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What Happened to Celie and Idgie?: “Apparitional Lesbians” in American Film

Southern literature enthusiasts who attended the films *The Color Purple* (1985) and *Fried Green Tomatoes* (1991) could not help but wonder what had happened to the two central characters. The lesbians whom they had met in the novels had (perhaps not so mysteriously) all but disappeared. This study deals with the transmutation of Celie in *The Color Purple* and Idgie Threadgoode in *Fried Green Tomatoes at the Whistle Stop Café* into their film versions; it also analyzes the relationships between Celie and Shug Avery and Idgie and Ruth Jamison and suggests ways that the screenwriters, producers, and directors transformed lesbian desire into friendships that were presumably more acceptable to the public. Substituting the romantic love in the novels with the near-platonic love in the films may ultimately, however, have made the subversive themes more obvious.

Although films such as “Kissing Jessica Stein” (2002) present out lesbians and occasionally appear in mainstream theaters, they have not gained the accolades afforded to *The Color Purple*, which boasted 11 Academy Award nominations, and *Fried Green Tomatoes*, which garnered two. Making the lesbian relationships in *The Color Purple* and *Fried Green Tomatoes* more ambiguous than they were in the novels may have helped to make the films palatable for heterosexual audiences,
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although we may never know what the reaction would have been had directors Steven Spielberg and Jon Avnet, respectively, acknowledged that the lesbian characters shared not only supportive friendships but sexual relationships. It seems clear that Terry Castle is correct in her book, *The Apparitional Lesbian: Female Homosexuality and Modern Culture*, when she argues that visibly lesbian protagonists are absent in American film: “The lesbian is never with us, it seems, but always somewhere else: in the shadows, in the margins, hidden from history, out of sight, out of mind” (2).

If the filmmakers’ decision to omit the sexual relationships of the central characters helped to make *The Color Purple* and *Fried Green Tomatoes* more acceptable to the public, however, that fact is hardly reassuring to gay and lesbian moviegoers who long for positive representations, who want to see their lives portrayed accurately and compassionately on film, and who hope that films about gays and lesbians will be widely distributed and knowledgeably reviewed. In a 10 January 1992 review of *Fried Green Tomatoes* published in the *Washington Post*, Rita Kempley goes to the heart of the matter: “In Fannie Flagg’s novel ‘Fried Green Tomatoes at the Whistle Stop Café,’ Idgie and Ruth shared a love that dares not speak its name. But in this movie by ‘Risky Business’ producer Jon Avnet, they are not lesbians, just really, really good friends. And Idgie just happens to be fond of brogans. Avnet, debuting as a director, isn’t about to let these heroines out of the closet and into the mainstream.” She argues that, with Flagg’s consent, Avnet turned the film into a “parable of platonic devotion.” She then writes, “In doing so, he might also have assured the movie’s stars the wider audience they deserve.”

Like Kempley, Jennifer Ross Church argues in “The Balancing Act of *Fried Green Tomatoes*” that the filmmakers managed to normalize numerous subversive themes: “It’s a story about a tomboy’s life of playing poker and drinking, defying the Ku Klux Klan, recapturing her lesbian lover from a violent marriage, and murdering and cannibalizing the husband. How could a movie that treats these controversial issues be con-
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sidered family entertainment, and how could it push to the number one position in video rentals in February 1993?” Church’s answer is quite simple: “It’s a story about two pairs of women finding strength and solace in their strong friendships” (193). *Fried Green Tomatoes* in film and video grossed more than $42 million in the year following its release (193), according to Church, who clearly suggests that the filmmakers were successful in normalizing the provocative issues in the film. The film version suggests that same-sex love may be “little more than a youthful crush or a sexual experimenting to be outgrown with childhood” (195), as Church writes.

Other critics acknowledge that lesbian desire is present between the characters in both *The Color Purple* and *Fried Green Tomatoes*, but at minimum the relationships are left ambiguous enough for audiences to interpret them in whatever ways they choose. Roger Ebert states in a 20 December 1985 review of *The Color Purple* that “the relationship between Shug and Celie is a good deal toned down from the book,” and in a 10 January 1992 review of *Fried Green Tomatoes* writes, “It’s pretty clear that Idgie is a lesbian, and fairly clear that she and Ruth are a couple.” James Berardinelli suggests in an online review that the relationship between Idgie and Ruth is deliberately “left ambiguous.”

