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Introduction: The Paradoxes of Children’s Literature; or Making Sense of Children’s Literature

‘And now, which of these finger-posts ought I to follow, I wonder?’
It was not a very difficult question to answer, as there was only one road through the wood, and the two finger-posts both pointed along it. ‘I’ll settle it,’ Alice said to herself, ‘when the road divides and they point different ways.’
But this did not seem likely to happen. She went on and on, a long way, but wherever the road divided there were sure to be two finger-posts pointing the same way. (Through the Looking-Glass, and What Alice Found There (Carroll 2008: 158))
‘Which way, which way?’ asks Alice. The question has no answer, since it is the characteristic of sense not to have any direction of ‘good sense.’ Rather, sense always goes in to both directions at once. (Logic of Sense 88–9E/95F)

Gilles Deleuze is known for his somewhat cerebral tastes in literature, and throughout his Œuvre he makes reference to innumerable authors, playwrights and poets, who he sees as exemplary practitioners of their craft and whose works create such new possibilities for life. Yet, to elaborate his theory of sense in his Logique du Sens [The Logic of Sense] (1969), Deleuze turns, in part, to the nonsense and paradoxes he finds in Lewis Carroll’s children’s texts Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland (1865) and Through the Looking-Glass, and What Alice Found There (1871). Whilst these are the only children’s texts to which Deleuze explicitly refers, there are, nonetheless, glimpses of an interest in children’s literature throughout his work. The series of conversations recorded with Claire Parnet, his former student, broadcast posthumously on Arte in 1995, give a nod to children’s literature with their title L’Abécédaire de Gilles Deleuze. These conversations reprise the deceptively simple format, typically reserved for children, of the alphabet primer and provide a glimpse into Deleuze’s mind at work as he speaks about words and concepts derived from each letter of the alphabet (A is for animal . . . Z is for zigzag). The small book published in 1997 by Éditions du Seuil with the whimsical title L’Oiseau philosophie: Duhême dessine
Deleuze [The Bird Philosophy: Duhême draws Deleuze] – a homage in the most delightful way from Deleuze’s long-time friend and illustrious children’s literature illustrator, Jaqueline Duhême – makes a children’s picture book of Deleuze and extracts of his thought. More broadly, Deleuze’s thought is peopled with a rich imagery of sorcerers and witches, more commonly found in the genre of children’s literature itself.

Children’s literature is particularly attuned to Deleuzian thought because of a peculiarity it creates within the context of literary studies. The study of literature typically departs from distinct points of origin; the study of particular authors, Shakespeare, Molière or Goethe, for example; or specific periods, such as nineteenth- or twentieth-century literature. The study of children’s literature, however, begins ‘from the point of arrival, the child consumers, [which] feels like Alice’s Looking-Glass logic, in which you must select the exact opposite direction in order to get to where you really want to go’ (McMaster 2001: 281, original emphasis). Children’s literature, unlike any other genre, forces us to consider the slippery idea of an implied child readership from the outset, and in doing so takes us into a Deleuzian looking-glass world of paradox and presumed binaries.

Paradox works against doxa or commonly held beliefs or opinions, taking terms which, on the surface, appear straightforward and self-explanatory and showing them to need further investigation. Paradox may trouble us and tempt us: we may feel the need to refute or resolve it. But for Deleuze we should do neither. Instead, we should approach paradox productively and use it to highlight the limitations of common sense and to create anew. The paradoxes of children’s literature arise from the possessive apostrophe that links the two parts of the term children’s literature, provoking in turn the emergence of a binary of what appear to be mutually exclusive terms – child and adult.

Common sense tells us that children’s literature is a misnomer: children’s literature is not a literature of children, created by children for children. Children do not typically write the texts we find in bookshops and libraries marketed and offered to children, adults do. The texts that children write are rarely considered to be Literature: great, canonical literature, the stuff of university studies; and in some ways, this mirrors the position of the discipline of children’s literature itself, which in its infancy was not considered substantial enough for the academy. Children’s literature is, then, a literature for children and about children: a literature to be read by children.
Therein lies the paradox of children’s literature: it seems almost impossible to talk about children’s literature without talking about the adult who writes it, provides it, critiques and reviews it, and therefore also reads it, in juxtaposition to the child for whom it is essentially destined. The challenge of grappling with this paradox is taken up by many eminent scholars of children’s literature. Two ground-breaking critiques, laudable for bringing the inherent imbalances of power between the key players of child and adult in children’s literature to the fore, are Jacqueline Rose’s *The Case of Peter Pan, or The Impossibility of Children’s Fiction* (1984) and Karin Lesnik-Oberstein’s later text, *Children’s Literature: Criticism and the Fictional Child* (1994). Rose gestures towards the paradox of children’s literature when, as her title suggests, she describes children’s fiction as an impossible undertaking, one which positions the child as passive and external, ‘unashamedly, [taken] in’ (Rose 1994: 2, original emphasis) by a fiction, which purports to be its own but can never be. Whilst Rose posits the presence of a ‘real’ child existing, ‘outside’ the book, Lesnik-Oberstein denies any possibility for the existence of a real child outside the text with its own unique agency and voice. ‘Children’, Lesnik-Oberstein claims, ‘in culture and history, have no such voice’ (Lesnik-Oberstein 1994: 26): adults create or silence any voice that pertains to be of children. This ‘real’ child can never be, as that child is always constructed through the discourses that adults control and create. These readings of children’s literature are problematic, not only because they promote the somewhat self-perpetuating notions of the voiceless, passive child, but also because they foreground alterity: that the child is other than and different to its adult counterparts; that both child and adult are distinct, knowable entities, neatly organised into discrete categories in binary opposition to each other. Yet, as more recent scholars such as Susan Honeyman (2005), Markus Bohlmann (2012) and Marah Gubar (2013) suggest, both child and adult are much more elusive. Both are knowable and unknowable, ‘at once strangely familiar and yet elusively unrepresentable’ (Bohlmann 2012: 1); both overlap and pass through each other: the child may play at being grown up; the adult may long to rediscover childhood. The not-yet-adult of the child is co-present with the once-was-child of the adult.

