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First introduced over a hundred years ago, the story of Peter Pan has been told in several books, plays, and movies as a magical story about childhood. While the play was wildly popular at its debut and has since seen many avenues of scholarly criticism mostly in the psychoanalytic style of Sigmund Freud, another equally important area of criticism for *Peter Pan* is in how the story functions in the realm of fairy tales and mythology. Through Peter Pan’s ties to Greek mythology, and the way the story changed through each retelling, *Peter Pan* is a myth both in content and in origin. Beyond this, I propose that James Barrie inadvertently created Peter Pan as the lovechild of the Greek nature gods Persephone and Pan, and because of this, his character and story as a whole is a modern addition to the ancient nature myth that bridges the gap between nature and childhood mythology. Through specific traits Peter inherited from these gods along with his intrinsic childlike nature, he becomes a more appropriate symbol for nature than either of his mythological “parents” individually. In this paper, I will look at what exact traits Peter has inherited from those parents, the role mythical allusions serve in helping us understand nature, and whether or not this relationship with nature is what makes a true Eden. In addition, because of the way the story evolved like a myth itself through fragments
of ideas, constant revision, and oral storytelling, this origin allows Peter a far more flexible future as a myth than other children’s stories or literature. Knowing this background, I will show that Peter uses his mythical traits and an idealized version of nature to lure his companions, whether the fictional Darlings or his real-life readers, to a wild island unencumbered by civilization. Though this escape to Neverland may seem like an idyllic return to Eden, what Peter’s companions learn there decides whether or not they will realize the true desired Eden and be able to return to the adult world to be productive members of society living “betwixt and between” wild nature and modern civilization.

To understand how Peter Pan is a myth, we must first understand what a myth is. All cultures throughout history have come up with stories to explain the world around them: these stories become what we call “myths.” Though all cultures each have their own belief system of gods and creation myths, the Greek and Roman mythologies (on which Peter Pan is more closely based) stand apart in making their gods and goddesses more closely resemble humans than other mythological cultures before them. Edith Hamilton explains in the introduction of her book Mythology that their stories are “quite generally supposed to show us the way the human race thought and felt untold ages ago” (3). Additionally, where other cultures held their gods up as deities for religious worship, the Greek and Roman gods were so human and so notably flawed in comparison to other cultures that Hamilton writes, “According to the most modern idea, a real myth has nothing to do with religion. It is an explanation of something in nature; how . . . any and everything in the universe came into existence” (12). It was from this idea of creation and nature myths that Barrie had the idea to create his own myth: Peter Pan.

R. D. S. Jack explains in his book The Road to the Never Land that Barrie’s mythological connection with Peter Pan was done intentionally, and through Barrie’s constant revisions over twenty years the story bloomed naturally into the complex world we have today. Based on Barrie’s notebooks, Jack says, “it seems that Barrie wished to create a new MYTH [sic] based on classical material” (The Road 159). Yet part of the charm of myths is that, while some of them have been documented through pictographs or stories, a crucial part of their origin is that they began as an oral tradition. This means that no matter what culture of mythology you study, the story was likely altered multiple times before it was finally written down. Operating under
these constraints, Barrie had to find some way to create a new story in his current time period that simultaneously seemed ancient and modern. As Jack says, “the first major problem is how to embody ‘world without end’—or indeed . . . world without known beginning” (160). Thus, Barrie had to first plant an idea—one that would grow up to be “the boy who wouldn’t grow up.”

Even though this mythology connection may have been intentional, long before anything was written down, snippets of Peter Pan, the Lost Boys, and Neverland were found throughout James Barrie’s works, and events in his life were clearly drawn upon for inspiration. Jack notes that Peter Pan “is the culmination of [Barrie’s] thinking over many years” (The Road 155). When Peter was officially introduced, his story as a “Betwixt-and-Between” (The Little 138), half-way between boy and bird and living with the fairies in Kensington Gardens was planted as just a small fairy tale within one of Barrie’s novels for adults, The Little White Bird, in 1902. Yet even in his first introduction, Peter is referred to so casually as an eternal figure everyone should already know, as if his myth already exists. The narrator in The Little White Bird introduces us to this idea by starting, “If you ask your mother whether she knew about Peter Pan when she was a little girl, she will say, ‘Why, of course, I did, child’ . . . Then if you ask your grandmother whether she knew about Peter Pan when she was a girl, she also says, ‘Why, of course, I did, child’” (131). But between the two generations some of the details have already been lost. The important thing this shows, according to the narrator, is that “Peter is ever so old, but he is really always the same age” (131).

