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Abstract

It is a little-known fact that several modernists wrote for children: this project will focus on T. S. Eliot’s *Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats*, James Joyce’s *The Cat and the Devil*, Gertrude Stein’s *The World is Round* and Virginia Woolf’s *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain*. While not often thought of as a modernist, I contend that Walter de la Mare’s short stories for children, especially *The Lord Fish*, take part in this corpus of modernist texts for children. These children’s stories, while scarcely represented in critical circles, have enjoyed a wide popular audience and have all been translated into French. Modernism is often considered an elitist movement, but these texts can contribute to its reassessment, as they suggest an effort towards inclusivity of audience.

The translation of children’s literature is a relatively new field of study, which builds from descriptive translation studies with what is unique to children’s literature: its relation to pedagogy and consequent censorship or other tailoring to local knowledge; frequently, the importance of images; the dual audience that many children’s books have in relating to the adults who will select, buy and potentially perform the texts; and what Puurtinen calls ‘read-aloud-ability’ for many texts.

For these texts and their French translations, questions of children’s relations to place and space are emphasised, and how these are complicated in translation through domestication, foreignisation and other cultural context adaptations. In particular, these modernists actively write against Rousseau’s notion of the “innocent” boy delighting in the countryside and learning from nature. I examine the international dialogue that takes place in these ideas of childhood moving between France and England, and renegotiated over the span of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

This study thus seeks to contribute to British modernist studies, the growing field of the translation of children’s literature, and children’s geographies.
Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to all the people who have helped and encouraged me over the years. I would firstly like to thank my supervisors Doctor Kiera Vaclavik and Professor Eddie Hughes for their endless patience and insight, and for all their support in opening up new opportunities for me. I am also very grateful to Professor Kim Reynolds and Professor Michael Moriarty for their interest in my project and for their generous advice.

I would like to sincerely thank my parents, my siblings, their families and children and Aakash Suchak for their support and encouragement, in life and in learning. Most of all, I would like to thank Nozomi Uematsu, for her daily company, kindness and love, and for her invaluable suggestions for the chapter on queer childhood. I would like to thank all of these people, and many more, for helping me to get where I am today.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Modernist Children’s Literature and Its Translation into French</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>Theories of the Translation of Children’s Literature</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>‘A landscape as still and miraculous as that of a dream’:</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woolf, de la Mare and Dreaming Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td>‘Children and cats in the alley’:</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliot, Baudelaire and Urban Childhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>‘O Loire, what a fine bridge!’:</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce, Foreignising Domestications and Illustrating Bridges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
<td>A Queer Phenomenology of Girlhood:</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stein’s <em>The World is Round</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Rejecting Rousseau Today?</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables and Illustrations

Table 1. English-language editions of the primary texts 17
Table 2. French translations of the texts 19
Table 3. *Practical Cats* main characters’ names 144
Table 4. Cats in ‘The Naming of Cats’ 146
Table 5. *Cats* musical names 160

Image 1. Napo’s flamingo, dodo and rabbit 95
Image 2. Vivas’ Lugton-mountain 97
Image 3. Vivas’ Windsor chair, back cover 99
Image 4. Grant’s concrete jungle 100
Image 5. Napo’s observing cat 102
Image 6. Scheffler fills the city with nature, ‘Mungojerrie and Rumpleteazer’ 128
Image 7. Scheffler’s cats and children in collusion, ‘The Rum Tum Tugger’ and ‘Mr Mistoffelees’ 132
Image 8. Morgan’s cats in adult clothes, ‘La vieille Chatte Pôdcolleuse’ and ‘Machiavel’ 137
Image 9. Grizabella’s costume, Webber 155
Image 10. Erdoes’ devil takes a bow 189
Image 11. Rose and Corre’s Joycean devils 191
Image 12. Corre’s image-text interplay and diababélien ideograms 193
Image 13. Corre’s night architecture and child dreaming of the Eiffel Tower 195
Image 14. Blachon’s medieval town, babyish devil and papal mayor 196
Image 15. Dachy fitting chapters to the edges of pages 237
Image 16. Dachy’s incongruous dog 243
Introduction. Modernist Children’s Literature and Its Translation into French

‘The higher the aesthetic ideal, the lower seems the calling to write for children.’

‘Modernist children’s literature’ may at first appear a paradoxical term. The modernists are often associated with abstract complexity and their works typified by radical experimentation in style, genre, structure and language itself, producing such notoriously difficult works as *The Waste Land*, *The Waves* and *Finnegans Wake*. Further, it is the modernists who rigidified the distinction between serious ‘Literature’ and popular forms, working alongside the newly formed academic discipline of English Literature to seek to establish a canon that largely excluded women, the working class and, of course, children’s literature.

In *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (1986), Andreas Huyssen sees no points of connection between modernism and mass culture (including such supposedly populist modes as children’s literature), only antagonism: ‘Modernism constituted itself through a conscious strategy of exclusion, an anxiety of contamination by its other: an increasingly consuming and engulfing mass culture.’ One of the figures Huyssen points to in particular is T. S. Eliot, as an example of a modernist author attempting to distance art from the modern world: ‘Modernists such as T. S. Eliot and Ortega y Gasset emphasized time and again that it was their mission to salvage the purity of high art from the encroachments of urbanization, massification, technological modernization, in short, of modern mass culture.’

Huyssen’s view of modernism, as exclusionary and intentionally difficult, neglects the

---

4 Huyssen, p. 163.
multifaceted nature of most modernist writers, and I will discuss the true variety of (plural) modernisms below.

Moreover, Huyssen takes no account of the brief but significant interest that several modernist authors showed in child audiences. Virginia Woolf, T. S. Eliot, James Joyce and Gertrude Stein all wrote children’s stories. While not often thought of as a modernist, I contend that Walter de la Mare’s short stories for children, especially The Lord Fish, take part in this small but significant corpus of modernist texts for children. Their children’s stories all reveal not a division or distance between modernism and children’s literature, but common grounds between them: playfulness, a fresh outlook and the (in)significance of authority figures. They thus reached audiences outside the high brow and this readership has increased past the English-speaking world through the many translations of these children’s stories. I will examine these neglected texts and their continued reception and reinterpretation through their French translations, in order to consider the places and spaces of childhood in the modernist rejection of childhood “innocence”. Specifically, Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s idea of the boy alone with his tutor, playing in and learning from nature, proposed in his profoundly influential text Émile, ou De l’Éducation (1762), is challenged in multiple ways by the texts I examine here, in light of the developments in psychology, transport technology, urbanisation and philosophy of the early twentieth century, as I will discuss further below.

In this introduction, I will outline the issues surrounding attempts to define “children’s literature”, give a critical history of modernist children’s literature broadly, before specifically discussing the primary texts and their particular critical histories. I will then discuss the modernist rejection of Rousseau’s ideas and especially his still powerful notion of childhood as “innocent” and “natural” put forth in Émile. I will focus on his presentation of childhood as belonging to a particular space (the countryside, for Rousseau) and how the modernists wrote against this, before ending with an outline of the chapters and the key
research questions of this thesis. Names, places and spaces will play a central role in this study, and I will give equal focus to my primary texts in both English and French translation.

Virginia Woolf’s short story, written for her niece in 1924 and now known as ‘Nurse Lugton’s Golden Thimble’ or ‘Nurse Lugton’s Curtain’, was first published in 1966; Walter de la Mare published ‘The Lord Fish’ in 1933; James Joyce wrote a letter to his grandson giving the folk tale of a town he had visited in 1936, now known as ‘The Cat and the Devil’, first published in 1964; T. S. Eliot wrote Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats for his godchildren and published it in 1939; Gertrude Stein published The World is Round at the request of her friend Margaret Brown, a picturebook writer, in 1939. As such, the texts fall into two groups for first publications – de la Mare, Eliot and Stein in the 1930s, and Woolf and Joyce in the 1960s (see Table 1 below). All of these texts have been translated into French (see Table 2 below).

**Children’s Literature, Childhood and Modernism(s)**

The status of these texts as “children’s literature” is often contested: indeed, the very category “children’s literature” is a troubled one. Theorists such as Jacqueline Rose and Jack Zipes famously asserting that it is indefinable by content, an adult construct: ‘There is nothing inherently or essentially “childish,” “childlike,” or “appropriate for children” in a book. There is nothing definitive about a text or a book that automatically demands that it be classified as a children’s book.’ Sandra Beckett enters the debate on defining works by celebrated authors for adults who also write for children – Henri Bosco, Jean Giono, Michel Tournier, Marguerite Yourcenar and Jean-Marie Gustave le Clézio – as is the case in this study: ‘Avec les grands auteurs, les catégories de fiction pour adultes et de fiction pour enfants semblent

---

voler en éclats. Il n’y a plus que la “littérature” [With great authors, the categories of fiction for adults and of fiction for children seem to shatter. There remains only “literature”]. Even though the authors that Beckett discusses themselves distinguish between works for adults and children – Yourcenar, for example, rewrites a story to be less violent and republishes it for children – Beckett concludes that the complexity and subtlety of texts by great authors transcend classification by audience. Lewis Carroll’s books, too, are often now seen to be for adult audiences more than young ones and there is a growing (adult) academic audience for children’s literature, which reads books differently from both child and lay adult audiences.

Marah Gubar has recently argued against defining children’s literature, contending that to seek to define children’s literature is to misrepresent the heterogeneity of literature produced for and consumed by children: she begins by outlining the difficulties of defining children’s literature, as the category cannot be simply constructed solely from authorial intention, publication history, reception history and certainly not by any particular themes or styles, as there are no such universally shared traits in children’s literature. Gubar refers to Wittgenstein’s account of ‘family resemblances’ for indefinable categories that nevertheless have recognisable elements, such as the category ‘games’:

board games, Olympic games, the game of catch—have no one thing in common; rather, a complicated network of similarities crop up and disappear as we compare and contrast different types of games. Faced with complex phenomena of this kind, Wittgenstein says, we should eschew grand attempts to define or theorize about the category as a whole.

The impossibility of creating a definition that encompasses all uses of the notion of a ‘game’ is not cause for despair, however, as the word ‘game’ remains perfectly functional. Moreover, an attempted definition of ‘game’ would effectively simplify and downplay its shifts in meaning over time and place. Rather, as Gubar concludes, ‘we simply have to accept

---

8 Gubar, p. 212.
that the concept under consideration is complex and capacious; it may also be unstable (its meaning shifts over time and across different cultures) and fuzzy at the edges (its boundaries are not fixed or exact). Childhood is one such concept; children’s literature is another.9

The mathematical concept of the fuzzy set is indeed appropriate for both childhood and children’s literature. Fuzzy sets are not mutually exclusive and instead have degrees of membership. For the fuzzy set of ‘childhood’, one could for example be partially, mostly, or more often, in the set, allowing for both a broader grouping (essential for the recognisability of the set) and a range of possible relations to the set ‘adulthood’. As the children’s geographers Paul Cloke and Owain Jones assert: ‘there is no dualistic break-point at which child becomes adult, and in all kinds of ways children and adults form allegiances in opposition to other children and adults.’10 Modern societies have no specific rites of passage through which, or particular age at which, a child has decidedly entered adulthood. As distinctions in size and capacity with language gradually diminish (in general), the ‘degree’ of otherness of the child from the adult equally diminishes. ‘Adult’ and ‘child’ can in no way be binary or mutually exclusive categories, given the lack of a clear dividing line; they can thus instead be seen as fuzzy sets, and also dependent on relative positionalities (for example, infant and teenager, short adult and tall child). As such, the dividing line between literature for adults and literature for children is equally fraught. This is not to say that there is no distinction, or that they cannot be distinguished, only that there are no absolute criteria by which to separate the two categories.

I will thus simply assert that I draw my category of modernist children’s literature both from the intended audiences of the authors themselves (specific children in the case of Eliot, Woolf, Joyce and Stein) and from the publications of all of these texts as picturebooks, a

9 Ibid.

10 Paul Cloke and Owain Jones, ‘“Unclaimed Territory”: Childhood and Disordered Space(s)’, Social and Cultural Geography, 6.3 (2005), 311-33 (p. 313). Subsequent citations will be in parentheses.
decidedly child-orientated medium. While Sandra Beckett’s authors often simplified or self-censored their works for children, these modernist authors compromise little of their trademark styles in these works and very much push against the notion that works for children should be simple. Eliot, for example, uses such high register vocabulary as ‘terpischorean’, an allusion to the muse of dance that few adults would be likely to know; Woolf strings together long and complex sentences with semi-colons and is criticised for using such ‘advanced punctuation’ in a review of the picturebook in The New York Times; Stein’s The World is Round in no way differs in style from her prose for adults, such as Three Lives (1909), entirely breaking from conventional grammar and playing with sonorous repetition and continuous tenses. We can that see that definitions of “children’s literature” can never be complete, finite or draw unbreakable boundaries.

I would equally contend that the idea of the fuzzy set is appropriate for considering the definition of “modernism”. Indeed, in the past twenty years, a reappraisal of modernism has come about, broaching the idea of modernisms, and of peripheral modernisms. Katherine Mullin notes, for example, that ‘Just as there are many feminisms, so there are many modernisms. A range of diverse, even incompatible aesthetic practices are commonly labeled modernist, including Futurism, Symbolism, Imagism, Vorticism, Expressionism, and Surrealism.’ The conceptual shift in modernist studies from its best-known representation (as a Western European, mostly male, urban phenomenon) can most clearly be seen in 1995 with Peter Nicholl’s seminal work Modernisms: A Literary Guide, which contains chapters on all of the above movements, as well as on Dada and High Modernism. His account of

---

11 Books for adults can also involve illustrations, as Stevie Smith’s poetry collections demonstrate; however, as Smith equally exemplifies, such an act is often itself a purposeful play with a kind of childlikeness or childding of the reader and so can reinforce the connection between illustrated books and child readers.


modernisms, however, remains focused on the artistic output of Western Europe and America. In recent years, work has been done that seeks to expand beyond these national borders, to consider modernisms globally, such as in the collection of essays *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (2012). This development in modernist studies includes considering racial identities that cross national borders, such as in Allison Schachter’s *Diasporic Modernisms: Hebrew and Yiddish Literature in the Twentieth Century* (2012) and the edited collection *Afromodernisms: Paris, Harlem and the Avant-garde* (2013). It equally includes examining different gendered and embodied identities across communities and cultures, as Mullin does in bringing together studies of women and modernism.

This current decade has seen a slow rise in interest in the relationships between modernism and childhood, as in the works of Daniela Caselli, Catherine Crimp, Jennifer Margaret Fraser and Paul March-Russell. This very recent and ongoing interest in the largely understudied field of modernist childhood points to the richness of the modernist period for rethinking the child outside of Rousseauvian models of “innocence”, as I will discuss in more detail below. Critics have also sought to bridge the gap between childhood and modernism by showing the importance of children’s literature from the nineteenth century to English and French modernist authors, as in the works of Juliette Dusinberre, Grace Eckley and Rosemary Lloyd. I intend to build on these projects by looking at what

---

15 Mark Wollaeger and Matt Eatough, eds, *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). A conference titled ‘Peripheral Modernisms’ in London in 2012 is also indicative of the ongoing work in this field. The 2013 conference ‘Alternative Modernism(s)’ (Dublin) and the forthcoming issue of the journal *Planeta Literatur* on ‘Global Modernism(s)’ are both efforts to bring together the varied work now taking place in modernist studies.


modernists wrote specifically for children, and how their works for children put forward constructions of childhood through their style and subject matter. By looking at modernist children’s literature, this study will differ from others on modernist childhood: as well as (or rather than) presenting child characters, the works I will focus on provide a sense of modernist childhood in targeting themselves towards an intended child reader, and so, in the process, constructing a sense of that child reader. As such, this project is a study of modernist childhood in conjunction with modernist children’s literature.

With regards to the modernist production of children’s literature, work has been done on three broad strands: Russian Futurist picturebooks, Scandinavian avant-garde children’s literature, and the texts that I will be focusing on, children’s stories in English by the mainstream writers of High Modernism. I will now look at the critical histories of these three strands in turn. Where little attention has been paid to children’s input in the critical reception of modernism, Margaret Higgonet argues that children’s art and childlike art played a pivotal role in Russian Futurism and Russian Futurist children’s literature. She notes, for example, that Wassily Kandinsky collected children’s drawings and that there were exhibitions of children’s art during the First World War in Russia and western Europe. Philip Pullman has also discussed Russian modernist children’s literature in a review of a forthcoming book on radical Russian children’s literature from the 1920s and 30s, Inside the Rainbow: Russian Children's Literature 1920-1935: Beautiful Books, Terrible Times (2015). He suggests that Russian authors found a place to hide from government censorship in children’s literature, as well as gaining the opportunity to collaborate with avant-garde visual

---


18 It is important to note that while these texts are all written in English (and the ‘English’ of my title refers to the language of the texts), I am not discussing a group of exclusively “English” writers: Eliot and Stein were born in the United States of America; Eliot became a British citizen and Stein moved to France; Joyce, of course, was Irish, and lived in a number of European countries.


20 Ibid.
artists. Sara Pankenier focuses in more detail on particular artists and writers of the Russian avant-garde, to consider Vladimir Mayakovsky writing for children in an article, and analyzing the role of childlikeness in the works of Russian artists, writers and literary theorists in her thesis. She asserts that:

Ideally situated before the conventions of verbal and visual representation and the reification of signification that turns material experience into abstract thought, the “infant/child” serves as a liberating force and outlet for modern art, literature, and theory. Thus *infans*, the “infant/child,” and child are employed as strange “other” in order to defamiliarize the world of adults, the world of arts, and the world at large.

Although she is specifically talking about the Russian avant-garde here, she suggests this use of the child can be more broadly applicable to modernist literature.

Elina Druker also considers the relation between text and image in modernist children’s literature from Scandinavian countries, looking at the illustrations of *Pippi Longstocking* and Tove Jansson’s Moomin comics. For example, she writes on Ingrid Vang Nyman, the first illustrator of *Pippi Longstocking*, that her “individual and humorous expression, together with her extraordinary spatial depiction, is highly innovative, related if anything, to modernist painting and, within children’s literature, placing her among the pioneers in illustrating Nordic children’s literature.”

---


22 Mayakovsky’s children’s books are *This Is My Book about the Seas and about a Lighthouse* (1927), *Not a Page without an Elephant or a Lioness* (1928) and *What Is Good and What Is Bad?* (1925). Discussing the first of these, Pankenier notes that the Russian word for ‘lighthouse’ is *mayak*, and so is a very personal play on words for Mayakovsky. Sara Pankenier, “‘Uncle Lighthouse’: The Authorial Presence in Vladimir Maiakovskii’s Books for Children’, *Princeton University Library Chronicle*, 68.3 (2007), 909-39.


24 Pankenier, *infant non sens*, p. 15.


26 Druker, ‘Animated’, p. 65. Druker links these illustrations to contemporary education reforms: ‘it is the modern, liberated and active child who is depicted by Vang Nyman, demonstrating the pedagogical ideas of the
For modernist children’s literature in English, few critics have shown an interest in including these works in broader discussions of these famous authors, despite the efforts by these authors to maintain their own styles and interests in these texts. As recently as 2007, Karin Westman lamented the dearth of criticism that connects modernism and children’s literature, which is in part due to critics accepting Rose’s seminal account of children’s literature as a rejection of modernism. However, a more recent reappraisal of modernism and children’s literature has begun to take place. In Radical Children’s Literature (2007), Kimberley Reynolds directly addresses the children’s fiction of Woolf, Joyce and Stein, and sees in these texts the potential to radically change their child readers, as she more broadly sees in avant-garde children’s literature from all periods. In 2011, Reynolds engages in a re-evaluation of modernism, writing of the few but significant intersections between modernism and children’s literature, including the ‘tendency to play with language and meaning; its combination of visual and textual elements in illustrated and picture books; and the willingness of children’s writers and illustrators to bypass or subvert conventions, not least those associated with the book as object.’ Reynolds notes a ‘rehabilitation’ of the notion of modernism in children’s literature studies, breaking past the sense of modernism as elitist and incompatible with children’s literature studies.

Hope Hodgkins points to modernist children’s books in an article in 2007, considering works by Woolf, Joyce and Graham Greene, but she is largely critical of the former two and claims that they ultimately fail to connect to child readers as Greene does. For her, Woolf and Joyce’s children’s stories reveal a modernist mindset that was fundamentally disinterested in

children: ‘The high modernists saw the boundaries between children and adults as impassible, just as the road from childhood to maturity is a one-way street. We also might see their elitism as a one-way street, leading to a powerful but narrow art that raids but does not reinvest in childhood.’\textsuperscript{31} When Hodgkins’s claims are examined more closely, a particular ideal of children’s literature becomes apparent and one that she rightly sees modernist authors as differing from. Her criticism of Woolf and Joyce’s stories is centrally because (she claims) modernists do not value children.\textsuperscript{32} Her concept of children’s literature and of valuing childhood as a distinct and special period in life are deeply based on the ideas of Rousseau: it is this very grounding in Rousseau that the modernists speak against. Thus, while Hodgkins finds little of interest in the children’s literature of high modernist authors, I contend that it is essential to interrogate the prevailing influence of Rousseau’s conception of childhood and that modernist children’s literature merits exploring for the range of subtle arguments against Rousseauvian childhood that it puts forth.

As we will see below, a number of modernists explicitly rejected Rousseau and Rousseauvian philosophies, and concomitantly their presentations of childhood reveal a very different sense of the child to that proposed by Rousseau and still commonly followed today. I will now look in more detail at the modernist production of children’s stories and particularly at the texts that form my corpus for analysis.

\textsuperscript{31} Hodgkins, p. 365.

\textsuperscript{32} Hodgkins argues for the indifference of modernists to children by citing Waugh’s apathy to his seven children, and the childlessness of Woolf, as evidence (p. 358). However, Joyce was very fond of his children and grandson, and the childless Woolf and Eliot both showed some interest in their godchildren, writing stories for them. Further, child characters play a large role in a number of Woolf’s and Joyce’s novels. While Pound scorned \textit{Practical Cats}, this did not stop Eliot from writing children’s verse again and it is clear from the corpus of this study that a number of modernists sought to communicate with children through literature. It may be possible to accuse Woolf’s story of “elitism” when analysed through the lens of class, as few households could afford a nurse, as I will discuss below in Chapter 2, and as I suggest there, the imaginative and psychological elements of the story may unite child readers just as much as class differences may divide them. In either case, an indifference towards children in the text is hard to argue for.
The Primary Texts

As shown in Table 1, all of my primary texts exist in a number of editions, with different illustrators for each – for example, Eliot himself illustrated the first edition of *Cats* and Axel Scheffler, illustrator of *The Gruffalo*, created new illustrations in 2009. The interplay of text and image is strong in a certain number of editions of these texts and attention will be paid to illustrations, particularly for Joyce, whose story has had two French illustrators, and Eliot and Stein, who involved themselves in early illustrations of their texts.

Table 1. English-language editions of the primary texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year of production</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Illustrator</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Woolf</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Nurse Lugton's Golden Thimble</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Duncan Grant</td>
<td>Originally letter to Nurse Lugton's Curtain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurse Lugton's Curtain</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Julie Vivas</td>
<td>her niece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter de la Mare</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>The Lord Fish and Other Tales</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Rex Whistler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Lord Fish</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Patrick Benson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. S. Eliot</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Old Possum's Book of Practical Cats</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>T. S. Eliot</td>
<td>Originated in letters to his godchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Nicolas Bentley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Edward Gorey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Axel Scheffler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Joyce</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>The Cat and the Devil</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Gerald Rose</td>
<td>Originally letter to his grandson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Stein</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>The World is Round</td>
<td>1939 (UK)</td>
<td>Francis Rose</td>
<td>Dedicated to her neighbour’s daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1939 (USA)</td>
<td>Clement Hurd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Roberta Arenson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These texts have much in common and common to much children’s literature: they all contain animals, are short and have more or less prominent young characters. More common to modernism than children’s literature, they all contain authority figures and are very detailed about place and space.

De la Mare is the only one of these authors who is largely known to be a writer of children’s literature, but all of these authors wrote more than one children’s story – as well as my primary texts, Woolf wrote *The Widow and the Parrot* (c. 1923), Stein *To Do: A Book of Alphabets and Birthdays* (1940), *The Gertrude Stein First Reader* (1941) and *Three Plays*
(1943), Eliot an epistolary poem titled *A Practical Possum* (1947) and Joyce the recently-published *The Cats of Copenhagen* (1936). These childrens stories provide useful contexts to the texts that I am focusing on.

Despite this range of texts for children existing that could be considered as modernist, critical work on the subject tends to deal with these authors separately. As such, I would like to propose the need for naming this corpus of texts “modernist children’s literature”. Indeed, my primary authors are not alone in writing modernist children’s literature in English: figures as varied as Mina Loy, H. D. and Aldous Huxley also wrote for children. As mentioned above, Mayakovsky and other members of the Russian avant garde wrote children’s books, and a number of Scandinavian children’s texts can also be considered as modernist. Moreover, Jean Webb writes of certain children’s writers from before or around this period, such as George MacDonald and P. L. Travers, as ‘modernist’ in various ways: ‘The innovative early Modernist narrative style and form employed by MacDonald, emphasises the reader, thus moving away from the dominance of the omniscient narrator’; discussing the influence of Yeats on Travers, she asserts that ‘Travers’ work clearly fits closely within the Modernist frame of thinking.’ Bringing together these texts and others, I hope for the term “modernist children’s literature” both to expand upon the idea of what is suitable for study in modernism, and to create a larger space for modernism in children’s literature.

While none of these other English modernist children’s books has been translated into
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French, all of my primary texts have been translated into French at least once (see Table 2):

Woolf’s *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* as *Le Dé en or* in 1983 by Frédéric Armel; de la Mare’s *The Lord Fish* as *Le Seigneur des poissons*, translated by Didier Debord in 1999; Joyce’s *The Cat and the Devil* in 1966 by Jacques Borel and again by Solange and Stephen Joyce in 2008; Eliot’s *Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats* as *Chats!* in 1983 by Jacques Charpentreau and again in 2010 by Jean-François Ménard as *Le Guide des Chats du Vieil Opossum*; Stein’s *The World is Round* as *Le Monde est rond* by Françoise Collin and Pierre Taminiaux in 1984 and as *La Terre est ronde* by Marc Dachy, also in 1984. The musical *Cats* was translated into French by Jacques Marchais: it was first performed in French on 23 February 1989 at the Théâtre de Paris and there is a CD of Marchais’ translation.

Table 2. French translations of the texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>English Title</th>
<th>French Title</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Illustrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Woolf</td>
<td>Nurse Lugton’s Curtain</td>
<td><em>Le Dé en or</em></td>
<td>Frédéric Armel</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Napo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter de la Mare</td>
<td>The Lord Fish</td>
<td><em>Le Seigneur des poissons</em></td>
<td>Didier Debord</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Patrick Benson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. S. Eliot</td>
<td>Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats</td>
<td>Chats!</td>
<td>Jacques Charpentreau</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Le Guide des Chats du Vieil Opossum</em></td>
<td>Jean-François Ménard</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Axel Scheffler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Joyce</td>
<td>The Cat and the Devil</td>
<td><em>Le Chat et le Diable</em></td>
<td>Jacques Borel</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Jean-Jacques Corre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Le Chat et le Diable</em></td>
<td>Solange and Stephen Joyce</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Roger Blachon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Stein</td>
<td>The World is Round</td>
<td><em>Le Monde est rond</em></td>
<td>Françoise Collin and</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre Taminiaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>La Terre est ronde</em></td>
<td>Marc Dachy</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>No illustrations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This thesis will analyse in detail the transformations that these texts undergo in being translated into another language – visually, verbally, and in terms of content – as well as the challenges such experimental texts pose to their translators. In particular, these texts challenge national and linguistic boundaries in various ways; for example, both Joyce and Stein’s children’s books were written in France, and so translating them into French is in a sense bringing their stories home, rather than representing the foreign. In such a way, the binary distinction between the domestic and the foreign is called into question, as I will
discuss in detail in the next chapter. Through the decisions that translators make, we will be able to develop an idea of how these translators conceive of childhood and childhood spaces, and I will argue that these decisions are intimately connected to Rousseau’s influence on ideas of childhood, either in line with or rejecting them. I will discuss the translations of my primary texts, theories of the translation of children’s literature and the key research questions of this project regarding translation in more detail in Chapter 1. I will now outline each of my primary texts and their extant criticism, in the order that they will appear in the following chapters.

Virginia Woolf’s *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* tells the story of a nursemaid who falls asleep while sewing a blanket with animal images on it. As she falls asleep, the animals come to life and dance and play, but when she wakens, they are fixed back in their original positions. A number of typical Woolfian motifs are clear here – in particular, needlework and dreaming recur throughout Woolf’s works and both stand for different aspects of the creative process.36 Also typical of Woolf is the language, including high register vocabulary, long sentences and numerous semi-colons. Only Reynolds, Hodgkins and Sayako Okumura briefly address Woolf’s children’s story, looking at dreaming, sewing and creativity in this story.37 Work has also been done by Elizabeth Goodenough on childhood in Woolf’s novels and essays, which connects with the presentation of childhood in this story.38

In the same chapter, I will discuss Walter de la Mare’s *The Lord Fish*, as it also deals with natural spaces and dreaming. In this story, the fisherman John finds a walled-off natural haven in which to fish and, while there, he hears a woman singing. He goes to save her, but to

37 Hodgkins, pp. 361-62.
do so needs a potion held by the Lord Fish, so he transforms into a fish in order to steal it from him. He succeeds, saves the girl, finds a casket of treasure and marries her. Such a narrative may seem to have little place alongside works of High Modernism and indeed be closer to fairy tale. However, as well as this conventional focus on plot, The Lord Fish is also an experimental narrative about the act of reading and is filled with metatextual accounts of the creative process; as with Woolf, dreams are important to this story. John’s literacy is frequently tested through the story and he struggles to interpret poetry, hieroglyphs and even Latin in a scene of uneducated translation. Despite these interesting links with modernism, no work has been done on The Lord Fish and only little on de la Mare’s children’s literature more generally. One book and three chapters have been written on de la Mare which focus on childhood in his works for adults.39 De la Mare is also popular in France and there is a monograph on him in French.40

T. S. Eliot’s Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats is a set of fifteen short poems about the antics of various cats. Typical of Eliot’s poetry are its allusiveness, non-standard rhythms and urban setting. Comparatively few articles have been written about Cats over these seventy years. The three key focus points in work on Cats so far are names (see studies by Harmon, Olson, Sanders), the opposition of religion and play (Bay-Cheng, Clowder, Hodge) and the inventiveness of Eliot’s rhythms in these poems (Douglass).41 While adaptations are


40 Luce Bonnerot, L’œuvre de Walter de la Mare une aventure spirituelle; thèse pour le Doctorat ès Lettres (Paris: Didier, 1969).

common in children’s literature, of my primary texts only Eliot’s *Practical Cats* has been
adapted, into the Andrew Lloyd Webber musical *Cats*. The musical *Cats* is of particular
importance because of the wide international audience it has reached, making it better-known
than Eliot’s *Practical Cats*. Little academic work has been done on musical theatre, but partly
in redress of this lack, a book has recently been published on Webber’s works.\(^{42}\) Andrew
Lloyd Webber, Trevor Nunn and others involved in creating *Cats* have also added a little to
its critical history, in short essays prefacing the book of their musical.\(^{43}\)

Joyce’s *The Cat and the Devil* tells the story of a French town which made a deal with
the devil – a bridge built overnight in exchange for the first soul to cross the bridge. The
mayor makes a cat cross the bridge first and so cheats the devil of his payment. The story
derives from a French, local legend of a town that Joyce visited. As such, Joyce’s story, the
source text, is itself a ‘translation’, although of a text not written. In *Cat*, the creator in exile,
the satire of authority figures and the meaningful misuse of languages (in the plural) are
typical of Joyce’s *œuvre*. Of the few articles written about *Cat*, some use it to illuminate parts
of *Finnegans Wake*, which Joyce was working on as he wrote it (Garnier, Lewis, Sigler),
while those that consider it among other children’s books focus on the idea of bridging
(Hodgkins, Reynolds).\(^{44}\) Work has also been done on Joyce as a translator, but not on *Cat* as
a work translated from French.\(^{45}\)

Gertrude Stein’s *The World is Round* relates a crisis of identity faced by a girl called
Rose, who embarks on a quest up a mountain, to escape the horror she feels on discovering


\(^{43}\) Andrew Lloyd Webber, *Cats: The Book of the Musical* (London: Faber and The Really Useful Company,
1981). Subsequent citations will be made in parentheses.

\(^{44}\) Marie-Dominique Garnier, ‘The Lapse and the Lap: Joyce with Deleuze’, in *James Joyce and the Difference
of Language*, ed. by Laurent Milesi (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 97-111; Janet Lewis,
‘The Cat and the Devil and Finnegans Wake’, *James Joyce Quarterly*, 29.4 (1992), 805-14; Amanda Sigler,
‘Crossing Folkloric Bridges: The Cat, The Devil, and Joyce’, *James Joyce Quarterly*, 45.4 (2008), 537-55;

\(^{45}\) Steven Yao, *Translation and the Languages of Modernism: Gender, Politics, Language* (Basingstoke:
the world’s roundness. This unusual plot ends conventionally, however, with Rose marrying a boy called Willie and living happily. It is written in Stein’s very unique and challenging style, neglecting syntax and punctuation for repetition and pushing language towards uncertainty, emptying it of referentiality. Stein’s story has attracted a little attention from postmodernist critics for its play with identity and language (Rust, Watts), including a queer feminist reading (Cleveland); attention has also been paid to its use of nature (Natov). However, only Barbara Will notes the phenomenological underpinning of Rose’s despair: while intellectually we accept that the world is round, experientially the world as we see and live it, is flat. Stein pre-dates phenomenology, but foresees it throughout her work.

In this critical history, much of the work on the children’s literature of these authors has been done by specialists in modernism, with only Hodgkins and Reynolds as specialists in children’s literature. The majority of this work on their children’s literature has been published since 1990 and over a third since 2000 (with the exception of some work in the 1970s and 1980s on Eliot), as critical interest in these authors has broadened beyond their major works and as children’s literature has grown as a field. As can be seen, the critical histories of these texts largely reside in short articles (the average length of these articles is under 12 pages) and so the present study constitutes the first sustained account of British modernist children’s literature.

---


48 Stein studied under the psychologist and philosopher William James, who was an important precursor to phenomenology. For criticism that links Stein to phenomenology, see Ariane Mildenberg, ‘Seeing Fine Substances Strangely: Phenomenology in Gertrude Stein’s Tender Buttons’, Studia Phaenomenologica, 8 (2008), 259-82; ‘Openings: Epoche as Aesthetic Tool in Modernist Texts’, in Phenomenology, Modernism and Beyond, ed. by Carole Bourne-Taylor and Mildenberg (Bern: Peter Lang, 2010), pp. 41-74; and Matt Miller, ‘Makings of Americans: Whitman and Stein’s Poetics of Inclusion’, The Arizona Quarterly, 65.3 (2009), 39-59.
This is an often disregarded moment in children’s literature. Peter Hunt generally praises the situation of children’s literature in the inter-war period, but calls Eliot’s *Cats* ‘a major poet’s whimsies’, dismisses de la Mare’s poetry and does not mention Joyce, Woolf or Stein in his survey of ‘the long weekend’.49 Deborah Thacker’s survey chapter of children’s literature in the first half of the 20th century is more dismissive still: ‘The period between the wars, although productive, was strangely lacking in innovation or challenge.’50 Beckett’s study of children’s literature by famous authors for adults begins in 1945 and many critics take the end of the war (and the publication of *Pippi Långstrump*) as the beginning of a new period in children’s literature, from which they begin.51 These primary texts stand out as formally and stylistically inventive pieces in an otherwise conventional period. As such, I intend to give equal weight to these understudied source texts and to their as yet undiscussed translations. In particular, these texts propose alternatives to contemporary normative understandings of childhood and childhood spaces. Reynolds opens *Radical Children’s Literature* by challenging Rose’s sense of modernism and children’s literature: she points to authors who do not treat children and child readers as Rousseauvian and Lockean innocents, but recognise and respond to their multifariousness. I would also strongly contend that these modernist children’s books pose a challenge to notions of the innocent and Rousseauvian child, and remain urgently valuable by doing so.

---

Rejecting Rousseau

Modernism was a large-scale (although not whole-sale) rejection of Romanticism. Romanticism established the ‘cult of the ego’ as its main model for authorship and figured the work of art as an untrammelled outpouring of genius. In contrast, modernist drives such as downplaying the notion of ‘originality’, returning to the sense of literature as a craft and Eliot’s sense of ‘impersonality’ all work to undo Romantic solipsism. A key part of this challenge to Romanticism is the modernist rethinking of the child, outside of Rousseau’s account of innocence, engaging with nature and learning organically through experience. The modernists developed new models of childhood. I will outline here Rousseau’s idea of childhood, how it differed from those before him, how it was used by the Romantics and Victorians, and how the modernists challenged it.

Critical discussion of Rousseau and his works remain prolific to this day, including: feminist readings of his texts in the 1990s (as explored by Weiss and Harper, Thomas, Trouille, Darling and Van De Pijpekamp, Fermon, Schaeffer); more ambiguous explorations of gender in Rousseau’s works in the last decade (including the works of Brace, Ice, Kennedy, Guichet); analysis of his educational system and its relevance today (Dame, Walter, Soëtard); and investigations into more marginal aspects of his philosophy (such as Wolloch on Rousseau and animals, and Voorhes on music). While his influence on the Romantics is
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well recorded, as yet nothing has been written on modernist engagements with Rousseau and his philosophy. This present study is seeking to explore new territory in exploring the modernist interrogation of Rousseau’s concept of childhood.

Rousseau’s biggest contribution to our understanding of childhood is the sense of childhood as fundamentally different from adulthood. Criticising the discussion of his contemporaries on children, Rousseau asserts: ‘Les plus sages [...] cherchent toujours l’homme dans l’enfant, sans penser à ce qu’il est avant que d’être homme’ [The wisest always search for the man in the child, without thinking about what he is before he is a man]. Frances Ferguson astutely summarises Rousseau’s contribution: ‘No longer were [children] deficient adults. Now they were, finally, completely adequate children.’ Before Rousseau, childhood had been considered first as predominantly indistinct from adulthood and then had been considered distinct, but as a stage to be passed through in order to achieve adulthood. In contrast to these, Rousseau valued childhood in and of itself. In his seminal work on the history of childhood L’Enfant et la Vie Familiale sous l’Ancien Régime [The Child and Family Life under the Old Regime] (1960), Philippe Ariès suggests that up to the beginning of the early modern period, there was no clear differentiation between childhood and adulthood, and while later historians have challenged Ariès on this, David Archard concludes that Ariès was ‘at least right to observe that the most important feature of the way
in which the modern age conceives of children is as meriting separation from the world of adults.\footnote{David Archard, \textit{Children: Rights and Childhood} (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 29. Colin Heywood contends there most likely was a distinct sense of childhood in the medieval period, but it would have been very different to our understanding of the distinction, and we have very little evidence for or against it. Colin Heywood, \textit{A History of Childhood} (Cambridge: Polity, 2001). Regardless, that the distinction \textit{does} come to be seen from the early modern period is widely accepted and evidence for this distinction is widely documented.}

Since we can see this distinction from the early modern period onwards, I will compare Rousseau’s account of childhood with key thinkers and trends that preceded him – from Enlightenment ideals of education in the sixteenth century, through religious developments in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and most closely preceding Rousseau, Locke’s rationalist approach to raising children.

François Rabelais expresses many of the common ideals of childhood education in his time in \textit{La vie de Gargantua et de Pantagruel} [The Life of Gargantua and of Pantagruel] (1532-1564).\footnote{It is important to note that the majority of thinking on childhood before the nineteenth century took place in discussions of education; the child was only worth considering for how it could be developed into an adult.} He asserted that freedom is essential to education, as Gargantua establishes the abbey of Thélème with one ‘clause’: ‘FAIS CE QUE VOUDRAS. Parce que les gens libres, bien nés, bien éduqués, vivant en bonne société, ont naturellement un instinct, un aiguillon qu’ils appellent honneur et qui les pousse toujours à agir vertueusement et les éloigne du vice’ [DO WHAT YOU WILL. Because free people, well-born, well-educated, living in good society, naturally have an instinct, a spur that they call honour and that always pushes them to act virtuously and distances them from vice].\footnote{François Rabelais, \textit{Gargantua et Pantagruel} (Paris: Arléa, [1532-1564] 1999), p. 177. Emphasis in original.} First-hand experience is also key to education in \textit{Gargantua}: Gargantua and his tutor Ponocrates ‘allaient voir comment on tirait les métaux, ou comment on fondait l’artillerie, ou allaient voir les lapidaires, orfèvres et tailleurs de piergeries’ [go to see how they extract metal, or how they forge artillery, or they go to see lapidaries, goldsmiths and jewellers] (p. 84). In these respects, Rousseau’s thoughts have much in common with the kind of education Rabelais proposes. However, they differ...
significantly on their appraisal of books. Rabelais places a large value on academic knowledge, learning many languages and reading authoritative figures of the past: ‘J’entends et veux que tu apprennes les langues parfaitement. Premièrement la grecque comme le veut Quintilien, secondement, la latine [...] Et quant à la connaissance des faits de nature, je veux que tu t’y adonnes curieusement : qu’il n’y ait mer, rivière ni fontaine, dont tu ne connais ses poissons, tous les oiseaux de l’air, tous les arbres’ [I intend and want you to learn languages perfectly. Firstly, Greek as Quintilian desired, secondly, Latin. And with regards to knowledge of the facts of nature, I want you to devote yourself to them with curiosity: so that there is no sea, river or fountain of which you do not know the fish, all the birds of the air, all the trees], and so on.59

Rousseau could not be more different, in his blunt rejection of reading: ‘Je hais les livres; ils n’apprennent qu’à parler de ce qu’on ne sait pas’ [I hate books; they teach nothing but how to talk about what one does not know].60 For Rousseau, the absolute priority of the child’s learning is to develop his own freedom through his own experiences and judgement, and not through submitting to the authorities of others, nor reading of a world he has not himself experienced. Moreover, where Rabelais talks above of living ‘en bonne société’, Rousseau has Émile taken out of society altogether, to learn from nature and to experience a greater sense of freedom and individualism.

In England and France, shifts in religious beliefs played a large role in dominant constructions of childhood. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Puritanism in England and Jansenism in France rose to be dominant Christian sects and their followers, focusing on original sin, spread the belief that children were inherently sinful. Rousseau explicitly states his rejection of this sense of childhood and, indeed, the very purpose of his educational treatise is to preserve the child’s innocence:

59 Rabelais, p. 224.
60 Rousseau, p. 454.
Aimez l’enfance ; favorisez ses jeux, ses plaisirs, son aimable instinct. Qui de vous n’a pas regretté quelquefois cet âge où le rire est toujours sur les lèvres, et où l’âme est toujours en paix ? Pourquoi voulez-vous ôter à ces petits innocens la jouissance d’un temps si court qui leur échape, et d’un bien si précieux dont ils ne sauroient [abuser]?

[Love childhood; give favour to its games, its pleasures, its delightful instinct. Who of you does not sometimes miss that age where a smile was always on your lips, and where your soul was always at peace? Why would you rob these little innocents the pleasure of a time so short that flees them, and of a good so precious, which they cannot misuse?]"\(^{61}\)

The soul of these ‘innocents’ is at peace, not stained by sin. It is not nature that brings sinfulness to children, but society, which Rousseau frequently condemns: ‘La société a fait l’homme plus foible, non seulement en lui ôtant le droit qu’il avoit sur ses propres forces, mais sur-tout en les lui rendant insuffisantes’ [Society has made man feebler, not only in robbing him of the power he has in his own forces, but most of all in rendering them insufficient].\(^{62}\)

John Locke, too, saw society as having the potential to make children evil. He conceived of the child as a tabula rasa, a blank page susceptible to the influence of those around it. Locke argued against punishing children violently, as he saw this as instilling in children a belief in the value of violence. Instead, Locke tells us to respect children and be reasonable with them, not because they are rational, but because reasoning with a child will help it to accept that there is justice and fairness behind one’s actions. Locke believes that from this, children too will learn to be just and fair. Locke’s conception of childhood is closest to Rousseau’s of his predecessors, in valuing the child, but Rousseau is wholly against the idea of reasoning with children: ‘Raisoner avec les enfants étoit la grande maxime de Locke, c’est la plus en vogue aujourd’hui [...] et pour moi je ne vois rien de plus sot que ces enfans avec qui l’on a tant raisoné’ [The great maxim of Locke is to reason with children, it is

\(^{61}\) Rousseau, p. 302.

\(^{62}\) Rousseau, p. 309.
the most in vogue today and for me I see nothing more foolish than the children with whom one has reasoned]. For Rousseau, children learn through experience, not explanation, and children who see adults reasoning will think that value is dependent on explanation. These children can then become precocious, in learning to badly reason for their desires. Rousseau wants children to see value as an absolute, inscribed in nature and not in the will of any individual.

Up to this point, my account of Rousseau has been about the education of boys. However, Rousseau was equally interested in girls’ education and equally provided a model of “ideal” girlhood in Book V of Émile, discussing Émile’s ideal partner, Sophie. He claims that children are not gendered until adolescence – ‘Jusqu’à l’âge nubile, les enfants des deux sexes n’ont rien d’apparent qui les distingue […] les filles sont des enfants, les garçons sont des enfants’ [Up to puberty, the children of the two sexes have nothing obvious that distinguishes them … girls are children, boys are children] – but nonetheless he treats girls as requiring different childhood experiences to boys from when they are past infancy. Rousseau objected to the idea of sending girls to convents for their education, since this separated them from their families and so did not prepare them for their future domestic roles. For Rousseau, girls need to learn only to accept the knowledge of others and not to question or think for themselves, so that they may most effectively serve their husbands and families domestically, and instil religious values into their own children. This education is evidently far less in-depth than Émile’s and indeed Rousseau was against women becoming as educated as men, as he claimed it detracted from their feminine charms. Many feminist thinkers of his time, in particular Mary Wollstonecraft, challenged and debated issues of girls’ education with Rousseau, arguing for an education equal to Émile’s. At the same time, the popularity of Rousseau’s account of female education can be seen in the efforts by some

63 Rousseau, p. 317.
64 Rousseau, p. 489.
eighteenth century educational reformists, such as Thomas Day, to raise girls by Rousseau’s methods. I will consider these issues in particular in chapters 2 and 5, on Woolf and Stein’s children’s stories, to show the range of modernist responses to girlhood and education.

Despite Rousseau’s many detractors, the ramifications of his conception of childhood were wide-reaching. The Romantics, in both England and France, drew on Rousseau’s sense of the child’s innocence and valued childhood as a discrete part of one’s life, as is particularly evident in the poetry of Wordsworth, Blake and Hugo. For example, in ‘Ode’ (1815), Wordsworth writes: ‘But trailing clouds of glory do we come [/] From God, who is our home: [/] Heaven lies about us in our infancy!’\(^{65}\) The spiritual innocence of children and enormous value placed on childhood is evident here. Moreover, like Rousseau, Wordsworth sees the child as innately belonging to nature, rather than corrupt human society: he calls the boy in his poem ‘Nature’s Priest.’\(^{66}\)

Where Rousseau’s ideas are in the poetry of the Romantic period, they are codified in law in the Victorian period.\(^{67}\) A number of new laws were created that recognised children as having a distinct personhood and requiring their own rights and protection by law. In particular, these involved stopping children from working in mines, reducing the amount of work that children could do in factories and opening access to education, culminating in a free and compulsory elementary education for all children in 1891.\(^{68}\) The cumulative effect of these laws was to shift from a sense of children as a potential labour force, valuable for their

---


\(^{66}\) Ibid.


\(^{68}\) The main laws relating to children were The Factory Act (1831, 1833, 1844, 1847, 1850, 1874), of which the 1874 act made factory work illegal for under-tens, and only part-time for under-14s, The Mines Act (1842), The Education Act (1870, 1876, 1881), of which the 1881 act made elementary education compulsory, and The Fee Grant Act (1891), which made elementary education free. In France, a law in 1841 regulated children’s factory work, making the minimum work age eight and limited working hours until the age of sixteen. The most famous French laws from the nineteenth century for children are the 1881 Jules Ferry laws, providing free education, which were followed in 1882 by a law making primary education obligatory.
earning capacity, towards a sense of childhood as a time to be nurtured and protected. In literature, too, authors put forward representations of vulnerable children to encourage social change towards protecting them, as Dickens does in *The Adventures of Oliver Twist* (1839), with Paul Dombey in *Dombey and Son* (1848) and with Jo in *Bleak House* (1853). The sense of the child as innocent and even redemptive persists from the Romantics, in such novels as George Eliot’s *Silas Marner* (1861) and in artwork from the period. For examples, in the 1840s and 50s, the Pre-Raphaelites gave radically new portrayals of Christ and Mary, as children. As they were depicted as ordinary-looking children, it is suggested that their divinity is not an exception among children, but exemplary of childhood. The most extreme attention to children in this period was described and typified by Ernest Dowson, who wrote of ‘The Cult of the Child’ (1889). Dowson and other men of his time found relief from the corruption and pressures of modern life in watching children perform on stage; while overtly a spiritual and aesthetic appreciation of children, a number of men in this period pursued romantic relationships with young girls, such as John Ruskin, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dowson himself.

Many modernists explored childhood in their writing. Indeed, children took on a new value in the early twentieth century, in light of the new discourse of psychoanalysis. After Rousseau, Freud provided the most radical change to our understanding of children. Where Rousseau does not think of the child as gendered until adolescence, Freud reveals the sexual identity and sexuality of children that exists from birth onwards. I will discuss this in detail in Chapter 5. Joyce and Eliot both also turn from the supposed innocence of childhood to represent children as sexually knowing and street-wise beings, as critics of *Dubliners* and *Finnegans Wake* have explored (Albert, Lauer), and as Eliot shows in his only child character, Orlandino in the ‘King Bolo’ poems:

The cabin boy they had aboard
His name was Orlandino
A child of upright character
But his language was obscene-o.
‘Fuck Spiders’ was his chief remark
In accents mild and dulcet.
They asked him what there was for lunch
And he simply answered ‘Bullshit.’

While this particular stanza is excised from an unpublished poem and so cannot be taken as an absolute statement of Eliot’s sense of children as far from innocent, a later stanza in which the cabin boy is sodomised by the captain is not deleted, openly associating the child with (homo)sexuality. Further, Eliot elsewhere writes of his rejection of Rousseau’s thoughts: ‘not only was the foundation of Rousseau rotten, his structure was chaotic and inconsistent.’ Peter Ackroyd notes Eliot’s anti-Rousseau stance in his seminal biography of the poet, in particular challenging ‘sentimentalists who had derived from Rousseau the appealing but dangerously false notion that the human personality was innately good.’ Stanislaus Joyce equally writes in his biography of his brother that they were taught that ‘children come into the world trailing murky clouds of original sin’, after seeing the funeral of an unbaptised child.

Critics commonly see the modernists as identifying childhood perspectives with “primitive” art, finding a shared innocence of modern cultural values in both, as indeed Roger Fry asserts. For example, Stein shows unquestionable interest in primitive art and one can derive some sense of the darkness she sees in children from the stories that she wrote for them, presenting depression, cannibalism and arbitrary violence. This cannibalism, as well as

70 Eliot, ‘[Columbo and Bolo Verses]’, p. 317.
the central tenet of World, the pre-Copernican belief that the world is flat, align Stein’s children with “primitive” cultures. However, this likening of childhood and naïve “primitive” culture is only one among the many approaches to childhood that the modernists developed.

For Woolf and de la Mare, children are intense perceivers and ideal experiencers of art, easily becoming absorbed by attention to beautiful things, as Woolf shows in many of her ‘moments of being’: in her autobiography, Woolf presents herself as a child lost in the euphoric experience of seeing a flower and, in Between the Acts, she recreates the moment for the boy George Oliver. In The Years, Woolf represents a child’s rapt attention to a performance of an opera, while Kitty watches the child and implicitly contrasts her own wandering attention with the child’s ability to focus so totally on one thing: ‘He, she thought, looking at the handsome boy, knows exactly what the music means. He was already completely possessed by the music. She liked the look of complete absorption that had swum up on top of his immaculate respectability.’ For de la Mare, the hero of Lord Fish loves fishing and will happily spend hours sitting calmly and patiently to catch a fish; he is also an intense dreamer, generating vivid and intricate images in his mind. While nature is more prominent in these works than those of Eliot and Joyce, issues of innocence and education are wholly disregarded to focus on the aesthetic sensibilities of children – it is not that they encounter the world naïvely, but with greater and closer focus than adults, with children experiencing nature in a dream-like state.

These modernist models of childhood should be examined because Rousseauism remains the prevalent model in Western society’s views of children even today. Rose notes: ‘Children’s fiction has never completely severed its links with a philosophy which sets up the child as a pure point of origin in relation to language, sexuality and the state’, and in
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particular, with a philosophy of the child established by Locke and Rousseau. Christopher Jenks shows the urgency of re-evaluating childhood today, in his account of violent crimes by children in recent decades: with the Bulger case in 1993, he contends, ‘our preconceptions [of childhood innocence] began to waver.’ As such, this modernist challenging of Rousseauist childhood continues to serve as a pressing critique of the notion of the natural and innocent child.

