doi: 10.12957/childphilo.2020.45025

from silencing children's literature to attempting to learn from it: changing views towards picturebooks in p4c movement

morteza khosronejad[1]
shiraz university centre for children's literature studies, iran
orcid id: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1110-9434
soudabeh shokrollahzadeh[2]
shiraz university centre for children's literature studies, iran
orcid id: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7093-9430

abstract
This paper investigates critically the approaches to picturebooks as used in the history of philosophy for children (P4C) movement. Our concern with picturebooks rests mainly on Morteza Khosronejad's broader criticism that children's literature has been treated instrumentally by early founders of P4C, the consequence of which is abolishing the independent voice of this literature (2007). As such it demands that we scrutinize the position of children's literature in the history of this educational program, as well as other genres and forms, including picturebooks as a highly valued artistic-literary form to educationalists. In our inquiry, we probe, therefore, the transition of approaches to picturebooks concomitantly with the investigation of the transition of approaches to children's literature. This research evinces that some later scholars and practitioners of P4C have departed significantly not only from Lipman's approach to children's literature and picturebooks, but also from his conceptualization of childhood and philosophy for children. Meanwhile, it demonstrates that in spite of P4C scholars' taking effective steps to address children's literature in general and picturebooks in particular, there are some steps for them to take in order to fully recognize this literature as an independent branch of knowledge and picturebooks as artistic-literary unique works. While revealing the limitations and paradoxes that P4C scholars continue to deal with, in this article, we see Khosronejad's earlier idea (2007) as a suggestion to overcome the instrumentalization of children's literature and picturebooks in P4C. Fundamental dialogue with children's literature theorists particularly those of picturebooks will open new horizons to the realization of our suggestion.

keywords: picturebooks; philosophy for children (p4c); children's literature.

de silenciar la literatura infantil a intentar aprender de ella: cambiar de opinión sobre los libros ilustrados en el movimiento fpn

resumen
Este artículo investiga críticamente los enfoques de los libros ilustrados que se usan en la historia del movimiento de filosofía para niños (FpN). Nuestra preocupación por los libros ilustrados se basa principalmente en la crítica más amplia de Morteza Khosronejad de que la literatura infantil ha sido tratada instrumentalmente por los primeros fundadores de FpN, cuya consecuencia es abolir la voz independiente de esta literatura (2007). Como tal, exige que analicemos la posición de la literatura infantil en la historia de este programa educativo, así como otros géneros y formas, incluidos los picturebooks como una forma

[1] E-mail: m.khosronejad@gmail.com
[2] E-mail: shokrollahzadehs@gmail.com

artístico-literaria muy valorada por los educadores. En nuestra búsqueda, investigamos, por lo tanto, la transición de esos enfoques a los libros ilustrados concomitantemente con la transición a la literatura infantil. Esta investigación demuestra que algunos estudiosos y practicantes posteriores de FpN se han alejado significativamente no solo del enfoque de Lipman sobre la literatura infantil y los libros ilustrados, sino también de su conceptualización de la infancia y de filosofía para niños. A la vez, demuestra que a pesar de que académicos de FpN han tomado medidas efectivas para abordar la literatura infantil en general y los libros ilustrados en particular, hay algunos pasos que deben tomar para reconocer plenamente esta literatura como una rama independiente del conocimiento y los libros ilustrados como obras artísticos y literarias singulares. Si bien revelamos las limitaciones y paradojas con las que los académicos de FpN continúan lidiando, en este artículo, vemos la idea anterior de Khosronejad (2007) como una sugerencia para superar la instrumentalización de la literatura y los libros ilustrados para niños en FpN. El diálogo fundamental con los teóricos de la literatura infantil, particularmente los de los libros ilustrados, abrirá nuevos horizontes para la realización de nuestra sugerencia.

palabras clave: libros ilustrados; filosofía para niños (fpn); literatura infantil.

de silenciar a literatura infantil à tentativa de aprender com ela: mudando as visões dos livros ilustrados no movimento de fpc

resumo
Este artigo investiga criticamente as abordagens dos livros de figuras usadas na história do movimento de filosofia para crianças (FpC). Nossa preocupação com os livros ilustrados baseia-se principalmente nas críticas mais amplas de Morteza Khosronejad de que a literatura infantil foi tratada de maneira instrumental pelos primeiros fundadores do FpC, que, com isso, está abolindo a voz independente dessa literatura (2007). Como tal, exige que examinemos a posição da literatura infantil na história deste programa educacional, bem como outros gêneros e formas, incluindo os livros ilustrados como uma forma artístico-literária altamente valorizada para os educadores. Em nossa investigação, pesquisamos, portanto, a transição de abordagens de livros ilustrados concomitantemente com a transição de abordagens da literatura infantil. Esta pesquisa demonstra que alguns estudiosos e praticantes posteriores do FpC se afastaram significativamente não apenas da abordagem de Lipman sobre a literatura e os livros ilustrados, mas também de sua conceituação de infância e filosofia para crianças. Enquanto isso, demonstra que, apesar dos estudiosos do P4C tomarem medidas efetivas para abordar a literatura infantil em geral e os livros ilustrados em particular, existem algumas etapas a serem seguidas para reconhecer plenamente essa literatura como um ramo independente do conhecimento e os livros ilustrados como obras artísticas e literárias singulares. Embora revele as limitações e paradoxos com que os estudiosos do FpC continuam lidando, neste artigo, vemos a ideia anterior de Khosronejad (2007) como uma sugestão para superar a instrumentalização da literatura infantil e dos livros ilustrados em FpC. O diálogo fundamental com os teóricos da literatura infantil, particularmente os dos livros ilustrados, abrirá novos horizontes para a realização de nossa sugestão.

palavras chave: livros ilustrados; filosofia para crianças (fpc); literatura infantil.

from silencing children's literature to attempting to learn from it: changing views towards picturebooks in p4c movement

> "Alice thought: "What is the use of a book, without pictures and conversation?"
>
> Lewis Carroll (1994, 23)

introduction

It has been forty years since Matthew Lipman, the founder of P4C, deemed writing and illustrating for children "unwholesome" and "parasitical" (Lipman et al, 1980: 36). In 1980, when he articulated this idea about writing and illustrating for children, it was a century after the publication of Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, eighty years after Beatrix Potter's *The Tale of Peter Rabbit* and around seventeen years after Maurice Sendak's *Where the Wild Things Are*. Sara Liptai states that Lipman was against illustrating for children, in spite of his own engagement with aesthetics. His first book is entitled *What Happens in Art* (1967) and aesthetic concepts are discussed in his philosophical novels. "Lipman's ink drawings also decorate several publications he was *associated with* – *yet* there are no illustrations in his novels. He believed that the inclusion of images would restrict children's imagination…" (Liptai, 2012: 199).

Now, some decades after Lipman's rejection of the inclusion of pictures in children's books not only do we find that some researchers and theorists of P4C recognize the importance of pictures in children's books, they employ picturebooks in their philosophical practice, but also discuss picturebooks, in a way identical to theorists of this artistic-literary form.

In this paper, we trace the changing approaches to picturebooksin the history of P4C trying to speculate on the prospects the movement can look to in using these books. The transition of approaches to picturebooks will be studied concomitantly with the investigation of the transition of approaches to children's literature.