Peter Hunt’s *Criticism, Theory, and Children’s Literature* (1995) extends the paradox of children’s literature to questions of readership. Children’s books typically position the reader as a child: a tenable situation for a child reader of a children’s text perhaps, but
more problematic for an adult reader. Hunt advocates the need to adopt a new criticism when dealing with children’s literature, which seeks to make the adult critic of children’s literature acknowledge and consider the child’s perspective. This criticism he calls childist, thereby sidestepping the often-pejorative suffixes of terms such as ‘childish’ and ‘child-like’ and capturing a similar approach to that of, for example, a feminist reading of a text. As Hunt openly admits, however, such an approach is grounded on (im)possibilities: ‘childist criticism confronts an unacknowledged impossibility by manipulating probabilities. The impossibility is that the adult can never really know what a book means to a child: the major probability is that a child’s reading differs substantially from an adult’s’ (Hunt 1995: 180). Hunt argues that an adult accepting the implied role and surrendering to the book ‘is as close as we can get to reading as a child’, but he outlines further complications in the process: ‘do you read as the child you were, or as the child you are? on your self-image as a child or the memory of the “feel” of youthful reading? How far can experienced readers forget their adult experience?’ (48). Hunt’s arguments capture the paradox of an adult reading a text written by another adult, but destined for a child. Whilst Hunt acknowledges there may be traces of the child that remain with the adult, a childist critique of children’s literature is, by his own admission, always beyond our reach. For Hunt, as for Rose and Lesnik-Oberstein, child and adult remain different to each other and a child’s experience of a children’s text remains different from and essentially unknowable to the adult.

More recently, Perry Nodelman, in his The Hidden Adult: Defining Children’s Literature (2008), addresses this notion of the otherness of the child by referring to what he calls ‘the fatal contradiction’ in adult perceptions of childhood ‘which insist both that children are different from and even opposite to adults and that they are in the process of becoming more adult all the time’ (Nodelman 2008: 67). This leads to a situation where children’s literature, for Nodelman, paradoxically ‘claims to be devoid of adult content that nevertheless lurks within it’ (341). David Rudd’s Reading the Child in Children’s Literature: An Heretical Approach (2013) challenges Nodelman’s reading of children’s literature, however, and views, inversely, the adult as the more visible figure in children’s literature, ‘unlike the more occluded presence of the child’ (Rudd 2013: 102). The paradox of the intertwined presence of child and adult surfaces again: for Nodelman, it is the shadowy presence of the adult that paradoxically
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pervades literature for children and causes concern; for Rudd, it is the child of children’s literature who is more elusive. We return to a looking-glass world where we are being pulled in two opposite directions at the same time.

To read Deleuze in children’s literature is not to attempt to resolve these contradictions of children’s literature, but to put the paradoxes inherent in it to use to negotiate new pathways through this looking-glass genre. These pathways bring us to two key concepts which recur throughout Deleuze’s work: the molecular child and the encounter. The following sections expand upon these concepts as they underpin my readings that follow.

A Molecular Child

The child is a recurrent figure throughout Deleuze’s œuvre, and in *Capitalisme et Schizophrénie 2: Mille Plateaux [A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia]* (1980), Deleuze and Guattari write of “a” molecular child [which] is produced . . . “a” child coexists with us, in a zone of proximity or block of becoming, on a line of deterritorialization that carries us both off’ (ATP 294E/360F). They oppose this molecular child to ‘the child we once were, whom we remember or phantasize, the molar child whose future is adult’ (ATP 294E/360F). The molar child has already been categorised by the adult world around it: parameters (age, gender, race, nationality and so on) have been ‘imposed on it and [. . .] its subsequent actions are made to conform to those prescribed by its assigned category’ (Massumi 1992: 55). The molar child is the child constructed, as Lesnik-Oberstein would argue, through the discourses of the adult world around it. It is this molar child who Jacqueline Rose invites into children’s fiction. It is the child who Nodelman’s hidden adults form and mould. The molar child is the child in children’s literature who we think we know and understand, or, at the very least, hope to come to know and understand from reading its fiction.

For the molar child, there is only one prescribed, linear pathway from childhood towards adulthood. It is the molar child who we recall in our childhood memories and who, for Hunt, may colour our adult readings of children’s texts. In his E (*Enfance/Childhood*) entry to *L’Abécédaire*, however, Deleuze warns us of the dangers of speaking about childhood: of import is not discussing one’s own childhood, but a childhood, marked by an indefinite article. Deleuze sees no interest in recalling a personal childhood, rather ‘what interests
him is discovering the “child emotion” and, through it, “not the child I once was,” but rather “a child emerging among others, any child whatsoever (un enfant quelconque)”’ (Stivale 2008: 130, original emphasis). In the encounter of child and adult in the space that is children’s literature, another child emerges: a Deleuzian child. This Deleuzian child is any child whatsoever. It has not been subjected to categorisation; it retains ‘an experimental body, sexuality and subjectivity’ (Beckman 2017: 17). It has not been subjected to the constraints of possession; it is not somebody’s child, nor the child somebody once was, nor the child of our memory. Rather, it is an indefinite, impersonal child: a molecular child.

It is not a child who exists purely outside the text waiting to be invited in; nor is it merely a fictional child inside the text waiting to be discovered. Rather the molecular child of children’s literature draws from the reader and character alike, bringing both together through reading. The molecular child is not just accessible to the child, but to both adult and child alike. It is not a child longing to be an adult, nor is it an adult attempting to recapture a past childhood. The molecular child captures something of the adult and something of the child within, transforming what it takes from each so that it is both child and adult and yet neither. The molecular child is then what we discover as an adult or a child reader, or simply a reader, of a children’s text; or as adult and child come together in a communal reading of a children’s story. The molecular child is what emerges through the paradoxical pull of children’s literature, in the pull towards both child and adult. The molecular child therefore undoes our traditional perceptions of childhood and adulthood; of two consecutive periods of life accessed in a linear fashion. The molecular child allows for the contiguity of childhood and adulthood. To read Deleuze in children’s literature is to seek the emergence of this molecular child through the encounter7 of children’s literature.

An Encounter

To encounter is to come upon or to meet with, perhaps unexpectedly. The encounter inherent in children’s literature is, at its very simplest, the coming-together of reader and book. When Deleuze speaks about an encounter however, he considers not only the coming-together of the individual elements comprising the encounter but also what passes between those elements. For Deleuze, this may be a block or a line; a zigzag which captures both parts of the encounter, steals
something of each, and transforms each *and* that which they become. What passes between both parts of the encounter is a lightning-like flash, a Z-like connector which ‘draws together creative forces and often incites the spark that unleashes potentials and thought’ (Stivale 2008: 22).

