34

PRINT

William Gray

Notwithstanding the impact of fairy-tale films and oral storytelling, most of us will probably have had formative early experiences of reading fairy tales in print. However, the relation of fairy tales to print culture is perhaps more complex and controversial than might commonly be expected. The assumption that there is a quasi-natural transition from the oral transmission of fairy tales to their subsequent collection in printed volumes has been radically challenged by two scholars in particular, Ruth B. Bottigheimer (2002, 2009) and Willem de Blécourt (2012), who argue that this "natural" order of things with respect to the origin of fairy tales is actually a kind of myth, propagated above all by the Grimms and their (more or less scholarly and more or less credulous) fan base over the next couple of centuries.

Of this myth of origins, Bottigheimer says: "Literary analysis undermines it, literary history rejects it, social history repudiates it, and publishing history (whether of manuscripts or of books) contradicts it" (2009, 1). Fairy tales as we now understand the term, specifically the so-called "rise tale," which "begins with a poor and lowly hero or heroine who rises dramatically up the social ladder" (13), Bottigheimer argues, began to circulate not in the immemorial past in oral form, but in a particular historical context and in the form of print: in sixteenth-century Venice in the collection *Le piacevoli notti* (Pleasant Nights) by Gianfrancesco Straparola (1550), Bottigheimer's "Fairy Godfather" (2002, 11–13). Jack Zipes has devoted two appendices of his magnum opus *The Irresistible Fairy Tale* (2012b) to demolish the arguments not only of Bottigheimer but also of de Blécourt.

Valdimar Hafstein gives an important slant on this argument about the role of print in the origins of the fairy tale (2015). He argues that the very dichotomy on which the dispute between Bottigheimer and Zipes seems to rest, that is, folklore versus individual authorship in print, far from being a natural opposition, was actually created at a particular historical moment: the Romantic inauguration of the author as solitary genius (18). Hafstein's point is that it was not just that before the invention of the author everything was public domain "folklore" (20); rather, he insists, the very concept of "folklore" (anonymous, usually oral, public production) was co-created with its binary opposite, the isolated Romantic author/genius. And this is not a merely intellectual debate, it has to do with intellectual property. The invention of "folklore" and of the author as individual creative genius go hand in hand with the invention of something more practical and economically motivated: copyright.

Hafstein's argument seeks to undermine the received dichotomy of individual author versus folklore as non-authored, or, as he says, "anti-authored" (21), production. Rather than individual author and anonymous folklore being pre-established either/or options, they are actually at extreme ends of an always already existing spectrum of collaborative creative production. And somewhere near the middle of that spectrum come collector-editors, such as the Grimms (32). The ambiguity about where to draw a dividing line in the fusion of their shaping creativity

with the material they received is only a *problem* if you start with the abstract premises of individual author versus anonymous folklore. This idea connects with Jerome McGann's idea of a social contract between author, editor, and publisher, which rejects privileging the holograph (handwritten by the author) manuscript—if it is extant—and proposes to take instead as copy text the first printed edition where it has authorial approval because much of our experience of creative agency is actually *collaborative* (1983).

As Hafstein points out, the difference of emphasis (not dichotomy) between the fastidious editor concerned with the faithful reproduction of received material, on the one hand, and the creative artistic elaboration of that given material, on the other, can be seen in the partnership of the Grimms themselves, with Jacob generally more concerned with scholarly accuracy and Wilhelm more willing to recreate the material with a degree of artistic license. But the recognition of difference does not necessitate division; the Grimms were (though Hafstein doesn't put it exactly this way) precisely a *team*. And such collaboration is less the exception than the norm in our experience of cultural production.

Recalling Alan Dundes's famous answer to the question: "Who are the folk?" [. . .]. "Among others, *we* are" (quoted in Bronner 2007, 231), Hafstein provocatively suggests as an answer to the question: "Who are the Grimms?"—"Among others, we are! But so is everybody else" (2015, 32). Challenging what Hafstein calls "the untenable dichotomy" of authorship in print and oral folk tradition can open up a more realistic and helpful perspective on creativity and the circulation of culture because story sharing involves a teller addressing various audiences whatever the medium. Especially with print fairy tales, authorship itself, whether attributed to a single writer, director, show runner, or corporation, still resembles a storyteller reaching a certain audience through timely morals and motivations.

