1

Introduction: Children's Literature, Intertextuality, and the Anglosphere

ONE OF THE ENDURING themes of the study of comparative literature is the apparent conflict existing between Anglo-American and British values.[1] Indeed, the nature of Anglo-American culture's connection to, and disconnection from, British culture was perhaps the greatest problem confronting the Anglo-American writer in the nineteenth century.[2] However, the primary aim of this thesis is to discover whether in the course of the nineteenth-century the literatures of Great Britain and Anglo-America — especially those aimed at, or read by, children — were so similar and intertextually related that it would be realistic to view them as parts of a more complex whole.[3] I examine that complex whole as the literature of the

---

[1] David Hume observed that 'All kinds of reasoning consist in nothing but a *comparison*, and a discovery of those relations, either constant or inconstant, which two or more objects bear to each other.' See 'Of probability; and the idea of cause and effect', in *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1739) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 52-55 (p. 52).

[2] Raoul Granqvist, *Imitation as Resistance: Appropriations of English Literature in Nineteenth-Century America* (Madison, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1995), p. 19.

[3] This is how they were once viewed. Indeed, it was 1921 before an American Literature section of the Modern Language Association of America was formed, and the learned journal, *American Literature,* was not published until 1929. The founding of the Modern Language Association in 1883 ushered in the age of English Language and Literature as an independent academic discipline in American institutions of higher education. See Donald A. Sears, *The Discipline of English* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963), p. 15. In 1895, Fred Lewis Pattee became the first Full Professor of American Literature when he was appointed to that position at the Pennsylvania State University. However, American Literature was still being taught as a subset of British Literature. In 1896, Pattee published a paper titled 'Is there an American Literature?' in the Chicago journal, *The Dial*. His appointment had not been without controversy, and he felt compelled to defend the academic status of American Literature. In 1961, the University of Leeds became the first institution of higher education in the United Kingdom to endow a chair devoted specifically to the study of American Literature. See Arthur N.

Anglosphere, a concept that I shall discuss more fully below. However, the literature of the wider Anglosphere — including that of the former British colonies — is not reviewed herein, for it is a heuristic principle in any form of scholarly inquiry not to assume the existence of more entities than is necessary for clear explanation. William of Ockham was not wrong.

Henry David Thoreau observed that 'it is difficult to begin without borrowing'.[4] Correspondingly, it is my intention to explore in this thesis the extent to which some of the more prominent writers of children's works in the nineteenth century borrow from the works of their forerunners. In discussing questions of direct influence and allusion it is my intention to draw upon scholarship that is both historical and contemporary in nature. In particular, I shall be examining the flow of intertextual influences that crisscrossed the Atlantic Ocean. In addition, I shall explore to what degree, and in what manner, Anglo-American and British literature interacted. I shall also attempt to define what it is one actually studies when one claims to be studying intertextuality in the nineteenth-century children's novel, and extrapolate from this how the study thereby defined may best be undertaken. It is my design, therefore, to identify specific aspects of Anglospheric thought with reference to children's literature, and to comment upon how they relate to what Paul Giles has called 'points of transnational convergence'.[5] Some of my conclusions may prove to be of a provisional nature, while others may be merely speculative. One may seek precision only insofar as the nature of the subject under investigation admits.

In what follows, I shall try to discover in what way Anglospheric identity influenced literary output primarily aimed at a juvenile readership. (Influence is not a deterministic

---

Applebee, *Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English* (Chicago, Illinois: The National Council of the Teachers of English, 1974), pp. 20-21.
[4] Henry David Thoreau, *Walden* (1854) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 38.
[5] Paul Giles, *Transatlantic Insurrections: British Culture and the Formation of American Literature, 1730-1860* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), p. 8.

process. Each writer examined articulates Anglospheric tendencies in his or her own way.) It is my intention to argue that a more praxis-oriented perspective on ethnolinguistic identity can improve understanding of how the concept of the Anglosphere is made manifest in nineteenth-century children's literature. In both introduction and thesis I hope to show a background of cultural assumptions shared by Anglospheric authors, who propagated an ethnocentric outlook.[6] Ethnicity, rather than nationality, is the lens of analysis. The philosophical attitudes toward children's literature were relatively uniform throughout the Anglosphere, even though an *ethos* is not a *genos*, and philosophy is not genealogy. The nineteenth-century boy's own story was a form of propaganda; a psychological moulding by literary means.[7] Indeed, it could be viewed as an expression of a self-conscious group evolutionary strategy, for a marked ingroup preference is a hallmark of the genre. The boy's own adventure story promoted an ideology of whiteness even as it oscillated between fiction and historical experience. Anglospheric authors instilled a level of ethnic consciousness that determined an individual's way of thinking, thereby shaping the moral, and indeed political, contours of the nineteenth-century adult world. The inherent whiteness of Anglospheric literary memory cannot be gainsaid.

The institutional structures, and strictures, of literary studies have been conditioned largely by categories that are nationally defined.[8] However, a study of literature founded on Anglospheric migratory flows will challenge some basic assumptions pertaining to contemporary literary criticism. I shall question whether the primacy of national boundaries in demarcating literary spaces is legitimate. However, there is sometimes a remarkable continuity

---

[6] Gillian Lathey, 'The Road from Damascus: Children's Authors and the Crossing of National Boundaries', in *Children's Literature and National Identity*, ed. by Margaret Meek (Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham, 2001), pp. 3-9.

[7] Jill P. May, 'Literature as Propaganda', *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, 10 (1985), pp. 156-157.

[8] Paul Giles, *Atlantic Republic: The American Tradition in English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. 2. See also Susan David Bernstein, 'Transatlantic Networks in the Nineteenth Century', in *Teaching Transatlanticism: Resources for Teaching Nineteenth-Century Anglo-American Print Culture*, ed. by Linda K. Hughes and Sarah R. Robbins (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015), pp. 32-39.

between nations and *ethnie*, nationalism and ethnicism, though such continuity cannot invariably be equated with identity.[9] *Ethnos* is the *expression* of an *ethnie* based on common experiences, thereby forming a common outlook, with a consciousness of being distinct from others.[10] The literary culture of the Anglosphere is such an expression.

Before entering fully into the matter at hand, I would like to address the concept of ethnicity in a literary context.[11] It is widespread practice to define ethnicity as otherness, and such contrastive terminology lends itself to a viewpoint that changes according to whomsoever employs it. Indeed, there is potential for subjective bias in any form of ethnographic observation. I define ethnoliterature as a collective literature that stands as much for the concerns of a group related by ties of kinship, an extended family, as for that of an individual author. It is an expression of a named human population sharing common myths and historical memories, and possessed of a distinctive group consciousness.[12] However, I shall be articulating a concept, not proposing a code of belief. My aim is not simply to defend my thesis, though that I most certainly do, but rather to launch a debate on the character and pedigree of Anglospheric ethnoliterature, or white literature, for this thesis is of a type that Aristotle calls *doxa*, which is defined as the first step taken in the finding of knowledge.[13] In this introduction I shall attempt to identify and clarify the strengths and weaknesses of previous research findings in the field of nineteenth-century children's literature, and examine any theoretical

---

[9] Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1999), p. 217.
[10] Alexander Dugin, *Ethnos and Society* (London: Arktos, 2018), p. 2.
[11] An ethnic group is generally understood to designate an extended community that is rendered biologically self-perpetuating by the maintenance of endogamy, and that shares fundamental cultural values. See Fredrik Barth, 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries', in *Ethnicity*, ed. by John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 75-82 (p. 75). Ethnicity appears to be a term of relatively recent coinage. It does not appear in the 1933 edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but it does appear in the 1972 Supplement, where the first usage recorded is in 1953.
[12] Holly E. Martin, 'Ethnicity, Ethnic Literature, and Hybrid Narratives', in *Writing Between Cultures: A Study of Hybrid Narratives in Ethnic Literature of the United States* (Jefferson, North Carolina: MacFarland, 2011), pp. 1-20. Martin points out that 'ethnic' is often taken to be synonymous with 'not white'.
[13] Aristotle often compares and relates *doxa* to thought and belief, but no theory of it is to be found anywhere in his extant *corpus*. See Jessica Moss, *Aristotle and the Apparent Good: Perception, Phantasia, Thought, and Desire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. 70.

assumptions contained therein. The reader may be led to a fuller understanding, albeit in a new way, of a concept that has perhaps been *instinctively* understood hitherto.[14] I shall also explore to what extent ethnocentrism, though sometimes tacit, lies at the core of Anglospheric literature.[15] It is invariably difficult to interpret that which is tacit, and I shall do so here in a fittingly tentative manner.

Four texts in the genre will be analysed in order to test the substantive hypothesis. Reading these texts as an adult male places the reader's attention exactly where I believe it should be, which is on the fabricated, though by no means fallacious, nature of the characters who appear in what we call the boy's own adventure story. This compels the reader not to lose sight of what is perhaps the most salient fact regarding the nineteenth-century boy's own adventure story, which is that its creation is centrally, and almost exclusively, an activity of men. My topic in this thesis is texts that were written by men, and often purchased by men, and read by men throughout the course of a lifetime, but were supposedly written for bookish boys. The prolonged contemplation of this phenomenon may lead to some degree of cognitive dissonance. The boy protagonists of the texts examined are of a hybrid nature, which is to say that they are not wholly juvenile. They possess qualities that mark them out from their peers. As we will see, inside every one of the boys discussed therein is demonstrably a man in the

---

[14] To paraphrase Ludwig Wittgenstein, the work of the literary critic often consists in 'assembling reminders' for a particular purpose; an activity which consists in a study of that which is already known in order to know it better still. Problems are solved not by creation or discovery, but by *assembling* that with which we have long been familiar. See *Philosophische Untersuchungen* (1953). Published in English as *Philosophical Investigations*, trans. by G. E. M. Anscombe (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953), p. 96.

[15] Similarly, ethnocentrism, and a concomitant self-definition, lies at the core of African-American literature. It is undeniably the case that in the nineteenth century African-American literature was largely ignored or neglected by mainstream society. Literary representations *of* African-Americans *by* African-Americans met with limited commercial success. See Bernard W. Bell, *The Afro-American Novel and its Tradition* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), p. 5. African-American authors wrote with the express purpose of fostering a heightened sense of ethnic identity among their own people. Identity perforce implies difference. See Kenneth W. Warren, 'Historicizing African-American Literature', in *What was African-American Literature?* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2012), pp. 1-43. See also Eric Sundquist, *To Wake the Nations: Race in the Making of American Literature* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1993), pp. 619-624. In this thesis, however, Afro-Diasporic literature is touched upon but tangentially.

making. Jim Hawkins, Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn, and Kimball O'Hara can all, on occasion, exhibit the dominant traits of the adult male action hero. Although Hawkeye, protagonist of James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826), is an adult, in some respects he manifests a boyish innocence, in addition to which he is the man that perhaps every bookish boy would aspire to be. Concomitantly, he can sometimes fail to manifest traits of character that are indicative of the alpha male. Indeed, this is the essential nature of the boy's own story, which is really the male's own story.[16] The ways of boys, and the ways of men, run along lines that inevitably converge.

In Chapter Two, I show that though *The Last of the Mohicans* was written for a mature readership it has long since been embraced by juvenile readers. I aim to show why such an elision is characteristic of the boy's own story. Hawkeye is a role model for the men and boys of the Anglosphere. Fenimore Cooper does not subscribe to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's views, as expressed in *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (1755), regarding the inherent virtue of primitive peoples, but nevertheless shows some of them in an exemplary light.[17] The historical and political processes that give rise to what is commonly called boy's own adventure stories are discussed. *The Last of the Mohicans* is a training manual for those whose task it is to expand, and to validate, the Anglosphere. The ideology of Anglo-Saxon supremacy serves as a rationale for the subjugation of primitive indigenes wherever encountered.[18] The subtleties of the text are doubtless lost on naïve readers, but are revealed on rereading in later years, for the boy's own adventure story is reading material that spans a lifetime. *The Last of the Mohicans* is explicitly aimed at an Anglospheric readership; Native American readers would perhaps read it in a spirit not intended by the

---

[16] E. S. Turner, *Boys Will Be Boys: A History of British Boys' Weeklies* (London: Faber & Faber, 2012), p. 2.
[17] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, trans. by Franklin Philip (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 26-54.
[18] Christine Bolt, *Victorian Attitudes to Race* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1991), p. 147.

author. Anglospheric boy's own adventure stories do not always travel well. Hawkeye is a Faustian spirit who exemplifies whiteness and the warrior ethos. *The Last of the Mohicans* is very much a white novel. Tribalism is seen to be a basic human instinct that is both natural and adaptive in the evolutionary sense.

Chapter Three focusses on *Treasure Island* (1883), which was written for boys and is revealingly formulaic in structure. This chapter attempts to show that although the novel appears to be an essentially English tale, albeit written by a Scot, its significance cannot be understood without an understanding of the many and varied American influences contained therein. *Treasure Island*, I suggest, should really be read as an Anglospheric novel, and as an implicitly white novel. (The Other is granted a tokenistic presence only.) Jim Hawkins is a moral exemplar. Indeed, *Treasure Island* is a morality tale, even though Silver eludes condign punishment. Stevenson is never explicitly moralistic, but implicitly he most certainly is. The boy's own story is written to assist in building a boy's character, but also to maintain, and indeed reinforce, the moral code adhered to by the best of men.[19] However, as we will see, morality is not an immutable concept.

Chapter Four presents an intertextual reading of *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (1884) from a white perspective. This is one of the most controversial Anglo-American novels of the nineteenth century, and the eponymous protagonist is a lasting symbolic figure not only in fiction, but also in popular culture. Huck embodies the divergent, indeed contradictory, opinions of cynical idealism and bigoted tolerance that typified *antebellum* America.[20] *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn* are replete with references and allusions to British and European

---

[19] The guided study of improving literature as a means to instil virtue has not gone out of fashion. See David Carr and Tom Harrison, *Educating Character through Stories* (Exeter, Devon: Imprint Academic, 2015), *passim*.

[20] Carol J. Singley, *Adopting America: Childhood, Kinship, and National Identity in Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 2.

literature, some of which are relatively obscure, though he does not appear to have been influenced by African-American literature, which is surprising given that *Huckleberry Finn* is a story of a runaway slave. The slave narrative is a staple of nineteenth-century black literature, but on this occasion it is told from a white perspective. It could perhaps be viewed as an act of cultural appropriation. As one would expect, Twain's hymn to the boy's own morality tale is rather oblique, if not indeed convoluted. Huck's sense of identity, perhaps even his very whiteness, is called into question.

As we will see in Chapter Five, *Kim* (1901) is perhaps the most perceptive examination of imperialism in the genre. In common with the previous works examined, representatives of subject peoples, and that includes Long John Silver, are viewed in an alternating favourable and unfavourable light. Imperialism is seen to take many forms, though the most significant one is theft and murder. *Kim* is a masterpiece in the genre of crossover literature, and its educative power rewards multiple readings. It is sufficiently entertaining to maintain a naïve reader's interest, and yet profound enough to repeatedly draw sophisticated readers back to it. Naïve readers learn that subject peoples are not necessarily passive, and that subordinate and superordinate partners in the imperial project have perforce a symbiotic relationship. Indeed, the idea that subject peoples may collude in their own subjection makes *Kim* a controversial work. I wish to argue that Kim is polemical and didactic in equal measure. The lessons drawn from a reading of *Kim* are every bit as relevant today as they were in the nineteenth century. The key to unlocking *Kim* is to grasp the nature of its eponymous protagonist's whiteness, which is no easy feat, given that he does not seem to fully understand it himself.