The encounter inherent in children’s literature is double: it not only involves the coming-together of reader and book, but also, as we have seen, of child and adult in the space of children’s literature. When Deleuze, with Guattari, considers the book, it is as such an encounter. They tell us never to ‘ask what a book means, as signified or signifier’, but only to ask ‘what it functions with, in connection with what other things it does or does not transmit intensities’ (ATP 4E/10F). Of interest here is the expression ‘transmit’ (in French *faire passer*): the book functions with and transmits intensities to an external body. Intensity occurs in the flow between parts, in the connection between book and its external observer or reader. With this statement, Deleuze and Guattari are asking us to change, in the most radical way, how we approach literature, and it merits citing at length how Deleuze compares a traditional interpretative method to his encounter with the book:

> there are, you see, two ways of reading a book: you either see it as a box with something inside and start looking for what it signifies, and then if you are even more perverse and depraved you set off after signifiers. And you treat the next book like a box contained in the first or containing it. And you annotate and interpret and question, and write a book about the book, and so on. Or there’s the other way: you see the book as a little non-signifying machine, and the only question is ‘Does it work, and how does it work?’ How does it work for you? If it doesn’t work, if nothing comes through, you try another book. The second way of reading’s intensive: something comes through or it doesn’t. There’s nothing to explain, nothing to understand, nothing to interpret. It’s like plugging into an electric circuit. (N 7–8E/17F)

The traditional literary method, about which Deleuze is so cynical, creates distance: a gap imposes itself between reader and book, between interpreter and text. Authors can equally accentuate this gap and Deleuze tells us that those authors who allow readers to identify with their characters ‘introduce[] a distance which allows [them] and us to observe, to criticize, to prolong. But this is no good’ (D 52E/66F). Deleuze’s proposed approach is one of proximity. It eliminates this distance, by considering the book as a machine, which
connects with something on the outside. In this gesture of connecting, the book, this machine, comes together or is plugged in to its reader. Of import is not whether this reader is child or adult but whether an electric zigzag passes between the two parts. Of import is that a Deleuzian encounter occurs; an assemblage is formed.

In a Deleuzian approach to literature, ‘there is no hidden meaning or secret to be interpreted; rather, the text is part of a complex continuum with everything that is external to it. Its interest does not lie in what it contains, because it contains nothing; rather, we should be concerned with how it functions as it engages with the world’ (Davis 2010: 62). It could be argued that whilst we are no longer looking for something to interpret in a text, no longer asking what a text means or represents, attempting to understand what a text connects with and how it transmits intensities is nonetheless a form of interpretation. In such an approach to literature, we are not, therefore, dismissing interpretation all together; rather we are shifting the focus of that interpretation, away from ‘the empire of signs and the idea of the text as a tissue of signifiers in favour of a vision of the literary work as a machine or practical object composed of asignifying or non-representational particles discernible in blocs, traits and figures’ (Buchanan et al. 2015: 2). Literature, then, for Deleuze is not a revelatory process, but a productive process. It is not a critical process, but an intensely creative process, producing assemblages and creating possibilities for molecular transformations of those who read it.

To read Deleuze in children’s literature is to read children’s literature in an entirely different way. With Deleuze in children’s literature, we must relinquish the role of the distanced observer of a text. With Deleuze, we no longer get tangled up in ways of reading children’s literature, as adult or child. We no longer need to search for meanings or negotiate questions of ideology or problems of didacticism. Rather, we can focus on the immediacy of reading, on the intense encounter that is reading and how assemblages arising from this encounter may transform us and disrupt the molar structures in our lives that try to contain us. To read Deleuze in children’s literature allows us to embrace the molecular child that emerges from the curious and paradoxical sense of children’s literature, which never ceases to pull us in two directions at once.
Chapter Overview

Many authors fascinate Deleuze and references to them recur across his œuvre, shaping his writings on literature. Of his favoured authors, Miguel Angel Asturias, Lewis Carroll, Jean-Marie Gustave Le Clézio, André Dhôtel, Pierrette Fleutiaux, James Joyce, Eugène Ionesco, Michel Tournier and Virginia Woolf are unusual in that, in addition to their more well-known texts destined for an adult readership, they have also written texts for children. Of these authors, Tournier, Le Clézio and Ionesco could be considered as crossover writers: their texts are not distinguishable by readership and can be enjoyed by both young and adult readers alike. Dhôtel, Fleutiaux, Tournier and Le Clézio write for distinct readerships of children and adults. Despite a vast corpus, Dhôtel is remembered specifically for one particular children’s book, *Le Pays où l’on n’arrive jamais*, for which he won the Prix Fémina in 1955. Tournier is renowned for re-writing his texts for adults as texts for children, and many of Le Clézio’s children’s texts have been adapted from his texts for adults. Ionesco, Joyce and Woolf wrote for specific children, young relatives, whereas Asturias wrote his children’s texts for one specific children’s literature illustrator, Jacqueline Duhême.

Some of these authors, such as Lewis Carroll or Virginia Woolf, feature prominently in Deleuze’s work; others, like Jean-Marie Gustave Le Clézio or Miguel Angel Asturias, only appear more briefly. With the exception of the work of Lewis Carroll, the children’s texts of these authors tend to be largely understudied in the field of children’s literature and are often poorly known. For that reason, I draw on other more widely known children’s texts as illustration where appropriate. In *Deleuze in Children’s Literature*, I read the texts specifically written for children (as opposed to those appropriated by or adapted for children) by Deleuze’s favoured authors. With the exception of Lewis Carroll’s texts, Deleuze does not allude to these children’s texts at any point in his work. Yet, the children’s texts I study here reveal much of what intrigues Deleuze in literature and point to key tensions and further paradoxes within the genre of children’s literature itself. In these children’s texts we find stunning examples of repetitions and ritournelles that resonate across time and space, liberating us from linear time. There are curious becomings-animal and -plant that force us to re-evaluate what it means to grow up. There are child cartographers and nomads, who do not simply leave home to return changed but require us to move rhizomatically
to access the atemporal landscapes of the molecular child. And of course, there is much (non)sense.

In Chapter 2, I begin my readings of Deleuze in children’s literature with repetition – a concept not only key to Deleuze’s philosophical project but also to children’s literature. For Deleuze, the publication of his *Différence et Répétition* [*Difference and Repetition*] in 1968 marks a turning point in his work, moving him, in some ways, away from the studies of historical figures (Hume, Nietzsche, Kant, Bergson) in philosophy who dominate his early career. *Difference and Repetition* is the text in which Deleuze, as he so unassumingly puts it, first ‘tried to do philosophy’ (TRM 305E/280F).