Depicting friendship between women on film—even the intense friendships exhibited by the characters in *Julia* (1977), *The Turning Point* (1977), *Steel Magnolias* (1989), and *Thelma and Louise* (1991)—seems to be failsafe. Scholar Jeff Berglund argues that “friendship is invoked as the culminating explanation of Idgie and Ruth’s relationship” (144-45) in the film *Fried Green Tomatoes*. He documents the reactions of actress Mary-Louise Parker, who plays Ruth Jamison; Flagg, who co-wrote the script; and Avnet, the director, to the virtual omission of lesbian desire in the film. According to Berglund, Parker believes same-sex desire in the film is so obvious that mainstream audiences will understand it; Flagg says the book is a “story about love and friendship” and that “sexuality is unimportant”; and Avnet echoes Flagg, saying, “The sexuality had no interest for me” (146-47).
As we will see, it is lesbian critics who provide the context for understanding the novels *The Color Purple* and *Fried Green Tomatoes*—and the films drawn from them—as lesbian texts. Lesbian criticism also acknowledges the encoding present in the texts and makes it possible to understand the subversive themes that may be drawn even from the ambiguous lesbian relationships in the films. In “What Is Lesbian Literature? Forming a Historical Canon,” Lillian Faderman states that *The Color Purple* “takes as its emotional center the nurturing, loving, and specifically sexual relationship between Celie and Shug.” She adds, “For Celie, the relationship remains erotically charged to the end of the novel and represents the only satisfactory sexual experience of her life. Do the absence of the word *lesbian*, the oblivion to the existence of a lesbian subculture, and the author’s putative heterosexuality mandate that we cannot consider such a work lesbian literature?” Faderman’s answer, of course, is “no,” and, as we will see, the answer remains the same for the film drawn from the novel. In spite of the near-annihilation of lesbian themes in the award-winning film, *The Color Purple* may suggest as much as it obfuscates. In both *The Color Purple* and *Fried Green Tomatoes*, what is omitted may be more important (and more suggestive) than what is clearly depicted on the screen.

The decisions by directors Steven Spielberg in *The Color Purple* and John Avnet in *Fried Green Tomatoes* to erase lesbian sexual desire would be of interest to Terry Castle and other critics who concern themselves with “apparitional lesbians” and the ways in which they all but vanish from contemporary film. Castle is concerned that the lesbian is “a kind of ‘ghost effect’ in the cinema world of modern life: elusive, vaporous, difficult to spot—even when she is there, in plain view, mortal and magnificent, at the center of the screen” (2). Another critic, Andrea Weiss, agrees, noting in *Vampires and Violets: Lesbians in Film* that “lesbian images in the cinema have been and continue to be virtually invisible. Hollywood cinema, especially, needs to repress lesbianism in order to give free rein to its endless variations on heterosexual romance” (1). And finally, in “Theorizing Lesbian: Writing—A Love Letter,” Elizabeth Meese
defines “lesbian” as “a word written in invisible ink, readable when held up to a flame and self-consuming, a disappearing trick before my eyes where the letters appear and fade into the paper on which they were written” (83).

If, as lesbian critics suggest, lesbian characters in popular culture are ghosts and shadows whose lives are written in invisible ink, is it reasonable to expect Celie and Idgie to have been more visible as lesbian protagonists? It would seem, for example, that Walker and Flagg, who both had sexual relationships with women, would argue for their characters to be clearly drawn in the films created from their books. However, in addition to the producers, screenwriters, and directors, authors themselves are sometimes not involved in writing the script, as was the case with Walker, or are themselves uncomfortable with their own sexual orientation, as was Flagg.

