

The term "audience" has only relatively recently come to acquire its dominant modern meaning, referring to the viewers of an entertainment or readers of a book. The earliest such usage listed in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) dates to 1855. Earlier meanings include "[t]he action of hearing" (dating from c. 1374) and a "[f]ormal hearing," often with royalty or with a judge (from 1377). Derived from the Latin *audire*, to hear, the term has a special resonance for children's literature, for the youngest children are not readers but rather auditors of literature, truly an audience. Indeed the broad term "audience" better captures the many ways in which children consume literature—and other aspects of culture—than does "reader," the generally preferred term in literary criticism.

Raymond Williams (1976/1983a) did not include "audience" in his *Keywords*. The term does receive an entry in *New Keywords*, edited by Tony Bennett, Lawrence Grossberg, and Meaghan Morris (2005), though David Morley's account focuses almost entirely on the audience for mass media, especially addressing the extent to which such an audience is passively susceptible or actively shapes the messages received. This question of agency has been central to examinations of children's culture, broadly considered. Given that most scholars condescend to children, assuming them to be

passive and hence mere pawns, a popular approach in cultural criticism has been to castigate the media, arguing that our children must be protected from its effects. Since at least 1965, when the librarian Frances Clarke Sayers fired a salvo (Sayers and Welsenberg 1965)—and perhaps even from 1938, when Anne Carroll Moore expressed her concern—critics have deplored how reductive and saccharine Disney products are, for instance. Yet a few cultural critics, such as Ellen Seiter (1993) and Gerard Jones (2002), highlight some of the ways in which children respond actively, perhaps reshaping what they see on television and elsewhere or using comic books to mitigate anxieties. Similarly, an extensive literature attends to the numerous uses of Barbie, that icon of modern children's culture—even if the most radical uses (Barbie as dildo) are often associated with adults (Rand 1995).

My focus here, however, is on "audience" with respect not to popular culture but to literature. The concept has a special salience for children's literature, beyond the root associations with the auditory, for this literature is not by children, as the possessive might conceivably imply, but rather literature read by or to them: it is defined by its audience. Yet how exactly audience defines it is subject to debate. Scholars disagree, for instance, as to whether it is defined by being intended for children (e.g., Nodelman 2008b) or is simply literature that they read (e.g., Lerer 2008). Does a book appropriated by children, such as *Robinson Crusoe* (Defoe 1719), count? Do books that a publisher markets for children count, even if an author didn't have

such an audience in mind while writing? Scholars also disagree whether to focus more on the "book" or the "child" in their judgments, but even the "book" people cannot altogether forget the target audience: "Naturally a knowledge of and sympathy with children is . . . vital," notes Brian Alderson in "The Irrelevance of Children to the Children's Book Reviewer" (quoted in Hunt 1991).

Beyond debates within the field, the study of children's literature raises intriguing theoretical questions of broader interest that are too often missed by mainstream literary theorists, who generally ignore children's literature. However well Stanley Fish's (1980) concept of an "interpretive community" might work for adult readers, how does one define such a community for children's literature? Where might one find an interpretive community purely of children? As Deborah Stevenson (1997) notes, "The best child readers rise longitudinally [to a different reading level] rather than exerting power latitudinally, which means that there are no child gatekeepers of the canon."

Children's literature also points to the multiplicity of address of literature—necessarily so, given that no other literature so thoroughly excludes the intended audience from the various aspects of production. Very few young people have written, edited, published, or sold books. And relatively few children directly buy them; even if a smaller proportion of children's book sales are now to libraries than was the case in the 1960s, librarians, teachers, and parents are still the primary buyers (Stevenson 1997). The result, as Zohar

Shavit (1986) and others have noted, is that children's literature always has at least a double address: the children who are the ostensible audience and the adults whose decisions make it available. Given that the decision makers are not part of the ostensible audience, the nature of children's literature very much depends on how adults construct childhood and children. Indeed, Jacqueline Rose (1984) would argue that it is impossible for adults truly to know children—rather, they are always constructing them. If adults construct children as beings to be molded for the future, then children's literature may be conceived as an important part of this molding—and therefore as necessarily didactic and needing to be monitored or censored. Others, following a Romantic construction of childhood, feel that children's literature should provide wings for the imagination. Yet maybe we should not lose sight of the fact that children are not just passive; they can be active agents too, constructing what they read—and themselves.

For children are real, too. A focus on the duality of the audience may, in fact, occlude its multiplicities, masking the heterogeneity of children. Who exactly comprises the target audience for children's literature? Some scholars study the kinds of address created within a work, the narratee or the implied reader (Wall 1991/1994); others examine the reading processes of actual child readers (Benton 1995/2005). Children differ among themselves—by age, for example. When does childhood end? Is the audience made up only of those under the age of, say, twelve, or does it include

adolescents? But children also differ by gender, race, class, nationality. Focus on "the child" as audience too often misses the real differences among children.

In any case, what we now consider to be children's literature arose through early market segmentation. Literature for children wasn't always separated from literature for adults. Early literature in the West—mystery plays, ballads, folk tales, sermons—embraced children as part of its audience. Even later, literature for children long overlapped with that for the laboring and later working classes: children often read chapbooks, evangelical tracts, and dime novels. What is often considered children's literature per se—an imaginative literature directly targeting children—is generally seen as arising in the eighteenth century, along with the middle class, whether or not one dates the first work of Anglophone children's literature precisely to 1744 with *A Little Pretty Pocket-Book*, published by John Newbery (Darton 1932/1982). For most of the nineteenth century, nevertheless, writers and their gatekeepers often assumed they should publish nothing "that could not be read aloud in the family circle," to quote an editor of *Harper's Monthly* in the 1890s (Mott 1938): they assumed that the young would be part of the general readership. And works that ostensibly targeted children, and which subsequent readers have classified as children's literature, were often read by adults as well—not just in the company of children, as now with a bedtime story, but independently.

In the United States, boy books—most of which we would now consider children's literature—were

for young and old, and juvenile domestic stories were not clearly separated from ones for a more mature audience. *Little Women* (Alcott 1868–69) was enjoyed by "[g]rave merchants and lawyers," "clerks," "the civil engineer," "the boy in the elevator" (Stearns 1895). In the nineteenth century, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (Twain 1876) and *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (Twain 1884) were seen as equivalent books, usually mentioned in the same breath; only in the twentieth century did *Tom Sawyer* devolve into a children's book, and *Huckleberry Finn* ascend to hypercanonicity, to use Jonathan Arac's term (1997), as a prime candidate for the great American novel (Clark 2003).