The inherent didacticism of the nineteenth-century boy's own story is a given, for despite the boyish pranks, and sometimes downright bad behaviour, there is an exhortation, albeit sometimes implicit, to play the game. Such stories generally convey conservative social

norms and traditional standards of behaviour by appending homilies of one kind or another. Adult readers can learn much from such morally improving tales of boyish adventures in a man's world, though this is surely to state the obvious, for to expunge any claim of an adult male's understanding of boyhood experience, even in a literary context, would be to refuse the possibility of any meaningful interaction between men and boys. It could not be any other way, for the boy's own story is part of the man's own story. Just as many female literary critics claim to read *Little Women* at regular intervals, and take inspiration from it, a number of male literary critics have made a similar claim for *Kim*.[21] Profoundly different lessons, which are *demonstrably* gender specific, are to be derived from these two very different works. Perhaps the main strength of the nineteenth-century boy's own adventure story is its educative power.

In what follows in this thesis I attempt to show that the concept of national literature has been detrimental to an understanding of Anglospheric writers, and has led to some misreading of their texts. To this end, I shall attempt to bring to light the assumptions that underlie the false dichotomy of nineteenth-century English and American literature by means of a radical rereading of so-called children's literature. A cognisance of how ethnic identity, and consequently ethnic cohesion, was reinforced by the nineteenth-century boy's own adventure story is paramount. Moreover, the concept of heroism as a hallmark of authentic whiteness is a given.

In place of national literatures, therefore, I am proposing a study of the ethnocentric literature of the Anglosphere. Now, it would be an error of judgement to conceive of ethnocentric literature as an absolute, and to assume that a work of literature is either ethnocentric or it is not. Ethnocentric literatures vary incrementally. Ethnocentrism is a degree,

---

[21] Elaine Showalter, '*Little Women*: The American Female Myth', in *Sister's Choice: Tradition and Change in American Women's Writing* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 42-64, (p. 46).

not a kind, for no form of ethnocentrism is impervious to exogenous influence.[22] Indeed, the concept of the Anglosphere blends three sets of dimensions: civic and territorial, ethnic and genealogical, linguistic and cultural.[23] Ethnocentrism is a general predisposition toward self-identification, and it is in this respect that it differs from prejudice.[24] It is commonly an ingroup affinity, and not an outgroup antipathy, that leads to a particularistic ethnic solidarity.[25] The literary manifestations of the Anglosphere will be reviewed in this context, albeit with the proviso that I am dealing with what I infer to be a subjective *sense* of common ethnicity implied by writers.[26] To this end, I shall investigate the notion that the organic basis of Anglospheric literature might be related to folk memory.[27] Moreover, we will see that the nineteenth-century boy's own adventure story laid the foundations of white identity in the minds of its readers.[28]

Previous critics

D. H. Lawrence's gallimaufry of occasional pieces, *Studies in Classic American Literature* (1923),[29] exhibits many vices, though it does exhibit one great virtue. Indeed, this work could

---

[22] Satoshi Kanazawa and Norman P. Li, 'Happiness in modern society: Why intelligence and ethnic composition matter', *Journal of Research in Personality*, 59 (2015), pp. 111-120.

[23] Werner Sollers, *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 21-23. See also Anthony Brundage and Richard A. Cosgrove, *The Great Tradition: Constitutional History and National Identity in Britain and the United States, 1870-1960* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), *passim*.

[24] Literature can evidence much about the community that produces it. See Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), *passim*. See also J. M. Coetzee, *White Writing: On the Culture of Letters in South Africa* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1990), *passim*.

[25] Lee Jussim, *Social Perception and Social Reality: Why Accuracy Dominates Bias and Self-Fulfilling Prophecy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 241-244. See also Byron Roth, 'The Evolutionary Sources of Group Solidarity and Conflict', in *Perils of Diversity: Immigration and Human Nature* (Augusta, Georgia: Washington Summit, 2010), pp. 61-78.

[26] Frank Salter*, On Genetic Interests: Family, Ethnicity, and Humanity in an Age of Mass Migration* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction, 2007), pp. 145-147.

[27] William Graham Sumner, *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals* (1906) (New York: Dover, 2002), *passim*. Sumner has been widely, and wrongly, credited with coining the concept of ethnocentrism. It was, however, Ludwig Gumplowicz who coined, and discussed at length, *Ethnocentrismus* in *Das Recht der Nationalität und Sprachen in Österreich-Ungarn* (1879). See Boris Bizumic, 'Who Coined the Concept of Ethnocentrism?', *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 2 (2014), pp. 3-10 (p. 4).

[28] Daniel Hill, 'What is Cultural Identity?', in *White Awake: An honest look at what it means to be white* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2017), pp. 25-46.

[29] D. H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature* (London: Penguin Books, 1971), *passim*.

be viewed as a marriage of Archilochus' hedgehog and fox,[30] for though Lawrence knows very many things, he more importantly knows one *very* significant thing, which is that ethnic consciousness is central to an understanding of Anglospheric literature. Lawrence's ethnic identity demonstrably influenced his judgement of what is *classic* American literature. Perhaps he regarded being white as being synonymous with being American, for he seems to equate a comprehension of literature with a comprehension of whiteness. Indeed, throughout *Studies in Classic American Literature* he appears to assume that literary culture is indissolubly connected with the mores of the hegemonic ethnic group. The literary output of subordinate ethnic groups is conspicuous by its absence. Whiteness in an American context, the most acceptable permutation of which is Anglo-Saxon, engenders a literature that is marked by ingroup preference.[31] The nineteenth-century boy's own adventure story, however defined, is a vehicle of imperial propaganda.[32] Lawrence is a pivotal figure, albeit an eccentric one, in the study of literary whiteness and its concomitant endorsement, indeed celebration, of white ethnic consciousness. Lawrence's study of classic white American literature rewards a close reading, despite its inherent limitations.

Toni Morrison is also signal in the study of literary whiteness, albeit in a tellingly different way, for her *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (1992)[33] also seeks to promote an ethnocentric view of literature.[34] However, despite what Morrison

---

[30] Isaiah Berlin, 'The Hedgehog and the Fox', (1953) in *The Proper Study of Mankind* (London: Vintage, 1997), pp. 436-498.

[31] A. Robert Lee, 'Fictions of Whiteness', in *Multicultural American Literature* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003), pp. 235-268.

[32] John M. MacKenzie, 'Imperialism and Juvenile Literature', in *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), pp. 199-227.

[33] Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1992), *passim*.

[34] Morrison has always welcomed being described as a 'black writer'. She states unequivocally, 'I'm writing for black people in the same way that Tolstoy was *not* writing for me…The point is not having the white critic sit on your shoulder and approve it.' See Hermione Hoby, 'Toni Morrison: "I'm writing for black people…I don't have to apologise"', *The Guardian*, 25 April, 2015, p. 17. See also Joseph Keller, 'Black Writing and the White Critic', *Negro American Literary Forum*, 3 (1970), pp. 103-110, and Frederick C. Stern, 'Black Lit., White Crit.?', *College English*, 35 (1974), pp. 637-658.

may wish us to believe, black writers have never been indifferent to the judgement of white readers. As James Weldon Johnson observed in 'The Dilemma of the Negro Author' (1928), 'I judge there is not a single Negro writer who is not, at least secondarily, impelled by the desire to make his work have some effect on the white world for the good of his race.'[35] Moreover, there were, and indeed still are, compelling financial reasons for black writers to seek a wide readership.

Correspondingly, in Morrison's novels white society is usually presented as a theatrical background before which black characters play out their lives. Morrison, an unabashedly ethnocentric author and critic, has argued that representations of whiteness are ontologically dependent on the concept of blackness. This is to my mind a case of special pleading. The position adopted by Morrison is untenable, for literary whiteness antedates, and developed independently of, black literature. African-American literary norms are not universal. However, Morrison does make some thought-provoking observations, and is certainly cognisant of the import of ethnic identity, both real and imagined, in literature and literary criticism, if not indeed in quotidian events. African-Americans continue to have an organic connection to their literary culture. Morrison uses the terms 'black' and 'African-American' interchangeably. Similarly, in this thesis the terms 'white' and 'Anglo-American' are employed as synonyms. Correlatively, in the nineteenth century the terms 'black' and 'American' were mutually exclusive for many.[36]

However, though the question of who is or is not black is usually self-evident, it is on occasion problematic. Indeed, there is a certain measure of racial slipperiness to be found in

---

[35] James Weldon Johnson, 'The Dilemma of the Negro Author', in *The New Negro: Readings on Race, Representation, and African-American Culture, 1892-1938*, ed. by Henry Louis Gates and Gene Andrew Jarrett (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007, pp.378-382, (p. 382).
[36] Valerie Babb, *A History of the African-American Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), p. 115. See also Lerone Bennett, 'Prologue in Blackface and Whiteface', in *Forced into Glory: Abraham Lincoln's White Dream* (Chicago: Johnson, 1999), pp. 87-112, and Peter Kolchin on the 'Americanization' of sub-Saharan Africans in *American Slavery, 1619-1877* (London: Penguin, 1995), pp. 40-44.

the African-American canon that is apparently absent from its Anglo-American counterpart. For example, there is the strange case of Emma Dunham Kelley-Hawkins, who is the first writer to be excluded from the canon of African-American literature due to her whiteness. She was embraced by the African-American *literati* in the mistaken belief that she was of partly sub-Saharan African ethnicity, but once it was discovered that she was a person of unalloyed European ancestry they wasted no time in disowning her. This is what is called being raced.[37] It is evidently the case that the appellation of 'black literature' is premised upon the blackness of its author.

In a similar vein, Valerie Babb, in *Whiteness Visible: The Meaning of Whiteness in American Literature and Culture* (1998), explores the nature of non-white American literary identity in relation to a hegemonic whiteness. Now, while Babb does appear to be subconsciously enamoured of white literature, there is some measure of scepticism detected. Babb has argued that '*The Last of the Mohicans* (1826) and *Huckleberry Finn* (1884-1885), both credited with breaking American imitation of English forms and content, could not have done so without depending largely on Native American and African-American elements.'[38] However, as we will see, this is very much a mistaken view. Cooper and Twain were profoundly influenced by British literary culture, and did not seek to break with it. Babb's misreading does nothing to support her case against whiteness. Indeed, the title of her book evocatively inverts the oxymoronic expression 'darkness visible' that is to be found in John Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667).[39] It would appear that she does not herself wish to break with British literary forms and content. Yet, Babb does show a refreshing willingness to engage with the concept of whiteness, even though her views of Anglospheric culture, and those who create

---

[37] Jennifer Harris, 'Black Like?: The Strange Case of Emma Dunham Kelley-Hawkins', *African-American Review*, 40 (2006), pp. 401-409.
[38] Valerie Babb, 'Toward a Philosophy of Whiteness', in *Whiteness Visible: The Meaning of Whiteness in American Literature and Culture* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), pp. 7-45 (p. 43).
[39] John Milton, *Paradise Lost* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 5.

it, would appear to evidence a lack of objectivity.[40] Scepticism with regard to Anglospheric

lineage, language, and customs has a long history in African-American thought. However,

nineteenth-century Afrospheric ethnological literature, be it fictive or factual, hardly differed

in tone from its Anglospheric counterpart.[41]

Kenneth W. Warren is correct in stating that nineteenth-century African-American

writers wrote primarily for a readership of their own ethnicity, but their readers were primarily

a minority *within* a minority, which is to say the literate, aspirational section of the African-

American community. He writes that 'black authors, consciously and unconsciously, have

worked and reworked rhetorical practices, myths, folklore, and traditions that derive from the

African continent.'[42] They strived to create a literary counterculture to which the African-

American community could readily relate, though such cultural patterns did become associated

in the white mind with peculiar racial traits that were judged to be inherently inferior.[43] As we

will see, the authors of Anglospheric nineteenth-century boy's own adventure stories were also

ethnocentric in outlook. Both Afrocentric and Anglocentric authors wrote not just to entertain,

but to proselytise. However, some Afrocentric writers were indeed influenced by Anglospheric

---

[40] Jack London was of a mind that the nineteenth-century Anglo-American community evidenced a similar misunderstanding of the Other. 'Half the trouble is the stupidity of the whites…If the white man would lay himself out a bit to understand the working of the black man's mind, most of the messes would be avoided.' See 'The Inevitable White Man', in *Tales of Cannibals and Head Hunters*, ed. by Gary Riedl and Thomas R. Tietze (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2006), pp. 201-216 (p. 206). See also Jeanne Campbell Reesman, 'Jack London and Race', in *Jack London's Racial Lives* (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 2009), pp. 13-54, and George M. Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (Hanover, New Hampshire: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), *passim*.
[41] Mia Bay, *The White Image in the Black Mind: African-American Ideas about White People, 1830-1925* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 75-116. See also Langston Hughes, who describes 'that other America' and its collective view of the Anglosphere in *The Ways of White Folks* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1934), *passim*. Stephanie Li has also described the multivalent ways in which African-American authors have critiqued white society. See *Playing in the White: Black Writers, White Subjects* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), *passim*.
[42] Kenneth W. Warren, 'Historicizing African-American Literature', in *What was African-American Literature? op. cit.*, p. 2.
[43] Lawrence W. Levine, *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 444-445.

literature.[44] Warren believes African-American writers were well aware of the social impact of literature. They were also doubtless aware that the nineteenth-century boy's own adventure story was not written with an African-American readership in mind. He advances the view that African-American literary critics grasp the centrality of *ethnie* in the study of writers and writing, and in this he is entirely correct.

Leslie A. Fiedler's defence of the nineteenth-century boy's own adventure story is based, like Lawrence's *Studies in Classic American Literature* (1923), on a handful of texts. The examples discussed therein are uniformly of Anglo-Saxon origin.[45] Indeed, as Valerie Babb has observed, 'American whiteness is essentially an English creation'.[46] Fiedler makes clear that though *ethnie* and national identity are often related they can sometimes be a source of friction. He certainly subscribed to the power of blackness, albeit in a literary sense, while simultaneously recognising the power of whiteness in *The Last of the Mohicans*. Fiedler intones that the reader is induced to identify with Hawkeye by means of a narratorial convention; notably the presentation of a heroic white warrior whose social connections are impersonal, but nonetheless fraternal. Like Lawrence, Fiedler was inclined to read *The Last of the Mohicans* as a white novel.

Paul Giles insists on seeing literary cultures in terms of their mutual relations, while stressing that a comparative approach sits uneasily with powerful attachments to local and national identity. However, ethnic identity does not perforce have an attachment to place, though in practise it often does. Nineteenth-century African-Americans had very limited

---

[44] Shelley Fisher Fishkin has noted that white writers played a key role in shaping the literary art of their black counterparts. See *Was Huck Black? Mark Twain and African-American Voices* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 216.

