

Résumé : *La littérature d'enfance, reflétée dans plusieurs études de spécialité dans les centres de recherche de tout le monde, reste un domaine plutôt périphérique chez nous. Si les théoriciens distinguent la littérature créée pour les enfants de celle qui a comme public-cible les adultes, mais peut être utilisée dans les activités déroulées avec les enfants aussi (la littérature de jeunesse ne constitue n'objet de cet article), notre démarche envisage une troisième acception de la littérature d'enfance, celle créée par les enfants mêmes (ici, par des enfants de 6-7 ans).*

Notre analyse est réalisée sur un corpus de 32 contes créés par des enfants de 6-7 ans (textes enregistrés et ensuite édités, représentant le produit d'un programme déroulé dans une maternelle de Iași par Elena Lungu, enseignante préscolaire) et a comme objectifs : identifier les principales coordonnées de la communication (dans certains textes, même interculturelle) que les enfants de 6-7 ans actualisent dans leurs contes ; distinguer les différents types d'éléments discursifs repérables dans les créations des enfants.

D'ici, d'une part, l'importance du sujet – donnée par l'approche d'un domaine avec lequel la recherche n'a été, pour l'espace roumain, très généreuse – et, d'autre part, l'originalité de notre démarche, donnée par l'analyse proposé : de la perspective de la communication et de la théorie du discours – sur un corpus qui n'a plus été utilisé chez nous.

Les résultats de notre analyse constitueront, en même temps, les prémisses de nos recherches ultérieures au carrefour des domaines de la communication, de la littérature d'enfance et du discours ; les coordonnées de la communication et les types d'éléments discursifs identifiés dans notre corpus pourront être confirmés ou infirmés par rapport à d'autres textes littéraire pour les enfants ou à d'autres manifestations de la communication dans la société contemporaine (par exemple, le «discours» des BD, des albums, des romans-jeu pour les lecteurs-zappeurs etc., l'alternative de la communication/ communication interculturelle dans les films pour les enfants, dans les dessins animés, les thèmes préférés dans les contes des enfants d'aujourd'hui etc.).

Mots-clés : *littérature d'enfance, communication, contextualisation, discours, auteurs-enfants*

0. Premises of the analysis

Children's literature, despite being widely explored in specialist paper/studies worldwide, does not unfortunately attract the same level of interest in Romania. As a rather peripheral field of research in Romania [1], the issues surrounding children's literature feature in very few theoretical works (diachronic and/or synchronic overviews of children's Romanian and/or world literature and academic courses/papers intended in particular for initial/continuous teacher training) and – from a different, practical and applicative perspective – in a range of publications aimed at utilising children's literature in school-based/extracurricular activities involving children of various ages, such as anthologies and collections of children's literature where the selected texts are followed, most frequently, by teaching recommendations.

In contrast, at international level, the universe of children's literature is reflected in multiple ways in works focusing on issues such as: the various theoretical bases of research on children's literature, illustrated by literary texts from other cultures [2]; aspects of children's books publishing [3]; the embeddedness of children's literature in current realities [4]; particular concerns in children's literature (at the junction of psychology, sociology, gastronomy, theology, structuralism, etc): family, the male-female relationship, the political/social/cultural system, stereotypes, the Harry Potter phenomenon, the McDonald's phenomenon etc. and their valorisation in various educational contexts [5].

Whereas specialised studies generally highlight the distinction between children's literature written for children specifically (for instance, in the Romanian context, the works of Otilia Cazimir or Elena Farago) and literature whose primary target audience is comprised of adults yet is read (and recommended to be read) by children equally (the case of Romanian authors such as I.L. Caragiale, I. Creangă, M. Eminescu etc.), this paper aims to draw attention to a third accepted meaning of the term, i.e. children's literature written by children, for children.

