CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR. . .

Here it is. The new (and, we hope, improved) *Children's Folklore* Review. Since last year, when the changeover was approved here at East Carolina University and by the Executive Board of the Children's Folklore Section, much has changed, and the most important change, perhaps, has been in the North Carolina budget. It has shrunk. Still, we hope this new format will be the beginning of an important new journal rather than an ill-fated bravura gesture in the face of monetary shortfalls.

But concentrate on the present for a moment, and we think you will find a rather nice first issue in your hands. The two 1989 Newell Prize papers, Nicola Hurlston's "Who's the Boss?" and Linda Riley's "Extremes," lead off the issue. The co-winners were students of Jay Mechling's when they wrote their papers. They are followed by Brian Sutton-Smith's report from the Children's Folklore Section's panel, "The Future Agenda for Child Study," held at the 1989 AFS meeting. Next, a reprint from *ADWEEK*, "The Latest Teen Rage," provides an interesting follow-up to Catherine Klutz's "Friendship Bracelets," CFR XII. 1 (1989): 4-5. And Bill Senior's review of Warren Wooden's *Children's Literature of the English Renaissance*, contains some important comments on folklore and children's literature. Each issue will carry a Notes and Announcements section, and the Membership list will be included in each Fall number.

We are encouraging members and others interested in children and their lore to send in materials (see inside back cover for details), and we are open to suggestions for future issues and conference panels.

Bringing out this first issue would have been much more difficult without the hard work and good advice of Victoria Lewkow, a graduate student in the English Department at BCU who has now left CFR for greener editing pastures at ECU's School of Medicine (we wish her well and will call on her for advice from time to time), and the English Department's Graduate Studies Secretary, Tina Moore, who also helped set up this first new-format issue and who will remain and will be the contact person for inquiries concerning CFR matters. Between the two of them, they did "right much" of the editor's job.

C. W. Sullivan III

Who's the Boss?
A Study of Power Defining Folklore Among Children

Nicola Hurlston

Power is something we all seek to achieve, both in the work-place and among friends and family. We all want our opinions to be heard and acted upon; we have an innate desire to hold the most esteemed position. The struggle for power is probably the most common source of tension within any group, and children are certainly not exempt from this struggle. In fact, it is present in so many of their actions and statements that it seems to be at the core of all their interactions. Children are always fighting over who the "boss" is, who gets to go first, who is the oldest, and who has the most of something.

The study of children's folklore gives some key insights into the formation of power hierarchies. As Jay Mechling has noted, "Children sometimes use their folklore to experiment with power, to try out power roles that might not be available to them in the normal course of the day" (105). As a student-teacher at the Early Childhood Laboratory on the Davis campus, I witnessed folk behaviors being used in power struggles daily. Of special interest to me was the difference between sexes in these behaviors. Boys seem especially concerned with forming a hierarchy, for they participate in power-defining folklore frequently. Brian Sutton-Smith observed that they play in larger groups, they make much more contact through shouting, and they are much more aggressive in their negotiations (241). Boys also engage in verbal dueling frequently. Though girls partake in these behaviors, they do not occur nearly as often or with as much intensity.

Sutton-Smith noted that girls used inclusion-exclusion devices while boys used physical and strategic power tactics (241-242); my findings definitely agree with this. To watch children in the middle of a power struggle is fascinating; it is always interesting to observe the techniques they use and to see the struggle come to its conclusion. I think these behaviors are significant because they reveal so much about human nature. The fact that power struggles are present at such a young age is a real indication of the importance we place upon being the "best"; the greater intensity of these behaviors among males also shows which sex we are socializing to be more powerful.

The Early Childhood Laboratory holds class daily for three hours. There are twenty-five children at the ECL, eleven females and fourteen males between the ages of four and five. They are all children of either students or instructors at the University. Most of these children have been attending the ECL together since they were toddlers, and they play together after school. Approximately eight of them live in a student-family complex called Solano Park, and their families exchange child

care frequently. The fact that all of these children have such extended contact leads me to believe that they are quite a high context folk group.

As a student-teacher at the ECL two days a week, I was given a great opportunity to both observe the children and interact with them. Part of my obligation as a teacher was to take anecdotal notes on the children, which are brief reports of unusual or interesting incidents, stating the child involved and the location of the action. The children were therefore used to having people write about them, so my note-taking did not alter any of their behaviors. I also kept a daily journal, in which I further discussed any unique incidents that I witnessed. I had access to files on the children, which included all anecdotal notes on them as well as family information. I used this material for further insights on a child's behavior. Additionally, of course, I participated in projects with the children, read to them, and offered guidance.

My interest in the topic of power struggles started developing as a result of my target child assignments. Each teacher is assigned two or three children to observe closely and take notes on throughout the quarter. My male target child, Jack (all names have been changed), is the "dominant male" and constantly asserted himself as such. Jack is charismatic and will often organize his own activities and get all of the other children involved. He is also the oldest child at the ECL. He has frequent battles with another boy, Tom, who is struggling to obtain Jack's position. My female target child, Martha, is one of the leaders of the girl's clique. She is a bright girl and uses this to her advantage by pointing out when others are wrong; in doing this, she affirms her superiority over them. She shares her position as leader of this clique with a girl named Amy. These four children are certainly not the only ones who are involved in the power struggle; it is something that affects all children in many different forms.

Perhaps the most common way that power struggles are enacted by both boys and girls is through age dueling. Age is an important issue with children, and they all seem to know exactly how old they are, right down to the quarter year. One duel I observed involved several boys; among these were Tom and Jack, the two who are vying for the position as the "dominant male."

HENRY: I'm five.
CHARLES: Well, I'm five and a half.
TOM: Well, I turned five and a half before you.
JACK*:* Well, I turned five and a half very first of all!

Age is a way for the children to organize a dominance hierarchy; the older a person is, the more powerful he becomes. All the children at the ECL seem quite aware that Jack is the oldest. In several age duels where he was not present. I noticed the winner being reminded, "Well, you are not older than Jack." It is interesting to note that Charles is the second oldest male at the ECL and that Tom had only just turned five. Tom feels it is necessary to lie to maintain his position of prowess among his peers. This is part of a circular reaction; he lies to seem powerful, but his lies are

believed because he is held in such reverence.

Girls also participate in age discussions, but these appear more like conversations than duels. A winner is not clearly established, and their efforts to "top" one another are considerably less vehement

THERESA: I'm four and a half.
AMY: I'm five.
ANNA: Well, I think I'm a little older than that.
THERESA: That means you're five and a half.
AMY: Well, you're not older than Jack.

Compared to the boys, these girls' efforts at topping one another are weak. Anna "thinks" she is older than Amy, and Theresa helps her obtain this position by verifying her age. Boys certainly would not help one another out in this manner, and if they were unsure of their age in comparison to their predecessor's, they definitely would not state this. Amy ends this duel by saying that Jack, who is not even present, is actually the oldest By acknowledging that they are all inferior to Jack rather than establishing one girl as superior to the others, the girls use the duel to create cohesion among the group. Unlike males, females appear to have little interest in establishing a hierarchy.

Both girls and boys also use their possessions to gain prowess with their peers. Again, it seems that the person with the "best" is the most admired. By bringing an exciting toy to the ECL, a child can gain power by attracting other children around him or her. Once the other children take an interest in the toy, the owner can manipulate them by offering them a chance to play with it.

The child who most often brings toys to school is Murray, the youngest boy in the class, who is otherwise very unpopular. The children only pay attention to him in order to gain an opportunity to play with his attractive toys. Murray takes full advantage of this, often making the other children beg before he will give them a chance to play with his toys. When two children both want the toy, he will let them fight about it for a while, and then step in and give it to one of them. That child will, of course, become quite indebted to Murray.

Arguments over possessions seem to trigger the most fierce reactions. For both boys and girls, power seems to be represented by having more of something, so it is very important to them that everybody always has the same amount I was amazed by one fight between Jack and Tom over what I perceived to be the most trivial of possessions. They were outside, bent over something when I approached them, then suddenly, Tom began punching Jack. When I separated them and asked what the problem was, Tom explained that Jack had found an "egg" before he had, and that this had violated the rules of the game because they were always supposed to have the same amount The "eggs" were microscopic seeds that falloff a tree in the ECL; there were an infinite amount scattered beneath the tree. The boys were taking turns in picking them up, and apparently Jack had picked up two in a row. Tom could

easily have done the same thing, but the fact that Jack had pulled ahead of him even for this fleeting moment was enough to start a fight

Amy had a similar argument with Theresa. They were both playing at the "shaving cream art" project along with another girl, Kayla. When Kayla left. Amy started taking all of her shaving cream and kept announcing that she had the most now. Finally, Theresa reacted by taking some of Amy's shaving cream. Amy began crying and called a teacher over. The teacher told her that she had the most and could therefore afford to share some. Amy responded by saying, "I know I have the most, and I like it that way!"