This paper advances Khosronejad's argument (2007) against the instrumentalization of children's literature in the P4C movement. Deliberating over the founders' view of P4C towards children's literature, he contends that while

having used children's literature to achieve their goals, the founders have addressed solely the two concepts of philosophy and childhood in theoretical discussions, leaving out children's literature. Theoretical weakness in the field of children's literature in P4C has led to writing stories and novels that are majorly didactic lacking the aesthetic features of the genre. That is why the books written in Lipmanian's tradition have not received attention by literary critics. We contend that marginalizing and instrumentalizing children's literature in P4C can exert negative influence on the attitudes of children-inquirers in CPI towards children's literature. Furthermore, the lack of a tenable literary theory leads to serious limitations in theorization of P4C. Conversely, bringing the discipline of children's literature (especially picturebooks and young adult novels) to the center, working alongside philosophy and childhood studies, prompts the fertility of interdisciplinary dialogues and contributes positively to P4C's theories.

matthew lipman: illustrating children's stories as pre-empting child's imagination

Lipman considers purposefully written philosophical novels more effective than textbooks in teaching philosophy to children (Lipman, 2017: 14). He and his colleague, Ann Margaret Sharp wrote philosophical novels with accompanying instructions and practical manuals to assist teachers in facilitating students' inquiries in CPI. As Jo Oyler (2016) states "Lipman and Sharp were not against teachers using materials from outside of the IAPC curriculum, but did see the philosophical novels as *best equipped* to fully address the pedagogical commitments and theoretical insights of their model" (3) (our emphasis).

Using the terms 'springboard' and 'instrument' when referring to their philosophical novels (stories) (Lipman et al, 1980; Sharp, 2017) Lipman et al affirm their instrumentalist view of this kind of literature. Furthermore, some of their remarks show they consider philosophy and literature as fundamentally different in kind. Lipman and his colleagues (1980) for example, state that there are three ways that children try to cope with the mysteries or marvels they find around them: literal, symbolic and philosophical. Literal meaning embraces satisfaction of children's curiosity through factual information and scientific explanations that

provide them with the causes or purposes of things. They believe that as children want more, they wish for a symbolic interpretation in addition to a literal one. That is why they turn to folklore, fairy tale and countless levels of other artistic inventions (Lipman et al, 1980: 34). The third level, philosophical investigation, embodies metaphysical, logical and ethical questions, demanding philosophical answers. According to this classification, children's literature belonging to the realm of symbolic meaning and is irrelevant to the philosophical level.

Lipman et al are against children's literature because they believe:

> The parent who invents stories for children runs the risk of so indulging his own imagination as to pre-empt the child's imagination[3]. We find delight in the creativity with which we express ourselves in such stories (and in the illustrations that go with them). But to what extent do we rob children of their creativity by doing their imagining for them? (35, 36)

Defending their own writing for children while contending that others such as professional authors of fairy tales (and illustrators) and the writers of textbooks pre-empt children's imagination can be seen as further evidence of their opposition. They argue that their "purpose [had not] been to establish an immortal children's literature, but to get children thinking" (ibid, 36). Drawing on this pedagogical aim, they suppose the tradition of writing purposefully philosophical narratives as encouraging rather than pre-empting children's imagination. To them the narrative accompanies inquirers insofar as their thinking is kindled; after that the narrative self-destructs, as a match burns up once it has lit the fire (ibid).

Lipman himself writes *for* children yet resists illustrating philosophical novels as he and his colleagues "feel that to do so is to do for children what they

[3] Lipman et al (1980) idea that "the parent who invents stories for children runs the risk of so indulging his own imagination as to pre-empt the child's imagination. We find delight in the creativity with which we express ourselves in such stories (and in the illustrations that go with them). But to what extent do we rob children of their creativity by doing their imagining for them" (35-36) is reminiscent of Jacqueline Rose's argument about the impossibility of children's fiction (1984). Rose, a critic of children's literature offered her critical study on these issue three years after Lipman et al above-mentioned argumentation. Taking up a Freudian psychoanalysis she considers children's fiction "… even a seduction" (Rose, 1984: 2) because rather than addressing children's needs, these books satisfy the needs and desires of adults. As evident, Lipman et al and Rose are in agreement with each other on the impossibility of children's literature. Yet they are different in explanation of this impossibility in that while Rose speaks of the pleasure of author's sexual intentions in creation of children's fiction, Lipman et al foregrounds the author's pleasure of imagination. So, unlike the critics of children's literature who attribute the 'impossibility of children's fiction' to Rose, Lipman is the originator of this idea.

should do for themselves: provide the imagery that accompanies reading and interpretation" (ibid, 35-36). Based on this mindset, Lipman leaves blank pages in some of his novels like *Pixie* intended for children to provide illustrations themselves. Although his attention to children's own illustrating when and/ or after reading novels is a commendable initiative allowing them to participate in meaning-making more, it does not indicate Lipman's change of view towards picture inclusion in children's books, In the following sections we will explore the ways in which different P4C scholars deviated from Lipman's position on the use of picturebooks in philosophical inquiry. By doing so we will not only demonstrate the distance the literature has come, but also point to areas in which theoretical advances could still be made. We conclude with an epilogue which gives insight to the future of P4C regarding the use of children's literature and picturebooks.

david kennedy: approaching the word-image relationship in theory but silent about it in practice

David Kennedy, as a scholar of P4C and author of philosophical novels[4], manifests his approach to children's literature and to some extent picturebooks in 'using *Peter Rabbit* as a philosophical text with young children[5] (1992/2010) in which he provides methodological reflections on how to use classics of children's literature as philosophical texts with children. Analyzing *The Tale of Peter Rabbit*, Kennedy makes the pedagogical connection between the methodology of philosophy for children and high-quality children's literature. Pursuing this goal places, him among the scholars who acknowledge children's literature as the first-hand material for philosophizing. He compares Lipmanian purposefully written philosophical novels with children's books –which are not written purposefully for this program- stating that identical to philosophical novels, children's books abound in philosophical implications and the fact that children's literature does not directly model CPI does not exclude it from use in philosophical dialogue (Kennedy, 2010: 190). He finds commonalities between purposefully written philosophical novels

[4] *My Name is Myshkin* and *Dreamer* are two of his philosophical novels.
[5] This article was first published in (1992) and then reprinted in Kennedy, D. *Philosophical Dialogue with Children: Essays on Theory and Practice* (2010).

and children's books such as *The Tale of Peter Rabbit* in which they both depend on fictional narrative, with the ambiguities and complexities created by its multiple subtexts, to communicate concepts (ibid).

It seems that Kennedy recognizes children's literature as philosophical text due to the philosophical themes and concepts contained in them, which-Lipman's novels similarly contain. However, there is a difference between the two in which while the latter is designed for a direct pedagogical approach to P4C and consequently the philosophical concepts are at the surface, the former embodies them at deeper levels. Finally, he recognizes the co-existence of both in CPI (ibid). In the analysis of *The Tale of Peter Rabbit* Kennedy regarding it as a deep philosophical illustrated text believes that "under deceptive simplicity that is characteristic of *The Tale of Peter Rabbit* is the result of the interplay of a number of subtexts, which interact in prolific and ambiguous ways with narratives[6]: Actually there are two surface narratives: the story and the illustrations" (ibid, 183). Kennedy distances himself from Lipman and colleagues when he states that "The book is typically read aloud to children, and the pictures and the written-word-read-aloud combine to create a rich, multisensory textual space worthy of the young child's vivid sensorium, intense imaginative life, and keen sense of wonder" (ibid). Further, by his emphasis on creating a space that is the result of the interaction of written-word-read-aloud and pictures as well as his regarding the pictures as an independent narrative layer he approaches awareness of word-image relationship in picturebooks. However, in spite of all the advancement he brings to the issue of picturebooks in CPI, he does not analyze the interactions of word-image that constitute the whole existence of picturebooks, but rather he identifies three levels of subtextual narrative pattern: developmental, social and mythic narrative.

gareth b. matthews and thomas e. wartenberg: considering the written text, but silent about the pictures

[6] Kennedy's statement is reminiscent of Perry Nodelman's remark in his article "Pleasure and genre: speculations on the characteristics of children's fiction" (2000) in which he writes: I like them [picturebooks including The Tale of Peter Rabbit] I believe, because they resonate—because they seem so simple and yet allow for so much thought. (2).

a. gareth b. matthews

Children's literature, for Matthews, goes hand in hand with children's rights and child art as a way of realizing childhood philosophy. In *philosophy of childhood* (1994) in the chapter "literature for children", although he appears as a childhood philosopher, not a literary theorist, his response to the 'impossibility' of children's fiction — a seminal issue at the heart of theories of children's literature (Jacqueline Rose, 1984) — has profound implications for theorists and researchers of this literature. The significant achievements of Matthews' approach to children's literature in PC4 are as follows:

1) Contrary to Lipman, who instrumentalizes children's literature, considering it a 'springboard', Matthews deems some fictions inherently philosophical. Furthermore, he deserves recognition as the discoverer of a new genre in children's literature named by him 'philosophical whimsy' (Khosronejad, 2008: 323). Children's fictions for Matthews is authentic literature, because it raises "hard questions with directedness and simplicity and also ideally with humor" (Matthews, 1994: 110). As pointed out before, Lipman and colleagues discuss three levels of meaning-making among them philosophical investigation, manifested in the form of philosophical questions, is not allied to symbolic interpretation. But, it seems that Matthews makes an inextricable link between the two when he considers the philosophical questions raised in children's stories as an important factor of their authenticity.

