

The Fairy-tale Collections of Andrew Lang and Joseph Jacobs: Identity, Nation, Empire

Andrew Teverson

This article is the transcript of a lecture first presented at the Sussex Centre for Folklore, Fairy Tales and Fantasy on 14 March 2016.

Joseph Jacobs' *English Fairy Tales* (1890) and the first of Andrew Lang's popular coloured fairy books (*The Blue Fairy Book*, 1889) were published within a year of one another and are, arguably, the two most influential and enduring contributions to the canon of fairy-tale collection to emerge in Britain in the 19th century. Yet, as collections of traditions, their objectives and assumptions could not be more different. Jacobs seeks to assemble a selection of scattered narratives from England, Lowland Scotland, America and Australia under the unifying banner of Englishness, and in so doing to forge that elusive grail, an English fairy-tale collection. Lang sets out to showcase a broad cross-section of European and international narratives, and thereby to bring domesticated versions of the narratives of the world to Britain. Jacobs' collection endeavours to assemble the narratives of the nation, whereas Lang's has transnational ambitions, and implicitly refuses the national gesture with its location-neutral title and its colour-coded intimations of multiplicity (the colours of the world).

When thinking about these two collections and their proximity in time, two questions occur: why is it that these two major contributions to British fairy-tale publication appear at this moment in history, and so close together? And why is it that two collections appearing so close in time should end up pursuing such different, even contrary, objectives? One answer I would like to propose is that both collections are divergent responses to the same set of cultural and political problems that became manifest in Britain towards the end of the 19th century: the problem of the increasing fragility of the British Empire and of the simultaneous threat to Britain posed by Irish, Scottish and Welsh separatist movements.

Joseph Jacobs was born in Sydney, Australia, in 1854. His father was a Londoner, John Jacobs, who had travelled to New South Wales in 1837 and there met Joseph's mother, Sarah Myers. Both parents were Jewish and Joseph was a practising Jew throughout his life. He remained in Australia until he was 19, when he transferred from the University of Sydney to Cambridge University to study law, intending to return to Australia on completion of his studies. Following his graduation in 1876, however, he chose to remain in London to make a career as a writer. He worked as a ghost-writer on a book of dentistry, and thereafter



Andrew Lang,
The Olive Fairy Book (1907).

involved himself increasingly in writing about Jewish history and culture, and simultaneously about folklore and tradition. Notably he wrote two prominent articles in *The Times* in 1882 condemning the persecution of Jews in Russia, and became a leading figure in the protests against the Russian pogroms.

His first book on folklore appeared in 1888, a scholarly edition titled *The Earliest English Version of the Fables of Bidpai*, the ancient Indian collection of animal tales now better known as the *Panchatantra*. Describing the work, Jacobs observed, 'It is an English version of an Italian adaptation of a Spanish translation of a Latin version of a Hebrew translation of an Arabic adaptation of the Pehlevi version of the Indian original',¹ showing his ready interest in the nature of tale transmission and the extent to which tales can move between languages and traditions. He followed this with a two-volume edition of *The Fables of Aesop* (1893), and also began to publish the collections that would make him a household name and a Christmas perennial in late Victorian England: *English Fairy Tales* (1890), *Celtic Fairy Tales* (1892), *Indian Fairy Tales* (1892), *More English Fairy Tales* (1894), *More Celtic Fairy Tales* (1894), and in the final year of his life, after he had moved to America, *Europa's Fairy Book* (1916).

English Fairy Tales is not, as the title might lead us to believe, a collection of English fairy tales. It is, rather, an act of will, that act of will being to forge a collection of English tales out of sundry, and in many cases non-English, materials. The collection, we might say, is a kind of Frankenstein's monster, forged out of diverse body parts and unified by the fusive science of folklore; but, as with Frankenstein's monster, it is possible to see the stitches and joins where the disparate fictions meet.

