TRANSCENDING BOUNDARIES

WRITING FOR A DUAL AUDIENCE OF CHILDREN AND ADULTS

edited by

SANDRA L. BECKETT

GARLAND PUBLISHING, INC.
A MEMBER OF THE TAYLOR & FRANCIS GROUP
NEW YORK & LONDON / 1999

Published in 1999 by
Garland Publishing, Inc.
A Member of the Taylor & Francis Group
19 Union Square West
New York, NY 10003

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Transcending boundaries : writing for a dual audience of children and adults / edited by Sandra L. Beckett.
p. cm. — (Garland reference library of the humanities : v. 2152. Children's literature and culture ; v. 13)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-8153-3359-5
1. Children's literature—History and criticism. 2. Children's literature—Authorship. 3. Children—Books and reading. 4. Authors and readers. 5. Books and reading. 6. Authorship. 7. Adulthood. I. Beckett, Sandra L., 1953– . II. Series: Garland reference library of the humanities ; vol. 2152. III. Series: Garland reference library of the humanities. Children's literature and culture ; v. 13.
PN1009.A1T69 1999
809'.89282—dc21
99-39096
CIP

Printed on acid-free, 250-year-life paper
Manufactured in the United States of America

Contents

Series Editor's Foreword ix
Jack Zipes

Introduction
Sandra L. Beckett xi

Part I
Critics, Crosswriting, and the Canon

Chapter 1 Crossing the Border: Authors Do It, but Do Critics? The Reception of Dual-Readership Authors in the Netherlands 3
Helma van Lierop-Debrauwer

Chapter 2 Crosswriting as a Criterion for Canonicity: The Case of Erich Kästner 13
Bettina Kümmerling-Meibauer

Chapter 3 Crosswriting Child and Adult in France: Children's Fiction for Adults? Adult Fiction for Children? Fiction for All Ages? 31
Sandra L. Beckett

Chapter 4 Children's, Adult, Human . . . ? 63
Maria Nikolajeva

Part II
Ages All? Parents, Play, and Picturebooks

Chapter 5 The Double Attribution of Texts for Children and How It Affects Writing for Children 83
Zohar Shavit

Chapter 6 Dual Audience in Picturebooks 99
Carole Scott

Chapter 7 "Ages: All": Readers, Texts, and Intertexts in *The Stinky Cheese Man and Other Fairly Stupid Tales* 111
Roderick McGillis

Part III
Oppression, Repression, Subversion, Transgression: Crossover and Censorship

Chapter 8 Writing for a Dual Audience in the Former Soviet Union: The Aesopian Children's Literature of Kornei Chukovskii, Mikhail Zoshchenko, and Daniil Kharms 129
Larissa Klein Tumanov

Chapter 9 Crossing Borders from Africa to America 149
Paula T. Connolly

Part IV
Distinctions, Demarcations, and Double Address

Chapter 10 "What happened?": The Holocaust Memoirs of Isabella Leitner 167
Adrienne Kertzer

Chapter 11 Maintaining Distinctions: Realism, Voice, and Subject Position in Australian Young Adult Fiction 183
John Stephens

Part V
Tradition and Innovation: Modernism, Postmodernism, and Beyond

Chapter 12 Crossing Borders: Calvino in the Footprints of Collodi 201
Alida Poeti

Chapter 13 Two Crosswriting Authors: Carl Sandburg and Lennart Hellsing 215
Lena Kåreland

Chapter 14 Postmodernism Is Over. Something Else Is Here. What? 239
Lissa Paul

Selected Bibliography 255
Index 273
About the Editor and Contributors 283

CHAPTER 5

The Double Attribution of Texts for Children and How It Affects Writing for Children

ZOHAR SHAVIT

The most characteristic feature of children's literature is its double attribution. By definition, children's literature addresses children, but always and without exception, children's literature has an additional addressee—the adult, who functions as either a passive or an active addressee of texts written for children. This is because:

