A NEVER ENDING STORY?
PERMUTATIONS OF “SNOW WHITE AND ROSE RED” NARRATIVE AND ITS RESEARCH ACROSS TIME AND SPACE

The article discusses the presumptions, interdependences and paradoxes of representations of folktale performances in 19th century literary collections (Wilhelm and Jacob Grimm Kinder- und Hausmärchen and Mijat Stojanović Narodne pripoviedke) and contemporary scholarly works. The focus is on paratextual and epitextual differences as markers of ideological and epistemological background of Wilhelm Grimm’s “Schneeweißchen und Rosenrot” and its verbatim Croatian translation “Bielka i Rumenka” by Mijat Stojanović. In the conclusion, representation (definition and concordance) of Grimm’s text and its verbatim translation in the latest edition of The Types of International Folktales is discussed regarding the blurring borders between the oral and written, text and research in folk narrative research.
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From the beginning of scholarly interest in them, folktales have been comprehended as being in constant change.1 The very fact that every folktale performance is unique, at the same time different and alike to other performances, has led folklorists to the issues of difference, distortion or fragmentation long before they became popular theoretical terms. Whether they were interpreted as broken ancient myths as in the work of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, or as orally transmitted stories as in the context of the historical-geographic method, or even as by-products of the printing press as in the writings of Albert Wesselski, folktales were discussed in terms of the changes that they have undergone throughout time and space.2

---

1 This article is an expanded version of the paper presented at the 15th ISFNR Congress (Athens, Greece – June 21–27, 2009).
2 For the overview of folklore studies approaches to the folktale, see for example Holbek 1987, Haase 2007 etc.
These changes were detected primarily on the textual, verbal level of different texts. Contrary to that, this article, to use Gerard Genette’s (1997) terms, focuses on paratextual and epitextual differences of one and the same sequence of verbal statements or, in other words, the one and only text and its verbatim translation. The text in issue here is Wilhelm Grimm’s “Schneeweißchen und Rosenrot” [Snow White and Rose Red]. More precisely, the above mentioned Grimm tale will be interpreted, as well as its 19th-century verbatim Croatian translation. Representation (definitions and concordances) of this text and its translation in the latest edition of *The Types of International Folktales* (Uther 2004:256) will be discussed in the conclusion.

Setting aside the whole network of questions regarding this text’s permutations (different epitextual and paratextual representations) across time and space, this article will focus on the following one: Which concepts of folk narrative research and history of reading, writing (authorship) and publishing were employed and developed in the presentation of this text in such different times and different spaces?

****

It seems appropriate to start this discussion with the remark that the Grimms only subsequently included “Snow White and Rose Red” in their world famous collection – *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* [Children’s and Household Tales]. Only after Wilhelm Grimm published a predecessor variant of “Snow White and Rose Red” in Wilhelm Hauff’s *Märchen-Almanach* [Almanach of Tales] in 1827, did this tale find its place in the second edition of the abridged or so-called Small Edition [Kleine Ausgabe] of the *Children’s and Household Tales* (1833). In 1837, it appeared for the first time in the so-called Large Edition [Große Ausgabe] of the *Children’s and Household Tales* i.e. in its third edition. This subsequent inclusion of “Snow White and Rose Red” in the *Children’s and Household Tales* is hardly an exception. It is generally acknowledged today (cf. for example Uther 2007:538-540), that Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm constantly and substantially re-edited and reshaped their collection. This practice might seem inconsistent with their own firm and explicit opposition to the “deliberate reshaping” of their forerunners (Grimm 1987:221). However, it seems quite expected in the light of their explicit calling for “phrasing and filling in the details” of tales (Grimm 1987:220)

---

3 Peritextual or liminal verbal devices within the particular publication are for example the title, preface and notes and epitextual or external liminal devices of the publication are, for example, private and public discourses about it.