There are 43 tales in the collection; about ten of them are fairy tales in the strict generic sense, and these include such important contributions to English tradition as 'Tom Tit Tot', 'The Rose Tree', 'Cap o' Rushes', and 'Jack and the Beanstalk'. Otherwise the collection includes nursery tales, cautionary tales, condensed chapbooks, tales of fairy abduction, cumulative narratives, and so on. Taken together these tales are highly diverse in form and genre. They are also fictions that derive from a range of regional and national sources. The first story in the collection, 'Tom Tit Tot', and the 11th, 'Cap o' Rushes', derive from Suffolk, and were told to the minor Victorian poet Anna Walter Thomas by a family servant and written down by her for publication in the *Ipswich Journal* in 1877; 'Jack and the Beanstalk' and 'Henny Penny', according to Jacobs, were told to him in Australia when he was a child; 'Nix Nought Nothing' was collected by Andrew Lang from his great-aunt in Morayshire and published by him (for the first time) in the *St Andrews University Magazine* in 1863; and 'Johnny Cake' and 'How Jack Went to Seek His Fortune' were both collected in America and published in *The American Journal of Folk-Lore*.

Jacobs has endeavoured to smooth over this diversity of material as much as possible. The act of placing the stories together in a collection side by side serves to give them the appearance of a coherent group. Jacobs has also passed the wand of homogeneity

over the collection through his editorial interventions. Some of these are extensive. The stories 'Binnorie' and 'Childe Rowland' are adaptations of ballads that Jacobs has, in his own words, 'prosed'.² Other interventions are more piecemeal. Lang's story, originally titled 'Nicht Nought Nothing', has been retitled 'Nix Nought Nothing' – the more Anglo-American 'Nix' being presumed to be more comprehensible to an English readership than the Scottish 'Nicht' – and this provides a pattern for alterations throughout the story, in which the Scotch dialect of Lang's original becomes a more standard English.³ Likewise the Suffolk dialect in Anna Walter Thomas's version of 'Tom Tit Tot' has been modulated, with unfamiliar Suffolk terms such as 'Maw'r' (short for 'mawther' and meaning, according to a glossary supplied by Edward Clodd, 'woman or daughter') being replaced with the phonetically modified, but more readily understood, term used elsewhere in the story, 'darter'.⁴

This practice of interfering with the textual integrity of the source narratives provoked some consternation amongst Jacobs' contemporaries in the Folklore Society. Laurence Gomme encapsulates these objections in a bad-tempered comment made in his presidential address to the Folklore Society in November 1890:

My friend, Mr. Jacobs, wishes to put into the hands of reading English children a collection of English traditional tales. He finds them too incomplete or too rude in their traditional form, so he 'eliminates a malodorous and un-English skunk' from one tale ... 'reduces' the dialect of such a tale as Tom Tit Tot ... and tells us of all these gay doings in his notes. I am sure my friend, Mr. Jacobs, will forgive me for using his production as a literary artist to push home my argument as a folklorist. These tales will be read, not told; read by the children who are brought up on bright and well-pictured books, not by the peasant children from whom the tales are originally taken; and the appeal with those who use them will always be from book to book, not from tradition to tradition. Literature such as this may, and does, kill tradition, but it does not create it.⁵

Jacobs was goaded into making a response to these objections in his preface to *More English Fairy Tales*, published four years after the first volume:

My folk-lore friends look on with sadness while they view me laying profane hands on the sacred text of my originals ... This is rank sacrilege in the eyes of the rigid orthodox in matters folk-lorical. My defence might be that I had a cause at heart as sacred as our science of folk-lore – the filling of our children's imaginations with bright trains of images. But even on the lofty heights of folk-lore science I am not entirely defenceless. Do my friendly

critics believe that even Campbell's materials had not been modified by the various narrators before they reached the great J. F.? Why may I not have the same privilege as any other storyteller, especially when I know the ways of story-telling as she is told in English, at least as well as a Devonshire or Lancashire peasant?⁶

Jacobs also defends his use of fictions taken from outside England. Anticipating objections to this in the preface for *English Fairy Tales*, he writes:

I have acted on Molière's principle, and have taken what was good wherever I could find it. Thus, a couple of these stories have been found among descendants of English immigrants in America; a couple of others I tell as I heard them myself in my youth in Australia. . . . I have also included some stories that have only been found in Lowland Scotch. I have felt justified in doing this, as of the twenty-one folk-tales contained in Chambers' "Popular Rhymes of Scotland," no less than sixteen are also to be found in an English form. With the Folk-tale as with the Ballad, Lowland Scotch may be regarded as simply a dialect of English, and it is a mere chance whether a tale is extant in one or other, or both.⁷

