



Notes on the Origin and History of the Tar-Baby story

Author(s): Aurelio M. Espinosa

Source: *The Journal of American Folklore*, Vol. 43, No. 168 (Apr. - Jun., 1930), pp. 129-209

Published by: [American Folklore Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/534999>

Accessed: 11/09/2011 22:34

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Folklore Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of American Folklore*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE JOURNAL OF
AMERICAN FOLK-LORE

VOL. 43 — APR.-JUNE, 1930 — No. 168.

NOTES ON THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF
THE TAR-BABY STORY

BY AURELIO M. ESPINOSA.

I.

INTRODUCTION.

I doubt that any single folktale or short story of any kind has attracted more attention and attained greater popularity both among learned scholars and among general readers and listeners than the "wonderful" Tar-baby story published by Joel Chandler Harris in his book "Uncle Remus, His Songs and His Sayings" in 1880. His daughter, Julia Collier Harris, in her book, "The Life and Letters of Joel Chandler Harris" published in 1918, page 145, has this to say about the story: "Of all the 'Uncle Remus' legends written during twenty-five years and gathered into five separate volumes, the 'Tar-Baby' story is perhaps the best loved. Father received letters about this story from every quarter of the civilized world. Missionaries have translated it into the Bengali and African dialects; learned professors in France, England, Austria, and Germany have written, suggesting clues as to its source; it has been used to illustrate points in Parliamentary debates, and has been quoted from pulpits and in the halls of Congress."

When Uncle Remus was published it was thought that most of the stories were of Afro-American source. They were thought to be part of the creative contribution of the American Negro to the folklore of the world. Why his famous tar-baby story reached such extraordinary popularity immediately after its publication in 1880, and why immediately scholars began to comment upon it and study its sources may be explained from the intrinsic worth of the tale itself, the interest that folklorists saw in the stick-fast motif, Brer Rabbit being stuck fast at five points, front feet, back feet and head. But why a similar story, another extraordinary version of the tar-baby story, with the same stick-fast motif, a witch being caught fast at five points on a horse smeared with tar, a Lithuanian folktale published in 1857, twenty-three

years before "Uncle Remus", was not only not popular but has been unknown to all those who have discussed the problem of the tar-baby story is very much of a mystery. This Lithuanian version published by August Schleicher in 1857 was discovered for me last year by my research assistant, Mr. John Reid.

In 1920 The American Folk-Lore Society sent me to Spain to collect folktales. We had collected and published a large number of American-Spanish folktales and the problem of their source often presented great difficulties on account of the fact that we did not possess abundant collections of peninsular Spanish folktales. The three hundred folktales of my Spanish collection have been already published in three volumes and a fourth volume, a comparative study of the materials, is now being prepared.¹ Among other interesting materials I found a splendid version of the tar-baby story. This Spanish version I have had since 1920 as the first European version of the tar-baby story known to any one, and a version that had already proved erroneous the guess made by Joseph Jacobs that the tale would not be found in Europe. But now I have two European versions, my own Spanish version and the Lithuanian version of Schleicher.

In 1880 when Joel Chandler Harris first published his tar-baby version no one knew or remembered the story from Lithuania published by Schleicher twenty-three years before. No European versions were known, therefore, and in view of other Anglo-African and African versions that were soon discovered by those who looked for them, the story was accepted generally as an African tale. Very ingenious statements were made by some writers attempting to show that the folktale in reality depicted the character and spirit of the African race. There are some who believe yet that the story is of African origin. The first one who made a definite scholarly attempt to show that the majority of the tales of Uncle Remus were from European and ultimately Oriental sources was Mr. A. Gerber in 1893.² Mr. Gerber did not include the tar-baby story among those of European or Oriental sources because he could not find a single parallel to it from the old world. Apparently he knew nothing of the India versions, one of which had been already made known to scholars, *Jataka* 55, by Joseph Jacobs in 1888.³ Jacobs made a careful analysis and comparison of Chandler's tar-baby story from North Carolina and the *Jataka* 55 version, the tale of the demon with sticky

¹ See *JAF*, XXXIV, 127—142. The three volumes of the tales already published appeared in 1923—1926. See Appendix II, General Bibliography, under *Cuentos*.

