoss (2002, 78) says: "Snape is a rather oily, rather untrustworthy individual, yet he saves Harry's life". Lacoss (*ibid.*) observes that Rowling "transposes characteristics usually associated with evil characters onto good ones"; the character of Sirius, for example, "represents a reversal employed to demonstrate further to the readers that things are not always as they appear".

Harry, like Anne, does not experience corporal punishment—except in detention with Umbridge in *Order of the Phoenix*—although the Dursleys threaten him with physical violence on several occasions. In *Chamber of Secrets* (19), Uncle Vernon tells Harry "…one more sound and you'll wish you'd never been born, boy!" and in *Prisoner of Azkaban* (21), he threatens to knock

the stuffing out of Harry if Harry lets anything of his abnormality slip to Aunt Marge. The Dursleys have told Aunt Marge Harry goes to "St Brutus's Secure Centre for Incurably Criminal Boys" (*ibid.*), "a first rate institution for hopeless cases" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 23). She wants to know whether "they use the cane at St Brutus's" (*ibid.*) and is very happy to learn that they do, "[a]ll the time" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 24). Thus Aunt Marge presents the view that physical punishment is needed (like Mrs. Lynde in *AGG* and Jane Andrews and Gilbert Blythe in *AA*, 26–27); "I won't have this namby-pamby, wishy-washy nonsense about not hitting people who deserve it. A good thrashing is what's needed in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 24). In addition, she "loved criticizing [Harry]" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 22) and always "boom[ed] out suggestions for his improvement" (*Prisoner of Azkaban*, 24). Aunt Marge, therefore, supports emotional as well as physical discipline (or even abuse)—and Rowling appears to condemn both.

While Anne is sent to her room as punishment (and is nevertheless provided with food), Harry is punished at the Dursleys by being locked inside his cupboard (and later by being sent to his room) without food. In *Philosopher's Stone* (26), Uncle Vernon is so angry that "[h]e only manage[s] to say, 'Go – cupboard – stay – no meals…'". Thus Harry (instead of Anne) experiences the popular punishment in Victorian fiction of "being sent to bed with nothing for supper but bread and water" that Seelye (2005, 134) mentions—on this occasion, however, Harry is denied food altogether. Conversely at Hogwarts, as De Rosa (2003, 168) notes, "punishment [does not] mean going to bed hungry"; students may be punished but they are not deprived of food. Professor McGonagall gives Harry and Ron detention for driving (or rather flying) the Ford Anglia into the Whomping Willow but instead of sending them to bed, she produces "[a] large plate of sandwiches, two silver goblets and a jug of iced pumpkin juice" and tells them to "eat in here and then go straight up to your dormitory" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 65). This seems to be exactly the same as Marilla's way of punishing Anne; there is a consequence for rule-breaking (even if alleged) but the child is not starved. Thus at Hogwarts (like at Green Gables), children are punished but they are not starved; food is not used as a punishment. This accords with the recommendations of nutritionists

and psychologists and contrasts with the less than ideal practices of the Dursleys.

According to De Rosa (2003, 169), "Harry's journey away from 4 Privet Drive and to Hogwarts is, ironically, a journey toward physical safety". I would argue that it is also a journey toward psychological safety as Harry moves away from his abusive foster family into the more nurturing environment of the wizarding world. "The extensive physical abuse Harry experiences at the Dursleys differs significantly from the nonharmful punishment he witnesses and/or receives while at the Weasleys or at Hogwarts [except under Umbridge's rule]" (De Rosa 2003, 169); "[t]he punishments… are (besides being humorous) reasonable (as opposed to the Dursley's [sic] excessive demands) and justifiable (the boy actually misbehaves)…" (De Rosa 2003, 170). De Rosa (*ibid.*) notes that Mrs Weasley punishes Fred, George, and Ron for flying the Ford Anglia "to teach responsibility to family" by making them "de-gnome the garden" (*Chamber of Secrets*, 32), a tedious and endless but not a harmful exercise. The Weasleys, however, do not seem to treat Harry exactly as their own son because they are more strict with their own children. In *Chamber of Secrets* (31), Molly tells Harry "I don't blame *you*, dear". And, as she tells Fred, George, and Ron "to de-gnome the garden", she adds to Harry "You can go up to bed, dear,... You didn't ask them to fly that wretched car" (32). Harry, however, good-naturedly offers to help the others. In *Order of the Phoenix* (78), Molly tells the room at large "And if you want dinner before midnight I'll need a hand... No, you can stay where you are, Harry dear, you've had a long journey".