Just like those ancient traditions of oral story-telling and constant revisions, Barrie was able to create a story that would develop organically, ever changing to fit a certain situation, just as ancient mythology was known to do. From the idea planted in The Little White Bird, the story of Peter Pan bloomed into a full-blown nature myth, just as Barrie intended. Fabio Vericat writes that like Peter’s own status of being not exactly a human and not exactly a bird, the story itself has never been exactly a novel nor exactly a play. Vericat discusses that Barrie was so obsessed with the changeability of the stage version of Peter Pan that he was constantly revising the written script. As such, the script, and the novelizations all started playing off one another: two years after The Little White Bird, in 1904, Barrie expanded and adjusted Peter’s story to create the annual stage play of Peter Pan, or the Boy Who Wouldn’t Grow Up. After more revisions and expansions, Barrie
published the novel *Peter and Wendy* in 1911 which would later become the novel *Peter Pan* we know today. And even though *Peter Pan* is the book that was unofficially declared the official story, Barrie continued to revise the stage play until he finally published the script for *Peter Pan, or the Boy Who Wouldn’t Grow Up* in 1928 with changes that neither the original play nor the book had seen. Of this evolution Vericat says, “It is a literary hybrid subject to a precarious but crucial literary existence: betwixt-and-between” (120). With all these changes, even Barrie himself has noted in a dedication of the novel that he “has no recollection of having written it” (“To the Five”). This history shows us that, though Barrie may have started the story, Peter ran off on his own, changing the story along with him as mythical creatures are wont to do. In this way, not only is the character of Peter Pan acting as a figure of mythology, but the way the whole story was pulled together is very reminiscent of oral mythology and folklore telling, which gave us so many different versions of myths and fairy tales.

In further studying Barrie’s intentions, Jack adds that, not only did Barrie want to write a myth, but he seemed to have the intent to make a “CREATION Myth [sic]” (The Road 160) which connects Peter’s island to nature on top of his own intrinsic qualities. Thus Barrie’s new world, the Never Land (or later, “Neverland”) was born. Though we don’t know much about how the island is physically created in Barrie’s story, we know that, except for Peter, Neverland exists inside the minds of children. In the terms of Barrie’s “creation myth,” explaining it this way leaves room for the island to be different in the minds of every child, and likewise different in how each child creates the island. However, Barrie unifies the islands by having a group of simple shared traits always on Neverland: beasts, mermaids, pirates, and “redskins.” Despite the negative connotation that today’s readers will likely see in Barrie’s treatment of the book’s natives, and even in the use of the word “redskins,” it is notable that Barrie chose Natives so similar to Native Americans for his new myth, and why those Natives, though adults, deserve a truce with the Lost Boys when the pirates do not. Native American cultures have a vast collection of mythology as well, with their most popular stories being their creation myths. With this subtle connection to creation narrative, Tiger Lily’s tribe on Neverland actually helps place Barrie’s story deeper into a mythology culture possibly more so than any other indigenous tribe on the island would. Though Barrie still describes them from a white European perspective, it is perhaps because of the Native American link to
nature mythology that Peter Pan decides to rescue Tiger Lily and call a truce with the rest of the Piccaninny tribe when the pirates (the only other adults on the island) by contrast are nothing but evil.

Moving on to focus on Peter Pan as a character, Barrie’s deliberate introduction of him as someone who is “Betwixt and Between” links Peter directly to mythology and begins to prove his mythological inheritance of becoming the halfling lovechild of the Greek gods Pan and Persephone. Peter exemplifies traits from both Pan, the god of the wild, and Persephone, the goddess of spring, in his features and his actions to such an extent that he becomes a nature deity as well. Peter’s mythological father figure, the Greek god Pan, is a satyr (half-goat, half-man) who lords over nature and the wild; like his father, Peter is only a half-boy with a wild temperament who lives with the fairies, rules over the wild of Neverland, and plays Panpipes (named after the Greek god). Additionally, in Barrie’s earliest drafts of the story—namely *The Little White Bird* and the first versions of the stage play—Peter even rides a goat to more obviously connect him to his mythical father. Then, like his mythical mother Persephone, Peter seems to show an overall control over the physical island of Neverland, including its nature and warm seasons; this is shown in the book when it says, “feeling that Peter was on his way back, the Neverland had again woke [sic] into life” (*Peter Pan* 71). Further than that, Peter displays a siren-like nature which displays possible connections to the original sirens of lore that were Persephone’s companions in the underworld. The way Barrie interweaves all of these traits into one character implies that Peter was always meant to be a mythological character, and it also implies that Peter is an essential figure in nature mythology.

