Englisch

Sabine Nittnaus

Language and theme in children's literature

Diplomarbeit

GRIN

BEI GRIN MACHT SICH IHR
WISSEN BEZAHLT

- Wir veröffentlichen Ihre Hausarbeit,
  Bachelor- und Masterarbeit

- Ihr eigenes eBook und Buch -
  weltweit in allen wichtigen Shops

- Verdienen Sie an jedem Verkauf

Jetzt bei www.GRIN.com hochladen
und kostenlos publizieren

GRIN

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek:

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de/ abrufbar.

Dieses Werk sowie alle darin enthaltenen einzelnen Beiträge und Abbildungen sind urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung, die nicht ausdrücklich vom Urheberrechtsschutz zugelassen ist, bedarf der vorherigen Zustimmung des Verlages. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Bearbeitungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen, Auswertungen durch Datenbanken und für die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronische Systeme. Alle Rechte, auch die des auszugsweisen Nachdrucks, der fotomechanischen Wiedergabe (einschließlich Mikrokopie) sowie der Auswertung durch Datenbanken oder ähnliche Einrichtungen, vorbehalten.

Impressum:

Copyright © 2002 GRIN Verlag
ISBN: 9783656758365

Dieses Buch bei GRIN:

https://www.grin.com/document/281480

Sabine Nittnaus

Language and theme in children's literature

GRIN Verlag

GRIN - Your knowledge has value

Der GRIN Verlag publiziert seit 1998 wissenschaftliche Arbeiten von Studenten, Hochschullehrern und anderen Akademikern als eBook und gedrucktes Buch. Die Verlagswebsite www.grin.com ist die ideale Plattform zur Veröffentlichung von Hausarbeiten, Abschlussarbeiten, wissenschaftlichen Aufsätzen, Dissertationen und Fachbüchern.

Besuchen Sie uns im Internet:

http://www.grin.com/

http://www.facebook.com/grincom

http://www.twitter.com/grin_com

SABINE NITTNAUS

LANGUAGE AND THEME IN CHILDREN'S LITERATURE

Diplomarbeit zur Erlangung des Magistergrades der Philosophie aus der Studienrichtung Anglistik und Amerikanistik eingereicht an der Geistes- und Kulturwissenschaftlichen Fakultät Wien

Wien, im Jänner 2002

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

I have never stopped loving children's literature, and I have been interested in it as a field of research ever since I took a course on the history of children's literature at the University of Toronto. When I started out on this paper I had little idea what it would be about, only that the focus would be on language. I knew I was fascinated by the subject so I started exploring the issue in general terms, reading more or less randomly about children's literature, and reading children's literature, before I decided on the structure of the paper and the texts I would use for it. My fascination for children's literature is grounded in its potential for change and for development which is one of its major aspects. The fierce attempts to control children's readings, adults' prescriptions of what is good for them and what is not, have to do with this aspect of children's literature which has always been considered dangerous by some adults, because there is nothing more powerful than the potency of the literary imagination. Fairy tales, which were viewed as suspicious for a long time, as the history of children's literature shows, are a good example of this perceived threat.

The question of what children should read, how much freedom they should have to choose, which ultimately comes down to the question if they should be allowed to have an imagination or not, has had to do with changing notions of childhood, on which the emergence of imaginative literature for children depended, but to which it has contributed a lot in turn. The question really is if children's natural liveliness, curiosity, and open-mindedness should be suppressed, if children should be frightened, and kept in their place, taught to accept everything unquestioningly, or be offered what they need to develop and grow at their own pace, and develop into critical, self-confident, open-minded adults. This issue goes beyond the scope of this paper, and the subject of children's literature, but it more than touches on the debate and is reflected in it, as well as explaining the passion with which the question on what children should read or rather should not read has always been discussed. A good example of how these issues interrelate is the zeal of some American parents when it comes to banning books like 'Huckleberry Finn', which I will talk about in chapter 6. They have obviously been stunted in their own development, and fearfully try to protect their children from what they think is the cause of all evil, thus unfortunately ensuring that the deficit is passed on.

The complexity of the relationship between children and books has often been underestimated, and the effects books can have on children have been simplified. If

children grow up to realize their own potential or are stunted in their growth certainly depends on many factors, but a development of appreciation for literature is in my opinion part of this process, not to forget the role literature can play in developing and giving space to children's imagination.

In the first and theoretical part of this paper I will explore issues connected with the social and literary context of children's literature, in view of the complex relationship between children and books. I have found it useful to look at this relationship in the light of Guy Cook's (1994) schema theory, as it is an exploration of the complex effects literature can have on the reader on a cognitive level.

According to this 'theory of discourse deviation', of 'schema refreshment and cognitive change' (1994: 181), which I will more fully discuss in chapter 10, discourses can have three kinds of effects on the reader's schemata, they can be 'schema-refreshing', 'schema-preserving', or 'schema-reinforcing'. What distinguishes literature from other discourses, and is the reason for why it is specially valued, according to Guy Cook, is that it allows the readers' schemata to be refreshed. How this relates to children's literature is interesting, because it seems that children, because of their lack of experience, by necessity have fewer schemata, and more unfinished ones than adults, and would therefore need literature that accounts of this difference, while initiating them into schema-refreshing effects of adult literature. It certainly should not limit them by only reinforcing conventional assumptions while feeding them with effects.

In the second and practical part of my paper I will look at two very different texts, Roald Dahl's 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' (1964/1995), and William Mayne's 'Kelpie' (1993) to explore these issues empirically and see where they fit into the context of social/historical conditions of the production and reception of children's literature discussed in the first part, also in view of schema theory and ideology.

In the course of this paper, my empathy with Lucy's growing awareness of herself and the world around her, with her newly developed self-confidence and self-awareness at the end of the story has grown. Regarding the gradually clarifying take on my topic and my paper I feel a little like Lucy, who, after her journey of discovery, looks at herself on photographs of the trip. 'Once, Lucy thought, I would not have been able to recognise myself; but now I think I could.' (Mayne 1993: 79)

Part One

1 What is children's literature?

What exactly is 'children's literature'? This question, which appears to be so easy to answer, turns out to be more difficult than it seems at first sight, when we consider all the different books subsumed under this category. For instance, does 'children's literature' refer to books written for, or read by children, or both?[1] The first definition, 'written for children', would only focus on the author's original target audience and therefore include historical 'children's books' which are not read by children anymore and are only of interest to a few literary adults. The second, 'read by children' would encompass anything ever read by children, including books which were intended for adults and later adopted by children, as for instance 'Robinson Crusoe', as well as comics and other material children read but most adults would not associate with children's 'literature'.[2] What about books intended for children but read by adults? What about textbooks, encyclopedias or other non-fiction written for children? Do they count as children's literature?

Knowles and Malmkjaer (1996: 2) define 'children's literature' simply as 'any narrative written and published for children', a definition that excludes some poetry written for children and also assumes that 'written for children' and 'published for children' are synonymous. This is not necessarily the case, as some books are published as children's books in one country and as books for adults in another - for instance Philip Pullman's 'Northern Lights' which was sold as a book for adults in Britain and as a children's book in the USA (cf. 'The Children's Bookseller': 22.). And of the recently published 'Harry Potter' books there are children's and adult versions available, even in the same bookstore, the only difference lying in the packaging and the price, which is higher for the adult version. This may be a recent phenomenon, but the demarcation lines separating children's and adult literature have never been clear-cut and texts have always passed from one 'system' to the other over the course of time (cf. Shavit 1986, 65f.)[3]. Publishing indeed plays a crucial role in the classification of books as children's books. If the writer's intention is left out entirely we arrive at Townsend's pragmatic definition, quoted by Knowles and Malmkjaer (1996: 1).

> If he [the publisher] puts a book on the children's list, it will be reviewed as a children's book and will be read by children (or young people), if it is read at all. If he puts it on the adult list, it will not – or at least not immediately (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 1).

In my view, as a definition, this is not satisfactory enough for our purposes. If we talk about 'children' and their 'literature', we should be as clear as possible of what is meant by these terms. Why is it that children's literature is so difficult to define, the field has such hazy boundaries? This question leads right into the center of the issue.

> The definition of children's literature lies at the heart of its endeavor: it is a category of books the existence of which absolutely depends on supposed relationships with a particular reading audience: children (Lesnik-Oberstein 1996: 17).

Children's literature as a field tends to resist clear-cut definitions, it is ambivalent, an oddity, 'a species of literature whose boundaries are very hazy' (Hunt 1990: 1). This has to do with the fact that both terms, 'children' and 'literature', are culturally and historically determined concepts. When we look at the children of 'children's literature' we realize that their first and foremost defining characteristic, namely age, has varied considerably over time. Up to what age a person is regarded as a child has changed much in the history of childhood (e.g. cf. Ariès 1975). It seems that the characteristics we regard as typical of children, that is, lack of experience, resulting in a certain behavior, time for play, no responsibility, and in particular, our ideas of the sweetness and innocence of children go back to the Romantic period, while our conviction that children are in need of adult supervision originated in the middle of the 18th century (cf. Shavit 1986: 26). It is important to keep in mind that our ideas of what children are and what makes them children, is constructed.

> 'Notions of the 'child', 'childhood' and 'children's literature' […] embody the social construction of a particular historical context […] such notions today are bound up with the language and ideology of Romantic literature and criticism (Myers 1992, in Watkins 1996: 35).

What constitutes a child is therefore a culturally determined concept and subject to change. One critic's idea of what 'children' are or what makes them children may be very different from another's, and the same is true for writers. And then there are the children in the books, and the reading children who may be very different children indeed if notions of childhood have changed.

For this reason there can be no 'intrinsic' definition of 'children's literature', as the cultural and social context always comes into play. Lesnik-Oberstein (1996: 17) goes so far as to say that

> the two constituent terms-'children' and 'literature' - within the label 'children's literature' cannot be separated and traced back to original independent meanings, and then reassembled to achieve a greater understanding of what 'children's literature' is. Within the label the two terms totally qualify each other and transform each other's meaning for the purposes of the field. In short: the 'children' of children's literature are constituted as specialised ideas of 'children' […]

In short, both 'children' and the 'literature' written for them, are shaped by 'the views held within the adult population about children and young people themselves and their place in society'. (Hollindale 1988?)

Over the following pages I will look closely at both terms in their context to gain a better understanding of their meanings and the way they interact to result in 'children's literature'.

> Children's literature and children's literature criticism define themselves as existing because of, and for, 'children', and it is these 'children' who remain the passion of – and therefore the source of conflict for – children's authors and critics (Lesnik-Oberstein 1996: 29).

Looking at the issue from the 'literature' side, however,

> [...] there is an implicit definition of children's literature which has little necessarily to do with children: it is not the title of a readership but of a genre, collateral perhaps with fable or fantasy (Hollindale 1988: 26).

In my opinion the integration of these two ways of looking at the subject will bring us a considerable step closer to a comprehensive understanding. For this reason, I will take a short look at the term 'literature', which raises as many questions as 'children'. The conventional, in many contexts still prevalent, underlying 'definition' or understanding of literature as 'the inaccessible, the pretentious, the difficult' (Hunt 1991: 23) that only the 'self-elected' with 'trained intuition' (Hunt 1991: 50) can access is particularly detrimental in the context of children's 'literature', in fact it would actually exclude it, as it has done for a long time when children's literature was excluded from the canon. Unfortunately, it is still in the back of the mind of many who write about children's literature and is responsible for their hostile attitude against 'literature' (cf. I, 5). Over the last decades this conventional notion of 'literature' has been deconstructed (cf. Hunt 1991) and it has been pointed out that the label 'literature' has been applied as a 'value' term (e.g. Hunt 1991: 51), which is

embedded in a context of culture and power and cannot be defined in terms of its linguistic features.[4] The question linguists and critics have then been concerned with is, if literature can be defined at all or if it is essentially no different from other discourses. I think it is a different discourse. Cook's 'idea of schema refreshment through discourse deviation' (1994: 206), which I will discuss in chapter 10, provides an explanation for the special status of literature compared to other discourses, and is particularly interesting in regard to children's literature.

In conclusion, both terms 'children' and 'literature' are cultural concepts and it is 'the cultural context that dominates the categorization' (Hunt 1991: 51) of books as children's books.

2 The History of Children's Literature: from 'Instruction' to 'Delight'

Aesthetic quality has always been seen as a very important characteristic of the literary text. The special pleasure that can be derived from reading such a text makes it different from a merely informational text. Texts written with the sole intention to instruct or inform children are therefore usually excluded from the field 'children's literature'. The purpose to teach children, however, comes in many disguises: it is rarely explicitly stated (except in some non-fiction) and more often than not intertwined with the purpose to amuse in one and the same text. The history of children's literature, as the field in general, is characterized by this opposition between literary qualities that 'delight' the reader, and didactic purposes aiming at 'instruction', c.f. for instance the title of the Oxford anthology of children's literature I will draw on, 'From Instruction to Delight'. (Demers and Moyles 1982), which interprets the whole history of children's literature as a journey from the one to the other.

The book regarded as the beginning of children's 'literature' in this anthology is Newbery's 'Little Pretty Pocketbook'. The decision of what counts as the first children's book is of course to some extent arbitrary, as such decisions invariably have to be, in this case it is based on the opposition between 'instruction' and 'delight': The 'Little Pretty Pocketbook' is the first book targeted at children that explicitly brings in 'delight', as it is 'intended for the Instruction and **Amusement** of little Master Tommy and pretty Miss Polly [...]' (Newbery in Demers and Moyles 1982: 104) and it is the second term that makes it a landmark of children's literature. By our standards this is rather surprising, after all there seems nothing more natural than a writer's expression of his intention to amuse children, (an expressive intention to instruct would more likely be kept quiet nowadays). When we take a

short look at the history of children's literature, however, we realize that this idea is very 'modern' and the production of literature (that is material written with the aim to delight) specifically for children a comparatively recent phenomenon.

For the emergence of a literature especially for children certain social and cultural conditions were necessary. It was not possible in a world in which the child was seen as part of the adult world (Shavit 1986, 6f.). According to Ariès 'Geschichte der Kindheit' (1975) this was the case in medieval society, which had no awareness of the child as a being with separate, and special needs, no concept of childhood. As soon as babies could live without the constant attention of the mother or nurse they entered society at large without a transitional period (Ariès 1975: 209). The period before the child was able to take part in adult society was very short, as the lifespan in general was much shorter than it is today, and it did not count much: infant mortality was very high, so one had to expect that very young children would die anyway and for this reason were not important. This attitude can still be found in the 17th century (209).[5]

According to Ariès (1975: 210), it was in the 14th century that a tendency developed in art to assign the child more importance; there were for instance portraits of children. Over the next centuries this changing view of childhood slowly spread to other areas of life. In the 16th and 17th centuries awareness of childhood as a separate state can be seen in the dress of upper class children, which for the first time differed from adults'. The beginning polarization of the world of children and adults brought with it different notions of childhood. At first children came to be seen as a source of pleasure and amusement. Adults began to find the naivety and cuteness of children amusing and on a large scale began to take pleasure in hugging and cuddling them (Aries 1975: 210f.). They might have done this before but now it was spoken about. It was also in the 17th century that a second notion, propagated by moralists and educators, began to develop, which emphasized the importance of the 'spiritual well-being' of children. Psychological and moral interest in the upbringing and education of children began to replace the view of child as toy (Ariès 1975: 217), and characterizes attitudes towards childhood to this day (Ariès 1975: 215). This is where the origins of children's literature lie, even though there was nothing published specifically for children before 1700 (cf. Hunt 1991: 21).

John Locke's treatise 'Some Thoughts Concerning Education' (1693) reflected the change in attitudes towards children (cf. Hunt 1995: 12). The Puritan notion of the child as a vessel of sin was replaced by the new Enlightenment view of the child as 'tabula rasa', a blank slate that could be written on (cf. Townsend 1996: 677). Locke's educational philosophy advocated instruction in combination with

pleasure, and saw the possibility that 'children could play themselves into what others are whipped for' (Townsend 1996: 677). Slowly this began to be reflected in the literature for the child. It had started with the Puritans' 'Hell-Fire' tales, which were now followed by stories written by the 'Rational Moralists' (cf. Demers and Moyles 1982) in the tradition of Locke. However, these tales were still predominantly instructional, and at times just as gruesome as the Puritans' tales.[6] Newbery, a shrewd publisher and businessman, and admirer of Locke's educational philosophy perceived the gap in the market and began to publish children's books. His first title, 'A Little Pretty Pocketbook' (1744), is, as mentioned above, generally regarded as the beginning of 'children's literature', as it was the first book expressly written to delight children, while attempting a compromise between the interests of parents and children. Its proclaimed motto is 'Delectando monemus: Instruction with Delight' (Newbery in Demers and Moyles 1982: 105).

> [Newbery's] many titles brought together the pleasurable and the instructive, frequently between the same covers. The two aims – to teach and to please – have remained twined together ever since (Townsend 1996: 677).

Of course Newbery was not the first to delight children, only the first to do so expressively. Fairytales and folktales were always told to children and enjoyed by them but also by adults. Bottigheimer (1996: 152) distinguishes between the original stories about fairies enjoyed by adults, and fairy tales. Tales about fairies are 'elaborate narratives that depict the fairy kingdom and elfland; the leprechauns, kobolds, gnomes, elves, and little people […] based on surviving Celtic lore' (152). They often have 'amoral consequences and conclusions'. In the seventeenth century, versions of these tales about fairies were in fact intended for French adult aristocratic audiences but soon found a child readership. The lower classes also told their children fairy stories. After 1700 fairy stories intended for a child audience began to appear.

> Fairy tales, unlike tales about fairies, more often than not, do not include fairies in their cast of characters and are generally brief narratives in simple language that detail a reversal of fortune, with a rags-to-riches plot that often culminates in a wedding. Magical creatures regularly assist earthly heroes and heroines achieve happiness, and the entire story is usually made to demonstrate a moral point […] (Bottigheimer 1996: 152).

Folk-tales include many genres, for instance animal tales, nonsense tales, jests, burlesques, chapbook romances and many more (cf. Bottigheimer 1996: 161). Some folk tales, like Robin Hood, Tom Thumb, Jack and the Giant, 'thematize the confrontation of small, weak, poor but witty hero against a large, strong, rich, but

stupid real or metaphorical giant' (Bottigheimer 1996: 162). Folk-tales are difficult to distinguish from fairy tales, except that almost all of the folk-tales, according to Bottigheimer (1996:162) 'enjoy a truly ancient literary lineage'. Both fairy tales and folk-tales are important components of children's literature. In fact, the history of children's literature is to a large extent the history of fairytales and folktales. For a long time they were for the most part children's territory, it was even thought that children understood them better than adults (cf. Bottigheimer 1996: 162).

It seems natural that children, because of their comparatively powerless social position, would particularly empathize with the weak disadvantaged hero/ine who wins out in the end. Moreover, fairy tales and folk-tales are radical and extreme not only in the heroes' reversals of fortune, but also in the punishment of evil, thus affording pleasure in justice (which may have to compensate for lack of it in the real world). The weakling wins, often by defeating a powerful figure that can be compared to the parent or any other powerful adult in the child's life. This rise to power of the disadvantaged hero/ine can be seen as a possibility that children could throw over the adult order, at least symbolically, and serves as a reminder that there is justice, which wins in the end, and despite the apparently greater power of the giant/witch or whoever it is who is conquered. This has probably always attracted children, and put off many adults who passionately opposed these tales as reading material for children in the name of protecting them.

Fairy tales and folk-tales were part of an underground tradition and attacked from all sides, at different times for different reasons: they were 'regarded by the Tudor and Stuart literati as 'peasant absurdities' (Townsend 1996: 680), the Puritans railed against them because of their fictional nature and because they feared they might 'disgust... children with what is useful and of real importance' (Demers and Moyles 1982: 78), besides having 'not even the shadow of common sense in them' (Demers and Moyles 1982: 78), and, 'by the 18th century [they were regarded] as contrary to reason' (Townsend 1996: 680). As much as their predecessors, Locke and his followers, including Newbery, opposed the old tales, the 'Ballads and foolish Books' already deplored by White in 1671. In fact, efforts were made till well into the 19th century to ban fanciful adventurous tales such as folktales and ballads of legend and romance once and for all from the nursery.

Despite these attacks, the old tales survived and were passed on from generation to generation. Aside from the oral tradition, this is largely due to their preservation in 'chapbooks'[7], 'slim, cheap pamphlets sold by pedlars throughout the country that contained romances, dramas, and histories (Hunt 1995: 27). Towards the end of the 18th century there were chapbooks published specifically for children

but even before that children read them. As everything published for children was heavily instructional, there was no competition for these little books (Demers and Moyles 1982), until Newbery set up the tradition of publishing books that tried to please both children and adults, while (in his own interest) opposing the original tales as fiercely as anyone else.

It was not till Romanticism that the rehabilitation of these old tales began:

> their emergence into respectable print is probably associated with the rise of Romanticism, the greater esteem for imagination that had followed the Age of Reason, and the replacement to some extent of classical influences by Nordic ones' (Townsend 1996: 680).

The Romantics' preference of fairy tales over more realistic fiction (cf. Hunt 1992: 12) helped to make them again socially acceptable and contributed to their later re-establishment as literature which was considered 'proper' at least for children. Contemporary notions of the child as innocent, sweet, closer to God and in some way wiser than adults, as well as the glorification of childhood as a state of innocence can be traced back to 'Romantic ideologies of childhood' (Hunt 1992: 12), which regarded childhood as a somewhat mythical state, more natural than adulthood, because yet unspoilt.[8]

By the mid-nineteenth century a number of authors, to differing degrees associated with the Romantic movement, had appeared, who signalled important changes in children's literature, and, according to Demers and Moyles (1982: 219ff.), ushered in the Golden Age of children's literature.

> Unlike their doctrinaire contemporaries they were willing to endorse entertainment as a creditable goal in their works for the young, and were capable of fashioning delightful vehicles to ensure success (219).

Blake's 'Songs of Innocence and Experience' (1794), Roscoe's 'The Butterfly's Ball and the Grasshopper's Feast (1807), Lamb's 'Poetry for children' (1809), and Lear's 'The Book of Nonsense' (1846), among other works, survived from that time. Interestingly, it was these books that were by no means typical of children's literature of the time, which were heavily influential, tasting as they did 'more of honey than of medicine' (Demers and Moyles 1982: 221). According to Demers and Moyles (1982) and also Knowles and Malmkjaer (1996: 3), a number of writers of instructional and moral tales, now forgotten (except in histories of children's literature), remained in the majority for a long time to come. Examples are Thomas Day's 'The History of Sandford and Merton' (1783-9) and Mrs. Trimmer's 'Fabulous Histories' (1786), later renamed as 'The History of the Robins'.

In the 19th century, there was for the first time 'a mass output of popular juvenile fiction' (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 3) and the emergence of what came to be called 'traditional juvenile fiction' which can be divided into the 'adventure story' and the 'school story'. Both offered role models the reader could identify with. Representatives of the adventure story are Ballantyne, Kingston, Marryat and G.A. Henty. With Stevenson the genre reaches its height, and is at the same time transcended. The school story became a popular genre with Thomas Hughes's 'Tom Brown's Schooldays' (1857).

> In the early nineteenth century, the output of books for children continued to grow, but emphasis was still largely on the didactic and instructional […] By the mid-nineteenth century, imagination was in favour among the more forward-looking writers (Townsend 1996: 680).

The second half of the 19th century (and beginning of the 20th century, up to the outbreak of the First World War) is generally regarded as the 'Golden Age' of children's literature with authors such as Ruskin, Dickens, Wilde, Grahame, Rossetti, in different genres casting off the restraints of hundreds of years of instruction. Lewis Carroll's 'Alice in Wonderland', published in 1865, is often regarded as the final victory of the imagination. At the same time, there was still a large output of heavily instructional, didactic literature for children, 'the work of third- and fourth-rate writers turning out what the market demanded' (Townsend 1996: 680).

> The Victorian ideal of childhood, in brief, was that children should be good and do as they were told. Piety, often to an unrealistic degree, was approved of; the activity of tract societies and the growing trade in Sunday School 'rewards' resulted in a torrent of 'goody-goody' books. To look at the Victorian children's books still familiar today is in one way misleading but in another way illuminating: the survivors are far from representative of the entire output and come almost invariably from the minority that ignored, bent or broke the rules (Townsend 1996: 680).

The First World War ended the Golden Age of children's literature. Compared to the years before, both wars and the interwar period were an impoverished period of children's writing, with less importance and status assigned to children's books and their writers[9] (cf. Townsend 1996: 682).

> The stresses of war and post-war shortages restricted publishing during the second war as they had done in the First, and the decade of recovery was the 1950s (Townsend 1996: 683).

The 1950s led up to a very prolific period of writing, often called the second 'Golden Age', with a large number of books published in many different genres, such as the

adventure story, historical novel, fantasy, realistic fiction (cf. Townsend 1996: 684f.). The major writers representing the 'Golden Age' include Lucy Boston, Philippa Pearce, William Mayne, Alan Garner, Jill Paton Walsh, Leon Garfield, and Joan Aiken among others (cf. Hollindale and Sutherland 1995, 256ff.). Hollindale and Sutherland (1995: 259) attribute the flowering of children's literature at the time to the remarkable freedom of non-artistic influences authors enjoyed. This 'period of exceptional artistic licence for the children's author' (259), however, ended in the 1970s with the arrival of a new agenda of political correctness, thus opening again the debate on 'instruction' and 'delight', this time in a modern dress. While authors of children's books these days are not so much in danger of being openly criticized for the morals they propagate, they may be accused of a number of different –isms. This may be even more dangerous because it is often not made obvious that different morals/politics are at issue and that the standards of 'political correctness' against which works are measured are ideological as well. This is not to say that ideology in children's literature should not be discussed, but on a different level (cf. I, 6,7).

This short overview of the historical development of children's literature is important for the discussion that follows because it shows the war that has been fought over the bodies of children over the question if children are allowed to have an imagination or not. It also shows the roots of the issues discussed today, and the similarities, and this is important because our own immersion in our cultural climate means that we are far less able to see contemporary issues like the debate on political correctness from a distance than we are able to see historical issues. The split between more or less didactic writing for children and books that feed the imagination has always been of interest. It is important to bear in mind that the children's books that survive and become classics are often the delightful ones, those that go against the rules of the time, while instructional works tend to be forgotten, unless they are particularly gruesome and disgusting as some cautionary tales. Fairytales have been favorites with children for a long time and have survived the different morals that have at different times been attached to them. This goes to show that children's inclinations are not so easy to influence or divert as adults think (or would wish), and that they like or dislike stories for their own reasons, no matter what the 'moral' is, as adults would have it.

3 The situation of children's literature today: economic factors and social changes

There can be no doubt that children's literature continues to occupy a prominent place in the modern world of children and of adults. If proof was needed one could point to innumerable books, articles, and online discussions about books, as well as the interdisciplinary discussion of issues connected with children's literature, involving adults from different spheres of society. The adults in some way involved in the production of children's literature and in public debates about it, are not only writers and publishers, but also the booksellers, teachers, and, parents, as well as educationalists, psychologists, and literary critics. Over the last decades children's literature, after having been 'recognized as part of the mainstream of literature' (Watkins and Sutherland 1995: 293), has received much serious critical attention, a number of journals have been established and it has been finally acknowledged as a subject worthy of study in universities, though very interestingly courses were offered at first in education and only later in literature departments.

Apart from the social, educational and literary importance, there is also an economic dimension to the production and reception of children's literature that is not to be overlooked. For instance, in the 1970s, the number of new titles published began to rise while print runs were decreased.[10] According to Hunt (1991, 17), 5.000 new children's books are published every year in Britain alone, with 55.000 titles currently in print. For the USA the figure in the early 1990s was 6.000 new titles per year (cf. Watkins and Sutherland 1995: 319). The dependence of the production of children's literature on economic circumstances is considerable: rise in prices of paper, for instance has a direct effect on the system, the same is true for budget cuts in money for public libraries, as happened in Britain in the 1980s (cf. Watkins and Sutherland 1995, 290). A positive opposite example would be the government funding to schools and libraries in the USA in the 1960s, which allowed publishers to 'expand their lists' (Watkins and Sutherland 1995: 291). There is some critical disagreement on the economic situation of children's literature in the 1990's. Watkins and Sutherland (1995: 320) find it promising:

> There is a wider audience of children's books [...] And there is a ripple effect as bookstore and mass market sales increase: the range of books carried in bookstores has broadened, since a healthy sales volume encourages publishers once again to take risks. It is a satisfying spiral.

Townsend's (1996: 687) assessment of the 1990s is less positive. Schools and libraries in Britain had less money to spend, while books got more and more

expensive. 'The chill economic wind seemed to cause, or at any rate to be accompanied by, a fall in the numbers of good new writers'. Children's literature does not exist in a vacuum but depends on a number of social and economic factors. That there often is a correlation between the emergence of good children's books and a favorable economic situation is important to bear in mind because it shows how much books depend on a market, and therefore children's reading on the amount of money parents, schools, and libraries can afford to spend on them. How much money there is to spend also depends on adults' priorities and if they think children's reading is the right place to save money, as they seem to do, which has negative consequences on the whole system.

A negative voice, as far as the quality of the new children' s books is concerned, is Carpenter (1985: 222), who, in his book 'Secret Gardens', about the Victorian classics of children's literature, even speaks of 'the gradual disappearance of notable new fiction for children between seven and twelve'. He attributes this to a change in the current notion of childhood. Drawing on Neil Postman's 'The Disappearance of Childhood' (1983) he argues that 'the 'idea of childhood' has been largely eroded by television, a medium which makes no real distinction between childhood and adults' (222). He concludes with a nostalgic statement that 'we may revisit those Enchanted Places [of the Victorians] ourselves, but we cannot create new ones'. This rather gloomy assessment of the situation does not mean the ending of children's literature. There are still many children's books and children do read them, though perhaps not so much anymore the ones that would qualify as 'notable' in Carpenter's terms, or in anyone else's, whose views of what constitutes a good book are formed by Victorian standards.

At the same time it is true that we may in fact be witnessing 'change in progress' in the prevailing views of childhood, as Griswold (1996: 880) cites evidence[11] that, particularly in the USA 'the concept of childhood [...] is being dismantled before our eyes'. And, if we don't know anymore what a child is, how can we know what the literature for the child should be? On the other hand, adults are taking increasing interest not only in the production and evaluation of children's literature, as they always have, but also in reading children's literature as a leisure time activity. These adults are part of the 'wider audience' Watkins and Sutherland (1995: 320) refer to. It seems that the two phenomena are interrelated. Noting an 'extensive adult interest in children's literature' in the USA during the last two decades, Griswold (1996: 880) attributes adult fascination with childhood and children's literature to nostalgic feelings about this 'disappearance of childhood' in our society.

> While the number of children in the population has dropped precipitously […] children's books have been selling in extraordinary numbers (for example, sales quadrupled between 1982 and 1990) and marketing surveys indicate that as many as a third of all sales are made to childless customers in their 20s or 30s who don't mean to pass these purchases along to a minor (Griswold 1996: 880).

Nostalgia and 'anxieties of the middle-aged and a wish for rejuvenation' (Griswold 1996: 880) may be reasons for this phenomenon. If there is a tendency that children are arguably no longer allowed to be children (in the traditional sense), it is an ironic fact that Western mass culture idealizes the state that comes right after childhood, namely youth, 'being young', and everything associated with it, one of the few taboos left in Western societies being certainly death.