However, Harry is unjustifiably punished at Hogwarts, usually by Snape. De Rosa (2003, 169–170) notes that "Rowling affirms the need for nonexcessive punishment and the preservation of a degree of innocence when she casts Professor McGonagall reprimanding 'Professor Moody' for transforming Draco Malfoy into a ferret": "…we *never* use Transfiguration as a punishment! … We give detentions…. Or speak to the offender's Head of house!" (*Goblet of Fire*, 182). Here again, Rowling's text echoes Montgomery's views on upbringing and discipline (in *AGG*); excessive punishment is unnecessary and parents (adults) should show children some respect. An opposing view on upbringing and discipline is provided by Filch, the Hogwarts caretaker, who says

that “hard work and pain are the best teachers” and who misses “the old punishments [that have] die[d] out” (*Philosopher’s Stone*, 181). He would like to “hang [students] by [thei]r wrists from the ceiling for a few days, [he’s] got the chains still in [his] office, [and] keep[s] ‘em well oiled in case they’re ever needed” (*ibid.*). Disciplinary methods have thus changed at Hogwarts—possibly because of the humane approach of Dumbledore. Under Umbridge’s rule, however, the old punishment methods are almost reinstated and she runs the school like a military state; students are not even allowed to assemble freely (*Order of the Phoenix*, 313).

Similarly as in *AGG*, in *Harry*, too, the need to fit into ‘the dominant social pattern’ is apparent. As Grimes (2002, 102) notes, Petunia and Vernon conspire “to force Harry to behave in ways acceptable to their guests and kinfolk, to deny his very identity, [which] mirrors... attempts to force young people to behave in culturally approved manners”. In *Order of the Phoenix* (7), it is mentioned that “Harry Potter’s appearance did not endear him to the neighbours, who were the sort of people who thought scruffiness ought to be punishable by law…”. Thus the community only approves of people like the Dursleys. While the Dursleys do not manage to stamp out the magic from Harry, the Hogwarts teachers (especially Dumbledore) do manage to bring him up to be a respectable member of the magical community. Furthermore the Dursleys have, even with all their shortcomings, taught Harry humility and selflessness.

De Rosa (2003, 169) points out that if the Dursleys “truly believed that physical abuse possessed beneficial character-forming potential, they would have showered such acts upon Dudley”. Instead, they are *permissive-indulgent parents*—overly tolerant of their child’s misbehaviour (Stringer, quoted in De Rosa 2003, 169); Dudley is never punished or scolded. According to Adesman and Adamec (2004, 54), the most common parenting error is overindulgence or ‘spoiling’ a child; “parents who not only strive mightily to please their child, but who often attempt to anticipate the child’s every whim before it takes shape in her mind” are not doing their child a favour. Overindulgence appears in different forms; parents may buy their “child everything he expresses a passing interest in” or “rarely (or never!) saying the word *no*” or parents

may strive "to make everything easy" for their child—thus "the overindulged child… gains whether he endures minimal emotional pain or not" which "is not good preparation for the cold outside world" (*ibid.*). This seems to be exactly how the Dursleys are bringing up Dudley.

Towards Harry, however, the Dursleys take an *authoritarian* approach (Stringer, quoted in De Rosa 2003, 169); Harry "can do no right in their eyes" (De Rosa 2003, 169). De Rosa (2003, 177) notes that the Dursleys have, by satisfying Dudley's every greedy desire, "produce[d] a young man who lacks an age-appropriate level of 'emotional autonomy'" (Stringer, quoted in De Rosa 2003, 177). On the other hand, De Rosa (2003, 178) says, Harry has a capacity for selflessness; he is not "immature and self-centered" like Dudley. Dumbledore states that he "left [Harry] upon [the Dursleys'] doorstep… with a letter… expressing the hope that [they] would care for him as though he were [their] own" and he scolds the Dursleys for not complying (*Half-Blood Prince*, 57):

> You never treated Harry as a son. He has known nothing but neglect and often cruelty at your hands. The best that can be said is that he has at least escaped the appalling damage you have inflicted upon the unfortunate boy sitting between you.

Thus Dumbledore has noticed that the upbringing Dudley has received is even worse than the one Harry has received. Nevertheless, in *Deathly Hallows* (38), Dudley is worried about what is going to happen to Harry who is not coming with the Dursleys; "But where's he going to go?" Dudley asks. He is grateful to Harry who saved his life in *Goblet of Fire*—and may thus grow up to be a 'better' person than his parents. He tells Harry "I don't think you're a waste of space"—"You saved my life" which, "coming from Dudley[, is] like [saying] 'I love you'" according to Harry (*Deathly Hallows*, 39). Thus having Harry as a "family member" may have had a positive influence on Dudley; Harry has taught him a little consideration for others.

