Martin Hallett and Barbara Karasek, eds. **Folk & Fairy Tales.** 2d ed. Peterborough, Ontario, Canada: Broadview Press, (1996) 1997. Pp. 400, black and white illustrations, selected bibliography.

JoAnn Conrad
University of California, Berkeley

Folk and Fairy Tales is an anthology of tales appended by a sampling of "analytic" articles. On the basis of this combination, the editors claim that the book is a rarity and "much more than simply entertainment for children" (9). Those familiar with the anthologies of Angela Carter, Jane Yolen, Peter and Iona Opie, Jack Zipes, and, more recently, Maria Tatar's *The Classic Fairy Tales* (Norton, 1999), will realize that this claim is unfounded. What it signals is that this ad hoc collection—based on the editors' experience in the classroom attempting to find common ground among students who represent today's "increasing multiculturalism" (9)—demonstrates a profound lack of engagement in any of the three fields this book purports to survey: "Children's Literature, Folklore, and the Literature of Fantasy" (back cover). The result is an organizational premise that is ill-defined, confused, and arbitrary.

At the heart of this disorganization is the inability of the editors to define their terms at the outset. Any attempts to do so also reflect an amazing disconnect with recent scholarship in any of the three fields. In the Introduction the editors correctly state that the term *fairy tale* is used "loosely," but then muddy the waters by proposing two "more accurate" terms: *folk tale* and *literary tale* (12), which they take to represent opposite ends of a continuum (15). According to this model, the former is defined as "a tale of the folk" (12), who are rendered the illiterate "common people of a nation" (12). (The "peasant" connotation persists, but the editors also include the"working class" in this category of "oral-based" groups [16]). This lingering evolutionist strand results in claims that the "genuine folk tale" can never be represented in books, leaving us with the impression that literary fairy tales are somehow inauthentic, and, more importantly, that all the tales in the book are generically of a kind (thus the easy transition from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century collections of Perrault and the Grimms to the work of H. C. Andersen

and Angela Carter). Even more confusing, after having established that the folk tale cannot be represented, the editors continue to refer to the tales in their collection as variously fairy, folk, or even "folk-fairy tale[s]" (53). The evolutionist strains continue in an insidious aesthetic hierarchy in which oral tales are genuine, but also inferior and less sophisticated than their literary adaptations by "accomplished writers" (10). Similarly, in this evolutionary scheme children are unsophisticated, and thus it comes as no surprise that most of the analysis of the "meaning" of these tales derives from Bettelheim. Absent is any reference to the work on the emergence of "childhood" in the same social milieu as witnessed the rise of the literary fairy tale in the West, and, more generally, the relationship of these with the emergence of the bourgeoisie.

The unresolved confusion about the nature of folk tales, wonder tales, and the literary fairy tale affects the chapter organization. The first, "Loss of Innocence"—a collection of Little Red Riding Hood versions—and the second, "Sleeping Beauties," suggest that the book will be organized on the basis of tale types. This taxonomic logic is dispensed with by the third section, replaced with the editors' own (undefined) organizational scheme. The subsequent sections include "Damsels in Distress," which lumps Cinderella, Snow White, and Rapunzel; "Brain over Brawn," combining The Brave Little Tailor, Hop o' My Thumb, and Puss in Boots; "The Child as Hero," linking Hansel and Gretel with Jack and the Beanstalk; "Villains," containing the stories of Rumpelstiltskin and Bluebeard; and "Animal Bridegroom," which returns, partially, to the tale type model, comparing Beauty and the Beast, The Frog King, and East of the Sun and West of the Moon. If the organization of these sections is based on functions rather than dramatis personae, suggesting a Proppian influence, it is never articulated. The next sections showcase literary works from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—the works of H. C. Andersen and Oscar Wilde, and Angela Carter and Tanith Lee respectively.

Some of the problems associated with such an organizational scheme are immediately apparent—why, for example, could not Bluebeard be in the"Damsels in Distress" section? The collection of "versions" [sic] also assumes that the reader will be working comparatively, although many of the tales are only minimally (single

motif) comparable. Furthermore, this comparison serves as an end in itself: tales are similar, or they exhibit differences, but there is no attempt to analyze why these differences and similarities occur or to investigate the mechanisms by which such motifs and themes are combined and reworked. And although the editors insist that the collection points to the global nature of these tales, there is scant evidence to support this. Almost all of the tales from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are from Perrault and the Grimms, exposing a very limited data base, as well as a European bias—a tendency that is deepened in the presentation of nineteenth- and twentieth-century material.

Missing is a differentiation between the classic literary fairy tale and modern works of literature that adopt, rework, and subvert these texts. Missing also is a discussion of the intertextual nature of all these texts—how themes and structures insinuate themselves into the various genres. Similarly undifferentiated are the works of Perrault and the Grimms. In fact, a discussion of the history of the literary fairy tale as it emerged as a distinct genre in France (analyzed at length by Zipes) is obfuscated by the focus on Perrault at the expense of all the women writers who contributed to the enormous *cabinet des fées*, including Marie-Jeanne L'Heritier and Marie-Catherine d'Aulnoy.

The analytic articles at the end of the book are interesting but seemingly arbitrarily selected and very dated; they include the work of J. R. R. Tolkien, Max Lüthi, Bruno Bettelheim, Karen E. Rowe, Maria Tatar, and Jack Zipes. With the possible exception of Zipes's article "Spells of Enchantment," they leave the reader with no theoretical foundation to understand the variety of different genres presented in the anthology, and the articles do nothing to illuminate the particular tales or the organizing principle behind the editors' selection and arrangement of the tales. The greatest deficiency is perhaps in the book's coverage of feminist theory and the fairy tale. Since the 1980s, feminist theorists have made significant contributions to the field that aren't represented by the inclusion of Rowe's "Feminism and the Fairy Tale" (1979), which, although seminal and historically important, is not representative of current scholarship. The entire book is plagued by this lack of identity: it fails to establish itself within folkloristics, children's literature, or the literary study of the fairy tale.