INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Order Number 1335253

To educate and amuse: Paper dolls and toys, 1640–1900

Hammell, Rebecca Jordan, M.A.

University of Delaware, 1988

Copyright ©1988 by Hammell, Rebecca Jordan. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TO EDUCATE AND AMUSE:

PAPER DOLLS AND TOYS, 1640-1900

by

Rebecca Jordan Hammell

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Early American Culture

May, 1988

@ 1988 Rebecca Jordan Hammell

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TO EDUCATE AND AMUSE:

PAPER DOLL AND TOYS, 1640-1900

by

Rebecca Jordan Hammell

Approved: James C. Curtis

James C. Curtis, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of thesis

Approved: James C. Curtis

James C. Curtis, Ph.D.
Chairman, Winterthur Program in Early American Culture

Approved: Richard B Murray

Richard B. Murray, Ph.D.
Associate Provost for Graduate Studies

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The list of all those who have helped me along the way is lengthy. To those of you who were there, especially my parents, thank you. Special thanks to Louis Schmier who believed in my talents, and whose knowledge and enthusiasm made me want to go to graduate school. This thesis would not have been possible without the help of Beatrice Taylor, Librarian, Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection at Winterthur. Her guidance and unfailing assistance in working with the Waldron Collection was, and still is, a great help. For pithy quotes and tantalizing ideas, my thanks go to Karin Calvert, who spent as much time as I did in the Rare Book Room at Winterthur in 1982. Many initial ideas for this thesis were suggested by Stephanie G. Wolf, past Winterthur Program Director. Her knowledge of the history of American childhood is broad and she frequently knew where to look when I was at a loss. My deepest and most sincere thanks go to James C. Curtis, Winterthur Program Director, for his unfailing faith in this project and his ability to get me motivated. And finally, to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Peter, my thanks for the encouragement, moral support and computer expertise.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ABSTRACT

Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, certain cultural and economic changes occurred which succeeded in making children a major focal point of American family life and society. Earlier beliefs of children as beings tainted by original sin were modified by Enlightenment philosophy and concepts in progressive education. At the same time as these ideological changes happened, rapid industrialization and rampant consumerism also affected American family life. By the mid-nineteenth century these trends merged and resulted in the creation of a market aimed at the development and production of goods designed just for children.

The Maxine Waldron Collection of Paper Dolls and Toys, housed in the Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection at Winterthur, provided an excellent opportunity to study one type of children's material and popular culture. Business and marketing aspects of these objects were examined, as well as prevailing notions of children's play, education and psychology. The paper dolls and toys

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

themselves provided clues to their "adult" origins, popular imagery and ideas for correct use. Utlimately the project synthesized the blending of business and social trends which resulted in a proliferation of paper playthings for children in the late nineteenth century.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Attitudes towards children and their play have changed significantly over the last three hundred years, as philosophical, educational and psychological concepts about the basic nature of children have changed. The artifacts designed for play reflect many of these changes even when not articulated in the literature of the period. The purpose of this paper is to trace the evolution of modern ideas about children and play, from Europe to the earliest American settlement through the present, and focusing upon paper dolls as an especially appropriate indicator of these social changes at work.[1] The Maxine Waldron Collection of Paper Dolls and Toys housed in the Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection at Winterthur Museum provided the majority of material on which this study is based. This well-developed collection includes hundreds of European and American examples of paper dolls and toys dating from the late seventeenth century through the first third of the twentieth century.

The earliest settlers to America brought with them an English religious orientation that contained an established philosophy concerning the nature of children. From this perspective, the child came into the world with a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

will of its own, filled with sin. Historian Philip Greven discusses these "Puritan-Evangelical" concepts in his seminal work The Protestant Temperament. Perhaps the best expression of this is found in the writings of theologian John Robinson who wrote in 1628:

> Not that grace is derived by natural generation, but by the supernatural covenant with believers and their seed, confirmed in Christ; and by godly education on the parents part.[2]

According to Puritan theology, a child was either born a member of the elect or he was not. Only by a life of penitence and good deeds, guided by parents and the community, could he prove his election by becoming a "visible saint." For most parents it seemed the longest part of their daily battle was in bringing the child's own individual will under control. Susannah Wesley, mother of evangelist John Wesley, wrote in 1732:

> In order to form the minds of children, the first thing to be done is to conquer their will and bring them to an obedient temper. . . . I insist on the conquering of the will of children betimes, because this is the only strong and rational foundation of a religious education, without which both precept and example will be ineffectual. . . . As self-will is the root of all sin and misery, so that whatever cherished this in children insures their after wretchedness and irreligion; whatever checks and mortifies it, promotes their future happiness and piety.[3]

This type of moral outlook created an environment which, by present standards, seems harsh. There was undoubtedly less emphasis on encouraging spontaneity and creativity in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

child, but rather a strict socialization process at work. Play had little significance in this social context, except as an activity filled with potential for mischief and trouble.

These expressions of childrearing beliefs reflected the reality of seventeenth century family life in which childhood as a nonproductive period was shortened due to the exigencies of everyday living. As soon as the child was physically able to care for himself or perform simple tasks, he was expected to do so. The family was primarily an economic unit, rather than an environment for emotional nurturing, and youngsters were considered part of its wage earning base.

> Children provided parents in preindustrial society with a form of social security, unemployment insurance, and yearly support. As soon as children were able to work, in or out of the home, they were expected to contribute to the support of their parents; when parents were no longer able to work, children could look after them.[4]

Further, historian Philip Greven asserts that the geographic reality of American life created a conscious sense of isolation structuring the family in such a way as to make it a closed system. Outside influences, particularly school, and other child-supporting institutions had not yet emerged. Greven writes:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Within relatively isolated and self-contained households, the focus of authority and the source of love were united in the parents, who dominated the household and determined the principles and practices that were to shape their offspring.[5]

As a baby, the infant was integrated immediately into the home, having a predetermined place in the social hierarchy of the family. Although it is obvious that parents spent a great deal of time disciplining and socializing their children, there was very little thought of centering an entire household around the needs and whims of a toddler. The baby had its place in the home, was loved and cared for, but in a manner very different from today's standards.

In the late seventeenth century, John Locke and other European philosophers introduced ideas that changed childrearing. Locke disregarded the concept of original sin, and argued instead that the child's mind was a tabula rasa, an unwritten slate. Parents had the responsibility of filling the slate with moral ideals, knowledge, and positive thought. The child's will was still to be dealt with, but, beyond that, Locke recognized that certain facets of temper ("personality" is perhaps the most appropriate term) could not be changed.

> We must not hope to wholly change their original tempers, nor make the gay pensive and grave, nor the melancholy sportive without spoiling them. God has stamped certain characters upon men's minds, which like their shapes, may perhaps be a little mended, but can hardly be totally alter'd and transform'd into the contrary. . . . For in many

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> cases, all that we can do or should aim at, is, to make the best of what nature has given, to prevent the vices and faults to which such a constitution is most inclined, and give it all the advantage it is capable of.[6]

Locke outlined a comprehensive approach to childrearing from proper diet and nutrition through education. For the first time, play became an important part of the child's daily regimen, valued for stimulating creativity and providing for a healthy pastime.

> For all their innocent folly, playing and childish actions are to be left perfectly free and unrestrained, as far as they can consist with the respect due to those that are present . . . . If these faults of their age, rather than those of the children themselves, were, as they should be, left only to time and imitation and riper years to cure, children would escape a great deal of misapplied and useless correction. . . . If the noise and bustle of their play at any one time prove inconvenient or unsuitable to the place or company they are in, a look or word from the father or mother . . . will be enough either to remove them or quiet them for that time. But their gamesome humour, which is wisely adapted by nature to their age and temper, should rather be encouraged to keep up their spirits, and improve their strength and health, than curb'd and restrain'd; and the chief art is to make all that they have to do, sport and play, too.[7]

Revolutionary for the seventeenth century, Locke's ideas did not achieve a measure of popular acceptance until well into the eighteenth-century, and then mainly among the educated, more affluent upper classes. Locke's theories chipped away, but never completely replaced older childrearing practices, although increasingly the focus of parental responsibility focused on a more humanistic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

upbringing of children.[8] In America, additional social, economic and technological advances resulting from the Industrial Revolution and the emergence of a more urban oriented society, assisted with the appearance of institutions and businesses centered around children complementing parental authority in the childrearing process.