I use "devolve" advisedly. Late in the nineteenth and especially early in the twentieth centuries the canons of taste changed. As the cultural gatekeepers shifted from the likes of magazine editors to the profession, and Herman Melville's star, for one, ascended, only works (especially those by white men) seen as targeting an adult audience came to be seen as worthy of the highest approbation. Children's literature came to be seen as inferior. If, in 1893, "The Best American Books," published in the literary journal *The Critic*, included *Little Women* and *Little Lord Fauntleroy* (Burns 1886) among its top forty, twentieth-century lists of important books rarely included works we now classify for children.

In the twentieth century, the academy did not provide a friendly audience for children's literature. Now, however, as academic departments devote courses and programs to children's literature, as books such

those in the Harry Potter series have reached a crossover audience, as publishers seem to welcome such crossovers (Beckett 2009)—and, indeed, as books such as *Keywords for Children's Literature* are published—change would seem to be afoot.

4 Body

Kelly Hager

The *Oxford English Dictionary's* (OED) definition of "body"—"the material frame of man (and animals)"—immediately sets before us one of the term's principal controversies in children's literature. That is, what Peter Hunt (1984) would call the adultist, not to mention the sexist, nature of the OED's language reminds us that the matter of the corporeal is often not deemed proper for the consideration of children and is frequently bound up with questions of gender and the adult body. But when we consider the OED's elaboration on this definition—"the material body and its properties"—the physical nature of the human body becomes more clearly a matter of interest and importance to the study of children's literature and culture. David Macaulay's picture book *The Way We Work: Getting to Know the Amazing Human Body* (2008) describes the parts of the body and its functions. The American Girl Just Like You® doll comes made to order with "hair and eye color" and "skin tone" "to match" the girl who buys her. And the Cookie Monster describes his new healthy eating habits in his "Healthy Food" rap, part of *Sesame Street's* new "Healthy Habits for Life" initiative. As just these few examples suggest, children's culture reveals an overwhelming interest in describing, depicting, and reproducing images of the body in order to educate, orient, and delight the child consumer.



er issue permeates the debates over character and literature in the early twenty-first century. The sense of a character crisis and the re-juvenile fiction writers a century ago was dismissed. The present-day adult moral panic about character includes girls, but the term "character," with its historical contexts, seems not quite right in light of the qualities the society now desires in young women. Juvenile fiction for girls deals with bullying, sexual abuse, teen pregnancy, and—unlikely to appear on Character Counts!—lists of recommended reading—certainly not the qualities of "strong" girls.

Concept of good "character" is so tied to the conservative position in the culture wars (Goodwin 1991, 2000), and is so locked into a nineteenth-century masculine concept of moral behavior, that the term no longer seems useful in thinking about character in the moral education of both boys and girls in the twenty-first century. Fieldwork research on the everyday lives of children and adolescents that seeks to understand how youth experience and deal with moral dilemmas in their everyday lives (e.g., Goodwin 2006) now sees boys and girls as more alike than previously thought in the ways they deal with problems. If, as this research suggests, girls are becoming more like boys in their friendship practices, and if both boys and girls actually practice nuanced moral reasoning than the rigid, absolutist positions advocated by most "character education" programs, then reader-response criticism needs to respect

the "native" categories young people use in thinking and talking about negotiating challenges, conflicts, and moral dilemmas in their everyday lives. Whether or not the term "character" is a native category among young people, male or female, remains to be seen.

8

Childhood

Karen Sánchez-Eppler

"Childhood" is an ancient word in English, not a young one. The *Oxford English Dictionary* takes as its earliest example for "cildhad" an English gloss inserted during the tenth century between the lines of the Lindisfarne Gospels. The meaning expressed there appears consistent with the most literal strand of our contemporary usage: this passage from the Gospel of Mark ("soð he cuoeð from cildhad"; 9:21) employs childhood as a temporal marker: a father explains to Jesus that his son had been wracked by fits since the earliest years of his life. The miraculous cure Jesus performs stands as a test of belief and a compelling instance of the power of prayer. The gathered crowd, the disciples, and generations of interpreters since have voiced many questions about this scene and what it means, but no one questions the meaning of childhood. This apparent clarity—the confident unanimity over the implications and significance of "childhood"—is perhaps the most potent, and indeed dangerous, thing about this keyword. We have, it seems, a miraculous faith in childhood itself.

"The child, and stories about the child," Adam Phillips explains, "have become our most convincing essentialism" (1998). Ever since Philippe Ariès's (1962) provocative assertion that "in medieval society the idea of childhood did not exist," historians of childhood,

scholars of children's literature, even psychoanalysts like Phillips, have striven to dismantle the essentialism of childhood. These accounts stress the complicated relations, and often glaring contradictions, between any society's idea of childhood and the lived experience of actual children. They offer persuasive evidence both of how attitudes toward childhood have changed over time and place, and of how much the content and duration of this life stage has differed even for children in the same society but of different genders, races, or class positions. Such studies reveal that ideas about childhood frequently articulated differences of status: modes of schooling and play serve as prime markers of class identity, of differences between boys and girls even within the same family, of the transition from an agricultural to an urban/industrial economy, and of racial inequality. Changes in children's literature have not only reflected these various biases, but in many ways served to create and disseminate them. The different models of behavior and desire voiced in Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women* (1868–69) and Thomas Bailey Aldrich's *The Story of a Bad Boy* (1869) schooled their readers in gender norms, and in their realist detail these books have similarly informed historians' accounts of mid-nineteenth-century American girlhood and boyhood. The idea of the child is repeatedly made and remade in the stories told to children.

Yet despite such constructionist scholarship, the sense of childhood as a ubiquitous and fundamental category of human life has proved remarkably resilient. Belief in the universal and unchanging essence of



childhood can make all sorts of cultural arrangements and power structures appear natural. The configuration of the family and of gender roles, the socializing institutions of education, class and racial formations, literary and other forms of cultural production, national security, religious and sexual virtue all tout the needs of the child. Seen this way, children appear less as the object of control than as a rationale for regulation in general. Worse, the concept of childhood dependency has frequently been used to naturalize a lack of autonomy, not only for the young, but for all sorts of subservient people. In cases of poverty, colonial status, and racial or gender oppression, analogies to childhood easily implement exclusion from civil rights. "If politics is ultimately about the distribution of power," Henry Jenkins argues, "then the power imbalance between children and adults remains at heart a profoundly political matter" (1998). The question persists: How and why do evocations of childhood succeed so often and so well in enforcing social norms and justifying social hierarchies?

