

#### 4. Parody of 'Rotkäppchen' (*KHM26*)

As Jack Zipes has pointed out, the appropriation of textual material from the *KHM* is by no means an enterprise of recent origin.<sup>1</sup> Although the diverse currents and tendencies at work in the use of preformed material from the *KHM* have to date received limited critical attention, it can be suggested - using the definitions developed in Chapter 1 - that appropriation of Grimmian material is likely to have involved the use of such textual strategies as parody, travesty and contrafact, and that misuse of these textual strategies will have produced pekorality. Where the material has been exploited for its reader familiarity and popularity, in order to create comic contrast, or for its communicative potential, it is likely that travesty and contrafact have been used. Where attempts at developing a critical dialogue with the *KHM* have been made, it is likely that parody has been employed, bearing in mind that parodic texts can be read as utilising preformed material for purposes of comic contrast and communication, that is, as travesty or contrafact.

An extensive body of secondary literature has been devoted to the analysis of a textual tradition characterised as *Kunstmärchen*.<sup>2</sup> Since the turn of the century, the tales usually identified as belonging to this tradition have increasingly employed generic conventions codified by the Grimms in their collection, and in some cases textual strategies which appropriate recognisably Grimmian elements. However, a lack of critical awareness about the complex literary nature of Grimms' collection and a Promethean insistence on the role of 'solitary genius' in

---

<sup>1</sup> Zipes: *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion*, pp. 59-60.

<sup>2</sup> See for example: Volker Klotz: *Das europäische Kunstmärchen*. Stuttgart: Metzler 1985

the production of *Kunstmärchen* have led commentators on *Kunstmärchen* to view the tales which comprise the *KHM* as a 'special type' of literary fairy tale. This approach, also proposed by Hermann Bausinger in his designation of Grimms' tales as *Buchmärchen*,<sup>3</sup> has led to a critical neglect of the influence of the *KHM* on the growth of the *Kunstmärchen* tradition, and especially of its role in stabilising the generic conventions of the *Kunstmärchen* since the late nineteenth century.<sup>4</sup> This tendency to underestimate the influence of the *KHM* on the production of other literary fairy tales has intensified the assumption that the generic conventions of the *Märchen* form ought to be used for their communicative potential, effectively producing a critical emphasis on contrafact as a textual strategy and a neglect of parody. Thus, the earlier history of parody of the *KHM* remains a subject largely unexplored.<sup>5</sup>

After a period of comparative neglect in the 1950s and 1960s, the 1970s saw a gradual reawakening of interest in *Märchen* from a number of viewpoints. Critical and pedagogical discussion about the meanings and uses of *Märchen* began again, especially with regard to their suitability for children, and has continued to grow ever since, expanding to legitimise the

<sup>3</sup> Hermann Bausinger: "Buchmärchen" in: Kurt Ranke (ed.): *Enzyklopädie des Märchens. Handwörterbuch zur historischen Erzählforschung*. Berlin, New York 1976ff, pp. 974-977.

<sup>4</sup> This view is represented by Jens Tismar in: *Kunstmärchen*. Sammlung Metzler, 177. Stuttgart: Metzler 1977, p. 16.

<sup>5</sup> Most of the extant studies of this phenomenon confine themselves to responses to single tales. See for example: Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*, Lutz Röhrich: "Der Froschkönig und seine Wandlungen" in: *Fabula* 20 (1979), pp. 170-192, Wolfgang Mieder: "Survival Forms of Little Red Riding Hood in Modern Society" in: *International Folklore Review* 2 (1982), pp. 23-40, and: "Grim Variations From Fairy Tales to Modern Anti-Fairy Tales", in: *Germanic Review* 62 (Spring 1987), pp. 90-102. The most general approach to date has been that taken by Jack Zipes in: *Fairy Tales and the Art of Subversion*.