[45] Leslie A. Fiedler, 'James Fenimore Cooper and the Historical Romance', in *Love and Death in the American Novel* (Champaign, Illinois: Dalkey Archive, 1960), pp. 162-214.

[46] Valerie Babb, 'Crafting Whiteness in Early America', in *Whiteness Visible: The Meaning of Whiteness in American Literature and Culture*, *op. cit.,* pp. 46-88 (p. 47).

contact with the literary culture of sub-Saharan Africa, though there was certainly some element of folk memory in play, and that made manifest in an oral tradition of storytelling,[47] as evidenced by the stories collected by Joel Chandler Harris.[48] Giles certainly does comment upon the interaction between the Afrosphere and the Anglosphere, but he is primarily concerned with Anglospheric literature. However, it cannot be denied that there is an Afrospheric presence in Anglospheric literature that is not always accorded recognition. Giles views Anglospheric literature through the prism of the British tradition, and would appear to write much more about Anglo-American literature than American literature *per se*. In contrast, Nancy Glazener's seminal study, *Literature in the Making: A History of U.S. Literary Culture in the Long Nineteenth Century*, accords full recognition of the African-American contribution to American letters. Glazener notes how much of African-American literary output in the nineteenth century was concerned with racial politics, even though sometimes obliquely.[49]

Paul Gilroy, an African-British critic, believes that a systematic *mélange* of literary cultures is preferable to the unique literary identities of each culture, which is a position that stems from a misguided view that the establishment of some sort of global civilisation is necessary. To be sure, globalism is a form of political monotheism; a secular faith that brooks no opposition. Gilroy is 'against race',[50] which may be socially and politically fashionable, but is intellectually and morally indefensible. The notion of race does not exhaust that of ethnicity. Race is the biological constituent of ethnicity.[51] Carleton Coon gives this definition:

> A race…might be defined as a large group of individuals — all of them members of the same species — who have formed a partially or completely isolated breeding

---

[47] Leila Kamali, *The Cultural Memory of Africa in African-American and Black British Fiction* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), *passim*. See also Lawrence Levine, *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), *passim*.

[48] Joel Chandler Harris, *The Complete Tales of Uncle Remus* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002), *passim*.

[49] Nancy Glazener, *Literature in the Making: A History of U.S. Literary Culture in the Long Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 31.

[50] Paul Gilroy, *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), *passim*.

[51] John F. Szwed, 'Race and the Embodiment of Culture', *Ethnicity*, 2 (1975), pp. 19-33.

population for a significant period of time, and who consequently differ statistically from the rest of the species in various heritable traits by which they can be recognised.[52]

Gilroy would appear to be *against* biological reality. Contemporary genetics, though out of favour with the dominant ideology of the age, has nevertheless confirmed humanity's division into *genetically statistical populations*.[53] Identity rests, at root, on a sense of kinship.[54] The instinct to organise into ingroups and outgroups along lines of genetic relatedness is found in all living things. Indeed, such self-segregation assists organisms to survive, and is thus favoured by natural selection. Moreover, such a behavioural disposition should not be viewed as problematic. For Gilroy, whiteness has been, and supposedly still is, experienced as terror.[55] As a consequence, he seeks to renounce race and nation as the basis of identity, and imagines that a mode of 'planetary humanism' can supplant them, and lead to what he describes as a 'heterocultural, postanthropological, and cosmopolitan yet-to-come.'[56] Etymologically, cosmopolitanism is the establishment of a 'world city' whose every inhabitant is a citizen, no matter his or her origin. The concept of a global culture, or cosmopolitanism ascendant, is essentially totalitarian, for within its simulacrum of heterogeneity there lurks the threat of enforced conformity. Gilroy is surely aware that literature is premised upon freedom of expression.

Susan Manning is particularly concerned with Scottish-American literary relations, exploring the conflict, and cooperation, between old and new cultures. She explores literary

---

[52] Carleton Coon, *The Living Races of Man* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965), p. 11.
[53] Vincent Sarich and Frank Miele, *Race: The Reality of Human Differences* (Oxford: Westview, 2004), pp. 120-124. See also David Reich, *Who We Are and How We Got Here: Ancient DNA and the New Science of the Human Past* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), *passim*.
[54] Toni Morrison, 'Rootedness: The Ancestor as Foundation', in *Black Women Writers: Arguments and Interviews*, ed. by Mari Evans (London: Pluto, 1985), pp. 339-345.
[55] Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 174.
[56] Paul Gilroy, *Against Race: Imagining Political Culture beyond the Color Line, op. cit.,* p. 334.

relationships in a rhetorical sense, rather than in a historical chain of causation, which perhaps stems from her abiding interest in the philosophical foundations of the Scottish Enlightenment. Manning's intervention in the field of ethnoliterature could be viewed as partial, yet perhaps all the more instructive for so being. She considers the self-conscious stance that sets nineteenth-century Scottish and so-called American literatures apart from English literature. The divergences between them had both a psychological and metaphysical dimension, though Manning does not view such divergences as a contradiction, but as a complement. Unfortunately, she does not explain how African-American literature figures in the equation. Manning rightly viewed the Enlightenment as a force for emancipation, and yet she has little to say in her monographs about slavery, manumission, or the literary output of African-Americans, though there is a very great deal that could be said thereof.[57]

Robert Weisbuch, in *Atlantic Double-Cross: American Literature and British Influence in the Age of Emerson* (1986), is yet another critic who claims to write about American literature, when what he really does is write about Anglo-American literature. Indeed, he offers a *mea culpa* of sorts when he confesses that he writes about what is termed the traditional canon, though he neglects to give good reason why no African-American author should figure in it. However, credit to him for at least acknowledging in his text the absence of any African-American contribution.[58] Weisbuch writes self-consciously about the literature of the nineteenth-century Anglosphere, being more than aware that he treads a path that has been well worn by previous critics. There seems to be a tacit acceptance of the otherness of African-American writing. Weisbuch claims that African-American writers would seek to veer away from 'any homogenizing American ideal'[59] that would fail to recognise their distinctive social

---

[57] Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, *Race and the Enlightenment* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), *passim*.

[58] Toni Morrison, 'Unspeakable Things Unspoken: The Afro-American Presence in American Literature', *Michigan Quarterly Review*, 28 (1989), pp. 1-34 (p. 2).

[59] Robert Weisbuch, 'Preface', in *Atlantic Double-Cross: American Literature and British Influence in the Age of Emerson* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), pp. *ix-xx* (p. *xx*).

and literary identity. Of course, Anglo-Americans also have a distinctive literary identity, albeit a very different one. There is, however, a tacit assumption that whiteness is the legitimate racial identity of the United States.

Now, one should not regard white literature as merely books written *by* white people, *for* white people, or simply as literature written *about* white people. However, that being said, there is an elusive, albeit identifiable, style in the nineteenth-century boy's own adventure story that is in essence white, though it demonstrably has an appeal to a much wider readership. Lawrence pointed out the elephant in the room; many contemporary white critics show a marked reluctance to point in the same direction. Perhaps some white critics downplay, or simply ignore, black literature as a way of asserting their literary separateness. Toni Morrison describes such an attitude:

> In matters of race, silence and evasion have historically ruled literary discourse. Evasion has fostered another, substitute language in which the issues are encoded, foreclosing open debate. The situation is aggravated by the tremor that breaks into discourse on race. It is further complicated by the fact that the habit of ignoring race is understood to be a graceful, even generous, liberal gesture. To notice is to recognise an already discredited difference…According to this logic, every well-bred instinct argues against noticing, and forecloses adult discourse.[60]

As Morrison observes, this is an approach to literary study that fails to indicate, and in point of fact distorts, the literary culture of the United States. However, white critics are by no means alone in their attempt to manipulate what is read and said, and Morrison has the good grace to admit it, too. Anglospheric literature occupies a hegemonic position in American culture, but that does not justify giving the Afrospheric contribution a lower profile than it deserves in any

---

[60] Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination, op. cit.,* pp. 9-10. Sharon E. Rush, a white critic, has also drawn attention to the reluctance of some white critics to discuss race. See *Huck Finn's "Hidden" Lessons: Teaching and Learning Across the Color Line* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), p. 7. Rush's attempt to move the Overton window in this respect deserves a wider audience.

study of American literature *per se*. White literature and American literature are not one and the same.

Parameters

G. M. Trevelyan advised that temporal nomenclature should be employed with some degree of circumspection. For example, the Victorian period, in a literary context, is not perforce confined to the reign of Victoria Regina. 'Unlike dates, periods are not facts. They are retrospective conceptions that we form about past events, useful to focus discussion, but very often reading historical thought astray.'[61] Similarly, Raymond Williams warned that the use of epochal terms could suggest too static a historical sense.[62] A measure of flexibility is required when discussing a literary era.

In this thesis I am able to deal with just a few of the tributaries that flowed into the broad stream that is nineteenth-century children's literature. There is never any suggestion that I am attempting to offer a comprehensive account, though I certainly believe it to be a representative one. Illustrative particulars take precedence over general exposition, and hence myriad quotations from primary and secondary texts are referenced and discussed. In exploring the intertextual dimensions of four novels I am ever mindful that such a closely focussed discussion leaves some related areas unexplored, such as that found in periodical literature aimed at a juvenile readership, for example.

It is my intention to demonstrate conclusively that many nineteenth-century Anglo-American writers of children's literature were in thrall to the English or British literary tradition, and that this in essence familial devotion was reciprocated in full. Brander Matthews, in *American Authors and British Pirates* (1889), describes this Anglospheric literary vision as

---

[61] G. M. Trevelyan, *'De Descriptione Temporum'*, in *Selected Literary Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 1-17 (p. 2).
[62] Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 121.

the 'community of blood, of law, of language, and of books existing between Great Britain and the United States'.[63] However, as in all families, there were differences of opinion.[64] In 1819, Washington Irving wrote that 'It is with feelings of deep regret that I observe the literary animosity daily growing up between England and America.'[65] There was indeed some measure of animosity.[66] For example, Frances Trollope, mother of Anthony, castigated Anglo-American society in *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (1832): 'I do not like them. I do not like their principles. I do not like their manners. I do not like their customs.'[67] The response of the American Fourth Estate to this work was predictably hostile. Yet, the centrality of the British Isles in the nineteenth-century Anglo-American literary imagination is amply evidenced by the references and allusions in the publications of the age. Hence, allusion should be recognised as a key convention in nineteenth-century literature.[68] As we shall see, the extensive use of allusion has the effect of reinforcing the essential whiteness of the Anglospheric literary tradition. The *sine qua non* of ethnicity, which is a sense of tribal belonging through common ancestry, fused the Anglospheric literary communities.

If Anglo-American literature has not always been deemed worthy of serious study in Britain, D. H. Lawrence's influential, albeit idiosyncratic, *Studies in Classic American Literature*, insists that it has been wholly misunderstood:

> We like to think of the old-fashioned American classics as children's books, which is just childishness on our part. The old American art-speech contains an alien quality, which belongs to the American continent and to nowhere else. But, of course, so long as we insist on reading the books as children's tales, we miss all that…It is hard to hear a new voice, as hard as it is to listen to an unknown language. We just don't

---

[63] Brander Matthews, *American Authors and British Pirates* (New York, American Copyright League, 1889), pp. 14-15.

[64] Britons and Americans were alike and yet unalike; physically distant, yet culturally close. See Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 136-137.

[65] Washington Irving, *The Sketch-Book of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 50.

[66] Diana C. Archibald, 'Anti-Americanism in Nineteenth-Century British Literature', *Symbiosis: A Journal of Transatlantic Literary and Cultural Relations*, 14 (2010), pp. 127-140.

[67] Frances Trollope, *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), p. 404.

[68] Michael Wheeler, *The Art of Allusion in Victorian Fiction* (London: Macmillan, 1979), *passim*.

listen. There is a new voice in the old American classics. The world has declined to hear it, and has babbled about children's stories.[69]

Studies in Classic American Literature was a pioneering work, and arguably the first major critical reassessment of nineteenth-century American writers.[70] However, as has been earlier noted, African-American literature is conspicuous by its absence. Lawrence also contributed much to Americans' assessment of their own literary output, for he was among the first to accord James Fenimore Cooper and Herman Melville their places in the pantheon of American literature.

The implicit dismissal of children's literature in Lawrence's passage is telling, though it perhaps tells us more about Lawrence than it does about children's literature. Some of what is perhaps wrongly labelled as children's literature is really lifetime literature, which is to say literature that can be read and enjoyed in childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. The cultural Anglosphere may be viewed and interpreted, and perhaps also reinforced, over the course of a lifetime through the reading of so-called children's books. Adult readers, on both sides of the Atlantic, can remind themselves not only of who they are, but also from whence they came, for the very best of children's literature is not for childhood only, but for a lifetime. Children's literature never finishes saying what it has to say.

We will see in what follows that children's literature has historically occupied an indeterminate, or perhaps subordinate, place within the canon, and that it has been deemed unworthy to be included among 'the best which has been thought and said in the world'.[71] Indeed, the very label is to some degree exclusionary. However, adults do indeed read so-called children's literature. For example, *The Last of the Mohicans* (1826) remains popular with a

---

[69] D. H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American Literature, op. cit.,* p. 2.

[70] At least one American reviewer was unimpressed by Lawrence's work. Raymond M. Weaver commented that Lawrence's 'ignorance of American literature is comprehensive and profound'. 'Narcissus and Echo', *The Bookman*, 58 (1923), p. 327.

[71] Matthew Arnold, 'The Function of Criticism at the Present Time' (1864), in *Culture and Anarchy and Other Writings*, ed. by Stefan Collini (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 26-52 (p. 36).

bookish section of adult men, though this should not be surprising given that such a demographic was the original target readership. Fenimore Cooper is a crossover writer whose work has an appeal to both sophisticated *and* naïve readers.[72] In addition, many works aimed at an adult audience find an unintended readership among adolescents and children. *Huckleberry Finn* (1884) is a significant example of a crossover novel.[73] On first being published it was widely regarded as suitable for a universal readership, which it is, though it is now regarded by many as a children's book. Literature written for children, and also literature read by children, which is not always the same thing, appends a signal category to the history of literature in general.[74] Despite many attempts to categorise and appraise specific literary works and genres, readers of all ages and social backgrounds have continued to read books that were not specifically written for them. For instance, Frances Hodgson Burnett's famous account of her precocious reading of Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852), and how it influenced her thought and behaviour.[75] I suggest, therefore, that any attempt to understand the literature of the Anglosphere without reference to children's literature would be akin to writing a biography without reference to childhood.

---

[72] In America, six of the ten bestsellers between 1875 and 1895 could be considered books for younger readers. See Helmut Lehmann-Haupt, *The Book in America: A History of the Making and Selling of Books in the United States* (New York: Bowker, 1951), pp. 160-161.

[73] This is by no means a literary phenomenon unique to the nineteenth century. See Rachel Falconer, *The Crossover Novel: Contemporary Children's Fiction and its Adult Readership* (New York: Routledge, 2009), *passim*.