The analysis I propose is based on a corpus of 32 texts composed by six and seven-year old children at kindergarten no. 18 in the city of Iasi, who have been participating in a project aimed at

* Lecturer, PhD, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University, Iasi

developing creativity and fostering oral language expressiveness. In addition to the focus on these two classical areas of kindergarten education, the project has also emphasised interaction, creative play and interpretation. The texts were collected during activities with preschool children and subsequently transcribed by Ms. Elena Lungu (an early-childhood and primary school teacher) and now form a volume currently being prepared for publication.

The research focuses on two main areas, seeking to identify, on the one hand, the key dimensions of communication, as actualised by 6 and 7-year olds in their stories, and, on the other hand, the various types of discourse elements in children's writings (along the lines of the analysis of repeated discourse [6]).

1. Dimensions of communication actualised in texts composed by children

The elements actualised in texts created by preschool children fall within the general framework of communication, complying with standards of both written discourse (by using components of literary communication) and spoken discourse (mainly as a result of the particular context for the development of the stories by the 32 children involved in the project – oral “composition” of the text, the process of “storytelling” to the instructor and the other children, who therefore serve as audience/interlocutors).

Thus, on the one hand, as regards message delivery, and on the other, in terms of the relationship between a message and a particular communication situation (real – that of the “telling” of the story – or fictional – the actual content of the text), one may distinguish:

(a) the children's tendency to actualise familiar names (nouns, mostly in the diminutive form; regular and formal personal pronouns; constructions with possessive pronoun adjectives or actual pronouns etc.) whether or not implying kinship: “daddy”, “mum, dad!”, “Mommyyy!”, “baby”, “Sir!”, “little boy”, “pal”, “you, my dear”, “dear child”, “my dears”, etc;

(b) constructing (or often visibly reproducing) replies that may be associated with familiar communication settings: greetings (“Good afternoon, Sir!”, “Good afternoon! Welcome!”), retorts by children who seek to make their point (“No! No! I want it today!”, “just one more minute and then I'm leaving for school”, “I will do it [the homework] later ...”; parents' replies to children (“Don't worry, these things happen ...”, “Why are you crying, my dear?”, “Hurry up! You must get to school, it's late”, “Promise you'll behave?”, “Be careful, you shouldn't go there on your own!”); parents' replies typical of particular communication situations, characterised by distinct social, cultural, etc. dimensions (“What do you think?” “Dear, I couldn't find the baby! What should we do?”, “What a fool, he's wasting his time. / Why does he even bother ...?”); parent-parent dialogues, most often rendered as exchanges between animate characters (“You rooster had better do some work yourself, all I do is toil for you every day ... You don't do anything, just lying there, sleeping in the barn all day. Now, get to work. My wings hurt so much ..., what have I done to deserve this?”, “Master, I am the Cloșcuța-Hârnicuța [the Tireless Little Hen] and I have ten chicks: Ghiță, Adi, Milică, Bobiță, Costiță, Vasilică, Angela, Andrei, Țața and Ionuț. My rooster, Cocoșel-Lenevel [the Listless Cockerel], does nothing all day long. I've had enough of this! I'm thinking of moving to another yard!”); parent-child dialogues (“What are you doing with my shoesies, mommy?/I'm cleaning them up and putting them in the closet; you won't be wearing them from now on. / Why? / Because you didn't keep your promise.”); parents' replies to children (“Why did you go outside? I've just saw your mother and she told me you may not go out until she returns. Go back in, it's getting dark soon”, “Do as you want! What I just told you is for your own good!); children's replies (“If you knew how much I'd like you to play with me too ... just a little bit./ Look, tomorrow morning we will play, I promise!”, “Pencil, some of my classmates draw better than me, won't you help me please? I'd like you to come with me to the kindergarten”) etc.;

(c) actualisation of strategies intended to capture and hold the interlocutor's attention/interest and to build up tension: “This is tricky ...”, “When he was about to return he could not find his way back any longer ...”, “she kept looking for the path in vain”;

