"When she climbed up on the bed she was astonished to see how her grandmother looked in her nightgown." (Perrault)

"There lay her grandmother with her cap pulled down over her face giving a strange appearance." (Grimm)

This illustration of the celebrated "bedroom scene" in which the wolf archly attempts to conceal his identity comes from *Little Red Riding Hood* (New York: McLoughlin Brothers, circa 1890s) courtesy of Professor Jack Zipes.

Edited by

ALAN DUNDES

Little Red Riding Hood

A Casebook

The University of Wisconsin Press

The University of Wisconsin Press
114 North Murray Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53715

The University of Wisconsin Press, Ltd.
1 Gower Street
London WC1E 6HA, England

5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Little Red Riding Hood.
Bibliography: pp. 239–247.
Includes index.
1. Little Red Riding Hood (Tale). I. Dundes, Alan.
II. Little Red Riding Hood. English.
GR75.L56L58 1989 398.2'1 88-40431
ISBN 0-299-12030-9
ISBN 0-299-12034-1 (pbk.)

Contents

ZOHAR SHAVIT

The Concept of Childhood and Children's Folktales: Test Case—"Little Red Riding Hood"

Folklorists are wont to claim that fairy tales belong exclusively to their corner of the academy, but the truth is that fairy tales are equally of interest to educators and students of children's literature. Children's literature, a discipline unto itself, includes both folklore and stories written by known authors.

The perspective of a children's literature scholar may differ from that of a folklorist insofar as the former is very likely to be more concerned with the possible impact of a particular fairy tale upon the psyche of a young child. In the following unusual essay, Zohar Shavit of the department of Poetics and Comparative Literature at Tel Aviv University considers the very definition of "child" and "childhood" in her study of the Perrault and Grimm versions of "Little Red Riding Hood." In this investigation, the particular timeframes of the two classic versions are once again examined, but not so much with respect to political events or to the gender of the collectors-editors.

For other essays written from the perspective of children's literature, see Lee Burns, "Red Riding Hood," *Children's Literature* 1 (1972), 30–36, and Carole Hanks and D. T. Hanks, Jr., "Perrault's 'Little Red Riding Hood': Victim of the Revisers," *Children's Literature* 7 (1978), 68–77. For

Reprinted from *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Folklore* 4 (1983), 93–124, by permission of the Institute of Jewish Studies, Hebrew University, Jerusalem. I am indebted to folklorist Michael L. Chyet for translating this essay from Hebrew into English.

more of Zohar Shavit's consideration of children's literature, see her *Poetics of Children's Literature* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986).

Children's literature today enjoys centrality in cultural awareness and constitutes such a sizeable proportion of new educational materials that it is hard to imagine publishing activity without it. However, although children's literature is today a "natural" phenomenon taken for granted in any national literature, it is a relatively new development—less than two hundred years old. Books written especially for children were virtually unknown until the eighteenth century, and the children's book industry did not begin to flourish until the second half of the nineteenth century, when adult literature (in the modern sense) had already been established for at least one hundred years.

The reasons contributing to the late development of children's literature are diverse, but undoubtedly among the most important was the total absence of the concepts of "child" and "childhood" as we perceive them today. Before children's literature could be written, "childhood" itself had to come into existence and receive recognition and legitimation as a distinct time period in the life of the individual, or in the words of Townsend: "Before there could be children's books, there had to be children—children, that is, who were accepted as beings with their own particular needs and interests, not only as miniature men and women."[1]

In this article I will analyze along general lines and only in their principal features the creation and crystallization of the prerequisites for the development of Western children's literature—the development of the concept of the "child" in culture—and I will examine the relationships between this concept and texts written for children. In other words, I will ask how the nature of the concept of the child in literature and the meaning that has been given to that nature have to a large extent determined the character and the structure of

texts for children, and how the changes that occurred in this concept were largely responsible for the changes that came about in texts for children. In attempting to answer these questions, I will use as a test case different versions of the folktale "Red Riding Hood."

The twentieth century is characterized by the almost obsessive use of the concept of childhood: issues about psychological, physical, and sexual problems of the child do not cease to concern adults. The period of childhood is considered the most important period in one's life, and an adult's behavior is often explained by his childhood experiences. But such a perception of childhood is completely different from the cultural outlook that prevailed two hundred years ago—the concept of childhood as we know it today did not exist then.

In his classic work, Philip Ariès[2] proposes the argument, supported by later research as well,[3] that from the Middle Ages until the seventeenth century a different view of childhood dominated social consciousness, a view which began to develop and to change along lines familiar to us today beginning in the seventeenth century, passing through several transformations as one of the basic concepts of Western civilization.

The Concept of Childhood up to the Seventeenth Century

Up to the seventeenth century the child was not perceived as an entity distinct from the adult, and consequently he was not recognized as having special needs. One of the results of this outlook was the lack of an established educational system for children, and of books written specifically for them.

In the Middle Ages and the ensuing period neither the living conditions nor the prevailing theological standpoint allowed for the concept of childhood. In the conceptual outlook of the day there was no room for the concept of child-

hood because of the identification between man and nature, as a result of which the life cycle was described as analogous to that of nature, including only the periods of birth, life, and death. In such a system there was no place for the period of childhood, the lack of which in the conceptual framework was no doubt strengthened by the poor chances of survival of children and their high mortality rate, which rendered their continued existence utterly uncertain. In addition, the basic living conditions were a contributing factor: people were wed at a relatively young age, and therefore "left childhood"—in the modern sense of the term—at a very tender age. Upper-class children took an active part in society from an extremely young age (10–13), whereas children of the lower classes were needed in the work force, and began working at a tender age. Consequently, children who successfully survived the first dangerous years of life could not remain children for long, and were quickly forced to enter the adult world and to become part of it.

