

MacDonald's Fairy Tales and Fantasy Novels as a Critique of Victorian Middle-Class Ideology

Osama Jarrar

Folklorists in general agree that the evolution of the fairy tale genre is indebted to one of the earliest oral storytelling traditions related to the wonder tale—*Märchen*. The *Märchen* existed largely in Europe. They were spoken traditional narratives in the sense that they were meant to be told, not read; they were told to adults by men and to children by women. From a Marxist viewpoint, the *Märchen* were used to reflect social problems and ideological concerns in pre-capitalist societies. In societies based on class struggle and exploitation, wonder tales embodied a subversive potential that reflected a utopian spirit. The questioning of norms upheld by the dominant socializing process was at the heart of this spirit; magic, elves, witches, kings, and queens, were metaphorical representations of ossified reality. The disruption of social relationships in figurative representation gives fairy tales aesthetic capacity to reveal the familiar world in a new light. In other words, wonder in old fairy tales, according to Jack Zipes, is ideological; wonder gives the fairy tale its subversive potential to evoke surprise in readers who respond to their hidden message. Zipes writes:

Yet, it is exactly this *disturbance* which the liberating fairy tales seek on both a conscious and unconscious level. They interfere with the civilizing process in hope of creating change and a new awareness of social conditions. This provocation is why it is more important for critics to recognize the *upsetting* effect of emancipatory tales and to study their uncanny institutions for old and young readers. (*Fairy Tales* 191; emphasis in the original)

By the time writers like the Brothers Grimm (Jacob and Wilhem) and Charles Perrault collected and edited wonder tales for the purpose of the socialization of children, wonder tales had become what is now known as fairy tales. According to Katharine Briggs, the Grimm's *Märchen* inspired many English collectors and paved the way to the emergence of literary fairy tales in England. She argues that

The Grimm Brothers' method of working was an inspiration to collectors, and after their time the conscientious reproduction of tales as they were told began in England. Most of the *Märchen*

are more tales of enchantment and strange happenings than of real fairies, but where fairies occur . . . they are very much after the English pattern. As far as the German fairies altered the English tradition it was to strengthen the image of the hobgoblins, pixies and hags and rather to overlay the memory of the fairy ladies of the Romances. From the time of the Grimms onward our own stories began to be collected. (179)

The literary fairy tale, however, is different from the fairy tale in the sense that the former is written by an identifiable author. Many literary fairy tale writers incorporate some of the themes and motifs of the *Märchen* to add complexity to the language and to enrich their fantasy novels. The language of the fairy tale and the fantasy embodies ideological messages that either subvert or stabilize values and norms of mainstream culture. The combination of ideology and language in children's fiction is key element because it mirrors the ideology the authors want to pass on to child readers whether consciously or unconsciously. According to John Stephens:

If a child is to take part in society and act purposively within its structures, he or she will have to master the various signifying codes used by society to order itself. The principal code is language, since language is the most common form of social communication, and one particular use of language through which society seeks to exemplify and inculcate its current values and attitudes is the imagining and recording of stories. (8)

Although some theorists do not differentiate between the fairy tale and the fantasy and include them in the same discussion, fantasy seems more sophisticated literary work of art than a fairy tale. Fantasy includes more literary features than a fairy tale, primarily in its length, theme, setting and narrative sequentiality.

George MacDonald is a nineteenth-century British writer who uses both forms of magic narrative—the fairy tale and the fantasy novel. MacDonald uses his fairy tales and fantasies to question middle-class ideology of family and social hierarchy in England. MacDonald's alternative ideology contradicts the hierarchical structure of the Victorian social scale that is based on hereditary privilege, and argues in favor of genetic nobility.

Class and Family in MacDonald's Eyes

The Victorian middle-class, in MacDonald's eyes, had internalized a false

notion of gentleness and nobility, believing that nobility of character was exclusive to people of high rank. This idea was based on a traditional hierarchy, which necessitated the presence of wealth and high social rank. This meant that the poor were excluded from the privileged structure of the Victorian social scale. Middle-class people rationalized this exclusion by their belief in the incontrovertible laws of human behavior, in the sense that the poor will always remain inferior to the rich. Richard D Altick, in his *Victorian People and Ideas: A Companion for Modern Readers of Victorian Literature*, asserts that

the belief that the hierarchical structure based on hereditary privilege had something sacred about it survived into an age of increasing social fluidity In Victorian England the concept of “deference”—willing acknowledgment that the people in the classes above one’s own were justly entitled to their superiority—was so strong that it was proof against all the subversive and disintegrating forces which were brought to bear against it. (18)

Victorian society was influenced by the upheavals of the industrialization process. The family, one of the cornerstones of Victorian society, was subjected to continuous social and cultural changes. One of these changes was that the family was no longer based on a solid organic structure.