(a) as the modern notion of the child was more widely accepted by Western society, the child's culture gradually began to develop into an autonomous domain in which the needs of the child and his/her well-being were taken care of by adults, under their strict supervision. As we approach the end of the century, this supervision appears to be becoming increasingly more rigid.
(b) the opposition between adults and children has become one of the most conspicuous societal oppositions of modern times. It is one of the first a child learns to respect and submit to in the process of socialization; it also is one of the basic cultural notions that organizes the lives of all adults who are members of a modern community.
(c) the opposition between adults and children does not entail a solid untransferable border between the two. On the contrary, each of these social systems determines not only the other's boundaries, but defines its own patterns of behavior and derives its own societal meanings from the existence of the other.
(d) over the past decades, adult involvement in the child's culture continuously has grown, with the result that children's literature

needs to be approved by two groups of readers, which by definition exclude each other.

This double attribution has far-reaching implications on writing for children, on the status of writers for children as well as on the nature of the texts produced for the child. Children's literature must cater for adult approval in order to secure its existence, even its physical existence.

Every book for children is first read by adults. If adults don't approve of a certain text, the author may find it extremely difficult to reach an audience, let alone find his/her way to being published. It is the adults who have the right and the obligation to provide for children and it is the adults who, in the framework of these obligations, produce books for children.

Adults not only write books for children, they also publish, evaluate, interpret, and distribute them. Adults also are the only ones in a position to decide whether a book will be published, how it will be published, and how it will be distributed to its official readership of children.

As is well known, this has not always been the case. Because we have become accustomed to the modern societal understanding of childhood, and to the overall existence of books for children, we tend to forget that both concepts, that of childhood itself and that of books for children, are relatively new. The connection between them is inseparable. It has repeatedly been noted by several scholars that the creation of the notion of childhood was an indispensable precondition for the production of children's books and to a large extent determined the course of development and specific options within the development of children's literature.

Before children's literature could begin to develop, a total reform in the notion of childhood had to take place; this reform has been described in the well-known, pioneering study by Philippe Ariès.[1] Children's literature could not have existed before children's needs in themselves were legitimately recognized as distinct from the needs of adults. As John Rowe Townsend states: "Before there could be children's books, there had to be children—children, that is, who were accepted as beings with their own particular needs and interests, not only as miniature men and women."[2]

Ariès and his followers have taught us that, until the seventeenth century, children were not considered to have had needs that were any different from the needs of adults. Subsequently, there was no such thing as children's literature, that is, if we perceive children's literature as a steady and continuous flow and not as a sporadic activity. Books written specifically for children were seldom published until the eighteenth century, and the

whole industry of children's books began to flourish only in the second half of the nineteenth century. Children's literature became a culturally recognized field only in the eighteenth century, and a prominent field within the publishing establishment only from the middle of that same century.

The reading of the few children's books that were published during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was not regarded as part of the "leisure time" of the child, nor did they encourage further education by means of books; moreover, these books lacked the recognition that became part of the conceptual cultural framework of the eighteenth century—the recognition that children needed books of their own that could be distinguished from books read by adults.

The basic idea was that through books the child would be disciplined along the paths of learning and godliness. In an unprecedented way, schooling and education were given pride of place in the life of an individual; moreover, the more they were perceived as indispensable tools for carrying out the process of education, the overall demand for children's books, providing encouragement and fresh turf for writers of children's books. The latter all shared the view that in the process of their education, children needed books, and agreed that these books should be distinguished from adult books principally through their fundamental attachment to the educational system itself.

Thus, it was within the framework of the new concept of childhood, evolved in Western society since the seventeenth century, that children's literature began to emerge, and it was this new concept of childhood that determined the terms of existence for children's literature. Since its initial stages of conceptualization, the notion of childhood may well have changed considerably, but the linkage between children's literature, notions of childhood, and the child's education remained crucial factors in determining the nature of children's literature. In fact, the notion that children's literature is the outcome of a specific notion of childhood dominant at the time of its construction can be formulated as a universal.