More recently, Cloke and Jones attempt to retheorise the child through post-structuralist concepts of identity. “Innocence”, as an overarching label for childhood, limits children’s possibilities for self-determination and limits their acceptable spaces: ‘seeing children as innocent and “cute” diminishes our view of them as individual humans and pushes them into a state in which they are deemed not to be able to judge, and, to some extent at least, control their own lives’ (p. 326). They propose, in place of an outmodedly religious and morally judgemental term such as “innocence”, thinking of the otherness of children: ‘we argue that, unlike romanticism, post-structuralism is concerned not so much with the innocence of childhood as with the otherness of childhood’ (p. 313, italics in original). However, asserting the otherness of children in this way risks overlooking the differences between children: ‘childhood is a highly differentiated category, varying across and between culture, age, gender, class, ethnicity, family structure, individual disposition and so on’ (ibid.). Indeed, this is a particularly complex instance of otherness, they recognise, as children are constantly in the process of becoming adults, as discussed above. These modernist authors too, in thinking beyond moralising frameworks, enlarge for children the potential range of expressivity and of experiences, and seek physically to open up new spaces for children.
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77 Rose, p. 8.
79 The idea of children as “cute” does not directly come from Rousseau; it more likely comes from Rousseau via the Victorian cult of the child, as discussed above.
Childhood Spaces

Space plays a large role in reimagining childhood. Before Rousseau, children and nature were both seen as subordinate to man. These hierarchies begin with Aristotle, in his valuation in *Politics* of reason as the faculty that distinguishes and elevates men over others: he aligns children, women and slaves with the natural, as all deficit in rationality. Rousseau centrally differs from earlier commentators on childhood with the idea of separating the child from society: Émile’s imagined childhood is set in the countryside to protect his childhood “innocence”. When Rousseau talked of the corrupting influence of society, he particularly wanted to warn against city life. Indeed, Rousseau’s theory of childhood is equally a theory of rural space. Cloke and Jones, for example, note the enduring belief in childhood innocence and its identification with rural landscapes: ‘the link between innocent childhood and innocent nature remains strong. This is one of the reasons why the idea of the countryside as a childhood idyll remains so powerful’ (p. 323).

Rousseau asserts the many advantages of being raised in the countryside, and learning – physically, intellectually and morally – from direct experiences of nature: ‘Au lieu de le laisser croupir dans l’air usé d’une chambre, qu’on le mène journellement au milieu d’un pré. Là, qu’il coure, qu’il s’élbète, qu’il tombe cent fois le jour, tant mieux ; il en apprendra plus tôt à se relever. Le bien-être de la liberté rachette beaucoup de blessures’ [Rather than letting him stagnate in the stale air of a bedroom, put him daily in the middle of a meadow. There, all the better if he runs, if he frolics, if he falls over a hundred times per day; he will learn
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80 Aristotle tells us that ‘tame animals have a better nature than wild, and all tame animals are better off when they are ruled by man; for then they are preserved. Again the male is by nature superior, and the female inferior; and the one rules, and the other is ruled; this principle, of necessity, extends to all mankind.’ He further claims that man is both naturally and morally superior: ‘For the slave has no deliberative faculty at all; the woman has but it is without authority; and the child has but it is immature.’ Cited in Margery Hourihan, *Deconstructing the Hero: Literary Theory and Children’s Literature* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 19.
sooner to pick himself up. The well-being of liberty will make up for many injuries. The child playing in nature learns its physical limits and experiences its freedom. Rousseau points to animals living in harmony with nature and suggests that we can profitably imitate this in educating our children: ‘On me dira que les animaux vivant d’une manière plus conforme à la nature, doivent être sujets à moins de maux que nous. Hé bien cette manière de vivre est précisément celle que je veux donner à mon élève; il en doit donc tirer le même profit.’ [They will say to me that animals living in a manner that more closely conforms to nature, are inevitably subject to fewer ills than we are. And indeed this manner of living is precisely that which I want to give my student; he must therefore take from it the same profit] Rousseau wants the child to avoid learning ills from other men and frequently points to the city as a hothouse of sin. He writes, for example:

C’est encore ici une des raisons pourquoi je veux élever Émile à la campagne loin de la canaille des valets, les derniers des hommes après leurs maîtres; loin des noires mœurs des villes que le vernis dont on le couvre rend séduisantes et contagieuses pour les enfants; au lieu que les vices des paysans sans apprêt et dans toute leur grossièreté sont plus propres à rebuter qu’à séduire, quand on n’a nul intérêt à les imiter.

[This is again one of the reasons why I want to raise Émile in the countryside far from the riff-raff of lackeys, the lowest of men apart from their masters; far from the black customs of cities whose varnished surfaces make them seductive and contagious for children; while the vices of peasants without artifice and in all their rudeness are more likely to put off than to seduce, when one has no interest in imitating them.]

Country people are figured here as honest and open, even about their vices: they do not have the ability of city people to dissimulate or conceal their true selves.

81 Rousseau, p. 301.
82 Rousseau, p. 271.
84 Rousseau, p. 326.
Again, for Rousseau, girls are to be placed very differently. Domestic space is an underlying issue that runs through Émile, as Rousseau believes that a mother making the home into a welcoming space is essential for the ‘moral order’ of the whole family:

"On respecte moins la mère dont on ne voit pas les enfants; il n’y a point de résidence dans les familles; l’habitude ne renforce plus les liens du sang; il n’y a ni pères ni mères, ni enfants, ni frères ni sœurs; tous se connaissent à peine, comment s’aimeroient-ils? Chacun ne songe plus qu’à soi. Quand la maison n’est qu’une triste solitude, il faut bien aller s’égayer ailleurs."

Mais que les mères daignent nourrir leurs enfants, les mœurs vont se réformer d’elles-mêmes, les sentiments de la nature se réveiller dans tous les coeurs, l’État va se repeupler: ce premier point, ce point seul va tout réunir. 

*L’attrait de la vie domestique est le meilleur contrepoison des mauvaises mœurs.* Le tracas des enfants qu’on croit importun devient agréable; il rend le père et la mère plus nécessaires, plus chers l’un à l’autre, il resserre entre eux le lien conjugal. Quand la famille est vivante et animée, les soins domestique font la plus chère occupation de la femme et le plus doux amusement du mari.

[we respect less the mother whose children we cannot see; there is no home life; habit does not reinforce the ties of blood; there are neither fathers nor mothers, nor children, nor brothers nor sisters; all scarcely know each other, how could they love each other? Each only thinks of himself/herself. When the home is a sad solitude, one must go elsewhere to amuse oneself.

But when mothers deign to nurse their children, manners will reform by themselves, and natural feelings will reawaken in all their hearts, the State will be re-peopled: this first point, this one point will reunite everything. The appeal of domestic life is the best antidote to vice. The care for children that one thought inconvenient becomes agreeable; it makes the father and the mother more necessary, more dear to each other, it reasserts between them the conjugal tie. When the family is lively and animated, domestic cares are the dearest occupation of the wife and the softest amusement of the husband.]85 (my emphasis)

Rousseau tells us here that the role of the mother in creating domestic harmony is essential for all members of the family and even for society at large. As such, it is essential that girls be well trained in domesticity from childhood onwards, as Rousseau outlines in Book V of Émile. Many modernists reject both this female domesticity (Woolf, Stein) and the notion of the boy playing freely in nature (de la Mare, Joyce, Eliot).

My chapters will be structured by starting with the most proximate to Rousseau’s model of childhood: Woolf and de la Mare closely interrogate Rousseau’s concepts by
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85 Rousseau, p. 258.
rethinking the child from within the very settings that Rousseau specifies for girls and boys; Eliot, on the other hand, directly reverses Rousseau’s hierarchy of country over city, by imagining urban childhood; Joyce responds to Rousseau more obliquely, in considering children’s mobility; Stein explores a girl’s relation to the world in its most abstract phenomenological sense.

As there is an equal focus on translation in this study, my first chapter will outline theories of the translation of children’s literature and in particular how these relate to questions of space, place and identity. In this first chapter, I will also outline in more detail the specific translation issues that each chapter will consider, although I will briefly mention the issues in this paragraph. In my second chapter, I will consider how Woolf and de la Mare reimagine the countryside and nature for the twentieth century in *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* and *The Lord Fish*. In particular, they explore nature as a kind of dreamspace that is grounded in contemporary psychological thought and, where de la Mare shows an alternative to Rousseau’s rural boyhood, Woolf presents a different domestic girlhood. Moreover, Woolf considers the difference to conceptions of nature that arise from experiencing nature in the city. In looking at the relationship between country (nation) and country(side), I will also consider the relation between nation and translation in this chapter. Chapter 3 on Eliot’s *Practical Cats* will consider the significance of London to Eliot’s poetics: while London is a well-known theme across Eliot’s works, “urbanity” and “childhood” are often seen as mutually exclusive domains. In this chapter I will also examine the musical of *Cats*, particularly in relation to adaptation and staging its urban setting. Both poetry and song involve specific challenges in translation, as I will analyse in this chapter. The fourth chapter, on Joyce’s *The Cat and the Devil*, will consider the implications of mobility and travel for Rousseau’s sense of the child learning from his surroundings. Unlike Rousseau, Joyce appears to see the value of introducing children through literature to places they have not
experienced themselves. At the same time, Joyce inscribes mobile children and, through his
polylingualism, foregrounds border-crossing and international travel in his text. As the text is
set in France, (back)translating into one’s own culture is a key issue for analysing the
translations of this text. My final chapter is on ontology and topology in Stein’s *The World is
Round*. A particular phenomenology of childhood, or more specifically of girlhood is built
not only from the events of the story but from Stein’s unique style. Here we see a country girl
learning directly from nature, precisely as Rousseau describes as the ideal male education for
Émile, but Stein’s story stands in direct contradiction to the notion of learning through
experience: rather, it challenges the possibility of trusting one’s knowledge and one’s
perception. I will look at this story as a queer text, and consider its translations in relation to
recent studies on queer translation.

To summarise, the key research questions of this study are:

What are the intersections between modernism and children’s literature? This aims to build
on such works as those authored by Dusinberre, Reynolds and Hodgkins, to build bridges
between these two literary fields and will seek to expand our understanding of modernism
beyond the highbrow. What are the challenges of and strategies for translating experimental
and complex literature for child audiences? This endeavours to bring fresh material to the
well-established discussions on translating Lewis Carroll, as I will discuss in detail in the
following chapter. How have these modernist authors presented childhood and how do their
ideas stand in relation to Rousseauvian ideals of childhood? How do these modernist texts
represent space in relation to children/childhood and how do the French translations work
with and alter these relations? I aim to show the multifaceted challenging of Rousseau’s
conception of childhood spaces by modernism here. This study thus seeks to enter new
grounds in modernist studies, in the growing field of the translation of children’s literature
and in theories of space and childhood.
Chapter 1. Theories of the Translation of Children’s Literature

The wide translation and re-translation of these texts has granted them a large international audience. In particular, these texts have all been translated into French and are especially deserving of study for their accounts of place and space in relation to children and childhood. As yet, no work has been done on the translation of British modernist children’s literature and so this study hopes enter new ground in translation and in modernist studies.

Modernist children’s literature poses a significant challenge to translators. This movement involved radical experimentation with language, form and how language and form might relate to the expression of identity. The very playfulness, subtlety and importance of language to modernism is a challenge for a translator, but multiply so when combined with the specific challenges of translating for children, as will be seen below. We will see the many points of intersection between English modernism and French culture, and, given these connections, my research will explore the subtle differences that arise in this endeavour to share children’s literature. That is to say, the closeness of French and English allows for the relatively straightforward translation of broad meanings, but inflections, allusions and especially play with language and style do not always translate so smoothly. However, while places and languages were sometimes shared, deep-rooted differences in attitudes to space and childhood can be seen in the translations of these texts: the modernist rejection of Rousseauism is not often in the interest of the French translator, as will be seen in the treatment of childhood spaces in these texts. Indeed, it may be that Rousseau has continued to have a more powerful effect on French configurations of childhood than on those of the English, which were reshaped in the nineteenth century by authors such as Charles Dickens and Lewis Carroll. Alternatively, as I will consider below, the act of translation itself has the potential to work as a challenge to Rousseau’s notion of childhood as ideally bound to a
particular space: translation has the potential to destabilise the “natural” linking of identity to place. As we will see, from an outline of the modernist interchange of ideas between Britain and France, a sketch of the history of the study of translation and in particular research into the translation of children’s literature, these particular modernist texts raise a number of key issues in translation studies.

**Modernism and Translation**

There was an exchange of ideas between French and English modernist authors, and France was of particular importance for Joyce, Eliot and Stein. Modernism itself often involves drawing on the art of other cultures and is generally seen as a Western European movement, more than the movement of any particular country. However, many see modernism as a movement that begins in France, with Baudelaire as the first modernist poet, Flaubert as the first modernist novelist and Manet as the first modernist painter. Indeed, Baudelaire was the first to define ‘modernity’, in *Le Peintre de la vie moderne* (1863), as a particular kind of urban existence that needed to be captured in art. Following Baudelaire, Flaubert and Manet, Paris was seen as a hub of avant-garde activity: artists and writers from around the world came to live there. Stein, for example, lived in Paris, dedicated *The World is Round* to a French girl and wrote it while living in France. She occasionally wrote in French (such as ‘À la recherche d’un jeune peintre’), translated Pétain’s speeches from French into English and wrote about Paris.¹ As she was friends with artists such as Matisse, Picasso and Duchamp, there is a long critical history of associating Stein’s literature with French art.² As well as

² This begins during Stein’s lifetime, as her friend Mabel Dodge Luhan likens reading her texts to experiencing a Picasso painting, while advertising Stein’s work in 1913. Cited in James Mellow, *Charmed Circle: Gertrude Stein and Company* (New York: Henry Holt, [1974] 2003), p. 171. See, for more recent examples, L. T. Fitz, ‘Gertrude Stein and Picasso: The Language of Surfaces’, *American Literature*, 45 (1973), 228-37; Jane Bowers,
French art, it is well known that British modernism was strongly influenced by French modernist literature. Eliot, for example, takes much from his reading of Baudelaire, as will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3; equally, E. J. H. Greene makes much of the influence of the French Symbolists, and especially Laforgue, on Eliot. Nancy Hargrove considers all the culture that Eliot would have been exposed to on his exchange year studying in Paris, contending that this year was central in Eliot’s literary development. During that year, Eliot also wrote some poems in French and afterwards holidayed to France frequently, even meeting Joyce there.

Joyce travelled extensively around Europe, before finally settling in France. Beginning work on *Finnegans Wake*, Joyce is reported to have said, in French, ‘Je suis au bout de l’anglais.’ [I am at the end of English] It is precisely such a description of English in French that typifies the multilingualism of modernism and the influence of French language, literature and culture on the formation of British modernist voices. It is partly from this mixing of languages that modernism is seen as “difficult”. Leonard Forster writes of polyglot poetry as apotheosised in modernism, most famously by Eliot and Ezra Pound, but equally in the prose of Joyce: ‘Stuart Gilbert suggested as early as 1929, when only fragments of the work were available (it was not completed until 1939) that *Finnegans Wake* might well “be easier reading for a polyglot foreigner than for an Englishman with but his mother-tongue.”

Translation also figures as a part of this exchange of literature and language between England and France. For example, Gide translated Conrad from English into French and
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Joyce helped to translate some of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry’s novels. Likewise, Mina Loy, living in Paris, wrote her children’s story ‘The Crocodile without any Tail’ in English, but read it to her children first in French and then in English, to teach them French. This bilingual usage of the children’s story is suggestive for the value of the French translations of the texts by my primary authors. While no written French translation exists of the Loy, all of these texts were written in a culture in which the boundary between English and French was porous, and the French language never too distant.

At the same time, modernism was a time for rethinking what translation might mean as an act and what values it might hold. Pound was especially vocal on a new sense of translation as an art form, not a weak imitation of an old poem, but the creation of ‘virtually a new poem’: ‘The translation of a poem having any depth ends by being one of two things; either it is the expression of the translator and virtually a new poem, or it is, as it were, a photograph, as exact as possible, of one side of a statue.’ Pound’s ideal of translation as the expression of an artist-translator is evident in the works and translations of a number of modernist figures, including Eliot, Woolf and Joyce. In *Translation and the Languages of Modernism*, Steven Yao considers Joyce as a translator. Yao looks at Joyce’s translation of Gerhart Hauptmann’s plays from German – *Before Sunrise* and *Michael Kramer* – despite Joyce having no prior knowledge of the language. This is very common for modernist translation, as with Pound’s translations of Chinese poetry and Woolf’s of Russian prose; both Pound and Woolf had native speakers of the source language create a ‘rough’ translation,
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7 Rather than a break or shift from the nineteenth century, this can be seen as an amplification of the situation. For example, Rudyard Kipling discusses the English translations of Jules Verne as a gateway into children learning French: ‘Give an English boy the first half of *Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Sea* in his native tongue. When he is properly intoxicated, withdraw it and present to him the second half in the original.’ Rudyard Kipling, *The Writings in Prose and Verse of Rudyard Kipling* (New York: C. Scribner’s Sons, [1897] 1947), p. 295. Such connections between English and French literature, translation and language only grow with advances in technology and travel.


9 Yao, p. 195.
from which they then worked. For the modernists, translation was itself a mode of artistic production. As Yao notes, with figures such as Golding and Chapman, ‘Before Modernism, literary translation functioned primarily as a means for renewing and strategically deploying the authority of the classics.’ Modernist authors used translation as a way of engaging with, but overtly moving away from, the classics (or tradition) – as Eliot does with Dante and H. D. with Sappho – and of moving outside of the Western canon altogether, as Pound does in *Cathay*. *Ulysses*, in this respect, is itself a reworking of a classical text: Homer’s *Odyssey*. Fritz Senn indeed considers *Ulysses* as ‘a radical translation of the *Odyssey*, from ancient Greek into modern Irish.’ While this sense of modernisation is not often discussed in translation studies, it is a key component to much modernist translation, such as Eliot’s urbanisation of Dante.

*Finnegans Wake* approaches translation at a wholly different level – not simply thematically or structurally, but at the semantic level of the morpheme. As Deleuze and Guattari note, ‘Les mots de Joyce, justement dits « à racines multiples », ne brisent effectivement l’unité linéaire du mot, ou même de la langage, qu’en posant une unité cyclique de la phrase, du texte ou du savoir.’ [Joyce’s words, rightly said to have “multiple roots”, only shatter the linear unity of the word, or even of language, in positing a cyclical unity of the
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11 Yao, p. 10.
phrase, of the text or of knowledge.]^{14} The *Wake* contains ‘some sixty different languages, including such exotic specimens as Beche-la-Mar (a Melanesian pidgin), Samoan, Shelta, Gipsy, Norwegian, Kiswahili, and Bearlagair Na Saer.’^{15} Jean Michel Rabaté likens reading the *Wake* to learning a new language, with its own consistent world-view, but Senn sees it rather as a process of translation, in which readers come to ‘recognize English itself as a foreign language, even if they themselves are native speakers.’^{16}

We are also able to see Joyce’s understanding of translation through the French and Italian translations of his works that took place during his lifetime, as he was often personally involved in them. A brief survey of Joyce’s translations in French shows that the more complex the source text, the more creative and varied the translations become: for example, of the four main French translations of *Dubliners* (by Yva Fernandez, Jacques Aubert, Jean-Noël Vuarnet and Benoît Tadié), only one makes considerable changes to names, titles and places, whereas at the other end of the spectrum, Auguste Morel’s *Ulysse* and the two French translations of *Finnegans Wake* proceed by radically changing contexts, allusions and so to a large degree, content.^{17} Indeed, Joyce’s letters show that he considered Morel’s translation as an autonomous work of art, despite his involvement, and where he helped with early efforts to translate extracts of *Finnegans Wake*, he encouraged the translators to make their works different, even disapproving of a translation by Samuel Beckett and Alfred Péron until it was more significantly changed from the source text. As Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli summates, when Joyce was involved in translations of his works, he aimed ‘to provide a
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^{15} Yao, p. 6.


^{17} Patrick O’Neill, *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation* (London: University of Toronto Press, 2005), pp. 45, 99. Philippe Lavergne’s translation of the *Wake* into French was also the first translation of the *Wake* into any language; it had hitherto been assumed an impossibility, and even after the translation, Marie Jolas and others still maintained that it was impossible to translate.
similarity of reading experience even at the expense of semantic equivalence.'\textsuperscript{18} As we will see below, such modernist approaches to translation have much in common with translations of children’s literature. Moreover, modernist approaches to translation mark a shift in the history of translation, from questions of fidelity and accuracy, to a vision of the originality that translation can involve.

\textbf{Translation Studies}

There is, of course, a marked difference in approaches to translating literature and to translating factual documents, such as instruction manuals. Literature involves more than the conveyance of information, and opens up both the connotations of words and their sonorous effects and combinations. As such, the question of how to translate literature has been debated since Antiquity. In the year 395, Jerome initiates the idea of translating ‘not word for word, but sense for sense’ for texts other than Scripture.\textsuperscript{19} Debate over literalness versus liberty and how precisely to translate well has persisted for almost two millenia, continuing to this day.

Susan Bassnett points to the origins of translation studies in foreign language studies and comparative literature; translation study was seen as a secondary and subordinate activity within other fields, and only became a field in its own right in the late 1970s.\textsuperscript{20} Translation studies initially struggled for space outside of comparative literature and linguistic training, and remained dominated by theoretical questions of what makes a good translation. However, translation studies took a leap forwards in the 1990s, when it moved away from questions of

\textsuperscript{18} Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli, ‘Anna Livia’s Italian Sister’, in \textit{Transcultural Joyce}, ed. by Karen Lawrence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 193-98 (p. 195). Bosinelli contends that this is more the case for Joyce’s Italian than French or German translations, but the enduring recognition of Morel’s \textit{Ulysse} in the French literary system, and Joyce’s praise for Ludmila Savitsky’s French \textit{Portrait} would suggest otherwise.


how to translate accurately, towards an interrogation of the *cultural implications* of translation.\(^\text{21}\) This focus changed as Itamar Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory became more prominent, notably through Gideon Toury’s reassessment in *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995).\(^\text{22}\) As Even-Zohar asserts, translation studies are a central component of polysystem theory: ‘I conceive of translated literature not only as an integral system within any literary polysystem, but as a most active system within it.’\(^\text{23}\) It is a system that crosses other systems and, while its broader value is entirely variable depending on cultural and historical focus, its accumulated effect is felt in every language. With Toury, instead of thinking of a text as authoritative and its translation as derivative and subordinate, translation studies began to think in terms of source texts and target texts as separate domains, with distinct audiences and goals. In this way, translation was no longer seen as a secondary act, simply of representing a foreign text; it was seen as a recreation of that text in a new context. This development is marked in the change of the name of the discipline from translation ‘theory’ to translation ‘studies’ and, in Toury’s terminology, is a shift from prescriptive translation study to descriptive translation study.

There are many sub-fields of translation studies opening up, as researchers point to the specificities of different media, genres and art forms, and the different requirements of translating for each. For example, Lefevere considers in detail the specific challenges of translating poetry, while Bassnett looks at the requirements of translating for the stage and others work on translations of films in dubbing and subtitles, of opera in surtitles, of singable

\(^{21}\) That is, “good” translation was the focus in 20\(^{\text{th}}\)-century academic study, but as the range of ideas in *The Translation Studies Reader* shows, thinkers such as Nietzsche and Benjamin have always considered the cultural and philosophical implications of translation too.


song lyrics, and so on. Translation studies has also expanded to consider other kinds of “movement across” as within its scope, such as adaptation across media, or abridgement. This expansion of translation studies has helped to include the study of more literature targeted at children, such as adaptations of classic texts for child readers. Indeed, there is a growing body of researchers looking at the particular issues that surround translating and adapting literature for children.

The Translation of Children’s Literature

Children’s literature is an almost unique field, in that it is nominally defined not by a particular style or subject matter, but by its target audience. Further, it is always intertwined with the education system and so often (re)(con)figures national ideals and values. In France, for example, the Ministère de l’Éducation nationale provides schools with a list of three hundred books that it recommends children to read, including the fables of Jean de la Fontaine and the fairy tales of Charles Perrault. The purpose of this reading for children is, according to the French government, the development in children of a ‘culture littéraire’ [literary culture]: ‘qu’il s’agisse de comprendre, d’expliquer ou d’interpréter, le véritable lecteur vient sans cesse puiser dans les matériaux riches et diversifiés qu’il a structurés dans sa mémoire et qui sont, à proprement parler, sa culture.’ [whether it is about understanding, explaining or interpreting, the true reader comes to ceaselessly draw from the rich and diverse materials which s/he has structured in his/her memory and which are, rightly speaking, his/her culture.’] As such, with all French elementary school children reading from the same

25 http://eduscol.education.fr/cid50485/litterature.html#lien0 [accessed 20 December 2012].
three hundred books, the nation comes to build a shared cultural base through children’s literature. However, this reading list involves literature translated from a range of languages, including English, German and Japanese, and so we see that the translation of children’s literature is readily put into the service of the education system.

Criticism of the translation of children’s literature is most commonly seen to begin in the 1960s, with Lisa-Christina Persson’s collection of essays suggesting books to be translated and recording talks by translators and publishers on the importance of translating children’s literature for expanding culture (1962). While some aspects of the field have changed significantly since then, other aspects have persisted since these beginnings, and Deborah Hallford and Edgardo Zaghini’s Outside In: Children’s Books in Translation (2010) can be seen as updating Persson, publicising and assessing extant translations, conscripting Philip Pullman to call for the cultural importance of translation and giving brief articles by publishers and translators. A critical approach to existing translations of children’s literature begins with Astrid Lindgren, who frequently challenged the absurd adaptations and excisions in the translations of her own children’s books in the late 1960s. This critical approach enters academic circles with the third international symposium of the International Research Society for Children’s Literature (1976) on the translation of children’s literature. The papers of this conference were collected by Göte Klingberg, Mary Ørvig and Stuart Amor in Children’s Books in Translation: The Situation and the Problems (1978), which is largely, like Klingberg’s own work on the matter (1986), against domestication and adaptation, and frequently prescriptive. However, even at this stage some recognition of the effects of
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27 Lisa-Christina Persson, Translation of Children’s Books (Lund: Bibliotekstjänst, 1962). The first of my primary texts to be translated was also in the 1960s.
different target cultures is analysed, as in Wolfgang Bussewitz and others on the GDR, a unique cultural context which has continued to attract analysis. Toury’s paradigm-shifting formation of descriptive translation studies involved children’s literature through its examples and surrounding Toury at Tel Aviv University is a group of scholars who focus on the translation of children’s literature into Hebrew. With Toury’s change in focus, some translation studies researchers branched into children’s literature, such as Puurtinen on syntax and Cay Dollerup on reading aloud, later followed by some children’s literature researchers branching into translation studies, such as Maria Nikolajeva on child image and Emer O’Sullivan on cultural transfer. It is only in the twenty-first century, however, that we find scholars primarily specialising in the translation of children’s literature, such as Lathey, Susan Kreller and Vanessa Joosen. The historical staggering of the translations studied here will give some indication of whether translation practice in France matches dominant theoretical trends, lags behind it, or simply persists as it always has.

Despite the move from prescriptive translation studies in the 1990s, much work on the


translation of children’s literature remains critical of “bad” translations. Common criticisms are that translations of children’s literature cannot achieve all the target audiences of the source text and so must decide between the academic and the child audience (Lathey), between a text for reading aloud or reading privately (Dollerup) and, in texts with a dual address, between the addressees (Kreller). Such work is necessary if we want publishers to take the translation of children’s literature more seriously, since most parents and publishers are not in a position themselves to judge the quality of the translation. However, it is not my intention here to evaluate the quality of these translations. Inevitably, judgements will creep in, as words are not neutral, but value-laden objects. However, judging the quality of the translations I address here will not be my primary concern. I aim to follow an approach similar to Kreller’s for studying the translation of children’s literature: she describes it as ‘a non-prescriptive, non-evaluative and strongly historical investigation which concentrates both on the source and the target text.’ Puurtinen suggests that one step beyond prescriptive practices is to compare two translations of the same source text. Puurtinen’s approach embraces the fractured nature of the target culture, the independent agency of different translators and, in place of judging translations against a source text, sees the multiple versions of the same text in a non-hierarchical framework. I will employ this approach where it is appropriate here: for the two extant translations of Eliot, Joyce and Stein.

The specific challenges of translating children’s literature have been uncovered by the

renewed critical focus on the translation of children’s literature in the past decade. I will look at the issues raised by translating children’s literature and then at the Alice books as a case in point for the majority of these issues. The first such issue is the low status of children’s literature in the literary polysystem, which presents both challenges and possibilities in its translation: it allows for a wider scope and variety of changes to be made in translating children’s literature, provided they defer to the norms of the target culture. Culturally bound and personally variable notions of childhood, or ‘child images’ (Oittinen) spur translators and editors to adapt children’s literature to what they assume will be suitable for their target audience’s understanding and entertainment.\(^{39}\) As discussed above, the majority of children’s literature functions through a dual address, not only engaging with child readers or listeners, but with the adults who will publish, most likely buy and perhaps read out loud the books. Lathey contends that it is impossible for a translation to encompass both sides of a dual address and a translator must choose: ‘Should the translator make a clear choice between the academic audience and the child? My answer would be yes. The two audiences are so different that it is unlikely that one translation can suit both.’\(^{40}\)

Images in picturebooks are another challenge in translating children’s literature.\(^{41}\) All of my primary texts have been illustrated a number of times. In recent years seminal work has been done on picturebooks, by such eminent children’s literature critics as Perry Nodelman and Nikolajeva.\(^{42}\) The best picturebooks operate through a dialogue (Oittinen) or ‘interanimation’ (David Lewis) of image and text.\(^{43}\) Nikolajeva and Carole Scott write of a spectrum of possible connections between text and image, spanning symmetry, enhancement,
counterpoint and contradiction.\textsuperscript{44} The particular challenge of translating picturebooks must take into account this interaction with images, which translators of children’s literature frequently undo in over-explaining or in directly contradicting the image.\textsuperscript{45} The two key theorists of translating picturebooks are Riitta Oittinen and Emer O’Sullivan, who both approach the issue from opposite ends: Oittinen from the position of training translators to successfully translate picturebooks, and O’Sullivan from looking at ineffective translations of picturebooks. In each of her works about translating picturebooks, Oittinen calls for specialised training for translators of texts with pictures.\textsuperscript{46} Her earlier work considers the relation between image and text as dialogic: ‘because I see illustrations as part of the translated whole, I have not applied any picture theory; instead, I have found Bakhtin’s dialogics a useful tool for describing what happens when pictures are involved in translating for children.’\textsuperscript{47} This idea of the ‘translated whole’ including images remains in her subsequent work in the idea of the picturebook as an ‘iconotext’; thence, ‘the unity of words and images is translated with the intent of producing (rewriting) a new iconotext “picture book” in the [target] language.’\textsuperscript{48} Her most recent work returns to Bakhtin, and considers not only dialogics, but the carnivalesque as an approach to translating for children: proposing that ‘children’s culture can be considered carnivalistic’, she sees translation as a ‘dialogic, carnivalistic, collaborative process carried out in individual situations.’\textsuperscript{49}

Emer O’Sullivan is primarily descriptive of extant translations, and does not set out approaches to translating picturebooks. However, she does suggest that a good picturebook entails a subtle interaction between image and text: a translation sensitive to pictures ‘does

\textsuperscript{44} Nikolajeva and Carole Scott, \textit{How Picturebooks Work} (New York: Garland, 2001).
\textsuperscript{47} Oittinen, \textit{Translating for Children}, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{49} Oittinen, ‘The Verbal and the Visual’, p. 84.
not verbalize the interaction, but leaves gaps that make the interplay possible and exciting.\textsuperscript{50} She exhorts that for picturebooks in which ‘readers can experience the thrill of noticing more in the pictures than the words have told and draw their own conclusions’, translators and publishers of translated works need to trust ‘children to be able to read between the lines and the pictures, to be able to resolve the sophisticated connections between the verbal and visual elements of the books.’\textsuperscript{51} In this earlier work she looks at translations that over-explain, and so lose this tension and play between image and text; in her later work, the seminal \textit{Comparative Children’s Literature}, she considers the market forces behind such translations.

As an example of poor editing practice, O’Sullivan writes of a German translation of Philippe Dumas’ picturebook \textit{Laura sur la route} (1978), which domesticates all the place names, but still has the Eiffel Tower in its pictures.\textsuperscript{52} She looks at publishers’ directives that effect a ‘precensorship’ of culturally specific material, encouraging an ‘international insipidity.’\textsuperscript{53} She concludes with the damning assessment that if such cultural levelling has become the standard, there is little to be gained from the international sharing of children’s literature: ‘Instead of multiculturality based on knowledge and acceptance of the differences between cultures, we have here an (alleged) cultural neutrality, resulting in non-specific, levelled-out, international products. The mere fact that children’s literature is being translated or coproduced thus has no particular cultural value in itself.’\textsuperscript{54} I will particularly be looking at these issues, thinking of illustration as a kind of translation, and working in relation to verbal translations, in Chapter 2 on Woolf and Chapter 4 on Joyce.

‘Read-aloud-ability’ (Puurtinen) is a final issue for translating some children’s literature

\textsuperscript{52} O’Sullivan, \textit{Comparative Children’s Literature}, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{54} O’Sullivan, \textit{Comparative Children’s Literature}, p. 88.
that does not concern translation of much adult literature today.\textsuperscript{55} The onus of being easy to read aloud makes translating complex wordplay and syntax yet more difficult, as it cannot be too wordy, unnatural to the syntax of the target language, or involve too large an elevation of register. \textit{Nurse Lugton’s Curtain} is rather awkward to read even in English and so this particular challenge does not apply, but the cover of \textit{The World is Round} insists ‘This book is to be read aloud’, and Eliot’s poetry, distinctly pleasurable on the tongue in English, is also the source text for a performance.

A central issue in the translation of children’s literature is the debate between “domestication” and “foreignisation”. Lawrence Venuti, a key theorist of translation studies, distinguishes between translations that choose to domesticate foreign details and those that choose to foreignise, that is, to keep foreign details foreign.\textsuperscript{56} In doing so, he gives names to the decision process that Friedrich Schleiermacher outlined as early as 1813: ‘Either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader towards him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the author towards him.’\textsuperscript{57} Toury names this decision one of adequacy (to the source text) and acceptability (to the target culture). I will work here with Venuti’s terminology, but note in Schleiermacher’s account that what Venuti calls ‘foreignisation’ is an active step of moving the reader towards the source culture, which can be achieved through added explanations in the text or paratextually; it is not simply leaving details of the source text unchanged. Gillian Lathey approves of such added explanations for translated children’s literature when they both entertain and do not underestimate their child readers, as she sees in the work of translators Anthea Bell and Joan Aiken.\textsuperscript{58} Textual elements that often require decisions over domestication and foreignisation are various, and include names, places, food, money, the weather, leisure activities and jobs.

\textsuperscript{55} Puurtinen, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{56} Venuti, \textit{The Translator’s Invisibility}, passim.
\textsuperscript{58} Lathey, \textit{The Role of Translators in Children’s Literature}. 
For example, when in the Harry Potter books we hear about sausages and mash for lunch, this is a distinctly English dish, with which a Chinese or Italian reader may not be familiar. Faced with this, does a translator keep sausages and mash, add an explanation of what sausages and mash are, or substitute in a local dish of equivalent mood? Moreover, decisions of domestication and foreignisation are complicated when the source text itself introduces different cultures. In *Harry Potter and the Goblet of Fire*, for example, a French school comes to visit Hogwarts and, throughout the series, the names Malfoy and Voldemort play off their meanings in French; if the French translations domesticated names, these instances of foreign names become less distinct or meaningful.

The debate of domestication and foreignisation has already come to the conclusion of foreignisation in texts for adults, largely at the call of Venuti himself. However, as Tiina Puurtinen notes, children’s literature ‘belongs simultaneously to the literary system and the social-education system’, and so it is frequently domesticated and otherwise adapted to meet the anticipated knowledge (or lack thereof) of its target culture readers.59 Further, Even-Zohar’s model of the literary polysystem reveals the low standing of children’s literature in the eyes of publishers and, as such, children’s literature does not tend to have the cultural authority to avoid domestication and adaptation. The texts that I discuss here are a significant exception to these formulations, however, since they are the minor works of major authors, as will be discussed further below. Nikolajeva stands against domestication in children’s literature by implicitly suggesting that the texts should be taken as seriously as the most serious literature for adults, modernist literature. She asks rhetorically: ‘Can you imagine *Ulysses* taking place in Berlin in a German translation or Paris in a French translation?’60

60 Nikolajeva, ‘What Do We Translate When We Translate Children’s Literature?’, in *Beyond Babar: The European Tradition in Children’s Literature*, ed. by Beckett and Nikolajeva (Oxford: Scarecrow, 2006), pp. 277-98 (p. 285). As mentioned above, however, *Ulysses* itself can be seen as a domestication of the *Odyssey*, so a potential answer to her rhetorical question is “yes”.

Gabrina Pounds contends that the roots of the ideology of domesticating literature for children are in Rousseauvian childcare philosophy. She tells us that there is a belief, ‘initiated by Rousseau’, that children must be isolated from cosmopolitan society and raised monoculturally in nature (as discussed in my introduction): ‘Traditionally translators have opted for “domestication” or “acceptability” on the assumption that young readers are not able to empathize with “alien” characters and to relate to foreign settings and references.’ As such, the very conception of childhood that these modernist texts are challenging equally underlies the conception of most translations of children’s literature, and so translation becomes a site of possible dissidence from Rousseau’s imagined childhood. That is to say, where Rousseau is against the idea of children learning about what they cannot directly experience, foreignised children’s literature opens up the possibility of children learning about cultures that they have not yet experienced.

Akiko Yamazaki also challenges this norm of domestication in translations of children’s literature, pointing to the arbitrariness of the reasoning behind it. She proposes that ‘almost everything is foreign or new for a very young child, regardless of the culture to which the thing belongs.’ As such, it is absurd to believe that children are inherently worried by or unable to cope with the foreign – such feelings in children can only be culturally ‘imprinted’ upon them. Indeed, with regards to television, children show a general ease with representations of other cultures, with Yamazaki giving the example of the popularity of the Japanese animation *Pokémon* in the UK and USA. In literature, Yamazaki points to fantasy as a counter-example to children rejecting foreignness: it is a genre often targeted to children, which frequently introduces them to entirely alien, imagined cultures, complete with foreign
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62 Rousseau does not totally discard the value of spoken descriptions and explanations, but clearly subordinates them in a hierarchy with actions: “Il faut parler tant qu’on peut par les actions et ne dire que ce qu’on ne sauroit faire.” Rousseau, p. 451.
63 Yamazaki, p. 58.
64 *Ibid.*
names, customs and invented languages. Contemporaneous with my primary texts, J. R. R.
Tolkien’s *The Hobbit* (1937) and its related texts are a prime example of readers being
introduced to a new world and to new words. It begins: ‘In a hole in the ground there lived a
hobbit [...] The mother of our particular hobbit—what is a hobbit? I suppose hobbits need
some description nowadays, since they have become rare and shy of the Big People, as they
call us.’ For such a text, which is always already introducing its reader to a foreign world, it
may be more natural for a translator to foreignise, as indeed its French translator does. For
Yamazaki, it is of urgent political importance to overthrow the norm of domesticating for
children: ‘The change of names creates a false impression of a homogenous world, only to
discourage children from learning about other possibilities, enhancing the feeling of
strangeness when children actually come across foreign names in real life.’

Names in these modernist texts, as is common in children’s literature, are not only
denotative of particular people, but connotative, allusive or otherwise telling of the identity of
those they name. In children’s literature, it is common for a character’s name to be a
description of what it is, such as the Caterpillar in the Alice books, or for names to give the
defining characteristic of a figure, such as Sleepy, Grumpy and so on, for the dwarves in
*Snow White*. The cultural implications of names is a place-bound phenomenon. Some names
belong to an international culture, such as Mephistopheles, but others differ in subtle ways, as
we will see in Chapter 5 in the many implications of the name ‘Rose.’ Where Pounds and
Yamazaki appear to propose dogmatically that names must be foreignised, B. J. Epstein
asserts that different usages of names require different translation approaches: ‘If the meaning
of a name is essential to the story or to the reader’s understanding of the text, then the name
ought to be translated in some way. If the sound of it is what is most important, then the
sound should probably be adapted for the target readership. If allusion is the most important
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67 Yamazaki, p. 60.
aspect, then retention is likely to be a beneficial strategy.\footnote{68} In contrast, Elvira Cámara Aguilera asserts that we must differentiate in approaches to translating names not by usage, but by audience, according to the general age grouping of the child “reader”:

1. Pre-reading children (0 to 6 years old)
2. Children capable of reading and writing (from 6 to adolescence)
3. Adolescents and youngsters.\footnote{69}

Cámara’s assumption is that ‘the lower the age the lower the capability of understanding, therefore, the acceptability of foreignizing elements.’\footnote{70} However, I would contend that fantasy, fairy tale and prehistoric stories all stand as counter-examples to this, with children readily learning the lengthy and difficult to pronounce names of invented worlds, dinosaurs and fairy tale figures, as simply as they would any other name, regardless of age. Indeed, a story such as ‘Rumpelstiltskin’ inscribes the ability of a child to learn an alien and complicated name when necessary and helps child readers to follow suit by repeating it a few times. As such, no definitive rules can be determined on how to translate proper names in children’s literature.

While these critics make strong judgements on when or whether it is appropriate to domesticate children’s literature and show a clear preference for foreignisation on the whole, I do not share their hierarchy. Both domestication and foreignisation have their values and contexts. Not all foreignised children’s literature is inherently radical and, indeed, since much children’s literature is highly conservative, its translations too are likely to be conservative. Helen Frank, for example, shows that French translations of Australian children’s literature tend to foreignise in such a way as to make Australia appear more distant: techniques such as ‘explication, euphemism, and sequencing of the narrative’, ‘attenuation in the form of

\footnote{70} Ibid.
downplaying and modification’ all ‘allowed translators to foster a perception and understanding of Australia as the “discoverable” fascinating “Other.”’ As such, she concludes, ‘Australia’s seemingly permanent exotic and distant status in French eyes suggests that the likelihood of a deeper understanding of Australian cultural identity through children’s books remains low.’

Equally, as modernist approaches to translation show, domestication can be just as radical an approach to translation as foreignisation can be. Rather than judge which would have been more appropriate for a particular text, I intend to see the effects of the translation decisions on constructions of childhood in the target texts. Names and places are the first two things that a translator must decide whether to domesticate or foreignise. Thus, the immediate challenge in translating these children’s books – how to represent their names and places – is a question that is at the crux of the meanings and values of these texts for child readers: how they engage with placing childhood identities. Moreover, these critics repeatedly set up domestication and foreignisation as binary opposites, but due to the close relation between these modernist authors and avant-garde French art and culture, the dividing line between domestication and foreignisation can become blurry.

Just as authors with higher cultural capital are less likely to see their texts domesticated, do some places hold more authority than others? For example, does a story set in New York resist domestication more than one set in the countryside? Is the rural more generic than the urban? Looking at these translations of modernist children’s literature, such questions of the relation of translation to place can be considered, as they involve a variety of locations and kinds of space. In particular, how might translation trouble notions of a stable sense of place/space?

These issues, of domestication, foreignisation, dual address, text/image relation and
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notions of childhood have all been considered in relation to the Alice books.\textsuperscript{73} Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass are two of the most discussed books in studies of the translation of children’s literature.\textsuperscript{74} The challenges of translating Carroll’s works have much in common with those of translating modernist children’s literature, with regard to allusions and wordplay. These books have been translated into French over twenty times, with translators taking a variety of approaches. Christiane Nord looks at the translation of names in eight translations of Wonderland into five languages (four German, French, Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese and Italian).\textsuperscript{75} Focusing on the same issue in a large range of French translations, Douglas Kibbee assesses that first names are usually kept, even if very alien to French readers, as they are often referential to real life people.\textsuperscript{76} For other kinds of proper noun, however, most translators have consistently ‘chosen to make greater efforts to make the names more accessible to French child readers.’\textsuperscript{77} In general, translators that do not domesticate names will often distinguish between names and wordplay, and do domesticate the latter. However, this distinction breaks down in modernist texts as in Carroll’s books, because names are often more than denotative. They are multiply meaningful, including on the acoustic level.

Where Kibbee begins by telling us that the Alice books were ‘written for a girl, but nowadays understandable only by adults’, Isabelle Nières-Chevrel looks more deeply into this question of adult or child audience, in assessing the target audiences of French

\textsuperscript{73} On text/image relations and Alice, see Oittinen, \textit{Translating for Children}, pp. 96-97.

\textsuperscript{74} As well as innumerable articles and chapters, there are two book-length studies on translations of Alice: Warren Weaver, \textit{Alice in Many Tongues: The Translations of Alice in Wonderland} (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964); Isabelle Nières-Chevrel, \textit{Lewis Carroll en France, 1870-1985: les ambivalences d’une réception littéraire} (Lille 3: ANRT, 1989).


\textsuperscript{77} Kibbee, p. 311.
translations of Wonderland. According to Nières-Chevrel, the most effective translation, and the most widely sold and available in France, is that of Jacques Papy (1961), which began as a translation for adults, while also taking into account the register of the source text, and was subsequently published in editions targeted at children, too. Nières-Chevrel has also written of issues regarding gender and age relations, and speaking of the self, as French inflects these issues more than English with its pronouns and gendered articles. For example, she explores the differences of ‘you’ from ‘tu’ and ‘vous’, the change from the very male Caterpillar to La Chenille, and the irreplacable wordplay on ‘myself’ in English, given with ‘moi’ and ‘moi-même’ in French, ultimately to assert the quintessential untranslatability of the Alice books.

She builds a rounded picture of translations of Carroll’s texts in France through her account of their reception history there. They began as targeted purely at children until the 1930s, at which point surrealist writers and artists such as Antonin Artaud and Louis Aragon took up Carroll’s works, and they were considered among the elite and exclusive arts. His fortunes shifted again in the 1970s with Deleuze’s anaylsis, Logique du sens (1969), and with Henri Parisot’s translation of the Alice books (1972), which elevated the register of the work, both of which brought it firmly into French academic life, where Carroll’s reputation has since remained in France – perceived as an elite and intellectual author.

Peter Rickard and Riita Oittinen focus on this translation by Parisot, either in praise or criticism of the efforts to find equivalent jeux de mots in the target language. Rickard claims that ‘A perfect translator would be one who gave to each of the countless puns which are the very stuff of the original text, its most appropriate French equivalent [...] He would have to be
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79 Nières-Chevrel, ‘Retraduire un classique’, p. 82.
82 Oittinen, Translating for Children; Peter Rickard, ‘Alice in France or Can Lewis Carroll Be Translated?’, Comparative Literature Studies, 12.1 (1975), 45-66.
a genius, a first-rate punster, and moreover a psychoanalyst subtle enough to capture every fine shade of a text whose every word may reflect a subconscious intention of the author.83 Parisot himself wrote of the issues he found in translating, including puns, allusions and neologisms, and his creative solutions, occasional omissions and extra inventions for them.84 In such issues as audience, wordplay, gender and naming, the translations of modernist children’s literature may provide fresh material for these well-established debates surrounding the translation of Carroll’s works.

The Translation of English Modernist Children’s Literature

Publication of the translations of modernist children’s literature begins in the 1960s, at around the same time as ‘modernism’ was labelled as a discrete movement and identified with the distinction between ‘high’ and ‘low’ brow art. As postmodernism challenged the distinctions that it perceived modernism to have made, part of undoing the distinction between ‘Literature’ and non-serious writing is through the publication of modernist works that themselves overcomes this boundary. The study of these texts and their translations is equally a widening of the perception of High Modernism, showing that a part of it can be shared by all, which builds bridges rather than towers, in stark contrast, for example, to the extreme difficulty of translating even parts of *Finnegans Wake*.

*Nurse Lugton’s Curtain, The Lord Fish, The Cat and the Devil, Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats* and *The World is Round* have all been translated into French (see Table 2 above). As we will see, for the Woolf and de la Mare stories, dreamspace and nature interact in a complex matrix and questions of the relations between countryside, nation and education must be negotiated in their translation. As Luce Bonnerot asserts of de la Mare’s works for

83 Rickard, p. 63.
adults, a key challenge in translating him is in equalling his immense knowledge of the countryside and nature.\textsuperscript{85} Other issues for translating \textit{The Lord Fish} are de la Mare’s use of dialect and in the troubled interaction of sound and meaning in John’s effort at uneducated translation. Woolf’s story challenges its translator with its distinctly English details and name, and draws heavily on the Alice books. In Chapter 3, I will look at the main challenge in translating \textit{Practical Cats}, namely its groundbreaking variety of rhythms, the playful allusiveness of its names and its London setting. The translation of Webber’s musical raises questions of singability and performability, as the text becomes secondary to the music and performance takes priority over meaning. In Chapter 4, I will see how \textit{The Cat and the Devil} poses challenges to its translators since it contains French in its original, includes a neologism and plays with cliché. Its two French translations are of particular interest because Joyce’s story is a translation of a French legend and, as such, the translators face Joyce’s disjunctive domestications. Stein’s style confronts the potential of language to define and identify, forcing the translators of \textit{The World is Round} to match her ambiguities as Rose loses herself in the circularity of the world and language. Aside from the challenging grammar and questions of self and space, cultural differences subtly yet significantly alter the meanings of the two names in the text: Willie and Rose. In particular, the French translation must negotiate this linguistic and cultural disparity between how roses are understood in the French and British literary historical contexts, while also negotiating the feminist and queer poetics that underlie Stein’s work. As well as the connecting thread of names, places and spaces in each chapter, I will consider the various translations alongside a range of sub-sections of translation studies: the translation of musicals, of images, of children’s poetry, written folklore, foreignising the domestic, and feminist and queer translation.

The unique position of these texts in the literary polysystem can be seen by contrasting

\textsuperscript{85} Bonnerot, ‘Traduire Walter de la Mare’, \textit{Études anglaises}, 43.2 (1990), 186-93 (pp. 187-88).
them with other texts in their period. Unlike much canonical children’s literature, these modernist works have not been adapted in their source language (with the exception of *Practical Cats*) and are not likely to be. While works by writers such as Enid Blyton and Hugh Lofting from around this period have been adapted in English to lessen what is now seen as potential racism and sexism, no such cultural adaptation has happened for these texts in English, despite some racial stereotyping in Eliot’s *Practical Cats*. Part of what these translations will show, then, is any changes or constants in (French) attitudes to childhood spaces and the relation of place to childhood identity over the past 80 years, as well as complicating relations to place, space and identity through the cultural transfer of translation. Comparing translations with other translations will be particularly effective for seeing such changes in time, as they keep place as a constant. Marisa López and Isabella Zeli both assert that there is a trend in translations into Spanish and Italian respectively to foreignise, and they contrast this with the many changes that French translators make in translating children’s literature. French translators of children’s literature are evidently more willing than translators of other countries to adapt the children’s literature that they translate, and the changes that translators make can reveal changing attitudes towards these texts. Thus, this study is also about the reception of modernism in France.

Indeed, even before an approach to translation has been decided on, we must note that the very decision to translate these modernist texts is a value judgement upon them, and expresses the belief that they will find a French audience. France translates significantly more children’s literature per year than the United Kingdom or United States of America: around 40% of children’s literature published in France each year is translated from another
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language, while only 1% of children’s literature published in English is translated.\(^{87}\) From this much higher percentage of translated children’s literature published in France, we can assume that there is a French audience for translated texts, and that French publishers are not as deterred by the idea of translating literature as the British are. As such, the decision to translate or not to translate a children’s text can be seen as a judgement on the marketability or accessibility of the text itself, more than as a consequence of publishing limitations. In other words, the French publishers of the translations of these modernist children’s texts evidently believed that these texts would find popularity with a French audience.

