

ELORE (ISSN 1456-3010), vol. 17 – 2/2010.

Julkaisija: Suomen Kansantietouden Tutkijain Seura ry.

[http://www.elore.fi/arkisto/2_10/bottigheimer_2_10.pdf]



ACTUAL

Book Culture from Below – The Eighteenth Annual Conference of the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing (SHARP) in Helsinki, 17–20 August 2010: Keynote session “Exposing the oral and literary background of fairy tales”

Key note lecture:

Upward and Outward: Fairy Tales And Popular, Print, and Proletarian Culture, 1550–1850

Ruth B. Bottigheimer

We who are gathered in this hall are all book historians in one way or another, and each of us knows that book history research is detailed. We work with “slips and scraps” (Yale) that steadily build upon each other until a mass of information comes together into a pattern that thrusts itself before us with immediacy and urgency in the form of a new understanding. Many such new understandings have emerged over the last twenty or so years about the modern publishing industry (Todd) and the ancient one (Overt), and the practice of reading among children as well as among adults (Grenby; McDowell; Price), to name only a few contributions made on the pages of *Book History*. It is out of multifarious details that printshop life, bookshop culture, readers’ responses, collectors’ interests, even canon formation emerge.

The same is true of a newly emerging, book- and print-based understanding of the history of fairy tales. It posits the written word as the point of origin for the spoken word of the folk as tales are – and were – told. This relationship between print and oral tellings is very different from past models for fairy tale history, and the hundreds and thousands of details that comprise the foundation for the new model of fairy tale history make for compelling arguments, but they are ill-suited for a lecture, especially one that lasts 40 minutes. So I’ll stick to the big picture, into which I’ll interject some of the details that make up the new model.

The conventional understanding of “upward and outward” as far as fairy tales are concerned has been this: The folk is the bedrock of the nation. Fairy tales arose from this foundational population, because, so it was long believed, an anonymous folk composed them in the distant past and then disseminated them down to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The old, conventional understanding of the history of fairy tales has fairy tales rise upward to the literate classes via peasant nursemaids, who nourished bourgeois and upper class children with milk and with fairy tales until collectors eventually gathered their tales.

The old view has the “collection” process beginning in the sixteenth century and being slow at first. In the beginning there was the Venetian, Giovan Francesco Straparola (c1480–c1557) in Venice, who inserted rise and restoration fairy tales into his 2–volume collection of urban tales, *The Pleasant Nights* (2 volumes, 1551, 1553; *Le Piacevoli Notti*) in the 1550s. Noone else “collected” tales from the folk until seventy–some years later, when the Neapolitan Giambattista Basile (c1575–1632), so the old history goes, listened in on the stories told by sharp–tongued foul–mouthed street women, and put them into his *Tale of the Tales* (5 Days, 1634–1636, *Cunto de li cunti*). First published in 1634–1636, it was a five–day storytelling session that had been organized to relieve the tedium of the last week of a princess’s pregnancy. After Basile, the pace of literary consultations with the folk is supposed to have picked up considerably, according to the old history, as first Charles Perrault (1628–1703) and his niece Marie–Jeanne Lhéritier (c1664–1734) as well as Catherine Bernard (1663–c1712) dipped into the great ocean of story and between 1694 and 1696 drew from it some of the same tales that Straparola and Basile had also found there. Others soon followed. Marie–Catherine d’Aulnoy (c1650–1705), Charlotte–Rose Caumont de La Force (1654–1724), and Henriette Julie de Murat (1670–1716) are also believed to have drawn from the folk, although generally writing longer tales. Then, according to the old history, nothing much happened in terms of folk contributions to literary knowledge until a long century passed, and in the early 19th century, the Grimm brothers, Jacob (1785–1863) and Wilhelm (1786–1859), brought together a stunning collection. In fact, their work precipitated collecting all over Europe and culminated in the assemblage of the remarkable Finnish archive in Helsinki that underlay the Arrne–Thompson–Uther Tale Type Index that has guided folk and fairy tale research for decades. From this point onward, a host of folklorists went out into the world, finding fairy tales everywhere: Grimm tales among the click–language peoples of Namibia (Schmidt), “Cinderella” all over the world (Cox, Rooth) and “Puss in Boots” in various guises nearly as widespread (Escarpit). These findings confirmed folklorists and the general public in their understanding of fairy tales as a genre that had existed always and everywhere. For their collection, therefore, one need only dip into that great pre–existing ocean of narrative to bring in the same haul of stories that Straparola, Basile, Perrault, his contemporaries, and the Grimms had pulled from that story–rich sea.

The “outward” part of this old conventional history is equally well known. In it the knowledge of fairy tales that folkloristic collectors took down from the folk spread outward to scholars, to society at large, and to modern children, to Jung–

ian psychotherapists who posited a collective unconscious composed of universal archetypes and to Freudian psychoanalysts who found expressions of the human unconscious in fairy tales. The circle was completed when perceptions like these were brought back to the magazine-reading population in the form of popular explanations and as therapeutic devices for personal counseling. Upward, outward, and circling back again.

This account of the history of fairy tales probably sounds familiar, for it is the one that is propagated in the popular press and that continues in school and university textbooks (Caplan) as well as in scholarly editions and scholarly monographs (Sermain).

Authorship Now let's pursue an unconventional line of thinking about the history of fairy tales. The unconventional approach, the one that is newly emerging, relies on a print-based understanding of the history of fairy tales, and – where fairy tales are concerned – it posits the printed word as the point of origin for subsequent spoken words. That is, this view holds that published fairy tales provided folk storytellers with their material, and not the other way round. In supporting this line of reasoning we will visit the three areas to which the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing is principally devoted. In pursuing authorship, we'll begin with the history of a particular medieval and early modern literary phenomenon, the tale collection. And in thinking about and talking about tale collections we enter the realm of story.

