

RISKING MASCULINITY: PLAYING FAST AND LOOSE WITH HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN *THE HERO'S GUIDE TO SAVING YOUR KINGDOM*

JANICE ROBERTSON

Department of English Studies
University of South Africa
Pretoria, South Africa
janice@jrobertson.co.za

ABSTRACT

In Christopher Healy's (2012) children's book, *The hero's guide to saving your kingdom*, the idea of hegemonic masculinity is subverted in various ways. In this reinvention of four fairy tales – 'Cinderella', 'Sleeping Beauty', 'Snow White' and 'Rapunzel' – the author seems consciously to subvert the prevalent stereotypes surrounding traditional representations of the idealised, yet largely uninterrogated image of 'Prince Charming'. All four of the princes who feature as protagonists in the book express their dissatisfaction at the prescriptive expectations that govern every aspect of their lived realities. Healy explores alternative ways of representing this type of character to modern child readers, in many cases testing the boundaries that dictate which physical characteristics and behavioural patterns are allowable in such characters. This article explores Healy's negotiation of masculinity in the context of its intended 21st century child audience.

KEYWORDS

Prince Charming, masculinity studies, fairy tales, hegemonic masculinity, children's literature, Christopher Healy

1 INTRODUCTION

Christopher Healy's *The hero's guide to saving your kingdom* (2012) tells the humorous tale of the exploits of four Princes Charming and their attempts to protect their kingdoms from the evil machinations of the sorceress Zaubera. In the process, their stories and even their love-interests become disastrously entangled and the members of this mismatched quartet, ultimately referred to as 'The League of Princes', set out on a quest

of self-discovery and reinvention. The book is interesting in terms of its representations of contemporary and culturally mediated performances of gender, and particularly in relation to the politics of masculinity that shape the narrative. Healy's text explores various portrayals of the Prince Charming character and seems, initially, intentionally to undermine the reader's expectations – though with a sense of indulgent hilarity throughout. It is significant, however, that even in a book that takes such liberties with the Prince Charming character as to render him incapable of defending himself with dignity against a ten-year old bandit in a duel, there seem to be certain gendered realities that remain incontrovertible; certain risks that popular children's literature cannot run.

2 MEETING PRINCE CHARMING

According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, 'Prince Charming' represents 'a man who is handsome, brave, polite [...] and would be a perfect husband or boyfriend.' This definition may be seen as a reflection of a traditional, arguably self-deluded Western imagination fuelled by a variety of deeply gendered children's texts and their associated cultural practices. According to Orenstein (2002:121) in *Little Red Riding Hood uncloaked: sex, morality, and the evolution of a fairy tale*, Prince Charming characters appear most often as 'banal male foils' to the female protagonists. Moreover, they are 'all interchangeable and usually illustrated as one and the same from tale to tale'. In much the same vein, Healy asserts his opinion of historical representations of this stock character: "He's so inconsequential [...] He's presented as the ideal man, but he has no personality. If princesses are going to fall in love with princes, [...] then shouldn't we care about who these men are?" (Burnett 2012:1).

Thus, it is not surprising that *The hero's guide to saving your kingdom* opens with the following rather unsettling observation:

Prince Charming is afraid of old ladies. Didn't know that, did you?

Don't worry. There's a lot you don't know about Prince Charming: Prince Charming has no idea how to use a sword; Prince Charming has no patience for dwarfs; Prince Charming has an irrational hatred of capes.

Some of you may not even realise that there's more than one Prince Charming. And that none of them are actually *named* Charming. No one is. *Charming* isn't a name; it's an adjective (Healy 2012:1).

As a children's literature scholar with a gender representation agenda, this prologue caught my attention. Here is a book, I thought, that promises to subvert the stereotypical hegemonic masculinity inherent in the popular fairy tale culture that children consume so voraciously. As Wannamaker (2008:24) observes, a 'major goal of masculinity studies is to make masculinity visible as a social construct that is, in varying degrees, created by society and, therefore, also alterable by society.' Moreover, as Clowes (2013:13) argues convincingly,

it is only through a focus on men and masculinity, through foregrounding masculinity as a performance of gender, rather than nature, that men and boys are likely to begin to understand that they too are gendered, that their gender exposes them to avoidable harm and profoundly threatens their wellbeing.