At the same time, one can only speculate on why any given text was translated into French, and there is certainly no one reason for why a text would be translated and another not. In the first place, we can see that Eliot, Joyce and Woolf are three of the key figures of literary modernism, and many of their works for adults have been translated. Following from their literary fame, it stands to reason that their works for children are also deemed worthy of translation. Their high status in the literary polysystem can be seen in contrast to writers who are primarily considered “children’s authors” from this period. For example, while A. A. Milne’s most famous works – *The House at Pooh Corner* and *When We Were Very Young* – have been translated into French, his works of the 1930s – his plays, novels and non-fiction –

\(^{87}\) While figures vary from year to year, studies on average show that of the literature published in Britain each year, 4-5% of it is translated from other languages. Of this, around 1% of published children’s literature is translated work. Hallford and Zaghini provide the 1% estimate for translated children’s literature. Hallford and Zaghini, p. 5. They claim that around 3% of English literary publications on the whole are translated texts, but this (commonly accepted) estimate is corrected by Jasmine Donahaye, who is the only person to provide actual data to support her statistics. Jasmine Donahaye, ‘Three Percent? Publishing Data and Statistics on Translated Literature in the United Kingdom and Ireland’, *Making Literature Travel* (2012), 1-50 (p. 28). In France, translation figures for literature have been cited as 6% (2001), 25% (2005) and 15% (2013). Myriam Salama-Carr: ‘More recent estimates suggest that translations represent just over 6 per cent of the 36,000 titles published in France every year.’ Myriam Salama-Carr, ‘French Tradition’, in *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. by Mona Baker (London: Routledge, 2001), pp. 409-18 (p. 414); Hallford and Zaghini, p. 5; Joanna Zgadzaj and Nancy Roberts, ‘Books in Translation: It’s Time for Others to Join the Fight’, *Publishing Perspectives*, 15 Feb 2013, n.p.. While other parts of Europe are considerably higher, particularly the Scandinavian countries, which average around 40% translated texts published per year, these figures for France are clearly higher than those for Britain. For children’s literature in particular, the Director of Foreign Rights and Licenses for Éditions Gallimard Jeunesse, Anne Bouteloup, claims that as much as 40% of children’s books published in France are translated texts in a year. Anne Bouteloup, cited in Diane Roback, ‘The French Connection: Children’s Books in Translation’, *Publishers Weekly*, 20 Nov 2008, n.p..
have not made it across the Channel. As such, none of Milne’s output for adults and none of his more minor works for children have a place in his French reception. Despite his internationally high status as a children’s writer, it appears Milne does not have the cultural capital to merit a translation of the breadth of his corpus. Similarly, despite Blyton’s immensely prolific output (over 750 books), including tales from the Odyssey, Robin Hood and nineteen series of books, all of the French translations of her works come from The Famous Five, The Secret Seven, the Noddy books or Brer Rabbit. Again, her fame as a children’s writer proves insufficient to merit the translation of her less famous works. It is evident that this stands in contrast to the modernist authors studied here, whose children’s books are in some cases manuscript marginalia (Woolf) or personal letters (Joyce) that have been reprinted as picturebooks and from there have been translated into numerous languages. Indeed, Joyce’s *Cat* has been translated into at least thirteen languages and Eliot’s *Practical Cats* into at least eight, no doubt bolstered by the fame of the musical *Cats*. Woolf’s story has also been translated into Spanish and Italian, and Stein’s book has also found a wide international audience, having been translated into Spanish, Italian and Japanese.

A second potential factor in the decision to translate these texts into French could be the connection some of these texts have to France, in particular the Joyce text set in France and the Stein text dedicated to a French girl. A text is presumably more likely to be translated when it has a clear connection to the target country, as can be seen in publishers’ decisions to translate the works of a lesser-known English writer, Eleanor Doorly, who was a contemporary of these modernist authors. In the 1930s and 40s, she wrote *The Insect Man* (1936) on Jean Henri Fabre, *The Microbe Man* (1938) on Louis Pasteur, *The Radium Woman* (1939) on Marie Curie and *The Story of France* (1944), of which the stories of Pasteur and Curie have been translated into French. A third potential factor is the purely pragmatic publication history of the texts in English. All of my primary texts have existed as
picturebooks since the 1960s, giving plenty of time for French publishers to encounter and consider them. In contrast, Woolf’s *The Widow and the Parrot*, Joyce’s *The Cats of Copenhagen* and Stein’s *To Do* were published as picturebooks in 1988, 2011 and 2012 respectively, and have not been translated into French. H. D.’s *The Hedgehog* was also first published as a picturebook in 1988, and deals centrally with the French language in its narrative (it is set in Switzerland), and so it might be surprising that this text has not been translated into French. It may be that H. D. is not considered as central a figure to British literary history as the other authors discussed here, or it may be that these modernist children’s texts that achieved wider reception in English in 1988 and later have not yet reached the attention of French publishers.  

Walter de la Mare’s situation is different from these modernist authors, as he is primarily considered as a children’s writer, not as part of the literary avant-garde. *The Lord Fish* has only been translated into French, and no other languages. The story was originally published as part of a collection, but was illustrated and published separately in 1997 for Walkers Books ‘Treasures’ series; the French translation is for the correlative edition in France, ‘Trésors’ by Gründ publishers. This means that most of my primary texts are available in Spanish and Italian, but all of them are available in French translation. I am particularly interested in these French translations, over those of other languages, because of the relations some of these authors had with France, because of the implicit engagement with Rousseau’s oppressive ideology of rural boyhood in these texts, and because of the wider variety of approaches that French translators take to children’s literature than Spanish and Italian translators. This was noted above by López and Zeli, and fits precisely with these
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88 Woolf’s *The Widow and the Parrot* has, however, made it into Spanish and Italian translation, suggesting that the publishers of these countries are quicker to take up texts than their French counterparts.

89 Eleanor Farjeon’s *Elsie Piddock Skips in Her Sleep* (1937) is another fascinating children’s text from the 1930s to be published by this series in both English and French. Although it is less experimental in style and form than the texts that I am focusing on, its feminist and class-based interests make it stand out as a politically engaged children’s story from its period.
texts. I have surveyed the Spanish and Italian translations of the Joyce, Eliot, Stein and Woolf texts, and saw that they all domesticated names, but foreignised places: they uniformly distanced themselves spatially from the narratives taking place. Further, there is never more than one translation of each text in each language, apart from in French, which welcomes multiple translations of the same source text, allowing for a variety of translation approaches to the same material. To summarise, looking at the French translations of these texts opens up the largest potential corpus of texts to analyse, involves seeing multiple responses to the translation challenges that these texts hold, and includes the most complex instances of (back)translating French into French. As we will see, these modernist children’s texts, in English and French, challenge the binary distinction between domestication and foreignisation, and so can open up a more nuanced lexis for thinking about translated children’s literature.

Conclusion

Translators of children’s literature often approach their texts in a manner similar to modernist authors approaching texts in other languages, although perhaps for very different reasons. Just as modernist translation pays more attention to the inventiveness of the target text and less to the replicating of details in the source text, often children’s literature experiences the same treatment, due to its low status in the literary polysystem. Where the children’s literature system is inextricably tied to both nation and education, domestication and cultural context adaptation are common. In this descriptive translation study, the issues of names, places, images and wordplay will be explored in relation to the overall construction of childhood that these texts present.

While domestication is common in the translation of children’s literature, and
especially so in French translations of children’s literature, these modernist texts are an exception. These modernist children’s books, because they are by canonical authors, are more often (though not always) foreignised, in line with the translations of their works for adults, because of the authority these modernist writers hold. These modernists themselves took many liberties with their source texts, and so there is a particular irony in the reverence with which their texts are treated. While Eliot has no issues with domesticating Dante, the 2011 translation of *Practical Cats* is at pains to set the poems in London (see Chapter 3).

There remains a tendency to create a binary distinction and hierarchise “domestication” and “foreignisation” in translation studies: the majority of critics argue for the importance of foreignisation, in order to avoid assimilating other cultures into our own and presenting culture as monolithic. This valuation also stands against the common idea among publishers and translators of children’s literature that consumers of children’s books will not want something markedly foreign and will prefer a text in which the foreign is excised or played down. However, we have also seen that the situation is not so straightforward for children’s literature and that there is no objective standard by which to decide what translation decisions are any better or worse for their own conjunction of text and context. Indeed, as we will see, the translations I will discuss here challenge the binary distinction of domestication and foreignisation, by taking a range of approaches to a single text, both domesticating and foreignising different aspects of it, and in some texts by sitting on ambiguous national and linguistic lines, in which French is translated into French.

Just as these modernist texts serve as a rejection of Rousseau’s ideology, these translations, too, have the potential to affirm or to trouble what may be seen as a “natural” relation to spaces. Translations can, contrary to Rousseau’s ideals, connect children to other places and cultures, in presenting an unfamiliar world and world view to its target audience. Where these modernist texts bring to the fore questions of identity as located in the world and
interrogate the place of childhood, these translations are forced to make decisions about identities and places, and so further complicate the picture of childhood spaces put forth. Translating children’s literature creates a fissure between place and self, but in translating these space-related texts, the issue of where to place the child becomes central. Translation puts childhood spaces and languages into tension.
Virginia Woolf and Walter de la Mare both resist the Romantic and persistent coupling of “innocent” child and idealised nature from within natural settings. Woolf and de la Mare’s stories serve as antidotes to the naïve Rousseauvian concept of the child profiting from play in the countryside, by showing nature’s eeriness and danger, and by denaturalising nature through intrusions of the surreal. Moreover, while Woolf’s story coincides with Freud’s account of day-dreaming, childhood and creative writing, de la Mare’s story draws on a Freudian symbology of obsessive dreaming and uncanny encounters, to reconceive natural space through dreamspace for the twentieth-century world. In particular, where Rousseau considers gender differences by discussing the education of both Émile and Sophie, these two authors give gendered counter-narratives to Rousseau, with de la Mare showing country boyhood and Woolf presenting domestic rural girlhood. In this chapter, I will be using “nature” to describe both flora and fauna. This chapter will first outline *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* and *The Lord Fish*, arguing for de la Mare’s inclusion in modernist studies, then contextualise the theoretical linking of nature, dreamspace and childhood that these works portray, before focusing in detail on these issues in each of the texts in turn and finally considering the specific issues of translating texts that thoroughly embody their own national identity, as these two do in making the countryside metonymic of the nation, allied as Raymond Williams notes, in the dual valency of the word “country.”¹

*Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* (1924) was written for Woolf’s niece, Adrian Stephen’s daughter, when she was five years old. It was lost among the manuscripts of *Mrs Dalloway* and only rediscovered and published posthumously as a picturebook in 1966 by Wallace

Hildick. This 1966 edition is illustrated by Duncan Grant and entitled *Nurse Lugton's Golden Thimble*. In the early 1980s, a typescript draft of the story was found among the Charleston Papers in Kings College Library, Cambridge, by Michael Halls. This latter version of the story adds considerable detail and more complex punctuation, and unlike the holograph found in the *Mrs Dalloway* manuscripts, has a title given by Woolf: *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain*. This version and title is used for both the story as presented in Woolf’s collected short stories (1985) and the 1991 picturebook illustrated by Julie Vivas. The Lugton of the title most likely refers to a real nursemaid working in the Bell or Stephen’s household. In the story, the nursemaid is sewing animal designs onto a curtain and, as she falls asleep, the animals come to life. They play on the geography of Nurse Lugton, who is their world, and when she stirs, they are fixed back into place. As I will contend, this story can be read not only as Nurse Lugton’s creative dream, but as the vivid day-dream of a silently observing child.

Woolf’s works for children (*Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* and *The Widow and the Parrot*) have received very little critical attention. Only Reynolds, Hodgkins and Okumura briefly address Woolf’s children’s story and all three consider the sewing and dreaming in the story as an analogy of domestic female creativity: Okumura takes for granted that Nurse Lugton’s ‘textile is equated to the author’s text, allowing us to consider her as another self-portrait of Woolf.’\(^2\) Hodgkins is highly critical of this supposed narcissism: she laments Woolf’s failure to engage with children and concludes that *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* reveals that ‘the modernist author—like Nurse Lugton, most productive in solitude—is amply fulfilled without actual children.’\(^3\) In a review of the 1991 Julie Vivas picturebook in *The New York Times*, Wendy Lesser reads the book to a five year old boy, who responds ‘It has nice pictures, I like the words, and it’s a good story.’\(^4\) Despite this, Lesser finds ‘irritation at Woolf’s prissiness’, suggesting that perhaps ‘the less you know about the author, the more
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\(^2\) Okumura, p. 175.
\(^3\) Hodgkins, pp. 361-62.
\(^4\) Lesser, n.p.
you'll like this particular book. Kristin Czarnecki is the only critic to see something that engages children in the story: she uses the work of Elizabeth Goodenough on intense silent children in Woolf’s novels to rethink the story as not Lugton’s dream, but the visions of an imaginative child, a reading on which I will expand below.

Walter de la Mare was a highly popular writer for children and adults, earning the praise of no less than Woolf and T. S. Eliot themselves in reviews. Anne Bentinck argues that de la Mare’s treatment of nature separates him from his contemporary Georgian poets, but she does not see him engaging in the radical re-evaluation of poetry that was taking place in modernist poetry. While mainly seen as a middlebrow writer, de la Mare’s short stories are unique among his works for their modernist challenge to modes of interpretation, experimentation in limited narrative perspective and use of aporia. Perhaps because he is seen primarily as a writer for children, de la Mare is rarely recognised for the complexity and allusiveness of his writing, and the subtle presence of contemporary psychoanalytic thought in his prose. In particular, in The Lord Fish (1930), he blurs natural space and dreamspace in a way remarkably similar to Nurse Lugton’s Curtain. The Lord Fish was published as the title story of a collection of short stories for children in 1933. It has since been reprinted as a separate book in 1997, illustrated by Patrick Benson. It is a somewhat surreal story of intense dreams and fairy-tale happenings. John, the hero of The Lord Fish, dreams of fish and sirens, only to meet a mermaid, and to himself turn into a tench, in order to infiltrate the castle of the humanoid cod Lord Fish. De la Mare’s wrought prose is filled with technical vocabulary for breeds of fish and birds, and species of flora and fauna, describing the minutiae of British country life, but encasing a dreamlike surreal world of magic inside this rural realism.

Nothing has been written about de la Mare’s The Lord Fish and very little on his
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5 Ibid.
7 Bentinck, p. 267.
children’s short stories altogether. Critics primarily focus on his adult poetry, although some write on his prose for adults too. What is useful is the attention that de la Mare’s critics have paid to nature, dream and representations of the child in his works for adults. Hugh Pyper writes on the uncanniness of de la Mare’s child characters and figures. He notes that for de la Mare it is not an inherent creativity in children that separates them from adults, but ‘the peculiarly childlike gift of responding to language as experience rather than as a means of interpreting experience’, and an ‘openness’ to a wider sense of “reality”, since, he suggests, the ‘bounds between the real and fantastic are not yet certain’ for children.\(^8\) John Bayley, looking at childish adults in de la Mare’s stories, affirms the disturbing otherness of children in de la Mare: ‘there is nothing serene or innocent in the child’s world of vision […] It is a pre-moral world, rather than a morally ambiguous one.’\(^9\) Doris McCrosson surveys de la Mare’s works for adults, but begins with a chapter on dreams, noting their connection to a childlike imagination, as will be discussed below. Bentinck also looks at dreams in de la Mare and, like McCrosson, points to de la Mare’s interest in Jung. Bentinck focuses on Romantic influences on de la Mare and as such considers his deployment of the “Romantic child” and of nature, both as idealised and spiritual forces that serve as fodder for the poet’s musings.\(^10\) However, for both childhood and nature, Bentinck observes the greater complexity and variety of attitudes that de la Mare’s works take to these subjects, undoing their idealisation and pushing towards non-adultist and non-anthropocentric perspectives.\(^11\)

Through history, the anthropocentrism that de la Mare and Woolf write against has persisted under different rationales: as discussed in the Introduction, this hierarchy begins with Aristotle, who unequivocally asserts man’s authority over women, slaves, children, animals and nature. Through the medieval period, Christianity saw man as superior to nature

\(^8\) Pyper, p. 77.
\(^9\) Bayley, p. 341.
\(^10\) Bentinck, pp. 241, 244, 250.
\(^11\) Bentinck, pp. 256, 267, 278.
and animals for possessing a soul; from the Enlightenment, the lack of rationality in animals was seen as license to acts of any kind of cruelty against animals.\textsuperscript{12} Darwin brought the first significant paradigm shift to the understanding of human-animal relations, in revealing the contiguity of human and animal lives, and shattering religious creation mythology and its concomitant positioning of man at the top of earth’s hierarchy. Regardless, Darwin’s theory places humans at the pinnacle of evolution, as the most advanced species, and so, while developed from animals, still in many ways distinct from them.

As discussed in the introduction, Rousseau considers the countryside to be the ideal location for a boy to grow up, to learn to be a ‘natural’ man by observation of the world around him, without being tainted by the corruption of urban life and society. Following Rousseau, the Romantics equally idealise the child revelling in nature. However, for the Romantics it is not about the children as real beings to be educated: they often used children as symbols of rebirth and proximity to the divine; as, essentially, objects of the poet’s musings. The Romantics also followed Rousseau in his implicit assumption of man’s dominion over nature, of the countryside as a tool for self-reflection and inspiration, in subjecting nature to their authorial eye. For example, in William Wordsworth’s \textit{The Prelude}, both the poetic eye and the egotistical ‘I’ imbue meaning into a passively observed nature: ‘To every natural form, rock, fruit or flower, [/] Even the loose stones that cover the highway, [/] I gave a moral life: I saw them feel [/] Or linked them to some feeling.’\textsuperscript{13}

Woolf explicitly mocks this Romantic imprinting of the ego on the canvas of nature in \textit{Orlando} (1928), which charts its hero/ine’s life from the reign of Elizabeth I up to 1928 and shows his/her shifts in attitudes along with the dominant ideologies of the times. In particular, Woolf parodies the Romantic sublime shortly after Orlando’s transformation into a woman, as she lives with Gypsies in Constantinople: ‘her soul expanded with her eyeballs, and she

prayed that she might share the majesty of the hills, know the serenity of the plains, etc., etc., as all such believers do. [...] raising her eyes again, she beheld the eagle soaring, and imagined its raptures and made them her own.'

The comically crass ‘eyeballs’, the dismissive ‘etc.’, and the desire to make nature ‘her own’ all indicate that we should not take seriously such egotistical and possessive ‘raptures’.

*To the Lighthouse* also undermines poetic musings, but to much less comic effect, as the ‘Time Passes’ section of the novel gives a stream of musings upon moral rightness and truth affirmed by beauty, interrupted by concrete sentences in square brackets, stating facts and primarily stating death: ‘it was impossible to resist the strange intimation which every gull, flower, tree, man and woman, and the white earth itself seemed to declare (but if questioned at once to withdraw) that good triumphs, happiness prevails, order rules’, is followed shortly by ‘[Prue Ramsay died that summer in some illness connected with childbirth, which was indeed a tragedy, people said. They said nobody deserved happiness more.]’

While in this example it is not specifically World War I that causes the parenthetical death, Woolf points in this section to the absurdity of impressionistic visions of nature and natural beauty in the light of the horrors of early twentieth-century life.

Woolf’s later works, especially *The Waves* (1931) and *Between the Acts* (1941) carefully juxtapose the cultural with a natural world devoid of humans, to suggest the indifference of nature to human activity, to push beyond a world view centred on human activity and to position humans as simply a part of nature. The account of nature in these later works has much in common with Woolf’s earlier children’s literature, and also with postmodern reassessments of nature and the natural. Postmodern rethinks of identity politics have unravelled many of the preconceptions still surrounding the human-nature binary. Kate Soper explores the social constructedness of nature, both unsettling the nature-
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culture binary and at the same time asserting that this does not subsume the natural into the cultural. She asserts the value of distinguishing between “nature” and “culture” in terms of usage: it remains useful to consider a park in a city as an instance of nature, within its context, even if it is delimited and controlled by the urban culture around it. I will discuss nature in the city in more detail below. Similarly, Cloke and Jones point to the constructedness of the categories “urban” and “rural”, and suggest that children’s use of space can create cross-currents between the two: ‘we do not regard urban and rural as naturalized spatial boundaries, and we later argue that disorder often transcends such categories, which themselves serve to striate notions of spatiality’ (p. 318). Félix Guattari puts forth a non-anthropocentric ecology, rejecting distinctions between nature and culture: ‘Moins que jamais la nature ne peut être séparée de la culture et il nous faut apprendre à penser « transversalement » les interactions entre écosystèmes, mécanosphère et Univers de référence sociaux et individuels.’ [More than ever, nature cannot be separated from culture and we must learn to think “crosswise” about the interactions between ecosystems, the mecanosphere and the Universe of social and individual reference.] ‘Méchanosphère’ is a term from Guattari’s earlier works with Gilles Deleuze, and his monograph on ‘écosophie’, *Les Trois Écologies*, is a continuation and expansion on ideas found in their collaborative works. For example, in *L’anti-œdipe*, they write against anthropocentrism: ‘il n’y a pas davantage de distinction homme-nature […] Non pas l’homme en tant que roi de la création, mais plutôt celui qui est touché par la vie profonde de toutes les formes ou de tous les genres.’ [There is no longer the distinction man-nature … Not man as the king of creation, but rather he who is touched by the profound life of all forms or of all kinds.] These postmodern re-theorisations of the relations of humans to nature – social constructions of
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17 Soper, p. 20.
“nature” and the drive to undo anthropocentrism – both have their roots in the modernist challenge to Romantic ideologies of nature, as Woolf and de la Mare’s works will show.

As well as exploring nature in her work, Woolf more specifically writes of children engaging with nature too. She presents children’s rapturous encounters with nature, as described in the Introduction of Woolf’s and George Oliver’s moments of being when looking at a flower. Her most complex exploration of the relation of children to nature comes in Flush (1933), her biography of a dog. Aside from its canine perspective pushing against anthropocentrism, the birth of Elizabeth Barrett Browning’s baby gives rise to a number of comparisons between children and animals. At first, the baby is seen by Flush to be an animal much like himself, ‘bleating’ and ‘mew[ing]’ like a lamb or kitten: ‘There was a faint bleating in the shadowed room—something waved on the pillow. It was a live animal. Independently of them all, without the street door being opened, out of herself in the room, alone, Mrs Browning had become two people. The horrid thing waved and mewed by her side.’

The narration of the text is often a free indirect discourse of Flush’s thoughts, as when Flush soon after the birth comes to identify with the baby: ‘Did they not share something in common—did not the baby somehow resemble Flush in many ways? Did they not hold the same views, the same tastes? For instance, in the matter of scenery.’ However, the baby and dog are ultimately differentiated by language acquisition; when they first meet, Flush and Elizabeth hold an unspeakable intimacy, one that would be trivialised by conventional discussion, but that nevertheless points to their irreducible otherness: ‘Between them lay the widest gulf that can separate one being from another. She spoke. He was dumb.’ In contrast, ‘the baby day by day picked up a new word and thus removed sensation a little further beyond reach.’ As we will see below, Woolf’s sense that language ‘remove[s] sensation’ has its corollary in the

21 Woolf, Flush, p. 84.
22 Woolf, Flush, pp. 18-19.
23 Woolf, Flush, p. 88.
intensity of silent engagement, which, although epitomised by Flush’s mute experiences, she particularly identifies with child characters throughout her corpus.

De la Mare’s work is almost entirely set in the British countryside and his most common settings are country houses, forests and bodies of water. Where Woolf engages a little in writing for animal rights (for example, against the use of bird feathers in women’s fashion), de la Mare argues frequently against both the abuse of animals and the destruction of flora, in essays and in such poems as ‘Tit for Tat’ and ‘Hi’. His work is replete with similes linking humans and animals, bringing out all sides of nature as he does so, including its violence, pride and beauty. He shows a curiosity in children towards the natural world that goes beyond any empathy for animal life, and evoking a tendency to violence in them: in the poem ‘Dry August Burned’, a child begins by weeping over seeing a dead hare, but she quickly overcomes any grief and asks ‘Please, may I go to see it skinned?’ His children’s stories also show intense interpersonal relations between humans and animals, although not always positively, as with the woman who believes that her cat is the devil and paranoidly seeks to catch him unawares in ‘Broomsticks’ (1925). The only metamorphosis between human and animal, and the only talking animals in de la Mare’s œuvre, are found in The Lord Fish. The surreality of this story is, however, not uncommon in de la Mare’s work, as Doris McCrosson notes of his short stories for adults: ‘the settings have a two-fold function: they provide a realistic background on which the sometimes bizarre action is projected, and they serve to increase the significance of the action by assuming a symbolic role’. This symbolism and this bizarreness are key components of de la Mare’s rethinking of nature through psychoanalysis and, in particular, through contemporary dream theory.

Both Woolf and de la Mare explicitly professed a disinterest in the work of Freud, and
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24 See for example, Walter de la Mare, ‘The Three Sleeping Boys of Warwickshire’ (1925), in Short Stories for Children (London: Giles de la Mare, 2006), pp. 118-35 (p. 118), and below on children as dreamers.
yet the children’s fiction of both authors blend natural and supernatural elements into symbolically charged dreams. De la Mare wrote extensively on dreams, including editing an anthology of non-fiction writing on dreams, entitled *Behold, This Dreamer!* (1939). In the introduction to this work, he explains his decision not to include Freud in the collection, presenting an informed rejection of Freudianism, favouring instead the theories of Jung.27 Woolf claims in letters to have not studied Freud, but as Leonard Woolf reviewed *The Interpretation of Dreams* and wrote two books on psychology, the Hogarth press published the collected works of Freud and Woolf reviewed a number of contemporary Freudian novels, many critics see Woolf as having more than a passing knowledge of Freud’s theories.28

The radical shift that Freud brought to our understanding of dreams was to connect them to the inner life: unconscious desires, fears and other emotions are translated into a visual and verbal form that only hints at its deeper roots symbolically and obliquely. As such, dreams required interpretation, in order to gain a greater understanding of the dreamer. The symbolic nature of dreams was not new – indeed, oneirology, the study of dreams, began with interpreting dreams as gifts from God, and those who were able to understand them were seen as prophetic in power. Aristotle challenged this conventional view in an uncharacteristic conjoining of human and animal life – “In general, since some of the other animals dream, dreams could not be sent by God, nor do they occur for that purpose’ – but his work did not find an audience open to its argument.29 By the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a popular counternarrative of oneirology was that dreams are purely related to physical processes. Kant, for example, accedes that dreams are mysterious, but suggests they may be related to

27 De la Mare, *Behold, This Dreamer!*: Of Reverie, Night, Sleep, Dream, Love-Dreams, Nightmare, Death, the Unconscious, the Imagination, Divination, the Artist, and Kindred Subjects (London: Faber, [1939] 1984), pp. 80-83. See also Bentinck, p. 63; McCrosson, p. 17.
28 See Dyrud, pp. 21-25, 40.
indigestion. D. H. Lawrence, writing in 1922 against the rise of psychoanalysis, claims that ‘Many dreams are purely insignificant’, and ‘we may have the most appalling nightmare because we eat pancakes for supper’, wholly identifying dreams with the state of the body.

De la Mare displays his knowledge of this current of dream theory in naming a highly surreal children’s story ‘The Dutch Cheese’, to frame the story with the suggestion that its events are caused by or alike to a cheese-induced nightmare (as there is no mention of cheese in the story itself); in *The Lord Fish*, too, John’s mother tells him his symbolically charged dreams are caused by eating cheese before sleeping.

Freud’s dream theories are perhaps more illuminating. In particular, Freud draws links between children’s vision, day-dreaming and creative processes, in his essay ‘Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming’ (1907): ‘every child at play behaves like a creative writer, in that he creates a world of his own, or, rather, re-arranges the things of this world in a new way which pleases him.’ Marilyn Ann Dyrud, on dreams in Woolf, sees day-dreaming as essentially the same as dreaming at night, except that the dreamer is awake. However, it is useful here to consider day-dreaming as a solitary and liminal state: it is not a pure plunge into the world of the unconscious, but a site from which the conscious and the unconscious ambiguously intermingle. Like Freud, de la Mare describes children’s perception as dream-like:

[Children] are not so closely confined and bound in by their groping senses. Facts
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30 Immanuel Kant talks of people who claim their dreams are prophetic as in fact only having stomach problems: ‘if, formerly it was found necessary at times to burn some of them [seers], it will now suffice to give them a purgative. [...] The keen Hudibras could alone have solved for us the riddle, for he thinks that visions and holy inspirations are simply caused by a disordered stomach.’ ‘Dreams of a Spirit Seer’, trans. by E. F. Goerwitz, in *The World of Dreams: An Anthology*, ed. by Ralph Woods (New York: Random House, 1947), pp. 233-36 (pp. 235-36).
32 De la Mare, ‘The Lord Fish’ (1933), in *Short Stories for Children*, pp. 197-221 (p 201). Subsequent citations will be in parentheses; ‘The Dutch Cheese’ (1908), in *Short Stories for Children*, pp. 18-24.
34 Dyrud, p. 4.
to them are the liveliest of chameleons. Between their dreams and their actuality looms no impassable abyss. There is no solitude more secluded [...] no absorption more complete, no perception more exquisite, and one might even say, more comprehensive. [...] They are contemplatives, solitaries, fakirs, who sink again and again out of the noise and fever of existence into a waking vision.35

As this passage typifies, de la Mare uses nature images to blur the human and the animal, likening rational thought to reptiles. He emphasises the solitary nature of children’s perception by stating it twice and, in talking of a ‘waking vision’, he evokes day-dreaming as this ‘between’ state that children inhabit.

For Woolf, too, this solitariness is essential, and her key condemnation of the Freudian novels of her time was that they only focused on the psychoanalysis of interpersonal relationships, giving no account of the self in solitude, including dreaming, reading and engaging intensely with the natural world:

For under the dominion of the novel we have scrutinized one part of the mind closely and left another unexplored. We have come to forget that a large and important part of life consists in our emotions toward such things as roses and nightingales, the dawn, the sunset, life, death, and fate; we forget that we spend much more time sleeping, dreaming, thinking, reading, alone; we are not entirely occupied in personal relations; all our energies are not absorbed in making our livings. The psychological novelist has been too prone to limit psychology to the psychology of personal intercourse.36

‘Soliloquy in solitude’ is a key idea of Woolf’s put forth in the same essay; while her later novels, particularly The Waves, provide the apotheosis of this intense childlike perception, soliloquy in solitude and, as discussed above, non-anthropocentric world view, her two stories for children are earlier experiments in these same artistic ideals. Predating such experimentation in her works for adults by almost a decade, Nurse Lugton’s Curtain is most profitably read as the intense silent vision of a child, whose day-dream creatively sees the blurring of human, animal and plant life, of urban and rural, and of nature and culture.

35 De la Mare, Rupert Brooke and the Intellectual Imagination: A Lecture by Walter de la Mare (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1919), pp. 7-8.
Woolf’s Silent Visionaries: Children Day-Dreaming of Unnatural Natures

*Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* has almost exclusively been read from the perspective of Nurse Lugton as an image of Woolf, in line with knitting women in her novels as figures of female creativity. In these readings, Lugton’s dream unleashes creative power, which the conscious mind pins down just as Lugton pins down the bluebottle at the end of the story.\textsuperscript{37} Hodgkins, making this reading, claims that because of this, it is a narcissistic piece that makes no effort to connect with children: ‘For the adult reader, attuned to pure text, Nurse Lugton is an entertaining alter-ego for Woolf and an image of the creative female unconscious, making life it knows not how.’\textsuperscript{38} I contend, however, that a silent spectator child is the central character of the story, and essential to Woolf’s poetics: the story not only engages the child reader, but also points to the creative power of the child’s day-dreaming vision. The text both emphasises spectacle and insists that Nurse Lugton does not share in this spectacle: ‘Really, it was a beautiful sight [...] But Nurse Lugton slept; Nurse Lugton saw nothing at all’ (pp. 14, 16). As such, it is equally possible that a child is watching Nurse Lugton sleep and imagining the events of the story.

Where significant work has been done by Elizabeth Goodenough on children in Woolf’s novels, this can be fruitfully connected with *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* to broaden its possibilities and see this story as both complex and engaging for children. Goodenough delineates the child as silent visionary in Woolf’s works and points to the universal importance of children in Woolf’s *œuvre*: childhood and adolescent experiences forge formative roots in characters we see grow up, in such novels as *Jacob’s Room, To the


\textsuperscript{38} Hodgkins, p. 361.
*Lighthouse, Orlando, The Waves* and *The Years.* To the *Lighthouse* begins, Goodenough notes, with the response to James Ramsay’s question. A child’s persistence both sets in motion the story we read and itself remains unrecorded: the child is the ignition for creativity (the content of the novel) and yet is inaudible. On James Ramsay at the beginning of *To the Lighthouse,* Goodenough tells us: ‘the absolute authority and receptivity of the child’s mind, transforming impressions in a unique configuration, symbolizes Woolf’s highest ideal: the power and freedom of the unfettered imagination to create its own reality.’ This creative power is not in spite of the silence of children in Woolf’s novels, it is for Goodenough because they are not given words that Woolf does not cheapen their experiences with dull and worn expressions: ‘That children’s language goes largely unrecorded in Woolf does not indicate that she thought them voiceless creatures, seen but not heard by their elders [...] she gives their silence a vital narrative and thematic role, seeing early epiphanies as the elusive core of life and entrapment in adult roles as tantamount to the dulling of perception.’ Their silence is a freedom from adult conformity and authority. While Goodenough does not discuss *Flush,* as we have seen it strongly reinforces this assertion.

The intensity of childhood experience is not only recorded in Woolf’s novels, but also in such essays as ‘Mr. Hudson’s Childhood’ and in her autobiographical writing, ‘A Sketch of the Past.’ Goodenough distinguishes between the visionary experiences of Woolf’s children and Joyce’s epiphanies, talking of *Jacob’s Room:* ‘Moments of vision in this novel are unlike Joyce’s epiphanies: they are not instants of revelation which define stages of development and explain actions. Rather, they are seconds of intense visualization or pure sensation whose meaning is unclear and indefinable.’ With this intensity and the uncertainty of their

---

40 Goodenough, ‘We Haven’t the Words’, pp. 185-86.
42 See Goodenough, ‘We Haven’t the Words’, pp. 186-88.
43 Goodenough, ‘We Haven’t the Words’, p. 194.
meaning, these childhood moments have much in common with dreams.\textsuperscript{44} In Woolf’s later novels – *The Waves*, *The Years* and *Between the Acts*, Woolf presents numerous children engaging in what she calls “soliloquy in solitude”, but we do not see them communicating with others.\textsuperscript{45} This is because their vision is something that cannot be shared with ordinary communication, but can be shared with the reader through a direct engagement with their unique and intense interiority, presented to us through Woolf’s radical experimentation with style and frequent adoption of free indirect discourse.

*Nurse Lugton’s Curtain* predates these works, and foresees them in its use of a child’s interiority to focalise a solitary vision. This reading of the silent child does not undo the interpretation of Nurse Lugton as a figure of creativity, even as potentially an alter-ego for Woolf. In *The Waves*, Bernard sees a woman writing through a window: ‘Look over the wall. That is Elvedon. The lady sits between the two long windows, writing.’\textsuperscript{46} This writing woman may equally figure Woolf, delimited by the frames of the windows, but we are not given a view into her thoughts; she is not a character in the story, and what matters in this scene is not so much the many things that Bernard sees (including gardeners, ferns, a wood-pigeon), but that it is Bernard seeing them. The uniqueness of his perspective is emphasised by Susan’s matter-of-fact and sombre response to the same scene: “‘I see the lady writing. I see the gardener sweeping,’” said Susan. “‘If we died here, nobody would bury us.’”\textsuperscript{47} Woolf does also present a female stitcher-writer in *Flush*, in the figure of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, but here too, the narrative does not enter into her thoughts – it is the child-like, unspeaking Flush

\textsuperscript{44} The mysterious and intense vision of children, who cannot entirely understand what they see, also forges a link between Woolf and Proust’s young Marcel in *À la recherche du temps perdu* (1913-27). Woolf expressed admiration at Proust in her diary: ‘The thing about Proust is his combination of the utmost sensibility with the utmost tenacity. […] He will I suppose both influence me & make me out of temper with every sentence of my own.’ Woolf, *The Diary of Virginia Woolf, Volume III: 1925-1930*, ed. by Anne Bell (London: Hogarth, 1980), p. 7 (8 April 1925).

\textsuperscript{45} In *The Years*, it is more that they fail to communicate their experiences, such as the ten year old Rose unable to talk about the man who exposed himself to her on the street, and only expresses broken and unfinished sentences.


\textsuperscript{47} Ibid.
whose consciousness we follow as readers. Okumura contends from her reading of knitting in Woolf’s novels that detached women knitters ‘are more representative of her work as a writer than are her writing women themselves’, because they engage other characters and, through their aloofness, invite interpretation from those around them. If this is so, it is equally apparent that the knitting woman rarely if ever represents Woolf herself: in ‘A Sketch of the Past’ and To the Lighthouse, the knitter is her mother or a mother figure; Mrs Ramsay is both admired for her ability to bring people and things together, and exposed as being too limited in her domestic and conventional world view, leaving her far from representing Woolf’s ideal woman writer. In these instances, the knitting woman represents an outmoded world order, in which women were “peaceweavers” and sought to bring about social and domestic harmony, an order which even before the First World War, the girls in To the Lighthouse can see does not fit their generation.

Moreover, the entire story can be seen as intertextually linked to an episode in Carroll’s Through the Looking-Glass: Alice meets the White Queen, an elderly lady who transforms into a knitting sheep, as their location suddenly shifts from a wood to a shop and, from there, to a rowing boat in a river. As this happens, Alice’s intense observation is emphasised, with mention of her ‘bright eager eyes’, and the metamorphosing landscape – shifting between interior and natural spaces – is shown to be a dream of nature: Alice picks rushes that are in fact ‘dream-rushes’, and so ‘melted away almost like snow, as they lay in heaps at her feet.’ As the world shifts before Alice’s gaze, the Sheep emphatically looks at nothing but her knitting, a point that Carroll repeats as a refrain through these events: she talks ‘without looking up from her knitting’, ‘went on with her knitting all the while, just as if nothing had

48 Woolf, Flush, p. 82.
49 Okumura, p. 179.
50 Woolf, To the Lighthouse (London: Penguin, [1927] 1992), pp. 10, 190. This old-fashioned thinking is in stark contrast to the radical experimentation and effrontery of Woolf’s female artists such as Lily Briscoe and Miss La Trobe.
happened’, and ‘only laughed scornfully and went on with her knitting.’\(^{52}\) As Adela Pinch accurately diagnoses, this Sheep is the epitome of the literary figure of ‘the Victorian old lady’: she knits with fourteen pairs of needles at once, ‘as if she were doing the knitting of all the knitting Victorian old ladies rolled into one.’\(^{53}\) As with Woolf watching her mother and James watching Mrs Ramsay, the silently watching child is the central creative figure, and the text is focalised through this child, watching the Victorian matriarchal knitter.

The manuscript context of the first discovered version of Nurse Lugton in Mrs Dalloway lends weight to seeing the story as the imagination of an onlooking child: it ‘interrupts the scene in which Septimus watches Rezia sewing a hat for Mrs Filmer’s daughter.’\(^{54}\) This scene in Mrs Dalloway is entirely external from the sewing figure, and the reader’s perspective is located in the visionary eyes of Septimus, in perfect parallel with the visionary child watching Nurse Lugton sew. There was also most likely a real life referent to Nurse Lugton, as Woolf alludes to Nurse Lugton’s sayings in her diary: there was thus perhaps a maid that Woolf herself watched as a child, or that her niece, Ann Stephen, for whom she wrote the story, may have sat watching in their country house, where she was given the story.\(^{55}\)

In such a way, Woolf’s story can be seen as effectively forging bonds with a child reader, indeed making a child the central character of the story and filtering everything through her perspective. This child is very much located in Woolf’s time and class, as maids and large-scale sewing projects are not so common in the modern world, but readers are youthfully capable of identifying past such details and recognising the sleeping Nurse Lugtons and the curtains in their own lives. Indeed, Nurse Lugton’s Curtain can be seen as

\(^{52}\) Ibid.


having a broadly accessible appeal to children if the curtain is seen as a kind of ‘transitional object’, as child psychologist D. W. Winnicott describes it: transitional objects belong to ‘that wide area which is intermediate between living in the external world and dreaming.’\(^{56}\) Young children often use blankets as transitional objects, insisting that the blanket come with them on journeys and that they cannot sleep without it. Winnicott contends that many children facilitate their separation from the mother-child dyad and learn gradually to engage with others through emotional investment in a transitional object, and through imaginative play:

> Play is especially important here, since it is both real and also a dream, and although play experiences allow tremendous feelings of all kinds which otherwise stay locked up in the unremembered dream, the game eventually ceases, and those who are playing pack up and eat tea together, or prepare for bath and the bed-time story. Moreover, in play (at the period we are considering) there is always a grown-up person nearby who is indirectly involved, and who is ready to assume control.\(^{57}\)

Precisely this kind of play may underlie Woolf’s story, with Nurse Lugton as the nearby grown-up whose stern gaze takes control over the imaginary play taking place, freezing the animals back in place and bringing the story/game to an end. The curtain, as transitional object, is used by the child as invested with both a tangible presence and a dream-like otherworldliness.\(^{58}\)

> With the intense, silent visionary child using the curtain as at the conjunction of dream and reality, a point of connection can be made between this interpretation of the story and the conventional interpretation of the story as Nurse Lugton’s dream, through day-dreaming. As with the Freud discussed above, this text can be seen as creating a confluence between day-dream, children’s perception and artistic processes. Just as the boundary between waking and

---


\(^{57}\) Winnicott, p. 182.

\(^{58}\) Indeed, curtains can more broadly seen as delimiting a safe interiority and an unknown outer world, and as liminal entities, thus, between imagination and reality. In *Mrs Dalloway*, a curtain with birds embroidered on it catches the wind and the birds appear to fly. There are only adult spectators, however, and the imaginative beauty of birds flying is checked by an unimaginative voice in parenthesis, and a lady at the party complaining about the cold. Woolf, *Mrs Dalloway* (London: Grafton, [1925] 1992), p. 180.
dream is blurred at the site of day-dreaming, the likening of a child’s perception to an artist’s perception creates a nexus in the adult-child binary, rupturing its hierarchy. Hodgkins asserts that ‘The high modernists saw the boundaries between children and adults as impassible, just as the road from childhood to maturity is a one-way street. We also might see their elitism as a one-way street, leading to a powerful but narrow art that raids but does not reinvest in childhood.’

Far from this, however, Nurse Lugton’s Curtain can connect with its child readers and introduce them to the play of Woolf’s prose. It can also give them a sympathetic ally in the fight against any ogre or ‘ogress’ (p. 22) who contains their creativity. Where Nurse Lugton ‘froze alive’ (p. 23) the child’s creative efforts, Woolf artfully avoids such entrapment in representing through the child, and not representing the child to herself.

Given its writing context, and taking the girl it is written for and the nurse it is written about as the characters in the sketch, it seems reasonable to infer that the setting of the story is equally the setting of Ann Stephen reading the story: a country house. And yet the child in the story is not experiencing the nature around her: she is indoors imagining a much more exotic nature and, moreover, a nature she has experienced as nature in the city.

The mention of animals at the zoo immediately brings to mind London Zoo in Regent’s Park, to which the Woolfs had strong ties. Ann Stephen lived in Bloomsbury too, in Gordon Square, and so is likely to have been familiar with London Zoo. In the story, thus, seeing images of animals indoors in the country, the child thinks of animals she had seen in the city: her experience of
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59 Hodgkins, p. 365.

60 This issue of nature in the city is also seen in Mrs Dalloway: Nora Weichert points to Woolf’s critique of the assumptions underlying urban green space as helping city-dwellers to relax and be healthy, undermined by the worsening of Septimus’ mental health as he wanders through Regent’s Park. Nora Weichert, “‘No Sense of Proportion’: Urban Green Space and Mental Health in Mrs. Dalloway’, Virginia Woolf Miscellany, 78 (2010), 21-23.


nature is of one as caged as she in her country house under the nursemaid’s watchful eyes.\textsuperscript{63} It is not that of the countryside at all, but of the spoils of Empire, naming animals she would have seen at a zoo founded by Sir Stamford Raffles, who also founded Singapore, conquered Java and actively participated in numerous acts of Empire building. The zoo, as a collecting point for and domestication of the exotic, can be seen as on a continuum with Sir Raffles’ imperial activities. Indeed, the two versions of Nurse Lugton make mute references to Empire, in one through the mention of a ‘pagoda’ and a ‘palanquin’, suggesting the interpolation of the oriental, and in the other through the inclusion of bananas – ‘the people who crossed the bridges threw bananas at them’ – which metonymically stand for the domestic fruits of Empire, as Winterson stages in Sexing the Cherry.\textsuperscript{64} In this way, Woolf breaks down any notion of the mutual innocence of the child and nature, or of the two in communion – she exposes, rather, the mutual entrapment of both.

In bringing children and animals together in this way, Woolf also suggests that the child’s perspective puts forth a non-anthropocentric world: animals and people alike seem to belong to the imagined town, Millamarchmontopolis, and Nurse Lugton is a human, an ogress, and their natural environment: ‘She had a face like the side of a mountain with great precipices and avalanches, and chasms for her eyes and hair and nose and teeth’ (p. 23). Even in this world, humans have power over animals; nevertheless, this society succeeds in finding equality between humans and animals, because humans do not exercise their authority. We are told that ‘Nobody harmed the lovely beasts’ (p. 22), suggesting that it was well within the power of people to do the animals harm, but they chose to peacefully coexist.

Nurse Lugton’s Curtain is, thus, a child’s day-dream – intensely blurring the human and

\textsuperscript{63} Colin Ward argues that there is a greater similarity in lifestyles across lines of class than in relation to place; that is to say, the rich live much the same in the country and in the city, and so do the poor. Ward, The Child in the Country (London: Robert Hale, 1988), p. 12. I will consider class in more detail in the following chapter.

natural with its creativity, and silently observed. Woolf shows that simply visiting the country
does not allow children to commune with nature in a different way; they only continue to
engage with nature in the way they already were, through the nature they have seen in the
city. The nature put forth here is not an ordinary English countryside but an enchanted world
– exotically mixing reality and fantasy. There is nothing here like innocent childhood or
innocent nature, as oppression weighs down on both (with children and animals marginalised
and contained by elders and Empire). In this way, Woolf imagines a non-anthropocentric and
non-adultist world through the eyes of a child, and complicates our sense of the English
countryside by showing it through the eyes of an urban visitor. As I will discuss in the next
chapter, the majority of British children by the 1920s were raised in the city, and so most
British children would be experiencing the countryside in relation to their prior experiences
of nature in the city. Woolf is thus particularly timely in rethinking nature’s relation to
childhood through a child’s imagination of an exotic nature, while in an interior space. This
child is not directly communing with nature as Rousseau and the Romantics would have it,
but filtering her experience of nature through her urban experiences. Even in a country house,
the zoo is this child’s base model for imagining the natural world, from which the
domestically entrapped girl day-dreams of freedom.

Woolf across the Channel and through the Looking-Glass

Frédéric Armel’s translation of Nurse Lugton’s Golden Thimble, as Le dé en or, follows the
Hildick manuscript, and so has more in common with the edition illustrated by Duncan Grant
than the more recent Julie Vivas edition. Armel uses simpler sentences than Woolf: he
changes punctuation to shorten sentences, and where Woolf strings together gerunds to create
a sense of frozen motion, Armel tends to add verbs. For example, ‘the blue curtain (for Nurse
Lugton was making a curtain for Mrs. John Jasper Gingham’s drawing-room window)
became made of grass, and roses and daisies; strewn with white and black stones; with puddles on it, and cart tracks, and little frogs hopping quickly lest the elephants should tread on them’ (p. 11) becomes ‘le rideau bleu se couvrait d’herbe, de fleurs et de petits cailloux. Les grenouilles sautaient dans l’herbe pour ne pas se faire écraser par les éléphants.’ [the blue curtain was covered in grass, flowers and little stones. Frogs were jumping in the grass so as not to be squashed by the elephants.] The semi-colon becomes a full stop, details of flowers and colours are omitted, and rather than frogs trapped in the perpetually unfinished moment of ‘hopping’, the use of the imperfect tense suggests numerous completed hops, giving a greater sense of action and motion to the scene in the target text. The exoticness of the pagoda and palanquin are built on in this French edition, through the use of the less common term ‘manchot’ (p. 7) for penguin. The illustrations, however, by the comic artist Napo, mix together the exotic animals the text describes – elephants, frogs, leopards, giraffes – with yet more exotic creatures – flamingos and even a dodo – and although it is rather out of place in this jungle, a rabbit (see Image 1 below). With these three particular inclusions – a flamingo, a rabbit and a dodo – Napo immediately evokes an Alice-like feel to the fantasy, as all three creatures play notable parts in *Alice in Wonderland*.

In Armel’s translation, Lugton is not simply likened to nature, but in a series of copula metaphors, we are told that she *is* nature: for Woolf’s ‘She had a face like the side of a mountain, with great precipices, and avalanches and chasms for eyes and hair, nose and teeth’ (p. 15), Armel gives ‘Son visage était une montagne, ses yeux des précipices, ses cheveux des avalanches et son nez une cascade’ [Her face was a mountain, her eyes precipices, her hair avalanches and her nose a waterfall] (pp. 15-16). This description also sets up a direct matching of body parts to parts of nature, generating a greater sense of a connection between Lugton’s body and nature. In this respect, Armel’s description puts into words what Vivas
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Image 1. Napo’s flamingo, dodo and rabbit.
figures in her illustrations (see Image 2).

Some domestication takes place within this translation: Woolf talks of ‘beautifully crescent-shaped rolls filled with rose leaves and honey’ (p. 12), which straightforwardly enter French culture as ‘croissants’: ‘petits croissants fourrés aux pétales de rose et au miel’ [little croissants filled with rose petals and honey] (p. 12). Armel adds some colour in changing Woolf’s ‘For she was mortally afraid of wild beasts’ (p. 11) to ‘Elle avait une peur bleue des animaux sauvages’ [She was pale (lit. blue) with fear of the savage animals] (p. 10). While not as formal (Armel could have begun the sentence with ‘Car’), the use of this French phrase evokes the ‘étoffe bleue’ [blue material] (p. 5) of the curtain, blurring the boundary between Nurse Lugton and the object of her production, and consequently strengthening the identification between Lugton and the fantasy world that the curtain evokes.

Three significant foreignisations take place in Armel’s translation, however. The first is, of course, Nurse Lugton’s name, which while absent from the title of the book, is repeated throughout the story despite its very English sounds and evocations – of lugging, lugubriousness, being a big lug and so on. The second is the name ‘Mme Gingham’ (pp. 5, 18), again a name with particular resonance in English, as Gingham is a type of fabric. In a similar way to the blueness of Nurse Lugton in Armel’s translation, Woolf’s naming of the curtain’s recipient after a kind of fabric brings together the human and the non-human.

Where these two foreignisations suggest an Englishness, the third of Armel’s foreignisation points explicitly to England as the location of the story: Nurse Lugton’s ‘Windsor chair’ (p. 16) becomes ‘son fauteuil anglais’ [her English armchair] (p. 9). A ‘fauteuil anglais’ is not a specific design of chair, simply Armel’s way of expressing that the armchair Nurse Lugton is sitting in is somehow English – indeed in the illustrations it is not a wooden Windsor chair, but an upholstered armchair (see Image 5).

66 There is a French equivalent, called ‘tissu vichy’, and so the pun could be recreated.
Image 2. Vivas’ Lugton-mountain.
In her review of the Vivas edition of *Nurse Lugton*, Wendy Lesser argues that Vivas’ illustrations are in fact a foreignisation of the story, including her image of the chair:

> The pictures themselves are very attractive, but I’m not sure they go with the book. That is, the story is extremely English—from the nursemaid herself to the Waughian name of the town to the presence of Windsor chairs and umbrellas and ‘figured blue stuff’—whereas Julie Vivas’s illustrations have a much wilder feel, of wide-open spaces and back-country existence, and she substitutes an ordinary wooden side-chair. This fits the artist’s Australian origins, and it might almost fit the imaginary (that is, definitely not of urban London) side of the fantasy.67

Lesser is mistaken about the chair, as side chairs have no arm rests, and Nurse Lugton’s chair does: they are not visible on the front cover, because the curtain is draped over them, but they are faintly visible on the back cover, and very clear on the second page (see Image 3).

However, Lesser accurately notes the more open feel to Vivas’ illustrations – as with Image 2, they are sometimes cut off by the edge of the page, suggesting a greater expansiveness, and she does not illustrate the animals caged in the zoo, unlike Napo and Grant. It may indeed be that Vivas’ illustrations foreignise the tale to a more Australian encounter with nature; Grant’s illustrations, in stark contrast, often have a claustrophobic feel, and the illustration of Nurse Lugton at the zoo shows her in sombre Victorian attire and the animal peeking in on a concrete world (see Image 4). Napo’s illustrations sit between these two extremes, by giving wide views of a fantastical nature, but neatly framing each image with a line around its edges and a pattern in each corner (see Image 5).

Napo’s framing of the illustrations sets apart the content of the story as part of a spectacle, and raises the question of who is watching – a question which, as discussed above, is central to understanding Woolf’s story. Armel’s translation makes the issue of the observer more ambiguous, by removing the occasional use of the second person address from the story: ‘you could hear the waves breaking; and see the people crossing the bridge’ (p. 7) becomes ‘Les vagues clapotaient sur le lac et les gens traversaient le pont’ [Waves were

67 Lesser, n.p.
Image 4. Grant’s concrete jungle.
breaking in the lake and people were crossing the bridge] (p. 6). In this way, the sense of an external observer of events is diminished. Similarly, ‘all the animals heard the wind roaring in the trees’ (p. 8) is changed to ‘on entendait le bruit du vent passer dans les arbres’ (p. 8), again making it less clear who is hearing. This French edition puts forward a fascinating alternative to the silent watching child, in the first illustration, in which a black cat is sitting on the illustration’s frame and watching Nurse Lugton at work (see Image 5). Where Woolf has experimented with a canine protagonist, the idea of Nurse Lugton as the imaginings of an observing cat is particularly apt, as it connects with the non-anthropocentric elements of the story. Moreover, a black kitten is the companion of Alice in the parts of Through the Looking-Glass set in the real world. Thus, by letting us see a black cat watching, there is also a suggestion of a little girl watching with it, behind the frame. If so, it is this perspective that frames the story, and this view through the girl’s eyes that the reader shares. Le dé en or, in this way, brings a greater variety of animal life to Nurse Lugton, and even opens up the possibility that the entire story is focalised from an animal perspective.