This trend towards and striving for a universal state of 'youthfulness' independent of age may be reflected in a change in the audience that actually reads children's literature as well as in the blurring of the demarcation line between children's and adult literature. There are 'crossover books' for instance, like J.K. Rowling's 'Harry Potter' books (first published by Bloomsbury in 1997), which have been called a 'phenomenon of the publishing world' (The Children's Bookseller: 22) and have appeared atop children's and adult bestseller lists alike. Interestingly, a special adult version has been published which only differs in the price, which is higher, and the cover picture it shows, perhaps to make it more 'respectable' for adults to be seen reading a children's book. The 'Harry Potter' books may or may or may not only be worth referring to because of their immense success but the phenomenon at any rate reminds us that the children's book is far from dead, and on the contrary can still have an enormous hold over the minds and imagination of children. But the fact that this success came as such a surprise, and the astonishment it caused in the book world shows how rare it is. It was greeted – and not only by booksellers – by a relieved 'children do read after all' or 'it makes children read', and this was often as of itself regarded as an enormous achievement. If the Potter craze really initiates children into the reading of other books or just into the buying of Potter paraphernalia is a different question but this response may be indicative of a general insecurity about and concern for the role of the children's book in a world dominated by modern media, as well as for the future of reading – an activity that has always been regarded superior to the watching of television for instance. This is not surprising as children are living in a multimedia world dominated by visual images, by television shows and video games, a world in which reading is increasingly becoming associated with elitism, an activity that has not only to be taught as always, but also to be continually encouraged and is then

self-consciously practiced. Hollindale and Sutherland (1995: 259) take a more positive view on the 'effect' of television of 'supplanting books as the lowest level of escapist entertainment for the young and therefore raising their prestige'. In my opinion, however, this tendency involves the danger that reading once again becomes the privilege of a few elect and a strong class marker, serving as a 'label' of group membership. Some of the 'cultural' and 'elitist' connotations of reading today are reminiscent of the ritual it was in medieval times.

Undoubtedly, the book culture stands in opposition to the more populist medium television, and reading has very different connotations than watching television - imagine anyone saying about a television series, for instance, 'finally a show that makes children watch television...'

How do these two cultures interrelate? What is the relationship between children and books now in comparison to what it was when the book proved to be an important – or even the only – source of entertainment for children, and how has modern media influenced it?

4 Children's Literature and Modern Media

When we think of the possible effects of visual media, in particular television, on children's literature, the first question that comes to mind is, if television is responsible for a gradual decline in children's reading, which may possibly lead to the replacement of the book by television. Do children actually spend less time reading because of television? To even ask this question may seem unnecessary as a positive answer appears very obvious. And indeed, the figures available to me (from 'Children and the Media' 1996) tend to confirm this common feeling at least for the USA: if the average 2-11 year old spends almost 22 hours a week watching television (Heintz 1996: 176), or, according to a different source 3 hours a day (McGill 1996:73), there seems not much time left for leisure time reading. At least it is difficult to imagine how the hours spent watching television do not take their toll on the time spent reading.

Some studies, however, suggest that the activities replaced by television are usually those of a similar kind, activities that can be put into the category relaxing and do not ask for much attention, hanging around, in the sense of 'doing nothing', listening to the radio, but also 'comic book reading' (Heintz 1996: 164). This divides activities into serious and fun or relaxing ones, a distinction that in my opinion is impossible to uphold when it comes to reading. A finding that rather surprised me is

that, according to 'By the numbers – What Kids Watch' (McGill 1996: 74), children in the USA spend less time in front of TV than adults, and watch less television than ten years ago (this however, is attributed to the rise in popularity of video games and the VCR). The time spent watching television seems to decrease as children get older and develop other interests, going down to two hours a day in the age group of the 14-19 year olds (Wartella 1996: 30). This still seems a lot but not all programs are awarded the same kind of attention, some only serve as background to other activities and family interaction. The highest attention level is reached when programs are 'challenging' and 'unpredictable' (Heintz 1996: 164f.).

A thorough discussion of the interaction of children and television goes beyond the scope of this paper. These findings, however, which rather surprised me, are nevertheless relevant if only because they suggest that while it is true that children watch much television, a number of myths about the role of television in children's lives will have to be rethought. It seems that the relation between children, television, and other activities, like reading, is more complex than often supposed.

So, even though the question of how much of the time spent watching television would otherwise be spent reading cannot be answered with any certainty, there can be no doubt that the existence of visual media like television must have an enormous impact on children, on the books written for them, and on the relationship between children and books which it is likely to have changed. In the following, I will first look at some of the characteristics of television (as the most widespread visual mass medium) – both at the nature of the medium and its contents – and the kind of role it plays in our society, and then look at the possible effects of all this on the relationship between children and books.

As television is a visual medium, the succession of images presented is of extreme importance. Even though in television the words are more important than in film because of the size of the screen and forms like the news broadcast and documentaries (cf. Scheunemann 1996, 176), for the most part they function in relation to the pictures, complement and add to them, in contrast to books where the written words contained within the covers hold all the power and the picture-making is left to the imagination of the reader. It is the 'perfect view' the audience has of what is happening on the screen which may induce an illusory 'sense of omniscience' (Fiske: 1998: 1091) in the viewer and further an acceptance as truth of all that is presented, as people, used to believe in what their eyes show them, may be conditioned to accept as reality what they see, rather than what they only hear or read. This is something we all hear frequently: 'It's got to be true…I've seen it'. For this reason television is said to exercise a very strong emotional hold over the

viewer who is unaware of the parameters that determine the medium and the 'codes' it works with. In 'Television Culture' Fiske (1998: 1087-1090) analyzes two scenes from an episode of 'Hart to Hart' and demonstrates how 'camera work', 'editing' (time, number, length of shots), 'music', 'casting', and 'setting and costume' in combination strongly influence the viewer to make certain meanings rather than others. To give only one example, the camera angle and distance can influence our sympathies: close-ups for instance may prejudice us against somebody who is being interviewed or make villains appear more villainous – the exact effect depending on the context (cf. Fiske 1998).

All this has to do with the medium and does not yet say anything about the content, or the kinds of meanings likely to be produced by the viewer. In terms of content, it is true that anything that is 'transmittable technically' (Fiske 1998: 1089) could be on television. As far as concerns the nature of the medium, for instance, it is possible to imagine that viewers' contributions and feedback could play an important role. We are so used to television the way we know it that accounts which envisage a different future for the medium may come as a surprise. As late as 1985, Kadelbach (1985: 235), for instance, deplores the monological nature of television and the passive, subordinate position of the viewer and expresses his optimistic hopes for a future in which the recipient also turns producer and thus takes a more active stance towards what is being offered. In the year 2002 we know that these hopes have been disappointed, although a two-way communication is definitely imaginable in technological terms. The recipient is still the passive receiver, except in shows that ask for audience participation, which is usually minimal and concerns ratings. In terms of the specific content, what is shown on television and the way it is shown are obviously governed by principles of selection. A lot has been written about their ideological basis in our society, beginning in the 1960's with Horkheimer and Adorno's 'The Culture Industry as Mass Deception' (1998), according to which we are all victims of a huge entertainment machinery, of which television is a part, which only serves economic interests and overfeeds us with ever the same clichés, kills 'imagination and 'spontaneity' (1039) and makes impossible 'sustained thought' by drowning it in a 'rush of facts'. Television obviously plays an essential role in this, furthermore allowing the same message to be repeated endlessly in different countries, spreading the same capitalist values everywhere. (Seen in this light digitalization and other new media technologies developed since then have furthered globalization even more, and are nothing but the next steps in the same direction.)

In 'Cultural Studies' (cf. Rivkin and Ryan 1998: 1026), media is seen as a tool of power and domination, which serves the dominant interests in a patriarchal and capitalist society. This is essentially agreed on. The argument is as to what extent the viewer/consumer is a passive receiver who is at the mercy of the manipulative nature of the medium/product. There are two different perspectives outlined by Rivkin and Ryan (1998: 1026), which I think complement each other. The optimistic perspective takes into account the 'permanent possibility of eruption, of dissonance, and of an alternative imagination of reality' – subversion that lies in the viewer's eye. According to Radway (1998: 1048), we should not assume

> that those commodified objects [in her case romances...] exert such pressure and influence on their consumers that they have no power as individuals to resist or alter the ways in which these objects mean or can be used.

I think in principle this is beyond a doubt, but the question is to what extent it happens. Because it is also true, and this is the more negative perspective, that the viewer who identifies with what is being offered and takes it as he finds it is rewarded. By 'adopt[ing] the same ideological practice in the decoding as in the encoding' (Fiske 1998:1094) the viewer is rewarded with 'easy pleasure' (Fiske 1998: 1094) thus becoming the ''reading subject'' constructed by the text' (1094). However, according to the 'Theorie der kognitiven Dissonanz' as explained by Kadelbach (1985: 231), the viewer is likely to unconsciously seek conformation for already existing attitudes and opinions to avoid the displeasure of an internal conflict, therefore, put simply, seeing what he wants to see.

In terms of Guy Cook's schema theory (cf. Cook 1994) this would attribute an essentially schema-reinforcing quality to television. The nature of the schemata that are being reinforced depends on the viewer's already existing schemata. Television satisfies the viewers' immediate needs, it is entertainment which is easy to consume and offers compensation and reassurance for the viewer, making him again comfortable in his world, creating an illusion of togetherness, of common purpose with other people by strengthening conventional views.

If the nature of television is essentially schema-reinforcing, and I think it is, what effects does it have on the relationship between children and books? On television, children are exposed to a world ruled by money and glamour that abounds with stereotypical representations of sexuality and positively connoted violence, the latter two most heavily criticized for their potentially damaging effects on child-viewers[12], followed by gender-stereotyping and mis- (or non-) representation of minorities. (These questions are also relevant when it comes to children's reading and will be

taken up in chapter 7 on censorship.) Undoubtedly, television is a powerful influence on children and has had an effect on both children's cultural context and mode of reading.

For one, it has profoundly changed the culture in which children grow up and therefore the cultural context in which children have always interacted with books, as well as children's own culture. Meek (1982: 169), for instance, speaks of the influence television has on the 'culture of childhood', with its 'underground' (170) oral tradition of story-telling, 'recit[ing], threaten[ing], [...] word-calling' (171), which 'lay the foundations of literature' (171) as written text, as we, who have already grown into a book culture, know it. However, as most children nowadays encounter children's books long after they have encountered television and learnt its conventions, their references have changed:

> Any significant theory of children's literature cannot ignore the texts children hold in common, for on these is their view of literature founded, and from these are their literary competences developed (172).

Because of television, children nowadays have a different intertextual background than the generations before them. Meek argues that what follows from this is that the conventions of children's literature have changed as well and are based now on television rather than other texts.

> The style and narrative conventions adopted by modern writers for children develop less from earlier books than from the shared texts of television, where new codes are made and learned as universally as in the medieval art of stained glass (Meek 1982: 172).

Comparing the television drama 'Grange Hill' with the 'Oresteia' and finding similarities Meek emphasizes the necessity to investigate this and similar 'cultural artifact[s] that dominate contemporary childhood' (1982: 172), and the challenge this presents to the children's book critic. The question is if television artifacts like 'Grange Hill' can exist side by side with the 'Oresteia' or if they gradually come to replace it entirely. Rather than a contradiction Meek (cf. 1982: 172) seems to see a natural progression from one to the other, meaning that the children who watch 'Grange Hill' on television grow into the young people who enjoy the 'Oresteia' in the theater. This seems to me too optimistic. There may be a continuation from ancient to modern epic (cf. Ong 1984), but I doubt that the transition from television show to theater is an easy one or comes naturally (perhaps only because of the association of theater with 'high' culture). Between book and television culture there seems to be even a larger gap that cannot be bridged without a great personal effort and/or what we call 'education'. And this is because the required effort is different. For

somebody used to the presentation mode of television, reading may be frustrating at first. Television tends to present everything as entertainment; there is a 'predominance of the effect' (Adorno 1998: 1039). Television is also frequently (cf. for instance Goetsch's discussion of 'The 1992 Presidential Debates' in the U.S.) designated as a 'medium of emotions' (Goetsch 1996: 135) not ideas, that by its nature is 'story hungry', favors a 'relational style' and therefore lends itself well to fulfilling the 'emotional needs of people'. The exact influence this has on mode of reading is a difficult question but it seems obvious that children, used to the easy pleasure of watching television, in its attractive and easily accessible presentation of every subject matter, will have problems with the different kind of effort asked for by literature, an effort in terms of concentration and discipline that is not matched by the effort required to process the endless flow of entertainment via television or other electronic media. And if a child is used to 'user-friendly' media and being served information only in small bits and pieces it is hard to imagine how this would not affect her expectations from books, perhaps less in terms of contents but certainly in the way they are presented.

For this reason I think television programs that try to teach children how to read or motivate them to read, which are used occasionally as a pro-TV argument (cf. Chen 1996: 81), are somehow problematic. It is true that television programs and books often work hand in hand, and if there is a book featuring the show for instance, the child who likes the show may be motivated to read the book. I see two problems involved in this: the first is the question if the kind of book being propagated is more than just a regurgitation of the television program, and if it initiates the reader into the codes needed for reading other books not based on television programs. It seems more than doubtful if one medium can do that for another (after all, in order to learn how to swim one does not go hiking).

Another reason why television cannot initiate children into reading books, or is even counter-productive, has to do with the consumer-oriented nature of television, which involves the book as part of a commercial 'supersystem' (Kinder 1991, in Heintz 167ff.), in which the same character features in television programs and books, and is also used to promote other products like toys and really anything imaginable. These character-based products are what children have in common and share, and they have therefore contributed to the creation of a culture that belongs only to children, a culture that emphatically rejects the adult world and celebrates the differences and the separation between the worlds of adults and children[13], fostering disapproval of 'adult' or 'high' culture. At the same time it is a culture created not by children themselves but by the big companies[14] (cf. Heintz 172,

Seiter 1993) that sell the comic books, toys, and chocolate Pokémons and take a very material interest in inviting the identification of children, and teaching them to be consumers. Books are not always the by-products in such a supersystem, but may also be the starting point, as the 'Harry Potter' craze has shown, which started out as a series of books and soon included a whole promotional package of lightning-bolt shaped tattoos and other items from the story world, and, by now, the perfectly timed film version of the first book.

The practice of advertising and selling to children as well as to their parents is of course nothing new, and something the production of children's books has always depended on. It may be surprising to note in this context that as early as 1744, Newbery, trying to please both parents and children, advertised his 'Little Pretty Pocketbook', often regarded as the first children's book, with the words:

> A Little Pretty Pocketbook, intended for the Instruction and Amusement of little Master Tommy and pretty Miss Polly; with an agreeable Letter to each from Jack the Giant-Killer; as also a Ball and Pincushion, the Use of which will infallibly make Tommy a good Boy and Polly a good Girl (June 18 1744, London Penny Advertiser, in Demers and Moyles 1982, 104).

Even though most of today's children would probably refuse to have anything to do with toys that claim to make them 'good', the parallel is obvious: there is the book as part of a package, even though it is true that Newbery could not have dreamt of finding an enormous audience, an audience of millions, of the kind the Harry Potter books, for instance, have done, something that has only become possible in a highly globalized world. And this makes an enormous difference. As Newbery marks the beginning of children's literature, a time in which children's books needed all kinds of moral justifications in order to be sold and reach their audience, one might perhaps compare this to the situation of children's literature today, only now it is the children and not the parents that have to be persuaded to choose the book over other things, a marketing situation caused by the new media competition for the book. But the parallel goes further. In both cases adults prescribe what children have to be: at Newbery's time it was to be good and virtuous, and nowadays it is to be different and separate from adults in every possible way because this is how companies make the most money.

At any rate, never was there so much competition for the book as today. According to Scheunemann (1996, 163), who discusses 'the challenge to an existing art-form emerging from an advance of cultural technology', in particular that to film from television, there are different stages in the accommodation of old media

to new ones […] the first one characterized by a 'demarcation of the domains and differentiation of the functions' (164) as well as 'separation' (165). At this stage there is often a lot of underlying resentment and rejection of the new medium. This is generally followed by creative and constructive attempts to deal with the new medium, by incorporating aspects of it and reassembling them artistically, in the way 'photomontage' for instance, was developed in visual arts (164) as a comment on photography. When it comes to books and television, however, this is problematic because of the essentially different and competitive nature of the media just discussed. Scheunemann only discusses the impact of technological progress on already existing visual arts/media (painting-photography, theater-film, film-television), but nevertheless this throws an interesting light on the relationship between literature and television. It does leave aside, however, the possibility of one medium or art form really being pushed aside by another.

The central question concerns the place children's literature will take in the 21st century and if and how it will be able to defend its position of high regard next to multimedia. To survive it may have to defend and make better known its importance for the child, which lies in giving children who live in a world of pictures something that multimedia cannot. In short, it should not only be privileged children who have access to a book culture and have a real choice between the book and the television show, knowing the different kinds of pleasures of both.

5 The educational value of children's books: what's the use?

> Alice was beginning to get very tired of sitting by her sister on the bank, and of having nothing to do: once or twice she had peeped into the book her sister was reading, but it had no pictures or conversations in it, 'and what is the use of a book,' thought Alice, 'without pictures or conversations?' (Carroll 1970: 25)

This famous child character's criteria of what constitutes a good book are in my opinion the right beginning for a chapter of adults' opinions on the uses children's books should have for children. It is an ironic commentary on the following discussion because it brings together the serious and very adult word 'use', with something many children like, 'pictures and conversation'. It is important to keep in mind that children's books are written for children, and their ideas of usefulness can go in quite different directions from those of adults, and ones that certainly do not

make less sense than the various 'uses' adults have at times assigned to children's books.

One assumption underlying the debate on books-versus-television is that the child should profit from whatever it is he or she spends time doing. This unfortunately usually either means that it should help the child to acquire specific knowledge or be educationally/morally valuable in a narrow sense. Both of these functions have at times been assigned to children's books, as they have always been thought to play an important role in the socialization of the child, by some this is even regarded as their first and most important function. Even though there are educational, and more or less didactic television programs for children many parents would still prefer their children to read even if only because of a feeling that books somehow belong to school or the education system and have therefore important things to teach children, help them to prepare for school or society at large. Watkins and Sutherland (1995: 319), in line with this, identify a trend towards a replacement of more and more 'textbooks' by 'trade books' in schools, which has positive sides but may also lead to children's literature being more and more associated with school. As the image of literature is already burdened by a 'high culture' heritage, this might make it harder for children to find their own access. (Of course this depends on the child's attitude towards school, and the teacher's ability.)

The idea of instruction is certainly not embedded as deeply in television, which started out as and continues to be a popular medium, as it is in children's literature, which belongs on the one hand to a book culture that seems mythical and elitist to many, and on the other to the educational establishment. Shavit (1986: 35) goes even so far as to say that the children's book belongs more to the 'educational apparatus' than to literature. She points out the comparatively low status of writers of children's literature who at times are asked to respond to the child reader's needs and write about whatever it is that is important for the child (cf. Shavit 1986: 36ff.), something that would be unthinkable in adult literature. Very often prizes are awarded along similar lines: Paula Fox, for instance, was awarded the Hans Christian Anderson Medal because her books 'help children to develop understanding for one another [...] and also help the many adults [...] to find a way of teaching the child and the adolescent' (Binder 1978; in Shavit 1986: 36f.). A book may well have this effect on readers (among many), but elevating this to the standard against which it is judged, and awarding it a prize for this reason, means seeing it as a self-help book or teacher's guide and not as literature. At the same time no one seems to want to believe that these are the standards against which children's books are judged.

Shavit explains this confusion of educational with literary values, which we encounter so often in comments on children's literature, by reference to the history of children's literature.

> The educational system and various educational ideologies responded to the demands of the new reading public [...] Thus it was a cyclical process, fueled by the increasing demand from a new reading public and the legitimation from within the educational system that made the development of children's literature possible...unlike adult literature, canonized children's literature began to develop in response to the needs of the educational system, the result of which is the strong grip of the educational system on children's literature and the major part it plays in its formulation (Shavit 1986: 137).

The important point is that children's literature needed this educational legitimization in order to be accepted. At any rate it seems that since the 18th century the 'educational system [has been] a major frame of reference for children's literature' (Shavit 1986: 35), which has implicitly shaped not only expectations of the works but also the works themselves more than we normally suppose. This helps to explain why unfortunately didacticism is far from dead in children's literature.

> A clear distinction [between recreational and instructional books] is drawn [...] on the publishers' lists; but the urge to instruct the young is deeply built into human nature, and at all times there have been supposedly recreational books which have had, consciously or unconsciously, a didactic element (Townsend 1996: 677).

Despite the historical journey from 'instruction' to 'delight' and the final victory of 'delight' in the 19th century, if we agree with the interpretation of Demers and Moyles (1982), children's books still have didactic purposes, only now they are made less explicit. In fact, the very terminology 'instruction' versus 'delight' conceals the extent to which 'children's books are [...] determined by their social and historical context' (Meek 1982: 169).

Hollindale (1996: 30), however, in my opinion goes too far when he says that 'all children's literature is inescapably didactic'. The history of children's literature, on the contrary, has shown that indeed there is an escape from didacticism: imagination. But it is true that the adult 'urge to instruct', which is often misdirected because of the adult's own deficits and therefore harmful to children, evidently finds a manifestation in children's literature. The heavy emphasis on **use** (cf. for instance Hunt 1992: 6) for some means that it can even be paraphrased as 'literature that is good for children'. The question 'Is this good for children?' seems to be at the center of many discussions of children's literature and the most important yardstick against which it is measured. What is really good for children, however, may very well be delightful, imaginative books without the kind of straightforward 'use' that is the only

kind imaginable to some adults. Questions of the aesthetic quality of a work are often pushed into the background by this overwhelming concern for the more obvious and conflicting (and also more transitory) uses children's books may have for children.

This issue is the basis of an ongoing critical controversy that occupies a prominent place in publications about children's literature and has resulted in a now almost legendary division of critics and writers into two camps: the so-called 'child people' and the 'book people' (cf. for instance Hollindale 1988: 20-22). 'Child people' are (typically) educationalists, psychologists, librarians, teachers, and other professionals interested in children, who are most concerned with the effect of a book on the child: 'children's judgments and their importance'[15] and 'the influence on readers of a book's social and political values' (Hollindale 1988: 21). They take a practical interest in children's literature (cf. Hunt 1991: 22) and ask questions like 'what is good for children, while 'book people', on the other hand, ask 'what is good?' (cf. Hunt 1991: 42ff.). Their emphasis is on 'adult judgments and their importance' and 'differences of literary merit' (Hollindale 1992: 21). According to Townsend (1996: 684), the division between 'book people' and 'child people' originated in the 1950's when there were attempts to extend the readership of children's books, and it was ''the book people' who drew attention to the excellent books available and the 'child people' who pointed to the large numbers of children who did not willingly read them' (684). The 'child people', in particular teachers, made children's books responsible for this, claiming, that as they were mostly written by middle class writers for middle-class readers they alienated children from disadvantaged sections of society (cf. Townsend 1996: 684). They felt that many of canonized books that academics love so much for their complexities, in particular the classics, should not be forced on children. Book people objected to this on the grounds that, far from liberating children, it would in fact patronize them by restricting what they are supposed to be able to read, thus limiting them and depriving them of valuable experience. In the course of the debate child people have become connected with 'the propagation through children's books of a 'progressive' ideology expressed through social values' (Hollindale 1992: 21), as well as anti- intellectualism (cf. Hunt 1991: 23). 'Book people', on the other hand, have become associated with the literary establishment and 'a broadly conservative' and even 'reactionary' ideological position'. (21) Hollindale (1992) points out the absurdity of the situation in which concern with the child has come to be connected with disregard of quality and, conversely, concern for quality with disregard of the child reader (cf. 21). This artificial binary opposition dangerously simplifies the

complexities of the issue, as both sides are concerned with both questions but place their emphasis differently. And both sides may be right, in fact even complement each other.

The question of what 'good' means when it is applied to children's books is likely to be tied up with political values and not just with questions of literary criteria alone, as didacticism, overtly or covertly, looms in the background.

> 'There is, I think, a tension between what is 'good' in the exploded abstract, what is good for the child socially, intellectually, and educationally, and what we, really, honestly think is a good book (Hunt 1991: 15).

A debate has arisen as to which of these 'good' is the most relevant, and the most important yardstick for children's literature. I think they have more in common than we suppose. In a sense this is a question of trusting one's instincts: I do not think that what we 'honestly think is a good book' is likely to be bad for the child 'socially, intellectually, and educationally'.

On the contrary, book people's concern for the aesthetic quality of children's books is always also connected with the children. It seems that in children's literature the question 'what is good' always ends up as 'what is good for'. There are just differences in opinion as to what books should teach children, and if 'teach' is to mean the handing over of conveniently packaged bits and pieces of knowledge or the development of critical thinking and judging for oneself, admittedly less graspable entities, and less convenient for those in power. The emphasis for book people is clearly not on social virtues but on the literary skills books can teach children, by showing them 'how their story is to be read' (Meek 1982: 176).

Clearly, if children nowadays grow into a television, rather than a book culture, they might feel that books their parents may still have enjoyed are too difficult and are being forced on them. (Hunt 1991: 23) points out the problem:

> On the one hand, it is understandable that something seen as out of the range of children should not be forced upon them; on the other, there is an anti-intellectualism which leads directly to an implied restriction upon what children should be able to read.

The problem is the question of how to decide on what is 'out of the range' of children (and who is to decide!). I think this problem would not arise if children were given what they need and ask for at the right time – they are naturally curious – and once they had gotten into the habit of reading, left to choose and decide for themselves. (This presupposes an ideal situation, not one in which the parents' prejudices, limitations, and other emotional deficits are passed on, and enforced by neurotic teachers.)

The argument goes that sometimes the books that are thrust on children are too difficult or outdated, and often both. It is true that the middle class children depicted in many children's books are romantic, fossilized versions of more or less ideal children that no longer exist (cf. Meek 1982). Children may in fact find a world very different from their own when they read E. Nesbit's books, where there is a social structure that no longer exists. This may alienate them or be interesting for them but it seems unlikely to present great difficulties for understanding the stories (at least in Nesbit's case). In other cases the effort required may be greater. As with historical adult literature the decision to read something or not has to do with cost-benefit, of how much effort is warranted by the satisfaction the text gives. When the effort the engagement with the text asks of readers becomes too great it may become obsolete for anyone but the specialist, this is relative and depends on the reader. So I think that, while nothing should be forced on children, there is no need to keep the difficult, or what adults perceive as difficult, away from them.

This is not to say there should not be literatures that take into account the changing notions of childhood. If all the children's books written today were in the same vein as Nesbit's (with the same frame of references) this would be more a question of ideology, being more of a conscious choice (or at least hopelessly nostalgic).

The solution, in my opinion, is not to expose children only to what they presumably know, what they can identify with. I agree with Leeson (1977, in Lesnik-Oberstein 1996: 28) that 'the good book for the 'child' offers not only the 'child' back to itself, but also needs to offer the 'child' that which it is not itself.' And this is a major quality of literature. And why should the working class or middle class child in principle not want to read about worlds different from their own? The question raised again is if the child's natural curiosity was encouraged or quenched at an early age. How much suppression it takes to kill a child's curiosity also depends on the child's natural talents, but I think there can be no doubt that it is always there in the first place, and therefore it is unfair to reduce children to their social origins and then try to fit them up with the 'correct' literature.

> 'Identification' cannot account for reading which is not a perpetual reading of the self; and, finally, it cannot account therefore for other hypothetical processes in reading such as a possible learning of the new, or escapism, or what D.W. Harding has called ''imaginative insight into what another person may be feeling, and the contemplation of possible human experiences which we are not at that moment going through ourselves'' (Lesnik-Oberstein 1996: 28).

This is the recreation which can be brought about by schema refreshment, in Cook's (1994) terms (cf. I, 10). If a real access to these experiences is still largely a prerogative of some middle-class children, as I think it is, in combination with other factors mentioned above, it is a serious social problem. According to Townsend (1996: 684),

> in spite of all efforts the aim of extending the readership base has not been achieved as fully as might be hoped. Book buying and reading remain largely characteristics of middle-class homes.

One might even have to go further and say that the enjoyment of literature, as opposed to the buying of books for representational purposes, is probably restricted to some middle-class homes only.

The question is, if, and to what extent schools and libraries can compensate deficits children bring from home, and in what way this can be done. Common sense says that forcing anything on them will be counter-productive; they would need the right kind of introduction, and this is where the difficulties and the arguments begin. The ideal seems to be neither to limit children nor to force them into reading something they do not want to, which is not necessarily a paradox. In my opinion it is most important to introduce children to the enjoyment books can give them, and to give them the affection and space to develop emotionally and intellectually, (which is most difficult if they come from disadvantaged homes): but if once they are on the right track, I think, both 'book people' and 'child people' underestimate their ability to judge for themselves, to accept the challenge that the difficult presents at times, and to enjoy the simple or 'trivial' at other times - after all we read at different times for different reasons (cf. I, 6).

6 The politically correct(ed) book

What happens when books are changed, to fit the child, or rather the editor's idea of the child, as it were, Hunt (cf. 1991: 26ff.) exemplifies in reference to the new Ladybird edition of Beatrix Potter's 'Peter Rabbit' which was republished with a new text and new pictures. Anything that arguably does not fit into a modern child's view of the world, in this instance archaic words, plots, characters, were edited out and changed. On the one hand, it may be regarded as elitist snobbery, or showing the 'book' as a cultural artifact too much reverence, to keep to the letter of the original at the risk of alienating possible readers, on the other hand, once we have decided to change anachronisms, where do we draw the line? Anything that does not fit

mainstream morals and values may be edited out on the pretext of making things easier for the reader, as is in fact done: in the new edition of 'Peter Rabbit', for instance, a reference to death was edited out (cf. Hunt 1991: 26ff). It may be better to leave books the way they are and leave it up to children to read them or not. If a book for them is not worth the effort they will put it aside, take up a different one, and possibly, return later. This presupposes that they already have been 'initiated' into a book culture.

These questions of principle are particularly relevant in regard to 'the three political missions which are seen as most urgent in contemporary society: anti-racism, anti-sexism and anti-classism' (Hollindale 1988: 22) which started in the 1970s and have led to frequent re-writings of older texts and the production of new ones which are ostentatiously politically correct, anti-sexist and anti-classist. However modern these missions may seem to us we can trace them back to moral endeavors in the 19th century, a time when fairy tales without a spelled out moral were not considered suitable reading material for children and frequently changed and rewritten for the purposes of instruction, the fairy tale form serving as the famous 'spoonful of sugar'. The fierce debate about their legitimization reached its height with Dickens' critical commentary 'Fraud on the Fairies' (1853 in Hunt 1990: 24), an attack on Cruikshank's 'Fairy Library' which had appropriated old tales for moralistic purposes. The following extract is of particular relevance today, and seems almost prophetic:

> Imagine a Total abstinence edition of Robinson Crusoe, with the rum left out. Imagine a Peace edition, with the gunpowder left out, and the rum left in. Imagine a Vegetarian edition, with the goat's flesh left out. Imagine a Kentucky edition, to introduce a flogging of that 'tarnal old nigger Friday, twice a week. Imagine an Aborigines Protection Society edition, to deny the cannibalism and make Robinson embrace the amiable savages whenever they landed. Robinson Crusoe would be 'edited' out of his island in a hundred years, and the island would be swallowed up in the editorial ocean... Frauds on the Fairies once permitted, we see little reason why they may not come to this, and great reason why they may [...]The world is too much with us, early and late. Leave this previous old escape from it, alone.