The middle ages was filled with stories of many sorts. Stories in Latin amused clerics and lawyers; those in secular tale collections were in the vernacular languages spoken by merchants, guild masters, and their wives. Tale collections spring into life with the *Decameron* of Giovanni Boccaccio. Fifty some years later came the *Novellabook* (*Libro di Novelle*, c 1400–1423) by Giovanni Sercambi (1348–1424). Scores of European tale collections followed in the next two centuries, some good, some bad, some uplifting, some scurrilous.

Storytelling in story collections had rules, and they were rules that were much discussed by literary critics then and now. Foremost in their critical awareness was the concept that the best story was a new take on an old, known story. The novelty that the new version introduced was precisely what was worth reading. But the tale had to follow the rule of verisimilitude: no matter how outlandish or improbable its plot was, it had to be somehow possible, that is, to recount events that *could* have taken place. Boccaccio, whom subsequent authors took as their model, had written at length on this very subject in his 1355 *Genealogy of the Gods*, and his essay provided foundational rules for *novella* writing for nearly three centuries (Magnanini, Canepa).

This is where Giovan Francesco Straparola (c1480–c1557) enters the picture. In 1551 he threw together a collection of stories, nearly all of which he took from earlier tale collections. His practice was, of course, consistent with the concept of authorship in the early modern period: providing an old story with a new take. In his “Address to the Reader” at the beginning of volume 2 (1553), we see that Straparola

had been criticized for not having enough of a new take on some of the old stories, but in one area, he produced not only a new take, but an entirely new plot line, one that became the most widespread and well beloved in popular literature in the modern world. That plot line was the rise fairy tale, in which a poor boy or girl suffers tasks and trials, and then through magic, marries royalty and becomes wealthy (Bottigheimer). Straparola put several of these into his otherwise very conventional tale collection. He also took plotlines from contemporary romances about princes and princesses adventuring among supernatural enemies and friends, abbreviated them, and made sure that each one came to a happily married conclusion. These restoration fairy tales begin with a *royal* protagonist who's expelled from home, suffers trials and performs tasks, and through magic marries another royal and ascends a throne, thus achieving a *social* restoration. It's perfectly evident that these plotlines for rise and for restoration fairy tales are neither possible nor probable and that they violate the fundamental requirement for verisimilitude in *novella* writing. What happens in Straparola's rise and restoration fairy tales is not only improbable, it's patently impossible, because magic plays so prominent a role in achieving resolution.

Now, I have asserted that Straparola invented these two kinds of tales, but you have no reason to believe that assertion in the absence of supporting evidence. That is, in fact, what the problem comes down to, an absence of evidence. I have diligently searched for such rise fairy tales in the ancient and medieval worlds for decades and have found none. Neither did Maren Clausen-Stolzenburg and Albert Wesselski, both careful scholars of medieval literature. That yawning absence impelled me to write a little book called *Fairy Tales. A New History* (2009).

A large number of folklorists, literary scholars, and members of the general public disagree with a history of rise and restoration fairy tales that begins in the 1550s, and they have advanced numerous narrative candidates from the ancient and medieval worlds to try to demonstrate the existence of fairy tales in those eras (Ben-Amos; Ziolkowski; Vaz da Silva; Bottigheimer 2010). But not a single one of the tales they cite is a rise or a restoration fairy tale. They're something else: a legend, a warning tale, a Marian miracle – or simply a story with a shoe in it somewhere, or perhaps a story in which a poor girl consorts sexually with a king with no magical intervention necessary. The long and the short of it is that Giovan Francesco Straparola can be identified as the author of these two kinds of happily ever after fairy tales.

Let's now turn to the question of **Readership**. We know that books were published, but were they bought? How many people, more or less, bought a particular book? We want to know this because the number of books bought gives a rough measure of a book's readership, rough, because of a large number of unknowns. How many copies did a single print run produce? There are people here who are more knowledgeable about this question than I am, and I hope they'll come forward and tell me what they know about the sizes of print runs for the kinds of books printed under the kinds of conditions in which Straparola's *Pleasant Nights* was printed and published. But even in the absence of specific numbers, let's hazard some generalizations. The first is that print run sizes could be unusually large, such as a print run of 6,000

for an eighteenth-century Bible or as small as 20 or 30, or even fewer, for a private printing. It's often said that a standard print run was for 1,000 copies, because that has long been held to be the number of sheets that could be printed, pulled, and hung up to dry in a single workday on a single printing press in the early modern period.

The wording of the copyright gives us one piece of information that is specific to Straparola's *Pleasant Nights*: Straparola himself seems to have paid for the initial printing of his book. We also know that the first volume of the *Pleasant Nights* was printed twice in the first year of its appearance, one printing in January 1551 and another in September 1551. With paper one of the largest parts of print costs (King 88–90), let's speculate that Straparola commissioned a smallish printing – say 500 copies – the first time around, and that when this imprint sold out, he commissioned a second printing. Maybe the second imprint also consisted of a small number of copies, maybe it consisted of 1,000 copies. We don't know. We *do* know that the first edition of volume 2 in 1553 had only one print run. And for the two-volume sets dated 1555, 1556, and 1557 we also know that there are different, and differently dated, title pages. But do these differently dated title pages actually reflect three print runs, one each for 1555, 1556, and 1557? If that *were* the case, Straparola's *Pleasant Nights* would have been a runaway success in the 16th-century Venetian book market.