² In *JAF*, VI, 245—257.

³ In *The Earliest English Version of the Fables of Bidpai*, London, 1888, Introduction xlv-xlvi. See also his edition of *Caxton's Aesop*, London, 1889, vol. I, 113 and 136—137; *Indian Fairy Tales*, London, 1892, 9; and *ibid*, 1910, 194—198, and 251—253.

hair to which Buddha, as a valiant young prince, became stuck at five points, and came to the conclusion that the tale was originally of Hindu source. He suggested that the primitive tale travelled from India to Africa and from Africa to America and other lands. Later he has maintained the same theory and has even suggested the ingenious idea that Brer Rabbit of the African and American versions is Buddha himself, in view of the fact that Buddha was often venerated as a hare in the moon because having once done a great deed of sacrifice as a hare, as narrated in one of the Jatakas, he was translated to the moon.¹

The cardinal point of Mr. Jacob's theory, namely, that the tar-baby story was not of African but Hindu origin seemed to some absolutely conclusive. Scholars have not been satisfied, however, with his theory that the tar-baby versions of America are of African source. In the meantime versions of the tar-baby story have been found from various parts of the world. The tale is well known in all parts of Spanish-America. The folklore of Spanish-America appears to be for the most part of Spanish source. Of this we have been more than convinced after the folklore expedition to Spain. Professor Boas, Dr. Elsie Clews Parsons and I have become convinced that the folklore of Spanish-America is fundamentally and principally of peninsular Spanish origin. The Indian and Negro influences are negligible in our Spanish Southwest and in most of Spanish South America. In Central America and Mexico the Indian influence is not negligible but not especially prominent. On the other hand Spanish-American tradition of European source has greatly influenced the folklore of the Negro and Indian.²

In an article published in 1914³ I insisted on the peninsular Spanish origin of the New Mexican Spanish and other American-Spanish versions of the tar-baby story. At that time I had the firm conviction that the story would be found in Spain. I did find it, as I have already stated.

Professor Boas, in his *Notes on Mexican Folk-Lore*⁴, came to conclusions similar to mine. He suggested that the Hispanic forms of the

¹ *Indian Fairy Tales*, 1910 edition, 252.

² See Boas, *Notes JAFL XXV* 247—260, and *Romantic Review XVI*, 199—207, Parsons in *JAFL XXXI*, 216—265, and Espinosa in *JAFL XXVII*, 211—231. See also the valuable observations of Dr. Parsons in the introductory chapters to her various publications on Portuguese and Anglo-African folklore. The presence of European folklore influences in the materials published from Andros Island, South Sea Islands and other regions of Anglo-Africa in America is not extraordinary for these peoples have been in contact with Spanish and other European peoples since their migration to America. Even the Medieval tale of the three hunchbacks, of Oriental source of course, is well known among the American Negroes. See Parsons, *South Sea Islands* 77. Such a well known Spanish folktale as that of my *Cuentos* 208 is found in Harris 2, II.

³ *JAFL XXVII*, 211—232.

⁴ *JAFL XXV*, 204—260.

story could have come to America from two sources. On the one hand, the Spanish colonizers could have brought them directly from Spain, and on the other hand the African negroes that came to America could have brought them from African regions that had been colonized by the Spanish and Portuguese since the early XVIth century.¹ In 1919 Dr. Parsons published an article in "Folk-Lore" suggesting that in view of the fact that in two Portuguese versions from the Cape Verde Islands the tar-baby episode appears attached to the tale of the master-thief so well known since Herodotus, it was probable that the tar-baby story had come from India to Europe attached to the tale of the master-thief.² In both of the European versions of the tar-baby story we find the tar-baby episode attached to other tales. It is logical to suppose that this episode has been transmitted as part of the tale of the master-thief, which tale has actually a thief-catching episode with a bucket of tar. Dr. Parsons also suggested that if the story was originally of Hindu source it could have travelled to Africa directly from Asia or indirectly through Spanish and Portuguese source as Professor Boas had suggested before.³