In The Same River Twice: Honoring the Difficult, which was written a decade after The Color Purple became a film, Walker concedes that the film did not replicate her vision of her characters: “It was clear that Shug is, like me, bisexual. That Celie is a lesbian. Do I regret that my version of the book was not filmed? I have accepted that it wasn’t” (35). After Walker wrote The Color Purple, she was “‘accused’ of being a lesbian, as if respecting and honoring women automatically discredited anything a woman might say” (22), Walker writes. Walker did argue strongly with Spielberg about allowing the kiss between Celie and Shug. She writes of wanting her mother, a fundamentalist Christian opposed to homosexuality, to understand that Celie and Shug are in love: “I did not want her to miss the love between women in The Color Purple. And so I lobbied for a kiss” (167). Later, she writes:

It was important to me that Celie and Shug be portrayed as the lovers they are in The Color Purple. It took a bit of gentle insistence . . . simply to include “the kiss,” chaste and soon over as it is. However I was aware, because Quincy Jones sent copies of some of the letters he received, that there were people in the black community who adamantly opposed any display of sexual affection between Celie and Shug. There were also editorials in black newspapers condemning such behavior. Incredibly, love
between women was considered analogous to drug addiction and violence. I knew the passion of Celie and Shug’s relationship would be sacrificed when, on the day “the kiss” was shot, Quincy reassured me that Steven had shot it “five or six” different ways, all of them “tasteful.” (219)

In a letter Walker includes in *The Same River Twice*, a lesbian who wrote to her after the film was released is quoted as saying: “As a lesbian, I’m also disappointed that Celie and Shug are not portrayed as lovers... The love, affection and sensuality that the two women share is what makes Celie come alive, learn to value herself. She did not receive that from any man in her life. How can that be ignored?” (250).

Although Flagg thought the portrayal of Idgie and Ruth was consistent between the novel and the book, Rita Mae Brown, lesbian author of *Rubyfruit Jungle* and a series of books that include mystery novels, attributes Flagg’s assessment to her homophobia. Brown claims in *Rita Will: Memoir of a Literary Rabble-Rouser* (1997) that she was with Flagg at a café that served as the basis for *Fried Green Tomatoes at the Whistle Stop Café*, that Flagg’s aunt who ran the café lived with another woman, and that Flagg told her she did not want to write a lesbian novel. Brown, who calls Flagg “one of the great loves of my life” (303) and discusses their relationship in her autobiography, describes the event:

Fannie drove me out to the Iron Café, frequented by the railroad workers. Bill Neal’s sister, Iggy, having battled the bottle herself (ran in the family), helped the railroad drunks dry out. She lived with another woman. The two women were kind but tough. Fannie always believed her aunt was a lesbian. As the good woman and her companion had been dead many years, I had no opportunity to form my own opinion.

We poked, prodded and talked about how to frame the story. Fannie didn’t want to write a lesbian book. What a surprise. But her aunt’s story was a great story. I told her she could soft-pedal it. Just write the women as she remembered them. I helped her with the structure.

This was the novel that eventually became *Fried Green Tomatoes at the Whistle Stop Café*. (325)

---
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As is obvious from Brown’s chronicle of the origin of *Fried Green Tomatoes*, one of the challenges of lesbian criticism is to identify a “lesbian text” even when the author herself refuses to acknowledge that there are lesbian characters or themes. A scholar’s definition of “lesbian” will necessarily determine the texts she or he identifies as “lesbian texts,” and it is unlikely that the definition of “lesbian” or the identified “lesbian texts” will please everyone. Is a lesbian text created only by a lesbian? Might a lesbian text be created by a bisexual or straight woman who describes lesbians in her work? Could a text have overtones identified as “lesbian” by readers or viewers without the creator’s conscious knowledge? Might a “lesbian text” be written by a man? Finally, as in Flagg’s case, could a “lesbian text” be written by a woman who is ambivalent about her own sexual orientation? If she is uncomfortable with her sexuality and claims she has not created a lesbian character, do critics have a right to identify her character as a lesbian in spite of her protests? The answer to the last question—notably in the case of the film *Fried Green Tomatoes*—is a resounding “yes.”

Identifying the sexual orientation of authors, producers, screenwriters, and directors ostensibly may seem to strengthen or weaken a gay or lesbian reading of a text, but, in fact, it is not—and must not be—the deciding factor. As Bonnie Zimmerman reminds us, “Literary interpretation will, of course, be supported by historical and biographical evidence, but perhaps lesbian critics should borrow a few insights from textual criticism. If a text lends itself to a lesbian reading, then no amount of biographical ‘proof’ ought to be necessary to establish that it is a lesbian text” (39). When scholars discuss Walker and Flagg in their work, it is essential to remember that, as Zimmerman writes, “The problem of definition is exacerbated by the problem of silence”: “One of the most pervasive themes in lesbian criticism is that woman-identified writers, silenced by a homophobic and misogynistic society, have been forced to adopt coded and obscure language and internal censorship” (40).