Beginning with Peter’s connection to Pan, this heritage is essential for linking Peter to nature myths as Pan has been the god invoked in ancient pastoral poetry since Virgil’s *Eclogues*. In Thomas K. Hubbard’s book *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*, he discusses intertextuality in pastoral poetry: more specifically the links to nature and mythology that are consistently brought up in pastoral poems such as Virgil’s *Eclogues* and Theocritus’ story of “Thyrsis” from *Idylls*. A central feature of pastoral poems is the focus on shepherds or country workers, and these two poets specifically address *goatherds*, referring back to the half-goat god, Pan. Additionally, the song used in “Thyrsis” is specifically accompanied by *Panpipes*. In *Idylls*, Thyrsis begins addressing the Goatherd with, “Pleasant, the musical
murmur . . . and equally pleasant your piping. Indeed, after Pan, you take second prize” (Theocritus 3), and he again praises and prays to Pan in his song that follows. Reference to Pan in pastoral poetry seems a matter of fact as Pan is the god of the goats and wild; however references to the Panpipes serve a more potent focus of uniting pastoral poems through their use of song. And with this connection to song, Hubbard concludes that “pastoral is from its origins a vehicle of transition from the past to the future” (350). By Peter Pan playing these same Panpipes, he too is brought into that realm of the pastoral tradition, and rather than the pastoral transitioning him from the past to the future, Barrie uses the pastoral to transition his new character into the past.

Even as Pan’s relationship to Peter explains the unaging boy’s lineage and connection to the past, the traits he inherited from his mother Persephone explain how he is so adept at drawing in those around him and how his “Betwixt-and-Between” nature explains his easy flight and his friendship with the mermaids of Neverland. The central idea of Peter Pan, that three children who love their parents dearly would suddenly run away in the middle of the night with a strange boy just because he asks, only begins to make sense when we realize that Peter may have a supernaturally powerful gift of persuasion. The most persuasive creatures in the realm of mythology are the sirens, and their later counterparts the mermaids. Accordingly, as Elisa Di Biase explains in her article, “On that Conspiratorial Smile Between Peter Pan and the Mermaids,” Peter’s half-bird nature actually makes him a magical cousin of the mermaids, and explains how he is so persuasive and alluring to his companions. Going back to original folklore of mermaids, the more menacing version known as the sirens were once “the companions of young Proserpine who [were] turned into birds by Ceres, her mother, in order to fly to the underworld to look for her” after she was kidnapped by Pluto (Di Biase 96). When Persephone (Proserpine) became the queen of the Underworld, the sirens remained her companions who accompanied mortal souls down to her and later sang sweet songs to entice even more souls to come down with them. Like the sirens, Peter deals with death in his origins as well. When Peter first lives at Kensington Gardens with the fairies, he starts worrying that other children who get left in the gardens will be abandoned as he was. Soon he takes it upon himself to gather the lost children at night before they freeze, but sometimes he is too late, and “he digs a grave for the child and erects a little tombstone” (The Little 207). This origin has evolved
into other beliefs that Peter began accompanying the dead souls of children to the Never Land so they wouldn’t be lonely. From origins such as these Di Biase concludes, “Both Peter and the sirens begin as soul-birds” (98). Nevertheless from this shared bird origin, the physical similarities between Peter and the sirens parted ways as the siren myth got passed down; the luring sirens were merged with the Christian fish-tail symbolism warning of the dangers of womanly lust, until eventually the bird-like sirens became the fish-like mermaids. Though they are now different, Di Biase argues that Peter and the mermaids both remember their true origins and shared heritage, which is why Peter is the only one of the Neverland gang to get special treatment from the mermaids.