Though I observed this dueling over possessions in both sexes, the boys react more frequently and with much more intensity. Tom, for example, began punching Jack for acquiring more seeds, while Amy merely began to whine and call for a teacher. Again, it appears that boys place much more significance on their possessions as symbols of their own personal superiority over their peers. They are constantly trying to gain prowess by outdoing one another or by using their toys as direct tools for access to power over friends, as Murray does. Like the status symbols of the adult world, such as European cars and designer clothes, toys and other play tools give both girls and boys a feeling of superiority.

One way of exhibiting power that is exclusive to boys is through the enactment of scenes using superheroes. Two boys at the ECL, Charles and Neil, have taken the superhero play to such an extent that they come dressed as Superman every day. Perhaps it is significant that I perceive these two boys as being quite low in the power hierarchy. Wearing the Superman uniform helps them feel more powerful; Charles even told his mom that he could not come to school without it because it was the one thing that made him feel important The underlying meaning of the superhero play seems to relate to the child's perception of his own power. Thus, when role playing, the more dominant roles are desired, as shown one day by Jack and Tom:

TOM: Jack, let's play Batman and Robin. I'll be Robin and you're Batman. JACK: Okay.
TOM: I'm Robin, and you're Batman, okay?
JACK: Did you know that Batman is the boss of Robin? So I'm your boss. TOM: Then I'll be Batman and you can be Robin.
JACK: No, sorry Tom, you already told me I'm Batman, so that's the way it stays because I'm your boss.

Obviously, Tom initially thought Robin dominated over Batman, so he asserted twice that he was Robin. Jack slyly accepted his position as Batman, knowing that Tom thought that he was the superior character. Jack waited until Tom fully acknowledged that he was Robin before telling him of his misconception and then used his position as Batman to maintain his dominance over Tom and keep the situation to his advantage. The power struggle of Jack versus Tom was thus symbolized by their

battle over who should be Batman.

I did not observe girls engaging in superhero play at all. This may be because most of the superheroes are male, but the girls do seem aware of their female counterparts, for I heard mention of Cat Girl and Bat Woman. According to Brian Sutton-Smith, girls do not tend to favor action and adventure play such as this, but prefer to act out house themes (238-239). I also observed this, and in these situations, girls' power struggles in role-playing center around who will play the part of "mother." Three or four girls always want to be the mom. They resolve this by. providing other adult female roles such as "aunt" and "big sister." Unlike the boys, who can only allow one person to play the dominant role, the girls try to compromise so that everybody is happy; girls do not limit the availability of the powerful parts.

Another way both girls and boys obtain power over their peers is through the use of bribes. The two favorites are "I'll be your best friend" and "I'll invite you to my birthday party." Both of these bribes involve the promise of acceptance. Children seem very concerned about who their friends are. Almost every time I asked a glum-looking child why he or she was so upset, it was because another child had refused to play with him or her. By heeding these bribes, children are offered some sort of verbal confirmation of companionship.

Again, I noticed that the children with the least power were most persuaded by these inducements. One incident I witnessed involved Murray. A group of boys was playing on a tractor that is in the ECL yard. Hoon was "driving" the tractor when Murray approached, asking to play. Hoon refused Murray's requests and kept telling him to leave them alone. Murray just sat at the edge of the sandbox and watched. Then Hoon left the driver's seat to look at a bug that was attracting the other boys' interest Murray capitalized on this opportunity and quickly climbed into the esteemed seat When Hoon saw what had happened, he instantly recaptured the seat by telling Murray he would "be his best friend" if Murray gave up the seat. Though Murray was in a position of power while in the "driver's seat," Hoon still asserted his control over Murray by offering him friendship--the one thing Murray wanted very much. Hoon thus continued to dominate; not only did he regain the esteemed position of driver, but after promising his friendship, he only allowed Murray a trivial part in the game.

The girls are especially skilled at employing friendship as a means of gaining power. According to Brian Sutton-Smith, "girls more often use inclusion-exclusion devices" (242), and offering or retracting friendship is the most popular of these. This method was used by Martha and Amy in a fascinating power struggle that I ob served. Amy, Martha, and Edith were all playing house. Both Amy and Martha wanted to use the same doll, which resulted in a big struggle. Finally, Amy stormed off, claiming she was going to get a teacher. While she was gone, Martha started telling Edith that she did not like Amy and was not going to be her friend; she convinced Edith to also avoid playing with Amy. Amy finally came back without a teacher, and began demanding the doll again:

AMY; Give me that doll, Martha.
MARTHA: You can't talk to me like that, because I'm not even your friend any more.
EDITH: Yeah, we're not you're friends, and I'm not even going to invite you to my birthday party.

Amy then threw the doll at Martha and ran off crying. Martha really ended up on top at the end of this struggle; she persuaded Edith to be "on her side," she gained the doll, and when Amy fled, she was rid of the one person who threatened her dominance. I observed many power struggles among girls where the "birthday party" and "friendship" exclusion devices were extremely successful in maintaining their user's dominance. Perhaps this is because girls tend to form very close and intimate relationships (Welker 23); thus, for any girl, the threat of being rejected by her friends is a very frightening prospect.

Children are conscious of the hierarchies outside of their peer group and are concerned with organizing these correctly. I have been asked by almost all of the children at the ECL how old I am, and whether I am older than Pam (the Director), and if Pam is my boss. The children also compare the ages of all the student-teachers and try to figure out "who's the boss of who." When they are role-playing, children spend time analyzing who is in charge before they begin the game. I have heard such comments as: "The principal is the boss of the teachers," "Peter Pan is the boss" (when acting out Peter Pan), and "Dads are the bosses of moms!"

With such a concern over hierarchies, children soon realize that though they may be dominant over some of their peers, in the grand scheme of things, they are relatively powerless. The boys seem especially conscious of this, and as a result, they are constantly trying to do things to "beat the system" and gain some control. They do this by not conforming to the typical behaviors. For example, at forum time, we sing a song called, "Five Little Sausages." One line of this song is "The grease got hot, and one went bam!" At this point, all the children, who are standing, fall down to the ground. However, on one occasion, Jack boldly proclaimed, "I'm not going to fall down," and remained standing. The verse is repeated five times, and by the end of the fifth round, all the boys had joined in on this "rebellious" act, but only a few girls had.

Another example of this effort to gain some power is in some of the boys' treatment of the "clean-up song." The teachers sing this song when it is time to clean up: "It's time to clean up. Put away all your toys, it's time to clean up!" One day a group of boys went around singing their own version of the song, changing the phrase "clean up" to "poo up," "pee up," and "barf up."

In both of these instances, the boys exhibited their power by doing things in their own way. The adult world designates the standard way of doing these things, but the boys chose not to adhere to these "rules." The boy who initiates these behaviors gains power because he is brave enough to challenge the hierarchy and defy the adult way of singing the song; as a result, he is regarded with reverence by his peers. In

turn, they gain a feeling of increased control, because through his example, they now see that though they may have to participate in these songs, they do not have to sing them correctly.

The girls, however, do not initiate these "rebel" behaviors. Girls are much more dependent on adults, and thus, they are generally compliant (Welker 23). To them, obtaining power is simply not as important as maintaining the nurturance and respect of an adult They may be afraid they will lose these things by engaging in defiant behavior, so they choose to conform.

The power struggles among children are rich in folklore. So many of the behaviors I saw at the ECL are known as "typical" behaviors, and people who work with children joke about them all the time. The employees at the ECL, for example, would follow their requests to one another with, "I'll be your best friend!" To children, however, these devices are not jokes, but are successful techniques in achieving power over their peers. By studying their roleplaying, their verbalizations, and their arguments, it became apparent to me that the struggle for power is at the heart of many of these children's interactions. Unfortunately, however, it is also obvious that for girls, the struggle is not as important as it is for boys.

The fact that these differences between the sexes in the desire for power are appearing among this group of four and five year olds is significant. Though the Sexual Revolution is supposed to have brought increased equality for females, it is clear that many attitudes have not changed. Apparently, young girls are still raised to be less assertive and more compliant; they certainly are not encouraged to strive for increased power, as males are. By taking a closer look at what this "power folklore" is telling us about the way we are socializing females, perhaps we can begin to change our ways and raise females to be more assertive. Maybe if females were encouraged to remain standing during "Five Little Sausages" or to be more concerned about organizing a hierarchy, they would be more likely to strive for positions of power as adults.