Title pages, however, can – and often do – provide false testimony about a book's true imprint history. And therefore, it's important to find out just how frequently a book was reprinted. That can be done pretty easily from an identifying marker that reliably varies from one print run to another. That marker is its STCN fingerprint. In the case of the *Pleasant Nights*, the STCN fingerprint shows incontrovertibly that the differing 1555, 1556, and 1557 title pages precede the same, single, print run. That means that instead of being a runaway bestseller, the book's sales history is probably just the reverse, because the STCN fingerprints of the 1555, 1556, and 1557 editions shows that they are all from one and the same print run. The process seems to be this: when a new year rolled around, the publisher or the bookseller simply tore out the old title page, glued in a new one, and with this simulacrum of newness, tried again to sell his sheets. Some of the copies of the *Pleasant Nights* that I've seen show a different tactic: their title page must have initially been printed without a date, because the date that appears is in a different typeface and is also out of line, suggesting that someone simply handstamped a new date into an existing blank space.

Let me pause here to review the nature of a fingerprint (*empreinte* in French, and *impronta* in Italian) and in particular the workings of the STCN fingerprint along with a brief explanation about the way in which a fingerprint identifies a print run. The fingerprint of a print run consists of the letters, spaces, and punctuation marks at specified points in a book. Of two general methods, the more sensitive is the STCN fingerprint – the Short Title Catalogue Netherlands S-T-C-N – developed by P.C. A. Vriesema. For my own use, I have refined Vriesema's method by noting partial letters, spaces, and punctuation marks.

What about fingerprints of post-1550s editions of Straparola? The work hasn't been done. But the large number of imprints is a provocative piece of information about which we could draw some important conclusions, if we knew whether or not each apparently new imprint actually represents a new print run. Why is this important? Because fairy tale sales correlate with specific developments in the history of fairy tales.

Let's consider another example of the utility of identifying print runs by their fingerprint. It involves another set of fairy tales, ones by Charles Perrault. His fairy tales were translated into English in 1729, possibly earlier, and common wisdom has it that Perrault's tales immediately became popular, because of the number of English imprints that followed hard upon their first appearance. But those imprints were not market-driven. Instead they were dual language French / English readers for Eton schoolboys. As such, the book sold not well, but reliably for a while. But then in 1764 and 1765, two apparently different imprints of Perrault's tales appeared in two successive years, a fact long cited to prove how popular Perrault's fairy tales had become in England. Let's look closely at these two imprints. In 1764, J. Melvil of London and Exeter brought out a dual-language edition of Perrault's *Histories* with finely worked illustrations tipped in. Did it really have the success long attributed to it? No, it did not. We can easily tell that the book did not sell well, because sheets with the same fingerprint appeared the following year with crude illustrations tipped in from a publisher with offices in London and The Hague, whose name was Van Os. Van Os substituted cheap copies of Melvil's fine illustrations and a new title – *Mother Goose's Tales* – on a new titlepage, but the fingerprint of the 1765 central text is identical to that of the 1764 edition. The 1764–1765 edition of Perrault's *Tales* thus provides incontrovertible evidence for a decelerating pace of sales of Perrault's tales in England from their first appearance in 1729 to the 1760s.

Readership: Who? Using the fingerprint method to estimate readership for Straparola's tales suggests that the number of people who read his tales might have diminished from 1551 to 1557. But some people did read his tales – both the urban ones he had taken over from earlier tale collections and the new ones – the rise and the restoration fairy tales – that he had invented. The first reader of Straparola's fairy tales whose name we know was Andrea Calmo (1510–1571), who – in 1556 – used one of Straparola's fairy tales as part of a seduction strategy directed at a woman named Signora Frondosa. In a letter to her, he proposed a weekend of carnal pleasures, part of whose entertainments included telling about “the beautiful green bird,” a figure in Straparola's tale “Ancillotto” (Night 4, tale 3) (Magnanini 2011a). But Andrea Calmo's voice is a singular one in Italy in those decades, as far as documenting a love for or a utilization of fairy tales. In theory there were many potential readers, because stories were told within a variety of populations: other lovelorn scribblers, village farmers, town-based artisans, and city-based merchants and nobles. However, few of these people seem to have been telling fairy tales. Sixteenth-century advice-giving experts on storytelling, such as Baldassare Castiglione, recommended Boccaccian urban tales embodying verisimilitude. [Marcantonio Piccolomini] speci-

fically “suggests that those called upon to tell a tale would do best to carefully select a novella from Boccaccio’s *Decameron* that will complement the other tales that have been told that evening” to which Piccolomini added certain “episodes taken from [Ludovico] Ariosto’s (1474–1533) chivalric epic” *Orlando Furioso* (1516) (Magnanini 2011b). “[I]t would seem fairy tales such as Straparola’s were considered inappropriate for both the men and the women attending the *veglie*” (ibid.). And among village farmers, town artisans, and urban merchants, nobody mentions a fairy tale, not even once (Schenda 1993). Straparola’s rise and restoration fairy tales made a slow entry into European consciousness: they were absent at the *litterati*’s glittering evening gatherings or at the peasants’ humble after hours work sessions, but they didn’t disappear. They were translated into French, and were published perhaps sixteen times in Lyons, Paris, and Rouen by 1615.

Now let’s approach the question of fairy tale readership from a different direction altogether. I believe that Straparola invented rise fairy tales in order to put some stories into his collection that might appeal to poor but literate urban book buyers. All of Straparola’s rise fairy tales are set in cityscapes of one sort or another and their poor heroes and heroines wander city streets, not fields and forests.