It is obvious that the Dursleys do not make very good parents to either Harry or Dudley; while Harry is neglected, Dudley is over-indulged and the Dursleys seem to live by his rules. For Dudley, there are no consequences for actions—unlike for Harry, who is punished even when he is innocent. According to Adesman and Adamec (2004, 94), parents should be consistent and quick in their punishments so that "child[ren] will learn that misbehavior relates to a consequence". In this

sense, the Dursleys do a much better job of raising Harry than of raising Dudley. Mr Dursley chortles "[l]ittle tyke" when Dudley has a tantrum and throws his cereal at the walls (*Philosopher's Stone*, 8). Dudley also kicks his mother, "screaming for sweets" (*Philosopher's Stone*, 15). By showing 'bad' parenting, Rowling seems to call for 'good' parenting; a balance between discipline and indulgence—and, it seems, in particular by portraying the "spoiled, pampered, bullying Dudley" (*Order of the Phoenix*, 33), to show that parents need to be able to deny some of their children's desires (despite the child's tantrums) even if (and because) they love their children.

5 Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine how foster parenting is portrayed in L.M. Montgomery's *Anne of Green Gables* and *Anne of Avonlea* and in J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* novel series. In particular, the aim was to observe similarities and differences in the representation of parenting in a children's novel from the late 19th to a novel from the late 20th century and to propose possible reasons for the representations.

Both orphan protagonists, Anne and Harry, have lived with foster families until they are about eleven years old. The early childhoods of the orphans are not represented in the novels but there are a few references to them. Despite having lost their birth parents as infants, both Anne and Harry seem to have been securely attached to their own parents. In addition, as adolescents, both are able to become attached to other people; new foster or adoptive parents, teachers, other adults, and peers. While the orphan's attachment patterns seem to be secure, Harry's attachment to the Dursley's, however, appears to be anxious avoidant.

Harry is neglected and maltreated by the Dursleys before he enters the magical world. Anne is neglected and maltreated by two foster families before being sent to an orphanage from which she is adopted by the Cuthberts. Anne, however, is of the wrong sex—the Cuthberts had intended to adopt an orphan boy—and receive a girl by mistake. Matthew does not seem to mind much about the change of plans but Marilla is not so eager to adopt a girl. It seems that Marilla's mothering instinct starts (slowly) to awaken after she hears the story of Anne's past. Matthew, on the other hand, likes Anne immediately and thinks they should keep her even though she is not the useful boy he had originally wanted to help on the farm. Matthew sets his mind on keeping Anne and Marilla eventually yields because she does not tolerate the idea of Anne continuing a life of drudgery at Mrs. Blewett's. The Cuthberts thus provide Anne with the home she has been looking for for so long; Anne finally belongs to somebody. Once she enters the 'magical' world of Avonlea, Anne is cared for and nurtured both physically and mentally.

In the Victorian era, orphans were usually treated as a source of free labour and they were

not educated. In this sense, Marilla and Matthew seem to be exceptional adoptive parents; they offer Anne a real home but also schooling and free time. Anne plays with her "bosom friend", Diana, after she has completed her home chores (*AGG*, 75). She is also able to go to school and she is not held back from school to work on the farm, instead, the Cuthberts hire help. In fact, Anne does not need to work at home any more than her friends do so the Cuthberts do not view her as a source of free labour but as their own child; Marilla eventually comes to view Anne as her "own flesh and blood" while Matthew seems to view her from the beginning as "my girl".

Despite her good treatment of Anne, Marilla initially admits to having had some doubts herself concerning the adoption. Because the orphan is an outsider, Marilla insists on having at least "a born Canadian" to minimize the risks of foreignness. Matthew seems less apprehensive: he would have been willing to adopt "a Barnardo boy", a street child from England. Indeed, it seems that Matthew is behind the decision to adopt in the first place—and it is Matthew who insists on keeping Anne. This is unusual as he is male. The author has placed a male character to perform feminine tasks also when Matthew "insists on puffed sleeves" (*AGG*, 157) and continues to shower Anne with other feminine paraphernalia. As Kornfeld and Jackson note (1987, 71), men could act as mothers in nineteenth-century female *Bildungsromane* and both "[f]eminized men and women… could teach the blessed duties of benevolence and domesticity…". While Marilla teaches Anne domesticity (household chores) and demureness (proper behaviour and not to talk "nineteen to the dozen"; *AGG*, 77), "[i]t is Matthew who enables Anne to achieve stylish beauty and the rounded shape of maturing womanhood", as Waterston (1993, 32) notes. Thus, as Kornfeld and Jackson (1987, 71) say, "traditional masculine qualities" find no room "in this world of women", or feminine utopia that Montgomery has created. In the end, Avonlea accepts Anne, the outsider, as a prominent member of the community. Anne is applauded as an elocutionist, goes on to Queen's college to study and qualifies as a first class teacher in only one year. In *AA*, she teaches in the village school she herself attended earlier.