Bibliography

Mechling, Jay. "Children's Folklore." Folk Groups and Folklore Genres. Ed. Elliot Oring. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 1986. 91-120.

Sutton-Smith, Brian. "The Play of Girls." Becoming: Female: Perspectives on Development. Ed. Claire B. Kopp and Martha Kirkpatrick. New York: Plenum, 1979. 229-57.

Welker, Jane. "Selected Normative Information." Svllabus for Human Development lOOA. Fal11988. 2.

Extremes: How Girls Play Slaughter, How Boys Play Slaughter at Valley Oak Elementary

Linda Riley

Extremes
A little boy once played so loud
That the thunder up in the thunderclouds,
Said,"Since I can't be heard, why, then, I'll
never, never thunder again!"

And a little girl once kept so still
That she heard a fly on the window sill
Whisper and say to a ladybird
"She's the stillest child I ever heard."
James Whitcomb Riley

Lunchtime at Valley Oak Elementary School in Davis is busy. Packs of children roar through the playground, running, shouting, shoving, laughing, skipping, crying, kicking, cheering, and chasing-their movements seem random and complicated to the adult eye. But if you watch carefully, you can find a method to all their madness. The children sort themselves out. Some play alone, some in small groups of two or three, some in larger groups. And they know who belongs where: The benches nearest the classrooms are for the loners, the jungle gym and lawn area east of the school are for the small groups, and the center of the playground is where the large groups play.

This center, made of asphalt, is where games like four-square, kickball, or pogo are played. Directly in the center of this center, in between the basketball hoops, the children playa game they call Slaughter. Some days Slaughter is played by a regular group of fifth grade boys; some days is is played by a regular group of fifth grade girls. The two groups are always separate; they never play together. The first group to stake out the basketball hoops is the group who gets to play that day.

Both groups play Slaughter the same way. The game is similar to Dodge Ball, but the rules are more complex. The children form two lines of opposing teams. Each team has a goalie who stands in the back behind the team of opposition. To play, the goalie throws a lightweight ball at the opposing team. The opposing team members try either to dodge the ball or to catch it in midair and throw it at the first team. If a child is struck with the ball or drops the ball onto the ground while trying to catch it, she is said to be "slaughtered" and must exchange places with the goalie.

What is interesting about the two groups who play Slaughter is that, although they use the same methods and rules of play, each game is quite different. Both teams have formed their own folkgroups and have invented their own stylized form of play in order to create their own shared group meaning. I believe that shared meanings of each group are different because one group is a male group and the other is a female group.

I arrived at my conclusions after spending three hours a week for eight weeks observing the children at Valley Oak as they played Slaughter. To observe, I sat under a tree about ten feet way from their game, watching and taking notes. I chose Valley Oak because both my children attend school there, although neither plays Slaughter. My research was helped by the fact that to the players I was simply Matt and Dani' s mother. Most of them seemed oblivious to my presence.

The only problem I had with my research was in the beginning when I tended to make judgements about what was "good" play and what was "bad" play. Sometimes I wanted to interfere when the children cheated or fought. Someone needed to, I thought.

The person in charge of lunchtime discipline at Valley Oak is a playground supervisor named Mary. Mary is an elderly Hispanic woman who has worked at various school playgrounds for the past twenty-four years. She always stays on the periphery of the playground, only interfering if a child complains to her or if the children's play becomes clearly dangerous. The playground is large, and she misses much of the fighting and swearing. Mary smiles often, her eyes crinkling with tiredness. I thought it was from shell-shock. I asked her if the children's play has changed in the past twenty-four years. She smiled and told me, "No, it doesn't change." She paused a moment, then said, "They're good kids though."

After talking to Mary, I relaxed a bit. I remembered my own childhood games, remembered that we too fought and swore and cheated. I realized that the mortality of modem children is not in decline, at least at Valley Oak. If anything, these children are more resilient than ever. It was then that I began to see the underlying patterns to their play. I began to be deeply interested in my research and started to relish the "bad" play. It gave me good material to write down.

It was from this "bad" play that I learned how Slaughter is played, what differences "exist between the girls' playing of it and the boys', and what the implications of these differences are. In discussing the differences and their implications, I will focus upon three topics: how the game is framed by both groups, the boundaries created by both, and how disputes are handled within each group.

Framing: Let the Games Begin

For the boys at Valley Oak, getting ready to play Slaughter is a complicated business. First the boys stand around aimlessly for a while, thumping and kicking the ball. A few try to appoint themselves leader, but are ignored. They wait. There is much scuffling, boasting, and swearing. Sometimes the boys throw the ball at

each other's genitals or call out to each other in falsetto, "Don't do that! You'll hurt me." One day Alex tells Billy, "You're such a virgin."

The tallest boy in the group, Arona, usually arrives late. He looks bored and says little. Usually Billy names some possibilities for a team. The names include his and Arona. Arona nods. The game begins.

The boys arrange themselves on the basketball court haphazardly. An outsider cannot tell who is on what team. There is more boasting and swearing. The language is aggressive: "Waste him." "Cream him." "You are trying to challenge me, asshole?" One boy hits another with the ball and pretends to fire a semi-automatic randomly thought the schoolyard.[1]

For the girls, Slaughter begins much differently. The game starts the moment everyone is assembled. The team members are usually the same from day to day. The girls line up in even rows. When a girl takes a turn or is hit by the ball, she looks downward to the ground, as if in embarrassment. No one boasts; no one taunts. Two girls act as cheerleaders, dancing in unison, singing "Woogah, Woogah," and laughing. The play is slow.

Why the variations? Children's folklore can often be understood in relation to four polar oppositions: order versus disorder, hierarchy versus equality, male versus female, and dynamic versus conservative (Mechling 96-97). Perhaps the differences are the result of different folkgroups focusing on different sides of the dialectics. The boys seem to be constructing a play frame that stresses hierarchy and disorder, the girls, a frame that stresses equality and order.

For these particular boys, the notion that children are an underclass in American society seems important. Children's play is often antithetical, and is constructed to oppose the official order of meaning, uses, and processes (Mechling 97).

Perhaps boys have good reason to oppose the official order of society. Men in American society are valued for their ability to be aggressive and individualistic. During the 20th century, however, boys have been more closely supervised, and their most aggressive games have been delineated. In fact, since 1920, the whole of the play world has become more feminine and favors domestic, verbal, and non aggressive play (Sutton-Smith 232-233).

Slaughter is a means for the Valley Oak boys to invert adult values which stress order and equality. Freed from the constraints of the classroom and any adult intervention, the Valley Oak boys can experiment with the notion of what it means to be male in American society. Slaughter is constructed as a folk performance so that the boys can learn how to maintain the balance between being masculine and being a member of society. The game helps them come to terms with significant cultural categories (Brady 175). When they play they are learning to be aggressive and individualistic along with learning how to fit into a group.

The boys invert adult values of order in the way they play haphazardly and aggressively; they invert adult values of equality in the way that they have a clear leader, choose sides, boast, and taunt each other. The boys also show anxiety in their ability to be masculine; so they invert masculinity by talking like females and

taunting each other about their sexuality. Excitement is heightened because these boys are exploring themes not open to them in the everyday world (Mechling 98).

The girls at Valley Oak do not seem to be opposing the adult world of school, which I said earlier stresses the "feminine." Instead, their play seems to focus on the tension between what is typically thought to be male and female behavior.

The early play of girls was segregated and focused on status and marriage. But girls have shown a steady increase in their interest in the more active games formally played by boys. Title IX of the Federal Education Amendments in 1972 mandated equality in sports for girls and resulted in increased changes (Sutton-Smith 232-233). The women's movement has also resulted in changes in attitudes about what is proper female behavior.

But the result of change is often confusion. Boy's games are inherently disorderly, aggressive, and hierarchical. When the girls stress order and equality in their games (order by always having the same team members and standing in even row; equality by not taunting or boasting and by looking embarrassed when it is time to take a turn), they address the inherent tension between order and disorder, hierarchy and equality, and ultimately the puzzling contradictions inherent in being a female in modem society. The girls' game of Slaughter is purposely framed so that they can address the tensions they have as females, and so that, like the boys, they too can learn how to balance these tensions. What they have to balance is different from what the boys have to balance, so they adopt a different frame.