Challenging the oral–print dichotomy may also shed light on what seems one of the more puzzling aspects of the Grimms' textual production: the paradoxical idea that by editing and rewriting one can get *closer* to the "authentic" voice of the storyteller. As Zipes (2015) points out, by comparing the different versions of the oral tales the Grimms claimed to be recording, for example a comparison of the 1810 Ölenberg manuscript with the 1812/15 editions of *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, it is clear that the Grimms had to abandon any pretentions to exact verbal accuracy, so that in fact none of their tales could strictly speaking count as "pure," "authentic," or "original." Nevertheless, because the Grimms believed their tales bore the traces of a profound oral tradition, "they felt justified to proclaim that tales were 'genuine' and 'pure' because the changes they made were based on their understanding of the 'natural' poetics of oral storytelling" (Zipes 2015, 9). The creative literary representation of the folkloric voice can thus arguably take us not *away from*, but actually *toward* that "original" voice, since such "originality" is a kind of illusion produced by the performative process that may be conveyed orally, in print, and even through still and audiovisual images.

Rather than print culture being inimical to the flourishing of fairy tales, in fact both in the older form of chapbooks—already semi-canonized by the Romantics—and in the newer form of newspapers and magazines, it has provided a fertile context in which fairy tales of all shapes and sizes thrive. So, another important approach to the relation of print culture to fairy tales is Caroline Sumpter's (2008). She undercuts the conventional—though increasingly unstable— opposition between the (always already disappearing) tradition of "authentic" oral storytelling on the one hand and the "alien" invasion of print culture on the other. The "departure of the fairies" is an enduring literary theme that runs from Chaucer through Kipling to Tolkien. In Sumpter's discussion of this narrative, that itself almost amounts to a folktale, the role of the villain who symbolically drives away both the fairies and the authentic oral culture of storytelling is Print Culture (here capitalized in the spirit of such allegorical narratives).

This tale of lost origins reaches a climax in the Romantic period, and then in its Victorian afterlife, and has dominated most accounts until fairly recently. According to this version, print culture, and especially magazines and newspapers, metonymically represent the evils of modern civilization and increasingly sweep away the vibrant old traditions of storytelling. Jennifer Schacker analyzes the relationship and cultural implications of folklore, fairy tale, and print in nineteenth-century Britain (2003). Sumpter, and others, examine the way chapbooks become like a halfway house in which the authentic traditions of times past are represented not only by oral storytelling but in print. Once chapbooks have become replaced by more modern and more technologically sophisticated productions (and are therefore sufficiently outmoded and rare), they acquire some of the mystical glamor of "tradition."

Cathy L. Preston and Michael J. Preston study how ephemeral print such as chapbooks and broadsides transmitted much folklore, some of which went back to medieval times (1995). Chapbooks were controversial, not only in the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries but also in histories of children's literature (O'Malley 2003, 18–21); nevertheless, as Victor E. Neuburg puts it: "fairy tales were available to [young readers] only in chapbook form. The rich tradition of English fairy mythology survived in the eighteenth century almost entirely because of chapbooks" (1968, 15). This is the reading material famously lamented by Wordsworth in *The Prelude* (1979) ("Oh! Give us once again the wishing cap/Of Fortunatus, and the invisible coat/of Jack the giant-killer"), which literary histories routinely set alongside S. T. Coleridge's 1797 letter to Thomas Poole about his "early reading of Faery Tales, Genii &c &c." (1956–1971). Thus, print may take on a vernacular appeal, especially in conjunction with the fairy tale, confirming that an oral/print continuum is more conceptually productive, and empirically accurate, than a dichotomy.

But if chapbooks could be elevated into the venerable realms of "tradition," the new bogey was the arrival and pervasive circulation of newspapers and magazines, whose contemporary relevance and therefore ephemerality is the opposite of the supposedly eternal values of oral culture. Sumpter's wide-ranging and ground-breaking book begins with yet another "Alternative History of the Fairy Tale," where she contends that "fairy tales were clearly circulating in Britain before the 1750s: in newspapers and magazines as well as chapbooks. They evolved alongside, rather than cleared the way for, that newest of genres, the novel—a dialogue that was to continue throughout the nineteenth century" (2008, 13). Thus, Sumpter shows that even innovative print forms could facilitate the sharing of tales.