In *Harry*, the orphan hero is parented by a host of mother- and father-figures. In fact, Harry

receives better parenting from characters other than his actual foster parents who, despite neglecting their charge, nevertheless expect gratefulness from him (*Goblet of Fire*, 35). Thus even though he is fostered by his kin, Harry receives better parenting from people who are not his kin, for example, from the wizard family Weasleys, who come to view him "as good as" their own son (*Order of the Phoenix*, 85). It is the Weasleys who provide Harry with a familial and secure atmosphere and even fulfil his animal needs better than the Dursleys—although they are poorer than the Dursleys. De Rosa (2003, 167) notes that after leaving the Dursleys, "Harry encounters adults who nurture him literally and psychologically". Thus in the magical world, Harry receives the kind of parenting, physical and emotional nurturance, he has been missing since his parents died. Harry's magical parent figures fill in the 'gaps' left by the Dursleys in Harry's upbringing. While Harry's relationship with the Dursleys is far from warm and close, he does have a rather warm and close relationship with Hagrid, Dumbledore, the Weasleys and, especially, with his godfather Sirius.

It seems that the Dursleys are able to deny Harry everything because they do not care for him. In contrast, they love Dudley and spoil him by overindulgence. While Harry is taught humility and denial, the gluttonous Dudley is taught only self-indulgence and narcissism—and the Malfoys seem to do the same with Draco. Marilla, in contrast, is able to parent Anne (with Matthew's help) well even though she cares for Anne. For Anne then, one parent is indulging and the other one is strict. The Dursleys, instead, give in to Dudley's wishes and never deny him anything. In the beginning, Marilla's parenting methods may be called what Stringer (quoted in De Rosa 2003, 169) calls *authoritarian* while Matthew seems to be what Stringer (*ibid.*) calls a *permissive-indulgent parent*—although maybe not *overly* tolerant of Anne's misbehaviour, he is slightly so, nevertheless.

Even though Anne is adopted by complete strangers she nevertheless receives better care from them than Harry receives from his own relatives. In fact, Anne's adoptive parents are better than what could be expected in the Victorian era—especially from a spinster and a bachelor of whom Mrs. Lynde says it "is hard to believe [they ever *were* children themselves] when one looks at them" (*AGG*, 13).

In *AGG*, Marilla teaches Anne that actions have consequences: rule-breaking or bad behaviour leads to punishment. It is solely Matthew's role to give Anne love and affection. Marilla sets limits for Anne; she has a curfew, for example. After her outburst at Mrs. Lynde, Anne is sent to her room until she is ready to apologize and after Marilla's brooch goes missing, until she is ready to confess. Anne is never deprived of food, however, as Marilla takes trays full of food up to her room.

Both Anne and Harry have been underweight for the duration of their childhood but gain some weight in their new homes, at Green Gables and at Hogwarts. Dudley, in contrast, is gluttonous; he has been stuffed at Harry's cost. Food may thus symbolize moral needs (Labbe 2009, 101) and the Dursleys certainly seem to lack morals. In addition, Webb (2009, 114) says, the Dursleys "lack the appropriate attitudes in parenting" shown by the way they teach Dudley to grow up just as selfish as they themselves are by giving into every single one of his greedy desires. Harry, in contrast, grows up to take others into consideration. Harry has "moral character", as Griesinger (2002, 464) observes. The Dursleys, in contrast, lack moral character; and Harry has learned to be as different from the Dursleys in behaviour as he is in looks and personality.

The Puritan view (which Marilla holds) regarded, according to Labbe (2009, 94), "venial sins such as gluttony, sloth and greed as the precursors to mortal sins…". The inherently vicious child, who eats too much, needs to be purged of "the residue of Original Sin" through austerity (Daniel, quoted in Labbe 2009, 94). Even though Anne is not gluttonous, Mrs. Lynde, the devout Presbyterian, says that Anne is "full of original sin" (*AGG*, 146–147) and Anne herself tells Marilla "No matter how hard I try to be good I can never make such a success of it as those who are naturally good" (147). Thus Anne has a desire to be good while Davy, in *AA*, does not.

As at Green Gables, so at Hogwarts, children are punished but they are not starved; food is not used as a punishment. This accords with the recommendations of nutritionists and psychologists (Adesman & Adamec 2004, 39). If food is equated with love then withholding food as punishment would mean withholding love. Thus at Green Gables and at Hogwarts, the parents (or teachers *in*

loco parentis) are careful not to let the children think they are not loved—and even though they are punished, they will still receive food. Thus both Montgomery and Rowling support the idea that discipline is necessary but physical or emotional punishment is not acceptable. Both authors seem to call for softer approaches in the upbringing of children. As De Rosa (2003, 169), observes, "Rowling affirms the need for nonexcessive punishment…". It appears that Montgomery did the same in *AGG*. This seems surprising, as if no progress has been made in parenting methods; as if nothing has changed in 100 years (except laws prohibiting physical punishment). Yet Montgomery does not seem to condemn physical punishment in all cases; in *AA*, despite her ideals, Anne "actually whipped one of her pupils [Anthony Pye]" but she "feel[s] ashamed, repentant, and bitterly mortified" afterwards (*AA*, 97). However, it is later noted that the whipping actually "agreed" with Anthony—it earned Anne his respect (*AA*, 130). Thus Montgomery may actually agree with Gilbert, who says "…there is an occasional child who can't be influenced in any other way and who, in short, needs a whipping and would be improved by it" (*AA*, 27). Montgomery does not, however, seem to view this as a general rule, suitable for all children—but the occasional child who is "full of original sin", might be improved by corporal punishment.