In "The Scientific Monthly" for September 1922, there appeared the last defense of the African origin of the tar-baby story by Dr. Norman Brown of Johns Hopkins University. His article is on the whole a series of affirmations and denials. He has made a study of some fifty-five versions of the tale despite the fact that he easily could have studied over one hundred. When his article was published, some twelve versions had already been published from Spanish-America and he does not mention a single one of them. A very important Portuguese version from Brazil published in 1889 by Santa-Anna Nery, of special interest because it has certain features that are strikingly similar to certain features of the Jataka 55 version, is unknown to Dr. Brown. He compares the Jataka 55 and a few other India versions to the Negro types in a very general and superficial way and rejects the India origin of the tale. Despite the fact that the Jataka 55 version from India may be actually 2000 years old he does not believe that it is a primitive tale. His chief and fundamental error lies in the fact that he confuses the motif of a folktale

¹ See Boas, Notes, 254. My study of the tar-baby story confirms fully the belief expressed by Dr. Boas in the following words: "Thus it does not seem to me improbable that those particular elements of the rabbit tales which are common to large parts of South America and of Central America, reaching at least as far north as New Mexico and Arizona, and differing in their composition from the Central African tales, are essentially of European origin."

² See FL, XXX, 227-234, The Provenience of certain Negro Folk Tales: III, Tar Baby.

³ See also Dähnhardt, *Natursagen* IV, 27-30.

with the folktale itself.¹ In the case of the tar-baby story I take it that most folklorists agree that the fundamental elements of the tale, the motif, the baustein, is the multiple-point attack and the stick-fast episode together with the dramatic elements involved. Just what other elements of the numerous versions are part of the baustein is for folklorists to determine.² But it seems to me that we cannot take very seriously the arguments of one who fails to accept the idea of a definite relation between folktales because certain insignificant details in them are different. The powerful argument that the multiple attack and the stick-fast episode occur in the Jataka version of probably two thousand years ago Dr. Brown calls *argumentum ex silentio*. He concludes that Africa is the original home of the tale in the following language: "And Africa is eminently suited to fill the needs of the situation. First of all it is a plausible center for the story's radiation. Slaves brought it thence to this continent; other Negroes, or perhaps the Uncle Remus books, have taken it to India in modern times, still other Negroes, or possibly Spanish sailors, have planted it in the Phillipines. These are the only people among whom it has yet appeared, to the best of my knowledge, but if it should at some time appear among other peoples, I am confident that it will be easy to uncover its tracks back to Africa."

The opinion expressed by Dr. Brown that the old and modern versions from India are not related to the Uncle Remus version is really quite astonishing, but not more so than the conclusions just read. It is not as easy to "uncover the tracks of the tar-baby story back to Africa" as it is to say that it can be done. To attempt to "uncover the tracks" of the Castilian and Lithuanian versions "back to Africa" is difficult even in our imagination.

For the present study I have brought together and carefully examined all the versions that I could possibly obtain of any type of tale where a man or an animal is caught fast by a tar or wax figure, a figure smeared with any sticky substance or with the sticky substance placed anywhere, provided the tale had some resemblance to the tale that has the multiple attack and catch episode. This method involved a study of some two hundred different folktales, many of which, such as the Medieval versions of the tale of the master-thief, have only an indirect relation to our story. After a process of elimination that seems to me to be strictly scientific there remained one hundred and fifty-two versions that one can certainly accept as genuine versions of the tar-baby story. Of these one hundred and fifty-two versions, one hundred and

¹ Dr. Brown makes exactly the same mistake that Bédier makes in attempting to prove that all the Medieval French fabliaux are of French origin. In the specific case of the tale of the trois bossus, for example, *Les Fabliaux* (4th edition), 236—250, he confuses the baustein of the tale with the actual forms of the versions themselves.