By the nineteenth century, major developments in domestic practices, backed by social and economic changes and bolstered by educational philosophy resulted in a re-evaluation and reformulation of attitudes about the child's place in society. European educators like Heinrich Pestalozzi and Friedrich Froebel influenced American schools and curricula. The emphasis on didactic learning and educational play at school was carried over to the home. Furthermore, the Victorian cult of domesticity helped shape the child's role in the home

> The central convention of domesticity was the contrast between the home and the world. Home was an 'oasis in the desert,' a 'sanctuary' where 'sympathy, honor, virtue all assembled,' where 'disinterested love is ready to sacrifice everything at the altar of affection.'[9]

Normative literature of the period stressed that a house was not truly a home, nor a woman a woman, until fulfilled by the presence of children. Joseph and Laura Lyman wrote in 1867:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> There is many a draught of sweetness in the mingled chalice of life; some hours of perfect happiness given to a woman to cheer and strengthen her along the dusty thoroughfare of existence; many a beam of 'purest ray serene,' to illumine the darkness which at times shrouds every human pathway; but she who has passed through this life without knowing the unutterable blessedness of maternal love has missed the most delicious draught ever pressed to the lips of woman.[10]

In this middle class environment, the child was an important part of the total concept of home. He or she was a major focal point in an institution which provided a "treasury of pure disinterested love, such as is seldom found in the busy walk of a selfish and calculating world."[11]

Between 1830 and 1850, the institutionalization of American society, notably the proliferation of public schools added yet another dimension to child-rearing. Prior to that time, the family had the main responsibility for the academic and moral education of the child. Now children spent a good deal of time in the public school which usurped part of this privilege, and by the end of the century one can observe a certain amount of tension between educator's beliefs and the normative household literature for women. Historian Bernard Wishy has suggested that as early as 1830 the Victorian wife and mother had been entrusted with the patriotic, almost sacred duty of childrearing. Redefining the mother's function helped fill

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a gap created by the trend away from the family as an economic unit, and the specialization of the male head of household as chief wage earner. Wishy wrote:

> In the new tide of 'domestic reform,' the American mother was placed under the sternest pressure. She was to give up wealth, frivolity, and "fashion," to conquer weaknesses and ailments, sloth and insensitivity, and acquire a discipline and knowledge preparing her for a great calling. The reason was simple enough: the mother was the obvious source of everything that would save or damn the child; the historical and spiritual destiny of American lay in her hands. Her own states of mind, body and soul were of the utmost importance. The 'new mother's' place was in the home as the most powerful figure affecting American society.[12]

The paradox of the struggle between the sacredness of home and the equal importance of school, as Wishy saw it, lay in the question of responsibility. With so much power centered in the home, the teacher who was charged with enlightening pupils both intellectually and morally seemed to have little or no power to make demands upon the students. A cooperative resolution to this problem was never reached.

Added to the struggle between home and school for primary responsibility in the area of socialization were the philosophical complications of religious versus secular training, and battles over pedagogical technique or approach. The first problem was partially resolved by the adoption of a civic religion, chiefly the constant and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

abiding expression of American civilization. (The secular religion of nineteenth century America was patriotism.)

> These conceptions of the nation and of its history thus strengthened and supplemented the ideas of individual destiny that parents and teachers were urged to instill in the child. America was the moral individual written large.[13]

On the pedagogical side it was more difficult to reach a consensus. The battle between classical education at home as opposed to the more modern approach of contemporary educators who taught in the school touched off an argument which, even today, remains unresolved. As late as 1879, Mrs. H. W. Beecher commenting on quality of education wrote:

> We have no doubt that children educated at home, under very favorable auspices, are more dedicated-minded, have more refined manners, and are less passionate and unruly than those who are made to 'rough it' with a large number of children of every variety of disposition.[14]

Despite conflicts between educators and parents over the content of education there seemed to be a general acceptance of the Lockeian concept that play was beneficial, healthful and necessary for children.

> If there is anything in life that a child requires as much as food and air, it is a certain amount of healthful exercise. . . .It is a child's prerogative as well as pleasure to frisk and frolic in the open air, and out of the very dirt to gain health.[15]

An 1865 publication, The Boy's Own Toy-Maker, a practical guide published for boys went so far as to equate toys and play with the basic rudiments of man's learning and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

potential for greatness.

> The boyish days of many of the great men who have enlightened the world by their discoveries and inventions have been remarkable for the practical bias their minds have taken. . . . The great Sir Isaac Newton was the first to introduce the paper-kite, when a little school-boy at Grantham. . . . Whoever would be a great inventor to the benefit of humanity must begin to learn common things in very early life. . .[16]

Household manuals and periodicals prescribed activities for both indoor and outdoor play. The Beecher sisters, in The American Woman's Home, encouraged outdoor activities, especially those that were didactic or that taught a moral lesson. For example, gardening was considered a very acceptable pastime because it often led to the development of many useful habits.

> Early rising would, in many cases, be thus secured; and if they were required to keep their walks and borders free from rubbish, habits of order and neatness would be induced. Benevolent and social feeling could also be cultivated, by influencing children to share their fruits and flowers with friends and neighbors . . .[17]

Indoor games and pastimes were designed to teach children and, of course, encouraged a quieter, more sedentary type of play. Some card and board games promoted moral virtues. "Newton's New Game of Virtue Rewarded and Vice Punished for the Amusement of Youth of Both Sexes" [London, 1818] contained a packaging advertisement that read "It is designed with a View to promote the progressive Improvement of the Juvenile Mind, and to deter them from

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pursuing the dangerous Pathes [sic] of Vice."[18] Virtues inculcated by paper dolls and toys were those which "when they are not abused, exercise ingenuity, patience and perseverance . . . as well as quiet amusement for stormy days."[19] Play had, obviously, by the nineteenth century become a recognized and accepted part of the child's daily routine.

As an intellectual tool, the concept of play was just beginning to be discovered and debated in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Educators, anthropologists, and psychologists began to recognize, isolate and evaluate play. One of the earliest educators to re-evaluate play was Heinrich Pestalozzi, a Swiss teacher whose ideas became the basis of modern education. He rejected traditional, classic education in favor of a learning process based on sense perception or anschaung. The child did not learn by rote, rather by "a face-to-face experience of the realities of the universe, whether these realities are minerals, plants, animals, mental or moral phenomena, historical persons or events, or what not."[20] "Things before words" became the motto of Pestalozzian supporters.

A disciple of Pestalozzi, Friederich Froebel endorsed his teacher's notions about play and introduced a few more specific ideas concerning playthings. He defined

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the stages of development which Pestalozzi had left undefined, writing of the nursling, the child, and the boyhood stages of childhood. Froebel was particularly interested in the middle period, the child-stage from two to seven years, and was perhaps best known for his contributions to the American kindergarten movement. Like Pestalozzi, Froebel acknowledged the importance of both active and intellectual play. Gymnastics and exercise were encouraged and Froebel introduced a special kind of toy--the "Gifts." Much like building blocks, the "Gifts" were given to the child over a period of time to encourage both cognitive and motor development.

> It is clear that the use of such objects may serve as an admirable introduction to mathematical, artistic, and other realms. Their applications, in fact, are almost countless. The Frobelians also lay stress, . . . upon such occupations as clay modelling and cardboard modelling, paper folding, wood carving, brushwork in colour, plaiting, and wax or cork work with sticks. . . . The 'gifts' must precede the 'occupations,' in accordance with the principle that the human mind must, generally speaking, be fed before it can be very successfully exercised.[21]

Both Pestalozzi and Froebel, although cognizant of psychological theories of human development, were essentially pragmatic in their ideas and attitudes about play. Both taught in the classroom and were no doubt aware of limitations and individuals differences among children.

On the purely theoretical level, the newly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

developing disciplines of psychology and anthropology also attempted to explain how and where play fit into an entire cultural system, and furthermore what play could say about the values and morals of a particular group. As early as the 1870s, Herbert Spencer (1873) and Hermann Schiller (1875) advanced the surplus energy theory. They believed play was a way of using excess energy which existed "because the young are freed from the business of self-preservation through the actions of their parents".[22] Conversely the relaxation theory proposed by Moritz Lazarus (1883) and George T. W. Patrick (1916) saw play as regenerative. It replenished energy which had been expended during work time.

Evolutionary ideas also influenced views about play. In the late nineteenth century, the theories of Charles Darwin began to exert an influence on social science disciplines. Supporters of evolutionism in anthropology believed that culture evolved in stages, from the simple to the complex. Similarities among cultures could be accounted for by the "psychic" unity of mankind. According to the pre-exercise theory, expounded by Carl Groos (1898) and others, play was "the product of emerging instincts, something that fixes these instincts and exercises them in preparation for their maturation time."[23] Thus a child who cuddled a stuffed animal or doll

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

was demonstrating the first sign of parental love and nurture.

Later works by modern twentieth century researchers, notably Erik Erikson expanded this idea with more Freudian interpretations. In his studies, Erikson stresses the growth-enhancing, as opposed to anxiety-reducing, qualities of play. In Childhood and Society (1963), he suggested that "the child's play is the infantile form of the human ability to deal with experience by creating model situations and to master reality by experiment and planning."[24]

One of the most important Darwinian-based concepts following Groos, was advanced in 1904 by G. Stanley Hall, a noted American psychologist who was best known for his pioneering work on adolescence. In The Psychology of Adolescence, Hall advanced the recapitulation theory that the childhood years were nothing more than the reliving of man's evolutionary past up to and through present day civilized man. He wrote:

> The child revels in savagery, and if its tribal, predatory, hunting, fishing, fighting, roving, idle, playing proclivites could be indulged . . . they could conceivably be so organized and directed as to be far more humanistic and liberal than all that the best modern school can provide. . . . These nativistic and more or less feral instincts can and should be fed and formed. The deep and strong cravings in the individual to revive an ancestral experience and occupations of the race

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> can and must be met. . . . The teacher's art should so vivify all that the resources of literature, tradition, history can supply which represents the crude, rank virtues of the world's childhood that, with his almost visual imagination, reinforced his psychonomic reacpitulatory impulses the child can enter upon his full heritage, live out each stage of his life to the fullest, and realize in himself all it manifold tendencies.[25]

Modern trends in play theory have focused on infantile dynamics theories and the psychoanalytic or Freudian tradition. Freud extensively used play in psychoanalysis and found it useful for the fantasy behavior enacted by children under treatment, "in fact he defined play as fantasy woven around real objects.[26]

Perhaps the most influential of contemporary writers on the subject of play is Jean Piaget, a French psychologist, who uses the combined theoretical and practical approaches of his professional predecessors. Piaget views play as the outcome of several levels or stages of thinking through which the child must pass on its way to becoming an adult. He identifies several categories of play: practice play, symbolic play, and games with rules. The first of these is merely repetition of developing motor skills; the second, enactments or actions which denote a growing recognition of some idea or concept; and the third, the final stage of child play before adulthood. With maturity, Piaget believes, play ends. In the recent works of Brian Sutton-Smith, this point has been

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

debated. Sutton-Smith writes:

> Play . . . continues as games on the one hand and as an internalized expressive system (fantasy) on the other. Adult counterparts to child's play are the daydreams and ruminations that occupy so much of waking time.[27]

After summarizing the development of educational, anthropological and psychological theories of play, one must still consider the question of the role actually filled by play in the life of the child. It has been viewed by some as part of the evolutionary process, as a physiological restorative, or a daily enactment of sublimated desires.