4 For a detailed overview of the publishing prehistory and history of the Grimms’ “Snow White and Rose Red” see Rölleke 1986 and 1996.
in order, among other, to restore what they considered, in their own words, to be the “simplicity, innocence, and artless purity” of tales (Grimm 1987:222). Commenting on their editorial practice in the “Preface” to the second edition, the Grimms stressed: “For this second edition, we wanted to incorporate into our book everything that we have been collecting. For that reason, the first volume has been almost completely reworked; fragments have been completed, many stories have been told more directly and simply, and there are very few tales that do not appear in an improved form” (Grimm 1987:220). The Grimms also “carefully eliminated every phrase not appropriate for children” (Grimm 1987:217). And apart from the details and phrases, they also eliminated whole tales and inserted others in their place, as for example, in the second edition of the Small Edition of Children’s and Household Tales (1833), when they replaced the tale “Three Brothers” with the tale at issue here – “Snow White and Rose Red”. Although the Grimms added or inserted a relevant number of other tales over the course of time, the insertion of “Snow White and Rose Red” is unique because this tale was labelled as Wilhelm Grimm’s own literary creation as early as when it appeared in their collection for the first time (1833). As has been said, Wilhelm Grimm published a variant of it in Hauff’s Almanach of Tales in 1827 and at least some readers of Grimms’ collection were certainly aware that this tale was Wilhelm’s creation. Even more of them were aware of that after 1856, when the second edition of Grimms’ Anmerkungs-band (Notes) was published. One of the brothers, probably Wilhelm, admitted in Notes that the tale of “Snow White and Rose Red” is his retelling of a fairy tale, which the Livonian-born writer for children Karoline Stahl had published in her Fabeln: Märchen und Erzählungen für Kinder [Children’s Tales, Fairy Tales and Stories, 1818, 1822]. Or, in his own words: “I have used Caroline Stahl’s story, ’Der undankbare Zwerg’ [Ungrateful Dwarf], the contents of which will be given afterwards, but I have told it in my own fashion” (Grimm 1884, note to the KHM 161). Therefore, Wilhelm Grimm will be named as the author of “Snow White and Rose Red” tale in this article.

Karoline Stahl’s story of two good girls who successfully resist the trials of their generosity was representative of, as Jack Zipes called it, a fairy tale’s “discourse about mores, values, and manners so that children would become civilized according to the social code of that time” (Zipes 1991:3). Because of that, it was a perfect candidate for rewriting and inclusion in Grimms’ collection (moreover, the Small Edition) dedicated, as numerous studies show, to the same mission (cf. Tatar 1987, Zipes 1991). Containing historical anxieties about childhood as the state of innocence that should be saved from corruption and modelled in accordance to middle-class values, this tale was, as Ruth Bottigheimer has noted regarding the Grimm’s Small Edition in general, oriented towards “maintaining the status quo, 

\textsuperscript{5} Here and elsewhere in the article, the English translation has been quoted, whenever it was available. Of course, Grimm’s (1812–1857) German original was always consulted.
with stories of girls – sweet, marriageable and often suffering – preponderant” (Bottigheimer 1987:20).

But how did the tale that was Wilhelm Grimm’s own literary rewriting of Stahl’s literary creation find its place in a collection self-proclaimed as a collection of orally performed folktales? This tale inclusion in Children’s and Household Tales, as well as the Grimms’ editorial work in general, can be understood in line with the Grimms’ romantic view of folklore as a degenerated relict of the past (Abrahams 1993:10-13) and their hierarchical division of “content” and “expression”. According to Charles Briggs, the Grimms assumed that the “focus on fidelity to the particular wording of an oral text and ‘individual details’ would fail to capture the linguistically significant elements of a text and to reveal its ‘spirit’ and ‘genius’” (Briggs 1993:401). They therefore exerted numerous textual interventions in the name of preserving, as they called it, the content (story events and features) and important particularities of the tales. Or as the Grimms put it: “We tried to relate the content just as we have heard it; we hardly need emphasize that the phrasing and filling in of details were mainly our work, but we did try to preserve every particularity that we noticed so that in this respect the collection would reflect the diversity of nature” (Grimm 1987:220).