In literature, this visibility is sometimes achieved by the ‘subversion of [the] hegemonic ideal’ which effectually ‘highlights the vulnerability of masculinity’ (Wannamaker 2008:24). Thus, a Prince Charming who is unable to wield a sword or even ride a horse is not only a break from tradition, but also an indicator that such a tradition exists. For the purposes of this article, ‘hegemonic masculinity’ will refer to ‘the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women’ (Connell 2005:77). The concept has been extended by scholars to propose ‘a multiplicity of masculinities and hierarchies of power’ that demonstrate ‘how men exercise power over women and other men’ (Morrell et al 2013:3). In challenging dominant masculinity, Healy’s book presents a comparison of different versions of masculinity; from the diminished and susceptible to the overstated and essentially impotent.

Healy’s (2012:1) opening paragraph offers some valuable insight into the construction of the popular image of Prince Charming by pointing out that ‘*Charming* isn’t a name. It’s an adjective’. Implicit in this remark is the assumption that the individual characteristics and tendencies, or the unique ‘names’ that would potentially differentiate between the various identities of the respective princes, pale into insignificance beside the overwhelming ideology regarding the performance of their masculinity. Instead of a name that acknowledges the reality of their necessarily differing identities, these characters are labelled according to prescribed expectations regarding performativity and appearance. The Cambridge Dictionary defines ‘charming’ as ‘pleasant and attractive’. The male hero’s identity then is bound up in issues of social acceptance and physical appeal.

The largely idealised yet perhaps genuinely desired model of masculinity that reaches its epitome in Prince Charming constitutes a fine illustration of Judith Butler’s proposal that gender is ‘the result of performance, a performance that [does] not so much imitate a given essential model as create the idea of such a model and norm through incessant repetition in the first place’ (Emig & Rowland 2010:5). As she puts it, ‘gender is a kind of imitation for which there is no original; in fact, it is a kind of imitation that produces the very notion of the original as an effect and consequence of the imitation itself’ (Butler 1997:306).

Healy’s deliberately subversive introduction to Prince Charming may also be interpreted at a deeper level. The observation that ‘Charming is an adjective’ also implies the added positioning of the character as an object of public scrutiny by an external, critical gaze. This is evident in the following extract from *Grimm’s fairy tales* (Grimm & Grimm

[1812] 1993:77) which describes Rapunzel's first impression of the prince when he enters her tower room:

Rapunzel was greatly terrified when she saw that a man had come in to her, for she had never seen one before; but the king's son began speaking so kindly to her, and told how her singing had entered his heart, so that he could have no peace until he had seen her herself [sic]. Then Rapunzel forgot her terror, and when he asked her to take him for her husband, and she saw that he was young and beautiful, [...] she put her hand into his saying, "I would willingly go with thee".

From this extract it is clear that the prince's ability to appear 'pleasant' and 'attractive' – in a word, charming – enables him to not only seduce Rapunzel but also to sire the twins that she bears 'in a waste and desert place' before he is able to find her again, thus securing the royal succession.

The versions of the four princes presented in the retellings by the 'Brothers Grimm' present similarly generic portrayals of the character, but with an added distancing in terms of personal explorations of identity. In many cases, such as the one above, the hero is merely referred to as 'the king's son' – a description which removes individual agency from the young, virile lover and presents him, instead, as the product of patriarchal desire. One is led to assume, through this impersonal discussion of the prince's actions, that his behaviour and demeanour comply with paternal ideologies and expectations.

That is not to say, of course, that being born into circumstances in which the specifications for successful performance of hegemonic masculinity are unusually high does not have its advantages. Should the build of one's body (natural or constructed) and one's personality make emulation of the ideal possible, all the advantages of a monarchy built on patriarchal precepts become the prince's ordained property. After all, the prince's successful embodiment of society's ideals gives him the unchallenged right to claim the bride of his choice without any further ado. This is evident in the Grimm's version of Cinderella when the prince is finally reunited with the elusive heroine. After the two step-sisters have mutilated their own bodies by chopping off their heels and toes in order to fit into the prince's rather restrictive specifications for a desirable bride, they discover that their sacrifices have been in vain:

The stepmother and the two sisters were thunderstruck, and grew pale with anger; but [the prince] put Cinderella before him on his horse and rode off. And as they passed the hazel bush, the two white pigeons cried,

'There they go, there they go!