Armel’s translation foreignises a few elements, leaving the Englishness of the human characters intact. Grant’s illustrations go further – identifying Nurse Lugton as of a particular time as well as place, in her Victorian apparel, and evoking the sense of animals trapped in urban spaces, in the image of Lugton at the zoo. Vivas’ illustrations, in contrast, can be seen as moving away from this Englishness, by opening the story up to a wilder and more expansive sense of space. Likewise, Napo does not seek to create a foreign feel with his illustrations, entering instead into a colourful fantasy world where even nursemaids have elegant armchairs and, in a Wonderland way, rabbits play alongside dodos. Napo’s illustrations bring to the fore the Alice allusions of this tale, suggesting that this too is the imaginative escape of a little girl from an oppressive interior, in a day-dream of a fantastical nature. Le dé en or, thus, recreates Woolf’s story in all its Carrollian whimsy.
Image 5. Napo’s observing cat.
Becoming Fish in *The Lord Fish*: John as Rural Child, Dreamer and Kingfisher

As with *Nurse Lugton*, de la Mare presents a quiet dreamer and a narrative that mixes day-dream, dream, nature and fantasy. For de la Mare too, nature is not as Rousseau and the Romantics know it – it is silent, mysterious, transformative, and de la Mare blurs the boundaries between the human and the natural. Where Goodenough points to the intense inner lives of Woolf’s silent children, *The Lord Fish* makes clear that its hero lives between dream and reality: ‘John was by nature idle and a day-dreamer’ (p. 197). Like Woolf’s children, de la Mare draws a link between childhood and a wholehearted engagement with art: as John listens to the mermaid’s song, ‘though he did not know it, his face as he listened puckered up almost as if he were a child again and was going to cry’ (p. 204). His physical and emotional reaction to her song makes him childlike again (he is an adolescent), responding silently but wholly engaged. The inexpressibility of children’s experience is as typical for John as it is for Woolf’s children: *The Lord Fish* begins with the narrator telling us that John’s mother loved him ‘ever since he was a baby, when his chief joy was to suck his thumb and stare out of his saucer-blue eyes at nothing in particular except what he had no words to tell about’ (p. 197). The syntactical aporia of what precisely John sees as a baby matches the powerful imaginative inability to speak of it that Woolf and de la Mare both see in children. As a young man, John retains this tendency to silence, and with it, a liminal perspective on the “real” world of adults.

Indeed, the story itself is filled with an eery silence. It is an oddly underpopulated tale, with very little dialogue, and often people/creatures talk to John, but he cannot reply to them – such as choking when his mother questions him (p. 206) – or he cannot understand them, as when the fish or mermaid attempt to talk with him: meeting the mermaid, John ‘merely kept his mouth open in case any words should come […] And when the lips in the odd small face of this strange creature began to speak to him, he could hardly make head or tail of the words’
The words ‘silence’ and ‘soundlessly’ recur, and even John’s efforts to break out of this oppressive silence only enhance the uncanniness of his environment: ‘out of the silence that had again descended he heard in midday the mournful hooting as of an owl, and a cold terror swept over him’ (p. 205); “‘Aha!” cried John out loud to himself; and the sound of his voice rang so oddly in the air that he whipped round and stared about as if someone else had spoken’ (p. 202).

This uncanny nature, however, is not separated off from the real world. De la Mare does not allow nature to become a vast, generalisable other in his stories, and grounds his stories in the minutiae of the English countryside. Ian Blyth asserts that ‘The rook is a very British bird. It is perhaps the most British of all birds.’ De la Mare includes not only this quintessentially British bird in this story (p. 202), but a range of species of birds, flowers and fish: roach, tench, trout, eels, stickleback, minnow, pike, barbel, mullet, jack, perch, cuckoos, ducks, nightjars, blackbirds, peacocks, crows, wood-pigeons, woodpeckers, jackdaws, brambles, briars, bracken, bryony, roses, foxgloves and lilies. We are told that the setting of The Lord Fish is Wiltshire (p. 197), and it is clear that de la Mare’s attention to natural details brings to life this rural setting with a meticulous accuracy.

However, within this verisimilitude, de la Mare invents a village – Tussock (p. 197). In this way, fantasy is enfolded into nature. The very name ‘Tussock’ codifies this structure, as it is both an invented place, and a way of describing a grassy area, thus binding together fantasy and nature. John’s dreams follow this same logic of the fantastical springing from, and living in, the natural: ‘if a wild duck cried overhead under the stars, there would be thousands of wild ducks and wild swans too and many another water-bird haunting his mind, his head on his pillow. Sometimes great whales would come swimming into his dreams. And he would hear mermaids blowing in their hollow shells and singing as they combed their hair’ (p. 200).

---

A very simple and common natural event – the cry of a duck – creates a vision of excess and exoticism in his head, leading from plebeian ducks to regal swans, and from there to the largest of all living creatures, the whale. While ‘And’ implies a logical connection, the step from whales to mermaids is a movement from the real world into a separate realm, and yet in John’s dream, as in de la Mare’s story, the supernatural is positioned as simply another part of the natural.69 The mermaid of John’s dream world is not simply an expression of John’s repressed desire, but also a premonition of the mermaid he soon meets, sitting in a country manor.70

This mermaid, Almanara, is described not as a complete being in herself, but as two half species conjoined: ‘And, reclining there by the window, the wan green light shining in on her pale face and plaited copper-coloured hair, was what John took at first to be a mermaid; and for the very good reason that she had a human head and body, but a fish’s tail’ (p. 207).

That she took her ‘at first’ to be a mermaid suggests that despite appearances, a second consideration shows that she is something else – a person, with a fish’s tail. How this differs from a mermaid is questionable, but in making the distinction, de la Mare brings to the fore the sense of the fantastic as the binding together of the human and the non-human. Lord Fish typifies this blurring of human and animal boundaries. He is lord of a country household, but also the servant of a sorcerer (p. 213), and a human-cod hybrid: John ‘perceived the strangest shape in human kind he had every set eyes on. This bony old being had scarcely any shoulders. His grey glassy eyes bulged out of his head above his flat nose. A tuft of beard hung from his cod-like chin, and the hand that clutched his fishing-rod was little else but skin

---
69 In this respect, de la Mare’s earlier short story ‘Dutch Cheese’ (1908), is very similar: it too features a walled-in singing voice, and blurs the boundary between dream and fantastical nature through its title, as discussed above. In this story, fairies are treated as a common and familiar existence in the countryside, as if they were typical troublesome neighbours.
70 Joshua Cohen describes the mermaid as ‘an equivocal figure, suggesting both innocence and sexual potential. Above the waist, she is traditionally portrayed as a young nubile maiden, beautiful and desirable, but below, her body tapers off into a long fishtail which fuses loins and legs together and conceals her sexual organs […] She is, in essence, a symbol of female sexuality at the threshold of sexual experience.’ Cohen, ‘Mermaid-like: The Tragedy of Ophelia’, Shakespeare Newsletter, 56.2 (2006), 57-59 (p. 57).
Indeed, John himself crosses the human-animal binary by transforming into a fish. However, even before this change, his devotion to fishing leads him away from conventional humanness in a kind of Deleuzian becoming-fish, with an inhuman ability to sense the presence of water (pp. 202), and with his body shape altering towards an imitation of the object of his obsession: ‘Through continually staring at a float, his eyes became almost as round as one, and his elbows stood out like fins when he walked. The wonder was his blood had not turned to water’ (p. 198). At the end of the story, having bested Lord Fish, John is described as ‘happy as a kingfisher’ (p. 221); while bird and animal similes are common in de la Mare’s prose, this particular comparison hints at John’s movement away from humanness and towards his enemy in this tale – having outwitted Lord Fish, John is crowned a kingfisher. John begins to mirror this creature’s hybridity and monstrosity.

We see, thus, that Mare engages more than Woolf with rural English nature, but still to subvert the common representation of the countryside. John’s environment is entirely unlike the nature that Rousseau himself played with or imagines Emile playing with. It is silent, uncanny, transformative, and blurs fantasy with reality in the same manner as the day-dreaming child. Moreover, humans are not its masters, and it is not generalisable or just a backdrop to the child, as for the Romantics – the details of nature matter, the variety of species shows it not as one othered mass, but in recognisable variety.

Translating the Country: The Place of Language in Le Seigneur des poissons

Where de la Mare’s The Lord Fish places great focus on locating fantasy in the English countryside, translating the story into French troubles this contiguity of action to place. Didier Debord’s translation begins ‘Il était une fois à Tussock, petit village du comté de Wiltshire, en Angleterre’ [Once upon a time in Tussock, a small village of the county of
Wiltshire, in England], crucially adding the country to the county and de la Mare’s invented village.\textsuperscript{71} While both names plausibly sound made-up to someone unfamiliar with the English countryside, the French text lends an authoritative realism to this place through the invocation of the unquestionably real ‘Angleterre’, without making note of the fictionality of ‘Tussock’.

The French text does not allow its reader to forget its purportedly English setting by continuing this foreignisation with the inclusion and expansion of de la Mare’s own brief mentions of England: for example, Debord gives ‘Les eaux anglaises regorgent certes de toutes sortes de poissons succulents’ [English waters certainly overflow with all sorts of succulent fish] (p. 10), for ‘there are many kinds of tasty English fish’ (p. 198). The foreignness of the English countryside is emphasised through the footnoting of the uncommon vocabulary that Debord resorts to in order to replicate de la Mare’s attention to details of local natural life. There are footnotes in the text for ‘freux’ (p. 25), ‘bryones’ (p. 39), ‘épinoche’, ‘vairon’ (p. 42) and ‘un ru’ (p. 80) [rooks, bryonies, stickleback, minnow, a brook] – each in the form of an asterisk by the word and a very brief description at the bottom of the same page.\textsuperscript{72} Indeed, the French text elevates the English countryside, with Debord suggesting it has a unique and mysterious beauty. He writes: ‘Il atteignit le mur au début d’une matinée radieuse et fraîche dont seules les campagnes anglaises ont le secret’ [He reached the wall at the beginning of a radiant and fresh morning of which only the English countryside has the secret] (p. 23) – for ‘he came to the wall while it was still morning, and a morning as fresh and green as even England can show’ (p. 201). De la Mare’s ‘even’ evokes the rarity of a clear and sunny English morning, mildly reminding us that this is typically a country of rain, and a countryside of morning mists. In contrast, Debord takes the sunny

\textsuperscript{71} De la Mare, \textit{Le Seigneur des poissons}, trans. by Didier Debord, illus. by Patrick Benson (Paris: Gründ, [1933] 1999), p. 7. Subsequent citations will be made in parentheses.

\textsuperscript{72} The descriptions are: ‘Corbeaux avec bec étroit dont le plumage renvoie un éclat métallique violet.’ [Crows with narrow beaks whose plumage reflects a purple metallic shine.]; ‘Plantes grimpantes à fleurs verdâtres et à baies rouges.’ [Creepers with greenish flowers and red berries.]; ‘Petit poisson qui porte des épines sur le dos.’ [Little fish which has spines on its back.]; ‘Petit poisson d’eau douce au corps presque cylindrique.’ [Little freshwater fish with an almost cylindrical body.]; ‘Petit ruisseau.’ [Little river.]
morning on which John finds himself to be metonymic of a particular power of the English countryside to delight.

Debord also foreignises by adding explanation for John Cobbler’s unchanged name, where de la Mare talks about Jack’s many professions: Debord gives ‘Bien que Cobbler signifiât cordonnier en anglais’ [Although Cobbler means shoemaker in English] (p. 7), for ‘Cobbler being his name’ (p. 197). However, de la Mare considers ‘John’ synonymous with ‘Jack’, and makes numerous associative links with Jacks in the story, which Debord omits: de la Mare’s John is a ‘jack of such trades and master of none’ (ibid.), where Debord’s John ‘touchit à tout et n’excellait en rien’ [touches on all and excels at nothing] (p. 8). The name Jack has two plausible origins: in the medieval period, it may have split off from having been a diminutive form of John; alternatively, it may come from “Jacques”, the French for “Jacob”. As such, while “Jack” is not an unfamiliar name to French audiences, its association with John is not a part of French etymological history. Moreover, “Jack” is an unusually resonant name in English: “jack” can be a noun, a verb, and comes up in many phrases, most notably the “Union Jack”. It is thus not surprising that Debord does not seek to replicate de la Mare’s linking of John to the Jack of fairy-tale fame, and makes nothing of de la Mare’s comparison of John to Jack the Giant Killer: ‘He could seldom finish off anything; not at any rate as his namesake the Giant Killer could finish off his giants’ (p. 197). Jack the Giant Killer is a legend from Cornwall, and always associated with Arthurian times; it is referred to by no less than Shakespeare, Henry Fielding and Samuel Johnson. As such, it too holds its place in the English literary tradition, and has firmly English resonances.73 Debord’s foreignisations do not stretch to the extent of describing such broad historical resonances, and by cutting difference, he emphasis similarities between England and France.

A key example of this lessening of difference is Debord’s treatment of speech and

73 It is not simply that Debord decided to remove literary allusions from the story, as he keeps a mention of the fable of the Fox and the Grapes, known from both Aesop and La Fontaine: John climbs the tree ‘tel le renard de la fable qui tentait d’attraper les raisins’ [like the fox of the fable who tried to get the grapes] (p. 24).
dialect from the source text. De la Mare’s characters are not often eloquent speakers, but ordinary conversationalists, and use meaningful sounds and broken sentences in comprehensible ways: for example, ‘Ho, there!’ (p. 203) and ‘Hst’ (p. 216) to catch John’s attention. Debord’s speakers are often more polite, and do not use non-semantic sounds to call people: ‘John!’ (p. 29) and ‘Attention’ (p. 98) are used instead. Some of the direct speech in *The Lord Fish* is quaintly English in colour: ‘Well I never!’ (p. 206); ‘Alackaday’ (p. 211). Debord does not keep this mood of an Englishness to the speakers, nor seek to replicate it with a distinct French ruralness, but tends to neutralise this sense of a local language, giving for these two, simply, ‘Incroyable!’ [Incredible!] (p. 47) and ‘Pauvre de moi!’ [Woe is me!] (p. 67). In some places, he elevates the language to make recognisable allusions: where John’s mother talks cryptically of being ‘rich as Old Creatures’ (p. 206), a phrase with no clear referent, Debord’s mother instead says they will be ‘riches comme Crésus’ [rich like Croesus] (p. 48). Croesus was a Greek king of famed wealth, and ‘rich as Croesus’ is even recorded as an English phrase, first used by Gower in *Confessio Amantis* (1390). The allusion is thus a bridge between cultures – pointing to their shared Greco-Roman roots – where de la Mare’s is an aporia even in its own language. In other instances, Debord matches informal language with informal language, such as giving ‘Il était dans de beaux draps!’ [He was in a right mess!] (p. 67) for ‘A pretty bargain this!’ (p. 211). Similarly, where de la Mare’s John thinks to himself colloquially: ‘if that old rascal there ain’t the Lord Fish in the rhyme, I’ll eat my buttons’ (p. 212), Debord’s John is equally informal: ‘Si ce vieux chacal n’est pas le seigneur des poissons dont parle le parchemin, pensa John en fixant le vieillard, je mange mon chapeau!’ [If that old jackal isn’t the lord fish which the parchment talked about, though John fixing his eyes on the old one, I’ll eat my hat!] (p. 74). Again, ‘I’ll eat my hat’ is also a phrase in English, and so an effective bridge, and effectively absurd when spoken by a fish. However, the French John speaks in an informal but standard French, while de la Mare’s John
speaks not only informally, but in a non-standard dialect, disregarding conventional grammar in saying ‗ain’t’.

De la Mare uses the linguistic habits of his local region, rural southern England, to bring verisimilitude to his tale in much the same way as he gives attention to the realism of his plant and animal life in the region. The fish maid, in particular, speaks in a distinctly non-standard dialect: ‘ackh, what’s wrong with ’ee? What’s amiss with ’ee?’ (p. 215). In Debord’s world, this becomes the much more formal: ‘Mon Dieu, vous n’êtes pas bien ? De quoi souffrez-vous ?’ [My God, are you not well? What pains you?] (p. 92). The pronoun ‘’ee’ can be seen as an abbreviation of ‘thee’, and so could be considered formal – she also calls John ‘master’, although mostly in a mocking way, such as ‘Master Sobersides’ (p. 216) – but it is nonetheless a significant change in the level of formality for Debord to have her use the polite ‘vous’ form for John. Perhaps because she is a servant, Debord decided to have her language be appropriately deferent, also losing her colloquialisms: ‘goggle’ (p. 217) becomes the plain ‘regard [to see] (p. 98), and ‘Stay mum as mum can be, you precious thing’ (p. 216) becomes ‘Ne dites pas un mot, mon trésor’ [Do not say a word, my treasure] (p. 98).74 We see thus that for Debord language is not a location-specific event, but a class-based system.

While de la Mare presents the English countryside both through its natural details and through tying it to a spoken style that emphasises its rural Englishness, Debord’s translation seeks to separate these two, maintaining the specificities of nature, but neutralising language differences and bridging difference where possible.

In this manner, Debord’s translations of the two poems in The Lord Fish very much naturalise the local and mystical lore that they contain to the French language, in neatly rhyming and shapely verse. Moreover, where in the story John engages in a lay translation – trying to decipher ‘Unguentum ad pisces hominibus transmogrificandos’ (p. 214) by relating

74 That she calls John ‘mon trésor’ here may also allude to Tolkein’s Gollum, a similarly watery monster, as in the French translation of The Hobbit, he calls the ring ‘mon trésor’. Tolkein, Bilbo le Hobbit, p. 79.
the sounds to English words – Debord fits John’s reasoning entirely to the French language instead, as if it were natural for John to try to understand this Latin through French, not English. At this point in the story, de la Mare leaves behind the action to give a brief account of John’s education:

Now John had left school very early. He had taken up crow-scareng at seven, pig-keeping at nine, turnip-hoeing at twelve – though he had kept up none of them for very long. But even if John had stayed at school until he was grown-up, he would never have learned any Latin – none at all, not even dog Latin – since the old dame who kept the village school at Tussock didn’t know any herself. She could cut and come again as easily as you please with the cane she kept in her cupboard, but this had never done John much good, and she didn’t know any Latin. (p. 214)

While no judgement is passed on the authoritatian and punitive system John went through, with the fact that crow-scareng does not substitute well for an education, and that his school was entirely run by one lady, de la Mare points here to the poverty of rural education.

Nevertheless, with this scant education, John seeks to make sense of the Latin he is faced with. We are told that he is already aware that unguent means ointment, and that he guessed that transmogrification means ‘a change for the better’ (p. 215) after fixing a chair for a rich lady. He reasons to himself that the start of ‘hominibus’ sounds like “home” – ‘If you make a full round O of the first syllable it sounds uncommonly like home’ – but can make little sense of this connection: ‘Nobody could call the stony cell in which the enchanted maid with the fish-tail was kept shut up a home; and John himself at this moment was a good many miles from his mother!’ (ibid.). For ‘pisces’, John thinks of ‘tales of the piskies’ that his mother often told him, although it ‘sounded even to his ear poor spelling, but it would do’ (ibid.), presumably for “pixies”. Putting the connections he has made together, John concludes: ‘So what the Lord Fish, John thought at last, had meant by this lingo on his glass pot must be that it contained an UNGUENT to which some secret PISKY stuff or what is known as wizardry had been added, and that it was useful for “changing” for the better
anything or anybody on which it was rubbed when away from HOME’ (ibid.). While half of
John’s translation is thus off the mark, he nonetheless gets the gist of the label, and from
context sees what to do with it: ‘John was just clever enough to come to the conclusion that
the one unguent had been meant for turning humans into fish, and that this in the pot beside
him was for turning fish into humans again’ (ibid.).

John is frequently faced with written language he does not understand in The Lord Fish,
first in the hieroglyphs on the gold key he finds: the images of birds and beasts on key ‘might
be all ornament or might, thought John [...] be a secret writing’ (p. 206). He then finds a
parchment with a poem on it: ‘He took the piece of parchment into the light [...] and, syllable
by syllable, muttered over to himself what it said – leaving the longer words until he had
more time’ (p. 209); ‘John read this doggerel once, he read it twice, and though he couldn’t
understand it all even when he read it a third time, he understood a good deal of it’ (p. 210).
John’s scene of uneducated translation is thus the end of a sequence of tests to his interpreting
skills. We see that he has much in common with a child reader: he reads slowly, often comes
across words he does not understand, and does his best to make sense of them from a limited
knowledge. He is not always accurate, but figures out enough to get the sense from the
context, and faced with this Latin to translate, he is right to deduce that this is the potion he
wants to turn himself and Almanara back into humans.

Debord’s translation of this scene begins by foreignising: de la Mare’s John can see that
these are not ‘good honest English words’ (p. 214), and Debord’s John also notes that these
words ‘ne ressemblaient en rien à de l’anglais honnête’ [did not at all resemble honest
English] (p. 88). From there, however, Debord makes the illogical but convenient step of
domesticating John’s explanations and understanding to the French language: Debord’s John
knows that ‘unguentum’ means ‘pomma’ [ointment] (p. 89), and that ‘transmogrification’
means ‘mieux après une […] transformation’ [better after a … transformation] (p. 90).
Debord creates entirely original explanations for ‘hominibus’ and ‘pisces’. For ‘hominibus’, John makes the sound observation that ‘Dans HOMINIBUS, il y a HOMME’ [In HOMINIBUS, there is man (‘HOMME’)] (ibid.), a deduction facilitated by the closer proximity of French to Latin in this case. For ‘pisces’, John recalls the many sermons he has sat through: ‘Le pasteur ne l’avait-il pas moulî fois menacé, à grand renfort de citations latines, de perdre son âme s’il pêchait le dimanche au lieu de se rendre au temple. « Dieu pardonne au pécheur repenînt, lui avait-il expliqué en pointant un index menaçant vers le ciel. Mais pas au pêcheur de poisson. »’ [Had not the pastor many times threatened, with a great deal of Latin quotations, him with losing his soul if he went fishing on Sundays instead of going to the temple. “God forgives a penitent sinner (pécheur),” he explained while pointing a menacing index finger at the sky. “But not a fisherman (pêcheur).”] (ibid.). He remembers that it always ends with ‘pisces’, and so unlike the English John, does know a little Latin, thanks to French Catholicism. With this connection made, John thinks to himself: ‘« Il ne peut donc s’agir que d’un onguent pour transformer des poissons en hommes », conclut-il, triomphant’ [“It can only therefore be an unguent to transform fish into men,” he concluded, triumphant] (p. 91). This French John has every right to feel ‘triumphant’ at his conclusion, having proven to be far more astute than his English confrère.

No distinction between English and French takes place here, as the explicitly English John translates Latin into a French he understands. This same process of undifferentiation happens on a smaller scale when the incomprehensibility of other languages is elided. De la Mare writes that John’s speech was to Almanara ‘little better than Double Dutch’ (p. 220) before her return to human form, but Debord removes the national-linguistic element of this, saying she ‘comprénait à peine le charabia du jeune homme’ [barely understood the gibberish of the young man] (p. 114). For Debord, language becomes something understood across borders, separated off from issues of place and space, but only divisible across class lines,
and across time. That is, all contemporary languages are equally understandable to Debord’s hero, and only enchanted speakers and ancient languages pose an interpretative challenge.⁷⁵

Debord, thus, specifies that the setting of The Lord Fish is the English countryside, in its nature, but not in its language – he allows the language of the countryside to be the same anywhere. Debord emphasises the education one can gain from nature, through his footnotes to introduce young readers to new words for flora and fauna, but at the same time de-emphasises the problems that rural children faced with regards to education, idealising John’s ability to understand beyond his learning. Debord’s mix of foreignisation and domestication results in a kind of “tourism foreignisation”, exoticising the English countryside but also making it more generalisable – palatable to a French person culturally, by not being too different, but beautiful to look at. This flawed foreignisation may be an inevitable result of seeking to translate the English countryside: with the country(side) serving as a metonym for the country (England), English nature becomes troublesome to translate.

Conclusion

In 1926, Stanley Baldwin idealised English country childhood, in his book On England:

The wild anemones in the woods in April, the last load at night of hay being drawn down a lane as the twilight comes on, when you can scarcely distinguish the figures of the horses as they take it home to the farm […] These things strike down into the very depths of our nature. […] These are the things that make England, and I grieve for it that they are not the childish inheritance of the majority of the people today in our country.⁷⁶

This nostalgia for the beautiful English countryside persists even today, as seen in the 2012 Olympics opening ceremony: the setting for the ceremony was designed to be a ‘recreation of

⁷⁵ Indeed, where de la Mare’s John sees ‘CAVE’ and assumes it refers to a cave, Debord footnotes that it is a Latin word, meaning ‘« Prends garde! »’ [“Beware!”] (p. 58).
the English countryside’, with an emphasis on depicting ‘Britain's charming and picturesque heritage.’

Stereotyping Britain in this way risks blinding us to three key issues. The first is that experiences of the countryside are generally divided by gender, as Rousseau insisted they should be, and as Woolf shows they remained to be in the early twentieth century, in the domestic setting of Nurse Lugton. Secondly, we must not forget that since the beginning of the twentieth century, most children are raised in cities, and so their childhood in no way resembles this idealised English childhood, as Woolf also indicates in Nurse Lugton. Their first encounters with nature are through spaces with a designated “natural” function in the city – zoos and parks. Thus when they do come to the country, their tendency will be to conceive of it through the nature in the city they have previously encountered. Unlike Rousseau and the Romantic poets, who talk at or of children, and so delimit an image of the child in their works, Woolf focalises her story through the child, which avoids representing her to herself. The child is involved in the text, without being fixed into any particular form. Woolf parallels an episode in Carroll’s Through the Looking-Glass to expose an outmoded Victorian mindset, and to show a girl escape her domestic environment through thoughts of a fantasy world, an allusion that her French illustrator picks up on. In this way, Woolf reveals the mutual entrapment of city girls brought to the country and zoo animals, even as she imagines a world in which the hierarchies that oppress them could be Overturned. Such a world does not connect the child to nature as Rousseau or the Romantics conceived of it, but seeks to blur the human-nature boundary.

The third issue is the reality of poverty and the lack of resources that country children face. While it is imagined that they have unlimited free space for roaming and exploring, the

reality is that most of this space is closed off from them as it is dangerous – a great deal of modern farming involves harmful pesticides. This issue of the privatisation and closing off of common ground was prevalent in the 1930s, as shown in the story of de la Mare’s friend, Eleanor Farjeon, *Elsie Piddock Skips in her Sleep*. Central to Rousseau’s *Émile* is the idea that children learn better from a direct experience of nature, and de la Mare’s *The Lord Fish* concertedly engages with this issue, going into details on the education history, reading practice and local knowledge of its hero. In the 1950s, Kenneth Richmond rejected the image of the country boy that follows from Rousseau: ‘The notion that country children cannot help being interested in their surroundings, may be thought to be somewhat starry-eyed, seeing how utterly indifferent and oblivious most of them seem to be.’\(^{78}\) While de la Mare’s John does take time to engage with nature, this does not enhance his education; rather, it obstructs a scant education that he manages despite the distraction:

> When he was small he had liked watching the clouds and butterflies and birds flitting to and fro and the green leaves twinkling in the sun, and found frogs and newts and sticklebacks and minnows better company than anything he could read in print on paper. Still he had managed at last to learn all his letters and even to read, though he read so slowly that he sometimes forgot the first letter of a long word before he had spelled out the last. (pp. 208-09)

John suffers little from this lack of a formal education – where his efforts to translate Latin go awry, he nonetheless achieves his goals – but it is clear that his reading skills are put to the test by the events of the story. Further, while de la Mare shows us John’s understanding of the natural world around him, putting this knowledge into a book is in itself a rejection of Rousseau’s ideals. Reading is, of course, not a direct engagement with nature, but a mediated one. As such, reading Debord’s translation may teach French child readers some new vocabulary relating to nature, but may equally leave them unaware what these birds, fish and plants look like. *The Lord Fish* and its French translation, thus, gives a many-sided view of the issues around rural education, including the value of a direct experience of nature, and the

\(^{78}\) Cited in Ward, p. 99.
poverty of village schools.

In these ways, the idealisation of a country childhood, and the identification of the countryside as the nation, push to the fringes issues such as the urban child’s experience of nature, and rural education. Woolf and de la Mare’s stories bring to the fore both the particular Englishness of their locales, and through day-dreamers and fantasy, write against these oppressive idealisations to rethink nature and childhood for the twentieth century. Woolf and de la Mare explode the stereotypes of rural childhood from within.
Chapter 3. ‘Children and cats in the alley’:

Eliot, Baudelaire and Urban Childhood

Unlike Woolf and de la Mare, Eliot counters Rousseau’s sense of childhood not by rethinking the countryside, but by imagining the place of the child in the city. To do this, he follows the influence of another Frenchman. In 1907, while studying Baudelaire as an undergraduate, Eliot wrote a poem entitled ‘Spleen’. The poem is primarily focused on capturing a mood, of ‘Life, a little bald and gray, [/] Languid, fastidious, and bland’, but contains a very Baudelairian image of ‘Children and cats in the alley’, conflating, as Baudelaire often does, children with cats, and situating them in the city.¹ In Le Spleen de Paris [Paris Spleen] (1855-69), Baudelaire connects children and cats frequently, as in ‘Le Joujou du pauvre’. Here, he talks of giving gifts to children, who run away with them like cats with food: ‘D’abord ils n’oseront pas prendre ; ils douteront de leur bonheur ; puis leurs mains agripperont vivement le cadeau, et ils s’enfuiront comme font les chats qui vont manger loin de vous le morceau que vous leur avez donné, ayant appris à se défier de l’homme.’ [At first they do not dare to take them; they doubt of their fortune; then their hands grip the gift livelily, and they run off like cats who are going to eat far from you the morsel that you gave them, having learnt to defy man.]² Eliot displays his knowledge of Baudelaire’s urban writing in reversing this very image in ‘Rhapsody on a Windy Night’: “‘Remark the cat which flattens itself in the gutter, [/] Slips out its tongue [/] And devours a morsel of rancid butter.” [/] So the hand of the child, automatic, [/] Slipped out and pocketed a toy that was running along the quay’ (p. 27). Eliot’s Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats shows Baudelaire’s influence on Eliot, bringing together Baudelaire’s separate poetry of the city and of cats, but also bringing to them Eliot’s play with poetic structures and his literary allusiveness, particularly in the names of the

This chapter will first explore intersections of childhood with urban spaces in Baudelaire and *Practical Cats*, and then domestications and foreignisations of rhythms, names and places in the two translations of *Practical Cats* into French. It will end with an account of the adaptation of *Practical Cats* into the musical *Cats*, the issues of translation that arise from this adaptation and from the translation of the musical into French. Throughout, the urbanity of *Practical Cats* is a central feature and, as we will see, Eliot entirely disregards the Rousseauvian notion of the child in nature, to show to children the delight that can be found in urban settings. This is in stark contrast to the general trend in children’s literature, both in the 1930s and today. In 1981, Bruno Bettelheim assessed the representations of urban life in school books for children and lamented that few even depicted cities: ‘While urban life is not described as undesirable—nothing is in these books—it is denied importance through complete neglect, that suggests to the child that it is not worth being paid attention to.’ Those few that did show urban life associated the city with prohibitions and presented the ‘emptiness and purposelessness of a city existence’ through dull repetitions: such children’s literature ‘tends to discourage both interest in literature and living in cities.’ As Bettelheim astutely notes, there is a damaging effect in continuing to believe that ‘childhood’ and ‘the city’ are opposing terms, while increasing numbers of children live in cities. Not only will urban children develop a negative view of their own living environments, but this may also

3 Baudelaire is of course not Eliot’s only urban or feline influence, but is the only writer to present *both* cats and cities: Robert Crawford convincingly argues for the importance to Eliot of James Thomson’s *The City of Dreadful Night* (1874) not only in itself, but as a gateway to Dante’s poetry. Robert Crawford, *The Savage and the City in the Work of T. S. Eliot* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), p. 45. Wanda Gág’s children’s book *Millions of Cats* (1929) was highly successful in the 1930s, and published by Faber while Eliot worked there. Closer to home, Ackroyd tells us that Eliot’s own father, Henry Ware Eliot, was a sketcher of cats. Ackroyd, p. 19. For the broader influence of French poets and particularly Laforgue, see Greene, and for the broader importance of French culture and Paris to Eliot, see Hargrove. Eliot also wrote cat poems among his poetry for adults, in ‘Five-Finger Exercises’, *Collected Poems: 1909-1962* (London: Faber, 1963), pp. 149-51, first published in the *Criterion* in January 1933. Subsequent citations from *Collected Poems* will be in parentheses.


5 Bettelheim, pp. 230-31.
decrease their engagement with literature, which will appear distant and less identifiable to them. Jenny Bavidge, who works at the intersection of urban geography and children’s literature studies, performed a similar study of children’s literature about cities in 2006 and found that this situation has not improved.6 As such, we can see that *Practical Cats* is exceptional in children’s literature for its representation of the city. As we will also see below, it is equally an exception in Eliot’s *œuvre* for showing the city in a positive way.

*Practical Cats* originated in letters from 1934 to Eliot’s godson, aged seven, and Eliot published it in 1939. There are two French translations of *Practical Cats*, the first by Jacques Charpentreau as *Chats!* in 1983, the second by Jean-François Ménard under the title *Le Guide des Chats du Vieil Opossum* in 2010 (hereafter *Le Guide*). These two translations take opposite approaches to translating this text: where Charpentreau domesticates names but works to replicate Eliot’s rhythms, Ménard standardises rhythms and rhymes to French norms, but keeps Eliot’s names or close French equivalents. Unlike the musical of *Practical Cats*, Eliot’s collection of poems has no overarching narrative and is simply fifteen poems related by theme. It begins with ‘The Naming of Cats’, followed by twelve poems mostly about individual cats, then ‘The Ad-dressing of Cats’ and ends with a poem added to the collection in 1982, ‘Cat Morgan Introduces Himself’.7 The two French translations keep the same order to the poems, with the 2010 edition even including Eliot’s short preface, in which he dedicates the poems to a number of friends and signs off ‘O. P.’ for Old Possum.

Comparatively few articles have been written about *Practical Cats* over these seventy years. William Harmon notes Wyndham Lewis as a possible source for the poems: Lewis wrote ‘Name a cat and you destroy it!’ in a mock philosophical debate on names in *The Apes*

---

7 As Johannes Hedberg notes, Cat Morgan is a portrait of Eliot, settled at last with life at Faber. Johannes Hedberg, ‘T. S. Eliot, Old Possum and *Cats*,’ *Modernia Språk*, 78.2 (1984), 97-105 (p. 100). Cat Morgan also draws on Eliot’s childhood love of sailing, in his pirate background.
of God (1930). Harmon points to the ‘ineffable’ name of the cats as part of the matrix of the inexpressibility of interior life in Eliot’s plays and poems. Charles Sanders, however, sees the treatment of inexpressibility in ‘The Naming of Cats’ as merely parodic of what is a serious theme elsewhere in Eliot. Marion Hodge argues that *Practical Cats* is a moralising text, about living a practical life, and sees religious elements throughout, which Felix Clowder supports by positing Possum as a pun for parson and Jellicle as short for ‘evangelical’. Dorothy Lindemann asserts further that Eliot wrote *Practical Cats* to be ‘unconsciously Christian’, so that it could enter Christian elements into an ‘unchristian world’, but to support her argument can only draw on a few of the poems.

Paul Douglass does not refute these accounts of the sobriety of *Practical Cats*, but balances them with a literary appreciation of Eliot’s poetry. He particularly focuses on the extraordinary and captivating rhythms of the poems, using such a variety of beats as dactylic tetrameter, iambic octameter, and varying verse and foot length within poems. Douglass ultimately concludes that if a child is to learn anything from *Practical Cats*, it is the importance of living playfully. Sarah Bay-Cheng notes the importance of play and its inventive rhythms and rhymes, but also sees the potential religiosity of *Practical Cats*. She talks of the three names of a cat as a ‘Christian trinity’ and Jellicle as (more convincingly than Clowder) ‘angelical’, but points to Eliot’s own self-mocking illustrations in the letters in which *Practical Cats* originated and his decision to end *Practical Cats* with the ‘humble recognition that a human must earn the respect of a cat.’

In other words, religion is not the final purpose of the poems, while it is a prevalent issue. Of all critical accounts so far, Marilyn Olson’s work on *Practical Cats* most closely relates to my own in pointing to the importance of London in the poems: for Olson, the playfulness of the poems is about finding

---

10 Bay-Cheng, p. 237.
pleasure in life and naming is about maintaining one’s individuality when faced with the apathy and anonymity of city living. Olson observes that the final poem of the first edition, ‘The Ad-dressing of Cats’, is a practical guide to city life: ‘The question of the importance of names ends, in other words, with the encouragement to work oneself into social relationships by graceful steps.’

Through much of this critical history, names and rhythms have held a prominent position.


Eliot himself recognises Baudelaire’s literary significance for him: ‘I think that from Baudelaire I learned first, a precedent for the poetical possibilities, never developed by any poet writing in my own language, of the more sordid aspects of the modern metropolis, of the possibility of fusion between the sordidly realistic and the phantasmagoric, the possibility of the juxtaposition of the matter-of-fact and the fantastic.’

---

11 Olson, p. 159.
14 Eliot, ‘What Dante Means to Me’, in his *To Criticize the Critic and Other Writings* (London: Faber, 1965), p. 126. Christopher Ricks has gathered Eliot’s comments on influence as an appendix to *Inventions of the March Hare*, among which Eliot writes for *La France Libre* (15 June 1944): ‘Si je n’avais découvert Baudelaire, et toute la poésie qui découle de Baudelaire — en particulier celle de Laforgue, Corbière, Rimbaud et Mallarmé — je ne crois pas que j’aurais jamais pu écrire’ [If I had not discovered Baudelaire, and all the poetry that follows from Baudelaire — in particular that of Laforgue, Corbière, Rimbaud and Mallarmé — I do not believe I would...
points of connection to Baudelaire’s three cat poems. ‘Les Chats’ [The Cats] is filled with the mystical and magical: ‘Magique’ [Magical] and ‘Mystique’ [Mystical] recur, and the poem contains a potion – ‘un philtre’ – and mythical beings, ‘Des grands sphinx’ [Great sphinxes]; this mysteriousness is particularly clear in Eliot’s ‘Macavity: The Mystery Cat’ and ‘Mr Mistoffelees’. In ‘Les Chats’ the cats ‘semblent s’endormir’ [appear to be asleep], like Macavity, who ‘when you think he’s half asleep, he’s always wide awake.’ The Gumbie cat ‘sits and sits and sits and sits’ (p. 5), and Baudelaire’s cats are ‘sédentaires’ [sedentary]. The ‘profound meditation’ of cats in ‘The Naming of Cats’ (p. 1) is similar to ‘son regard profond’ [its profound gaze] in Baudelaire’s ‘Le Chat’ [The Cat]. Eliot’s poems are of course very different in mood from Baudelaire’s, with a far greater sense of levity, but in making his cats ecstatic city wanderers, Eliot merges two of Baudelaire’s tropes, producing a feline city opus. In presenting the city, names and rhythms take a central role: in translating Practical Cats into French, Charpentreau and Ménard take opposite paths on urban names and rhythms.

The Petits Flâneurs

Baudelaire is often thought of as the originator of flânerie in poetry, of urban aesthetics and a poetics that faces up to modern life. In Le Peintre de la vie moderne [The Painter of Modern Life] (1863), he writes:

Pour le parfait flâneur, pour l’observateur passionné, c’est une immense joie d’élire domicile dans le nombre, dans l’ondoyant, dans le mouvement, dans le fugitif et l’infini. Être hors de chez soi, et pourtant se sentir partout chez soi; voir le monde, être au centre du monde et rester caché au ever have been able to write]. Eliot, Inventions of the March Hare: Poems 1909-1917, ed. by Christopher Ricks (London: Harvest, 1998), p. 406. Eliot wrote two essays specifically on Baudelaire, but focused on him as a person more than on his poetry, and in particular, on Baudelaire’s stance on religion. ‘The Lessons of Baudelaire’ and ‘Baudelaire (1930)’, in his Selected Essays (New York: Harvest, 1964), pp. 371-81. Weinberg, p. 63.
16 Weinberg, p. 64; Eliot, Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats (London: Faber, 1998), p. 31. Subsequent citations will be in parentheses.
17 Weinberg, p. 65.
18 Ibid.
monde, tels sont quelques-uns des moindres plaisirs de ces esprits indépendants, passionnés, impartiaux, que la langue ne peut que maladroitement définir.

[For the perfect flaneur, for the passionate observer, it is an immense joy to set up house in the many, in the undulating, in the movement, in the fugitive and the infinite. To be away from home and yet to feel everywhere at home; to see the world, to be at the centre of the world and to remain hidden from the world, such are among the smallest pleasures of these independent spirits, passionate, impartial, which the tongue can only clumsily define.]¹⁹

The ecstasy of city walking is entirely about a mobile spectatorship, with the walker described as a ‘kaléidoscope doué de conscience’ [kaleidoscope gifted with conscience] (‘Peintre’, p. 692). The flâneur is absorbed into the emotions of the crowd as he walks, which Baudelaire describes as a kind of drunkenness in his prose poem ‘Les Foules’: ‘Le promeneur solitaire et pensif tire une singulière ivresse de cette universelle communion. [...] Il adopte comme siennes toutes les professions toutes les joies et toutes les misères que la circonstance lui présente’ [The solitary and pensive walker draws a singular drunkenness from this universal communion. … He adopts as his own all the professions all the joys and all the miseries that circumstance presents to him].²⁰ What distinguishes the poetic flâneur from the ordinary city walker, however, is that he does not simply find the transitory and fashionable, but makes it his task ‘de tirer l’éternel du transitoire’ [to draw the eternal from the tranistory] (‘Peintre’, p. 694).

In Le Peintre de la vie moderne, Baudelaire talks extensively of children, and of the child’s fascinated gaze as a model for the flâneur. He writes that ‘la génie n’est que l’enfance retrouvée à volonté, l’enfance douée maintenant, pour s’exprimer, d’organes virils et de l’esprit analytique qui lui permet d’ordonner la somme de matériaux involontairement amassée’ [genius is no more than childhood regained at will, a childhood now gifted in self-

¹⁹ Baudelaire, ‘Le Peintre de la vie moderne’, in his Œuvres complètes II, ed. by Pichois (Paris: Gallimard, 1976), pp. 683-724 (pp. 691-92). All italics are Baudelaire’s. Subsequent citations will be in parentheses. This anonymity that he desires is further expounded in the Paris poems of Les Fleurs du mal: for example in ‘Les Sept Vieillards’ the poet suffers under the gaze of others watching him back.

²⁰ Spleen, p. 91.
expression, with a manly body and an analytical mind that allows him to order the sum of material he has involuntarily amassed] (p. 690, italics in original). The flâneur amasses information as he walks and transforms what he sees through an ‘idealisation’, due to his ‘childlike perceptiveness’: ‘Tous les matériaux dont la mémoire s’est encombrée se classent, se rangent, s’harmonisent et subissent cette idéalisation forcée qui est le résultat d’une perception enfantine, c’est-à-dire d’une perception aiguë, magique à force d’ingénuité!’ [All the materials with which his memory is cluttered are classified, are arranged, are harmonised and are subjected to that forced idealisation which is the result of a childlike perception, that is to say, a sharp perception, magical by dint of its ingenuity!] (p. 694, italics in original).

Baudelaire likens the child’s reception of the world’s impressions to those of the poet in a crowd and to his own poetics through the image of drunkenness: ‘L’enfant voit tout en nouveauté ; il est toujours ivre. Rien ne ressemble plus à ce qu’on appelle l’inspiration, que la joie avec laquelle l’enfant absorbe la forme et la couleur’ [The child sees everything in newness; he is always drunk. Nothing more resembles what we call inspiration than the joy with which a child absorbs form and colour] (p. 690). However, the child is not for Baudelaire valued per se as an artist: he criticises Constantin Guys’ early works as ‘barbouillages primitifs’ [primitive scribbles], as ‘il dessinait comme un barbare, comme un enfant’ [he drew like a barbarian, like a child] (p. 688). Rather, it is the adult who has maintained or reacquired those childlike aspects of himself which he can use with adult wisdom, who succeeds as an artist of modernity: Baudelaire praises Guys as a ‘man-child’: ‘prenez-le aussi pour un homme-enfant, pour un homme possédant à chaque minute le génie de l’enfance, c’est-à-dire un génie pour lequel aucun aspect de la vie n’est émoussé’ [take him also for a man-child, for a man possessing at every moment the genius of childhood, that is to say a genius for whom no aspect of life has become dulled] (p. 691, italics in original).

For Baudelaire, the artist of modernity cannot be a child; he must be a man. Writing on
Baudelaire, Benjamin attempts to broaden the scope of the flâneur by making him a liminal figure: ‘The flâneur still stands on the threshold—of the metropolis as of the middle class. Neither has him in its power yet. In neither is he at home.’\(^{21}\) However, the flâneur is more at home in the middle classes than the working or aristocratic classes: Baudelaire’s figuration of the flâneur fits a precise mould of class, sex and age. More recent work on flânerie has challenged the exclusivity of the position, such as Kirsten Ortega on the black ‘flâneuse’.\(^{22}\) Critics of Woolf’s *Mrs Dalloway* and Joyce’s *Ulysses* have also attested to the existence and differences of the flânerie of characters who are not white middle-class male adults.\(^{23}\) Most recently, and importantly for this study, Eric Tribunella has asserted that there are child flâneurs in children’s novels set in New York.\(^{24}\) For Tribunella, adult writers imagine a flânerie through the eyes of their child characters; they thus follow Baudelaire’s dictum perfectly, as with the faculties of an adult they recapture a childhood sense of wonder. As such, there is nothing specifically *childlike* about the flânerie that he describes. He is significant in showing that children can and have been flâneurs, but he only sees their ‘innocent’ gaze as enabling them to be flâneurs like adults are, without considering what differences there are between adults and children in their urban experiences.

While Tribunella believes in the ‘innocence’ of children, other theorists of childhood endeavour to push away from this quasi-religious approach to childhood. Jones retheorises

---


Subsequent citations will be made in parentheses.
the child out of ‘innocence’, to productively recognise the difference of childhood, and so open a space for a specifically childlike flânerie. He argues against the Romantic tradition that sees children and cities as fundamentally opposed terms, the notion that “‘childhood’ and the ‘urban’ are, at best, uneasy companions, and, at worst, symbolically incompatible.”

Scheffler’s illustrations for Practical Cats (2010) are complicit in this ‘naturalisation’ of childhood: even where the poems make explicit references to urban areas and they are signposted in his drawings, the city Scheffler presents is filled with animals and plantlife, as if representing urbanity to children were taboo (see Image 6).

The children’s geographers Cloke and Jones welcome children into city spaces, in seeking to undo the historical association of childhood with innocence. They focus on ‘disordered space’, writing of the ability of children to territorialise unused, hidden and forgotten spaces, outside of adult authority. In this, they echo the seminal work of Colin Ward on children in the city, his writing on construction work and what he terms places of ‘unmake’: ‘The place that is becoming, the unfinished habitat, is rich in experiences and adventures for the child, just because of the plenitude of “unmake” bits of no-man’s land.’

Ward’s primary focus, however, as a geographical theorist, is in making the city more welcoming to children, rather than consigning them to areas abandoned by adults. He recognises that there are many dangers for children in the city, particularly since cars began to replace horse-drawn carriages in the 1930s (p. 11), and that a child alone lacks knowledge specific to city living: ‘The isolated child in the city is unfamiliar with the public transport system, with the use of the telephone, with the public library service, with eliciting information from strangers, with the norms of behaviour in cafes and restaurants’, and so on (p. 50). At the same time, simply keeping children indoors and denying them access to the

---

city can lead to children secretly going out and suffering accidents that some basic city knowledge could have prevented (p. 125). For Ward, thus, a little supervised experience is better than being kept away from the city.

More than this, he contends that children can gain much from city living if they can develop interests that create for them a personally mapped, ‘specialised city’: ‘Blessed is the child, rich or poor, with a hobby or a skill or an all-consuming passion, for he or she is motivated to utilise the city as a generator of happiness. [...] the child who is hooked on to some network built around a shared activity has found ways of making the city work for him’ (p. 106). His examples of such activities are following a band to different venues, or a football team to different stadiums, or being a musician and travelling to specialist shops. Ward also provides examples of children being given responsibilities in their local communities, buildings or parts of the city, and through these responsibilities not only learning to enjoy city life but to contribute to it in return (pp. 104-05). Children with interests and responsibilities can become involved in the city if adults recognise them as valuable members of urban society and not simply as nuisances or dangers to themselves. Ward’s work is an impassioned injunction both to parents and to city planners not to reinforce boundaries between the city and children. More recently, Christopher Jenks also assesses the notion of urban space as inimical to childhood, and the position adults hold in this relation: ‘The late-modern private child, predominantly the city child, is now often the victim of public space. The big “outside” is conceived as a dangerous place to be and the child is introduced to this risk both gradually and in company.’ That is to say, children are no longer welcomed into public spaces, but separated off from them for their own purported safety. With his mention of adult company, Jenks hints at the role that adults can play in introducing children to city spaces, a role which can equally be taken up by adults in writing urban literature for children.

---

27 Jenks, p. 88.
Bavidge calls for the inclusion of children’s literature in the study of children’s geographies, particularly to widen our discourse around urban childhood.\textsuperscript{28} She has written about finding natural spaces in the city in children’s picturebooks and spoken about a child’s-eye view of the city, as in Alexis Deacon’s picturebook \textit{Beegu} (2004).\textsuperscript{29} The small alien lost in the city is analogous to a child flâneur: Beegu is too small to get people’s attention, but she also uses this smallness to find comfort in unconventional spaces, sleeping in a cardboard box full of puppies. Beegu finds there are people she can engage with in the city – children – and both she and the children squeeze through barred gates to get to each other. Rather than requiring adult help to adapt to the city, she finds allies in a community of children, who do not find their smallness problematic, but advantageous. At the same time, the picturebook itself is an adult interjection into the child’s world: Deacon shows precisely how literature can be part of a child’s introduction to urban life. Like \textit{Beegu}, \textit{Practical Cats} suggests finding non-adult non-hierarchical alliances in the city, through its cat characters. Scheffler’s illustrations recognise the possibility of cat-child connections, as in his illustrations for ‘The Rum Tum Tugger’ and ‘Mr Mistoffelees’, in which children play with cats, while adults fail to notice the mess or magic taking place (see Image 7).

These alliances take place indoors, not in urban but in domestic spaces. Bettelheim claims the value of such domestic representations in introducing children to urban life: ‘The manner in which we respond to our living in a city, and with it what our urban experience will be, is conditioned by the ideas of what city life is all about which we developed in and around our \textit{home}, long before we had much direct experience with the city’s wider aspects, or any ability to evaluate them objectively.’\textsuperscript{30} Several of the poems in \textit{Practical Cats} are set in domestic spaces – ‘The Old Gumbie Cat’, ‘The Rum Tum Tugger’, ‘Mr Mistoffelees’ and

\textsuperscript{28} Bavidge, p. 320.
\textsuperscript{30} Bettelheim, p. 219, my emphasis.
‘Mungojerrie and Rumpleteazer’ – and all of these poems are concerned with order and disorder within the home. Jennyanydots is evidently an ordering force, in her efforts to train the other creatures of the house, but at the same time subverts the order of the humans in the house, by beginning her day in secret, after theirs has ended: she is thus the agent of a secret order, which opposes conventional (diurnal) order. The Rum Tum Tugger, in contrast, is an overtly disruptive domestic influence, enjoying nothing more than ‘a horrible muddle’ (p. 12). Mr Mistoffelees, Mungojerrie and Rumpleteazer are made into scapegoats for anything lost or damaged in the house: if something goes missing, the family claims, “It’s that horrible cat! [/] It was Mungojerrie — or Rumpleteazer!” — And most of the time they left it at that’ (p. 17). As they are not seen performing the acts they are blamed for, they take on the level of symbols of disruption, not responsible for mere isolated incidents, but universally responsible for disorder. Apart from Jennyanydots, these domestic cats enter and exit the house with remarkable ease – the Rum Tum Tugger is ‘always on the wrong side of every door’ (p. 11), Mr Mistoffelees can simultaneously be on the roof and by the fire, and Mungojerrie and Rumpleteazer need only a window left ajar to break in or out of any house.

As agents of disorder and secret order within the household, and as figures easily capable of crossing the borders of domestic space, these cats serve as a bridge between domestic and urban spaces. In relishing the disorderliness of these domestic cats, *Practical Cats* encourages its child readers to delight in, and not to fear, the chaos of the city.