From this perspective, it can be assumed, that Wilhelm Grimm interpreted Stahl’s tale as a folktale as the brothers did with Perrault’s, Straparola’s or Basile’s tales. For them, they were more or less accurate records of “authentic” folktales (Grimm 1987:209-210). Expanding – not so rarely even today – a sort of, to use Rudolf Schenda’s (2007) term, reversal of historical logic in which tales that are part of contemporary oral repertoire (or are included in collections in which at least some tales are such) serve as evidence of the oral origins of collections published centuries ago, being familiar with the long-lasting publishing history of plots or motifs of some other Stahl fairy tales (see for example notes to the KHM 15, 40 and 55), the Grimms probably interpreted Stahl’s “Ungrateful Dwarf” as coming from the distant past and in that, a part at least of ancient folk oral repertoire.

In order to further reception of “Snow White and Rose Red” as a folktale, and not as a literary tale, Wilhelm Grimm incorporated a rhyme he defined as der Spruch in his variant of the tale, a “saying (…) which is taken from a popular song” [Volkslied] (Grimm 1884, notes to the KHM 161). Through this insertion, as well as through the characteristic “folk” style adopted in this and all other tales in the collection (cf. Briggs 1993), and the definition of the entire Grimm collection as a collection of folktales, Wilhelm Grimm’s rewriting of Karoline Stahl’s tale transformed into a record of a popular tale or even a folktale.
Following a slightly different route, but also strongly marked by the conceptions of both children’s and folk literature, the accurate, verbatim translation of Grimm’s version of “Snow White and Rose Red” found its way to the first Croatian collection ever published of what were, presumably, oral folktales for children – Narodne pripoviedke [Folktales] (1879) by the Croatian schoolteacher and antiquarian folklorist, Mijat Stojanović (1879:92-100). In this collection, the tale was named “Bielka i Rumenka” [Snow White and Rose Red] and it was presented as a South Slavic Croatian and/or Serbian folktale. This tale was a verbatim Croatian translation of Grimm’s “Snow White and Rose Red” with minimal adjustments, minimally graphically re-arranged (a few paragraph divisions were omitted) and contextualized (references to Croatian toponyms were introduced).

There are many similarities between the Brothers Grimm and Stojanović. Before Stojanović published his folktale collection for children, he also edited several folklore (mostly folktale) collections. Like the Grimms, Stojanović in these collections, as well in his folktale collection for children, comprehended folktales as the property of illiterate folk “derived from an ancient time, time without written history” (Stojanović 1867:3-4). Like them, he also edited his collections substantially in order to facilitate processes of language standardization, and nation-building in general.

But there are some crucial differences for this discussion between Stojanović and the Grimms. Stojanović was not only a prominent antiquarian folklorist, he was also one of the most dedicated Croatian schoolteachers and pedagogues of his time. He was very active in the Croatian teachers’ movement and in the field of Croatian children’s literature publishing (Crnković 1978:189-190). Consequently, his folktale collection for children was not directed solely to the presentation of his ethnographic records, which were aimed at the facilitation of national mobilization and language standardization, but was also aimed at the education of youngsters.

It is important to note that, at the time Stojanović edited his collection, the concept of education throughout amusement was predominant in Croatian children’s literature. He himself was prone to it and (as can be seen from the orientation...
of his collection of folktales for children) he conceived (folk)literature as an educational device. And if Stojanović wanted to meet the demands of education through amusement, which is exactly what he declared as his aim in the “Preface” (Stojanović 1879), he needed to consult a different and wider corpus of texts than when he edited his non-children’s folktale collections. Therefore, his children’s collection was based exclusively on previously published (folk)tales – including his own – contrary to his non-children’s folktale collections, which were based primarily on his own and previously unpublished ethnographic fieldwork. Moreover, he openly stated in the “Preface” that previously published tales were reprinted in his Folktales. Analysis of the manuscript of Stojanović’s folktale collection for children (Stojanović 1879b) shows furthermore that Stojanović declared the printed origin of his collection already in the subtitle, but this part of the subtitle was, symptomatically, erased from or, literary, crossed out, in the process of preparation for print.

The question is how and why the Grimm’s “Snow White and Rose Red” ended up in the collection that was already defined in the “Preface” as a collection of Slavic, particularly Croatian and Serbian folktales? Answering it calls for a brief look into the history of Croatian popular and children’s literature, its publishing practices, procedures and ideological context.

It is obvious that the Grimm’s “Snow White and Rose Red”, as a tale which had already been edited in accordance with desirable middle-class standards of morals and manners, was more than suitable for inclusion in Stojanović’s collection, based on the concept of educational use of (folk)tales and literature in general.