(d) employing constructions which reflect the locutor-interlocutor relationship: locutor interested in the interlocutor's feedback (including in terms of the value – see for instance the child-narrator's dissociation from the negative character in the created text: “Andreea is not my friend!” vs. emphasising similarity with the positive character: “I do the same when I am happy ...”), attempting to clarify one's message to the interlocutor, when necessary: “Well, I hope you

liked my story!”; “I forgot to tell you that the dog’s called Lăbuș and the owner’s name is Mr. Florin! That’s all.”; “And you know why?”; “I forgot to tell you that the extraterrestrials were actually trying to steal all our resources on Earth and to kill all people. But because the inhabitants of the earth were very clever, they had already planned for that ...”) and the idea of a locutor-interlocutor union (“our puppy”, “our Sergiu”, “our boy”, “our little fox”);

(e) spoken style, the play on creativeness and storytelling as form of communication with the other/the others: “But before that he said ...”, “And that’s the end of that!”; “And so the story goes”, “*And that is how it is to this day!*”, “And one day, their dream came true”, “That was the extraterrestrials’ weakness and people eventually found it!”, “Well ...”, “Well, what could the parents do?”.

The communicative structures actualised in texts produced by children reflect, as demonstrated by the examples above, the strong impact of the everyday environment of the preschool child’s life – a point emphasised in Kristin Wardetzky’s research also („children remember motivationally neutral elements more briefly and less accurately than those which are associated with acute sociopersonal needs and requirements” – Wardetzky 1990: 159). The perspective is broadened by the focus on those discourse elements that can be traced in stories created by children, as such elements are both embedded in a particular type of context and recurrent, as they reflect the dimensions of children’s literature familiar to children.

2. Discourse elements observed in stories created by children

The analysis of the texts in the corpus under review falls both within “the enunciation system which correlates a textual construction and a defined social reality” (Charaudeau, Maingueneau 2002: 43) and within the research framework of repeated discourse, which embraces “everything that in the language of a community is repeated more or less identically as ready-made discourse or a more or less fixed combination, as an extended or brief excerpt of that which has already been said” (Coșeriu 2000: 258-259).

2.1. The „story content” of texts created by preschool children involves in the corpus under review, various types of contextualisations:

(a) spatial and temporal contextualisations – placing the action in a real family setting (“We do not have hazelnut trees near our block of flats”) vs. real created setting (“in a small village”) vs. unreal setting (“a planet called the Strange Planet”), dissociating the types of setting (“two peasants lived in the two houses, while the king naturally lived in the castle”), or by setting the action in a specific time unit (season, day, time of day), in the past (“Once upon a time”), present (“Then the extraterrestrial beings also contacted those on the spaceship from earth, speaking another language, their own language”) or the future (“they would find in the outer space better, peace-loving beings”);

(b) contextualisations at action level, reflected in episodes which point to literary works known by children (“He feared that if he kissed her he might swallow her whole” – an allusion to Neghiniță, a Romanian story about a puny, elf-like boy; “He [Andrei] has been through a lot and has learnt that he must work in order to succeed – as in that story...”) and, on the other hand, in scenes which re-enact customary situations in preschool childrens’ lives, such as: aspects of contemporary life (“enough with the Pet Shop food”), stereotypes of childhood (“he [the child] would just go out and play instead of doing what he claimed he was doing”, “Andrei saw a couple of boys playing with a new ball on the street and wanted one himself. So he ran to his father and asked him to buy him one too”, “without his mum’s permission”, “The two children asked their mum to buy them the little animals”, “The children each gave a little kiss to the cute animals”), aspects of the education of children of various ages, in different educational and family settings (“After some serious ear pulling, Iepurilă (“the Hare”) promised he would never do that again.”; “The teacher was very upset and called Andreea’s home”), family and friendship (“All the guests, his friends, wished him “Happy birthday!” and all started playing in the room. When mother rabbit brought the cake, Țup-Țup [Hopper the Bunny] blew into the candles so hard that the cream flew onto the guests and smeared them all, yet they all laughed and had fun ... Everyone loved the party!”), elements of the current social environment, actualising components of the system of values to which children refer, through the prism of “rolemodels”, i.e. the adults in the family