Play is the main occupation of the child, contributing both to its own development and to that of society. For children there are four main areas of growth: physical, cognitive, emotional and social. Improved perceptual-motor coordination and physical development are among the most obvious benefits of play aiding not only in gross development but in the fine tuning of motor skills as well.

The child's ability to perceive and comprehend his universe intellectually comes with those kinds of play which encourage cognitive development. For example, the baby who perceives tickling as a form of attack will realize after repeated experience that these are only mock

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

attacks. "With games like tickle-tickle and peek-a-boo, the child begins to grasp the concept of pretend, the notion that things are not always what they seem."[28] Dr. Catherine Garvey writes: "What we see in play is not just wagons and soldiers, teacups and saucers, but the child's conception of the world, his grasp of morals, manners, sex roles, language."[29]

Emotional development also occurs through play which helps the child to cope with life and resolve inner conflicts. In a psychoanalytical sense, Freud and Erikson viewed play as a way of expressing or releasing pent up anger and frustration. In an article entitled "Models of Children's Play," Lili Pellec defines about a dozen examples of the types of play Freud and Erikson described. In one of these models called "Choice Based on Love, Admiration," the child "pretends to be some one whom he admires and loves and whom he would like to resemble."[30] Another model called "Happy Ending" is one which the child duplicates or repeats a former experience, but reverses the ending from unhappy to happy.[31]

The fourth area in which play may contribute to a child's development is that of socialization. Play teaches cooperation, as well as competition.

> Children learn about struggling toward an arbitrary goal, about rules, about aggression, about team

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> spirit, and about the joy of winning and the misery of losing. Play also helps children to understand all sorts of complex social concepts such as power relationships, hierarchies, social status and roles.[32]

More important, as play develops the child socially, society benefits by gaining an individual who has been acculturated to mores and norms of that particular group. Johan Huizinga thought of play not so much "as a separate process which gives rise to culture, but rather culture is thought of play not so much "as a separate process which gives rise to culture, but rather culture is thought to contain, at least to some extent, the characteristics of play."[33] Furthermore, as Brian Sutton-Smith points out, play and culture exist in a dialectical relationship with one another.

> If play is left unchecked or uncontrolled by culture, it may threaten the stability of culture; if culture provides excessive rewards for play, it may threaten the existence of play. Within this model, than, too much play would lead to cultural instability, and too little play would lead to cultural stagnation.[34]

It becomes apparent then, that play vitally affects both the individual and his culture. While considered the "devil's workshop" only a few centuries ago, play since the nineteenth century has been recognized as an important and intrinsic part of childhood, if not of all human life.

A significant part of the play process is the tool or prop used by the child--the toy. The Oxford English

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dictionary defines toys as "material objects for children or others to play with (often an imitation of some familiar object); a plaything; also, something contrived for amusement rather than practical use."[35] Toys function on a variety of levels, as props for games, as objects of familiarity and comfort, as vehicles for social interactions with other children, as playthings for solitary times, and as teaching tools. These functions tend to take on different meanings according to prevailing interpretations of education and play, and depend on who is analyzing the toy or the play situation. An elementary school teacher, for example, may view doll play in a very different manner from a psychiatrist who has attempted to gain symbolic meaning from such activities.

Within the context of this thesis, there have been two particularly important studies of toys in their relationship to theories of play and childhood development. Both deal with doll play. The first, A Study of Dolls, by A. Caswell Ellis and G. Stanley Hall was done in 1896 and sheds some light on attitudes and ideas about play at that time, as well as providing informative and interesting raw data and interview material not available elsewhere. The second work done in 1961 by Brian Sutton-Smith and B. G. Rosenberg surveyed sixty years of change in the play preferences of American children. Based

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

on four studies done in various geographic areas between 1896 and 1959, the survey found some startling changes had occurred in the play of American youth.

Ellis and Hall based their results upon the questionnaire findings of a relatively small group, 845 children and adults. While their conclusions are therefore limited, they offer some interesting insights. The first questionnaire, completed by parents and teachers who had observed doll play, requested descriptions of dolls, what they were fed, how they were medically treated, their deaths, psychic attributes of dolls and their names, doll clothing and accessories, doll family and relationships, and doll discipline, hygiene and regimen. The second form filled out by children who played or had played with dolls questioned them specifically about doll play and preference. Hall and Ellis made no generalized claim on the basis of their findings but did make a few suggestions. "The rudest doll has the great advantage of stimulating the imagination by giving it more to do, than does the elaborately finished doll."[36] They felt that doll play was also a useful device in expressing the child's alter ego.

> Perhaps nothing so fully opens up the juvenile soul to the student of childhood as well as developed doll play. Here we see things which the childish instinct often tends to keep secret. . . . Thus the individuality of children sometimes is more clearly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> revealed in the characters they give their dolls than in their own traits.[37]

The traditional notion that doll play was indicative of maternal nurturing was refuted by the two researchers who found that some mothers who enjoyed their children had never played with dolls, while unmarried and childless women were quite enthusiastic about these toys. Both men concurred that doll play was educational in a variety of ways from encouraging children to sew or knit for their "babies," to reading and writing for "babies" as well.

The more recent work by Brian Sutton-Smith and B. L. Rosenberg traces the change in game and play preferences of American children. Using data collected as early as 1896, they analyzed the information on the basis of sixteen areas or types of play. Overall impressions indicated that play differences between the sexes had slowly eroded as previously sex stereotyped play became less the social norm.

> On the other hand, the finding that boy's play roles have become increasingly circumscribed with the passing of years was unexpected. Yet there is little doubt that boys have been steadily lowering their preference for games that have anything to do with girl's play. So that it is by implication much more deviant behavior for a modern boy to play at, say, Dolls, Hopscotch, Jacks, Houses, Schools, Cooking . . . than it was for a boy to play at these things in the earlier historical periods covered by these studies.[38]

This change in girl's play preferences can offer a partial explanation for the continuing decline in the popularity of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

both dolls and paper dolls. The 1896 and 1898 polls of children's play preferences clearly list dolls play for girls in first place. This preference had dropped to eighth place by 1959.

These two studies were both important for the information they added to the understanding of paper doll play. Hall and Ellis' statement concerning the value of even the "rudest doll" is quite applicable to this study. Many examples of home-made paper dolls in the Waldron Collection include crudely executed examples made by juvenile hands. Some, cut from old newspapers and lacking all features of face or dress were beloved playthings--their very survival indicates that fact.[39] The next step up would include the dolls that are made of cutouts from trade catalogs. One example, includes figures cut from the New York Rubber Company catalog, which have been provided with a range of costumes, crudely cut from colored paper with little detail, except for tissue paper accents.[40] On the far end of the spectrum, but still handmade and no doubt a set of dolls which provided hours of enjoyment, were those crafted by Lily Gardiner of Boston in the late nineteenth century.[41] Miss Gardiner vividly portrayed a wealthy family of the period in this set that included Mother and Father, five little girls, an older

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sister and her fiance, a baby, the family minister, the Black butler, the Irish maid, the Black cook, the coachman, and the family dog--a Russian Wolfhound. This extensive paper family was replete with elaborately drawn and finely detailed watercolor costumes and accessories. Hall and Ellis found that paper doll families were not uncommon, and that young girls frequently created elaborate kinship networks of characters replete with well-developed personalities and quirks similar to real families. Paper doll families played an important role in socializing young girls to their future roles as wives and mothers, in addition to stimulating the imaginations of their young creators.

A second point made by Sutton Smith and Rosenberg in their study concerns the decreasing popularity of doll play in the twentieth century. No doubt, as play for girls became less prescribed and more ambiguous, it was natural for interest in doll play to wane. In the mid-twentieth century, this fact combined with the advent of plastic technology which enabled consumers to purchase cheap, plastic dolls, all but sounded the death knell for paper dolls. Few children born after 1965 played with paper dolls, and only in the last six or seven years have they been revived, more as a sentimental reminder of the past

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

geared towards an older, adult audience.

In studying the history of toys, it becomes apparent that these objects were not always intended for the sole amusement of children. In fact, as in the case of paper dolls, what began as a pastime for adults filtered down to become part of the child's world of play. In his work on the history of childhood, Phillipe Aries noted that both toys and games "originated in that spirit of emulation which induces children to imitate adult processes while reducing them to their own scale."[42] John Earle, a seventeenth century poet and cleric aptly observed:

> A child is a Man in small Letter. . .We laugh at his foolish sports, but his game is our earnest; and his drums, rattles, and hobby-horse but the Emblems and making of man's business.[43]

The relationship between the diversions of adult and child are inextricably bound, and as Aries notes, the significant point

> which needs to be emphasized is the abandonment of these games by the adults of the upper classes and their survival among both the lower classes and the children of the upper classes.[44]

In addition, it is important to remember that most toys are, first and foremost, objects created by adults to sell to other adults for children. They are, therefore, tools for understanding the social and cultural values of adults at a given time, as well as their expectations for their children. By organizing play and selecting

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

appropriate toys for youngsters, the adult insures himself a certain amount of power or control over the socialization of the next generation.