Relations between the Child's World and the Adult's World: From Unity to Polarization

Up to the seventeenth century children were an integral part of adult society, sharing clothing, lodging, games, and work. Unity prevailed between children and adults in regard to all physical and psychic needs. A process of polarization began to undermine this unity from the seventeenth century on, as can be seen, for instance, from a discussion about the nature of the dress of children and adults of the upper class.[4] Up to the seventeenth century it was customary for children to wear a miniature version of the adults' clothing as soon as they stopped wearing swaddling clothes, which occurred at a relatively late age (3–5 years). With the development of the concept of childhood, the designing of special clothes for children also began. In general it can be said that the child's new wardrobe was characterized by items of attire which

formerly belonged to the realm of adult wear and lost their function as such. Children's clothes became systematized through a process of reduction and at times also of simplification, and in the new system they also acquired a new function: they became a symbol of the separation of the world of children from that of the adult. Soon after certain items became children's clothing, they were used exclusively for children, such as breeches, which formerly had been a standard item of adult attire, but later became a trademark of children's dress. Moreover, various items of dress designated different stages of childhood, and permission to wear a certain item marked another stage in a child's maturation, until finally he entered the adult world and began to dress as a full-fledged adult.

The process of the transformation of childhood was expressed in other aspects of daily life, such as children's games, the educational system of the child, and even the fact that there was a special room in the house set aside for children, just as there were special rooms for the parents, for dining, and the like. As Ariès points out, an interesting example of this process of the transformation of elements from the adult's world to the world of the child and their consequent evolution into a trademark of the child's world is the case of the wooden rocking horse. The horse, which had been a primary medium of transportation, lost this function for the adult world at the end of the nineteenth century. It did not disappear from the culture, but rather evolved through a process of reduction and simplification into the wooden horse of the nursery, where it acquired a new function as a toy. Moreover, in addition to this function it became a symbol differentiating the children's room from the adults' room, and a sine qua non in nursery furnishings. (For a similar phenomenon, other dolls and miniature toys can be pointed to which originally had a ritual function for adults and children alike, but which later lost their ritual function, becoming not only part of the child's world, but his exclusive monopoly.)

Hence, in the process of the formation of the concept of

"child," there occurred a polarization between the adult's and the child's world. The system of childhood began to be characterized by a series of elements which migrated from the adult system to the child's system, and took on the function of differentiating between the two systems.

The Spread of the Concept of Childhood into Society: Two Concepts

The polarization between the adult's and the child's world and the spread of the concept of childhood were the result of many processes which occurred in Western society, especially the changes in social and material processes. The Industrial Revolution, the decrease in infant mortality, and the increase in life expectancy undoubtedly all played an important part in the development of the child concept, but changes in man's perception of the world during the Renaissance and the Enlightenment contributed considerably to the fact that the concept of "child" began to rise to consciousness before the physical conditions justified it, that is, before any change occurred in living conditions, and the change in these conditions later aided in the dissemination of the child concept among the middle class as well.

The first signs of the formation of this child concept, and the recognition that the child is a creature distinct from the adult, were already apparent at the end of the sixteenth century in the realm of painting. Here the child served a religious purpose—the infant Jesus, Jesus and the Angels, and the like—being depicted for the first time as sweet, angelic, and innocent, qualities which were also to characterize the image of the child at a later date. In time this iconography acquired a decorative character (viz. the paintings of Putt) beyond its original religious nature, and images of children gradually began to undergo a process of secularization and to hold a dominant position in the realms of painting and iconography. These pictures were the expression of a perception of the child as different from the adult by virtue of

the former's innocence, sweetness, and angelic appearance. Gradually depictions of children began to acquire their own legitimacy, and painting children's portraits became more and more common. Thus the depiction of children aided in the spread of the new concept of the child as possessing the qualities portrayed in the paintings, qualities which from the seventeenth century onward made children a source of amusement for adults.

Regarding the child as a source of entertainment began to develop within the family circle. People no longer hesitated to acknowledge the diversion which children provided, and delighting in children, as well as in their sweetness, beauty, and witticisms, became fashionable among the upper classes. Children were invited to the parlor so that adults might be amused by them: the attitude towards children greatly resembled that assumed for cherished pet animals. Fleury described this attitude as follows: "It is as if the poor children had been made only to amuse the adults, like little dogs or little monkeys."[5]

This attitude began to arouse resistance among extra-familial groups, such as moralists and pedagogues, who were opposed to the fashion which prevailed in relation to children. Nevertheless, they accepted the principal concept of considering the innocent child who is closer to God as distinct from the adult. They used this very concept to justify their demand for separating children from the corrupt adult society.

In contrast to the perception that was developing within the extended family circle, which saw the child as a source of amusement, a second perception of the child arose among groups which stood in opposition to the family: the church, the moralists, and the pedagogues, who, because of their awareness of his different nature, felt responsible for the spiritual development of the child. They believed that children need education and discipline, and simultaneous with the new interest in the psychology of the child, they drafted a demand for an educational system that would satisfy these needs. Henceforth the child was perceived as a delicate crea-

ture who must be protected, educated, and molded in accordance with the current educational beliefs and goals.

The way to shape children along these lines was first and foremost by means of books, which were considered the primary tool in achieving these "pedagogical" goals. This new "educational" perception of society, unlike the "amusement" perception which preceded it, created for the first time the need for children's books, and became the frame of reference in which the first books were written whose intended audience was specifically children. From then on official children's books were written, based on an understanding of the child as the audience and of his needs, which were different from those of adults. When a change in this understanding came about, texts written for children changed as well.