Never has the notion of childhood been as dominant as it is today, nor has the presence of the child in Western culture been so striking. This is of course in contradistinction to Neil Postman's ideas in *The Disappearance of Childhood*.[3] To my mind, Postman errs in assuming that childhood has disappeared from modern Western society, largely because he seems to confuse the changing nature of childhood with the existence of childhood as a cultural institution. He is right, however, in pointing out the changes undergone by the notion of childhood in terms of the changing borders between children and adults. In this process,

childhood has indeed shed some of its older characteristics and has taken on new ones, but the notion of childhood itself remains one of the more significant organizing principles within Western society. The past few decades have placed increasing emphasis on the notion of the child's well-being as central to both the private and the public spheres, even as it determines adult agendas and specifies divisions of labor.

Within this framework of shared labor and responsibilities, children's literature has come to occupy a special position in-the-culture. It is, in fact, this framework that authorizes children's literature and legitimizes it, even as it determines its social mandate. This social mandate expects children's literature to function as one of several tools in a conglomerate of social institutions, all seeking to supply the needs of the child as understood by society at a given point in time.

Writers of children's books seem to regard as increasingly disturbing the social mandate given to them, and consequently the demand that children's literature must respond to the needs of the child. Where previously writers for children were willing to accept their instrumental task, in recent decades they seem to wish to challenge the responsibility they are ascribed as writers of books for children, and the educational idea of children's literature as a device for the proper raising of children.

Jill Paton Walsh speaks for many writers when she says protestingly:

> Many teachers see the children's writer, like the children's doctor, the children's psychiatrist, the children's teacher, the children's home, as part of the apparatus of society for dealing with and helping children, as a sort of extracurricular psychiatric social worker.[4]

The result of viewing children's literature as an agent of other systems is that each children's book must meet social expectations, determined by a group of adults, whose social mandate is to approve or disapprove of books for children. In fact, this is the whole raison d'être of modern society. Based on the assumption that the needs of children and young people as distinct social groups are different from those of adults, members of modern Western society believe that children's needs should be determined by adults because they always know better what is best for children.

Adults pretend to know and to understand what children like and what is good for them. Moreover, adults presume to know *better* than children what is good for them. Not only do children's evaluations of books for children not count, they can even be counterproductive. If children find a certain book attractive or good or interesting—their assess-

ment is ascribed very little value or authority, and often none at all, and may even prompt a negative assessment of a book by adults. This is so because children's understanding and children's taste are perceived as having far less value than adult taste and understanding. Unless a book is approved of by adults, it will not be introduced into the official system of the child. Nor will a book for children stand a chance of being evaluated as "good" if "only" children like it or find it a "good book"; to this end, it always needs to be authorized by adults.

This leads to the well-known formulations about what good children's literature is all about. Widely accepted, for instance, is the conviction that: "Good literature is good literature; it satisfies both children and critics," as formulated by the critic Rebecca Lukens.[5]

Here, I must say, I have my doubts. To begin with, I doubt whether "good literature" exists at all—good literature, that is, in the sense that "good literature" is not a cultural construct, but a substantial entity. As we all know, what a given generation regards as "good literature" may well be regarded by the next generation as "bad" or unworthy literature. Adults all too easily hasten to agree with the famous writer C. S. Lewis, who made the following, oft-cited statement:

> I am almost inclined to set it up as a canon that a children's story which is enjoyed only by children is a bad children's story.[6]

But what is the real implication of a statement such as this? Is it not like saying a child's game enjoyed only by children is a bad children's game, or even, a child's dress worn only by children is a bad/ugly child's dress? Lewis's words are not only patronizing—which is always the case when adults refer to the child's culture—but they deny children any right to cultivate their own taste or preferences.

What do adults really know about children's culture and about what children enjoy? Only the following: Were children the only ones to enjoy something, adults would most probably not approve of it. I believe that adults should at least be aware of the irreconcilable differences between adult and children's tastes and sources of pleasure. Nowadays, adults in Western society have the privilege of determining what children should like, but have very little knowledge of what children actually do like. I don't think it is for us to try and change this situation, nor do I believe this disparity can be reconciled. After all, this is the very basis for the cultural opposition in the West between children and adults; I do believe, however, that adults should be more modest and question their own ideas of what children prefer and like.