No blood on her shoe:

The shoe's not too small,

The right bride is she after all' (Grimm & Grimm [1812] 1993:125).

During this spectacular exhibition of male sovereignty, even nature conspires to vindicate the man's right to carry Cinderella off. Prince Charming, successfully performed and internalised, grants the performer all the historically unchallenged privileges due to representatives of dominant masculinity.

3 UNMANNING PRINCE CHARMING

Nevertheless, in cases where the male protagonist fails, due to environmental conditioning or personal inclination, to personify the ideal, his deviation from the desired model often serves to negate his masculinity in the text. In *The emergence of man into the 21st century*, Madden speculates that 'those people who are most conscious of the ways that dominant masculinity is constructed in our culture and those most invested in making it visible are perhaps those who have been most marginalised by it, not those who most easily conform' (Munhall et al 2002:xxix). Similarly, one could argue that the characters in a narrative that are most instrumental in delineating the ideals of preferred masculinity are those who, in some respect or another, fail to perform according to the culturally constructed script.

3.1 PRINCE FREDERIC

A case in point is Healy's subversive portrayal of Prince Frederic, who is famed for having impressed the lovely Cinderella with his dancing skill. Frederic's overbearing and overprotective sire does everything in his power to control his son's actions.

Pretty much anything young Frederic could have wanted or needed was handed to him on a silver platter. Literally. The only thing Frederic had to do in return was live the life of a proper gentleman. He was allowed to attend as many poetry readings, ballroom dances and twelve-course luncheons as he wanted. But he was forbidden to take part in any activity that could be considered remotely risky or dangerous (Healy 2012:6).

Beyond his direct control of Prince Frederic's activities, the king's ideology is reinforced through the literature he allows his son to read. We know, for example, that Frederic's favourite bedtime story is, and has always been, 'Sir Bertram the Dainty and the Quest for the Enchanted Salad Fork' (Healy 2012:7). To understand the importance of this seemingly insignificant piece of trivia one must understand that '[I]terature is of significant cultural importance in reaffirming or challenging cultural ideologies, including those of gender and masculinity' (Potter 2007:28). In his article on men and masculinity in Australian young adult fiction, Potter supports Buchbinder's belief that cultural texts 'reflect models and ideologies abroad in the culture and [...] reinforce them and refract them back into the culture' (Buchbinder 1994:74; Potter 2007:28). Moreover, it is probable that 'repeated representations will become naturalised, with any criticism of these representations deflated and, potentially, absent' (Buchbinder 1994:74; Potter 2007:28).

For Frederic, the performance of masculinity presented by the inimitable Sir Bertram the Dainty has become naturalised within his context and he seems to feel no discomfort in spending ‘over an hour grooming himself to his father’s specifications’ (Healy 2013:15). At first, one may assume that Frederic’s father is intent on modelling his son along the lines of the ‘New Age Man’ who is, according to Buchbinder (1994:2),

supposedly gentler and less aggressive than Old Age Man, more in harmony with the earth and with nature, less convinced of the authority and rightness of traditional male logic, and more amenable to alternative ways of thinking. He attempts to get in touch with his feelings, and is willing to make himself vulnerable, emotionally, to others.

In many ways, Frederic exhibits the definitive traits of this kind of alternative masculinity. He is remarkably persuadable and he allows significant persons (both male and female) to understand their importance in his life. When Ella disappears from the palace in order to seek adventure and carve her own destiny, Frederic consults his valet regarding the incident.

‘I don’t want any other women. I want *Ella*. Reginald, what do you think I should do? And be honest with me; don’t just tell me what you think my father would want you to say.’ [...]

‘Don’t let her get away,’ Reginald said (Healy 2012:25).

The valet’s advice is clearly reminiscent of dominant masculine rhetoric in which the female object remains the unquestioned property of the male; the girl’s flight is interpreted as reckless rebellion, rather than an expression of rational personal agency. Frederic is urged to not let Ella ‘get away’ and his decision to set out in pursuit of her marks the beginning of his attempts to perform a foreign, yet, as the author insinuates, innate, form of capable and possessive masculinity.