*KHM* once again as reading material for adults. Meanwhile, a literary phenomenon which has been referred to as the *veränderte Märchen* flourished from the late 1960s until the early 1980s, producing hundreds of retold, modified and bowdlerised tales aimed at children and their parents, and at adults.<sup>6</sup> These interrelated and mutually reinforcing tendencies in dialogue with the *Märchen* genre can however be characterised within certain parameters of reception; *Märchen*, and especially Grimms' *KHM*, were seen as violent, sexist, racist and repressive, as the editorial product of the 'bourgeois mentality' of Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, but as having emancipatory and utopian potential, as preserving elements of the oppressed voice of 'the folk'.<sup>7</sup> As a result of the diverse, complex yet stylistically consistent nature of the *KHM*, and a lack of reliable historical and biographical information about the complexity of its origins and production, both of these viewpoints were able to be supported through selective use of textual evidence. At the same time, although writers for children and parents were attempting to use Grimmian material for its communicative, comic and critical potential, they often operated under these same conditions of reception, with the intention of divesting Grimms' *Märchen* of 'undesirable' traits whilst using the material to fashion social and political commentary. However, a small number of authors, writing sometimes for children and parents, sometimes for adults, some pre-dating (James Thurber, Joachim Ringelnatz), some involved with this trend

<sup>6</sup> Hildegard Pischke: "Das veränderte Märchen. Untersuchungen zu einer neuen Gattung der Kinderliteratur" in: Maria Lipp (ed.): *Literatur für Kinder*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 1977, pp. 94-113.

<sup>7</sup> Hans-Joachim Gelberg's "Nachwort" in: *Janosch erzählt Grimms Märchen*. Weinheim: Beltz und Gelberg 1972, pp. 249-254 is an example of the former view; Ernst Bloch perhaps most strongly represents the latter in: *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*.

(Janosch), and some writing *Märchen* in the wake of this trend (Peter Rühmkorf), have produced work which also enters into a dialogue with the *KHM* itself, and can hence be considered to be employing the strategy of parody with respect to the *KHM*. These parameters of reception, which have also dominated critical discussion of the *veränderte Märchen* phenomenon, bear a marked resemblance to those involved in the definition of the terms *Volksmärchen* and *Kunstmärchen*. Most literary and dictionary definitions of *Volksmärchen* and *Kunstmärchen* distinguish between the two on the basis that the *Volksmärchen* is a product of many, unidentifiable authors, whereas the *Kunstmärchen* is the product of a single, identifiable author, and thus echo Jacob and Wilhelm Grimms' understanding of *Naturpoesie* and *Kunstpoesie*.<sup>8</sup> The circumstances surrounding the authorship of Grimms' collection and the history of its reception clearly demonstrate the difficulty of separating *Volksmärchen* from *Kunstmärchen* in these terms, since the *KHM* are a product of complex interactions between oral and literary traditions, while the collection itself has in turn exerted a strong normative influence on both oral and literary traditions, with the high rates of literacy in the German-speaking countries contributing more generally to this increasing interdependence.<sup>9</sup> The diverse generic nature of the tales which comprise the *KHM* and the fact of the collection's multiple authorship make it impossible to understand the *KHM* as *Kunstmärchen*, if by this the product of a single, identifiable author is meant, while designation of the *KHM* as 'authentic' *Volksmärchen* is unrealistic in modern folkloristic terms, since

---

<sup>8</sup> See Chapter 2, p. 48f.

<sup>9</sup> Dégh: "What Did the Grimm Brothers Give to and Take from the Folk?", p. 66-68.

the collection clearly does not present the verbatim dictation of oral performances. On the other hand, the huge influence the collection has had on both oral and literary traditions is undeniable, suggesting that the collection must be accorded a certain paradigmatic value in consideration of the *Märchen* genre.

Indeed, such a paradigmatic significance for Grimms' *KHM* has already been postulated by Max Lüthi.<sup>10</sup> The stylistic and structural qualities which he advances as supposedly characteristic of the 'European folktale' all describe an 'ideal' type of *Märchen* which is to some extent exemplified by the most popular tales which make up the *KHM*, and especially the tales collected in the *Kleine Ausgabe*. His conclusions thus echo and invert those of André Jolles, who points out the increasingly hermetic correspondence between the popular conception of *Märchen* and the conventions of *die Gattung Grimm*.