[74] Peter Hunt notes two pertinent aspects to the subject of historical children's literature and its relevance for contemporary readers, which are the study of books that *are* for children and the study of books that *were* for children. 'Passing on the Past: The Problem of Books that *are* for Children and that *were* for Children', *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, 21 (1996), p. 200.

[75] Frances Hodgson Burnett, *The One I Knew Best of All: A Memory of the Mind of a Child* (1893) (London: William Clowes, 1974), p. 51.

The Literature of the Anglosphere

The concept of the Anglosphere is a body of biopolitical theory that I wish to argue has an application to the study of literature.[76] Q. D. Leavis, in 'The Discipline of Letters: A Sociological Approach' (1943), called for a more holistic approach to the study of literature:

> What English Studies need is not more scholarship, but rather fresh contacts, cross-fertilization…of the complex of cultural subjects of which the study of literature forms part and the intellectual disciplines of which it can profitably draw upon to enrich its method.'[77]

Intellectual boundaries are inherently porous, and the shifting, sometimes overlapping, parameters within which genres, disciplines, and discourses are defined may be predicated to varying degrees on the concept of the political, which is itself a locus of perpetual disputation.[78] Literary culture can sometimes be a form of metapolitics. The United States of America was invented by Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence in 1776, but the Anglosphere is an organic growth that antedates it.[79] The concept of the Anglosphere, which I wish to prove is central to an understanding of the nineteenth-century children's literature of the English-speaking peoples, provides an illumination of the interdependence of British and Anglo-American literary culture that is both necessary and important.

---

[76] Baruch Spinoza was probably the first modern metaphysician of biopolitics. See Mika Ojakangas, *On the Origins of Greek Biopolitics: A Reinterpretation of the History of Biopower* (London: Routledge, 2016), p. 121. See also Paul Colinvaux, *The Fates of Nations: A Biological Theory of History* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1980), *passim*. Correlatively, political power ultimately stems from the production and control of the culture which shapes the ethical framework of society. See Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks*, 3 vols (New York, Columbia University Press, 2011), *passim.*

[77] Q. D. Leavis, 'The Discipline of Letters: A Sociological Approach', 12 (1943), *Scrutiny*, pp. 12-26 (p. 26).

[78] Irving Howe, 'The Idea of the Political Novel', in *Politics and the Novel* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), pp. 15-24. Howe explores at length the literary tradition of the political novel. See also *Politics in Literature in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. by Janie Teissedou (Paris: Editions Universitaires, 1974), *passim*. Terry Eagleton believes that 'literary theory has been indissociably bound with political beliefs and ideological values.' See 'Conclusion: Political Criticism', in *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (London: Blackwell, 2008), pp. 169-189 (pp. 169-170).

[79] Garry Wills, *Inventing America: Jefferson's Declaration of Independence* (New York: Mariner, 2002), p. *xiii*. See also Samuel Huntingdon, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004), p. 38.

The Anglosphere refers to a set of English-speaking peoples with a similar cultural heritage, based upon populations originating from the nations of the British Isles.[80] The term Anglosphere does not include all countries in which English is an official language, for often English is employed as a *lingua franca*, and is not an expression of cultural identity.[81] However, questions of cultural identity may arise in any genre of literature. Anglosphere and Anglophone are not synonyms, though they are sometimes conflated. The neologism 'Anglosphere',[82] though by no means the concept, was devised by Neal Stephenson, and figures in a science fiction novel titled *The Diamond Age* (1995):

> The tiny old houses and flats of this once impoverished quarter had mostly been refurbished into toeholds for young Atlantans from all around the Anglosphere, poor in equity but rich in expectations, who had come to the great city to incubate their careers.[83]

James C. Bennett has done much to popularise this term in the field of political theory. He explains in his influential work, *The Anglosphere Challenge* (2004), that: 'The Anglosphere, as a network civilisation without a corresponding political form, has necessarily imprecise boundaries. Geographically, the densest nodes of the Anglosphere are to be found in the United States and the United Kingdom.'[84] This concept of the Anglosphere has been further refined by historians such as James Belich, who conflates the term with Anglophone: ''Anglo' is simply shorthand for Anglophone or English-speaking…during most of our period, 1780s–1920s, full citizenship of the Anglosphere tended to be restricted to a handful of ethnic groups, including Britons and White Americans.'[85] Correspondingly, Beverly Lyon Clark notes that

---

[80] Michael Kenny and Nick Pearce, 'The Origins of the Anglosphere', in *Shadows of Empire: The Anglosphere in British Politics* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2018), pp. 10-37.
[81] Srdjan Vucetic, 'What is the Anglosphere?', in *The Anglosphere: A Genealogy of a Racialized Identity in International Relations* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2011), pp. 1-21.
[82] This term entered the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* in 2007.
[83] Neal Stephenson, *The Diamond Age* (London: Penguin, 2011), p. 410.
[84] James C. Bennett, *The Anglosphere Challenge* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), p. 2.
[85] James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World*, *1783-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 58.

the market for children's literature in America has been primarily middle-class and white since its inception.[86] In nineteenth-century America the greater part of the populace comprised English-speaking people of British ancestry who understandably looked upon British literature as something akin to their own.[87] It is certainly the case that children's literature reinforced ethnic consciousness. For example, Robert Louis Stevenson's famous collection of poems, *A Child's Garden of Verses* (1885), includes 'Foreign Children', in which an English child says:

> Little Indian, Sioux or Crow,
> Little frosty Eskimo
> Little Turk or Japanee,
> O! don't you wish that you were me?[88]

In what follows I shall evidence that such celebrations of ethnic consciousness were not uncommon, albeit sometimes in an understated manner. The Anglospheric communities have built their history, and shaped their collective identity, by telling *some* stories from their past, while preferring to forget others.[89]

---

[86] Beverly Lyon Clark, *Kiddie Lit: The Cultural Construction of Children's Literature in America* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), p. 16. See also Barbara Sicherman, 'Reading *Little Women*', in *Well-Read Lives: How Books inspired a Generation of American Women* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), pp. 13-36 (p. 17), and Gail Schmunk Murray, 'Middle-Class Consumers, 1880-1920', in *American Children's Literature and the Construction of Childhood* (New York: Twayne, 1998), pp. 82-116. African-American authors did indeed produce children's literature, which was aimed in the main at a readership of their own ethnicity, but it was published customarily in periodicals and newspapers. The ethnic dimension of such a literary output cannot be gainsaid, though its isomorphic nature does not preclude a wider readership. See Chanta Haywood, 'Constructing Childhood: *The Christian Recorder* and Literature for Black Children, 1854-1865', *African-American Review*, 36 (2002), pp. 417-428. See also Eric Gardner, *Black Print Unbound:* The Christian Recorder*, African-American Literature, and Periodical Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 39, and *Who Writes for Black Children?*: *African-American Children's Literature before 1900*, ed. by Katharine Capshaw and Anna Mae Duane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), *passim*, and Rudine Sims Bishop, *Free Within Ourselves: The Development of African-American Children's Literature* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood, 2007), *passim*.

[87] David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 854-855. See also Kevin Phillips, *The Cousins' Wars: Religion, Politics, Civil Warfare, and the Triumph of Anglo-America* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), p. 70. F. O. Matthiesson has observed that Theodore Dreiser, born in 1871, was 'the first major American writer whose family name was not English or Scotch-Irish'. 'Introduction', in *Sister Carrie* (1900) (New York: Modern Library, 1997), p. *xvi*.

[88] Robert Louis Stevenson, 'Foreign Children', in *A Child's Garden of Verses* (1885) (London: Pavilion, 1994), p. 35.

[89] Benedict Anderson, 'Memory and Forgetting', in *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006), pp.187-206.

John Jay, a Founding Father of the United States of America, and the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, stated in *The Federalist; or, The New Constitution* (1788):

> Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country to one united people — a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs.[90]

Indeed, as Herodotus noted, custom is key.[91] However, as Jay observed, Anglo-American citizens lived, to all intents and purposes, in a homogenous society. (Slaves and indigenes were not part of mainstream society.) Yet, this is not to imply that there were no meaningful differences in culture between sections of American society, as indeed there were in British society.[92] In general, cultural distinctions within the Anglo-American community reflected those to be found in their ancestral homelands.[93] The common language and cultural base of the United States was decided by immigration.[94] Demography proved to be destiny. In effect, British, or English, literature was America's own literature by default. American children learned to read using British texts, particularly *The New-England Primer* (1690), in which religious instruction was combined with the acquirement of literacy.[95]

---

[90] John Jay, 'The Federalist Paper, 2', in *The Federalist Papers*, ed. by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 15.

[91] Herodotus, *The Histories*, trans. by Robin Waterfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), *passim*.

[92] Roger Daniels, 'Overseas Migration from Europe', in *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2002), pp. 3-29.

[93] Ferdinand Tönnies distinguished between two social groups, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, which are commonly translated as community and society. *Gemeinschaft* is a subjective view that is affective and traditional, and rooted in social interactions. *Gesellschaft* is an objective view that is rooted in rational agreements by mutual consent. These concepts do on occasion overlap, but the distinction is fundamental. See *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (1887), published in English as *Community and Society*, trans. by Charles P. Loomis (New York: Dover, 2003), *passim*. See also Fischer, 'The Origin and Persistence of Regional Cultures in the United States', in *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America*, *op. cit.,* pp.783-898.

[94] H. L. Mencken, 'The Future of the Language: English or American?', in *The American Language: An Inquiry into the Development of English in the United States* (1919) (New York: Knopf, 1984), pp. 382-387. See also *British Immigration to the United States: 1776-1914*, ed. by William E. van Vugt, 4 vols (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), *passim*, and Malcolm Gaskill, *Between Two Worlds: How the English became Americans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), p. *xi*.

[95] 'By the 1640s, Massachusetts law required heads of families and apprentices to read. No one, the law said, 'should suffer so much barbarism in any of their families as not to endeavour to teach…their children and apprentices so much learning as may enable them perfectly to read the English tongue'.' Ignorance was

According to Linda Colley, the geopolitical boundary that is the Atlantic 'has not been a moat or a barrier. It has been a bridge.'[96] Letters and journals passed freely both ways:

> Britain had a much greater lead over the rest of Europe in mail…Four letters *per capita* in England and Wales in 1839 instantly doubled to eight with the advent of the penny post in 1840, and then quadrupled to thirty-two by 1871. Only one other nation was in this league, and that was the United States…The speed of postal services increased with transportation improvements. A letter took thirty-two days to get from London to New York in 1820; thirteen days in1860. This was not just a matter of steamships, but of the frequency and efficiency of high-volume mail services.[97]

The increasing volume of correspondence would seem to indicate a heightened sense of shared identity. The culture of the nineteenth-century Anglosphere was strengthened, and indeed unified, by this increase in the speed and volume of communications.[98] However, the increased level of awareness shaped by these developments intensified some disquiet in the publishing industry in relation to abuse of copyright.[99] The correspondences between Sir Walter Scott and Washington Irving, and between Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson, give some

---

considered to be a source of heresy. See Anne Scott MacLeod, 'Children's Literature in America from the Puritan Beginnings to 1870', in *Children's Literature: An Illustrated History*, ed. by Peter Hunt (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 102-129 (p. 102). *The New-England Primer*, printed and published by Benjamin Harris of Boston, Massachusetts, was a work of a didactic and spiritual nature that was used widely in American schools into the early part of the twentieth century, and indeed is still in limited use today. It was, however, an abridged reprint of *The Protestant Tutor, Instructing Youth and Others, In The Compleat Method of Spelling, Reading, and Writing True English. To Which Is Prefix'd, A Timely Memorial To All True Protestants*, which Harris had published in 1679 while he was still resident in London. *The New-England Primer* was tailored to an American readership by adding material of local interest. It was regarded as being in the public domain, and was reprinted under a number of titles, such as *The New-York Primer*, or *The American Primer*. In the early colonial period, reading *The Bible* was the principal motivation for acquiring literacy. The *New-England Primer* was sometimes referred to as 'The Little Bible of New England'. American schoolchildren's first brush with literature often came through this essentially English text that promotes the doctrines of Puritanism and Congregationalism. Emory Elliot, *Power and the Pulpit in Puritan New England* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1975), pp. 19-21. This method of instruction had been in place for a considerable period of time prior to the publication of *The Protestant Tutor*. Paul Leicester Ford states that the earliest extant catechism, combined with instruction in the Roman alphabet designed to facilitate the acquirement of literacy, was printed in Edinburgh in 1591. *The New England Primer: A History of Its Origin and Development* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1897), p. 6. The contemporary study of children's literature usually begins with the Puritan educational programme.
[96] Linda Colley, *Acts of Union and Disunion* (London: Profile, 2014), p. 20.
[97] Belich, *op. cit.,* p. 122.
[98] Jessica DeSpain, 'Steaming Across the Pond: Books, Bodies, and Citizenship in Nineteenth-Century Transatlantic Culture', in *Nineteenth-Century Transatlantic Reprinting and the Embodied Book* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 1-16.
[99] Aubert J. Clark, *The Movement for International Copyright in America* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1960), *passim*.

indication of the pressure from writers to reform the copyright laws on both sides of the Atlantic, and the corresponding implications for the exchange of literary materials.[100] Until 1891, American publishers were under no legal obligation to pay royalties to overseas authors, and a similar situation pertained in the British Isles.[101] In addition, the pirated publication of British and American works did not incur translation costs. As a consequence, books authored by British writers could be sold more cheaply in the United States than those written by their American counterparts, which to some extent militated against American authors supporting themselves from publishing royalties.[102] (In practice, however, most authors sold the copyright to the publisher out of financial necessity.)[103] The American book trade thrived in the absence of international copyright laws.[104] Consequently, there was a ferocious reaction by American publishers to Charles Dickens' criticism of literary piracy in his *American Notes for General Circulation* (1842).[105] The fount and matrix of the nineteenth-century literary Anglosphere was the self-regulating market. The nature and evolution of book publishing has always been dependent upon the economics of production and distribution.[106]

The early part of the nineteenth century saw a marked increase in the number of works being published for children in Britain and America, but Anglo-American children read for the most part literature of British provenance, which would reinforce a sense of cultural

---

[100] Richard Gray, *A History of American Literature* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2004), p. 104.

[101] Sometimes American publishers did offer compensatory payments to British authors, albeit of a token nature. See Anthony Trollope, *An Autobiography and Other Writings* (1883) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 104-105.

[102] Joseph Gerhard, 'Charles Dickens, International Copyright, and the Discretionary Silence of *Martin Chuzzlewit*', in *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature,* ed. by Zemer Lior (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 259-270.

[103] Richard D. Altick, *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 382.

[104] Ronald J. Zboray and Mary Saracino Zboray, 'The novel in the *antebellum* book market', in *The Cambridge History of the American Novel*, ed. by Leonard Cassuto, Clare Virginia Edy, and Benjamin Reiss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 67-87 (p. 73).

[105] Clare Pettitt, 'The Transatlantic Novel in the Nineteenth Century', in *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel,* ed. by Deirdre David (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 231-250 (p. 232).