² I have tried to do this in Chapter V of my study.

forty eight have practically all the fundamental elements of the *baustein* of the tar-baby story. The remaining four have only some of the fundamentals, but have most of the secondary elements.¹ The conclusions embodied in the present study are based, therefore, on a detailed statistical examination and study of one hundred and fifty-two versions of the tar-baby story. All the significant elements or episodes of the total number have been reduced to fifty-six, the various versions from the different geographical and racial groups have been carefully studied,

¹ These four versions are the following: two Spanish-American versions, one from Cuba (32), and the other one from Guatemala (44); and two African versions (136, 143). In all four of these versions the play of hands and feet is missing, but there are other important features of the *baustein* and many important secondary elements. All are from regions where the tar-baby story with all the elements of the *baustein* occurs and for that reason we have included these that are similar to other versions except in the multiple attack and catch elements.

There are of course many other tales where a thief or evil-doer is caught by traps and sticky objects, but when the versions had none, absolutely none of the elements of the *baustein* I did not include them in my study. It is quite possible that some of these omitted tales are connected in some way with the tar-baby story, but I did not wish to risk confusion in my method by including doubtful versions. Among those omitted, and somewhat reluctantly, is the Asturian tale of the water-nymph caught fast by a tarred horse, which is certainly related, at least indirectly, with the tar-baby story. I give a resumé of this European tale in Appendix I, 21. Others are Boas, *Indianische Sagen* 214 (four bird-men are caught attacking a tarred whale and die stuck to it); Barbosa Rodrigues 245, Amazonian version, (young hunter pulls tarred tail of the image of an armadillo prepared by the father, and the armadillo comes to life and pulls him down, since he can not release his hand); JAFI, XI, 289—290, North Carolina (greedy crows eat young birds and get their beaks stuck together by sticking them into a tub of tar and wool prepared by the parent birds); Harris 2, XXXI (rabbit caught in a box-trap).

There is, of course, no end to the indirectly related versions. Some begin like genuine tar-baby versions and end in an entirely different manner so they could not be included in our study. The following interesting version from the French Congo appears to be a genuine version with the tar-baby *baustein* forgotten, *Revue Congolaise*, Paris, 1910, I, 346—353: A partridge and an a leopard build a home together to live in it with their families. The leopards eat the mother partridge and the little ones, so father partridge runs away. He then prepares a rubber-man with feathers and weapons and places it near the house-well. The female leopard appears and speaks to him. He does not reply. They go and bring it into the house and attempt to feed it, but it falls down and rebounds, thus scaring the leopards away.

The tale of the Roman de Renard (ed. Martin Vol. II, 609—698), a bear caught by feet and mouth while seeking honey in a piece of split wood prepared by the fox, I do not believe to be connected with the tar-baby story. See Foulet 333—334.

and the attempt has been made to determine definitely the primitive baustein of the tar-baby story, to discover with precision the character of the geographical and racial groups in view of the special developments that certain secondary features have followed in the evolution of the tale across the ages and in its transmission from one country to another, and lastly, to determine definitely the problem of the origin of the tale.

The one hundred and fifty-two versions of the tar-baby story studied are the following. I have reasons for believing that my bibliography is over 95⁰/₀ complete.¹

II

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE TAR-BABY STORY

I

Oriental versions from India — 9

(1) Jataka 55; (2) Samyutta Nikaya V, 3, 7; (3) Paricistaparvan II, 720—745; (4) Bodding I, 179—185; (5) Ibid. 213—217; (6) Bompas 324—325; (7) Gordon 65—69; (8) Indian Antiquary XX, 29—32; (9) Ibid. XXIX, 399—401.