Marilla and Matthew complement each other in their upbringing methods (strict and soft approach). Marilla tries to cultivate humility, as Rachel observes, while Matthew overindulges. Marilla seems to be more masculine than Matthew who appears to be quite feminine as far as traditional gender roles are considered; Marilla assumes more authority in the household than Matthew and she is strict and does not show her emotions. In *Anne*, Montgomery seems to stress the importance of finding a balance between the Puritan and the Romantic view of children and between the strict and soft parenting approaches. Thus both indulgence and denial are needed so that the child will develop 'normally'. Rowling may suggest the same, as the Dursleys are strict (although overly so) and discipline Harry while the magical personae (mainly) nurture and indulge him (yet at school he is disciplined). The strict and the soft approach can be amalgamated in one caretaker or they can be provided by two (or more) separate parent figures, as in the novels.

Harry chooses to be ‘good’ (like Dumbledore, the Weasleys, Hagrid, and Sirius) instead of ‘evil’ (like the Dursleys, the Malfoys, and Voldemort). Anne strives hard to be good—and she is aided in this task by Marilla, even though Anne herself thinks Marilla’s aim “to bring [her] up properly… is very discouraging work” (*AGG*, 131). Thus both Anne and Harry want to be good; people may therefore choose what they become and genetics are not determinative even though they play a part. As Dumbledore says “...it matters not what someone is born, but what they grow to be!” (*Goblet of Fire*, 614–615). Nature and nurture both play a part in how children turn out but nature may be more determinative.

Bibliography

Adesman, Andrew & Christine Adamec. *Parenting Your Adopted Child – A Positive Approach to Building a Strong Family.* New York: McGraw-Hill. 2004.

Ainsworth, Mary D. Salter. "Attachments and Other Affectional Bonds Across the Life Cycle". In *Attachment Across the Life Cycle*. Eds. Colin M. Parkes & Joan Stevenson-Hinde & Peter Marris. London: Routledge. 1991.

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

Alton, Anne Hiebert. "Generic Fusion and the Mosaic of *Harry Potter*" in *Harry Potter's World – Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives*. Ed. by Elizabeth E. Heilman. New York: RoutledgeFalmer. 2003.

Barry, Wendy E. "The Settlers of P.E.I.: The Celtic Influence in *Anne*". In *The Annotated* Anne of Green Gables *by L.M. Montgomery*. Eds. Wendy E. Barry & Margaret Anne Doody & Mary E. Doody Jones. New York: Oxford University Press. 1997.

Barry, Wendy E. & Margaret Anne Doody & Mary E. Doody Jones, eds. *The Annotated* Anne of Green Gables *by L.M. Montgomery*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1997.

Berebitsky, Julie. 'Family Ideals and Social Construction of Modern Adoption – A Historical Perspective'. In *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. Ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Bernardes, Jon. *Family Studies – An Introduction*. London: Routledge. 1997.

Black, Sharon. "Harry Potter: A Magical Prescription for Just about Anyone". *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* (JoAAL). Vol. 46, No. 7 (Apr 2003), 540-44.

Bowlby, John. *A Secure Base – Clinical Applications of Attachment Theory*. London: Routledge. 2005. [First published 1988]

----------. *Child Care and the Growth of Love*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd. 1976. [First published in Pelican Books 1953]

Brennan, Joseph Gerard. "The Story of a Classic – Anne and After". *The American Scholar* (Classics Revisited). Vol. 64, No. 2 (Spring 1995), 247–256.

Buehler, Cheryl & Kathryn W. Rhodes & John G. Orme & Gary Cuddeback. "The Potential for Successful Family Foster Care: Conceptualizing Competency Domains for Foster Parents". *Child Welfare*. Vol. LXXXV, No. 3 (May/June). 2006. 523–558.

Catechism of the Catholic Church. 1997. The Second Edition English Translation. Available at http://www.vatican.va/archive/catechism/ccc_toc.htm [Accessed 16.6.2009]

Clarkson, Adrienne. "Foreword". In *L.M. Montgomery and Canadian Culture*. Eds. Irene Gammel & Elizabeth Epperly. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated. 1999.

Cockrell, Amanda. "Harry Potter and the Secret Password – Finding Our Way in the Magical Genre". In *Ivory Tower and Harry Potter : Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed. Lana A.