In children’s literature, repetition is not only ubiquitous, its presence creates a paradox. Young readers often appear to revel in repetition, delightedly returning to the same book over and over or reading something which is quite near to the original apart from minor variations. Traditional approaches to literature in general focus on the concept of comparative difference looking for distinctiveness and uniqueness in a given work. When such difference cannot be demonstrated, the literature concerned is typically rejected as inferior. Children’s literature suffers under these conditions because of what children’s literature scholars identify as its apparent sameness which, in turn, gives rise to its historically unhappy position in the field of critical theory.9 Eugène Ionesco’s *Contes 1, 2, 3, 4* pop art picture books, illustrated by Étienne Delessert, provide a perfect illustration of the excesses of repetition in children’s literature. Whilst Deleuze himself only makes the most fleeting of references to Ionesco in *Deux Régimes de Fous* [*Two Regimes of Madness*],11 by considering Deleuze’s concept of repetition for itself alongside Ionesco’s *contes* we can put the paradox of repetition in children’s literature to productive use to discover the difference in repetition.

To discuss another facet of repetition, the ritournelle,12 I turn to Pierrette Fleutiaux’s13 *Trini fait des vagues* [*Trini Makes Waves*] (1997) and its sequel *Trini à l’île de Pâques* [*Trini on Easter Island*] (1999). Fleutiaux admits that, during the 1970s, she was fascinated by Deleuze. In describing Deleuze as ‘someone who sent an electric current through your tired or lazy visions. He literally turned you on’ (Knapp 1998: 438), Fleutiaux captures the essence of the Deleuzian approach to reading outlined above. Pierrette Fleutiaux’s two detective novels, featuring the thirteen-year-old Trini and her police inspector sister Séréna, resemble traditional series fiction to some extent with their use of recurring characters, although they are
not as formulaic as, for example, the Nancy Drew series from the Stratemeyer syndicate in the United States or the Famous Five series written by Enid Blyton in England. Fleutiaux’s two texts exemplify how a haunting refrain can permeate a work. Her ritournelles drift through her writing for children and adults alike, creating not a pre-classified molar child, but a molecular child who brings together the seemingly disparate periods of childhood and adulthood in one.

Leading on from my discussion of the time of repetition – Aiôn, which simultaneously links all times: past, present and future – in Chapter 3 I focus on the notion of growing up in children’s literature and how characters evolve and mature over time. Inherent in the idea of growing up is a linear, uni-directional movement through time towards a greater maturity and towards adulthood. If such linear movement of time is not apparent, then the characters of children’s literature appear to stagnate, unable to grow up. Deleuze and Guattari do not deny this movement towards adulthood but create room for other changes or becomings during this progression from child to adult which break with our traditional expectations of growing up. In this chapter, I shift the focus of growing up from evolution and transformation to what Deleuze and Guattari term involution and becoming, specifically the becomings-animal, -plant and -molecular of characters, and the progression to the cosmic formula of becoming: becoming-imperceptible.

To illustrate becomings-animal, I draw firstly on two texts by Virginia Woolf: Nurse Lugton’s Curtain and The Widow and the Parrot. In Nurse Lugton’s Curtain, we discover the eponymous nurse dozing in her rocking chair with a width of blue patterned material draped over her knees. Intended to be a curtain for the drawing room of her employer, Mrs. Gingham, the animals depicted on the material come to life as Nurse Lugton sleeps, only to be frozen back in place on the curtain when she wakes. Woolf’s other children’s tale, The Widow and the Parrot, is a story of an old lady, Mrs. Gage, who loves animals and who inherits her late brother’s estate. Arriving to claim her inheritance, Mrs. Gage discovers nothing but a dilapidated house and a parrot named James. My readings of The Widow and the Parrot and Nurse Lugton’s Curtain reveal the intense movement of becoming, and specifically becoming-animal, in these texts, and show how becomings-animal may, in turn, disrupt our preconceived notions of what ‘a child’ and ‘an animal’ may be.

To progress from becoming-animal to becoming-plant, I then discuss J.-M. Gustave Le Clézio, one of France’s most renowned
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contemporary authors. His first novel *Le Procès-Verbal* [The Interrogation] (1963), to which Deleuze alludes in *Critique et Clinique* [Essays Critical and Clinical] (1993), received the Prix Renaudot in 1963, and in 2008 he received the Nobel Prize for literature for his complete work. In an interview with children’s literature scholar Sandra Beckett given in 1993, Le Clézio, evoking to some degree the position of Jacqueline Rose, states that ‘there is no literature for children’ (Beckett 1997: 197). It is perhaps not surprising then to learn that ‘all Le Clézio’s texts published in children’s collections are extracts from two collections of short stories intended for an adult readership’ (Beckett 1997: 198). *Voyage au pays des arbres* [Journey to the Country of Trees] is his only text written intentionally for young readers, and is described by Le Clézio as ‘rather a story which ought to be read aloud, to children who are not yet able to read’ (Beckett 1997: 198). Le Clézio’s only intentional children’s story is one which he sees as a communal experience, bringing adult and child together in the shared experience of a text read out loud. In *Voyage au pays des arbres* (written earlier but only published in 1978 by Gallimard Jeunesse, and illustrated by Henri Galeron), a little boy, named Hihuit, who longs to travel, finds his way into a forest at night and discovers a universe where the trees come alive and dance all night. Given Deleuze’s disdain for trees, this text may appear un-Deleuzian. A similar critique could be made of Woolf’s *The Widow and the Parrot*, due to Deleuze’s loathing of domesticated animals. Woolf’s and Le Clézio’s texts nonetheless reveal possibilities for many becomings, in particular becoming-molecular and becoming-plant.