¹ The task of bringing together the one hundred and fifty-two versions of the tar-baby story would have been impossible without the assistance of colleagues and friends. It is not possible to record here in detail the assistance so generously given me by colleagues and friends who, in order to help me, have stolen valuable time from their own researches. To mention their names here is to express only a small part of my gratitude for their generous assistance. Copies of versions not accessible to me at Stanford University were sent to me by Professor Boas of Columbia University and by his pupils, Miss Gene Weltfish and Mrs. Margery L. Loeb, by Dr. J. Alden Mason of the Museum of Anthropology of the University of Pennsylvania, by Dr. Ruth Benedict of Columbia University, and by Dr. George V. Bobrinskoy of the University of Chicago. Mr. Manuel J. Adrade of New York and Dr. Herminio Portell Vilá of Havana, Cuba, have sent me manuscript copies of Santo Domingo and Cuban versions. Professor and Mrs. Melville J. Herskovits of Northwestern University have been good enough to send me manuscript copies of the four versions from Dutch Guiana recently collected by them. My colleague Professor Johnston and my research-assistant Mr. Reid of Stanford University have called my attention to some European parallels to the various secondary elements of the tale. And lastly I wish to record especially my deep appreciation for the assistance given me by Dr. Elsie Clews Parsons, who has not only given me bibliographical assistance and counsel, but has sent me eleven manuscript copies of versions of the tar-baby tale recently collected by her, — four Indian versions from Taos, a most valuable and timely contribution, and the seven Lesser Antilles versions.

II

European versions — 2

(10) Schleicher 35—37; (11) Cuentos 35.

III

Spanish-American versions — 35

(12) Andrade 156; (13) Ibid. 157; (14) Ibid. 158; (15) Ibid. 159; (16) Boas, Notes 210—214; (17) Ibid. 235—241; (18) Espinosa III, 7; (19) Espinosa, New Mexico MS; (20) Laval, Cuentos 154—165; (21) Mason-Espinosa PRF I, 21; (22) Ibid. V, 1; (23) Ibid. V, 2; (24) Ibid. V, 3; (25) Ibid. V, 5; (26) Ibid. V, 9; (27) Ibid. V, 13; (28) Ibid. V, 15; (29) Ibid. V, 17; (30) Ibid. V, 21; (31) Portell Vilá 122; (32) Ibid. 123; (33) Ibid. 124; (34) Radin-Espinosa 46; (35) Ibid. 66; (36) Ibid. 85; (37) Ibid. 90; (38) Ibid. 100; (39) Tía Panchita 131—132; (40) JAFLL XXV, 200—201; (41) Ibid. XXV, 201—202; (42) Ibid. XXIX, 549—551; (43) Ibid. XXXI, 472; (44) Ibid. XXXI, 473; (45) Ibid. XLIII, 216; (46) ZFE XX, 2, 275.

IV

Portuguese versions from Brazil and the Cape Verde Islands — 6

(47) Parsons, Cape Verde 30; (48) Ibid. 31; (49) Ibid. 33; (50) Pimentel 217—218; (51) Romero 317—318; (52) Santa-Anna Nery 213.

V

Version from Orinoco (South-American Indians) — 1

(53) Koch-Grünberg 47—48.

VI

Versions from the Lesser Antilles — 7

(54) Parsons, Trinidad MS 1; (55) Ibid. 2; (56) Ibid. 3; (57) Parsons, St. Vincent MS; (58) Parsons, St. Lucia MS; (59) Parsons, Martinique MS 1; (60) Ibid. 2.

VII

Versions from Dutch Guiana — 4

(61) Herskovits MS 1; (62) Ibid. 2; (63) Ibid. 3; (64) Ibid. 4.

VIII

Phillipine versions — 2

(65) Fansler 48; (66) JAFLL XX, 311—314.

IX

American-Indian versions — 23

(67) Boas, Indianische Sagen 44; (68) Goddard 74—75; (69) Mooney I, 271—272; (70) Ibid. II, 272—273; (71) Parsons, Tewa I, 69; (72) Par-

sons, Taos MS 1; (73) *Ibid.* 2; (74) *Ibid.* 3; (75) *Ibid.* 4; (76) Preuss I, 289—290; (77) Sapir, Takelma 86—89; (78) Sapir, Yana 227—228; (79) Speck, Taskigi 149—150; (80) Speck, Yuchi 152—153; (81) FMC VII, 24—25; (82) JAFI, VI, 48—49; (83) *Ibid.* XI, 267—268; (84) *Ibid.* XXIII, 34; (85) *Ibid.* XXVI, 5; (86) *Ibid.* XXVI, 194; (87) *Ibid.* XXVIII, 218; (88) *Ibid.* XXVIII, 356; (89) *Ibid.* XXXVII, 58—59.