This acknowledgement is both strained and partial. The assertion that the forced assimilation of Scottish stories is justified by the fact that many of the stories taken from Scottish sources have English parallels invites speculation as to why Jacobs did not simply make use of the English variants (the unspoken answer is that the English variants could not be found in a sufficiently well-preserved form). One wonders too where this practice would stop. By the same logic, narratives from all over the world might be included in this English collection. Jacobs' justification also, predictably, attracted a chorus of objections from Scots incensed by the assumption that theirs was 'simply a dialect of English'. In the pages of the *Saturday Review*, on 8 November 1890, an 'infuriated Caledonian' wrote:

Mr Jacobs has no business to do the Scotch tales into English . . . It is the Scot, and not the pock-pudding, who has preserved the best stories . . . Mr Jacobs is enough to make one a Scotch Home Ruler.

But this reviewer reserves his fury especially for a bannock:

It is fairly calm conduct in Mr Jacobs . . . to bring in a substance called 'A johnny cake,' which may be American for a bannock. A johnny cake, in a legend like this, is simply an outrage.⁸

This latter criticism is in some respects misplaced. Jacobs has not changed a bannock to a johnny cake in this instance, but borrowed the story from an American source in which the transformation has already occurred. The general point stands, however, that Jacobs, throughout his collection, has endeavoured to claim non-English tales as English and has made changes to his source texts to make them appear more English. His reasons for doing this, by his own admission, have something to do with a desire to render the stories fully comprehensible for a readership of English children. Unstated in his justification, however, is the fact that the transformation of these stories also has much to do with his cultural project: that is, to bend the materials he has to hand to the purpose of forging a national collection; to create the impression that all the tales in the collection come from the same place and were spoken in the same voice – the voice of England, telling stories as one.

In doing this Jacobs is fulfilling a project that many other folklorists and collectors had been pursuing around Europe and throughout the world for the previous eighty years or so. This practice, as is well known, had been initiated by the Brothers Grimm, who, between 1812 and 1815 had assembled the first edition of their *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, and in so doing provided a scholarly model for the collation of diverse materials into a coherent national collection. Following the lead of the Grimms a host of comparable collections appeared, including Vuk Stefanovic Karadžić's Serbian folktales, collected from 1814 onwards; Thomas Crofton Croker's *Fairy Legends and Traditions of the South of Ireland* (1825-7); Elias Lönnrot's epic assemblage of Finnish songs, the *Kalevala* (1835-49); Jørgen Moe and Peter Asbjørnsen's *Norske Folkeeventyr* (*Norwegian Folktales*, 1841-4); and Aleksander Afanás'ev's *Rússkie národnye skázki* (*Russian Folktales*, 1855-64). The primary object of these collections was to preserve, as much as possible, the narrative traditions of a defined set of people at a time when those traditions were felt to be disappearing under the pressure of modernisation, the dislocation of traditional communities, and the erosion of agrarian seasonal practices. Jacobs' collection arrives rather tardily in this timeline, appearing as it does at the latter end of the century. Nonetheless he regards his project as being directly in line with that of the Grimms. In his preface to *More English Fairy Tales* he notes with pride that the earlier volume had, in four short years, 'established itself as a kind of English Grimm'.⁹

An obvious question to pose at this point, is why it took the English so long to follow suit and attempt the creation of an 'English Grimm'. The English folklorist William J. Thoms, inventor of the English term 'folklore', in his preface to *The Lays and Legends of Germany* in 1834, had lamented that his series of lays and legends of various nations was concluding without a volume for England. He writes:

We must close our list of . . . works on the subject of Legendary Lore. Not one of them, alas! dedicated to the preservation of the legends of our "Father

Land.” – To rescue these scattered relics from the hand of Time – is one of the principal objects of our little work, and one in which we most earnestly implore the assistance of our readers.¹⁰