In order to investigate the relationship between the cultural concept of the child and the norms governing literature for children, I shall analyze as a test-case different versions of "Little Red Riding Hood." The text of "Little Red Riding Hood" has been chosen not only because it is a "classic" of children's literature, but also for reasons of methodological convenience, as there is an extraordinary correspondence between the periods in which the different versions of the text were produced and the parallel developments in the child concept and the changes which occurred in it. Examining this text may therefore shed light on the link between the changes that took place in the child concept in Western civilization at different periods and the changes that occurred in the versions of the text in at least two ways: (1) understanding the child's needs and his comprehension capacity, and (2) seeing the manner in which the child and his world are presented in the texts themselves.

The examination of versions of "Little Red Riding Hood" will deal therefore with these questions and the way in which the "amusement" perception served as a basis for Perrault's version, its transformation into the "educational" version of the Brothers Grimm, and the further transformation of this version to the "protective" version of the twentieth century.

"Little Red Riding Hood": A Test Case of Attitudes towards Folktales from the Seventeenth Century on

We have seen how, in the process of the creation of the child concept, elements from the adult world have passed over to the child's world, becoming the exclusive property of the child, after previously being shared by adults and children alike. This process characterized modes of dress, games children played, and folktales, which gradually entered the child's world, until in the twentieth century they were considered an essential component in his development (unlike the first half of the nineteenth century, when they were considered too dangerous for children and were removed from the canon of juvenile literature).

Up until the nineteenth century, folktales were told and read, as were romances, by adults (even among the upper classes). Children, who constituted part of adult society, were acquainted with them in the same way, although the tales were not considered meant for them. However, starting from the second half of the seventeenth century a change occurred in the attitude of the upper class vis-à-vis folktales. This was part of a general change in the prevailing literary fashions. Members of the literary elite, whose tastes were becoming more "sophisticated," regarded folktales as too "simple" and "childish," suitable, in their estimation, only for children and members of the lower classes (who were seen as social equals by the class-conscious of the time).[6] Despite this, it became fashionable to be interested in folktales and to write tales modeled after oral tales, at times pretending to be setting down an oral tale in written form (which was in some cases true). Yet in spite of the fact that folktales were in vogue, the writing and acceptance of them were based on the assumption that they were meant for children and the lower classes. Thus members of high society could enjoy them only vicariously through children, but since the child was perceived in any case as a source of

amusement, adults could enjoy elements of the child's world while openly or covertly considering them part of the world of children, part of a culture different from that of the upper classes.

Perrault's Version

Concealing the Author's Identity

This attitude towards children's culture functioned as the background and the motivation as well as the source of legitimation for Perrault's book *Histoires ou Contes du temps passé.* As is known, in 1697 Perrault published a collection of tales, some of which had never before been written down (such as "Little Red Riding Hood"). Perrault's collection was not unusual, but rather belonged to the genre of tales written by upper-class women such as Mme d'Aulnoy, Mlle l'Héritier, and Mme Le Prince de Beaumont which began to flood French literature at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries. Perrault's collection stirred up a controversy almost immediately after it was published, not only because it was specifically intended for children while being both ironic and very sophisticated, but even more so because it was not signed by Perrault, the distinguished member of the Académie Française, but instead by his seventeen-year-old son Pierre d'Armancour.

The ambiguous nature of the text, which will be discussed below, and its author's mysterious identity raise two questions: (1) Why did the author's identity remain unclear? and (2) For whom was the work intended?

The author's identity became a topic of controversy among researchers, who based their arguments on the following facts. Although the work was by Perrault's son, it was attributed to Perrault himself even in his lifetime. In two volumes of *Le Cabinet des fées* (a vast collection consisting of thirty-seven volumes of tales gathered in that period, evidence for the great interest taken in them), one reads that

Histoires ou Contes du temps passé was written by Perrault, despite its being ascribed to his son.[7]

Soriano, the well-known expert on Perrault, maintains that the text was often attributed to the latter after it became a great success, as if to say that an important name was required. But this claim does not explain why the work was ascribed to Perrault before it attained world renown, or why Perrault never bothered to clarify the issue, as Soriano himself asserts: "The academician knew the truth of this affair, but he did nothing to eliminate the doubt."[8] Moreover, it seems that the opposite can be argued: not only did Perrault fail to clarify unequivocally the issue of the author's identity, he did all he could to leave it ambiguous.

Perrault did not deny the fact that he was a writer. He signed his name to "La Marquise de Salusses ou la Patience de Griselidis," which appeared in *Mercure Galant* together with a comment to the effect that it was given as a lecture in the Académie Française (1691). His name also appeared on the story "Les Souhaits ridicules" which also appeared in *Mercure Galant* (1693). Nevertheless, at the same time Perrault did all he could to conceal the identity of the writer of *Les Contes*. Among the ruses he resorted to was the following: In the second version of "L'Histoire de la Marquise-Marquis de Banneville"—which was written, to all appearances, by Perrault—there is a long digression relating to the author of "La Belle au bois dormant" (February 1696), which contains the following quote: "But I was not at all surprised when I was told the name of the author. It is the son of Master——"[9] Such a comment about a story included in *Les Contes* undoubtedly added to the mystery which surrounded the author's identity.