The newer print culture, especially of magazines, gave the first home to many fairy tales and fantasy works which are now mostly known in terms of their appearance in books. For example, Charles Kingsley's *The Water-Babies: A Fairy Tale for a Land Baby*, serialized 1862–1963 in *Macmillan's Magazine*, then published by Macmillan in 1863; George MacDonald's *At The Back Of The North Wind* (1868–70; 1871), *The Princess and the Goblin* (1870–1; 1872), and *The Princess and Curdie* (1877; 1883) all originally appeared in *Good Words for the Young* (which MacDonald edited 1869–1872). Robert Louis Stevenson's *Fables* (*Longman's Magazine*, 1895) first appeared in book form as *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde with Other Fables* (1895). Laurence Housman's fairy tales "A Capful of Moonshine" and "How Little Duke Jarl Saved the Castle" first appeared in the *Dome* in October 1898 and October 1899 respectively, and were later included in *The Blue Moon* (1904). And the stories in Edith Nesbit's *Book of Dragons* (1900) first appeared in the *Strand Magazine* (1899–1900).

The original magazine context of fairy tales is important to understanding their reception history, argues Sumpter. Though pedagogically convenient, extracting the tales from that context, as Zipes does, is liable to skew the reader response to the fairy tale when abstracted from the accompanying material in the original serial publication (1987). The response in question

here is not only that of the modern reader who will lose much of the situatedness of the historical telling of the tale when it is anthologized (no matter how good the contextualizing notes); also in question is the response of the historical magazine readers who often exercised considerable agency in the production of the tales they read.

Sumpter includes an interesting example when the purportedly juvenile readers of Keir Hardie's politically-motivated magazine threaten to go on strike if the magazine does not regularly provide their staple fare because tales were relegated to the back page (or omitted altogether) if a political issue that the editor deemed more important came up (2008, 124–125). The *Labour Leader* featured Hardie's own fairy tale "Jack Clearhead" which included such messages as the maiden "Social-ism" being trapped in a dungeon with the fearsome "Press Curs" (88). Magazines linked writers and readers with fairy tales and such social commentary.

The explicit symbolic and allegorical motivation was by no means new to fairy tales and fables: the full title of Charles Perrault's fairy-tale collection was after all *Stories or Fairy Tales from Past Times with Morals*. However, for Charles Dickens the moralizing went too far in the overt promotion of teetotalism in George Cruickshank's fairy tales (Sumpter 2008, 28–29). Dickens's wrath in "Fraud on the Fairies" was published in October 1853 in his own weekly journal *Household Words*. The attack included a satirical teetotal version of "Cinderella." Nothing daunted, Cruikshank responded by publishing his own teetotal version of "Cinderella" in the 1854 *Fairy Book*. Sumpter also makes a strong case for the *implicit* or coded gay motivation of the fairy tales (for example by Laurence Housman) in decadent *fin de siècle* Little Magazines such as the *Dome* and the *Yellow Book* (2008, 131–140). Fairy tales (and fables) have always been retold, and every retelling, including these magazine versions, involves some kind of motivation, even if only the storyteller's need to keep the wolf from the door.

The New Chapbooks? Disney and Ladybird Fairy-Tale Storybooks

Disney and Ladybird fairy-tale storybooks are arguably comparable with historical chapbooks insofar as they are cheap, popular, strikingly illustrated, and often disdained by educationalists and sections of the literary elite. A brief examination and comparison of versions by Disney, Vera Southgate's stories published in the Ladybird series *Well-Loved Tales* (1964–1974), and the later Ladybird Disney tales again shows how motivations and values of writers and readers appear in print. Some discrepancies between the Disney print versions of "Snow White," "Cinderella," and "Sleeping Beauty" are particularly interesting since the original Ladybird versions of fairy tales retold by Vera Southgate in the "Easy Reading" *Well-Loved Tales* were replaced in the 1980s onward by the Ladybird Disney versions. The different versions suggest changing motivations in retelling tales by adjusting attitudes toward violence and women's roles and also indicate ways that corporations and media conglomerates may act, and be received, as authors and storytellers.