I suspect the essentialism of childhood has proved this resilient and convincing because it rests, at least in part, upon biological fact. Unlike the months, or days, or even hours of dependency for most animals, human young require years of training and protection before they are capable of surviving on their own. The need for care is indeed a natural and essential aspect of children's lives, as is children's growing self-reliance. Young children everywhere must be fed, carried, taught to speak, and prepared to function appropriately within

their particular social world (Stearns 2009). The complexities of the idea of childhood, and the conflicting ways this keyword has been wielded, all harken back to this sense of beginnings, to the general trajectory from dependency toward autonomy, but there consensus ends. Few areas of human life are at once so universally shared and so differently experienced and understood. Is the mewling infant darling or bestial, the roaming youth a crusader or a truant, the laboring child valued or abused, the child reader virtuous, imaginative, or indolent? Childhood may be widely recognized as a life stage that stretches from birth until the taking on of adult competence and responsibility, but its contours and meanings are deeply circumstantial, formed by the particulars of each historical and social situation, and the stories we tell about them. Perhaps it is because childhood simultaneously roots itself in both biological and ideological ground that it proves so potent a means of naturalizing cultural formations.

Changes in the status of children are notable for what they indicate about shifts in social priorities, that is, for what they reveal about alterations in the desires and behaviors of adults. Ideas of childhood, however, are not only an adult concern. Ethnographic projects with contemporary children and archival research on the diaries, letters, and school compositions that children produced in earlier periods have enabled scholars to measure the gap between children and childhood, not only interrogating how adults' ideas about childhood inform children's experiences, but also documenting children's participation in the discourses of

childhood. The letters written to the Children's Aid Society by nineteenth-century street children skillfully manipulate the philanthropic rhetoric of vulnerable child waifs to serve their own, often oppositional, needs (Sánchez-Eppler 2005). Children's literature plays a powerful part in these dynamics, mediating between societal ideas and child actors. Charles Loring Brace's work with the Children's Aid Society inspired Horatio Alger, Jr.'s "rags-to-riches" tales, and the Society's lodging houses for newsboys happily stocked Alger's novels and used them to promote newsboy savings accounts and other improving habits such as reading. Ideas of childhood inform a broad array of practices, institutions, and ways of thinking about human identity; genre shifts within children's literature have both spurred and been spurred by such changes.

As the example of Alger suggests, books written for children remain one of the best gauges we have for a particular society's views of childhood, and one that we know children themselves engaged with directly. The books written for children instruct the young in how their particular culture understands their role. Literacy primers, school books, and conduct manuals were produced for young readers since at least the late Middle Ages, but until the eighteenth century most childhood reading was gleaned from books primarily intended for adults. The publication of literature explicitly for children burgeoned into a flourishing wing of the publishing business with John Newbery's line of "toy books" in the 1740s (Avery 1995). The success of Newbery's offerings depended upon a new conception

of childhood, which presumed that children should be sufficiently literate and leisured to make use of such volumes, that children's skills and taste as readers would differ enough from that of adults to warrant such separate publications, and that enough parents would be interested in pleasing and instructing their children to make such a specialized line profitable. The collection of illustrated alphabet cards and other reading aids, including home-made story books, which Jane Johnson carefully created for her four children, predates Newbery's commercial publications by a few years and attests to the intense desire in such affluent households for materials that would make reading instruction pleasurable (Arizpe and Styles 2004). Thus the very notion that there should be books produced specifically for child readers in itself indicates a great deal about the evolution of the idea of childhood.

The gloss in the Lindisfarne Gospel treats childhood as an easy temporal marker, but the "when" of childhood has in fact proved remarkably variable. In medieval Europe the notion of the "ages of life" provided a familiar symbolic frame, neatly dividing the human life span into distinct periods with specific social roles and clearly defined expectations. Infancy and childhood inaugurated these iconic series, but such life stages were not understood as tightly correlated to chronological age (Ariès 1962). Gary Dickson (2009) argues that the twelfth-century "Children's Crusade" served as a means of marking the passage from *pueri* to adulthood in a social world in which merely growing older did not necessarily enable a shift of status, especially



for the rural poor. Later bureaucratic and institutional structures would increasingly depend on the more precise divisions offered by years, flanking childhood with the question, "How old are you?" (Chudacoff 1989). Whether through the increasingly rigorous recording practices of parish and state registers of birth in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the age groupings of graded classrooms that would become standard educational practice in the mid-nineteenth century, or the exacting calibrations of developmental psychology in the twentieth, chronological age—gauged in years, not skills or activities—has gradually become a bulwark of identity.

This attention to age has resulted in ever more normative claims about the temporal limits of childhood, although the slightest prodding reveals them to be shallow claims indeed. The child mill-workers and miners of the Industrial Revolution, whose small, dexterous fingers and capacity to squeeze down shafts too low or thin for adults turned these five and six year olds into arduous and cheap workers, labored during the very period when children in the middle and professional classes began taking on more years of schooling before employment (Tuttle 1999). Still, the conviction that childhood can be measured in years is one of the ways that assertions about the nature of childhood gain authority and the aura of universality. Anna Barbauld's *Lessons for Children from Two to Three Years Old* (1778) demonstrates that from the first decades of children's publishing a conception of childhood measured in years structured the market, even though it would

be nearly a century before schools generally divided students and their lessons by age rather than ability (Chudacoff 1989). By the nineteenth century not only child readers, but also child characters were increasingly described by age—thus we are told that Alice enters Wonderland on her seventh birthday, and A. A. Milne merges child reader and child character in the identity of years: "now we are six."