Guesses as to the identity of the author of the tales were not limited to Perrault's son. Some attributed them to his niece or to other contemporary tale writers because of their resemblance to other literary tales. It must also be borne in mind that similarities between different tales were not necessarily due to familial relations, but rather to the simple fact that all the writers relied on the same literary models

and consciously attempted to imitate them, as Soriano rightly points out: "Perrault, his son, Mademoiselle l'Héritier, Perrault's niece, Mademoiselle Bernard, the niece of Fontenelle, the abbot of Choisy, found themselves in the same salons, playing the same society games, intellectually competing with themes which were identical."[10] In addition, it should be noted that Perrault's contemporaries were not particularly impressed by his endeavors to conceal his identity, nor by the similarity between his text and others. They had no doubt about the author's true identity, as is evident from a letter which Dubois wrote to Bayle: "The same publisher also printed the *Contes de ma mere l'Oye* by Monsieur Perrault."[11]

The fact that Perrault deliberately masked his identity as author, preferring officially to attribute the work to his son, can be explained, at least partially, by the fact that as a member of the Académie Française he did not feel comfortable writing texts that it was felt should be written by young people or by upper-class women, whose social status was lower than his. However it seems that there was more than just Perrault's social standing involved in the blurring of the author's identity: otherwise it would have been more logical to identify his son as the sole author of the tales, rather than to play around with two identities. It appears that the main reason for Perrault's behavior is embedded in a social convention current among elite literary circles of the time vis-à-vis folktales. The games around the author's double identity were part of the general pretense regarding folktales. Even though the literary elite knew who the true author was, it preferred to pretend that the work was written by Perrault's son, just as it preferred to pretend that the tales were meant for children. The game surrounding the author's ambiguity paralleled the game around the intended audience's identity. Nevertheless, the manipulation of the text and of the folktale model, and more particularly their satiric and ironic tone, left no doubt as to the true identity of both the audience and the writer.

Manipulating the Model: The Ambiguity of "Little Red Riding Hood"

As stated above, Perrault was the first person to set down "Little Red Riding Hood" in writing. Scholars are still undecided on the question of whether or not Perrault's text is based on an existing folktale, mainly because of the atypical tragic ending of his text, a phenomenon unheard of in folktales. At any rate, even those scholars who believe that his text is based on an original folktale agree that Perrault doctored the text, altering part of its formal structure in order to make it more sophisticated.

For instance, Perrault changed the formulaic structure of the dialogue, which is generally characterized by completely symmetrical repetitions. Perrault violated this semi-sacred symmetry in the following manner:

> The *better* to embrace you,—
> The *better* to run with,—
> The *better* to hear with,—
> The *better* to see with,—
> To eat *you* with.[12]

Nevertheless, Perrault took pains to create the illusion of a folktale, mainly by means of stylistic devices, as Soriano asserts: "An attentive study of vocabulary shows that many of the turns of phrase utilized by the tale-teller were already considered old at that time—it is in sum a reconstitution, a sort of "in the manner of."[13]

The function of the stylizing of the text was not only to lend it the qualities of "authenticity" and "antiquity," but also, and perhaps primarily, to emphasize who its official audience was. The desire to stress the intended audience, that is, the child, would explain why Perrault used in the text words which were at that time considered to belong exclusively to the language of children, words such as *la bobinette* and *la chevillette,* which were not part of the accepted written language. The very act of inserting such vocabulary

items into the texts was a striking departure from the norm, thus serving an important stylistic function.

However, together with the attempt to characterize the work as "authentic" and as intended for children through the use of elements whose stylistic identity was clear, Perrault did not hesitate to deviate from the formulas of the folktale even at key points, such as the addition of a tragic ending, or in typical structures, such as the repetitions. In this manner he created a text which cannot be considered unequivocally either a folktale or a literary tale, possessing instead an ambiguous nature.

The Basis for the Ambiguous Nature of the Text

It seems that the ambiguous nature of the text can be explained by its official and unofficial audience. This ambiguity enabled Perrault to address two different audiences at one and the same time. On the one hand, he was able to take advantage of the current perception regarding the appropriateness of folktales for children in order to direct the text officially to them, while at the same time availing himself of the common conception of the child as a source of amusement in order to orient the text to the literary elite. However, in order to ensure that the upper classes would read his work, he felt obliged to "equip" it with signs that would indicate who the true audience was, while also making possible the duplicity of the text. While the folktale formulas designated the official audience, the breaking of such formulas—in addition to lending an ironic and satirical aspect to the text—marked the unofficial audience, the literary elite. Numerous accounts from the period testify to Perrault's success in attracting his unofficial audience to reading these texts—perhaps even more so than their officially intended audience—as Muir states:

> A feature of these salons, male and female alike, was the reading aloud of pasquinades, vaudevilles, sonnets à bouts-rimés, and similar short pieces: and the Comtesse d'Aulnoy seems to

> have introduced the telling of fairy-stories in the female salons. The idea caught on and became the rage. The fashion eventually extended to the male writers—The curious point to be taken is that the stories were devised or adapted from ancient originals, for the amusement not of children but of adults. The consequence is that, although the characters and the background belong superficially to fairy-tales, most of them are too sophisticated for children.[14]

It is therefore evident that Perrault, like many of his contemporaries, did not write his famous tales for children alone, but also, or perhaps mainly, for the pleasure of his friends. It seems that the following quotation about his contemporary Mlle l'Héritier also applies to Perrault himself: "Mademoiselle l'Héritier wrote for the amusement of her friends and all of her writings bear the imprint of her 'salon wit.'"[15]

The Function of the Duality of the Intended Audience

Perrault had to emphasize the fact that children were the official audience of his work because this was a condition for its acceptance by high society. Even scholars who see the text as meant primarily for children agree that at least part of it is aimed at adults, as Soriano, for example, says: "It is always addressed to an audience of children, no doubt, but at the same time allowing a wink in the direction of the adult."[16]

Whether the text was intended entirely for adults or only partially so, there is no disagreement that the ironic and satirical tone of the text, particularly as it is expressed in the tragic ending of the tale, is meant for adults, and not for children. By means of the tragic ending, Perrault created a satire about the city gentleman who does not hesitate to take advantage of the poor village girl. The text's satirical nature depends primarily on the moral, which comes at the end. From this ending it is made clear that the wolf is not a real wolf, but rather represents all sorts of people whom an innocent village girl must beware of:

Who does not know that these gentle wolves
Are of all such creatures the most dangerous.[17]

The depiction of the gentleman abusing the innocent village girl is further strengthened in the text by the erotic elements that accompany her description: her beauty, the color red which is her symbol, and of course the erotic bed scene, in which she is surprised to discover what "grandmother" looks like in bed, after the latter asks her to undress and to come lie with her: "Little Red Riding Hood took off her cloak, but when she climbed up on the bed she was astonished to see how her grandmother looked in her nightgown."[18] It is clear that the erotic aspect encourages the reading of the text as the story of a gentleman exploiting the innocence of a village girl and enjoying her charms, rather than simply as the story of a little girl who is devoured by a wolf.