Some toys however have always escaped the control of adults. Much of children's play is self-generated and involves the creation of handmade or vernacular toys by the players themselves. Simple paper dolls of cut newspaper, or guns made of sticks--symbolic only in many instances--fulfill the play needs of children, and are passed in a kind of oral tradition from one generation to another. On the opposite end of the scale are the finely designed and built toys which have been made for play, but conceived and crafted by adults. The most elaborate example of this might be Queen Mary's dollhouse. Finally, there is the middle ground which consists of mass produced or "builder crafted" toys which are representative of the popular needs of a mass market. Since paper dolls have always been widely used in all three of these levels, examining them permits one to observe many of the aforementioned changes: the transition from adult toy to children's toy; the evolution of mass produced or "builder" toys; and the similarities between vernacular and high end objects.

European origins of paper toys may be traced back

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

as far as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Made of paper bodies and decorated with expensive material and trims, these toys were intended primarily for fashionable, upper class adults. They were handmade diversions, craft projects for the idle hours of the well-to-do. Related to stump work, a term used to describe the padded applique needlework of the period, the earliest examples were made with padded physical features, decorated by embroidery, fine fabrics and even human hair. As this process evolved, paper bodies became more common.

> First the body was cut out of stiff, heavy paper, providing the contour for the dress it was to wear. Then the fabric selected for the costume was glued in drapes or folds upon the paper dummy, and trimmed according to the makers' whims with lace and metallic fringe. Finally the exposed parts of the body, face and hands and also legs and feet if bare, were painted in opaque water colors on pieces of vellum cut in the proper shapes, inserted in their places and fastened down with glue.[45]

One of these types of paper dolls is found in the Waldron Collection, sadly lacking its head and body, but with its chenille embroidered dress and trim still intact. These objects were far too sophisticated and elaborately done to be the works or playthings of children, but they do provide the first example of adult paper toys which eventually became standard playthings for children.

The eighteenth century witnessed the development of paper dolls in several new forms. One of the most popular

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

was the Pantin or jumping-jack. Originally for adult amusement, some of the most elaborate came from the courts of France. They were flat figures, swivel jointed, and operated by a string or strings which when pulled caused the figure to dance or jump about. Some pantins were caricatures of well-known public figures. The toy, though, had little appeal outside of France, particularly in England, because as noted toy historian Constance King writes:

> The Pantin was never popular with the more sober English aristocracy, who considered it strictly a child's toy, and even as a toy it does not appear to have been as popular as it was in France. There is a belief that the Pantins lost their popularity in France after the law intervened to prohibit their use, as they were believed to excite women and cause them to give birth to crippled children, though in fact it is more likely that the adults became bored with the craze, and the Pantin reverted to its place as a child's toy.[46]

Nonetheless, the Pantin persisted and as late as the nineteenth century was still being produced and exported from France. The letterbook of Lewis Page, a New York toyman, records orders from a French exporter between 1829 and 1833 for "dancing Jacks painted," "wood dancing Jacks," and "caracatures [sic] Common and comical."[47]

The paper theatre represented another popular type of eighteenth century paper toy. English in design and conception, the paper theatre evolved from the satiric prints of the artist Robert Dighton. Dighton was among the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

first to print pictures of theatre actors and actresses, to meet the demands of an adult market. Within a decade, the ideas of illustrating several actors, including costume changes, sets and a stage gave birth to a popular new pastime. The inclusion of the playbook or script made the package complete. By the end of the century, paper theatres had become a well loved part of many children's toychests.[48]

At the same time that toy theatres began to appear, the British introduced one of the first paper dolls. An article in the German fashion magazine Journalen der Moden of 1791 noted:

> A new and very pretty invention is the so-called English doll which we have lately received from London. It is properly a toy for little girls, but it is so pleasing and tasteful that mothers and grown women will likely also want to play with it, the more since good or bad taste in dress or coiffure can be observed and, so to speak, studied. It is about 8 inches high, has simply curled hair, and is dressed in underclothes and corset. With it go six sets of tastefully designed dresses and head dresses.[49]

This "fashion" paper doll was the forerunner of a whole genre of paper dolls that were to follow. Although, over the years, many variations on the fashion doll evolved, a major appeal through all time has been the lavishness of the costumes and the opportunity for dressing and undressing the dolls. The French rapidly adopted the fashion dolls as dress mannequins in coutourier shops.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Some of the earliest and most elaborately detailed dolls in the Waldron Collection are the Psyche figure sets which include very fashionable costumes and coiffures. While many of these may have been intended for adult uses and entertainment, one set from the 1820s, "La Psyche ou La Petit Magasin de Modes," indicates that it found its way into young hands. This elaborate set, features a single doll with her own dressing mirror and almost a dozen elaborately drawn and colored costumes and hats. The very fashionable outfits range from daywear to evening wear and show in detail the appropriate types of accessories and accents needed to complete each ensemble. On the box is a notation which reads:

> This paper doll was bought over from France by Mrs. Bery Welles in 1822 as a present to her little daughter, Georgianna, my dear Mother. Georgianna Welles Sargent[50]

In the collection at Winterthur, this is one of the earliest examples of paper dolls in America. It also provides evidence of an adult amusement passing from adult favor to become the toy of a child.

By the early nineteenth century, as Locke's ideas on play became more accepted, a market for children's goods rapidly developed. More enlightened ideas about the nature of children and childrearing began to take hold, as old habits gave way to a more sympathetic and humanistic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

approach to the care and education of youngsters. Toys during this early nineteenth century period were, for the most part, didactic in intent, but designed to make learning a pleasurable and entertaining process. The most popular paper dolls during this time, were the "toy books" which consisted of a paper doll accompanied by a morally didactic story book. The doll and numerous costumes illustrated the events described in the text. Printing techniques made production of these ornate book and doll sets quite expensive and therefore limited their appeal.

The earliest of the toy books was printed in England and was designed to combine "Instruction with Amusement." S. & J. Fuller, the London publisher, began in 1810 printing and selling these sets, of which "Little Fanny" is perhaps the most notable example of this genre. Fanny was a child from fairly well-to-do circumstances who disobeyed her mother, and was "punished" by a series of misadventures until rescued from a life of penury and privation by her beloved parent. Fanny had learned her "lesson":

> Once more the little Fanny you must see, Since she has return'd to what she ought to be; She's no longer idle, proud, or vain Eager her own opinion to maintain; But pious, modest, diligent and mild, Belov'd by all, a good and happy child.[51]

Didacticism or moral instruction was the primary literary style and emphasis of children's literature and play. The virtues of obedience, humility, piety, and responsibility

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

were all stressed in games and books, and a tale like "Little Fanny" was thought to be a particularly palatable way to express these ideas. The combined paper doll and story book was successful not only in England, but on the continent and in America as well. Die Kleine Fanny was published in Germany shortly after its English predecessor, and Nouveaux Contes pour les Enfans Phebe was the 1817 French response to Fuller's Phoebe, the Cottage Maid published in 1811. The first pirated American version of Little Fanny was not published until 1854 in Boston by Crosby, Nichols and Company, indicating the popularity of the story and the traditional persistence of children's toys.

Produced at the same time as the toy books, and equally popular, were the fashion paper dolls. The English called these dolls "Metamorphosis." They featured fashionable costumes and coifs, which were often hand painted and decorated. One of these English dolls sported a set of clothing that included historic dress, religious garb, and ethnic costumes.[52] Another published set, reflecting a new interest in ethnic dress, was done by R. Ackermann at his "Repository of Arts" and was entitled "Marriage Costumes of Various Nations." An even more interesting fashion doll was "The Protean Figure" done by S. & J. Fuller in 1811. This was a male doll with costumes

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that included walking dress, naval uniform, monks habit, turkish costume, Quakers habit, mourning suit, German Hussar uniform and several others. "Protean Figure," a hand colored etching, came in a leather case that housed the doll and its elaborate dress. This is the first fashion doll which featured masculine costume. One author has written of the doll:

> In every respect it has a degree of niceness that satisfies adult taste. A rather sophisticated and altogether lovely toy, it may well have been aimed at an adult market, male or female, as a good many paper dolls have been.[53]

In America, imported paper dolls made their way into toy shops and book stores almost as soon as they had been published abroad. However, commercially the production of paper dolls on a mass scale did not become possible until the middle of the nineteenth century. Technological changes, combined with the philosophical and educational changes towards children discussed earlier in this paper, created a market in America that began to expand in the 1860s. Older methods of printing which involved a great deal of hand work, like wood block engraving were aided by the invention of stereotyping and electrotyping. Notations on paper doll folders, especially those produced in New York by the McLoughlin Brothers, indicate that a good portion of their work was, by the 1860s, being stereotyped or electrotyped, a printing process that made possible

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

large volume printing. In simple terms, it became possible to duplicate in metal plate form a hand-engraved wooden block. This was a major advance for the printing industry on several levels. First, metal plates were far more durable for printing thousands of times than were the wood blocks which wore down or warped over successive years of imprints. Second, the use of duplicated metal plates relieved the printer of the fear that a block would crack or break during an important printing. The wood engravings were kept as prototypes from which future generations of stereotypes and electrotypes could be made. Third, over a long period of use, metal plates, especially electrotypes, kept a clean, crisp line unlike wood blocks which abraded and lost their freshness. Companies, like McLoughlin of New York had huge inventories of wooden blocks which could be used again and again to create paper dolls, toy books, and games.