On the other hand, I have no doubts whatsoever about the implications of these convictions as far as writers for children are concerned. With the increased autonomization of children's literature, writers for children have become less reluctant to submit to their inferior status. Any field of culture whose autonomy is undermined is less appreciated by the comprehensive cultural system. The need to be evaluated and appreciated by a different group of readers than the official addressee of children's literature ultimately results in lowering the status of children's literature, as compared to adult's literature.

In his Nobel Prize address, Isaac Bashevis Singer cited ten reasons why he wrote for the young.[7] Why Bashevis Singer chose to address children's literature on such a prestigious occasion is indeed unclear. Was he interested in improving the status of writing for children? I hardly think so. Perhaps he was simply using the case of children's literature to make a statement about adult literature and thus to add a flare of irony to the rather pompous circumstances in which the Nobel prize is awarded. At any rate, Bashevis Singer characterizes the child reader in ten points, of which the following are relevant in the context of our discussion:

1. Children read books, not reviews. They don't give a hoot about the critics.
2. Children don't read to find their identity.
3. They don't read to free themselves of guilt, to quench their thirst for rebellion. or to get rid of alienation.
4. They have no use for psychology.
5. They detest sociology.
6. They don't try to understand Kafka or *Finnegan's Wake*.
7. They still believe in God, the family, angels, devils, witches, goblins, logic, clarity, punctuation, and other such obsolete stuff.
8. They love interesting stories, not commentary, guides, or footnotes.
9. When a book is boring, they yawn openly, without any shame or fear of authority.
10. They don't expect their beloved writer to redeem humanity. Young as they are, they know that it is not in his power. Only adults have such childish illusions.

Well, perhaps one could say that children read books (not reviews), but writers of children's books, like all writers, do read reviews. Furthermore, although children may not give a hoot about critics, writers for

children most certainly do. Like all other writers, writers for children wish to be well received, they hanker after good reviews, and hope to be acknowledged as worthy writers by the literary elite. If they are accepted "merely" as writers for children, however, their chances of acquiring recognition are rather poor. Writing for children is located on a lower rung of the cultural ladder, on which writers can only aspire to climb upward, as Patricia Wrightson openly admitted:

> So I ventured to try my hand at a novel for children, very deliberately making my work into a course of training; requiring that in each book I should break new and (for me) difficult ground, and hoping to graduate to adult novels some day.[8]

But writers for children are often confined to their own territory and are not easily permitted to leave it, as Maurice Sendak confirmed in an interview he gave in 1980:

> We who work on children's books inhabit a sort of literary shtetl. When I won a prize for *Wild Things*, my father spoke for a great many critics when he asked whether I would now be allowed to work on "real" books.[9]

The sense of this shtetl results almost immediately in a shared denial on the part of writers for children of the fact that they write children's books. Absurd as it may sound, I have seldom read an interview with a writer for children in which their position as writers for children, or the standing of their addressees, was not denied.

Madeleine L'Engle recalls that when asked why she writes for children she answered: "I don't." Rosemary Sutcliff proclaims: "I have never written for any age-group,"[10] while Jane Gardam has said: "Each book I have written I have desperately wanted to write. Whether or not they had anything to do with children has never occurred to me. I have never liked children's books very much, I don't read very many."[11] L. M. Boston, for her part, has claimed: "I could pick out passages from any of the books and you would not be able to tell what age it was aimed at"[12] and Pamela Travers assures us that her books do not have "anything to do with that other label: 'Literature for children.' "[13] Scott O'Dell even seems to be protesting when he claims: "Books of mine which are classified officially as books for children were not written for children."[14]

This, it must be admitted, reveals a strange disposition: In most cases the writers at stake are highly praised and acclaimed figures who

have acquired their high social position because they write for children. Despite this, they not only deny that they themselves have written for children, but also that there even exists an opposition between children's literature and literature for adults.

This denial has nothing whatsoever to do with being familiar with the literary field. As themselves people in-the-culture, writers for children know that children's literature and writing for children are strong societal forces. Their attempts to deny the existence of an opposition between adults and children's literature are actually a protest against both the inferior status of writers for children, and against the textual implications of this systemic opposition.