The child concept of Perrault's day provided the background for *Les Contes* and the mask necessary for their acceptance by the literary elite. However, in addition to the changes that later took place in the conception of the child, the nature of the texts meant for him also changed, as well as in the way the child himself was depicted in different texts. These changes were among the factors causing the transformation of "Little Red Riding Hood" from Perrault's version to the later one that the Brothers Grimm collected and committed to writing—along with their own revisions and alterations—a century later.

Differences between Versions of "Little Red Riding Hood": Perrault vs. the Brothers Grimm

Folktale research has dealt at length with the differences between the tales of Perrault and different versions of tales similar to his published by the Brothers Grimm. Scholars are divided regarding the origins of the texts and their degree of "originality," accounting for the similarities and differ-

ences in them by various methods. Some explain them using the historic-geographic method, while others prefer to look at cross-cultural relationships[19] or the crossover from one national culture to another.[20] Other researchers deny the possibility of a direct connection between Perrault's tales and those of the Brothers Grimm, attributing the similarities and differences to the intermediary influences of Tieck, whom the Brothers Grimm refer to in their commentary on "Little Red Riding Hood": "Perrault's 'Little Red Riding Hood' which Tieck elegantly reworked in his romantic drama . . ."[21]

Rather than getting involved in this complex argument, or refuting the conclusions of this or that researcher, I would like to propose an alternative way of accounting for the differences between Perrault's version and that of the Brothers Grimm: One could also regard the differences between the two as the result of the different perceptions of the concept of childhood which prevailed in each of the two periods in question, thereby yielding differing assumptions concerning the intended audience and the manner in which the child is presented in the texts.

In the hundred years that had passed since Perrault's days, a revolutionary change had taken place in the child concept. The "amusement" perception of the child was replaced in the Grimm Brothers' day by an "educational" perception which gave primary importance to a new and heretofore unheard of concept: that of educating the child. Consequently, an educational system evolved, the needs of which largely dictated both the nature of works written for children, and above all the literary models then dominating the literary scene.

The Brothers Grimm, like other writers of the mid-nineteenth century, adopted the new image of the child, stressing his straightforwardness and the ability, uniquely his, to look at the world in a special way. They expressed this view in the introduction to *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, claiming to transmit the text from the child's point of view: "There runs throughout these narratives that quality of pu-

rity which makes children appear to us so wonderful and happy. The tales have, so to speak, the selfsame shining eyes open as far as they can possibly be while the rest of the body is still fragile, weak and unskilled for earthly labor."[22]

However, in contradistinction to Perrault, whose official audience was the child, the Brothers Grimm did not intend their text for children at first, although the book's title indicates the origin of the texts: they were collected from household members—maidservants—and children. The tales were first intended for adult members of the literary elite, for the accepted literary tastes—a return to the primary sources and to nature were in vogue—enabled them to enjoy such texts. The Brothers Grimm did not have the option of directing their works to adults and children at one and the same time, for according to the current child concept, the child was seen as an entity distinct from the adult, with different needs and capabilities of understanding. In order nevertheless to enable children to read their tales, the Brothers Grimm thought it necessary to revise them, gearing them to a child's level of understanding, particularly from a stylistic point of view. This they did starting with the second edition, in the introduction to which they outlined the principles that guided them in their endeavor to render the texts suitable for children.

In spite of this, the Brothers Grimm still recognized the possibility that there would be parents who would deem the book inappropriate for their children, forbidding them to read it: "Therefore we have taken care to leave out of this new edition expressions which were not suitable for children. Yet there may be objections. One or another parent may find material embarrassing or offensive, so that they would not be comfortable putting the book into the hands of children. In such well-founded individual cases, the parents have an easy choice to make."[23] In this introduction, two new ideas are evident which apparently were a major part of the changes that occurred in the text since Perrault's time. As stated above, one idea expressed the supposition that the child is an entity distinct from the adult. The other ex-

pressed the belief that the adult is responsible for satisfying the child's needs, and that the latter must be under his direct and constant supervision.

The differences between the versions of Perrault and the Brothers Grimm thus consist of more than just different assumptions about the audience and the fact that in the Grimm text there is no trace of the protracted game which Perrault played with his audience. Another striking difference between the texts is the distinctive way the child and everything connected with him is presented in each. In the Grimm version of "Little Red Riding Hood" the two beliefs that were combined in the child concept of the time are evident, particularly in the portrayal of intrafamilial relations, the simple honesty of the child, and the need to guide and instruct him. These viewpoints will be treated here through an examination of the differing tones of the two texts, and their divergent endings, as well as less salient differences.

Differences in Tone and Ending

As many scholars have asserted, the most salient differences between Perrault and the Brothers Grimm lie in the tone of the texts, ironic versus naive, and in the ending, happy versus tragic.