Psychological, social, and economic tensions affected the Victorian family, bringing about some of the most drastic changes in nineteenth century social history. In *A Prison of Expectations: The Family in Victorian Culture*, Steven Mintz argues that social historians often describe the Victorian middle-class family as a “walled garden” (12), partly because Victorian parents believed that the materialistic upheavals of the Industrial Revolution might corrupt their families. Thus, they tended to isolate the private family sphere from the public sphere. In other words, the stereotypical middle-class family was somewhat similar to what is known today as the nuclear family. Mintz writes:

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, the middle-class family was thought of in a new way — as isolated from larger kinship structures and the world of work. Conceived of as an inward-turning, self-contained unit, the conjugal family was regarded as connected to the extended kin group and the outside society only on the basis of economic self-interest and voluntary consent. (14)

The isolation of the “conjugal unit” of the Victorian middle-class family helped define the social relation between family members; established positions for boys, girls, women, and men emerged. Broadly speaking, girls and boys, according to Mintz, were emotionally and financially dependent on

their parents. Victorians maintained the traditional attitude to girls as future mothers and housewives once they got married; men were considered an absolute authority in the home; and parents prolonged the childhood stage of their children. Thus children were subjected to a strict code of behavior that made them comply with the middle-class ideology. In other words, “the increasing isolation of the middle-class family from broader structures of kinship and work placed extraordinary psychological burdens on the home” (21).

MacDonald’s nonconformity stems from the fact that he challenges the supposed hereditary gentleness of middle-class ideology, and rationalizes his assumptions on the grounds that nobility of character is genetic, and that this kind of nobility contributes to the organic structure of the *extended* family. To elaborate on how MacDonald contradicts the ideology of the Victorian middle-class about social hierarchy, I would like to quote Knowles and Malmkjær: “In Victorian society, nobility of birth was becoming undervalued in comparison with purely financial status, and MacDonald can appear to be concerned to return to a pre-industrialized social order. However, his main concern is to establish nobility as a moral, rather than a social, concept” (171). The poor were gentle and morally superior to the rich because nobility, in MacDonald’s view, was not bound to a specific social class. Thus hereditary gentleness was not hierarchical. One should be aware that MacDonald was a Congregational minister and because he expressed his heterodox views about salvation from the pulpit, he came into conflict with his congregation which forced him to resign. According to the Calvinist faith only the elect will be saved.

MacDonald opposed this doctrine because he believed that anyone, young, old, rich or poor, could attain salvation by the cultivation of the inner goodness of the heart and soul (Carpenter 76; Knowles and Malmkjær 164). So it is no accident that MacDonald’s fairy tales and fantasy novels picture poor characters as noble. As a nonconformist and dissenter, MacDonald adhered to those who were more concerned with the nobility of soul. But he was far from alone in this. Mill and Dickens acknowledged the inherent qualities of the poor and wrote in favor of a nobility of character that worked in harmonious interaction with the richness of morals and ethics. In *On Liberty: The Subjection of Women* (1859) John Mill questioned the Calvinist theory that underestimated the inner goodness of humans and stressed original sin: “Human nature being radically corrupt, there is no redemption for anyone until human nature is killed within him” (360). Like Mill, Dickens too directed his attention to the freedom of the individual will, regardless of wealth or social rank.