2) Criticizing developmental psychologists such as Piaget, Matthews (1980) contends that neither developmental psychologists nor educational theorists are sensitive to young children's philosophical thinking. Instead, the writers of children's stories–or at least some of them–are the only adults who recognize the fact that many children are naturally intrigued by philosophical questions (56).

Although Matthews underlines the importance of children's literature in P4C, and he analyzes some picturebooks as suitable materials for CPI, he says nothing about the importance of these books, the function and significance of the pictures in them and the interactions of word-image. What fascinates him are the *philosophical themes and issues* reflected in some picturebooks.

b. thomas e. wartenberg

Thomas E. Wartenberg recognizes children's literature, especially picturebooks, as a good way of teaching philosophy to children. He considers basing philosophical discussion on picturebooks as the second 'big idea' underlying his 'big ideas for little kids' program. (Wartenberg, 2019: xvii). For him, picturebooks and children's literature, in general have a double function. On the one hand, stimulating philosophical discussions they allow children to articulate and substantiate their thinking on important philosophical issues. On the other hand, they enhance all the other areas of the grade-school curriculum (Wartenberg, 2009: 7). To Wartenberg, the pleasure of children's books comes from the first function in that they "call attention to philosophical issues that arise in the course of the lives of their protagonists" (Wartenberg, 2013: 143). The second function of children's literature lies in the role it plays in literacy.

Hand in hand with Matthews' idea of recognizing children as 'natural philosophers' Wartenberg has benefitted from picturebooks in philosophically working with children. He believes that many bewildering complexities of the world, which baffles and amuses both young children and adult philosophers, are reflected in picturebooks. To him, picturebooks make philosophical puzzles and questions tangible.

All in all, Wartenberg like Matthews speaks only of the *written text* of picturebooks, while remaining silent about pictures. Yet there is a subtle difference between the two in that Matthews does not address the term 'picturebook' in his writings, while Wartenberg demonstrates greater consciousness of this artistic-literary form by mentioning the term explicitly.

Wartenberg has recently edited *Philosophy in classroom and beyond: New approaches to picture-book philosophy (big ideas for young thinkers)* (2019), a compilation of the papers whose authors have followed his approach. Although a number of authors of this volume introduce innovations and initiatives in *using* picturebooks (mostly in CPI), the dominant approach to this artistic-literary form pays special attention to philosophical issues and themes embedded in picturebooks and

sometimes image analysis and yet, the interactions of word-image constituting the existence and identity of picturebooks remain unexplored. Wartenberg himself, as the author of the introductory and final chapter of this book, still maintains his earlier view (2007 & 2009) towards picturebooks when he expounds the process of introducing the picturebooks approach to philosophy undergraduates.

sarah liptai: picturebooks and art education in p4c (pictures at the center of attention)

Sara Liptai (2012) has focused on the connections between P4C and art education in secondary school curriculum. Central to Liptai's approach is consideration of pictures in picturebooks rather than the interactions of word-image. Yet Liptai seems to be acquainted with one definition of picturebooks, when she considers them as 'dual narrative' in which, "pictures either tell a slightly different story from the words or generally amplify the story told in words"(Liptai, 2012: 199). But her preoccupation with art education has made her focus on the pictorial medium of picturebooks, rather than seeing this form as a whole.

In Liptai's view, the pictures in picturebooks have a twofold function: they are both an independent stimulus for inquiry and a specific source of aesthetic analysis – such as moods and artistic styles. Although Liptai is mostly interested in single image, she prefers using picturebooks over single image in teaching; because in her view "the outstanding quality and wide range of art work makes picture books both rich and appropriate resource for aesthetic enquiry with secondary students". Furthermore, "they are easily available" and "unlike a single image, they offer a ready-made context for an artist's work: each picture can be considered both on its own and in relation to all the others in the book." (Liptai, 2012: 200).

karin murris and joanna haynes: philosophy with picturebooks

Picturebooks for Karin Murris generally occupy a higher position in comparison with all her predecessors. Contrary to what some of Lipman's followers consider his unique contribution to P4C with his writing of philosophical novels (Oyler, 2016) these works are the targets of criticism for Murris, as she claims that

philosophical novels fail to engage children's imagination. Murris who specialized in children's literature before embarking on her study of philosophy (Murris, 1997: vii) was an early critic of Lipman's rejection of children's literature and as Pritchard (2018) says, an early objector to Lipman's resistance to using illustrated materials. Practicing philosophy with children through picturebooks led her to consider the visual materials, especially picturebooks as 'the most appropriate' for philosophizing. She subsequently developed her approach, 'philosophy with picture books' in *Teaching Philosophy with Picture books* (1992), a textbook written for teachers intending to work with this artistic-literary form. Pursuing her contestation over the movement's early dismissive attitude towards using pictorial materials, Murris in her PhD. dissertation, *metaphors of the child's mind: Teaching philosophy to young children* (1997) defended using existing children's literature and especially picturebooks as the materials for philosophizing speaking of P4C gradual changing attitude towards using them. She deemed Philip Cam's *thinking stories* with illustrations and her own use of existing picturebooks as examples of this change. Thenceforth, in collaboration with Joanna Haynes she developed her approach both theoretically and practically in CPI. What follows is a chronological look at their approach.

Storywise: Thinking through stories (2000) is Murris and Haynes' first joint publication, in which they justify using picturebooks as follows:

> **1. An entire story.** Pictures cannot stand on their own, neither can the text. Working together, words and pictures narrate an entire story.
> **2. Thought-provoking.** Like words and sentences, in high quality picturebooks, we have to give meaning to the pictures. In order to give meaning to pictures we connect our own knowledge, our own lives and ourselves with what we see.
> **3. Existing resources.** Picture books are usually already used to teach infants to read. The pictures 'trap' the children into reading the text. And then they can move on to reading books with only a few illustrations and more text, until they reach a level where illustrations are no longer required.
> **4. Rich, sensual images**. Picture books are like poems in their intensity and power and some of them are sensual. It is at this point that picture books and philosophy meet, as Philosophy is not exclusively cognitive, but interwoven with sensual elements.
> **5. All ages**. Picture books are good material, not only for philosophical works with young children, but for all age levels.

> **6. A vehicle for thought.** Each picture book is used primarily as a vehicle for philosophical thought – not to explore *the* meaning of the book 'put' into it by the author. Nor is each book regarded as an object for aesthetic reflection, although occasionally this might be the case. The emphasis has been to use the books as starting points for philosophical investigation.
> **7. Binary concepts.** Picture books often deal with abstract binary concepts such as bad/good, right/wrong, love/hate, life/death. From an early age, children are puzzled by everything that falls between those concepts: fairies, trolls, vampires, witches, and ghosts etc. which have immense appeal for children. (pp 9-10).