It seems that the difference in tone is due to the differing intentions of the authors. Whereas Perrault used satire and irony to address the literary elite, the Brothers Grimm made a noticeable effort to preserve the illusion of the naive narrator, considered crucial to the "authenticity" of the text. Although they freely admitted reworking the oral text—the written version is probably very different from it and closer to Tieck's,[24]—they still took pains to keep intact the naive character of the narrator, mainly by preserving the naive tone.

The other striking difference is, as noted earlier, the ending. In Perrault's version, the story ends when the wolf devours the girl, followed by a moral in rhyming verse. The Grimm version, on the other hand, offers two alternative

endings, the common denominator between them being that the girl is not harmed in the end. In the first alternative, she is punished—the grandmother and the girl are at first devoured by the wolf, but are later rescued by the hunter, who also kills the wolf; however in the second alternative the wolf is drowned before it has a chance to harm the girl or her grandmother.

The drastic change in the nature of the tale's ending, completely changing its significance, raises the question why there was the need to insert such an ending at all, apart from the question of whether or not it was organic to the text.[25] In other words, what function did the addition of this ending to the text serve?

It is clear that turning the tragic ending into a happy one was first and foremost the result of the need to fit the story into the pattern of the folktale. The happy ending is considered an indispensable component of the folktale; it can be said to be a distinctive feature which differentiates folktales from literary tales. Hence the Brothers Grimm, or the anonymous narrator who added the happy ending (from the point of view of the function of the ending it is immaterial who was responsible for the addition, rather it is important to understand why it was necessary) could not deviate from the pattern, unlike Perrault, who intentionally departed from it at decisive points in the story. However, the selection of this specific ending has implications above and beyond the folktale pattern, reflecting also the educational views of the day. According to these views, the child must derive a moral lesson from every event, experience, or story to which he is exposed. Punishment was itself perceived as an integral part of the educational process—and in this respect the "Red Riding Hood" of the Brothers Grimm was no different. It is interesting to note that the Brothers Grimm themselves were pleased with the "educational" nature of the tales, seeing it as further proof that the text was suitable for children.[26]

Bolte and Polívka[27] suggest that this specific ending was chosen because it already existed in the folktale inventory

in the tale "The Wolf and the Seven Young Kids." Because the wolf's role as protagonist is common to both tales, its choice presented a "natural" and ready-made solution. Even if we accept this explanation, it does not contradict the one offered above. Moreover, we must not ignore the fact that in the tale "The Wolf and the Seven Young Kids" the element of learning a lesson is absent. This is a feature which exists only in the text of "Red Riding Hood," which strengthens the assumptions made about the text regarding the education of the child and the process of reward and punishment.

This difference between the versions of Perrault and the Brothers Grimm changed not only the ending of the text, but also its meaning and moral. Unlike Perrault's Little Red Riding Hood, the Grimms' Little Red Riding Hood has the opportunity to learn a lesson, and indeed avails herself of the opportunity. Whereas Perrault's moral emphasizes the wolf, thereby pointing to the gentleman from the city, the moral of the Brothers Grimm's version stresses Little Red Riding Hood's learning a lesson. Thus the tale was transformed from a satire to a tale about reward and punishment and learning a lesson.

The difference in emphasis in the two versions and in their general significance explains the total omission of the erotic scene and the erotic elements from the Grimm version, and was probably also the reason for some less obvious changes. In Perrault's version there are only slight hints as to the relationship between family members, while in the Grimm version they are quite explicit. Examples include the grandmother's love for the girl, the mother's feeling of respnsibility for the grandmother, and the girl's love for her grandmother.

While in Perrault's version the grandmother's love for the girl is not mentioned at all, in the Grimm version her love for Little Red Riding Hood is boundless, and she makes her the red hood as a symbol of her love. Hence the hood serves a different function in each of the two versions: for Perrault it symbolizes the girl's eroticism, whereas for the Brothers Grimm it is an expression of the grandmother's deep love.

Perrault	*The Brothers Grimm*
The good woman made her a little red hood, which became her so well that everywhere she went by the name of Little Red Riding Hood.[28]	But it was her grandmother who loved her most. She could never give the child enough. One time she made her a present, a small, red velvet cap, and since it was so becoming and the maiden insisted on always wearing it, she was called Little Red Cap.[29]

In the Grimm version, the mother's feeling of responsibility for the grandmother is far greater than in Perrault's version. Whereas in Perrault's, the girl is sent to the grandmother's house because the mother has baked flat cakes and because she has heard that the grandmother is sick, in the Grimm version the mother has precise knowledge of the grandmother's condition, and consequently sends the girl to help her. In the Grimm version family ties are much stronger than in Perrault's:

Perrault	*The Brothers Grimm*
One day her mother, who had just made and baked some cakes, said to her: "Go and see how your grandmother is, for I have been told that she is ill. Take her a cake and this little pot of butter."[30]	One day her mother said to her, "Come, Little Red Cap, take this piece of cake and bottle of wine and bring them to your grandmother. She's sick and weak, and this will strengthen her.[31]

The bond between the girl and her grandmother is also less haphazard in the Grimm version. In Perrault's version, the girl picks flowers for her own enjoyment alone, while in the Grimm version she picks them to bring as a gift to her grandmother:

Perrault	*The Brothers Grimm*
. . . and the little girl continued on her way by the	Little Red Cap looked around and saw how the rays of the

longer road. As she went she amused herself by gathering nuts, running after the butterflies, and making nosegays of the wild flowers which she found.[32]

sun were dancing through the trees back and forth and how the woods were full of beautiful flowers. So she thought to herself, If I bring Grandmother a bunch of fresh flowers, she'd certainly like that.[33]

Family ties and the great amount of attention paid to children—a phenomenon which was nonexistent in Perrault's time[34]—took on a central importance in the century following Perrault, and were apparently also among the reasons for the discrepancy between the texts in the presentation of family ties. Similarly, different assumptions regarding the rearing of children are discernible in the two versions.