I share folklorists’ perceptions that readers gravitate towards stories that reflect their identities. The perception that story protagonists and intended readerships share common social characteristics is borne out in the fairy tales of Europe’s second fairy tale author, the Neapolitan Giambattista Basile. A consummate courtier, Basile had served the Italian rulers in Mantua and the Spanish Viceroy in Naples. He moved among the titled, and when he set about crafting fairy tales, he created a body of tales that turned principally to restoration fairy tales, with princes and princesses in leading roles.

Basile’s choice of ten sniveling scabrous crones to tell the tales might appear puzzling at first; but it was a conscious part of his storytelling strategy of creating humor through inversion. That is, Basile repeatedly invoked the high culture of classical Latin literature by borrowing known situations and motifs from classical authors, but then he turned that high literary canon inside out and upside down by putting those situations and motifs into stories told by coarse fishwives, instead of by ideal storytellers at an ideal gathering.

Where is the folk in this new history of fairy tales? Occasional humble people appeared in Straparola’s rise fairy tales, and it is their presence together with the promise of a good marriage and attendant riches that have fuelled my assumption that Straparola meant to take the aspirations of the urban poor into account as well as the expectations of the merchant and noble tale-collection-buying public. For the poor but literate (Grendler) there were his rise fairy tales.

That was far less the case with Basile or with most of the French fairy tale authors who followed at the end of the seventeenth century. They clearly preferred restoration fairy tales. And the overwhelming majority of fairy tales composed from the 1690s until the 1790s featured restoration fairy tale plots, in which princes and princesses bravely faced adversity, overcame obstacles, and fought off dragons, sorcerers, and

wicked fairies, before marrying – appropriately – into their own royal ranks, ascending a throne, and living happily ever after. This overwhelming emphasis on upper class heroes and heroines in fairy tales composed in the century between the 1690s and the 1790s is strong evidence for middle- and upper-economic class origins for these kinds of fairy tales, and for a middle and upper-economic class readership. It is significant that the majority of fairy tales until the 1780s feature princes and princesses, and at the lower end of the fairy tale social spectrum, “a gentleman’s daughter.”

What else can we say about rise fairy tales in the fairy tale corpus written by French authors at the end of the seventeenth century? Mme d’Aulnoy changed the poor hero of Straparola’s “Pietro Pazzo” into a prince, and she also changed the poor heroine of Straparola’s “Prince Pig” into a princess. A few tales didn’t belong to that French salon preference for royal heroes and heroines, and almost every one of those tales was written by the French Academician Charles Perrault. He took the quintessential rise fairy tale “Puss in Boots” directly from Straparola, paragraph for paragraph and often word for word, changing the names and cleaning up his hero and scrubbing off each and every moral and ethical ambiguity. Perrault wrote a poor heroine into another tale, “The Fairies,” and his “Little Thumbling” was a woodcutter’s son. The plots for these two tales came from Basile’s rare examples of rise fairy tales. At the time of their composition, Perrault’s rise fairy tales enjoyed critical success among his admirers, but in the literary marketplace they remained in the shadows because of the contemporaneous preference in the book-buying public for restoration fairy tales. In particular, his rise fairy tales were outsold and therefore probably outread by the restoration fairy tales of his prolific contemporary Madame d’Aulnoy. One of Perrault’s restoration fairy tales, paradoxically, leads directly into the question of fairy tales and the folk. Perrault, making a literary critical joke of sorts, composed a verse tale that he called “Donkeyskin,” after the seventeenth-century term for nonsense tales. The tale itself he created by putting together elements from two already existing tales, one from Straparola and one from Basile.” The result tale goes this way:

There was once a mighty prince for whom a marvelous donkey provided unending wealth by excreting gold. When the king’s wife fell ill, she made him promise that after her death he would only marry someone wiser and more beautiful than she. The king searched for months, then fell violently in love with his own daughter, who was both wise and beautiful.

The princess sought help and advice from her godmother (Maraine), a fairy, who told her to put her father off with impossible requests: a dress the color of heaven, one the color of the moon, one the color of the sun, and finally the skin of the gold-producing donkey. When her father satisfied each demand, his daughter had no recourse other than flight, and flee she did. Disguised, she made her way to a distant farm and took work in the kitchen. Sundays, however, she locked the door and dressed up.

One day the prince came to visit his farm. Without knowing who he was, Princess Donkeyskin fell in love with him; he saw her, thought she must be a goddess, and fell desperately in love with her.

The lovesick prince refused to eat unless the girl named Donkeyskin brought him cake, and so the disguised princess prepared a gateau, putting her ring into it. The prince found it and declared he would marry whomever the ring fit, and in the end only the kitchenmaid Donkeyskin's finger fit.

To the wedding came royal guests, including Donkeyskin's father, now purified of his criminal passion for her. Donkeyskin's fairy godmother also arrived and delighted the prince when she told him that his bride was a royal princess.

The folk and the fairy tale come together in fact For literary scholars Perrault's "Donkeyskin" is of great interest, because textual analysis shows that Perrault created it from two pre-existing published prose tales. But Perrault's "Donkeyskin," manifestly a restoration fairy tale, also gives us additional information about the relationship between fairytales and the folk. This tale includes the magic required for a fairy tale; in it a donkey's manure is real gold; the princess's godmother is a fairy who gives her a wand; and a chest filled with her gowns follows her underground and unseen wherever she goes. Perrault wrote this restoration fairy tale in elegantly rhymed language for an elevated social class of readers, and it thus fits the social context I've described for restoration fairy tales.