What seems incredible and ridiculous to Dickens, who seems to anticipate the political climate of the 1970s, does not seem so strange to us who are used to retellings of the kind he attacks. But we notice how relative and subject to change such movements are when the morals promoted are not our own, even though they may be very similar. Cruikshank's 'Fairy Library', for instance, went to ridiculous lengths to attack drunkenness, something that at least seems strange to Europeans today. Anyway, though it is easy to ridicule the extreme excesses of 'political

correctness' this does not relieve us from taking it seriously and raising the broader question that is behind the debate, namely, what is 'good' for children to read? Where do we draw the line? And, not to forget, how much control is justified?

7 What should children read? What should they not read? Questions of censorship

Control over children's reading can take many forms, some very obvious, others more subtle: it can be public or private, manifest itself in changes or rewritings of older texts of the kind just discussed, in the choice of texts that are published, in exerting pressure on authors to change texts. On the receiving end it can mean not making texts available to children or preventing them from reading them, for instance by influencing teachers, parents or the public in general against them. This does not necessarily mean that children's literature has been monopolized by moralists. In a sense, any publisher's choice of one text over another is a form of control if it means that the other text is the one that will not be available, or not be promoted, and therefore not be read. This is something that happens all the time and not only in children's literature.

In children's literature, however, questions to do with any form of 'control' are particularly at issue because of the crucial point that makes children's literature different from other literatures: the audience age. There is a basic human/adult 'urge to instruct' (Townsend 1996: 677) children as the younger and less experienced members of society as well as to protect them from harm, which manifests itself in a tendency towards more control than in adult literature. And it cannot be denied that children are in a less powerful position than adults when it comes to choosing and judging reading material, and making sense of it. It is the 'imbalance of power between the children and young people who read the books, and the adults who write, publish and review the books' (Sarland 1996: 41) that calls into action those who wish to protect children from being corrupted – and in their mind justifies control. It is the very same imbalance that calls into action others who wish to protect children from the protectors. The question is, how this quite natural urge to protect children manifests itself: the range goes from advice to attempts at absolute control. And this is essentially bound up with our view of and respect for children.

This issue goes back to the beginnings of children's literature. As soon as children were recognized as a potential group of readers there were adults who told them what to read. The following is an example of advice from 1671:

> Thomas White told his readers in a 'Little Book for Little Children', 'read no Ballads and foolish Books but a Bible and the Plainmans pathway to Heaven, a very plain holy book for you; get the Practice of Piety [...]' (in Hunt 1995: 19).

To modern readers it may seem incredible that this is 'one of the first books ever addressed to young children' (Hunt 1995: 19), so young in fact that they have barely learnt to speak and are already urged to read 'adult theological and devotional works' (Hunt 1995: 19). However, even though the nature of the recommendations has changed over the intervening 300 years, the concerns are very similar. Adults still worry about the influence of children's reading on their moral development. At the same time this is also part of the power struggle between adults and children. A taste for forbidden fruit (or forbidden books) has always been in the nature of children, is part of their development. After all, had children not been known to prefer 'Ballads and foolish books' to the Bible, Thomas White need not have mentioned them.

More severe than White's advice is Mrs. Trimmer's exhortation to parents, expressed more than a hundred years later. Mrs. Trimmer, who was an important figure in children's literature of the time and in anthologies about it, both as writer and commentator, was a famous proponant of control. Clearly on the side of 'instruction' and everything it implies, she held strong, but by no means uncommon, views about children's reading, which she addresses to the parents, not the children, as White did.

> The utmost circumspection is therefore requisite in making a proper selection; and children should not be permitted to make their own choice, or to read any books that may accidentally be thrown in their way, or offered for their perusal; but should be taught to consider it as a *duty*, to consult their parents in this momentous concern (Trimmer 1803, in Hunt 1990:18).[16]

This severe comment takes the choice of reading material entirely out of the control of children and seems extremely old-fashioned and authoritarian to us because our ideas of the upbringing of children have fortunately changed. The right to decide in this case belongs to the parents, it is a matter of private concern.

We may be used to be sensitive towards forms of private control but should not forget that society has always had a word to say about what books are being read. As in private life, this control can assume more or less extreme proportions. To a certain extent we are all used to it. Most people would agree, for instance, that the decision of what is to be included in school reading lists should only be left up to a certain point, if at all, to the students. There is a very broad consensus that schools are not the place for pornographic literature, to use an extreme example. However,

what seems simple in the case of pornography can turn into a complicated question. For instance, as we all seem to agree that this is less a question of principle than a question of where to draw the line, what about literary works that are censored on grounds of 'sexual explicitness'? Should they be read in schools? And who is to decide? Where does common sense end and paranoia begin?

We speak of 'censorship' when 'protection' (put positively) and control are carried to their negative extremes in the public sphere. This can mean removal of books from the bookstores, making them unavailable, or, in its extreme manifestation, the burning of them. 'Censorship' is a heavily loaded term with politically negative connotations that smack of fascist regimes. However, it is still present in modern society, in the USA it has even assumed alarming proportions (cf. 'Banned Books Week' with lists of challenged and banned books). American society seems to be particularly intolerant of anything that could be considered harmful for children. There are organized groups of parents, for instance, who exert pressure on schools to take books off reading lists. In the USA even the 'Harry Potter' books, which in many ways can be considered very typical children's books, have been attacked for featuring 'witchcraft' and 'sheer evil'. Parents in the Bible Belt have even been trying to ban them.[17] For protests against this kind of excess we do not have to look very far. It may be surprising, however, that one of the comments that best sums up a 'liberal' position comes from Elizabeth Rigby, as early as 1844, however widespread the views of the 'Mrs. Trimmers' were at the time.

> The truth is,...that children are distinguished from ourselves less by an *inferiority* than by a *difference* in capacity...We fear, that parents ...are by no means satisfied in their consciences as to the time spent in useless reading, or the risk incurred by pernicious. But may not these misgivings, like many another concerning the education of children, be traced to our giving ourselves too much credit for judgement, and them too little for discernment?...Children have an instinct of food which more cultivated palates lose; and many is the scrap they will pick from hedge and common which to us seem barren (Rigby 1844: 20f.).

This is an impressively modern expression of confidence into children and their natural resilience rather than adult supervisors. It does provide an optimistic perspective on the question of how much, better how little, control is needed, relieving adults from worrying too much, or rather from worrying about the wrong things. (Children whose parents feel they have to protect them from reading 'Huckleberry Finn' are a rightful cause of worry I think.)

An important question to ask is the one of the author's responsibility (cf. Hunt 1991:163). Is the author responsible for the effects of a book on the child reader?

This becomes particularly relevant if the author succeeds in getting published a 'controversial book' that somehow runs counter to mainstream ideology, or simply to 'morality', as defined by the society at the time in question. In adult literature the question seems to have long been settled. In general, the work stands by itself, and, as soon as published becomes independent of its author. In our society the author will be judged for it but, as long as he remains within certain limits, by different, aesthetic, standards. The case of children's literature is more difficult. Rather than a black-and-white issue this is a conflict between 'the ideal of freedom' ('all censorship is bad.') and the 'idea of responsibility towards children' (cf. Hunt 1991: 33, 163). A point to be considered is the authority of the book (cf. Hunt 1991: 139), the respect it still commands, and therefore the 'force of respectability' (170) that is conferred upon its contents. 'Television and video' may be 'blamed more than books for sometimes having a bad influence upon the young' (Tucker 1992: 171), but the book represents the power and authority of 'high' culture which make it potentially more dangerous. This 'myth' perpetuates a belief in the almost magic power of books over the minds of the readers, which is why they are perceived as threatening, in particular when it comes to their effect on children.

The only solution to this is to teach children that literary texts differ from other texts, from factual accounts, and ask to be read in a different way, and to initiate them into the reading of literature as already mentioned. This knowledge will make what children read not unimportant but at least less potentially dangerous. It is very important for the child to become familiar with the concept of story, and the rules that apply in the story world: conventions one needs to be familiar with in order to fully enjoy what the story offers, and respond to its complexities. And the only way to learn this is by reading, by experiencing books as fun and not as threatening. Children 'learn how to act as literary readers because the resources of the texts they care about make it possible for them to act as literary readers' (Williams 1996: 576). To introduce children to texts worth caring about would be an effort worthwhile for parents, instead of trying to save their children from 'evil' books. This is a very important point that many critics agree on.[18]

In particular, because reading is removed from social occupations and responsibilities, books do not have 'a direct, linear effect' (Hunt 1991. 141) on readers, which is something that unfortunately even many adults do not know. According to Hunt (1991: 31), there is a growing body of research that suggests that 'children's responses are subtle and variable'. For this reason it is almost always impossible to be sure of a direct cause-and- effect relationship between the book and the behavior or even the feelings of the child reader. A book that causes

nightmares to an insecure unhappy child reader, for instance, might be digested quite well by another child reader of the same age. Books are not straightforward and simple and neither are children. It may therefore be better to begin to deconstruct the myth of omniscience surrounding books by allowing or even encouraging children to be disrespectful to books, than to put pressure on the author or restrict children's access to them. Ideally, education makes censorship redundant, if the child is taught to take the book as it finds it – rather than the other way around. The only way to learn this is by reading.

> […] literacy is constructed in action, in and through the reading of texts and through engaging in the forms of interpretation which these texts make possible […] Literary texts are thus a necessary requirement for the development of literary readers. They are not, though, a sufficient condition (Williams 1996: 576).

A number of factors seem to have to contribute to a 'sufficient condition'. That literary texts are available to child readers is one step on the way to help them become literary readers, that there is a really helpful teacher or parent possibly another. Of course, allowing children to judge for themselves, and doing as much as possible to enable them to do so through education is a way to develop their critical thinking, which may threaten those people who never got the chance themselves, or others who take an interest in keeping things simple. There has always been a revolutionary potential in literature, and in helping people to become really literate, with all this entails.

8 Ideology

As we can see, issues of power and control are central concerns in the field of children's literature. This does not only mean regulations imposed from the outside on the production or distribution of books of the kind discussed above but goes much further. Because ideology is intrinsically inseparable from children's literature it is important to understand how it works, and teach others to understand it as well. Ideology and children's literature are intertwined, and texts written for children can be 'ideological' in a number of ways.

'Ideology' can be defined as a 'system of beliefs or theories that usually serves as a guide to action and that may form the basis of a sociological program' (Encyclopaedia Britannica) or as

> a systematic scheme of ideas, usu. relating to politics or society, or to the conduct of a class or group, and regarded as justifying actions, esp. one that is held implicitly or adopted as a whole and maintained regardless of the course of events (OED).

Ideology can, however, also mean

> in the service of power - as the mobilisation of language in attempts to establish and sustain relations of domination, of systematically asymmetrical relationships of power. (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 262).

It is this sense of the term that makes it interesting for children's literature, as the relationship both between parents and children, and between writer and reader can be seen as 'asymmetrical relationship[s] of power'. For this reason the power differential between adult/writer and child/reader is particularly great and this makes it very interesting to look closely at texts written by adults, and for children, as 'such texts ought to illustrate particularly just how language can be made to serve the ideological purpose in such a relationship' (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 263).

These 'ideological purposes' can be realized on different levels of a text. According to Hollindale (1988: 27 ff.), there are three levels (or dimensions) of 'ideology'. Firstly, there is the 'surface ideology' of a text, containing the writer's 'explicit social, political or moral beliefs' (27), it is here that 'fiction carries new ideas, non-conformist or revolutionary attitudes...in line with contemporary social criticism' (28). Ideology on this level is easiest to detect and therefore to attack. The current debate on political correctness is happening on this level. According to Hollindale (1988: 39), it is a disproportionate amount of critical attention to this level, and

neglect of the others that has led to various attacks on literary works, for instance on the grounds of racism, as happened to 'Huckleberry Finn' (cf. 6.). Hollindale puts this down to a misunderstanding:

> They [the critiques] observe only the external conservative values detectable in some major children's books, and overlook the radical questioning to which the text exposes them (1988: 39).

In my opinion the 'radical questioning' is not so much overlooked by these readers as simply not there for them. The text they read makes them feel rightfully indignant because they have never learnt how to read literature. This has to do with a confusion of the literary text with the non-literary text, because of lack of literary experience and/or because of an intentional refusal to accept the different nature of the literary text. The second dimension of ideology includes the writer's 'unexamined assumptions' (1988: 30), beliefs, and values that a text will reveal, even without any missionary (or didactic) intention on the writer's part. These 'unexamined, passive values' are the 'widely shared' (30) ones that need to be questioned because of their 'powers of reinforcement' (30). Thirdly, there is a broader definition of ideology as a 'climate of belief' (37), rather than a 'political policy' (37), a 'climate of ideas and values' (34) which envelops author, reader, and book alike. According to Hollindale (1988: 32), 'a large part of any book is written not by its author but by the world its author lives in'. The question of 'who decides what goes into children's books' is particularly interesting and not easy to answer. In his discussion of the circumstances surrounding the production of children's books, Hunt (1991: 158ff), points out the diverse direct and indirect influences and pressures that come to bear on the writer of a children's book, from the author's immediate family to the agent and publisher.[19] For the reader it is important to be aware of this intrinsically 'ideological' network of influences that author, reader and book are equally enmeshed in (cf. Hunt 1991: 158, 160).

Ideology, however, goes far beyond such explicit and implicit constraints as well as pressures of the kind discussed in chapter six with regard to censorship, even though they are a part of this omnipresent and therefore invisible 'climate' in which we live and which we have grown so used to as to not to notice it anymore. As I understand it, it is this 'climate' (or Zeitgeist), which makes some things 'more natural to write than others' (Waller 1986 in Hollindale 1988:32), and others more difficult or indeed impossible to write. Hollindale (1988:32) speaks of 'the huge commonalities of an age, and the captivity of mind we undergo by living in our own time and place and no other'. What is meant by this becomes very obvious when we read historical children's books which presuppose that there is a reality that the

reader will share with the writer, a reality that, to a greater or lesser extent, differs from ours. Chambers (1985: 103) refers to these assumptions as 'referential gaps' and discusses them in the context of a text's implied readership. In the 19th and early 20th century, for instance, servants formed part of an unexamined cultural middle-class background. Therefore, in much of the children's fiction written at the time, servants are present as almost invisible helpmates, obviously expected to be taken for granted by a readership predominantly of the same middle class (cf. Chambers 1985: 103).

> These referential gaps, these assumptions of commonality, are relatively unimportant until they become so dominant in the text that people who do not – or do not wish to – make the same assumptions feel alienated by them as they read (Chambers 1985: 103).

As the 'ideological climate' (including class, values, and gender-stereotypes) may thus become noticeable to the reader of historical fiction it may also do so to the reader of contemporary fiction who does not share in the dominant ideology. Mainstream ideology has many 'fractures' (Hollindale 1985: 33) in the same national society, there are for instance ethnic and language minorities with their own subcultures. Hence the demand for different 'literatures' (34) that serve all these groups.

> […] ideology is not something which is transferred to children as if they were empty receptacles. It is something which they already possess, having drawn it from a mass of experiences far more powerful than literature (Hollindale 1988: 35).

As pointed out in the last chapter, however, this should not mean that the child has to be protected from a fictional encounter with children from different (sub)cultures.

It is important to bear in mind, nevertheless, that the 'reading child' is anything but an ideal abstraction but has been politicized in a very specific way simply by living a specific life in specific surroundings. As Hollindale (1988: 27) points out:

> ideology is an inevitable, untamable and largely uncontrollable factor in the transaction between books and children, and [...] it is so because of the multiplicity and diversity of both 'book' and 'child' and of the social world in which each of these seductive abstractions takes a plenitude of individual forms.

It is only when the ideology the text carries is very different from the one the reading child brings to the text that it becomes noticeable, in a similar way as we may notice the servants in Nesbit because most of us do not have any. Very often, however, the

reader's and writer's ideology will coincide or at least overlap so as not to be noticeable to the reader. These shared 'assumptions' in my opinion can be problematic, particularly because they are so difficult to spot. If the reader shares the same or a similar cultural, social, and ideological background as the writer, there can more easily be a tacit and unconscious agreement that reinforces rather than questions conventional meanings, as it should, because the pleasure of reading of literature is in part caused by a defamiliarization from ordinary assumptions. If this is achieved depends on the quality of the work, and the reader's ability as a reader. An inquiry into what is not said in the literary work, what is taken for granted, can nevertheless be quite interesting and revealing, as it may be a pointer to its ideological climate and its cultural and social blind spots, and bring them to our notice. 'All literary works contain...sub-texts, and there is a sense in which they may be spoken of as the 'unconscious' of the work itself' (Eagleton 1983, in Hunt 1988: 163). Looking at texts in this way may also help us to decide if we regard them as 'literary' or not.

An exploration of these issues may help us to understand the way ideology works in texts, which is important for adults but also for children because it is a step away from an unquestioning acceptance both of what a book offers and adults' judgments on it, an awareness that is essential for developing children's (and adults') ability to think critically. In other words, as children's literature cannot be 'innocent' – nothing produced in a social context can be free of a purpose or an interest – it is important to understand the ideology in (and behind) the texts.

> Our priority in the world of children's books should not be to promote ideology but to understand it, and find ways of helping others to understand it, including the children themselves (Hollindale 1988: 27).

Hollindale (1988: 37ff.) suggests a number of questions we might ask of a text to bring to light its ideology. Apart from inquiring into what is left out, the 'omission' or 'invisibility' (40) of women for instance, we can see if we are being confronted with 'packages' of values, for instance 'loyalty', 'patriotism' and 'courage' as an inseparable combination, if the good characters are also always the nicest ones (put simply), if a happy ending reinforces values that were put into question first, or if the characters have to make any difficult choices.

9 Language and ideology: the study of style

If we want to find out about ideology as a 'climate of belief', the third level of ideology Hollindale (1988: 37) distinguishes, it is necessary to look beyond plot and characters at the language of a text, because this is where its 'climate' is inscribed. This is ideology in the sense of 'a socially and politically dominant set of values and beliefs which are not 'out there' but are constructed in all texts especially in and through language.' (Carter 1990: 21). Language is not neutral but it carries the conventional meanings it has been assigned over a long time by social and cultural practices, which is why there may be a word for something in one language but not in another. The structure of the language influences in turn the thought processes of its users, who tend to think along the lines suggested by the language. As there is redundancy in the language, there is a lot of material for a language user to choose from. Forms encapsulate concepts and beliefs and there is an often unconscious reason why one expression is chosen rather than another, a reason which has something to do with the language user's own immersion in his culture. Therefore, we can say that 'social processes are inextricable from the linguistic processes which give them expression' (Stephens 1996: 58). So, the words someone uses, tell us something about the user.

> 'The forms and meanings of reality are constructed in language: by analyzing how language works, we come nearer to knowing how our culture constructs itself, and where we fit into that construction.' (Stephen 1996: 59)

Analysis of the language is particularly interesting in literature, which is constructed through language, and can therefore only be accessed through language. Unlike other texts it does not refer in any direct way to a reality outside itself (cf. Widdowson 1992). No literature without language. If language is intrinsically ideological, and therefore more than the medium through which the content is expressed, but also responsible for its shape, it undoubtedly gains importance. It is along these lines that Stephens (1996: 58) argues against the assumption that 'what is said can be extricated from how it is said', or, as Leech and Short put it, the 'dualist' notion of 'style as 'the dress of thought' (Leech and Short, 15).

To a certain extent it is true that every time we use language we become 'prisoners of other people's meanings' (Hollindale 1988: 33), which have been conventionally established, but our choice of words may also give away our own attitudes and prejudices, where we are still prisoners of other people's thoughts, which is very interesting. I think this is the idea behind politically correct language use – but the fact that euphemisms, for instance, often soon acquire negative

connotations shows that using a new word is not enough to change thought patterns.

In children's literature it is often the case that simplified language expresses simplified ideas, or that language even betrays or reveals 'a sub-text rhetoric which is actually anti-child' (Hunt 1988: 165). This may mean that the 'conscious surface ideology' and the 'passive ideology' (Hollindale 1988: 31) of a text are in conflict. In children's literature, which on its 'surface ideology' level can obviously never be 'anti-child' (at least not today), this may mean overtly encouraging the child's freedom, while covertly suppressing it, for instance, by use of a restricted and restricting language. As there is an enormous power differential between the inexperienced child reader and experienced adult author, and therefore the relationship between child reader and adult author is 'a more than usually unbalanced power relationship' (Hunt 1991: 84), it is particularly important to find out, by analyzing how language works in a text, if the surface ideology of a text is contradicted on the language level. A closed text which is full of clichés, for instance, can betray the author's patronizing attitude towards children. The point of view may be that children will not be able to tell the difference between good and bad writing anyway, that they do not have to be taken seriously, but rather told what to think, and have to have every little thing explained to them in that patronizing voice some adults use when they talk down to children.

This is a matter of even more concern, if, as Hunt (cf. 1991: 109) argues, control is most dangerous where it is least obvious, as is the case on the level of 'style' as opposed to the more easily accessible ideological content of 'narrative' or 'plot', or in the terms of Stephens (1996: 63) 'lexis or story existents'. Children, on the other hand, may be much better at spotting a condescending attitude in a text than adults give them credit for, but probably only if they are also exposed to other texts and already have some point of comparison.

Stylistics can be extremely helpful in bringing to light attitudes in a text, and saying more about it than just 'it feels like this author does not really like children...', but following this feeling up. According to Malmkjaer's Linguistics Encyclopedia, stylistics is 'the study of style in spoken and written text'. 'By style is meant a consistent occurrence in the text of certain items and structures, or types of items and structures, among those offered by the language as a whole.' It is a way to understand ideology[20], but not only ideology, in a text as it is encoded in the language (the ideological subtext). 'Stylistic features' of a text may, for instance, reflect unconscious prejudices (Hunt 1991: 109), or tell us something about the

'climate of belief' in which the text was written. Stylistics can be an 'important tool in distinguishing between 'writerly' or 'scriptible' texts and 'readerly' or 'lisible' ones (Roland Barthes in Hunt 1991: 81). The first kind is complex and 'open' and leaves room for the reader's 'interaction' (Hunt 1991: 82) by not filling all the gaps, and trusting to the reader's intelligence and imagination. It is this the kind of text which 'enables critical and thoughtful responses' (Stephens 1996: 69), and teaches children how to read literature, as it is 'good' by the same adult norm of complexity as literature written for adults. The 'lisible' or 'restrictive text', on the other hand, can be characterized linguistically by an excessive use of cliché, prepackaged thought and experience, and excessive use of summarizing words, devices which allow little scope for active reader judgments or different interpretations. The text that is 100% controlled by the author, that Hunt refers to as the 'monological' text (cf. Hunt 1991: 81), arguably exercises control over the reader's mind by not leaving room for the reader's imagination: It 'prescribes what the reader must be [...] and can be' (Hunt 1991: 84) for it leaves nothing unexplained and allows only reading on one level or 'prescrib[es] a level of reading' (Hunt 1991: 81). Nevertheless, there is always the possibility of subversion, as the reader is a factor that can fortunately never be predicted absolutely by the text. Gruesome cautionary tales, for instance, may have been enjoyed by children for their exaggerated violence and not their morals, read against themselves.

If a text can really 'prescribe meaning' therefore is more than doubtful and a point I will take up again in my discussion of the reader. Compared to the scriptible text, however, the meanings in this predictable text are pinned down, and therefore 'closed'[21] (Hunt 1991: 81) for interaction: 'the writer has attempted to do all the work for the reader, to limit the possibilities of interpretation, to heavily guide understanding' (Hunt 1991: 81). As to which of the two is valued more highly in adult literature, there can be no doubt. In children's literature books are put to sometimes conflicting uses, which obscures the matter. Hunt (1991: 82) even says that 'what you decide is the 'better' book 'depends on what you want to use the book for'. In my opinion, however, no 'use' can be an excuse for thrusting limiting didactic material on children and therefore (ab)using the book as a carrier of instruction, thus spoiling the child's pleasure in literature perhaps for ever, by giving the child a wrong idea of what books and reading are for.

If the idea is, as it should be, to initiate the child into the special way of reading and enjoying literature, the 'rich' text is certainly to be preferred. This is not necessarily the complicated text but always the imaginative one, the one that invites the child's interaction. It is true, however, that the heavily controlled text is very often

not the original one because control often means a reduction to the most conventional meanings only. 'Restricted' (Hunt 1991: 106) language serves only to express 'simple and simplistic ideas' (106), but this is not true for simple language, which can have very complex effects. The language of nursery rhymes, for instance, is often simple but their content can be enigmatic. Children memorize strings of words, repeat them, change them, sing them. The creative, playful element is very important. It is important to remember the magic words hold for many children. They enjoy playing with words.

Therefore 'quality' in a text may best be defined as offering 'potentials for interaction' (Hunt 1991: 83). In this sense, stylistics can serve as a quick 'originality check' of a text. In children's literature, nevertheless, the other kind of text seems to prevail. The 'readerly', 'limited' text is possibly even so typical of children's literature it has come to define it. This may be responsible for what does seem to be the 'typical' language of the 'typical' children's book. How else would we be able to recognize children's books by their language, as we are, I think, in a good number of cases, despite the theoretical difficulties in finding a satisfactory definition for children's literature as a field? A reason for this may be an excessive control the author exercises on the different levels of plot, character, and, above all, language. For Hunt (1991: 114) it is 'implicit authorial control [that is] a marker... of the genre of children's literature'. 'The cliché, the 'standard phrase', may well be an automatic identifier of children's literature' (1991:116). It seems that even when writers assert the opposite (cf. Shavit 1986), the language of children's fiction is more simplified, and overcoded than that of adult books, which means there is more redundant information, and less left to infer. There is a higher proportion of clichés, of summarizing words, of telling rather than showing, more control in general, as studies have shown. According to Hunt (1991: 107) 'the blend of cliché, spoken idiom, and simplification have typified writing for children since the early nineteenth century'. Stephens also agrees that the literature produced for children, is characterized by 'conventionalised discourses' (1996: 58). If this is true to such an extent, which is doubtful, it may provide a very negative definition of children's books by linguistic features (cf. Hunt 1991: 84).

It seems to go too far to say that the children's books is of 'poor quality by definition' because it is similar to 'the low level adult novel' (Hunt 1991: 35), 'because of certain characteristics of plot shape, vocabulary, and narrational control'. Looking at children's books in this way justifies the low esteem traditionally accorded to them as compared with adult literature. For a long time children's literature was not regarded as worthy of study by literary critics, it was seen as

clearly inferior to adult literature: 'for children' was equated with childish, simplistic, not good enough for adults.[22] I do not think, however, that 'poor quality by definition' would do justice to many excellent children's books, therefore some of the differences between books for children and for adults may better be explained by a different set of ideas (cf. next chapter).

But, if we take as given for the moment, that there is such a thing as the 'average children's book', and I think there is, why is it the way it is? Why do adults feel that they need to overly control texts for children (cf. Hunt 1991: 40)? What is responsible for the conventions that determine and restrict writing for children? The reasons for patronizing children by restricting texts and 'talking down' to them, or by talking over their heads, may have to do with the author's disparaging attitude towards them, an attitude the author is possibly even unaware of. This may be the down-side of a social relationship between children and adults, in which the adult's responsibility for the child is often misunderstood. Adults have a lot of power over children, which can be exploited in many ways. A need to feel superior may be one reason for some adults' simplified ideas of children's understanding. Adults feel that a text other than a 'readerly' and overly simplified text is too difficult for children, that information has to be pre-digested for children 'because of the need to supply a balanced view' (Hunt 1991: 35).

It may be that this sometimes well-meant but always patronizing attitude has become fossilized in the register of children's literature, so that now there may be no more reason for why writers continue to write in this way than a self-perpetuating convention: 'children's books are as they are because writers assume, from what they write, that that is how they should be' (Hunt 1991: 83). This low esteem or expectation of an entire readership may in fact be self-fulfilling: children learn to take what they are offered; if they are only offered the simple, they will never learn how to cope with the complex.

At the same time, however, there is the possibility of subversion, of children reading texts in not quite the way in which they were intended to be read. It is also true that even though much of what is written for children is conventional, there has always been imaginative literature, and children have always appropriated material that was not intended for them.

10 Schema theory

What is needed I think is a comprehensive theory which deals with children's literature as literature for children, and not as ways to instruct them, and may be used to account for the phenomena that occur in the interaction between children and books.

The most convincing and comprehensive theory for 'adult' literature is in my mind Guy Cook's schema theory, which he develops in his book 'Discourse and Literature. The Interplay of Form and Mind' (1994). Cook in short argues that literature is indeed a special kind of discourse that is valued over other discourses because it has a schema-refreshing effect on the reader's mind. His theory tries to include (and account for) all the parameters involved in the interaction of reader and text: the reader's experience of the world, language and text and the world of the text, and the interaction of the two. In the following I will look at the main claims of schema theory, the extent to which it may be applicable to the criticism of children's literature, the insights we can gain from it, and the possible uses we could make of it for analysis of texts written for children. Schema theory is based on the claim that

> a new experience is understood by comparison with a stereotypical version of a similar experience held in memory. The new experience is then processed in terms of its deviation from the stereotypical version, or conformity to it (Cook 1994: 9).

These stereotypical versions are schemata, 'mental representations of typical instances' (11). Evidence for this can be found in everyday situations, when somebody tells another person how their day was spent. Some things will be told, others left out, for different reasons, but some because they are assumed to be known. Cook uses the example of a witness asked to tell the court everything they did that morning, 'the whole truth' (11). They will not mention that they were breathing or that they ate the toast after making it, and so on. The 'default elements' (12) of a schema are assumed to be known.

> When the sender of a message judges an interlocutor's schema to correspond to a significant degree with his or her own, then it is only necessary to mention specific features which are not contained in it (12).

Even though there will be some differences among adults, the assumption here is that this is true in an overwhelming number of cases within one culture.

This is a crucial point when it comes to children's understanding because their schemata cannot always correspond to adults'. Depending on age (and other factors), some schemata may already correspond to adults', others will still be missing, others again may be half-finished, or different from adults' ('wrong' in a real world sense), the result of misunderstandings, wrong assumptions or overgeneralizations. The degree of mismatch is likely to depend on children's development. In what ways exactly children's schemata differ from adults' is an important question, if we are interested in the child's interaction with a text as opposed to the critic's, a question that goes beyond the scope of this paper. There can be no doubt, however, that children rapidly acquire or construct new schemata, and deconstruct the ones that are no longer needed. This seems to be the cognitive aspect of development. Overcoding in children's literature, which is overcoding for children and not just for critics, may really be an underestimation of children's schemata and could be a result of the writer's misunderstanding, deliberate or otherwise, of children's understanding, or an attempt to limit them. Children's schemata are of vital importance in their interaction with literature because literature relies on readers' knowledge of the world, building on and playing with what is assumed. Cook mentions the use of the definite article as a first word to

> make the reader process the discourse as though the relevant schema were shared with the narrator or characters when in fact it is unknown. This achieves both a degree of involvement, […] and also drives the reader forward to construct the necessary schema as quickly as possible […] This mental ability to 'read in' details is particularly relevant to literary narrative, in which readers are given points of reference and left to fill in the gaps 'from imagination (13).