The Princess and the Goblin, *The Princess and Curdie*, and *North Wind* contradict Victorian notions about class, poverty, and the family and

introduce interrogative assumptions that aim at making children comply with a new process of socialization. In *The Princess and the Goblin* the nurse reveals her middle-class assumptions about social hierarchy when she underestimates Curdie and treats him as inferior to the princess. This is clearly seen when Curdie protects Irene from the goblins and thus she promises him a kiss: the nurse relates that “there’s no occasion; he’s [Curdie] only a miner-boy” (48). This comment is juxtaposed by Irene, who replies to the nurse that Curdie is “a good boy, and a brave boy, and he has been very kind to us” (48). Goodness, bravery and kindness are part of the *moral* scale by which Irene judges Curdie. The nurse, however, does not care about the inner goodness of Curdie and judges him by a *social* scale, partly because she has internalized a middle-class notion of “dignity.” As a counterview to the social standards of the nurse, the narrator introduces moral ones:

Here I should like to remark, for the sake of princes and princesses in general, that it is a low and contemptible thing to refuse to confess a fault. If a true princess has done wrong, she is always uneasy until she has had an opportunity of throwing the wrongness away from her by saying, “I did it; and I wish I had not; and I am sorry for having done it.” *So you see* there is some ground for supposing that Curdie was *not* a miner *only*, but a prince as well. *Many such* instances have been known in the *world’s history*. (198; emphasis added)

The phrase “so you see” is indeed a rationalization of the fact that Curdie is a prince of inner goodness and of humble manners; the conjunction “not . . . only” privileges Curdie as a miner boy and therefore the narrator negates the social standards which are used by the nurse; and the use of “many such” and “world’s history” is a historicization that stresses the existence of limitless cases similar to that of Curdie’s. What is being rationalized and historicized is that nobility is genetic and the hierarchical structure, based on hereditary privilege, is a false notion because history proves it so. The nonconformity of MacDonald’s assumptions is revealed at the level of language. However, the narrator in *The Princess and Curdie* also makes the ideological assumptions clear and direct, and this helps the reader to understand the prevailing ideology in the text.

This is seen when Curdie and his father, Peter, returning home from the mines, come across Irene’s grandmother. She transforms herself into a beautiful young lady while she talks to them: Peter is surprised, primarily because he is a poor miner and the lady is of a high social rank. The lady refutes Peter’s assumptions and says that she considers him and his family as noble as herself. The lady addresses Peter thus:

You have got to thank me that you are so poor, Peter
Things come to the poor that can’t get in at the door of the rich.

Their money somehow blocks it up. It is a great privilege to be poor Hadst thou been rich, my Peter, thou wouldst not have been so good as some rich men I know. (60-61)

The implication of the quotation cited above is two-fold. First, poverty is not a sin but a privilege that the poor possess and the rich lack. It is not accidental that MacDonald considers riches an obstacle to renunciation and mysticism, because his thoughts are based on Christian philosophy of the inner goodness of people. Therefore, material riches are not part of MacDonald's visionary insights. If Peter had been rich, the possibility of his "goodness" would have been limited. Second, nobility of character is not bound to a definite social class because the poor can also be noble and their nobility is judged by their goodness. In this case gentleness is judged by spiritual and emotional standards, not by material and physical ones. It is interesting to note that the ideas in the quotation cited above are also recurrent themes in *North Wind* and in *The Princess and Curdie*.

For example, the narrator in *North Wind*, directs the reader's attention to two social conditions that people dislike—the first is poverty and the second is dishonesty, both linked to what the narrator calls "value." The narrator comments that "Poverty will not make a man worthless—he may be worth a great deal more when he is poor than he was when he was rich" (106). This implies that poverty is favored above riches partly because of the "value" that makes poverty a privilege not a curse. The image of poverty is continually juxtaposed with that of dishonesty; dishonesty is indeed a curse that takes the inner goodness out of man and leaves him without moral values. The narrator maintains: "but dishonesty goes very far indeed to make a man of no value—a thing to be thrown out in the dust-hole of the creation, like a bit of broken basin, or a dirty rag" (106). The ideological message behind this is that people should be judged by moral standards not by a social hierarchy.

In *The Princess and Curdie* Irene's grandmother gives Curdie the gift of imaginative perception and she puts it in Curdie's hands. This gift gives Curdie the power to sense whether a person has inner goodness or inner wickedness. Curdie tries the gift on his mother by touching her hands and discovers that his mother is a lady, but the latter refuses to believe him. The narrative is focalized through the voice of Peter when he rationalizes Curdie's claims. Peter's revolutionary views of nobility are clearly seen when he asserts:

And I am sure the boy speaks true, said Peter. He only says about your hand what I have known ever so long about yourself, Joan. Curdie, your mother's foot is as pretty a foot as any lady's in the land, and where her hand is not so pretty it comes of killing its beauty for you and me, my boy. And I

can tell you more, Curdie, I don't know much about ladies and gentlemen, but I am sure your *inside mother* must be a lady. (89; emphasis added)

