

The Pilcher and Whelehan article is a basic overview of “queer theory,” and I know that it will refer to people and concepts that you may not have come across before. Without worrying too much about the detail and using your own words, give a one or two sentence definition of “queer theory.”

Answer one of these two questions:

1. Kathleen Manley accuses Disney of returning us to the Victorian model of the “Angel in the House.” We talked about Coventry Patmore’s ideal when we were talking about Victorian sexism: “Marr'd less than man by mortal fall,/Her disposition is devout,/Her countenance angelical;/The best things that the best believe/Are in her face so kindly writ/The faithless, seeing her, conceive/Not only heaven, but hope of it.” Do you agree with this critique of Disney? Give an example or two to support your reasoning.
2. Manley takes a very uncritical position in relation to Villanueva and Beaumont’s texts by glossing their tales’ moral as “see people for who they are” instead of “be grateful and do your duty by marrying for your father’s benefit.” Does Beaumont’s heroine fundamentally alter her Beastly lover’s behavior? How?/Why not? Give an example or two to support your reasoning.

Steeves’ reading of *Beauty and the Beast* is unconventional, to say the least, and for most of you, the instinctive reaction will be to reject everything he says as outrageous and unthinkable. However, Steeves is aware of this and is, by his sheer outrageousness (literally, provoking outrage), he’s trying to make you think about/from an anti-conventional point of view. Bearing in mind that he is writing out of the “queer theory” movement described by Pilcher and Whelehan, find at least one argument in his paper that you find persuasive. Paraphrase or quote it, and explain why you think it is compelling.