Because of all this extra attention, Peter unconsciously starts picking up the mermaids’ seductive mannerisms, enticing all the women he comes in contact with—Tinker Bell, Wendy, Tiger Lily, and in a way, even Mrs. Darling. In more general terms, we see that the younger girls he meets—Wendy, Tiger Lily, and Tinker Bell—are all attracted to him without his knowledge. When Wendy asks Peter, “what are your exact feelings for me?,” she is very disappointed when he answers that he has the feelings “of a devoted son” towards her, though Peter is far too innocent to understand why this disappoints Wendy. “‘You are so queer,’ he [says], frankly puzzled, ‘and Tiger Lily is just the same. There is something she wants to be to me, but she says it is not my mother’” (Peter Pan 145). Tinker Bell feels this too, for when he asks if she would be his mother instead of Wendy, she indignantly replies with, “You silly ass!” and for the first time in the book, Wendy and Tink agree on something (146). Even Mrs. Darling is somewhat bewitched by him even when she only briefly sees him at the nursery window: “He was a lovely boy,” “entrancing” (20), and something about him relates to Mrs. Darling enough that even after he’s stolen her children she “wanted . . . not to call Peter names” (23).

In a more detailed example, we see Peter acting as a full siren the night he invites Wendy to come with him to Neverland. Right after their first conversation, Peter inadvertently insults Wendy, causing her to dash back under her covers. In an attempt to get her to come back out and talk with him, Peter calls to her “in a voice that no woman has ever yet been able to resist,” and Wendy, “every inch a woman, though there were not very many inches . . . peeped out of the bedclothes” (Peter Pan 40). While he may not realize it, Peter becomes every bit like the sirens he’s related to
as he persuades the young girl to let down her guard and come out of her safe hiding place. Peter Pan’s siren nature gets even more sinister when we explore the actions he takes in getting the Darling children, especially Wendy, to follow him to Neverland. Holly Blackford, one of the many psychoanalytic scholars of Peter Pan, looks into these siren-like dangers of Peter in her article “Mrs. Darling’s Scream: The Rites of Persephone in Peter and Wendy and Wuthering Heights.” Blackford reminds us that in the Female Gothic tradition, “heroines, themselves in transition between states of being just as Peter is forever ‘betwixt and between’. . . persist in being attracted to various kinds of creatures that embody both immortal youth and an opportunity to express sexual desire” (118). She relates Peter Pan to the darker myths of eternally youthful vampires who wait at a window to be let in, and once inside they steal away the pretty girls who will grow old without them. Blackford argues that Peter is clearly tied to the Persephone myth, when we look at the versions of her origins that show Hades kidnapping her to the Underworld, but Peter relates more to the kidnapper, Hades, than he does to the victim, Persephone.

When Peter steals the Darling children away to Neverland, his darker siren nature seems to take over when he gets the idea that Wendy could come back with him. Barrie writes, “there was a greedy look in his eyes now which ought to have alarmed her, but did not . . . and then Peter gripped her and began to draw her towards the window” (Peter Pan 48). Wendy calls out in her distress, but Peter merely continues to entice her to Neverland, telling her specifically about the mermaids which she might see on the island. Indeed, “he had become frightfully cunning . . . [Wendy] was wriggling her body in distress. It was quite as if she were trying to remain on the nursery floor. But he had no pity for her” (Peter Pan 48). And just a few pages later, the Darlings are all following him out of the nursery window, and he succeeds in capturing his prey. Peter’s siren nature fully takes over as he lures not only the Darling children to Neverland, but also all those who read or watch his story play out.

Beyond this parallel to Hades kidnapping Persephone, Blackford also compares Peter and Wendy’s flight from London to the Fall from Eden. In the beginning of Peter Pan, Barrie writes, “All children, except one, grow up. They soon know that they will grow up,” and Wendy knew it by the time she was two. “You always know after you are two. Two is the beginning of the end” (Peter Pan 7). Of this passage, Blackford states that it “recites
the fall of the daughter from a pre-linguistic mother-daughter Eden, framing the eternal child-son Peter Pan as a transitional figure between mother and daughter” (116). By the idealistic nature of Neverland, one would assume Neverland would be Eden, but Blackford complicates this idea by claiming that the real Eden is the perfect innocent relationship between mother and child. For although Neverland is a place of magic and possibility, the island only exists inside the minds of children. Thus Neverland could never be a true Eden, for it is unattainable in the waking world, and entirely unattainable for adults in general. The mother/child relationship, with its pure innocence and love, is a much better representation of the ideal Eden. While Peter lacks this Edenic innocence, he does display his own particular brand of innocence that closely aligns with key traits of Nature.