Ariès (1962) argues that during the Middle Ages and early modern period, children might have been loved and cared for, but their lives were largely undifferentiated from those of adults. His account of the "invention of childhood" as a distinct social category during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries presents it as an idea constructed by historical forces in response to more general cultural needs; thus he shows the specific utility of the idea of the child as different from adults in sanctioning the learned classes now needed to train the young, and in privatizing the family now needed to protect the innocent. Although he tends to base his arguments on other evidence (how children are represented in paintings, the gradual creation of distinctive dress for the young, the way parents write about their offspring in letters and journals), clearly the rise of children's publishing near the end of this period confirms that such a transformation had indeed been achieved. In narrating how the concept of childhood was forged in early modern Europe, Ariès does not present a narrative of progress. The alternately "coddled" and "disciplined" childhoods that emerge have in their different ways lost much of the autonomy and latitude that he

identified in the lives of premodern children. Thus the vulnerabilities associated with modern conceptions of childhood prove double-edged: they elicit tenderness and care, but they also disallow agency.

Most accounts of Euro-American conceptions of childhood note how the development of these ideas has followed a general trajectory from the stern and punitive to the doting and indulgent. Yet for individual theorists, and in the daily life of culture, any such tidy history of ideas has tended to mix and muddle in ambivalent practice. The concept of "infant depravity" expressed in John Wesley's insistent plea—"Do not give up your child to his own will, that is, to the devil. Though it be pain to yourself, yet . . . make them submit" (1784)—expresses an understanding of childhood as a period of innate and inevitably sinful desires, but also gives voice to a desperate concern for children's ultimate wellbeing. Thus, accounts of shifts in the history of childhood that simply veer from a cruel reliance on the "rod" to a doting array of gifts and endearments mishear the anguished cherishing in these injunctions.

John Locke's (1690) depiction of the child as a *tabula rasa*, not already tainted by sin but simply waiting to be inscribed by experience, presents childhood in a manner both more benign and more passive than that offered by evangelical accounts of devilish will. Victorian child-rearing manuals would make Locke's epistemological thesis into a paean of malleability and a justification of parental authority: "Like clay in hands of the potter, they are waiting only to be molded"



(quoted in Kincaid 1992, 90). Jean-Jacques Rousseau inverted the assumptions of infant depravity, instead declaring adulthood corrupt and the social world a sad decline from natural innocence. In *Émile, or On Education* (1762), Rousseau urged parents to "leave childhood to ripen in your children" (1979), but this idealization of childhood as a period of freedom and natural goodness did not actually grant children much latitude. Émile's tutor, after all, trusts to the boy's capacity for observation and induction, but the goals of this training remain firmly in the tutor's hands.

These competing theories of childhood seeded quite different assumptions about the most appropriate stories to tell to children, ranging from didactic to playful. Locke's image of the child's mind as a "white paper void of all characters" conflates child and page in a way that seems particularly illuminating for a discussion of children's literature, since it presents ideas and identity as not only strongly marked but powerfully embodied by the pages we read as children. The ideas of childhood proffered by Locke and Rousseau melded to disrupt older strategies of child-rearing, resulting by the mid-nineteenth century in an explicitly new set of goals for children's literature: "[W]e have ceased to think it the part of wisdom to cross the first instincts of children, and to insist upon making of them little moralists, metaphysicians, and philosophers, when great nature determines that their first education shall be in the senses and muscles, the affections and fancies" (Osgood 1865). Such changes in the content and purpose of childhood reading prove formative not only for the

individual but for the culture. As Gillian Brown (2001) details, Locke's pedagogical models did as much as or more than his political theories to inform American revolutionary conceptions of governmental authority and consent. Similarly, Andrew O'Malley (2003) explains the genre shifts of children's literature from didacticism to humor, adventure, and fantasy in terms of political economy, suggesting that the moralizing children's books of the eighteenth century not just reflected but actually fostered the development of industrial capitalism, training docile workers and frugal masters. Thus, he suggests, the burgeoning of imaginative children's literature can be read as a sign of the secure triumph of the middle class, finally confident enough to play.

Children themselves participate in the construction of these different ideas of childhood, and these different attitudes toward children's books. Scraps of writing left behind by two young girls in mid-nineteenth-century New England articulate the change Osgood described and demonstrate the fluidity with which conflicting ideas about childhood can coexist even for children from fairly similar backgrounds. Lilly St. Agnan Barrett, whose father owned a dye house in Malden, Massachusetts (just north of Boston), penciled this pledge on a small piece of torn card: "I will try this day to live a simple sincere serene life; repelling every thought of discordant self-seeking an [*sic*] anxiety; cultivating magninimity [*sic*] self-control and the habit of silence; practicing economy cheerfulness and helpfulness" (c. 1856). Her hesitant handwriting and a

vocabulary somewhat in advance of her spelling suggest she was probably somewhat under ten years old. Lilly's pledge charts the process of socialization to a docile domesticity, as she strives to subdue any discordant aspects of her childhood self. Eliza Wadsworth, the ten-year-old daughter of a successful farmer in West Hartford, Connecticut, added sly phrases in a small penciled script after many of the lessons in her *Practical Spelling-Book* (1861): "Do you not love bread and milk?" concludes the lesson entitled "The Grist-mill"; "No I'll bet I don't," writes Eliza. She inserts the simple words "no yes" beneath the book's printed question "Good boys and girls try to behave well at school because it makes their parents happy. *Do you do so?*" Eliza may not behave well at school, but she still makes her parents happy; splitting obedience from the notion of parental pleasure, she takes pride in willful rebellion and seems to suspect that her parents will too. The differences between these girls' understanding of their childhood role, and the divergent ways they deploy their fledgling literary skills, suggests the fluidity of cultural change and the function of reading and writing in the redefinition of childhood.

The mid-nineteenth-century flourishing of children's literature as a site for fantasy and play ultimately produced a sense of childhood less as a period of preparation for adult life than as a time magically and wonderfully separate from it—a period where, as Eliza seems to feel, the rules don't really apply. Childhood from this perspective appears so different from the rest of life that it becomes another place entirely.

Virginia Woolf's lovely phrase for it—"that great cathedral space which was childhood" (1939)—is loaded with awe and beauty but also (this is Woolf, after all) with ironic pieties. All the magical places of children's literature (Wonderland, Neverland, Narnia, Oz, where the wild things are) understand childhood in these topical terms as someplace else, asserting a distance ripe for nostalgia. There is obvious class bias in the luxurious abundance of these fantasies, and indeed a way in which they sentimentalize and absolve inequalities, since even Hans Christian Andersen's destitute "Little Match Girl" can feel warmed by the glow of her imagination.