Later in the same year, in his *Lays and Legends of Spain*, Thoms intimated that there would be a forthcoming ‘Lays and Legends of England’ made up of a collection of ‘curious stories which we have in reserve.’¹¹ No such volume appeared, however. In the course of the 19th century, collections of local legends and some anthologies of English fairy lore and literature were published. But it was not until the 1890s that a serious endeavour was made to assemble a pan-English collection. Then, when the pan-English collection did arrive, it came in abundance, with Jacobs’ *English Fairy Tales* and *More English Fairy Tales*, but also in other forms too, with E.S. Hartland’s *English Folk and Fairy Tales* (1890), which Jacobs drew on as one of his sources, William Carew Hazlitt’s *Tales and Legends of National Origin or Widely Current in England from Early Times* (1892), Sabine Baring-Gould’s *Old English Fairy Tales* (1895) and Ernest Rhys’s *Fairy Gold: A Book of Old English Fairy Tales* (1906).

What caused this sudden, large-scale, comprehensive endeavour to invent a tradition? Why had it taken 78 years from the publication of the first volume of the Grimms for a pan-English collection to appear? And why, when it did happen, was it so emphatic and extensive? A common answer is that the English had a harder task than other national collectors because they no longer had a store of traditional tales to preserve in the way that the Germans or the Finns or the Irish had. The aggrieved Saturday Reviewer cited above claims that the reason Jacobs is forced to steal Scottish fairy tales is that the English ‘had not the wit’ to keep their own.¹² But we may be sceptical of this argument. The history of folk narrative collection suggests that if the need is there, it is always possible to find or fabricate a collection of traditions. Rather, what was missing beforehand were not the traditions, but the motivation: the political and social circumstances that would make the collection of English lore meaningful. Indeed, we might even argue that a collection of English traditions in the earlier 19th century would have actively disadvantaged the English in their broader global ambitions.

What is notable about many of the national contexts in which collections of traditions were made at the start of the 19th century is that they almost invariably involve situations of struggle. The Grimms began collecting in the context of the Napoleonic invasion of their homeland, which saw the establishment of the vassal kingdom of Westphalia, incorporating the Grimms’ hometown of Kassel. In Serbia, Karadžić recognised in the traditions he collected a record of the Serbian people’s opposition to the Turks during four centuries of Turkish oppression, as well as ‘a means of revalidating Serbian culture in the context of on-going struggles against Ottoman power.’¹³ In Finland, comparably, as William A. Wilson demonstrates, the collection of Finnish traditions and the assemblage of the *Kalevala* took place in the context of Russian political and cultural domination.¹⁴ These collections arose, in other words, from cultural revivals that took shape in response to pressing threats to the culture in question.

In England at the same time, by contrast, the problem of a national identity is quite different. In the first place, Englishness, in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, is not embattled: it is in the ascendant. The English were the wealthiest and most influential nation in the Union of Great Britain, and they had become, within Britain, part of a major imperial power. They had far less need to create national collections of traditions to give themselves cultural rooting. More than this, it was in many ways actively disadvantageous to English identity to encourage acts of national differentiation. England was powerful because it was part of Britain, and Britain was the engine of the Empire. In this context, England’s elites did not want or need a separate identity from Britain. More importantly Britain did not want the nations over which it exercised imperial rule, in India, Africa, Australia, the Far East and the Caribbean, to develop nationalist ambitions of their own. Separatist nationalism was a danger to English power in the world, so the nationalist motivations that gave rise to collections such as the Grimms’ tales or the *Kalevala* did not find traction in England. It is for this reason, according to the cultural theorist Krishan Kumar, that

[t]here is no equivalent, in England, to the nationalist theory of a Herder or a Fichte; no English Grimm or Savigny; no searching of the national soul, as is to be found in nineteenth-century Russian literature . . . no nationalist movements of the kind found throughout continental Europe in the nineteenth century.¹⁵