Walt Disney indisputably made the most influential intervention in the modern history of fairy tales. But while his major impact was undoubtedly through his animated films, to which much attention has been devoted, not least by Zipes (1994, 72–95, 2012a, 191–210), the lesser but still enormous impact of the Disney tie-in fairy-tale books seems relatively under-researched. This is not to underestimate the importance of other kinds of merchandising, sometimes in print, for example a special *Snow White* issue of the magazine *Hollywood* in May 1938 (Miller) and a coloring book (Hollis and Sibley 1987, 78–79). Before the advent of readily available home video versions of the Disney fairy-tale animations on VHS, DVD, Blu-Ray Disc, and now online streamed versions from Netflix and other providers, arguably

the print retelling with the iconic Disney images of "Snow White" (ATU 709), "Cinderella" (ATU 510A), and "Sleeping Beauty" (ATU 410) became the major form of their dissemination outside the cinema.

From *Walt Disney's Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs: Adapted from Grimms' Fairy Tales* (1937), published soon after the release of Disney's eponymous animated film, tie-in Disney storybooks of this and other fairy tales have continued to be produced in tandem with Disney fairy-tale films. While certain key features, and indeed innovations, of the Disney films remain constant through the tie-in storybooks (for example Snow White always meets the Prince at the beginning of the Disney versions), there are discrepancies between the various Disney versions, with the consequence that while the animated film version is fixed, the printed editions differ, resulting in a more variable, and thus folkloric, text that further blurs an oral/print dichotomy. In many ways noted in the following, the Vera Southgate/Ladybird version aligns more closely with the Grimms' while still signaling awareness of Disney fairy-tale conventions and softening the harshness of the Grimms' and Disney's versions.

Ladybird books, originally a British phenomenon, gradually developed during the twentieth century; by the 1960s they were immensely popular, covering a huge range of topics and being widely used in British primary schools (Johnson and Alderson 2014). From October 2013, the original *Well-Loved Tales* series was reissued to mark the fiftieth anniversary of its first publication, with edited text by Vera Southgate, author of the entire series. *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*, with its title referencing Disney rather than the Grimms, who simply called the tale "Snow White," was retold first by Southgate in the Ladybird "Easy Reading" series (for ages twelve and up)in 1969. Despite the title's nod to Disney, however, the beginning of the fairy tale very much follows the Grimm versions—not only the 1812 and 1857 versions but also the urtext of 1808 in a letter from Jacob Grimm to Carl von Savigny (Zipes 2015, 552). This (not unimportant) backstory of how Snow White got her name when her mother pricked her finger while sewing by an ebony-framed window on a snowy day is entirely dispensed with in the Disney versions.

The 1969 Ladybird version—following the 1812 and 1857 Grimm versions, though not the 1808 version, which has the King off fighting in a war (Zipes 2015, 553)—says nothing about the King, while the later Ladybird Disney version lets him off the hook by saying that he was already dead by the time the action commences. Only the Disney versions have Snow White meet the Prince at the beginning of the story; the original Ladybird edition omits this episode (though it is later introduced into the Ladybird Disney version). While the original Ladybird version is in many respects closer to the Grimms than the Disney adaptations (including the Ladybird Disney edition), the book omits all mention of the huntsman substituting an animal's heart (let alone its lungs and liver, as in the Grimms) for Snow White's in the elaborate casket the Queen has given him for this gruesome purpose. However, all the Disney versions not only make reference to this detail, they also incorporate an illustration of the casket with its distinctive clasp, which features a sword-shaped pin penetrating a heart-shaped hasp.

In the original Ladybird version, the dwarfs' house is "small and neat" as in the Grimms; however, in the Disney versions (including the Ladybird Disney edition) everything is dusty, dirty, and untidy. Understandably tired out after dusting and cleaning the filthy cottage in the Disney adaptation (though no such housework is required in Grimm or the original Ladybird), Snow White lies down across three or more of the tiny beds and falls asleep. In Grimm and the original Ladybird version, Snow White tries all the dwarfs' beds but only the seventh is right. And when she awakes to find the dwarfs watching her, she is initially frightened in the original Ladybird version (as in Grimm 1857, but not 1812).