By admitting to writing "merely" for children, a writer automatically acknowledges his or her lesser status. Since the wide acceptance of C. S. Lewis's statement about "good" children's literature, writers for children are afraid that if only children accept their books they will be confined to a cultural Ghetto, and will be committed to social responsibilities that will seriously constrain their options of writing. In addition, they are afraid that this commitment also will implicate them in the system's reluctance to admit new models, its preference for simplified and reductive models over more sophisticated ones, and its assumption of the limits of the possible realizations of texts. The textual implication of the double attribution of children's literature lies in the fact that a writer for children has a more limited mandate than that enjoyed by a writer for adults. In denying their status as writers for children, writers of books for children are in fact trying to deny the limits of this mandate.

I would like to turn now to the texts themselves, and briefly address the textual implications of the limitations mentioned above. In discussing the texts, I will briefly refer here to three well-known cases of writing for children. In the first, that of Lewis Carroll's three versions of *Alice*, I will point to the writer's different strategies in appealing either to adults or "merely" to children. In the two other cases, those of Maurice Sendak and Shel Silverstein, I will point to a new genre of writing for children, one which addresses the parents, very often at the expense of their children, or as Astrid Lindgren puts it:

> Many who write for children wink slyly over the heads of their child-readers to an imaginary reader; they wink agreeingly to the adults and ignore the child.[15]

FROM LEWIS CARROLL'S OWN ADAPTATION OF *ALICE'S ADVENTURES IN WONDERLAND* TO MAURICE SENDAK'S *HIGGLETY PIGGLETY POP!*

As we all know, Carroll wrote three different versions of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. After the unprecedented success of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, followed by *Alice's Adventures Underground*, which primarily addressed adults, Carroll published a third version of the story, *The Nursery Alice*, which addressed children and children only.[16] Carroll eliminated and deleted all the elements that he had elaborated in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* in order to make sure that his text would appeal to adults as well: He totally changed the tone of the text, omitting all its satirical and parodical elements, renouncing his previous attempt to blur the relations between reality and fantasy, thus transforming *The Nursery Alice* into a simple fantasy story, based on the conventional model of the time. Fantasy is motivated in the *Nursery* version as something that happens in a dream; a logical explanation exists for each event. In the *Nursery* version, Carroll made clear-cut distinctions between reality and fantasy and allowed for no confusion between them.

The distorted relations between space and time, fantasy and reality, so typical of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, were unacceptable for the *Nursery* version, written especially for children. Thus, for example, in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Carroll deliberately confuses the two worlds and at the most decisive points of the text; that is, he does this not only at the beginning of the story, but at the end as well. For example, Alice grows back to her normal size while she is still with the cards. In other words, she comes back to the "real" world when she is still in the world of fantasy. This confusion of the two worlds is described in detail as a long process, extending the coexistence of the two worlds for quite a long time:

> "If any one of them can explain it," said Alice, (she had grown so large in the last few minutes that she wasn't a bit afraid of interrupting him). . . .
>
> "Who cares for you?" said Alice, (she had grown to her full size by this time). "You're nothing but a pack of cards!"[17]

To confuse matters even more, Carroll does not end the story when Alice wakes up; rather, he leaves open the question of whether or not it was a dream, and even makes Alice's sister dream the whole story again. Thus, while he opened the story by framing it within another story, he uses the sister's dream to reframe the entire text into "a dream within a dream":

> But her sister sat still just as she left her, leaning her head on her hand, watching the setting sun, and thinking of little Alice and all her wonderful Adventures, till she too began dreaming after a fashion, and this was her dream. . . .[18]

This complicated technique totally blurs the relations between the two worlds. Alice's sister dreams about Alice's adventures, as if they were of real substance, belonging, as it were, to the same ontological order of the real world. In this way, Carroll questions the boundaries between the two dimensions. If a dream can be dreamed about, as if it were real, conversely, reality can be described as if it were a dream. The two dimensions exist equally and are equally "real." Evidence of this can be seen when Alice's sister dreams about Alice and about her adventures in the same sequence, without distinguishing between them at all.