Despite the fact that Joan's hands are coarse and cracked; despite the fact that her body is shabby and weary, her "inside" value assures her goodness and identifies her as "a lady." The ideology behind this episode is that it praises work and undermines play, because Joan's beauty is consumed by work for her family: "True, her hands were hard and chapped and large, but it was with work for them" (98). The father justifies his claims about the nobility of his wife by stating the difference between a "pretended" gentleman and a "real" gentleman. The major difference between the two is around the notions of work and play, seeming and being:

This is how: when I forget myself looking at her as she goes about her work—and that happens oftener as I grow older—I fancy for a moment or two that I am a gentleman; and when I wake up from my little dream, it is only to feel the more strongly that I must do everything as a gentleman should. I will try to tell you what I mean, Curdie. If a gentleman—I mean a *real* gentleman, not a *pretended* one, of which sort they say there are a many above ground—if a real gentleman were to lose all his money and come down in the mines to get bread for his family—do you think, Curdie, he would work like the lazy ones? Would he try to do as little as he could for his wages? I know the sort of the true gentleman—pretty near as well as he does himself. (89; emphasis added)

Peter's justification negates the hierarchical Victorian notion of gentlemanliness. As Avery and Bull assert, "Along with this complexity of emotions surrounding the Victorian use of the word 'gentleman' went the feeling that gentlemanly virtues were hereditary, that the ruling classes were morally superior to those below them" (198). The proximity of the connotations "pretended" and "real" expose the real meaning of nobility: real nobility is equated with goodness, work, and family solidarity, while pretended nobility is equated with laziness, play, and external appearance. The father agrees with Curdie that his mother is a true lady: "And my wife, that's your mother, Curdie, she's a *true lady*, you may take my word for it, for it's she that makes me want to be a *true gentleman*. Wife, the boy is in the right about your hand" (89; emphasis added). The concept of a true lady, in Victorian mind, stressed that women were to be submissive, fragile, inferior, and powerless, while in Peter's eyes the concept designates strength,

mutual love, and understanding. Thus, the father contradicts one of the most cherished doctrines of Victorian mentality—the “Perfect Lady.” Bauer and Ritt argue that:

if the woman of the lower classes had been downgraded to the status of a mere female, the upper middle-class woman had been elevated in the social scale so that the term “woman” no longer sufficed to describe her. The self-image of the model Victorian woman now demanded that she be considered not merely a woman, but a lady, a conception that effectively placed her outside and beyond the world of her humble *working-class* sister. (1-2; emphasis added)

North Wind introduces another radical and subversive picture of nobility. Despite the fact that Nanny is very poor, miserable, and at the bottom of the social ladder, she “was so sweet, and gentle, and refined that she might have had a lady and gentleman for a father and mother” (214-215). *North Wind* refers several times to the theme of the nobility of working-class people and she rationalizes their nobility on moral grounds, not on social ones. Diamond and his father are gentlemen and their gentleness gives them social acceptance among people despite the fact that they are poor. Diamond’s gentleness is acknowledged by *North Wind*:

“But I’m not a gentleman,” said Diamond, scratching away at the paper.

“I hope you won’t say so ten years after this.”

“I’m going to be a coachman, and a coachman is not a gentleman,” persisted Diamond.

“We call your father a gentleman in our house,” said *North Wind*.

“He does not call himself one,” said Diamond.

“That’s of no consequence: every man ought to be a gentleman, and your father is one.” (26)

Indeed, “every man ought to be a gentleman” in MacDonald’s moral scale, which makes a distinction between physical appearance and spiritual goodness. For example, while driving, Diamond loses his way so some “idlers” block his path and bother him. Luckily, “a pale-faced man, in very shabby clothes, but with the look of a gentleman somewhere about him, came up, and making good use of his stick, drove them off” (206). The appearance of the gentleman creates two contradictory pictures that are manifested through the adjectives “pale-faced” and “shabby,” and the noun “look.” The first undermines the physical appearance of the man but the second highlights

his gentlemanly look.