The original Ladybird version follows the Grimms by including the Queen's first two murder attempts, death by corset and death by poison comb, before moving onto the poison apple—or more accurately the poison (red) half of an apple. Disney's Queen is less subtle in this respect, and her apple is all red. As in the Grimms, the original Ladybird version has the poisoned Snow White laid to rest in a glass coffin; sometimes Disney has a glass coffin or a golden casket covered in glass, but in the Ladybird Disney edition it is "a special bed made of glass and gold" (Southgate 2003, 39). As in Grimm, Snow White's resuscitation is effected in the original Ladybird storybook by an accidental jolt to her coffin (1857)—and not by an irritable servant slapping her on the back (Grimm 1812)—thus dislodging the piece of poison apple stuck in her throat. In Disney of course it is all down to the Prince's kiss.

The original Ladybird version spares younger readers the gruesome spectacle of the evil Queen having to dance herself to death in red-hot iron slippers at Snow White's wedding (as in all Grimm versions, including the 1808 urtext); in this 1969 version she dies of sheer rage. The Disney storybooks mostly follow the film and have the Queen fall off a cliff amid thunder and lightning while trying to perpetrate a final murderous act (rolling a boulder onto the approaching dwarfs), though in some more recent Disney storybook versions she just falls off a cliff.

The beginning of Southgate's version of "Sleeping Beauty" in the Ladybird series *Well-Loved Tales* (1965) follows the Grimms' (1857) version of "Briar Rose" when a frog announces to the wife of a childless couple when she is bathing that she will give birth to a daughter (in the 1812 Grimms' edition a crab does the annunciation). In Disney (the film and the printed Ladybird Disney) we begin with the happy couple arranging the feast to celebrate the birth of their daughter, Aurora, which is the name of the Princess's *daughter* in Part II of Perrault's "Sleeping Beauty." Southgate's version borrows from Perrault some of the magic gifts the fairies bestow on the infant at her christening; the Grimms' list of the gifts of the "wise women" is much shorter. Both the Southgate versions (1990, 2012) follow the Grimms' list of creatures in the castle who fall asleep, including the flies on the wall.

Both Southgate versions omit the miserable deaths suffered by the princes who over the years have tried vainly to penetrate the hedge of thorns to reach the Sleeping Beauty (Briar Rose). After the century-old spell has elapsed, the thorns turn into beautiful flowers (roses, in Southgate) and let the prince enter, and the princess is awakened by his kiss. Life picks up again where it left off in the castle: horses, dogs, pigeons, and flies resume their normal activities.

After the prince and princess get married and start living happily ever after, the 2012 Southgate version offers a brief history of "Sleeping Beauty," mentioning not only Tchaikovsky, Disney, and Perrault, but also the much more obscure fourteenth-century Catalan tale *Frayre de Joy e Sor de Placer* and the sixteenth-century French romance *Perceforest*. However, while such literary references are undoubtedly worthy, and even impressive, in a Ladybird book, one cannot help wondering who exactly they are trying to impress and whether they are really appropriate to the *Well-Loved Tales* series. This paratextual information suggests that the long print history of the story affords the tale, and perhaps the series itself, more educational and economic status.

The initial backstory of *Sleeping Beauty* is omitted by the Ladybird Disney. Not only the princess's prospective spouse (Philip) but the fairy godmothers (Flora, Fauna, and Merryweather)—who rename the princess "Briar Rose"—are all named, as is the wicked fairy Maleficent, who will of course feature in a later Disney film all of her own. Unique to the Disney versions is Maleficent's ability to shapeshift into a huge and terrible black dragon. Apart from these far from minor alterations, the story of "Sleeping Beauty" remains broadly similar to the Grimms' "Briar Rose"—and of course totally omits the second part of Perrault's "Sleeping Beauty"

(and of Giambattista Basile's "Sun, Moon and Talia") in which the princess's children face the threat of cannibalism from either the prince's ogreish mother (or his existing wife, in "Sun, Moon and Talia").