Prince Frederic may conform to his father’s apparently misguided requirements for what is necessary to perpetuate male-centred power in his kingdom, but the author seems to imply that this kind of gentle, cautious and sensitive masculinity is signally lacking in the ability to maintain peace and prosperity. The chapter in which we are introduced to Prince Frederic is significantly named: ‘Prince Charming Misplaces His Bride’. In this deeply layered title, Healy hints at the essential impotence of this kind of masculinity and its inability to maintain hegemony in the face of feminist opposition. Healy, moreover, implies that this shift in power dynamics is undesirable as it paves the way for a widespread massacre and the destruction of the kingdoms by evil. Cinderella flees the palace in an attempt to escape the monotony of Prince Frederic’s cloistered lifestyle and his penchant for picnics, petit-fours and poached eggs. Her flight, which signals her rebellion against the expectations placed upon women to accede to the whims of powerful men, gives the narrative direction as the heretofore ineffectual prince decides to exert himself in order to reclaim the object of his desire.

In order to follow Ella (alias Cinderella), Frederic is required to enact performances which are entirely foreign to his unconventional expression of manhood. Frederic's intentions to set out in pursuit of his bride are hindered by his apparent deficiencies. Healy (2012:28) portrays the departure scene in singularly unromantic and unpromising terms:

The next morning, after several hours of secret, intensive riding lessons, Prince Frederic trotted out through the palace gates on horseback, with Reginald and Charles the groom waving him good-bye. His eyes were tightly closed, his arms wrapped around the horse's neck. Then something dawned on him. 'Wait,' he called back to Reginald. 'I don't know where I'm going.'

This account is just one of many in which expressions of alternative masculinity, in this case signified by a lack of equestrian and athletic ability, feature as less desirable than the dominant form of manly performance. Thus, although Healy presents essentially subversive versions of masculinity in the narrative, the hilarity and negativity attached to these representations serve to underscore rather than undercut dominant gender configurations.

Moreover, Healy's first description of Frederic suggests the idea of an innate masculinity that is brave, adventurous and physically capable and that can be either fostered or stifled by parental and societal interference. We are told that 'Frederic wasn't always helpless. There was a time when he aspired to become a hero. But it seemed it wasn't meant to be' (Healy 2012:5). Clearly, Healy does not wish to promote Frederic's emasculated version of male gender performance, and although the character is presented in such a manner as to engage the reader's loyalty and sympathy, it is clear, from the start, that Frederic's is a quest of self-discovery, a pursuit of the virility and heroic potential that years of parental conditioning have suppressed. Frederic's valet assumes the voice of hegemonic masculinity in his advice to the distraught prince: "Look, if you go on this journey, you're not just doing it for Ella, you're also doing it for that little boy who once wanted to try everything" (Healy 2012:27).

3.2 PRINCE LIAM

By contrast, Prince Liam, famed for his rescue of Sleeping Beauty (the vindictive and manipulative Briar Rose in this version of the fairy tale) has been encouraged and admired for his heroism since toddlerhood. In response to this adulation, we are told that Liam 'devoted himself to being a one-man army, on call to rescue anyone in need. And he was really good at it. He had strength, courage, agility, and natural skill with a sword. He even looked the part: tall and lean, with caramel-toned skin, bright green eyes, and lustrous, black hair that appeared permanently windswept' (Healy 2012:75).

Petted and praised by all his subjects, Prince Liam is seduced into the belief that it is his frequent displays of bravery and protectiveness in the interests of the people that

have secured his acceptance by the populace. That is until he decides to do something unheard of.

After the hullabaloo [surrounding his heroic liberation of Sleeping Beauty] finally died down, it occurred to Liam that he had never really spoken to Briar Rose other than to say, ‘Good morning. You can consider yourself rescued.’ He was curious to know more about her. So he did something extremely rare: He sent her a note. Even more shocking, he suggested they meet. In person. Two people from different kingdoms – who are engaged to be married – seeing and talking to each other. Crazy, I know (Healy 2012:77).