Because of the lack of research in that field, it is far less obvious, that inclusion of verbatim translation of the Grimm’s “Snow White and Rose Red” in the Stojanović’s folktale collection for children was in line with the institutional and ideological strands of the production of children’s folk and fairy tales in Croatia at the time. It is inseparable from processes of national formation and practices of chain translation.

Let us first focus on chain translations. Chain translations are, as Klaus Roth pointed out (1998), characteristic for nineteenth-century translations of folklore as well as of popular literature, including children’s popular literature. In this type of translation, references to the original language, author or media are very frequently lost and the final translation is represented as an anonymous, domesticated piece of work. All this can be said for Stojanović’s translation of Wilhelm Grimm’s “Snow White and Rose Red”. In Stojanović’s Folktales, “Snow White and Rose Red” is presented as an anonymous South Slavic, Croatian and/or Serbian folktale.

7 Paradoxically, due to the fact that the criteria for selection in initial and final contexts differ even more than in the case of Stojanović’s previous collections intended for popular reading, the narrowing down of the readership of this collection for children was followed by the expansion of sources.
It seems that Stojanović’s “Snow White and Rose Red” belonged, as Milan Crnković noticed long ago, to the majority of nineteenth-century Croatian children’s literature, which consisted of “more or less adaptations and ‘Croatisations’ of texts read in the children’s journals from all over the Monarchy, primarily in Czech or German, but there are also adaptations from Hungarian and Italian, as well as borrowings from Zmaj’s [Serbian] journals” (Crnković 1978:104).

Because of this widespread practice of multiple, chain translations, Croatian popular and children’s authors and editors from the middle of 19th century (see for example, Filipović 1850:7) lamented that they did not refer to exact sources of the texts they included in their collections. To put it simply, they did not refer to them because they themselves did not know them. Stojanović also did not refer to any of the Grimms’ work and it is an open question whether he knew that the source text of the tale he included in the collection was Wilhelm Grimm’s tale. It could be that he was also not aware that the “Snow White and Rose Red” he included in his collection is the translation of the Grimm tale or even a translation from German, in the event that he adopted it from some Czech or German language children’s magazine or book published in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Still, this is only a thesis, which would require further bibliographical research into the Austrian, Czech and Hungarian children’s and popular magazines. Nevertheless, it is supported by the fact that, as far as it can be known from the available bibliographical data bases (Brešić 2006; bibliographical catalogue of the Miroslav Krleža Lexicographic Institute), the translation of “Snow White and Rose Red” included in Stojanović’s Folktales had not been published previously in Croatian.

Stojanović’s indifference towards naming the source text of the “Snow White and Rose Red”, which he might or might not have known, as well as his presentation of it as an authentic South Slavic, Croatian and/or Serbian folktale, was quite common practice at the time. Until the end of the 19th-century and the final collapse of ideas of Slavic unity in the Croatian political arena and popular discourse (Stančić 1997:33), Croatian translations of non-Slavic fairy and folktales were regularly published in a way that their folk origin, which was emphasized in the context of the source text, was denied or Slavicised. Or more precisely, in the field of Croatian children’s literature, the Grimms’ and other non-Slavic tales and folktales were represented by definition in texts or paratexts as merely anonymous tales, or as Slavic, Croatian or Serbian folktales, until the end of the 19th century. Until 1895, when the first Croatian translation of a text explicitly ascribed to the Grimms appeared (cf. Crnković 1978:104), more than thirty Grimm tales had been translated, adapted or appropriated, some of them several times, in the field of Croatian children’s literature. All of them were published without references to

---

8 As far as it is known, the first Croatian children’s literature tale explicitly defined (in the subtitle) as a non-Slavic folktale was published in Croatian children’s journal Bršljan [Ivy] in 1899. Its full title and subtitle was “The Marvellous Jar. An Irish Tale”. 