There is of course no Ladybird Disney version of "Rapunzel" (ATU 310) since there was no Disney film of this fairy tale until *Tangled* (2010), which is *very* loosely based on the traditional tale as is the tie-in "Little Golden Book" of the film (*Disney: Tangled* 2010). There are, however, two Ladybird editions of Southgate's version of "Rapunzel": the original 1968 edition replicated in 2014 to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Ladybird's *Well-Loved Tales* series and the 2012 edition with different illustrations, but an identical text to the original 1968 Southgate version. This exact textual identity is interesting since (as we have seen) the various Ladybird editions by Southgate, for example of "Sleeping Beauty," do have textual differences.

The 2012 Ladybird edition does, however, contain "A History of *Rapunzel*," which after mentioning the films *Tangled* and *Shrek* (2001)—and the latter's sequels—goes on to cite not only the Grimms' "Rapunzel," but also "Persinette" (1697) by Charlotte-Rose de Caumont de La Force and Giambattista Basile's 1634 version "Petrosinalla." Again, while such literary references are undoubtedly impressive in a Ladybird book, one cannot help wondering just how appropriate they really are to the *Well-Loved Tales* series. Perhaps Ladybird might be suspected of overcompensating for what some would see as the faux pas of embracing the Disney brand in the 1980s. Be that as it may, it is nevertheless surely a welcome move to reinstate the Southgate versions of the classic fairy tales, which were all but lost in the heyday of the Disney Ladybird editions.

Fairy–Tale Retellings in Print (By Literary "Celebs")

The Disney and Ladybird Disney imprints indicate that readers may embrace corporate authors as storytellers, while the continuing loyalty to Southgate versions also honors the individual author as storyteller. Fairy tales have always been tales for the (re)telling, for example by nineteenth-century literary celebs Charles Dickens and George Cruikshank in their respectively satirical and temperance versions of "Cinderella." As Disney suggests, celebrity may arise as much from successfully retelling fairy-tales, in print or film, as in some previous accomplishment.

The Fairies Return: Or, New Tales for Old, appearing originally in 1934 and edited by Peter Llewelyn Davies, who is the original of Peter Pan and adopted son of J. M. Barrie, is an early twentieth-century collection of fairy-tale retellings by nowadays rather less celebrated celebs. This book was republished in Zipes's important series "Oddly Modern Fairy Tales" with an introduction by Maria Tatar (Davies 2012). Other now less well-known storytelling celebs in this series include Naomi Mitchison (2014) and Walter de la Mare (2014), introduced by currently fêted fairy-tale writers Marina Warner and Philip Pullman respectively. Pullman (perhaps rather modestly) retells the Grimms' tales in his own voice in *Grimm Tales for Young and Old* (2012). This attribution to one tale teller also happens in other media such as when viewers and critics refer to the Kenneth Branagh (2015) *Cinderella* film or Joss Whedon's *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* (1997–2003).

Authors associated with retelling the fairy tale over the past few decades achieve cultural recognition that verges on celebrity. The number of more radical fairy-tale retellings in print has increased exponentially in the later twentieth and early twenty-first centuries through the tellings of such authors: writers include Margaret Atwood, Neil Gaiman, Tanith Lee, Kelly Link, Patricia A. McKillip, Robin McKinley, Jane Yolen, and of course Angela Carter in *The Bloody Chamber* (1979). Some of these writers have been anthologized in the many and varied

fairy-tale collections of Ellen Datlow and Terri Windling, starting with *Snow White, Blood Red* in 1993. Another phenomenon is that of longer novellas or novel-length fairy stories, although such "faerie romances"—to use the subtitle of George MacDonald's *Phantastes* (1858)—go well back into the nineteenth century, arguably to Novalis's *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* (1800). Notable recent examples include Cornelia Funke's *Reckless* (Funke, Wigram, and Latsch 2010) and its sequels; Neil Gaiman's work, especially perhaps *Stardust* (Gaiman and Vess 1997) and *The Sleeper and the Spindle* (Gaiman and Riddell 2014); Robin McKinley's *Beauty: A Retelling of the Story of Beauty and the Beast* (1978) and *Spindle's End* (2000); and Catherynne M. Valente, *The Orphan's Tales: In the Night Garden* (2006) and *The Girl Who Circumnavigated Fairyland in a Ship of Her Own Making* (2012).