In Perrault's day there was no educational system in the modern sense of the term, nor was the need for the systematic education of the child recognized. In the time of the Brothers Grimm, on the other hand, not only was an educational system already established, but it was seen as an essential condition for the normal development of the child, and as part of the adult's responsibility toward him. Views about children's education are expressed in the Grimm version first and foremost in the directions which the mother gives the little girl about how she should conduct herself at her grandmother's house, directions which are totally absent from the Perrault version. The mother instructs the girl to behave nicely: "And when you enter her room, don't forget to say good morning, and don't go peeping in all the corners."[35] She admonishes her not to turn off the path: "Get an early start, before it becomes hot, and when you're out in the woods, be nice and good and don't stray from the path, otherwise you'll fall and break the glass, and your grandmother will get nothing."[36]

The girl does not obey, and is therefore punished. However, she ultimately learns her lesson. What is even more important from an educational standpoint is the alternative ending of the text, which furnishes proof that the lesson has indeed been learned: "Meanwhile, Little Red Cap thought to herself, Never again will you stray from the path by yourself

and go into the forest when your mother has forbidden it."[37]

Although the notion that adults are duty-bound to guide their children and that they are responsible for the behavior of the latter did not yet exist in Perrault's time, it became the basis for the mother-daughter relationship in the Grimm version. Moreover, the school, an institution lacking in Perrault's day, became not just a recognized institution, but a hated one. In the version of the Grimm Brothers, when the wolf encounters Little Red Riding Hood in the woods, he says something that could not have appeared in Perrault's version: she looks as sad as if she were going to school: "You march along as if you were going straight to school."[38]

In the century following Perrault's lifetime, the concept of children's education took definite shape. This new concept, which struck deep roots in the educational system developed during the same period, lent a great deal of importance to children's reading material, thus creating an intellectual climate suitable for the composition of an official children's literature. Henceforth the prevalent educational concept has been largely responsible for the norms governing writing for children, and to it are attributable the changes that have occurred in twentieth-century adaptations of "Little Red Riding Hood."

Modern Adaptations of "Little Red Riding Hood"

The perception of children's literature as an educational tool of the first order, stressing that reading materials for children must serve educational goals, has remained basically unchanged from the nineteenth century until our own time. At the basis of official children's literature today is the assumption that reading materials for children must be suitable from an educational standpoint, and must contribute to their development. Nevertheless, a change has taken place since the nineteenth century in the educational views regarding the child's needs and his comprehension capabilities. Paralleling the change in these perceptions, a change

has taken place in the nature of the norms of writing for children. So, for instance, folktales were kept from children at the beginning of the nineteenth century because it was feared that literature dealing with fantasy would corrupt the child. The educational establishment in those days preferred "realistic" texts, in which the featured images were death and disease.[39] Folktales were preserved in non-canonical literature, commonly in the form of chapbooks. However, with the changes that came about in the concept of education since the second half of the nineteenth century, fantastic literature also underwent a rehabilitation. Fantasy was no longer considered harmful, but was rather seen as an essential factor in the child's normal development. Consequently, there began to appear numerous editions of folktales which were adapted in various ways, mainly in an attempt to infuse them with instructive morals. Since that time folktales have become regularly featured on the children's Western literature shelf, and have been published in many editions. The number of different editions of the Grimm tales for children in English, French, German, and Hebrew is in the tens, if not hundreds, appearing in editions differing greatly from each other. However, all the versions of the children's folktales have a common denominator: behind them stand various views on the child and his educational needs. Even when a complete and precise edition of the original version of the Grimm tales for children comes out, its appearance is generally explained not only by the classical status of the text, but also using a psychological argument, as there are psychologists who attach importance to the child's full acquaintance with the text, even seeing it as a requisite part of his emotional development.[40]

In contrast to this, in a large number of children's editions it is assumed that the original text of the Brothers Grimm is beyond the comprehension level of the child, revealing too much of "reality" to him. There is a great deal of correspondence between these two views and the varied adaptations of children's folktales. The differences between them correspond to the different ways of treating these two matters.

In order to discuss the nature of the modern adaptations of "Little Red Riding Hood" for children, three versions have been selected as samples, enabling us to learn about the norms that guide the reworking of folktales for children, and about the procedures involved in such adaptations. The versions chosen are Modern Promotions (n.d.), Puppet Book, 1970;[41] and A Pop-Up Book (n.d.).

The Comprehension Capacity of the Child and Possibilities of "Exposure"

Assumptions regarding the child's comprehension capacity are expressed in the texts first and foremost in the tone of the story. Unlike the naive tone typical of the Grimms' style, adaptations for children are characterized by an authoritative, condescending tone. This is particularly obvious at the points in the story where the narrator fears that the child may not understand on his own. So, for example, the narrator of the Puppet edition explains the little girl's name: "That is exactly why she was called Little Red Riding Hood." In this adaptation, even the wolf's slyness is explained to the audience, because it is assumed that the child cannot figure this out for himself: "The crafty old wolf really knew where grandmother lived. He also knew that the path across the meadow was the shortest way to reach grandmother's house."

The adaptor of the Pop-Up edition, on the other hand, is afraid that the child will not be able to understand by himself that the wolf disguised himself as the grandmother, and therefore explains, "She was surprised to see her granny in bed (you see, she thought the wolf was her granny)."

However, the connection between the principles of adaptation and the adaptors' assumptions are most obvious in the various solutions which they propose for any bit of information which is considered unpleasant, especially the "violent" scenes existing in the original. This is the reason that in the Modern Promotion version the grandmother is not sick, it being merely implied that she is "not well," and in the Pop-Up edition, the grandmother's condition is not men-

tioned at all, the mother simply suggesting to the girl that she go visit her: "Why don't you go and visit Granny—I'm sure she would be pleased to see you."