The question then arises as to what changes between the early and later parts of the 19th century to create conditions more favourable to the collection of English national traditions. The answer lies in part in the fact that, towards the end of the 19th century, the global political situation had begun to shift. The Empire had faced some serious challenges: Britain’s rivals ‘France . . . Germany, Russia, the United States, Japan – were growing more powerful as well as more numerous. Britain’s economic preponderance came under threat; its naval supremacy was no longer unquestionable; its global power was challenged both East and West.’¹⁶ There had been difficult and disillusioning campaigns in Afghanistan and in the struggle against the Boers in South Africa; the Indian National Congress had been formed in 1885 with the express aim of securing a greater role in government for Indians. The Empire suddenly seemed vulnerable. The union of Britain, moreover, had become strained as a result of ‘strong expressions of ethnic and cultural nationalism in other parts of the British Isles’,¹⁷ notably through the Gaelic revival in Ireland and the rediscovery of Celtic culture and history in Wales and Scotland. In 1885 Scottish administrative devolution began with the creation of a Scottish Office and a Secretary for Scotland; in the same year Charles Stewart Parnell’s Irish Parliamentary Party secured a significant majority of Irish seats in the General Election, and a year later, in 1886, Cymru Fydd (‘Young Wales’) was established to agitate for Welsh home rule. In the 1880s and 1890s, therefore, the English began to face the prospect of the diminishment, possibly the end, of Britain’s imperial mission, and simultaneously the prospect

of a break-up of Britain. At this point they began to ask themselves a powerful question: who would they be without Britain and the Empire? Who exactly are the English? England had invested its identity for so long in supra-national agglomerations – Britain, Empire, Global Mission – what would be left to it if these things were to go?

These questions, Kumar argues, generated a swathe of the cultural output that characterises English art and letters at the *fin de siècle* and the start of the 20th century; cultural output that includes the music of Ralph Vaughan Williams, characterised by stirring English pastoral nostalgia; the art of the pre-Raphaelites, with its appreciation of the allure of English medievalism and English legendary tradition; Cecil Sharp's collection of English folk songs begun in 1903; but also, not mentioned by Kumar, and indeed rarely ever mentioned in this context, Joseph Jacobs' two bold endeavours to finally identify a distinctively English contribution to tradition: *English Fairy Tales* and *More English Fairy Tales*.

This is not to suggest that Jacobs' collection is an act of blunt jingoism. Jacobs' biography suggests a more complicated relationship to national identity and the power of the nation. In particular, Jacobs, as a Jew, would have been suspicious of the model of national identity that depends upon the assertion of a homogenous ethnic majority and the marginalisation or exclusion of minority groups. In fact, what Jacobs implicitly sought through his collection was a presentation of stability, coherence and continuity. Jacobs believed that the British were, to echo a current slogan, better together, and in the 1890s he saw that unifying capacity as being centred on England. This is the reason he silently aligns the other members of Britain and its settler colonies (current and former) behind England, as a ballast against the alarming disruption and change that might ensue from a loosening of empire and a loss of coherence in the British Isles. He also draws together the regions and classes of Britain, minimising their differences, creating a common language, arguing for a unity of purpose. What Jacobs creates, in other words, is a kind of working model for the union: a host of different tales, taken from different sources, regional and national, cohabiting peacefully in two volumes. The volumes are named after England, but England in this context is not an ethnic category but a guarantor of stable governance and cohesive statecraft. In an indirect way, Jacobs is, in fact, reasserting the idea of Britain in *English Fairy Tales*. What English means in this context is the British Isles united under the leadership of England, and this is the status quo that Jacobs endeavours to defend.

If we turn now to consider the collections of Andrew Lang, we find a very different approach to cultural developments in Britain at the *fin de siècle*. Lang knew Jacobs well, and they met frequently as fellow members of the Folklore Society. But in many respects, they disagreed on scholarly matters. Lang, born in Selkirk, and one of the principal Scottish writers of his day, was one of those who had objected to Jacobs' practice of regarding Lowland Scotch tales as English traditions. The most fundamental scholarly disagreement between the pair, however, arose from their advocacy of what were at the time the dominant opposing arguments about the origin and spread of traditional tales. Jacobs was a diffusionist, believing that stories originated in a single place and were spread and transformed by human

agents over time. Lang, by contrast, whilst he regarded diffusion as playing a crucial role in the dissemination of tale types, maintained that some of the similarities between narrative elements in the folk traditions of diverse peoples across the globe were a product of independent invention of story elements. In particular he argued, along with other proponents of what became known as the anthropological school of folklore studies, that the folklores of diverse peoples contain similar elements because folktales originate when society is at a savage stage of its development, and all societies have, at some point, passed through this stage. As a scholar of fairy tales, consequently, Lang was interested primarily in the points of similarity between the traditions of diverse people, and in demonstrating these similarities through a comparative methodology that involved the detection of affinities between cognate traditions.