Boundaries: Risky Business

According to the regular rules of Slaughter, if a boy is "slaughtered" with the ball, he becomes a goalie, and the boy who "slaughters" him becomes "it" But one day I watched the goalie hit a boy named Tai squarely in the stomach with the ball. Quickly, Tai threw the ball back to the goalie, saying, "I have two lives."[2] The group discussed the events for a few minutes and then decided that Tai did in fact have two lives and would not be required to be a goalie unless he was "slaughtered" one more time. The next boy to be "slaughtered" also tried to impose the two lives rule, but was not allowed even a period of negotiation. Instead, he was handed the ball and motioned to the goalie spot, where he went without complaint.

When the girls play Slaughter, they never cheat. In fact, when a girl takes a turn, she does it quickly without calling attention to herself. Afterwards, she usually joins her teammates in a ritual slapping of hands. The girls then re-form into their team line. Frequently, one girl stays behind with the girl who has just thrown the ball, and the two spend a moment smoothing and stroking each other's hair. When the bell rings, many of the team members walk back to their classrooms together, again smoothing and stroking each other's hair.[3]

These instances of group behavior are quite different from each other, but they both show the way that children deal with dangerous categories and erect boundaries.

When boys play Slaughter, they seem to understand that power is not equal. Some

boys have more "lives," or chances at success. The boys constantly try to negotiate the rules to suit their own needs and therefore push for more power. They seem to understand that real life favors those who possess the dynamism to push against the boundaries of the rules, those who are more socially adept, those who can intimidate, or those who can cheat. By doing so, these boys learn the process of negotiation (Sutton-Smith 242), the value of creativity, as well as the importance of luck.

But this play can be dangerous as well. Because the boundaries to Slaughter are dynamic, there are those who will push against the rules and be unsuccessful, the result being loss of face. Pushing the limits is risky.

When the girls play Slaughter, they are experimenting with power also. Power for these girls is a dangerous activity since girls' play usually places a high value on affiliation and intimacy (Sutton-Smith 248). When a girl takes a turn in Slaughter, she is the most powerful player on the team; she has the ball and can control the game. The ritual hand slapping is the girls' way of rewarding that individual performance. The grooming behavior gives the girls a chance to acknowledge the boundaries, to draw quickly back from their dangerous play. It is the way the girls reassure one another that group affiliation is more important to them than individual performance. The girl with the ball may be reassuring the team members that she still identifies herself as a group member, while the group may be reassuring the girl that they accept her need to experiment with power.

It seems significant that the girls stroke each other's hair, the part of their body that is outwardly feminine. The girls may be displaying to themselves and to others that they are females. They may be establishing an "in group" that consists of females and identifying what is appropriate female behavior. The girls erect boundaries about who is in (girls) and also who is out (boys).[4]

The boundaries that the children erect in their game in Slaughter involve both the tension between hierarchies and equality. The boundaries that they erect are different because once again the boys are stressing the hierarchical nature of society, and the girls the egalitarian. Throughout their play, they address different anxieties, for the boys being "out" in the hierarchical order, for the girls, being "out" in the female group. The boys' boundaries give them less chance to experiment with intimacy skills; the girls' less chance to experiment with individual performance.

Fighting: Dangerous Liaisons

One day during a game of Slaughter, a boy named Billy started to cheat. Normally cheating would not be a serious violation, but Billy's cheating violated Arona's chance to take a turn. Arona moved close-up and face-to-face with Billy. Both boys quickly posed themselves into fighting stances. First Billy would take a turn moving in closer, looking threatening while Arona mocked and taunted him. Next it was Arona's turn to be the aggressor.

A third boy named Jason appointed himself as conciliator, standing nearby and keeping a steady stream of calming talk going while the two boys continued to circle

around each other. Finally Jason made a joke. Everyone thought this joke was so funny that they had to stop the fight because they were all laughing so hard. The boys resumed play and after a few minutes, Billy again started to cheat. Arona looked at him. "I can't live with this guy," he said in a comical way. The two boys slapped hands. For the rest of the game, they played as far apart as possible.

The girls at Valley Oak never came close to a physical fight, but one day a girl named Sara refused to go out after she was hit with the ball. The girls started chanting, "You're out, Sara, you're out," but she ignored them. In order to keep the game going, most of the girls decided to ignore Sara's breach, but a few angry girls quit the game and stood next to me, under the tree. "I hate her so much, I feel like smacking her," said one. "She wears ugly clothes," says another.

Another girl was hit, and the girls instantly cried out, "You're out. You're out." This girl refused to become goalie, citing Sara's example. The argument became vehement. One girl turned to Sara and said, "Everyone hates you because of this." The girls under the tree kept up their gossip. "You should see her temper," said one girl. More girls joined the circle. "She's a pooh head," said another. "You guys aren't playing," yelled out someone. The group still playing started a chant, "Play around Sara. Play around Sara." Before the situation was anywhere close to resolution, the bell rang.

The disputes within both groups can be understood by using Turner's model for social dramas (Myerhoff 31). Each dispute contains Turner's first stage--a violation. In both cases the violation was cheating.

For the boys, cheating is not a serious offense, but since the individual rights of a valued member were violated, the breach was important. Billy had violated important boundaries established by the group, affecting their most important need-the need for a hierarchy within their folkgroup.

For the girls, cheating is a serious offense. Sara had violated important boundaries established by the folkgroup, affecting their highest need-the need for equality.

Because their most important values had been violated, each group quickly moved to the crisis stage. For both the boys and girls the game stopped.

Fighting at Valley Oak School is a serious offense that results in suspension. Arona and Billy also looked afraid. Clearly the third step in the social drama, that of redress, had to happen or serious punishment and/or loss of face might occur. In the boys' case a conciliator started negotiations.

In the girls' case, the drama had to be redressed or the game would end in anarchy. Instead of using negotiation as a means of redress, the girls tried at first to ignore Sara's breach. When that didn't work, they used exclusionary tactics, which are common in the play of girls (Sutton-Smith 242). Because the girls did not successfully redress their crisis, they never reached the fourth and final stage of restoration. The boys, however, were able to share in a final ritual (the slapping of hands) and therefore, were able to reaffirm their basic system of beliefs.

The boys' game of Slaughter is more equipped to deal with crisis situations than is the girls' game. Because the girls place an enormous value on affiliation, they are

less able to learn negotiation skills. According to Sutton-Smith, this is common feature of girls play (242).

The game of Slaughter defines two separate folkgroups at Valley Oak Elementary School. These two groups function differently. Each expresses group needs and addresses contradictions that the children see in larger society, most especially the contradictions between order and disorder, hierarchy and equality, and male and female. Because the expectations in society are different for males and females, each group stresses different sides of these dialectics: The boys stress disorder, hierarchical relationships, and male behavior while the girls stress order, egalitarian relationships, and female behavior. Boys who play Slaughter at Valley Oak seem more adept at negotiation, the girls at intimacy skills.

I learned during my fieldwork that children's play is neither good nor bad. I don't believe that the different negotiation and intimacy skills these children obtain from their play are good or bad either. They are simply different and react the present attitudes of society. Sutton-Smith quotes some who believe that adults should teach girls to play in a way that they can learn proper negotiation skills (253-254). I doubt that it matters what adults think or try to do about children's play. The children at Valley Oak Elementary will continue to play Slaughter in their own way because children's games belong to children.

Notes

1. This boy may be expressing anxiety about a shooting incident that took place in Stockton, California, in 1988. A sniper opened fire on a playground, randomly killing several children.
2. The concept of "lives" has probably been used in different ways. The most common use is the cat who is in legend said to have nine lives. These particular boys play Nintendo quite a bit, which is a computer game that allows each player three lives.
3. This hair stroking reminds me of the grooming behavior anthropologists have observed in gorillas and chimpanzees.
4. I heard two girls talking about a boy whom they saw playing aggressively. "Why stoop to his badness," said one.

Bibliography

Brady, Margaret K. Some Kind of Power. Salt Lake City: U of Utah P, 1984.

Mechling, Jay. "Children's Folklore." Folk Groups and Folklore Genres: An Introduction. Ed. Elliot Oring. Logan, UT: Utah State UP 1986.91-120.

Myerhoff, Barbara. Number Our Days. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978.

Sutton-Smith, Brian. "The Play of Girls." Becoming Female: Perspectives on Development. Eds. Claire B. Kopp and Martha Kirkpatrick. New York: Plenum, 1979. 229-257.