Despite Peter’s dark tendencies, he still shows a version of this Edenic childlike innocence, but mixed with his own inherent cockiness, and this combination of traits is what makes Peter a much better representation of nature than either of his mythological parents could be. Innocence is one of the things Barrie was trying to capture as he centered his myth around an immortal child. Barrie’s stories came out during a time when adults had a new fervor for creating an actual “childhood” for the new generation—an idea which had been growing in popularity through the Romantic and Victorian eras. In her article “Myths of Innocence and Imagination: The Case of the Fairy Tale,” professor of literature Jeannette Sky discusses the importance of this time period on the creation of fairy tales. She suggests that the Romantics were so influenced by nature and the supernatural, that they soon began writing fantasy and fairy tales as adult fiction, long before it was considered “children’s literature,” just as Barrie began with *The Little White Bird* for adults before moving on to the stories centered on Peter. Because of the new idealized “childhood” idea, children were often subjects of their fairy tales because they seemed more mythical than adults. Out of this idea sprang characters such as Carroll’s Alice, Kipling’s Mowgli, and Barrie’s Peter Pan. In contrast to adults, Mowgli and Peter especially can live mythical lives because they are children who are separated from the adult world and living in nature. Of the comparison of Neverland to Eden, Sky says,

> With Peter Pan’s Never Land a new and secularised childhood Eden is portrayed, but it is still an Eden, a state separated from the fallen condition of experience that characterizes adulthood. But this is not the voice of the child, it is the adult world that wants Peter Pan and his likes to never grow up, to
remain in a never land. The myth of the innocent child and of the primacy of
childhood imagination enshrines adult desires and dreams . . . Maybe this
childhood Eden is the only Eden imaginable in the modern world, as the
Biblical Eden has become more and more like a true fantasy—nothing but
the ‘airy imagination of the brain.’ (363)

In this way, Sky does interpret Neverland as an Eden in contrast to Blackford,
but that belief is still founded on the same principles as before: that childhood
innocence is the key to a better Eden. By creating an escape from the reality of
adulthood, the adults of Barrie’s time tried to create Eden in the literal mind
of a child, but because they lack that inward innocence themselves, they still
can’t reach it. One cannot stay forever in this natural world secluded from
everything because these books were written about children rather than by
children, and adults will always have to return. As Alice’s, Mowgli’s, and
Peter’s stories play out, the children eventually return to the adult world: all
except for Peter.

As this theory indicates, an immortal child such as Peter is exactly
what is needed for a mythological figure of nature that holds true to the
most pure form of nature: one of innocence and sentimentality. In Friedrich
Schiller’s essay, “On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry,” Schiller breaks poetry
into two categories: the naïve and the sentimental. He then compares the
two in an attempt to decide which one is better suited to describing Nature.
Schiller states that the naïve is closer to that pure innocence of true nature,
but lacks the same knowledge displayed in older works. On the other hand,
the sentimental has the knowledge and the experience needed to write with
better feelings, but lacks the pure innocence of those feelings. In essence,
“So long as we were merely children of nature, we were happy and perfect;
we have become free and have lost both . . . The sensuous man laments
only the loss of the first; the moral one can mourn only for the loss of the
other” (Schiller 91). Schiller argues that the epitome of nature is seen as all
that is “untouched” or “innocent” and therefore relates most to the perfect
innocence of childhood. This “perfect innocence” fits Peter Pan especially in
his original 1902 form because he was, in fact, only a week-old baby when
he flew away to play with the fairies in Kensington Gardens (The Little
132). While everyone knows that Peter is a child, his young age is often lost
because the popular modern Disney interpretations show this as an older,
child-like teenager, and stage performances generally depict him as a small
adult who only acts like a child. But these characterizations fall flat because
neither interpretation is the same as the innocent child in Schiller’s ideal, and only Barrie’s original Peter fully fits this idea. The difference between the Disney Peter and *The Little White Bird* Peter is that despite the fact that neither children nor teenagers have officially entered adulthood, the cocky, teenager Peter seen in production generally maintains an air that he’s better than everyone because he knows things the other children don’t, as if he’s closer to being an all-knowing adult than the others; but a true child is cocky because he doesn’t know any better. To Schiller, Nature just *is* because it doesn’t have the worldly knowledge to do anything different; likewise the true innocence of the original baby Peter fits this idea of nature more fully, even if this innocence leads to Peter becoming dangerously cocky in his “genius.”