Another technical process which was of great benefit to American printers and toymakers was chromolithography. Prior to the development of this printing method, color in printed material was done laboriously by hand. Chromolithography, invented by Alois Senefelder in the 1790s, was brought to America by a Prussian immigrant Louis Prang. By 1856, Prang was on his way to becoming a successful printer who specialized in prints, album cards,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

greeting cards, juvenile toys and toy books. These techniques, adapted by children's publishers like the McLoughlins and J. G. Chandler enhanced quick and colorful production of books and paper toys. Color printing was no longer done only by hand; it had become a viable mechanical process.

The trend toward power production in the publishing business was aided by simultaneous developments in paper science and technology. The development of wood-pulp paper in rolls, rather than sheets facilitated rapid printing. Inks of higher quality came into standard production taking the guess work out of the home-made preparations of the past.[54] Literally hundreds of patents for all aspects of the printing industry were taken out during the first half of the nineteenth century.[55]

These technological advances made possible a proliferation of paper dolls in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. The children's book industries expanded their lines to take advantage of the profits from sales of paper dolls and toys. Cheap production costs were passed on to the consumer, thus making it possible for children of all economic levels to play with paper playthings.[56] Paper dolls and toys appeared regularly in toyshops and also as special newspaper and magazine

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

supplements. Advertisers quickly became aware of this trend and used paper dolls to promote every kind of product from mincemeat to stove polish. And, of course, children continued to make their own dolls, inspired by their own imaginative resources and examples around them.

By the 1860s, there was a noticeable decline in the didactic message of paper dolls and they had, for the most part, become purely entertaining. However, since the toy market was still one in which adult control and opinion prevailed, key marketing expressions or phrases still centered upon the idea of educational play, whether or not the product was deserving of such a title. One sermonette found on the back of a game stated: "Children require amusement, and to furnish them such as shall be not only entertaining but educational and elevating, requires no mean order of talent. . ."[57] This toy probably appealed more to children because of the colorful playing pieces rather than the intellectual content. Nonetheless, the promise of children learning through play seemed to please parents at the time, and is a good indicator of adult opinion that play had to accomplish something, and was not in and of itself intrinsically valuable or significant.

Education was always promoted as an added value to the inexpensive paper doll. The Rag-Bag dolls encouraged

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

creative play, at least according to the package which read:

> How to Dress the Dolls. Use any kind of goods. Select a straight edge for bottom hem--shove the rest thru the cuts which will shape the frock. Push a piece of ribbon thru cuts each side of legs for stockings. Use pieces of ribbon for hat and cap bows, sashes etc. which will complete the Rag Bag Doll. Instruction and Amusement. Teach the child to think. Endless enjoyment with discarded finery.[58]

"Reely Trooly Dolls" were advertised in a similar manner as: "The dolls that educate and amuse because the children make them."[59] A desire to educate and amuse was fairly congruent with prevailing ideas on play and education. Although men like Froebel had attempted to introduce abstract shapes and forms into children's play, they had never supplanted or exceeded the popularity of realistic doll play. Stanley Hall in his 1896 study of dolls wrote:

> The educational value of dolls is enormous, and the protest of this paper is against the longer neglect of it. It educates the heart and will, even more than the intellect and to learn how to control and apply it, will be to discover a new instrument in education of the very highest potency. . . . Many children learn to sew, knit and do millinery work, observe and design costumes, acquire taste in color and even prepare food for the benefit of the doll. Children who are indifferent to reading for themselves sometimes read to their doll and learn things they would not otherwise do in order to teach it or are clean to be like it.[60]

Besides educating and amusing children, paper dolls assisted in the important task of socialization--preparing youngsters for their future roles in life. In the first place, they defined male and female norms through

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

illustration, and through the manner in which they subtly trained the child to emulate qualities which society considered desirable and important at the time. The paper dolls for boys were therefore quite different than the ones for girls. Boy dolls were shown hunting, sailing and playing at active games, typical of the kinds of activities boys generally enjoyed. The paper toys that boys played with, generally for rainy day or sick play, reflected social expectations which were held for male children. Most of these dolls were actually paper soldiers, or dioramas illustrating military battle or maneuvers, scenes which illustrated and subliminally expressed the virtues of bravery, heroism, aggressiveness, and assertiveness.

Girls were pictured in passive situations, engaged in quiet activities like knitting, sewing or doing needlepoint. An article in the March, 1912 issue of Ladies Home Journal on the "real value of dolls" began with the statement: "A doll brings out a great deal of latent womanliness in a little girl."[61] Indeed, the dolls which were perfectly coiffed and attired, the baby paper dolls, and sets like "The Young ladies School" or "The Industrious Lady" all illustrated the values and virtues which society considered important in the nineteenth century woman.[62]

Not only did paper dolls and toys serve as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

socializers of sexual and social mores and customs, but they also provided models of social and material success to which middle class children could aspire. Within paper dolls and toys there existed a "hidden agenda" which on a subliminal, if not unconscious level, promoted social and material success. Most paper doll publishers created paper dolls that were embued with moral and material goodness and success. These "good" dolls were well dressed and lived comfortable lives surrounded by furniture, toys, clothes, and other items of prosperity.

In early and mid-nineteenth century paper dolls, the very presence of large wardrobes of ten or more dresses and accessories to coordinate with these costumes certainly provided models for material aspiration and possession. More recent expression of this could be seen in "The Companion Paper Doll" published as a monthly series in Woman's Home Companion during the 1920's.[63] Each month, Margery May appeared with several new costumes or toys and a new bit of commentary for her juvenile readers. Margery's life was perfect. In the first month of her publication (February 1920), she told her young friends: "I live in a big, red brick house in the city, and I have just the jolliest, nicest family a little girl could want. . . ."[64] Margery's polite, upper-middle class home was never a place of sorrow, misery or unhappiness, nor did she

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ever lack for toys, clothes or friends. Her life was moral and upright, and her goodness, both spiritual and material influenced all who came in contact with her. In meeting her new friend Marie Louise (August 1920), a young French child, Margery told her young audience: "The pretty dresses here were bought for Marie Louise to make her look like a real American girl, just like you."[65] Not only does the assert the greatness of Margery May's American nationality by insisting that Marie Louise "look American," but also reinforces the need in young reader's minds that they too, should own clothes similar to those purchased for the foreign child.

In addition to the clothes and clothing accessories to which children could aspire, several companies, both American and foreign, published paper houses or furniture which gave children a whole new range of items to wish for. These paper doll's rooms and houses provided children with guidance in tastefully furnishing one's domicile, in addition to whetting their young appetites for things to buy by training them to be good little consumers. Probably the most well-known American series was produced by McLoughlin Brothers during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.[66] The parlor and dining room sets guided youngsters in selecting socially appropriate household goods. The parlor contained a Turkish sofa,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

upholstered chairs, a screen, a desk, a piano, a lamp, a mirror, a vase, a letter holder and many other household ornaments and accessories all in the latest style. The McLoughlin dining room contained a table and chairs, china cabinet, sofa, and a wide variety of room ornaments. All these items could be cut from paper and folded to make three dimensional furniture. A German paper doll house called Das Puppenhaus worked on a slightly different principle.[67] Room walls were colorfully lithographed in a book format with slits cut in each wall picture. A huge array of smaller pieces of furniture and accessories could be mixed and matched in the various rooms by inserting them into the slots provided in each wall elevation.

On a more creative level, Anson D. F. Randolph of New York, published in 1857 a book entitled Paper Doll's Furniture: How To Make It subtitled "How to Spend a Cheerful Rainy Day." Not only does this book provide modern readers with an idea of what constituted appropriate furnishings for the Victorian home (doll's home at least), but the text is quite useful for the information it imparted to its young readers on how to run a household, or certainly how one should aspire to run one's home.

> You must now furnish your kitchen, as your mamma will probably tell you all good housekeepers do, at first; and I will give you a list of articles necessary to make your kitchen a comfortable place for Bridget, your paper doll servant, to work in.[68]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Children received the subliminal message that aspiration to certain material comforts was good, as was support of the institution of servitude. In fact, a comfortable home and servants to assist in running it, were assumed requisites for one's future lifestyle.

Another quote in the same book is laden with information on the proper way in which dinner was to be served, and on the manner in which one's home was to be arranged to facilitate such service. All of this is communicated in the directions for making a paper doll's butler's tray.

> Now I am going to give you a design for the Butler's Tray. A Butler's Tray is intended to place the soiled dishes upon after the removal of the first course; but if you prefer, and as your dining room is to communicate with the kitchen, Bridget could remove the dishes after the first course directly to the kitchen, and the dessert could be nicely arranged upon the Butler's Tray, before the ringing of the dinner bell.[69]

Here, paper toys were used to teach valued social customs as well as guidance for purchasing necessary household goods.