The celebrity associated with tale telling thus reinforces the importance of the author function while tying it directly with the storyteller role. While celebrity is not synonymous with scholarship, fairy-tale studies has produced well-regarded and recognized authors who themselves become important cultural tale tellers, such as Zipes, Tatar, and Warner. Print remains the crucial venue for constructing and sharing fairy-tale scholarship. Fairy-tale magazines and journals currently available in print include *Marvels & Tales* published by Wayne State University Press, which also produces Kate Bernheimer's *Fairy Tale Review* as well as the "Fairy-Tale Studies" series of critical monographs. See also *Gramarye*, the journal of the Sussex Centre for Folklore, Fairy Tales, and Fantasy. Rather than working to patrol borders between oral and print tale telling, scholars, writers, readers, and viewers benefit from the historical and contemporary continuum that is the heritage of this storytelling.

Related topics: Adaptation and the Fairy-Tale Web; Anthologies and Tale Collections; Children's and Young Adult (YA) Literature; Convergence Culture; Disney Corporation; Intellectual Property; Novels; Material Culture; Oral Tradition; Pictorial; Poetry; Storyworlds/Narratology

References Cited and Further Reading

Bottigheimer, Ruth B. 2002. *Fairy Godfather: Straparola, Venice and the Fairy Tale Tradition*. Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P.
———. 2009. *Fairy Tales: A New History*. New York: SUNY P.
Bronner, Simon. 2007. "Grouping Lore: Scientists and Musicians." In *The Meaning of Folklore*, edited by Simon Bronner, 229–31. Logan: Utah State UP.
Carter, Angela. 1979. *The Bloody Chamber and Other Stories*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. 1956–1971. *Collected Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, edited by E. L. Griggs. Oxford: Clarendon.
Cruikshank, George. (1854) 1910. *The Cruikshank Fairy Book*. New York: Putnam.
Datlow, Ellen, and Terri Windling. 1993. *Snow White, Blood Red*. New York: W. Morrow.
Davies, Peter Llewelyn. 2012. *The Fairies Return: Or, New Tales for Old*, edited by Maria Tatar. Princeton: Princeton UP.
de Blécourt, Willem. 2012. *Tales of Magic, Tales in Print: On the Genealogy of Fairy Tales and the Brothers Grimm*. Manchester: Manchester UP.
de la Mare, Walter. 2014. *Told Again: Old Tales Told Again*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
Dickens, Charles. 1853. *Frauds on the Fairies*. London: Bradbury & Evans.
Disney: Tangled. 2010. New York: Golden Books.
Funke, Cornelia, Lionel Wigram, and Oliver Latsch. 2010. *Reckless*. New York: Little, Brown.
Gaiman, Neil, and Chris Riddell. 2014. *The Sleeper and the Spindle*. New York: Harper.
Gaiman, Neil, and Charles Vess. 1997. *Stardust: Being a Romance within the Realms of Faerie, Book 1*. London: Vertigo.
Grimm, Jacob, and Wilhelm Grimm. 1812. *Kinder- und Hausmärchen (Children's and Household Tales)*. 1st ed. Germany.
———. 1857. *Kinder- und Hausmärchen (Children's and Household Tales)*. 7th ed. Germany.
Hafstein, Valdimar. 2015. "Fairy Tales, Copyright, and the Public Domain." In *The Cambridge Companion to Fairy Tales*, edited by Maria Tatar, 11–38. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Hollis, Richard, and Brian Sibley. 1987. *Walt Disney's Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs & the Making of the Classic Film*. London: André Deutsch.

Housman, Laurence. 1904. *The Blue Moon*. London: John Murray.

Johnson, Lorraine, and Brian Alderson. 2014. *The Ladybird Story: Children's Books for Everyone*. London: British Library Publishing.

Kingsley, Charles. (1863) 1898. *The Water-Babies: A Fairy Tale for a Land-Baby*. New York: Maynard, Merrill, & Co.