Walter Filz, recognising the problematic nature of the terms *Kunstmärchen* and *Volksmärchen*, has advanced a concept of *Märchenelemente* which utilises the conclusions of Jolles and Lüthi, and studied their use in literature of the 1970s.<sup>11</sup> This method avoids the futility of attempting to define a *Märchen* genre capable of subsuming all possible uses of *Märchenelemente*, and is infinitely more profitable than the use of the generic terms *Volksmärchen* and *Kunstmärchen*, since it recognises the elements which make up the conventional *Märchen* genre to be essentially preformed textual material.<sup>12</sup>

In analysing texts containing *Märchenelemente* however, Filz, like Hutcheon in her theory of parody, equates size with com-

<sup>10</sup> See Chapter 2, p. 52f.

<sup>11</sup> Walter Filz: *Es war einmal? Elemente des Märchens in der deutschen Literatur der siebziger Jahre*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang 1989.

<sup>12</sup> Filz: *Es war einmal?*, p. 18-20.

plexity. Accordingly, he recognises the possibility that *Märchenelemente* may be used profitably in longer forms such as novels, but is largely dismissive of the possibility of their use in shorter forms, and especially forms which utilise the generic conventions of the *Märchen*:

Warum aber sind derart aufwendige Wiederbelebungsversuche überhaupt notwendig? Läge es nicht näher, gleich ganz neu, ganz andere Geschichten zu erzählen?<sup>13</sup>

This implicit rejection of parody as a possibility results from Filz' choice of typology. Filz understands the use of *Märchenelemente*:

einerseits als Rückgriff auf bestimmte literarische und erzählerische Traditionen, andererseits als Reflex auf die gesellschaftliche und politische Realität der siebziger Jahre.<sup>14</sup>

As a result, he distinguishes between the the use of *Märchenelemente* in response to the *KHM* and more common attempts to use *Märchenelemente* in order to pass comment on social or political issues, strategies which could be referred to as parody and contrafact respectively, using the terms proposed in this study. However, by refusing to consider the use of *Märchenelemente* in terms of textual strategies, Filz neglects the possibility that the texts he describes may be more profitably described as parody, travesty, contrafact and so on rather than

---

<sup>13</sup> Filz: *Es war einmal?*, p. 26.

<sup>14</sup> Filz: *Es war einmal?*, p. 20.

as "'einfache' Texte (Adaptionen Grimmscher Märchen)".<sup>15</sup> For example, parody may simultaneously criticise and construct an independent message without a loss of structural integrity, that is, parody can also be received by the reader as contrafact or travesty, or even without recognition of critical elements, as 'merely' comic. Furthermore, parody may function in such a way as to call the epistemological situation of reading into question for the reader, and may thereby call distinctions of high and low such as 'literature for adults' and 'literature for children' into question, whatever the length of the text.

As a result of neglecting these possibilities, Filz criticises *einfache Texte* which are aimed at children for containing messages which can be read as political commentary by adults.<sup>16</sup> He judges that *veränderte Märchen* written in response to the *KHM* are meant to 'improve' or 'adapt' Grimms' tales, and hence that many of these *veränderte Märchen* fail to measure up to the aesthetic standards of the *Märchen* genre as perfected by the Grimms.<sup>17</sup> He tends to judge the use of *Märchenelemente* as *Rückgriff* because he is concerned to show that their use did not measure up to the social and political realities of the 1970s. In the latter case, where *Märchenelemente* are used for social or critical comment, he judges that while some texts succeed in producing social comment, this social comment often functions in uneasy opposition to the 'traditional' uses of *Märchenelemente*, or, at worst, is used to encourage regressive thinking.<sup>18</sup> This final conclusion about the use of *Märchenelemente* in short texts to reinforce the

<sup>15</sup> Filz: *Es war einmal?*, p. 21.

<sup>16</sup> Filz: *Es war einmal?*, pp. 32-33.

<sup>17</sup> Filz: *Es war einmal?*, p. 237.