On a darker note, paper dolls and toys also served to assert white American middle class supremacy through both written and pictorial means. Ethnic slurs and stereotypical imagery was not uncommon to paper toys and other types of toys as well. Mid and late-nineteenth

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

century America was the America of manifest destiny and of conspicuous consumption. Society was expanding at an unprecedented rate both socially and technologically, and the United State was becoming a major world power. Interest in other nations was apparent in literary sources, and in 1857, Anson D. F. Randolph of New York brought this interest down to the children's world by means of a paper doll published with sixteen national costumes. She was accompanied by an instruction book which provided commentary about each nation represented. Called "National Costumes: An Elegant and Instructive Amusement/With a Description of the Countries Where These Dresses Are Worn," this set of dolls provided a less than flattering look at several foreign countries. Many of the comments reflect a rather xenophobic feeling towards foreigners which became a marked part of American society during the late nineteenth century when thousands of immigrants poured into this country. Some of the more volatile and caustic comments in this series included:

> The Hungarian nobles are very rich and oppress the poor who live upon their lands. . . . The Italians of the lower classes are generally idle, ignorant and superstitious. . . . The Greeks are a gay, thoughtless uncultivated people. The women are not handsome, but fond of dress, and uneducated.[70]

This set is by far the worst of its kind. Later sets like Raphael Tuck's "Children of Many Lands" or "Costumes of All Nations" by Singer Manufacturing (parenthetically showing

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

native women with sewing machines) were not nearly as contemptuous of foreigners.[71]

While foreigners certainly took verbal and pictorial abuse, Black Americans were the subject of a sustained assault. Manufacturers of paper toys repeated gross caricatures of black physiognomy including prominent lips, large noses and curly hair.[72] They were shown in stereotypical poses and jobs--the ubiquitous pickaninny in overalls next to the watermelon patch.[73] Even the paper tableau representation of Uncle Tom's Cabin in the Boston Globe of January 1, 1896 presented this same type of imagery.[74] Caricatures or stereotypes of Blacks were slow to die, and persisted well into this century. Children's paper toys, as well as iron and metal toys bore the distorted images of Blacks, impressing upon white children their own social and moral supremacy.

Paper dolls and toys also served as political and patriotic socializers. This fact is manifested not only in the thousands of paper soldiers produced mainly for boys, but also in weekly supplements which appeared in Sunday newspapers like the Boston Globe in the late 1890s. The Globe included as supplements many battle scenes and paper dolls of famous soldiers, including a sailor from the U.S.S. Boston, Washington Crossing the Delaware, five

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

tableaux of famous American battle scenes of the past, and a special supplement of Admiral Dewey and his uniforms.[75] Appearing in the late 19th century at a time when America was using military power to her advantage, these toys certainly promoted the idea that military service was a moral responsibility in spreading the American way of life throughout the world.

During World War I, The Delineator, a monthly magazine printed several sentimental and patriotically stirring paper dolls which were, no doubt, designed to increase awareness in children of patriotic loyalty and duty to America., particularly during war time. The first toy, printed in January 1918, was called "With an Ambulance on the Firing Line." This set enabled children to assemble a war scene featuring an injured soldier, a nurse, a jeep, and a complete series of medical supplies.[76] Another doll which appeared in May 1918, "Tommy Atkins on Furlough," provided youngsters with a paper doll soldier and the paper doll bride he came home to marry while on leave.[77]

By the twentieth century, paper dolls were a well entrenched part of most toy chests. By and large, the educational component of these toys had long since given way to entertainment. Paper dolls, for many young girls, between 1900 and 1950 reinforced another popular pastime,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

that of going to the movies. With the exception of a few nineteenth century examples, like Tom Thumb and Jenny Lind, few early paper dolls were made to represent actual people. But the advent of cinema, with the wide exposure offered movie stars, made them a likely subject for children's dolls and toys. By 1920, American girls could buy Mary Pickford, Mary Miles Minter, Lila Lee, Charlie Chaplin, and Buster Brown and Tige in paper doll forms.[78] Like the earlier fashion dolls, these sets came with lavish wardrobes. Young girls were no doubt attracted to the perceived glamour of life in Hollywood, and this was made even more real for them by having their own movie star doll to dress and undress.

Glamour for young girls, on a juvenile level, was best illustrated in a series done by American Colortype Company of Chicago between 1920 and 1929. Reflecting the changing values of the Flapper era, these sets featured paper dolls which looked like children, but had extremely adult clothing. For example, "Little Miss-Up-To-Date" was the proud owner of an extremely revealing Grecian gown.[79] Likewise, her companion dolls, "Little Alice-Busy-Bee: A Stylish Dressing Doll" and "Little Betty-Gad-About: A Classy Dressing Doll" came with very stylish frocks and accessories ranging from a tennis dress to evening

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

gowns.[80] It is doubtful that American girls of the 1920s actually dressed in the type of clothing seen in sets like these, but as in the past, these toys served to socialize and train the upcoming generation to the standards subscribed to by adults of the period.

As discussed earlier, by 1960 paper dolls had all but disappeared from the market place. The advent of inexpensive plastic dolls, and the range of clothes and accessories available for them forced paper dolls out of the market for a time. Recently, they have started making a comeback, first on the adult level where humorous and satirical dolls became popular in the 1970s. On the market in the past ten years have been sets which poked fun at Ronald and Nancy Reagen, Prince Charles and Princess Diana, and one set which even caricatured the guests at an artsy Manhattan cocktail party. Adult interest has also been piqued by reprints of nostalgic old favorites, many of them magazine dolls from the 20s, 30s, and 40s, like Lettie Lane, Betty Bonnet, and the Kewpies. Of course, as these toys make inroads on the adult market, they once again filter down to become part of the child's world of play.

This paper has attempted to deal with the particular issue of paper doll play as it reflected certain trends in education, psychology and technology. Certainly, the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

incredible popularity of these toys in the nineteenth and early twentieth century would not have been possible without the intersection of social changes and technology. A world without play would have precluded toys, so the changes brought about by Locke, Froebel and others helped on a popular level to provide an atmosphere for play by shaping adult beliefs. The development of new technologies which aided quick, inexpensive production of paper toys was another needed element. The third key element needed to bring about the popular success of paper dolls and toys was the idea or concept for these types of items. Remaining material evidence would suggest that the concept for paper dolls began on an adult level, as the pastimes of fairly well-to-do individuals. Early costume dolls and pantins were also geared towards and adult audience, but gradually these toys lost their novelty with the adult market. Their use by children occurred when these toys dropped from adult favor and became readily available thanks to new production techniques. Co-existing all along with the mass-produced toys were the ones made by individuals for their own enjoyment. It would be difficult to conclude that paper dolls were solely the result of a vernacular idea made popular by printers or that printers took and idea and made it popular through saavy marketing. It is safe to say, though, that paper dolls and toys were the result of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

aforementioned social and technological changes interacting simultaneously. Finally, as with all toys, they were designed and marketed by adult to sell to other adults for children. Their spoken, as well as hidden agendas, were the tools used by the older generation to assure the success and stability of the future generation.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

NOTES

[1]E. McClung Fleming, "Artifact Study: A Proposed Model," Winterthur Portfolio Number 9, pp 153-173. E. M. Flemings's proposed model for artifact study provided inspiration for this project, making it possible to direct my thoughts and ideas in a way that ephemeral items like paper dolls took on new meaning as indicators of children's roles in society--both in economic and cultural terms. Fleming proposes two steps in his model. The first involves consideration of the artifact, a study of its history, material, construction, design and function. After this preliminary exercise, the artifact is interpreted from four different standpoints--very basic to very complex. Identification, the most basic of the operations, invokes factual description; evaluation (comparison with other similar objects) is second; cultural analysis (relationship of artifact to culture) is the third process; and finally interpretation (the object's significance to both past and present cultural systems).

[2]Philip Greven, Child Rearing Concepts, p 10.

[3]Ibid., pp 47-48.

[4]Joseph Kett, Rites of Passage, p. 23.

[5]Greven, The Protestant Temperament, p. 25.

[6]John Locke, Some Thoughts Concerning Education, p. 47.

[7]Ibid., p. 45.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[8]Philip Greven's book, The Protestant Temperament, make the point that these changing attitudes and approaches to childrearing were by no means linear. I don't mean to suggest that they were; merely that certain styles of childrearing were more popular during specific times than others. Each new theory was part of the intellectual development of an historical period, but by not means supplanted or obliterated practices of preceding generations. A modern parallel can be seen in the childrearing theories of Dr. Benjamin Spock. Not every mid-twentieth century child has been raised as a "Spock" baby, but clearly the good doctor's ideas have had a pervasive and long-lasting impact on American society.

[9]Nancy Cott, The Bonds of Womanhood, p. 64.

[10]Joseph and Laura Lyman, The Philosophy of Housekeeping, p. 370.

[11]Cott, Bonds, p. 64.

[12]Bernard Wishy, The Child and the Republic, p. 64.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Mrs. H. W. Beecher, All Around the House, p. 301.

[15]Dr. Austin, Indespensible Handbook and General Educator, p. 183

[16]E. Landells, The Boys Own Toymaker, p. vii.

[17]Catherine Beecher, The American Woman's Home, p. 295.

[18]Waldron Collection 74x438.

[19]Godey's, February 1861, p. 190.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[20]F. H. Hayword, Educational Ideas of Pestalozzi and Froebel, p. 37.

[21]Ibid., p. 71.

[22]J. B. Gilmore, "Play: A Special Behavior," Child's Play, p. 312.

[24]H. Schwartzman, Transformations, p. 148.

[25] G. Stanley Hall, The Psychology of Adolescents, p.