---
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the Grimms or their folk-literature background, which was emphasized in source (con)text. In sum, almost one hundred Croatian translations of the Grimms’ tales were published before 1895, all of them with no reference to the Grimms’ authorship or editorship, as well as to their proclaimed German folk origin. These translations, along with the “Snow White and Rose Red” translation published in Stojanović’s collection are, as Klaus Roth (1998) points out for the 19th-century popular translations of folklore narratives in general, part of an extensive practice of, to borrow from Lawrence Venuti (1998:31), domestication, transformation of the “other” into the “own”. Moreover, it could be said that these translations are radical examples of radical domestication.

Domestication of this and other Grimm tales in the field of nineteenth-century Croatian children’s literature took place primarily because, in the Croatia of that time, folktales were comprehended as being embodiments of national spirit and therefore relevant only to the members of the nation to which they were ascribed. It seems that while the Herderian notion of the nation as a distinct organic entity different from all other nations was generally accepted (Wilson 1989:22; Stančić 1997), the reference to the non-Slavic origin of a particular Croatian children’s literary text was counter-productive because such text, according to the applied criteria of national exclusiveness, could have no relevance for the members of emerging Slavic, Croatian or Serbian nations. Therefore, although the shift of focus in Croatian children’s literature fairy tale production from engineering the nation (predominant in the 1860s) to engineering its citizens (predominant in the 1870s), was followed by an increase in the share of non-Slavic magic tales and folktales in Croatian children’s and popular literature. These tales were not presented as coming from non-Slavic traditions or coming from folk traditions at all. Still, because of their poetic and moral exemplarity, some of these tales were also subsequently included in the collections of presumably Slavic, South Slavic or Croatian folktales published in Croatia, of which Stojanović’s (1879) collection was the first. In that, they gained back their folk label, but this time with Slavic, Croatian or Serbian determinants. On such a premise and on the grounds of such editorial practices, verbatim translation of Wilhelm Grimm’s “Snow White and Rose Red” into Croatian transformed into the alleged transcript of South Slavic, Croatian or/and Serbian folktales.

---

9 For a detailed discussion of the poetics and politics of 19th-century Croatian translations of Grimms’ tales, see Hameršak 2009-10.

10 It should be pointed out that, in the case of Stojanović’s “Snow White and Rose Red”, the domestication was conducted at the paratextual, not textual level. In Stojanović’s collection, Grimm’s tale became an authentic Slavic, Croatian or Serbian folktale through paratextual contextualization, and not through textual adaptation.
The inclusion of one of the Grimm tales in a non-German folktale collection is far from unique. As, for example, Satu Åpo has recently pointed out, “because Finnish folklorists were not required to take the literary tradition of magic tales into account, they did not know this tradition well enough to recognize which tale text was ‘impure’ and which had its roots in the oral tradition. Consequently, the collections of the Folklore Archives contain plenty of copies and summaries of printed magic tales. Especially well represented are the translations of Children’s and Household Tales. Some of these texts even found their way into the first scholarly anthology of Finnish magic tales” (Åpo 2007:20-21). Following the same course, the verbatim Croatian translation of Wilhelm Grimm’s “Snow White and Rose Red” could find its way to the “Variants” section of Tale Type 426 of the Aarne-Thomson-Uther (ATU) catalogue of folktales (Uther 2004:256), i.e., the latest edition and revision of the famous Antti Aarne’s catalogue (1910).  

Perhaps it found its way there because the person who classified or translated it for the purpose of classification was not familiar enough with the Croatian language to recognize or mark in the translation that the Croatian text was a verbatim translation of Wilhelm Grimm’s tale, and not an oral or popular tale variant of the tale. As far I know, ATU 426 was not updated by references from Croatian folklorists or on the basis of Croatian folktale databases. In other words, the inclusion of Stojanović’s tales from the *Folktale* (1789) in ATU catalogue was probably based on the insight or translation of *Folktale* held in the special collection of the Enzyklopädie des Märchens, Göttingen (Uther 1987).