The sense of childhood as a time and space of enchantment intriguingly mirrors the development of psychoanalysis (Blum 1995). Psychoanalytic theory gave a new primacy to childhood as the origin of the adult self and its inchoate desires. In particular, Sigmund Freud's account of infantile sexuality and the processes of its repression served to equate the unconscious with childhood. Carolyn Steedman (1995) goes so far as to credit the figure of the child with grounding the modern concept of the self with its personal history and individual interiority. Thus, by the late nineteenth century childhood had become a locus of memory and imagination, a "secret garden," whose characteristics are in many ways shared with those of fiction itself.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century such an idealized romance of childhood appears to many cultural critics as something lost, or on the verge of loss. The hectic pace of modern life, the stress of high-stakes

testing, the juvenilization of poverty, and the commercialization of desire all seem to threaten the sacred pastoral of childhood. Television and video games besiege the golden citadel of children's literature (Postman 1994), and the ravaged figure of the child soldier explodes the myths both of childhood adventure and of childhood security (Briggs 2005). Resisting childhood's essentialism, recognizing the constructed nature of this idyll, puts the language of crises in historical perspective. Pub signs and other commercial interests infiltrated alphabet primers from as early as the seventeenth century (Crain 2000), and as William Blake's *Songs of Innocence and Experience* (1794) insists, romantic celebrations of childhood were always shadowed by grim alternatives. Anne Higonnet (1998) urges that we replace the investment in childhood innocence with the recognition of the "knowing child," a figure aware of the world's threats and desires but still deserving of adult protection. We would do better at tending to the real needs and situations of children if we were to forgo our miraculous faith in any essential and singular idea of childhood. The historical record reveals the broad array both of ideas of childhood and of children's ways of living it. Contemporary "American society is unique in its assumption that all young people should follow a single, unitary path to adulthood," Steven Mintz observes with disapproval (2004). The plural "childhoods" could prove a more honest and productive keyword, and children's literature may help inscribe this change by telling an ever wider array of new and different stories.

"Children's literature" is a term used to describe both a set of texts and an academic discipline—and it is often regarded as an oxymoron. If "children" commonly connotes immaturity, and "literature" commonly connotes sophistication in texts and reading, then the two terms may seem to be incompatible. Henry James, in "The Future of the Novel" (1900b), observed that "the literature, as it may be called for convenience, of children, is an industry," but not one to be taken seriously: "the sort of taste that used to be called 'good' has nothing to do with the matter; we are demonstrably in [the] presence of millions for whom taste is but an obscure, confused, immediate instinct" (quoted in Hughes 1978). As recently as 1997, Roderick McGillis wrote: "[B]ooks for the young still carry a burden of perceived simplicity that sets them outside the complexities we associate with literature for adults." This view is held by many regardless of whether the possessive (children's) is taken to indicate "for," "by," "of," or "belonging to." Both parts of the term are what Raymond Williams (1976/1983a) would have called "difficult" in that both cover a huge range of possible meanings, synchronically and diachronically, and together they have caused much confusion and influenced (often negatively) the development of the areas that they ostensibly name. The term has so many practical and

theoretical disadvantages that "books for children" or "children's fiction" are often used as equivalents.

The earliest use of the term to describe texts has not been established, although it appeared as the title of an anonymous article in the *Quarterly Review* in January 1860 (469–500); otherwise, the term "juvenile literature" was well-established by the end of the nineteenth century (for example, *Juvenile Literature As It Is* [Salmon 1888]), while Charles Dickens referred to "the fairy literature of our childhood" in "Frauds on the Fairies" (1853). Its use as a title for academic courses probably dates from the 1960s in the United States and the 1980s in the United Kingdom.

All definitions rely on their purpose, and so the broadest definition of "children's literature"—any text read by any child—is of little practical value. Another distinction, popularized in the United States in the 1960s, largely for administrative purposes, is between "children's literature" and "young adult literature." However, it goes back at least as far as Sarah Trimmer's *Guardian of Education* (1802) in which she distinguishes between "'Books for Children' and 'Books for Young Persons,'" adding, "We shall take the liberty of . . . supposing all young gentlemen and ladies to be children, till they are fourteen, and young persons till they are at least twenty-one."

It is helpful to consider the elements of the term: children's and literature, separately and together. The *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (1987) unhelpfully defines children as "boys or girls," but there is some question as to whether "children" is too broad a term.

Matthew Grenby (2008) asks: "Is there such a thing as children's literature? Might it be more accurate to talk of a boys' literature and a girls' literature?" Perry Nodelman (2008b) concurs in part: "[A] defining characteristic of children's literature is that it intends to teach what it means for girls to be girls and boys to be boys."

The cultural concept of "children" (and "childhood") also changes radically with time, place, gender, and perceiver, and so the corpus of texts ("children's literature") is unstable. Childhood two hundred years ago (and consequently the books designed for it) may seem so remote from current childhood (and its texts) that a distinction might be made between "historical children's literature" (or books that were for children) and "contemporary children's literature," books that address or relate to recognizable current childhoods (see P. Hunt 1996; Flynn 1997). The body of texts, however constituted, can be seen as a symbiotic moveable feast: the book defines its audience (children), and that in turn affects how children are generally defined, as well as how they actually are in the future. In this context, the term "children" is increasingly being interpreted as "comparatively inexperienced/unskilled readers."

Because of the possessive, the element "children's" in "children's literature" does not have the same standing as the adjective in "Canadian" in "Canadian children's literature": "children's literature" is one of the relatively few categories of texts/literature defined by its audience (compare "women's literature"). A. A. Milne, writing about the verses in *When We Were Very Young*, observed to a friend that "they are a curious

collection; some for children, some by, with or from children" (Thwaite 1990), thus pinpointing the essential power-relationships within "children's literature." Leaving aside the very few examples of books written by children (such as Daisy Ashford's *The Young Visitors* [1919]), and the very many books that are about childhood that are sometimes brought into the category (such as William Golding's *The Lord of the Flies* [1954]), difficulties hinge on books for children. The current Western concept of "children" connotes immaturity, inexperience, lack of responsibility—and, perhaps most importantly, *dependence*. Hence the presence of "the hidden adult" in (almost) all texts for children (Nodelman 2008b), and hence the denial of the possibility of "children's literature's" existence at all as something independent of adults, something that belongs to children. Jacqueline Rose, who, in *The Case of Peter Pan* (1984), carefully uses the term "children's fiction," suggests (negatively) that

children's fiction is impossible, not in the sense that it cannot be written (that would be nonsense), but that it hangs on . . . the impossible relation between adult and child. . . . Children's fiction sets up a world in which the adult comes first (author, maker, giver) and the child comes after (reader, product, receiver), but where neither of them enter the space in between.