Where *Beegu* presents a generic cityscape, *Practical Cats* very specifically introduces its child readers to places in London. Barry Faulk notes that as Eliot was writing his urban poetry, in the 1920s and 30s, the nature of the city was changing, through the creation of specialised zones: ‘With the rise of mass entertainment in the new metropolis, there was for the first time a concerted effort by capitalist entrepreneurs to rezone the city according to
Image 7. Scheffler’s cats and children in collusion, ‘The Rum Tum Tugger’ and ‘Mr Mistofflees’.
cultural differences.’ With this re-zoning, different parts of London came to be known for different qualities. This is precisely played out in *Practical Cats* in, for example, the clubs and eateries of St James Square in ‘Bustopher Jones: The Cat About Town’, and the multicultural docks of the Thames in ‘Growltiger’s Last Stand.’ As well as St James Square, the Thames, Victoria Grove (the home of Mungojerrie and Rumpleteazer) and Bloomsbury Square (where Cat Morgan keeps the door), *Practical Cats* is filled with places that cannot be mapped. There are thirteen pubs and clubs named in the poems, but also generic places such as ‘the neighbouring pub’, ‘the Theatre’, ‘a small basement flat’ (pp. 24, 35), which can only be known to those personally involved in those places. In Michel de Certeau’s theory of the illocutionary act of city walking, he writes on these kinds of references as a subversion of authoritative accounts of the city: such places “become liberated spaces that can be occupied”, as they are “names that have ceased precisely to be ‘proper’”; as such, they build “a second, poetic geography on top of the geography of the literal”. Richard Badenhausen asserts that these unnamed spaces are “most significant due to their very indeterminacy, which allows alternative occupations of those spaces to function as creative acts in themselves” (“Totalizing the City”, p. 103).

It may appear that *Practical Cats* contrasts *The Waste Land* in its approach to the city, since *The Waste Land* only names landmarks such as London Bridge and King William Street, and so allows itself to be precisely mapped. However, the early drafts of *The Waste Land*, published in a facsimile with Ezra Pound’s emendations, reveal that Eliot’s original

31 Faulk, p. 32.
32 Bustopher Jones is not only a petit flâneur but also a Baudelairian dandy and a gastro-flâneur, as Katherine Gantz discusses a flânerie of food in the novels of Michel Houellebecq: ‘Strolling with Houellebecq: The Textual Terrain of Postmodern Flânerie’, *Journal of Modern Literature*, 28.3 (2005), 149-61. Bustopher Jones wanders St James Square with impeccable fashion sense – “No commonplace mousers have such well-cut trousers” – and describes his movements by the food available at each place he goes: ‘he’s frequently seen at the gay *Stage and Screen* [l] Which is famous for winkles and shrimps. [l] In the season of venison he gives his ben’son [l] To the *Pothunter’s* succulent bones; [l] And just before noon’s not a moment too soon [l] To drop in for a drink at the *Drones*’ (p. 39, italics in original).
vision for *The Waste Land* has much in common with *Practical Cats* in its representation of the city. In the final version of *The Waste Land*, the individuality that is so central to the characters of *Practical Cats* is all subsumed into the figure of Tiresias. Eliot cut eighteen characters from the poem, thus emphasising Tiresias’ position and undermining the individuality of the remaining characters as they merge into him (Badenhausen, p. 94). The change in title from *He Do the Police in Different Voices* to *The Waste Land* itself attests to Eliot’s move from working-class subversive voices to an overarching moral vision (pp. 92-94). Indeed, where Badenhausen sees Eliot censuring his own interest in the everyday multiple voices and individuality of the city under Pound’s strict guidance, *Practical Cats* can be seen as the ultimate expression of Eliot’s original poetic vision of the city. ‘The Burial of the Dead’ originally began with personal mapping, multiple voices and the exuberance of city living: ‘First we had a couple of feelers down at Tom’s place, [/] There was old Tom, boiled to the eyes, blind.’  

34 Badenhausen concludes that this early draft of *The Waste Land* ‘deeply reflects the individualized vision and personal interests of Eliot, for it includes extended references to or meditations on some of the writer’s pet interests [...] and even a character named Tom, a notably personal echo that never appears in any of Eliot’s published poetry or drama’ (p. 108). Where the final published version of *The Waste Land* excised all of these, favouring instead a universal and authoritative vision, *Practical Cats* revives Eliot’s personal and individual sense of the city.

*Practical Cats* also makes space for the range of social classes that Eliot aimed to depict in *The Waste Land*, reaching all the way down to the criminal underclass. The cats in these poems are perhaps more masterful of their urban surroundings than children are likely to be, but they are nonetheless petits flâneurs in the size and scope of their relations to city space. It is perhaps because of their social mastery that the French illustrator Morgan depicts

them in adult clothes, although cat-sized (see Image 8). Indeed, Tribunella talks of children evading the gaze of adults and finding freedom in city streets: ‘Partly because of their status as second-class citizens, children are sometimes able to roam without being noticed’ (p. 68). While Tribunella puts this down to social reasons, their ability to go unseen can also be matter of physical stature. As discussed above with Beegu, children may experience the city differently to most adults purely because they are smaller, and so can traverse the city differently. In *Practical Cats*, Macavity and Mr Mistoffelees are especially noted for being hard to find: ‘You may meet him in a by-street, you may see him in the square — /[ ] But when a crime’s discovered, then *Macavity’s not there!*’ (p. 32, italics in original). Further, the criminal cats of the poems, such as Mungojerrie and Rumpleteazer, have their child equivalents in such figures as Dickens’ Artful Dodger and Ward makes mention of street-wise urban children: ‘Some children steal, not because they have no access to the purchase money, but because they find it a less arduous task than the verbal encounter with the seller. They move like strangers through their own city, so that one is forced to admire those cheerful rogues who know every inch of it backwards and get involved in much more serious and sophisticated offences, just because they have absorbed the structure and functions of the city’ (p. 47). Like these ‘cheerful rogues’, Eliot’s cats are thus exemplary petits flâneurs in their mastery of the city, not despite, but because of their small stature and ability to go unnoticed.

The penultimate poem of *Practical Cats*, ‘The Ad-dressing of Cats’ teaches children how, in the anonymity of city living, to find allies and create their own personal mappings of the city through entering into relationships with city dwellers. Eliot recaps what he has presented of cats in the collection: ‘You’ve seen them both at work and games, /[ ] And learnt about their proper names, /[ ] Their habits and their habitat’ (p. 45). As we have seen, it is precisely this attention to play, to confident individuality (alluded to in their ‘proper names’)}
and to ‘habitat’ that is essential to Eliot’s poems here. The practical introduction to urban life made evident in this poem undergirds Eliot’s entire collection, and *Practical Cats* can thus be seen as the pinnacle of Eliot’s urban poetry (also chronologically his last major urban work). These poems bring together the varied influences of Baudelaire on him, his personal vision of the city, his class interests in the spectrum of cats presented and focus all of these into a text that officially and subversively maps London as a way of introducing the city to a child audience.
Image 8. Morgan’s cats in adult clothes, ‘La vieille Chatte Pôdcolleuse’ and ‘Machiavel’.
The two translators of *Practical Cats* into French, Charpentreau and Ménard, renegotiate these relations of childhood to London, but this urban childhood is situated within their two distinct priorities in translating these poems as poems (for children). Charpentreau and Ménard both choose different aspects of Eliot’s text as most important and try to replicate and develop them in French in their own ways. For Charpentreau the playful characters are most important; he domesticates names but works to replicate Eliot’s rhythms. For Ménard it is the pleasing poetic shapes, as he standardises rhythms and rhymes to French norms, but keeps Eliot’s names or close French equivalents. Charpentreau’s focus is in line with his background as a children’s poet and educator (he has only translated one other book), focusing more than Ménard on what he can use *Practical Cats* to teach French children about Paris, and embracing unconventional but entertaining poetic forms. Ménard is best known as a translator of school texts and popular works for children, including the Harry Potter books and Roald Dahl’s *The BFG*, and in his capacity as a professional translator, focuses more than Charpentreau on giving a sense of the foreignness of the text he is translating. However, Ménard much more often translates prose than poetry, which may explain his more conservative choices for rhythms and rhymes in this translation.

Ménard’s translation makes clear that it was commissioned to accompany Axel Scheffler’s new illustrations, and Scheffler’s internationality is stressed on the sleeve of the cover: ‘Axel Scheffler est né à Hambourg, en Allemagne et vit à Londres avec son épouse, française’ [Axel Scheffler was born in Hamburg, in Germany and lives in London with his French wife] (*Le Guide*, [n.p.]). Almost every page is illustrated in colour, including seven full-page illustrations. The 1983 translation, in contrast, does not break up the text of the poems with illustrations, but has a black-and-white image of the titular cat/s before each
poem and depicts a cat reading for those poems with no main character. Charpentreau’s translation is the only edition with a French illustrator, Morgan, a renowned illustrator of children’s stories and mythology picturebooks; his illustrations, like Charpentreau’s domestication of names, help lay emphasis in this edition on the cats as characters.

In this section, I will look first at how translators have approached Eliot’s works for adults, then at the metrical forms of ‘Skimbleshanks’, ‘The Old Gumbie Cat’ and ‘The Song of the Jellicles’ in all three texts, and finally at the names of cats in the poems, focusing on domestication for rhyme, wordplay and allusion.

Translations of Eliot’s works for adults make little effort to replicate the shapes of Eliot’s poems and, of course, do not domesticate. Pierre Leyris and Claude Vigée are the two main translators of Eliot’s poetry and their translations focus on conveying Eliot’s meaning, such that it is only incidental that it is in verse and not prose, for most of Eliot’s writing. Translations of Eliot’s main works for adults proceed by translating word for word, neglecting rhythm, rhyme and other sound patternings. Leyris even keeps quotations in English, doing his best to foreignise, to show the patchwork of Eliot’s text and to keep his reader remembering that what s/he is reading is not in its original language: everything Venuti asks of a translator to avoid becoming ‘invisible’. Eliot is not known for his stanza forms or rhyme – he is known more for breaking form and for fragmentation – but this only means that the occasional rhymes and the ghosts of rhythms are more subtly significant to his works. Eliot himself writes on *vers libre* that ‘the ghost of some simple metre should lurk behind the arras in even the “freest” verse’ and ‘this liberation from rhyme might be as well a liberation of rhyme. Freed from its exacting task of supporting lame verse, it could be applied with greater effect where it is most needed.’

35 However, to find equivalent rhythms and rhymes in translation often means significantly changing the words, and the word is taken as central to

---

Eliot’s poetry, as more important than shape, sound, pleasure and the ability of the target
culture reader to identify with the poem. For example, Eliot uses rhyme for parts of *Four
Quartets*, such as this couplet: ‘The parched eviscerate soil [/] Gapes at the vanity of toil’ (p.
216). Vigée translates this word for word, only changing the word order of the first line to
‘The soil, parched, eviscerate’ to follow French grammar, and makes no effort to rhyme the
lines: ‘Le sol brûlé, éviscéré, [/] Bée face au vain labeur’ [The soil burnt, eviscerated, /
gaping faces to vain labour].

36 Leyris’ translation of the same passage adds an extra line to
more carefully capture the meaning: ‘Le sol broui, éviscéré [/] Bée au spectacle de l’effort [/]
En dénonçant sa vanité’ [The soil parched, eviscerated / gaping at the spectacle of effort / in
denouncing its vanity].

Leyris thus approximates Eliot’s meaning in French with no regard
for Eliot’s rhyme scheme or lineation.

None of this is the case for *Practical Cats*, because it has a lower place in the literary
polysystem and so is more malleable in the hands of its translators. It is translated with a
greater emphasis on reader enjoyment. For example, the poetic shape is chosen over exact
meaning in both translations of *Practical Cats* for the opening lines of the collection: ‘The
Naming of Cats is a difficult matter, [/] It isn’t just one of your holiday games; [/] You may
think at first I’m as mad as a hatter [/] When I tell you, a cat must have THREE DIFFERENT
NAMES’ (p. 1). While both translations are clear on the fact that cats have three names, neither
Charpentreau nor Ménard keep the allusion to Lewis Carroll’s Mad Hatter – Charpentreau
appears to raise the idea of a magician or illusionist who uses a hat in his tricks, with ‘Je ne
travaille pas du chapeau’ [I am not deceiving you, lit. I am not working the hat]
(Charpentreau, p. 9), while Ménard simply states ‘je paraîtrai dément’ [I may seem crazy]
(Ménard, p. 1) – and neither keeps the mention of holiday games, replacing it with ‘passe-
temps’ [pastimes] and ‘jeu d’enfant’ [child’s play]. In place of holiday games, the translations

36 Eliot, *Quatre Quatuors* [Four Quartets], trans. Claude Vigée, commentary Gabriel Josipovici (London:
Menard, 1992), p. 43.
have loose French equivalents that rhyme readily and, instead of including and having to explain ‘mad as a hatter’, their equivalents are more recognisable to a French reader. With greater liberty to change the text in translating children’s poetry, these translators work harder than the translators of Eliot’s adult works to make their texts poetic for their audiences, including paying attention to the ‘read-aloud-ability’ of the poems.

Rhythm:

For French poetry, the most common and recognisable verse form is the alexandrine, which Eliot loosely uses in some poems, since he often uses lines of four feet. The majority of Ménard’s rhymes are pauvre, but he is much more consistent about rhyming than Eliot and, where Eliot has unusual rhyming schemes, Ménard makes them into standard ones, often as rigid alexandrines. ‘Skimbleshanks’, for example, alternates tetrameter with lines of either trimeter or dimeter, rhyming the shorter lines with each other, but making the tetrameter lines rhyme internally: ‘They are searching high and low, [/] Saying “Skimble where is Skimble for unless he’s very nimble [/] Then the Night Mail just can’t go’ (p. 41). In Ménard’s ‘Skimbleshank’, all the lines are alexandrines and all end-rhymed, either cross-rhyming or couplet rhyming: ‘Skimbel alors s’avance, d’un pas souple et gracieux, [/] Il était occupé dans le fourgon de queue’ [Skimbel thus advances, with a supple and gracious step, / He was busy in the rear carriage] (p. 53). Charpentreau approaches this poem with lines of thirteen or fourteen syllables interspersed with lines of seven syllables, making all of his longer lines internally rhyme and all of his shorter lines end-rhyme. His railway cat is called Roulifrotambole and he generates a pleasing locomotive feel with his longer lines: where Ménard has the formal ‘Où est passé Skimbel? À la chasse aux ficelles?’ [Where has Skimbel been? Hunting bits of string?] (p. 52), which looks backwards in its single internal rhyme, Charpentreau has: ‘C’est: “Rouli, où est Rouli, chasserait-il la poulie?’ [It’s: “Rouli, where is
Rouli, is he chasing the pulley?] (p. 57), which chugs forward with its dactylic double internal rhyme.

‘The Old Gumbie Cat’ is a highly structured poem, with two kinds of stanza. The first has four exceedingly long lines, of sixteen syllables with medial caesura, rhyming a hemistichs with a hemistichs as well as end-rhyming each line: ‘I have a Gumbie Cat in mind, her name is Jennyanydots; [/] Her coat is of the tabby kind, with tiger stripes and leopard spots’ (p. 5). The second kind of stanza has eight lines of eleven to thirteen syllables, and is dependent on having four feet of varying length per line and couplet rhymes: ‘But when the day’s hustle and bustle is done [/] Then the Gumbie Cat’s work is but hardly begun’ (ibid.). Charpentrea also has long lines for his translation, ‘La vieille Chatte Pôdcolleuse’: sixteen syllables for the first stanza and alexandrines for the second. He does not internally rhyme his longer lines, but mostly achieves medial caesura and has high quality end-rhymes, often suffisant or riche: ‘J’ai une Chatte Pôdcolleuse en tête. Son nom: Nénulpart. [/] Fourrure marquetée, tigrée, mouchetée comme un léopard’ [I have a Pôdcolleuse Cat in mind. Her name: Nénulpart. / Fur coat inlaid, striped, dappled like a leopard] (p. 13). Ménard’s lines are a little shorter at fourteen syllables for the first kind of stanza and alexandrines for the second. This shortening of lines impacts what is perhaps the most famous line of the poem: ‘She sits and sits and sits and sits — and that’s what makes a Gumbie Cat!’ (p. 5). As French is slightly more verbose than English, Charpentrea has only three repetitions, which he achieves by restructuring the line: ‘Que fait la Chatte Pôdcolleuse? Elle est assise, assise, assise!’ [What does the Pôdcolleuse Cat do? She sits, sits, sits!] (p. 13) Ménard endeavours to keep the same order to the phrase and, with his shorter line, can only say it twice: ‘Rester couché, couché, c’est ce que les Chats Mollets font!’ [Staying lying down, lying down, that’s what Mollet Cats do!] (p. 4).

38 The musical Cats acknowledges this variety of rhythms by giving the different kinds of verse to different voices, and even varying genres of music within the song.
The extra verbosity of French is particularly a challenge for the very short lines of ‘The Song of the Jellicles’, with eight to ten syllables per line: ‘Jellicle Cats are black and white, [/] Jellicle cats are rather small; [/] Jellicle cats are merry and bright, [/] And pleasant to hear when they caterwaul’ (p. 15). Charpentreau makes all the lines ten syllables and varies between cross-rhyme, as Eliot has, and couplet rhyme, to make it easier to find rhyming words for such short lines: ‘Les Chats-Soupléchine, ils sont noir et blanc, [/] Les Chats-Soupléchine, ils ne sont pas grands’ [Soupléchine Cats, they are black and white, / Soupléchine Cats, they are not big] (p. 25). Ménard also utilise ten syllable lines, but more evenly cross-rhymes throughout: ‘Les Jerpitits Chats sont tout noir et blanc, [/] Les Jerpitits Chats sont plutôt petits, [/] Les Jerpitits Chats sont joyeux, brillants, [/] Et miaulent avec une belle harmonie’ [Jerpitits Cats are all black and white, / Jerpitits Cats are rather small, / Jerpitits cats are happy, bright, / And miaow with a beautiful harmony] (p. 18). Ménard appears to be more interested than Charpentreau in the neatness of his poetry, and he includes an effective repetition in the final line of the poem: ‘La Jerpitite Lune, le Jerpitit Bal’ [The Jerpitit Moon, the Jerpitit Ball] (p. 21), where Charpentreau has ‘Au grand Bal sous la Lune-Soupléchine’ [At the great Ball under the Soupléchine Moon] (p. 26). Ménard’s translation prioritises normalising the poetry to French standards for his target audience, shortening unusually long lines and lengthening unusually short ones, cutting excessive repetitions down and adding regularity in creating simple rhyme schemes. Charpentreau’s translation does not prioritise making the shape of the poetry more familiar to his target audience, more often and more closely recreating Eliot’s stanza forms. Charpentreau’s interest appears to lie more in making identifiable characters of the cats for his child readers.

Names:

A brief glance at Table 3 of the names of cat protagonists in each of the texts shows how
differently Charpentreau and Ménard have chosen to deal with names in *Practical Cats*.

Indeed, even Ménard’s title reveals his effort to keep closer to Eliot’s names, despite their awkwardness in French – ‘Vieil Opossum’ being much more unwieldy than ‘Old Possum’ and neither as straightforward as ‘Chats!’, which no doubt plays off the popularity of the musical.

**Table 3. *Practical Cats* main characters’ names.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gumbie Cat –</td>
<td>Chatte Pôdcoleuse –</td>
<td>Chat Mollet –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennyanydots</td>
<td>Nénulpart</td>
<td>Jennanydots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growltiger</td>
<td>Grostigré</td>
<td>Gronetigre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum Tum Tugger</td>
<td>Rapattenplan</td>
<td>Rum Tum Tugger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jellicles</td>
<td>Chats-Soupléchine</td>
<td>Jerpitits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungojerrie and Rumpleteaizer</td>
<td>Macatoc et Chabichotté</td>
<td>Mungojerrie et Rumpletaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Deutéronome</td>
<td>Deutéronome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekes and Pollicles</td>
<td>Chows-chows et Toutous</td>
<td>Pékinois et Popitits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mistoffeeees</td>
<td>Monsieur Méphistophile</td>
<td>Mr. Mistoffélis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macavity</td>
<td>Machiavel</td>
<td>Macavity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas (Asparagus)</td>
<td>Hugo (Hugolâtre)</td>
<td>Gus (Asparagus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustopher Jones</td>
<td>Florimond d’Orsay</td>
<td>Bustopher Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimbleshanks</td>
<td>Roulifrotambole</td>
<td>Skimbleshank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Morgan</td>
<td>Le Chat d’Olonne</td>
<td>Morgan le Chat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ménard does domesticate some names and parts of names, ostensibly only when he is required to do so for the sake of rhyme. Jellicle and Pollicle have no easy rhymes in French, and so an equivalent French diminutive form is invented from ‘petit’ [small], so that ‘Jerpitits’ and ‘Popitits’ can be better integrated into French verse. The first poem of the collection, ‘The Naming of Cats’, has three lists of names and a regular rhyme scheme (see Table 4), and Ménard only domesticates names at the end of lines to rhyme them, but leaves distinctly foreign other names: ‘Il y a d’abord le nom donné par la famille, [/] Tel que Pierre ou Auguste, Alonzo ou Matthieu, [/] Victor ou Jonathan, Bill Bailey ou Camille’ [There is first of all the name given by the family, / Such as Pierre or Auguste, Alonzo or Matthieu, / Victor or Jonathan, Bill Bailey or Camille] (p. 1). Slight cultural adaptation takes place for
Peter and Augustus, but James is replaced by Matthieu so that it can rhyme below with ‘judicieux’ [judicious]. Likewise, the order of names is changed, so that instead of Bill Bailey at the end of the line, it is put in the middle, and Camille, which replaces George, is put at the end to rhyme with ‘famille’ [family]. Mungojerrie and Rumpleteazer are both as alien as each other to the French language, but Mungojerrie is left untouched by Ménard, while the ‘teazer’ of Rumpleteazer is change for ‘taquin’, which means a teaser. Eliot does not rhyme Rumpleteazer with anything in his poem, but as we have seen, Ménard adds rhymes to most of his poems. Here, Rumpletaquin ends three lines and is rhymed with ‘baladins’ [wandering entertainers], ‘festin’ [feast], ‘vaurien’ [good-for-nothing] and ‘rien’ [nothing].

Charpentreau leaves almost none of Eliot’s names alone and, in his rendition of ‘The Naming of Cats’, invents his own playful names: some with similar sounds, such as Méta-Méthyl for Munkustrap, Kalikola for Coricopat and others of their own pleasing strangeness: Ouitchi for Quaxo, Psychologie for Bombalurina, Presbytère-Pacha for Jellylorum, the latter of which meets some of the potential religious implications of Eliot’s naming. Where Eliot’s Jellicle could be short for ‘evangelical’ or allude to dancing angels and be ‘angelical’, it also has a secular sense of jelly-like flexibility. Charpentreau works with this sense of the name in his creative Soupléchines, which combines the French words ‘souple’ or supple, and ‘échine’ or spine, but binding them together in making the ‘e’ work for both words. Charpentreau is perhaps less playful and more intellectual in renaming Mr Mistoffelees as Monsieur Méphistophile, the backtranslation of which would be Mr Mephistopheles. He makes the allusion more explicit and makes little effort to make the name sound silly, which Mr Mistoffelees naturally succeeds in by repeating the sound ‘mist’ and having double f’s. Charpentreau’s choice of the allusion over the sound for Mr Mistoffelees is part of a concerted effort to build allusions the French may recognise into his translation. This is clear in his translation of ‘Cat Morgan Introduces Himself’. Cat Morgan is a pirate, but Morgan is
Table 4. Cats in ‘The Naming of Cats’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T. S. Eliot</th>
<th>Jacques Charpentreau</th>
<th>Jean-François Ménard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘The Naming of Cats’</td>
<td>‘Comment appeler son Chat’</td>
<td>‘Le Nom d’un chat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Pierre</td>
<td>Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>Jean-Paul</td>
<td>Auguste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alonzo</td>
<td>Aglaé</td>
<td>Alonzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Pompadour</td>
<td>Matthieu (rhymes judicieux)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor</td>
<td>Sylvain</td>
<td>Victor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>Luc</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Chat-Fourré</td>
<td>Camille (rhymes famille)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bailey</td>
<td>Cyprien</td>
<td>Bill Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkustrap</td>
<td>Mêta-Méthyl</td>
<td>Trapanânk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaxo</td>
<td>Ouitchi</td>
<td>Couaxo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coricopat</td>
<td>Kalikola</td>
<td>Coricopat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombalurina</td>
<td>Psychologie</td>
<td>Bomballerina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jellylorum</td>
<td>Presbytère-Pacha</td>
<td>Jellylorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

not the name of any particularly famous pirates – Francis Drake and Edward Teach come to mind before Sir Henry Morgan. In contrast, François l’Olonnaïs is most likely the best-known of French pirates. While this cat is ‘d’Olonne’ in the title, he is called ‘l’Olonnaïs’ and ‘le vieil Olonnaïs’ [the old Olonnaïs] during the poem. Olonne is also further removed than Morgan from ordinary names, and so more obviously allusive. Machiavel for Macavity raises further issues as Macavity was to Eliot an allusion to a different person altogether. He wrote in a letter about Macavity: ‘I have done a new cat, modeled on the late Professor Moriarty.’

Macavity has the same face as Sherlock Holmes’ nemesis and both are called ‘the Napoleon of Crime.’ Charpentreau perhaps thought that French children would not be as familiar with Arthur Conan Doyle, or simply that Machiavelli is a more internationally known “evil”

39 Cited in Bay-Cheng, p. 231.
40 Joseph Blenkinsopp points to the similarities between Macavity and Moriarty: their proficiency in mathematics and their appearance. In The Final Problem, Holmes describes Moriarty as ‘extremely tall and thin [...] his forehead domes out [...] his two eyes are deeply sunken in his head’, and his head is ‘forever slowly oscillating from side to side in a curiously reptilian fashion’. Eliot uses many of the same words: ‘Macavity’s a ginger cat, he’s very tall and thin; […] You would know him if you saw him for his eyes are sunken in. [...] His brow is deeply lined with thought, his head is highly domed; […] He sways his head from side to side, with movements like a snake’ (p. 31). Blenkinsopp, ‘Macavity and Moriarty’, Baker Street Journal, 28.1 (1978), 103-04.
Machiavelli is as closely echoed as Moriarty in the shape of the name Macavity, and so Charpentreau’s renaming in translation opens up a new allusiveness to the name, even as it closes down a specifically British one.

Charpentreau justifies his domestication of names in his short preface to the text:

Les chats formant une aristocratie internationale, les amis des chats se retrouvant dans de nombreux pays francophones, il m’a semblé nécessaire non seulement de traduire ce savoureux manuel, mais de l’adapter à notre propre civilisation. Car nous avons aussi nos chats pirates comme Grostigré (ils ne hantent pas la Tamise, mais la Seine), nos chats mondains comme Florimond d’Orsay (ils ne fréquentent pas St James, mais les Champs-Élysées), nos chats voyageurs comme Roulfrotambole (ils ne roulent pas vers l’Écosse, mais vers la Côte d’Azur)

[Since cats form an international aristocracy [...] it seemed necessary to me not only to translate this delightful manual, but to adapt it to our own civilisation. For we too have our pirate cats like Grostigré (they don’t haunt the Thames, but the Seine), our worldly cats like Florimond d’Orsay (they don’t frequent St James, but the Champs-Élysées), our travelling cats like Roulfrotambole (they don’t drive to Scotland, but to the Côte d’Azur)] (p. 6)

As Charpentreau makes clear here, it is not only names that he domesticates, but the places associated with each cat and, in doing so, he highlights the deep importance of London to Eliot’s text. He even posits Eliot as a flâneur: ‘Voilà quelques années, on pouvait voir dans les rues de Londres un monsieur distingué s’arrêter de temps en temps au cours de sa promenade pour saluer comme il convenait d’importants personnages. Ce gentleman était T. S. Eliot; ces personnages importants, c’étaient les chats’ [Some years ago, one could see in the streets of London a distinguished gentleman stopping from time to time as he walked, to greet important individuals as befitted them. This gentleman was T. S. Eliot; as for these individual, they were cats] (p. 5).

Paris is the home and origin of flânerie, as Keith Tester notes in The Flâneur. Eliot himself writes Parisian urban poetry, as in his Prelude three (Collected Poems, p. 24). It is thus something of a ‘backtranslation’ for Charpentreau to domesticate his poems to Paris.

Charpentreau clearly sees that a central aspect of Practical Cats is exploring separate parts of London through a number of its cat portraits, and sees the value of doing so in children’s literature. As such, he embarks upon the same endeavour in representing Paris in his text. The London names in Ménard’s foreignised text and in the new illustrations to Ménard’s edition may introduce its French readers to London, but often appear incongruous, as in Ménard’s ‘Bustopher Jones’: ‘Et dans tout St James Street, c’est le chat qu’on salue’ [And in all St James Street, he’s the cat that we greet] (p. 49). Perhaps Ménard’s edition would benefit from a map or two of London, to help its target audience locate these places.42

As we have seen, therefore, Charpentreau prioritises the cats as localised individuals in his translation, and domesticates these to bring to his text a playful introduction to city life appropriate to his target audience. Ménard, in contrast, does not prioritise the effects of names and places in his translation, only domesticating when required to do so for his stanza form, since his priority appears to be in finding pleasing shapes for the poetry. As such, Ménard’s poems introduce French child readers to urban life through London, as something other and foreign. Equally, Charpentreau introduces Eliot to child readers through Paris, as if a French poet himself. Whether London or Paris, however, the city lies at the heart of both sets of poems.

The Musical Cats. Adaptation and Allusion

Andrew Lloyd Webber’s Cats is one of the most popular musicals in history. Although adapted from a book, it is not classified as a “book musical”, but as a “revue”, for its lower emphasis on plot and higher emphasis on showcasing the talents of its performers. The key

42 Indeed, it would be worth publishing Practical Cats with a map of the city that showed the locations of the various cats, given the division of London into zones, as discussed above, and the commonality of maps in children’s books. In Beatrice Alemagna’s Un lion à Paris [A Lion in Paris] (2006), a feline leads its child reader through famous parts of Paris, and the book very helpfully ends with a map to help situate its story.
difference between musicals and plays that include songs (for example, Shakespearean comedies and romances), is the value given to songs in musicals: they are not interludes from the action, but the action itself. In musicals, the songs and dances are the mechanisms of both plot and character development. Musicals today are often seen as light in tone and the musical as we know it is most likely descended from French and Viennese operettas. These begin in the mid-19th century with the French composer Hervé (Florimond Ronger) and were made popular by the German Parisian Jacques Offenbach. As such, France has a significant historical role in the development of musical theatre. Eliot himself would have encountered an early form of musical theatre on his year abroad in France, a type of melodrama known simply as “les pièces à grand spectacle” [plays of great spectacle], as Nancy Hargrove notes. It may be because of Eliot’s interest in popular music that Valerie Eliot, his late wife and literary executor, approved of Webber’s early musical setting of *Practical Cats* and shared some unpublished poems with him (Webber, p. 7).

I will consider the musical *Cats* here as a translation, with its own independent target audience and requirements of a different semiotics in order to best engage its audience. With its focus on spectacle and the show tune ‘Memory’, Andrew Lloyd Webber, Gillian Lynne and Trevor Nunn created one of the most successful musicals of all time. *Cats* ran in London for twenty-one years (1981-2002) and in New York for eighteen years (1982-2000), making it the fourth longest-running show in the West End and the second longest-running on Broadway. While little has been written about the translation of written texts into musicals, Reba Gostand, writing on translation and theatre, includes the shift from one medium to

---

43 There are, of course, musicals that are violent or sexual in content, such as *Sweeney Todd* or *Rent*, but given the expectation that a musical is not very serious in its content, these musicals play on the disparity between their catchy, light-hearted tunes and dark content, to create black comedy.

44 Hargrove, ‘T. S. Eliot and Popular Entertainment in Paris, 1910-1911’, *Journal of Popular Culture*, 36.2 (2003), 547-88 (p. 548). In particular, she calls this form of entertainment ‘roughly equivalent to Broadway musicals today’, and notes that the ‘original meaning of the French word “mélodrame” was “musical drama”’.

another among kinds of translation, in attempting to broaden the sense of the word
‘translation’. Gostand further insists on a secondary stage to translations of performances,
‘effected by interpretation on the part of the director, actor or by staging devices.’

As such, a consideration of the translation of Eliot’s poetry collection *Practical Cats*
into the musical *Cats* must include not only an account of differences in the lyrics, but
equally with the staging, choreography and music styles of which the translation comprises.
Martine Beugnet and Marion Schmid, writing on film adaptations of literature and Proust,
take the modernity of Proust’s writing as itself significant to the adaptation process: ‘Usually
thought of in relation to the hackneyed concept of fidelity to an original, adaptation is further
associated with the most conservative tendencies in filmmaking […] To consider adaptation in
relation to Proust’s writing, however, is to challenge these common and generally valid
assumptions.’ In the same way, Eliot’s modernism inflects upon Webber’s translation of the
poems. Eliot’s experimentation resurfaces in the experimental aspects of the musical and its
play with its own theatricality: the breaking of the fourth wall by the dancers, characters
acting other characters (Gus sings of how he performed the role of Growltiger, and Macavity
disguises himself as Deuteronomy), and the *mise en abyme* of storytelling, as the loose plot
gives way to digressions (as when the cats sing to Deuteronomy about the battle of the Pekes
and the Pollicles).

Webber and Nunn have added a little to the critical history of *Practical Cats*, in short
essays prefacing the book of their musical: both focus on the ‘irregular and exciting metre’,
and the issue of making a musical when Eliot provides no plot (pp. 7-12). To achieve
narrative cohesion, they introduced the character of Grizabella from fragments of poetry that

46 Reba Gostand, ‘Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication: Drama as Translation’, in *The Languages of
Theatre: Problems in the Translation and Transposition of Drama*, ed. by Ortrun Zuber (Oxford: Pergamon
pp. 7-8.

Eliot did not publish, since he thought it ‘too sad for children.’\textsuperscript{48} They combined the figure of Grizabella, fallen from public fame and success, with the ending that Eliot drafted but chose not to use, of cats ascending ‘Up up up past the Russell Hotel [/] Up up up to the Heaviside Layer’ (p. 100).\textsuperscript{49} While this ending may make more overt the religious undertones to much of the text, it is nonetheless a playful and self-subverting seriousness, as Trevor Nunn noted: ‘The Russell Hotel sits right behind one of our big bookstores. Supposedly, the heaviest books were shelved on the very top floor. There’s the Heaviside Layer the cats are talking about!’\textsuperscript{50} Bay-Cheng, working with a hierarchical appreciation of source over target text, sees the choice of this ending as a critical misinterpretation of \textit{Practical Cats}, since this ‘overindulgence in spectacle’ is in stark contrast to the ‘humble’ ending of Eliot’s collection of poems: with the spectacular ascension of Grizabella, the musical ‘came to define material theatrical excess.’\textsuperscript{51}

Grizabella is lifted up into the ‘Heaviside layer’ (or ‘félinosphère’ in Marchais) on either a giant tyre on the West End stage or a forklift on Broadway. They are giant because, as with everything else on the stage, their sizes are scaled up to the assumption that the actors are cat-sized. However, apart from the ascension at the end, the staging overall underplays spectacle in its drab colours and nondescript objects: the stage is, indeed, a cat-sized ‘waste land’, replete with miscellaneous waste materials.\textsuperscript{52} John Napier, the set and costume designer, describes it as a ‘playground-cum-rubbish-dump’, with such urban waste as ‘huge rubbish bins, an abandoned car, massive tyres, bicycles, even used tubes of toothpaste, worn-

\textsuperscript{49} Grizabella is comparable to the fallen Norma Desmond of Webber’s \textit{Sunset Boulevard}.
\textsuperscript{50} Cited in Bay-Cheng, p. 235. If Eliot was alluding to this, then it is also possible that salvation in books is being mutely or mockingly suggested.
\textsuperscript{51} Bay-Cheng, p. 235.
out Christmas decorations and lots of other garbage.\footnote{John Napier, ‘A Giant Playground for Cats’, in \textit{Cats: The Book of the Musical, op. cit.}, p. 14.} Often, the identity of these background objects is not at all clear from the audience’s perspective, and so the setting does not catch the viewer’s eye. Similarly, the costumes, while Napier talks of ‘blending together the cat and human elements’, are primarily dirty and rag-like in appearance, underplaying the variety of social classes and character types in Eliot’s poems, to show a more generic city street life.\footnote{Ibid.}

Spectacle is significant to the musical, however, in its set piece dances, such as the tap dance by Jennyanydots, and Skimbleshanks coordinating the construction of a train.\footnote{For discussion of these set pieces, see Noriko Takeda, ‘T. S. Eliot’s Playful Catharsis: \textit{Cats} as the Rejuvenated Human’, in her \textit{The Modernist Human: Configurations of Humanness in Stéphane Mallarmé’s Hérodiade, T. S. Eliot’s Cats, and Modernist Lyrical Poetry} (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2008), pp. 65-91 (p. 86).} Moreover, the dancing oversteps the boundary of the stage and the actors and actresses not only traverse the audience, but dance with audience members. The choreographer Lynne adds that there were no wings to the stage, giving an ‘immediacy’ to the space – all actions were visible to the audience (Webber 13). For Lynne the greatest challenge was making the Jellicle ball a visual centrepiece: ‘I knew I had to extend T. S. Eliot’s beautiful poem and find a dance poem that carried on the ideas he suggested, to become a piece of exciting theatre whilst showing the cats at the height of their passion, dancing their most private, energetic and anarchic rituals’ (\textit{ibid.}).

The lyrics of the musical significantly differ from Eliot’s collection of poems in three places. New lyrics are added in ‘Growltiger’s Last Stand’ and in the opening number, ‘Jellicle Songs for Jellicle Cats’. However, where the opening number is entirely Nunn’s invention, the lyrics added to ‘Growltiger’s Last Stand’ are from Eliot’s uncollected poetry: Growltiger and Griddlebone sing a duet of Eliot’s poem ‘Billy M’Caw: The Remarkable Parrot’ (p. 71). This poem is about a barmaid called Lily (perhaps the same as the ‘Lil’ from ‘A Game of Chess’) and the parrot in her bar, whose dancing and musical performances entertain the
clientele. It is written in a Cockney dialect, with such non-standard pronunciations as ‘Sattaday’ and ‘anythink’, and non-standard grammar as ‘a girl what had brains’ and ‘when we was thirsty’ (*ibid*). This poem is thus not only appropriately urban, but has much akin in its first person perspective to the deleted opening section of *The Waste Land*, in which ‘Tom’ and his friends went from bar to bar. Perhaps for its Cockney dialect, the Broadway *Cats* does not have this song and instead parodies Puccini’s famous duet from *Madame Butterfly* with ‘In una tepida notte’. The French *Cats*, too, uses this duet-aria, sung in Italian. The Broadway Growltiger adds a little to the comedy by turning a sustained high note into a cat’s wailing, but his French counterpart extends this to several comic noises that undermine the notion of a cat singing in a ‘manly baritone’ (p. 70), making the aria into a true caterwaul.

In ‘Memory’, the musical’s third extended addition to Eliot’s poems, no such parody or comedy is to be found. Nunn created the lyrics largely out of Eliot’s earlier urban poetry, such as ‘Rhapsody on a Windy Night’ and the Preludes, taking for example ‘The moon has lost her memory’ and ‘Every street-lamp that I pass [\]/ Beats like a fatalistic drum’ (*Collected Poems*, pp. 26-27) from the former, and ‘The burnt-out ends of smoky days. [\]/ And now a gusty shower wraps [\]/ The grimy scraps [\]/ Of withered leaves about your feet’ from Prelude I (p. 23). Nunn’s most effective adaptation of Eliot’s poetry is ‘Someone mutters and the street lamp gutters’. Apart from its internal rhyme, it takes Eliot’s use of ‘gutters’ as a noun and resituates it as a pun, which evokes the gutters of a grimy city, but also connects in its guttural voice to the line ‘Burnt-out ends of smoky days’ (p. 98). This smoke is city smog, but the two images together also suggest the fashionable smoking of a stylish urban figure as Grizabella used to be, aligning her lifestyle, her dying and her locale in the many senses of smoke. Nunn connects these adapted fragments of Eliot’s poetry with very simple lines: ‘I was beautiful then’, ‘I mustn’t give in’, ‘a new day will begin’ (p. 98). Despite the simplicity of these connections, ‘Memory’ is evocative in the imagery it uses, as for example the ‘withered
leaves’ become an objective correlative for Grizabella’s own death, alluding to Dante and Virgil’s use of leaves for death, and enhanced by the leafy appearance of her ragged, earthy-coloured costume (see Image 9).

‘Memory’, dialect and spectacle are three of the key issues in the translation of this musical. *Cats* has been translated into over twenty languages and performed around the world. Its French translation, by Jacques Marchais, did not experience the same success as the Broadway and West End productions.\(^{56}\) The French version of the show only ran at the Théâtre de Paris from the 23\(^{\text{rd}}\) February 1989 until the 29\(^{\text{th}}\) April 1990. It followed the make-up and choreography of the highly successful Vienna production (also designed by Trevor Nunn and Gillian Lynne).\(^{57}\) As such, all that is unique to the French production is Marchais’ translation. Part of the cause for the brevity of its run may be the lower popularity of musicals in France, despite the French origins of musical theatre discussed above. As an example of this lower popularity, the musical *Les Misérables* is the longest-running musical in the world, in its West End production, but the original French production only ran in Paris for sixteen weeks in 1980; it has been revived there twice, but for no more than a season at a time. The musical adaptation of *Practical Cats* required a translation approach that prioritised shape over content, more than even Ménard’s translation and an effort towards read-aloud-ability in translating poetry. As stated in Chapter 1, there is very little written about the translation of musicals, but it has clear commonalities with the separate work taking place in the translation of drama and the translation of songs. The main issues in musical translation, according to Peter Low, are ‘singability’ and ‘performability’: ‘a singable song-translation requires “performability”. It must function effectively as an oral text delivered at performance speed

\(^{56}\) Jacques Marchais was a singer/songwriter in the 1960s and 1970s. Among his songs are arrangements of famous French poems, such as Ronsard’s ‘Ode au plaisir’ and Aragon’s ‘Paris 42’. The translator of *Cats* is not the Jacques Marchais who collected Tibetan art, who died in 1948.

\(^{57}\) The Vienna production ran for seven years, and is being revived in January 2012.
— whereas with a written text the reader has a chance to pause, reflect or even re-read.'

This effort towards singability requires consideration of the sequence of words in source and target text, in relation to extended syllables, louder notes and notes of higher pitch. Sirkku Aaltonen asserts that performability and ‘speakability’ (the theatrical translation equivalent of singability) ‘can be read as generalised descriptions of translation strategies in the theatre which are seen to set them apart from the dominant view in the literary system of how translations should relate to their source text.’

That is to say, these terms serve a functional purpose in distinguishing ways of prioritising material in translating, although theorists of translation such as Aaltonen and Bassnett criticise the ‘vagueness’ of these concepts.

Bassnett notes that if these terms were to be defined, their definitions ‘would constantly vary, from culture to culture, from period to period and from text type to text type.’ They would also vary from person to person, as subjective judgement determines to what extent one considers something ‘singable’ or ‘speakable’.

Nevertheless, it is evident that for Marchais’ translation of Cats, singability is high among his priorities, as the translation consistently reduces content and neutralises specifics of location, but effectively recreates the shape and sound plays of the Webber musical. Indeed, in interview, Thierry Gondet, who played the French version of Skimbleshanks, claimed that the translation decision of shape over content marred the success of this production of Cats:

- Quelles ont été les réactions du public français face à Cats ?
  Mitigées. Ils étaient admiratifs de l’effort physique et des compétences requises pour jouer un tel spectacle, mais ils étaient un peu déroutés par le contenu. La traduction n’étaient pas très réussie, en partie à cause des anglais qui exigeaient du mot à mot et nous chantions parfois des choses incompréhensibles.

[- What were the reactions of the French public towards Cats?

58 Peter Low, ‘Singable Translations of Songs’, Perspectives, 11.2 (2003), 87-103 (p. 93).
60 Aaltonen, p. 42.
Mitigated. They were admiring of the physical effort and the competence required to perform such a show, but they were a bit disconcerted by the content. The translation was not a great success partly because of the English that had to be word to word and we were sometimes singing incomprehensible things.]62

In this section, we will see that Jacques Marchais’ French translation of *Cats*, while changing much, is in fact very internally consistent with its changes, in particular to names and places, even adding its own motif of cat-related wordplay and allusions. However, the translation of ‘Memory’, the most famous number from *Cats*, entirely fits with Gondet’s criticism, and it appears that to keep to its shape, Marchais greatly de-prioritised the meaning of the song. Moreover, it may be that in *adding* wordplay, Marchais opens himself up to Gondet’s accusation of being unintelligible: where nonsense verse is historically a genre for children in English literature, the nonsense poetry of Lewis Carroll was taken up in France by the historical avant-garde and in particular surrealists and Dadaists such as Artaud and Breton.63 Rickard notes the very different place in French society that nonsense literature holds: ‘Nonsense and absurdity certainly play their part in Dadaist and Surrealist literature, but they tend to be, for those schools, nothing if not consciously wielded social weapons, and the tone is often extremely savage, violent, and destructive. […] In France, nonsense and evocations of the world upside-down tend to be satirical, ironic, and hostile.’64 As such, the linguistic play and sense of urban and domestic disorder that typifies the songs of *Cats* may have had significantly less popular and family appeal in Paris as it would in countries where nonsense literature is popular among children.

The most obvious set of changes that Marchais made was shortening many characters’

---

62 Interview with http://lemondedecats.free.fr/ 04 May 2005 [accessed 03 Aug 2011]. Gondet also played the Rum Tum Tugger in Stuttgart in 2001. One must note the time lag between this interview and the performance in Paris, and consider that Gondet’s response may be influenced by an effort not to criticise other members of the cast, or to blame the French public for its disinterest in musicals.


64 Rickard, p. 46.
names (see Table 5). Giving ‘Edgar’ for Skimbleshanks, ‘Mathusalém’ for Deuteronomy and ‘Amélie Ron Ron’ for Jennyanydots is one key change that aids in keeping the rhythms and musicality of *Cats*. These first two are obviously shorter, and Mathusalem has the same mood as Deuteronomy, of aged wisdom – perhaps even more so, as Methuselah was the name of a person, not a book of the Bible, and he was even older than Moses, whose words are recorded in the Book of Deuteronomy. Amélie Ron Ron is not shorter, but can rhyme in French much more easily than Jennyanydots: Marchais rhymes it with ‘jupons’ [petticoats] and ‘salon’ [lounge]. Jellicle Cats are changed to Jalupates, since again Jellicle does not rhyme easily in French, but more than this, to achieve the very short line lengths needed for this song (mostly eight syllables), Marchais does not repeat ‘Jellicle Cats’ at the beginning of most lines, instead often using ‘Ils’ [They]: ‘Les Jalupates sont fringants [/] Ils ont des yeux noirs pleins de rêves [/] Ils sont joyeux et bondissant’ [Jalupates are dashing / They have black eyes full of dreams / They are joyful and leaping] (p. 12). Nonetheless, Marchais is sensitive to the importance of repetition in the songs and, in ‘Edgar: le Chat Ferroviaire’ [Edgar: the Railway Cat], he exchanges repetitions in places that he cannot replicate with added repetition in other places, to meet the chugging repetitions of this song. Webber keeps Eliot’s ‘Saying “Skimble where is Skimble has he gone to hunt the thimble?”’ (p. 77). Marchais fits this into a half-line – ‘“Que fait Edgar, trouvez Edgar”’ [What is Edgar doing, find Edgar] – but rhymes it with all the half-lines around it: depart/Edgar/hagard/r’tard [departure/Edgar/haggard/late] (p. 15). He adds repetition to ‘And we’re off at last for the northern part’ [/] Of the Northern Hemisphere!’ (p. 77) with the playful ‘Vers le nord du nord de l’hémisphère nord’ [/] “En voiture pour le grand nord!”’ [To the north of the north of the northern hemisphere / “All aboard for the great north!”] (p. 15).

To keep to the rhythms, much is cut and altered, but a clear sense of design is apparent

---

65 Marchais, pp. 7-8. Subsequent citations will be made in parentheses.
in the changes made. For example, in ‘Macavity’, rather than literary allusions to Professor Moriarty, his devilish nature is emphasised. Where in English Macavity is ‘a fiend in feline shape’ (p. 82), he is the devil incarnate in French: ‘L’incarnation du diable’ [the incarnation of the devil], and ‘prince de la pègre’ [prince of the underworld] (p. 16). These identifications of Macavity as the devil may also build from the likening of Macavity to a snake, especially as in French the word ‘serpent’ is more biblically allusive than simply ‘snake’. As such, the sense of Macavity as a criminal, a Moriarty in feline shape, is de-emphasised in Marchais’ translation, but a consistent set of different characteristics replace it. The most consistent difference to the French musical is the addition of cat puns and wordplay throughout, as in ‘félinosphère’, ‘Châtelune’ for Griddlebone (both ‘cat-moon’ and evoking ‘chaste-moon’) and ‘Mathusalem’ for Deuteronomy (punning on ‘matou’, slang for cat). The opening number, ‘Jellicle Songs for Jellicle Cats’, which comprises wholly new material by Webber and Nunn, contains a possible example of such a cat pun in English, as the ‘cat-hedral’ inscribes cat-ness into its singing: ‘The mystical divinity of unashamed felinity [/] Round the cathedral rang Vivat!’ (p. 16). This first song contains playful neologisms in both languages, such as Webber’s ‘Oratorical cats, delphinoricle cats’ (p. 110). For this line, Marchais creates his own neologism that alludes to cats – ‘Chats psychanalytiques, et charistocratiques’ [Cats psychoanalytic, and aristocratic] – a portmanteau he repeats soon after with ‘chapostoliques’ [cat-postolic] (p. 7).

The set piece ‘Jellicle Songs’ alludes to famous cats: ‘Were you Whittington’s friend? the Pied Piper’s assistant?’ (p. 16) Marchais domesticates this allusion and continues to domesticate throughout the musical: ‘Pourriez-vous, à la course battre le Chat Botté?’ [Could you beat Puss in Boots in a race?] (p. 6). By the same token, allusions to English culture are removed, such as Webber’s pun on Handel – ‘Handelling pieces from the Messiah’ – while mention of Rossini and Strauss is still made. ‘Gus: The Theatre Cat’ makes reference to
Table 5. *Cats* musical names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eliot and Webber</th>
<th>Marchais</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jellicle</td>
<td>Jalupate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennyanydots</td>
<td>Amélie Ron Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum Tum Tugger</td>
<td>Rocky Tam Tam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grizabella</td>
<td>Grisabelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustopher Jones</td>
<td>Bustopher Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mungojerrie</td>
<td>Mungo Jerry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumpleteazer</td>
<td>Rumpleteazer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Mathusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asparagus (Gus)</td>
<td>Asparagus (Gus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growltiger</td>
<td>Matamore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griddlebone</td>
<td>Chatelune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimbleshanks</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macavity</td>
<td>Macavity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Mistoffekees</td>
<td>Mistopheles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shakespeare, the novel *East Lynne* and the actor Henry Irving. Marchais, however, fills the French ‘Gus’ with allusions to French theatre, creating an almost entirely new set of lyrics, with Cyrano de Bergerac, ‘Racine est le plus grand surtout dans Andromaque’ [Racine is the greatest especially in *Andromaque*], Iphigénie, the actor Jean Mounet-Sully, and five other references to famous theatrical roles (p. 13). The corollary to these domestications is the foreignisation of British things, as in ‘Amélie Ron Ron’, where ‘sailor knots’ are called ‘broderie anglaise’ [English embroidery] (p. 8).66

As with cultural and literary allusions, places are also domesticated in Marchais’ translation. For ‘Monsieur Bustopher Jones’, rather than St James, he frequents the Champs-Elysées, and ‘De la Rue de la Paix jusqu’à la Rue Royale’ [From the Rue de la Paix up to the Rue Royale]; the clubs he frequents are ‘Le Claridge’, ‘Fouquet’s’, ‘Chez Lasserre’ and ‘Chez Prunier’, all of which are still open in Paris today. In ‘Les Deux Complices (Mungo Jerry et Rumpleteazer)’ [The Two Accomplice (Mungo Jerry and Rumpleteazer)], their

66 Broderie anglaise is also the English term for this kind of needlework, but it is a specifically English kind of patterning, and in using this term, its Englishness, as foreignness, is emphasised.
reputation is known ‘Dans tout l’quartier de Jasmin à Passy [/] De la Rue d’la Pomp à la Muette [/] C’est là qu’on zone, le jour et la nuit’ [In all the districts from Jasmin to Passy, / From the Rue de la Pomp to the Muette / It’s there they hang around, day and night] (p. 10). Also important to the urban mood of this song is its use of slang: they are ‘remarkably smart at a smash-and-grab’ (p. 41). Marchais captures a similar mood with ‘Mungo Jerry et Rumpleteazer [/] s’entendent vraiment comme des larrons en foire’ [Mungo Jerry and Rumpleteazer / are truly as thick as thieves] (p. 10). In Marchais’ Growltiger, ‘La dernière bagarre de Matamore’ [Matamore’s final fight], far fewer places are named – not even the river on which he sails – but domestication is evident in that Matamore hates ‘tous les étrangers’ [all foreigners], that is, any cat who ‘n’est pas français’ [isn’t French] (p. 14). The oriental aspects of this song are more greatly emphasised by the absence of other place names: ‘Bangkok’, ‘les persans’ [Persian cats] ‘les chats siamois’ [Siamese cats], their ships are ‘les sampans et les jonques’ [sampans and junks], ‘les restaurants chinois’ [Chinese restaurants] (pp. 14-15).67

Where consistent changes are made to these songs in the French translation, Marchais’ ‘Memory’ is different in almost every line from Nunn’s. His translation may have been written using different parts of the same two Eliot poems: Grizabelle mentions ‘Mascarade sans fin’ [Endless masquerade] (p. 18), similar to ‘With the other masquerades [/] That time resumes’ in Prelude II (Collected Poems, p. 23); Marchais adds generic foliage to his urban scene, perhaps building on the ‘grass’ and ‘geranium’ from ‘Rhapsody’ (pp. 26-27). Marchais overall employs a lower register of language and simpler imagery, such as a plain flower metaphor with no species of flower given to deepen its symbolism: ‘Comme une fleur [/] Qui s’étiole et se meurt’ [Like a flower / That wilts and dies] (p. 18). Where Nunn figures the

67 Webber’s musical, as with Eliot’s poems, originally used the now racist term ‘Chinks’ (p. 70) in this song, and even parodies high-pitched Chinese singing during the song, but this has been largely cut in the DVD edition of the musical. Marchais avoids such loaded terms, but the CD of the French musical does not cut the ‘Chinese-style’ singing.
weather with the synaesthetic image of smelling cold – ‘The stale cold smell of morning’ (p. 98) – Marchais has the literal description, ‘cette aube glacée’ [this icy dawn] (p. 18), in its place. Where the French ‘Memory’ alternates between using the synonyms ‘souvenirs’ [memories] and ‘mémoire’ [memory] (p. 18), Nunn builds the theme of memory into the sun/moon imagery that dominates the song, in using the line ‘my days in the sun’ to refer to the past (p. 98). The song is almost Manichean in its light/dark imagery and unexpected intrusion of the concept of truth: ‘Tu sauras toute la vérité’ [You will know the entire truth] (ibid.). For many viewers and reviewers of Cats, it is the power of Grizabella’s solo that made the musical the success it was, with its simple yet haunting lyrics fitting perfectly to its key change and chord progression. Marchais’ emphasis on maintaining the shape of a song with such short lines led to a simplification of its imagery and linguistic patterning.