environment – the problem of children whom parents leave in the care of an acquaintance (“the bird decided it was time she took a holiday. So she left for the seaside. But before that she said she should really find someone to sit with her chick so she called in their neighbour, the elephant”); irresponsible parents (“The nosey hen, instead of caring for her young, was peeping through the fence at the neighbours next door”); emigration issues (“the father rang his friend, Mihai, who worked in Italy, asking him to quickly send the gift his daughter wanted. So Mr. Mihai went to the shop in Italy, found and bought the doll and sent the package by car, to make sure it would arrive as fast as possible”); children’s wishes and the (often problematic) relations among children (“The little girl wanted a baby brother or sister to sleep with at night”, “Buburuzel [Master Ladybird] went outside to play and met a tiny ant; yet the two didn’t let Buburica [Miss Ladybird] join in their game. Buburica was weeping as she wanted to play with them, but no matter how much she begged, they would not accept her in their game”);

(c) character contextualisations [7]: in terms of typology, the observed characters belong to (1) the human world (embedded in the children’s family, social and cultural environment) – e.g. “the father of a boy called Andrei”, “two children – Veronica and Tudor”, “a little girl called Ionela and a little boy called Adiță”, “a pupil called Ionuț”, “a girl called Andreea”, Mrs. teacher, “two children: a girl and a boy. The girl’s name was Karinuța, and the boy’s Sebișor; (2) the animal kingdom, most frequently re-enacting human-like relations: “a bunny called Fulg de Nea [Snowflake]”, “Moș Martin [Uncle Bear], the bunny’s uncle”, “a doggie called Botic [Muzzle]”, “Ariceș și Bursucel” [Hedgehog and Badger], “a bunny and an ant”, “who were very good friends”, “the chief hen”; (3) the imaginary plane: “beings who live in outer space”, “a charmed eraser”, “there was once a pencil with amazing powers. As soon as you put it on the paper, it would draw whatever you wished, in all the colours you could dream of”. In terms of character construction, one may single out those whose traits reflect the universe of childhood (“The bunny was mighty mischievous”, “a group of people who since childhood had wanted to travel in outer space”, “the naughty bunny”, “the bragging girl”, “two cute and smart little brothers”, “a restless puppy”, “Țup-Țup the bunny was polite and hard-working and deserved to have a party”); characters shaped on those known to children from books: “a rooster who used to crow very early and drove people angry by waking them up so early” (modelled on the woodpecker in Ion Creangă’s *Amintiri*), „a lazy cockerel for which even eating a wheat grain was too hard ...” (the idle man in one of Ion Creangă’s stories);

(d) contextualisations of magic objects most often incorporated in reality: “the beautiful red new ball”, “highly sophisticated rocket”, “radars”;

(e) contextualisations of the dénouement of stories created by children, resulting in various conclusions:

- happy ending: as in fairy tales (“The king congratulated them on changing their ways and made them knights. They lived happily ever after.”), or patterned on fairy tales conclusions, yet with content adjusted to the child’s recognisable social context (“One year after this event, an elegant shop opened at the ground floor of the house Moș Martin, the bear, where animals could find anything they wanted”, „The two children asked their mum to buy them the cute animals. Thus Harriet and Rex finally found owners and all were happy to be a family”, „They should not have been afraid, as all the animals were well-behaved – they gave them food, welcomed them and played with them nicely. All summer long, Codiță Albă [White Tail] and Veverița Lizuca [Lizuca the Squirrel] played and made lots of friends. They kept telling all the inhabitants of the forest about how fine the two children had treated them, but still, it was even better to be home, in the big forest”, “Thus all the animals could escape and were able to find their parents and ... all lived happily ever after”, “Every night she would come in the little girl’s dreams, and the girl dreamt they were playing together. Thus they were both very happy”) – most often the happy ending being assimilated with the concepts of *family* and *friendship*;
- moral ending – actualising classical systems of values and ideas such as: the need to adapt (“The man led the young rooster to his home, and the rooster had learnt his lesson and now crowed later, with the other roosters”); respect (“What Ionuț learnt from this was to never throw out the window any objects that had been useful, as you never know when luck might strike. Codruț lost his eraser or perhaps someone took it away because he’s been having low grades in school ...”); the importance of following parents’ advice and the problem of