As Jack Zipes (2001) puts it, in "Why Children's Literature Does Not Exist," "[T]here has never been a literature conceived by children for children, a literature that belongs to children, and there never will be."

"Literature" has proved a particularly contentious term for those working in the field of "children's literature," because the latter is most frequently taken as a category that subsumes any texts (written, spoken, visual) intended for children. Most of these fall into Williams's "popular literature" category:

At the same time many, even most poems and plays and novels are not seen as literature; they fall below its level, in a sense related to the old distinction of *polite learning*; they are not "substantial" or "important" enough to be called "works of literature." A new category of popular literature or the sub-literary has then to be instituted, to describe works which may be fiction but which are not *imaginative* or creative, and which are therefore devoid of aesthetic interest, and which are not art. (Williams 1976)

Initially, this grouping together of *all* texts for children was a negative, default adoption: "children's literature" is any text not for adults. There have been several consequences of this. The first is that *all* has been compared to *some*: that is, because the category of "adult literature" (as opposed to the "sub-literary") is comparatively clear, texts that are demonstrably "sub-literary" for children have come to characterize the whole of "children's literature"—which therefore equates with "popular literature." The second consequence is that those texts within "children's literature" that have stylistic or content characteristics normally associated with "adult literature" (or which are valorized by their age) are (with a very few notable, rule-proving

exceptions, such as Milne's *Winnie-the-Pooh* [1926]) removed from the category of "children's literature" into a hybrid category of "the classic." They become, in effect, canonical, and cease to be "children's literature" in any significant sense. Some of these (which are often crossover texts), such as Frances Hodgson Burnett's *The Secret Garden* (1911) or Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island* (1883), are published both in series of "classics" for children and scholarly editions for adults, supported by academic textual apparatus. In short, the less a book looks like a "popular" book for children, the more likely it is to acquire the status of "children's literature" or "literature" and to be treated with critical tools not specifically designed for it. The third consequence is that many people concerned with mediating or teaching children's books to children are still in thrall to the nebulous idea that some texts are "literature"—*inherently better* than others—and they consequently denigrate the very books that are most likely to connect with children.

More recently, as the literary canon has been challenged in a way that would not have been recognized by Williams (see Nodelman and Reimer 2003), the grouping of diverse texts into the "children's literature" category has been seen as indicative of a liberated critical approach. The premise is that all texts are complex, and therefore all texts are worthy of serious critical and theoretical examination. Hence category and discipline boundaries come together (or are crossed) in a positive concept of "children's literature" whose strength is its very diversity.

However, if "literature" is consequently defined *not* as a set of textual characteristics, but as a *way of reading*, this may still suggest that "children's literature" is an oxymoron. This leads to other kinds of definition of "children's literature," resting on the characteristics of the texts and the intent of the authors. Nodelman (2008b) presents an exhaustive analysis of definitions—"an overview of how adults over the past century or so in Europe, North America, and elsewhere have generally tended to think about children and literature."

Historians have attempted to distinguish between books of instruction and books designed for entertainment. As Patricia Demers and Gordon Moyles (1982) have noted, "If by the term 'children's literature' we mean only those books written specifically for the entertainment of the young, we are forced to exclude . . . a great deal of material that, in the early centuries of English civilization, was the only kind of literature children ever knew." Historians have suggested that "there was no clear dividing line in the Middle Ages between adult and children's literature" (Cunningham 2006); meaningful distinctions between "adult literature" and "children's literature" only begin with the separate marketing strategies of booksellers in England, such as John Newbery in the eighteenth century (O'Malley 2003). However, as Gillian Adams (1998) points out, this is to define "children's literature" "in terms of its commodification . . . that its very existence as a separate entity is tied to commercial interests." Her own view, that early concepts of childhood "do not logically

preclude the possibility of a literature for children," has led her to posit a considerable body of "children's literature" not merely in medieval times, but "works closely associated with children" in the Sumerian civilizations of the fourth century B.C.E. (Adams 1986).

More frequently, circular definitions are derived from describing a body of texts already "self-evidently" for children. One of the most-reprinted is by Miles MacDowell (1973):

Children's books are generally shorter; they tend to favour an active rather than passive treatment, with dialogue and incident rather than description and introspection; child protagonists are the rule; conventions are much used; the story develops within a clear-cut moral schematisation which much adult fiction ignores; children's books tend to be optimistic rather than depressive; language is child-oriented; plots are of a distinctive order.

Since then, definitions of "children's literature" have been based on rather more subtle textual elements. Aidan Chambers, in his seminal paper "The Reader in the Book" (1985b), adopted Wolfgang Iser's concept of the "implied reader" as a defining feature; this has been developed, directly or indirectly, through Barbara Wall (1991) and her theory of address: "My conclusions are founded on the conviction that adults, whether or not they are speaking ironically, speak differently in fiction when they are aware that they are addressing children. Such subtleties of address define a children's book."

These approaches generally avoid the question of "intent" as a defining element in whether a text is "for

children" or "children's literature." History is littered with authorial ambiguities—notably Mark Twain's indecision over character in *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (1876), Louisa May Alcott's misjudgment of the quality of *Little Women* (1868), or Arthur Ransome's assertion that he wrote only for himself. Similarly, crossover books from Richard Adams's *Watership Down* (1972) to Mark Haddon's *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time* (2003) demonstrate commercial ambiguities, and invalidate one of the earliest attempts at a definition, by John Rowe Townsend (1971a):

I know from conversations over a period of years that there are intelligent and even bookish people to whom children's literature, by definition, is a childish thing which adults have put away. . . . [T]hey . . . regard . . . interest [in it] as an oddity, an amiable weakness. . . . Yet children are part of mankind and children's books are part of literature, and any line which is drawn to confine children or their books to their own special corner is an artificial one. . . . Arguments about whether such-and-such a book is "really for children" are always cropping up, and are usually pointless in any but organisational terms. The only practical definition of a children's book today—absurd as it sounds—is "a book which appears on the children's list of a publisher."