We can infer from Murris and Haynes' reasons for using picturebooks that: 1) They significantly distance themselves from Lipman, when they state that words and pictures in picturebooks are interdependent both working together in meaning-making. And by emphasizing the sensual features of both picturebooks and philosophy (No. 4) contributes significantly to this distance. 2). In spite of the fact that Murris and Haynes start breaking away from Lipman's instrumentalism, they still use the words 'vehicle' and 'starting point' when referring to 'picturebooks' (No. 6). 3) Contrary to logocentric approaches, the authentic role of pictures in picturebooks has been captivating for Murris and Haynes. They characterize this artistic-literary form as thought-provoking (No. 2). They therefore underline the vital function of pictures in meaning-making and yet believe that reaching higher levels of reading occurs when the child is able to read texts without any need for illustrations (No. 3) which is another manifestation of an instrumentalist position in a way that 'pictorial text' is instrumentalized to teach the 'verbal text' reading.

In *Picturebook, pedagogy and philosophy* (2012) Haynes and Murris move from an instrumentalist view towards greater recognition of picturebooks and respect for their artistic and aesthetic existence. To the extent that it is related to the present article, there are some core issues in this book for which the authors argue: 1) criticism of Lipman's approach (his belief in demarcation of three levels of meaning-making, his ignorance of emotion and imagination contribution to philosophical ideas; and his conflation of 'imagery' with 'imagination') and 2) expanding their view on children's literature and the roles of picturebooks in CPI (giving the reasons for using picturebooks in CPI, providing criteria for selecting picturebooks, and differentiating their own approach from their predecessors).

Haynes and Murris' criticism of Lipman is more conspicuous in this book when referring to Lipman's demarcation of three levels of meaning-making (literal, symbolic and philosophical). They state that since philosophical meaning for Lipman is neither literal nor symbolic, existing children's literature is not suitable for teaching philosophy to children. In response to this claim they specify two limitations, the first of which lies in P4C's implicit theory of meaning which they consider to be logocenrtic and logic-oriented. They then spell out that Lipman's philosophical novels are steeped in topics and exercises that are part of academic philosophy courses in formal and informal logic. In this perspective, even children's moral responses need to be disciplined by logic. To show the extent to which meaning-making in P4C is logocentric, they touch upon Lipman et al (1980) assertion that "*what a statement means* consists in the inferences that can *logically* be drawn from and inference is reasoning from what is given literally to what is suggested or implied" (Haynes & Murris, 2012: 63)

Regarding it as static and ignorant of the role of emotion and imagination in meaning-making, Haynes and Murris interrogate this theory of meaning. They instead provide an alternative avenue drawing on imagination and moral values, in addition to considering emotion as an inextricable part of the process of reasonable judgments.

For Haynes and Murris, Lipman et al's other drawback is that, they conflate 'imagery' with 'imagination'. They write that imagination, frequently equivalent to 'visualization' is conceptualized as the faculty of the mind to create pictures 'in' the mind. However, the etymological roots of the term imagination, *imago*, demonstrates that it also denotes representation. Based on this etymology, imagination allows flexible rehearsal of the possible situations (a situation like Willy's goal against a gorilla goalkeeper in Anthony Browne's *Willy the Wizard*[7]) and to combine knowledge in unusual ways as, for example, in a thought experiment. Hence, it is wrong to assume imagination is in disagreement and challenge with reason (Haynes and Murris, 2012: 62-69).

[7] Willy the chimp loves football. But he doesn't have any boots, so he's never picked for the team. Then one evening Willy is given a strange pair of old-looking football boots... Willy's luck is about to change! (https://www.penguin.com.au/books/willy-the-wizard-9780552549356)

Just as other approaches to picturebooks we have already investigated, that of Haynes and Murris is studied in the context of their view of children's literature[8]. They consider children's literature as part of a culture's ideology[9] recognizing the question of "who is children's literature for" as a political one; because the answer hinges on the view of children, their ability to think for themselves, and their place in society. (Haynes and Murris, 2012: 118). According to these two scholars, a literary work is the one that affects us profoundly and it is one by which we are addressed to understand what it means to be human. To them, what makes a narrative philosophical is an investigation into 'existence', illuminating humans' concrete being. Children's literature effects the body, in the way that we sigh, keep calm or get excited when reading words and seeing pictures, the power of words and pictures—and the interdependency of word-image in the case of picturebooks—influences the power of a story and the penetration and emotion it provokes in CPI (117). As far as the emotions in picturebooks are concerned, they suppose that the gaps between words and images demand imagination and empathetic understanding which offers a unique kind of emotional knowledge (87).

The reasons why Haynes and Murris have found contemporary picturebooks rich materials for philosophizing are that they bend, stretch or break the rules (39); open up space between the 'real' world and other possible worlds which encourages a free exploration of philosophical ideas; employ postmodern devices that disturb

[8] P4C scholars' views towards picturebooks have mostly been embedded in their views towards children's literature. But it is the case when discussing specifically instrumentalization of children's literature and studying the phenomenon of picturebooks in the beginning and middle of its development. The course of picturebooks' development both in the history of children's literature and P4C evinces that the apex of picturebooks growth and expansion is grounded in the growth and expansion of children's literature. However, considering the unique characteristics of picturebooks, these works have been slowly becoming an independent phenomenon in theorization, adding new concepts and principles to children's literature criticism unprecedented in the history of this literature criticism and thus we can claim that now it is picturebooks theory and criticism that is generally decisive in establishing new conceptualization of children's literature and providing a basis for it.

[9] It is another indicative of the authors' being under the influence of children's literature theories. They have imported the issue of 'ideology' from these theories. More than two decades ago John Stephens pointed out that there cannot be a narrative without an ideology; Murris and Haynes employ this idea in relation to their speculation up on picturebooks quoting Stephens that "even carnivalesque or interrogative texts can mask both conservative and liberal ideologies and hide didactic and educational purposes. (Stephens, 1992: 125; cited in Haynes & Murris, 2012: 39).

the readers' expectations; and hold up a mirror for the adult, encouraging a self-critical stance (21).

Murris and Haynes (2012) have identified the following criteria for selecting picturebooks for use in CPI: epistemological, ethical and political and finally aesthetic, among them the 'aesthetic' is chiefly adopted from the findings of picturebooks' scholars. They have also found that "books that are considered 'good' for giving the right moral message are not 'good' at all for philosophy". Therefore, one needs to distinguish between children's literature and narratives written for didactic purposes. Good narratives kindle the imagination and question posing, without necessarily knowing the 'right' answer (117). Elsewhere, Haynes and Murris (2013) mention particular qualities in the selection of picturebooks: ambiguity and complexity, the ability to make the familiar appear strange, playfulness, provoking questions that cannot easily be settled through empirical investigation, engaging the emotions and the imagination, questioning power relationships between adults and children, blurring the boundaries between social and anti-social behaviors and offering the reader the opportunity to become immersed in other places, times or characters and that invite critical reflection (1088).

Besides criticizing Lipman's approach to children's literature and use of illustrated materials in CPI, Haynes and Murris see their approach to children's literature and using picturebooks in teaching philosophy differently from Matthews who has focused on philosophical themes embedded in children's fiction and has been in search of finding similarities between children's responses and adult philosophers to justify his claim of children's inherent ability to philosophize. They instead, step into a paradigm that contrary to Matthews is not adult philosophy, but "suggest[s] a more expanded notion of rationality that critiques modernist and rationalist philosophies" (Haynes & Murris, 2012: 61). In line with this project, these two scholars are specifically intrigued by "children's philosophical perspectives and what they can bring to academic philosophy as a discipline" (ibid). Their use of children's literature is integral to such a project and as they state "not accidental to it" (ibid).

Murris (2014) believes that the philosophical use of selected picturebooks calls for a particular epistemology and therefore, pedagogy. She claims that the ambiguity and complexity of picturebooks entails pedagogy that positions children as able meaning-makers and problem-posers. (146). She also posits that meaning in picturebooks is constructed in the space between words, images and embodied readers (152).

