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James and the giant peach- Summary

*Summary:* James and the giant peach written by Roald Dahl is a story about a young orphan boy whose parents have been killed in an encounter with a rhinoceros(Dahl, 1961). The young orphan boy then starts living with his two cruel aunts. During an attempt of saving a spider's life, the young boy finds a crocodile tongue. Right after he finds the tongue, a large-sized peach starts growing in the garden. When finally the young boy steps inside the giant peach, he finds some new friends. His new friends in the giant peach include a ladybug and centipede. The ladybug and centipede then help the young boy to flee to New York.

*Critical Reviews:* Mark I. West argues that although Dahl's writing has received accomplishments form the critiques, but there are some inherent flaws in his writing (West, 1985). Mark writes that regression in children’s literature is something of the kind of exaggeration. According to him, the story is entertaining and adventurous at the same time, which sometimes become difficult to comprehend by the minors.

Rob Barens writes about James and the Giant peach that the story presents some unimaginable phenomena (Barnes, 2002). He mentions that with time when the story starts to unfold, things become far from realities. He is of the view that in such literature it is apparent that the readers will lose the interest.

Julie E. Wollman and Barbara Werchadlo write that the first-grade stories are aimed at developing the interests of the minors in the literature(Wollman-Bonilla & Werchadlo, 1995). They mention that interests is developed by presenting them a coherent piece of writing. They have praised Dahl's writing, but have also opined that James and the giant peach follows two different aspects in single literature. According to them, this could not be a part of the minor's literature.

James (et. al) writes that James and the giant peach develops the interests but with time drags the attention toward the unrealistic approaches (Hoffman, Roser, & Battle, 1993). They mention that since for the minors the art and literature go hand in hand, therefore this story lacks amalmagation f these two aspects. They write that this could have been done better if Dahl had opted for any single aspect from among these two.

Smith (et. al) writes about James and the giant peach that equitable approach must be the format of the readings of the minors(Smith, Greenlaw, & Scott, 1987). They have written about Dahl's writing that his writing does not follow an equitable approach in the sense of developing the interest of the readers. They have mentioned that Dahl's writings have remain inclined toward any single approach of art. For example, towards imagination in James and the giant peach.

David Rees writes that Dahl’s writing over emphasis on literary interpretation (Rees, 1988). He mentions that by presenting some unimaginable attributes of the literary art, Dahl creates two extents in James and the giant peach. He mentions that this cannot be done with early grade literature. He also goes on to write that Dahl’s interpretive strategy in literature cannot be beneficial at this level.

Trelease being critical with Dahl's stories opines that although his readings are a good addition in minor's literature, it lacks developing a comprehensive sense(Trelease, 1992). She mentions that comprehensiveness must be the baseline for minor's literature. She also goes on to write about James and the giant peach that this story also lacks comprehensiveness, and puts the readers at one extreme during the complete story.

Perry (et. al) argues that the stories are much attractive if they develop a sense of interpretation among the readers(Perry, Hutchinson, & Thauberger, 2007). They write that this strategy must be part of the minor's literature as they are more prone to imagining things. For James and the giant peach, they have argued that the story remained too narrow in its interpretation and which is just regression and joy.

E. Moss argues that interests developing must be the purpose of minor’s literature (Moss, 1986). He remained too critical of Dahl's writing. He writes that double designed literature cannot serve the purpose of interests' development. He lastly argues that literature can be general and interest-oriented at the same time. This is what he thinks is not present in the writings of Roald Dahl.

Finally, Chen We Yu argues that the case of Roald Dahl is different compared to those of other writers of minor’s literature (Yu, 2008). He writes that Dahl sticks and exaggerates on one literary aspect and then abruptly takes the readers to the second aspect in his writings. He mentions that in the minor grade literature it is unjustifiable to talk about any phenomena in such a general sense.
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