[106] Claudia Stokes, 'Copyrighting American History: International Copyright and the Periodization of the Nineteenth Century', *American Literature*, 77 (2005), pp. 291-317 (p. 293).

dependency.[107] As Anne Lundin has it, 'The preponderance of books was British, reflecting a dependent cultural relationship to the mother country and an American marketplace that privileged foreign authors over home-grown.'[108] By contrast, many of the American authors of the same period who are now held in high esteem were relatively little read in their own day.[109] America's British culture, and the economics of the publishing trade, ensured a healthy market for British literature.[110]

The Copyright Act (1709), also known as the Statute of Anne, came into force in England in April, 1710,[111] but this legislation did not apply to the American colonies. The early history of copyright law in the American colonies borders on the labyrinthine, and was for the most part piecemeal and ineffective, but the first federal copyright legislation was enacted in 1790. The American Copyright Act (1790) is copied almost verbatim from the Statute of Anne.[112] There was no effective copyright protection extended to European authors in the United States, nor to American authors in Europe, until Congress passed the 1891 International Copyright Treaty, the Platt-Simonds Bill, which is sometimes called the Chace Act.[113]

A single literary culture shared between polities of different political culture created legal and commercial quandaries. Indeed, repeated violations of copyright law created much tension between Anglo-American and British authors and publishers. Conversely, Anglo-

---

[107] Brian Alderson and Felix de Marez Oyens, *Be Wise and Happy: Origins of Children's Book Publishing in England, 1650-1850* (London: British Library, 2006), pp. 241-242. See also Kathleen Burk, *Old World, New World: Great Britain and America from the Beginning* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2007), p. 310.
[108] Anne Lundin, *Constructing the Canon of Children's Literature* (New York: Routledge, 2004), p. 8.
[109] Ann Douglas, 'The Legacy of American Victorianism', in *The Feminization of American Culture* (New York: Anchor, 1988), pp. 3-17 (p. 6).
[110] James D. Hart, *The Popular Book: A History of America's Literary Taste* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1950), p. 70.
[111] The full title was 'An Act for the Encouragement of Learning, by vesting the Copies of Printed Books in the Authors or Purchasers of such Copies, during the Times therein mentioned.' Hector L. MacQueen, Charlotte Waelde, and Graeme T. Laurie, *Contemporary Intellectual Property: Law and Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 34.
[112] Peter K. Yu, *Information Property and Information Wealth* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood, 2007), p. 143.
[113] Siva Vaidhyanathan, *Copyrights and Copywrongs: The Rise of Intellectual Property and How It Threatens Creativity* (New York: New York University Press, 2001), pp. 50-55.

American authors often sought prior publication within the British domain, usually London, but sometimes Toronto, in order to obtain sufficient qualification to warrant protection of copyright.[114] Among such Anglo-American works published initially in London are Ralph Waldo Emerson's *Representative Men* (1850), Herman Melville's *Moby-Dick* (1851), and Mark Twain's *Tom Sawyer* (1876), *Life on the Mississippi* (1883), and *Huckleberry Finn* (1884). Thirty titles by James Fenimore Cooper, six by Washington Irving, and fourteen by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow are believed to have had publication priority assigned to England. Yet, the reverse was also true, with many British authors anxious to obtain prior publication in the United States in order to obtain the financial advantage of copyright protection.[115] Some American authors of the day had significantly higher sales in the United Kingdom than in the United States, and publishing policy was dictated by financial considerations. In the course of the nineteenth century British readers consumed more contemporary literature from the United States than from all other countries combined.[116] Similarly, British authors knew the importance of the American market. Dickens sent the eponymous protagonist of his novel, *Martin Chuzzlewit* (1843-1844), to America, William Makepeace Thackeray wrote *The Virginians: A Tale of the Last Century* (1857-59), and Anthony Trollope gave us *The American Senator* (1875). In addition, G. A. Henty's *With Lee in Virginia* (1890) is a boy's own adventure story of the internecine War Between the States (1861-1865).

Walt Whitman chose to mark the United States centennial of 1876 with a celebration of the Anglosphere. He composed an open letter 'To the Foreign Reader' of the 'Centennial

---

[114] Simon Eliot, *Some Patterns and Trends in British Publishing, 1800-1919* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1994), pp. 12-15.

[115] Isidore Rosenbaum Brussel, *Anglo-American First Editions, 1826-1900: East to West, describing first editions of English authors whose books were published in America before their publication in England*, 2 vols (London: Constable, 1935), *passim.*

[116] Clarence Gohdes, 'The Reception of Some Nineteenth-Century American Authors in Europe', in *The American Writer and the European Tradition*, ed. by Margaret Denny and William H. Gilman (New York: Haskell House, 1968), pp. 106-120 (pp. 108-109).

Edition' of *Leaves of Grass*,[117] though it remained unpublished at the time of his death. In it, Whitman confessed:

> I will not repress the impulse I feel, (what is it, after all, only one man facing another man, and giving him his hand?) to proffer here, for fittest outset to this Book, to share with the English, the Irish, the Scottish, and the Welsh, — to highest and to lowest, of these islands…the sister's salutation of America from over the sea.[118]

This is noteworthy, given that Whitman's poetry is a celebration of all that is American, in addition to being an avowal of personal and political liberty.[119] Whitman's work attracted numerous reviews in the London newspapers and journals. Many British journals were so popular in the United States that they were pirated in American editions. When Whitman was employed as editor of *The Brooklyn Times* he read the British book reviews of popular works and gave summaries of them in his own editorial pages. British and American literary criticism of this time was actually far more alike than is commonly believed.[120]

British literary dominance in the United States was assured, but not always welcomed. Melville rejected 'literary flunkeyism toward England' in a critical review of Nathaniel Hawthorne's short story collection, *Mosses from an Old Manse* (1850).[121] However, Washington Irving, writing in the Preface to *The Sketch Book* (1820), explained why so many of his stories were set in England:

> No, never need an American look beyond his own country for the sublime and beautiful of natural scenery, but Europe held forth the charms of stories and political

---

[117] Leslie Elizabeth Eckel, *Atlantic Citizens: Nineteenth-Century American Writers at Work in the World* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), p. 1.

[118] Walt Whitman 'To the Foreign Reader', in *Walt Whitman's Workshop: A Collection of Unpublished Manuscripts*, ed. by Clifton Joseph Furness (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1928), pp. 163-164.

[119] Whitman was heavily influenced by the British literary tradition, though he sought to conceal it. See Gary Schmidgall, *Containing Multitudes: Walt Whitman and the British Literary Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), *passim*.

[120] Gay Wilson Allen, *The Solitary Singer: A Critical Biography of Walt Whitman* (New York: New York University Press, 1969), p. 130.

[121] Herman Melville, 'Hawthorne and the Mosses' (1850), in *The Writings of Herman Melville*, 15 vols (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1987), IX, pp. 239-255 (p.248).

associations. There were to be seen the masterpieces of art, the refinements of highly-cultivated society, the quaint peculiarities of ancient and local custom. My native country was full of youthful promise: Europe was full of the accumulated treasures of the age.[122]

American writers found inspiration in various discourses of English origin, literary and extraliterary. James Fenimore Cooper seems to have assumed that Americans lacked a native literary tradition, and required creative intertextual interaction with the parent tradition.[123] He made this plain in 'Notions of the Americans' (1833):

> There is scarcely an ore which contributes to the wealth of the author, that is found, here, in veins as rich as in Europe. There are no annals for the historian; no follies (beyond the most vulgar and commonplace) for the satirist; no manners for the dramatist; no obscure fictions for the writer of romance; no gross and hardy offences against decorum for the moralist; nor any of the rich artificial auxiliaries of poetry.[124]

Cooper's diagnosis of the relative lack of rich veins of literary ore in America perhaps accounts for the fact that American readers remained remarkably fond of British, and Continental, writers throughout the nineteenth century and beyond. Cooper explained the Americans to the British, and the British to the Americans, thereby accentuating his status as an Anglospheric author.[125] The popularity of British texts, and a much smaller number of European texts in translation, with American readers meant that the intertextuality with which I am concerned had an inherently Anglospheric quality. The fact that many of these intertextual elements are often inaccessible to the child reader is a point to which I shall return.

---

[122] Washington Irving, *The Sketch-Book of Geoffrey Crayon, Gent.*, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

[123] Malcolm Bradbury, *The Expatriate Tradition in American Literature* (London: British Association for American Studies, 1982), p. 8.

[124] James Fenimore Cooper, 'Notions of the Americans; Picked Up by a Travelling Bachelor' (1828), in *The Native Muse: Theories of American Literature*, ed. by Richard Ruland (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1976), p. 224.

[125] Benjamin Lease, 'Homeward Bound: the two voices of Fenimore Cooper', in *Anglo-American Encounters: England and the Rise of American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 36-50. See also Malcolm Bradbury, *Dangerous Pilgrimages: Trans-Atlantic Mythologies and the Novel* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1995), p. 49.

The dominance of English and European literature in nineteenth-century America spurred Ralph Waldo Emerson, in a speech delivered to The *Phi Beta Kappa* Society at Cambridge, Massachusetts on 31 August, 1837, to call for an American national literature and culture that had severed its ties from its Anglo-European origins: 'We have listened too long to the courtly muses of Europe. The spirit of the American freeman is already suspected to be timid, imitative, tame…See already the tragic consequence.'[126] The tone and content of Emerson's speech is notably similar to the graduation oration delivered earlier at Bowdoin College by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow on 7 September, 1825:

> England has reproached us that we have no finished scholars. But there is reason for believing that men of mere learning, men of sober research and studied correctness, do not give to a nation its great name. Our very poverty in this respect will have a tendency to give a national character to our literature. Our writers will not be constantly toiling and panting after classical allusions…[127]

Nevertheless, Longfellow was the first American to translate Dante Alighieri's *The Divine Comedy*.[128] In addition, Jeffrey Meyers records that in 1845 Edgar Allan Poe, in a publication he edited, *Broadway Journal*, described Longfellow as 'a determined imitator and a dextrous adapter of the ideas of other people', specifically Alfred, Lord Tennyson.[129] Moreover, Poe opposed Longfellow's advocacy of an American *newness* and defended the *status quo*, which was an adherence to the European tradition in general, and the Anglospheric tradition in particular.[130] The inherent whiteness of such a tradition cannot be denied.[131]

---

[126] Ralph Waldo Emerson, 'The American Scholar' in *The Essential Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson,* ed. by Brooks Atkinson (New York: Modern Library, 2000), p. 61.

[127] Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, 'Our Native Writers', in *The American Literary Revolution, 1783-1837*, ed. by Robert E. Spiller (New York: New York University Press, 1967), p. 389.

[128] Bonnie L. Lukes, *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow: America's Beloved Poet* (Greensboro, North Carolina: Morgan Reynolds, 2003), p. 89.

[129] Jeffrey Meyers, *Edgar Allan Poe: His Life and Legacy* (New York: Cooper Square Press, 1992), p. 171.

[130] Floyd Stovall, 'Introduction', in *The Development of American Literary Criticism*, ed. by Floyd Stovall (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1955), pp. 3-14 (p. 5).

[131] It should be borne in mind that tradition, however defined, is an amorphous concept. See Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014), pp. 318-320.

Emerson's *cri de coeur* was hopelessly unrealistic, for his rampant Anglophilia is amply evidenced in his own writings. Indeed, Emerson confessed that 'The American is only the continuation of the English genius into new conditions.'[132] Emerson, who was himself a New Englander of English stock, derived many of his ideas on literature and philosophy from the work of Thomas Carlyle, whose essays in *The Edinburgh Review* and other British periodicals were widely read in the United States.[133] He spoke of Carlyle as having 'an imagination such as never rejoiced before the face of God, since Shakespeare'.[134] Emerson drew up a list of 'My men' in his journal, and Carlyle was at the top.[135] However, Emerson was far from being the only, or earliest, admirer of Carlyle in America, as Andrew Hook notes: 'America was good news for Carlyle because in the early years, up to and including the publication of *Sartor Resartus*, it was *only* in America that he had found a receptive, and even enthusiastic, audience.'[136]

Carlyle's popularity was linked to his wholehearted affinity with American Transcendentalism.[137] Emerson's essay 'Nature' (1836), which helped turn Transcendentalism into a major cultural movement, and is probably his most widely read work, is derivative of Carlyle's own writing on the subject.[138] Emerson's intellectual Declaration of Independence

---

[132] See Emerson's travelogue, *English Traits* (Boston: Phillips, Samson, 1856), p. 42.

[133] 'No periodical, probably not even the native *North American Review*, carried more weight in the American intellectual and literary world than *The Edinburgh Review*.' Andrew Hook, *Carlyle and America* (Edinburgh: The Carlyle Society, 1970), p. 6. '*North American Review* was founded in 1815 with the express purpose of countering slurs against American culture in the British quarterlies.' Stephen Fender, *Sea Changes: British Emigration and American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 96. See also Pam Perkins, 'Reviewing America: Francis Jeffrey, *The Edinburgh Review*, and the United States', in *Scotland and the Nineteenth-Century World*, ed. by Gerard Carruthers, David Goldie, and Alastair Renfrew (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2012), pp. 53-70.

[134] Emerson, *The Heart of Emerson's Journals*, ed. by Perry Bliss (New York: Dover Publications, 1958), p. 124.

[135] *Ibid.,* p. 331.

[136] Andrew Hook, *From Goosecreek to Gandercleugh: Studies in Scottish-American Literary and Cultural History* (East Linton, East Lothian: Tuckwell Press, 1999), p. 138.

[137] In 1853, when Louisa May Alcott was aged 20, she placed Carlyle's *The French Revolution: A History* (1837) and *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays* (1839) at the top of a list of favourite books she had read. *The Journals of Louis May Alcott*, ed. by Joel Myerson and Daniel Shealy, assoc. ed. Madeleine B. Stern (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1997), p. 67.

[138] Emerson was introduced to Carlyle's writing by a short piece published in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1825. He was, by his own admittance, greatly influenced by 'Sartor Resartus' (1833-34 in serial form), which was

therefore rang hollow.[139] In fact, Emerson's dependence on Carlyle is by no means idiosyncratic, but rather symptomatic of a greater cultural dependency, and he was merely reiterating what many before him had said and written.[140] It seems that the more American writers rejected their literary heritage, the greater became their desire or need to embrace it. There is, it would appear, a common misperception that nineteenth-century Anglo-American writers either reacted against British literary influence or gravitated toward it. However, as we will see, they did both.[141]

J. Hillis Miller notes that 'The claim that there is a distinct species of literature in America, as the American robin differs from the English robin, has a long tradition.'[142] However, Miller himself adopts a more universalistic position, asserting that literary works transcend any intellectual constraints of cultural, chronological, or geographical contiguity. In contrast, Harold Bloom suggests that the assertion of an independent American literary tradition is a symptom of an anxiety of influence regarding Anglo-European literature's originary powers.[143]

---

serialised in *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country,* a journal that was published in London. Emerson thought so highly of this work that he was instrumental in the publication of it in book form in Boston, Massachusetts in 1836, a volume to which he contributed a lengthy introduction. *Sartor Resartus* was not published in book form in Great Britain until 1838. See Robert D. Richardson and Barry Moser, *Emerson: The Mind on Fire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), p. 218.