X

Anglo-African versions from North America — 36

(90) Beckwith 21a; (91) *Ibid.* 21b; (92) *Ibid.* 21c; (93) *Ibid.* 59a; (94) Christensen 73—80; (95) Edwards 73; (96) Fauset I, 20, I; (97) *Ibid.* I, 20, II; (98) *Ibid.* I, 20, III; (99) Fortier 98—109; (100) Harris I, 7—11 and 16—19; (101) Jones 7—11; (102) Parsons, Andros 10, I; (103) *Ibid.* 10, II; (104) *Ibid.* 10, III; (105) *Ibid.* 11; (106) *Ibid.* 12; (107) Parsons, Sea Islands 13; (108) *Ibid.* 14, I; (109) *Ibid.* 14, II; (110) *Ibid.* 15; (111) JAFI XXX, 171; (112) *Ibid.* XXX, 171—172; (113) *Ibid.* XXX, 222; (114) *Ibid.* XXXIV, 4—5; (115) *Ibid.* XXXIV, 5; (116) *Ibid.* XXXIV, 53; (117) *Ibid.* XXXV, 256—257; (118) *Ibid.* XXXV, 257—258; (119) *Ibid.* XXXV, 258; (120) *Ibid.* XXXV, 258—259; (121) *Ibid.* XXXV, 259—260; (122) *Ibid.* XLI, 500; (123) *Ibid.* XLI, 515; (124) *Ibid.* XLI, 532; (125) *Ibid.* XLI, 532—533.

XI

African versions — 26

(126) Bachman 84—86; (127) Barker-Sinclair 69—72; (128) Chatelain 183—189; (129) Cronise-Ward 101—109; (130) Dennet 90—93; (131) Ellis 2, 275—277; (132) Honeÿ 73—78; (133) *Ibid.* 79—83; (134) Johnston II, 1087—1089; (135) Junod 96—98; (136) Kootz-Kretschmer II, 159—161; (137) Lederbogen 59—60; (138) Meinhoff 18; (139) *Ibid.* 78; (140) Mitterrutzner 13—15; (141) Mockler-Ferryman 288—289; (142) Nassau 18—26; (143) Schultze 477—479; (144) Smith-Dale II, 396—398; (145) Amaury Talbot 397—400; (146) Tremearne 212—214; (147) FL X, 285—286; (148) *Ibid.* XX, 209—211; (149) *Ibid.* XX, 443; (150) *Ibid.* XXVII, 117—118; (151) RTP X, 41—48.

XII

Version from Mauritius — 1

(152) Baissac 2—14.

III

STUDY OF THE VERSIONS ACCORDING TO DISTRIBUTION

The results of my study of the above one hundred and fifty-two versions of the tar-baby story from various parts of the world, versions from Old India from 1500 to 2000 years old, modern India versions, European versions from Lithuania and Castile, Spanish-American versions from

New Mexico, Mexico, Central America, Venezuela, Colombia, Chile, Porto Rico, Cuba and Santo Domingo, Brazilian versions, Portuguese versions from the Cape Verde Islands, Philippine versions, American-Indian versions from North and South America, Anglo-African versions from the Southern States and neighboring English-speaking islands, Jamaica and the Bahamas, versions from the Lesser Antilles and Dutch Guiana, and African versions from Africa and Mauritius, attempting to characterize not only the individual versions but also the versions of the various geographical and racial groups, are most interesting and valuable. Some of the most popular and cherished theories disappear at once upon a very cursory examination of the materials. There is a wide gap, for example, between the Spanish-American versions, which some believe to be of Negro origin, and the Anglo-African versions in the majority of secondary details. The Anglo-African versions are clearly developed under both European and African influences, and the majority of the secondary details of all the versions show clearly their European origin.¹