The years between 2012 to 2014 is evidently, the period of Murris and Haynes' taking further steps towards recognition of children's literature in P4C by expanding and deepening their critiques of Lipman's approach; as well as visiting and acknowledging the achievements of prominent critics and theorists of picturebooks. Furthermore, they are close to reader-response approaches to children's literature in their realization of picturebooks not only as the interactions of the word-image, but also with the child involved. As such, in the realization of these books the child as meaning-maker is given a position equal to that of the words and images.

In her article (2016 a) Murris clarifies her change of mind regarding her use of the spelling 'picturebooks' instead of 'picture book'; because she found good quality picturebooks more than just books with illustrations (4). Furthermore, following the theorists of picturebooks (Sipe, 1998; Lewis; 2001; Nikolajea & Scott, 2006) she defines this artistic-literary form as a phenomenon "involve[ing] *two* very different interdependent sign systems (the images and the words). The reader… is pulled in different directions of meaning-making by the use of those two different sign systems; the linear direction of the text invites readers to continue reading; the picture compels them to ponder" (ibid).

In *The Posthuman Child: Educational Transformation through Philosophy with Picturebooks* (2016 b) Murris, adopts a posthumanist approach through which she moves from a semiotic approach towards a relational materialist ontoepistemology. Adopting critical posthumanism has directed her to pay more attention to the materiality of picturebooks such as the effects of graphic design, choice of art style,

visual grammar, use of colours and medium (paper, virtual, etc.)[10]. To her, there are infinite material discursive elements that could and should be considered when reading picturebooks (Murris, 2016 b)

In another joint article, "Intra-generational education: Imagining a post-age Pedagogy" (2017) drawing on two concepts of posthumanist theorists, Braidotti's 'omadic subject' and Barad's conception of 'agency', Haynes and Murris discuss the intra-generational education that has emerged out of their objections to the discourse of developmentality. It is in this context that they consider contemporary picturebooks as post-age philosophical texts being able to constitute an ageless curriculum for intra-generational education. Due to provoking emotion and aesthetic aspects, picturebooks pave the way for thinking about age differently. It seems that Murris and Haynes' theoretical and practical work with picturebooks, as philosophical texts have led them to identify four concepts of agelessness, playfulness, homelessness and wakefulness in these books that support post-age pedagogy (Haynes & Murris, 2017b).

Of paramount importance in Murris and Haynes' approach concerning meaning-making through picturebooks is interactions of elements engaged in CPI. In the article "Readings and readers of texts in philosophy for children" (2017 a) drawing on Biesta's concept of 'subjectification' they argue for a relational ontology in which individuals and the texts are not self-contained and their existence depends on each other (176). In other words, they exist in a symbiotic relationship with one another and the interplay of text, reader and reading is therefore highly decisive. In this view not only the child, but the text, comes into existence in interactions with other elements. Based on Murris and Haynes' general criticism of developmentalism discourse Murris (2016 a) claims that P4C focuses on

[10] Posthumanism also known as relational materialism, critical posthumanism, feminist posthumanism and new materialism (Murris, 2016 b: 8) redefines the meaning of human being previously assumed in knowledge production. It focuses on the interdependence between human, animal and machine. For feminist philosopher, Rosi Braidotti, posthumanism is not a concept, but a navigational tool that helps us rethink the place of human in the bio-genetic age known as anthropocene (Murris, 2016 a: 59). Murris emphasizes that her posthumanist approach is a radical break from her original philosophical orientation in that this current one welcomes a non-hierarchal, monist philosophy of education that is critical of anthropocentric gaze. (Murris, 2016 a: 6).

development in understanding philosophical concepts based on age sequence. The older the children get, the deeper and more complex concepts are offered to them[11].

Murris then, compares Lipman's philosophical novels with her approach, 'philosophy with picturebooks' concerning the *position* they give to the child. She maintains that his novels position the child as the "abnormal, thinking and adult philosopher's child modeled in communities of inquiry with peers" (5). But philosophy with picturebooks, conceptualizes the child as an individual involved in "inquiries about fantastical scenarios in the void between reality and fantasy, rather than about the world as it is" (for the adult philosopher) (ibid). While in Lipman's approach, "child-philosopher-like is firmly embedded in adult assumptions and desires about how a child should be", philosophy with picturebooks, "does not locate the philosophical 'in' texts themselves but in the space in between text, child reader, and adult reader (teacher)" (ibid).

As this exploration has made evident, we are able once more to discern how Murris and Hynes are spiraling on to an extended process of raising objections to Lipman, moving to deeper recognition of picturebooks.

robert fisher: approaching literary criticism in cpi

Robert Fisher took up an approach to children's literature distanced from that of P4C originators. Taking into account a variety of materials for philosophizing including philosophical novels, traditional stories, children's fictions, curriculum-based narratives, picturebooks, pictures and photos, artifacts and objects, drama, role play, first-hand experience, poetry, music, TV and video and factual narrative is representative of such a distance. Among these materials traditional stories, children's fictions, poetry and picturebooks fall under the general rubric of children's literature that Fisher suggests as suitable materials for philosophizing.

[11] With such an approach to developmental perspectives in P4C, it seems that it is necessary to question Vygotsky's psychological theory as the basis of the program, because in addition to being developmental, Vygotsky's thinking is based on the zone of proximal development (ZPD) and internalization, which lead to the dominance of the adult's voice over the child's in CPI. To gain familiarity with critiques of Vygotsky's theory and to see suggestions regarding the ways in which this theory could become compatible with the objectives of P4C, see Khosronejad and Shokrollahzadeh (2018).

Fisher's view towards the function of the story in teaching thinking is another example of carrying such a distance. Although his use of the term 'stimulus' when referring to the stories may imply the instrumentalization of children's literature, he hints that, children's literature (at least some of it) does not function as the stimulus (of thinking) in the sense used by the founders of P4C. When discussing the advantages of using thinking stories in the classroom and making meaning from them, Fisher mentions the opportunities stories bestow on children, to 'decentre' them from the immediacy of their own personal lives' and "become able to look at themselves through looking at and thinking about others" (Fisher, 2013: 93). For decentering to be achieved, one needs to question the story which involves interrogating the narrative text or story; to interpret the story in which she/he seeks precise meanings and gives reasons for judgments; and to discuss issues arising from the story which embraces finding answers to questions that have arisen (ibid). Meaning-making to Fisher demands reflecting upon, interpreting and discussing the elements of narrative such as context (setting of the story), temporal order, particular events, intentions (intentions and motivation of the characters), choices, in quest for meaning of the story, genres and the telling (distinction between the narrative plot, and its mode of telling). The example Fisher gives from the inquiries into thinking stories with children indicates what they have done in the process of inquiry is identical to what we do in the process of literary criticism.

To defend children's literature as a material for philosophizing, Fisher lays the foundation of his argument on Lipman and colleagues' demarcation of three levels of children's meaning-making (literal, symbolic and philosophical) based on which children's literature is only suitable for symbolic interpretation and not philosophical investigations. In response, he states that "much of the best of children's fiction includes metaphysical themes such as time, space and human identity; logical themes to do with informal reasoning and the interpretation of meaning; and ethical themes to do with the rightness of actions and moral judgments" (106). Well-aware of the pros and cons of Lipman's novels, as far as the former is concerned, Fisher posits that "it may be that Lipman's novels express these

themes in a more expository way" (ibid) and yet they lack "the motivating and imaginatively nourishing qualities of the best of children's fiction" (ibid).