To consider becoming-imperceptible, I turn to the Guatemalan Nobel laureate Miguel Angel Asturias and his philosophical fairy tale published a year before his death in 1974, entitled *El Hombre que lo tenia todo, todo, todo*, translated into French and published by Éditions G.P. (Générale de Publicité) as *L’Homme qui avait tout, tout, tout* [The Man Who Had Everything, Everything, Everything] (1973). Asturias is one of the authors to whom Deleuze refers, albeit briefly, in *L’île déserte et autres textes: Textes et entretiens 1953–1974* [Desert Islands and other texts 1953–1974] (2002), but they share another important link: Asturias turned to Jacqueline Duhême, children’s literature illustrator and long-time friend of Deleuze, to illustrate his work. Deleuze says of Asturias’s writing that it reveals a ‘power of metamorphosis [. . .] and it emanates from other landscapes: the Savannah, the pampas, a fruit company, a field of corn or rice’ (DI 290E/402F): a notion that he evokes in
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his correspondence with Duhême on the publication of *L’Homme qui avait tout, tout, tout*. Deleuze wrote to Duhême: ‘Jacqueline, I was happy to read the book. It’s a beautiful text. I find your drawings complement it particularly well: they convey the image of such thick vegetation that the slightest movement would require magical forces’ (Duhême 1998: 100). Duhême’s illustration for the cover of the tale depicts a jungle-like scene, evoking the rich landscape of Asturias’s Guatemalan heritage, with the youthful man who has everything perched in the trees, arms outstretched as if flying. It is not this vegetation that leads to becoming-imperceptible in this text, however. Apart from possessing everything, this man has one curious particularity: at night, his lungs become magnetic and attract metal from all around. This malediction reminiscent of the inherited *fêlure* or crack Deleuze sees in Émile Zola’s Rougon-Macquart series can only be relieved if Asturias’s nameless protagonist lies on a bed of salt at night. Asturias’s text explores the limits of the human body through a merging of the artificial and the natural and reveals how the physical can give way to becoming-imperceptible.

Chapter 3 concludes by considering Lewis Carroll’s Alice, who for Deleuze epitomises pure becoming. Bemused by her paradoxical movements of growing up and down, of getting bigger and smaller, during her stay in Wonderland, Alice clutches at a sense of self through the act of recitation, of multiplication tables, geographical facts and poetry. These failed recitals give rise to humorous parodies, but more importantly allow for the dissolution of Alice’s self which allows for her pure becoming, divested from uni-directional time. In her pure becoming, Alice ages incorporeally, bringing her childhood and adulthood into contact with each other, permitting the emergence of a molecular child in a childhood-block that endures across all time.

In order to grow up, child protagonists often have to journey, and journeying is therefore a common trope in children’s fiction, taking a character away from and then returning him or her, newly initiated and matured, home. Deleuze, with Guattari, asks us not to journey to and from somewhere, but to move rhizomatically from the middle, creating maps and tracing dynamic lines as we proceed. Chapter 4 focuses on the cartographies of children’s literature and the maps and lines composed by journeying child characters. To explore such Deleuzian journeys I draw predominantly on Pierrette Fleutiaux’s *Trini à l’île de Pâques*, Michel Tournier’s *Vendredi ou la vie sauvage* and André Dhôtel’s *Le Pays où l’on n’arrive jamais*. 
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Despite his vast œuvre, French novelist, storyteller and poet, André Dhôtel (1900–91), is best known for his text *Le Pays où l’on n’arrive jamais* [The Country Always Beyond Reach] (1955) thanks to the Prix Fémina it received. For many critics, though, *Le Pays où l’on n’arrive jamais* ‘is not, aggravatingly, what one could call his masterpiece’ (Frankart 2012: 39). It follows in the tradition of Alain-Fournier’s (1886–1914) *Le Grand Meaulnes* [The Wanderer] (1913) and Henri Bosco’s (1888–1976) *L’enfant et la rivière* [The Child and the River] (1945) in that its protagonists are driven by a desire to roam, attempting to find something lost to them. *Le Pays où l’on n’arrive jamais* is, like its predecessors, an example of l’école buissonnière, where children play truant, to partake of a more natural schooling in the countryside away from the constraints and regulations of the academy. The expression faire l’école buissonnière is therefore synonymous with actions such as walking, wandering, meandering and roaming. Dhôtel’s protagonist, Gaspard, is an otherworldly boy (rather in the vein of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry’s *Le Petit Prince* or Maurice Druon’s Tistou). Left in his aunt’s care as a baby by his itinerant parents, Gaspard’s innate curiosity frequently sparks incidents which would endanger other children but leave him relatively unscathed. The accumulation of these incidents lead villagers to believe that Gaspard is visited by a hidden curse and, as a result, he has a lonely and somewhat mundane existence working at his strict aunt’s auberge. This humdrum life is disrupted when, during one of his many walks in the countryside surrounding his aunt’s guesthouse, Gaspard encounters a runaway child. They connect and Gaspard learns that the child is fleeing the Belgian city of Antwerp in search of family and homeland. On his travels to help the fugitive child, Gaspard befriends and is aided by other colourful characters: a barber, a travelling musician and his sons, and an entrepreneurial boy. Gaspard has an innate longing to be in the verdant Ardennes countryside surrounding his aunt’s auberge in the fictitious village of Lominval, and Dhôtel’s descriptions focus on the familiar countrysides of his birthplace, the Meuse and the Ardennes. Danielle Henky considers that ‘for Dhôtel as for Alain-Fournier or Bosco for example, the staging of the moment when the child becomes aware of its life in childhood (sa vie en enfance) [. . .] is crucial’ (Henky 2012: 73). This, for Gaspard, comes as his nomadism surfaces as he learns to understand the maps immanent within him.

The acclaimed French novelist Michel Tournier (1924–2016) received the Grand Prix du Roman de l’Académie Française for his
first text, *Vendredi ou les limbes du Pacifique* [Friday, or the Other Island] in 1967, and ‘almost immediately after the publication of his first novel, Tournier felt the need to rewrite his Robinsonnade “in a leaner, tauter form”’ (Beckett 2009: 74). His *Vendredi ou la vie sauvage* [Friday and Robinson] appeared in 1971, ‘reluctantly published’ by Flammarion, who ‘pessimistically predict[ed] that it would not be a success’ (Beckett 2009: 74). In these retellings of Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), Tournier’s Robinson is shipwrecked on a desert island, which he names Speranza, or hope in Italian. In the initial part of the novel, Robinson spends his time taming the island’s flora and fauna, cultivating crops, and creating structures and laws; in short, organising and civilising the island. His only companion is Tenn, the ship’s dog, until the arrival of Vendredi (Friday), who flees a sacrificial party of native Araucanians who have previously come to the island to carry out such acts. After a period of subservience, where Robinson civilises Friday, teaching him English and educating him in his strict and regimented ways of the island, an explosion of gunpowder left over from the shipwreck destroys everything that Robinson has worked to establish. After the explosion, in the second part of the novel, it is Friday who guides Robinson, ‘the end result is Robinson becoming elemental on his isle’ (LOS 342E/351F). Tournier’s novels differ from Defoe’s in that Tournier’s Robinson chooses to remain on Speranza after the appearance of the *Whitebird*, a British vessel. Friday, mesmerised by the ship with its lofty rigging, secretly leaves the island as the *Whitebird* departs.