[139] Emerson made a number of assertions regarding American literary identity. See Christopher Gair, 'Literary Nationalism', in *American History through Literature, 1820-1870*, ed. by Janet Gabler Hover and Robert Sattelmeyer (New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 2005), pp. 679-680.

[140] Noah Webster asserted that 'America must be as independent in literature as she is in politics', though this was perhaps more of a proleptic statement than any realistic appraisal of the condition of American letters in his own time. Webster's plea for the nurturing of intellectual self-sufficiency in American society, which was made in his *A Grammatical Institute of the English Language* (1784), was still being discussed in Emerson's day, but has now largely been forgotten. See Merle Curti, *The Growth of American Thought* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 142.

[141] Stephen Spender, *Love-Hate Relations: English and American Sensibilities* (New York: Random House, 1974), p. *xxvi.* See also Isobel Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, 'The American Origins of the English Novel', *American Literary History*, 4 (1992), pp. 386-410.

[142] J. Hillis Miller, *Theory Now and Then* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), p. 217.

[143] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), *passim.*

Anglo-American literature, even in its comparatively inchoate nineteenth-century state, was characterised by an aesthetic, regional, and thematic diversity. Nevertheless, many American writers and critics assumed that British domination of American letters would stifle native thought. However, as we shall see, the Anglo-American writers of children's literature examined in this thesis do not appear to be anxious about the Anglo-American literary tradition, but rather eagerly borrow from it. Bloom's perspective, however, would indicate that they are not profoundly original writers, for their works are unashamedly derivative.[144] Moreover, their status as writers of children's literature might be seen as supporting this conclusion.

If American writers were ambivalent about their dependence on English literature, English writers and critics exhibited some measure of prejudice against American literature. In *The King's English* (1906) the Fowler brothers voiced their fears that English literature would be to some extent linguistically debased by an increasing American influence:

> There is a real danger of our literature's being Americanized, and that not merely in details of vocabulary ― which are all that we are directly concerned with ― but in its general tone. Mr. Rudyard Kipling is a very great writer, and a patriot; his influence is probably the strongest that there is at present in the land; but he and his school are Americanizing us. …The English and American language and literature are both good things; but they are better apart than mixed.[145]

This would seem to indicate some resistance to the way that the Anglosphere was threatening national distinctions in a literary sense. The Fowler brothers' anxiety concerning the Americanisation of literary English may have been justified, but they were wrong in their assessment of its consequences. Anglo-American literature of the nineteenth century could be looked upon as Victorian literature at one remove. The reflections issuing back and forth across

---

[144] Children's stories are retold and adapted from earlier stories, and from stories borrowed from cultural outgroups. See John Stephens, 'Retelling stories across time and cultures', in *The Cambridge Companion to Children's Literature*, ed. by M. O. Grenby and Andrea Immel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 91-107.

[145] H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler, *The King's English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), pp. 34-35. This view still pertains in some quarters. For example, see John Algeo, 'America is Ruining the English Language', in *Language Myths*, ed. by Laurie Bauer and Peter Trudgill (London: Penguin, 2015), pp. 176-182.

the Atlantic were between literary traditions that were different from, as well as similar to, one another, and these differences had creative ramifications which I shall explore fully in the following chapters.

However, in the act of invoking the notion of the nineteenth-century literary Anglosphere I am not implying that there were no noticeable differences between British and Anglo-American literature.[146] Moreover, as Robert Weisbuch has reminded us, there is indeed an American *Volksgeist*.[147] 'The youth of America is their oldest tradition,' Oscar Wilde has Lord Illingworth say in *A Woman of No Importance* (1893). He adds that 'It has been going on now for three hundred years.'[148] The concept of newness is an essential component of the American national identity.[149] Nevertheless, Paul Langford has noted that the Anglo-American identity is contingent upon a shared heritage that is deeply rooted in earlier times:

> The growing part that Americans played in construing Englishness for a wider world had the effect of emphasising their own particular needs. These were understandably concerned with ancient roots and traditions. *Our Old Home*, as Hawthorne expressed it, was meant to exhibit stability rather than change, age rather than youth.[150]

Hawthorne saw England as the 'mother country'. He wrote: 'After all these bloody wars and vindictive animosities, we still have an unspeakable yearning towards England'.[151] The literary tradition espoused by Hawthorne perforce antedated the *Mayflower*, and he fervently wished

---

[146] As T. S. Eliot observed, 'Every nation, every race, has not only its own creative, but its own critical turn of mind'. 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' (1919), in *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism* (1920) (London: Faber & Faber, 1997), pp. 39-49 (p. 39).

[147] Robert Weisbuch, *Atlantic Double-Cross: American Literature and British Influence in the Age of Emerson* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), p. 30.

[148] Oscar Wilde, 'A Woman of No Importance', in *The Importance of Being Earnest and Other Plays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 93-154 (p. 105).

[149] Irving Howe, *The American Newness: Culture and Politics in the Age of Emerson* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1986), *passim*.

[150] Paul Langford, *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650-1850* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 4.

[151] Nathaniel Hawthorne, *Our Old Home*: *A Series of English Sketches*, 2 vols (Cambridge, Massachusetts: H. O. Houghton, 1863), I, p. 18.

to recover an English aesthetic for himself and America.[152] However, the Anglospheric enrootment advocated by Hawthorne is not a sentimental attachment to the past, nor is it a prescription for intellectual stasis. Instead, it is a concept that indivisibly links literary heritage with creative process. The literariness of the Anglospheric community was based on a conscious sharing of a similar *Weltanschauung*. These were white authors writing for white readers.

Intertextuality

The clarity and constancy of literary terms are signal to any work of criticism. Yet, intertextuality, a new-yet-old way of reading literary texts, is a somewhat nebulous concept. I need, therefore, to examine some of the concepts and meanings of intertextuality that are current in literary studies before looking at intertextuality in the context of children's literature in general, and in the particular texts/authors to which I am here attending.[153]

Julia Kristeva presented the neologism, *intertextualité*, in her seminal essay, 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel' (1966), in the course of which she expressed her intellectual debt to Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of dialogism.[154] The Bakhtinian concept of heteroglossia posits that novels consist of a hierarchical array of different, and perhaps conflicting, voices and registers, mainly those of characters and narrators, but also those of concepts and categories.[155] Bakhtin suggests that the reader resist viewing literary texts as autonomous objects wholly independent

---

[152] Frederick Newberry, *Hawthorne's Divided Loyalties: England and America in His Works* (Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1987), p. 167. See also Raymona E. Hull, *Nathaniel Hawthorne: The English Experience, 1853-1864* (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1980), pp. 113-114.

[153] Deborah Thacker has noted that literary critics who theorise reading have not written extensively about children's reading practices. 'Disdain or Ignorance? Literary Theory and the Absence of Children's Literature', *Lion and the Unicorn*, 24 (2000), pp. 1-17.

[154] María Jesús Martínez Alfaro, 'Intertextuality: Origins and Development of the Concept', *Atlantis*, 18 (1996), pp. 268-285. Kristeva is similarly indebted to Ferdinand de Saussure.

[155] This concept was introduced by Bakhtin in a 1935 paper that was published in English as 'Discourse in the Novel' in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), pp. 259-422.

of previously published works, and contends that heteroglossia is the dominant characteristic of prose fiction. In his description of the polyphonic novel, Bakhtin explains how stories, and the characters and plots contained therein, can be understood more fully through a perceptive reading of other stories that may be related in some way, though his intertextuality is not confined to relations between texts. Contemporary texts are woven from earlier texts.[156] Every story is understood as a section of a literary matrix, and there is a constant interaction between genres. Indeed, any single genre is related to its past; genre is an intertextual concept.

> A genre lives in the present, but it always *remembers* the past, its beginnings. Genre is a representative of creative memory in the process of literary development. Precisely for this reason genre is capable of guaranteeing the *unity* and *uninterrupted continuity* of this development.
> For a correct understanding of a genre, therefore, it is necessary to return to its sources.[157]

For Bakhtin, genre is inherently intertextual, and he grants agency to genres themselves, not individual authors. Bakhtin also links genre to assumptions about the addressee: 'Each speech genre in each area of speech communication has its typical conception of the addressee, and this defines it as a genre.'[158] Kristeva's stress on the significance of the speaking subject as the primary object for linguistic analysis appears to be rooted in her understanding of Bakhtinian dialogism as an interaction between the text of the subject and the text of the addressee. It is this analysis that produces the Kristevan concept of intertextuality.[159] However, my thesis focuses on a particular genre, children's literature, and though I grant agency to individual

---

[156] Geoffrey Leech notes that etymologically the word *text* originates in a metaphor of textile 'weaving' — the weaving of lesser materials into a yet greater whole. *Language in Literature: Style and Foregrounding* (London: Pearson, 2008), p.185.

[157] M. M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, trans. by Caryl Emerson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), p. 106.

[158] Bakhtin, 'The Problem of Speech Genres', in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, trans. by Vern W. McGhee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 60-102, (p. 95).

[159] Julia Kristeva, *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. by Toril Moi (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), p. 34.

writers, I accept that the genre is defined by presuppositions about the nature of its intended readership.

For Kristeva, however, intertextuality is a term that refers to the dialogic nature of literary language. A writer's words are never simply his or her own, but contain what has already been said or written before. According to Kristeva, 'any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another'.[160] As Kristeva's mentor/colleague, Roland Barthes, explains in his essay, 'From Work to Text' (1977),

> The intertextual in which every text is held, it itself being the text-between of another text, is not to be confused with some origin of the text: to try to find the 'sources', the 'influences' of a work, is to fall in with the myth of filiation; the citations which go to make up a text are anonymous, untraceable, and yet *already read*: they are quotations without inverted commas.[161]

Barthes stresses that the origins and meaning of a text cannot be found in its sources or influences. The concept of intertextuality that is articulated by Kristeva and Barthes has little to do with matters of 'influence' by one writer upon another, or with the 'sources' of a literary work. Instead, it delineates the essential condition of meaning, and also signification, in any literary text. Kristeva argues that intertextuality is not simply an intellectual tool with which to recognise and comprehend influences and sources, which is to say that it is not an interpretive strategy.[162]

---

[160] Kristeva, *op. cit.,* p. 66.

[161] Roland Barthes, 'From Work to Text', in *Image Music Text,* trans. by Stephen Heath (London: Fontana Press, 1993), pp. 155-164 (p. 160).

[162] Kristeva, *doyenne* of Continental obscurantism, has any number of learned detractors. For example, Alan Sokal and Jean Bricmont have noted in their inflammatory work, *Impostures Intellectuelles* (1997), that 'Kristeva…does not always understand the meaning of the words she uses…the main problem raised by these texts is that she makes no effort to justify the *relevance* of these…concepts to the fields she is purporting to study — linguistics, literary criticism…and this, in our opinion, is for the very good reason that there is none. Her sentences are more meaningful than those of Lacan, but she surpasses even him in the superficiality of her erudition.' Published in English as *Intellectual Impostures: Postmodern Philosophers' Abuse of Science* (London: Profile, 1998), p. 47.

In *Séméiotikè: recherches pour une sémanalyse* (1969), Kristeva echoed Bakhtin insofar as she argued that 'The novel, seen as a text, is a semiotic practice in which the synthesized patterns of several utterances can be read.'[163] She assumed that there are three components involved in addition to the text under examination: the author, the reader, and exterior texts.[164] Michael Riffaterre, however, suggests that a literary experience consists only of a text, a reader, and his or her critical response to it, and he defines an intertext as 'the corpus of texts the reader may legitimately connect with the one before his eyes, that is, the texts brought to mind by what he is reading'.[165] The differences between Riffaterre and Kristeva may be construed as more a matter of degree or emphasis than of kind. Kristeva argues that the notion of intertextuality replaces the notion of intersubjectivity, and that meaning is not transferred directly from writer to reader. For Riffaterre, however, meaning is imparted through a prism of past reading, which emphasises the notion of subjectivity. Riffaterre's intertextuality is the subjective experience of a reader who perceives connections between the text being read and the texts that he or she has already read.

Gérard Genette, in *Palimpsestes: La littérature au second degré* (1982), relates literary allusion to 'an enunciation whose full meaning presupposes the perception of a relationship between it and another text, to which it necessarily refers by some inflections that would otherwise remain unintelligible.'[166] Riffaterre and Genette concern themselves with the diverse allusions that primary texts may have with antecedent texts.[167] In order to understand contemporary literature one must possess knowledge of historical literature.

---

[163] Published in English as *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trans. by Tom Gora and Alice Jardine (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980), p. 37.
[164] Megan Becker-Leckrone, *Julia Kristeva and Literary Theory* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), p. 11.
[165] Michael Riffaterre, 'Syllepsis', *Critical Inquiry*, 6 (1980), pp. 625-638 (p. 626).
[166] Published in English as *Palimpsest: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 2.
[167] Michael Leddy adopts a similar position in 'Limits of Allusion', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 32 (1992), pp. 110-122.

William Irwin claims that, since Kristeva's coinage of the term, intertextuality has come to have almost as many meanings as users, from those faithful to Kristeva's original vision to those who simply use it as a stylish way of talking about allusion and influence.[168] Indeed, the use of influence as a literary term has somewhat atrophied recently, Bloom's contribution to the debate notwithstanding, but the heuristic and historical functions of the concept are most certainly extant.[169] For Bakhtin, Kristeva, and Barthes, intertextuality is the necessary and non-subjective condition of all writing, whereas influence is subjective and psychological, and either conscious or unconscious, as Harold Bloom's deployment of Freudian concepts would indicate. Intertextuality is a word that is used to describe different things.

Bloom distinguishes his theory of influence from what he describes as that 'wearisome industry of source-hunting',[170] but what is wearisome to one critic may be a source of endless fascination to another. I shall trace the multiple sources and influences that went into the making of each of my chosen texts with the assumption that it will not be wearisome, but illuminating. I favour a more empirical approach, for it cannot be denied that terms such as influence, allusion, and reference have stood the test of time. In this thesis, therefore, I shall employ the more traditional terms used in literary criticism for intertextual relations, which perhaps are more in keeping with the Anglosphere's textual past.

The *concept* of intertextuality is by no means a twentieth-century innovation. Walter Pater suggests in *Plato and Platonism* (1893) that every text is to some degree a product of earlier texts, and his argument in respect of Platonic and Pre-Socratic philosophy could be generalised to include every literary text in every period:

---

[168] William Irwin, 'Against Intertextuality', *Philosophy and Literature*, 28 (2004), pp. 227-242 (p. 227-228). See also Irwin's 'What is an Allusion?', *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 59 (2001), pp. 287-297.
[169] Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, op. cit., passim.
[170] *Ibid.,* p. 31.