Whited. Columbia, MO, USA: University of Missouri Press. 2002.

Cunningham, Hugh. [Review of] *Orphan Texts: Victorian Orphans, Culture and Empire* (by Laura Peters, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000). *Victorian Studies*. Vol. 45, Issue 4 (Summer 2003), 737–738.

Dawson, Janis. "Literary Relations: Anne Shirley and Her American Cousins". *Children's Literature in Education*. Vol. 33, No. 1 (March 2002), 29–51.

Deavel, Catherine Jack & David Paul Deavel. "Character, Choice, and Harry Potter". *Logos*. Vol. 5, No. 4 (Fall 2002), 49–64.

Dentith, Simon. *Parody* [*the* New Critical Idiom]. London: Routledge. 2000.

De Rosa, Deborah. "Wizardly Challenges to and Affirmations of the Initiation Paradigm in *Harry Potter*" in *Harry Potter's World – Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives*. Ed. by Elizabeth E. Heilman. New York: RoutledgeFalmer. 2003.

Devereux, Cecily. "The Culture of Imperial Motherhood". In Montgomery, L. M. *Anne of Green Gables*. A Norton Critical Edition. Eds. Rubio, Mary Henley & Elizabeth Waterston. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2007.

Doody, Margaret Anne. "Introduction". In *The Annotated* Anne of Green Gables *by L.M. Montgomery*. Eds. Wendy E. Barry & Margaret Anne Doody & Mary E. Doody Jones. New York: Oxford University Press. 1997.

Doody Jones, Mary E. "Education on P.E.I". In *The Annotated* Anne of Green Gables *by L.M. Montgomery*. Eds. Wendy E. Barry & Margaret Anne Doody & Mary E. Doody Jones. New York: Oxford University Press. 1997a.

Doody Jones, Mary E. "The Exceptional Orphan Anne: Child Care, Orphan Asylums, Farming Out, Indenturing, and Adoption". In *The Annotated* Anne of Green Gables *by L.M. Montgomery*. Eds. Wendy E. Barry & Margaret Anne Doody & Mary E. Doody Jones. New York: Oxford University Press. 1997b.

Epperly, Elizabeth R. "Romancing the Voice: *Anne of Green Gables*". In Montgomery, L. M. *Anne of Green Gables*. A Norton Critical Edition. Eds. Rubio, Mary Henley & Elizabeth Waterston. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2007.

Farmer, Elaine & Sue Moyers & Jo Lipscombe. *Fostering Adolescents: Research Messages on Placement Success*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers. 2004.

Gailey, Christine Ward. "Urchins, Orphans, Monsters, and Victims – Images of Adoptive Families in U.S. Commercial Films, 1920–1950". In *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. Ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Gammel, Irene & Elizabeth Epperly, eds. *L.M. Montgomery and Canadian Culture*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated. 1999.

Griesinger, Emily. "Harry Potter and the 'Deeper Magic': Narrating Hope in Children's Literature". *Christianity and Literature* (C&L) 2002 Spring; 51 (3): 455-80.

Grimes, Katherine M. “Harry Potter Fairy Tale Prince, Real Boy, and Archetypal Hero”. In *Ivory Tower and Harry Potter : Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed. Lana A. Whited. Columbia, MO, USA: University of Missouri Press. 2002.

Gubar, Marah. “’Where Is the Boy?’: The Pleasures of Postponement in the *Anne of Green Gables* Series”. *The Lion and The Unicorn*. Vol. 25 (2001): 47–69.

Harris, Tirril & Antonia Bifulco. “Loss of Parent in Childhood, Attachment Style, and Depression in Adulthood”. In *Attachment Across the Life Cycle*. Eds. Colin Murray Parkes & Joan Stevenson-Hinde & Peter Marris. London: Routledge. 1991.

Heilman, Elizabeth E., ed. *Harry Potter’s World – Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer. 2003.

Heilman, Elizabeth E. & Anne E. Gregory. “Images of the Privileged Insider and Outcast Outsider” in *Harry Potter’s World – Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives*. Ed. by Elizabeth E. Heilman. New York: RoutledgeFalmer. 2003.

Hinojosa, Ramon & Melanie Sberna & William Marsiglio. “Adoptive Fatherhood – Gender, Identity, and Sociocultural Considerations.” In *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. Ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Holmes, Jeremy. *The Search for the Secure Base: Attachment Theory and Psychotherapy*. Hove: Brunner–Routledge. 2001.

Hunt, Peter. *Children's Literature* [Blackwell Guides to Literature]. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2001.

Höjer, Ingrid. *Fosterfamiljens inre liv* (The Inner Life of Foster Families). Göteborg: Göteborgs universitet. 2001.

Kadushin, Alfred. *Adopting Older Children*. New York: Columbia University Press. 1970.