On the other hand, when Alice wakes up in the *Nursery* version, she finds "that the cards were only some leaves off the tree, that the wind had blown down upon her face." Furthermore, Carroll makes sure to stress once again that the whole story is a dream: "*Wouldn't* it be a nice thing to have a curious dream, just like Alice? (56).

Carroll further adjusted the tone of the narrative to take on a condescending authoritative tone, which was typical of conventional didactic stories of the time, especially those intended to be read to, not by, children. The difference between the two versions, the conflicting narrative tones, the lack of parody and satire in the *Nursery* version, the different handling of space and time, and the relations between reality and fantasy, all indicate that in the *Nursery* version Carroll was indeed well aware of the child as the text's sole addressee.

Many famous writers for children who followed Carroll preferred to adopt his version of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* as a model of imitation, rather than the *Nursery* version that Carroll transformed into a "pure" children's story. What writers such as Maurice Sendak in his *Higglety Pigglety Pop!*, or Shel Silverstein in his *The Giving Tree*, have decided to do, is to maintain a dialogue with the adult reader in their illustrated texts for preschool children. The process of reading these texts always involves adults as active coreaders (a notion coined by H.-H. Ewers[19]). This tendency to maintain a dialogue with the adult reader appears to be on the rise over the past few decades.

Let's take a look first at Maurice Sendak's *Higglety Pigglety Pop!*, a highly successful and well-loved children's book that has dominated the bestseller list for children for several years. The protagonist's name is bor-

rowed from a nonsense rhyme that is well known, and remembered by heart, by almost every literate native-speaker of English in the Anglo-American world. This nonsense rhyme was not originally included in the collection of *Mother Goose*, as is occasionally assumed. It was written as a parody on *Mother Goose* "stupid" poems by Samuel Goodrich, a serious American writer and educationalist. He wrote this poem as part of a campaign against nonsense writing for children, in order to illustrate how ineffectual this kind of verse actually is. Ironically, Samuel Goodrich, who advocated rationalistic writing for children, was destined to leave to posterity nothing but this very poem, "Higglety Pigglety Pop," which, against his every will and intention, was ultimately included in *Mother Goose*.

Sendak, who was probably well aware of the history of the poem/rhyme, and probably assumed that highbrow readers were well aware of it, too, drew on its history and in so doing transformed it into a base from which he navigated into the cultural repertoire of his highbrow adult reader: most notable are the literary, historical, and psychological aspects of this repertoire.

Higglety Pigglety Pop! recounts the adventures of Jennie, a dog who leaves the cozy and comfortable home where she is well taken care of, and sets off on an instructive tour, which alludes to the tradition of the *Erbaaungsliteratur*. Jennie wishes to become a star, the main actress in Mother Goose's theater, and gets involved in strange and eccentric adventures, modeled at once on the theater of life, the theater of the stage, and the theater of the absurd.

Jennie leaves home not because she wants for anything, but because she believes that:

> There must be more to life than having everything! (5)

Or, in other words, money and property are not everything in life. Between being a dog who has everything and being a dog who has nothing, she loses everything she has, which leads her to say:

> There must be more to life than having nothing. (39)

She risks her own life and almost loses it, fails as a nanny (or almost fails), but eventually gets what she wants: the part of the main actress in a play staging the five lines of *Higglety Pigglety Pop!*

Her long and complicated adventures, and especially their interpretation by Jennie's aphorisms, leave lots of room for the adult reader, and

especially the adult critic, to delve deeply into the text and come up with piles of fertile soil for interpretation.

What *Higglety Pigglety Pop!* offers, as does Shel Silverstein's *The Giving Tree*, is a philosophical story about the value of life and what makes life worth living. Like other books of this genre, this illustrated book, which is allegedly intended for preschool children is jam-packed with prevailing psychological and philosophical cliches, also to be found in the commonplace highbrow narrative.