Other writers, such as Peter Hollindale (1997), feel that "children's literature" partakes of a certain *jouissance*, and can be seen as an "event":

The definition of children's literature which I propose therefore involves the author, the text and the child, but with qualified meanings in each case. The author is a person with imaginative interests in constructing childhood (usually but not necessarily through creating child characters) and who on purpose or accidentally uses a narrative voice and language that are audible to children. The text of children's literature is one in which this construction is present. The reader is a child who is still in the business of constructing his or her own childhood, and aware of its presentness—aware that it is not yet over. Where these conditions co-exist, the *event* of children's literature takes place. This definition recognises a doubleness that we have to live with, namely that children's literature is characterized both by textual status and by readership, and its uniqueness is evident at the point where they meet.

In other words, "[C]hildren's literature knowingly engages with the idea of power at the heart of the relationship between author and reader" (Thacker and Webb 2002).

This idea has been elaborated by David Rudd (2005), who observed that "it is not enough to declare that children's literature is just 'a boojum'—a meaningless construction—and leave it at that":

Children's literature consists of texts that consciously or unconsciously address particular constructions of the child, or metaphorical

equivalents in terms of character or situation . . . the commonality being that such texts display an awareness of children's disempowered status (whether containing or controlling it, questioning or overturning it). Adults are as caught up in this discourse as children, engaging dialogically with it (writing/reading it) just as children themselves engage with many "adult" discourses. But it is how these texts are read and used that will determine their success as "children's literature"; how fruitfully they are seen to negotiate this hybrid, or border country.

This same question of the "border country" has applied to "children's literature" as an academic discipline. There are many thousands of undergraduate and graduate degrees called "children's literature" across the world, although in practice many have little in common. They range from primary education to abstract theory, and from aspects of childhood studies to the most arcane bibliography—and despite a common title, they do not present a coherent, or even mutually comprehensible core. The basic division is sometimes seen as one between "child people" and "book people" (a distinction first coined by Townsend [1971a]); the one sees "children" as central to the enterprise, the other not. At the literary end of the spectrum, as Beverly Lyon Clark (2003) has pointed out, the distortion of the term "children's literature" to "kiddie lit" indicates the condescension of some in the academic establishment. This may be a reaction to the predominance

of women teachers in the field of children's literature, and its association with low-status (female-dominated) disciplines, notably education and librarianship. As Clark notes, "[A]ttitudes to children's literature are never simple; they're always complexly connected to attitudes associated with gender or class or . . . a particular profession." "Children's literature" is marginalized by being excluded from critical and theoretical discourses to which it could contribute vitally (Thacker 2000); this is the more surprising in that it is widely established as an exemplar of interdisciplinary studies.

The reaction by those working within the academic literary field called "children's literature" to academic "marginalization" has variously been to adopt the critical and theoretical strategies of their peers in "adult literature," or to position "children's literature" as a valuable partner in the cross-disciplinary "childhood studies" or an essential concomitant to established academic areas such as "Victorian Studies."

"Children's literature" as a term carries with it complex emotional freight, which a more precise term ("texts intended for inexperienced readers," for example) might not—but there is little chance that, for all its shortcomings, it will be displaced. As Nodelman (2008b) has observed, "[C]hildren's literature . . . is always ambivalent."

While the definition of the term "popular" has remained relatively unchanged for over four hundred years, its connotation certainly takes on new meaning when applied to children's literature. In *Keywords*, Raymond Williams (1981a) reports that the term "popular" was "originally a legal and political term" that first came into the English language in the late fifteenth century. Within the domain of the legal system, an "action popular" was any suit that was open to or brought forth by anyone who was part of the general public. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), in the early sixteenth century the term "popular" defined the "common people" or people of "lowly birth" as opposed to people of the aristocracy. By the late sixteenth century (the OED cites 1599), the intention behind the word shifted slightly to invite negative similes such as low, vulgar, and plebeian. Nine short years later, in 1608, "popular" appeared for the first time as a positive attribute indicating that a subject was a favorite, acceptable, and pleasing to numerous people. The change from a pejorative to a complementary connotation reflected the beginning of the "common" people's effect on culture. Well into the twentieth century, the term "popular" continued to contain these diametrically opposed negative and positive connotations, particularly when describing texts created for and read by children.

As early as the 1920s in the United States, the term "popular" was held in direct opposition to the term "literature" in the children's-book world because the former indicated "not only those creations of expressive culture that actually had a large audience" but also "those that had questionable artistic merit" (Levine 1988). At the same time, "literature" signified a masterpiece that inherently contained a high degree of worth and value. In this regard, the term "literature" maintained an attachment to its definition as "polite or humane learning," which the OED deemed "rare and obsolete" by the late 1800s. In *Literary Theory* (2000), Jonathan Culler further emphasizes that "literature is 'an institutional label that gives us [the readers] reason to expect that the results of our reading efforts will be 'worth it.''" According to these standards, a mass produced, popular text must have "questionable artistic merit" by the very definition of its consumer driven nature, and therefore cannot simultaneously contain literary merit or be labeled as "literature." Beginning in the 1920s and persisting for decades, the rift between these two ideologies fueled a debate among public school teachers and librarians over what types of texts children in the United States should be reading.

In 1916, Lucy Sprague Mitchell indirectly challenged the standards librarians placed on children's literature by establishing the Bank Street College of Education in New York City (originally named the Bureau of Educational Experiments before its move to Bank Street). Mitchell promoted experimenting with and adopting

new educational techniques. She also encouraged authors to test the popularity of new books on the students who attended Bank Street's School for Children before they were published (Bank Street School for Children 2006). Rather than base their teaching materials solely on the educational value of the "classics" of children's literature, teachers emerging from the Bank Street College understood that a popular children's text could also trigger the imagination and intelligence of a child. In challenging the standards by which librarians judged texts for children, public school teachers also brought into question the librarians' larger ownership of children's literature.