Fisher also questions Lipman's stance towards picturebooks. In Fisher's opinion, the reason why philosophers like Lipman avoid illustrations is that pictures do not contain within them propositional units of meaning in the way sentences do. But Fisher believes that both words and pictures demand interpretation, and the active construction of meaning. According to Fisher, high quality picturebooks such as John Burningham's *Would You Rather…* and Maurice Sendak's *Where the Wild Things Are* are worthwhile as they open the gap between the words and the pictures, forcing the reader/viewer to work hard to forge a conceptual and narrative relationship between them. He considers wordless picturebooks as powerful incentive for visual thinking and for the translation of the visual into the verbal (108).

We can conclude that Fisher is in tune with Murris and Haynes' criticisms of Lipman's view of children's literature and childhood, making space for more participation of children's literature and artworks in P4C.

mary roche: picturebooks and literacy, critical thinking and book talk (ct & bt)

Some scholars including Mary Roche, have used picturebooks to develop critical and creative thinking (Murris, 2016 a: 4). CT & BT approach emphasizes the neglected aspects of literacy, such as the development of oral language, critical thinking, love of reading, and the development of the ability to respond to literature in an authentic fashion through dialogue and discussion. Cultivating her approach in *Developing Children's Critical Thinking through Picturebooks* (2015) Roche ultimately aims at indicating how students can become critical thinkers through picturebooks. Her application of 'critical thinking' as a requirement for critical literacy and critical pedagogy is necessary for meaning-making of our lives and the world as well as reflective assessment of social practices and ideology. Therefore, students need to be able to discover the implicit and explicit ideologies of the texts.

In *Developing Children's Critical Thinking through Picturebooks* (2015) Roche addresses picturebooks richly, justifying the reasons for using them as follows:

1) Being immense sources of pleasure; 2) Sparking off an interest in reading for beginner students; 3) Developing children of all ages' thinking and dialogue skills in discussion groups; 4) Encouraging the development of critical literacy and visual literacy in people of all ages; 5) Contributing extensively to classrooms becoming an open democratic space for collaborative enquiry and exploration; 6) Providing students and teachers with opportunities for creating knowledge and for expanding understanding and empathy towards others; 7) Keeping children who were in danger of losing love of reading engaged; 8) Developing children's aesthetic interest; 9) Generating discussions that exposes a wide diversity of perspectives and assumptions about the world; 10) Having huge potential for exploratory dialogues between adult and adult readers as well as between adult and child and child and child readers; 11) Inviting speculative and imaginative responses because of the indeterminacies, or gaps the filling of which makes the reader a meaning-maker and so a coauthor of the text (79 & 81).

Identical to Murris and Haynes, Roche prefers 'picturebook' spelling to 'picture book' and 'picture-book' because it has the intricacy of the relationship between words and pictures and also allows for the wordless and the non-fictional forms (81). Roche devotes a whole chapter of her book to theories of picturebooks; since in her view these theories contribute to a deep understanding of this phenomenon. Furthermore, they also help choose good picturebooks for discussion and interpretation with children. With this perspective, she explores many definitions and features of picturebooks as provided by literary critics, educationalists[12] and illustrators from which we have extracted a number of issues:

> 1. Qualities of picturebooks: representing two levels of communication, the visual and the verbal as the essence of this form, the aesthetic relationship between pictures and text, metafiction, semiotic[13], semiotic and advertising[14], intertextuality,

[12] Roche quotes from some scholars who discuss the potentials of picturebooks for encouraging philosophizing. Maagerø and Østbye (2012), for instance, emphasize the gaps to be filled by the readers of picturebooks. They state that "gaps in the iconotext …may encourage the readers to go into dialogues concerning philosophical wonderings and puzzles" (cited in Roche, 2015: 85).

[13] By this item, Roche means the incorporation of text-image creates polysemy and that picturebooks convey both temporal and spatial information.

[14] Roche referring to McAlister and Cornwell (2010) remarks that picturebooks could be seen as a very powerful way to counteract some of the risks associated with being targeted by producers of commodities. To her children who have experience at discussing and examining picturebooks for

> irony, benefitting from postmodern literary theory in the process of creation and criticism of picturebooks
> 2. The functions of picturebooks: meaning-making, developing critical literacy, developing imaginative responses, encouraging philosophizing, developing awareness; in a sense that provides opportunity to be more human and offering unique experience for all ages;
> 3. Audience of picturebooks: all ages. (80-99).

While she tries to find as many definitions and characteristics of picturebooks as possible, she does not offer her own definition. However, she does voices her idea of what a 'good' picturebook is.

Despite the fact that Roche considers picturebooks as 'stimulus' (4) 'springboard' (7) and 'vehicle' her overall view reveals that we cannot considered her approach thoroughly instrumentalist for two reasons. Firstly, the ability of literary understanding, for her is an aim per se. Secondly, her emphasis on aesthetics of picturebooks (for example, elements of picturebooks such as 'peritext'). Among the scholars of P4C active in the field of picturebooks, Roche seems to be one of the few who has addressed the paramount importance of 'peritext' in picturebooks. Criticizing the neglect of peritexts by teachers she states; "Let the children have time to study the illustrations. Let them examine all of the images, including the covers front and back, the endpapers and the introductory pages" (16). To her, the reasons for this importance are that "[these] pages are very important for setting the scene and providing clues and cues as to what the story is about. They have been carefully chosen and considered by the author, the illustrator and the publisher" (ibid).

Citing Sipe and McGuire, Roche refers to the implication of peritexts as "aesthetic coherence to the entire book" (17). She, then states that if we invite children to listen to the story and look at the pictures and think about peritexts they are being invited into a dialogue (ibid). in conjunction with scholars of picturebooks, Roche continuously characterizes these books as polysemic, multimodal and ironic. Intertextuality, metafiction and benefitting from techniques

their hidden messages or ideology may be able to begin to critique the consumerist ideology that is inherent in messages (Roche, 2015: 91-92).

of postmodern art are other characteristics she attributes to this artistic-literary form in agreement with picturebook scholars.

epilogue

In this inquiry we have explored the process of changing views towards picturebooks in the P4C movement. It demonstrates that from the inception of this educational program these views have changed significantly in a way that we can speak of as an alteration from picture exclusion to careful consideration of the text-image interaction along with a move from a pessimistic view to an optimistic one. We also observe that while Kennedy and Murris have simultaneously (1992) paid attention to the text-image relationship in picturebooks, this seminal point is not followed by Kennedy himself nor the later scholars such as Matthews and Wartenberg. In fact, Murris, Haynes and Roche are the only scholars who have seriously pursued the issue. Another change is a shift in views towards literariness of children's literature in CPI. While disregarded previously, disposition to literariness is increasingly emphasized. Moreover, it appears that for some scholars like Murris and Haynes (implicitly), Fisher (more explicitly) and Roche (with even more explicitness, explication and emphasis) a space is opened to dialogue about the books per se.

It seems that what Khosronejad (2007) proposed is happening now in that P4C thinkers have slowly and practically stepped into the explication of children's literature and specifically picturebooks. They have also appended children's literature to the previous duality of philosophy and childhood; as if they are about to conclude that it is high time to talk about a 'dialogue' between 'philosophy', 'child' and 'children's literature', instead of making children's literature the instrument of children's philosophical thinking. Besides, in this process they have inevitably reached out to 'other side of relationship[15] (i.e. children's literature theories) and

[15] It is the title of a part of Khosronejad's paper (2007) that addresses the capability of children's literature theories to meet the needs of P4C program. In addition to Khosronejad, Peter R. Costello similarly marks this point. As the editor of *philosophy in children's literature* (2012) in the introduction of this book, he addresses how Western philosophy has marginalized children's literature, after addressing how this philosophy has relegated children to the status of seldom mentioned for a long time. According to him, pre-modern philosophy has deemed children's literature a means of raising children. But not as philosophical in nature. He continues that it is by means of development in

listened to its voice. Therefore, it can be concluded that the P4C movement — or at least parts of it — is significantly distancing itself from an instrumentalist stance to children's literature and, ultimately, it is hearing and recognizing the voice of children's literature alongside the other two, namely, philosophy and childhood studies, expanding interdisciplinary dialogues accordingly. The continuous references made by Haynes, Murris, Fisher and specially Roche to picturebooks provide evidence of this shift. By taking the child into account in the process of meaning-making, the scholars of P4C have approached reader-response (Aidan Chambers) to some extent and even 'childist' criticism (Peter Hunt). A part of the terminology Roche has chosen for her approach (book talk) is also the title of a book by Chambers in which he makes efforts to bring children and books together. In another of his books, *Tell me*[16], Chambers places the child as critic. As a result, we can claim that Murris, Haynes and especially Roche have managed to realize special approaches to children's literature in P4C by living in close proximity to children's literature theories.