To summarise, in all the translations and adaptations of Eliot’s Practical Cats, creative rhythms and urban setting have been key issues. In the musical adaptation and translation, these are expanded by the further dimensions of which styles of music can fit which rhythms, and how to stage a cat/child-sized view of the city. The musical is highly acclaimed for its spectacular nature, with impressive dance routines, audience interaction and a moving stage.

However, the lack of success of the French translation of the musical cannot only be attributed to the cultural context of the medium and the relative unpopularity of musical theatre in Paris. Marchais’ translation is highly consistent in its domestications, cat wordplay and added literary allusions, and effectively keeps to the rhythms of Webber’s song structures, but with the key musical number of the piece, ‘Memory’, Marchais’ translation appears not to have caught the attention of French audiences. Where translators of Eliot’s Practical Cats confidently alter Eliot’s rhythms to refocus the poetry for their target child audiences, it is perhaps that the enormous fame of ‘Memory’ rendered it too rigid for creative translation and it could not be changed enough to meet its target audience. Moreover, adding
allusion and wordplay to the translation opened Marchais up to the accusation of the lyrics being ‘incompréhensibles’ to a lay audience, who perhaps see nonsense verse as an avant-garde genre. While singability and performability are evidently significant aspects to the translation of musical theatre, it appears that even for a musical of little plot, the conveyance of meaning remains high among audience expectations, and simply pleasing shapes and playful sounds were not enough to capture a Parisian audience.

Conclusion

Eliot’s *Practical Cats* writes against this mainstream valuation of the child in nature, rejects the supposed ‘innocence’ of childhood to delight instead in disorder, and to present petit flâneurs mastering the codes of the city. Where Bettelheim notes the dull repetitions of city writing for children, which discourage children from enjoying urban environments, Eliot’s poetry is replete with lively rhymes and unexpected rhythms. In this way, the urban content of *Practical Cats* is tied to its poetic forms and, as Olson noted, the significance of individuality in the anonymous city is shown through Eliot’s thematisation of naming.

This chapter has focused on children in the city and on translation for reading, singing and acting, to contend that the translation processes chosen in each case are intrinsically tied to the representations of the city, and that questions of domestication and foreignisation apply equally to locations and to poetic norms. Where Ménard does not prioritise introducing children to urban life (supported by Scheffler’s nature-filled artwork), his translation equally does not try to match Eliot’s rhythms, instead forming conventional French alexandrines and standard rhyme schemes. For Charpentreau, local details are transposed to French equivalents, and his effort to present the city is matched by the delight his unorthodox rhythms convey about city living. With the musical, Webber and Nunn visibly stage this
sense of urban wonder in making even the ‘waste’ on the set exciting in its enormity, from the child’s or cat’s perspective – the scene is effectively a waste playground. Eliot’s poetry and its musical adaptation continue to perform a significant role in challenging the Rousseauvian identification of the child with nature, as an exception to the situation that Bettelheim and Bavidge rightly diagnose. Both in London and Paris, Eliot’s *Practical Cats* and its adaptations and French translations, bring children and cats to the city.

Marchais’ translation of the musical keeps the generic urban setting, but brings all the allusions into the sphere of French culture. With Marchais, two kinds of translation – of the poetry and into a visual/musical context – come together: to face the challenges of performability and singability, Marchais de-prioritises precise meanings, and enhances the poetic and allusive play of the lyrics, adding the motif of cat puns throughout the musical. While the French musical enjoys a continuing presence in clips on Youtube and through CD sales, it did not enjoy great success in Paris in 1989. Equally, the publication of Ménard’s translation suggests that Charpentureau’s was not highly successful. It may simply be that the French reception of nonsense verse differs so significantly from its reception in England, or that Marchais and Charpentureau’s domestication of the urban setting did not meet audience or reader expectations of children’s literature, in attempting to introduce child spectators/readers to local urban spaces. Indeed, while this only provides a small corpus for examination, it also suggests that in this case, French readers/experiencers of performances had a preference for foreignisation. As such, *Practical Cats*, its adaptation and their translations also stand against the mainstream preference for domestication in French translations of children’s literature, as noted by Zeli and Lopéz, suggesting the unusual position that modernist children’s literature holds in the literary polysystem.

Overall, it appears from these efforts at adaptation and translation, and in particular in Ménard’s very recent translation, that Eliot enjoys a wide reception among families and
children in the UK and France, perhaps enhanced through his poetic connections to Paris and French literature through the influence of Baudelaire’s feline and urban poetry. Furthermore, with musical theatre also beginning in Paris, the translations of Eliot’s poems and Webber’s musical have the circular effect of, in a manner, bringing these texts back to their sources. This sense of French translations as a return to their home ground was also evident in the translation of Joyce’s children’s book, and will be seen again in Stein’s, as both were written in France. In all of these texts, thus, there is a fractured relationship between language and nation, destabilising the binary distinction between domestication and foreignisation, by being already appropriate to the target culture. In these texts, source and target domains are not mutually exclusive, and refute the division of foreign from domestic. Just as cats form an international aristocracy, these cat poems/songs blur borderlines with their many roots.
Chapter 4. ‘O Loire, what a fine bridge!’:

Joyce, Foreignising Domestications and Illustrating Bridges

Where the previous chapters looked at the challenges Woolf, de la Mare’s and Eliot’s children’s stories posed to Rousseau’s valourisation of the child in the countryside, Joyce’s children’s story *The Cat and the Devil* suggests an alternative model of childhood not bound to a particular place. As Joyce relates his travels to his grandson, he hints at the new potential for children to explore beyond their limits of their homes. Rousseau’s Émile is introduced to society slowly and under his tutor’s supervision, but Joyce embraces the mobility of the modern child, in constructing a narrative of bridge-building. This modern child is equally capable of multiple languages, unlike Émile, who is only taught one language through direct experience of material objects. Indeed, Joyce’s tale of his travels itself stands as an exemplum of introducing children to new cultures, and teaching them more than they can directly experience.

Joyce’s *Cat*, written in 1936, was originally a letter to his grandson Stephen, and has become a minor children’s classic since it was made a picture book in 1964. Although it has been translated into thirteen languages, no work has been done on its translation. It was first translated into French only two years after its publication, by Jacques Borel, who went on to translate Joyce’s *Chamber Music* and *Pomes Penyeach*. It has had two French illustrators: Jean-Jacques Corre and Roger Blachon. The story is set in France and contains French in its original, as the devil speaks it to the townspeople for a page (fifty-one words), but is technically trilingual, as the letter is signed off ‘Nonno’, which is Italian for ‘grandfather’, a polylingualism expressive of the international nature of modernism.¹

The few articles that have been written about *Cat* largely use it to illuminate parts of

¹ Joyce, *The Cat and the Devil*, n.p..
*Finnegans Wake* (hereafter *Wake*), which Joyce was working on as he wrote it. Marie-Dominique Garnier focuses on religion and wordplay in a Deleuzian account of cat-related words in Joyce’s *œuvre*, such as catachresis and *felix culpa*. Amanda Sigler looks at Joyce’s representation of Dublin and authority in Joyce’s writing, including biographical information about the Mayor Alfred Byrne and Joyce’s explicit goal in writing of exposing Dublin’s flaws to itself. Janet Lewis explores the role of cats in Joyce and in folk lore, drawing on the works of catlore specialist Patricia Dale-Green, and noting references to cats, mayors, devils and bridges in the *Wake*. Hodgkins differs in her article by not relating *Cat* to other texts by Joyce, but seeing it among other children’s stories from its period, including Woolf’s, and assessing what effort these texts make to relate to child readers, ultimately seeing the image of the bridge as an insufficient step towards connecting to child readers. Kimberley Reynolds also considers *Cat* alongside modernist children’s books, but goes against Hodgkins’ reading of the image of the bridge, using it to discuss the idea of connecting to the future in and through children’s literature.¹ I will discuss the bridge in more detail below. Eckley has worked on Joyce’s use of children’s literature and culture in his most difficult work, to show the central importance of childhood knowledge as a means of understanding the world that can easily be related to. Yao has written about Joyce as a translator in his monograph on modernist translation, but does not include *Cat* as a work translated from French. What is useful to this study from the criticism so far is Yao’s work on Joyce’s other translations, and Garnier and Lewis’ focus on wordplay and religion in *Cat*, in looking at how they translate back across into French, both linguistically and visually.

The translation of *Cat* into French complicates issues of domestication and foreignisation, and strains the relationship of language to place. *Cat* tells the local legend of Beaugency, a town that Joyce visited in France. In this tale, the devil builds a bridge for the

---

¹ Reynolds, *Radical Children’s Literature*, p. 28.
town, and is cheated of his payment of the first person to cross the bridge, when a cat is made to cross first. As a local legend, its interest in location is clear, and reinforced by Joyce’s choice of Beaugency’s version of the legend over variants that he would have read in Henry Bett’s *Nursery Rhymes and Tales*. This folk tale exists in different forms around the world, and is on the Aarne-Thompson standard directory of folk tale motifs as motif number 1191. It is essential to see that Joyce’s story is thus also a translation, of a tale he heard in Beaugency. As such, we can see his approach to the story as commensurate to the work of a translator: he makes key choices in domestication and foreignisation, in order to best engage his target audience, his grandson.

As we will see, Joyce overlaps cats and letters in their textual functioning as bridges between cultures, and at the same time domesticates this French local legend, as the devil and the mayor take on contemporary Irish traits. Joyce’s French translator not only leaves these Irish elements as strained foreignisations, but seeks to repeat their effect, by foreignising what was originally domestic – the French language itself. The two French illustrators, however, approach domestication in connecting the source and target cultures: Corre focuses on bridging modernism and children’s literature through the concept of the ideogram, or hieroglyph, and Blachon, in evoking Catholicism, suggests cultural similarities between Ireland and medieval France. Where the *Wake* asks ‘How farflung is your fokloire?’

3, evoking a particular link between folk lore and the river Loire, *Cat’s* answer appears to be, ‘close to home’, bridging and domesticating differences, as Joyce translates Beaugency’s legend for his grandson and brings the Loire to Dublin.

This chapter will begin by considering children’s and national languages as a structure and basis for Joyce’s prose works: the transmission of language itself becomes a theme for Joyce. I will then look at his translations of fables in relation to the theory of ‘written

---

3 Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, intro. by Seamus Deane (London: Penguin, [1939] 1992), 419.11-12. Subsequent citations will be made in parentheses. It is common practice when quoting *Finnegans Wake* to do so by page number and line, in the form [page].[line].
folklore’, and focus on Joyce’s *Cat* as a translation of a French tale and its translations back into French. I will finally consider the role of illustrations in translated children’s literature, and in particular, the unique ways that Corre and Blachon bridge generic and cultural differences through their illustrations.

‗Je suis au bout de l’anglais’: Joyce, Modernist Translation and Written Folklore

Joyce’s novels push at the boundaries of languages, and from *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (hereafter *Portrait*) to the *Wake*, progressively distance the language they are written in from recognisable English. The seeds of this alienation from language, however, are evident in the opening page of *Portrait*, in which we see a recreation of Stephen Dedalus’ perception through a childlike language: ‘Once upon a time and a very good time it was there was a moo-cow that was coming down along the road met a nicens little boy named baby tuckoo.’

Beginning with a fairy-tale formulation, associating an animal with the noise it makes, breathlessly lacking punctuation, twisting language with ‘nicens’ and inventing language with ‘tuckoo’, before the reader is even aware of the context of the narrative, the language alone makes it clear that a child is speaking. As a child, Stephen brings language acquisition to the fore by pondering on language. For example, he thinks about how identity can stand above names, and how names vary between languages and cultures:

> God was God’s name just as his was Stephen. *Dieu* was the French word for God and that was God’s name too; and when anyone prayed to God and said *Dieu* then God knew that it was a French person that was praying. But though there were different names for God in all the different languages in the world and God understood what all the people who prayed said in their languages still God remained always the same God and God’s real name was *God*. (*Portrait*, p. 16)

What stands beyond Stephen’s youthful understanding is that ‘God’ is itself a translation of

---

the Hebrew name for God, ‘יהוה’ (YHWH). Moreover, Biblical translation has recently come to stand in uneasy relation to other kinds of translation: where authorial authority has been rethought in descriptive translation studies, placing equal emphasis on the target text as an entity of its own authority, such a claim is troubled by the absolute authority that Christians give to the word of God, as it is passed down in the Bible. Indeed, this passage can be seen as an early step in Stephen’s recognition of cultural and linguistic difference, but one still dependent upon his faith in an absolute entity, in a religion that he later rejects, as he later opens himself up to the importance of the difference that language makes.

A more mature Stephen recognises the power relations that underlie language communities, and the importance of language to nation. Contrasting himself with his teacher, he reflects on encountering English language as a colonised subject: ‘The language in which we are speaking is his before it is mine. How different are the words home, Christ, ale, master on his lips and on mine! I cannot speak or write these words without unrest of spirit. His language, so familiar and so foreign, will always be for me an acquired speech’ (p. 166). In *Ulysses*, too, Joyce stages a scene of cultural connection that puts forward the importance of a national language. Leopold Bloom and Stephen share Jewish and Irish literature as they come together in ‘Ithaca’: ‘By Stephen: *suil, suil, suil arun, suil go siocair agus suil go cuin* (walk, walk, walk your way, walk in safety, walk with care). [/] By Bloom: *Kifeloch, harimon rakatejch m’baad l’zamatejch* (thy temple amid thy hair is as a slice of pomegranate).5 Stephen, now more mature than in *Portrait*, recognises that his cultural heritage is tied to the language in which it is expressed, and as such first expresses the poetry to Bloom in Irish, before explaining it to him.

In the *Wake*, Joyce goes much further in exploring the difference that language makes, in blending languages and predicating his entire work on polylingualism. Joyce’s pushing at

---

the boundaries of language through multiplying points of contact between languages can be related to contemporary debates about a universal language. On a deep structural level, the language of the *Wake* can be seen in relation to its opening scene. As Seamus Deane notes, the Fall is the repeated structure of the *Wake*’s plot, varying details of what such a fall entails, and seeking to get at its consequences. One key ‘fall’ that is present from the opening pages of the *Wake* is the fall of thunder in a hundred-letter long word that initiates the fall into language from a ‘molten Ur-language’: ‘since it is one of the narrative’s implications that the myth of the Fall can be understood as a fall into language, then the secondary, post-lapsarian nature of language might be the very thing the *Wake* seeks to overcome by replacing it with that putative directness of communication that preceded the Fall.’\(^6\) This loss of a single unifying language is the fall of the tower of Babel, the ‘bauble-top’ (5.02) mentioned in the opening pages, and punned on throughout the work. Babel was a topic of some debate in the early twentieth century, with Joyce’s friend Eugene Jolas describing himself as the *Man from Babel* (1939-1947) and linguists such as C. K. Ogden writing on *Debabelization* (1931). For Ogden, the issue was of seeking to create a universal language, to facilitate communication between different nationalities and language communities. His effort towards this end, Basic English, sat alongside other such universalist projects as Esperanto and Volapuk. As Joyce begins his work with the fall into a post-Babelian world, we can see that (despite his interest in these projects) he is not seeking to create a universal language, but to embrace the polysemy and polyphony of there being many languages. The novel stands against efforts to simplify or universalise language – it is, instead, a language founded on deeply personal pronunciations and connotations: a private language. It childs its reader, who must again learn to read.

Indeed, we must also consider the *Wake*’s language in relation to children’s language

---

\(^6\) James Joyce, *Finnegans Wake* (*op. cit.*), p. viii-ix, xxx.
acquisition processes, in particular for children who are initially bi- or trilingual (as the recipient of *Cat*, Stephen Joyce, was). Such children often mix languages without recognition of their boundaries, and create neologisms with new linguistic combinations. The most popular model of language acquisition in bilingual children is Traute Taeschner’s model in *The Sun is Feminine: A Study on Language Acquisition in Bilingual Children*: Taeschner asserts that bilingual children begin with no knowledge of the difference between the two languages they speak, then learn to differentiate between the vocabulary but not the grammar of the two, which language to speak to whom, and finally which grammar system to use for which language.\(^7\) Joyce may have experienced this himself, knowing many languages as a child, and hearing Gaelic, English and Italian from his parents, or may have witnessed it in the language development of his own children and grandchildren, who lived in France and Italy, and to whom he communicated in a mix of languages. It is unclear how young the “child” characters are in the *Wake*, but Joyce writes of the letter in the *Wake* as ‘written in lappish language with bursts of Maggyer’, which Yao notes spans the languages Lappish and Magyar, but is further a pun on the German word *läppisch*, meaning “childish”.\(^8\) Moreover, Babel, for Joyce, must be heard alongside its homophone ‘babble’, and just as a child seeks to create a coherent language system out of the sounds around it (particularly a multilingual child), the fall of man at the beginning of the *Wake* is like a world’s infancy, unable to differentiate languages. It appears that Joyce enjoys the collision of languages, and through it the creation of new language in acquiring words from everywhere, like a child. This sense of many languages not coherently melded together brings together the legend of Babel’s fall with the modernist, mobile and multilingual child. We will see that these issues of Babel and babble significantly connect to *Cat*, below.

---


8 Yao, p. 206.
Turning now to Joyce’s translations, of which *The Cat and the Devil* is a key example, Joyce shows in the *Wake* an apparent preference for including in his work extended passages of translation from fairy tales, fables and folk tales. As well as chiding the reader, the *Wake* connects with the reader as a child, through the use of widely known aspects of children’s culture. This section will look at the two fables interpolated into *Finnegans Wake* and at *Cat* as belonging to a particular translation tradition known as ‘written folklore’. Written folklore, we will see, has significant points of connection with both modernist translation and translation for children. The two fables in the *Wake* occur during question and answer sessions between Shem and Shaun, the twin brothers, and feature opposing pairs in debate. The *Wake* operates by chains of association, among which the twin brothers are associated with the artist (Shem) and the bourgeois (Shaun), time (Shem) and space (Shaun), tree and rock, Esau and Jacob, Cain and Abel, hungry and well fed, sexually frustrated and sexually active, ear and eye, and so on.

The first fable, delivered by Professor Jones, argues for the priority of space over time; having exhausted his reasoning, he turns to fable to prove his point. As a spatialist, he appears as another aspect of Shaun’s character. His story, of ‘The Mookse and The Gripes’ (152.15), is a rendering of Aesop’s story of the Fox and the Grapes, in which a fox cannot reach a grape vine growing around a tree, and so consoles himself that the grapes were probably unripe anyway. In Professor Jones’ version, the fox on his rock argues for space against the grapes on the tree – ‘Is this space of our couple of hours too dimensional for you, temporiser?’ (154.25-26) – as for eye over ear and rock (of the church) over tree. The Gripes (which is both a singular ‘I’ and a plural ‘we’) argues back in favour of time, and Nuvoletta (Isabel, the sister of the twins) attempts to calm them, until she accepts that they will never be resolved: ‘The Mookse had a sound eyes right but he could not all hear. The Gripes had light ears left yet he could but ill see’ (158.12-13). Professor Jones sides in his comments with the Mookse,
and by way of non sequitur abruptly concludes: ‘So you see the Mookse he had reason as I knew and you knew and he knew all along’ (158.30-31). It is unclear precisely what a ‘Mookse’ is, but it may refer to a mouse (an iconic Aesopian character), a moose, and William Tindall suggests allusions to Alice’s Mock Turtle and the ‘moocow’ from the opening lines of *Portrait*. The Danish word ‘mukke’ means ‘to gripe’, and this among other connective plays, suggests an equality between the Mookse and the Gripes, despite the Professor’s desire to claim otherwise. The fable is a site of oversignification, meaning beyond the means of its teller, digressing into the purely descriptive and poetic, involving countless themes other than space and time, and overall proving to be an unsuitable genre for ‘proving’ a unified argument.

The second tale is of ‘the Ondt and the Gracehoper’ (414.20-21), told by Shaun and again focusing on a metaphysical debate of space over time. In Aesop’s ‘The Ant and the Grasshopper’, a grasshopper sees an ant preparing supplies for winter and asks for a little food. The ant asks what the grasshopper did with his summer, and the grasshopper replies that he was busy singing, at which the ant laughs and tells him that if he sang all summer, he may dance all winter. There is also a version of this tale by La Fontaine, ‘La Cigale et la Fourmi’, the very first fable of the first book of his fables. In this primary position, it clearly constructs an ironic frame to La Fontaine’s fables, as his work as poet is more akin to the singing cicada than to the hoarding ant. As with the relation of Shem to Shaun, the Gracehoper is jealous to see the Ondt feasting and surrounded by desiring girl-insects, smoking ‘a spatial brunt of Hosana cigals’ (417.7). This ‘special brand of Havana cigars’ emphasises the ant’s bourgeoisie, spatialism, religious self-assuredness (Hosana) and his attractiveness to ‘gals’. It further suggests his ownership, and even burning of a cicada (or

---

10 There are variations of the tale by Aesop with a cicada and with a beetle, who does not produce any kind of art, and receives his come-upance for mocking the industry of the ant over summer. *Fables of Aesop*, trans. by S. A. Handford (London: Penguin, [1954] 1982), pp. 141-42. However, the edition of Aesop’s fables in Joyce’s library has a grasshopper for this story. Eckley, p. 24.
cigale), the grasshopper’s equivalent in La Fontaine’s and some variants of Aesop’s version of the fable.

The impoverished and hungry artist equally fits Shem and Joyce himself, and Richard Ellmann asserts a biographical reading for this tale, of James Joyce and his brother Stanislaus.11 Joyce’s valuation of the ‘Gracehoper’ (Shem) over the ‘Ondt’ (Shaun) is evident, even though Shaun is telling the tale, as Ondt is Norwegian for ‘evil’, and the grasshopper that humbly hopes for grace is given the last words, a song with a playful rhyming couplet to end the debate: ‘Your genus its worldwide, your spacest sublime! [/] But, Holy Saltmartin, why can’t you beat time?’ (419.7-8, italics in original). Joyce also identifies himself with the Gracehoper in the joyous and Joycean neologism ‘joyicity’: ‘The Gracehoper was always jigging a jog, hoppy on akkant of his joyicity’ (414.22-23). Critics of this tale thus often consider the grasshopper triumphant, and contend that Joyce overturns Aesop’s and La Fontaine’s conclusions to this fable.12 However, it is important to note that the grasshopper remains hungry at the end of the fable, and so his triumph is not in material but more abstract terms. Certainly, the tale rebels against the authority of its teller, as Shaun endeavours to show that temporalists and artists like his brother are wasting their time in polishing their art and failing to stock up for the future, but he presents the supposedly sensible Ondt as evil and the Gracehoper as morally superior in doing so.

These rewritings of Aesop’s fables come shortly after the publication of a new edition of the fables in 1889, illustrated by John Tenniel. As noted above, La Fontaine also draws on Aesop’s fables, and variant editions of the fables exist. In this way, fables, like fairy tales, folk tales and myth, can be considered under Alieda Assmann’s category of ‘written folklore’,

11 Ellmann, p. 596. Ellmann also points to the likeness of the ant and Wyndham Lewis, a spatialist, a parallel that William Dohmen follows up in “Chilly Spaces”: Wyndham Lewis as Ondt’, James Joyce Quarterly, 11.4 (1974), 368-86.
which has a different transmissions means to most kinds of literature. Assmann outlines five specific differences in the transmission of written folklore, of which the fourth is most significant here: the condition for the continued existence of literature is preservation; of folktale it is replacement. As Emer O’Sullivan summates: ‘whereas the continued existence of a literary text is linked with its being conserved as a unique work, that of written folklore is guaranteed by a series of versions which replace one another.’ Folklore is traditionally thought to have roots in oral culture, and as such was originally designed with no one authoritative version, but many local variants. The concept of written folklore suggests that this variety is inflected even when folk tales are written down, and continues to apply to their publication contexts and contemporary marketing.

O’Sullivan asserts that the translation of children’s literature often has much in common with written folklore, and that it ‘also applies to books written specifically for children when they are translated, edited or adapted in such a way that all that is left is a recognizable character, situation or plot that can be seen as the marketable aspect synonymous with the general idea of what the work is.’ Her examples are Robinson Crusoe and Pinocchio, who both appear in countless adaptations, translations and picture books with nothing of their original plot, characterisation or ideology, apart from Crusoe’s context of landing on a deserted island and Pinocchio’s characteristic appearance as a long-nosed puppet boy. The transmission of written folklore also has much in common with the modernist practice of translation discussed in Chapter 1: it disregards the authority of its source text’s author, recreates texts with contemporary and local details, and often wholly reconstitutes the

significance of the story. Joyce can clearly be seen to do this in the two tales above, conflating them with a wider debate between contrasting twins, and in particular with the metaphysical debate in the early twentieth century of the nature of space and time, and their relations to different artistic media.

‗How farflung is your fokloire’: The Cat and the Devil Returning to France

_The Cat and the Devil_ brings together written folklore, modernist translation and translation for children, as a prime example of all three. Joyce takes a local legend from the French town Beaugency and translates it as a modernist text of his own style for a child. While the story is originally one of rebelling against authority, and outwitting the devil, Joyce reverses this by siding with the devil as the outwitted party, but suggesting some consolation in this position, as the exiled devil gains the company of a scapegoated cat.

What is most notable about Beaugency’s version of the tale is that the creature made to cross the bridge is a cat, from which the people of Beaugency have earned their (still extant) nickname, ‘les chats de Beaugency’ [the cats of Beaugency]. In Bett’s versions, it can be a goat, a rooster, a dog or a cat that crosses. Patricia Dale-Green, the catlore specialist, writes of the Beaugency myth: ‘Satan was so furious when he found he had been fobbed off with a cat, that he tried to kick down the new bridge. He failed, however, and as he carried off the cat, it tore at his hands and face with its claws.’

16 Joyce’s cat and devil make a somewhat friendlier team, however, with the devil affectionately calling the cat ‘mon petit chou-chat’ [my little sweetheart-cat], and taking it off to dry it. Joyce himself was particularly fond of cats, and Frank Budgen tells us that he owned a black cat.17 Cats and mayors come together elsewhere in Joyce, as Dick Whittington turns up in the _Wake_. The mayor in _Cat_, Alfred Byrne,

16 Patricia Dale-Green, _Cult of the Cat_ (London: Heinemann, 1963), pp. 131-32. The bridge is still standing in Beaugency, and is thought to have been built in the fourteenth century.
discussed in more detail below, also appears in a mocking list in the *Wake*, in the Dom King episode: he is not mayor here, but the mayor Pomkey Dompkey reads, ‘His Serenemost by a speechreading from his miniated vellum, *alfi byrni* gamman dealter etcera zezer’ (568.31-32). Byrne is made diminutive by the alphabetising, and by the unstressed rhymed endings to his inclusion; *Cat* shows that such an insulting allusion is part of a trend in Joyce’s interpolation of Byrne.

This domestication of the mayor invites comparison between Dublin and Beaugency, which is supported by the geography of the two locations, built around rivers. Where rivers, and in particular the Liffey, are of prime importance to the *Wake*, here it is rather the bridge that holds the central position in Joyce’s story. Where Hope Hodgkins sees the bridge as a metaphor for the relation of adult author to child reader, it can also be seen as a powerful metaphor for the cross-cultural narrative of Joyce’s letter, and the cross-cultural performance of translating it.18 This kind of bridging is particularly apparent in Joyce’s clear efforts to foreignise, such as describing the river Loire to his reader, and using the local language for dialogue in France. The letter itself can be seen as a bridge across countries, as Joyce relates his travels around Europe to his grandson in Dublin; all editions of *Cat* not only maintain the letter format, but most also keep the dateline, with the location in it, to indicate that the story comes from abroad. Cats can also be seen as bridges between cultures, as children around the world can relate to them, as we saw Charpentreau claim in his preface to *Practical Cats* in the previous chapter. Moreover, cats are traditionally seen as bridges between worlds, as Dale-Green describes: ‘The cat formed a bridge not only between good and evil, but also between interior and exterior life, and between supernatural forces and men.’19 Joyce’s letters and postcards often talk of cats to Stephen, at times acting as supplements and substitutes for cats

---

18 This bridge has also been analogised as a ‘window’ through which children see new places, by Patricia Aldana, ‘Books that are Windows. Books that are Mirrors’, <www.ibby.org/index.php?id=1008>, accessed 30 Dec 2011.

19 Dale-Green, p. 132.
in themselves, just as the cat acts as a substitute for a human soul in the legend. Joyce sent Stephen a postcard of for his second birthday, on which there is a picture of Puss-in-Boots.\(^{20}\) In a later letter to Stephen from Copenhagen, Joyce apologises that there are no cats there to describe, and proceeds to comically depict the city for his grandson.\(^{21}\) In this way, we can see both that cats are a means of linking the new locations of Joyce’s travel to something that a four year old will be familiar with, and that the letter serves as a cat-like substitute in replacing a cat narrative or souvenir with a playful depiction of a city.

Lucia Joyce also received a letter about a cat around the mid-1930s, in which Joyce wrote: ‘Il famoso gatto, diventato randagio, fa il giro di tutti gli appartamenti e si fa mantenere da tutti con un cinisimo quasi nobile.’\(^{22}\) [The famous cat which went astray is now making a tour of all the flats and lives on everybody with an almost noble cynicism.] In this way, Joyce’s cat letters bring together multilingualism, his children and mobility. Cat-letters can thus be seen as apt vessels for the cross-cultural and mobile schematics of modernism, and moreover, matched specifically for children. In *Cat*, it is clear that the story is not a substitute but a supplement to a cat souvenir sent from Beaugency: ‘I sent you a little cat filled with sweets a few days ago but perhaps you do not know the story about the cat of Beaugency’. We see, thus, that in Joyce’s works, the letter can take the place of cats, and cats are in themselves textual. As such, *The Cat and the Devil* literally writes on (about) a cat, telling the story behind a cat toy that Joyce had sent to Stephen, using the full implications of cat and letter to bridge the space between grandfather and grandson.

*Cat* plays with the relation of place and language through bilingual punning, when the devil tells the people of Beaugency that they are not ‘belles gens’ [beautiful people]. That is to say, the title of their town, ‘Beau gens [sic]’, fails to describe them. As Garnier notes, the

\(^{20}\) Sigler, p. 551.  
\(^{21}\) Sigler, pp. 538-39. This story was published as a highly expensive, limited print picturebook in 2012, and made more widely available in 2013.  
‘belles’ of ‘belles gens’ recurs in the name of the language that the devil speaks, ‘Bellsybabble.’

This neologism, also found in the Wake’s ‘belzey babble’ (64.11), not only evokes a tension of place and language in the contrast of ‘belle’ and ‘beau’, but through its allusion to the biblical Babel. Conjoining Babel and babble suggests that this Joycean language brings together childspeak, sin and the fall into language, which as discussed above is a central theme of the Wake. As in Wake, the allusion to Babel points to the multiplicity of languages in the story, and to a childling of language. More specifically to Cat, this conjunction of Beelzebub and babbling works both to infantilise the devil and in reverse to identify the child as sinful. Joyce may have welcomed the implication of the child as always already fallen, as his brother Stanislaus recalls that he and Joyce were raised to believe that people are born into sin: Joyce’s first nursemaid, Mrs Conway, taught them at a child’s funeral that ‘children come into the world trailing murky clouds of original sin.’

Cats, too, have long been seen as sinful creatures, with Patricia Dale noting that black cats were thought to have no soul, and so were a way to cheat the devil of his payment in stories such as the folk tale of Beaugency. Indeed, Joyce’s devil is more careful in his phrasing than in other variants: he does not ask for the first ‘soul’ to cross the bridge, in which case a cat may have been a viable substitute for a human. The devil asks for a person and receives an animal, but accepts the cat as an alternative payment, although of lesser value than he had hoped. In this way, with ‘person’ being stretched to include cats, and the devil’s contract being broken at a fundamental semantic level, even the adults of Cat can be seen as involved in what the Wake would call ‘an overgrown babeling’ (6.31). This ‘babeling’ is, like a ‘childling’, a diminutive form of a ‘babe’, but it is also homophonic with ‘babbling’, and so

---

25 Stanislaus Joyce, pp. 32-33. Mrs Conway is the basis of the character Mrs Riordan, also known as Dante, in Portrait.
suggests a failure of communication between the devil and mayor over the terms of the contract, an inability to communitate perfectly that inevitably follows from the fall into language as an imperfect means of communication (the fall of Babel). It is also the devil’s babbling as he throws a childlike tantrum and rants against the people of Beaugency. Thus, while there is only one Joycean neologism in *The Cat and the Devil*, its presence brings out much from the deeper themes regarding language that the simplicity of the plot belies: the artist-devil’s precise wording is poorly repaid.

Borel’s French translation of ‘Belsybabble’ cannot hold together the homophonic conjunction of ‘Babel’ as legendary place and ‘babble’ as absurd speech, and opts for ‘diababélien.’ In choosing ‘Babel’ the place, a high register allusion has been selected, prioritising the implications of place, over the possible implications that involving ‘babiller’ [to babble] would have entailed. This is possibly in deference to the erudition one associates with Joyce’s wordplay. At the same time, ‘diababélien’ effectively maintains the pleasurable silliness of ‘Bellsybabble’, which Jan Van Coillie, writing on names in the translation of children’s literature, contends is more valuable than seeking to capture all the implications of wordplay.

Among the many playful and anachronistic details that Joyce brings to the tale, the most noticeable is the naming of the mayor of Beaugency ‘Monsieur Alfred Byrne’, whose French title firmly points to how out of place his name is. Alfred Byrne was the mayor of Dublin in 1936, for the seventh year running. It also happens that Byrne and Joyce were the same age, a fact that may tinge his hatred of the mayor, and his comparisons of himself and Byrne. Joyce particularly hated Byrne for his love of pomp and ceremony: in a letter to

---

Stephen’s parents, Joyce tells that he has been invited to the USA, and after mocking ‘every old fool in Europe’ who is invited and goes, Joyce writes, ‘I see the Lord Mayor of Dublin Alfie Byrne is going to N[ew]Y[ork] for the 17\textsuperscript{th}. Every day I open the \textit{Irish Times} I see him and his golden chain in some photograph or other.’\textsuperscript{28} Both his gold chain, and the scarlet robe that Byrne loved to wear as sign of his office, appear in \textit{The Cat and the Devil}, in which he is first gently mocked for his love of pomp, and then made wholly ridiculous for his strange habits: ‘This lord mayor was very fond of dressing himself too. He wore a scarlet robe and always had a great golden chain round his neck even when he was fast asleep in bed with his knees in his mouth’. Byrne is shown as a lover of spectacle – announcing his arrival with fanfare – which the cat playfully undermines through its disinterest: ‘he was tired of looking at the lord mayor (because even a cat gets tired of looking at a lord mayor)’. This page further undermines Byrne by stating his title five times in two sentences, such that ‘lord mayor’ becomes meaningless through repetition. \textit{Le Chat et le Diable}, naturally less interested in undermining Byrne, cuts the fifth repetition, and is in any case less conspicuous with the shorter title ‘le maire’ [the mayor] (pp. 50-51).

Stephen Joyce’s introductory letter raises the question of why this one particular detail, the mayor’s name, is domesticated in an evidently French story: ‘Il y a des choses bizarres dans cette histoire du pont sur la Loire. Par exemple, pourquoi faut-il que le maire d’une ville française ait un nom irlandais, en fait le nom d’un des maires de Dublin ?’ [There are strange things in this story of the bridge over the Loire. For example, why must the mayor of a French village have an Irish name, in fact the name of one of the mayors of Dublin?].\textsuperscript{29} Stephen suggests looking to Joyce’s texts for adults to answer this question: ‘Les réponses à ces questions, tu les découvririras quand tu seras plus grand en lisant \textit{Gens de Dublin, Portrait de l’Artiste en Jeune Homme et Ulysse}’ [The answers to these questions, you will find them

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{Letters III}, pp. 345-46.
when you are bigger in reading *Dubliners, Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Ulysses*. This in effect reverses the traditional use of Joyce’s children’s book, which is to elucidate issues in his work for adults, in particular *Finnegans Wake*. Rather than prioritising any text over another, or seeing any of Joyce’s works as usable in service of explaining another, it may be more fruitful to think in terms of Joyce’s works as a matrix of concerns, which connect and coordinate differently in different texts. For example, where Jacqueline Gmuca sees folk tales as providing ‘a model for rebellion and triumph over authoritative power’ in *Portrait*, we can clearly see that the town’s authorities unequivocally succeed in *Cat’s* folk tale. We may see, however, that both *Portrait* and *Cat* share a concern with local authorities. Suzette Henke claims that this is equally a central aspect of *Dubliners*: she writes that *Dubliners* ‘satirizes an authoritarian power structure defended by blustering and impotent males.’ Amanda Sigler looks at *Cat* in these terms, citing Joyce’s declaration in his letters that the Irish people need ‘one good look at themselves in my nicely polished looking-glass.’ Sigler asserts that in having Byrne as their mayor, the Balgentiens are aligned with the Irish, and as such the Irish are here criticised as cowardly and cunning, for sacrificing another to cheat a sympathetic devil of his dues.

Joyce domesticates the devil, too, in line with the domestication of his parallel, the mayor. As Garnier notes, for example, both the devil and the mayor are ‘compulsive dressers.’ In Blachon’s illustrations, they are both dressed in red robes, have large noses, and as they shake hands, appear to mirror each other (pp. 11-12). The devil is turned from the epitome of otherness, as he is in all other versions of this folk tale, into a humane, Joycean artist. He is also brought out of line with history through his anachronistic reading of newspapers, and use of spyglass. As such, he becomes identifiable with the present, and thus

---

30 Ibid.  
33 Garnier, p. 100.
aligned with the reader. Joyce at times associated himself with the devil, acting the devil in family plays as a child, and being called ‘Herr Satan’ by his Zurich landlady.\textsuperscript{34} In this way, we may see the model of the author-god turned on its head, bringing to bear the figure of the author-devil. Where the author-god suggests authority and power, the model of the author-devil suggests equally superhuman creative power, yet tied to a figure of exile, of no authority, who gains no respect or sympathy for his actions. The text itself, of course, makes clear the association between the devil and Joyce, in the well-known postscript: ‘P.S. The devil mostly speaks a language of his own called Bellsybabble which he makes up himself as he goes along but when he is very angry he can speak quite bad French very well though some who have heard him say that he has a strong Dublin accent’. However, he is not presented as a hateful character, and the contemporary and domestic image of the devil in \textit{Cat} makes him a sympathetic figure, and clearly one of more compassion than the mayor.

Where the Balgentiens call themselves ‘cats’ proudly, in recognition of their wit, Joyce’s domestication of the mayor and the devil reverses this understanding of events, such that the wronged devil insults them: ‘Vous n’êtes que des chats!’ [You are only cats!] We may think of translating Joyce’s story into French as, in a sense, “backtranslating” it into French. However, translating it into French requires an approach to the physically and temporally domesticated details that Joyce brought to the story. While Coillie tells us that it is particularly uncommon to foreignise names in books for children under ten, no translator of \textit{Cat} has altered the name ‘Alfred Byrne’, and so has, to greater or lesser extent, maintained \textit{Cat}’s implicit critique of Dublin. The ‘mirror’ that Beaugency provides to Dublin in \textit{Cat} becomes considerably more complex when the story is translated into the language of its locale. The text becomes primarily a mirror to France’s own town and customs, and elides Dublin from its implications.

\textsuperscript{34} Sigler, p. 542. Stanislaus Joyce’s first memory is of his brother acting the devil, \textit{My Brother’s Keeper}, p. 27.
Borel’s translation makes strange what would naturally be domestic, were it a French story: Borel italicises the French dialogue that Joyce has in the original text, and he adds an footnote: ‘Les passages en italique sont en français dans le texte originale’ [The passages in italics are in French in the original text] (p. 57). This note is evidently not there for the sake of its child readers, but so that adult readers are reminded that this French text is not an original, at the point when one is most likely to forget this: where Joyce himself wrote French into it. This context differs significantly from the issues that Vanessa Joosen discusses in ‘Translating Dutch into Dutch’: in that case, the Dutch backtranslations chose to change the Dutch, to fix errors and to normalise registers, but here the French is both considerably briefer and intentionally stranger, with its playful and informal terms of endearment – ‘mon pau petit chou-chat’ [my po’ little sweetheart-cat] (p. 57). 35 It is rather because it is left exactly as it is that the French raises issues of origin, which the French translators of Cat resolve by making the French language itself alien. The postscript of Joyce’s letter is also included in Chat, which enhances the sense of the devil’s, and overall of the text’s, foreignness, and ends the whole story with the word ‘Dublin’: ‘il sait aussi parler à la perfection un très mauvais français, quoique ceux qui l’ont entendu assurent qu’il a un fort accent de Dublin’ [he also knows how to perfectly speak very bad French, although those who have heard him say he has a strong Dublin accent] (p. 63). In this final sentence, again, it is precisely the French language that is made foreign-sounding, with its strong Dublin accent, despite being a French-language edition of Joyce’s story.

We see, thus, that both cats and letters serve as cross-cultural textual bridges, as Joyce’s story is itself a translation, domesticating the mayor and devil by giving them Irish and contemporary characteristics, in order to mutely set up Beaugency as a critical reflection of Dublin. In translating The Cat and the Devil into French, thus, Le Chat et le Diable

problematises the relation of place to language, in keeping foreign where one would ordinarily expect domestication, and in forcefully estranging its own language. In crossing the bridge once more, we see, one can only return much changed. Moreover, Joyce ends the story by placing children playing on the bridge: childhood is thus associated with the liminal space of the bridge, with travelling and mobility. Just as cats are identifiable the world over, and bridge national differences, children too, while variable in habits and significance, are essentially a global feature; indeed, it may be that children of the same age in England and France have more in common with each other than with adults in their own countries. Joyce presents a child as a liminal figure in one of his earliest works, his play *Exiles* (1918). In the play, there is a child called Archie, whose name itself resonates with arch-like bridging potential: as Mária Kurdi notes, ‘His very name suggesting a passageway, Archie’s connecting role between two different kinds of spheres is visualized by his repeated entries through the window.’

Archie’s mobility is apparent in the children at the end of *Cat*, crossing bridges to go beyond their town’s borders, and as such encountering the new and different, just as translation can serve as a bridge to bring them to other cultures. Corre’s illustrations point to a particular modernist moment when mobility became more widely possible, in having his children riding bicycles over the bridge. The effect of the availability of bicycles on women’s independence at the end of the nineteenth century has been much noted; it may equally have brought more freedom to children at the turn of the century.

In these ways, Joyce sets up the powerful image of the bridge to link translation to mobility, and a new sense of childhood space. Joyce shows the modern child not limited to the local, but seeking out and welcoming in those beyond its borders.

---

Kurdi, Mária, “‘Did He Seem to You a Child Only—Or an Angel?’ The Figure of Archie in James Joyce’s *Exiles*, *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies*, 1.2 (1995), 65-74 (p. 66).


Where the translation by Stephen and Solange Joyce purports to be entirely different from that of Borel – ‘Traduction de Jacques Borel entièrement revue par Solange et Stephen J. Joyce pour l’édition de 1985’ [Jacques Borel’s translation entirely edited by Solange and Stephen J. Joyce for the 1985 edition] (p. [30]) – it in fact differs in very few places, and follows Borel’s translation decisions at several key points: the neologism ‘diababélien’ for ‘Belsybabble’, the onomatopoeic expression ‘le temps de dire ouf, plouf!’ [the time to say ouf, plouf!] for ‘quick as a thought’ and ‘Le diable piqua une vraie colère de diable’ [The devil flew into a real devilish rage] for ‘The devil was as angry as the devil himself’. As such, Stephen and Solange’s apparent dissatisfaction with Borel’s translation cannot overall be seen as a lexical issue. It is likely, therefore, that their decision to retranslate the text is due to the difficult-to-read but visually beautiful pagination and illustration by Jean-Jacques Corre for Borel’s edition.

In Chapter 1 I discussed Oittinen and O’Sullivan’s accounts of illustrations for translations. O’Sullivan was particularly damning of disparities between text and image, and efforts to remove culturally specific items from text or image. Rather than this negative process of reducing images to cultural neutrality, there is as yet nothing written on the commissioning of new target culture illustrators for translations, as is the case for Joyce’s Cat in France. Cat is a particularly rare case, as one of the French illustrators’, Blachon’s, work was so popular that his illustrations are now used for English editions of the text too. In the same way that translators face decisions of domestication, foreignisation, modernisation, and hold a particular notion of childhood in mind for which they tailor their work, native illustrators of translated texts bring significant notions of culture to their illustrations. Indeed,
even before a picturebook is read, it will have been judged by its cover illustrations as suitable or not for its potential buyers. I will look first at the two English language illustrations, before turning to the two French illustrators who domesticate *Cat* in different ways, and build bridges between modernism and children’s literature, and between Ireland and medieval France.

The first English edition of *Cat*, with Gerald Rose’s illustrations, makes metatextual plays such as depicting the letter being written by Joyce at his desk, the cat model about which Joyce is writing to Stephen, and showing the devil reflected in a mirror and looking precisely like Joyce with horns. As such, Sigler notes that ‘*The Cat and the Devil*, like Joyce’s other works, provides yet another portrait of the artist.’ Rose plays with Joyce’s language, in literalising the expression ‘every man held his breath and every woman held her tongue’, with hands on mouths and tongues sticking out. Amid his standard colour illustrations, a double page spread of the cat being splashed with water stands as a centrepiece: it is a black and white image drawn in frenetic pencil lines and filling the pages to the corners with the cat. Richard Erdoes, the illustrator of the first American edition of *Cat*, focuses on a sense of performativity to the text: the titular cat leads animals in a dance at the conclusion of the story, and on the final page, the devil bows, as Sigler observes, ‘to an extratextual crowd, as if the previous story had all been a dramatic play staged for an audience of viewers and not merely readers’ (see Image 10).

For the first French edition, Jean-Jacques Corre’s illustrations are black and white ink prints on high quality off-white paper, in a book that is unusually square. Four beautiful pages near the centre of the book are white text and illustrations on black paper, as night falls and the people of Beaugency sleep, for the lines ‘La nuit vint, tous les gens de Beaugency allèrent se coucher et s’endormirent’ [Night came, all the people of Beaugency went to bed and slept]  

---

38 Sigler, p. 541.
39 Sigler, p. 543.
Image 10. Erdos’ devil takes a bow.
More so than Rose’s devil, Corre’s is not simply Joycean, but explicitly a portrait of Joyce’s head, made disproportionately large to the rest of his body. He first positions the face of Joyce mid-sentence, after the words ‘Le Diable’ [The Devil] (p. 22) (see Image 11). The mayor, in contrast, is almost disturbingly faceless, perhaps to figure him as a characterless puppet of authority or bureaucracy. On most pages, the writing extends across the gutter, and letters and short words are often lost in the middle of the two pages. While almost half of the pages have a single line of text or only individual words, a quarter of the pages are overcrowded with text, and would be difficult for an early reader. The words often follow the shapes of the illustrations, as with a single line of text serving as a road for people’s feet, for the lines ‘si tu voulais la traverser d’une rive à l’autre, il te faudrait bien faire au moins mille pas’ [if you wanted to cross from one riverbank to the other, you would need to take at least a thousand steps] (pp. 14-17). The text is large and comes at a slant along the bridge for the lines ‘O Loire, le beau pont!’ [Oh Loire, the beautiful bridge!], filling a double page spread (pp. 40-41). As the cat runs from the water being poured on it, the words jump along its back, following the cat into the devil’s arms, as the sentence ends appropriately with its last two words in the bottom right corner beneath the devil: we see the cat crossing the bridge ‘à toutes pattes, les oreilles rabattues, il vint se jeter dans les bras du diable’ [at full speed, ears turned down, he threw himself into the arms of the devil] (pp. 54-55) (see Image 12).

The letter’s postscript is given its own double page spread and printed sideways, so that the book has to be turned to read it. Above the postscript is an equally sideways image of the devil creating a speech bubble full of pictures, symbols, hieroglyphs and scattered letters. Its variety of images evokes the all-encompassing nature of the devil’s speech, which seems to contain the natural world (owls, crocodiles, fish, cats) and even the supernatural world (witches, a mermaid, a four leaf clover). Moreover, it connects with the modernist
Image 11. Rose and Corre’s Joycean devils.
understanding of ideograms and hieroglyphs, as put forward by Ernest Fenollosa, and propagated by Ezra Pound, as a kind of language that combines the verbal and the visual.\footnote{Ernest Fenollosa, \textit{The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry}, ed. by Ezra Pound (San Francisco: City Lights, \textit{[1919]} 1936).} This is a particularly apt connection to make, as it suggests that the modernist tying of visual to verbal can relate directly to the present picturebook, self-referentially pointing to a possible bridge between modernism and children’s picturebooks. Corrè’s style is itself modernist, conjoining ornate medieval style manuscript illustrations with cartoon style caricature, particularly in the giant head and cape of the devil. Medieval architecture takes on a cubist perspective for the houses along the riverbank (pp. 8-11), and during the night, the people of Beaugency dream of bridges in various styles (pp. 36-37), but one baby stands out by anachronistically dreaming of the Eiffel Tower (see Image 13). As such, Corrè’s illustrations connect with the anachronism, modernity and child audience of Joyce’s text, in a specifically French way.

For the second French edition, Roger Blachon’s highly colourful illustrations and textual layout are more overtly childlike and cartoonish, containing fewer details and large blocks of bright colours. His edition is also considerably clearer to read, with a more even balance of words per page, and with text only on one side of each double page spread for all but four pages. The illustrations present the entire population of the city involved in their daily activities, as well as serving as an audience to the mayor and devil. This populace is self-evidently medieval from its clothing, activities, weaponry and architecture, but the first two pages show a very modern moustachioed postman on a bicycle, carrying the model cat to which Joyce refers. In Blachon’s illustrations, the devil is not specifically Joycean, but wearing a one-piece jumpsuit with a front flap, looks like he is dressed in a babygrow or sleepsuit, infantilising him somewhat (see Image 14).
Image 12. Corre’s image-text interplay and diabélïen ideograms.
Blachon’s illustrations do not simply domesticate nor foreignise the mayor and devil, but bridge distance and difference in an Irish-French Catholic association. Where most illustrators anachronistically modernise clothing for this book, Blachon works with medieval dress style, and making the mayor look like a pope (see Image 14). In doing so, he envisions similarities between the two cultures – medieval French at the time of the legend, and contemporary Irish.\(^{41}\) Further, he brings out the Joycean theme of Catholicism, which Joyce associated with cats, bridges and devils across his work. The *Wake*, in the simplest example, makes ‘Catholic’ into ‘Catalick’ (158.4), to emphasise the cat link. The mention of the pope as ‘pontofacts massimust’ in the *Wake*, is a twisting of ‘pontifex maximus’, the Roman Catholic title for the Pope (532.9): this translates as ‘greatest bridge-maker’, and so identifies Catholicism with bridges. Another possible reference to Byrne in the *Wake*, alluding to his trip to New York, ends with a particularly cat-like Catholic blessing: ‘But will be not pontification? [...] Cantaberra and Neweryork may suppacre when, by vepers, for towned and travalled, his goldwhite swaystick aloft ylifted, umbrilla-parasoul, Monsignore of Deublan shall impart to all. *Benedictus benedicat!*’ (569.16-21). Garnier notes that the cat in the ‘Calypso’ section of *Ulysses* ‘tipped three times and licked lightly’, which she calls a ‘Trinitarian, Vichian ritual.’\(^{42}\) The ‘Mime’ chapter of the *Wake* associates bridges and the devil: ‘oaths and screams and bawley groans with a belchybubhub and a hellabelow bedemmed and bediabbled the arimaining lucisphere, Helldsdend, whestdselse! Lonedoms’s breach lay foulend up uncouth not be broched by punns and reedles’ (239.32-36). While ‘London Bridge’ is said here to not ‘be broached by puns and riddles’, it is precisely through such chthonic wordplay as ‘hellabelow’, ‘bediabbled’ and ‘lucisphere’ that the bridge comes to be understood in all its devilish undertones. Blachon’s bridging of Irish and French

\(^{41}\) The bridge in Beaugency was built in the fourteenth century, and so it can be assumed that the legend of the bridge’s construction is also set in this period.