Here, Healy is clearly satirising the impetuous lover presented in traditional fairy tales who responds to his manly instincts and rushes into matrimony (in the most sanitised cases) with alarming alacrity. Prince Liam is evidently subverting the tradition by hesitating and desiring to know more about his intended bride.

The upshot of this rendezvous is that Prince Liam decides to call off his engagement to Briar Rose because she is, as he carefully phrases it, ‘not a very nice person’. This is a mild description of the woman who claims: “‘You wanted the real me, you got it. Briar Rose doesn’t censor herself for anyone”” (Healy 2012:81). However, when Liam makes his decision known, his entire kingdom rebels against him. Here, Healy draws attention to another requirement for Prince Charming. Regardless of the number of babies he has rescued from burning hovels, a desirable man must also embody the image of financial security and prosperity. Marriage to Briar Rose, who is heiress to a vast and wonderfully rich kingdom, would secure economic growth and widespread affluence in his own country. As Prince Liam soon discovers, failure to promote and embody financial success destroys his image as a desirable Prince Charming.

According to Brickell (2005:37), those performing masculinity are ‘constructs and constructors of symbolic orders; simultaneously productive and produced, loci of action and participants of interaction, they may perpetuate and/or resist hegemonic social arrangements’. Prince Liam’s refusal to submit to the conditions of the marriage that has been arranged for him by his mercenary parents constitutes a destabilisation of the symbolic social and economic order; a rebellion against the norms that dictate the extent of a prince’s duty to his country.

3.3 PRINCE DUNCAN

Healy’s Prince Duncan, of Snow White fame, represents an example of gendered portrayal where the ‘configuration of the man’s body is at odds with the familiar representations of masculinity’ (Mallan 2002:26).

At that moment, a man burst out from behind some nearby shrubbery. The three princes were all startled, as was the newcomer, who yelped and did a dancey little jump when he saw them [...] He wore a velvety blue tunic with puffed cap sleeves and a frilly white ruff around his neck. The tunic was belted at the waist, so that the bottom of the garment flared

out like a skirt. [...] On his legs he wore striped tights. Vertically striped tights. Green and blue vertically striped tights (Healy 2012:106).

Because of his extreme deviation from idealised, preferred masculinity and his 'questionable fashion choices' (Healy 2012:108), Duncan, beyond experiencing marginalisation in the context of his role as Prince Charming, is subjected to the relentless tirade of epithets attached to him by the surly, but undeniably masculine dwarfs, who refer to him as Duncan the Daring and Prince Pipsqueak. Despite this inauspicious beginning, however, Prince Duncan plays a pivotal part in the reaffirmation of hegemonic masculinity; a constructive, yet manipulative role that is discussed later in this article.

3.4 PRINCE GUSTAV

In the narrative, Prince Duncan's emasculated character appears as the foil against which Prince Gustav's overstated machismo plays out. As Murphy (1994:4) observes, myths about masculinity 'have informed men's lives over the past two centuries and focus, frequently, on the relationship between a man and his body'. This particular Prince Charming, whose engagement to Rapunzel has been called off due to the latter's decision to abscond, suffers from various complexes in relation to what he perceives as his physical inadequacies.

Prince Gustav, who stood six-foot-five and had shoulders broad enough to get stuck in most doorways, was nonetheless the smallest member of his family. Growing up as the 'tiny' one among 16 older brothers, Gustav felt a desperate need to appear bigger and more imposing. This usually involved puffing out his chest and speaking very loudly: Picture a six-year-old boy standing on top of the dining room table, posing like a statue of a war hero, and shouting, 'The mighty Gustav demands his milk cup be refilled!' (Healy 2012:31).

In *Fictions of masculinity*, Murphy (1994:4) observes that 'because many men are forced to comply with macho standards of performance', they often experience their role as containing 'heavy burdens'. The burden of masculine performance drives Gustav away from home on a quest to validate his manliness and gain paternal acceptance, a boon which he acquires near the end of the book. Exasperated by Gustav's attention-seeking antics, King Olaf of Sturmhagen says to his youngest son, "'I'm proud of you. You can relax now.'" For the first time in his life, Gustav blushed' (Healy 2012:424). It is noteworthy, however, that this unreserved commendation is only bestowed after Gustav has indeed met the requirements of dominant masculinity by publicly exhibiting courage and physical strength in the face of mortal peril.