However, there are some steps yet to be taken for the voice of children's literature to be fully heard. First, it is true that the above-mentioned scholars have come nearer to the given destination, but by still insisting on viewing children's literature as an instrument, they are acting paradoxically. As an illustration, one can claim that although the scholars have initiated explanations of picturebooks regarding them implicitly as phenomena standing on their own, their persistence on the use of the terms 'vehicle' and 'starting point' to refer to picturebooks does not obliterate the vestige of instrumentalist view towards children's literature and picturebooks. Second, the definition of picturebooks as presented by Murris and Haynes (2000) and Murris (2016 a) seems doubtful and controversial, as they

twentieth century philosophy that views towards the concept of childhood, the child and children's literature has changed. After paying homage to Lipman and his followers to address the notion of childhood, he accentuates that the aims of *philosophy in children's literature*'s authors is to continue this path with special emphasis on taking children's literature seriously in the movement considering it as itself philosophical. To this end, he then suggests that philosophers and educationalists need to live with theorists and critics of children's literature (e.g., Nikolajeva and Nodelman) benefitting from their findings joining to the ongoing dialogue between educationalists and children's literature expertise.

[16] Chambers, A. (1993). *Tell me: children, reading and talk*. Stroud: Thimble Press.

conceive picturebooks as a combination of the verbal and visual text in such a way that neither is independent of the other. There is a problem with this conception of picturebooks in that it applies only to a specific type of picturebooks, eliminating many great ones from being considered. Conversely, Khosronejad et al (2015) have conceptualized picturebooks as artistic-literary works whose whole existence (its beauty and meaning) is independent of the existence (beauty and meaning) of each of its constituent elements. Based on this what realizes and defines picturebooks is not whether pictures and words can or cannot stand on their own. But rather the word-picture interplay narrating an entire story; i.e. there are some picturebooks whose words and images can narrate a story independently but, by their coming together, a different story emerges. *The Tale of Peter Rabbit* and *Where the Wild Things Are* exemplify the picturebooks whose words and images are independently meaningful and beautiful; but when sitting together they create a different whole (different meaning and beauty).

Roche argues that a 'good' picturebook should not just be an 'illustrated story'. The pictures and text in a good picturebook should complement each other in a special way, each leaving gaps for the reader to fill, perhaps even telling different narratives, and demanding different types of analyses and comprehension (2015, 101). While this remark (similar to Haynes and Murris') considers some picturebooks in line with the objectives of P4C and with the emphasis on the reader's participation in the meaning-making, seeing such works as implicitly philosophical, it could be controversial as well. Identical to that of Murris and Haynes, this definition recognizes *a number of* picturebooks, while relegating the rest to what Roche considers merely illustrated books. Naturally, P4C theorists can propose and select a special type of picturebooks for philosophizing in CPI, but such a selection does not warrant inclusive definition of these works.

Where is the developing process of changing views towards picturebooks in P4C leading? What is the future outlook? We think that the achievements P4C scholars have gained from 'the other side of relationship' is great, adding also that given the promising development of P4C scholars hitherto, it might happen that we see more and more ideas on picturebooks by them so that 'the other side of

relationship' (the scholars of picturebooks and children's literature) also feels the need for a symbiotic relationship with them. The reason for this claim is that the former is engaged both in working with the books and the practice with children directly; while the scholars of picturebooks are less involved in the experiential work with children. They are majorly text-oriented indeed.

Among the P4C scholars' approaches we have looked at in this paper, Murris and Roche's may hold more promise for the future; or better, it is our hope that they open new horizons in the future. Roche says that the development of responding to literature in an authentic fashion is through dialogue. Explaining why she uses picturebooks in P4C, she maintains that they have

> huge potential for exploratory dialogues between adult and adult readers as well as between adult and child and child and child readers, invite speculative and imaginative responses because of the indeterminacies, or gaps the filling of which makes the potential for meaning-making rich enough that the reader becomes a coauthor of the text (2015, 81).

Similarly, we can reflect upon Murris words:

> The child in philosophy with picturebooks is an individual involved in inquiries about fantastical scenarios in the void between reality and fantasy, rather than about the world as it 'is' (for the adult philosopher). Child-philosopher-like is firmly embedded in adult assumptions and desires about how a child should be. But in philosophy with picturebooks, does not locate the philosophical 'in' texts themselves but in the space in between text, child reader, and adult reader (teacher).

As literary scholars are well-aware, picturebooks are inherently an arena for dialogue to occur. Since they are multimodal constituted of at least two verbal and visual modes of communication, it is 'dialogue' of verbal and visual text that realizes their existence. In addition to the inherent dialogicality of picturebooks, the issue of dual audiences [17] in these books can immensely contribute to showing how

[17] Dual audience as an issue of children's literature studies and especially picturebooks (Nikolajeva & Scott, 2006; Beckett, 2013) can have great implication for childhood studies as well. In this line, Roni Natov's *the poetics of childhood* (2003) – a contribution to both children's literature and childhood studies– exploring the literature of childhood through children's literature implicitly points out the potentials of dual audience in the study of childhood poetics. It suggests that childhood needs to be studies in relation to adulthood; this book probing the literature of childhood through a variety of texts both conceived and written for children and those that engage an exclusively adult readership, focuses on the works that provide a shared area where adult and child come together. We can infer

picturebooks are a space, where the child and adult can come together to dialogue. According to children's literature theorists, literary works with dual implied reader and viewer (appealing to both the child and adult audience) are far more powerful and successful than those whose only audience is the child. Most of the classic picturebooks such as *The Tale of Peter Rabbit*, *Where the Wild Things Are* and *Little Blue and Little Yellow* cross the borders between adult and child.

Another remarkable feature of picturebooks is the fusion of reality and imagination that provides a ground for the expression of other voices (imagination and reality). Furthermore, the play of words and images is so pleasurable and mysterious that from the first pages the readers, whether children or adults, are enchanted and participated in the creation of the story. It is as if Roche is reiterating what Chambers has already mentioned, when she uses the term 'filling the gap'. Citing Laurence Sterne in *Tristram Shandy*, Chambers writes "no author who understands the just boundaries of decorum and good breeding would presume to think all: truest respect which you can pay to the reader's understanding is to halve this matter amicably, and leave him something to imagine, in his turn, as well as yourself" (Chambers, 1985; cited in Hunt, 1995: 103). It is halving imagination (and we add halving 'meaning-making') or in Roche's word 'gap' that paves the way for the reader to resonate her/ his voice, conductive of both cognition and emotion in the literary work. Such recognition combines the nature of some picturebooks to the process CPI goes through. 'Reading picturebooks in this way' will be nothing but philosophizing.

Murris' attention to in-between spaces as the birthplace of philosophical thinking is a fundamental departure from the pioneers of the movement who sought the possible birth of philosophical thinking only in the child-child and child-teacher relationship. For Murris, it is the ongoing dialogue between text, children, and teacher, better to say, the facilitator that provokes philosophical thinking and guarantees its continuity. If properly understood it implies that Lipman et al's analogizing the role of texts in the process of philosophizing to a 'match [that] burns

from Natov's that the works address both the child and adult (dual audience) open a space for dialogue between childhood and adulthood, innocence and experience.

up once it has lit the fire' (1980, 36) no longer works. But, similar to the children and teachers' (facilitators') mind, the texts are flaming torches burning to the end of the session (both in the text and in the paratexts of CPI). Consequently, in dialogic interaction of the three (the child, facilitator and picturebook) philosophy like a beautiful genie slowly creeps out of the magic lamp of dialogue, manifesting herself.