After an exploration of the endpaper maps in children’s literature, typified by Arthur Ransome’s *Swallows and Amazons* and taken up in *Trini à l’île de Pâques*, Chapter 4 moves on to consider the paradoxical endpaper map of *Through the Looking-Glass, and What Alice Found There*. The chapter then pursues the cartographic activity of child protagonists and the characters who have access to maps emanating from within, which in turn encourages their innate nomadism. Chapter 4 concludes by considering the nature of the desert island which exists in a time apart, a paradoxical time of molecular childhood which does not exist in opposition to adulthood.

Chapter 5 returns to the sense and more specifically the nonsense of children’s literature and the voices that create this interplay of (non)sense within children’s literature. Whilst I refer to Lewis Carroll’s Alice, either from *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* or *Through the Looking-Glass*, in each of my chapters, it is in this chapter that my extended discussion of Alice occurs. Bored by
sitting next to her grown-up sister on the riverbank, Alice follows a White Rabbit down a rabbit hole where she meets all manner of odd creatures who provoke and destabilise the ways in which she views and comprehends the curious Wonderland around her. They replace her learnt, established rules and codes by ones which appear to defy common sense. Scholars of children’s literature consider that the publication of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland ‘marked the liberation of children’s literature from the hands of the moralists and didacts. With its fantastic plot, extravagant characters, parodies of poems and songs, and use of nonsense, it revolutionized children’s literature’ (O’Sullivan 2010: 61). Moreover, presaging somewhat Deleuze’s own radical shift in literary approach, Carroll was oblique ‘when asked about the meaning of the Alice books, [replying] serenely that he was content for the meaning to be decided by the reader’; as Juliet Dusinberre goes on to note, ‘in 1865 such abrogation of authorial mastery was unprecedented in the children’s book’ (Dusinberre 1999: 42). Other scholars of children’s literature consider Carroll’s suppression of common sense as more sinister: Maria Nikolajeva reads Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland as a text ‘in which the child is threatened and humiliated’ (Nikolajeva 2010: 57) by Wonderland’s authoritarian inhabitants who manipulate and distort sense and meaning to suit their own ends and purposely, to disempower Alice. For Deleuze, however, it is precisely this interplay of sense and nonsense that is of interest in Carroll’s text. In his preface to The Logic of Sense, he writes:

the work of Lewis Carroll has everything required to please the modern reader: children’s books, or rather, books for little girls; splendidly bizarre and esoteric words; grids; codes and decodings; drawings and photographs; a profound psychoanalytic content; and an exemplary logical and linguistic formalism. Over and above the immediate pleasure, though, there is something else, a play of sense and nonsense [. . .] The privileged place assigned to Lewis Carroll is due to his having provided the first great account, the first great mise en scène of the paradoxes of sense. (LOS xiiiE/7F)

Through Carroll’s play on sense and nonsense, I consider how Alice tries in vain to recreate a majoritarian, adult language, but through stuttering and recourse to persiflage manages to make language vibrate and create her own unique style. I go on to consider the strange words invented by Humpty Dumpty. This self-proclaimed master of meaning invents esoteric and portmanteau words, and in doing so succeeds in pushing language through its fragile surface
of sense to its outside. I end this chapter by advocating for what I term the zeroth voice: a voice of the molecular child called out of the reading of texts which forms at the zero point of thought, as (non) sense is created.

To augment my readings in this chapter, I also draw on James Joyce’s *The Cat and the Devil*, whose eponymous Devil has recourse to *mots-cris* or howl-words to escape the constraints of majoritarian linguistic codes. Joyce’s tale has a simple premise: the people of the French town of Beaugency require a bridge to help them cross the wide Loire river, but do not have the financial means to pay for the bridge themselves. The Devil, whose penchant for his daily newspapers allows him to learn of this predicament, offers to build the bridge on condition that he will receive as payment the soul of the first person to cross it. The Devil creates a beautiful bridge in just one night, but the cunning major of Beaugency, Monsieur Alfred Byrne,\(^18\) tricks the Devil by forcing a white cat to cross the bridge first, thus releasing the people of Beaugency from the pact and freeing them to enjoy the bridge.

Joyce wrote this tale in a letter, dated 1936, to his polyglot grandson, Stephen Joyce. His tale, signed Nonno, is followed by a postscript, which explains that the Devil ‘mostly speaks a language of his own called Bellsybabble’\(^{19}\) (Joyce 1975: 384). Joyce’s tale, published only posthumously as a children’s book, has been translated into many languages, and many editions of the text exist. Here, I focus on the following four editions: the 1964 edition, illustrated by Richard Erdoes; the 1965 edition, illustrated by Gerald Rose; the 1966 edition, illustrated by Jean-Jacques Corre; and the 1990 edition illustrated by Roger Blachon.\(^20\) This latter edition includes a letter written by Joyce’s grandson addressed to the readers of the text, dated 1989. In this letter, which mirrors his grandfather’s own letter, ‘Stephen Joyce, originally the four-year-old recipient and reader of the story, becomes the writer who pens a letter to a child audience. [. . .] Casting himself as both grandfather and grandson and oscillating between these two roles throughout the letter’ (Sigler 2008: 540). Stephen Joyce thus accentuates the double pull of children’s literature to both child and adult. His letter creates a doubling of the tale’s bridge motif, encouraging young readers not simply to cross Joyce’s bridge in reading the text (‘the reading of the letter itself amount[s] to a crossing process’ (Garnier 2003: 101), poised as it is between the letter and its postscript), but also to remember Joyce as they cross into adulthood and pursue their reading of Joyce in their adult years.
In my final chapter, I turn to a small children’s picture book, *L’Oiseau philosophie*. Published shortly after Deleuze’s death, this unassuming book is at first glance an enchanting testimony to a three-way friendship between Gilles Deleuze and his long-time friends, Jean-Pierre Bamberger and Jacqueline Duhême. Yet, *L’Oiseau philosophie* is much more than that. It epitomises the very paradoxes of children’s literature discussed above, the curious pull to both child and adult. On the one hand, it is a colourful, vibrant picture book replete with exquisite illustrations by Jacqueline Duhême. Its small, square presentation makes it perfectly sized for the tiny hands of the young reader who might delight in the images of animals and children within its covers. On the other hand, *L’Oiseau philosophie* is a philosophical text, composed of excerpts from Deleuze’s *Dialogues*, written with Claire Parnet, and published in 1977, and *Qu’est-ce que la philosophie?*, written in collaboration with Félix Guattari in 1991 – texts more typically found in the hands of adult philosophers than young readers of picture books. *L’Oiseau philosophie* then draws us in two directions at once: to image and to word; to child and to adult; to the very youngest and, by their very nature, the most inexperienced of readers and to the most erudite of scholarly readers. In this chapter, I consider the images of a bird and a witch that recur throughout *L’Oiseau philosophie* and how each of these lead us beyond ourselves on liberating lines of flight. Duhême’s unusual portrayals of indefinite child figures give us an image of Deleuze’s child: a joyous molecular child, accessible to us through all moments in life, even death, and which escapes the limitations of Chronos and plays in the connectable time of Aiôn.