In this comparative method lies the seed of Lang's practice as a fairy-tale anthologist. *The Blue Fairy Book* places side-by-side narrative traditions from the Levant, the Middle East and various European sources, including the collections of Charles Perrault, Asbjørnsen and Moe, Robert Chambers, the Grimms, and Marie-Catherine d'Aulnoy; *The Red Fairy Book* incorporates traditions from Romania, Russia and Finland, and increasingly, as the colours troop by, stories are introduced from China, India, Africa, and elsewhere. Implicitly, the reader is asked to compare these stories, noting their national differences, but also recognising similarities in incident and motif. This recognition of similarity, moreover, is designed to illustrate Lang's principal thesis concerning fairy tales: that they preserve commonalities in experience from people to people. As Lang observes in the preface to *The Blue Fairy Book*:

Even a child . . . must recognise, as he turns the pages of the *Blue Fairy Book*, that the same adventures and something like the same plots meet him in stories translated from different languages. The Scotch 'Black Bull of Norrway,' for example, must remind the very youngest reader of 'East of the Sun and West of the Moon,' a tale from the Norse. Both, again, have manifest resemblances to 'Beauty and the Beast,' and every classical student has the fable of 'Eros and Psyche' brought back to his memory, while every anthropologist recollects a similar *Märchen* among Kaffirs and Bassutos. These resemblances and analogies recur on every page.¹⁸

As such passages demonstrate, Lang resists the nationalist impulse that characterises so much fairy-tale collection of the 19th century. His tale collections are designed to show how much is shared across the boundaries of race and nation, not to assert cultural particularity and racial distinctiveness.

Lang's critical writing and journalism also reveal his suspicion of nationalist approaches to literature. In his essay on the Celtic Renaissance for *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1897, for instance, he rejects the claim made by some 'Neo-Celts' that the best things in English

literature derive from 'the Celtic element' on the grounds that 'the relations of race to poetic or other mental qualities is a mystery'. 'When we bring race into literary criticism' he adds, 'we dally with that unlovely fluent enchantress, Popular Science'.¹⁹ Lang's sympathies are neither with the radical Celticists nor with those who set about creating what Kumar calls the 'moment of Englishness'.²⁰ As a Scot, he would have been excluded by any assertion of English particularism, but he also rejected Celtic separatism on the grounds that it is impossible to determine historically which people created which traditions in the first instance, and what the shaping impact of their ethnicity upon these traditions had been. It is safe to say that Lang would not have been a devolutionist: the trans-border social and political allegiances of Britain provided his natural cultural, intellectual and political grounding.

This resistance to nativism, in one respect, marks a distinction between Lang's books and Jacobs' English collections, with their ambition to define a native narrative archive. Yet it remains the case that both collectors are responding to the same historical situation. Lang, too, felt the anxiety attendant upon the fractures in Empire. He sensed the old world order trembling; he understood, like many of his contemporaries, that the security of Britain would be challenged by this realignment, and like Jacobs he resorted to the materials of folklore to stage a symbolic expression of togetherness under one banner, in order to ward off the disruption and disorder that would ensue from a crumbling of imperial mandate.

Lang's activities take place on a bigger canvas than Jacobs'; he endeavours to draw into his collections the narratives of the world and unite them under the rainbow colours of the fairy book. But in many respects, Lang enacts the same gesture: he seeks to homogenise, to draw together, and to shore up; he creates a symbolic commonwealth of nations, a spell against the disintegratory pressures of an empire in decline, and importantly, it is the idea of Britain, as a union, as the centre of Empire, that for Lang, as for Jacobs, offers the best guarantee of the stability of this commonwealth. Britain had created the conditions that made it possible to gather together the narratives of the world, and it was from Britain, as the centre of Empire, that the collections were being made and issued.

In this respect, the collections of Jacobs and Lang are more sympathetic than not: Jacobs draws together the idea of England, Lang draws together the narratives of the world, but both acts of unification are enacted in the interests of Britain, of the British Union, and the political arrangements that Britain historically represents.