A few years later, "Donkeyskin" went public, when it was translated into English as a ballad called "Catskin" and was hawked as a broadsheet ballad all over the British Isles to a popular readership. It would seem that this would have marked the coming together of the folk with Perrault's restoration fairy tale for the first time. Yet, that was not the case. In its English translation for a popular buyership, the plot's fairy tale trappings disappeared. Magic was erased and the fairy godmother vanished; the social class of the princess's father and her suitor dropped from the unimaginably royal to a more immediately recognizable squire and knight's son respectively, even though the plot remained a tale of social restoration. It is a clear case of the English print business adopting and adapting from the world of French print, with the print aspect of the English ballad affirmed in its opening lines:

*You fathers and mothers, and children also,
Draw unto me, and soon you shall know,
The sense of my ditty, and I dare to say,
The like han't (sic) been printed this many a day.*

The ballad thrusts listeners immediately and knowingly into the world of print; this ballad is meant to be performed for a general public made up of "fathers and mothers, and children also." In it [Part 1] they will hear about a squire who expels his daughter from home, because she's a girl. She wears a gold locket and fine clothes in her exile, where she gets a good education. (We're in Lockean England now.) When she's grown, however, she ties her fine clothes into a bundle and goes out into the world [Part 2] dressed in a robe made of catskins. At the end of the first day she arrives at a knight's household "in a town" (another hint about the probable location of the ballad's initial audiences), spends the night in a stable, and the next day wins

the cook's heart by her pastry-making skills. Everyone calls her, naturally, Catskin. [Part 3] In the household there is, of course, a tall and handsome son, whom one night Catskin follows to a ball wearing her long-hidden finery. And, of course, there is resistance from the boy's mother. For three nights in a row Catskin dances with her handsome fellow, answering his queries about her home with misleadingly coded addresses. On the third night he follows her and learns that she's "our cooks Scullion." But he adds romantically, and as is proper for an eighteenth-century English ballad, that

*"Thy beauty is a portion, my joy and my dear,
I prize it far better than a thousand a year.*

Then he outlines a plan:

*.... I have got a trick;
I'll go to bed, and I will feign myself sick.
There's no one shall attend me but thee I protest
So one day or another in thy rich dress,
Thou shalt be clad, and if my parents come nigh,
I'll tell them 'tis for thee that I sick do lie.*

[Part 4] The plan works. His parents send for a nurse, but he insists that Catskin alone can heal him. And so she is summoned and she comes, bearing "sweet cordials and other rich things," and

*... when all alone, they in each others arms,
Enjoy'd one another in love's pleasant charms.*

According to plan, Catskin dons her finery, his parents inquire about her family, they are satisfied and agree to their wedding. [Part 5] In the fifth and final part Catskin and her father reconcile, and he settles ten thousand on her,

And now altogether in love they do live.

Let me affirm once again the many reasons why we can't call the "Catskin" ballad England's first fairy tale. 1) Magic is absent, and in fairy tales, magic is essential to performing the tasks and surmounting the trials that fairy tale heroes and heroines must demonstrate their ability to do before they can marry up in the world. 2) Technical reasons – the ballad form and the verse realization – compound the impossibility of "Catskin"'s being considered England's first fairy tale. The history of the "Donkeyskin" / "Catskin" tales exemplifies restoration fairy tales' hesitation of on the threshold of the folk.

The "Catskin" plot has no precursors in England. "Cinderella" wouldn't arrive un-

til Perrault's *Histoires* were translated in 1729. Some might point toward the works by Mme d'Aulnoy that had earlier been translated into English. They, however, were not fairy tales, but lengthy fairyland fictions with their characteristic parallel fairyland and human worlds. Furthermore, the kinds of tales about supernaturals that John Locke had inveighed against in his *Letters on Education* did not come from stories, that is, real narratives with a beginning, a middle, and an end, but from anecdotes about brownies, bogles, and bloodybones. Like France and Germany, England still had no fairy tales among the folk at mid-century. Instead, fairy tales existed principally among Etonian schoolboys, their sisters, and their mothers.

At this point a large number of lines of inquiry open up. The "Catskin" tale, as it was told in the eighteenth-century English broadside, can be thought of as yet another ballad about the problems of love and social inequality. But in this case, there exists a previously published fairy tale precursor, Perrault's "Donkeyskin. Let's now follow the print footprints of the "Catskin" chapbook.

The "Catskin" ballad was published in Britain a great many times in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It first came on the scene in 1710, perhaps even earlier. The number of surviving "Catskin" ballads from the 1750s and 1760s suggest a rush of new imprints in those years. It was at this moment that the Catskin story leapt upward from its broadsheet ballad life into a soon-to-be-canonized novel by the English author Oliver Goldsmith. But the "upward" leap is an "upward" with a twist, as you'll soon see.

In the 1760s Goldsmith wrote "Princess Catskin" into Book VI of his novel *The Vicar of Wakefield*. There Goldsmith has a character, Sir William Thornhill, pretend to be a man of the people named "Mr. Burchell," and in this guise "Mr Burchell" tells assembled children "the adventure of Catskin." (Goldsmith 1766; rpt.1880:1 [Book VI].) Let's listen to Oliver Goldsmith's words:

Sir William Thornhill "was known in our neighbourhood by the character of the poor Gentleman that would do no good when he was young, though he was not yet thirty. He would at intervals talk with great good sense, but in general he was fondest of the company of children, whom he used to call harmless little men. He was famous, I found, for singing them ballads, and telling them stories; and seldom went out without something in his pockets for them, a piece of ginger-bread, or an halfpenny whistle. He generally came for a few days into our neighbourhood once a year, and lived upon the neighbours hospitality. He sate (sic) down to supper among us, and my wife was not sparing of her gooseberry wine. The tale went round; he sung us old songs, and gave the children the story of the Buck of Beverland, with the history of Patient Grissel, the adventures of Catskin, and then Fair Rosamond's bower. (56)

The character of Sir William-as-Mr. Burchell provides an excellent example of the broad reach of the popular ballad press, for Goldsmith listed four titles, *The Buck of Beverland*, *Patient Grissel*, *The Adventures of Catskin*, and *Fair Rosamund*, each of which survives in scores of copies in Britain's depository libraries. Goldsmith's

character was a man who was well read in the penny literature of his day and who transmitted it to children who gathered around him for gingerbread and for penny whistles as well as for the tales he told.