Moreover, it is also significant that Gustav is more desirous of fulfilling the role set out for him by his sire than paying any attention to Rapunzel's suggestions in favour of a more sensitive, caring model of masculinity. She observes:

‘You still feel the need to be a gruff, emotionless, manly hero, as if that’s what everyone expects you to be. There are obviously parts of you that you don’t feel comfortable admitting to. But they’re the good parts.’

‘I’m all good parts, okay?’ Gustav grumbled. ‘I don’t need you to tell me about myself’” (Healy 2012:411).

Gustav’s gruff rejoinder lends credence to bell hooks’s (2004: 4) declaration that ‘[p]atriarchy demands of men that they become and remain emotional cripples’.

4 REDEEMING PRINCE CHARMING

When I started reading Healy’s book, I entertained hopes of encountering male protagonists who subvert dominant paradigms of masculinity by presenting alternative expressions of maleness as valid models whereby the characters gain acceptance regardless of their perceived deficiencies in relation to the heroic ideal. I hoped that this children’s text would make an attempt to ‘unmask the invisibility of masculinity or to destabilise the unifying discourse on masculinity’ by challenging ‘common sense’ literary and cultural narratives that claim ‘a naturalness for boys and men’ (Wannamaker 2008:24). I assumed that Healy was aspiring to number amongst the ‘countercultural fairy tale writers’ that endeavour to ‘transform the civilizing process’ and thereby unleash ‘the liberating potential of the fantastic’ (Zipes 2012: 176, 177, 168). I was too ambitious. It seems that even in the twenty-first century, hegemonic masculinity can be risked only to a certain point.

Instead of exploring these issues, Healy’s book centres on the ways in which the four Princes Charming negotiate paternal expectations and discover what the author would have us believe is their innate masculinity. It comes as no surprise that this is of a distinctly traditional type. Even the timid Prince Duncan eventually manages not only to ride three horses at the same time, but also to tame and fly a dragon in a death-defying act of unsurpassed bravery. The book seems to function, ultimately, as a reaffirmation of the hegemonic ideal, despite its subversive veneer.

In this sense, the title of the book is self-explanatory. This is, after all, *The hero’s guide to saving your kingdom*, a publication which turns out to be the name of a treatise Prince Duncan decides to write at the end of the narrative. As Duroche (1994:81) points out, ‘the exploration of narration as a cognitive tool in men’s attempts to understand who they are is by now a fixed feature in male consciousness-raising and in male gender studies’.

‘What are you doing, Duncan?’ Frederic asked.

‘Writing a book,’ Duncan replied. ‘These good people have given me an idea. Now that I am officially a hero, I believe it’s my responsibility to share my knowledge of heroics with the world’ (Healy 2012:435).

Prince Duncan's book, in effect, 'serves as a process of self-definition, a staged rite of passage which erases feelings of marginality, fragmentation, and subjective dispersal [...] and in their place, imparts a sense of agency' (Stephens 2002:40). As Toerien and Durrheim (2001:37) suggest, masculinity is a project that 'entails attempts by individuals to develop unified narratives of their gendered selves'.

Prince Duncan's narrative may therefore be interpreted as a physical and literary manifestation of a process that involves the individual's attempts to 'consciously deploy argumentative strategies that establish coherence, in order to construct a preferred image' (Andersson 2008:143). His treatise becomes the ultimate expression of hegemony through his ability to 'impose a definition of the situation, to set the terms in which events are understood and issues discussed, to formulate ideals and define morality' (Connell 1987:107; Morrell et al 2013:4).

Moreover, Healy's text seems to be less preoccupied with an interrogation of instances 'where representations of masculine sovereignty show an awareness of its tensions, fragility, and elements of masquerade' (Mallan 2002:35) than with describing the means whereby marginalised masculinities can be reconstructed in order to maintain the status of hegemonic masculinity. *The hero's guide to saving your kingdom* functions, then, as a kind of manifesto delineating ways that men who subscribe to alternative constructions of masculinity can mitigate the effects of their disenfranchisement in order to reap the benefits of hegemony.