The Future Agenda for Child Study and the Implications for the Study of Children's Folklore

Brian Sutton-Smith

With the l00th Anniversary of the American Folklore Society upon us and with the preeminent role in that society played by William Wells Newell also the founder of Children's Folklore in the USA, Jay Mechling and I felt an incumbency to take some critical focus on the future. With that end in mind, we invited our five favorite radical scholars of American childhood to tell us what we could expect of the future for children. Given that children's folklore has not been a flourishing discipline throughout its first 100 years, despite the prominent beginning augured by Newell's 1883 *Games and Songs of American Children,* we felt this might be the occasion for a paradigm break in the nature of the discipline.

Looking back on that event somewhat later, and without involving Jay Mechling in my commentary, it seems to me that for the greater part the bulk of children's folklore, to which we wished them to address themselves, is devoted to antiquarian collections of children's lore and is in many senses a graveyard of trivia. The massive collections of Iona and Peter Opie represent both the best and the worst of our field. That is, they provide excellent historical scholarship as to earlier forms of this folklore, throughout the past hundreds of years, but give little ethnographic sense of what it means for children to live in that world and play those games which they have collected from their informants. When I began my own studies in this field of children's folklore, approximately 40 years ago, I was proud of a discipline that did not shy away from children's own organized behaviors and, unlike the social sciences, tried earnestly to put such activities on record. But as time has passed I have come to wonder whether these collections of ours (Bronner, Knapp, and including my own), by their very remoteness from childhood, have come to serve only nostalgic purposes and fail to bring home to the general population the nature and character of child life either in our tines or in earlier times. Rather, it seems that they have unwittingly assisted that same disregard for children's play which is so characteristic of both popular attitudes as well as the social sciences. While it is often admitted that play is the most important thing that children do, that admittance does not prevent their play from being ignored or supplanted in social science by more academically acceptable sounding phenomena with such names as cognitive play, curriculum play, exploration or sociodramatic play (Block & King). We folklorists have facilitated this disregard perhaps because our own studies are seldom well grounded in either their historical or their

contemporary contexts. It is only quite recently that they have begun to take on the kind of substantial ethnographic character illustrated by the book-length work of Fine or McDowell, work that actually demonstrates the kind of lives children are leading while in the context of their lore and the purposes which the latter can serve for them. What if, by contrast, children's folklore was actually an account of the startling vigor and intensity with which children conduct their own social traditions and eke out their own cultural and aesthetic existences? Then we could argue, perhaps, that its apparent triviality in the public mind might lie in the work-oriented defensiveness of that general population rather than in the pusillanimity of our own romantic and antiquarian collections of the children's lore.

To help us break out of our present condition, Jay and I invited the following experts on the current state of childhood to indicate what they thought the future agenda for childhood might be and what implications that might have for children's folklore. The chosen, in the arbitrary order of papers presented, included:

(1) Michael Zuckerman, a Professor of History at the University of Pennsylvania, with a penchant for Foucaultian accounts of such things as Benjamin Spock's *Baby and Child Care* as a document for guiding parents in the consumerist training of their children, and the Children's Rights Movement as associated historically with the confinement of ever more children in Residential Institutions and child life in the suburbs today as a pretraining in corporate relationships (1976, 1985).

(2) Dr. Viviana Zelizer, a Sociology Professor from Princeton, who in her book *Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing the Social Value of Children* (1985), coined the maxim that as children have become more useless they have also become more priceless. Look, for example, at what it costs to send them to college or to cover their legal liabilities.

(3) Dr. Richard Shweder, a Professor of Anthropology at the University of Chicago, in his turn infamous for "Standing Piaget on his Head" in his article on anthropology's romantic rebellion (1984) in which he does very serious damage to the usual psychogenic assumptions that modem psychologists make about twentieth-century children.

(4) Professor William Kessen of Yale University, a psychologist who in his article on "The child and other cultural inventions" (1983) has protested psychology's overemphasis on the individual child as focus, upon the social scientist as expert, and upon the discipline of child development as an agency of growth acceleration.

(5) Professor John Broughton, a psychology professor at Teacher's College Columbia University, whose edited book *Critical Theories of Psychology Development* (1987) suggests that psychology's individualistic childhood is not merely an academic confusion it is also a part of a corporate tendency to ignore the economic and radical contexts of behavior because the latter might lead to demands for social reform. Psychology instead chooses to concentrate, he says, on individual responsibility and guilt which blame the victim rather than the society for the social causation of its own ills.

With these powerful guns, then, Jay Mechlin and I hoped to get some gauge on

the future of Children's Folklore, though clearly we took the chance of being blown off the face of scholarship. What follows are my own notes of the occasion for which the authors cannot be asked to bear any responsibility. If! am lucky, they are somewhat near the mark.

The Future Agenda

Michael Zuckerman's main message was that the surge of interest in childhood that had characterized historical studies in the 1970s had passed. Studies of families and of women continued, but there was negligible mention of children in these. As he said: "Children are almost aggressively absent. They are banished from the new history of women." There may be more scholarship on the history of American families today, but when children are mentioned, which is seldom, it is as a subordinate clause. There is a "mystifying radical disregard of children." There is much talk about motherhood, but none on mothering. The 1980s are years of growing pessimism about children in a world in which the main focus is on adults of both sexes getting jobs and careers. The good news is the spreading academic recognition that adult/child relationships are reciprocal. The older dialectics of industrial relationships have been discredited and with them the parallel ways of viewing parent/child relationships. Nominal power and actual power are now seen as not necessarily the same. The investigator cannot infer child actuality from adult idealization. One of the roles of folklore in history is as a corrective to idealized historical views of childhood because in folklore, at least, children create their own trace marks. Folklore, in its late nineteenth century ruthlessness, is closer to the actual facts of child abandonment, child beatings, child houses of refuge with brutality, and children kidnapped to farms which characterize that time period but are seldom mentioned in conventional histories.

According to Viviana Zelizer, there never has been any substantial sociology of childhood despite course offerings of that name. Sociology is characterized by an invisibility of childhood, she said, even though childhood has flourished in child psychology. In the *Encyclopedia of Social Science* of the 1930s, there were 30 essays on childhood, but in the same volume of the 1980s, there were only two such essays. All the articles are basically adult oriented even when about marriages, family styles, or family power structures. Similarly, feminist sociology challenges gender, but not age. Women have become visible, but children have not. Children are usually dismissed with utopian proposals as when Germain Greer suggests, facetiously, we should send them all to Italy. Feminist family studies also exclude children. Even in discussions of housework, there is no discussion of the child's contributions; it is all between husband and wife. Mothering is about the problems of raising children, but has nothing to say about the social life of the children. Children are seen as victims of social problems, but there is no study of their own actual responses to these problems. Despite all of this, Zelizer finished her talk giving a few minor signs of encouragement that children's own social lives had

become a subject matter in several quarters of academia. In 1981, for example, there was the first ever meeting on the Sociology of Childhood within the American Sociological Association. About the only compensating note that children's folklore could derive from her talk was that its relative low standing in its own association was paralleled by this kind of academic treatment elsewhere.

Richard Shweder pronounced the break up of the classical view of the child's mind, as in Piaget, in which mental development proceeds from primitivity to abstraction. The rationalist Piagetian notion that the child is egocentric, animistic, associative, concrete and context bound is put to flight by lines of research showing the amazing competence of children in language and in Piagetian operations at early ages when there is the necessary evocation. Instead, he supplied a maintenance-loss model in which a latent multiplicity becomes narrowed through practice. The issue then becomes how children's capacities are shaped, not how the input occurs. Shweder suggests that cultural narratives playa great and neglected part in this shaping process. Most myths in India, for example, are about males getting away from their mothers. And he might have said that most Western games and most children's folklore is of similar import, or at least it concentrates on children learning a non gullible surrender to the values of the peer group as they empower themselves within their own subcultural society with their own traditions.

William Kesson said that our only hope for a better children's future was a better treatment of children today, and he was doubtful that that would occur. Psychology was still preoccupied with its own rigidities of wanting scientific certainty, of trusting experts to know what needed to be done, of searching for universal findings, and of a commitment to progress. In the nineteenth century Kessen pointed out some 90,000 children were sent West to save their souls (and help with the farming, mining etc.) and excused as part of the same commitment to progress. Progress has been and still is a core principle of academics who believe that they are a part of a progressive movement for the rationalization and improvement of society. But social science itself was invented on the analogy of evolution though since the 1930's biologists have undermined the simplistic inevitabilities of evolutionary progress, and yet this notion still over rationalizes the disciplines that have to do with children. And as we all know, since the 196Os, children's folklore has also gotten itself caught up with educational demonstrations of its value in schools. Its value to children themselves could be sufficient.