This is potentially interesting for children's literature because it raises the question of the different ways in which literature might impact on children's schemata, for instance by accelerating their construction.

Cook distinguishes three levels of schemata, 'language schemata', 'text schemata', and 'world schemata' (181). They correspond to 'levels of language, text structure, and world knowledge' (196).

> There is an understandable, but regrettable, tendency in various approaches to focus on one of these levels to the detriment of the others. This is most evident in literary theories where the legacy of formalism has fragmented into an exclusive emphasis on language (Jakobson), on text structure (structuralism) and on the reader […] (197).

Discourse may effect schemata in different ways. The effect may be schema-

refreshing, schema-preserving, or schema-reinforcing (191). Necessarily there is a predominance of schema-preserving and schema-reinforcing discourse around us.

> Our knowledge of what is appropriate and performed in communication is derived from social experience. It is inevitably concerned with conformity, normality, and convention, on the assumption that what has happened before is likely to happen again (251f.).

Cook argues that there has to be something else, the human mind needs change and in order to build new schemata, to change, it needs discourses which effect such schema refreshment. For this purpose there are 'experiences whose primary – and perhaps unique – function for the individual is to effect changes in schematic organization' (189), which is recreation.

> the primary function of certain discourses is to effect a change in the schemata of their readers. Sensations of pleasure, escape, profundity, and elevation are conceivably offshoots of this function (191).

Very often it is literature that provides these experiences. It is therefore a special discourse because its primary function is to refresh the reader's existing schemata, effect change in reader's minds. It lends itself well to this because reading literature has no direct impact on the real world, there are no direct consequences, it is a private activity, removed from social and practical concerns. Again, literature as a discourse is highly valued because it frequently fulfills this function. Cook proposes a

> 'theory of literariness as a dynamic interaction between linguistic and text-structural form on the one hand, and schematic representations of the world on the other, whose overall result is to bring about a change in the schemata of the reader. I shall call this dynamic interaction 'discourse deviation' (182).

What is important is that 'discourse deviation' takes account of the reader's schemata, 'the quality of schema refreshment is reader-dependent' (192). 'Deviation […] is never absolute, but always relative to the expectations of a specified reader.' (198) In certain contexts 'the absence of schema refreshment is itself schema-refreshing' (200).

The point that makes 'schema theory' especially interesting is that, even though it recognizes 'a connection between formal deviation and changes to schemata' (201) it also accounts for deviation which is not on the linguistic level but results from interaction on higher levels, in the following example intertextual. This emphasizes the importance of knowledge of the world and of literature. Cook (161-175) compares an advertisement whose linguistic features suggest that it is literary

with a poem whose linguistic features would suggest that it is not. He demonstrates that in the advertisement of a perfume ('Be touched by the fragrance that touches the woman. Elizabeth Taylor's Passion'; whole advertisement cf.162) 'defamiliarization operates only at the linguistic level, not at the schematic and discoursal level'. (167) The schemata he identifies (166) include 'sell product', 'attract attention', '(Liz Taylor) be attractive', '(female) be attractive', '(female) be feminine', '(male) touch woman'. Cook argues that even though the existence of these schemata is hard to prove, they are likely to be shared within one culture.

> In fact, it is the advertiser's assumption that receivers share and recognize these themes and are susceptible to the suggestion that they may be fulfilled by buying the perfume, which enables them to go unsaid. They are – in every sense – schematic stereotypical and predictable (167).

The important point is that this judgment, the classification of the advertisement as non-literary depends on the reader's schematic expectation and 'will vary with the schemata of the reader' (167). Therefore, 'textual and language deviation is no guarantee of discourse deviation' (205).

In the case of the poem 'First World War Poets'[23] by Edward Bond, Cook arrives at the opposite conclusion: it is for him linguistically uninteresting, 'poor in prosodic, grammatical, lexical, and metaphorical innovation'(171). Interestingly, he claims that its use of cliché 'makes it deviant in poetry, where traditionally clichés are avoided' (171). I think this also shows how reader-dependent the identification of linguistic deviation is, if a cliché can be perceived as innovative it is in a sense a linguistic deviation for that particular reader but this depends on world and text experience. For Cook this poem is literary because it is 'rich in intertextual meanings' (171), challenges a number of schemata about the First World War, and

> defamiliarizes received ideas of war, war poetry, and poetry in general. […] Only with reference to schemata (including text and language schemata), can an argument be made for its literariness at all (173).

I think this is interesting in regard to children's literature because it shows the extent to which experience or appreciation of a text depends on previous experience, the reader's knowledge of the world and of texts. In this particular example the schemata needed are of a very specific nature as Cook explicitly states. They are the schemata of 'British readers who received a Christian education during the twenty-five years following the Second World War' (171). The schemata include 'make life better', 'First World War: Britain defend empire, Britain help future generations, Britain build 'new world'', 'study 'anti-war' poetry', 'remember war dead', 'forgive enemies', 'make sacrifices' (172f.). According to Cook (196), 'the

Edward Bond poem stands or falls by its challenge to deeply ingrained high-level assumptions about poetry, poets, and the war dead.' This makes it accessible for a comparatively small number of people, to the others it will not say much either way (at least in my opinion). The schemata it triggered in me as a foreign reader and different generation were different – needless to say what I would have made of the poem would be different and this makes it perhaps comparable to children's reading, in the sense that children also do not have access to all the cultural connotations. Children belong to a 'primarily oral culture' (Hunt 1991: 75) which has some parallels with an alien culture, Hunt even goes so far as to say they have their own subculture.

At any rate, there can be no doubt that children have less experience of the world, of texts and of language than adults. They are in the process of acquiring new schemata. Their needs will therefore be different from adults' in some ways. Does literature have more functions for them than 'schema refreshment'? An important point about schema theory is that 'the new must always attach itself to the known in order to mean' (Cook 1994: 148), so in children's literature this means that there is less that the author can expect from his reader as given. Presumably, children will still need texts that help them expand existing schemata, 'schema-preserving' (191) ones, and possibly even schema-reinforcing ones. And what about the building of new schemata from scratch?

At the same time literature could initiate them into the process of 'schema-refreshment', of change which is very important for development and a preparation for adult literature – this is something that has to be acquired. If children fail to learn this, they may grow into the people who call for bans against 'Huckleberry Finn' or 'Harry Potter', not wanting their children to be exposed to what they could never understand, or ignore literature altogether. Cook's theory offers an explanation for their fury: if a literary text fails to fulfill its purpose, i.e. to refresh a particular reader's schemata, for whatever reason, this reader reacts not with indifference but with anger – on a large scale this may explain the hostility against literature that is widespread in many circles and subcultures.

If children's literature fulfills different roles than adult literature this would explain why so many adults nowadays return to it, what was once schema-refreshing has become schema-preserving and has a comforting effect on them. This may go beyond nostalgia. The emotional importance of books should not be overlooked, their importance in stabilizing identity, which may be one of the reasons why a reader returns to the same book many times. What about reading books for comfort? Reading for comfort is certainly something most readers do at times, but it

seems to me that great emotional needs, which were not fulfilled at the right time (i.e. in childhood) may prevent a reader from seeking out new experiences, the reader may get stuck with 'schema-preserving', and 'schema-reinforcing' texts, or even read potentially schema-refreshing texts only for what is comforting, known in them, to recreate an illusion of childhood. It seems that one has to get to know structures and feel sufficiently comfortable with them or rather with oneself in order to seek out and bear their disruption.

Cook argues that for literature teaching schema theory entails an integration of top-down and bottom-up approaches.

> Attention to the larger structures is a first step, and certainly an essential one to a student seeking to understand an unfamiliar culture, but a second step is to disrupt or refresh these structures, and this will demand use and understanding of inappropriate, innovative, never-before-performed manipulations of the code (253f.).

What is true for language and literature teaching may possibly also be applicable to children's experience of literature. In literature teaching, Cook argues against questions that ask students' reactions or any activities in which students need to participate because in his view 'mental disruption, refreshment, and play' (255) can best happen 'when the individual withdraws from the world of social and practical necessity' (255). This may be true for the adult reader who has already learnt how to read and enjoy literature in this way but it leaves open the question of how this is achieved, which is a significant question for adults and even more so for children. Then of course sharing literature is also an important experience, discussing it, learning how to talk about it.

11 The child reader

The questions this discussion opens up can only be answered if we change our focus and look at the children who interact with the books. How do children respond as readers? What is difficult for them? If they do not need adaptations of the kind just discussed, what do they need? To what extent can the child reader be controlled by the 'closed' text? Is there any way even to find out? What about receptivity?

These questions have to some extent been addressed by reader-response criticism[24] which emancipated the reader by a rejection of 'the affective fallacy': 'the confusion of the poem and its results' (Benton 1996: 73), the separation of the work

and its effects on the reader, which had been generally accepted. Reader-response criticism, on the other hand, has concentrated its focus on the individual response, the act of reading. Some reader-response theories have taken this to the point of 'treat[ing] the tale or books [merely] as a stimulus' (Meek 1982: 175).

One of the main tenets of reader response criticism is that 'reading is not the discovering of meaning [...] but the creation of it' (Benton 1996: 74). Common sense tells us, however, that this cannot be the case, or we would not be able to spread information via the written word, for instance, or agree on what street signs say, or what words there are in a specific text. If there were not a 'middle ground of common-sense agreement about what meaning is' (Hunt 1991: 89), all this would be impossible. It makes more sense, therefore, to agree with Iser, who speaks of 'the dialectical structure of reading' (Iser 1989: 83) and sees 'reading as an interactive process' between text and recipient. And, as far as the engagement of the reader with the text is concerned, it is

> the convergence of text and reader [that] brings the literary work into existence [...] Thus, reading causes the literary work to unfold its inherently dynamic character (Iser 1989: 75).

This view still leaves a way to talk about books without talking about readers, while at the same time shifting the critical focus towards exploring the unpredictable interaction between readers and books.

For children's literature the increased interest in the reading process, and the raise of the reader's prestige brought about by reader-response criticism, is very important because, unlike any other literature, children's literature is particularly oriented towards an audience.

> 'Reader-response criticism accommodates both the reader and the text; there is no area of literary activity where this is more necessary than in the literature that defines itself by reference to its young readership' (Benton 1996: 85).

The question is, how do we make sense of books? And does the way 'a child make[s] meaning [...] differ[s] significantly from the way in which an adult makes meaning? In what ways is this 'young readership' different from an adult readership? According to Hunt (1991: 70), any reader brings to books an 'attitude to books', 'attitudes to life', 'knowledge and experience of books', 'knowledge and experience of life', 'cultural background and prejudices', 'race, class, age, and sex attitudes'. Reading is an interaction of these reader codes with the codes of the text. Child readers or developing readers differ from adult readers in their 'decoding skills'

which are less developed as they have less experience of texts. Probably it is also true that their attitudes are not as fixed as those of adults', and they have less experience of the world, which has also an effect on their interaction with the text.

According to Hunt (1991: 89), the more unconventional a text is, the less relevant our expectations will be, and the less we will understand it: 'our access to those meanings depends on our decoding skills' and on our knowledge of the world. As our expectations are based on our previous experience, both of books and life, it means that texts that conform to adults' expectations may be unconventional for children, because they have no previous experience of similar texts.

What is perceived as cliché (a sign of the 'readerly' text), for instance, obviously depends on the reader's experience. If the reader has not or not often been confronted with a textual convention before, it can never be cliché for this specific reader. It is more likely that it will be experienced differently and may be quite original for this specific reader, whatever the critics say, at least initially, before it is encountered in many other texts too. This is a point that in my opinion has so far not received enough attention and emphasizes the importance of experience of many different texts, and of a transitional stage of simple texts. Therefore, 'quality', as found above in the rich, ambiguous text, may be much more reader- dependent. At the same time, the unpredictability of the reader may also mean that simplifications of the kind typical of the children's book register (as discussed above) do not make things simpler for the child reader. Adults may simply have wrong ideas about children's understanding and therefore about what is difficult for them. It has been found, for instance, that 'the more inexperienced the child in the ways of books, the less adult measures of difficulty will be relevant' (for evidence cf. Crago 1985: 125). Other research has shown that children are 'far more competent text-handlers than is generally assumed' (for research see Benton in Hunt 48). This seems to confirm Rigby's early assertion that 'children are distinguished from ourselves less by an inferiority than by a difference in capacity' (Hunt 1991: 20). According to the little evidence there is, moreover, the restrictions typical of writing for children have not been found to be necessary for children. (cf. Hunt 1991: 105).

> […] because the reader is assumed not to have code-skills equivalent to those of the writer, texts intended for children tend to be 'overcoded' either by unusually strong narrational control or by frequent summary. The paradox is that such modifications are beside the point, and merely reinforce the illusion that the structures of children's literature are easily accessible (Hunt 1991: 77).

This is an illusion because modifications may even make things more difficult for the reader, for instance clichés have been found difficult to process. The same has

been found true for an overly intrusive narrative voice, the remnant of an oral story-telling situation (cf. Ong 1982: 149), which has turned into a convention of children's literature. For children who are not yet familiar with this conventional simulation of a story-telling situation it may be a problem to locate where the voice is coming from and who is speaking. This is a feature of text which already implies a reader; the reader directly addressed is not the real reader but the reader as thought by the author, the 'implied reader'[25]. Again, many conventional adjustments or adaptations of language and plot may be beside the point and need to be rethought. This does not mean that the language of children's literature must not be simple. Simple language can be the best way to express ideas and feelings, while restricted language has been obviously adjusted to fit conventional ideas of children's understanding, often because of a condescending attitude.

To come to any conclusions about this issue, it would be important to know more about the child reader's responses and experiences while reading, and this has to remain in the dark. Why do we know so little about what the actual reader experiences while reading, and even less about the child reader? The reason seems to be that because the reading process happens in the reader's mind it is extremely difficult to reconstruct: it can only be articulated after it has been experienced and the fleeting images have already vanished. The data produced by such 'introspective recall', as Hunt (1991: 117) refers to the reader reporting on the reading experience, must by necessity be uncertain and vague. Then it is also difficult to generalize from the experience of one specific reader. Benton (1996: 71), who is at the forefront of research in this field, speaks of 'the mystery of what readers actually do and experience' and refers to the 'reader's response' as 'the Loch Ness Monster of literary studies'.

This is also true for the child reader whose responses are even more difficult to elicit and record. Crago, who observed and recorded the primary 'literary experience of his daughter 'in early childhood', long before she learnt to read (1985: 118) recounts the difficulties of studies concerned with the interaction between child and book: firstly, the children whose responses are usually studied are confronted with literature under the best conditions; influenced by a domestic context that is very positive and book-friendly. Secondly, 'observed response to literature is not equivalent to internal experience of literature' and 'interpersonal contexts cannot but affect the form and the content of what we choose to report from our inner worlds' (121f.). Meek (1982: 175) points out the difficulty of asking children about their literary experience, as questions always reflect the adult's focus and thus limit children's answers, or give them a direction, while 'without the stimulus of a

question, children often choose to talk about quite other aspects of a tale than those that preoccupy their elders'. (Meek 1982: 175)

However, there are some results. Despite the difficulties and limitations of his research, Crago does offer some tentative answers with regard to children's early reading experience. His research suggests, for instance, that 'taste or preference patterns are determined very, very early' (1985: 124) and that 'the younger the child, the less 'quality' [as defined by adults] might matter'. Age has been found to be much less relevant than experience of books, which often but not always correlates with 'chronological age'. This, by implication puts into question the whole concept of children's literature, which after all, rests primarily on a definition by age and confirms again the importance of literary experience. The responses of adults with little experience of books were found to be similar to children's, putting children on the same level with adults with little or no reading experience and reinforcing the idea that children for a time belong to a subculture that is comparable to oral preliterate cultures. This throws a new light on the way their experience of books is seen because it means their approach to literature may be compared to that of other minorities: 'the text may actually seem to symbolize an alien culture, and as such may be perceived perversely or subversively'. Hunt (1991: 75) makes the point that children may still belong to 'a primarily oral culture' that is essentially different but not inferior to literary adult culture. Research into 'performed narrative' has shown that there are crucial differences between children and adults which substantiate such claims (Hunt 1991: 76). Children have also been shown to have an 'easy access to metaphor', and 'an ability to handle complex narrative acts [...] not accounted for in conventional theory' (for studies cf. Hunt 1991: 76). To account for this essential, conventionally unrecognized 'otherness' of children Hunt (1991: 192) coins a new term, 'childist' criticism, in analogy to 'feminist criticism'. Convinced of a 'major cultural boundary between adults and children', (1991: 8) he claims to be concerned with what children want and not what adults want for them (Hunt 1991: 189ff.), a claim which is impossible, as, after all, he is an adult.

So, it may be best to rely more on children's natural instincts as choosers, and their powers of subversion. The history of children's literature, in particular of fairy tales, has shown that neither moralistic adults nor morals attached to texts can entirely prescribe children's interaction with texts. To what extent can ideology be imposed on the reader, in other words literature impose a vision of the world on the child reader? There is always the possibility that a child likes a book for different reasons than the adult thinks, reads it against itself, plays around with it. This ability of the child to subvert the adult world, to turn something into an imaginative tale and

read the 'right' book (as some adults would have it), for the 'wrong' reason should not be underestimated. The 'wrong' reason is the right reason, for those in favour of imagination, delight, joy in literature. This may also explain why and how children can learn 'how to read' literature even from 'bad' books, a point Meek (1982) wonders about. It may be that in this case the book was just not a bad book for the child but only by adult standards. I also feel, as Meek (1982: 179) does 'that every good reader has at some time been entranced by a thoroughly bad book with a strong, overarching narrative drive', only that the opposition of 'good' and 'bad' seems unnecessary. Perhaps the good reader is the one who enjoys literature, likes a broad variety of genres and text types for different reasons and makes up his own mind about what he reads, without worrying too much about definitions or what others think is a good book, at least not so much as to let it spoil his enjoyment. I think reading for suspense is as legitimate as is taking pleasure in every single word, and both are part of the enjoyment of literature, while reading a literary text as a set of instructions on how to live one's life is not. This is also important and often unacknowledged in children's literature, and it has to be hoped that many children discover the pleasures of story, of poetry, of magic words.

Part Two

1 Introduction

In the first part of this paper I tried to place children's literature in its social and historical context with particular view to the criteria against which children's books are measured. In my opinion, and for reasons outlined above, these should be criteria which take into account the child as a beginning literary reader. Cook's schema theory (1994) raised interesting questions about adjusting literary standards to children's needs. I came to the conclusion that schema-refreshment should be an important principle in the criticism of children's literature, as it is in 'adult' literature, while it should also be kept in mind that children's schemata are of a different nature than adults' because of their lesser experience of life, and, not necessarily, though usually, books. It seems to me that while the text that leaves space for children's interaction does not have to be the complicated one, it is certainly not the one which is condescending and patronizing, and limits children by trying to force them into a prescribed and narrow role. This is not to say that such a text cannot be appropriated and subverted by children. This possibility emphasizes the importance of the reader, and thus defines the power that a text can have over children in terms of its ideology, of prescribing thinking. In general, we might say that the text that leaves space for children's creative interaction, and initiates them into reading literature, is the text to be preferred, while we cannot know how it is read by every specific reader. As it is, we deal in probabilities.

With these guidelines in mind, I will now focus on two specific texts, William Mayne's 'Kelpie' (1987) and Roald Dahl's 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' (1964/1995). William Mayne and Roald Dahl are children's authors who are as different as can be, and it will therefore be interesting to see how the issues just discussed relate to them. Both 'Kelpie' and 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' exemplify debates about the kind of book children ought to read, like to read, or should ideally like to read. 'Kelpie' can be seen as an 'open' text, of the kind advocated by many critics and 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' can be seen as a 'closed' text and has arguably been a favorite with children.

Because they are so different, yet both subsumed under the heading 'children's literature', I think that closer analysis of them might throw an interesting light on the issues of power, ideology, and schema-refreshment. Why might children like or dislike these texts? Are they good for children, as literary texts in the sense just discussed?

Roald Dahl is an immensely popular children's book author, well-known and loved – especially by children – for books like 'James and the Giant Peach' (1961), 'Matilda' (1988), 'The BFG', and many others. At the same time, his books are controversial and he has been frequently criticized for a number of reasons. 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' which I will discuss in detail in the next chapter was criticized for its 'amorality' and 'racism' in the depiction of the Oompa-Loompas (cf. Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 125). There has also been a debate about Dahl that refers back to the controversy between book people and child people (cf. chapter 5). 'Book people', in particular, have criticized his books for quite different reasons, accusing Dahl of overtly siding with the children against parents while really limiting them on a deeper level, and therefore not being on their side at all.

I will look at the kind of relationship established between author and reader. Is there an obtrusive or condescending narrator? What kind of reader is inscribed in the text as the implied reader? How are the children in the text positioned in relation to the events? Do they control them? And what do the answers to these questions tell us about the issues ideology and schema refreshment in children's literature? And what do they tell us about the focal question of the distribution of 'power' between adult and child, writer and reader inside and outside the text? These questions are part of the same central issue, as the history of children's literature has shown us, which we have seen as a road from 'Instruction to Delight'. The same is true for the more recent struggles between 'didacticism' and 'imagination', and the debates about political correctness. Therefore the question of use or abuse, respectively, of power has evolved out of the preceding discussion as a very important and interesting one for me.

Children's literature is written by adults, but for and about children, who are not only in a less powerful position in social terms but also obviously differ from adults in age and experience. This makes children's literature different from literature written for adults. It is always the adult's view of children and childhood that finds expression in children's literature – and not children's own feelings or thoughts, or what they actively want – and the recipient, at least the intended one, is always a child.

Therefore it is of vital importance to see what attitude is taken towards children, what kind of relationship is established with them as readers, if they are respected as beginning literary readers, and given food for their imagination, or if they are limited emotionally and intellectually by a condescending attitude towards them.

'Kelpie' by William Mayne (1987), the second I text I will discuss, throws an interesting light on the same issues. William Mayne has been consistently and highly praised by adult critics for his high literary standards, for the aesthetic quality of his books, the originality of his language but is sometimes seen as an author whose children's books are really for adults, who writes the difficult, complex books some adults like and would therefore want their children to like as well. This is a claim that is obviously impossible to substantiate, as even sales figures cannot tell us which family member reads the book, or if it is read at all. It will be interesting to look closely at the imaginative attempt to capture children's experience, and to speculate if the emerging insights into childhood are only of interest for the adult reader or also for the child reader. Or if the child reader might read the book in a different way, enjoy it for altogether different reasons.

The child characters in 'Kelpie' are particularly interesting with regard to the reality of childhood experience. Rather than ideal and stereotypical abstractions or projections of positive or negative qualities adults wish (or do not wish) children to have, their experience is 'authentic' in a way in which Charlie's is not. 'Authentic' is probably best understood in the sense of a well imagined or creditable childhood experience, (as there is no way to know if it is really 'authentic'). This might refer to a text that concerns itself with what an imagined child might feel like or what it might feel like to be a child.

In both texts I will first look at the child characters and the different attitudes towards children and childhood implied with a particular concentration on the language used, on the assumption that analysis of the 'chromosomes' (Hunt 1991: 117) of a book may reveal a 'sub-text rhetoric' in contrast to its surface ideology. In this light, looking specifically at the register, are these very different books both children's books? If so in what way? What devices make their language the language of children's books (if any)? How do they make things simpler for the reader, if at all? How do they adhere to – or depart from the norm of the 'typical children's book' – if there is such a thing? And how does this relate to the literary quality of the two texts?

An exploration of these questions should throw an interesting light on the question

of quality in children's literature with a view of schema refreshment and ideology. As children's books are written by adults, and reflect adult ideas about childhood, it is of prime ideological interest to explore these, if we are serious that children's literature should not be used to promote a limited and limiting world view, (or indeed 'promote' anything), and should rather open than close children's minds and hearts. It should do more for children than a product for a consumer does (as many television shows, for instance). This means favouring delightful, imaginative over didactic literature for children, it means children's literature as 'literature for children', in the sense of beginning literary readers who deserve the same respect as adults and who are introduced to the special kind of recreation that the reading of literature can be.

2 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory'

Roald Dahl is often seen as the children's writer who is really on the side of the children, he 'allies himself with the child reader against the world of adults', as Knowles and Malmkjaer (1996: 125) see it. 'Ready obedience is out: anarchy is in'.

> 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory', which first appeared in 1964, 'has been loved by children and hated by adults because it is full of fun and virtually amoral' (Carpenter 1985, in Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 125).

Dahl is seen as the anarchist who rebels against an adult order, and children's submission to adults. It is true that in many of his books the usual family order is disrupted, and there is a suggestion of an alternative order.

In 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' (1964/1995) we are, as in other stories by Dahl, confronted with a family situation that is anything but idyllic because of the family's social problems. The family is a typical modern one in that it is overaged: there are four grandparents and only one child. Charlie's grandparents are passive and weak, except Grandpa Joe: The parents are not completely absent as in 'The BFG' or 'The Witches', for instance, but they play a marginal role in the story. When they are mentioned it is usually in association with their low social position and poverty (e.g.14ff.). The father's occupation as a 'toothpaste cap-screwer' (15) in a factory places the parents on the very lowest rung of the social ladder and disables the parents to sufficiently provide for Charlie. In the story they are replaced by other characters in all situations where they could act as his parents. It is Charlie's Grandpa Joe who is his companion/friend and who tells him stories about the magical chocolate factory nearby. It is also Grandpa Joe who accompanies him to the chocolate factory when he finds the golden ticket (72),

whereas the other children are accompanied by their parents (75). And it is Mr. Wonka, the owner of the factory who chooses him as heir, and who can be seen as the surrogate parent, who secures Charlie's future. This is something far beyond the possibilities of his biological parents. As in other stories by Dahl, the family, in this case because of its poverty, is not represented as an institution that allows the child hero to develop, self-fulfilment happens outside the family. The family, however, is not the source of the conflict, as for instance, in 'Matilda' (1988). The problems arise from social injustice rather than a conflict between the generations. The whole family is victimized by a repressive and unjust social system, capitalism, which does not even allow them enough to eat, but is ultimately celebrated in the figure of Wonka, the personification of capitalism. Charlie's rescue is the child's victory over circumstances. Indeed, while there is some criticism of the system, Dahl's distrust of society and social institutions, and belief in the individual's power to make his fortune, by luck or achievement can be seen as a capitalist position carried to its extremes. In most of his books Dahl is very critical of social institutions, in some of the institution of family (cf. Matilda 1988, James and the Giant Peach 1961). The submission of children to the authority of the family or school as social institutions is often seen as detrimental to the children's development, or at the very least as not beneficial[26].

It is interesting to note in this context that one of the chapters Dahl edited out in the course of his writing of 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' was published in 1997 in 'Charlie's Secret Chocolate Book', together with other parts that had been changed, and recipes. It is about a special invention of Wonka's, 'Spotty Powder' (1997: 12) which gives children red spots so that they do not have to go to school:

> Mr Piker, Miranda's father, stepped forward and faced Mr Wonka. He had a smooth white face like a boiled onion. 'Now see here, Wonka,' he said. 'I happen to be the headmaster of a large school, and I won't allow you to sell this rubbish to the children! It's…it's criminal! Why, you'll ruin the school system of the entire country!' 'I hope so,' said Mr Wonka. It's *got* to be stopped!' shouted Mr Piker, waving his cane. 'Who's going to stop it?' asked Mr Wonka. 'In *my* factory, I make things to please children. I don't care about grown-ups.' (Dahl 1997: 12f.)

This defiant attitude towards social institutions, and the adults that personify them, is characteristic of Dahl's writing – I think we could substitute 'books' for 'things' and we would be close to the writer's attitude, who, according to 'The Cambridge Guide Children's Books in English' (Watson 2001) 'claimed to be on the children's side'. Most of the attacks on the book have concentrated on charges of racism in the depiction of the Oompa-Loompas, the small-size tribe Wonka imports as his workforce, who were originally black pygmies from 'the very deepest and darkest part of the African jungle where no white man had been before'. (Treglown, Jeremy in Howard 2001). After a debate of the 'political agenda' of the book in 1972, 'Dahl's publishers decided that

> to those growing up in a racially mixed society, the Oompa-Loompas were no longer acceptable as originally written. The following year […] a revised edition appeared in which the Oompa-Loompas had been turned into 'dwarfish hippies with long "golden brown hair" and "rosy-white" skin (Treglown's 'Roald Dahl' in Howard 2001).

Significantly, their country of origin was also changed, from Africa to 'Loompaland'. This is an interesting case of a book being changed because of outside pressures (cf. part I, 6). Eleanor Cameron was the critic who started the famous debate on 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory', which led to the changes.

> Possibly its tastelessness, including the ugliness of the illustrations, is, indeed (whether the author meant it so or not), a comment upon our age and the quality of much of our entertainment. What bothers me about it, aside from its tone, is the using of the Oompa-Loompas, and the final indifference to the wishes of the grandparents (Cameron 1972).

It could be argued that this is just the kind of criticism a book that is truly a book for children might attract from an adult: criticism for its cheeky, disrespectful tone, its failure to adapt to the current political agenda, and a general lack of respect for adults and what they want, as opposed to what children want. Cameron attacks the book for more reasons than these, however. In her reviews for the Hornbook Magazine, 'McLuhan, Youth, and Literature: Part I' – III (1972), which are raging attacks against McLuhan's theories on television, and what she considers bad books, as well as a passionate defense of book culture, she tears it to pieces for its similarity with television.

> Certainly there are several interesting parallels between the point of view of *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* and McLuhan's 'theatrical view of experience as a production or stunt,' as well as his enthusiastic conviction that every ill of mankind can easily be solved by subservience to the senses […] To McLuhan […] man appears to be a device employed by the television industry in *its* self-development. Just so does Charlie seem to be employed

> by his creator in a situation of phony poverty simply a device to make more excruciatingly tantalizing the heavenly vision of being able to live eternally fed upon chocolate. This is Charlie's sole character and being. And just as in the average TV show, the protagonists of the book are types, extreme types […] As for Willy Wonka himself, he is the perfect type of TV showman with his gags and screechings. The exclamation mark is the extent of his individuality (Cameron 1972).

Cameron's dislike of the book is intense but the comparison with television offers an interesting perspective to be kept in mind. In particular, the exclamation mark in relation to a predominance of sensational effects and lack of content reminds us that it is a good idea to look at the 'chromosomes' of the text for evidence. 'The Cambridge Guide to Children's Books in English' goes in a similar direction.

> Although [Dahl] claimed to be on the children's side he has been widely seen as manipulative and has been accused variously of racism, Anti-Semitism, misogyny and cruelty. On the other hand, his supporters argue that he speaks to childhood values (such as love of simple justice), and to children's delight in excess, cartoon – like extravagance, and verbal ingenuity (Watson 2001).

The assumption here is that concepts like racism are adult concepts, which have nothing to do with children, they are confounded with 'being adult'. As so often happens in criticism of children's literature, educational criteria are not reflected and made explicit. Here, from the assumption that racism is bad for children it is taken to follow that it is an adult concept, which should not be in children's literature. There is no distinction between the literary quality, the political agenda, and the effect a children's book might have on the children. So that it can be said that 'rather too much of the criticism of Dahl has been leaning on a very simplistic cause-effect concept of reading' (Watson 2001). This is something that may be avoided by a 'bottom-up' approach. What is there actually in the book that is manipulative or resembles the style of television?