Some of the results of patient earlier thinkers, even when dead and gone, are the structure of [Plato's] philosophy. They are everywhere in it, not as the stray carved corner of some older edifice, to be found here or there amid the new, but rather like minute relics of earlier organic life in the very stone he builds with…It is hardly an exaggeration to say that in Plato, in spite of his wonderful savour of literary freshness, there is nothing absolutely new: or rather, as in many other very original products of human genius, the seemingly new is old also, a palimpsest, a tapestry of which the actual threads have served before, or like the animal frame itself, every particle of which has already lived and died many times over. Nothing but the life-giving principle of cohesion is new; the new perspective, the resultant complexion, the expressiveness which familiar thoughts by novel juxtaposition. In other words, the *form* is new.[171]

Furthermore, as Alfred North Whitehead in *Process and Reality* (1929) famously observed, 'The safest general characterisation of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato.'[172] However, Plato's originality would seem to consist in the way that he recycles the ideas of his predecessors. The form lends the *appearance* of newness. Such notions of intertextuality abounded in the nineteenth century. A Victorian literary critic, Charles Wibley, was of the opinion that

In one sense the literature of the world may be described as a series of thefts. Tradition, the essence of art, is but a chain which binds lender and borrower together…In truth, the first step to originality is a knowledge of other men's masterpieces…Since knowledge of others is necessary to originality, it follows that all men must, in their moments, be plagiarists. For no man, sensitive enough to write, is insensitive to influences. The result of study is half-conscious suggestion, and as Gibbon found his irony in Pascal, as Virgil found his measure in Homer, so everybody who is worth reading has taken what suited him from the past.[173]

Wibley was not the only nineteenth-century critic to articulate notions of intertextuality, though influence was the preferred terminology of the age.[174]

---

[171] Walter Pater, *Plato and Platonism* (1893) (New York: Chelsea House, 1983), pp. 7-8.
[172] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality* (1929) (London: Free Press, 1979), p. 39.
[173] Charles Wibley, 'A Plea for Legitimate Plagiarism', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 168 (1900), p. 598.
[174] Robert Douglas-Fairhurst explores this concept of influence, literary and extraliterary, in *Victorian Afterlives: The Shaping of Influence in Nineteenth-Century Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), *passim*.

The most useful definition of intertextuality I have found for my purpose is that presented by Allan H. Pasco:

> I see intertextuality as any textual exploitation of another text. It would include satire, parody, pastiche, *imitatio*, *refacimento*, reference, allusion, modelling, borrowing, even plagiarism. Although the list is far from complete, its range of intertextualities may seem ungainly. On looking closely, one might nonetheless discern three distinct categories: of *imitation*, of *opposition*, and of *allusion*. In *imitation*, the author fits his text into a tradition and willingly attempts to use its means — whether styles, forms, lexicon, or devices — and its values to echo previous success. In *opposition* — whether irony or satire or even negative commentary and comparison — the signified images resist integration and emphasize disparateness. In *allusion*, different texts — both the one in hand and those that are external — are integrated metaphorically into something new.[175]

Pasco's definition is fitting insofar as it places emphasis on the centrality of allusion to any understanding of literary history.[176] I define allusion as an intended reference that implies connotations more significant than mere substitution of a referent. As we will see, all four texts examined employ imitation, opposition, and allusion as intertextual devices in varying degrees. A small number of extraliterary sources are examined, for they have now been transformed into *bona fide* sources by virtue of being included in literary texts. It is not implied that the referent is a literary work, but rather that the referring text is in essence literary. As we will see, this brings us close to Genette's use of the term 'transtextuality' in *Introduction à l'architexte* (1979), by which he refers to *everything* that influences a text, either explicitly or implicitly.[177] However, my main emphasis is on intertextual sources, for successful allusion

---

[175] Allan H. Pasco, *Allusion: A Literary Graft* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), p. 5.

[176] Karl Popper lucidly explains the difficulties inherent to the concept of definition: 'a definition cannot establish the meaning of a term any more than a logical derivation can establish the truth of a statement; both can only shift this problem back. The derivation shifts the problem of truth back to the premises, the definition shifts the problem of meaning back to the defining terms (i.e., the terms that make up the defining formula). But these, for many reasons, are likely to be just as vague and confusing as the terms we started with; and in any case, we should have to go on to define them in turn; which leads to new terms which too must be defined. And so on, to infinity. One sees that the demand that all our terms should be defined is just as untenable as the demand that all our statements should be proved.' *The Open Society and its Enemies* (1945) (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 247.

[177] Gérard Genette, *The Architext: An Introduction*, trans. by Jane E. Lewin (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992), pp. 85-90.

must be recognised by the reader in order that it can augment or amplify. It must be identifiable as a part of the literary matrix.[178] Authors employ intertextuality for a reason, and therefore authorial intention must be taken into account, even though that concept may be problematic to determine.[179]

Imitation, or perhaps emulation, which is not quite the same thing, raises a number of issues. It can be viewed as a first step on the road to invention. Indeed, the authors of the texts examined in this thesis seem to have adopted that position. It is neither unnatural, nor uncommon, for a writer to seek to emulate an author whom he or she admires. A writer may use keywords in a text in order to affirm concepts that parallel antecedent texts. The device of allusive imitation can confuse the most discerning of readers. Yet, Aristotle noted that an appreciation of an imitation requires prior knowledge of that which is imitated.[180] The imitated and the imitation are aesthetically related, though an imitation is not a copy, but rather an emulation and/or adaption of an earlier text. However, it is not always easy to determine the dividing line between imitation and plagiarism, even though the latter is characterised by deceptive intent, and the former not. As we shall see, many authors consciously blur that distinction to good effect.

Oppositional allusion can be difficult to detect. A reference may be used ironically or paradoxically, and a referent may be of a composite nature. It requires that the references and referent come together to create something different from either. There is also the question of whether any resemblances or patterns detected are significant. Oppositional allusions are predicated upon extensive literary knowledge on the reader's part, much more so than other

---

[178] Joseph Pucco, *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition* (New Haven: Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998), p. 5.
[179] E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1967), *passim*.
[180] Aristotle, 'Poetics', in *Classical Literary Criticism*, ed. by D. A. Russell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 51-90 (p. 62).

types of allusion, and few readers possess the requisite reading skills, and literary hinterland, needed to recognise and interpret them. Some allusions may be aimed not at a general readership, but rather at a specific coterie. Oppositional allusion is an abstruse concept, for such allusions may reference multiple texts, implicit and explicit. Such allusions compel a reader to search his or her literary memory for knowledge that is not contained in the text itself, and without which the writer's intention cannot be understood. In general, oppositional allusions focus on a specific *Leitmotiv*, character, or plot development. For example, Oz is explored and transformed by a little girl, Dorothy Gale. It could have been a boy's own story, but instead L. Frank Baum subverted the genre and wrote a girl's own story. There are allusions to Alice in Wonderland, but Oz is a real place, albeit in another dimension, whereas Alice was only dreaming. Oppositional allusion depends on the semantic results of referencing several texts simultaneously rather than on textual appropriation. Baum employed a form of esoteric writing that could be described as oppositional allusion.[181]

It is surely the case that allusion, particularly extended allusion, sometimes called a conduit allusion, gains power by its explicitness and consistency.[182] An extended parallel allusion repeatedly draws the reader's attention to its source. Such an allusion can sometimes be described as allegorical, which can help explain one story in terms of another. C. S. Lewis' *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* (1950) would be an example of an extended allegorical allusion. The kingly Aslan, an anthropomorphised lion, is an allegorical representation of Jesus Christ. Extended allusion necessarily makes use of a large number of literary elements, albeit primarily from a single source, and thereby facilitates understanding of how allusion functions.

---

[181] Allusion as an esoteric technique is discussed by Arthur M. Melzer in *Philosophy between the Lines: The Lost History of Esoteric Writing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), p. 53-54. Oppositional allusion, whether recondite or tangential in nature, is discussed by Leo Strauss in *Persecution and the Art of Writing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), *passim*.

[182] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 3-13.

It is perhaps impossible for a writer to make observations that have not previously been touched upon by others. There is a sense in which each story written by an author is unique, just as each sentence is one of an infinite variety of possible sentences, but there is also a sense in which plots, situations, and sentences are reiterations of earlier literary instantiations. Some form of textual appropriation in the course of writing, conscious or otherwise,[183] is inevitable. T. S. Eliot, in his seminal essay 'Tradition and the Individual Talent', drew attention to the lasting presence of the past in the present when he wrote that 'the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of…his culture has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order'.[184] The literary device of allusion presupposes a cultural bond. Some measure of the past is always contained in the present. The significance of a writer's work cannot be evaluated without recourse to the work of his or her literary forebears. Correlatively, a text is commonly judged by standards set in the past, notwithstanding that the present may have markedly different standards.

Jack Stillinger suggests that every literary work is necessarily the product of a process that is in effect one of collective authorship. The contents and meanings of a text are not to be found in the act of an author creating *de novo* and *ex nihilo*, but rather through its relations to other texts:

> it is demonstrable…that every…work to some extent draws on and derives from other works that precede it. This is a solidly established fact of literary history, so much so

---

[183] Michael Maar has examined this crucial distinction in his *The Two Lolitas*, trans. by Perry Anderson (London: Verso, 2005). Vladimir Nabokov may have appropriated the plot, incidents, and characters that constitute his novel, *Lolita* (1955), from a short story by a German author, Heinz von Lichberg, which is titled 'Lolita' (1916). However, this may be a case of cryptomnesia on Nabokov's part. See also Julie Sanders, 'What is Appropriation?', in *Adaptation and Appropriation* (New York: Routledge, 2015), pp. 35-54.

[184] T. S. Eliot, 'Tradition and the Individual Talent', in *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism, op. cit.,* pp. 39-49 (p. 41). This essay satisfies the requirement of all traditionalist thought; it is not original, nor does it try to be. In the current intellectual climate the most radical position to adopt is a traditionalist one.

that scholarly or critical consideration of a work apart from the vast array of underlying sources and influences is virtually impossible.[185]

As Stillinger indicates, it is *demonstrable* that writers constantly borrow from their reading material; that texts perforce beget other texts. Such an approach is wholly germane to the intertextual case studies developed in this thesis, even though scholarly or critical consideration differs markedly from a child reader's approach.

Children's Literature, Intertextuality, and the Child Reader

The notion of intertextuality that I use in this thesis is subjective in the sense that it assumes that an author inevitably draws upon his or her reading. It is also subjective insofar as it assumes the reader's recognition of intertextual relations is necessarily dependent upon his or her past reading. The latter assumption has particular consequences, however, for the study of children's literature. Perhaps it is mainly to adult readers of children's novels that intertextual references are addressed, though it depends on the sort of texts being referenced. Skill in reading is highly dependent upon memory, and children have a limited store of textual memory upon which to draw.

Intertextuality, however defined, presupposes some level of cultural literacy in readers. It is therefore important to ask how this intertextual process works in children's literature, where the intended readers have a limited cultural literacy. Texts of quotation, or direct reference, are probably the most basic level at which naïve readers can recognise intertextuality. For example, *Little Women* opens with an explicit quotation from *The Pilgrim's Progress*, which straightaway establishes a cultural bond with those readers familiar with that

---

[185] Jack Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 96.

text, as indeed many American children were.[186] However, one could assume that the addressee in children's literature is not the reader, but what Wayne C. Booth calls the 'mock reader',[187] or perhaps what Wolfgang Iser calls the 'implied reader',[188] who is a hypothetical reader who possesses the cultural knowledge needed to respond to the text in the way that the author intends, or the text requires. Hans-Heino Ewers has defined the adult reader of children's fiction as the 'implied co-reader', arguing that so-called children's literature is often addressed to adults, too.[189] Intertextuality illuminates a grey area marking the boundary between boyhood and manhood in life and literature, that which Joseph Conrad called 'the shadow-line'.[190] Such crossover fiction, or literary hybridisation, could be seen as an adherence to communally shared values that transcend generational drift over the course of a lifetime, though this does not solve the problem of different levels of literary knowledge and experience.[191]

One strategy employed by those who write for children is to assume that their readers have a familiarity with earlier children's literature, though it may be that authors do not wish their child readers to recognise their sources.[192] Stevenson's *Treasure Island* (1883), for instance, may appear more original to readers who have not read *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) or *The Coral Island* (1857). There is much more in every story than is actually written, for between the lines of every story there is often a slightly different story running in parallel, but it is one that is not always read, and indeed one that is accessible to the most perceptive readers

---

[186] Ruth K. MacDonald has argued that *The Pilgrim's Progress* was much more influential in the United States than it ever was in England. See *Christian's Children: The Influence of John Bunyan's* The Pilgrim's Progress *on American Children's Literature* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989), *passim*.

[187] Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 138-139.

[188] Wolfgang Iser, *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), pp. 27-38.

[189] Hans-Heino Ewers, 'Children's Literature as Reading Material for Adults', in *Fundamental Concepts of Children's Literature Research: Literary and Sociological Approaches* (New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 43-52 (p. 44).

[190] Joseph Conrad, *The Shadow-Line: A Confession* (1917) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), *passim*.

[191] J. A. Appleyard, *Becoming a Reader: The Experience of Fiction from Childhood to Adulthood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), p. 2.

[192] Aidan Chambers, 'The Reader in the Book', in *Booktalk: Occasional Writings on Literature and Children* (London: Bodley Head, 1985), pp. 34-58 (p. 35).

only. The authorial tone in *Treasure Island* is understated, yet multifaceted and mutable in a manner that imparts legitimacy to Wayne C. Booth's notion of the 'implied author', that is, Stevenson *qua* storyteller, whose involvement is one of presenting Hawkins' *faux* autobiography.[193] The naïve reader comprehends the story at surface level, but the sophisticated reader explores its complex depths. It is this esoteric aspect of writing that adds an adult dimension to a story ostensibly written for children.[194] The distinction between children's literature and mainstream literature can be seen to blur, intersect, and hybridise. As we shall see, there is demonstrably a dual readership.[195]

The best of children's literature is that which touches childhood *and* adulthood.[196] However, any examination of intertextuality in children's literature needs to consider its impact upon the child reader. The ongoing development of a post-poststructuralist theory of intertextuality can be seen in the recent work of Christine Wilkie-Stibbs, who examines the implications of intertextuality in children's literature for the child reader. She argues that there are three significant categories of intertextuality.[197] Firstly, there are texts of quotation that quote from, or simply allude to, other texts, literary or otherwise. Such texts are in all probability the ones in which a child reader, at least a comparatively well-read one, can most readily identify an intertextual element. Secondly, there are imitative texts that may function as a signal to the perceptive reader. The child reader may find such intertextual elements difficult to identify, and the writer who is writing solely for children must tread carefully in

---

[193] Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction, op. cit.,* p. 431.

[194] Joanne Lewis, 'How far from Babylon? The Voice of Stevenson's Garden', in *The Voice of the Narrator in Children's Literature*, ed. by Charlotte F. Otten and Gary D. Schmidt (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), pp. 240-251 (p. 245).

[195] In the United States, from 1865 to 1914, so-called children's books were widely read by adults. See Jerry Griswold, *Audacious Kids: The Classic American Children's Story* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), p. *xviii*.

[196] Sandra L. Beckett, 'Crosswriting Child and Adult in France: Children's Fiction for Adults? Adult Fiction for Children? Fiction for all Ages?', in *Transcending Boundaries: Writing for a Dual Audience of Children and Adults*, ed. by Sandra L. Beckett (New York: Garland, 1999), pp. 31-62.