Furthermore, when dealing with woman-identified authors and their work, scholars should not overlook the possibility that they were not de-
liberately either hiding their sexual orientation or encoding their message; it is quite possible that the writers were actively questioning their own boundaries while creating characters who challenged theirs. Karla Jay and Joanne Glasgow suggest in the introduction to their collection entitled *Lesbian Texts and Contexts: Radical Revisions* that “problems of ‘encoded’ language remain and make especially difficult the analysis of all these texts written from a lesbian sensibility that was covered over, masked, or hidden from disapproving or simply uncomprehending eyes” (7).

Mainstream movie audiences might decipher some of the encoding afforded them in *The Color Purple* and *Fried Green Tomatoes*, but to do so they might also rely too heavily upon stereotypes of lesbians and gays. If, for example, they understand that Celie and Idgie are gay because they wear clothes traditionally understood to be “masculine,” they are, in fact, being discriminatory. Through cultural conditioning, we learn accepted ways of dress and self-expression; audiences might or might not understand that lesbians and gays often play with those artificial and constructed boundaries. Ruth and Shug are no less “lesbian” than Idgie and Celie because they wear “feminine” attire.

Ironically, although adopting a style of dress does not identify a woman as lesbian, in the film version of *Fried Green Tomatoes*, Idgie’s attire is one of the most reliable cues for the heterosexual audience, since Idgie and Ruth are rarely identified as lesbians through their expressions of physical intimacy, their building of a home together, or their rearing of Buddy Jr. However, even though Idgie is a lesbian and chooses to wear pants, suspenders, ties, and vests, it is still possible for members of the audience to refer to Idgie as a “tomboy” and avoid dealing with her lesbianism entirely. It would be far more honest to allow Celie and Shug and Idgie and Ruth to express their love for one another in ways that would identify them as individuals in committed relationships.

In “Heterosexual Plots and Lesbian Subtexts: Toward a Theory of Lesbian Narrative Space,” Marilyn R. Farwell argues that a lesbian text inevitably undercuts heterosexuality and conventional notions of normalcy: “The point in the narrative where this deconstruction begins is what I would
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call lesbian narrative space. It happens most often when two women seek another kind of relationship than that which is prescribed in the patriarchal structures, and when it occurs in the narrative, it can cast a different light on the rest of the novel, even on those portions that seem to affirm heterosexual patterns” (98). Identifying and understanding the significance of the “lesbian narrative space” in *The Color Purple* and *Fried Green Tomatoes*, of course, is the challenge of this and other studies. One way to locate that space in the novels and films important in this study is to examine the language used to describe the relationships between Celie and Shug and Idgie and Ruth in the films *The Color Purple* and *Fried Green Tomatoes*, respectively. In fact, the words the women speak to one another clearly support the fact that they are in love with one another. The encoding occurs, it seems to me, in the way the women gaze at one another and the way their limited physical contact is framed in the films.

In the novel *The Color Purple*, Walker describes both Celie’s enchantment with Shug Avery and her lack of sexual interest in her husband. It might be possible for heterosexual audiences to argue that in the film Celie loved Shug because Shug was kind to her and that she was uninterested in sexual relations with her husband because she was not in love with him and had never chosen marriage. However, it is clear in both the film and the novel that Celie falls in love at first sight, without any sense that Shug will care for her: “Shug Avery was a woman,” Walker writes, “the most beautiful woman I ever saw. She more pretty then my mama. She bout ten thousand times more prettier then me. . . . An now when I dream, I dream of Shug Avery. She be dress to kill, whirling and laughing” (16). There is no encoding in Walker’s book: Celie is sexually aroused by and falling in love with her husband’s long-time mistress. She has no interest in sex with men. Of Shug, she says, “I git the coffee and light her cigarette. She wearing a long white gown and her thin black hand stretching out of it to hold the white cigarette looks just right. . . . If I don’t watch out I’ll have hold of her hand, tasting her fingers in my mouth” (55). Of Albert, she says, “Mr. ______ clam on top of me, do his business, in
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ten minutes us both sleep. Only time I feel something stirring down there is when I think bout Shug” (68).

In the films, it is perhaps the kiss between the women that best identifies Celie and Shug and Idgie and Ruth as lesbian. In the novel The Color Purple, however, the kiss leads to a sexual relationship. Walker writes:

She say, I love you, Miss Celie. And then she haul off and kiss me on the mouth.