My own view of 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' differs from both Cameron's and Carpenter's. My impression of it is that it is not truly on the side of the children, nor of that of adults, but for different reasons. It is neither imaginative nor original and its very literary conventionality (and mediocrity) prevent development and are an attempt to limit children. It seems to me one of those 'typical' children's books which go against the values they appear to be celebrating superficially. Underneath a thin layer of apparent 'anarchy' and 'fun' it is essentially conservative and moralistic. Is there an underlying current of hostility against children, a wish to dominate and control them, that can be best described as 'ideological' in a negative sense of the

word? Does the text, substantiate or contradict my impressions, particularly if we look at its chromosomes to help us uncover its agenda? I will use the Concord, Wordlist, and Keywords functions of the Wordsmith Tools program to provide evidence for my interpretation, and illustration. Wordlist lists the words of a text according to their frequency. There is also a cluster function that might be useful. How many times a word or phrase occurs in a text may not mean much by itself but can be interesting for illustration to start with.

To begin with my first impression, presumably we can say that this is a 'typical' children's book if we identify typical devices of children's book language. An obtrusive narrator, an authoritarian quasi-storyteller's voice in close control of everything that happens is one such device and clearly what we have got here. The opening of the text keys us in to what we can expect of it: the characters are introduced with pictures, the verbal element is at a minimum to explain the pictures, the narrator mediates between the pictures and the reader, as if this were a real life introduction: 'This is Charlie. How d'you do? And how d'you do? And how d'you do again? He is pleased to meet you.' (13) It is assumed that the children who read this text need a lot of help. If this sophisticated device really makes it easier for them is doubtful, however. According to (Hunt 1988), research suggests that children know they are reading a book and not being told a story by a real person and are therefore only confused. An illusion of spoken emphasis as in real-life conversation is also created by the italics. Underneath the picture of Charlie's grandparents it says 'And *these* two very old people are the father and mother of Mrs Bucket.' (12) This is presumably meant to create the illusion of spoken idiom.

The narrator is an adult explaining to the child reader what is going on, mediating between child and event, keeping close control of the story. Not the slightest inference is left to make for the reading child, all the thinking is already done for the child, information is heavily pre-digested.

> It was quite a large party of people, when you came to think of. There were nine grown-ups and five children, fourteen in all. So you can imagine that there was a good deal of pushing and shoving as they hustled down the passage (84).

I do not think it is part of the child's normal reading process to practise sums while reading but not even the child reader interested in figuring out how many people there are altogether has a chance to do so, the didactic inference is forced on him or her. This passage is heavily overcoded, didactic and condescending.

Someone who knows how to read usually very soon knows that nine plus five equals fourteen, not that this is very interesting in this case. 'when you came to think of it' and 'so you can imagine' are clichés, overused phrases that just fill up space – and are markers of narratorial control. 'But I haven't yet told you about' and 'as you might have guessed' are both oral discourse markers, leftovers from storying as an event. The writer assumes and anticipates the reactions of the readers, writes them into the text. In this case I think the writer is overplaying the storyteller role. 'Just imagine that!' (17) is another example of the narrator's presence, which is telling the implied reader exactly what to do. 'Just imagine' occurs five times, 'imagine that' four times (cluster function in Wordsmith Tools) throughout the text. This, to my mind, is a very patronizing cliché because the author thinks something is so extraordinary that the child needs to be told to imagine it: 'In the town itself, actually within *sight* of the house in which Charlie lived, there was an ENORMOUS CHOCOLATE FACTORY! Just imagine that! (17)'.

As far as the occurrence of italics and capitalized words is concerned, the first sentence of this quotation is typical of the rest of the book. There is an abundance of italics, exclamation marks and capital letters which add visual emphasis to almost everything. They run consistently through the text and reinforce the impression that this is an extremely overcoded text, in which there is a huge perceived gap between the understanding of the implied (child) reader and the adult author. It is also visually closed for meanings other than the ones that are thrust on the reader and constantly overemphasized. Mr Wonka's appearance in front of the chocolate factory is an example of how italics and exclamation marks contribute to this closure: '*There he is*!' somebody shouted. '*That's him*!' And so it was!' (79) The italics and exclamation marks visually overemphasize what the tag is already expressing, that these remarks are shouted, to create an illusion of spoken language. 'And so it was!' is the narrator's assertion of what the children in the text have seen, it adds weight to it and closes off the situation so that not the slightest doubt may remain as to who the figure in front of the gates is. That the word 'shouted' has to be reinforced by italicized words and exclamation marks means that by itself it signifies not enough, that there has to be more than just the word. The italics and exclamation mark bring about a resemblance of spoken language, as they are additional stage directions (so to speak). The words alone are not reliable anymore, they need visual aid. The impression is of an emotionally heightened atmosphere with an exclamatory style which is indeed reminiscent of television and supports Cameron's criticism.

The number of exclamation marks as opposed to full stops gives further weight to this impression: There are 1.116 exclamation marks in the text as opposed to 1.905 full stops. In addition to italics and capitalizing, and an excessive amount of exclamation marks, the language itself abounds with boosters and intensifiers of all kinds, there is a preponderance of superlatives and intensifying adverbs: the 'cleverest' (1964: 20), 'extremely', 'so' (15), '*really* true', 'most *fantastic'*, 'most *amazing'* (20), '*absolutely* true' (21), to name a few. The numbers reinforce this impression: in a text of 31.286 words there are very many occurrences of words for 'big': 'enormous' occurs 26 times, 'big' 25 times, 'huge' 17 times, 'gigantic' 8 times, 'faster' 16 times. Everything we are told is absolutely so. This is denoted by 'certainly' (10 times) and 'completely' (12 times), among others. Adjectives to denote something positive or good are also frequent: 'marvellous' (12 times), 'fantastic' (11), 'absolutely' (10), 'terrific' (10), 'tremendous' (10), 'whizzing' (10), 'famous' (9), 'amazing' (6), 'special' (7), 'important' (6), 'extremely' (8). Some of these are also key words. And then, where these are not enough, there are the comparisons. The following each occur twice in the text: 'more fantastic', 'more and…', 'more for…', 'most amazing', 'most certainly', 'most extraordinary', 'most fantastic', 'most secret', and 'most tremendous'. These boosters obviously try to create an atmosphere of wonder and astonishment, one gets the impression that for the writer words are just not enough to explain how wonderful things are. This enthusiasm for exaggeration, which is supposed to convey speechless wonder, is what makes the text similar to television. The problem is that language loses its force if used in that way, there is more and more need of emphasis, and, once the reader is used to an excessive amount of superlatives, they come to mean nothing.

Such an exclamatory style may be necessary to create an effect because the descriptions themselves do not leave the impression that everything is so wonderful. So the text tries to proscribe the reader's reaction by anticipating it. The beginning of the description of Wonka's chocolate room by itself is not spectacular.

> They were looking down upon a lovely valley. There were green meadows on either side of the valley, and along the bottom of it there flowed a great brown river. What is more, there was a tremendous waterfall halfway along the river – (1995: 87).

The children and grown-ups who enter the room are, however, overwhelmed by the sight, before the description comes their reaction: '*oh*, what an amazing sight it was that now met their eyes!'

It is improbable that the description by itself would provoke such reactions from the reader, particularly because a probable association with the 'brown river' is pollution. The difference is here between showing and telling: the reader is not shown what is so great but only given a summary and is then, or in this case first, told the characters' reactions. 'Oh' is particularly frequently used to intensify reactions: it occurs 51 times in the text, for example 'oh, how bitter cold it was!' (1995:55), or 'Oh my, what lovely soup this is!' (1995:123), or 'oh, what a terrible country it is' (1995:93). These exaggerated and unoriginal exclamations are typical of children's book language and could not be found in a book for adults. 'Oh, how he loved that smell! And oh, how he wished he could go inside the factory and see what it was like!' (18) It is carried to such extremes that an adult reader may well be tempted to exaggerate when reading aloud, as a parody of the patronizing voice some people take on when they speak to small children. The oh's are used, just like the exclamation marks and other intensifiers to hype up unoriginal phrases.

Now I will see which of all these words that to me appear to occur very frequently in this text are key words. I would expect the same or similar words to the ones just discussed, which seem to me 'typical' of some fiction written for children, particularly as there is no section of children's fiction in the reference corpus I use (the Imaginative Prose section of the LOB with 305.694 words). I expect, apart from the proper names, words like 'cried' (37th most frequent word in the text), 'little' (47th most frequent), 'shouted' (67th most frequent). I also predict 'you', 'don't', possibly 'like', 'suddenly', 'tiny', 'whispered'. Then I predict subject specific words of this text 'chocolate', 'factory', 'golden', 'ticket', 'sweets' – words which especially indicate the text's 'aboutness' (Scott 1998: 155). Then I expect words which are 'boosters' like great, big, huge, and the, in absolute frequencies, less frequent ones like fantastic, tremendous, absolutely, terrific, whizzing etc. After calculating the keywords it is interesting to see where I was right and wrong. As the table on the next pages shows, on the whole I was right (with exceptions) but there are many more keywords than I could have predicted. I omitted proper nouns and negative keywords from the table.

Keywords in 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' Wordsmith Tools; Reference Corpus: LOB (Imaginative Prose)

	WORD	FREQ.	CHARLIE.TXT %	FREQ.	LOB.LST %		WORD	FREQ.	CHARLIE.TXT	FREQ.	LOB.LST
	MR	384	1,23	0		4	CACAO	15	0,05	0	
	GRANDPA	158	0,51	21		5	RIGHT	92	0,29	294	0,10
	CHOCOLATE	126	0,40	2		6	GATES	23	0,07	11	
	MRS	113	0,36	0		7	THEY	203	0,65	998	0,33
	CRIED	124	0,40	36	0,01	8	IT	507	1,62	3.285	1,07
0	FACTORY	74	0,24	7		9	LITTLE	105	0,34	376	0,12
4	SHOUTED	78	0,25	21		0	SCREAMED	21	0,07	8	
6	GUM	53	0,17	3		1	EVERY	54	0,17	118	0,04
8	TICKET	52	0,17	5		2	SCREEN	20	0,06	7	
2	GOLDEN	54	0,17	12		3	GREAT	50	0,16	104	0,03
3	SAID	338	1,08	1.291	0,42	4	FUDGE	13	0,04	0	
5	AND	1.136	3,63	6.977	2,28	5	BLUEBERRY	13	0,04	0	
7	GRANDMA	39	0,12	0		6	BAR	30	0,10	35	0,01

8	ALL	262	0,84	913	0,30	7	ARE	108	0,35	423	0,14
9	CHEWING	41	0,13	4		8	CREAM	19	0,06	8	
1	TELEVISION	41	0,13	11		9	EVERYBODY	20	0,06	10	
2	VITAMIN	28	0,09	1		0	MACHINE	22	0,07	16	
4	LIFT	42	0,13	24		1	YELLED	14	0,04	2	
5	IT'S	118	0,38	323	0,11	2	MOST	45	0,14	102	0,03
7	HE'S	64	0,20	103	0,03	3	RIVER	29	0,09	39	0,01
0	TINY	38	0,12	30		4	THEY'RE	29	0,09	39	0,01
1	CHILDREN	51	0,16	69	0,02	5	FASTER	16	0,05	6	
2	SWEETS	20	0,06	1		6	BEANS	14	0,04	3	
3	DEAR	42	0,13	49	0,02	7	DON'T	92	0,29	368	0,12
4	ENORMOUS	26	0,08	10		8	WHIZZING	10	0,03	0	
5	TICKETS	19	0,06	1		9	CHUTE	10	0,03	0	
7	SQUIRREL	16	0,05	0		0	OH	51	0,16	144	0,05
8	YOU	420	1,34	2.532	0,83	1	OUT	162	0,52	848	0,28
9	BARS	21	0,07	5		2	PIPE	20	0,06	18	
	WHOLE	4	0,1	72	0,0		WRAPPER	1	0,0	2	

0		6	5		2	3		2	4		
1	BUTTON	20	0,06	4		4	MARVELLOUS	12	0,04	2	
5	THEM	117	0,37	541	0,18	21	FANTASTIC	11	0,04	5	
6	DAY	59	0,19	188	0,06	22	BUTTONS	7	0,02	0	
7	UP	157	0,50	818	0,27	23	BED	37	0,12	106	0,03
8	WORKERS	13	0,04	4		24	LUCKY	17	0,05	21	
9	BOAT	29	0,09	50	0,02	25	HUGE	17	0,05	21	
0	GRANDPARENTS	9	0,03	0		26	SEE	86	0,27	403	0,13
1	GOING	73	0,23	279	0,09	27	UPS	8	0,03	1	
2	RUSHING	11	0,04	2		28	SUCKING	8	0,03	1	
3	GO	87	0,28	368	0,12	29	THERE'S	33	0,11	89	0,03
4	TERRIFIC	10	0,03	1		30	WATCH	22	0,07	40	0,01
5	ROOM	76	0,24	304	0,10	31	CEILING	11	0,04	6	
6	IS	159	0,51	870	0,28	32	VERY	80	0,26	370	0,12
7	SUDDENLY	42	0,13	116	0,04	33	LISTEN	18	0,06	26	
8	GLASS	29	0,09	57	0,02	34	RUSHED	13	0,04	11	
9	INSIDE	31	0,10	66	0,02	35	FIVE	29	0,09	72	0,02

00	SUGAR	11	0,04	3		36	NOW	109	0,35	576	0,19	
01	SHRIEKED	11	0,04	3		37	DO	109	0,35	577	0,19	
02	DELICIOUS	11	0,04	3		38	BIRTHDAY	9	0,03	3		
03	AROUND	40	0,13	109	0,04	39	THE	1.594	5,09	13.496	4,41	
04	WATERFALL	8	0,03	0		40	STANDING	25	0,08	58	0,02	
05	SHOPKEEPER	8	0,03	0		41	WALNUTS	6	0,02	0		
06	PIECES	15	0,05	11		42	CATERPILLARS	6	0,02	0		
07	SNOW	15	0,05	11		43	CAMERA	8	0,03	2		
08	PLEASE	29	0,09	59	0,02	44	WHISPERED	19	0,06	34	0,01	
09	FAT	16	0,05	14		45	TREMENDOUS	10	0,03	6		
10	SUCK	9	0,03	1		46	UNDERNEATH	9	0,03	4		
11	BOY	42	0,13	124	0,04	47	RUBBISH	9	0,03	4		
12	OLD	63	0,20	242	0,08	48	CABBAGE	7	0,02	1		
13	THAT'S	44	0,14	135	0,04	49	THIS	146	0,47	869	0,28	
14	EAT	17	0,05	18		50	GIGANTIC	8	0,03	3		
15	COMES	18	0,06	21		51	MILLION	8	0,03	3		
	LOOK	6	0,1	236	0,0		THOUSAN	8	0,0	3		

16		1	9		8	52	DS		3		
17	ONE	144	0,46	803	0,26	53	JOKING	8	0,03	3	
18	JUST	88	0,28	411	0,13	54	BEARD	9	0,03	5	
19	THERE	157	0,50	901	0,29	55	WONDERFUL	17	0,05	30	
20	SOUP	11	0,04	5		56	ON	268	0,86	1.864	0,61
57	PIECE	16	0,05	27							
58	TASTE	14	0,04	20							
59	INVENTING	7	0,02	2							

The keywords are listed according to keyness, most key coming first, and so on, missing numbers are proper nouns which I omitted. The third column shows the frequency of the word in 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory', the fourth the percentage of the text in total. Then there is the number of occurrences in the reference corpus, and the percentage of the total. Negative keywords are 'thought', 'he', 'if', 'been', 'was', 'not', 'I', 'her', 'had', 'she'.

I put some of the keywords into categories. The pink shows the 'boosters' already discussed above. 'Blue' is for words that might be needed for a summary, they indicate what the text is about. Green is for the different kinds of tags. 'Shouted', 'screamed', and 'yelled', and 'shrieked' are all keywords which provide evidence for an emotionally heightened atmosphere. There is much screaming going on. When we consider that 'thought' is one of the negative keywords, which means that it occurs much less often in the text than would be expected on the basis of the reference corpus, our impression is substantiated that while the characters in this text scream a lot they do not think much. This is another parallel with television.

In order to see who does the crying, the shrieking and the shouting, it might be useful to compare wordlists made up of word clusters, also to show the repetition of ready-made phrases, hyped up with boosters. 'Cluster' breaks the text into consecutive chunks of a specified number of words and makes a list of the ones which occur more than once. Among the most frequent two word clusters we find 'of course' (33 times), 'my dear' (29 times) and 'little Charlie' (25 times). There is also 'at once' (19 times), 'cried Charlie' (18), 'shouted Mr' (16), 'shrieked Mrs' (8), 'dear boy' (7), 'good Heavens' (7). It will be interesting to see which of these are key phrases (cf. the table on the next page). For better illustration I highlighted some of the key phrases. The negative keyphrases are in red. As we can see 'of course', 'dear boy' and 'good Heavens' are not key phrases even though they occur quite often in the text, at least in my mind seven occurrences of a cliché exclamation like 'good Heavens' is very much. Many key phrases are key because they do not occur at all in the reference corpus. Proper names are obviously in this category, but also other phrases, which is not surprising because my reference corpus is rather small, but the absolute frequencies of the phrases are interesting by themselves. They are listed in terms of keyness but very often the hierarchy is the same.

Key phrases (2word-clusters) WordSmith Tools --

	WORD	FREQ.	CHARLIE.TXT %	REQ OB		WORD	FREQ.	CHARLIE	Freq LOB
	MR WONKA	233	0,78		1	SHOUTED MR	16	0,05	0
	GRANDPA JOE	111	0,37		2	THE CHOCOLATE	15	0,05	0
	SAID MR	109	0,36		3	GOLDEN TICKETS	15	0,05	0
	CRIED MR	52	0,17		4	VIOLET BEAUREGARDE	15	0,05	0
	SAID GRANDPA	40	0,13		5	WONKA SAID	15	0,05	0
	OOMPA-LOOMPAS	39	0,13		6	AND MR	15	0,05	0
	MIKE TEAVEE	37	0,12		7	MRS BUCKET	15	0,05	0
	GOLDEN TICKET	35	0,12		8	GRANDPA GEORGE	14	0,05	0
	OF CHOCOLATE	35	0,12		9	CRIED MRS	13	0,04	0
0	MRS GLOOP	25	0,08		0	SAID ON	16	0,05	3
1	MRS TEAVEE	24	0,08		1	MY DEAR	23	0,08	15
2	THE FACTORY	28	0,09		2	CHARLIE SAID	15	0,05	2
3	THE OOMPA-LOOMPA	23	0,08		3	AN OOMPA-LOOMPA	12	0,04	0
4	LITTLE CHARLIE	22	0,07		4	AND MRS	12	0,04	0
5	THE LIFT	27	0,09		5	SHOUTED GRANDPA	12	0,04	0

6	MR BUCKET	21	0,07		6	SAID GRANDMA	12	0,04	0
7	MR WILLY	20	0,07		7	MR GLOOP	11	0,04	0
8	CHARLIE BUCKET	20	0,07		8	OF GUM	11	0,04	0
9	OOMPA-LOOMPA	20	0,07		9	SAID MIKE	11	0,04	0
0	GRANDMA JOSEPHINE	20	0,07		0	SCREAMED MRS	11	0,04	0
1	MRS SALT	20	0,07		1	SAID MRS	11	0,04	0
2	IT SAID	23	0,08		2	THE GATES	15	0,05	4
3	VERUCA SALT	19	0,06		3	AND GRANDPA	13	0,04	2
4	WILLY WONKA	19	0,06		4	OLD PEOPLE	10	0,03	0
5	CRIED CHARLIE	18	0,06		5	CHEWING-GUM	10	0,03	0
6	AUGUSTUS GLOOP	18	0,06		6	THE PIPE	10	0,03	0
7	MR TEAVEE	18	0,06		7	THE SCREEN	14	0,05	4
8	BAR OF	22	0,07		8	AND CHARLIE	9	0,03	0
9	GRANDMA GEORGINA	17	0,06		9	CACAO BEANS	9	0,03	0
0	MRS BEAUREGARDE	16	0,05		0	CHOCOLATE BARS	9	0,03	0
1	CRIED GRANDPA	9	0,03		3	CHOCOLATE FACTORY	7	0,02	0
2	GREAT BIG	9	0,03		4	THE GOLDEN	10	0,03	4
3	SWEETS THAT	9	0,03		5	THE RIVER	20	0,07	31
	MADE OF	1	0,05			THE AIR	2	0	3

4		5			6		1	,07	5
5	THE GREAT	20	0,07	0	7	WE GO	12	0,04	9
6	THE WHOLE	30	0,10	2	8	ALL OVER	16	0,05	20
7	OF THEM	39	0,13	9	9	THE SNOW	10	0,03	5
8	THE WRAPPER	8	0,03		00	ALL DAY	11	0,04	7
9	SHRIEKED MRS	8	0,03		01	TINY PIECES	6	0,02	0
0	WAIT AND	8	0,03		02	WONKA'S FACTORY	6	0,02	0
1	MR SALT	8	0,03		03	THEIR PARENTS	6	0,02	0
2	DAY LONG	8	0,03		04	OF OOMPA	6	0,02	0
3	BUCKET SAID	8	0,03		05	FIVE CHILDREN	6	0,02	0
4	WONKA WAS	8	0,03		06	FACTORY AND	6	0,02	0
5	GROWN-UPS	8	0,03		07	WATCH TELEVISION	6	0,02	0
6	CHARLIE COULD	8	0,03		08	OTHER END	6	0,02	0
7	BY TELEVISION	8	0,03		09	ASKED MR	6	0,02	0
8	AT CHARLIE	8	0,03		10	STOOD BESIDE	6	0,02	0
9	BARS OF	8	0,03		11	THE BUTTON	6	0,02	0
0	MR AND	8	0,03		12	SHOT OUT	6	0,02	0
1	ASKED CHARLIE	8	0,03		13	CHOCOLATE AND	6	0,02	0
2	THE BOAT	19	0,06	1	14	SHOUTED MRS	6	0,02	0

3	TELEVISION SET	10	0,03		15	A GOLDEN	8	0,03	2
4	THE MOST	19	0,06	4	16	THE FOUR	8	0,03	2
5	THEN SUDDENLY	10	0,03		17	AND STARED	11	0,04	8
6	AND GRANDMA	7	0,02		18	LIKE A	40	0,13	129
7	AND LITTLE	7	0,02		19	I HAD	3	0,01	200
8	MY FACTORY	7	0,02		20	SHE WAS	10	0,03	325
9	YELLED MRS	7	0,02		21	I WAS	3	0,01	232
0	MR WONKA'S	7	0,02		22	HAD BEEN	9	0,03	387
1	INSIDE IT	7	0,02		23	HE HAD	13	0,04	478
2	JOE AND	7	0,02						

Many of the key phrases contain tags, synonyms of say, or scream, and as we can see most of the screaming is done by the women ('yelled', 'shouted', 'shrieked'). Again, there is no thinking, at least there is no keyword that has to do with thought processes. Tags have come to be associated with children's fiction because 'the written 'tag' has to substitute for the change in voice tone or colour which may distinguish orally imitated speakers' (Hunt 1988: 175), a relic from storytelling as an event completely controlled by the teller. Hunt (1988: 176) asks:

> Are children's novels more prone to tagging? Can the process be reversed: if we perceive control of speech and thought presentation, do we deduce we are reading a children's book? (Hunt 1988: 176)

The fact that many of the key words are tags and that the reference corpus has no section of children's fiction, suggests that there is more tagging in a certain kind of children's book at least.

As far as the clusters are concerned, 3-word clusters that are key phrases are 'all day long' (8 occurrences), 'wait and see' (8), and 'my dear boy' (7), all pre-made phrases. None of the 4-word clusters are key, but even so 'cluster' is quite useful in uncovering ready-made phrases and lining them up, and showing just how many there are. Because ready-made chunks are often unoriginal phrases and tend to occur more than once this function serves to bring to light repetition and cliché. The following table shows some of them.

4-word clusters

N	Word	Freq.
1	ALL IN GOOD TIME	3
2	AND I'LL TELL YOU	2
3	AS GOOD AS EVER	2
4	FROM EAR TO EAR	2
5	FROM HEAD TO TOE	2
6	FROM MORNING TILL NIGHT	2
7	GET A CLOSER LOOK	2
8	JUST SO LONG AS	2
9	JUST WAIT AND SEE	3
10	LOOK LIKE A SKELETON	2
11	SIMPLY STOOD AND STARED	2
12	THE MOST WONDERFUL PLACE	2
13	THEN ALL AT ONCE	3
14	THERE ISN'T A HOPE	2
15	TO A STICKY END	2
16	WHAT ON EARTH DO	2
17	WHAT ON EARTH'S GOING	2
18	YOU WAIT AND SEE	4

All of these clusters are pre-made phrases, which by themselves, used sparsely might not be signs of a restrictive text. There are quite many of them,

however, they are typical of the book, and all of the above ones are used at least twice. 'Then all at once', like 'suddenly', which is a key word, is an oral discourse marker that has become a cliché, a 'standard phrase', in children's literature. 'You wait and see', and 'I'll tell you' mark the way an adult speaks to a child, which can easily be condescending. Some of the others are proverbs. This list of clusters shows the repetition of ready-made phrases, which are interspersed and hyped up with boosters.

Another sign that that this is an extremely closed children's book in which everything is simplified is that the newspaper is presented just as the spoken idiom, there is no difference in register (Dahl 1995: 33, 46). Mr Bucket reads the paper out loud to the family:

> There was great excitement when our reporter arrived to interview the lucky young lady – cameras were clicking and flashbulbs were flashing and people were pushing and jostling and trying to get a bit closer to the famous girl (46).

This might be funny if it was set off against a distinctly different background but as it is, it is no different from the rest of the book, the kind of language that some adults think children like, or that they think is even the only language children can understand.

On the whole this oversimplification is true for the entire book, on the levels of content, plot, and vocabulary. The story is more than straightforward. The simple plot can be summed up in one sentence. A small poor boy is lucky in finding a golden ticket inside a chocolate bar which gains him entry to a magical chocolate factory, and, after a tour of the factory he is singled out as heir. Everything is as clear-cut and certain as can be, the good are very good, and the bad, very bad. There are no different attitudes, or points of view suggested or even possible (at least not inscribed in the text), there is action, not the least bit of doubt, or the least speculation.

This might be said to be true for many 'typical' children's books, which are about things that happen, (e.g. adventure stories), what is surprising in this one is how passive the children are, how little control they have over the events. Things happen to the bad children, and things happen to the good child Charlie (rather than that the children happen to things). The only exception is when the 'bad children' do naughty things during their tour around the factory, and, significantly, are subsequently punished for them. Charlie is much less active than they are – the well-behaved, good, and passive child that does not ask cheeky questions. Ironically, the most active he ever gets, is when he finds the fifty-pence piece, and even this is something that happens to him. He does not earn it, or steal it, but finds

it. He buys a chocolate bar, and finds the Golden Ticket (Dahl 1995: 59ff.). Throughout the book he is passive. At first he suffers from hunger with the rest of his family, and is cheered by his grandfather's stories about the chocolate factory. The questions he asks of his grandfather are more like promptings than real questions (cf. Dahl 1995: 20ff.). Then he is lucky, finds the ticket, and is finally shown around the factory by Mr Wonka, who is clearly in every way the star showing off, while Charlie is an obedient, attentive, and admiring audience.

In 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory', the divide is between good adults/good children and bad adults/bad children, this makes it different from the similarly black-and-white Blyton novels, for instance where the children are quite separate from the adult world. There are fairy-tale contrasts. The poor starving boy contrasts with the chocolate factory, his goodness and poverty with the 'badness' of the spoilt children. It is a story that lives on extremes. Charlie is clearly presented just as 'lovely sweet' (1995: 17) as the chocolate he craves for, which acquires the importance of life-saving nourishment.

By what linguistic means is our impression of the sweet child created, how is sympathy created? Charlie's helplessness is emphasized if not exaggerated by the only adjectival collocate that qualifies his name, 'little'. Of the 105 overall occurrences of 'little', 25 qualify Charlie, by far more than any of the other children. Twice it qualifies 'friends', twice 'children', both including Charlie, four times 'girl', twice 'boy', once 'boys and girls'. The following concordance shows the 25 occurrences of 'little' in connection with Charlie. I reorganized and highlighted the lines for better illustration.

Concordance: little Charlie

N	
1	them. The rest of the party, including little Charlie Bucket and Grandpa Joe, s
2	ather, Charlie's mother, and especially little Charlie himself - went about from
3	ily- the six grown-ups (count them) and little Charlie Bucket- live together in
4	e lift stood Mr Wonka, Grandpa Joe, and little Charlie. 'How I love my chocola
5	Mr and Mrs Teavee and Grandpa Joe and little Charlie and Mr Wonka all gathered
6	a on this side. Mr and Mrs Bucket and little Charlie Bucket slept in the other
7	was sitting in the back of the boat and little Charlie Bucket was right beside h
8	afraid you can't stop them singing.' Little Charlie caught Grandpa Joe's hand
9	im, holding tightly on to his hand, was little Charlie Bucket himself. All the

10	huge brown sticky lake of chocolate.' Little Charlie sat very still on the edg
11	to his feet and caught hold of a strap.'Little Charlie, who couldn't possibly
12	and bubbling. By standing on his toes, little Charlie could just see inside it.
13	how many children are there left now?' Little Charlie looked at Grandpa Joe, an
14	ing into that place - or coming out?' Little Charlie looked slowly around at e
15	'But how do you come down again?' asked little Charlie. 'You do a burp, of cou
16	a and his factory?' 'Never,' answered little Charlie. 'Good heavens above! I
17	o runny!' 'But that's impossible.' said little Charlie, staring at his grandfa
18	d there chewing this extraordinary gum. Little Charlie Bucket was staring at her
19	about it,' he said. 'Mine, too,' said little Charlie. 'But please go on.' Whil
20	house began to starve. And every day, little Charlie Bucket, trudging 56 t
21	e a day, on his way to and from school, little Charlie Bucket had to walk right
22	dpa Joe, and Grandpa Joe looked back at little Charlie. 'But Mr Wonka,' Grandpa
23	185 whole of this enormous factory to little Charlie? After all . . .' 'Ther
24	should you want to give your factory to little Charlie?' 'Listen,' Mr Wonka sa
25	about the one awful thing that tortured little Charlie, the lover of chocolate,

The first six concordance lines show Charlie as part of a group of people. In all of the enumerations he comes last, and is clearly identified as the child by the adjectival collocate. The others, mostly grown-ups, are not qualified at all. In lines 7 to 10 his helplessness and sweetness are again emphasized, in 7, 8, and 9 he is close to a grown-up, his grandfather, holding on to him for comfort and support by typical childlike gestures. Lines 11 and 12 emphasize his physical inferiority as a child in a world that is adjusted to the height of adults. Lines 13 to 19 show him in conversation, asking questions and giving answers, doing a lot of 'looking' and 'staring' which again emphasize his bewilderment and innocence. In lines 20 and 21 he is walking, but the word choice of line 20 can be seen as again asking for sympathy. Trudging is a cliché that seems typical of children's literature, and in line 21 his neediness is shown. In 22-25 he is the passive goal of processes out of his control.