Keeling, Kara K. & Scott T. Pollard, eds. *Critical Approaches to Food in Children’s Literature*. New York: Routledge. 2009.

Kornfeld, Eve & Susan Jackson. “The Female Bildungsroman in Nineteenth-Century America: Parameters of a Vision”. *The Journal of American Culture*. Vol. 10, No. 4 (Winter 1987): 69-75.

Kornfeld, John & Laurie Prothro. “Comedy, Conflict, and Community: Home and Family in *Harry Potter*”. In *Harry Potter’s World – Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives*. Ed. by Elizabeth E. Heilman. New York: RoutledgeFalmer. 2003.

Labbe, Jacqueline M. “To Eat and Be Eaten in Nineteenth-Century Children’s Literature”. In *Critical Approaches to Food in Children’s Literature*. Eds. Kara K. Keeling & Scott T. Pollard, eds. New York: Routledge. 2009.

Lacoss, Jann. “Of Magicals and Muggles - Reversals and Revulsions at Hogwarts”. In *Ivory Tower and Harry Potter : Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Ed. Lana A. Whited. Columbia, MO, USA: University of Missouri Press. 2002.

Lehnert, Gertrud. “The Training of the Shrew: The Socialization and Education of Young Women

in Children's Literature". *Poetics Today*. Vol. 13, No.1, Children's Literature (Spring 1992), 109–122.

MacLulich, T. D. "L. M. Montgomery and the Literary Heroine: Jo, Rebecca, Anne, and Emily". In Montgomery, L. M. *Anne of Green Gables*. A Norton Critical Edition. Eds. Rubio, Mary Henley & Elizabeth Waterston. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2007.

Manlove, C. N. *From Alice to Harry Potter: Children's Fantasy in England*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Cybereditions Corporation. 2003.

McMaster, Juliet. "Hair Red, Black, Gold, and Nut-Brown". In Montgomery, L. M. *Anne of Green Gables*. A Norton Critical Edition. Eds. Rubio, Mary Henley & Elizabeth Waterston. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2007.

Miall, Charlene E. & Karen March. "Adoption and Public Opinion – Implications for Social Policy and Practice in Adoption". In *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. Ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Miller, Karl. "Magic in the Air". *Changing English: Studies in Reading & Culture*. Vol. 8, Issue 1 (March 2001): 29-34.

Mills, Claudia. "Children in Search of a Family: Orphan Novels Through the Century". *Children's Literature in Education*. Vol. 18, No. 4 (1987): 227–239.

Montgomery, L. M. *Anne of Avonlea*. [Special Collector's Edition]. New York: Bantam Books. 1998 [L. C. Page edition published in 1909].

----------. *Anne of Green Gables*. A Norton Critical Edition. Eds. Rubio, Mary Henley & Elizabeth Waterston. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2007. [L. C. Page edition published in 1908]

----------. "Journal Entry (1911)". In *Anne of Green Gables*. A Norton Critical Edition. Eds. Rubio, Mary Henley & Elizabeth Waterston. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2007.

Nelson, Claudia. "Drying the Orphan's Tear: Changing Representations of the Dependent Child in America, 1870–1930". *Children's Literature*. Vol. 29 (2001): 52–70.

Nodelman, Perry. "Progressive Utopia – Or, How to Grow Up Without Growing Up". In *Such a Simple Little Tale – Critical Responses to L.M. Montgomery's* Anne of Green Gables. Ed. Mavis Reimer. Metuchen, N. J.: The Children's Literature Association and The Scarecrow Press, Inc. 1992.

Parkes, Colin Murray & Joan Stevenson-Hinde & Peter Marris, eds. *Attachment Across the Life Cycle*. London: Routledge. 1991.

Pennington, John. "From Elfland to Hogwarts, or the Aesthetic Trouble with Harry Potter". *The Lion and the Unicorn*. Vol. 26 (2002): 78–97.

Peters, Laura. *Orphan Texts: Victorian Orphans, Culture and Empire*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 2000.

Pharr, Mary. "In Medias Res - Harry Potter as Hero-in-Progress". In *Ivory Tower and Harry Potter*

: Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon. Ed. Lana A. Whited. Columbia, MO, USA: University of Missouri Press. 2002.

Pinsent, Pat. "Theories of Genre and Gender: Change and Continuity in the School Story". In *Modern Children's Literature – An Introduction*. Ed. Kimberley Reynolds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2005.

Reimer, Mavis, ed. *Such a Simple Little Tale – Critical Responses to L.M. Montgomery's* Anne of Green Gables. Metuchen, N. J.: The Children's Literature Association and The Scarecrow Press, Inc. 1992.

Reynolds, Kimberley, ed. *Modern Children's Literature – An Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2005.

Reynolds, Kimberley. "Sociology, Politics, the Family: Children and Families in Anglo–American Children's Fiction, 1920–60". In *Modern Children's Literature – An Introduction*. Ed. Kimberley Reynolds. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2005.