MacDonald, George. 1858. *Phantastes: A Faerie Romance for Men and Women*. London: Smith, Elder.

———. (1868–1870) 1871. *At the Back of the North Wind*. London: Strahan & Co.

———. (1870–1871) 1872. *The Princess and the Goblin*. London: Strahan.

———. (1877) 1883. *The Princess and Curdie*. London: Chatto & Windus.

McGann, Jerome J. 1983. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.

McKinley, Robin. 1978. *Beauty: A Retelling of the Story of Beauty and the Beast*. New York: Harper Collins.

———. 2000. *Spindle's End*. New York: ACE Books.

Miller, Llewellyn, ed. 1938. "Snow White." *Hollywood* 27 (5).

Mitchinson, Naomi. 2014. *The Fourth Pig*. Princeton: Princeton UP.

Nesbit, Edith. 1900. *The Book of Dragons*. London: Harper.

Neuburg, Victor E. 1968. *The Penny Histories: A Study of Chapbooks for Young Readers Over Two Centuries*. London: Oxford UP.

Novalis. 1800. *Heinrich von Ofterdingen ein nachgelassener Roman; zwei Theile*. Berlin: Buchh. der Realsch.

O'Malley, Andrew. 2003. *The Making of the Modern Child: Children's Literature and Childhood in the Late Eighteenth Century*. London: Routledge.

Preston, Cathy L., and Michael J. Preston. 1995. *The Other Print Tradition: Essays on Chapbooks, Broadsides, and Related Ephemera*. London: Routledge.

Pullman, Philip. 2012. *Grimm Tales for Young and Old*. London: Penguin.

Schacker, Jennifer. 2005. *National Dreams: The Remaking of Fairy Tales in Nineteenth-Century England*. Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P.

Southgate, Vera. 1964–1974. *Well-Loved Tales (Easy Reading Series)*. Loughborough, UK: Ladybird Books.

———. 1969. *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs (Easy Reading Series)*. Loughborough, UK: Ladybird Books.

———. (1965) 1990. *Sleeping Beauty: Well-Loved Tales*, illustrated by Eric Winter. Loughborough, UK: Ladybird Books.

———. 2003. *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*. London: Ladybird.

———. 2012a. *Rapunzel*. London: Ladybird.

———. 2012b. *Sleeping Beauty*. London: Ladybird.

———. (1968) 2014. *Rapunzel: Well-Loved Tales*. Loughborough, UK: Ladybird Books.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. 1895. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Straparola, Gianfrancesco. (1550) 2012. *Le piacevoli notti* (Pleasant Nights), edited by Don Beecher, translated by W. G. Waters. Toronto: U Toronto Press.

Sumpter, Caroline. 2008. *The Victorian Press and the Fairy Tale*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Valente, Catherynne M. 2006. *The Orphan's Tales: In the Night Garden*. New York: Bantam Books.

———. 2012. *The Girl Who Circumnavigated Fairyland in a Ship of Her Own Making*. New York: Square Fish.

Walt Disney's Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs: Adapted from Grimms' Fairy Tales. 1937. New York: H.N. Abrams.

Wordsworth, William. 1979. *The Prelude of 1850*. New York: Norton Critical Edition.

Zipes, Jack, ed. 1987. *Victorian Fairy Tales: The Revolt of the Fairies and the Elves*. New York: Routledge.

———. 1994. *Fairy Tale as Myth/Myth as Fairy Tale*. Lexington: Kentucky UP.

———. (1983) 2012a. *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion*. New York: Routledge.

———. 2012b. *The Irresistible Fairy Tale: The Cultural and Social History of a Genre*. Princeton: Princeton UP.

———. 2015. *Grimm Legacies: The Magic Spell of the Grimms' Folk and Fairy Tales*. Princeton: Princeton UP.

Mediagraphy

Buffy the Vampire Slayer (TV). 1997–2003. Creator Joss Whedon. USA.

Cinderella. 2015. Director Kenneth Branagh. USA.

Maleficent. 2014. Director Robert Stromberg. USA.

Shrek. 2001. Directors Andrew Adamson and Vicky Jenson. USA.

Tangled. 2010. Directors Nathan Greno and Byron Howard. USA.