All in all, this concordance gives the impression of little Charlie as a rather pathetic child or an ideal one, depending on point of view. This text certainly sets up the passive obedient child as an ideal. Like in the Disney movies, empathy is created by what is meant to be a particularly sweet childlikeness. The characteristics of small children, physical and otherwise, which are meant to trigger

adults' sympathies, are exaggerated and overemphasized to create the sweet entirely non-threatening child, a child which conforms totally to adult expectations without challenging any of them, by showing the kind of liveliness that some adults disapprove of. Charlie is the personification of the sweet child with hardly an expansionary side to his nature, a type, devoid of anything that would make him an individual.

The same is true for the other characters. There is no psychological depth to them, only moral assessment of a superficial kind, which is limited and limiting (good children – bad children). Slightly modernized vices are attacked in an old-fashioned way, only exception is the pseudo-psychology, in the case of Veruca's parents, who are found at fault for spoiling her (148), but what about the unloved fat boy? And if we take Mr Teavee's rudeness to his son ('Shut up' 157) as a hint to his general behavior towards him it is no surprise he has grown into the boy he is and wants to watch TV all day. The TV song (173f.) has an extremely simplistic moral. Underneath the layer of superficial anarchy of the story children are reduced to puppets that have to be trained to behave according to the rules of the grown ups.

The underling wins, but the poor boy seems to be the one best loved by his parents and grandparents, while in a sense the fat unloved boy, who on top of everything is being punished, can be seen as the real loser. The story is very simplistic and old-fashioned in this sense too.

Wonka can in many ways be seen as the most important character, the film is quite appropriately called 'Mr Wonka and the Chocolate factory'. He is also the most prominent character in the book, even though he is not the 'hero'. Correspondingly, his name occurs more often than Charlie's ('Wonka' 296 times, 'Charlie' 221) even though Wonka's first appearance is only in chapter 13, on page 75. He is the pseudo-child, authoritative as an immature grown-up, but misbehaves like a child may in showing off his toys ('like a child among his Christmas presents' 114). He represents the negative side of childhood, of undesirable childhood characteristics the adult has not managed to leave behind. In that he is a foil to Charlie, who only represents the passive 'sweet' childhood characteristics. Wonka is impatient, and does not respond to the children. He wants to show them what he wants, not what the children would like to see (except once), he complains about their 'silly questions' (112) and does not bear to be contradicted. He is the child, and a very intolerant dogmatic child. The contrast between Wonka and Charlie, and the way they are treated in the text, the strict moralizing when it comes to children, and the indulgence towards the misbehaviour of an adult implied in the text, in my opinion reflect very negative adult attitudes towards childhood. Some adults grudge it the children, possibly because of their own need to catch up on what they have

missed out.

Then Wonka uses his adult authority to put children in their place. For instance, he misunderstands Violet intentionally and is rude about it.

> '[…] You can put an Everlasting Gobstopper in your mouth and you can suck it and suck it and suck it and suck it and it will never get any smaller!' 'It's like gum!' cried Violet Beauregarde. 'It's *not* like gum,' Mr Wonka said. 'Gum is for chewing, and if you tried chewing one of these Gobstoppers here you'd break your teeth off!' (116)

But Violet is right: in this one respect, that it never gets any smaller, the Gobstopper is like gum, and she does not say that it is gum. Wonka deliberately misunderstands the children, and in a similar way many of the conversations go wrong. Wonka hurls insults at children and adults alike. He is condescending, talks down to them, the way he behaves is the worst way an adult can use his authority over children. An example is when he explains his Hair Toffee to the children.

> '[…] But I'll get the mixture right soon! And when I do, then there'll be no excuse any more for little boys and girls going about with bald heads!' 'But Mr Wonka,' said Mike Teavee, 'little boy and girls never *do* go about with…' 'Don't argue, my dear child, *please* don't argue!' cried Mr Wonka. 'It's such a waste of precious time! Now, over *here*, if you will all step this way, I will show you something that I am terrifically proud of. Oh, do be careful! Don't knock anything over! Stand back!' (117)

The children are to accept anything unquestioningly so that Wonka has the perfect audience for his show, and presumably for his narcissistic gratification.

He does not use his adult authority, where it would be necessary, on the other hand, namely when the children are in danger, for instance when Violet wants to try the magic gum that is still in a test stage.

> 'I want the gum!' Violet said obstinately. 'What's so silly?' 'I would rather you didn't take it,' Mr Wonka told her gently. 'You see, I haven't got it *quite right* yet. There are still one or two things…' (1995: 122)

What happens to the 'bad' children is in many ways Wonka's fault. As rude as he is to them at times, when it comes to real danger he is gentle and polite, as if he wants them to go into the trap, which is probably true because he plans to single out one of them.

Only a small amount of talking is done by the children. In the factory Charlie says hardly anything. The others are told off for talking too much, or talking back, or asking the wrong questions. "Don't argue, my dear child, please don't argue!' cried Mr Wonka. 'It's such a waste of precious time!" (117) The attitude towards children is that the good child is the quiet child, who accepts everything with wondering eyes and without criticism. "Don't interrupt" (133), and "You're mumbling again" (133) are

Wonka's reactions to perfectly normal questions. After all, 'What does a snozzberry taste like?' (133) is not an absurd or rude question. Charlie is shy enough for Wonka's taste, he asks much less than the other children.

The way Wonka speaks to the Oompa-Loompas is in line with his behaviour towards the children. He speaks like a very bad-mannered businessman: 'Look here, if you and all your people will come back to my country and live in my factory, you can have *all* the cacao beans you want' (95). 'Look here' sets the tone for a superior speaking down to somebody. And surely something in this proposition is omitted, namely the fact that he means 'work in my factory', not only live. He talks of them as if they were goods which he 'smuggled over in large packing cases' (95f.). When he speaks of the leaves they wear and that they 'insist upon that' it becomes clear that he has a say in all matters of their life, otherwise there would be no need for them to 'insist' upon wearing what they want to wear – or Wonka would not talk about it in this way.

There is much of what children may be expected to find funny in the description of the Oompa-Loompas, that they look different, that they are short people, etc. But added to all this is a certain simplistic view of the world that may go down as well, unnoticed (cf. 101f.). The hierarchy there is, for instance, the fact, that there seems to be no need to respect these workers. "Now listen to me!' said Mr Wonka looking down at the tiny man.' (102) 'Listen to me' is again a marker of his superiority and 'looking down' is quite symbolic of the way he is talking down to him. Wonka says "You silly ass" (134) to an Oompa-Loompa who is used as a guinea pig for testing 'Fizzy Lifting Drinks' (133). 'I gave some to an old Oompa-Loompa once out in the back yard' (134). The Oompa-Loompa rises up in the air and is never seen again. This irresponsible behaviour is comparable to shooting an old dog.

Some of all this may have to do with when the book was written, which was in 1964. The fact that it is so dated says something about its lack of quality. The attitude towards women is bothersome to the literary reader, in the way it is not in some classics that are much older, because in 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' there is no point to the stereotypical caricatures, they are just presented as if they were normal people.

Charlie's mother does not go out to work, and there is no thought of her going to factory and leaving the old people (cf. 73). Women are described as if they were not real people, note for instance the animal imagery when Mrs Salt is described as 'a great fat creature with short legs, […] blowing like a rhinoceros' (137). This lack of respect may in fact appeal to children but the approval is cheaply won, in my opinion, because it relies on their own need to compensate, to raise their own value by diminishing that of another, in this case a mother figure.

Similarly, clichés about old people are reinforced, their self-pronounced modesty taken so far that they do not even need food. '[…] that child has *got* to have more food. It doesn't matter about us. We're too old to bother with. But a *growing boy*!' (58)

On the whole, it can be said that the text reinforces clichés about the nature of children, women, and old people, and this can be clearly seen in the conventional language used by them, and used to describe them. I think it altogether reinforces ways of thinking, already existing negative patterns, or in the terms of Cook's schema theory (1994), it is schema-reinforcing.

Extreme simplification on the one hand, and an emotional atmosphere created by all kinds of boosters and word plays on the other, contribute to this end, and to disguise as merely 'fun' what in reality is an extremely conservative, even didactic text. The following example illustrates this. There is didacticism, but presented in what is supposed to be a funny way. It works with simplification, exaggeration, and repetition.

> 'The cacao bean [...] which grows on the cacao tree happens to be *the thing* from which all chocolate is made. You cannot make chocolate without the cacao bean. The cacao bean *is* chocolate.' (94f.)

The impression left, in my opinion, is a vague idea that somehow chocolate and cocoa beans are related, or even almost the same thing. So much about the attempt to bring across tiny pieces of factual knowledge.

There is also undisguised moral didacticism. The reader is reminded of his luck because he is not as poor as Charlie.

> Most of us find ourselves beginning to crave rich steaming stews and hot apple pies and all kinds of delicious warming dishes; and because we are all a great deal luckier than we realize, we usually get what we want – or near enough. But Charlie Bucket never got what he wanted (1995: 56).

This is odious because it assumes a certain kind of reader, one who has enough of everything, which is not necessarily the case, and then it is presumptuous because the author assumes to know that the reader is a spoilt child that does not appreciate all he has got. And the idea that the child who has enough to eat is already lucky is clearly more than simplistic.

This leads to the question to what extent 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' is a compensatory fantasy, the vent of a child's or former child's aggressions, which should be directed at those who cause suffering and are displaced, in the direction of schadenfreude, and directed at those worse off than oneself. In this sense it is a very limiting anarchy that is presented here, the superficial fun element disguises

the maintenance of the status quo of a very disturbed reality.

There is no complexity, only black and white, no questions left, and most of the questions in the story are rhetoric questions. Good and poor, and bad and rich go together but in a way that is more questionable than in some fairytales because 'good' has come to mean well-behaved, undemanding, what adults want of children, and 'bad' has come to include or even mean, fat, cheeky, and disturbed (the children who are addicted to television and gum, respectively).

As 'good' and 'bad' are distorted, so are notions of happiness and unhappiness. Happiness has come to be associated with the 'paradise' of the chocolate factory, with having an abundance of sweets forever, while unhappiness means the bleak reality outside, where a child does not even have enough to eat. Both extremes justify and depend upon each other. The chocolate factory is almost a parallel universe, though it is in the same world technically, but it is completely separate from society, and the rules are laid down by Wonka. The underground chocolate landscape gives the impression of chocolate as a natural resource. There is a river, a 'mountain made entirely of fudge', and 'a lake of hot caramel' (154). The miniature world is made more real by the little inhabitants, the Oompa-Loompas, and their villages. It is a kind of chocolate arcadia ruled by the omnipotent Wonka, and can be seen as a megalomaniac chocolate fantasy.

This universe revolves around sweets, which in the story acquire the importance of life-saving nourishment, at the very center of life, not as an additional extra, in particular because they contrast with Charlie's previous starvation.

It is a very artificial paradise, however. The landscapes further the illusion that sweets or chocolate are natural and essential, while in fact they are artificial and contrived, as is the moral fabric of the story in my opinion. Fairyland is not a place of unlimited, infinite possibilities (cf. Hunt 1988), but a very narrow exclusive place for the well-behaved and obedient only, where the meaning of life is reduced to the consumption of sweets. Sweets have always been the treat for 'good' children, in the sense of well-trained, well-adjusted, undemanding children, so this factory must seem paradise for every child who has been trained to want to be 'good', craving adult approval in the form of sweets, as a substitute for real love which would presuppose acceptance of the child as a whole being, not a trained puppet. This fantasy perpetuates a system that reduces children to receptacles of adult expectations and victims to adults' moralizing. Children deprived in this way of real love in fact must have an overwhelming need for sweets, and a 'chocolate factory', which caters to one instinct only, where the only purpose of existence is the gratification of this one oral need that the story centers around. Sweets can therefore be seen as compensation and substitute for all the different things that can

normally make life wonderful but are unavailable to the child that has been trained to fulfil contradictory and unhealthy adult expectations rather than been allowed to develop an own personality. That so many children like the book can be seen as a sign of this unfulfilled need, and this misdirection of desires, and dreams towards adult approval as symbolized by sweets.

Sweets can only acquire this overwhelming importance if children's modesty is celebrated on the other hand, (otherwise there would be less emotional importance in chocolate), their self-denial seen as something positive, their needs misdirected or left unfulfilled. But how is this done in the book?

It seems that it is mainly by an emphasis on the 'bad' characteristics of childhood, children's aggressions, the excessive demands they make on weak adults, that this system of domination is justified. An example is the rich Mr. Salt, who ostentatiously spoils his daughter. He has his whole factory unwrap tons of chocolate bars to find the Golden Ticket that his spoilt daughter has demanded, which will gain her entry into Wonka's magical chocolate factory. Finally he is lucky and finds the ticket.

> […] and I rushed it home and gave it to my darling Veruca, and now she's all smiles, and we have a happy home once again.' 'That's even worse than the fat boy,' said Grandma Josephine. 'She needs a really good spanking,' said Grandma Georgina. [...] 'He spoils her,' Grandpa Joe said. 'And no good can ever come from spoiling a child like that, Charlie, you mark my words.' (41)

Every time Veruca screams 'I want…' her father gives in. Finally, the 'little brute' (147) as she is called in the Oompa-Loompa song, finally meets her deserved end and goes down the rubbish chute. That this small girl is probably very unhappy with all her 'wants', and her weak parents, is of no interest in the story, she belongs to the 'bad' children.

The Salt family contrasts with Charlie's grandparents, who take a decidedly different view on the upbringing of children, necessarily, as there is not even enough cabbage for Charlie. The opposition is here between good children/adults and bad children/adults. The last remark is even addressed to Charlie, who is spoken to like an adult by the grandfather. As his prediction turns out to be correct in the course of the story, as Veruca is later thrown down the garbage chute as a 'bad nut' (143), his grandparents' old-fashioned ideas of the upbringing of children and their belief in strict discipline seem to be justified. In fact, as far as different attitudes towards the upbringing of children are concerned, the good old ways of the poor are contrasted with the ridiculous new methods of the vulgar nouveau riche (as the name of the daughter, 'Veruca' seems to suggest), but more generally, of modern times. This is also expressed in their reaction to a newspaper article about Mike Teavee, the

fourth finder of a Golden Ticket and the boy, who is obsessed about television.

> 'That's quite enough! snapped Grandma Josephine. 'I can't *bear* to listen to it!' 'Nor me,' said Grandma Georgina. 'Do *all* children behave like this nowadays - like these brats we've been hearing about?' 'Of course not,' said Mr Bucket, smiling at the old lady in the bed. 'Some do, of course. In fact, quite a lot of them do. But not *all*.' 'And now there's only *one ticket left*!' said Grandpa George. 'Quite so,' sniffed Grandma Georgina. 'And just as sure as I'll be having cabbage soup for supper tomorrow, that ticket'll go to some nasty little beast who doesn't deserve it!' (51)

The fifth ticket goes to Charlie, who is on the other, the good side of the divide between the good and the bad children. Having been brought up in an old-fashioned way it seems that he has none of the 'modern' vices of the other children, which at various points of the story are attributed to the lenience of their parents, or rather an unhealthy overindulgence, most explicitly so in one of the Oompa-Loompas' moralizing songs (cf. 148). At the same time, Charlie seems to be the best loved of the children, so this may in fact be the reason for why he has turned out the way he is, shy and passive and insecure but arguably not as disturbed as some of the others. Charlie's parents and grandparents may be poor but they treat him much better, with more love, than the parents of the other children treat them, as can be seen when they have their accidents.

In Charlie's personality all the qualities adults often wish children to have are combined. Wonka lists them when he explains his choice of Charlie as his heir, the qualities he mentions ideally set off children from adults and the good children from the bad children in the story.

> Mind you, there are thousands of clever men who would give anything for the chance to come in and take over from me, but I don't want that sort of person. I don't want a grown-up person at all. A grown-up won't listen to me; he won't learn. He will try to do things his own way and not mine. So I have to have a child. I want a good sensible loving child, one to whom I can tell all my most precious sweet-making secrets (Dahl 1964/1995: 185).

'Good sensible loving' are qualities that are set up throughout the text as distinguishing the ideal child. It is a combination, a 'package' of values or qualities, of the kind that Hollindale (1988: 38) suggests is worth looking into for the reader interested in the ideology of a text. Is there a fusion of values not necessarily connected with one another? What are the qualities of Charlie, the child hero, the 'good sensible loving child'? For one thing, what he shares with others of Dahl's child characters (Matilda, James, Sophie) is a 'talent for wonderment and gentleness' (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996). Charlie takes an innocent and quiet pleasure in the wonders he sees: his happiness is unspoiled and complete (cf. 90, 109). He also worries about the other children every time something bad happens to

them (cf. 105, 130). In contrast to them, he trusts Wonka, and this unconditional, childlike trust is one of the things Wonka asks for on the crazy trip on which he takes them.

What 'good sensible loving', however, comes to mean in the story, is, above anything else obedience, 'sensibly' doing things the way Mr. Wonka wants them to be done, which is, after all, in his opinion the distinguishing difference between adults and children (cf. 185). Charlie is not given a chance to develop, and be himself, but rather an extension of Wonka. This ideal of what a child should be like is upheld throughout the story. Personified by Charlie, it is reinforced by constant contrasts with negative examples. The ideal of 'good' is upheld to the children and serves to limit and control them. "Well, well, well,' sighed Mr Willy Wonka, 'two naughty little children gone. Three good little children left" (130). In the end, however, only Charlie is left because the other four children with golden tickets have brought punishment upon themselves for their different vices, but ultimately for their disobedience. Greedy Augustus Gloop, who is the first to go, for instance, drinks out of the chocolate river, although he is forbidden to do so by Mr. Wonka, and falls in (98), and similar fates befall the others.

The obedience that Wonka asks for also includes an unquestioning acceptance of the wonders of the factory. This also sets Charlie apart from the other children in the story, who do not have this 'talent for wonderment' (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996) anymore. Mike Teavee, for instance, refuses to accept Wonka's pseudo-rational explanation of the functioning of television. It is this an explanation which is meant to appeal to children because it reflects a child's very literal understanding of technology.

> The photographs are then split up into million of tiny little pieces which are so small that you can't see them, and these little pieces are shot out into the sky by electricity. In the sky they go whizzing around all over the place until suddenly they hit the antenna on the roof of somebody's house (158).

Wonka is so much in love with his own explanation, which on his part we may call 'childish', particularly because he defends it with such vigour against a real child, that he silences Mike Teavee's justified objections authoritatively.

> 'That isn't exactly how it works,' Mike Teavee said. 'I am a little deaf in my left ear,' Mr Wonka said. 'You must forgive me if I don't hear everything you say.' 'I said, that isn't exactly how it works!' shouted Mike Teavee. 'You're a nice boy,' Mr Wonka said, 'but you talk too much [...]' (158 f.)

Mike Teavee quite logically responds to Mr. Wonka's pretense, which he does not recognize as such, by a louder repetition of what he just said. Now Wonka cannot pretend not to hear any longer and takes recourse to a stock adult response to

children's uncomfortable questions: 'you talk too much'. In his interactions with children Mr. Wonka always has the last word. What he says remains unquestioned and uncontradicted in the text. As we can see, pretending not to have heard what the child has said is one of his strategies to disparage, discredit, or ignore the child's point of view. When Violet Beauregarde for instance chews a piece of gum as yet in its experimental stages and is turned into a blueberry Wonka says:

> '[…] But there you are! That's what comes from chewing disgusting gum all day long!' 'If you think gum is so disgusting,' said Mike Teavee, 'then why do you make it in you factory?' 'I do wish you wouldn't mumble,' said Mr. Wonka. 'I can't hear a word you're saying […]' (130)

To me it seems that this is a logical question Mike is perfectly justified in asking. It is, however, not a comfortable one, as it exposes adult hypocrisy. Finding a satisfactory answer for it might in fact be quite difficult and it would involve taking the child who asks seriously. Therefore Wonka chooses not to hear it.

The 'good loving sensible' child in this story is the obedient one that does not ask uncomfortable questions. The magic world of Wonka's factory is a place where some of the physical rules and laws of the outside world may be suspended but this is certainly not true for the social conventions that unfortunately still govern many interactions between adults and children, and give adults too much power. It is not really a place of escape from the world children are socialized into. If anything, the role of children is more restricted inside than outside the factory, the only thing they are allowed to do is follow Mr. Wonka around and admire quietly the wonders of his factory. Mr. Wonka stands for the same old-fashioned values as Charlie's grandparents (but they are much nicer), and shares not only their views on children who watch too much television, but on their attitudes towards children's upbringing in general. For instance, showing the children around his 'television-chocolate room' (156), Wonka nevertheless states

> I don't like television myself [...] They [the children] want to sit there all day long staring and staring at the screen …' 'That's me!' said Mike Teavee. 'Shut up!' said Mr Teavee. 'Thank you, 'said Mr Wonka. 'I shall now tell you how this amazing television set of mine works.' (157)

As a statement on the rights of children in conversation with adults, it is difficult to imagine how it could be any harsher. The question is of course why children should think this is funny – possibly because it is so extreme and gives release to their own aggressions. What it says is clearly that children ought to speak when they are spoken to and there is no need to be polite to them as one would be to an equal partner.

All things considered, there can be no doubt that the 'good sensible loving'

child in this story can be equated with the quiet obedient acquiescent child. I think we can say that this is the attitude towards children that prevails as all opinions along these lines are voiced by the positively connoted adult characters and are neither contradicted nor satirized. This holds true for the grandparents, who as characters are weak and slightly ridiculous but nevertheless respected in the text (though as very stereotypical old people), but most of all for Mr. Wonka, who, as his interactions with the children of the story quite consistently show, shares their authoritarian attitude to the upbringing of children.

In conclusion, we can say that at least as far as attitudes towards children and childhood are concerned, the tale is anything but 'anarchical', except in the sense of 'hostile against social institutions'. It is set in the tradition of the moralizing tale, but the values it carries are slightly, but only slightly, different. Augustus is punished for eating too much whereas Hoffman's Augustus in 'The English Struwwelpeter' (in Demers and Moyles 1982: 301) is punished for not eating enough. This reflects a radical change in the values which are transmitted to children and shows their transience. The other children are also punished for 'modern' vices, like chewing gum, and watching television. Yet in the kind of transmission, the way this is done, the attitude taken, the way in which undesired child behavior is criticized, there is no difference. It is dogmatic and conventional, full of moralizing and of nostalgia for times past. As in a cautionary tale, as which this story can be seen, there is the raised forefinger. The characters are ideal abstractions of positive or negative qualities, and have an exemplary didactic function.

The factory may be the adult's idea of the child's world but in reality it is not the child's world at all, it resembles rather an adult's play room with perfect toys the child is not allowed to touch, which are used to test the child's obedience, and self-control. The wonders may be quite extraordinary, of the kind children are attracted to but the opinions expressed are quite old-fashioned.

The story also has elements of parody, or grotesque. His parents do not love the poor fat boy enough (cf. 98), and normally he would be pitiable, but he is so ridiculed, and the reader is so distanced that there is no sympathy. The extremity of the situation, of Augustus Gloop getting stuck in the pipe (cf. 99) has a farcical quality, while in reality he would be dead. Because people in the story are not described in a realistic way and have a comic strip quality, what happens to him seems not as cruel or serious as it would otherwise. People are like rubber and it is all a big joke. What happens to the children, and the adults' reactions to their accidents (cf. e.g. 100f.), which show their cruelty, are grotesque and absurd.

Critics speak of the 'savagery of Dahl's work' (Watson 2001). He certainly

appeals to the darker side of children's nature, as already discussed above, their brutality towards one another and towards adults, their need to compensate. It all boils down to very moralistic and fixed ideas of 'goodness' and 'badness', inner life, psychology are irrelevant and discounted.

Dahl himself, claiming to speak for the child, explains his attitude to children's writing.

> 'children are much more vulgar than grown ups. They have a coarser sense of humour. They are basically more cruel. So often, though, adults judge a book by their own, rather than the child's standards.' (Dahl in Watson 2001).

He makes it appear as if this were by necessity so. In his story, however, there is a very contrived contrast between the 'extremely good', i.e. well-behaved, and the 'bad', i.e. disturbed, spoilt, cheeky, demanding children. The bad children who take all the blame and are ridiculed, are necessary for the story, there has to be a contrast, and Charlie can only be so good because the others are so bad. In discussing Freud, Tucker (1992: 163) speaks of children's literature that gives direct 'expression to the unsocialized, aggressive and acquisitive forces existing within every individual'[27], which are integrated into the child's personality when all goes well, but not when the child has reasons to hate his parents. It is important in my opinion how these forces are treated, if there is merely compensation, or if they are the starting point for development. It seems obvious that children who are brought up in a rigid system of 'good' and 'bad', according to adult expectations will need a vent for their aggressions. The story, in my opinion, can be seen as a celebration of the more unpleasant characteristics of childhood that are left behind only in the course of a healthy development (schadenfreude, cruelty etc.), an aggressive 'compensatory fantasy' (Tucker 159), in which fun is derived from the extremity of the descriptions, from treating people like things, who, like in a cartoon or comic-strip, can be stretched, mashed up, blown up, shrunk and much more.

The extremity, the flat characters, the moralizing also have to do with the genre of this story. In many respects 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' (1964/1995) could be classified as a literary fairy tale.[28] It has got a typical fairy-tale plot suffused with magic, and flat fairy-tale characters, who, for the most part, represent fairly straightforward vices and virtues. As in a typical fairy-tale, the emphasis is not on characterization. The same is true for the cautionary tale, which also goes back to a strong oral tradition. The 'bad' children, for instance, are characterized and corrupted by their one respective vice only, which is responsible for their general unpleasantness of character: about the boy who eats too much we know nothing except this fact. What is interesting is that he is even called

'Augustus', and this name typifies him even more, as it is the name of the boy who refuses to eat his soup in Hoffman's Struwwelpeter (in Demers and Moyles 1982: 301), and, as a consequence, starves to death. Augustus, who brings punishment on himself for the opposite vice, namely gluttony, is an interesting foil to the original Augustus. This is a detail, which, taken together with the moralizing songs, places the tale into the Struwwelpeter-tradition of the moralizing or cautionary tale. Compare the beginnings of 'The Story of Augustus who would not have any soup' (Hoffmann: The English Struwwelpeter, in Demers and Moyles 1982: 301):

> Augustus was a chubby lad;
> Fat ruddy cheeks Augustus had;
> And everybody saw with joy
> The plump and hearty healthy boy.

and the song the Oompa- Loompas sing about Augustus Gloop (104):

> 'Augustus Gloop! Augustus Gloop!
> The great big greedy nincompoop!
> How long could we allow this beast
> To gorge and guzzle, feed and feast
> On everything he wanted to?

This is in kind the same song, with the same rhyme-scheme and meter, only with a timely reversal of the values promoted, which can be seen as a parody of the original. In terms of its tradition this may be of importance even though it is only an intertextual detail that children in the year 2002 will probably not notice, unless some children still read 'Struwwelpeter'.

Watson (2001) also sees the tale as an 'old-fashioned, Struwwelpeter-like moral tale with ruthless punishments being meted out to revolting children, and the poor and honest child being inordinately rewarded.'

Another way to look at Dahl is as part of the ironic tradition in children's literature, of nonsense poetry, rhyming tradition. The use of clichés, of formulaic language, of songs that children like may be seen as making fun of the overt ideology. One could say that the glaring moralizing is not to be taken seriously because it is just that bit over the top, the absurd language plays might be subversive in their extremity. Are the story and cardboard characters really there for the moral's sake, as argued so far? Or is there a nonsense moral for the story's sake? That the story is clear-cut, sentimental, and black-and-white there can be no doubt, nor that there is no process, or change.

If this story is read as ironic or not very much depends on the reader. I could imagine a child with experience of other texts delighting in the word-plays and songs, and finding the moral absurd and ironic. But I do not think this is obvious enough for a child without much experience of literature. So that it can be argued

that the moral is complicated by irony, but the irony only goes to a certain point in this text. The question is if the values are really questioned or just mildly made fun of. It seems that Dahl, while making fun of the extreme moralists, is himself enmeshed in the same net and does promote his own morals, after all there is nothing ironic in the exaggerated mildness and obedience of Charlie.

And even if on the surface level of ideology overt didacticism is being parodied, it does not mean that on a deeper level the very same values are not being reinforced. The fairy-tale does not replicate inner experience, but very often it is the story of the weakling who succeeds against enormous odds. The values it transports may be subversive, but are they in this case? The old pattern of punishment and reward is not put into question, there is a divide between the good and the bad children that is not questioned. So far this is typical of the fairy tale, which often reinforces an older feudal model, with the restoration of order at the end. There is social mobility (poor man becomes king, for instance) but maintenance of the status quo. 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' seems even more concerned with keeping things in place, or even reverting to an older order. The story is socially critical in a very modest way, the family's starvation is contrasted with the riches of the Salt family, for instance. The neat solution to their problems, however, reinforces an order which leaves everyone to their own resources. Even though society is to blame for the family's poverty, rescue comes from Wonka, the epitome of the 'entrepreneur', the capitalist.

Particularly some parts of the story (the moralizing songs for instance) can be read as an ironic comment on didactic works, but at the same time there is no questioning of the moralistic fabric of our society, the way injustice is perpetuated by common assumptions and conventions, such as that the disturbed child is naturally 'bad', and the place that is sometimes unjustly assigned to children and to adults

The text's ideology becomes apparent in the way that there are packages of values 'sold' to the child reader: 'obedience' is not quite spelled out but hides behind 'good loving gentle'. There may be parody, but 'good loving gentle' and 'sensible' as meaning undemanding and dependent are not put into question. How successful is the transmission of values to the reader? Its effectiveness depends on the interaction between reader and writer, and the 'fun' of the text, the absurdity of the word plays, the exaggerations, may actually aid this by drawing attention away from the conservative values. Rather than being on the children's side, this text tries to attract the child reader into accepting an authoritarian adult view, by administering the famous spoonful of sugar, in the form respectless rhyming. Wonka's irresponsible recklessness may have great appeal to children, his plays with words may be attractive, but at the same time their absurdity only seems harmless, as a

way of channelling and diverting children's energies, and never threatens the adult order, in the sense of unjustly assumed rights over children.

3 'Kelpie': Childhood experience as children's literature

As a children's book author William Mayne is as different from Dahl as can be. For one thing, he is much less well-known and less popular. According to 'The Cambridge Guide to Children's Books in English' (Watson 2001), he is 'best known for his fiction for the 10-13 age-group', but 'although Mayne's books have received considerable critical acclaim, he has never achieved widespread popularity nor bestselling status'.

This has to do with the demands his books make on the reader. 'Mayne is widely regarded as a difficult writer, mainly because the language he uses is unusually precise and economical' (Watson 2001). His books are carefully constructed, very much attention is paid to language, words still mean something. In this sense his books belong much more to the book culture than Dahl's, in their reliance on words, and they initiate children into this culture. This emphasis on language means they are the very opposite of television, there is no cheap thrill, no emphasis on affect and sensationalism. The difficulty of his books lies in the language, which, according to 'The Cambridge Guide' (Watson 2001), and also in my opinion, 'rewards persistence; frequently monosyllabic, and often onomatopoeic, it conveys a strong sense of the physical reality it describes'. The question that is interesting to ask is in how far this is children's literature. Is this 'persistence' too much to ask of children or indeed impossible for them?