upbringing (“The bunny’s mother thus came to learn to truth and scolded the wayward bunny. After some serious ear pulling, Iepurilă promised he would never do that again. Since then rabbits have had long ears. Rightly so. To make sure they remember ...!”; “indeed he learnt his lesson, and has never upset his master since that evening”); reward, the idea of merit (“After the guests left, Țup-Țup cleaned his room and when he was done it looked as good as new. Țup-Țup was polite and hardworking and deserved to have a party”); accomplishment through work (“The red ladybird became all yellow from eating so much honey, but she was the happiest ladybird, as she had now found a purpose”); the relationship between natural and adoptive parents (“Returning from her holiday one morning, the bird looked at her nest and was taken aback and angrily asked the elephant: Where is my chick? Why didn’t you look after it? Tell me where it is. / It’s there in the nest – the elephant replied. / You lie, there is only a winged elephant calf. / Well, this is our baby. / What do you mean “our”? / Yes, it is ours. You hatched it therefore it has wings, but I looked after it and that is why he is an elephant calf now. // And nobody was now making fun of the big elephant anymore...”); upholding the spirit of justice (“This is their due punishment, because instead of asking, mice steal food from people’s homes!”, “If she [Lisa the kitten] had wanted to eat, she should have been busy catching mice; enough with Pet Shop food”);

- semi-open ending: “Then the three space travellers managed to destroy the Strange Planet and were appointed generals, but still they did not lose hope that they would find better, peace-loving beings in the outer space”, “Then the two friends went out for a walk”, “Nobody knows if the girl learnt anything from this event ...”;

(f) contextualisations at the composition level – texts created by preschool children emerge as a mixture of imagery and structures, alluding to the features of epic genres such as fairy tales, fables, legends, narratives etc. – see, for example, the introductory, intermediate and concluding formulas typical of fairy tales, outlined under section 2.2; the types of human they present – similar to fables – represented by characters in the animal and object world (bunny, elephant, bird, eraser, etc.), final formulas typical of legends (Since then rabbits have had long ears. Rightly so. To make sure they remember...!), narratives – within the framework of the story – of everyday occurrences, reflecting life and communication situations familiar to children etc.

2.2. The „story format” of the texts included in the corpus under analysis are concrete embodiments of the various types of contextualisation laid out under 2.1, as manifestations of repeated discourse (by constant reference to elements of everyday communication – phrases, structures etc., and of fairy tale “discourse” – formulas, characters’ names etc.). One may distinguish the following:

(a) introductory formulas overlapping two dimensions: (1) as means of embedding action in a shared space-time (“one summer day”, “one day”, “on a beautiful autumn day”, “one morning in spring”); (2) as reiterations of established fairy tale formulas (elements of repeated discourse: “once upon a time”, “long ago, there lived in a forest”, “once upon a time, a long time ago”, “once upon time there was”, “once upon time and twice upon time there was”, “once upon a time, and a very good time it was”, “it so happened that ...”);

(b) intermediate formulas, which are the hallmarks of orality and serve as strategies to delay the flow of the story (building on or replicating patterns common in familiar fairy tales): “he was lost in thoughts, thinking over and over, and suddenly said”, “he kept walking, walking, walking till he ran into ...”, “as they walked on, talking about many different things”, “they kept thinking for a while”;