John Broughton presented a paper on the "Image of Evil in the Post Modem Child." Post modernism, he asserted, involves the subversion of rationality, of democracy, and instead there has developed an interest in the grotesque, the accidental, in circuses, irony, and satire in which the humanities have clearly pre-empted the social sciences in know ledge about childhood. Childhood itself is now a question. He then presented a disquisition on the Garbage Pail Kids. His position was that all of this post modem junk in childhood is itself a refraction of childhood abuse. What the children enjoy in punk and garbology, he contended, is itself a reflection of adult images of children as evil in an evil world. These childhood fantasies are the

children's defenses against this adult reality. But what the children now contend with in the largely mental and not physical world in which they live is an endless "play of evil signifiers" in their own internal worlds from which they must protect those around them. This, baldly, is the source of their love of garbology with both its evil and with its limits. We have created the menace to which they must respond by their management of such fictional creations.

Conclusion

The pessimism of the first two speakers about the neglected state of childhood (Zuckerman and Zelizer) was partly counterbalanced by the second two's confidence about the fruitfulness of changed assumptions allowing for a more anthropological and pragmatic view of the subject matter (Shweder, Kesson). Broughton seemed somewhat closer to the heart of folklore that the other speakers; on the other hand, his psychodynamic horrors, while not alien to our field, seemed a little ethnocentric. Those kinds of horrors have been around for thousands of years. They are not new phenomena, although their displacements may be new. Their antecedents are likely to have had a longer collective history than he had in mind.

In all, this conference's look into the future was not very helpful, except, I think, that the starkness of the attitudes ventured here might be taken as urging us, as children's folklorists, to a greater concern for the more authentic representations of children's folk lives. It is probable that we don't do children much good with our present nostalgic collectanea.

Bibliography

Block, J. H. & N. R. King. School Play. New York: Garland, 1987.

Bronner, S. J. American Children's Folklore. Little Rock, AK: August House, 1988,

Broughton, J. M. Critical Theories ofPsvchological Development. New York: Plenum, 1987.

Fine, G. A. With the Bovs. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987.

Foucault, M. The Birth of the Clinic. New York: Vintage, 1975.

Kessen, W. "The child and other cultural inventions," The Child and Other Cultural Inventions. Ed. F. S. Kessel and A. W. Siegel. New York: Praeger, 1983. 26-47.

Knapp, M. and H. Knapp. One Potato. Two Potato. New York: Norton, 1970.

McDowell, J. H. Children's Riddling. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 1979.

Opie, Iona, and Peter Opie. The Lore and Laneuaee of Schoolchildren. Oxford: Clarendon, 1959.

---. Children's Games in Street and Plaveround. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Shweder, R. A. 1984. "Anthropology's romantic rebellion against the enlightenment, or there's more to thinking than reason and evidence." Culture Theorv. Ed. F. S. Kessel and R. A. LeVine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984. 27-66.

Sutton-Smith, B. "New Zealand variants of the game Buck." Folklore 63 (1952): 398-433.

---. "The fate of English traditional games in New Zealand." Western Folklore 11 (1953): 250-253.

---. The Games of New Zealand Children. Berkeley: U of California P, 1959.

Zelizer, V. A. Pricing the Priceless Child. New York: Basic Books, 1985.

Zuckerman, M. "Children's Rights: The Failure of 'Reform' Policy." Analvsis 2.3 (1976): 371-385.

Zuckerman, M. "Suburban Play." Children's Play. Past. Present and Future. Ed. Brian

The Latest Teen Rage? Embroidery

Ariane Sains

A few years ago, when a friend showed Kate Ziegelmeier how to make a bracelet out of multicolored embroidery thread, the Brookfield, Conn., teenager thought it would be impossible to learn. But Ziegelmeier was attracted by the bold colors and patterns she saw around the wrists of so many classmates and decided to give it a shot

These days, with skeins of thread pinned to her jeans to keep the colors organized, she can make a basic bracelet in 30 minutes. In fact, when Kate and her friends get together, they can whip off four or five bracelets at a sitting.

On the surface, this modern-day sewing circle sounds like a pretty dweeby group. Teens today are supposed to be interested in high-tech diversions like VCRs and compact discs, not the crafts of retirees. That's the problem, says Robert Briefel, chairman of DMC Corp. Many marketers are too quick to generalize about kids today.

DMC has more than 50% of the U.S. embroidery-thread market, and sales in recent years have increased 20% annually. Most of this recent growth has been in the youth segment, which DMC began targeting with starter kits back in March 1987. The company now offers a wide range of products.

But DMC, the South Kearny, N.J., unit of French company Dollfus Mieg, is the industry exception, not the rule. The $400-million needlecraft industry has been flat in the past three years, and the number of independent retailers has shrunk 50%, from about 8,000 to 4,000. Until three or four years ago, needlecrafters tended to be conservative older women like First Lady Barbara Bush, an avid needlepointer.

DMC began targeting teens in 1986 by introducing embroidery floss, a thick, colorful version of thread. It also used ads to fuel interest in simple cross-stitching which appeals to young women. DMC's average customer today is 18-39.

DMC's most successful youth line has been its Friendship Bracelets. Company research shows that more than 50% of those surveyed in the 10-21-year-old group know about the product. But since teenagers don't stroll into crafts stores unprodded, DMC and its ad agency, Cox & Landey of New York, created ads that offered free bracelet starter kits. The ads ran in spring 1987 issues of *Seventeen, People* and *Teen.* They also appeared in publications aimed at summer camp counselors, who are always looking for ways to fill the inevitable rainy day. D MC also tied in with Ralston Purina, offering Friendship Bracelet kits in 1.5 million boxes of Honey Graham Chex.

As the fad picked up speed in late 1987 and 1988, magazines began reporting on the trend. *People* featured a story in late 1986 that said Jane

Fonda wore a bracelet made by her daughter. *Seventeen* recently published a picture of teen heartthrob actor Trey Ames wearing a bracelet

DMC also teamed up in January 1987 with Nabisco's Almost Home cookies, running freestanding inserts offering beginner cross-stitching kits, playing off the cross-stitched design on the cookies' package. To keep its hard-core needlecrafters, DMC works with designers to develop ads aimed for craft publications.

To keep interest up, DMC recently expanded the idea. The company now offers instructions for making Hair Flairs headbands-Friendship Bracelets for the hair; Friendship Collars, for pets and stuffed animals; and Friendship I.D. bracelets, which spell out the wearer's name. DMC has also launched campaigns to attract younger women to cross-stitching.

When it comes to promotions, Briefel doesn't rule anything out. Several years ago, he staged a male-only needlepoint seminar that was held at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum in New York. His rationale for targeting men was simple.

"I thought it would be great to double our consumer base," Briefel recalls. "We did get a turnout of what I'd call closet needlecrafters. They're the men who don't

Erratum, p. 24:
want to admit they’re doing it, because
it's not a macho activity.

BOOK REVIEW

WOODEN, WARREN Children's Literature of the English Renaissance. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky, 1986. 181, $19.00 hc.

Wooden's book, a posthumously published collection of nine essays on various Renaissance and late Medieval literature, has only tangential application to the study of folklore, and only two of the essays apply directly to folklore. However, as an introduction to early children's literature, the sum of these essays poses provocative questions about previous assumptions on children's literature, especially what it is and when it began. Wooden takes as his premise a definition promulgated by Sheila Egoff: "In a true sense, a children's book is simply one in which a child finds pleasure." Working from such an enabling statement, Wooden argues that many texts of the English Renaissance were written to appeal to as broad an audience as possible, an audience that obviously included children. He rejects the hypothesis that there is a distinct children's literature separate from the adult canon and articulates a taxonomy with rather amorphous bounds. While exclusively adult literature, such as the masques and poetry of the neo-classical Tribe of Ben, as he calls Jonson and his school, and the avant-garde, intellectual exercises of Donne and the metaphysical exists, Wooden argues that Renaissance literature contains a wide range of works, on a number of levels, that would apply and hold a child's interest.