[26]Gilmore, "Play: A Special Behavior," Child's Play, p. 320.

[27]Herron and B. Sutton-Smith, Child's Play, p. 110.

[28]Paul Chance, Learning Through Play, p. 27.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Herron and Sutton-Smith, Child's Play, p. 110.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Chance, Learning Through Play, p. 30.

[33]J. Harris, "Beyond Huizinga," Play as Context, p. 27.

[34]Ibid., p. 31.

[35]Etymologically, the word "toy" in its English form, is quite interesting. "Toy" has been in common use since 1530 according to the Oxford English Dictionary, but once in 1300 appears in Robert of Banne as toye sb., apparently the same word as in usage from 1530 on. "It is difficult

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to conceive how such a word used in 1300 should thus disappear for two centuries, and then should all at once burst into view with a wide senses development. The etymology is equally problematic, and, in spite of current conjecture must still be considered unascertained." Admittedly, the early definition for toy was as in dalliance. Nonetheless, the term toy for plaything suffers the same retarded development. This could perhaps be indicative of a word which escaped use in high literature between 1300 and 1500. Could this then indicate the possibility of "toy" existing on a vernacular level, or that terminology associated with children was, at that time, considered of little literary importance?

[36]Ellis and Hall, A Study of Dolls, p. 134.

[37]Ibid., pp 162-163

[38]Herron and Sutton-Smith, Child's Play, p. 48.

[39]Waldon Collection, 73x319.48.

[40]Ibid.

[41]Waldon Collection, 73x319.52.

[42]Aries, Centuries of Childhood, p. 68. Those toys which often begin as amusements for sophisticated adults, are passed on to children, whereas certain types of toys and play found among the folk tend towards conservatism and remain unchanged or altered through time.

[43]John Darle, Microcosmographie quoted in Lesley Gordon's Peepshow Into Paradise, p. 15.

[44]Aries, Centuries of Childhood, p. 99.

[45]Smith, J. I. "Dressed Pictures," Antiques Magazine, V 84, p. 694. Many later 19th century paper dolls for children were similar to these early montage figures.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dennison Paper Company made a big business of selling paper dolls with patterns and selections of crepe paper to make three dimensional clothing. Also, many handmade dolls in the Waldron Collection sport three dimensional and fancy paper dresses.

[46]King, Collector's History of Dolls, pp 81-82.

[47]Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection, Letterbook of Lewis Page (69x76). pp 42, 48 and 57.

[48]Spreaght, Toy Theatres, p. 13.

[49]Agnes Halsey, "Cardboard Lover," Antiques Magazine, August 1945, p. 90. Besides this type of paper fashion doll, there may have been some even earlier precedents, not of paper, however. Ruth Freeman in American Dolls, (p. 13) writes: "A possible forerunner of this mode may have been the costumed miniature paintings of the seventeenth century. These consisted of an oil miniature on copper, resting in a case, and accompanies by a number of costume details painted in opaque color on pieces of transparent talc which matched the miniature painting in shape and size." See also King, Collector's History, p. 146.

[50]Waldron Collection 73x319.10.

[51]The History of Little Fanny, reprinted by the Scolari Press, 1977, p. 15.

[52]Waldron Collection 73x319.6.

[53]Agnes Halsey, "Cardboard Lover," p. 90.

[54]Luther Ringwalt, American Encyclopedia of Printing, p. 218.

[55]Ibid., pp 220-252. Between 1844 and 1868, there were thirteen U. S. patents taken out for inventions pertaining to printing and color; between 1853 and 1868, five patents

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

for inks; between 1847 and 1868, 104 patents for papermaking; and between 1796 and 1868, 104 patents for presses, parts and processes.

[56]While researching this paper, the author often wondered about the buying power of middle-class children in the late nineteenth century. Many of the mass-produced paper dolls came in folders marked with prices which seemed quite modest--a half-penny to a few cents. Did children have discretionary funds or small allowances that would enable them to select and purchase inexpensive paper toys? The very survival of children's banks would indicate that some children either earned money or received an allowance, and some literary sources allude to this fact. In Harper's Weekly for December 19, 1863, there appeared a cartoon with a caption which read: "Well, Father, I wish you would give us your advice: Clara and George have tried everything--but these children say they positively will not go to school till their pocket money is raised to five cents a day." In Little Women by Louisa May Alcott, an even more unusual reference to paper dolls as barter objects is made in conversation between Amy and Meg. Amy has no money to buy limes and she explains to her older sister Meg: "Why, you see, the girls are always buying them, and unless you want to be thought mean, you must do it too. It's nothing but limes now, for every one is sticking them in their desks in school-time, and trading them off for pencils, bead-rings, paper dolls, or something else at recess."

[57]Waldron Collection 74x438 (Box 2).

[58]Waldron Collection 73x319.65.

[59]Waldron Collection 73x 319.65.

[60]Ellis and Hall, Study of Dolls, p. 164.

[61]Waldron Collection 74x438 (Box 13).

[62]Waldron Collection, 1978 Accession, Notebook 5. From a Fashion of Life by H. W. Vauxhall (1968).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[63]Waldron Collection 74x438, Box 12.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Ibid.

[66]Waldron Collection 74x438.150, 74x438.153 and 74x438.154.

[67]Waldron Collection 73x319.43.

[68]Allair, C. B., Paper Doll's Furniture: How To Make It, p. 11.

[69]Ibid.,p.23.

[70]Waldron Collection 73x319.67.

[71]Waldron Collection 73x319.63 and 74x438, Box 4.

[72]Waldron Collection 73x319.53.

[73]Waldron Collection 73x319.64.

[74]Waldron Collection 73x319.54.

[75]Ibid., Boston Globe issues 9/15/1896, 2/16/1896, 3/15/1896, 4/12/1896 and 5/22/1897.

[76]Waldron Collection 74x438, Box 12.

[77]Ibid.

[78]Waldron Collection 74x438, Box 22 and 73x319.56.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[79]Waldron Collection 74x438, Box 22.

[80]Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Collections

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Bill of B & L Lawrence Importers.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Bill of Harves Brothers & Co.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Bill of John S. Jones.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Bill of P. Tiers.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Broadside of South Boston Bookstore.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Diary of Eliza Ridgely.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Collection. Importation Papers and Bills of A. Fleschmann and Craemer.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Inventory of Eliza Dannenberg.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Journal of Abigail and Eliza Foote.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Journal of Susan Nichols.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Journal of Emmeline Moore.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Journal of Hannah Rogers.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Letterbook of Lewis Page.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Trade Card of Edward Ridley and Son.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Trade Card of Abraham Forst.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Trade Card of P. W. Lambert & Co.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Trade Card for German toymaker, B. Harrass.

Winterthur, Delaware. Henry Francis duPont Winterthur Museum. Joseph Downs Manuscript and Microfilm Collection. Maxine Waldron Collection of Paper Dolls, Toys and Games.

Primary Sources--Domestic Handbooks and Books on Play

Abbott, John S. C. The Child at Home. Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1834.

Austin, George L., M. D. Indispensible Handbook and General Educator. Portland, Maine: George Stinson and Co., 1885.

Allair, C. B. Paper Doll's Furniture & How to Make It New York: Anson D. F. Randolph, 1857.

Beard, Lina and Adelia B. The American Girls Handy Book. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898.

Beecher, Catherine E. The American Woman's Home. New York: J. B. Ford and Co., 1869.

Beecher, Mrs. H. W. All Around the House. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1879.

Bestlemeier, G. H. Magazin von Verscheidenen Kunst. Nuremburg: Neue Verberfette Nupage, 1812.

The Boy's Own Book. London: Viztelly, Branston and Co., 1831.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Bradley, Milton. Bradley's Catalogue of Games, Toys and Novelties. Springfield, Massachusetts: Milton Bradley, 1883.

Chadwick, Henry. The Sports and Pastimes of American Boys. New York: George Routledge and Sons, 1884.

Children in the Wood. New York: McLoughlin Bros. Publishers, n.d.

Crocker, W. M. The Mary Ware Doll Book. Boston: The Page Company, 1914.

Dennison Manufacturing Company. The Uses of Tissue Paper. Boston: Dennison Manufacturing Company, n.d.

The Doll and Her Dresses. London: F. Warne and Co., [1860].

Ehrich Bros. Toy Price List Winter 1882. Reprint by Burton Purnell, New York, n.d.

Godey's Magazine. October 1859, February 1861 and December 1878.

History of Little Fanny. London: S. and J. Fuller, 1810. (Reprinted by The Scolari Press. London: 1977.)

Home Games for Little Girls. Exciting to Play: No Trouble to Learn. New York: McLoughlin Brothers, 1870.

Johnston, Mary G. The Little Colonel Doll Book. Boston: The Page Company, 1910.

Kelley, Dale, ed. Marshall Field Toy Catalog 1892-93. Des Moines, Iowa: Wallace-Homestead, Co., 1969.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Landells, E. The Boy's Own Toy-Maker: A Practical Illustrated Guide to the Useful Employment of Leisure Hours. New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1865.

Lyman, Joseph and Laura. The Philosophy of Housekeeping. Hartford, Connecticut: Goodwin and Betts, 1967.

Mateaux, C. L. Wonderland of Work. New York: Cassell, Petter, Galpin and Co., [188-].

O'Neill, Rose. The Kewpie Kutouts. New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1914.

Our Darling's Book of Dolls. New York: Hurst & Company, 1912.

Pollard, Josephine. Plays and Games for Little Folks. New York: New York: McLoughlin Brothers, 1889.