If MacDonald gives a plentitude of pictures that every man ought to be a gentleman, he also gives the counterview that every gentleman is not a nobleman. The narrator, in “Little Daylight”, mocks the wickedness of the nobles because it brings about destruction for everyone in the country. The narrator comments:

About this time in a neighbouring kingdom, in consequence of the *wickedness of the nobles*, an insurrection took place upon the death of the old king, the greater part of the nobility was massacred, and the young Prince was compelled to flee for his life, disguised like a peasant . . . but when he got into that [country] ruled by the Princess’s father, and had no longer any fear of being recognized, he fared better, for the *people were kind*. (225; emphasis added)

Nobles are not exempt from wickedness, which is a symptom of their cruel inner intentions. The wickedness of the nobles is juxtaposed by the kindness of people in the neighboring kingdom. On one occasion, the narrator in *North Wind* assures the child reader that “all emperors are not gentlemen, and all cooks are not ladies—nor all queens and princesses for that matter, either” (15). Similarly, Curdie, in *The Princess and Curdie*, is surprised that Irene’s grandmother appears to him in different shapes. He asks her how she can transform herself into so many shapes, to which she replies: “shapes are only dresses, Curdie, and dresses are only names. That which is inside is the same all the time” (61-62), and maintains later that

many a lady, so delicate and nice that she can bear nothing coarser than the finest linen to touch her body, if she had a mirror that could show her the animal she is growing into, as it lies waiting within the fair skin and the fine linen and the silk and the jewels, would receive a shock that might possibly wake her up. (81)

MacDonald’s reversal of the theme of nobility is deliberate because it questions, and even subverts, the established ideology of the appearance of noblemen and establishes an alternative ideology that acknowledges the inner goodness of the poor. Everyone has the potential to be a gentleman and the cultivation of the inner goodness of heart places the one at the top of the social hierarchy regardless of wealth or rank.

MacDonald also discusses nobility within the family. This is seen in *The Princess and Curdie* when Irene’s grandmother stresses the nobility

of Peter's family and aims at cultivating it through Curdie. She addresses Peter: "You, Peter, and your wife have both the *blood of the royal family* in your veins. I have been trying to cultivate your family tree, every branch of which is known to me, and I expect Curdie to turn out a blossom on it" (61; emphasis added). The ideal family, in MacDonald's eyes, is like a tree: the stems, the leaves, and the trunk work in harmonious interaction that ensures the tree's (the family's) survival. The simile of tree/family dual relationship is a recurrent theme in MacDonald's narratives. The narrator further argues that Peter and Joan

were the happiest couple in that country, because they always understood each other, and that was because they always meant the same thing, and that was because they always loved what was fair and true and right better—not than anything else, but than everything else put together. (42)

It is apparent that the causes of happiness in Curdie's family are the mutual understanding and respect of the family members. According to MacDonald the ideal family is built on companionship, trust, commitment, and love.

Different episodes in his fairy tales and fantasy novels highlight such idealism. The family solidarity between Curdie and his family, and Diamond and his family, creates a microcosmic unity that ensures the stability of their families. Likewise, the relationship between Curdie and his mother is similar to that of Irene's with her grandmother. The narrator argues that Curdie's mother is very kind and one reason for her kindness is her care for Curdie and her husband: "I doubt if the princess was very much happier even in the arms of her huge-great-grandmother than Peter and Curdie were in the arms of Mrs. Peterson" (98). When Curdie in *The Princess and the Goblin* proves himself honest, loyal, and brave the king decides to take Curdie with him, but the latter feels that his duty toward his father and mother is more important. Curdie tells the king: "I cannot leave my father and mother," even though the parents try to convince Curdie that they can get along without him. But, filled with a sense of care and commitment toward his parents, Curdie says: "I can't get on very well without you" (235). Whereas, the parents in *The Princess and Curdie* show no objection to letting Curdie fulfill his mission and rescue the king and Irene from the wicked people, *because* they trust Curdie's honesty and courage. Besides, Curdie expresses his willingness to go, and therefore favors service for the common good to the solidarity of his family: he believes that the common interest of the country is not different from the interest of his family.