_Un_, she say, like she surprise. I kiss her back, say, _un_, too. Us kiss and kiss till us can’t hardly kiss no more. Then us touch each other.

I don’t know nothing bout it, I say to Shug.

I don’t know much, she say.

Then I feels something real soft and wet on my breast. (109).

In the film The Color Purple, the sexual relationship is less clear, although the film is true to the novel in its portrayal of Celie’s attraction to Shug Avery (Margaret Avery). In the screenplay written by Menno Meyjes, Celie (Whoopi Goldberg) thinks about Shug while she has sex with Albert (Danny Glover): “And then I think about that pretty woman in the picture. I know what he doin’ to me, he done to her. And maybe she like it.” After Shug comes to Celie’s home to recover, Celie walks in on Shug in the bath. Shug asks, “What you starin’ at? Never seen a naked woman before?” Celie is mesmerized by Shug and, kneeling beside the bathtub, brushes her hair.

Shug writes a song, “Miss Celie’s Blues,” and performs it for Celie as a tribute to her kindness: “Sister, you been on my mind/Oh, sister, we’re two of a kind/So sister, I’m keeping my eyes on you...I’m somethin’/I hope you think that you’re somethin’, too.” While singing, she holds Celie’s hand as Celie looks up shyly at her. Although a gay audience would understand the gaze between the women, a straight audience might hear “sister” in the song and respond only to the kindness Shug is showing Celie by singling her out in the song.

Later in the film, the two dance and look into mirrors together; the scenes melt into one in which Shug tells Celie, “I think you’re beautiful” and kisses her cheek, her forehead, her other cheek, and her mouth. Celie,
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embarrassed, pulls away and covers her mouth but then kisses Shug on the mouth tenderly. Shug kisses Celie hard, and the camera pans to their hands on each other’s shoulders. The viewer has no idea whether or not the two sleep together or whether Shug’s feelings for Celie go beyond sisterhood and a desire to help Celie feel good about herself and her body. After the kiss, Celie says, “Shug like honey. And now I’s just like a bee. I’s follows her everywhere. Wanna go where she go. What it like for her? And why she sometime get so sad... just like me.” The sexual attraction fades into Celie’s identification with Shug and a desire to be less alone.

Given Fannie Flagg’s alleged statement to Rita Mae Brown that she didn’t want to write a lesbian novel, an understanding of Fried Green Tomatoes and the film that followed it becomes more problematic. Encoding occurs in both the novel and film, although I would argue that the novel makes the lesbian relationship between Idgie and Ruth (and perhaps between Idgie and Eva) more obvious. Describing lesbian desire as a “crush” both minimizes it and creates confusion for heterosexual audiences: One might assume that many men and women have had same-sex crushes without those “crushes” being sexually actualized. When Idgie’s mother realizes that her daughter has strong feelings for Ruth, she announces to her family, “Now, children, your sister has a crush, and I don’t want one person to laugh at her” (81); later in the novel, she calls Ruth Idgie’s “sweet companion” (199). Idgie has been transformed by her feelings for Ruth to the extent that, as Flagg writes, “Even Sipsey razzed her. She’d see Idgie by herself and say, ‘That ol’ love bug done bit Idgie’” (82). One might argue that even here, though, Idgie’s love is trivialized.

Flagg doesn’t sexualize the relationship between Idgie and Ruth in the novel, although a lesbian or gay reader would understand that the two have a relationship that goes beyond a supportive friendship. When Ruth puts her arms around Idgie and says, “Oh Idgie, I’m not mad at you. It’s just that I don’t know what I’d do if anything ever happened to you. I really don’t,” Flagg tells the reader, “Idgie’s heart started pounding so
hard it almost knocked her over” (86). Clearly, Idgie’s feeling for Ruth is more than friendship. Flagg’s description of Ruth’s response also appears to be more than the response of a friend:

It’s funny, most people can be around someone and then gradually begin to love them and never know exactly when it happened; but Ruth knew the very second it happened to her. When Idgie had grinned at her and tried to hand her that jar of honey, all these feelings that she had been trying to hold back came flooding through her, and it was at that second in time that she knew she loved Idgie with all her heart. . . .