[197] Christine Wilkie-Stibbs, 'Intertextuality and the Child Reader', in *Understanding Children's Literature*, ed. by Peter Hunt (London: Routledge, 2005), pp. 168-180.

order not to include passages that prove to be redundant to a reader due to a lack of background reading. Thirdly, there are genre texts that contain stereotypical literary conventions. Sometimes allusions are of an almost formulaic nature; they are essential components of the literary genre in which the author is working. For example, pirate stories commonly include a mutiny, a desert island, buried treasure, and a protagonist who faces life-threatening danger but nevertheless emerges triumphant.[198] Some children's authors have a tendency to signpost their allusions and references more explicitly than authors who aim their works at an adult audience, though that is not to imply that this is done in a heavy-handed manner. However, this would seem to locate intertextuality in the works themselves, and yet, as we have seen, intertextuality is also an interpretive practice by readers.

Children's literature often works on two different levels, and with two different readerships in mind — children and adults.[199] Children's literature can therefore deploy two different levels of intertextuality — one recognised by children and the other by informed adult readers.[200] Reading aloud was common in bookish nineteenth-century households, and children often listened to stories that were beyond their reading abilities.[201] Similarly, adults read to the family books that were written for children.[202] A literary borderland in which books that could be enjoyed by children *and* adults became a meeting place for Everyreader.[203]

---

[198] Kevin Carpenter, *Desert Isles and Pirate Islands: The Island Theme in Nineteenth-Century English Juvenile Fiction* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1984), *passim*.

[199] U. C. Knoepflmacher, 'Children's texts and the grown-up reader', in *The Cambridge Companion to Children's Literature*, *op. cit.,* pp. 159-173 (p. 160).

[200] Nicholas Tucker, 'Who Reads Children's Books', in *The Child and the Book: A Psychological and Literary Exploration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 218-232.

[201] Roger Sale, *Fairy Tales and After: From Snow White to E. B. White* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1978), p. 15.

[202] Gail Schmunk Murray, *American Children's Literature and the Construction of Childhood, op. cit.,* p. 53.

[203] Nicholas Tucker, 'Who Reads Children's Books', in *The Child and the Book: A Psychological and Literary Exploration*, *op. cit.,* pp. 218-232. In nineteenth-century America children's literature was taken so seriously that it was reviewed on equal terms with adult literature in such prestigious journals as *Nation*. For example, Henry James reviewed Louisa May Alcott's *Eight Cousins* (1875). See Richard L. Darling, *The Rise of Children's Book Reviewing in America, 1865-1881* (New York: Bowker, 1968), *passim*. Such reviews are also discussed by Anne H. Lundin, 'Victorian Horizons: The Reception of Children's Books in England and America, 1880-1900', *Library Quarterly*, 64 (1994), pp. 30-59.

Children's Literature

Jacqueline Rose has famously argued for the impossibility of children's fiction. She points to the difficulty in defining children's literature in relation to the concept of childhood:

> Children's fiction rests on the idea that there is a child who is simply there to be addressed and that speaking to it might be simple. It is an idea whose innocent generality covers up a multitude of sins…*Peter Pan* stands in our culture as a monument to the impossibility of its own claims — that it represents the child, speaks to and for children, addresses them as a group which is knowable and exists for the book.[204]

Indeed, it could be argued that there might not be such a thing as children's literature *per se*, but simply books that are read by (or to) children. Perhaps children's literature is not so much a unique genre but more a particular way of reading literature. Katherine Jones has written that 'the *term* "children's literature" is simply impossible, for the possibilities of a children's literature are irrevocably undermined by the confusion created by the term.'[205] However, this is an assertion that I do not believe bears scrutiny, for every genre has blurred parameters. Fred Inglis takes issue with the view that children's literature is not an identifiable genre:

> It is simply ignorant not to admit that children's novelists have developed a set of conventions for their work. Such development is a natural extension of the elaborate and implicit system of rules, orthodoxies, improvisations, customs, forms, and adjustments which characterise the way any adult tells stories or simply talks at length to children.[206]

Inglis claims that children's literature is marked by characteristic conventions which have developed out of the way that adults tell stories to children, and that these conventions are

---

[204] Jacqueline Rose, *The Case of Peter Pan: or, The Impossibility of Children's Fiction* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1992), p. 1.

[205] Katherine Jones, 'Getting Rid of Children's Literature', *The Lion and the Unicorn*, 30 (2006), pp. 287-315 (p. 300).

[206] Fred Inglis, *The Promise of Happiness: Value and Meaning in Children's Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 32.

perforce intertextual. 'Once upon a time', for example, is an intertextual convention that children come to recognise as the indication that the telling of a story is about to begin.[207]

The concept of children's literature is constantly evolving, and the diversity to be discovered within the genre, multiplied by the diverse approaches to it by readers and writers, in addition to the various difficulties in distinguishing it from other genres, goes some way to explaining the impossibility of being definitive. There is no simple and concise definition that includes all kinds of children's literature while excluding all that is not children's literature. As a correlation of this, I suggest that to view children's literature as a wholly autonomous genre set within conceptual parameters that are immutable would be counterproductive, for it is evidently the case that what is viewed as children's literature today may be viewed very differently tomorrow. Not all children's books contain child characters, and not all books that are about children are written for children. Henry James' *What Maisie Knew* (1897), Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* (1901), Richard Hughes' *A High Wind in Jamaica* (1929), Jack Schaeffer's *Shane* (1949), and L. P. Hartley's *The Go-Between* (1953) are novels that explore the mental life of the child, though none is explicitly aimed at a juvenile readership.

Children's literature has distinct precursors, though not all of them belong in that genre. In Nicholas Orme's reckoning, the mediaeval period produced 'works aimed specifically at the young, works suitable for use by adults or the young, and works intended for adults that reached the young unofficially or by chance.'[208] Moreover, Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726, amended 1735), and Robert Louis Stevenson's *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886) were not initially aimed at child readers, though customised editions are now marketed to a juvenile audience. Richard Adams' *Watership*

---

[207] Arthur N. Applebee, *The Child's Concept of Story* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), p. 3.
[208] Nicholas Orme, 'Children and Literature in Mediaeval England', *Medium Aevum*, 68 (1999), pp.218-246 (p. 218). See also *Mediaeval Literature for Children*, ed. by Daniel T. Kline (London: Routledge, 2003), *passim*.

Down (1972) is a children's novel that has found an extensive adult readership, while J. D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951) was aimed at an adult readership, but has since become standard reading fare for adolescents. J. M. Barrie's novel, *Peter Pan* (1911), is a fantastical story about children, which was apparently inspired by Barrie's friendship with children, but it has never been widely read by children. James Vance Marshall's *Walkabout* (1959) is currently marketed to adult readers in the United States, but to adolescent readers in the United Kingdom. Richmal Crompton initially aimed *Just William* (1922) at an adult readership. Lucy Maud Montgomery wrote *Anne of Green Gables* (1908) for readers of all ages, but it has been widely held to be a children's novel since the mid-twentieth century. Anna Sewell's *Black Beauty: The Autobiography of a Horse* (1877), though now a classic of children's literature, was not originally published for children. (Sewell wrote the novel to raise awareness of animal welfare issues among the general populace.)[209] J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Hobbit* (1937) focuses on the adventures of adult characters, though the Hobbits do have a childlike quality. Moreover, Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (1865), Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* (1908), Frances Hodgson Burnett's *The Secret Garden* (1911), and T. H. White's *The Once and Future King* (1958) are marketed by publishers as children's books, and yet their narrative complexities, psychological insights, and range of intertextual references would seem to place them beyond the reach of the naïve reader. Such works are really adult novels in the fantasy genre, albeit in the guise of children's literature. This type of ambiguity is a salient factor of children's literature as a genre. The

---

[209] Peter Hunt, 'Passing on the Past: The Problem of Books that *are* for Children and that *were* for Children', *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, 21 (1997), pp. 200-202. See also Gina M. Dorré, *Victorian Fiction and the Cult of the Horse* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 16-17.

concept of children's literature resists any universally applicable definition, though some core elements of the genre are distinctive.[210]

Myles McDowell's seminal essay 'Fiction for Children and Adults: Some Essential Differences' present schematic distinctions between children's and adults' literature:

> Children's books are generally shorter; they tend to favour an active rather than a 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 schematism 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, probability is often disregarded; and one could go on endlessly talking of magic, and fantasy, and simplicity, and adventure.[211]

However, children's literature of the nineteenth century cannot be so easily pigeonholed. There are numerous exceptions to each of McDowell's definitions. Indeed, many literary works aimed at an adult readership could also be so defined. John Rowe Townsend wrote that 'The only practical definition of a children's book today — absurd as it sounds — is "a book that appears on the children's list of a publisher".'[212]

As a general rule, authors adopt a different style of writing, both in form and content, when crafting a story aimed at a juvenile readership, but it is not always easy to define the precise nature of that difference. Authors who write for children must, in some sense, write down to the reading level of their target readership. For example, children have a limited grasp of metaphor and irony.[213] Children's literature is, therefore, a genre that to some degree eschews a number of literary devices. It is, as Robert Bator submits, 'a necessarily limited

---

[210] Myriad attempts have been made to encapsulate within neat definitions or logical categories the elusive criteria of children's literature. See Perry Nodelman, *The Hidden Adult: Defining Children's Literature* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), *passim.*

[211] Myles McDowell, 'Fiction for Children and Adults: Some Essential Differences', in *Writers, Critics, and Children: Articles from Children's Literature in Education*, ed. by Geoff Hill (London: Heinemann, 1976), pp. 140-156 (pp. 141-142).

[212] John Rowe Townsend, *A Sense of Story* (London: Longman, 1971), p. 10.

[213] Ellen Winner, 'Constraints on Metaphor Comprehension', in *The Point of Words: Children's Understanding of Metaphor and Irony* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988), pp. 61-89 (p. 62).

literature',[214] and any analysis of its generic qualities has to weigh the consequences of that. There is perhaps an imaginative modification and straightforwardness that is characteristic of the genre; adherence to conventional story patterns is a given. A relatively simple plot structure, however, is in no way indicative of any lack of literary merit. Adult literature lies concealed in much of children's literature, and children's literature exists as one half of an implied whole. To some extent, children's literature defines itself by what it is not, which is to say that its criteria remain moot.

Conclusion

One advantage to studying literature at a generic level is that genres, as clusters of conventions, provide better guides to the fundamental nature of a literary tradition than individual texts studied seriatim. The texts scrutinised in this thesis are commonly categorised as children's literature, but I shall show that they were written with a much wider readership in mind, and that this readership was essentially a white one. Moreover, I shall evidence that they are illustrative paradigms that have a metafictional dimension. This process of inquiry will constitute a generic framework around which a logically consistent argument based on verifiable evidence may be constructed.

The apparent simplicity of the texts studied in this thesis masks a resonant complexity, for these texts entail an inkling of a more complex, a more complete, comprehension of words and deeds, people and places, than is on the surface evident. Yet, simplicity provides that very surface with its layers of comprehensibility. The relatively simple surface sublimates, yet still manages to suggest, the existence of something that is much less simple. A paragraph, even a sentence or phrase, may seem simple enough, but once it has been carefully examined by a

---

[214] Robert Bator, *Signposts to Criticism of Children's Literature* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1983), p. 6.

perceptive reader the complexities contained therein are plainly revealed. As we shall see, children's literature is different from, and yet intimately bound to, adult literature. The ramifications of such a diverse readership will be discussed and clarified throughout the following chapters. Children's literature is *not* simple. Indeed, it should perhaps be stamped with the impress, *caveat lector*, for it takes a perceptive reader to discern a complexity made evident by means of an apparent simplicity.

Those who write for children go some way to educating the bookish child in the codes of the Western literary tradition. The reading and contemplation of nineteenth-century children's novels promotes a heightened awareness of the shared identity of the literary Anglosphere. It would not do to describe classic children's literature of the Anglosphere as something inherently universalistic. However, there is indeed a distinct cosmopolitan strain, albeit of a constrained nature, to be detected in nineteenth-century children's literature, but it is one that in no way attenuates the Anglospheric essence. The so-called children's novels examined in this thesis are complex and multifaceted works that require to be viewed in an Anglospheric intertextual perspective. The British reader comes to a better understanding of his or her own nation's literature through being conversant with American literature, and *vice versa*. A consciousness of the past is crucial to the imbrication of these two narratives, as indeed is ethnic awareness.

Russell Kirk argued that 'the transplanted culture of Britain in America has been one of humankind's more successful experiments.'[215] The English language, and the cultures and traditions of the British Isles, made the United States an intellectual dependency of sorts, their political independence notwithstanding. On the other hand, it was this same legacy that was

---

[215] Russell Kirk, *America's British Culture* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction, 1993), p. 7.

instrumental in the eventual American cultural ascendancy.[216] Christopher Mulvey explains the

metaphor of the nineteenth-century Anglo-American family as an organic community:

> The racial identity, the blood tie, was the most recurrent of the pieties…Many
> believed that the transplanted English stock in America remained true to itself, and
> that the blood, the language, the spirit of an older, and even of a better, England were
> alive in the former colony. New England at least could be represented as an older
> England.[217]

Indeed, as Kipling had it, 'All people like us are We/And everyone else is They'.[218] The

nineteenth-century boy's own story perpetuated a hegemonic *Weltanschauung* that was based

on culture and ethnicity. The reading of it served an epistemic function. As I shall demonstrate

in what follows, that which has often been viewed as the literature of nations is in reality the

literature of cultures. In this instance, white cultures.[219] The nineteenth-century boy's own

adventure story, and indeed Anglospheric literature in general, imparted a white ethos to a

pluralistic Anglo-American society. (Whiteness, or Anglo-American identity, is much more

than race. It is also the traditions, customs, rituals, values, and belief systems of the

Anglosphere.) However, as in any other cultural relationship, it has at times proved difficult to

strike a mutually acceptable balance between independence and interdependence. To be sure,

it is an intermittent theme of this thesis that a literary community should be neither too united,

nor too divided, if its culture is to flourish.[220] The literatures of Great Britain and Anglo-

America each constitute unique traditions. Yet, like positive and negative poles, nineteenth-

century British and Anglo-American writers were, and indeed are, parts of a single entity; they

imply, entail, and attract each other.

---

[216] Frank Thistlethwaite, *The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959), pp. 10-12.

[217] Christopher Mulvey, 'Transatlantic Views', in *Anglo-American Landscapes: A Study of Nineteenth-Century Anglo-American Travel Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 249-267 (p. 267).

[218] Rudyard Kipling, 'We and They' (1919), in *The Complete Verse* (London: Kyle Cathie, 2006), p. 629. See also Jerry Z. Müller, 'Us and Them: The Enduring Power of Ethnic Nationalism', *Foreign Affairs*, 87 (2008), pp. 18-35.

[219] Donald R. Kinder and Cindy D. Kam, 'The Nature of Ethnocentrism', in *Us against Them: Ethnocentric Foundations of American Opinion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), pp. 5-70.

[220] T. S. Eliot, *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (1948) (London: Faber and Faber, 1973), p. 50.