\(^{42}\) *Ulysses*, p. 54. Garnier, p. 105.
Image 13. Corre’s night architecture and child dreaming of the Eiffel Tower.
differences through Catholicism is thus particularly apt for *The Cat and the Devil*, fitting into the matrix of concerns in Joyce’s works. The success of Blachon’s illustrations can be seen in that even English language editions make use of them; contrary to O’Sullivan’s diagnosis, they cross linguistic and national borders without losing cultural specificity, by building a bridge between source and target cultures.

**Conclusion**

Stephen Joyce’s preface to *Le Chat et le Diable* discusses the importance of Dublin to Joyce, and Joyce as an exile: ‘Nonno est né et a grandi à Dublin. Bien qu’il ait beaucoup aimé l’Irlande, il était en désaccord profond avec les autorités de l’Église et de l’État. Il quitta son pays à l’âge de vingt-deux ans [...] Lui et Nonna, ma grand-mère, étaient des exilés’ [Grandpa was born and grew up in Dublin. Although he loved Ireland, he was in deep discord with the authorities of the Church and the State. He left his country at the age of twenty-two … He and Nonna, my grandmother, were exiles]. As with Joyce’s literature, the issue of discord with authority figures arises here. Joyce recreates folk tales with his own concerns, to challenge authoritative figures such as the mayor and the Ondt, but he also uses them metatextually to challenge the authority of their own tellers. We see this when Professor Jones and Shaun undermine their own arguments, and in *Cat* when the author slips into the character of the devil, to discuss his own work as a made up language with a bad accent. Moreover, Joyce takes a radical perspective in *Cat*, in positing the devil not as the evil authority who threatens the townspeople, but as the lonely exile who is fooled by cowards. As with the story of the Gracehoper, there is no victory gained for the sympathetic artist figure, but some consolation found, here in the newly forged alliance between exiled devil and scapegoated cat.
Joyce’s translations of folk tales are in line with common practices for rewriting and recreating written folklore, but they are equally in line with his thematisation and approach to translation as a modernist, breaking from traditions and finding subversive perspectives. The theory of written folklore can be used to combine the highly intellectualised practice of modernist translation with more accessible notions of children’s literature translation and transmission, and it is perhaps partly in this manner that Joyce chooses a folk tale as a story for his grandson. However, no translator of Joyce’s children’s book has approached him from such an angle, and his authority is apparent in the manner in which the French translations maintain his domestications as foreignisations, with Alfred Bryne, and in particular with the estrangement of the French language in its own native context. The French translators seek to repeat Joyce’s words rather than his effect, and create a new effect in the foreignisation of the French language in its own country. While these are perhaps unintended parallels, this self-alienation from language has much in common with the approach to language that Joyce puts forward in *Portrait* as an Irish colonised subject speaking English: it is a strained relationship to language that Joyce welcomes into his works. Deane suggests for the *Wake* that its particular kind of unreadability forces a reader to ‘forego most of the conventions about reading and about language that constitute him/her as a reader’, and that a reader gains much from doing this: ‘the conventions survive but they are less likely thereafter to dwindle into assumptions about what reading or writing is.’\(^{43}\) In the same manner, this unlocalisability of language – a French that is not from the French – can begin to denaturalise one’s relation to language, much as Stephen Dedalus as a child begins to think through the consequences of the very existence of different languages. In other words, without seeking a universal language, Babelism can be an exhortation to recognise otherness and expand one’s personal boundaries. A child’s babble gives way to coherence with greater learning and effort to

\(^{43}\) Joyce, *Finnegans Wake*, p. vii.
understand others; in the same way, Joyce forces his readers to encounter new language (neologisms) and positions us as continuing language learners.

In contrast to these denaturalisations and foreignisations, Joyce uses cats and children as a way to link his different narratives about Europe to his grandson, and as a way to bring familiarity to foreign places. Likewise, the illustrators of the French editions of *Cat* bridge distances – between modernism and children’s picturebooks for Corre, and between Ireland and medieval France for Blachon – to invite child readers into new territories. These visual bridges, like textual translations, make intricate decisions about their intended audience: in connecting modernism and children’s literature, Corre enables a child reader (or “experiencer”) of the book to develop towards a familiarity with modernist or avant-garde aesthetics; in relating French and Irish history, Blachon encourages a child reader to learn something of a foreign culture, and move towards a more international perspective, which is also an aspect of modernism, and evident in Joyce’s trilingual travelling work. In all cases, Joyce’s translation of Beaugency’s folk tale, and these two French translations work to build from Beaugency across international, linguistic and aesthetic borders. Joyce’s ‘fine bridge’ over the Loire is an entry point for child audiences into modernist modes of reading and translation. Moreover, the central image of the bridge points to the real mobility of children at the beginning of the twentieth-century, no longer bound to one place, but freer to travel and encounter new places.
Chapter 5. A Queer Phenomenology of Girlhood:

Stein’s *The World is Round*

Just as Joyce’s engagement with childhood spaces is not bound to a particular locale, Stein’s *The World is Round* (1939) approaches the question of childhood space at an abstract level. As with Woolf’s *Nurse Lugton*, Stein’s text is about a girl’s perspective on the world: she expands from a girl’s view to a philosophical examination of perception, and its relation to emotion and embodiment. In this respect, her analysis of perception has much in common with phenomenology. As Maurice Merleau-Ponty describes it, phenomenology is the study of consciousness, and how our consciousness is not caged in by, but predicated upon, our physical embodiment. Merleau-Ponty conceives of a universal conscious subject, but I will look in this chapter at more recent challenges to his phenomenology of perception, in particular at Sara Ahmed’s queering of phenomenology.

Just as Woolf and de la Mare, between them, show two very gendered alternatives to experiences of the countryside, Stein’s story shows two gendered experiences of the world as a whole, in telling of the world views of Rose and Willy. The plot focuses on Rose’s identity crisis, which begins with her questioning of the relation between her name and her identity, and is deepened by the trauma of her learning at school that the world is round, an absolute refutation of her perception of the world. Rose sings and cries frequently, with the text erratically changing between prose and lineated poetry, and split into irregular subtitled sections. To overcome her horror of roundness, Rose seeks a taller perspective, and so decides to climb a mountain and see what she can see. On her way up the mountain, she inscribes her name in a ring around a tree, passes a dwarf and crosses through a rainbow, and upon reaching the top, a flashlight shines down upon her, bathing her in light. The suggestion is that the light belongs to Willy, who we were led to believe was Rose’s cousin, but turns out
not to be, as we are told in an abrupt leap forward in time from the top of the mountain to a few lines on Rose and Willy married with children. Even as a mother, ‘sometimes singing made Rose cry.’

The introduction to this chapter will look at the French context of World, Stein as a lesbian and World as a queer text, before finally turning to Stein as a phenomenologist and recent work that brings together study of queerness and of phenomenology. The second section of this chapter, ‘“Who in the world am I?”: Alice and Rose Becoming Taller/Women’, will consider World as reworking Carroll’s Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, in particular in questions of naming and a sense that a taller perspective should be a more mature one. Where Alice and Rose differ, however, particularly in their endings, is where Stein’s story reveals the queerness of its poetics: out of Alice, Stein creates a wholly new sense of girlhood, queering narrative/life progression, and uniting perception with both gender and body shape. In the final section, the two French translations of Stein, both published in 1984, are analysed in terms of the possibilities for a queer translation practice.

The story is dedicated to Stein’s friend’s daughter, Rose Lucy Renée Anne d’Aiguy, ‘a French Rose’ (p. 4), and written while Stein was living in France. As discussed above in Chapter 1, Stein lived in Paris from 1903 and was friends with French artists. As well as a cultural and artistic centre, Paris was, in the early twentieth century, considered a centre of sexual liberty, to which a number of lesbian figures fled, such as Sylvia Beach, Natalie Barney and Stein herself. Stein had a number of lesbian experiences in the USA, and coming to Paris, soon settled into a lesbian “marriage” with Alice Toklas. Unlike most Western countries of the time, France did not have a law against homosexual sex acts, since the Penal Code of 1791 decriminalised it, and this was reinforced and spread by the Napoleonic Code in 1803. As such, Paris was a haven for homosexual men in the nineteenth century, and as

---

women’s rights began to be asserted from the end of the century, homosexual women began
to enter more prominently into Parisian life, particularly through hosting fashionable salons
and tea rooms.  

Shari Benstock writes on Stein that she ‘was aware, for instance, that the establishment
of a domestic homosexual relationship in Baltimore would have required subterfuge beyond
the customary discretion practiced in the Stein-Toklas marriage in Paris. Nor would Stein
have been able in America to freely examine the sensual and emotional spectra of that
relationship in her writing.’  

Benstock is here asserting a link between Stein’s living in Paris
and her ability to express her sexuality in her writing. Indeed, it is only when Stein comes to
Paris that she begins writing, and her first novel, QED, is an openly lesbian semi-
autobiographical text about a love triangle Stein experienced at university with two women.

The OED also accredits Stein with the first printed use of ‘gay’ to refer to a homosexual
relationship, in her short story ‘Miss Furr and Miss Skeene’ (1922). The word ‘gay’ is first
defined as referring to homosexuality in 1941, but at the time said to be used exclusively by
homosexuals themselves, as a kind of shibboleth, known only to the homosexual community.
As such, both ‘Miss Furr and Miss Skeene’ and Stein’s A Long Gay Book (1933) would not
have been received as lesbian texts by the majority of their audience; their undertones of
sexuality would most likely only have been recognised by other gay people at the time.

Contrary to the common understanding of 1920s Paris as a liberating space for lesbians,
Elyse Blankley asserts that more subtle oppressions took place there:

Paris was thus a double-edged sword offering both free sexual expression and
oppressive sexual stereotyping. It might cultivate lesbianism like an exotic vine,
but it would never nourish it. In front of [Renée] Vivien—and, indeed, every
lesbian—yawned the immense, unbridgeable chasm separating men’s perceptions
of lesbian women and lesbian women’s perceptions of themselves.

---

4 QED was written in 1903, but Stein did not allow it to be published during her lifetime.
5 Cited in Benstock, p. 49.
What is at issue here, Blankley suggests, is the sense of varieties in perception, and a specifically lesbian perception that differs from a patriarchal one. Susan McCabe, too, relates a lesbian domesticity with a new perception of the world: ‘The Autobiography [of Alice B. Toklas] notes a shift in Stein’s writing from “the inside of people” to wanting “to express the rhythm of the visible world,” and yet this shift is synchronous in establishing a whole new household with Alice.’

The idea of a style that explores the ‘visible world’ of perception is here linked with the increasing depth of her relationship with Alice (recalling Carroll’s Alice, who stands behind World). This distinction between a masculine or patriarchal world order and a distinctly lesbian one is evident in Stein’s poetry. In particular, in ‘Patriarchal Poetry’ (1927), Stein describes the kind of literature that she is writing against: ‘Patriarchal poetry makes no mistake. [...] Patriarchal poetry in regular places placed regularly as if it were placed regularly regularly placed regularly as it were.’

The sense of rightness, as well as of sanctioned place are evidently key elements of patriarchal poetry. The patriarchy is recognisable as “regular” – both the norm, and that which is regulated, governed by standards and rules of acceptability. In direct contrast, Stein’s most explicitly lesbian poem, ‘Lifting Belly’, sets out a lesbian erotic poetics which sits outside of such patriarchally authorised logic: ‘Lifting belly is so erroneous.’ This poem is often spoken in a collective feminine ‘we’, includes a lesbian kiss, and uses the image of ‘lifting belly’ as a euphemism for lesbian sex; here, its erroneous nature is not a condemnation of lesbian sexuality as “wrong”, but a celebration of its deviancy from a heterosexual norm. As we will see, a specifically lesbian or queer perception, which challenges heteronormativity and a universalising, authoritative world view, equally plays a key role in The World is Round.

---

Stein’s children’s book has received little criticism. Only Barbara Will has discussed *World* in conjunction with Stein’s other children’s literature, and notes that, apart from *World*, none of them could find a publisher that would market them for children in Stein’s lifetime. For Will this is because the despair of the Second World War underlies all of Stein’s children’s stories, but especially those written after *World*, in the 1940s: ‘Was there a connection in Stein’s mind between her experience of this war and writing for children? Undoubtedly.’ Of Stein’s critics, only Will notes the phenomenological underpinning of Rose’s despair: in brief, while intellectually we accept that the world is round, experientially the world as we see and live it, is flat. Will’s notion of Rose’s despair can be expanded into a phenomenology of the child: Rose’s journey up the mountain can be seen as a failed or subverted quest narrative (Cleveland), but can also be seen as Rose’s effort to attain a taller perspective, to mimic growing up. As such, Stein’s story specifically thematises and addresses the child’s interrogation of her own identity in the world. Stein pre-dates the development of phenomenology, but is connected to it in a number of ways, as I will return to below.

Stein’s three other children’s books, *To Do* (1940), *The Gertrude Stein First Reader* (1941) and *Three Plays* (1943) contain violence and the grotesque to an extent not found in *World*. Indeed, despite the severe unhappiness of its heroine, Roni Natov considers *World* as a happy pastoral, with its natural setting and interest in animal life: ‘As a child of feeling, Rose’s task is to move into nature, away from the repressive forces of civilization into the

---

9 Will, ‘‘And Then One Day There Was a War’’: Gertrude Stein, Children’s Literature, and World War II’, *Children’s Literature Association Quarterly*, 32.4 (2007), 340-53 (pp. 345-46). Stein’s *To Do* was published as a picturebook in 2011.
11 Will, p. 341.
pastoral where one finds both fear and joy in wilderness.'\textsuperscript{13} However, we must note that Rose takes on her journey into nature a decidedly unnatural blue chair, she is openly disappointed by the reality of nature she sees and she is finally found (possibly saved) by an artificial light. Far from revelling in nature, one may argue that Rose gains nothing by climbing the mountain.

Martha Rust and Peter Schwenger point to the importance of Stein’s style in \textit{World} for exploring uncertain identity: ‘On one level, then, \textit{The World is Round} portrays Rose’s struggle with circularity in the world around her; on another level, it dramatizes her struggle to define herself within the treacherously slippery medium of language itself.’\textsuperscript{14} The story is written in Stein’s very unique and challenging style, neglecting syntax and punctuation for repetition and pushing language towards uncertainty, often emptying it of referentiality. Janne Cleveland also focuses on the language of \textit{World}, likening it to the language of children, and seeing in this a power to challenge conventional discourses: ‘As well as representing the circular, absurd moment, it mimics children’s command of language in its dependence upon the physical pleasures created by sound and tactility. […] Children’s linguistic play functions here to deconstruct the rigidity of normative identity categories through pleasure.’\textsuperscript{15} In seeing the language of \textit{World} as destabilising identity, Cleveland constructs a ‘queer feminist’ reading of the text, a reading supported by Linda Watts. Watts goes further in asserting that Rose ‘is no conventional girl. That is to say, Stein goes to some lengths to establish this figure as gender-transgressive. Make no mistake; Rose “carries a pen-knife” and “had nothing pink.”’\textsuperscript{16} The potential queerness of Rose and of \textit{World} are key aspects of Stein’s text, and challenge Rousseau’s model of childhood, as it was outlined in the Introduction to this thesis,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} Natov, p. 108.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Rust, p. 131; Peter Schwenger, ‘Gertrude Stein Writing Rose Writing Rose’, \textit{Children’s Literature Association Quarterly}, 19 (1994), 118-21.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Cleveland, p. 120.
\end{itemize}
at a fundamental level.

The terms “childhood” and “sexuality” do not sit together comfortably in the cultural imagination, and this is largely due to the ideology that follows from Rousseau’s sense of childhood “innocence”. Rousseau has Émile and Sophie educated and kept separately until into their mid-teenage years. As discussed in the Introduction, Sophie’s education differs from Émile’s on every level – she is not to learn from nature, but kept confined to domestic spaces; not taught to reason, but to accept the reasoning of others; not free to construct her own identity, but must subjugate her identity to her husband and future children. As Rousseau asserts: ‘L’un doit être actif et fort, l’autre passif et faible : il faut nécessairement que l’un veuille et puisse, il suffit que l’autre résiste peu’ [One must be active and strong, the other passive and weak: it must necessarily be that one desires and is capable, it is enough that the other offers little resistance]17 This male authority is thematised in Stein’s story in the boy named ‘Will’, who attempts to embody his name through sequences of imperatives: ‘Bring me bread / Bring me butter / Bring me cheese / And bring me jam’ (p. 28). His authoritative posturing is, however, undermined by Will’s uncontrollable fear of his own pet, a lion named Billy, whom Rose takes from him (p. 23).

There are no explicitly sexual activities or open discussions of sexuality in World, but Rousseau himself provides an example of erotic stimulation in childhood, in his autobiography, Les Confessions (1782-89). Where Émilde remains silent on childhood development and the erotic, Rousseau’s account of his own childhood details his erotic attraction to his nurse, who bathed, fed and spanked him. On being spanked, he tells us:

ce châtiment m’affectionna davantage encore à celle qui me l’avait imposé. Il fallait même toute la vérité de cette affection et toute ma douceur naturelle pour m’empêcher de chercher le retour du même traitement en le méritant ; car j’avais trouvé dans la douleur, dans la honte même, un mélange de sensualité qui m’avait laissé plus de désir que de crainte de l’éprouver derechef par la même main. Il est vrai que, comme il se meloit sans doute à cela quelque instinct précoce du séxe le

17 Rousseau, p. 466.
même châtiment receu de son frere ne m’eut point du tout paru plaisant [...] Qui croiroit que ce châtiment d’enfant, receu à huit ans par la main d’une fille de trente a décédé de mes gouts, de mes desirs, de mes passions, de moi pour le reste de ma vie.

[This punishment increased my affection for the one who inflicted it on me. It took all the truth of this affection and all my natural gentleness to prevent myself from seeking the return of the same treatment in deserving it; for I had found in the pain, in the shame even, a mixture of sensuality that left me more with desire than with fear of experiencing it once more by the same hand. It is true that, as it was mixed without doubt with a certain precocious sexual instinct the same punishment received from her brother would not have given me any pleasure … Who would believe that this childhood punished, received at eight years old at the hand of a girl of thirty would decide my tastes, my desires, my passions, for the rest of my life.]\(^\text{18}\)

Freud refers to Rousseau’s pleasure in being spanked in his essay ‘The Infantile Sexuality’ (1910). In this essay, he challenges the Victorian (following Rousseauvian) understanding of the child as asexual: ‘One feature of the popular view of the sexual instinct is that it is absent in childhood and only awakens on the period of life described as puberty. This, however, is not merely a simple error but one that has had grave consequences, for it is mainly to this idea that we owe our present ignorance of the fundamental conditions of sexual life.’\(^\text{19}\)

Freud’s challenge here is to rethink sexuality beyond heterosexual reproductive sexual activity (which of course is impossible for pre-pubescent children), defining sexuality instead as the libidinal flow of erotic desires, that may manifest in a variety of manners. He writes of the potential ‘polymorphously perverse’ sexuality of children, and suggests the erotic pleasures of orality (such as thumb-sucking and eating) and anality, before children develop a specifically genital-focused sexuality (although children of all ages masturbate).\(^\text{20}\) Jung,


\(^{20}\) Freud, ‘The Infantile Sexuality’, pp. 179-91. Kate Millett attests that while there is widespread silence about such matters, girls can achieve clitoral orgasm at any age; boys can even achieve erection in utero, and routinely in infancy and early childhood as part of their sleep cycle. The National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC) classes masturbation as ‘normal’ sexual behaviour at all ages. Millett observes that too rigidly denying children sexual exploration of their own bodies can lead to trauma and repression in later life.
following Freud, considers bed-wetting as a sexual act for children, asserting that ‘from the
Freudian standpoint [...] bed-wetting must be regarded as an infantile sexual substitute.’

Where Freud talks of this infantile sexuality as not being located solely in genital sexuality,
and normalising into genital heterosexuality in adolescence, he equally talks of the many
cases where it does not normalise, because of childhood trauma, leading to repression,
fetishes, or other kinds of deviancy. These adult deviant sexualities, like childhood sexuality
for Freud, are not necessarily expressed in heterosexual coitus, but through a variety of
possible activities that take on for that person a sexual significance. In either way, for Freud,
the many varieties of sexuality a child experiences reduce down in adulthood to
heterosexuality, or some deviation from normative heterosexuality.

It is important to recognise here that neither Rousseauvian “innocence” nor Freudian
“polymorphously perverse” sexuality provide us with an essential ‘truth’ about childhood.
However, there is frequently danger in rigidifying expectations of a group’s identity, as it will
inevitably be a painful oppression for some or many members of that group. This is equally
the case for assuming the innate sexuality of all children or for rejecting any such sexuality in
children. Rather than imposing such expectations on others, it is important to recognise
variety among individuals. At the same time, the cultural tendency to push sexual
“innocence” onto children can be a danger to them, as it leaves them ignorant of sexual
matters, and this can render them vulnerable to sexual abuse. Kerry Robinson works with
women who were victims of child abuse, and notes that many of them believe that an earlier


sex education could have helped them to avoid the suffering they endured.\textsuperscript{23} Robinson directly blames Rousseau’s ideology for this situation: denied a sexual education, these girls had no ability to understand, and no language to articulate, what was happening to them.\textsuperscript{24} 

An even deeper silence holds over childhood homosexuality. Indeed, its very possibility is often denied, as it implies children desiring sexual partners. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick is the first to talk about this issue, through what she terms the ‘proto-gay’ child, in her article ‘How to Bring Your Kids Up Gay’ (1991). She critiques the discourses around children and homosexuality in America, looking at the trauma that authorities in mental healthcare caused to non-heteronormative children, as psychology and psychotherapy sought to suppress their non-normative desires.\textsuperscript{25} Following Sedgwick, James Kincaid points to the eroticisation of children in Victorian culture, and Steven Bruhm and Natasha Hurley collect essays on representations of queer childhood.\textsuperscript{26}

It is important to note that queer is not precisely the same as gay/lesbian. “Queer” is a term that specifically speaks against heteropatriarchy, and challenges the monolithic authoritativeness of heterosexuality. It is worthwhile to recognise the multifariousness of heterosexuality, which includes in itself many possible fetishes: dom/me, submissive, switch, obsessions with particular body parts, roleplaying, exhibitionism, teleiophilia, and countless

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{23} Kerry Robinson, ‘Schooling the “Vulnerable” Child: Knowledge, Innocence, and the Construction of the Normative Citizen Subject in the Early Years’, at A Good Day for Stripes, London Metropolitan University, 21 June 2013. She often condemns sex education as leading to suffering for some, such as for its failure to shape a welcoming response to homosexuality, discussed in Robinson and Cristyn Davies, ‘Docile Bodies and Heteronormative Moral Subjects: Constructing the Child and Sexual Knowledge in Schooling’,\textit{Sexuality and Culture}, 12 (2008), 221-39, p. 237.
\textsuperscript{24} The NSPCC has recently launched a public campaign, ‘The Underwear Rule’ (2013), to encourage parents to talk to their children about their sexual rights. They assert that since nine out of ten abused children are abused by people they knew, not by strangers, children need to be aware of their boundaries, and able to express themselves if a situation makes them uncomfortable. http://www.nspcc.org.uk/help-and-advice/for-parents/keeping-your-child-safe/the-underwear-rule/the-underwear-rule_wda97016.html#pants , accessed 23 Aug 2013.
\end{flushright}
inflections of race, class, body shape and size. Indeed, there is an immense variety of sexual preferences, that all come under the umbrella term “heterosexual”. Nevertheless, sexuality continues by the majority of people to be thought of as a binary system, and not a spectrum or constellation of identities. As a binary system, (hetero)sexuality puts forward a hierarchy, and an understanding of one sexuality as normative, and the other as deviant: it remains the case that the varieties of sexual proclivities within heterosexuality constitute a cluster of (more or less) accepted sexual identities and push to the margins other sexual identities.

Moreover, throughout history, in many cultures, heterosexuality has been institutionally, socially and economically forced upon people. As Adrienne Rich passionately argues in ‘Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence’, this has been especially the case for women, who until relatively recently, did not have the economic or political independence to resist patriarchal expectations: ‘Heterosexuality has been both forcibly and subliminally imposed on women.’ Where Rich talks of ‘compulsory heterosexuality’, as the oppressive imposition of heterosexuality on women, Michael Warner proposes the idea of ‘heteronormativity’, as a way of describing how heterosexuality has tended to commingle with homophobia and misogyny, as a norm of heterosexual male authority from which it was punishable to deviate. For Warner, “queer”, more than “gay/lesbian”, is a term that can specifically speak against this heteronormativity:

Social theory, moreover, must begin to do more than occasionally acknowledge the gay movement because so much of heterosexual privilege lies in heterosexual culture’s exclusive ability to interpret itself as society. Even when coupled with a toleration of minority sexualities, heteronormativity has a totalizing tendency that can only be overcome by actively imagining a necessarily and desirably queer world.

The value that “queer” has here is in unifying the many marginalised sexual identities into one collective, and thus possessing a greater political force. However, this queer collective

does not seek to reproduce the hegemonic ideology of heterosexuality: it pushes against it by accepting greater specificities of identity within its own larger recognisable community or subculture. As Anthony Slagle of Queer Nation asserts: ‘Queer Nation develops a collective identity based on the idea that queers are unique not only from the mainstream but from one another.’

As we saw above with Stein’s contrasting accounts of ‘Patriarchal Poetry’ and ‘Lifting Belly’, her poetics of resisting normativity and regulation, and welcoming ambiguity and deviancy, fits very closely with the manner in which “queer” pushes against heteronormativity.

It is only very recently that these accounts of queer resistances to heteronormativity have been connected with childhood. Kathryn Bond Stockton’s monograph, The Queer Child: or, Growing Sideways in the Twentieth Century (2009) sets up ‘growing sideways’ as a queer alternative to ‘growing up.’ Stockton privileges modernist texts – by Henry James, Djuna Barnes and Woolf – in her discussion of the constructions of non-normative childhoods, and explores the relationship between such childhoods and non-linear temporalities:

There are ways of growing that are not growing up. The “gay” child’s fascinating asynchronicities, its required self-ghosting measures, its appearance only after its death, and its frequent fallback onto metaphor (as a way to grasp itself) indicate we need new words for growth. […] I want to prick (deflate, or just delay) the vertical, forward-motion metaphor of growing up, and do so by exploring the many kinds of sideways growth depicted by twentieth-century texts.

As we will see in the comparison of Carroll’s Alice and Stein’s Rose here, “growing up” has little to do with growth or up-ness, and in line with Stockton’s theory, Stein here explores the

failure of linear progression from childhood to adulthood, from supposed innocence to maturity, from ignorance to knowing.\textsuperscript{31}

Not all queer theorists embrace the queer potential of childhood in this manner, however. In contrast to these efforts to consider the queerness of the child, Lee Edelman points to the use of the normative figure of the child in normative discourses, as a way to reject queerness as a danger to society as we know it, for destabilising the traditional family. In \textit{No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive}, he asserts that social and political discourses draw on the figure of future children in the name of reactionary oppressions of gay rights, including gay marriage. He takes as an example the former Boston cardinal Bernard Law, who ‘denounced in 1996 proposed legislation giving health care benefits to same-sex partners of municipal employees.’\textsuperscript{32} Law did so on the grounds that such legislation would seriously damage the marital bond, and claimed that society is invested in marriage as ‘the principal, and the best, framework for the nurture, education and socialization of children.’\textsuperscript{33}

In a passionate retort, Edelman rejects the notion of basing present actions on future children: ‘Fuck the social order and the Child in whose name we’re collectively terrorized; fuck Annie; fuck the waif from \textit{Les Mis}; fuck the poor, innocent kid on the Net; fuck Laws both with capital ls and with small; fuck the whole network of Symbolic relations and the future that serves as its prop.’\textsuperscript{34} Edelman forcefully reminds us that children can be used as political props for heteronormativity and its institutionalisation in law. However, he does not push this

\textsuperscript{31} The rejection of linear progression from child to adult can also be found in Stein’s \textit{First Reader}, in the story of Baby Benjamin: ‘Benjamin was his name and he was not a baby. Little by little he was not a baby. [\[] Saturday he was not a baby and Friday he was not a baby. [\[] He was a baby Tuesday and Thursday. [\[] He skipped Wednesday and Sunday. Wednesday and Sunday was when they borrowed Baby Benjamin. [\[] So it was easy to notice which day it was.’ Stein, \textit{The First Reader and Three Plays}, p. 21. The first line of this poem suggests gradual development: ‘Little by little he was not a baby’. However, it turns out that Benjamin cycles between being a baby and not being a baby, growing and shrinking with the days of the week. As such, maturity and childhood are not stable points, but in flux. As we will see in \textit{The World is Round} with Rose, childhood does not lead to adulthood, but the two terms circle round and round.


\textsuperscript{33} Bernard Law, cited in Edelman, p. 29.

\textsuperscript{34} Edelman, p. 29. Edelman’s vehemence is in part explained by the urgency of health care for homosexual men for the time he was writing about, during the AIDS crisis in America which began in 1981.
acknowledgement further, to see that real children, in their many varieties, are equally forced to suffer from their own use as standards of future normativity. What we must recognise is that children are not political puppets in visions of a future society – as they are for Law and for Rousseau – but a varied collective with unstable borders and few defining commonalities. Children, too, are divided into a normative majority and a queer minority, as Sedgwick, Robinson and others show.

In this work on queer childhood discussed so far, much has been made of children, but little has been made of children’s literature itself. It is only in 2011, twenty years on from Sedgwick’s seminal contribution, that children’s literature has received focused attention from a queer perspective, in one collection of essays, Michelle Abate and Kenneth Kidd’s *Over the Rainbow: Queer Children’s and Young Adult Literature*, one monograph, Tison Pugh’s *Innocence, Sexuality and Children’s Literature*, and in articles by B. J. Epstein.35 While in the twenty-first century, children’s literature that openly represents gay and lesbian characters is being written, before that, any queerness was inevitably normalised by the end of the story. After the radical and subversive events of the story, a ‘happy ending’ was often tagged on that reasserted heteronormative roles for the story’s protagonists. As Kidd asserts elsewhere:

> Often such literary queerness—which may or may not be expressed in terms of sexuality or gender identification—manifests itself at the level of character, in the form of singular or eccentric kids like Jo Marsh, or Harriet the Spy, or Pippi

---

35 Epstein notes in 2012 that she has ‘not found an in-depth analysis of sexuality in children’s books.’ She discusses and praises the recent boom in publications of children’s literature which include non-heterosexual characters, but is equally critical of their representations, and of the continuing silence surrounding many sexual identities. In the wide range of books that her article covers, she observes that most books with GLBTQ characters are about their sexuality, as if to ‘suggest that non-heterosexuality is a problem that needs to be dealt with and that it is the main, perhaps sole, problem in a character’s life.’ Moreover, they tended to be about ‘lesbians and gays’ and not […] ‘lesbians and gays and bisexuals and transgenders,’ and the books analysed here tend to ignore other colours in the queer rainbow, which may mean that authors, publishers, and members of society in general are able to accept non-heterosexuals as long as they are monosexuals and as long as they are not too queer.’ Epstein, ‘We’re Here, We’re (Not?) Queer: GLBTQ Characters in Children’s Books’, *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 8.3 (2012), 287-300 (pp. 288, 292, 295). In another article, Epstein contrasts the liberated sex lives of gay male characters in Young Adult fiction, in contrast to the uncertain, euphemistically portrayed and frequently frustrated sexual lives of lesbian characters in YA fiction. Epstein, ‘Shy, Gentle Kisses and Soft, Sweet Cuddles: The Sex Lives of Lesbian Teenagers Versus Gay Male Teenagers in YA Literature’, *Write4Children*, 4.1 (2013), 17-26.
Longstocking. Resisting growing up or marriage, some such characters are rehabilitated through heteronormative plots (Jo in *Little Women*, Mary Lennox in *The Secret Garden*), while others manage to hold on to queerness indefinitely (Peter Pan certainly, perhaps Diamond in *At the Back of the North Wind*).  

Because of this frequent “rehabilitating” of queer characters in children’s literature, Pugh expands the definition of “queer” to encourage its interrelation with children’s literature, looking at any expression of sexuality or physical desire by children as queer, while professing that for many children these would end, nonetheless, in a heterosexual adulthood. As discussed above, “queer” is a term of particular inclusivity, but Pugh’s effort to define “queer” this way fails to encompass its challenge to heteronormativity. Tribunella suggests it may damage the political valency of the word/idea “queer” to make it so broad: ‘Such a capacious understanding of the term seems to rob it of much political and linguistic force. […] Delayed or inchoate normativity—normativity in training—hardly seems antinormative or queer.’  

Indeed, to see childhood as a time of varied sexual potentialities leading towards heterosexuality is simply to repeat Freud’s account of development into adult heterosexuality. As discussed above, for Freud, since sexuality will later be determined as heteronormative, any transgressive sexual expression in childhood is accepted as part of pre-sexual progression – simply developing towards genital sexuality. For a children’s text to be considered queer, as Tribunella thus implies, a more explicit or deeper challenge to heteronormativity must take place.

In *World*, there are no sexual acts, but this was equally the case in (lesbian) literature for adults in the early 20th century. Even novels from this period that sought to represent heterosexual sexuality, such as *Ulysses* and Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* faced censure and legal action. Nonetheless, novels from this period by lesbian and bisexual women were

---

published, and have come to be thought of as “lesbian” novels. Most famously, Radclyffe Hall’s *The Well of Loneliness* (1928) was a controversial novel published about a lesbian cross-dresser, Stephen, who identified herself by the term “invert”, following new developments in sexology. The novel was judged to be obscene in Britain, and its publication was banned. However, its only allusion to sexual acts comes in the highly ambiguous and brief mention that Stephen kisses Mary’s hand ‘and that night, they were not divided.’

Equally, Woolf’s *Orlando* has been described as a ‘love-letter’ to her friend and lover Vita Sackville-West, and its heroine loves both men and women, as both a man and a woman. Here, too, there are no descriptions of specific sexual acts, and as such we can determine that it is not sexual acts that can define literature from this period as queer or otherwise. Rather, it is through challenging normative gender roles, as *The Well of Loneliness* does with the invert, and *Orlando* through the transsexual, and through these gender roles, challenging the path on which heteropatriarchy sets women.

It is important to contextualise the issue of sexuality in children’s literature in this manner, to recognise that any efforts to interrogate sexual identities in this period could only happen obliquely, not coming through aspects we might typically associate with sexuality, but coming instead through rejecting normative sexual identities and institutional or patriarchal forms of knowledge. There are, of course, other possible reasons for and routes into not conforming to normative society, but in the case of *World*, we can surmise that sexuality is a key issue because Stein is a lesbian who writes about homosexuality, because of the troublesome marriage that ends the text (as I will discuss in more detail below), and because gender identity and body shape are interrogated. Stein’s

---

40 Another illuminating example is lesbian Irish writer Kate O’Brien’s *Mary Lavelle* (1936). O’Brien challenged heteronormativity in this early novel in breaking the marriage her heroine is engaged in. Although she veers away from the lesbian desire of a minor character to have Mary involved in less dangerously transgressive acts, she nevertheless has her transgress her patriarchal exchange in marriage (through an affair with a Spaniard). After the Second World War, O’Brien continued writing in the same vein, but with more openly lesbian characters and events.
Rose resists the normative perspective of the world presented to her, and through her uncommon perspective, reveals her own queerness.

This interest in childhood sexuality may have developed in Stein’s study of psychology. Indeed, Stein’s academic research plays a significant role in her literary experimentation, particularly with respect to phenomenology, which grew as a field during Stein’s lifetime. Stein studied under the psychologist and philosopher William James, who was an important precursor to twentieth-century phenomenology, and she foresees its ideas throughout her work. Stein’s other works have been read as phenomenological, and in particular Ariane Mildenberg sees Stein’s earlier collection of poetry, Tender Buttons, as requiring the lens of a phenomenological reading to engage with it.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty writes in Phénoménologie de la perception [Phenomenology of Perception] (1945) that true perception is a key, and unresolved, issue of phenomenology: ‘La phénoménologie, c’est l’étude des essences, et tous les problèmes, selon elle, reviennent à définir des essences : l’essence de la perception, l’essence de la conscience, par exemple’ [Phenomenology is the study of essences, and all problems, according to it, return to defining essences: the essence of perception, the essence of consciousness, for example]. 41 To find these definitions, one must not only see an object, but from seeing it, “intuit” its essence; the object must be seen free from preconceptions, and without even common-sense assumptions of what the object “should” look or be like. To this end, Merleau-Ponty asserts that ‘il nous faut réveiller d’abord cette expérience du monde dont [la science] est l’expression seconde’ [We must re-awaken first that experience of the world of which science is the secondary expression]. 42 This perception is not a disembodied viewing eye, no omniscient narrator of creation, but inevitably grounded in the body, which Merleau-Ponty sees not as a limit to perception, but as its very enabling principle: ‘j’ai conscience du monde par le moyen de mon

41 Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Phénoménologie de la perception (Paris: Gallimard, 1945), p. i.
42 Merleau-Ponty, p. ix.
corps’ [I have consciousness of the world through the medium of my body]. Merleau-Ponty attempts to think a little about the difference in perception that sexual desire may make, but has been much criticised for his heteronormative and patriarchal world view.

Elizabeth Grosz and Moira Gatens, theorists of corporeal feminism, in particular, contend that it is not simply gender that affects our perception, but body shape and size that determines our phenomenological engagement with the world. Grosz begins by pointing to what is valuable in Merleau-Ponty for a feminist philosophy: ‘Merleau-Ponty locates experience midway between mind and body. Not only does he link experience to the privileged locus of consciousness; he also demonstrates that experience is always necessarily embodied, corporeally constituted, located in and as the subject’s incarnation.’

Corporeal feminism asserts that gender difference alone does not account for different kinds of embodiment. Grosz, for example, agrees with Foucault that social forces inscribe the body, but contends that bodily differences palpably alter the limits and possibilities of this social inscription. That is to say, where society tends to impose certain models of behaviour on people, different body sizes may inflect or make impossible the performance of those expected models of behaving. For example, being very short or thin troubles expectations of “manliness”. For Grosz, an appropriate model for body writing ‘needs to take into account the specificities of the materials being thus inscribed and their concrete effects in the kind of text produced.’ It is not only the inscriptive tools – the modes of socialisation – that influence the formation of the body and subject, but also the matter that is inscribed. There are thus only ever bodies in their multiplicity, and varieties such as sex, race, age, size, and so on, respond differently to social inscriptions. Gatens elaborates on this by pointing to the

43 Merleau-Ponty, p. 97.
44 See for example, Luce Irigaray, Éthique de la différence sexuelle [Ethics of Sexual Difference] (Paris: Minuit, 1984).
46 Grosz, p. 191.
importance of the limits of the functionality of different bodies:

The body of a woman confined to the role of wife/mother/domestic worker, for example, is invested with particular desires, capacities and forms that have little in common with the body of a female Olympic athlete. In this case biological commonality fails to account for the specificity of these two bodies. Indeed, the female Olympic athlete may have more in common with a male Olympic athlete than with one confined to the role of wife/mother. (This is not to deny that some women are both wives/mothers and Olympic athletes.) This commonality is not simply at the level of interests or desires but at the level of the actual form and capacities of the body.47

Gatens thus points to the extent of bodily differences possible even within one gender. In this sense, corporeal feminism may be essential for considering the differences between adults and children, and between children and children, as embodied, not only along gender lines, but in greater varieties and specificities of body size and shape. Grosz contends that ‘Merleau-Ponty leaves out—indeed, is unable to address—the question of sexual difference, the question of what kind of human body he is discussing.’48 We may add to this that the question of the child’s phenomenology of the world must be seen as unaddressed, and as markedly different from that of adults.

Sara Ahmed’s recent reassessment of phenomenology in *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others* will also be of particular use here, as not only the body, but sexuality, matters to perception. For Ahmed, ‘queering phenomenology and moving queer theory toward phenomenology’ can show ‘how bodies are gendered, sexualized, and raced by how they extend into space, as an extension that differentiates between “left” and “right,” “front” and “behind,” “up” and “down,” as well as “near” and “far.” What is offered, in other words, is a model of how bodies become orientated by how they take up time and space.’49 Particularly of note, here, is Ahmed’s co-implication of sexuality, the body and relations to space. For *World*, we will see that Rose’s perceptions are challenged by the differentiations of

48 Grosz, p. 110.
up and down, and near and far, as she approaches and climbs the mountain. Ahmed discusses queer perception as not matching up with ordinary perception, as being ‘out of line’ with the norm: ‘Queer orientations might be those that don’t line up, which by seeing the world “slantwise” allow other objects to come into view. A queer orientation might be one that does not overcome what is “off line,” and hence acts out of line with others.’

Such a definition of queerness can apply not only to LGBTQ adults, but potentially also to a child who cannot connect with a normative perception of the world. Ahmed does not discuss queerness or sexuality in relation to childhood, but as discussed above, some work has been done on bringing together the terms “queer” and “childhood”, which can be connected with Ahmed’s queer phenomenology.

In *The World is Round*, Stein presents us precisely such a queer challenge to heteronormativity, in her phenomenology of girlhood. It is first of all a challenge to Rousseau’s argument that one learns best through experience. *World* deviates from such a narrative of normative progression, in pitting personal experience against school knowledge, as Rose’s understanding of the world is specifically contrary to that of the institution:

> There at the school were other girls and Rose did not have quite as much time to sing and cry.  
> The teachers taught her  
> That the world was round  
> That the sun was round  
> That the moon was round  
> That the stars were round  
> And that they were all going around and around  
> And not a sound.  
> It was so sad it almost made her cry  
> But then she did not believe it  
> Because mountains were so high (pp. 14-15)

The syntax here is a merry-go-round of null rhymes, if indeed this lineated passage is poetry, breaking up, as it does, rhyming and repetitive prose. Her syntax and her plot reject linear
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50 Ahmed, p. 107; Ahmed’s italics.
progress, but perhaps rather than sideways, as Stockton has it, we can see Rose as growing round and round, never reaching a stable point, and behaving the same as an adult and child.

‘Who in the world am I?’: Alice and Rose Becoming Taller/Women

Events in *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* can be seen as forming a structuring principle to Stein’s story. *World* picks up on and reverses the movements of *Alice’s Adventures*, not making a katabatic descent into the underworld/wonderland, but with its heroine Rose climbing a mountain instead. In the opening pages of the story, a rabbit stops in the headlights of their car, and her dog, Love, chases it off: ‘of course any little rabbit can run quicker than any white dog and even if the white dog is nice and kind and Love is, so that was all of that. It was a lovely night and Love came back into the car and Bob the father drove on home and of course Rose sang as the rabbit ran’ (pp. 13-14). A page later, with her new knowledge of the world’s roundness, Rose is traumatised by her past memory of singing in front of a looking-glass: ‘She remembered when she had been young [~/] That one day she had sung, [~/] And there was a looking-glass in front of her [~/] And as she sang her mouth was round and was going around and around’ (p. 15). While a rabbit is chased and a looking-glass looked into, no magical transportation takes place. Shortly after these failures to follow Alice, Rose attends school, and learns that her very perception of the world is wrong, shattering her belief in her own perception, and causing her to associate roundness with a traumatic loss of selfhood. As we will see, Alice’s experiences of growing are picked up on by Stein, and the ending of Alice is repeated and troubled by the ending of *World*.

Alice associates growing with becoming more mature, with aging, but is frustrated at the same time that her body is still uncontrollably childlike. In ‘The Pool of Tears’, after growing to an enormous size, she talks to herself: “‘You ought to be ashamed of yourself,”
said Alice, “a great girl like you” (she might well say this), “to go on crying in this way! Stop this moment, I tell you!” But she went on all the same, shedding gallons of tears.\textsuperscript{51} She endeavours to be the adult authority to herself, berating herself for still crying despite her size. The same notion that being tall means being older returns when she once again grows to an unwieldy size in the White Rabbit’s house: “when I grow up, I’ll write [a book] – but I’m grown up now […] at least there’s no room for me to grow up any more here.” \textsuperscript{51} “But then,” thought Alice, “shall I never grow any older than I am now? That’ll be a comfort, any way – never to be an old woman – but then – always to have lessons to learn! Oh, I shouldn’t like that!” (p. 44, Carroll’s italics). Since height so inevitably means maturity to her, Alice has difficulty reconciling the age she knows she is with her size, all confounded in the notion of being ‘grown up’, positing adulthood as a relative height.

It is certainly true that height distinguishes the majority of adults from the majority of children, and children’s literature often points to this as an issue in children’s lives, through giant or all-seeing, evil adult figures. Such figures are plentifully evident in this period, such as Woolf’s ‘great ogress’ Lugton ‘towering over’ the animals and freezing them alive with her vision (pp. 22-23). De la Mare’s evil sorcerer, too, ‘had mirrors on a tower in which he could detect any stranger’ in \textit{Lord Fish} (p. 199), and his wall makes John seem childishly small, as he is unable to see over it. Perhaps the best-known example is J. R. R. Tolkein’s Sauron in \textit{Lord of the Rings}, a giant disembodied eye which ‘strove with great power to pierce all shadows of cloud, and earth, and flesh, and to see you: to pin you under its deadly gaze, naked, immovable.’\textsuperscript{52} Colin Ward contends that this height difference gives children a different perspective of the world to adults. He talks about the importance of the ‘floorscape’ to children, such as in games involving cracks between paving stones or tiles, since their ‘eyelevel’ is lower, and he describes an architectural experiment to remind adults of how

different children’s experience of space is:

When he was teaching architecture at Nottingham, Paul Ritter got his students to mock-up a room two-and-a-half times actual size, just to remind us what a child’s-eye-view was really like. Erected in the Co-op Education Centre there, it brought gasps of astonishment from the visitors. Because we grow so slowly, we have completely forgotten—even though we see our own children doing it—how we used, without any fuss, to move around stools, boxes or upturned buckets just to be able to reach the light-switch, the door latch, shelves, cupboards or window sills.  

Alice, now capable of reaching even the ceiling of the house she is in, sees this as an adult prerogative, and so considers herself grown up. At the least, while she recognises that she has not grown older (and worries that she never will), she believes herself to have achieved a ‘grown up’ perspective, coupled with her persisting youth.

A by-product of her sudden change in size is a questioning of her own identity, in particular related to wondering if her name is her own, or if she now has someone else’s name. The first time she grows, she asks herself, ‘Who in the world am I? Ah, that’s the great puzzle!’ (p. 31). She wonders if she is now Ada, or Mabel, but this only confuses her more. She concludes she has indeed become somebody different, and begins to think of her name/identity as changeable: ‘I must be Mabel after all […] if I’m Mabel, I’ll stay down here! It’ll be no use their putting their heads down and saying “Come up again, dear!” I shall only look up and say “Who am I then? Tell me that first, and then, if I like being that person, I’ll come up: if not, I’ll stay down here till I’m somebody else”’ (p. 32). The thought of other people finding her reminds her of how lonely she is, and makes her cry: ““but, oh dear” cried Alice, with a sudden burst of tears, “I do wish they would put their heads down!”” (ibid.).

These persistent tears, doubting of one’s own name and experiencing taller perspectives form the basis of Stein’s story. As Rose’s perception of the world is challenged, she cries and sings her way through her identity crisis, until she finally reaches the top of a mountain, to see what
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greater perspective she can achieve from its heights.

Like Alice, Rose constantly questions her name. Referencing her own poem ‘Sacred Emily’ (1913), Stein’s character asserts that ‘Rose is a Rose is a Rose is a Rose’ (World, p. 50). While in this way, definition may appear to be circular, the polysemy of “rose” equally allows this assertion to take many directions. Rose, here, is a girl’s name, the name of a flower, a colour, and the past tense of the verb “rise”. Rose does indeed rise with her mountain trek, and thinks of herself as the flower: ‘Rose was a rose, she was not a dahlia, she was not a buttercup (that is yellow), she was not a fuschia or an oleander’ (p. 48). However, she worries if she can really be Rose when her favourite colour is not rose but blue: ‘Do you suppose that Rose is a rose [/] If her favorite color is blue [/] Roses can be blue but not noses but Rose was a rose and her favorite color was blue’ (p. 35). Just as Alice wonders if she has become Mabel, or somebody else, the story opens with Rose wondering if she would still be Rose if her name was different:

Rose was her name and would she have been Rose if her name had not been Rose. She used to think and then she used to think again.

Would she have been Rose if her name had not been Rose and would she have been Rose if she had been a twin. […] They all had names and her name was Rose, but would she have been she used to cry about it would she have been Rose if her name had not been Rose. (p. 5)

Stein’s own answer to the question of self-knowledge is that her dog knows who she is: ‘You are you because your little dog knows you.’ Rose perhaps does not place so much faith in her own dog, Love, and her self-doubting leads her instead to singing and crying. We see from this that Rose’s response is not a logical one, nor an interpersonal one, but one that pours out of her body, a response entirely grounded in her physicality. It is because she takes her emotions and her senses to be central, that she encounters a phenomenological despair upon learning that the world is round. As Jeanette Winterson notes: ‘The earth is round and

---

flat at the same time. This is obvious. That it is round appears indisputable; that it is flat is our common experience, also indisputable. The globe does not supersede the map; the map does not distort the globe.’ The narrator of *World* follows Rose’s thoughts in asserting our experience of the world as flat: ‘Rose oh Rose look down at the ground [\] And what do you see [\] You see that the world is not round’ (p. 27).

Rose cannot reconcile the map and the globe. She believes in her own perception over abstract knowledge, and suffers ontological panic when her perception is proven to be wrong. For example, having seen mountains from a distance, she believes they are blue: ‘When mountains are really true they are blue. [/] Rose knew they were blue and blue was her favorite color. She knew they were blue and they were far away or near just as rain came or went away […] There the mountains were and they were blue, oh dear blue blue just blue, dear blue sweet blue yes blue’ (pp. 31-32). As she comes close to them, she is horrified to learn that they are actually green: ‘and it was not blue there no dear no it was green there, grass and trees and rocks are green not blue there no blue was there but blue was her favorite color all through’ (p. 33).

Barbara Will notes the disjunction between academic knowledge and actual perception in Rose’s despair: ‘Subscribing to the belief that the world is round requires subordinating lived experience to abstract knowledge; it demands seeing things as they might or could be rather than things as they are.’ Rose does not have Alice’s relentless logic, and struggles to accept that the world is not as she perceives it. Forced to question her perception, she begins to doubt even those things that she had seen before, suspecting that they were merely hallucinations: ‘Once when five apples were red. [/] They never were it was my head’ (p. 57). Red apples are an extremely common example in discussions of the philosophy of perception. Even dating back to the 18th century, the British Empiricist George Berkeley writes of the
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perception of apples (and mountains) in his *Principles of Human Knowledge* (1710), and Wittgenstein opens his *Philosophical Investigations* with the example of ‘five red apples’. Through such allusion, Stein brings Rose’s despair into the realm of philosophical debate.

Rose’s solution to the problem of perception is to find a taller perspective: she decides ‘She was to sit on the mountain so high’ (p. 35). Aiming for the top of a mountain is specifically, for Rose, about being able to see as much as she can, thanks to the greater height: ‘Rose would put a chair and she would sit there and yes she did care yes there she would put a chair there there and everywhere she would see everywhere and she would sit on that chair, yes there’ (p. 33). She fears any figure that challenges her sense of adulthood as height, in particular, female little people: ‘Then she remembered if you see a girl or a woman dwarf it is awful more awful than any cough it is just awful awful all awful […] then she remembered that it was true if you saw a female dwarf everything was through everything was over there was nothing to do’ (p. 42). She specifies that it is the disjunction between age and height that scares her, a dwarf to her being ‘something little that should have been big’ (p. 42). Moreover, it is only female dwarves she fears, not male: ‘if she saw it and it was not a female but a man then everything would be better and better’ (*ibid.*). It appears that Rose seeks not adulthood, but more precisely, womanhood, and is in contrast given courage by the sight of short men, who do not trouble her sense of womanhood as being of a particular height. In this way, Alice and Rose’s desires for a taller perspective can be seen as part of their girlhood. In mimicry of Alice’s sudden growth, Rose seeks to be taller, but like Alice, she does not become an adult, simply a taller child.