And now, a month later, it was because she loved her so much that she had to leave. Idgie was a sixteen-year-old kid with a crush and couldn’t possibly understand what she was saying. She had no idea when she was begging Ruth to stay and live with them what she was asking; but Ruth knew, and she realized she had to get away.

She had no idea why she wanted to be with Idgie more than anybody else on this earth, but she did. She had prayed about it, she had cried about it. . . .(88)

What does Ruth know that Idgie doesn’t know? It is quite apparent that Ruth fears she is responding to Idgie as a mature, sexual, passionate woman would, and because Idgie is younger, Ruth is concerned about the impact of her desire on Idgie. When she tells Idgie that she will marry Frank Bennett, Idgie says, “You don’t love him. . . You love me. . . you know you do” (90). Idgie is equating their relationship with the relationship between a woman and a man, perhaps making it even more likely that Ruth will leave. After Ruth goes, she thinks of Idgie often. Flagg writes, “But sometimes, in the middle of a crowd or alone at night, she never knew when it was going to happen, Idgie would suddenly come to mind, and she would want to see her so bad that the pain of longing for her sometimes took her breath away” (194).

In many ways, including narrative structure, Fried Green Tomatoes is faithful to the novel it is based upon, but it stops short of allowing the two central characters to experience a sexual relationship; in fact, as a framing device, the film balances the relationship between Idgie and Ruth with that of Ninny Threadgoode (Jessica Tandy) and Evelyn Couch (Kathy
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Bates). According to Church, the film relies on the “safe rubric of friendship” (199): “The framing narrative of the building friendship between the middle-aged Evelyn and the elderly Mrs. Threadgoode stabilizes and normalizes the ambiguous but more potentially subversive stories of Ruth and Idgie” (200), she writes. Berglund goes a step further in “‘The Secret’s in the Sauce’: Dismembering Normativity in Fried Green Tomatoes” and argues that the film entirely “secrets the lesbian desire evoked in the novel” (132).

Unlike in the novel, Idgie (Mary Stuart Masterson) meets Ruth (Mary-Louise Parker) when Ruth is her brother’s girlfriend. This allows the filmmakers to establish Ruth as a straight woman and Idgie as a tomboy who so adores her older brother that she even dresses like him. The promotional material that accompanies the video released in 1992 reads, “It’s the story of a friendship that defied all obstacles, a devotion that couldn’t be broken.” The problem, of course, is that the relationship transcended a friendship between women; in fact, Idgie and Ruth establish a committed relationship and raise Ruth’s son together. In the screenplay by Fannie Flagg and Carol Sobieski, Idgie plays poker, drinks, and smokes and charms bees (and Ruth). At the River Club, Ruth kisses Idgie on the cheek while they sit by the lake, but the kiss is not sexualized. When Idgie drives the second time to Valdosta, Ga., to see how Ruth is faring with Frank Bennett, Ruth says, “Idgie Threatgoode. How are ya? You look so... so grown up. All the guys must be wild about you. Tell me... Do you have a fella yet?” Even though she is miserable in her abusive marriage, Ruth expects that Idgie will follow the tenets of southern life and marry.

When Ruth’s mother dies and Ruth sends Idgie the obituary, she includes a well-known passage from the book of Ruth: “Whither thou goest, I will go; whither thou lodgest, I will lodge. Thy people shall be my people.” Idgie brings Ruth home with her, and the movie audience—many of whom have heard the passage from the book of Ruth uttered at heterosexual wedding ceremonies—might assume the two are a couple. However, when Ruth is asked in court why a “respectable Christian
woman” would leave her husband and go to live with Idgie, Ruth replies, “She’s the best friend I’ve ever had and I love her.” It is this kind of deconstruction that leaves the relationship ambiguous, protects Flagg from questions about her own sexuality, and, presumably, helps to guarantee the popularity of the film among mainstream audiences.

The final word in this study belongs to Lori J. Kenschaft, whose article “Homoerotics and Human Connections: Reading Carson McCullers ‘As a Lesbian’” suggests another important way to deal with characters such as Celie and Idgie who have been made “apparitional lesbians” in American popular culture. Kenschaft argues persuasively that even if the text, the characters, the author, and the reader are not lesbian, “reading with the hypothesis that any or all might be reveals new ways of reading these texts” (231). These “new ways” can be rich, indeed, and they are long overdue.
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