In contrast, librarians championed the merits of "literature" over "popular" children's texts. Due to a secondary, audience based divide between books for adults and books for children, librarians in the early twentieth century had only recently become the cultural gatekeepers of children's literature. Unfortunately, this division of reading audiences further diminished the importance of texts for children by categorizing all books read by children as "kiddie lit." (Often books enjoyed by women were also forced into this same category in order to indicate their perceived lack of literary merit.) Prior to this division, a book's movement between child and adult audiences was rarely questioned. According to Beverly Lyon Clark in *Kiddie Lit: The Cultural Construction of Children's Literature in America* (2004), "[c]hildren and childhood were less segregated from adults and adulthood in the nineteenth century, before the split between high culture

and low, before literary authority shifted from genteel editors to the professoriate [sic]." By the early twentieth century, as "gatekeeping shifted from literary journals to the academy," this split forced children's literature out of the hands of "genteel editors" and into the hands of librarians, since "academics ignored it" (Clark 2004). This shift placed librarians in a position to dictate which children's texts contained the proper amount of moral fiber and artistry to be deemed literature worth reading. Thus, while librarians fought for the importance of literature over popular texts, they also struggled against the pejorative connotation of the term "kiddie lit" (a controversy people in the field of children's literature still face).

During this time, the United States witnessed a proliferation of popular series books such as Dick and Jane, the Bobbsey Twins, Betty Gordon, the Blythe Girls, Nancy Drew, Tom Swift, Perry Pieve, the Hardy Boys, and the Riddle Club. The Stratemeyer Syndicate produced many of these series books; if not, other publishers followed the Syndicate's example by hiring ghostwriters who could churn out multiple texts under a pseudonym. According to Leonard Marx's *Children's Legacy* (2002), the 1920s clash between traditional librarians and progressive educators deepened into the 1940s as librarians regarded "all juvenile fiction published in series form" with "deep suspicion." Most (but not all) librarians in the early twentieth century disapproved of these popular texts because the dominant discourse among librarians dictated that an inexpensive, highly popular children's text could not possibly



contain high-quality literature or artistry. Librarians feared that the consumption of popular children's texts would diminish a child's moral fiber and social consciousness. Thus, on a certain level "popular" became synonymous with "lowbrow."

At the turn of the twentieth century, a basic social assumption that cultivation and class could be achieved through literature complicated the debate surrounding the merit of popular children's texts. The growth of a middlebrow culture blurred the simplistically defined, either/or parameters of highbrow and lowbrow culture as the people in a growing middle and working class strove for self-improvement regardless of their class status and educational background. In response to the desire for self-improvement, book distribution was largely based on the conclusion that culture "could be acquired" through the process of "reading certain books and avoiding others" (Rubin 1992). For example, John Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men* was first circulated in 1937 through the Book of the Month Club. Since then, the literary status of Steinbeck's novel has transformed from that of a new book through which adults could acquire culture to a "classic" piece of literature for children, thereby avoiding the negative connotations of the term "popular." Quite commonly, texts that move from an adult to a child reading audience are labeled as "classic" while texts that crossover in the opposite direction are designated as "popular."

Currently within American children's literature and culture, "popular" connotes a widespread appreciation for and love of the object itself when appended

to a text, object, or person. Yet, the same question still resonates: Can a popular children's text also contain literary merit? Children's and young adult authors are deemed "popular" when the general public shows great admiration for them and their work. This question has faced numerous greatly admired, commercially successful authors, including Dr. Seuss, Judy Blume, J. K. Rowling, and Shel Silverstein. Popular texts, movies, toys, and the like can prove their popularity through sales figures. In 2000 Janette Sebring Lowrey's Little Golden Book *The Poky Little Puppy* (1942) was ranked the number one selling hardback book on the *Publishers Weekly* "All-Time Best-Selling Children's Books" list ("All-Time" 2006). The top ten slots on this list included three additional Little Golden Books: at #3 is *Tootle* (1945) by Gertrude Crampton, at #7 is *Saggy Baggy Elephant* (1947) by Kathryn and Byron Jackson, and at #8 is *Scuffy the Tugboat* (1946) also by Crampton. Furthermore, *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire* (2000) ranked at #5 and *Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets* (1998) claimed #10 on this same list. In June 2008, the final book in Rowling's wildly celebrated Harry Potter series, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows* (2007), had reportedly sold over 15 million copies within its first twenty-four hours on the market in the United States (Forbes.com 2008). As a result of their sudden and continued popularity, the literary merit of books like Harry Potter or the Little Golden Books remain in question.

If online dictionaries offer any gauge of contemporary use, then the term "popular" has largely been freed of its negative connotations with definitions like

"regarded with favor, approval, or affection by people in general" or "widely liked or appreciated." At face value, the term indicates that a person's work is worth reading or that a text is worth buying because it is loved and embraced by the general public. Yet, describing an author or a text as simply "popular" still brings into question the literary merit of the work. Here, the term becomes a conflicted selling point. Do authors sacrifice some of their own literary reputation if their books are marketed as popular? Can a book ranked highly on a best seller's list also be a "good" book of literary merit? What makes a children's book an instant classic as opposed to a marketing success? The establishment of both cultural studies and children's literature as legitimate fields of inquiry has created a space for academic dialogue about topics that are "popular" in American culture but have "questionable artistic merit" in the eyes of the critics (Levine 1988). Moreover, the exploration of consumer culture has opened the door for projects that recognize mass-marketed children's books as a significant part of American culture and children's "literature," not in spite of, but certainly because of, the books' widely popular appeal.

38

Postcolonial

Clare Bradford

The word "postcolonial" refers (1) to a period or state following (that is, "post") colonialism, and (2) to the effects of colonization upon cultures, peoples, places, and textuality. The terms most often associated with "postcolonial" are "imperialism," which denotes the formation of an empire, and "colonialism," which refers to the establishment of colonies by an imperial power that maintains control over them. The first usage of "postcolonial" (or "post-colonial") identified in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) occurs in 1883 in the *Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine* (White 1883), where it denotes "occurring or existing after the end of colonial rule." This association of the word with practices whereby history is divided into distinct periods (periodization) is sustained well into the twentieth century; for instance, the OED cites the following quotation from Gavin Black's *The Golden Cockatoo* in 1975: "If there's one thing worse than . . . rampant colonialism . . . it's post-colonial dictatorship." By the late 1970s "postcolonial" was used by literary critics to refer to the effects of colonization, and to reading strategies capable of interrogating the (often naturalized) manifestations of colonial discourse that appear in texts of all kinds and times. Although Edward Said did not use the term "postcolonial" in *Orientalism* (1978), his characterization of Orientalism as the discourse