Mayne's books are children's books in the sense that they are directed at a young audience, and that the central characters are mostly children. The concerns of children and adults are very different in his books. The 'gulf between the world of children and adults' sometimes has to do with the children's experiences of the preternatural and the adult's unwillingness or inability to believe them or empathize with them. In 'Kelpie' (1987), as also in other books by Mayne children are still in touch with something that adults have lost. In the course of their adventures they reconnect with their roots, the lore of the land, its natural history. This connection develops into a powerful force. In Mayne's work 'local legend and landscape are always central', there is a strong sense of the 'landscape's history beneath its surface'. Observation of the natural world is an important part of this. 'Acute awareness of the world around is common to all Mayne's novels.' (Watson 2001).

This is certainly true of 'Kelpie', which if one tried to summarize it, is the story

of a young girl's experience of two school trips to lakes, one of them a loch in Scotland. One might also say that it is about the existence or non-existence of a Scottish sea monster. But it is also, and this is most important in my opinion, about the main character Lucy's childhood experiences not only with this sea monster but with growing up in general.

It is the kind of book many adult book critics would approve and shares many of its qualities with other, highly praised, books by Mayne. This means it meets critical standards of quality, and does not adhere to the conventions of children's literature. It is still an exception in the field as it is an original and 'open' text which is directed at arguably fairly young children, judging by its cover and typeface (which is fairly large), and because it is clearly published as a children's book. I also found it in the British Council section for children's books. Also typical of a children's book is the age of its heroine who is in the bottom class and probably around five years old.

It is, however, in many ways an untypical children's book. There are none of the devices that typically mark the register of children's book language, that is unoriginal phrasing, repetition, summary, cliché (cf. Hunt 1988). The quasi-storyteller's voice is missing, the story is mediated through a child's consciousness. The implied reader is free to make his own deductions, arrive at his own interpretation of what is going on. The text does not proscribe anything but leaves much space for the reader's imagination. The distribution of power is therefore very different from the one in more 'typical' children's books.

There is, however, the question if this is really a book for children and if the real reader is likely to be a child. Are there adaptations to a child audience? How complex or difficult is this text? The lexical difficulty is one point to consider. The Type/Token Ratio can tell us how difficult a text is in this respect, the higher it is the more different words are used for every n tokens. Tokens are the running words in a text and types the number of different words. Therefore 'a high type/token ratio results from the use of many different words in a text, and therefore implies that there is little repetition' (Meunier 1998: 32). In 'Kelpie' the Standardised[29] Type/Token Ratio is 37,11%, lower than the ratio of the Imaginative Prose section of the FLOB corpus (comprised of the same categories as the LOB but from 1991) with 45,89 %. The average word length is 4 letters, quasi the same as in the FLOB with 4,05.

The mean sentence length, however, is higher with 16,98 words as opposed to 15,54 words in the FLOB. The standard deviation of sentence length is also higher (14,71%) than in the FLOB (12,13), which means that there is more variation in sentence length (cf. Meunier 1998: 28). This refers to the number of short

sentences (fewer than 12 words) in relation to long sentences (more than 30 words). So, if in general long sentences make more demands on the reader than short ones, and in 'Kelpie' the sentences are longer than in its reference corpus, which does not even have a section of children's fiction, it is difficult in this respect.

The structure of the book also makes demands on the reader. It begins in *medias res*. "Well I never", said Lucy, looking out of the bus window, hoping that the bus would park here, now it had stopped.' (Mayne 1987:7) There is no explanation and the reader has to work out more or less gradually, depending on his experience, that Lucy is on a schooltrip as the story unfolds. There are clues, 'bus' and a little further down 'school's top class'.

Chapter Three takes the reader to the events that happened 'last summer' (17), after 'Kelpie' is remembered at the end of chapter two. At the beginning of chapter six there is a reminder of the frame: 'Lucy, on the Carlow Stone at the beginning of the next summer, remembered the things concerning Kelpie' (32). Then the story continues with 'But last summer…' It is important for the reader at this point to remember the beginning of the book, in a way mirroring what Lucy is doing. And in chapter ten there is the final shift from (the remembered) last summer to 'a summer later' and what happens. It is a structure that is quite demanding, and at first reading it can be even confusing for an experienced reader, perhaps because it is unexpected in a children's book, or because both summers involve water and 'Kelpie'.

Another difficulty might be that 'speech is rarely reported with any phrase other than the basic ''said…'' so that emotions can appear muted to the unskilled reader' (Watson 2001).

This may appear to be the case to a reader used to excessively exaggerated feelings, like in 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory', or the similar way they are shown on TV. Feelings in 'Kelpie' are implied or shown and not told. For instance fear is shown when Lucy and Sally first hear about the Kelpie and go and stand close to Mr Gray (Mayne 1993: 21) after Lucy says ''I wish I was home again'' (21). After Lucy has first seen Kelpie, the reader can infer extreme fear, even shock from the physical description. 'All down her back something was trickling cold water. The top of her head felt lifted up. One knee wobbled. Her throat was stopped up and would never speak again.' (23) This is a detailed description, sweat is described the way it feels to her without the word being used. This is a very effective way of showing a feeling but it requires more decoding than saying 'she was afraid'. The girls' attack of homesickness is also shown, not told.

> Suddenly, unpacking in the dormitory, all the girls were silent at the same time, knowing they were a long way from home. Sally smiled, but not very strongly. Home was far off, and here they were, in another country, with monsters (29).

The form the girls' anger at Mrs Gray takes, when she refuses to believe that they have really seen Kelpie, is left to the reader's imagination.

> Mrs Gray was smiling at Morag, and saying, 'they are very excited', and touching Sally on the arm to calm her down, because she was getting angry. 'No, Sally,' she said, 'you mustn't speak to people in that way; and you too, Lucy. I hope you're not too young to have come with us (25).

We are only shown Mrs. Gray's reaction. The process of identification is complicated because we are distanced from the emotions of the characters. 'Thought' is a very frequent word in the text, with 79 occurrences the 45th most frequent word, even though it is not a key word. Compared to 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' there is very much thinking. And there are certainly no exclamations like ah or oh in this text. There are feelings in 'Kelpie' but they have to be deduced by the reader, they are not made explicit. That Lucy is afraid of hospitals, for instance, is implied when she misunderstands Mrs Gray's 'hostel' as 'hospital'. 'Lucy did not feel particularly well after the coach journey, so she thought Mrs Gray must have said hospital, and felt a lot better at once, in case anyone asked her' (17).

This can present difficulties for the unskilled reader. All in all, 'Kelpie' initiates the child reader into the reading of literature, but in my opinion this only works for a reader who has already got some experience of books, and the necessary patience and imagination. In this respect it is in between a children's book and an adult book.

The implied author is invisible, the field is left to Lucy, a small girl in the 'bottom class'. There is not much direct characterization of her (and the little there is, is by herself and by the other characters). We know that she the youngest child in the group. Occasionally, we read that she thinks about herself as 'the smallest' who is 'not to be noticed' (46,...) or called a 'dreamer' (47) by Sally. The character has an elusive quality. Noone sees Lucy (Mayne 1993: 7,9), nor hears her (9), her invisibility has to do with being the youngest child in the group.

But we learn much more about her by indirect characterization, by the way she thinks and acts. The child's bewilderment with an adult order, with adult conventions is a central aspect. Her experiences are the experiences of a small child in a group of older children. Mrs. Gray, the teacher, for instance, asks the group to choose one boy and one girl to go shopping.

> They won't choose me, thought Lucy. I like shopping, if I don't have to buy anything or ask the shop people, or go in if I daren't. However, all the girls looked at Elspbeth, and the boys at Craig [...] (45).

The exceptions Lucy makes actually do not leave much to like for her about shopping, yet at the same time she would like to be chosen. This is a deduction the reader has to make on the basis of 'however', which implies a contrast, possibly, I would like to be chosen, however,.... but this is not spelled out. This tunes us into Mayne's style, he leaves much space for the reader, for information the reader may supply but does not have to.

Then Lucy is asked what she wants.

> Lucy unwrapped her money, which she kept in a piece of green felt in her bag, laid out in separate coins and rolled up, and gave two of the coins to Elspbeth. 'I want a silver bracelet,' she said, but Elspbeth laughed at her, and hurried off with Mrs. Gray. Lucy wrapped the rest of the money up again, put it away, and sat on her bed for a long time, miserably wondering why Elspbeth had laughed at her, and what was going on. What was wrong with wanting a silver bracelet? (45)

Learning about the adult world is part of Lucy's development. The value of money is still foreign to her. Her sadness is shown, she does not know why she cannot ask for a silver bracelet. The question is left to the reader. As a young child she is still part of a fairy-tale world and is confused by social conventions. This is the experience of a small child who has not yet learnt all the conventions of the adult world (schema for 'shopping' for instance). She is not used to spend money on her own – notice where she keeps it – and does not know really how much two coins are worth. For the other children this may not be an ordinary situation (as it is on a class trip), but everybody knows what sort of thing one may reasonably ask for. Lucy does not, and, when she sees the others posting their orders, she takes the situation literally. Her answer is logical, a silver bracelet may well be what she wants, but it is inappropriate in the situation and this is why the others laugh. Lucy feels she has said something wrong but does not know why it is wrong and this makes her the more unhappy, disproportionately unhappy, as it would seem to an adult. This incident still occupies her at night, at the midnight party that the other children prepared and that Lucy did not know about.

> I wish I wasn't so silly, thought Lucy. Fancy asking for a silver bracelet. And in the dark she felt herself glowing with shame. Like a baby, she thought. And I don't know what to wear and I'm shivering. (49)

Her shame results from her feeling that she does not know what she thinks she ought to know already. This is a painful realization for the child, for whom this is a matter of grave concern. I think the young child's bewilderment and confusion are

depicted here in a realistic way.

A similar situation occurs at an earlier point in the book, on the trip to the Carlow stone, when Lucy forgets her lunch package in the bus and is ashamed of admitting it because everybody else has got theirs.

> 'Did you bring your dinner?' asked Sally. Lucy said nothing, because her dinner was still in the bus. I will pretend to eat quietly, she thought […] Lucy hoped it never was [dinner time] because of forgetting her cloth bag with her dinner in it (9f).

But Lucy is different from the rest of the group not only because she is shy and insecure but because she has qualities that make her special. She is a particularly observant child, and a collector. She finds seemingly meaningless little things and keeps them.

> the little locks of sheep wool, creamy or black; a red ribbon; strong purple, black, and silver wool from the Highlands of Scotland; a tartan bootlace; feathers from beside another lake; and other things rather like what she had found by the road (11)

This seemingly ordinary childlike behavior, and the collected items, are attributed a particular significance in the story. 'Finding' is Lucy's special quality, which has to do with observation and intuitive attention to detail. Lucy alone of all the group displays this gift of seeing things that the others do not notice. We have already seen the child as not yet familiar with the world of adults, yet there is another world that the smallest child has special access to because of her qualities, the child's own world that a lucky imaginative person never loses touch with, a rival world with different values.

> Lucy picked up the crystal tooth of a cave bear, but did not tell anyone in case it was only diamond; she found the feather of the golden eagle, and laid it in her bag: more findings (44).

We have seen above that Lucy knows as yet very little about money, and this is confirmed by her evaluation of this find, which reflects a different value system, in which money, in this case in the form of diamond, counts little. The things she finds here belong to a world of myths, the world of 'the golden eagle', and prehistoric times, the world of 'the cave bear'. Throughout the book Lucy finds such remnants, picks them up, keeps them, and puts them into order. Her collecting can be seen as a metaphor for the activities of the historian ('cave bear') and the writer ('golden eagle') who collect bits and pieces of our historical or mythical origins, and then impose an order on them, that is they make sense of them by re-imagining and telling their story. It is through these tokens of the other world, the world of myths

and the past, that the relation between history and present is explored in the story. Lucy has the gift of seeing how the past is present in the present, how myths are present in the present. 'Myth' in this story is personified by Kelpie, the Scottish sea-monster, the question of whose existence or non-existence, or rather the nature of whose existence, is an important part of the story. Lucy is the first of the children to see Kelpie. On the steamer, she looks through Mr. Gray's field-glasses:

> Lucy saw sky and land and water and land and sky, swinging up and down, [...] She saw birds on the water, in the air, standing upright on rocks. She saw another thing in the water, once, and then again, and a third time, on the surface and diving under it, and saw it open its mouth. A water horse called Kelpie is not exactly the same as a land pony, but even if you have not seen one before, you know what it is as soon as you do see it; and the second and third times (23).

The 'sky and land and water and land and sky' reflect the shifting of the picture Lucy sees through the field-glasses because the ship is moving, and the picture is still unclear. The language recreates exactly what Lucy is seeing, which is what the reader sees with her.

Of all the children who see Kelpie Lucy is most convinced of his existence. Her qualities enable her to see and find all the bits and pieces of Kelpie's bridle, first in Scotland and then in Yorkshire (Mayne 1993:8, 41). There is a special connection between Lucy and Kelpie. She is half-invisible like Kelpie and has special access to the world of myth and imagination. She is the first of the children to see him, she finds the pieces of his bridle, and he, sensing this, comes to fetch her in Vendale Water. She is afraid of him and does not know what he wants. 'Why does Kelpie know I am here? Why do I know Kelpie is here when no one else can see him? I wish I couldn't see him.' (Mayne 1993: 59) Finally, she bridles him, together with Craig (cf. 64ff).

Lucy, however, only sees Kelpie after being told about him by Morag, a Scottish girl the group meets on the steamer across the loch, and the most contradictory character in the story. After giving the children a description of the 'water-horse' and telling them his story, she concludes: 'But, I tell you, I wouldna see him if he came in sight, he's so wicked.' (21) This is only one of a number of contradictory statements Morag makes in the course of the story, almost everything she says has this enigmatic quality. Interestingly, 'but' is a keyword in the text. It serves to qualify statements, and sometimes, to string together contradictions. Often this has to do with Kelpie's existence or non-existence. Essentially, Morag says that Kelpie exists and does not exist at the same time. This might have to do with her intermediary position. On the one hand, she is older than the children, and therefore more at home than Lucy in the rational adult world, on the other hand she is a

Scottish country girl and has grown up with tales about Kelpie. Her position in the story might be interpreted as that of gatekeeper between these two worlds, the native Scottish lore and mainstream culture. When Morag is asked by one of the children from Yorkshire, if what she has just told them is really true, her answer brilliantly involves them into the Scottish folktale, and prompts the sightings.

> 'It's true,' said Morag. 'Or it's true there's a story, the same as there is about Loch Ness. But ours is the Kelpie, and you can read about him in books, because I've seen him there. But I never saw him in the loch, and I've looked all my life. But tell me if *you* do, because my Granny MacAlister tells a different story.' (21)

The tag 'said Morag' separates two statements which are logically completely different, they may in fact be the opposite, but they are strung together with 'or' as if our choice of which of them was true was purely optional and would not make a difference really. This is a way for Morag to avoid an unequivocal answer but it also refers us back to the world of Scottish folklore with its Celtic origins, where the two 'it's true' and 'it's true there's a story' may really be synonymous, or where 'truth' has a different meaning than an empirical one. It is to this mythical other world of Granny MacAlister's stories that Kelpie belongs.

The relationship between these two worlds is complicated and not unproblematic. The mythical other-world of the stories Kelpie belongs to overlaps and sometimes conflicts with the dominant mainstream culture that all the adults in the story except Morag's grandmother represent. The existence of Kelpie presents a threat to the rational adult world by undermining the conventional concept of reality which has clearly no place for sea-monsters. Kelpie, moreover, exists or does not exist depending on the way he is being looked at, and makes the watcher doubt his own senses, a quality which is paralleled by the elusiveness of the story which makes it difficult to summarize and retell. Lucy and Craig understand this when they are bridling Kelpie.

> they understood how Kelpie might not be visible to all people at all times: his skin was so fine that his edges did not begin all at once (as a person's hand does) but became visible gradually, or sometimes not at all. Craig and Lucy began to be able to see him or not see him, more or less as they wanted. It was possible to see the distant hills through him; or to let him obscure them (Mayne 1993: 64).

The question of Kelpie's existence is the central conflict between the world of adults and children. He is a magical creature and if he can be seen or not depends on who is looking, and how that person is looking, and if he wants to be seen. People choose and 'Kelpie chooses too' (64). Kelpie grows stronger when he is seen (52), more dangerous and larger with Lucy's fear (56-58), and shrinks when

Craig comes who is not afraid of him (62). A danger lies in his uncontrolled wildness. Sometimes it is optional to see him as Mrs Gray admits. ''I'm sure I could see him if I wanted' But Mrs Gray was sure she could not without her Scotch glasses.'(76)

Adults would rather not see Kelpie as Lucy and Sally find out when their first sighting of Kelpie brings them into conflict with their teacher. The discovery of this essential difference between them and the adults is a new experience for them. They are young enough to believe their senses, and trusting enough that it is okay to say what you have seen, while adults seem to have lost that capacity and only see what they expect to see. A negative result of socialization may be the loss of that innocence or capability. "It just needed to be looked at sensibly, and it wasn't there,' said Mrs Gray. 'And I think we go on looking at things sensibly." (25) What is seen is very much determined by what the mind says is possible, what is has a schema for, what fits into its construction. Children look, adults 'look sensibly'.

> The steamer started across the loch. Its whistle blew, in a motherly way, and the calves answered. The echoes came back, and then that other call. 'It's a bird,' said Mr Gray, binocularing, but only seeing, not getting the sound any closer. The sound came closer on its own. The calves answered, and the call came again, three or four times. 'I can see him,' said Lucy. 'Now, Lucy,' said Mrs Gray. 'What is she talking about, Sally?' And Mr Gray said, 'It's a cardboard box floating on the water, like an empty carton from a supermarket.' But a cardboard box does not have eyes and ears and a back, or open its mouth to call out (Mayne 1993: 35).

When Kelpie rescues the drowning calf 'everybody saw what happened next, but decided not to notice.' (37) Lucy has learnt to keep quiet. 'Lucy said nothing. She was sure of what she had seen.' (39) She is learning the rules of the game but still believes in her own senses. Adult games involve hypocrisy and a fear of things that are beyond an established reality. Secrets are there to be kept, adults can see what they want but there are rules for what can be told, for what is socially acceptable. This affects their memory. When the children get a letter from Morag reminding them of their 'friend', Lucy remembers Kelpie, and the process of remembering is reflected in the language.

> "Yes', said Lucy, remembering last year, and that loch so far away, when summer was being over and brambles ripening, months and miles from Vendale and the green grass of spring.' (15)

Her teacher does not remember. "I'm sure I don't,' said Mrs Gray, deciding not to remember. Lucy could tell.' (15) Lucy sees through this hypocrisy. Mrs. Gray 'would rather not see something she could not account for'. (16) There is always the option not to see Kelpie, and adults go to great lengths and take recourse to all kinds of

excuses to avoid having to see him, to avoid the confusion this brings with it. Mrs. Gray's reading glasses, for instance, serve this purpose (cf. 37).

At the same time adults have not lost all sense of Kelpie's world but they cannot afford to admit this. Mrs. Gray presumably even rides on Kelpie, at least this is the interpretation Lucy imposes on her disappearance during an evening walk:

> She hesitated for a while, then slipped off her shoes and paddled into the loch to sit on a smoothly rounded boulder a little way out. [...] But when they were all in Mrs. Gray was not there. And still, at the water's edge, was her pair of shoes, and footprints leading into the loch. Of the boulder she had set out for there was no sign. (40f.)

The next morning Mrs. Gray denies everything ('How could I ride away on something that doesn't exist?'), the girls find, however, what for them is conclusive evidence, and for the reader possibly too: her wet clothes hung up to dry (42). Of course she might have gone for a swim, there is always that other option.

Mrs. Gray represents the kind of knowledge that is taught in schools, which is only one aspect of reality, and tries to discount or ignore parts of nature that do not fit the picture, rather than admitting that there is a different kind of knowledge, which is represented by Morag's grandmother. When the trip is over and the class are looking at a number of strange photographs, that do or do not show Kelpie, Mrs. Gray implicitly acknowledges this: 'I don't know what to think but I expect you do' (81). Mrs. Gray even strokes Kelpie but without acknowledging it.

> 'How very strange,' said Mrs. Gray. 'I'm afraid I don't understand such things.' But stranger than Kelpie, who could be seen by everybody else, was what Mrs. Gray did next: she put out her hand and stroked Kelpie on the nose, and that was very odd if she could neither see him nor believe in him (77).

This contradiction must seem absurd to anybody who has not been socialized as to only see what has been conventionally agreed upon to be real, and trusts in his own sense of what is true or real.

Linguistically, the contrast between the different ways of perceiving is expressed in the difference between 'seeing' and 'looking', as a concordance of 'see/saw/seen' as the search word, and look* as the context word shows. 'Look' is intentional, and what a person looks for, or even looks at is not the same as what is being seen. When it comes to Kelpie the contrast is carried to its extremes. To 'see the truth' is what Lucy wants, but not the adults.

1	87 Everybody wanted to look at them and see other people, not themselves; but
2	looked too. 148 There was nothing to be seen now but ruffled water and some
3	Gray looked at the negatives, and could see even less in them, because they
4	580 Nobody stopped looking; everybody saw what happened next, but decided
5	d, and would not look up even when Lucy saw Kelpie swim clearly alongside and
6	9 I used to look for it, though I never saw it, but the monster hunter says it
7	I've seen him there. 262 But I never saw him in the loch, and I've looked
8	nd was not looking directly at him, she saw Kelpie clearly too. 777 He was
9	ed up. 767 She looked again. 768 She saw Lenore and most of the others mov
10	ow of the room and looked in. 825 They saw its eyes in the candlelight
11	bag too, and she had a look at them to see that they were tidy. 77 They were,
12	r did it, and they are looking at it to see whether there is a leak, and they
13	6 Mr Gray looked at her with one eye to see that she was not about to fall off
14	sh my work. 248 If I tell you what to see you can look for it, but be certain
15	tch," said Craig, looking at his arm to see where the other half was; but his
16	ked at Morag, straight into her eyes,to see the truth.373 Morag's eyes, she
17	ill never do that." 412 She looked to see that the gangway was empty, and be
18	nded the field-glasses to Mrs Gray, who saw it too, and then everybody looked
19	ad been looking for Lucy. 397 "Did you see a monster?" Elspbeth asked her.

Truth is not simple in this story. Morag, the Scottish girl is proud of her country and its legends of which 'Kelpie' is a part, but she is also in a transitional stage and has already learnt not to see Kelpie anymore. At the same time she understands that his existence does not depend upon his being seen. "But it's true, even if no one sees him, and even if it's not him when you do." (25) She takes the newly learnt illogical logical rules far: 'even if you ride him he's not there' (48).

Morag frequently refers to her grandmother as an authority on the subject of Kelpie ('you can't say your grandmother is wrong' 39), significantly she is the only adult who overtly believes in Kelpie, and openly tells of her experiences with him, if we believe Morag, and there is no reason not to. It is only the small child and the old woman who acknowledge Kelpie, or who have access to this other kind of knowledge. The old woman preserves the lore of the land, myths and traditions, in her stories, and passes them on, and they come alive through the child Lucy, who, by her own elusiveness is of a similar nature as Kelpie. This notion finds expression in Lucy's thoughts, when the children speak about Kelpie's wildness: 'We are all wild things, thought Lucy. If they would let us and we were brave enough.' (44) This is a

romantic but not sentimental notion of the child, it does not reduce the child to a stuffed animal that is merely sweet but recognizes the wildness that is in the child, the strong roots in nature. Both Kelpie and the children, however, are also more than wild things. Kelpie runs free and of his own accord looks for his bridle, so the conflict between wildness and control is not irreconcilable. Lucy, the almost unreal and invisible fairy creature and Craig, the rough boy, are opposites, till in the end they come together in the bridling of Kelpie and make a team. He is good at 'manag[ing]' (60) Kelpie, and Lucy has the pieces of bridle in her collection. They are tempted to make Kelpie their own, and even try to do so, before they realize that he has to be free. There is a moral choice involved, and the choice to renounce the power is theirs: 'you haven't got to want to catch him' (67). Letting the magical creature go is the right thing to do, and doing it even if though it is difficult is a step in their development. Kelpie's bridle is absorbed into his skin, becomes part of him, and makes him free by giving him to himself.

Kelpie's bridle (43) is symbolic of the children's development. Without it, Kelpie is a wild thing, and unhappily destroys things in his desperate search for it. Finally, he wants the bridle put on him in such a way that he is free, and not Lucy's and Craig's pet. I think that for children likewise an ideal upbringing means they are under their own control and really belong to themselves. The story can be seen as a story of development. There is the development of Lucy, the small almost invisible fairy child. At the end, when the children look at the photographs of their trip, she realizes she has changed. 'Once, Lucy thought, I would not have been able to recongnise myself; but now I think I could.' (79) Her self-awareness and self-confidence have increased. She was in a difficult situation, facing Kelpie alone, without knowing what he wanted, and then had a conflict with Craig, and renounced her own will to power in order to do the right thing, and managed to bridle Kelpie with pieces from her collection. Lucy's self-confidence has increased at the end of the story. Growing up for her does not mean adjusting to the standards of others at the expense of her own personality, but trusting to herself and into what she has seen. At the end she knows the truth, knows that she was right, even though there are blank spaces in the photographs where Kelpie should be.

> 'It was as true as sums,' said Lucy. 'As true as taking nine from eight, and you know that's impossible.' 'Anything is possible, Lucy', said Mrs Gray. 'If we are thinking of the sums in the blue book.' And Craig said that there were other things before the blue arithmetic book, but he wouldn't like to give the list. Far away on Loch Drumlinn, Kelpie had never heard of books or arithmetic, but had had a holiday in Vendale Water. In the back row Mr Gray fell asleep among the empty photographs. In Lucy's front row nine from eight would not go (Mayne 1993: 81).

Different kinds of knowledge, and different kinds of impossibilities are brought together in one paragraph. A lot more is possible than people tend to assume, and both Lucy and Mrs Gray are right, though about different things, and both could learn from each other. Lucy is the one who actually does this, so she is in an advantaged position. She will eventually acquire the kind of factual knowledge Mrs Gray represents, while not losing her special access to the world of Kelpie, to myth and legend in existence.

I will now take a closer look at the language of the text, and its relation to the issues just discussed. When we compare the wordlist of 'Kelpie' with the Imaginative Prose section of the FLOB (about 309.666 words) as a reference corpus, we arrive at the keywords of the text, some of which are noticeable and raise a number of interesting questions.

First of all, there is a number of verbs that refer to mental processes, i.e. 'processes of sensing', of 'feeling, thinking or seeing' (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 78). These are 'see' and its lemmas, then 'looking', and 'thought'. Then there are words that refer to the natural world, which plays an important role in 'Kelpie'. These are 'loch', 'water', 'stone', 'lake', among others. Then there is a group of words that has to do with the steamer that crosses the lake, and another that has to do with Kelpie.

N	WORD	FREQ.	KELPIE.TXT %	FREQ.	FLOB. LST %	N	WORD	FREQ.	KELPIE.TXT
1	LUCY	240	1,12	0		35	SAW	50	0,23
2	GRAY	186	0,87	0		36	STONE	25	0,12
3	CRAIG	163	0,76	0		37	AWAY	63	0,29
4	KELPIE	150	0,70	0		38	CALF	11	0,05
5	SAID	382	1,78	1.121	0,36	39	LATCH	12	0,06
6	MORAG	82	0,38	0		40	LAKE	18	0,08
7	MRS	113	0,53	99	0,03	41	EVERY BODY	18	0,08
8	LOCH	56	0,26	0		42	BAG	19	0,09
9	SALLY	73	0,34	44	0,01	43	BUT	198	0,92
10	WATER	91	0,42	99	0,03	44	THEY	138	0,64
11	ELSPBETH	39	0,18	0		45	DOWN	82	0,38
12	MR	77	0,36	119	0,04	46	DRUML INN	9	0,04
13	STEAMER	35	0,16	3		47	THE	1.164	5,42
14	AND	757	3,53	6.524	2,11	48	THING	41	0,19
15	BRIDLE	31	0,14	1		49	THERE	117	0,55
16	CARLOW	22	0,10	0		50	HEAD	54	0,25
17	BOAT	28	0,13	10		51	ECHO	9	0,

									04
18	KELPIE'S	18	0,08	0		52	DECK	10	0, 05
19	HOSTEL	21	0,10	3		53	WEEL	7	0, 03
20	IT	373	1,74	3.096	1,00	54	KNOT	7	0, 03
21	PUFFER	15	0,07	0		55	CRAIG 'S	7	0, 03
22	LENORE	15	0,07	0		56	LOOKI NG	37	0, 17
23	GRANNY	16	0,07	1		57	SCOTL AND	15	0, 07
24	FIELD	22	0,10	12		58	BUS	13	0, 06
25	PETER	23	0,11	15		59	ROCK	18	0, 08
26	LUCY'S	14	0,07	0		60	STRET CHED	12	0, 06
27	CAME	64	0,30	231	0,07	61	SCHOO L	20	0, 09
28	VENDALE	13	0,06	0		62	MONST ER	9	0, 04
29	NOT	175	0,82	1.202	0,39	63	SEEN	29	0,14
30	THOUGHT	79	0,37	349	0,11	64	RIDE	12	0,06
31	WENT	63	0,29	234	0,08	65	UNDER	33	0,15
32	MACALIST ER	12	0,06	0		66	SIDE	33	0,15
33	BECAUSE	60	0,28	228	0,07	67	ROWED	6	0,03
34	SEE	78	0,36	369	0,12	68	NOWT	6	0,03
70	GRASS	12	0,06	14		69	WAS	378	1,76
71	GLASSES	13	0,06	18		83	LAID	11	0,05
72	WISH	17	0,08	37	0,01	84	PASSE NGERS	9	0,04
73	NECK	17	0,08	38	0,01	85	HILLS	8	0,04

74	ON	207	0,96	1.971	0,64	86	ROCKS	8	0,04
75	WATER'S	7	0,03	2		87	RAIL	8	0,04
76	SPLASH	8	0,04	4		88	TOURISTS	8	0,04
77	LAND	17	0,08	40	0,01	89	HOLD	18	0,08
78	ACROSS	30	0,14	132	0,04	90	BEGAN	25	0,12
79	LOOKED	53	0,25	329	0,11	91	LINKS	6	0,03
80	SWAM	7	0,03	3		92	BRACELET	6	0,03
81	ALL	113	0,53	942	0,30	93	OF	306	1,43
82	AGAIN	51	0,24	313	0,10	94	THIS	19	0,09

And then, of the words that do not fit into any of the categories there are a few I find particularly interesting because I would never have predicted them and because their (absolute) frequency in the reference corpus is not low at all, as it is in the case of some of the others. These are 'but', 'not', 'because', 'the', 'thing', and 'it'.

'But', 'not', and 'because' may reveal how thoughts are constructed in the text. For instance, a concordance of the keyword 'not' as the search word, 'Kelpie' as context word shows the contradictions and conflicts embodied in his non/existence. Kelpie is a negation of the expected, of the easily graspable, a controversial subject that makes people doubt their own senses. Some do not want to see him, for others he is very real, sometimes he can only be seen when one stops looking. Kelpie cannot be pinned down, defined, he is there, and not, he is seen, and not.