<sup>18</sup> Filz: *Es war einmal?*, pp. 262-266.

trivial claims of popular psychology is perceptive and timely, especially with respect to recent popular psychological interpretations of *Märchen* from the *KHM* by Bruno Bettelheim and Carl-Heinz Mallet which totally ignore the complex literary nature of the collection, and a recent proliferation of 'psychologically' orientated *veränderte Märchen*.<sup>19</sup> However, his other claims largely result from conclusions that the use of *Märchenelemente* in short texts represent attempts at writing *Märchen*, as opposed to parody for example, and that attempts at using *Märchenelemente* for their communicative potential generally fail, because of their inability to measure up to the aesthetic standards of the *Märchen*. In contradistinction to these claims, it is suggested that if the use of *Märchenelemente* is considered on the basis of the textual strategy employed, then the recognition of a text by the reader as employing parody, for example, tends to make the reading of a text in a way which relies on the preformed material or generic conventions of the *Märchen* largely optional. In other words, the reader can read a tale using *Märchenelemente* as a *Märchen* in the Grimmian sense, but a reader who recognises a text to be employing parody knows that the parodic text has a higher semantic authority than the appropriated preformed material, and knows which 'code' to agree with.<sup>20</sup>

An earlier approach to the problem, under the aspect of the 'adaption' or 'improvement' of Grimms' tales as *veränderte Märchen* was taken by Hildegard Pischke.<sup>21</sup> Pischke also distinguishes between responses to the *KHM* and attempts at

---

<sup>19</sup> Bettelheim: *The Uses of Enchantment*. Carl-Heinz Mallet: *Kennen Sie Kinder? Wie Kinder denken, handeln und fühlen, aufgezeigt an vier Grimmschen Märchen*. Hamburg: Hoffmann and Campe 1981.

<sup>20</sup> Gary Morson, quoted by Hutcheon in: *A Theory of Parody*, p. 50.

<sup>21</sup> Hildegard Pischke: "Das veränderte Märchen".



social commentary. However, Pischke excludes the ability of parody to criticise or take issue with preformed material and simultaneously formulate its own message. Conversely, she neglects the fact that many of the *veränderten Märchen* she interprets exclusively in terms of social commentary, such as Janosch's 'Das Lumpengesindel'<sup>22</sup> and 'Des Schneider Dau-merlings Wanderschaft',<sup>23</sup> 'refunction' preformed Grimmian material, and could hence also be read as parody. Pischke also implicitly views parody as 'parasitic' or 'dependent':

Bedeutung bleibt [den Parodien] aber insofern gesichert, als Parodie und Opfer eine Symbiose bilden: Sinn der Parodie ist es, die Autorität ihres Objektes anzugreifen; ist das geleistet, d.h. ist die Bedeutung der Grimmschen Märchen reduziert, haben ihre Verfremdungen ihre Aufgabe erfüllt und ihre Berechtigung verloren.<sup>24</sup>

Pischke seems to be arguing for a perceived need to relativise the canonised authority of the *KHM*, rather than for the specific ability of parody to do this. The point which Pischke misses is that the symbiosis of *Parodie* and *Opfer* is achieved in a parody through the incorporation of preformed material into the structure of the parody, making parody ambivalent rather than essentially satiric. If the presence of parody is recognised, then a parodic text can be read as such; if not, then

---

<sup>22</sup> Janosch: *Janosch erzählt Grimms Märchen*, pp. 26-31.

<sup>23</sup> Janosch: *Janosch erzählt Grimms Märchen*, pp. 9-16.

<sup>24</sup> Pischke: "Das veränderte Märchen", p. 111. Another article about recent developments in the *Märchen* form which offers an assessment of parody in negative, dependent terms is Linda Dégh: "Zur Rezeption der Grimmschen Märchen in den USA", in: Klaus Doderer (ed.): *Über Märchen für Kinder von heute*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz 1983, pp. 116-128, p. 127.

it can also be read in other ways (for example, as social commentary), thanks to its double-coded nature. Even if parody is recognised as such, it is still up to the reader to understand it as criticism of preformed material, because the parodic text has an aesthetic existence independent of its 'target'. The reader's general familiarity with generic conventions and types of text is also exploited by strategies such as contrafact and travesty, and indeed, it is possible for the reader to understand a parodic text as employing contrafact or travesty. However, through close familiarity with the appropriated text the reader is able to recognise the presence of parody, its more complex interrelationship of intertextual, metafictional, comic and critical aspects, and most importantly, its critical or creative stance relative to the preformed material. If parody is seen in this light, it would seem reasonable to argue that social criticism through the use of preformed Grimmian material is more likely to be short-lived in appeal, especially if a social-critical text proves on examination to be using the preformed Grimmian material solely for its communicative potential, as an ideological vehicle.