Robinson, Laura M. "'A Born Canadian': The Bonds of Communal Identity in Anne of Green Gables and A Tangled Web." In *L.M. Montgomery and Canadian Culture*. Eds. Gammel, Irene & Elizabeth Epperly. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Incorporated. 1999.

Rossetti, Christina. *Goblin Market and Other Poems*. Second edition. London: Macmillan and Co. 1865.

Rothman, Barbara Katz. "Adoption ad the Culture of Genetic Determinism". In *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. Ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Rowling, J.K. *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets*. London: Bloomsbury. 1998.

----------. *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. London: Bloomsbury. 2007.

----------. *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*. London: Bloomsbury. 2000.

----------. *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. London: Bloomsbury. 2005.

----------. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. London: Bloomsbury. 2003.

----------. *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*. London: Bloomsbury. 1997.

----------. *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*. London: Bloomsbury. 1999.

Rubio, Mary. "*Anne of Green Gables* – The Architect of Adolescence". In *Such a Simple Little Tale – Critical Responses to L.M. Montgomery's* Anne of Green Gables. Ed. Mavis Reimer. Metuchen, N. J.: The Children's Literature Association and The Scarecrow Press, Inc. 1992.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. *Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence, and Narrative Theory*. Indiana: Univ. of Bloomington & Indianapolis Press. 1991.

Seelye, John. *Jane Eyre's American Daughters – From* The Wide, Wide World *to* Anne of Green Gables. *A Study of Marginalized Maidens and What They Mean*. Cranbury, NJ, United States of America: Associated University Presses. 2005.

Skinner, John. *The Stepmother Tongue : An Introduction to New Anglophone Fiction*. Basingstoke: Macmillan. 1998.

Smith, Betsy & Janet L. Surrey & Mary Watkins. "'Real' Mothers – Adoptive Mothers Resisting Marginalization and Recreating Motherhood." In *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. Ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Smith, Janet Farrell. "Identity, Race, and Culture in Adoption – Ethical Values in the Power of Language." In *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. Ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Taub, Deborah J. & Heather L. Servaty. "Controversial content in Children's Literature: Is *Harry Potter* Harmful to Children?" in *Harry Potter's World – Multidisciplinary Critical Perspectives*. Ed. by Elizabeth E. Heilman. New York: RoutledgeFalmer. 2003.

Trites, Roberta Seelinger. "The Harry Potter Novels as a Test Case for Adolescent Literature". *Style*. Vol.35, No. 3 (Fall 2001): 472-85.

Upshur, Emily & Jack Demick. "Adoption and Identity in Social Context." In *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. Ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Waterston, Elizabeth. *Kindling Spirit: L.M. Montgomery's* Anne of Green Gables. Toronto: ECW PRESS. 1993.

Watkins, Mary. "Adoption and Identity – Nomadic Possibilities for Reconceiving the Self." In *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. Ed. Katarina Wegar. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Webb, Jean. "'Voracious Appetites': The Construction of 'Fatness' in the Boy Hero in English Children's Literature". In In *Critical Approaches to Food in Children's Literature*. Eds. Kara K. Keeling & Scott T. Pollard, eds. New York: Routledge. 2009.

Wegar, Katarina, ed. *Adoptive Families in a Diverse Society*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 2006.

Weiss, Robert S. "The Attachment Bond in Childhood and Adulthood". In *Attachment Across the Life Cycle*. Eds. Colin Murray Parkes & Joan Stevenson-Hinde & Peter Marris. London: Routledge. 1991.

Whited, Lana A., ed. *Ivory Tower and Harry Potter : Perspectives on a Literary Phenomenon*. Columbia, MO, USA: University of Missouri Press. 2002.

Wood, Kate. "In the News". In Montgomery, L. M. *Anne of Green Gables*. A Norton Critical Edition. Eds. Rubio, Mary Henley & Elizabeth Waterston. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2007.

Zipes, Jack. *The Troublesome Success of Children's Literature. From Slovenly Peter to Harry Potter*. New York: Routledge. 2001.

Zipes, Jack. *Why Fairy Tales Stick - The Evolution and Relevance of a Genre*. New York: Routledge. 2006.

Åhmansson, Gabriella. “Lying and the Imagination”. In Montgomery, L. M. *Anne of Green Gables*. A Norton Critical Edition. Eds. Rubio, Mary Henley & Elizabeth Waterston. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2007.

Dictionaries

Encyclopædia Britannica Online. http://helios.uta.fi:2061/eb/article-39102 [Accessed 29.3.2009]

Oxford English Dictionary (OED Online). Available at http://oed.com/ [Accessed 4.11.2008]

West's Encyclopedia of American Law. published by Thomson Gale Available at http://www.enotes.com/wests-law-encyclopedia [Accessed 4.11.2008]