Finally, it could be that Stojanović’s text was recognized as a verbatim translation of Grimm’s tale, but was classified, regardless, as a variant in accordance to the broadening scope of printed sources, in the context of this edition. Regarding the fact that Stojanović’s text was the one taken into consideration, instead of some of the popular, no-name or explicitly Grimm “Snow White and Rose Red” in Croatian (children’s) literature, it was probably not the case that Stojanović’s translation was included in ATU as a representative of printed sources. It seems more probably that the catalogisation of Stojanović’s verbatim translation was guided by a presumption that it is a record of an orally performed folktale. This

---

11 At the beginning of the 20th century, the Grimm version was listed in the Antti Aarne’s (1910:18) catalogue of folktales as the only known variant of the tale type 426 “Die beiden Mädchen, der Bär und der Zwerg”. In the first revision of this catalogue (Thompson 1928:68), it had been listed under the same number (426) and under the name “The Two Girls, the Bear, and the Dwarf” together with a Finnish variant and with the reference to Johannes Bolte’s and Georg Polivka’s notes to the Grimms’ variant. In the next Thompson’s revision of this catalogue, the Grimm variant was accompanied by references to Finnish, German, Polish, and Russian variants (Thompson 1961:145). Finally, in the most recent revision of this catalogue (Uther 2004:256), several new variants have been included, among them the Croatian translation of Grimm tale.
catalogue’s long-standing interest primarily in oral folk narratives, and representation of Stojanović’s collection as a collection of “authentic” folktales which was, as it has been said, encouraged by the mentioned crossing out of the subtitle and Stojanović’s invisible editorial pastiche practices, suggests this line of inclusion.

Towards concluding, it could be said that the pertinent, although in the last edition of this catalogue not exclusive, stress on documenting oral transmission of tales, influenced and is still influencing not only the criteria of source selection, but also the necessary interpretation of every source as variant.12 In classifying mostly written records or texts according to the logic of exclusively oral transmission or the logic that every performance is unique, the catalogue is producing variants as it produced the variant of a Croatian verbatim translation of “Snow White and Rose Red”. The catalogue’s classification that imposed tale description as the ideal original, and all individual performances as variants, briefly said, promotes even copies (verbatim translations) to variants.

Regarding the premises very clearly stated in the “Introduction” to the catalogue’s last edition, this doubling of one and the same text as different variants cannot be seen as an objection, which can be solved by simply correcting this doubling in order to fulfil the task of classification. Since this edition of the catalogue has been edited with full awareness of, quoting from the “Introduction”, “lack of standardization in the collection of narratives even in Europe; some catalogues or other sources that list variants include, for example, sub-literary versions from magazines and schoolbooks, while others confine themselves to orally-transmitted texts” (Uther 2004:14), there is no need or space left for this type of correction. Taking these circumstances into consideration, it is equally pointless to erase and to perpetuate the reference to Stojanović’s “Snow White and Rose Red” from the future editions of ATU. Faced with this paradox, we can only think about this sort of representation of “Snow White and Rose Red”, its relationship with source texts and its possible readers and readings of which I will mention only three.

Firstly, for readers interested in the interpretation of folk narrative research and folk narrative representations as “deeply embodied in the social, political, and historical circumstances of their production and reception” (Briggs 1993:387), this catalogue entry of “Snow White and Rose Red” could be a starting-, or (as in this article) an ending-point for the discussion about the never-ending dimension or butterfly effect of folk narrative research, or about, as others have named it, one more “ethnographic phantom”, “open grave trope” (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1988 quoted in Briggs 1993:32), “letter in the bottle” (Abrahams 1993:32) or “ghost from the past” (Abrahams 1993:24). The fact that this last edition of the ATU catalogue is, as it has been said in the “Introduction”, merely a reflection of the “present state of knowledge” (Uther 2004:11), makes it very prone to the research

12 For a brief overview of this catalogue approach and its modifications during the course of time from the perspective of dichotomy orality-literacy, see Apo 2010.
of interdependences of different analytical insights, as well as their influence on publishing practices and vice versa.