(c) concluding formulas: summarising the story (“This is the story of Andrei the lazy boy. He has been through a lot and has learnt that he must work in order to succeed – as in that story...”), formulas from fairy tales (typical Romanian closings: “I jumped in the saddle and rode away to tell you the stories you’ve heard today”, “I jumped on a spoon and away I flew and you’ve heard all my stories, so God bless you.” “I jumped on a spindle and away I spun.”; “An’ the wheel bend, an’ the story end.” “That’s how it’s been to this day. And that’s a true story!”); closing formulas signifying the relationship between the narrator and the listener/interlocutor (“And that’s the end of that!”, “Well, I hope you enjoyed my story!”, “And so the story goes”, “And that is how

it is to this day”, “That’s what I do when I’m happy ...”), evaluative closing formulas serving as value judgments (“What a helpful dog!”);

(d) characters’ names: similar to or replicating those in stories familiar to children (Fulg de Nea [“Snow Flake”] the rabbit, Moș Martin [“uncle Bear”], Rilă Iepurilă [“Rilă the Hare”], Țup-Țup [“Hopper”] the rabbit) vs. names modelled on those of “famous” characters in childrens’ literature (Frunză Verde tree [“Evergreen Tree”], “Strange Planet”, „Ureche-Lungă” [“Long Ear”], Aricel și Bursucel [Hedgehog and Badger]), vs. names acquired from the family environment (Andrei, Mr. Florin, Ionela, Adiță, Codruț, Andreea, Karinuța, Sebișor) vs. names which combine the above-mentioned types (“Harriet the kitty and Rex the puppy”, Mr. Bear, Mrs. Hare, Mr. Hedgehog, “two fairies, one called Sabina, the other Georgiana”, Țupi [“Hops”], “Mother-Ladybird, Father-Ladybird and two younger ladybirds, Master Ladybird and Miss Ladybird]);

(e) phrases which reflect the children’s embeddedness in a particular linguistic context (“he came up with an idea”, “he was feeling lazy”, “in the end”, “all day long”, “they didn’t think about it too much”, “let’s find out what their weakness is”, “they took on risks”, “they learnt their lesson”, “he would have none of it”, “he tried his luck”, “he came right away”, “with all his might”, “he bumped into ...”, “he took flight and ran like a scared rabbit”, “lucky that ...”, “he was just about ...”, “he laughing, holding his stomach, and felt like kissing his girlfriend”, “he didn’t care for it”, “all day long”, “you never know when luck might strike”, “and what’s more ...”, “they said goodbye”, “they found a purpose”, “he didn’t care”, “he wasn’t ashamed”, “to take him to task”, “he acted out”, “he mustered courage and got down to work”, “what have I done to deserve all this”, “he told himself that he had better ...”, “he was left aghast”, “he ran for his life” etc.), and referencing literary texts familiar to children (cf. *Amintiri din copilărie*, by Ion Creangă: “and they were doing so many other things ...”, “the children were so drowsy they would have gone to sleep right there in the piglets’ nest”);

(f) repetitions – which reflect trends in ordinary communication: “there was a precious stone rich in minerals giving them everything they needed: food, energy, light, everything, everything, everything”, “Then the people decided to lock him up in a room. And lock him up they did”, “smoke was rising, either rose or green or blue”, “all he does is lie around all day”, “poor thing, he kept looking for her, under the table, in the refrigerator, all over the place, all over ...”;

(g) clause/sentence substitutes (based on direct into indirect speech exercises or, conversely, as premises of such exercises): “her mother told her there two conditions: to behave and to brag less about her stuff. The little girl promised she would do so”, “Will you be a good boy? Our doggie lifted his paw as a “yes”, “Țupi asked mother rabbit if it was indeed his birthday and she said it was.”;

(h) anchor structures employed in the text (signifiers of story “telling”): “On their moon the extraterrestrials had a base where there was a precious stone rich in minerals providing them with everything they needed: food, energy, light, everything, everything, everything. Indeed, that was the extraterrestrials’ weakness and people eventually found it!”, “The extraterrestrials lived on a planet called the Strange Planet which didn’t have a moon”, “When her mother would call her to eat, she just lied in bed and ignored her. Also ...”, “The fairies, seeing how nice the children were, wanted to charm them and keep them there forever. On seeing that, the parents were very scared ...”;