In Drayton's *Nymphidia*, he finds a child's classic, a poem with mock-heroic battle, whose comedy a child would revel in but whose literary craftsmanship an adult would understand, and with fairy folklore which informs so much Renaissance drama and poetry. In fact, Wooden devotes an entire chapter to the fairy poetry of the period, focusing primarily on Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* and figure of the Puck, and postulates that the portrayal of fairies as tiny creatures in part moves the literature within the reach of children. The fairies' diminutive size coupled with their formidable power against even adults fulfills every child's dream of controlling his world while the tales of changelings or of fairy adventure in a pastoral, welcoming landscape would appeal to the child's sense of adventure and terror.

Terror itself plays a role in the children's literature of the age. Wooden discusses John Foxe' s *Book of Martyrs* as a propagandistic text intended to save generations of English Protestant children from the horror of the anti-Christ pope and his demonic minions and their terrible depredations and tortures. The *Book of Martyrs*, which was popular well into the nineteenth century, contains stories of children enduring appalling torment at the hands of both infidels and Catholics and of pious, innocent Protestant children being saved or rewarded because of their beliefs. Much of the value of Foxe' s work lies in the

entertainment of its narrative style, which makes all stories into adventures with gripping suspense and climax would therefore make children eager to hear more.

This focus on entertainment--be it through fairies or adventure stories or even horror-is another of Wooden's subjects. He points to the use of woodcuts and illustrations in many books to help early readers both learn to read and learn to interpret pictures and stories. Caxton' s *Book of Curtesye* and *Aesop,* Foxe's *Martyrs,* and Comenius' *Orbis Pictus Sensualium* are all illustrated classics of the period. John Taylor, the seventeenth century writer known as the Water-poet. simplified medieval romances and other adventure stories into easily understandable chapbooks for children. He also wrote condensed version of bible stories, nonsense verse, and animal stories. Wooden says of Taylor's works that they "were the common property of adults and children" and points again to the mixture of entertainment, instruction, and emotional appeal which characterizes much of Renaissance literature in an attempt to bring together the adult and the child. In his essay on "Philip Sparrow," Wooden explains that Skelton is working through the grief of a child who is trying to understand the finality of death but is looking back and forth from the child's attitude to the adult's. The first half of the poem describes the child's attempts to apply conventional formulas and creeds that she has learned from adults in order to console herself, and she moves from religious to pagan to folklore authorities; the second half of the poem "possesses an emotional detachment and a wider experiential perspective than the child in the poem" and thus introduces an adult perspective on the same subject

Children's Literature of the English Renaissance consistently asks us to reconsider children both as an audience and as an influence on literature. Although these essays hopscotch through a period from Caxton to Bunyan's "Country Rimes," Wooden's central contention about the pervasive informative role children readers played on writers, educators, and ultimately on printers opens new venues of investigation. Wooden himself saw the individual studies as preliminary touchstones for further work, and they are as valuable as such as they are for his style, which combines a ready sense of humor with lucid prose and provocative insight. This is a book well worth reading.

William A. Senior
Broward Community College

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The *Children's Folklore Review* is available only to individual and institutional members of the Children's Folklore Section of the American Folklore Society. To become a CFS member, send $5.00 to:

Danielle Roemer
Department of Literature and Language
Northern Kentucky University Highland
Heights, KY 41076

Alacazam! Records, Waterbury, VT, and Sugar Hill Records, Durham, NC, announce the joint release of *Doc Watson Sings Songs for Little Pickers.* The album, scheduled for a June 1990 release, is the three-time grammy winner's first-ever children's album. For additional information about this or other albums, contact:

Madelyn Farr
Alacazam! Records
Box 429
Waterbury, VT
05676

The UCLA Film & Folklore Association invites film abstracts on contemporary folklife and popular culture for the 1991 VIT AS Film Festival to be held on February 16, 1991. Works must have been released no earlier than 1987. Send a one-page abstract by Friday, September 28, 1990; include color, etc. A selection of films for preview will be made and filmmakers will be invited to send their films by Monday, October 15, 1990. Final judging will take place by the end of November. Contact:

Michele Goldwasser (or) Sojin Kim
Folklore and Mythology Center
1037 GSM-Library Wing
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Information wanted:

Mary-Jo Am, Visiting Scholar at the University of Pennsylvania, has discovered an account of a fifteenth-century game called Post and Pillar and is looking for references in English to a game of that name. The game has been played in France since the Middle Ages at least and is generally known as *le jeu de fagots* or *les tiers.* In English it is known as Faggots, Twos and Threes, Round Tag, and Tierce (among, perhaps,

many other names). Dr. Am would appreciate hearing from anyone who knows of a reference to Post and Pillar, and if anyone can postulate a plausible relationship between the game and the expression "from pillar to post" (also known in the Middle Ages), she would be grateful.

Dr. Mary-Jo Am
Visiting Scholar Department
of English University of
Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA
19104-6273

W. W. Newell Prize

The Children's Folklore Section of the American Folklore society announces competition for the 1991 W. W. Newell Prize. A $100 cash award for the best student essay on a topic in children's folklore will be awarded. The paper must have been written by an undergraduate or graduate student within the 1990-1991 academic year. Papers published by students within the same time frame are also eligible. Students may submit their own papers; instructors are asked to encourage students with eligible papers to enter the competition.

Papers must be typed, double-spaced, on white bond paper. On the first page include the author's name, academic address, home address, and telephone numbers.

The winner will receive a $100 award at the annual meeting of the American Folklore Society in October 1991. The winning paper does not have to be read at the meeting but entrants are encouraged to submit abstracts of their papers to the AFS Program Committee. If the winning paper is read at the meeting it will be identified as the winner of the Newell prize.

Deadline for submissions is March I, 1991. Send 2 copies of each entry to:

Tom Johnson
Chico Folklore Archive
California State University
Chico, CA 95929-0480

MEMBERSHIP DIRECTORY

Jean Day Alexander 237 G
St. SW Washington, DC
20024

Shirley Arora
Dept. of Spanish & Portugese
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Shirley Baird
404 N. Morris S t.
Shippensburg, P A 17257

Mary Jo Sanna Barron
Quincy House E-25
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138

Caroline Feller Bauer
6892 Seaway Circle
Huntington Beach, CA 92548

Edna Garrido Boggs 536
Altara Ave.
Coral Gables, FL 33146

Carole Boughter
Director, Folklife Center
International House 3701
Chestnut St. Philadelphia,
PA 19104

Simon Bronner
American Studies Pennsylvania
State University
Harrisburg
Middletown, P A 17057

Arnold E. Burkart 704 E.
Washington St.
Muncie, IN 17057

Pack Carnes
Dept. of Anthropology
Univ.of California
Berkeley, CA 97402

John Cech
English Department
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

Richard Van Dongen
Curriculum & Instruction
College of Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Mary Gay Ducey
2808 Hillegas
Berkeley, CA 94705

Joseph Edgette
509 Academy Ave.
Glenolden, PA 19036

Bill Ellis
Pennsylvania State Univ.
Hazleton Campus
Highacres
Hazleton, PA 18201

Gary Alan Fine
Department of Sociology
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Mrs. J. W. Gaither
1130 West Imhoff
Norman, OK 73089

Sean Galvin Brooklyn
Arts Council 200 East
Parkway Brooklyn, NY
11238

Membership Directory

Michelle Mahan Gautsch
108 W. 39th St. #W-10
Baltimore, MD 21210

Susan Gordon Sorehon
Glen Assoc. 4436
Jamesville Rd. Jamesville,
MD 21754

Libby Tucker Gould
136 Meeker Road
Vestal, NY 13850

Sylvia Grider
English Department Texas
A & M University College
Station, TX 77843

Maryellen Hains
English Department Western
Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Judith Haut
2733 Halsey Road
Topanga, CA 90290

Bess Lomax Hawes
3800 N. Fairfax Dr. #410
Arlington, VA 22203

M. Kathryn Hill
167 Todd Street
Mt. Carmel, CT 06518

Karen Hirsch
SPO 1163 Sewanee
Sewanee, TN 37375

Linda Hughes
RD #2, Box 67
Cochranville, PA 19330

Ted Humphrey
421 Baughman Ave.
Claremont, CA 91711

Nancy J. Johnson
2900 Northwind Dr., #515
East Lansing, MI 48823

Thomas Johnson Department of
Anthropology California State
University Chico, CA 95929-
0400

Marilyn Jorgensen 8083
Caribbean Way
Sacramento, CA 95826

Tim Lloyd
Ohio Joint Program in Arts &
Humanities
695 Bryden Rd.
Columbus,OH 43210