In this centenary year of Jacobs' death and the Battle of the Somme it is salient to note that Jacobs' and Lang's anxieties about the impact of a crumbling of Empire were not without cause. Many of the first readers of these books, children in the 1890s, died in the trenches of France in a war that was, in part, an outcome of the weakening of Empire. In light of this, it becomes clearer what writers such as Jacobs and Lang were endeavouring to staunch: they perceived dimly the calamities that the weakening of the world order would bring and, in their small way, they endeavoured to write against it – to draw together again, to impose unity, to impose consensus. That consensus, for them, was Britain and the Empire, and in

this respect at least, their collections may be seen as an endorsement of imperial ambitions. Importantly, however, it was not an endorsement that necessarily proclaimed the moral rightness of empire. Rather, both Lang's and Jacobs' collections may be seen as an expression of fear about the alternative: what would happen if Britain and the Empire should fail? What terrors would be unleashed if the established orders should change?

Andrew Teverson

Notes

1. Sir Thomas North, *The earliest English version of the fables of Bidpai: The morall philosophie of Doni*, ed. Joseph Jacobs (London: D. Nutt, 1888), p.xi.
2. Joseph Jacobs, *English Fairy Tales and More English Fairy Tales*, ed. Donald Haase (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2002), p.348.
3. Lang himself softens the dialect in this story between its first publication in the *St Andrews University Magazine*, and its reproduction in the journal *Folklore* (Andrew Lang, 'Scottish Nursery Tales', *St Andrews Magazine* (April 1863), pp.172-9 and 'English and Scotch Fairy Tales', *Folklore* 1.3 (September 1890), pp.292-6). Jacobs's interventions are, in this respect, a continuation of Lang's own practice.
4. For the original term and its explication see Edward Clodd, 'The Philosophy of Rumpelstiltskin', *Folk-Lore* 7 (1889), pp.138 and 163. Donald Haase has pointed out that Jacobs continued to make editorial changes to *English Fairy Tales* (especially to the notes) over the course of the four editions published in his lifetime (1890, 1893, 1898 and 1911). See Donald Haase's Preface and Introduction in Jacobs (2002), p.vii. Haase's introduction more generally provides an excellent account of the changes Jacobs made to the tales and their significance.
5. Laurence Gomme, 'Annual Address to the Folk-Lore Society, Nov. 26, 1890', *Folklore* 2.1 (March 1891), pp.6-7.
6. Jacobs (2002), pp.189-90. 'J.F.' and 'Campbell' here refer to the folklorist John Francis Campbell (1822-85), also known as Campbell of Islay.
7. Jacobs (2002), p.12.
8. Anon., 'English Folk Tales', *Saturday Review* (8 November 1890), p.537.
9. Jacobs (2002), p.189.
10. William J. Thoms (ed.), *The Lays and Legends of Germany* (London: George Cowie, 1834), p.viii.
11. William J. Thoms (ed.), *The Lays and Legends of Spain* (London: George Cowie, 1834), p.54.
12. Anon. (1890), p.537. Modern scholars have explained the paucity of surviving English tales by citing the pragmatic and rationalist impact of Puritanism and the Enlightenment. For discussion, see Donald Haase's Preface and Introduction in Jacobs (2002), p.x.
13. Zora Devrnja Zimmerman, *Serbian Folk Poetry: Ancient Legends, Romantic Songs* (Columbus, Ohio: Kosovo Publishing, 1986), pp.74-5 and 81.
14. William A. Wilson, *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976).
15. Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p.184.
16. Kumar (2003), p.197.
17. Kumar (2003), p.xii.
18. Andrew Lang, *The Selected Works of Andrew Lang*, eds Andrew Teverson, Alexandra Warwick and Leigh Wilson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015), vol. 1, p.152.
19. Lang (2015), vol. 2, p.188.
20. Kumar (2003), p.175.

ISBN 978-1-907852-43-5
ISSN 2050 2915

Gramarye

The Journal of the Sussex Centre for Folklore, Fairy Tales and Fantasy

Summer 2016
Issue 9

New work by

- Andrew Teverson
- John Patrick Pazdziora
- Shaun Gunner
- Steven O'Brien
- Shweta Taneja
- Judith Woolf
- Nicholas Tucker
- Katherine Langrish
- Michelle Ryan-Sautour

Introduction by
Ruth Bottigheimer

University
of
Chichester