Let us go back to the epigraph from *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. When Lewis Carroll wrote "What is the use of a book without pictures or conversations?" on behalf of Alice; perhaps there was no significant difference between the meaning of 'conversation' and 'dialogue' as there is today in the field of humanities. Now, given the shift in meaning of the dialogue for the scholars of this field, and with regard to the conclusion of this article, we would like to end our investigation with a slightly modified version of what Alice said and replace conversation with dialogue: "What is the use of a book without pictures and *dialogue*".

acknowledgment

We are grateful to Professor David Kennedy and the reviewers of *childhood & philosophy* journal for their critical comments and helpful suggestions and Dr. Shirin Razani for proof reading.

references

Becket, S. L. (2012). *Crossover picturebooks*: A genre for all ages: London: Routledge.

Carroll, L. (1994). *Alice's adventures in wonderland*: *The complete stories of Lewis Carroll*. Au: The Book Company.

Chambers, A. (1985). The reader in the book. In P, Hunt (1995). *Children's literature: the development of criticism* (pp 91-114). London: Routledge.

Egan, K; & Ling, M. (2002). We begin as poets: Conceptual tools and the arts in early childhood. In L. Bresler; & C. M Thompson (Eds.), *The arts in Children's lives: Context, culture, and curriculum* (pp 93-100). Dordrecht, The Netherland: Kluwer.

Fisher, R. (2013). *Teaching thinking: Philosophical enquiry in the classroom*. London: Bloomsbury.

Haynes, J; & Murris, K. (2017 a). Readings and readers of texts in philosophy for children. In M. R. Gregory., J. Haynes & K. Murris (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of philosophy for children* (pp 171-178). London: Routledge.

Haynes, J; & Murris, K. (2017 b). Intra-generational education: Imagining a post-age pedagogy". *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 49 (10), 971- 983.

Haynes, J; & Murris, K. (2013). The realm of meaning: Imagination, narrative and playfulness in philosophical exploration with young children". In P. Costello (Ed.),

Special issues: Developing children are thinking in early childhood education. *Early child development and care*, 183 (8), 1084-1100.
Haynes, J; & Murris, K. (2012). *Picturebooks, Pedagogy and Philosophy*. London: Routledge.
Kennedy, D. (2010). Using Peter Rabbit as a philosophical text with young children. In D. Kennedy, *Philosophical Dialogue with Children: Essays on Theory and Practice* (pp 179-191). Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.
Khosronejad, M; & Shokrollahzadeh, S. (2018). Meaning and the foundation of dialogue in P4C: An attempt to developing theory of dialogic teaching and learning. *Studies in Learning & Instruction*, 10 (1), 56-93. (in Persian)
Khosronejad, M et al. (2015). In quest for a special theory of picturebooks. *Journal of Children's Literature Studies (JCLS)*, 11 (1), 205-224. (in Persian)
Khosronejad, M. (2008). Gareth B. Matthews [Editorial]. In M. Khosronejad (Ed.), *In quest for the centre: Greats of children's literature theory and criticism*. Tehran: Institute for the Intellectual Development of Children and Young Adults. (in Persian)
Khosronejad, M. (2007). Speculation on the dialogue of children's literature and philosophy in P4C. *Quarterly Journal of Educational Innovation* (20), 109-124. (in Persian)
Lewis, D. (2001). *Reading contemporary picturebooks*: Picturing text. London: Routledge.
Lipman, M. (2017). Brave old subject, brave new world". In S. Naji; & R. Hashim (Eds.). *History, Theory and Practice of Philosophy for Children: International Perspectives* (pp 12-17). London: Routledge.
Lipman, M; Sharp, A. M; & Oscanyan, F, S. (1980). *Philosophy in the classroom*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Liptai, S. P4C in art: connections between art and P4C. (2012). In L, Lewis' & N, Chandley (Eds.) *Philosophy for children through the secondary curriculum* (pp 199-214). London: Bloomsbury.
Matthews, G. B. (1994). *The Philosophy of Childhood*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Matthews, G. B. (1980). *Philosophy and the Young Child*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Miah, A. (2008). A critical history of posthumanism. In Gordijn, B; & Chadwick, R (Eds.) *Medical enhancement and posthumanity* (pp.71-94). Netherland: Springer.
Murris, K. (2016 a). Philosophy with picturebooks. *Encyclopedia of Educational philosophy and theory* (pp 1-7). Doi: 10.1007/978-981-287-532-7_164-1.
Murris, K. (2016 b). *The posthuman child: Educational transformation through philosophy with picturebooks*. London: Routledge.
Murris, K. (2015). Posthumanism, philosophy for children, and Anthony Browne's Little Beauty. *Bookbird*, 53 (2), 59- 65.
Murris, K. (2014). Reading philosophically in a community of enquiry: Challenging developmentality with Oram and Kitamura's Angry Arthur. *Children's Literature in Education*, 45 (2), 145-165.
Murris, K. (2009). A philosophical approach to emotions: Understanding Love's Knowledge through a Frog in Love. *Childhood and Philosophy*, 5 (9), 5-30.
Murris, K. &; Hynes, J. (2000). *Storywise: Thinking through stories*. Newport: Dialogue Works.
Murris, K. (1997). *Metaphors of the child's mind: Teaching philosophy to young children*. PhD. Thesis. University of Hull.
Murris, K. (1992). *Teaching philosophy with picture Books*. London: Infonet Publications Ltd.
Natov, R. (2003). *The poetics of childhood*. Routledge: New York.
Nikolajeva, M; & Scott, C. (2006). *How picturebooks Work*. London: Routledge.
Nodelman, P. (2000). Pleasure and genre: Speculations on the characteristics of children's fiction". *Childrem's literature*, 28 (1), 1-14.

Nodelman, P. (1988). *Words about Pictures: The Narrative Art of Children's Picture books*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Oyler, J. (2016). Philosophy with children: The Lipman-Sharp approach to philosophy for children. In M. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational philosophy and theory* (pp 1-7). Doi: 10.1007/978-981-287-532-7_226-1.

Pritchard, M. (2018). Philosophy for vhildren. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved* from https://seop.illc.uva.nl/entries/children/#toc

Pound, L; & Lee, T. (2015). *Teaching Mathematics Creatively*. London: Routledge.

Roche. M. (2015). *Developing children's critical thinking through picturebooks*. London: Routledge.

Rose, J. (1984). *The case of Peter Pan, or the impossibility of children's fiction*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sharp, A. M. (2017). Philosophical novel". In S. Naji; & R. Hashim (Eds.). History, *Theory and Practice of Philosophy for Children: International Perspectives* (pp 18-29). London: Routledge.

Short, K. G. (2011). Reading literature in elementary classrooms". In S. Wolf; K. Coats; P. Enciso; & C. Jenkins (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Children's and Young Adult Literature* (pp 48–63). London: Routledge

Sipe, L. R. (2001). Picturebooks as aesthetic objects". *Literacy Teaching and Learning*, 6 (1), 23–42.

Wartenberg, T. E. (2019). *Philosophy in classrooms and beyond: New approaches to picture-Book philosophy (Big Ideas for Young Thinkers).* Landham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Wartenberg, T. E. (2013). *A sneetch is a sneetch and other philosophical discoveries: Finding wisdom in children's literature*. Malden, M: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wartenberg, T. E. (2009). *Big ideas for little kids: Teaching Philosophy through Picture Books*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Wartenberg. (2007). Philosophy for children goes to college. *Theory and Research in Education*, 5 (3), 329-340.

received: 03.09.2019

approved: 20.04.20