Thus, despite their various eccentricities and initial inadequacies, the Princes Charming, by asserting their independence and fostering the development of an apparently innate masculinity, prove themselves capable of negotiating the challenges they face in order to protect their deeply gendered inheritance. For that is, after all, the crucial common denominator. It is *The hero's guide to saving your kingdom* (my emphasis). These men are heirs to the heritage of patriarchy; supreme beneficiaries of the status quo. The ideals of hegemonic masculinity which seemed to be at risk at the beginning of the narrative have been reaffirmed and successfully performed. Like the nameless princes of the stories preserved by the Brothers Grimm, Princes Frederic, Liam, Gustav and Duncan are ready to enter into the royal inheritance reserved for them through the cultural politics of privileged masculinity. For theirs is still the kingdom.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, K. 2008. Constructing young masculinity: a case study of heroic discourse on violence. *Discourse Society* 19(2):139–161.
- Brickell, C. 2005. Masculinities, performativity, and subversion: a sociological reappraisal. *Men and Masculinities* 8(1):24–43.
- Buchbinder, D. 1994. *Masculinities and identities*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

- Burnett, M. 2012. *Spring 2012 flying starts: Christopher Healy*. Internet book review. <http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/authors/profiles/article/52824-spring-2012-flying-starts-christopher-healy.html> (Accessed 15 November 2012).
- Butler, J. 1997. Imitation and gender insubordination. In Nicholson, L (ed), *The second wave: a reader in feminist theory*. London: Routledge: 300–316.
- Clowes, L. 2013. The limits of discourse: masculinity as vulnerability. *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity* 27(1):12–19.
- Connell, RW. 1987. *Gender and power: society, the person and sexual politics*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Connell, RW. 2005. *Masculinities*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Duroche, L. 1994. Gunter Grass's Cat and Mouse and the phenomenology of masculinity. In Murphy, P (ed), *Fictions of masculinity: crossing cultures, crossing sexualities*. New York: New York University Press: 74–95.
- Emig, R & Rowlan, A. 2010. *Performing masculinity*. London: Palgrave.
- Grimm, JLC & Grimm, WC. 1993. *Grimm's fairy tales*. London: Wordsworth.
- Healy, C. 2012. *The hero's guide to saving your kingdom*. London: Harper Collins.
- Hooks, B. 2004. *Understanding patriarchy*. Published online under the auspices of Louisville Anarchist Federation. <http://imagineborders.org/pdf/zines/UnderstandingPatriarchy.pdf> (Accessed 20 June 2014).
- Mallan, K. 2002. Picturing the male: representations of masculinity in picture books. In Stephens, J (ed), *Ways of being male: representing masculinities in children's literature and film*. New York: Routledge: 15–37.
- Morrell, R, Jewkes, R, Lindegger, G & Hamlall, V. 2013. Hegemonic masculinity: reviewing the gendered analysis of men's power in South Africa. *South African Review of Sociology* 44(1):3–21.
- Munhall, PL, Madden, E & Fitzsimons, VM (eds). 2002. *The emergence of man into the 21st century*. London: Jones and Bartlett.
- Murphy, P. 1994. Introduction: fictions of masculinity. In Murphy, P (ed), *Fictions of masculinity: crossing cultures, crossing sexualities*. New York: New York University Press: 1–17.
- Orenstein, C. 2002. *Little Red Riding Hood uncloaked: sex, morality, and the evolution of a fairy tale*. New York: Basic Books.
- Potter, T. 2007. (Re)constructing masculinity: representations of men and masculinity in Australian young adult literature. *Papers: Explorations into Children's Literature* 17(1):28–35.
- Stephens, J. 2002. Picturing the male: representations of masculinity in picture books. In Stephens, J (ed), *Ways of being male: representing masculinities in children's literature and film*. New York: Routledge: 38–54.
- Toerien, M & Durrheim, K. 2001. Power through knowledge: ignorance and the real man. *Feminism and Psychology* 11(1):35–54.

Wannamaker, A. 2008. *Boys in children's literature and popular culture: masculinity, abjection and the fictional child*. New York: Routledge.

Zipes, J. 2012. *Fairy tales and the art of subversion: the classical genre for children and the process of civilization*. New York: Routledge.