Another approach which has been employed by Wolfgang Mieder, Lutz Röhrich and Hans Ritz is to eschew such aesthetic and theoretical considerations and collect 'Survival Forms'<sup>25</sup> of the 'Rotkäppchen' tale on the one hand, and 'Parodien'<sup>26</sup> on the other. These approaches of course avoid the highly problematic nature of conventional definitions of *Volksmärchen*, *Kunstmärchen*, and of parody. Mieder's primarily folkloristic

<sup>25</sup> Wolfgang Mieder: "Survival Forms of 'Little Red Riding Hood' in Modern Society".

<sup>26</sup> Lutz Röhrich: "Zwölfmal Rotkäppchen" in: *Gebärde-Metapher-Parodie: Studien zur Sprache und Volksdichtung*. Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann 1967, pp. 130-152. Hans Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*.

approach has produced a rich source of material, from prose to poetry, cartoons to advertising, for comment and criticism, but his proposition that through "critical and often cynical" reinterpretations and adaptations of the material "the fairy tale is transfigured into a reflection upon a troubled society"<sup>27</sup> contains only one possible reading of parodic texts, and thus does not lay enough groundwork for a differentiated study of the material. Ritz on the other hand evinces a satiric, anti-theoretical tone in his commentary which, despite his informative discussion of the tale's interpretative history and extensive collection of texts which utilise 'Rotkäppchen' material, makes his approach basically unsuitable in the rehabilitation of 'parody' as a critical term.<sup>28</sup>

In the light of the definition of parody developed in Chapter 1, and the suggestion that the presence of parody in a text, if recognised by the reader, can lay claim to a higher semantic authority than the preformed material, whatever its generic conventions, it is argued that the presence of parody encourages the reader to multiple understandings of the parodic text. This understanding of parody contrasts with the approaches of Pischke, Filz and Mieder, which specify a unique function for parody without defining the term. Indeed, given the lack of general agreement about the meaning or use of the term, and the inadequacy of many definitions of parody, it would seem necessary to define the term before using it in discussion about *veränderte Märchen*.

It would therefore seem more fruitful to take as a starting point the existence of the *KHM*, and to examine the use of preformed material appropriated from it from the perspective of

<sup>27</sup> Mieder: "Survival Forms of "Little Red Riding Hood"", p. 23.

<sup>28</sup> Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*, p. 54.

the textual strategies employed. In order to emphasise the range of possibilities inherent in the appropriation of pre-formed material, a number of responses to Grimms' version of 'Rotkäppchen' (*KHM* 26) will be examined in terms of textual strategy.

On the basis of 'Rotkäppchen' material collected by Lutz Röhrich, Wolfgang Mieder and Hans Ritz, it can be claimed that much of the appropriation of Grimmian 'Rotkäppchen' material has proceeded on the basis of the popularity of the tale, and the widespread normative influence of the Grimms' version. The versions of 'Rotkäppchen' collected by Röhrich which retell the tale in *Amtsdeutsch*:

Im Kinderanfall unserer Stadtgemeinde ist eine hierorts wohnhafte, noch unbeschulte Minderjährige aktenkundig [...] <sup>29</sup>

in scientific terminology:

Für das aus Reaktion eines unbekanntem Chemikers mit seinem Reaktionspartner [...] hervorgegangene Produkt hat sich in der internationalen Nomenklatur der Name 'Rotkäppchen' allmählich durchgesteigt [...] <sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Thaddäus Troll (pseudonym for Hans Bayer): 'Untitled' in: Röhrich: "Zwölfmal Rotkäppchen", pp. 139-140. Also Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*, 141-142. Röhrich notes the similarities between this version and a related version retold in legal language and broadcast on *Bayerischer Rundfunk* in 1967. This broadcast version is one of many produced as pastiche or plagiarised from a version, probably written by Friedrich Jakob Graef, which first appeared in the magazine *Simplissimus* in 1909. See Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*, pp. 74-76.