(i) lexemes typical of childhood (reflected in the high recurrence of diminutives: “kitty”, “puppy”, “little paw”, “fishies”, “little boat”, “froggies”, “little animal”, „Adiță” (child’s name), “little kiss”, “small house”, etc.) or pointing to contemporary realities, which cannot generally be located in older children’s fiction: “the clients have arrived!”, “the pop-up shop was taken down”, “they detected a particular substance”, “heavily protected bases”, “if they use a nuclear bomb they will influence ...” etc;

(j) explanatory constructions – actualised as highlights of the locutor-interlocutor relationship, aimed at delivering a highly detailed message, which the interlocutor may be able to decode based on the initial communicative intention and on the tendency of adults (preschool teachers, parents, etc.) to frequently explain to children various components of the messages delivered to them: “other beings living in space, extraterrestrials that is”, “to make up his mind right then, on the spot”, “the eraser got smaller and smaller, meaning it was worn out”, “he stretched out his trunk and gently lifted the chick from its nest, putting it under his ear. It’s always warm under an elephant’s ear!”, “he brought home Lăbuș (that was the puppy’s name)”, “he went

to the newsstand – that was the old man’s workplace, he was a newsagent”, “she made a string puppet dwarf, a marionette that is. And everyday the dwarf went to work, at the puppet theatre.”

Conclusions

The analysis proposed above – focusing on an area which so far has not been thoroughly explored in the Romanian context and based on a previously unused corpus – is part of a broader research undertaking in the field of children’s literature. The outcomes of the study serve therefore as premises for upcoming research, at the junction of the fields of communication, children’s literature and discourse analysis. The dimensions of communication and the discourse elements illustrated under 2.1 and 2.2 may be subsequently confirmed or invalidated through references to other types of literary texts for children and other manifestations of communication in contemporary society (e.g. comics, albums, video game novels etc.)

Notes:

[1] Some references in Romanian literature in the field: Rațiu 2006, Căndroveanu 1988, Bârlea 2006, Mitu 2006, Bodiștean 2007, Casangiu 2007 etc.

[2] For example, children’s literature viewed from a semiotic standpoint and by reference to the diagram of communication; the system of concepts, symbols, norms, types of discourse observed in literary texts for children – Ewers 2009; defining children’s literature based on how it is understood in various contexts – Klingberg 2008; children’s literature across centuries, for children of different ages; issues related to children’s and youth magazines; the history of children’s literature, with reference to literary movements – Cogan, Webb 2002; literary genres and species included in children’s literature: classical (epic works – fairy tale, story, fable, short story etc; lyrical – pastel, lullabies etc; dramatic – fairy tale play, comedy; elements of children’s folklore) and modern (comics; videogame novels; graphic novels – viewed the only genre exclusively belonging to children’s literature, combining orality, imagery and text, cf. Nières-Chevrel 2011) etc.

[3] In this area, research focuses on: various aesthetic and cognitive aspects reflected in literary illustrations occurring in literary texts for children, analysed from an interdisciplinary perspective: literary theory, art history, linguistics, narratology, cognitive psychology, sociology, theory of painting, etc; difficulties encountered in translating literary texts for children; features of products targeting children (books, magazines, albums, DVDs etc.).

[4] By means of the analysis of the relationship of children’s literature with other arts and with the media: cf. references in children’s literature to films/film adaptations of children’s books, drama; the image of the child in contemporary society, the sociology of reading; other expression modes whose target audience are children – albums, comics, films, TV series, video games, etc; the impact of multimedia on children’s literature, etc.