The most interesting thing in the adaptations of "Little Red Riding Hood" for children is the manner in which the issue of "violence" is treated, as this is considered the least appropriate information for children. The adaptor of the Puppet edition is the most extreme, completely doing away with the potentially violent scene, making sure that even the wolf escapes unscathed: "When the wolf saw the hunter's long rifle, he had a change of mind. Now it was his turn to be frightened. He had time for just one yelp before running out of the house as quickly as he could." Other adaptors, however, elect to punish the wolf, apparently so as to see poetic justice done. Nevertheless, they omit the violent scenes between the wolf, the grandmother, and the girl. In the Puppet edition, the grandmother hides in the closet, escaping harm, and the girl is rescued before the wolf has a chance to devour her. "But grandmother saw the wolf too! She dashed into her clothes closet and locked the door behind her, doing it so quickly that the wolf hardly knew what was happening. At that moment a hunter passed the house. He heard Little Red Riding Hood's frightened scream and burst open the door." The adaptor of the Pop-Up edition provides a similar solution: "Fortunately, at that moment, the forester arrived. He ran inside and was just in time to rescue the little girl. Red Riding Hood breathed a sigh of relief when she realized what a narrow escape she had had."

The assumption that a text for children must not be injurious to the child's development, but on the contrary must justify its existence by contributing to that development, is expressed not only in global additions or omissions, but also in minor details, such as what items Little Red Riding Hood brings to her grandmother. Whereas in the original text she brings her cake and wine, every adaptation has her bringing something else, depending on the adaptor's views about what is best for the child. So, for instance, the adaptor of the Puppet edition disapproves of alcohol, and therefore has

Little Red Riding Hood bring fruit, rather than wine: "One day her mother packed a basket with cake and fruit." In the eyes of the adaptor of the Modern Promotion edition, cake is also undesirable for the child (as representing sweets), and hence it is replaced with nutritious foods, bread and honey: "One day her mother told her to take a basket of bread and honey to her grandmother who was sick." In the Puppet edition the baked goods disappear altogether, and the victory party is celebrated with milk alone: "They were all so happy that they decided to have a party then and there. Grandmother served glasses of milk to her visitors . . ."

This brief survey of three adaptations of "Little Red Riding Hood" from among hundreds testifies to the deep relationship between the cultural concept of the child and the way in which that culture produces texts for children, a connection which on certain occasions has provided material for parodies of folktales. If we were to reconstruct a hypothetical history of children's literature, it is safe to assume that if the literary establishment at the beginning of the nineteenth century had accepted folktales, it would have seen to it that death, violence, and cruelty—common themes in the literature of the time—were stressed in children's folktales, unlike adaptations from the second half of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries.

Children's literature in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is therefore grouped under the same entry. But when the texts under that entry are examined, it becomes clear that there are great differences between them. What determines their nature is not their official entry, but rather the way in which the concept of the child is perceived in a given society, a concept which is in large part responsible for the specific application of this entry in every period.

Notes

1. J. R. Townsend, *Written for Children* (London: Penguin, 1977), 17.

2. P. Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood* (New York: Vintage, 1962).
3. I. Weber-Kellermann, *Die Kindheit: Eine Kulturgeschichte* (Frankfurt a/M.: Insel Verlag, 1979); M.-L. Plessen and P. von Zahn, *Zwei Jahrtausende Kindheit* (Köln: VSG, 1979).
4. For an exhaustive discussion about this aspect, see Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, 50–61; Plessen and von Zahn, *Zwei Jahrtausende Kindheit*.
5. Quoted in Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, 131.
6. Ibid., 95–98.
7. M. Soriano, *Les Contes de Perrault* (Paris: Gallimard, 1968), 38.
8. Ibid., 69.
9. Ibid., 25.
10. Ibid., 66–67.
11. Ibid., 31.
12. Gilbert Rouger, ed., *Contes de Perrault* (Paris: Garnier, 1967–1972), 115. Italics are mine.
13. Soriano, 154–155.
14. P. Muir, *English Children's Books* (New York: Fredrick A. Praeger, 1969), 36.
15. Soriano, 65.
16. Ibid., 155.
17. Rouger, *Contes de Perrault*, 115.
18. Ibid., 114–115.
19. J. Bolte and G. Polívka, *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm*, vol. 4 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1963 reprint of 1913 edition), 261–277.
20. H. V. Velten, "The Influence of Charles Perrault's Contes de ma Mère l'Oie on German Folklore," *Germanic Review* 5 (1930), 4–18.
21. Brüder Grimm, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1890), 59.
22. Ibid., 16.
23. Ibid., 17.
24. R. Hagen, "Perraults Märchen und die Brüder Grimm," *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie* 74 (1955), 392–410.
25. On this question see Velten, "The Influence of Charles Perrault's Contes de ma Mère l'Oie."
26. See their introduction to the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, 17.
27. Bolte and Polívka, *Anmerkungen*, vol. 1, 234–237.
28. Rouger, *Contes de Perrault*, 113.
29. Brüder Grimm, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, 156–157.

30. Rouger, *Contes de Perrault*, 113.
31. Brüder Grimm, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, 157.
32. Rouger, *Contes de Perrault*, 114.
33. Brüder Grimm, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, 158.
34. For a discussion of the development of the nuclear family, see Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, 339–407.
35. Brüder Grimm, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, 157.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid., 159.
38. Ibid., 157–158.
39. For a detailed discussion on this matter, see Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, chs. 2–4.
40. B. Bettelheim, *The Uses of Enchantment* (New York: Knopf, 1976).
41. No pagination for the Puppet Book or A Pop-Up Book versions.