After the initial excerpt presented in *L’Oiseau philosophie*, which reminds us how to read a book (‘as you would treat a record you listen to, a film or a TV programme you watch’ (D 3–4E/10F)) and advocates for the intense encounter that is reading, the following double-page spread presents a line drawn from *What is Philosophy?: ‘to think is always to follow a witch’s flight’ (WP 41E/44F). This whimsical statement seems more at home in a child’s picture book than in the final instalment of Deleuze and Guattari’s unprecedented collaboration. The image of the witch’s broom or flight nevertheless bookends Deleuze’s *œuvre*. It stems from Deleuze’s early career when he found himself on his own witch’s broom through his readings of Spinoza, and it is an image to which he returns in his final book *Essays Critical and Clinical* to describe how great authors ‘make the language take flight, they send it racing along a witch’s line’ (CC
Of Spinoza, Deleuze says: ‘but he more than any other gave me the feeling of a gust of air from behind each time you read him, of a witch’s broom which he makes you mount’ (D 15E/22F). Indeed, as Ian Buchanan suggests, Deleuze’s ‘monographs on Hume, Bergson, Nietzsche and Spinoza written in the early part of his career [. . .] enabled Deleuze to think differently; they were his lines of flight or “witch’s brooms” that took him outside and beyond the confines of his situation’ (Buchanan 2009: 208), allowing him to break with convention and move on to do philosophy in his own way. ‘The witch’s flight21 [is] not a secure thought operation’ (Stengers 2009: 32), but an exhilarating one. A racing, mad vector that breaks with the ordinary. Deleuze in Children’s Literature allows us to mount our own witch’s broom and gives us the perhaps childlike feeling of being blown along by an invisible wind, ‘a witch’s wind’ (D 75–6E/91F), by an unseen force which allows us to move wildly and to explore unusual lines and directions. It is ‘a witch’s line that escapes the dominant system’ (CC 5E/15F) of representation and interpretation, of rigidly fixed childhoods, of sequential periods of life. It is the witch’s line that helps us make sense of the paradoxes of children’s literature with its molecular child. It is the witch’s line that we now seek in this exploration of children’s literature.

Finally, a word about what this study is not. Despite the centrality of psychoanalysis to the discussion of children’s literature and despite Deleuze’s investment in the discourse of psychoanalysis, I do not engage significantly with psychoanalysis in this text. In Chapter 2, I touch on the differences between Deleuze’s conceptualisation of repetition and the reactionary repetition of Freud’s Beyond the Pleasure Principle. Chapter 3 shows how psychoanalysis impedes becoming with its penchant for Oedipalised animals and the possessive and the personal. In Chapter 3, I also explore childhood blocks which allow us to reconsider the sequential periods of life – childhood, adolescence, adulthood – as malleable and contiguous, moving us away from the repeated childhood traumas of psychoanalysis. Lastly, in Chapter 6, I discuss the BwO (Body without Organs) as Deleuze’s antidote to psychoanalysis. A more in-depth engagement with Deleuze, psychoanalysis and children’s literature is a larger undertaking, worthy of a book-length study in and of itself.
Notes

1. Deleuze et les écrivains: Littérature et Philosophie (Gelas and Micolet 2007) provides an exhaustive index of the literary references that permeate Deleuze’s œuvre.

2. I am not referring here to juvenilia, or the writings of well-established authors produced during their childhood.

3. Children’s literature scholar, Jack Zipes, adopts a similar position in Sticks and Stones: The Troublesome Success of Children’s Literature from Slovenly Peter to Harry Potter (2001). He acknowledges that children are actively involved in the creation of ‘their own literary products, journals, newspapers, cartoons, comics, plays and videos. But the institution of children’s literature is not of their making’ (Zipes 2001: 40).

4. Lesnik-Oberstein extends Rose’s thesis of the impossibility of children’s fiction to the criticism of children’s literature itself.


6. I discuss the indefinite article in more depth in Chapter 3.

7. Many terms appear somewhat interchangeable in Deleuze’s work. An encounter is also a becoming, a concept which I explore in greater depth in Chapter 3.

8. For readers less familiar with Deleuzian terminology, assemblage is the standard translation of the French *agencement* used by Deleuze and Guattari to capture the ways in which heterogeneous terms come together and create relations between them. A helpful analogy is the bicycle. A bicycle, for example, is a collection of metal parts (gears, chains, handlebars, a saddle, pedals, wheels, etc.) put together in a certain way, but this assembled collection of parts, like the packets of flat-packed furniture, which have numbered pieces which must fit together to form a preconceived object, is not the Deleuzian assemblage. A bicycle, on its own, it is nothing more than the parts that compose it. It is only in coming-together with a person that this collection of parts is transformed: the bicycle ‘only works when it is connected with another “machine” such as the human body; and the production of these two machines can only be achieved through connection. The human body becomes a cyclist in connecting with the machine; the cycle becomes a vehicle’ (Colebrook 2002: 56). Merely placing any object on a bicycle will not create such an assemblage, a bicycle needs a human being to connect to it; with feet placed on its pedals and hands on its handlebars. When balance is achieved, the bicycle assemblage functions. It does not express unity but transformation, and transformation of both parts of the assemblage. The person riding the bike has new freedom and is able to travel greater
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distances. The immobile collection of parts is now machining with its rider, gaining movement from the energy of its rider. The assemblage comes about through desire: the rider desires to move more quickly, to be energised from a bicycle ride. The human body and the bicycle come together and are transformed. Machining with the bicycle, the human body is liberated and deterritorialised, as a child free-wheels down a hill, legs outstretched for example. Reterritorialisations are never far away, however: the wobbly child learning to assemble with the bicycle understands the inevitability of reterritorialisation as the child loses balance and falls off the bike, causing the fragile assemblage to break apart. Implications of safety and traffic laws keep cyclists in check, obliging us use our bicycles in molar, stratifying ways: they make us resist weaving all over the road, doing wheelies and so on. Moreover, the assemblage ‘produces utterances’ (D 51E/65F), to which the many online glossaries of cycling terms and jargon attest, giving us specific expressions for such de- and reterritorialisations, such as the ‘endo’, where the bicycle flips over its front wheel, or the ‘wipe-out’, where the cyclist completely loses balance and crashes. In short, the assemblage is a ‘complex constellations of objects, bodies, expressions, qualities, and territories that come together for varying periods of time to ideally create new ways of functioning’ (Livesey 2010: 18). See also Wise 2007 for further discussion of the assemblage.