1	elpie too. 374 Kelpie himself, seen or not, had gone from the water.
2	car had made such a hole the car would not drive away. 967 Kelpie was
3	n the Carlow Stone, which was certainly not Kelpie in disguise (I wish
4	" said Craig. 103 "There's no Kelpie, not here, not anywhere." 104
5	If you looked directly at Kelpie he was not there; if you stopped lookin
6	ave to lose him?" 1293 But Kelpie was not lost yet. 1294 He walked at
7	eel," said Morag, "is there a Kelpie or not: that's the question the mon
8	ing to Kelpie's head. 1145 Kelpie did not move away until Craig had th
9	Kelpie so large beside her, and perhaps not truly friendly. 973 Kelpie
10	ent down on one knee, because she could not help it. 987 Kelpie towered
11	gined, or saw, or knew, that Kelpie did not stay on the surface but dive
12	emembered the things concerning Kelpie, not the places the trip had tak
13	ig never had seen Kelpie. 1050 He did not answer, but stepped over to
14	e core into the grass. 984 Kelpie was not interested in that. 985 He g
15	nother they understood how Kelpie might not be visible to all people at
16	knees, and one or two to the waist, but not caring. 792 Kelpie swam awa
17	719 She was like Morag, she thought, not wanting to see Kelpie.
18	th. 292 A water horse called Kelpie is not exactly the same as a land p
19	ody saw what happened next, but decided not to notice. 581 Kelpie looke

The world is not what it seems in this text, and this is expressed in language that leaves the reader doubting himself, enmeshed in the confusions and contradictions

of the characters. The point that there is a way for Kelpie to exist on one level and not on another, to be seen only when somebody wants to see him, and he allows himself to be seen, is a threat to the real, the certain, the empirically proved. It is around this essential doubt that the story is constructed. Kelpie's otherness is expressed by negation and qualification of the readily accessible and conventional. He is 'not exactly the same as a land pony, but[…]' (line 18 above, 26 below). He is 'sniffing like a cat. But you can pick a cat up', line 9, in the concordance of 'but' with context word 'Kelpie' below. He seems to consist of contradictions. He is like some conventional animal in some respects but not in others, and keeps surprising us. This is echoed in the language which keeps surprising the reader, and does not allow him to be too certain of what is going on.

1	et of light, distinct, separate. 1140 But he would not let her comp
2	do it together he can get away. 1257 But I know what I wanted." 12
3	92 "Why do we have to lose him?" 1293 But Kelpie was not lost yet.
4	I don't understand such things." 1359 But stranger than Kelpie, who
5	said Sally. 145 "That's Kelpie. 146 But he should be in Loch Dru
6	w who she meant, and didn't care. 159 But a lot of people said Kelp
7	same as there is about Loch Ness. 261 But ours is the Kelpie, and y
8	ith fossil which I am sitting on. 672 But at Loch Drumlinn that ot
9	t eye level, sniffing like a cat. 974 But you can pick a cat up.
10	and soothe Kelpie, in full view again, but with all muscles tense, a
11	tood between them still, relaxed again; but what he was thinking they
12	seen Kelpie. 1050 He did not answer, but stepped over to Kelpie a
13	had never heard of books or arithmetic, but had had a holiday in Ven
14	s the question the monster hunter asks; but what my Granny MacAlister
15	trod on Mr Gray, who was still asleep, but it couldn't be helped, be
16	hem all on Kelpie's back, just as broad but stretched long enough to
17	move afterwards, because it never does, but neither was it moving bef
18	he latch, and he fought for Lucy's end. But with Kelpie joining in, w
19	the pieces. 1089 Kelpie breathed fast but gently, and moved his fee
20	Craig did not mean between her and him, but between them and Kelpie.
21	ow Kelpie is real, because I am on him; but I am glad Craig is seeing
22	1 The bridles were for catching Kelpie, but they wore

	them themselv
23	e else said the letter was from Kelpie, but Mrs Gray said that Morag
24	king; everybody saw what happened next, but decided not to notice. Ke
25	ie yet?" 302 Lucy felt her mouth open, but no sound came out.303 But
26	is not exactly the same as a land pony, but even if you have not seen
27	that Kelpie did not stay on the surface but dived deep to the bottom
28	cy, "when you get it out of the tangle. But I've nearly done it.
29	being stretched back by the toothbrush; but Kelpie's mouth went to t
30	the knees, and one or two to the waist, but not caring. 792 Kelpie s

Negation and qualification are used to describe Kelpie in such a way as to make him real to children. After all he is described with reference to concepts they are likely to know well, a pony, a cat. There are always objections, misunderstandings, corrections, which have to do with Kelpie and the children, and the complexity of the world. I think in this respect the text asks a lot of the reader, and the patience and interest required of the child reader are considerable.

At the same time the child's experience is reflected in the language used. The language conveys a strong sense of the child's observation and exploration of the world. The keywords 'but' and 'because' have to do with children's perception and organisation of the world. Children are often interested in reasons, in finding out about things, and in finding the real truth, not just the compromise some adults have settled for. 'It' and 'thing' are also keywords and important in children's language as substitutes for words children do not know yet. This re-imagination of children's reality is expressed in language that seems strange at first and leaves some guesswork to do for the reader. When Lucy finds a piece of Kelpie's bridle she does not know what it is, and neither does the reader.

> She went off to one side of the road, over a tumbledown wall and to a gorse bush, where she had seen something shiny and transparent. […] But she picked the thing up without looking at it, and slipped it, shiny and delicate, in her skirt pocket (Mayne 1993: 8).

The 'something', 'the thing' (8) is not specified, and we only find out much later what the pieces are, and what their significance is.

Another time the generic 'place' is used instead of a more specific term. 'Lucy tidied up several things she had found […] and some hard wool from a place they had visited' (32). Or, on the ship when the calf jumps into the water, 'there were shouts, and faces looking from where the man steered above' (35). The reader is

free to fill these very specific gaps or leave them open, depending on competence. This may be an adaptation to children's understanding because, while the text requires attention to detail and patience, I think it is not necessary to have a much larger vocabulary than the child through whose eyes we see. At the same time the text requires careful reading, because it is unconventional, and there is a lot that is unexpected.

The gaps can be left open, but the text is directed towards complexity. 'The trees near the hostel were pines, but those at the water's edge were sycamore and beech[...]' (33). In a text for adults 'trees' might be redundant information, but not so for the child who is learning (or has just learnt) the different kinds of trees.

Can it then be read by somebody who likes to see through an observant child's eyes again, as a child's inner experience recreated for an adult reader, and also by a child who identifies with the way things are described in a childlike way? The world is mediated through a child's consciousness but this is done artfully, by a grown up writer. This results in an original use of language that is not too difficult, for instance 'Lenore had been homesick in the basin' (32).

The attitude towards language implied by the way it is used is a playful and creative one. There is much attention to detail, to what is actually in the language. The jokes play with language on a very different level than the ones in 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory'. An example is when Craig is made fun of on the steamer. 'Off to the lamb sales. I would be going if I was home.' 'Nobody would buy you,' said Sally.' (Mayne 1993: 34) The joke lies in a deliberate misunderstanding on the part of Sally, of the ambivalence there would be in the language if there were no pragmatic agreement to avoid misunderstandings.

Language is something that still means in the text, it does not need to be hyped up in any way. 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory', in comparison, carries a cynical attitude, reflected in the excessive and exaggerated language of the soap opera, cursing, repetition, and extreme foregrounding. 'Kelpie' on the other hand can be seen as an introduction of literature, a discovery of literary language and how it is to be read, with attention to detail. And this makes development possible, both for the characters in the text, and the readers. The reader is not limited but has the option to work things out for himself, or wait until they are made quite clear. 'One of the other passengers sat herself down on a bench, opened her satchel, got out her school books and started to write[…]' (19). The fact that 'passenger' refers to a school girl becomes progressively clear.

A point that makes an important difference in a children's text is, if there is ambivalence or only one simple answer given to the child reader. In 'Kelpie' there is

ambivalence, there are contrasts ('but'…'not'), the children are thinking and feeling and their behavior is psychologically motivated. They are not reduced to good-bad categories. At one point Lucy is not sitting comfortably on the rock and this is the reason why she cannot keep still, when the teacher wants to read a letter to the children. And the teacher has found a way not to suppress them but still keep the discipline (cf. 12, 13). Mrs. Gray has to start reading letter a number of times, which is also realistic.

'Kelpie' is an 'open' and original text. We are not told what to think as readers or to have judgments made for us. It is not didactic but it is about learning, a different kind of learning: a child's voyage of discovery, of self and of the adult world, which the reader is invited to share. Like the child character in the story the reader learns to draw his own conclusions in the interpretation of the events of the story.

'Kelpie' translates children's concerns, children's psychological experiences into children's literature. Finding out about the contradictory nature of adults who are not logical in a child's sense at all, is a basic childhood experience the reader of this text makes together with the child characters. There is not always a simple reason for why things happen as they do, why adults act in a certain way, for instance. This makes the interaction between adults and children complex and unpredictable and the way in which it is portrayed very realistic. Adults are not shown as god-like creatures, nor are they sadistic, restrictions they impose on the behavior of the children are caused by worry rather than a desire to punish or control. The teacher, Mrs. Gray, for instance, is responsible for the children, and therefore, when Lucy and Craig disappear on the Carlow Stone, she begins to worry, 'anxiously counting everybody, wanting the total to come right without any trouble' (75). When they appear again she has no desire to punish them, which conforms with her behavior in general, she would rather not see what is going on than have to tell the children off.

When the children plan a midnight feast on their last night, and want to go to bed early, it seems that the adults in charge know what is going on because of the way their bedtime ritual is overemphasized, which arouses suspicion in a text in which nothing is coincidental. 'Mr Gray was heard to say to Mrs Gray that he was tired and would go to bed himself. Mrs Gray said it was a good idea, and doors banged as they went.' (48) Later there are heard 'some very distinct snores' from their room. We are not told if they really know what the children are up to or not, but it is left to the reader to interpret this situation, and this is typical of Mayne's style: the text leaves open different possibilities which are never closed down.

When Kelpie looks in at the window, the children's screams wake Mr. Gray, who comes down and scares him off. He is only worried, not surprised.

> Mr. Gray asked whether there was anything to eat and drink, please, for a hungry person; and counted everybody to see they were all there. [...] 'Are we going to get wrong?' asked Craig. It was obvious to him that Mr and Mrs Gray should not be at a secret midnight feast that was bound to be against the rules. 'No, not at all,' said Mrs Gray. 'But I do think it is bed time;...(50f.).

The punishment Craig expects is part of the game adults and children sometimes play, ideally both aware that it is also a game. The rules are part of this game. Children expect a certain behavior from adults who suddenly appear at midnight feasts, which are only fun if and because they are against the rules.

The complexity of the relations between adults and children is also apparent in a passage earlier in the book, after the children arrive at the hostel. From the way their feelings are described we conclude that they are homesick when Mrs. Gray comes in. 'Mrs Gray came to the girls and was slightly cross about untidiness, which made them all feel better than kindness would have done.' (29) This, I think, is very perceptive, and shows that there can be no hasty equation between superficial, and often exaggerated, niceness, and goodness, as there often tends to be in books written for children.

Other expectations are also turned on their head. Change, for instance, is typical of fantasy writing, where the hero or heroine gains self-confidence through experiences in the fantasy world, and returns as a different person to his or her own world. In this text, however, development does not mean that things have changed on a surface level, or rapidly and radically. At the end of the story Lucy is still a small girl, who has similar problems with the adult arrangement of the world as at the beginning. We see her

> struggling with the lock of the shed where the school kept all the sports stuff. The key was too large and her hands too small and the lock too stiff and the door had to be leaned on by someone a bit taller[…] (78).

Yet there has been development of a different kind, the experience of bridling Kelpie has changed her. This is something she knows about, she has found the pieces of the bridle and knows how to put them together, and she is the only one who does, for the first time she is 'giving an order; a thing she never did' (62), telling Craig what to do: 'she thought it was natural to be in charge when she knew what she was doing' (65). When Kelpie comes to the Carlow Stone to take the children for a ride, Lucy is in charge again

> 'Just take turns,' said Lucy, suddenly finding that she was taking charge and telling people what to do. And people were asking her whether they could come next, and how had she got him, and was she going to keep him?' (75)

At the end, she has understood something essential, namely that there is something

beyond the conventional world. After the trip the teacher and children look at photos that do and do not show Kelpie and find them puzzling. ‘’Cameras haven't got a medical brain,' said Lucy. 'They don't see things, like you can't take a photograph of hungry or yesterday." (80) Lucy begins to understand the relationship between the world she lives in, and the different world she has just discovered. There is something else out there that cannot be proved or photographed in the same way as 'hungry' cannot be photographed. She trusts herself, her own feelings, rather than the scientific and confused camera eye.

The story can be read as a recovery of the roots of a culture. There is a sense of transcendence between the present and the past, between what is here, and out there, the world of fairies, of magic, of folklore. There is learning but in a different way, by experience, without any obvious didacticism. The reader has learnt this with Lucy, through engagement with the text, which connects realism and myth. 'Kelpie' does not proscribe what the reader is to think, does not try manipulate, therefore it is not ideological at all because it leaves the reader to make up his own mind. As far as concerns the difficulty, the text may be read on different levels, also only on the story level. Yet it is not a simple story because it draws attention to its own writing. My feeling is that it will realistically only be read and enjoyed by the child who has already discovered the pleasures of reading, and has quite some experience of books already.

4 Comparison

I have examined two very different texts with the intention of exploring the attitudes towards children and childhood expressed in them, and their ideological content.

'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' (1964/1995) draws on the instructional, didactic tradition and can be read as a parody of instructional literature for children. Its absurd and grotesque elements in my opinion serve the moralistic purpose of the book, while there is no doubt that they can be subverted by the reader, as there is always this possibility.

William Mayne's 'Kelpie' (1987), on the other hand, draws on the tradition of classic children's literature. It translates childhood experience into children's literature. The relationship between adults and children is neither simplified nor idealized, but explored in its complexities. It can be seen as a child's experience of the contradictory nature of adults and the absurdity of the adult world. Adults could also learn from children, it is suggested, if they paid attention and listened to them.

In many ways it is subversive, in showing the children's perspective and its implied criticism of adults. The atmosphere is subdued and its humor is subtle. In my opinion there are some adaptations to children's understanding, and it seems that the book does try to find a new way of speaking to children, but its target or at least its actual audience will have to be older or more experienced than that of its sequel 'Captain Ming and the Mermaid' (1999). The sequel has a much larger print, there are illustrations, and the language is simpler, more transparent. I find this interesting because it could be an attempt to reach the children for whom 'Kelpie' proved to be too difficult.

'Kelpie' does cue the reader in to the reading of literature, of other books, while 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' comes in style and content very close to a television program or the 'typical' children's book, defined in negative terms as the overcoded, heavily controlled, closed text. There is a fantasy element in both stories but it serves a different purpose. In 'Kelpie' it is fantastic/mythical and in 'Charlie' it is fantastic/magical, the escapist reality of a fairy-tale. In my opinion 'Kelpie' has romantic elements, while 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' is sentimental/nostalgic. The fantasy element is an attraction for children, and serves also as an ornament to the – in my opinion – mainly moralistic fabric of the story.

What are the attitudes towards children and childhood in both stories? 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' carries old fashioned values, it is a moralistic tale with flat characters. Children are presented as puppets that personify 'good' and 'bad' qualities. It is, however, a bit over the top, and can be seen as an absurd or even cynical parody with a pessimistic view of the world, of adults and of children, whose paradise is a decadent chocolate factory, and whose imagination goes no further than to the invention of different kinds of sweets.

'Kelpie', on the other hand, takes up main childhood concerns, like psychological development, exploration of the natural world, and coming to terms with an adult world. The idea of the 'child' as implied by the text is a more modern one than in 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory'. The child is not shown as in need of moralizing, neither unhealthily good and sweet as a stuffed animal, but as a young human being who needs to develop and to find an own place in the present, which can happen through reconnection with a mythical past. I see it as a schema-refreshing text, which in spite of its adaptations to children's understanding makes quite a lot of demands on the reader.

5 In conclusion

In the first part of my paper I looked at children's literature in its social and historical context, particularly the aspects of ideology, and schema-refreshment. I tried to show how, since the beginning of children's literature, there have been attempts by the educational establishment, and moralists to usurp children's literature in the name of the protecting children, of didacticism, moralism, and political correctness. Paring books down to something that fits any of these standards which have been contrived by adults is a danger to the children's enjoyment of literature and their appreciation of it, to their imagination and therefore to their development, because it reduces children to vessels for adult ideas of 'instruction', which are based on a simplistic and limiting model of children's needs. Putting children's literature to different kinds of uses is, in my opinion, simply wrong, because it ultimately defeats the one use they should have: to initiate children into the enjoyment of literature, recreation, of which schema-refreshment, as defined by Cook (1994) is an important part. Therefore children should not be patronized, not by people who tell them what to read, and not by restricted texts with a condescending tone.

There are two different schematic levels. One satisfies children's immediate needs, feeds them with effects, while at the same time it reinforces conventional and simplistic models of the world, that limit them. The other schematic level furthers defamiliarization from ordinary assumptions and creative interaction with the text. The first level in my opinion includes both books designed for or put to specific and more or less instructional uses, as well as books in which they are more hidden, books which appear to be 'just fun', and on the children's side, such as for instance 'Charlie and the Chocolate Factory' (1964/1993), which I discussed in the second part of my paper. It also includes many television shows, films, and other modern media products which are threatening children's literature.

All this is not to deny the power of subversion that happily lies in many children's imagination, the possibility for children to creatively turn anything into an imaginative tale, to play with language and make it their own. After all, this has happened since the beginnings of children's literature and before, when children annexed adult books, as they still do sometimes. I fear, however, that an overfeeding with effects does not further this ability, and that consumerism contributes, by stuffing children with toys, chocolate, computer games, and videos, to blunting the edge of children's imagination, and to prevent them from realizing their potential to develop.

It goes to hope that children's literature will stand its own against these

threats.

Children's literature is a wide field, and a very fascinating one for me. My attempts to find some answers opened many more questions, for instance how exactly children make meaning and how the difference in their schematic organization relates to their enjoyment with literature, which I hope will be taken up as suggestions for further study and research.

Notes

[1] (p.1) Of course the term could also refer to 'written by children' (Lesnik-Oberstein 1996: 17), but this is of marginal, if any, importance in discussions of children's literature, which of course is very telling. There have been, however, a few attempts to give children a voice, for instance in magazines and yearbooks of children's literature. For German speaking children's contribution to children's literature cf. Gelberg (1985, 243-259) 'Kinder als Erzähler, ihr Einfluß auf die Kinderliteratur'.

[2] (p.1) Or would 'read by children' in this context only refer to canonized 'literature' chosen by adults and then read by children, if it is not to mean everything read by children? To avoid this association Charles Sarland (1996: 41), for instance, prefers the term 'children's fiction'.

Of course it is also not to be forgotten that when it comes to the question of what children read it is very difficult to say what it is in fact that children actually do read, as adults usually buy children's books, and even if they are then given to children it does not mean that they will be read then, and if they read them, this of course is not to say they like them and rather to be doubted in the case of some historical children's fiction. Knowles and Malmkjaer (1996: 2), refer to two surveys of children's reading habits, one from 1884, published by Edward Salmon in 1888, and the second part of a research project by Knowles and Malmkjaer (1989-90). It is difficult to say, however, if these surveys are comprehensive enough to be representative and if we can generalize from them.

[3] (p.1) Shavit (1986: 33ff.) distinguishes between canonized and non-canonized 'systems' in literature. While children's literature has much in common with the non-canonized adult system, it has developed its own canonized and non-canonized 'systems'. The non-canonized system leaves out adults, while the canonized system appeals mostly to adults in Shavit's opinion (63ff.). She claims that children's literature lags behind the developments in adult literature, and that often a model which has lost ground in adult literature establishes the new norm in children's literature. Her example of such an 'ambivalent' text that works on two levels and establishes a new norm is 'Alice in Wonderland'. She claims that children prefer the abridgements that followed the original.

[4] (p.4) 'It is not the type of feature but the value you place upon it which is significant' (Hunt 1991: 51).

[5] (p.5)

> Das sehr kleine Kind, das noch zu schwach ist, um am Leben der Erwachsenen teilzunehmen, zählt nicht – so heißt es bei Molière, ein Wort, an dem sich ablesen lässt, dass diese sehr alte Einstellung sich bis ins 17. Jahrhundert gehalten hat. [...] „Ich habe zwei oder drei Kinder im Säuglingsalter verloren und dies zwar nicht ohne Bedauern, aber doch ohne Verdruss", stellt Montaigne fest (Ariès 1976: 210).

[6] (p.6) As for instance the poems 'A Visit to Newgate' and 'A Visit to the Lunatic Asylum', from Henry Sharpe Horsley's collection 'The Affectionate Parent's Gift, and the Good Child's Reward' (in Demers and Moyles 1982: 156ff) published as late as 1828, demonstrate. These mediocre but probably not untypical poems also show the overlap in the traditions, and the persistence of instruction until well into the 19th century.

[7] (p.8) Chapbooks may in fact have furthered the democratization of literature, as they were spread throughout the country and really available to anyone who was able to read, 'the first cheap printed books for a popular market' (Knowles and Malmkjaer 1996: 3).

[8] (p.8) At this point it may be worth noting that the very terminology of many anthologies and histories of children's literature goes back to the Romantics. According to Myers' (quoted in Hunt 1992: 12) 'New Historicist' approach to children's literature 'we have long starred fantasy, glorified 'imagination', and relied on Romantic ideologies of childhood to structure our thinking about 'appropriate' literature'. Myers also states that the history of children's literature like most literary histories is 'teleology' rather than 'history'. This of course becomes obvious even from the title of the Oxford anthology 'From Instruction to Delight'. However, as all history is human interpretation of past events, there seems no way to avoid categorizing, and there is no problem as long as one is aware of it.

[9] (p.9) Among the books we remember from the 1920s and 1930s that are still famous today, are the 'Winnie-the-Pooh' books by A.A. Milne, or Hugh Lofting's 'Dr Doolittle' series (beginning in 1922), or Arthur Ransome's 'Swallows and Amazons' (1930). J.R.R. Tolkien's 'The Hobbit', published in 1937, became a landmark of fantasy and, together with 'Lord of the Rings' (published after the war), set the trend for many more books in the same tradition. (cf. Townsend 1996: 682f.)

[10] (p.11) This was caused by publishers' 'cash flow problems' and led, in turn, to problems of authors who could no longer rely on their royalties. (Watkins and Sutherland 1995, 289)

[11] (p.12)

> Noting how taboos are disappearing[...]; noting how child actors were no longer waif-like Shirley Temples but....transistorised adults; noting how the distinction between juvenile and adult court systems seems arbitrary (once the label 'gang member' is no longer applied to Al Capone-like adults but to metropolitan youths not yet old enough to vote) -noting all this and other evidence, social critics have sent up their wail and insisted that the concept of childhood...is being dismantled before our eyes. (Griswold 1996: 880)

Events in the past two years (e.g. the case of an eleven year old child being imprisoned) have reinforced this last point dramatically, being more extreme than anything envisaged by Griswold.

[12] (p.17) For an example cf. Fiske (1998:1097) on Hodge and Tripp's (1986) study on Australian Aboriginal children's subversive 'reading' of Westerns.

[13] (p.20) The idea of the separateness and superiority of the world of children over that of adults runs also through many very popular children's books which are aimed at

commercial success, and by indulging children, risk displeasing adults (cf. Shavit 1986: 42). An example would be Enid Blyton's novels.

[14] (p.20) Seiter (1993: 6) at the same time defends consumer culture (television, commercials) against snobbish moralizing, which devalues the kind of television based knowledge that often distinguishes working class children from middle class ones.

[15] (p.25) Children's judgement can be problematic of course, they may say as much about themselves as about their environment. Do they reflect what children really think or are they already socialized into thinking something?

[16] (p.31) It need hardly be mentioned that the reading material Mrs. Trimmer regarded good for children included her own instructional stories and excluded fairy tales. (cf. debate on 'instruction' and 'delight' Demers and Moyles 1982) A fierce opponent of Mrs. Trimmer and Mrs. Barbauld, (another important figure who also promoted 'instruction' in writings for children) was Charles Lamb: in a letter to Coleridge (23 October 1802) he deplores 'Mrs. Barbauld's stuff' and 'Mrs. Trimmer's nonsense' and sets his works for the young against the writings of 'the cursed Barbauld crew, those Blights & Blasts of all that is human in man and child' (quoted in Demers and Moyles 1982 220). This emotional and polemic debate has its parallel today and has in principle never been resolved, at least as far as the liberties of children's reading are concerned.

[17] (p.32)

> The Board of Education in South Carolina has agreed to review whether the books should be allowed in schools after complaints from parents that the tales of young Harry's adventures[…]are unsuitable for children.

One of the parents calling for a ban said

> 'The books have a serious tone of death, hate, lack of respect and sheer evil' […] In Georgia, Jerry Locke, an elementary school head, told teachers to stop reading the books to classes. ''It's questionable whether every parent wants their child to read or be exposed to books to do with magic and wizardry,' he said. (http: //www.Sunday-times.co.uk/news/pages/99/10/14/…)

This depressing narrow-mindedness on the part of parents, and, even worse, of a school head, who has obviously not learnt how to read fiction himself, does not leave much hope for the reading future of the majority children concerned.

[18] (p.34) Cf. Hollindale 1988: 24 und 29. 'Huckleberry Finn', for instance, was censored on the grounds of 'racism' – by adults who as children probably never learnt how to read literature (cf. also Meek 1982: 176,177,179; and Chambers 93/94 for examples of subcultures that do not accept that literature has no 1:1 relationship with reality)

[19] (p.36) Hunt (1991: 162ff.) recounts his own experiences with the publication of a novel for children ('Going Up') in which, for various reasons, his publisher suggested dramatic changes. After some hesitation he decided to comply and finally rewrote the novel, because 'a message is only a message if it is read' (170). He comes to the very questionable conclusion that 'the (live) writer begins with a freight of societal restraints, and

so, if I have to accept inexplicit restraints, why should I not accept explicit ones?' (171).

[20] (p.40) Stylistics is of course not free of ideology itself. Its danger, as Watt (in Hunt 102) points out, lies in 'its air of objectivity [which] confers a spurious authority on a process that is often only a rationalization of unexamined judgements'. According to Hunt this has been a reason why over the last two decades stylistics has to some extent has lost its central position which has been taken over by 'contextual studies, reader response, plurality of readings' (Hunt 1991: 102). These, however, do not preclude stylistics, and 'the recent work of Fowler and the revival of interest in Bakhtin and others who provide ideological correlatives for stylistics, place it once more in the mainstream of critical techniques' (Hunt 1991: 103).

[21] (p.41) According to Stephens (1996:63) 'closed' meanings can be traced back to a simplistic (or unsophisticated) view of the relationship between 'sign' and 'referent':

> the assumption that the relationship is direct and unproblematic has the initial effect of producing what might be termed closed meanings[...] language which is potentially open, enabling a variety of potential reader responses, is narrowed by paradigmatic recursiveness and essentialism' (Stephens 1996: 63).

[22] (p.42) Only recently children's literature has received similar serious critical attention as 'adult literature', it has been agreed that it is different but not lesser than literature for adults – and this may have been one reason why it has been emphasized how many high quality books there are, and why 'average' books have come under attack.

[23] (p.47) 'First World War Poets' (Edward Bond, in Cook 1994: 167f.)

You went to the front like sheep
And bleated at the pity of it
In academies that smell of abattoirs
Your poems are still studied

You turned the earth to mud
Yet complain you drowned in it
Your generals were dug in at the rear
Degenerates drunk on brandy and prayer
You saw the front – and only bleated
The pity!

You survived
Did you burn your general's houses
Loot the new millionaires?
No, you found new excuses
You'd lost an arm or your legs
You sat by the empty fire
And hummed music hall songs

Why did your generals send you away to die?
They saw a Great War coming
Between masters and workers
In their own land
So they herded you over the cliffs to be rid of you
How they hated you while you lived!
How they wept for you once you were dead!

What did you fight for?
A new world?

No – an old world already in ruins!
Your children?
Millions of your children died
Because you fought for your enemies
And not against them!

We will not forget!
We will not forgive!

[24] (p.50) Interest in the reader is a comparatively recent phenomenon. New Criticism in the 1940s and 50s was text-oriented and concerned only with the work without context, the 'words on the page' (Benton 1996: 72), and ignored the reader (both the adult and the child reader). Reader response criticism reached its height in the 70s (cf. Iser 1978, for an overview Benton 1996: 1973)

[25] (p.52) This is an area of interest the 'text-oriented studies' (Benton 1996: 83) of reader response criticism are concerned with: 'Who is the implied child reader inscribed in the text?' (Benton 1996: 71) If the notion of children's understanding that underlies the idea of the implied reader in a text is too simplistic or wrong in a text this may make it difficult for children to process (cf. Chambers 1985).

[25] In the power struggle between the generations, which is a central theme in Dahl's books, parents or other family members, for instance, are often portrayed as exploiting and limiting children, who, however, finally succeed in liberating themselves, though against great odds.

[25] Tucker (1992: 167) in a summary of some post -Piagetian research points out that: 'ideas of empathy, individual psychology or comparative justice...could all make sense even to a very young audience once described in the context of a lively story involving characters around the same age and stage as their readers'...167: 'play and language...the most fundamental of human attempts to transcent the here and now... a child's highly developed social sense...'

[25] There are the flat characters, the absence of pain and blood (cf. Lütti...) that characterize fairy-tales, as well as one-dimensional magic (what Gerhard Haas...refers to as 'Eindimensionalitätsfantastik'). There is, however, also a sense of wonder at the magic, as well as pseudo-rational explanations for it, which do not fit into a fairy tale, as it is usually defined.

[25] The Type/Token Ratio depends on the length of a text but the Standardised Type/Token Ratio computes a running average based on consecutive 1000 word chunks and therefore allows comparison of different text. (cf. WordSmith Tools)

[26] In the power struggle between the generations, which is a central theme in Dahl's books, parents or other family members, for instance, are often portrayed as exploiting and limiting children, who, however, finally succeed in liberating themselves, though against great odds.

[27] Tucker (1992: 167) in a summary of some post -Piagetian research points out that: 'ideas of empathy, individual psychology or comparative justice...could all make sense

even to a very young audience once described in the context of a lively story involving characters around the same age and stage as their readers'...167: 'play and language...the most fundamental of human attempts to transcent the here and now... a child's highly developed social sense...'

[28] There are the flat characters, the absence of pain and blood (cf. Lütti...) that characterize fairy-tales, as well as one-dimensional magic (what Gerhard Haas...refers to as 'Eindimensionalitätsfantastik'). There is, however, also a sense of wonder at the magic, as well as pseudo-rational explanations for it, which do not fit into a fairy tale, as it is usually defined.

[29] The Type/Token Ratio depends on the length of a text but the Standardised Type/Token Ratio computes a running average based on consecutive 1000 word chunks and therefore allows comparison of different text. (cf. WordSmith Tools)

BEI GRIN MACHT SICH IHR
WISSEN BEZAHLT

- Wir veröffentlichen Ihre Hausarbeit,
  Bachelor- und Masterarbeit

- Ihr eigenes eBook und Buch -
  weltweit in allen wichtigen Shops

- Verdienen Sie an jedem Verkauf

Jetzt bei www.GRIN.com hochladen
und kostenlos publizieren

GRIN