Here is an excellent example of a semi-literate process (Schenda 2007) in the practice of oral story communication. “Burchell” himself had clearly *read* the printed story of “Catskin” and then he *retold* it from memory. It is a process that Satu Apo and others have documented in Finland (Apo; Herranen) and that is daily documentable in oral storytelling performances of the Grimms’ tales at meetings of the European Fairy Tale Society in Germany, and that awaits documenting in many other cases.

The folk and fairy tales come together in theory Goldsmith didn’t show a man of the people telling “Princess Catskin”; he showed a literate but down at heels squire getting meals and a place to lay his head in return for using his gifts as a raconteur. For me, it’s impossible not to understand Goldsmith’s factitious Mr. Burchell as a mocking commentary on James Macpherson’s Ossian, whose “works” had been published the previous year but which had already been the subject of spirited debate in the early 1760s, that is, in the same period in which Goldsmith was composing *The Vicar of Wakefield*.

Goldsmith may have regarded “folk” poetics as a joke, but on the continent, Johann Herder immediately took it seriously: once Macpherson’s fictional folk poet had been published, Herder began writing about *Volkspoesie*. His fascination with the idea culminated in his *Correspondence about Ossian* of 1770 (Briefwechsel über Ossian), where he brought together the concepts of nature, the folk, and the nation as exemplified in Britain’s Ossianic writings and Germany’s folksongs (Oergel 52). At the end of the 1770s, Ferdinando Galiani, writing from Italy, but in close touch with intellectual life north of the Alps, took a more sophisticated and nuanced view of Basile’s 17th-century tale collection, which Herder would undoubtedly have considered a folk production. Galiani, however, argued more finely: the language of Basile’s tales came from the folk, but not the content (Magnanini 2011c). He made an important distinction.

In Germany there were *some* doubting Thomases, and Johann Karl August Musäus was obviously one. In 1782 he wrote a preface to his *Folktales of the Germans* (Volksmärchen der Deutschen) ([1782–1787] 1961) and treated folk participation in fairy tales satirically in a prefatory discourse between the author and a folk figure, “Mr. David Runkel, Thinker and Sexton at Saint Sebald’s Church.” Musäus invented a genuinely folk interlocutor to discuss what he called folk fairy tales; was he parodying Herder? No matter what he meant – Musäus’s heavy irony was completely lost on Benedikte Naubert, who adopted and adapted Musäus’s title, *Folktales* (Volksmärchen) for the title of her own book a few years later. (Neither the tales in Musäus’s nor in Naubert’s books were “folktales” as we think of them, but tales filled with fairies and magic and written in a high literary style.) She called her book *New folktales of the Germans* (Neue Volksmärchen der Deutschen, [1789–1793] 2001), and implied with her title the existence of fairy tales in folk form among the folk as an existing category. Herder had proposed folk poesis (*Volkspoesie*) based on a Scottish fraud, Musäus took

up the concept with German irony, and Naubert swallowed it hook line and sinker. The theory of fairy tales among the folk was solidly in place.

But a theory of fairy tales among the folk surely required there to be fairy tales *there*. And soon there were, but it is notable that the theory of their existence preceded their actual existence. That sequence in reasoning is valid in areas such as invisible but eventually palpable particles in physics or invisible but eventually proveable celestial bodies in astrophysics. In Naubert's case, however, fairy tales among the folk were postulated as existing in the eighteenth century and earlier, even though they hadn't yet been found. And for good reason. They weren't there —not yet, anyway. But they were about to be, because a busy Leipzig publisher, Friedrich Justin Bertuch (1747-1822), began translating and publishing fairy tales from the freshly published French multivolume *Cabinet des Fées*. Bertuch titled his collection the *Blue library of all nations*, that is, the *Blaue Bibliothek aller Nationen* ([1790–1800], alluding to the French *bibliothèque bleue*. In the case of physics and astrophysics, the atomic and celestial bodies had been there all the time and just needed instrumentation sensitive enough to record their existence; in the case of fairy tales among the folk, *they really weren't there until the late 1790s*, when Bertuch began publishing individual tales from Perrault in a handy little format that even very poor buyers could afford. My formulation for this process is this: "Musäus's preface precipitated the *concept* of Volksmärchen as it is now understood, and Bertuch's *Blaue Bibliothek* effectively distributed the broad variety of tales that constituted Germany's suddenly expanding late-eighteenth-century and early-nineteenth century *Märchen* corpus. Thus, it can be said that a critical mass of concept (Musäus and Naubert) and content (Bertuch's *Blaue Bibliothek*) was achieved between 1782 and 1806, the last year in which the *Blaue Bibliothek* introduced new fairy-tale material for German readers" (Bottigheimer 2010 478). Fairy tales began to enter folk awareness in Germany at the earliest in the late eighteenth century; recent scholarship suggests that their permeating broader folk awareness resulted from fairy tales' insertion into school readers and their inclusion in newspapers, a subject to which Caroline Sumpter has contributed pathbreaking research (Tomkowiak; Njagi; Sumpter).