[5] Main areas of focus include: the role of literature in the upbringing of children of various ages and in teacher training; the role of reading and arts classes; the image of the child in school textbooks; issues in selecting the essential literary texts for children (cf. the example of France, where the ministry has provided a list of recommended readings in schools); selecting particular texts and manners of presenting difficult themes/scenes (cf. the controversies surrounding the advisability of including certain content in textbooks or the use of certain fairy tales in activities with preschool and early school children – e.g. texts ending with the revenge/killing of a character) etc.

[6] Of particular interest here is the reference to the two main types of statements in repeated discourse identified by Stelian Dumistrăcel (2006): (a) “anonymous” statements: popular (set phrases, idiomatic phrases, proverbs, set comparison formulas; verses; set fairy tale formats; riddles) and cult (sayings, slogans, formulas borrowed from religious discourse, famous proper names, technical formulas associated with various functional styles) and (b) statements by known authors (titles of books, quotations, “famous” words/sentences). For examples of these elements on a different corpus than the one proposed in this paper see Amălăncei 2007.

[7] See, for instance Kristin Wardetzky’s statements: „Analysis of the content of the children's fairy tales reveals not the slightest glimmering of an effort to elaborate questions of social justice, morality, the relationship between good and evil, or power as a social category. On the other hand, the children's tales suggest a more highly differentiated and nuanced view of the characters they create than has been suggested by the often-cited good-mother/evil-witch dichotomy” (Wardetzky 1990: 172).

Bibliography:

Amălăncei, Brândușa-Mariana, *Discursul repetat și modificarea enunțurilor aparținând discursului repetat în textele publicitare, în Limbaje și comunicare. IX. Evoluția și funcționarea limbii – perspective normative în noul context european. Partea a II-a*, Editura Universității Suceava, 2007, pp. 101-105.

Bârlea, Gheorghe Petre (coord.), *Dicționar de locuri imaginare în literatura pentru copii*, Muzeul Literaturii Române, București, 2006.

Bodiștean, Florica, *Literatura pentru copii și tineret dincolo de „story”*, Casa Cărții de Știință, Cluj-Napoca, 2007.

Casangiu, Larisa Ileana, *Literatură română și literatură pentru copii. Note de curs și sugestii de lecturi plurale ale unor opere*, Ediția a II-a, Nautica, Constanța, 2007.

Căndroveanu, Hristu, *Literatura pentru copii*, Albatros, București, 1988.

Charaudeau, Patrick; Maingueneau, Dominique (ed.), *Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours*, Seuil, Paris, 2002.

Cogan Thacker, Deborah; Webb, Jean, *Introducing Children's Literature From Romanticism to Postmodernism*, Routledge, New York, 2002.

Coșeriu, Eugen, *Limba funcțională, în Lecții de lingvistică generală*, Arc, Chișinău, 2000.

Dumitrăcel, Stelian, *Discursul publicistic românesc din perspectiva stilurilor funcționale*, Institutul European, Iași, 2006.
Ewers, Hans-Heino, *Fundamental Concepts of Children's Literature Research Literary and Sociological Approaches*, Routledge, New York, 2009.
Klingberg, Göte, *Facets of Children's Literature Research: Collected and Revised Writings*, Swedish Institute for Children's Books, Stockholm, 2008.
Mitu, Florica, *Literatura pentru copii. Antologie de texte comentate, însoțite de sugestii metodice*, Humanitas, București, 2006.
Nières-Chevrel, Isabelle, *La littérature d'enfance et de jeunesse entre la voix, l'image et l'écrit*, in „Vox Poetica”, 30 janvier, <http://www.x-oetica.org/sflgc/biblio/nieres-chevrel.html>, 2011.
Rațiu, Iuliu, *O istorie a literaturii pentru copii și adolescenți*, Prut Internațional, Chișinău, 2006.
Wardetzky, Kristin, *The Structure and Interpretation of Fairy Tales Composed by Children*, in „The Journal of American Folklore”, Vol. 103, No. 408, American Folklore Society, 1990, pp. 157-176.

Corpus : Lungu, Elena, *Jucării din vorbe*, Iași, currently being prepared for publication.