In other words, the nuclear family is a miniature of the extended family, each of which consists of individuals that complement each other

in harmonious interaction towards what MacDonald calls the “family tree.” Knowles and Malmkjær suggest:

*MacDonald’s noble family is wider than the nuclear. It is, in fact, universal, a family of human and beast, grounded in the divine guardian of all nature whom we meet in *The Princess and the Goblin* and *The Princess and Curdie*. There, we also come to understand that a well-turned nuclear family is a microcosm of the universal family and that the child becomes socialized into both as it grows up with its mother and father. (174; emphasis in the original)*

The critics base their assumptions on the grounds that MacDonald emphasizes solidarity among family members on the one hand, and among people in general, on the other. Different episodes in MacDonald’s fairy tales and fantasy novels illustrate what I mean. For example, in *The Princess and the Goblin* the nurse prevents Irene from going up to the mountains and talking to the miners’ children. In deliberate contrast to the narrow-mindedness of the nurse, the narrator argues that “the truest princess is just the one who loves all her brothers and sisters best, and who is most able to do them good by being humble towards them” (197-198). Curdie ignores the ingratitude and impertinence of the nurse and he takes her to live with his family; Diamond takes Nanny to live with his family where she enhances the familial relationships of the family members. “Curdie liked most of them [the miners,] and was a favourite with all” (19); all cabdrivers like Diamond and they wish that they had a son like him. In addition, the family relationship exceeds the boundaries of the human sphere to include animals that have the potential of human companionship. For example, Lina [an animal creature] is a source of help for Curdie and she contributes to victory of the king against the wicked people; and old Diamond [the horse] contributes to the expenses of Diamond’s family.

In conclusion, MacDonald contradicts the hierarchical structure of the Victorian social scale that is based on hereditary privilege, and argues in favor of genetic nobility. In MacDonald’s moral scale the poor are also noble and their nobility ensures their social acceptance among the different social divisions. Thus, MacDonald reverses the theme of nobility to expose the false meaning of “gentlemanly” and to establish an alternative ideology that sees in nobility a step forward to family solidarity. This stems from the fact that the family is one of the main agents of socialization and thus the ideal family, in MacDonald’s eyes, is a microcosmic unity that complements the macrocosmic relationships between people in all class divisions. In this sense MacDonald’s ideal family is not different from his ideal government because

both are built on teamwork, not on the utilitarian spirit of the Victorian middle-class.

Works Cited

- Altick, Richard D. *Victorian People and Ideas: A Companion for Modern Readers of Victorian Literature*. New York: Norton, 1973. Print.
- Avery, Gillian, and Angela Bull. *Nineteenth Century Children: Heroes and Heroines in English Children's Stories 1780-1900*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1965. Print.
- Bauer, Carol, and Lawrence Ritt. eds. *Free and Ennobled: Source Readings in the Development of Victorian Feminism*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1979. Print.
- Briggs, Katharine M. *The Fairies in Tradition and Literature*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967. Print.
- Carpenter, Humphrey. *Secret Gardens: A Study of the Golden Age of Children's Literature*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985. Print.
- Hollindale, Peter. "Ideology and the Children's Book." *Literature for Children: Contemporary Criticism*. Ed. Peter Hunt. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. 19-40. Print.
- Knowles, Murray, and Kirsten Malmkjær. *Language and Control in Children's Literature*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Kane, Penny. *Victorian Families in Fact and Fiction*. London: Macmillan, 1995. Print.
- MacDonald, George. *At the Back of the North Wind*. 1871. London: Dent and Sons, 1973. Print.
- . *The Light Princess*. 1864. *George MacDonald: The Complete Fairy Tales*. Ed. U. C. Knoepfmacher. New York: Penguin, 1999. 15-53. Print.
- . *The Princess and Curdie*. 1883. London and Glasgow: Collins, 1958. Print.
- . *The Princess and the Goblin*. 1872. New York: Campbell, 1993. Print.
- . *Little Daylight* 1879. *George MacDonald: The Complete Fairy Tales*. Ed. U. C. Knoepfmacher. New York: Penguin, 1999. 304-341. Print.
- Mintz, Steven. *A Prison of Expectations: The Family in Victorian Culture*. New York: New York UP, 1985. Print.
- Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty: The Subjection of Women*. 1869. New York: Henry Holt, 1898. Print.
- Reynolds, Kimberley and Nicola Humble. *Victorian Heroines: Representations of Femininity in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Art*. New York: New York UP, 1993. Print.
- Stephens, John. *Language and Ideology in Children's Fiction*. London: Longman, 1992. Print.
- Zipes, Jack. *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion: The Classical Genre for Children and the Process of Civilization*. New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.