Margaret MacDonald
1507 NE l04th
Kirkland, W A 98033

Amy MacDonald-Persons
29A Sweet Road
Queensbury, NY 12804

Jean M. MacLaughlin
107 E. Dunedin Rd.
Columbus,OH 43214

Amy McClure
8751 Craighton Ct
Dublin, OH 43017

Jane Madsen
530 Hillside Ave.
State College, PA 16801

Priscilla Manwaring
4040 Grand Ave.
Bloomington, IN 47401

Patricia Marton
Secondary Education
1378 Education Bldg.
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61820

Phyllis May-Machunda
Multicultural Studies & Humanities
Moorhead State Univ.
Moorhead, MN 56560

Alan Mays
1212 Nissley Road
Lancaster, PA 17601

Jay Mechling American Studies
822 Sproul Hall
University of California
Davis, CA 95616

Richard E. Meyer
Dept. of Humanities Western
Oregon State College
Monmouth, OR 97361

Linda Morley
308 Sagamore Street
Manchester, NH 03104

John Niles
English Department
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Nancy Nystrom
180 Claywell Drive San
Antonio, TX 78209

Priscilla Ord
English Department
Longwood College
Farmville, VA 23901

Sandra Peck
24 Cedar Tree
Irvine, CA 92715

Barbara Reed
Old Quarry Guilford,
CT 06437

Rosalind L. Reichstein
832 Asbury Terrace
Philadelphia, PA 19126

Danielle Roemer
Language and Literature
Northern Kentucky Univ.
Highland Heights, KY
41076

Jane Rose
624 Village Blvd. N.
Baldwinsville, NY 13027

Sue Samuelson
405 Rancho Arroyo Parkway
Fremont, CA 94536

Sandra Schector
P.O. Box 336
New York, NY 10185

Kathleen Scholl
Dept. of Elementary Ed.
SUNY -New Paltz
New Paltz, NY 12561

Alvin Schwartz
505 Prospect Ave
Princeton, NJ 08540

Membership Directory

Elizabeth Simons
969 Hilldale Ave
Berkeley, CA 94708

Doris Smith
338 South Road
Bedford, MA 01730

Ruth Stotter
2244 Vistazo E.
Tiburon, CA 94920

Brian Sutton-Smith
Department of Educational Psychology
School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19174

Tad Tuleja
400 Warren Wright Rd.
Belchertown, ~ 01007

Ray Turner P.O.
Box 333
Ary, KY 41712

Barbara Walker
Archive of Turkish Oral Narrative
Texas Tech University
P.O. Box 4185
Lubbock, TX 79409

Bob Walser
2308 Fremont Ave. South
Minneapolis, MN 55405

Hilda Webb
2833 Hyde Park Place
Cincinnati, OH 45208

Elizabeth Wein
5933 Wayne Ave #2R
Philadelphia, PA 19144

Mark I. West
English Department
UNC-Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223

INSTITUTIONS

Association of Folklorists in the South
Folk & Intercultural Studies
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY 42101

Blue Ridge Institute Newsletter
Ferrum College
Ferrum, VA 24088

Center for Southern Folklore
Jude Duffell
1216 Peabody Avenue P.O.
Box 40105
Memphis, TN 38105

Central Serial Records
University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, KY 40506

Cooper Library
Serials Department
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29631

Folk Arts Coordinator
Folklife Program Archive
State Arts Council, Room 640 Jim Thorpe Building Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4987

Folklore Archive
448 Purdy Library
Wayne State University
Detroit, MI 48202

Folklore Archives
English Department
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Folklore Archives
English Department
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322

Folksong in the Classroom
Laurence I. Seidman, Editor
140 Hill Park Avenue Great
Neck, NY 11021

Gift & Exchange Division
Library of Congress
Washington, DC 20540

Hesser College Library
3 Sundial Avenue
Manchester, NH 03101

Joseph C. Hickerson, Head
Archive of Folk Culture
Library of Congress
Washington, DC 20540

Indiana University Libraries
Serials Department Indiana
University Bloomington, IN
47407

Joyner Library
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27834

Judith E. Lokenvitz
Program Assistant Museum
of International
Folk Art
P.O. Box 2087
Santa Fe, NM 87504-2087

Motif
Department of English
Ohio State University
165 West 17th Ave
Columbus, OH 43210

North Carolina Folklore Journal
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

Ralph Brown Draughton Library
Serials Dept/LABW9561
Mell Street
Auburn University
Auburn, AL 36849-3501

Serials Librarian
Country Music Foundation
Library and Media Center 4
Music Square East
Nashville, TN 37203

Southwest Folklore Center
1524 East 6th St Tucson,
AZ 85721

State Documents Assistant
Documents Unit
J. Murrey Atkins Library
UNC-Charlotte Charlotte, NC
28223

The Museum
Michigan State University East
Lansing, MI 48824-1045

Wheelock College Library
132 Riverway
Boston, MA 02215

FOREIGN AND OVERSEAS

Australian Children's
Folklore Newsletter
C/-I.E.C.D.
4 Madden Grove Kew,
Vic 3101 Australia

June Factor
18 Green Street
Ivanhoe 3079
Victoria
Australia

University of Melbourne Library
School of Early Childhood Studies
Private Bag lO/Kew
Vic 3101
Australia

Universiteitsbibliotheek - Kul
Lvol
Mgr. Ladeuzeplein 21 B-
3000 Leuven
Belgium

Canadian Museum of Civilization
Library
P.O. Box 3100, Station B
Hull, Quebec
J8X4H2
Canada

Carole H. Carpenter
172 Roselawn Avenue
Toronto, Ontario M4R
lE6
Canada

Edith Fowke
5 Notley Place
Toronto, Ontario
M4B 2M7
Canada

Paul Smith
Folklore/Memorial Univ.
S1. Johns, Newfoundland
AIC 5S7
Canada

Danmarks Paedagogiske
Bibliothek
Tidsskriftafdelingen
Lerso Parkalle 101
DK-2100 Copenhagen 0
Denmark

Erik Kaas Nielsen
Rypevaenget 16
2600 Gelostrup
DK Denmark

Ruth Canonico-Webster
15 Park Street Crediton,
Dexon EX17 3EQ
England

Iona Opie
Westerfield House
West Liss
Hampshire GU33
6JQ England

Stephen Roud
18 Amberley Grove
Addiscombe
Surrey CR06NO England

Akateeminen Kirjakauppa
Periodicals Department
P.O. Box 128
SF-OO 10 1
Helsinki 10
Finland

Library of the Society of Finnish Literature
Hallitusk
SF-00170HKI17
Finland

Osterbottens Traditionsarkiv
Handelsesplanaden 23A SF-65100
Vasa
Finland

Andy Ar1eo
Chemin du Bignon Baguet
44600 Saint-Nazaire France

Ase Enerstvedt
Etn-Folkloristisk lnstituit
Olaf Ryesvei 19
Postboks 23
5014 Bergen-Universitet
Norway

Norsk Senter for Barneforskning
v/Bjerg Helgemo
UniversitetiTrondheim N-7055
DRAGVOLL
Norway

Northern College of Education
The Librarian
Hilton Place
Aberdeen, AB91F A
Scotland

COOster Dominder
Horngatan 21B *S-602*
34 Norrkoping
Sweden

Bengt af Klintberg
Vendevagen 13
18131 Lidingo
Sweden

Per Peterson
Timmermansgantan 6F
S-753 33 Uppsala
Sweden

Dr. Maria Osorina
Dept of General Psychology
Leningrad State University
Universitetskaya Nabereznaya
Leningrad
USSR

Tecwyn Vaughan Jones
Welsh Folk Museum St.
Fagan's, Cardiff
CF56XB
Wales

Menna Lloyd Williams
Children's Literature Research Center
Castell Brychan
Aberystwyth
SY23 2JB
Wales

Niedersaechische Staats - Und
Universitaet - Bibliothek
Zugang II A-ZSS
Prinzenstr, 1
3400 Goettingen
West Germany

Rainer Wehse
Kapitan-Lechmann-Str.6
3400 Gottingen
West Germany

CFR will accept manuscripts on 3 1/2" disks if the manuscript was typed using Microsoft Word or MacWrite on a Macintosh computer.

We request that, if possible, authors using typewriters or dot-matrix printers have their manuscripts redone and a laser printed copy made. This will enable us to scan the copy, thereby eliminating rekeying the manuscript.

Please send manuscripts to:

C. W. Sullivan III, Editor
Children' s Folklore Review
Department of English East
Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27858-4353

Children' s Folklore Review is published twice a year and sent to all members of the Children's Folklore Section of the American Folklore Society.

Published by East Carolina University

Printed by Morgan Printers, Inc.