What the Grimms did with the concept of fairy tales among the folk is well known. Their theories about folk origins and folk dissemination laid the foundation for nineteenth- and twentieth-century folkloristics, as far as fairy tales are concerned. The fewness of knowledgeable tradition-bearers, however, was evident. This observation was accurate. The Grimms' interpretation of this observation was that folk knowledge of fairy tales was dying out. My interpretation is that folk knowledge of fairy tales was just beginning.

And what about the proletariat in the title of this talk? The Grimms' tales reached a German rural proletariat through school readers in the newly instituted public schools for the lower classes in Germany and Austria starting in the 1820s. There was not yet an urban proletariat for all practical purposes in Germany when the Grimms began putting together their collection in 1810. Their tales reified an agrarian past, and when increasing industrialization in Germany drew country dwellers to cities to join urban factory-working populations, and when the children of those populations were schoo-

led with literature considered appropriate for their age and class, they memorized fairy tales along with history and geography. The Grimms got this right: they had claimed that their collection should be an educational manual (*Erziehungsbuch*) for the German people. The word *Erziehung* generally implies education in the sense of *childrearing*; but the Grimms meant education in a far broader sense, namely, an education in being German. Consequently, when fairy tales appeared in German newspapers, that project was implemented in a real sense. And because newspapers and periodicals as a whole always need copy they often drew on published fairy tales for their daily or weekly or monthly issues. Scholars of print are finding increasing numbers of instances of fairy tales in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century newspapers in Germany, as well as in Europe as a whole, in the Americas, and even further afield.

Concluding Remarks Ulf Palmenfelt recently expressed a “nagging suspicion” that “the ideal folk tale [might have] never existed in an oral tradition, but solely in printed and edited form” (8). The paradigm for storytelling among the folk can be adjusted easily to include print sources as a point of departure. If that is done, studies of print sources will make clear what kinds of changes folk storytellers made to source tales. Tremendous possibilities thus await researchers. Consider the potential results of comparing fairy tales published in newspapers, chapbooks, school readers, and tale collections with fairy tales subsequently collected by nineteenth- and twentieth-century fairy tale collectors. Material for such studies is abundant: libraries are full of the cheap literature sold to ordinary readers all over Europe and archives are full of folk tellings. Print-based studies of folk and fairy tales in oral circulation can theoretically document individual folk imaginations, outline general folk imaginaries, discern historical attitudes among past storytellers, and bring new life to explorations of story origins and transmission.

Let us summarize the main points in this talk about European fairy tales. Straparola invented rise and restoration fairy tales in the 1550s. For the next 250 years publishing data suggest that the preferred form of fairy tale was the restoration type with its royal protagonists suffering tasks and trials but returning to their initial royal status. A new mass readership had its beginnings around 1800, and for this readership the *rise* fairy tale with its poor suffering protagonists and its magic that rewarded demonstrated good behavior, grew in importance until it became the dominant plotline in fairy tales for modern mass publishing. Plots affirming a shared storytelling culture among a rural proletariat became pedagogical tools for an emerging urban proletariat. Throughout this exploration of rise and restoration fairy tales’ origins and dissemination, of their outward movement, and then of the belief that they had moved upward from simple peasant origins to an educated bourgeois consciousness, we have seen print as the force dominating these processes. And that is the concluding thought that I would like to leave with you.

LITERATURE

- AARNE, ANTTI; STITH THOMPSON, HANS-JÖRG 2004: *The Types of the International Folktale. A Classification and Bibliography*. 3 vols. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- APO, SATU 2007: "The Relationship between Oral and Literary Traditions as a Challenge in Fairy-Tale Research." *Marvels & Tales* 21.1: 19-33.
- BASILE, GIAMBATTISTA 1987: *Giambattista Basile. Lo cunto de li cunti*. Michele Rak, ed. Rome: Garzanti Libri. [1634-1636]
- BASILE, GIAMBATTISTA 2007: *Giambattista's The Tale of the Tales, or Entertainment for Little Ones*. Nancy Canepa, ed. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- BASILE, GIAMBATTISTA 2000: *Giambattista Basile. Das Märchen der Märchen. Das Pentamerone*. Rudolf Schenda, trans. and ed. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- BEN-AMOS, DAN 2010: "Straparola: The Revolution that was Not." *Journal of American Folklore* 123.490: 426-446.
- BERTUCH, FRIEDRICH JUSTIN 1990-1994: *Blaue Bibliothek aller Nationen*. Hans-Jörg Uther, ed. 3 vols. Munich: Saur. [1790-1800]
- BOTTIGHEIMER, RUTH B. 2002: *Fairy Godfather: Straparola, Venice, and the Fairy Tale Tradition*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- BOTTIGHEIMER, RUTH B. 2009: *Fairy Tales. A New History*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.
- BOTTIGHEIMER, RUTH B. 2010: *Fairy Godfather, Fairy-Tale History, and Fairy-Tale Scholarship: A Response to Dan Ben-Amos, Jan M. Ziolkowski, and Francisco Vaz da Silva*. *Journal of American Folklore* 123.490: In press.
- CABINET DES FÉES 1785-1789: Charles-Joseph Mayer, ed. 41 volumes. Geneva: Barde (12°), and Amsterdam / Paris: Cuchet (8°).
- CATSKIN. = "The Wandering Young Gentlewoman; or, Catskin" (here London [1760?]) MH-H *pEB75. P4128 C no. 40 [British Library].
- CANEPA, NANCY 2011: "Pompeo Sarnelli." *Early Fairy Tales In Their Own Words*. Albany: SUNY Press. In preparation.
- CANEPA, NANCY 2011: "Luigi Serio." *Early Fairy Tales In Their Own Words*. Albany: SUNY Press. In preparation.
- CAPLAN, NELLY 2006: *Charles Perrault: Les contes illustrés par Gustave Doré in the series 40 Questions, 40 Réponses, 4 Études*. Paris: Ellipses Éditions.
- CLAUSEN-STOLZENBERG, MAREN 1995: *Märchen und mittelalterliche Literaturtradition*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- COX, MARION ROALFE 1893: *Cinderella. Three hundred and forty-five Variants*. London: Folk-Lore Society.
- ESCARPIT, DENISE 1985: *Histoire d'un conte. Le chat botté en France et en Angleterre*. 2 vols. Paris: Didier.
- GRENBY, MATTHEW O. 2000: "Adults Only? Children and Children's Books in British Circulating Libraries, 1748-1848," *Book History* 5: 19-38.