Randolph, Anson D. F. Paper Dolls and How to Make Them. New York: A. D. F. Randolph, 1856.

Youthful Recreations. Philadelphia: J. Johnson, n.d.

Secondary Sources--Toys and Games

Boehn, Max von. Dolls and Puppets. Philadelphia: David McKay Company, 1932.

Culff, R. The World of Toys. New York: Hamlyn Publishing, 1969.

Daiken, Leslie. Children's Toys Throughout the Ages. London: William Clowes and Sons, 1953.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fraser, Antonia. A History of Toys. Frankfurt-am-Main, BRD: K. G. Lohse, Grossbetrib, 1966.

Freeman, Ruth. American Dolls. Watkins Glen, N. Y.: Century House, 1952.

Fritsch, Karl Ewald. An Illustrated History of Toys. London: Abbey Library, 1965.

Gordon, Lesley. Peepshow into Paradise. London: George Harrap and Co., Ltd., 1953.

Grober, Karl. Children's Toys of Bygone Days. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1932.

Halsey, Agnes. "Cardboard Lover." Antiques Magazine. Vol. 48, pp. 90-92.

Hewitt, Karen and Louise Roomet. Educational Toys in America 1800 to the Present. Burlington, Vermont: University of Vermont, 1979.

Howard, Marian B. Those Fascinating Paper Dolls. New York: Dover Publications, 1981.

Jackson, F. Nevill. Toys of Other Days. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1968 (reprint of 1908 edition).

King, Constance E. Antique Toys and Dolls. New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1979.

King, Constance E. Collector's History of Dolls. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.

King, Constance E. The Encyclopedia of Toys. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1978.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Lee, Tina. Fun With Paper Dolls. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1949.

McClintock, Inez and Marshall. Toys in America. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1961.

Remise, J. and J. Fondin. The Golden Age of Toys. Switzerland Edita S. A. Lausanne, 1967.

Sayer, Philip and Caroline. Making Victorian Kinetic Toys. New York: Tapliner Publishing Co., 1977.

Schroeder, Joseph J. The Wonderful World of Toys, Games & Dolls, 1860-1930. Northfield, Illinois: Digest Books, Inc., 1971.

Smith, J. J. "Dressed Pictures." Antiques Magazine. Vol. 84, pp. 694-697.

Speaight, George. The History of the English Toy Theatre. London: Studio Vista, 1969.

Thomas, John B. et al. The Cottage of Content; Or, Toys, Games & Amusements of Nineteenth Century England. New Haven: Yale Center for British Art, 1977.

Viscomi, Joseph. The Juvenile Drama: Playing with the Toy Theatre. np, 1977.

White, Gwen. European and American Dolls. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1966.

Whitehouse, F. R. B. Table Games of Georgian and Victorian Days. Birmingham, England: Priory Press Ltd., 1971.

Yamanaski, Taeko. Japanese Paper Dolls. Tokyo: Toto Shupper Company, Ltd., 1964.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Secondary Sources--Childrearing and Theories of Learning/Development

Almy, Millie, ed. Early Childhood Play: Selected Readings Related to Cognition and Motivation. New York: Associated Educational Services Corporation, 1968.

Anderson, Lewis F. Pestalozzi. New York: AMS Press, Inc. 1931.

Aries, Phillipe. Centuries of Childhood. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Beales, Ross. "In Search of the Historical Child: Miniature Adulthood and Youth in Colonial New England." American Quarterly, V. XXVII Number 4, (October 1975).

Bode, Carl. The Anatomy of American Popular Culture. Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 1959.

Bratton, J. S. The Impact of Victorian Children's Fiction. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, 1981.

Cass, Joan. The Significance of Children's Play. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1971.

Chance, Paul. Learning Through Play. New York: Gardner Press, 1979.

Cott, Nancy. The Bonds of Womanhood. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1977.

Douglas, Anne. The Feminization of American Culture. New York: Knopf, 1977.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Erikson, E. H. Studies of Play. New York: Arno Press, 1975.

Garvan, Anthony N. B. and Peter Welsh. The Victorian American. Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1961.

Greven, Philip. The Protestant Temperament. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.

Hayward. F. H. The Educational Ideas of Pestalozzi and Frobel. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press,1979 (reprint of 1904 edition).

Herron, R. E. and Brian Sutton-Smith, Editors. Child's Play. New York: John Wiley and Son, 1971.

Kett, Joseph F. Rites of Passage. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1977.

Kiefer, Monica. American Children Through Their Books. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1948.

Lee, Joseph. Play in Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1918.

Mergan, Bernard. "The Discovery of Children's Play." American Quarterly, V. XXVII Number 4, (October 1975).

Mergan, Bernard. "Games and Toys." Handbook of American Popular Culture. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1980. Volume 2.

Mergan, Bernard. "Work and Play." American Quarterly, V. 32 Number 4, (Fall 1980).

Newell, William Wells. Games and Songs of American Children. New York: Dover Press, 1963 (reprint of 188- edition).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Monroe, Will S. History of the Pestalozzian Movement in the United States. New York: Arno Press, 1969 (reprint of 1907 edition).

Pestalozzi, Johan H. How Gertrude Teaches Her Children. Syracuse, New York: C. W. Bardren, Publisher, 1898.

Richardson, Selma K., ed. Research About Nineteenth Century Children and Books. Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1980.

Salter, Michael A., ed. Play, Anthropological Perspectives. West Point, New York: Leisure Press, 1978.

Schwartzman, H. E. Transformation: The Anthropology of Children's Play. New York: Plenum Press, 1978.

Smith, Henry Nash, ed. Popular Culture and Industrialism, 1865-1890. New York: New York University Press, 1967.

Sutton-Smith, Brian, ed. The Psychology of Play. New York: Arno Press, 1976.

Wishy, Bernard. The Child and the Republic. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968.

Primary--Technology of Printing

Cumming, David. Handbook of Lithography. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1904.

Dewey's New Catalogue of Colored Plates. Rochester, New York: D. M. Dewey, 1864.

Emerson, William A. Handbook of Wood Engraving. Boston: Lee and Shepard, Publishers, 1881.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Emerson, William A. Practical Instruction in the Art of Wood Engraving. East Douglas, Massachusetts: Charles J. Batchellor, 1876.

Goodman, Joseph. Metalithography. London: Lowe and Brydone Printers Limited, 1927.

Gould, J. Jay. Chromos, engraving, album gems, lithographs, picture frames, picture books, story books, card printer, little landscape chromos, photographs, games, embossed pictures, flower seeds, novelties, & c. Trade Catalog. Boston: J. Jay Gould, n.d.

The Great Industries of the United States. Hartford, Connecticut: J. B. Beers, 1872.

Henderson, G. K. American Test Book of Lithography. Indianapolis, Indiana: Levey Brothers and Company, 1906.

Prang's Chromo. Boston: L. Prang and Co., 1868-1869.

Ringwalt, Luther. American Encyclopedia of Printing. Philadelphia: Menamin and Ringwalt, 1871.

Senefelder, Alois. A Complete Course of Lithography. New York: Da Capo Press, 1968 (reprint).

Senefelder, Alois. The Invention of Lithography. New York: The Fuchs and Lang Manufacturing Company, 1911.

Secondary--Technology of Printing

Armstrong and Company, Artistic Lithographers. Boston: Boston Public Library, 1982.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Browne, Warren. C. Offset Lithography. New York: The National Lithographer, 1922.

Crosby, Everett V. Chromos. Nantucket Island, Massachusetts: Tetaukimmo Press, n.d.

The Great Industries of the United States. Hartford, Connecticut: J. B. Burr and Hyde, 1872.

Glover, John G. and William B. Cornell. The Development of American Industries: Their Economic Significance. New York: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1951. Los Angeles, California: Dawson's Book Shop, 1980.

Larson, Henrietta. Guide to Business History. Boston: J. S. Cannes and Company, Inc., 1964.

Library of Congress. Children's Books in the Rare Book Division of the Library of Congress. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1975.

Lindley, Kenneth. The Woodblock Engravers. Newton Abbot, England: David and Charles, 1970.

MacFarlane, John J. Manufacturing in Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Commercial Museum, 1912.

Original Wood Blocks from the Archives of McLoughlin Brothers Publishers. Catalogue 458. Los Angeles, California: Dawson's Book Shop, 1980.

Original Wood Blocks from the Archives of McLoughlin Brothers, Publishers. New York. Catalogue 35. New York: Justin J. Schiller, Ltd., 1978.

Marzio, Peter. The Democratic Art. Boston: David R. Godine, Publisher, 1979.

Strauss, Victor. Aloys Senefelder 1771-1834. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1972.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Twyman, Michael. "The Tinted Lithograph." Journal of the Printing Historical Society Number 1 (1965).

Rhodes, Henry J. The Art of Lithography. London: Scott, Greenwood and Son, 1924.

Rosenbach, A. S. W. Early American Children's Books. Portland, Maine: The Southworth Press, 1933.

Twyman, Michael. "Lithographic Stone and the Printing Trade in the 19th Century." Journal of the Printing Historical Society. Number 8 (1972).

Twyman, Michael. "The Lithographic Hand Press 1796-1850." Journal of the Printing Historical Society. Number 3 (1967).

Weber, Wilhelm. A History of Lithography. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Woodward, David. "The Decline of Commercial Wood-Engraving in Nineteenth Century America." Journal of the Printing Historical Society. Number 10 (1974-75).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.