10. Unillustrated versions of these contes can also be found in Ionesco’s autobiographical Présent Passé, passé Présent (1968).

12. In the original French, Deleuze uses the term ritournelle, translated from the Italian ritornello, which literally means ‘little return’ and is used to describe a recurring passage in Baroque music. The standard translation of Deleuze’s ritournelle is refrain. I use both terms interchangeably in this text.
13. Fleutiaux’s work Histoire du gouffre et de la lunette [The Story of the Abyss and the Spyglass] (1976) is subject to a lengthy discussion in A Thousand Plateaus. Deleuze and Guattari draw on this text to discuss the lines which compose us. They identify three types of lines: lines of molar or rigid segmentarity; lines of molecular or supple segmentation; and lines of flight (ATP 195–7E/239–241F). Molar lines are ‘conventional trajectories regulated by codes that impose broad social categories, fixed identities and pathways discretely divided into
clear segments’ (Bogue 2003: 159). Molecular lines are more fluid and supple. They create fissures, ruptures, cracks and minute disturbances in the molar regimes that contain us. Lines of flight ‘no longer tolerate[] segments; rather [they are] like an exploding of the two segmentary series’ (ATP 197F/241F). Deleuze likens lines of flight to ‘children leaving school at a run’ (ATP 202F/248F). Lines of flight have the potential for change and transformation, for the creation of the new, but they risk going nowhere and returning to more rigid, molar lines. Lines of flight is the standard translation for lignes de fuite. The French verb fuir means to flee, to escape, to leak (une fuite d’eau – a water leak). Its translation as lines of flight should not be confused with the action of flying. I discuss these lines in greater depth in Chapter 4.

14. Kristin Czarnecki details the discovery of Woolf’s short children’s text as follows: ‘It was in the second of the three large Dalloway manuscript notebooks amid pages depicting Septimus Warren Smith’s final scene, when he hursts himself out the window at the approach of Dr. Holmes, intent on separating him from his wife, Rezia. Just moments before, Septimus had been helping Rezia sew a hat, adding felt and flowers and laughing with his wife in a lovely and all too rare moment of lucidity’ (Czarnecki 2011: 222). In the Times Literary Supplement, Wallace Hildick discusses the provenance of the text, wondering ‘about the therapeutic motive’ (Hildick 1965) behind the story and if ‘it provided a respite for Woolf from working out the scenes of madness and suicide in Mrs. Dalloway’ (Czarnecki 2011: 222). Or speculating if it is a ‘simpler, more childlike dream’ (Hildick 1965) serving as an alternative to Peter Walsh’s dream having fallen asleep in Regent’s Park next to an old woman knitting. Woolf’s diary entry of 7 September 1924, however, mentions ‘a delightful afternoon spent with her young niece, Ann’ (Czarnecki 2011: 222), and Leonard Woolf’s subsequent corroboration of this allows Hildick to surmise that ‘one of the stories the girl heard [. . .] was this one about Nurse Lugton’ (Hildick 1965). Whilst Woolf’s text may not have been intended for publication, the discovery of the draft shows that the author had spent time revising and improving her text. Its classification as a children’s text remains improbable for some. In an article on the children’s texts of high modern authors, Hope Howell Hodgkins points out that in the edition illustrated by Julie Vivas Woolf’s prose is ‘typically graceful, with far more subordinated clauses than the usual children’s book, let alone the usual picture book (an opening sentence employs no fewer than five semicolons)’ (Hodgkins 2007: 361). She continues ‘Julie Vivas’s paintings in a recent edition employ color and whimsy appropriately. Yet the illustrations add no extra information or emotional content. In fact, the tale contains little excitement; we have no fascinating narrative, no causality to illustrate. The bland effect may not be the illustrator’s
fault but a condition of the text, which, of course, was not originally conceived as a picture book. High modernism’s antinarrative bias is all too evident here and deadly for readers who want an engaging story’ (361). Picture books are intended for the youngest of readers, or children who are not yet able to read, but who listen to a story being read and observe the pictures in the book as the pages are turned. It is clear through Hodgkins’ reading of *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* that she cannot conceive that such readers could ever be ‘plugged in’ to such a text because of its literariness.

15. Sandra Beckett (1997) points to the influence of Native American culture on Le Clézio, evident in the little boy’s name and the names of the trees.

16. According to Dhôtel, the fictitious Lominval is located where the actual village of Sécheval is found. See Frankart 2012.

17. See Beckett 2009 for an extended discussion of Tournier’s crossover writing and specifically the creation of *Vendredi ou la vie sauvage*.

18. Joyce’s mayor ‘wore a scarlet robe and always had a great golden chain round his neck even when he was fast asleep with his knees in his mouth’ (Joyce 1975: 382).

19. Readers of *The Cat and the Devil* (Hodgkins 2007; Reynolds 2007; Sigler 2008) agree that Joyce casts himself as the eponymous Devil. In naming the Devil’s invented language Bellsybabble ‘Joyce, still in the throes of writing the polyglot *Finnegans Wake*, jests about his own devilish creation of a literary “Tower of Babble”’ (Hodgkins 2007: 363). His humorous and slightly mocking description of the Major of Beaugency in his mayoral attire and who arrives to the inauguration of the new bridge to ‘the sound of bugles’ (Joyce 1975: 383) reflects Joyce’s view of his contemporary, Alfred Byrne, the Lord Major of Dublin, and in particular his penchant for pomp and fanfare. The illustrations by Gerald Rose, Jean-Jacques Corre and to a lesser extent, Roger Blachon reinforce the image of Joyce in the Devil’s role, depicting the Devil with dark hair, small round spectacles and a moustache. I explore the relationship of the Devil’s Bellsybabble to childhood voice in more detail in Chapter 5.

20. For ease of reference, I take all quotations of Joyce from the *Selected Letters of James Joyce*, edited by Richard Ellmann (Joyce 1975).