However, Peter continues to fit Schiller’s ideal of nature, not despite his egotistical nature but because of it. Schiller states, “Every true genius must be naïve or it is not genius. Its naïveté alone makes it genius, and what it is in the intellectual and the aesthetical, it cannot deny in the moral” (Schiller). The genius in the book *Peter Pan* is, of course, the immortal, naïve child Peter himself. When he gets separated from his own shadow, he is naïve enough to believe he can stick the shadow back to himself by using soap. This doesn’t work, and when Wendy, who has been preparing to grow up and be a mother since the age of two, has the intelligent idea to sew his shadow to him, Peter crows, “Oh the cleverness of me!” (*Peter Pan* 39). Peter then continues to show his carelessness repeatedly throughout the book. On the first long flight to Neverland, he often deserts the Darling children for long periods of time because he gets bored and “sometimes when he return[s] he [does] not remember them, at least not well” (60). Then, back on the island with the Lost Boys, Barrie writes, “The difference between [Peter] and the other boys . . . was that they knew it was make-believe, while to him make-believe and true were exactly the same thing. This sometimes troubled them, as when they had to make-believe that they had had their dinners” (96). Yet even when the Lost Boys and Darling children start to doubt Peter’s character, they still revere Peter as the genius leader of their group. Is this because they trust him entirely? Is it because he merely has more experience than them? The latter might be true sometimes, for Wendy does tell her brothers, “You must be nice to him . . . What would we do if he were to leave us?” (59). Still there are plenty of other instances in the book to negate these ideas, so perhaps Peter’s continued leadership despite his clear flaws prove
what Schiller suggests: it is the innocence of a thing that makes it genius. In turn, this genius innocence is what relates best to that pure, untouched genius of Nature.

In comparing Peter to Pan and Persephone, we see many mythological traits that Peter seems to have inherited from those Greek gods of nature, exemplifying the idea that Peter is more of a lovechild of these two characters rather than just being a parallel replacement as he adds his own mother/child twists to the nature narrative. He does inherit the halfling status, his panpipe music, and his dominion over the seasons and creatures from Pan and Persephone, and these connections are how Peter stakes his claim in mythology. At the same time though, he adds his own dark seductive siren qualities and arrogant naiveté of childhood to show the complex innocence and changeability of Nature. His differences from his mythological parents are what put him in the position to take over as the head of Nature—as seen in his role of being the chief of Neverland, itself a representation for the wild. By setting Peter apart from the civilized world, his island of immortal youth serves as the desired “other” to adulthood—a modern Eden to return to. As adults hearing Peter Pan’s story, we too are drawn in by his seductive cry to forget growing up and “come away” with them to Neverland (35). His innocent, playful personality combined with the idea of an eternal childhood creates a magical landscape that is naturally enticing to anyone outside of it. However, with longer exposure to Peter’s character, his egotistical immaturity becomes more of a prevalent flaw. Through his contrast with Wendy especially, Peter shows us the complexities of childhood, and soon Wendy, her brothers, and even the Lost Boys seek to return to the mothers they can barely remember (154–58). Thus, what seems to be Eden at the onset turns out to be the world that a child has to fall into to realize that the true Eden is that mother/child relationship they left at the beginning of the story.

Even as a perfect embodiment of childhood, Peter came into the world as an old story that Barrie doesn’t even take complete credit for fully creating. The story that Barrie wrote down started as a myth that had been told for generations; it continued to get passed on and changed until the story bloomed on its own, and it still gets passed down and changed generations after Barrie’s death, thereby succeeding in becoming a new myth as the author intended. Looking at this story, we may remember Neverland with the nostalgia of wanting to return, but every time we do return, Neverland becomes more foreboding than inviting, which convinces us to come home.
again. Peter isn’t just a good or bad character, because neither childhood nor nature are just good or just bad. *Peter Pan* is so memorable and lasting because it is full of the types of contradictions that come with growing up and living in the real world.


--- “To the Five: A Dedication.” *Peter Pan and Other Plays*. Oxford University Press, 1928.