58 This may be a personal joke on the part of Stein, as she and her partner Alice were both rather short women, standing at 5’1 and 4’11 respectively. As such, Stein may have seen the equation of height to maturity as a convention worth challenging. The troubling of the difference between adult women and children through dwarfism is explored in greater detail in de la Mare’s novel *Memoirs of a Midget* (1921). The heroine, Miss M, ponders on the relation between her size, her maturity and her identity: ‘I am older now; but am I wiser – or merely not so young?’; ‘How many times, too, have I vainly speculated what inward difference being a human creature of my dimensions really makes. What is – deep, deep in – at variance between Man and Midget?’ De la Mare, *Memoirs of a Midget* (London: Telegram [1921] 2009), p. 12.
For Alice, the search for womanhood is brought to a close at the end of the story, when her sister imagines her as a woman and a mother:

she pictured to herself how this same little sister of hers would, in the after-time, be herself a grown woman; and how she would keep, through all her riper years, the simple and loving heart of her childhood: and how she would gather about her other little children, and make their eyes bright and eager with many a strange tale, perhaps even with the dream of Wonderland of long ago; and how she would feel with all their simple sorrows, and find a pleasure in all their simple joys, remembering her own child-life, and the happy summer days. (p. 113)

This is a nostalgic maturity, which remembers childhood as a past life, a separate ‘child-life’, and thinks of Wonderland as simply a ‘dream’. Such an ending to Alice’s self-doubting, frequent tears and constant challenging of authority can be seen as something of a betrayal of Alice’s values and even her identity, reducing the richness and nonconformity of her character to a happy mother with a silly story to tell. Stein ends her story with an even greater abruptness, suddenly shifting from Rose under the searchlight on the mountain top to telling of her future in a single sentence:

Willy and Rose turned out not to be cousins, just how nobody knows, and so they married and had children and sang with them and sometimes singing made Rose cry and sometimes it made Willy get more and more excited and they lived happily ever after and the world just went on being round. (p. 62)

This ending is not only an unexpected leap from the unexplained climax of the story, but a betrayal of our previous understanding of events, as Willy is not who we believed he was. And yet in the same breath Stein tells us that nothing has changed – ‘the world just went on being round’ and still ‘sometimes singing made Rose cry’. As discussed above, Cleveland and Watts see Rose as a queer figure, but because of the ending of World, we are forced to believe in Rose’s eventual heterosexuality, and in her future happiness. However, her relationship with Will is itself odd. We are introduced to him as Willy, her cousin, and so he is originally unthinkable as a sexual object, despite the sexual nature of his name. His sudden change in character sets doubt in a reader’s mind as to the logic of this ending, just as much
as the lack of change in Rose’s character. In such a way, *World* can be seen as a valid inclusion into the discussion of queer children’s literature, because of its wholly non-conformist style and non-progressive narrative. Further, I would see this text as on a continuum with Stein’s lesbian autobiographies, which have been paid particular critical attention as queer texts – *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* and *Lifting Belly* – as they take on the perspective of her lesbian lover and put forth lesbian desire.\(^{59}\) *World*, too, enters into the life, extraordinary perceptions and desires of a female protagonist. Indeed, the title of an early draft of this story is ‘The Autobiography of Rose.’\(^{60}\) While Rose is ‘rehabilitated’ by the end of the story into a putatively heteronormative marriage, she remains throughout a queer child.

Stein’s more explicitly queer works equally trouble the sense of an ending. *QED* ends with the two other women in the love triangle marrying men. These marriages do not undo their sexual choices to date, but when seen from Stein’s perspective, suggest the pain of those left behind when others (re)enter normativity. It starkly emphasises Stein’s choice not to try to be heterosexual, to marry and have a “conventional” life, reminding us of her outsider status and the reason she left her country to come to Paris. Read against the ending of *QED*, we can see how to a queer audience, the ending of *World* can only be disappointing. However, as discussed above, to be publishable in the 1930s in the UK and the USA, a (queer) children’s story had little choice but to reassert normativity at its close. In seeing heteronormative ‘happy endings’ from the outside, *QED*’s queer perspective inevitably prevented it from being published in Stein’s lifetime.

*A Long Gay Book* overcomes such a hurdle by tackling these issues in a more abstract manner, and in the coded language of its title. It challenges the linear narrative of a
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heterosexual life that leads from childhood to parenthood, and suggests less stable, more playful ways of constructing an identity. Stein begins by suggesting that some people have children in a kind of power relationship – they have children to make themselves feel like secure adults: ‘One way perhaps of winning is to make a little one to come through them, little like the baby that once was all them and lost them their everlasting feeling. [...] Then they make a baby to make for themselves a new beginning and so win for themselves a new everlasting feeling.’ The tone here is typically non-judgemental, but the movement of the text suggests that rather than seeking a stable identity through parenthood, there are more interesting ways of being. Near the end of the text, Stein gathers imperatives to reclassify the world by one’s own imaginative rules: ‘Class a plain white suit as a fairy turtle, class an amazing black cup as an hour glass, class a single relief as a nut cracker, show the best table as a piece of statuary.’ The linear narrative of beginnings and endings is in particular described by Stein as uninteresting: ‘Some when they are very little ones very completely then do something. Some then find in this thing that beginning and ending is not at all something being existing. Some find in this that beginning and ending is not at all interesting.’ Rose is a child who, as a late chapter heading tells us ‘does something’ (p. 50), and so will be among those who have recognised the alternatives in life to framing ourselves with beginnings and endings.

The problem that Rose faces in the story, what the title suggests is the crux of the story, remains an unresolved issue – we do not learn if Rose came to accept the roundness of the world, or if it is still the cause of her tears. While entering the conventional womanly roles of wife and mother, Rose maintains her approach to life, singing and crying her way through the world. It is thus that we do not in truth see Rose growing up, but remaining the same as adult

or child, growing round and round and queerly refusing to progress along the line from
career to adulthood. For Ahmed, a queer perception is one that is out of line with others,
and does not “right” itself. She points to Merleau-Ponty’s use of the word étrange, which she
and Merleau-Ponty’s English translator, Colin Smith, both translate as ‘queer’, to describe
one of his perceptual experiments:

Si l’on s’arrange pour qu’un sujet ne voie la chambre où il se trouve que par
l’intermédiaire d’un miroir qui la reflète en l’inclinant de 45° par rapport à la
verticale, le sujet voit d’abord la chambre “oblique”. Un homme qui s’y déplace
semble marcher incliné sur le côté. Un morceau de carton qui tombe le longe du
chambranle de la porte paraît tomber selon une direction oblique. L’ensemble est
“étrange.”

[If one arranges such that a subject can only see the room in which he finds
himself through the intermediary of a mirror that reflects it at an inclination of
45° to the vertical, the subject first of all sees the room “slantwise”. A man who
walks about there seems to be walking leaning to one side. A piece of cardboard
that falls the length of the door-frame seems to fall obliquely. The overall effect is
“queer.”]

This “queer” perception soon normalises, as the man unconsciously “corrects” his own
angular view of the world, to appear upright to him, allowing him then to perceive and move
in the room without difficulty. For Ahmed, this example is a telling metaphor for queer
perception, which finds itself out of line with “ordinary” perception, but does not “correct”
itself from this different perception: ‘I have shown how ordinary perception corrects that
which does not “line up”, but for Ahmed queer orientations might be those that continue to
see ‘slantwise’, and do not ‘overcome what is “off line.”’ Rose’s perception, seeing
mountains as blue and the earth as flat, is something that the world, and education, seek to
painfully “correct”, but even by the end of the story, do not seem to succeed in doing. Rose’s
perception does not bend to match the norm, from childhood to adulthood.

We further see the difference between Stein’s ending and Carroll’s in relation to the
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heroines as creative figures. Where the child Alice thinks to herself, as we saw above, that she should later write a book of her adventures, and her sister thinks of the woman Alice as a storyteller, Rose is a writer-artist from beginning to end. We are early introduced to Rose’s most unique artifact, a glass pen:

My
What a sky
And then the glass pen
(Rose did have a glass pen)
When oh When
Little glass pen
Say when
Will there not be that little rabbit. (p. 14)

The glass pen returns near the end of the story, but instead of writing with it, Rose cuts her words into the bark of a tree with a pen-knife: ‘So she took out her pen-knife, she did not have a glass pen she did not have a feather from a hen she did not have any ink she had nothing pink, […] she would carve on the tree Rose is a Rose is a Rose is a Rose is a Rose until it went all the way round’ (p. 50). This sense of circulating identities, rather than a narrative progression of identities, has much in common with Stockton’s sense of ‘growing sideways’, as discussed above. However, rather than sideways, a more appropriate analogy for Rose would be growing round and round, showing that neither age nor size can mark out (sexual) maturity. Where Ahmed talks of queer perception as ‘out of line’, we see that for Rose, to her horror, the line is a curve, and even the line of poetry that she writes circles back on itself, to endlessly reconnect to its own beginning. Linear progression and direct perception both bend for Rose, and so we can say that although her ending appears heteronormative, both its normativity and sense of “ending” anything are strained.

We see, thus, that Stein appropriates Alice’s size-changing antics into her children’s story, and uses them to explore a philosophical debate – a sense of the phenomenological difference between childhood and adulthood. This difference, for most children and adults, is
not only in size, but essentially in the acceptance of abstracts over perception. Yi-Fu Tuan tells us that perception dulls and becomes taken for granted as we age, but for children, perception is alive, even miraculous. However, Rose appears exceptional as a child, with her extraordinary perception maintained into adulthood. The story thus tells of a threshold moment in Rose’s life, at which education seeks to force her to disregard her own queer perception and consent to a normative world view (literally), and ultimately appears to fail. Stein appropriates aspects of Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland to think through issues of contemporary philosophy, to open up a queer phenomenology of girlhood. While both Alice and Rose may be seen as betrayed by their forced conventional endings, we may also see that Rose does not grow up, but round and round. She does not become a writer of childhood fancy, but is always already a writer and songstress, continuing to locate herself in the outpourings of her body, and never openly accepting the roundness of the world, nor the normativity that it implies. Just as Stein’s relation to Alice (Toklas) queers her life, World’s relation to (Carroll’s) Alice is a queer one, with Stein philosophising beyond her source text, and challenging the forced normativity its ending imposes with her own forced ending, refuting linear progress as her queer heroine, even as an adult, maintains her unconventional view of the world.

‘Une Rose française’ or ‘A French Rose’?: Two French Worlds and Queer Ambiguities

There are two French translations of World, both published independently in the same year, 1984. It was translated by Françoise Collin and Pierre Taminiaux as Le Monde est rond [The World is Round], and by Marc Dachy as La Terre est ronde [The Earth is Round]. This section will consider the high number of similarities between these two separately organised
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editions, before turning to the effects of their differences, and pursuing the queer possibilities of translation and its consequences for children’s literature. At stake in these two translations is the question of who is an appropriate audience for this text.

Very little has been written about the intersection of “queer” and “translation”. The first steps were taken in 1998, with Keith Harvey making the initial connection. He contended that a society’s reception of a particular sexual identity makes a difference to how representations of that sexuality are translated, in his discussion of ‘camp’ talk between gay men in English and French literature and their translations.67

Emma Parker suggests that translation can be a queer trope. For Parker, translation can challenge the sense of an authoritative original, and show instead the performance or play of copies among copies, debunking the status of ‘original’ and breaking down the binary between original and imitation/derivation. She looks at two professional translator protagonists in postmodern texts by lesbian authors: Barbara Wilson’s Gaudi Afternoon and Winterson’s Written on the Body. For Parker, translation has the possibility to ‘[throw] firm borders into confusion’, and suggests ‘the impossibility of closure and the unfixity of meaning.’68 More than this, the proliferation of translations, and their multiplicity even within a target language, stands against the binary thinking that underlies heteronormativity, as discussed in the introduction to this chapter: ‘In Gaudi Afternoon and Written on the Body, translation represents the subversion of binarisms and is paradigmatic of the transcendence of the binary sex-gender system.”69

68 Emma Parker, ‘Lost in Translation: Gender and the Figure of the Translator in Contemporary Queer Fiction’, in The Poetics of Transubstantiation: from Theology to Metaphor, ed. by Douglas Burnham and Enrico Giaccherini (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 118-25 (p. 122).
69 Ibid. Lori Chamberlain similarly explores translation and feminism, in looking at uses of metaphors of translation and infidelity over history. Where in the past, these metaphors affirmed the gender hierarchy, of the masculine, creative and original text, over the feminine, derivative and secondary translation, Chamberlain seeks to overturn this hierarchy. Where this differs from a queer theory of translation is that it seeks to undo the hierarchy of male over female, but does not question the very categories of gender that underlie this, nor tease
However, what Parker misses is that Winterson’s text shows more than the disruption of binary thinking through its ambiguous hero/ine. For the narrator, translation is figured as a queer bodily act:

Written on the body is a secret code only visible in certain lights; the accumulations of a lifetime gather there. In places the palimpsest is so heavily worked that the letters feel like braille. I like to keep my body rolled up away from prying eyes. Never unfold too much, tell the whole story. I didn’t know that Louise would have reading hands. She has translated me into her own book.\textsuperscript{70}

This act of translation is performed on and through the body. It is possibly a lesbian act, although the narrator’s sex is never made clear, but it is unquestionably performed on a queer (bisexual) figure, and shatters a heterosexual marriage, as it is an affair. Winterson’s narrator, throughout the text, finds his/her translation work distracted by thoughts of his/her lover, but his/her translation work itself does not appear especially extraordinary. Indeed, in terms of a queer practice of translation, Parker says little. She only hints that ‘what is less and less clear is more and more queer.’\textsuperscript{71} That is to say, since the rigid definition of boundaries, in particular through binary divisions, is so central to heteronormativity, a queer translation may be one that does not seek to undo ambiguity, but welcomes it into the text.

Jack Hutchens discusses Polish translations of Allen Ginsberg’s poetry. Starting in the 1970s, these translations have worked to remove any hint of Ginsberg’s homosexuality, creating a very different target text especially for his poems ‘Message’ and ‘America’: ‘The role of the translator becomes especially important in understanding the various translations of Ginsberg’s poems with respect to the silencing of the queer voice in them.’\textsuperscript{72} Hutchens’ work thus points to the use of translations to analyse historical shifts or trends in responses to homosexuality in the target language: ‘Allen Ginsberg’s poetry provides an excellent medium

\textsuperscript{71} Parker, p. 119.
in the discussion of English–Polish translation and the state of gay life in communist Poland. […] Owing to Ginsberg’s open gayness, a translator, wishing to render his poetry into Polish, would face many difficulties. Translators of Stein have no doubt faced similar difficulties, and it is notable that Tender Buttons was not translated into French until 2005, and there is as yet no French translation of Lifting Belly. Indeed, Stein’s more overtly lesbian works were only published posthumously, and her lesbianism not made publicly known until after the death of Alice Toklas, in 1974. No French-language biographies of Stein existed until 1973, when Donald Sutherland’s 1951 biography was translated; it is only in 2010 and 2011 that two new biographies of Stein have appeared in France, and her sexuality made more accessible knowledge to a French audience. This dearth of information may explain why Stein’s more explicitly lesbian works have not yet been published for a French-language audience.

Marjorie Perloff has discussed the translation into French of Stein’s work for adults. Where Stein has long been associated with the modernist artwork of Matisse and Picasso, Perloff argues for a closer relationship with Duchamp. Indeed, Stein and Duchamp were close friends, wrote prefaces to each other’s works, and translated each other. Influenced by Stein’s poetic and playful use of roses, Duchamp took on the nickname ‘Rrose Sélavy’ [sic], which became the title of a book of puns he published in the same year as World. Perloff looks at Duchamp’s translations of Stein’s collection of poems Stanzas in Meditation (1932), considering punctuation, gendering and rhyme. For example, she looks at Stanza LXXI, which begins ‘There once was once upon a time a place they went from time to time. […] I think better of this than of that.’ Perloff notes that Duchamp enhances end and internal
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73 Hutchens, p. 984.
74 There are as yet no translations of Lifting Belly into any language. In contrast, The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas has enjoyed audiences in numerous languages, beginning with a French translation in 1934, the year after its first publication; this may be for its setting in Paris and discussion of French figures, or the general popularity of prose over poetry.
75 Stein, cited in Marjorie Perloff, “‘A Cessation of Resemblances”: Stein/Picasso/Duchamp’,
rhyming throughout. In the opening lines, he rhymes fois/endroit/cela [time/place/that]: ‘Il y avait une fois un endroit où ils allaient de temps en temps [/] Je pense mieux de ceci que de cela’ [Once upon a time there was a place where they went from time to time / I think better of this than of that]. As can also be seen here, Duchamp does not end his lines with full stops, as Stein does for almost every line of the poem.

While these are choices that Duchamp has made as a translator, Perloff sees the translation as perforce differing due to the propensities of the French language, in tending to have longer words and phrases, and in gendering its nouns: ‘The French cannot quite reproduce Stein’s clipped monosyllabic lines with their rhyme and paragram: “not only now but how / This I know now.”’ Duchamp renders these lines, the final lines of the poem, with a word-for-word translation, as ‘Pas seulement maintenant mais comment [/] Ceci je sais maintenant’, keeping the rhyme and sense, but adding seven syllables to do so. Perloff asserts that Stein makes a particular effort towards neutrality of pronouns – ‘In her own writing, Stein never gave herself away so fully; her pronouns usually have a studied indeterminacy’ – but in French, gender choices must be made for such phrases as ‘If I am one I would have liked to be the only one.’

It is not surprising, given how little has been done to bring the terms “children’s literature” and “queer” together, that only one critic has written on the queer translation of children’s literature, or the translation of queer children’s literature (as discussed above, B. J. Epstein). My account of the French translations of World is an attempt to contribute to connecting these terms.

World itself has a relation to translation, as an English text written for a French girl, and


Ibid.

Ibid.

Ibid.

Ibid. In this case, Duchamp chooses to make ‘one’ masculine (‘un’), but ‘the only one’ feminine (‘la seule’) to create a gender play that Perloff likens to Duchamp’s own adopting of the feminine nickname Rrose.
as Baroness d’Aiguy, the mother of the dedicatee of World, was herself a prominent translator of Stein’s works: she translated Paris, France in 1941 and Everybody’s Autobiography in 1945. Stein’s World has had the benefit of translators who are academically expert in a relevant field. Françoise Collin wrote her own feminist story Rose qui peut [Rose who could] (1960), and translated a number of feminist texts. Her co-translator Pierre Taminiaux also translated Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann’s Social Construction of Reality: Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, and so may have contributed to this translation of World an engagement with its concern with perspective and identity. Marc Dachy is a prominent academic on Dadaism, and has also translated works by the Dadaist Kurt Schwitters. His translation bears witness to this interest, in its unusual text-image interplay, as will be discussed below.

The translation by Collin and Taminiaux (hereafter Monde) has no illustrations, is evenly lineated, and has no visual play with text apart from in the dedication, which is surrounded by a ring of the words ‘Rose is a rose is a rose is a rose’ in block capitals. After the text of the story is an appendix, in which Collin and Taminiaux have translated the early draft of the story, ‘The Autobiography of Rose’, as ‘Autobiographie de Rose’. The translation by Dachy (hereafter Terre) is larger, with bigger print and sporadic black-and-white block printed illustrations. Terre begins with a list of chapters, and makes an effort in the text to fit chapters neatly onto pages, often using large white spaces before and after chapter breaks to push chapters to the edge of the page (see Image 15).

What is surprising is how similar these separately organised translations are, in particular in relation to clear chapter divisions (including one marked ‘Fin’ [End] for the final...
Et elle se mit à chanter.

Oh petit garçon sur une colline
Oh Will oh Will.
Un petit garçon sur une colline
Il veut oh veut-il.
Oh Will oh Will.
Et je suis ici et tu es là, et je suis ici et ici est là et tu es là et là est ici oh
Will oh Will sur n'importe quelle colline.
Oh Will oh Will oh Will.
Veux-tu chanter Rose oh oui tu veux.

Et elle chanta oh veux oh veux et elle pleura et pleura et pleura et
pleura et le poisson tourna et tourna et tourna et tourna.

Image 15. Dachy fitting chapters to the edges of pages.
sentence), matching Stein’s nonsense, and adding only a little punctuation. Most of all, they both italicise and separate out the songs. This indicates that both translations came from the American edition of the text, which has more punctuation, more chapter headings, and clearer delineation of poetry and prose than the English version. While the text was published simultaneously in both England and America, and Stein was heavily involved in the publication processes for both – in particular choosing their illustrators – there is good reason to believe the English edition is closer to Stein’s vision for the text, as she had a number of disagreements with her American editors over adding punctuation to the text. In the draft of the story, and in the English edition, Stein’s first song reads:

I am a little girl and my name is Rose, Rose is my name.
Why am I a little girl
And why is my name Rose
And when is my name Rose
And where am I a little girl
And where is my name Rose
And which little girl am I am I the little girl named Rose which little girl named Rose.
And as she sang this song and she sang it while Love did his drinking. (p. 8)

Monde, in contrast, presents it thus:

Je suis une petite fille et mon nom est Rose, Rose est mon nom.
Pourquoi suis-je une petite fille
Et pourquoi mon nom est-il Rose
Et quand suis-je une petite fille
Et où suis-je une petite fille
Et où est mon nom Rose
Et quelle petite fille suis-je
suis-je la petite fille nommée Rose
Quelle petite fille nommée Rose.
Et comme elle chantait cette chanson et elle la chantait pendant qu’Amour faisait son bruit de boire.

[I am a little girl and my name is Rose, Rose is my name.
Why am I a little girl
And why is my name Rose

81 Peter Rickard notes that translating absurd or nonsensical English into French is unproblematic, although it is not often aimed at children, and this is why Carroll’s reception in France has frequently placed him alongside Dadaism and Surrealism. Peter Rickard, ‘Alice in France or Can Lewis Carroll Be Translated?’, Comparative Literature Studies, 12.1 (1975), 45-66 (pp. 46, 51).
As we see here, the song is almost entirely italicised, to stand out from the prose surrounding it. The text even splits a line of poetry into three shorter lines, to make it more distinct from the text below it, which is then considered to be prose. It may be a printing error in this extract that the line ‘Quelle petite fille nommée Rose’ is not italicised, as in no other instant in the text are sung words not italicised. Later in Monde, even speech markers within lines of song are distinguished from song: ‘Je pense dit Rose’ [I think said Rose] (p. 64); ‘Juste alors gémit Rose j’aurais bien voulu que juste alors ait été d’or’ [Just then moaned Rose I would have really wished that just than had been gold] (p. 67); ‘Veux-tu chanta Rose tu veux oh oui’ [Do you want to sang Rose you want oh yes] (p. 68). Terre equally italicises sung words, but does not split lines, instead demarcating songs from prose with large white spaces. In doing so, these translations make nothing of the lineation that happens for lines that are not sung, but could also be read as poetry, and neglect potential rhyming and rhythm in the lines adjacent to the songs, which would otherwise work to blur such clear demarcation of prose and song. At the end of Rose’s first song, Stein rhymes ‘Which little girl am I’ with ‘And singing that made her so sad she began to cry’ (p. 8), which has no equivalent in the two translations.

As we also see from these extracts, Rose’s name of course has not changed. We must note, however, that its connotations do not precisely match up with those of the word ‘rose’ in English. In the French literary tradition of the Roman de la Rose [The Romance of the Rose], Ronsard’s poetry and Le Petit Prince [The Little Prince], roses all figure desired women, and
so ‘Rose’ has sexual undertones – a woman to be “attained”. In England, perhaps the most famous rose is in Shakespeare’s Romeo and Juliet, when Juliet thinks on ‘What’s in a name?’: ‘that which we call a rose [/] By any other name would smell as sweet.’ With this famous assertion, Shakespeare is another clear source text for Stein’s use of a rose/Rose to explore naming in her œuvre. As such, we see that English and French literary roses differ, and Stein’s Rose, in questioning if she would be herself if her name was different, evidently draws on the English tradition.

Willy, in British English, can be a crude sexual pun, but as a name causes its owner no self-doubt: ‘My name is Willy I am not like Rose [/] I would be Willy whatever arose, [/] I would be Willy if Henry was my name [/] I would be Willy always Willy all the same’ (p. 11). The certainty of William Shakespeare’s character that name does not shape identity is matched in Stein’s Will. While he begins the story as ‘Willy’, in the final chapter his name is more often given as ‘Will’: ‘A little boy upon a hill [/] Oh Will oh Will. [/] A little boy upon a hill. [/] He will oh will. [/] Oh Will oh Will’ (p. 61). This punning on Will as name and future tense, as well as the sexual implications of Willy, and the sense of self-determination as a kind of will, connect this name with Shakespeare, who puns on his own name frequently in his sonnets. For example, he begins sonnet 135 with ‘Whoever hath her wish, thou hast thy “Will,” [/] And “Will” to boot, and “Will” in over-plus.’ Even in Shakespeare’s time, ‘will’ was a way of referring to male genitalia, as well as to sexual desire, and so these lines pun in a particularly sexual way.

In the two translations, names are mostly kept the same (Bob, Gloria, Kate and William all remain unchanged), but some cultural context adaptation takes places, such as ‘Willy’ to

82 Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet (1597), II.ii.43-44 in his The Complete Works (London: Michael O’Mara, 1994), p. 700. There are, of course, some roses that figure desired women in British literary history, such as Robert Burns’ ‘My Love is Like a Red Red Rose’ (1794), but Stein’s famous like ‘A rose is a rose is a rose’ suggests her tendency to consider roses in connection with questions of being and naming.

83 William Shakespeare, ‘Sonnet CXXXV’, in his The Complete Works, p. 1012. William the Conqueror is another possible allusion of the name, particularly in a French context. Without making this connection, Natov discusses Willy as a ‘young colonialist’ and conqueror of animals (p. 107).
‘Willie’, ‘Billy’ to ‘Billie’, and in Terre but not Monde, ‘Lucy’ becomes ‘Lucie’. The most significant name changes in the text are to Rose’s dog: the white dog ‘Love’ becomes ‘Amour’, but the black dog ‘Pépé’ remains ‘Pépé’. This may be because he is the racial other to both England and France; he has his brother in Stein’s play Doctor Faustus Lights the Lights, in the black dog who has learnt his master’s tongue, but can only repeat ‘Thank you, thank you.’ Where Caliban curses Prospero for teaching him his language, the empty repetition of the black dog’s words suggests he has only been taught enough to express gratitude to his master, a damning account of British colonial expansion and treatment of foreign others. Pépé also evokes the black dog of depression, locked in a dark room, as indeed depression haunts this story. That ‘Love’ so readily becomes ‘Amour’ shows the easy domestication of the concept, while ‘Pépé’ remains a foreign body. Indeed, he is in a Kristevan sense identified with the abject. Where his name sounds close to the English ‘pee’ or French ‘pipi’, we are introduced to him through the story of his peeing indoors: ‘Poor little Pépé he had been taught never to do in a room what should be done outside but he was so nervous being left all alone he just did, poor little Pépé’ (p. 6). In both the English and French versions of this text, this black dog of depression and urine appears as something foreign and shameful to be expelled.

While these texts approach names in the same way, a significant difference between the two comes in their treatment of the dedication. Stein’s World is dedicated ‘To Rose Lucy Renée Anne d’Aiguy, A French Rose’ (p. 4), and in the American edition, this is written in a circle of the words ‘Rose is a Rose is a Rose is a Rose’. Perplexingly, Monde also dedicates itself, in English, to ‘A French Rose’ (p. 3), while Terre more predictably translates and gives
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84 Stein, La Terre est ronde, trans. by Marc Dachy (Paris: Transédition, 1984), p. 11. Subsequent citations will be made in parentheses.
85 Stein, Doctor Faustus Lights the Lights (1938), in A Stein Reader, pp. 595-624 (pp. 596, 599, 604, 606, 607, 618).
86 I am indebted to Kamillea Aghtan for this explanation, in conversation, of the dog in Doctor Faustus Lights the Lights.
‘une Rose française’ (p. 5). The latter welcomes this text into a French setting because of its writing context and intended audience, while *Monde* embraces everything that Venuti would praise, in creating a disjunction between its content and its language, to remind us that this is a translation. Indeed, just as we saw that French translations of Joyce’s *The Cat and the Devil* foreignised the French language itself, here we see the only overtly French element of the story being foreignised, in the only English words to appear in *Monde*. This decision not to translate, to remind us before we even start the text, that we are reading a translation, is in line with the general approach of *Monde* to its source text: it appears to seek an academic audience, in its lack of illustrations, conventional layout and appendixing of a draft of the story. Its only effort at visual play is that its cover is pink, which falls far short of the visual play in the first edition, which Stein oversaw – half blue, half pink, and arranging its texts in circles on square pages. *Terre* takes the opposite path to *Monde*, and endeavours to be visually appealing, with its abstract multicoloured cover and numerous black-and-white print illustrations within. These illustrations not only disrupt the prose, but are often out of place within it, such as a dog that comes when Rose is far up the mountain, and far from any dogs or mention of them (see Image 16).

With regards to translation as a potentially queer activity, *Monde* and *Terre* move against this in adding clarity through distinguishing song from prose, and seeking to create equivalents for names and Stein’s style (punctuation, parataxis and plot are equally unconventional in English and French). However, in playing with word-image relations in *Terre*, and by including the draft text in *Monde*, they can be seen as queering their source text in small ways: these changes help to destabilise conventional binaries such as text/draft, text/image, and text/peritext, with the text ordinarily valued more highly than the other term. Indeed in adding the draft, *Monde* hints at the notion of translation as a copy of a copy, undoing the supposed “originary” status of its source text, in pointing to the source of the
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Rose était une rose, elle n’était pas un dahlia, elle n’était pas un bouton d’or (c’est jaune), elle n’était pas un fuchsia ni un laurier-rose, bien Rose éveilla Rose, Rose ne s’était pas endormie oh cher non, l’aurore vient avant le soleil, et l’aurore est le moment pour partir, c’est facile de partir avant le soleil et Rose le fit. Elle était maintenant non parmi les buissons qui griffent mais parmi des arbres qui ont des noix et elle aimait ça, tout le monde aimait ça, et elle aussi.

C’est merveilleux le nombre d’arbres qu’il y a là quand ils sont tous là et juste alors tous les arbres étaient tous là, les troncs d’arbres sont ronds ça c’est si vous tournez autour mais ils ne sont pas ronds sinon juste dans l’air. Rose poussa un profond soupir de soulagement, et elle remonta sa chaise et elle était presque heureuse elle était là là où elle était.
source, building an appropriate sense of circularity into the book, by ending with the story’s origin. Moreover, that there are two contemporaneous but different translations of the same text may be seen as hinting at the queer potential of translation, in line with Parker’s argument above, as it points to the plural possibilities that translation opens up.

These two diverging translations raise the question of whether these texts can be considered as for children. Alternatively, what might they gain from being for children? As Stein designed it, World was replete with visual play, text-image interaction, and even potential meta-play, as she chose an illustrator named Francis Rose to work on her text. All of the texts in this study can be seen as, and all have also been published as being, directed towards academic audiences. And yet the same text, packaged differently, can be very appealing to children. For World, the source text opens up both possibilities, and these two simultaneously published translations take one each, with Monde aiming at academics, and Terre welcoming a younger, more visually-orientated audience. What we can infer from these two disparate approaches to translating World is how potentially permeable any boundaries between “modernism” and “children’s literature” can be, with this same source text leading to two differently orientated target texts.

We have seen, thus, that translation is an act of queer potential, where it makes changes and unpredictable moves with its source text, and breaks down binary distinctions within itself, and with the idea of the source text as an authoritative “original”. These two translations have much in common, in particular in their treatment of prose and song, and of names, but appear to direct their works to different audiences – one making the academic decision to include an appendix, the other making itself visually pleasing and spacing out its larger print to be easier to read. In doing so, they build on the possibility of the source text to appeal to both audiences.

The question of the appropriateness of World for children has existed since Stein’s first
efforts to publish her children’s works, and persisted in their critical accounts to this day.

While Stein’s other texts for children were rejected by publishers because of their violent content, Rose’s relentless unhappiness can also make for difficult reading. However, recent debate over whether these modernist books for children are enjoyable for children has been more a question of style than content. Wendy Lesser rejects Woolf’s Nurse Lugton’s Curtain by saying ‘this fragment is all too fragmentary’, and Hodgkins confidently asserts that there is nothing in Woolf’s Nurse Lugton nor Joyce’s Cat to entertain children: ‘these two books clearly were published above all as curiosities.’

Even children’s literature scholars find little of interest in modernist children’s literature, with Peter Hunt saying of Practical Cats that it is merely ‘a major poet’s whimsies’, as discussed above. Barbara Will sees in World a sense of Stein’s ‘masochism’ and for her, Rose ‘embodies Stein’s concerns both with youthful helplessness and dependency’; while she does not explicitly call the text inappropriate for children, she reads it alongside Stein’s submissive propaganda for Vichy France, saying of World and Stein’s writing on Pétain that ‘Both texts endorse a childlike submission to the charismatic adult protector.’ Watson, in contrast, opens her recent article on Stein’s children’s literature by rejecting Will’s claim, and seeing much of value for children in Stein’s children’s books.

As discussed in the Introduction to this thesis, Rousseau’s decision to keep Émile away from reading during childhood is because for Rousseau books ‘n’apprennent qu’à parler de ce qu’on ne sait pas.’ That is to say, Rousseau does not want books to contaminate children’s “innocence”, or ignorance, through imagining the lives and perspectives of others, as this may lead Rousseau’s ideal child away from the line of development that has been set up for

88 Hunt, p. 125.
89 Will, pp. 342-43, 345.
90 Watson, p. 245.
him. We see precisely this same logic of preserving childhood innocence in limiting or denying their sexual education, and in refusing to provide texts/translations for children that might prove too “difficult”. At a fundamental level, the question of appropriateness of texts for children creates an assumed child reader. Typically this child is an innocent one who cannot deal with such complexities as these modernist texts put forth, not only in terms of vocabulary, but especially in their radical styles. However, Stein’s text challenges precisely this sense of the distinction between childhood and adulthood, through the figure of the queer child, who does not move from innocence to maturity, and who in growing “up” does not become a different person. Indeed, the very call to a generic child for whom something may be “inappropriate” reduces the multiplicities of children and childhoods, and is something that queer theorists have spoken out against. It would be hasty to assume that these modernist children’s books are inappropriately difficult for children, by calling on an imagined innocent child to find difficulty with them. Indeed, as Monde and Terre take two opposite approaches to framing the text, they establish both poles of the issue. In holding both poles, and yet differing very little from each other while targeting different audiences, they show the potential reversibility of the hierarchy in the first place and so queer the notion of a fixed system that distinguishes literature for children from that for adults. As Stein shows, the boundary between adult and child is not always possible to determine: Monde and Terre lead their source text to supposedly opposite audiences.

Conclusion

Stein’s World reinvents both Alice and Shakespeare, presenting a queer phenomenological account of identity and perception as grounded in both gender and body shape. Where Rose asks ‘And where is my name Rose [/] And which little girl am I’ (p. 8), Stein’s text reveals
that these are connected questions, as identity can always only be grounded in place and space, be it seeking a taller perspective up a mountain, or, as the translations of this text brings to the fore, in a place where one speaks English or French. At the same time, the question ‘which little girl am I’ pushes against the generalisation of “little girls”. As discussed above, children’s perception of the world may differ from that of adults in a variety of ways, in particular relating to height and intensity. However, even within this difference, there will be variation in the ways that different children see the world, particularly for children who, in one way or another, deviate from the norm. Rose is no ordinary child, but a transgressive one who struggles with school, finds the world itself upsetting, and refuses the linear progression of aging into maturity; despite her conventional ending in marriage, she is a queer figure of a child.

While Rousseau asserts that the boys and girls are not sexually different until s/he reaches adolescence, he nevertheless tells us that they need to be socialised differently. Freud, in contrast, claims that the child is always already sexual, working through psychosexual dramas from birth onwards, a claim that is the foundation of modern psychology. Contrary to Freud, as Sedgwick, Stockton and others have argued, proto-gay or queer children often experience childhood in a different way to proto-heterosexual children, not showing a narrative of progression, but maturing differently, as in Stockton’s model of “growing sideways”. This is to say that not all children are similarly sexual, and that there are varieties in childhood sexualities too. As with Rose in World, different childhood sexualities may not be revealed in sexual acts, but in a variety of ways, including in the quality of their perception. In children’s literature, often children who do not fit in with society are normalised by the end of the story, as we saw in Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, and in World’s queer relation to it. In World, this normalisation takes place in a most unsettling way, and the lead characters are not shown to have developed or matured at all: Rose continues to
behave queerly, despite her marriage to her supposedly not-cousin Will. What has constantly marked her out as queer in this text is the very quality of her perception, which seems to materially differ from others – not only from adults, because of her size, but also from other children, because of her queerness. As Stein so powerfully shows, there will always be children who see the world differently, and in writing of queer girlhood, Stein pushes us to see differently too.

Stein’s text begins simultaneously in America and England, published in both countries in 1939, and is translated in France twice in the same year, 1984. This multiplicity, of both source texts and French translations, points to the ways in which the text differs in different places, within and across languages. Further, because of its dedication to a French girl, *World* is textually always already situated across language barriers. Where Collin and Taminiaux’s *Monde* leaves the dedication untranslated in English, it makes a move similar to translations of Joyce’s *Cat*, foreignising the French language itself, in a text written in France. While Dachy’s *Terre* domesticates the translation, both target texts foreignise in the same manner: separating out songs, lineating them as poetry, and italicising them, even when they are mixed together with ordinary prose. Stein’s queer text invites theorisation and analysis of possible translation strategies for queer children’s literature, in particular in relation to interrogation of binary thinking, hierarchisation, and ambiguities. We see potential challenges to hierarchies in the aptly circular inclusion of the story’s draft in *Monde*, and in the incongruity of image placements in *Terre*; however, overall, the target texts push towards greater clarity, in clearly demarcating the boundaries between prose and song.

In both the publication and the translation of a queer children’s text, we see the influence of Rousseau’s model of childhood. For Rousseau, literature is undesirable because it teaches the child what it does not yet understand: in line with this, we have seen in this chapter multiple withholdings of knowledge from children, assuming the desirability of
childhood “innocence” and/or ignorance, and seeking to teach the child progressively as it matures – working through a narrative of progress towards full sexual and linguistic knowledge. However, this may not be appropriate for all children, as Stein’s Rose shows that learning from direct experience of the world can deceive us, that the same education does not have the same effect on all children, and that not all children fall into a (hetero)normative path for their development into adulthood. Where most adults reconcile their abstract knowledge of the world’s roundness with their perception of it as flat, Rose refuses, or is unable, to do so, and so remains the same queer figure in childhood and as an adult. As such, Stein’s World poses a challenge to Rousseau’s model of childhood at its most fundamental level, by putting forth the varieties of children’s perceptions, and so undermining the sense of perception that forms the basis of Rousseau’s ideal of learning from direct experience. Rose shows that we cannot learn everything from observing nature, and that this generalised “observation” does not match all children’s perceptions. As such, Rose stands against Émile, as the non-ideal child, and exposes the generalisations underlying Rousseau’s vision of childhood.
Conclusion. Rejecting Rousseau Today?

As I hope to have shown from the modernist children’s texts and their translations studied in this thesis, childhood identities and spaces do not need to be as Rousseau claims. Woolf, de la Mare, Eliot, Joyce and Stein collectively challenge the purported innocence of the child and of nature. They subvert Rousseau’s account of the boy in the countryside and girl in the country house, and show alternatives to country childhood in urbanity, mobility and phenomenology.

In the Introduction, I explored recent rethinkings of modernism that recognised its connections to children’s literature and challenged the common conception of modernism as inaccessible and difficult. With the increase of urbanisation, lower child mortality rates and a spread of education to more children, Rousseau’s elitist model of one child with one tutor delighting in and learning from the countryside was ripe for rethinking. Rather than childhood innocence, these modernists focused on the child as sexually knowing, streetwise, aligned with “primitive” cultures, or curious and intensely artistic, among other new considerations of childhood. We saw here that there is a significant corpus of modernist writing for children – not only by Woolf, de la Mare, Eliot, Joyce and Stein, but also by other modernist figures such as H. D. and Loy. Of these, I focused on those texts that have been translated into French, to examine the interplay between French ideas of childhood, where Rousseau still holds sway, and their modernist rejections. These texts – *Nurse Lugton’s Curtain*, *The Lord Fish*, *Old Possum’s Book of Practical Cats*, *The Cat and the Devil* and *The World is Round* – all prominently feature issues of place and space and, in doing so, question Rousseau’s constructions of rural boyhood and domestic girlhood.

In Chapter 1, on the translation of children’s literature, we saw the recent rise in interest in this field. Translation studies tend no longer to focus on judging translations and instead
approach translations historically and in their social contexts. Part of this move away from debates on “fidelity” in translation began with modernism itself, which worked to rethink translation as the independent creation of its translator and as always situated in issues of society and culture. Modernist translations themselves frequently abridged, adapted, modernised and rewrote from their source texts and, in these ways, modernist translators have much in common with many translators of children’s literature. However, where for modernism this is because of the “high” literary authority of the translators, for children’s literature it is because of the “low” literary status of literature for children. Among the many changes that translators of children’s literature make, the key issue in contemporary critical discussion is the question of domestication and foreignisation. Venuti is strongly against domestication in literature for adults and many critics of children’s literature translations follow this line, in seeing domestication as cultural imperialism, reducing difference to sameness and denying its readers access to otherness or cultural variety. At the same time, foreignisation can easily risk creating stereotypes of other countries, or can overemphasise otherness, distanc[ing the reader from the issues of the texts, by suggesting that they are the problems or circumstances of another country. Many translations of children’s literature are conservative by nature, whether because of their content, editorial decisions, translators’ interpretations or authorial intervention. However, in introducing children to places beyond their experience, or in the translation of radical material, the translation of children’s literature can also challenge Rousseau’s educational ideals and trouble relations of identity to place and space, by teaching children about a world that they have not directly experienced.

In the second chapter of the thesis, on Woolf and de la Mare, this challenge to childhood spaces comes in rethinking Rousseau’s account of the countryside. Children in the works of Woolf and de la Mare show curiosity for, rather than innocence towards, the world around them (drawing on Carroll’s Alice) and silently engage in intense and dreamlike
visions of nature. Through this interpolation of a psychoanalytic discourse of dreams, desire and artistic creativity, the child is modernised from Rousseau’s pre-psychoanalytic notions and nature is presented as uncanny, violent and far from under human control. This rethinking of nature outside of anthropocentrism faces the double challenge, in translation, of its strong national ties: England is often identified by its countryside and these two children’s stories very much tie their texts down with details that emphasise Englishness. The French translations of these texts trouble this connection between England and countryside, when language and allusions shift to the target domain and so expose the artificiality of the connection in the first place. Indeed, while the countryside is often thought to be quintessentially English, its very translatability speaks against this.

In Chapter 3, I attempted to show that Eliot’s rejection of Rousseau’s ideals is supported by a different French influence: Baudelaire. Where Baudelaire’s urban and cat poetry has a clear impact on Eliot, the city is a central figure in Practical Cats, raising the question of urban childhood. Standing in direct contrast to most other accounts of the city in children’s literature, Eliot shows individuality and playfulness flourishing in London, emphasised by the allusive names of his cat characters and the inventive rhythms of his poetry. For Practical Cats, its adaptation and translations, thus, two connected issues emerge: its groundbreaking rhythms and its London setting. I considered the choices involved in translating poetry for children, in particular working towards “read-aloud-ability” and decisions between domestication and foreignisation for rhythms, names and places. Adapting a text to a musical and translating a musical are tasks with their own sets of concerns, including “performability” and “singability” (in ways comparable to translating and adapting for theatre, film and opera). In all of these texts, choices regarding sound affected the presentation of urbanity, in ways that inflected social and authorial attitudes towards the child’s place in the city.
In Chapter 4, we saw Joyce himself translating from French to English and playing with domestication and foreignisation. Looking at Joyce’s translations of fables in *Finnegans Wake*, we saw another potential connection between modernist translation and the translation and transmission of stories for children, through Alieda Assmann’s category of “written folklore”. The translation of Joyce’s children’s story back into French complicates conventional distinctions of domestication and foreignisation, and the many illustrators of *The Cat and the Devil* have approached this in different ways. Visual translation takes place through bridging Joyce’s story: for Corre, this is a matter of bridging between children’s literature and modernism, through hieroglyph and experimental pagination, while also playfully alluding to the French setting of the story; Blachon focuses more on forging a connection between the French and Irish elements of the story, through emphasising Catholicism as shared by both cultures. These translations do not verbally domesticate Joyce’s story, even though it is originally a French story and, in straining to foreignise what Joyce had domesticated, the French language itself becomes figured as a foreign element in this story. Again, a tension thus arises between place and identity. Children feature at the end of this story as travellers across borders and the story itself is a multilingual account of Joyce’s own travels, told to his grandson. As such, mobility, language acquisition and encountering new cultures are all evoked as Joyce’s approach to communicating with children.

In my final chapter, Stein presented a challenge to Rousseau’s ideas at their most fundamental level. It is, of course, instantly a rejection of Rousseau to have for the protagonist an independent, creative girl exploring nature. Moreover, far from “innocence”, there is something unsettling about Rose: she is a notably queer figure and lives out of line with her society, refusing to accept what she has learnt at school. Rousseau claims that the child learns from nature to trust his own judgement and so, in effect, Émile is fundamentally
learning a process of perception. Rose, in absolute contrast, learns from nature that she cannot trust her own perception, and begins to doubt all aspects of her knowledge and judgement. Indeed, Stein demonstrates that perception of nature does not align with scientific or institutionalised knowledge and that we cannot see with our eyes what others have seen with microscopes and telescopes, such as the shape of the world we live in. Thus, to prioritise our perception of nature over socially accepted knowledge is to set oneself solipsistically as an outsider to modern society. It is only in believing so ardently in one’s perception that the news of the world’s roundness can be felt as a trauma or personally life-shattering moment, as Rose does. Stein further points here to the difference that bodies make to our perceptions, in a phenomenological account of girlhood as different from both boyhood and adulthood. More specifically, Rose’s failure to align her perception with others positions her as a “queer child”, as Stockton and others have sought to define this term. This queerness is a particular issue in the translations of Stein’s work: Stein is known as a lesbian writer and while this text has much that people may not think of as appropriate for children, the question arises of how to harmonise this sexuality with children’s literature. Of the two translations, both published in the same year, Dachy’s illustrates and paginates in a playful way that suggests an intended child audience, while also no doubt connecting with Dachy’s (and Stein’s) Dadaist interests. Collin and Taminiaux, in contrast, do not illustrate and seem to seek an academic audience in including a draft of the story at the end. The idea of a specifically “queer” approach to translation has arisen in the last few years (Parker) and the approaches of these three translators to Stein’s potentially queer text can build on this discussion. In looking at the two source texts and two target texts in relation to each other, we can see that only the English text maintains an ambiguous line between song and prose from Stein’s draft, while the other three texts seek to make this distinction clear. At the same time, these two target texts subtly work against a sense of narrative progress and progression: in the
Dachy by inserting pictures at unconnected moments in the narrative; in the Collin and Taminiaux by ending the book with an earlier draft of the story, taking us from endings to origins.

Through this study, we have explored a range of translation issues: translation and nation, the transmission of written folklore, translating images, translating poetry, translating musicals and queer translation. In all of these, issues of placing childhood identity have figured significantly, through decisions to domesticate or foreignise names, places and spaces. These domestications and foreignisations were often complicated by the Frenchness of these source texts. There was in many cases a sense of backtranslation, as things ‘return’ to France – most notably Joyce’s French local legend, but also Stein’s French Rose, Eliot’s urban poetry and flanerie, Webber’s musical theatre and, for Woolf/Mare, Rousseau’s sense of the boy in the country and the girl inside the country house. However, in returning, this very French material becomes strained: everything has gained some modernist baggage along the way.

Overall, these translations reveal the authority of their source text authors, as they showed a prevalence of foreignisation and, in particular, a reluctance to change names. More than names, it was common for these translators to change wordplay, as for example, with Joyce’s ‘belsybabble’ to ‘diababélien’, and Webber’s ‘clerical cats’ to ‘chatpostoliques’. Where names were also wordplay, as for many of Eliot’s cats, we see a split in translators’ decisions, with some, such as Charpentreau, choosing to recreate the wordplay rather than keep the name and others, such as Ménard and Armel, preferring to keep allusive names in their English forms, such as Woolf’s ‘Lugton’ and ‘Millamarchmontopolis’. Literary allusions were often kept unchanged and not explained, or were simply dropped from the story in translation, such as de la Mare’s ‘old creatures’; in no cases were they explained. We have ultimately seen, thus, that no translator simply foreignises or domesticates: all use a variety of
strategies for different features of their source texts. Where Venuti and other theorists of translation tend to posit a binary between translations that domesticate and translations that foreignise, this corpus of translations would suggest that no such clear distinction can be made. Different aspects of source texts – including illustrations, rhyme schemes, names, places, allusions and wordplay – are not likely to be all domesticated or all foreignised. Rather, a variety of approaches will be used on each of these aspects, to create a target text that freely mixes domestication and foreignisation.

All of these texts and their translations raise issues with Rousseau’s model of childhood space as laid out in Émile. There is an urgent need to explore these rejections of Rousseau, because his conception of childhood in the countryside still so strongly holds sway in society today. In this decade, even, journalists often present children as in need of nature and many draw on the term ‘nature-deficit disorder’ from the American non-fiction writer Richard Louv’s bestseller, Last Child in the Woods: Saving Our Children from Nature-Deficit Disorder (2005). In 2012, Guardian journalist George Monbiot asserted that ‘Natural spaces encourage fantasy and roleplay, reasoning and observation. […] Perhaps forcing children to study so much, rather than running wild in the woods and fields, is counter-productive.’¹ Equally, in 2010, Jon Henley claims that ‘Free and unstructured play in the outdoors boosts problem-solving skills, focus and self-discipline. Socially, it improves cooperation, flexibility, and self-awareness. Emotional benefits include reduced aggression and increased happiness.’² Rousseau would no doubt agree with such sentiments. Stephen Moss, the naturalist and author, even goes so far as to replicate Rousseau’s argument for the child to learn its bodily limits by injuring itself in the countryside, as Henley reports: ‘“Nature is a tool,” says Moss, “to get children to experience not just the wider world, but themselves.”’

climbing a tree, he says, is about “learning how to take responsibility for yourself, and how – crucially – to measure risk for yourself. Falling out of a tree is a very good lesson in risk and reward.” While these reporters are often looking for a way to encourage children to fight to protect nature, this very notion of nature as a “tool” for self-development has recently been challenged by ecological critics. As I discussed in Chapter 2, Deleuze and Guattari argue poignantly that the first step towards ecological responsibility is to push against the anthropocentric hierarchy of man over nature, which sees nature as something to be exploited.

Moreover, there remains an undercurrent of nationalism beneath this seemingly universal discourse of the child’s need for nature. Moss observes that children know more today than ever before about nature around the world: ‘More kids today are interested in the natural world than ever before; they watch it on the telly, they may well visit a nature reserve or a National Trust site with their families.’ If this is so, then why do these journalists claim that children need to encounter nature to learn about it, and make quips about children’s ignorance of natural things? In the same article as Moss explains this wider knowledge, Henley jokes that ‘more children can identify a Dalek than an owl.’ The suggestion seems to be that it is not nature around the world that children need to see: it is the English countryside that they must experience. Indeed, in the UK, there are a number of organisations that work hard to encourage children to play in the countryside – such as the RSPB, National Trust and Natural England – an effort which is unique to this country.

Since the notion of the “innocent” child learning from direct experience of the countryside persists to the present day, it is evident that Woolf, de la Mare, Eliot, Joyce and Stein failed in their attempt to push towards a reassessment of Rousseau’s ideology. However, as critical ecology and childhood studies have developed recently, their challenge urgently calls to be heard, and form a contribution to current critical attention to children’s geography.

3 Henley.  
4 Cited in Henley.  
5 Henley.
In recent years, children’s geographers have sought to undo the persistent stereotypes (all inherited from Rousseau) of children’s need for nature and the natural goodness of the country child. They speak against these through factual surveys and statistics, and presenting counternarratives to the plethora of fictional accounts, nostalgic autobiographies and even government policies that reinforce those stereotypes. Indeed, statistics show that since the 1950s, it has been safer for children to live in cities than in the countryside.

In this work, I have sought to show the challenges these modernist children’s texts put forth specifically to Rousseau’s sense of childhood space and place. Where Woolf and de la Mare closely follow Rousseau’s model of a boy learning from nature and a girl confined to rural domesticity, they work from there to disrupt Rousseau’s very sense of “nature” through dream, non-anthropocentric perspectives and the blurry position of nature in the city. Eliot shows the alternative to rural living – urban life – as exciting, playful and welcoming for small mischievous beings, like cats or children, with his original and vibrant rhyme schemes and strong individuals bringing London alive for his young readers. Joyce ends his story with children crossing a bridge, suggesting rural mobility and, implying through his epistolary form, the value of travel and of learning about other parts of the world: both physically and imaginatively crossing the village border. Stein’s rural setting in fact deceives its heroine, rather than teach her, with the seemingly flat ground belying the roundness of the earth and the distant blue mountains turning out to be green. In these ways, through exploring childhood spaces, these modernist authors write against Rousseau’s model of childhood, bringing new modes of thought to bear on the question of children’s place in the world, through psychology (Woolf and de la Mare), urbanity (Eliot), technology (Joyce) and philosophy (Stein). The place of children, we can see, can no longer be bound solely to rural innocence: these modernists sought to expose the failings of Rousseau’s model and to this

day, the alternatives that they present need to be heard. Rousseau’s monolithic model of childhood can be broken down, as the works for children of Woolf, de la Mare, Joyce, Eliot, Stein and their adaptations and translations seek to do.
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