- GRENDLER, PAUL F. 1989: *Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning, 1300-1600*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- GRENDLER, PAUL F. 1995. "What Piero Learned in School: Fifteenth-Century Vernacular Education." In *Piero della Francesca and His Legacy*. Marilyn Aronberg Lavin, ed. Hanover NH: University Press of New England.
- HERRANEN, GUN 1989: "A Big Ugly Man with a Quest for Narrative." *Studies in Oral Narrative*, ed. Anna-Leena Sikkala (= *Studia Fennica* 33), 64-69.
- KING, JOHN N. 2009. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MAGNANINI, SUZANNE 2011a: "Letter to Signora Frondosa (1556)" in Ruth B. Bottigheimer, ed., *Early Fairy Tales In Their Own Words: Prefaces, Afterwords, and Critical Words*. Albany NY: SUNY Press. In preparation.
- MAGNANINI, SUZANNE 2011b: "Ghirolamo Bargagli, 'Dialogue on Games that are Played During the Siene Veglie (1522)'" in Ruth B. Bottigheimer, ed., *Early Fairy Tales In Their Own Words: Prefaces, Afterwords, and Critical Words*. Albany NY: SUNY Press. In preparation.
- MAGNANINI, SUZANNE 2011c: "Ferdinando Galiani, 'On the Neapolitan Dialect' (1779)" in *Early Fairy Tales in Their Own Words*, ed. Ruth B. Bottigheimer. Albany: SUNY Press. In preparation.
- MCDOWELL, KATHLEEN 2009: "Toward a History of children as Readers, 1890-1930," *Book History* 12: 240-265.
- NJAGI, MWANGI 2010: Personal communication.
- OERTEL, MAIKE 2006: *Historicity in German Literature and Thought: 1770-1815*. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter.
- OVERTY, JOANNE FILIPPONE 2008: "The Costs of Doing Scribal Business, 1300-1483," *Book History* 11: 1-32.
- PALMENFELT, ULF June 2010: "Once upon a time there was a genre," *Folklore Fellows Network* 3:8-11, 14-17.
- PIROVANO, DONATO 2001: "Per l'edizione de Le Piacevoli notti di Giovan Francesco Straparola." *Filologia e Critica* 26: 60-91.
- PRICE, LEAH 2004: "Reading: The State of the Discipline" *Book History* 7: 303-320.
- ROOTH, ANNA BIRGITTA 1951: *The Cinderella Cycle*. Lund: Gleerup.
- SCHENDA, RUDOLF 1993: *Von Mund zu Ohr. Bausteine zu einer Kulturgeschichte volkstümlichen Erzählens in Europa*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- SCHENDA, RUDOLF 2007: "Semiliterate and Semi-Oral Processes," Ruth B. Bottigheimer, trans. *Marvels & Tales* 21.1:127-140.
- SCHMIDT, SIGRID 1991: *Aschenputtel und Eulenspiegel in Afrika. Entlehntes Erzählgut der Nama und Damara in Namibia*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- SERMAIN, JEAN-PAUL 2005: *Le Conte de fées du classicisme aux Lumières*. Paris: Éditions Desjonquères.
- STRAPAROLA, GIOVAN FRANCESCO 2000: *La piacevoli notti*. 2 vols. Donato Pirovano, ed. Rome: Salerno Editrice. [1551, 1553]
- STRAPAROLA, GIOVAN FRANCESCO 1898: *The Facetious Nights of Giovanni*

Ruth B. Bottigheimer: Book Culture from Below

- Francesco Straparola*. 4 vols. W. G. Waters, trans. and ed. London: Society of Bibliophiles. [1551, 1553]
- SUMPTER, CAROLINE 2008: *The Victorian Press and the Fairy Tale*. London: Palgrave.
- TOMKOWIAK, INGRID 1993: *Lesebuchgeschichten: Erzählstoff in Schullesebüchern, 1770-1920*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- TODD, EMILY B. 2009: "Establishing Routes for Fiction in the United States: Walter Scott's Novels and the Early Nineteenth-Century Publishing Industry," *Book History* 12: 100-118.
- VAZ DA SILVA, FRANCISCO 2010: "The Invention of Fairy Tales." *Journal of American Folklore* 123.490:398-425.
- VRIESEMA, P.C.A. 1986 "The STCN Fingerprint" *Studies in Bibliography* 39:93-100.
- WESSELSKI, ALBERT 1925: *Märchen des Mittelalters*. Berlin: Stubenrauch.
- YALE, ELIZABETH 2009: "With Slips and Scraps: How Early Modern Naturalists Invented the Archive," *Book History* 12: 1-36.
- ZIOLKOWSKI, JAN 2010: "Straparola and the Fairy Tale: Between Literary and Oral Traditions" *Journal of American Folklore* 123.490:377-397.

Dr. Ruth B. Bottigheimer is an adjunct professor in the department of Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies at Stony Brook University, State University of New York.