Silverstein's *The Giving Tree* conveys a similar message to Sendak's, though the story is far less adventurous and Silverstein's message is much simpler than Sendak's. Sendak deliberately leaves unresolved the question of what gives life its value, suggesting that the answer is ambiguous and open to various interpretations. In addition, *Higglety Pigglety Pop!* is loaded with metaphors on life and death and with allusions to Freudian–psychological traumas such as the fear of rejection and the fear of death. In order to occupy the adult highbrow reader, it also alludes directly to Sendak's own private life—the baby illustrated on the cover is modeled on an old portrait of a child in the Sendaks' family album, and he himself had a dog named Jennie of whom he was very fond.

The combination of worldly and unworldly experiences results in an adventurous, fantastic story with a philosophical flavor, which addresses adults and children; it appears to be based on C. S. Lewis's assumption that this is the only kind of text for a "good" children's book.

It seems that this formula, used both by Silverstein and Sendak, has become a model in its own right, for by now there are many texts for children that address adults, as it were, over the shoulder of their child addressees. They are all rife with pseudophilosophical and pseudopsychological statements, which adults allegedly like to find in books for children. I doubt very much whether these statements would be at all acceptable in books for adults; I have a strong hunch that they would not. They have become almost mandatory, however, in children's books whose writers think that they should address parents or other adults who might read the text to the child. Personally I must admit that I find this thinly disguised genre of books for children that actually address adults quite tiresome. It appears to have become a channel for conveying simple and oversimplified messages, which seemingly conceal deeper thoughts that secure adult enjoyment of the texts but cannot be conveyed in books for adults.

This tendency goes back as far as the Victorian era, as the Victorians were the first to explore the magic of childhood, though in its abstract sense. As the terra incognita of every English gentleman, this aspect em-

phasized the beauty and the innocence of childhood, presenting it as the lost paradise from which adults are driven away at an early stage and to which they can never return. Ever since adults discovered both the existence of childhood as well as its sealed doorways, they have realized that they need a well-grounded excuse for entering the closed gates of the child's culture. Nineteenth-century texts, such as *Alice,* and twentieth-century texts, such as *Higglety Pigglety Pop!* and *The Giving Tree,* supply the key for catching a glimpse of this lost childhood. Texts for children that maintain a dialogue with adults supply this precious asset. Their inherent double attribution enables adults briefly to reexperience aspects of a lost childhood, though this is no longer a "pure" childhood, but rather an image of childhood that adults wish to reconstruct. Texts that address both children and adults make it possible to reenter a fabricated childhood—one that never really existed, but nonetheless pretends to be the nostalgic childhood adults always love to remember. Texts that merely address children could not fulfill this need. Only texts for children that also make sure to appeal to adults can repeatedly try to recall the illusion of experiencing childhood time and time again.

The double attribution of children's literature is used in this genre as a means of bypassing the limitations of writing for children without risking being rejected by adults. A writer for children can thus still write in the framework of children's literature without having to pay the price of being ascribed an inferior status and placing severe limitations on his or her writing. Combining the longing for a lost childhood with the attempt to secure the appeal of an adult readership has resulted in this new genre of books for children. Subsequently, more and more texts nowadays are less interested in appealing to the child, and indeed seem to forget that the child is, after all, their official addressee.

As much as adults enjoy this kind of literature, they should ask themselves whether children's literature is not reaching a point where the child-reader is being abused in favor of the child's parents. Perhaps the time has come to be more conscious of how the cultural differences between children and adults are used strategically by writers, readers, and critics of children's literature. Paradoxically, the process through which children's literature became an autonomous cultural system, defined by children as its addressee, led writers to clearly define the boundaries between children and adults in order to gain the support of the adult reader. Adults always will remain involved in the writing for children, but they must remember that children's literature is, after all, written not for them, but for children. Like a doting father who buys himself an electric train in

order to fulfill his own childhood dream that never came true, more and more recent books for children seem intent on satisfying adult wishes and, in this sense, often appeal to adults at the expense of the child-reader. For adults seem to find it difficult to accept that once their own childhood is over, it is over for good. Sadly, the loss of childhood is irreversible, for childhood can never be recovered, even in books for children.

NOTES

1. Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1962).