<sup>30</sup> Author unknown: 'Rotkäppchen aus der Sicht eines Chemikers' in: Röhrich: "Zwölfmal Rotkäppchen", pp. 141-142. Also Ritz: *Die Geschichte*

and in advertising jargon:

Es war einmal ein kleines Mädchen, das benutzte als Lippenstift den Rouge Baiser und trug ein Käppchen aus Ninoflex; deshalb nannten es alle Leute 'Rotkäppchen' [...]<sup>31</sup>

retain the Grimmian plot structure, characters and order of events. The version collected by Mieder which retells the tale in modern American jargon also largely retains these elements:

Once upon a point in time, a small person named Little Red Riding Hood initiated plans for the preparation, delivery and transport of foodstuffs to her grandmother [...]<sup>32</sup>

Hans Ritz has also collected numerous retellings of the tale,<sup>33</sup> including 'Rotkäppchen auf Linguistisch':

Es war einmal ein spezifiziertes Subjekt (Käppchen), dem wurde ein Feature (+rot) zugeordnet.[...]<sup>34</sup>

and 'Rotkäppchen in der Scene':

Da wa ma ne echt coole Frau, die hatte sich die Haare mit

---

*vom Rotkäppchen*, pp. 135-136.

<sup>31</sup> Lutz Röhrich and others: 'Untitled' in: Röhrich: "Zwölfmal Rotkäppchen", pp. 147-148.

<sup>32</sup> Russell Baker: 'Little Red Riding Hood Revisited' in: Mieder: "Survival Forms of "Little Red Riding Hood"", p. 33-34.

<sup>33</sup> Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*, pp. 135-158.

<sup>34</sup> Author unknown: 'Rotkäppchen auf Linguistisch' in: Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*, p. 150-151.

Henna gefärbt, da hieß sie überall nur noch Rotkäppchen.[...] <sup>35</sup>

These texts exploit the stylistic coherence and consistency of the Grimmian narrative, consistently substituting a new type of text. Since Grimms' material cannot be read as being criticised, and is rather used for the purpose of creating an inappropriate contrast, the strategy involved is best described as travesty. Furthermore, none of these texts signal the source of the preformed material, or the fact of its appropriation through metafictional comment; they instead rely on reader recognition of the material for the production of a comic effect. Similarly, examples of the use of the tale in the politics of the former West Germany by the CDU, where the wolf is made synonymous with Communism, <sup>36</sup> and uses of the tale by philosophers ranging from G. F. Hegel to Theodor Adorno <sup>37</sup> also rely on reader recognition, but are best described as contrafact, using the material for its communicative potential. Mieder also provides three sample uses of motifs from the tale to advertise rental cars, musical instruments and crystal glasses. <sup>38</sup>

These examples of travesty and contrafact all appropriate 'Rotkäppchen' material more or less intact, that is, without comment on the material itself, or the fact of its appropriation, and without altering the sense or coherence of the material. Both tend to emphasise and utilise the coherence of the preformed material, contrafact through the consistent use of

<sup>35</sup> Irmela: 'Rotkäppchen in der Scene' in: Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*, p. 154-155.

<sup>36</sup> Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*, pp. 80-87.

<sup>37</sup> Ritz: *Die Geschichte vom Rotkäppchen*, pp. 127-134.

<sup>38</sup> Mieder: "Survival Forms of "Little Red Riding Hood"", p. 38.

generic conventions, travesty through the consistent contrast of text-types. The interpretative possibilities of these texts are thus somewhat limited. In contrast, five parodic texts will be examined in some detail, in order to demonstrate some of the complex interpretative possibilities produced through application of the concept of parody proposed in this study. Initially, a text by James Thurber will be discussed briefly, in order to demonstrate the inadequacy of definitions of parody based on dichotomies of antecedent and imitation, or of form and content. A text by Janosch will be examined, to demonstrate some of the complex interpretative possibilities arising even from the application of an apparently simple parodic technique. Texts by Joachim Ringelnatz, Peter Rühmkorf and Heinrich E. Kühleborn will then be discussed to demonstrate the aesthetic complexity of parody. These texts will be examined in terms of the definition and possible uses of parody suggested in Chapter 1, and the views of the *KHM* and 'Rotkäppchen' (*KHM* 26) developed in Chapters 2 and 3. The proposition advanced is that parody is a textual strategy which should interest those engaged in serious study of the *KHM*, since parodic practices can be subjected to an especially wide variety of readings, whilst reflecting a level of understanding of the appropriated material.