Secondly, for readers interested in issues raised in recent decades concerning “literary orality” (Schenda 2007:128) or “processes of transmission and (...) interdependence of oral and written texts (including the issue of re-oralisation)” (Uther 1996:300), these catalogue entries (tale types) could be valuable research sources, because of their multiple, multi-genre references. The catalogue entry ATU 426 could, for example, be used as a reference tool for the study of the oral and written pathways of transmission of “Snow White and Rose Red”. ATU 426 references not only to Stahl’s variant of “Snow White and Rose Red”, but also to the Grimm’s rewriting of it in a folktale for children, the Croatian verbatim translation of it, as well to at least one undoubted recording of its oral variant, the one from Sardinia (cf. Karlinger 2003:91-99). By comparing and interpreting those articulations of the “same” fairy-tale, a contribution could be made, according to the Caroline Sumpter’s prediction, to “the biggest – and most exciting – challenge in the next stage of fairy-tale scholarship” (Sumpter 2010:134). In that case, the focal question of this article: “Which concepts of folk narrative research and history of reading, writing (authorship) and publishing were employed and developed in the presentation of this text in such different times and different spaces?” could be upgraded with the question: “How do we bring together micro and large-scale histories – that is, how do we combine those broad-brush debates over fairy-tale genesis and origin with evidence for specific context of reception” (Sumpter 2010:134)?

On the other hand, due to the fact that Croatian is difficult to read and Stojanović’s text is not easily available outside Croatia, Stojanović’s translation of “Snow White and Rose Red” could easily be summarily interpreted as proof that this (ATU 426) tale type was orally transmitted in Croatia already in the 19th century, regardless of the reflexivity of ATU’s “Introduction” and individual researchers. And, in that way we come to the third possible reading of ATU. Because of the above mentioned strictly technical difficulties (unfamiliarity with language or with the source), but also because lists and collections “obscure the hand that shapes the representation” and “create the illusion of genuine, which is to say, unmediated folklore” (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1988:145), readers interested in the general patterns of transmission of “Snow White and Rose Red”, as well as those interested in psychological, literary or any other aspects of this tale, could easily interpret its Croatian variant referred to in the catalogue as (to borrow Christine Goldberg’s phrase from her discussion of folktale “series”) a “glimpse into the workings of oral tradition” (Goldberg 2003:217), exactly as the Grimms and Stojanović supposed that nineteenth-century children would have interpreted it. And through that, instead of a reflexive history and geography of a particular tale, one more fairy and folktale’s scholarship never-ending story will be told and another “ghost in the bottle” will ride again.
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BESKRAJNA PRIČA?
PREOBRAZBE “SNJEGULJICE I RUŽICE” (BAJKE I ISTRAŽIVANJA) U PROSTORU I VREMENU

SAŽETAK

Varijantnost je od samih početaka istraživanja bajki uživala status privilegirane teme, pri čemu se analitička pozornost najčešće usmjeravala na tekstualnu razinu. U članku se na primjeru bajke “Schneeweißchen und Rosenrot” Wilhelma Grimma i njezina doslovnog hrvatskog prijevoda (“Bielka i Rumenka” Mijata Stojanovića) te njihove prezentacije u najnovijem izdanju znamenitog međunarodnog kataloga pripovijedaka (The Types of International Folktales) istražuju mogućnosti interpretativnog pomaka s teksta na paratekst. Riječ je, naime, o bajci koju je prema književnom predlošku napisao te u trećem, tzv. malom izdanju, Kinder- und Hausmärchen (1833.) objavio Wilhelm Grimm, a koju je zatim u doslovnom prijevodu, ali ne navodeći izvor, Mijat Stojanović uvrstio u Narodne pripovijedke (1879.), najstariju zbirku tog tipa u hrvatskoj književnosti.

Osvrtom na paratekstualne strategije i očitovanja Grimmova i Stojanovićeva teksta u članku se iznose ključne odrednice proizvodnje tzv. narodnih bajki i bajki za djecu u 19. stoljeću. Shvaćanja nacije, narodne književnosti, dječje književnosti, autorstva i dr. iščitavaju se iz inicijalnih reprezentacija i reakcija na Grimmov i Stojanovićev tekst, a prezentacija njihovih tekstova u međunarodnom katalogu kao dviju varijanti istoga tipa bajke u zaključku se ne promatra kao tehnička greška, nego kao poticaj za raspravu o ishodištima, mogućnostima, ali i u nekim primjerima i gotovo nepremestivim ograničenjima tog tipa folklorističkog znanja.

Ključne riječi: bajke, hrvatska dječja književnost devetnaestoga stoljeća, istraživanje narodnih pripovijedaka, Snjeguljica i Ružica, Jacob i Wilhelm Grimm, Mijat Stojanović