2. John Rowe Townsend, *Written for Children* (London: Penguin, 1977), 17.

3. Neil Postman, *The Disappearance of Childhood* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1982).

4. Jill Paton Walsh, "The Writer's Responsibility," *Children's Literature in Education* 4 (1973): 32.

5. Rebecca Lukens, "The Child, the Critic and a Good Book," *Language Arts* 55 (1978): 452.

6. C. S. Lewis 1969 [1952], "On Three Ways of Writing for Children," in *Only Connect*, ed. Sheila Egoff, G. T. Stubbs, and F. Ashley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), 210.

7. Isaac Bashevis Singer, "Isaac Bashevis Singer on Writing for Children," *Children's Literature* 6 (1977): 9–16.

8. Quoted in John Rowe Townsend, *A Sense of Story* (London: Longman, 1971): 212.

9. Stefan Kanfer, "A Lovely, Profitable World of Kid Lit." [interview with Maurice Sendak], *Time* 29 December 1980: 41.

10. Quoted in Townsend, *A Sense of Story*, 127, 201.

11. Jane Gardam, "On Writing for Children: Some Wasps in the Marmalade," part 1, *Horn Book Magazine* 60 (1978): 489.

12. Quoted in Townsend, *A Sense of Story*, 36.

13. Pamela Travers, "On Not Writing for Children," *Children's Literature* 5 (1975): 21.

14. Quoted in Townsend, *A Sense of Story*, 160.

15. Astrid Lindgren, "A Small Chat with a Future Children's Book Author," *Bookbird* 16 (1978): 12.

16. Lewis Carroll, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (New York: Macmillan, 1968 [1865]); *Alice's Adventures Underground* (New York: Dover, 1965 [1886]); *The Nursery Alice* (New York: Dover, 1966 [1890]).

17. Martin Gardner, ed., *The Annotated Alice* (London: Penguin, 1977), 159, 161.

18. Ibid.,162.

19. Hans-Heino Ewers. "Das doppelsinnige Kinderbuch: Erwachsene als Leser und als Mitleser von Kinderliteratur." *Fundevogel*, 14, no. 42 (1987): 8–12.

REFERENCES

Ariès, Philippe. *Centuries of Childhood*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1962.

Carroll, Lewis. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. New York: Macmillan, 1968 [1865].

———. *Alice's Adventures Underground*. New York: Dover, 1965 [1886].

———. *The Nursery Alice*. New York: Dover, 1966 [1890].

Egoff, Sheila, G. T. Stubbs, and F. Ashley. *Only Connect*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Ewers, Hans-Heino. "Das doppelsinnige Kinderbuch: Erwachsene als Leser und als Mitleser von Kinderliteratur." *Fundevogel* 14, no. 42 (1987): 8–12.

Gardam, Jane. "On Writing for Children: Some Wasps in the Marmalade." Part 1. *Horn Book Magazine* 60 (1978): 489–496.

Gardner, Martin, ed. *The Annotated Alice*. London: Penguin, 1977.

Kanfer, Stefan. "A Lovely, Profitable World of Kid Lit" [Interview with Maurice Sendak]. *Time* 29 December 1980: 38–41.

Lewis, C. S. "On Three Ways of Writing for Children." In *Only Connect*, ed. Sheila Egoff, G. T. Stubbs, and F. Ashley, 207–220. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969 [1952].

Lindgren, Astrid. "A Small Chat with a Future Children's Book Author." *Bookbird* 16 (1978): 9–12.

Lukens, Rebecca. "The Child, the Critic and a Good Book." *Language Arts* 55 (1978): 452–454, 546.

Postman, Neil. *The Disappearance of Childhood*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1982.

Sendak, Maurice. *Higglety Pigglety Pop!*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Silverstein, Shel. *The Giving Tree*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Singer, Isaac, Bashevis. "Isaac Bashevis-Singer on Writing for Children." *Children's Literature* 6 (1977): 9–16.

Townsend, John Rowe. *A Sense of Story*. London: Longman, 1971.

———. *Written for Children*. London: Penguin, 1977.

Travers, Pamela. "On Not Writing for Children." *Children's Literature* 5 (1975): 15–22.

Walsh, Jill-Paton. "The Writer's Responsibility." *Children's Literature in Education* 4 (1973): 30–36.