Let us first study the one hundred and fifty-two versions according to the geographical and racial groupings already established in the Bibliography, by groups and dominant types as well as by individual versions. We will then have a brief history and catalogue of the various types of versions of the tar-baby story from the earliest to modern times. In tracing the history of the fundamental motif of the tar-baby story across the ages and from country to country I must begin with the oldest known versions, those from India, adding also the modern versions. I will then study the European versions because one of them, the Lithuanian version, was published as early as 1857 and it is the first version of the tar-baby story collected in modern times anywhere.

There are nine versions from India. Two of them are very old. The Jataka 55 tale, the best of the group, was recorded at least fifteen hundred years ago, and from all evidence the work goes back to the beginnings of the Christian era. I give below a brief resumé of the tale, giving in detail only the five-point attack and catch episode:

Once upon a time when Brahmadata was reigning in Benares the Bodhisatta or Buddha was born as his queen's child.

When the prince had come to years of discretion, and was sixteen years old he was sent to study in the town of Takasila. Upon the completion of his education he left for Benares, armed with a set of five weapons which his master had given him.

On his way he came to a forest haunted by an ogre named Hairy-grip, and, at the entrance to the forest, men who met him tried to stop him, saying: "Young brahmin, do not go through that forest; it is the haunt of the ogre Hairy-grip, and he kills every one he

¹ See Appendix I.

meets." But, bold as a lion, the self-reliant Bodhisatta pressed on, till, in the heart of the forest, he came on the ogre. The monster made himself appear in stature as tall as a palmtree, with a head as big as an arbor and huge eyes like bowls, with two tusks like turnips and the beak of a hawk; his belly was blotched with purple, and the palms of his hands and the soles of his feet were blue-black! "Whither away?" cried the monster. "Halt! you are my prey." "Ogre," answered the Bodhisatta, "I knew what I was doing when entering this forest. You will be ill-advised to come near me. For with a poisoned arrow I will slay you where you stand." And with this defiance, he fitted to his bow an arrow dipped in deadliest poison and shot it at the ogre. But it only stuck on to the monster's shaggy coat. Then he shot another and another, till fifty were spent, all of which merely stuck on to the ogre's shaggy coat. Hereupon the ogre, shaking the arrows off so that they fell at his feet, came at the Bodhisatta; and the latter, again shouting defiance, drew his sword and struck at the ogre. But, like the arrows, his sword, which was thirty-three inches long, merely stuck fast in the shaggy hair. Next the Bodhisatta hurled his spear, and that stuck fast also. Seeing this, he smote the ogre with his club; but, like his other weapons, that too stuck fast. And thereupon the Bodhisatta shouted, "Ogre, you never heard yet of me, Prince Five-Weapons. When I ventured into this forest, I put my trust not in my bow and other weapons, but in myself. Now will I strike you a blow which shall crush you into dust." So saying, the Bodhisatta smote the ogre with his right hand; but the hand stuck fast upon the hair. Then, in turn, with his left hand, and with his right and left feet, he struck at the monster, but hand and feet alike clave to the hide. Again shouting, "I will crush you into dust!" he butted the ogre with his head, and that too stuck fast.

Yet, even when thus caught and snared in fivefold wise, the Bodhisatta, as he hung upon the ogre, was still fearless, still undaunted. And the monster thought to himself, "This is a very lion among men, a hero without peer, and no mere man. Though he is caught in the clutches of an ogre like me, yet not so much as a tremor will he exhibit. Never since I first took to slaying travellers upon this road have I seen a man to equal him. How comes it that he is not frightened?" Not daring to devour the Bodhisatta offhand, he said, "How is it, young brahmin, that you have no fear of death?"

"Why should I?" answered the Bodhisatta. "Each life must surely have its destined death. Moreover, within my body is a sword of adamant, which you will never digest, if you eat me. It will chop your inwards into mincemeat, and my death will involve yours too. Therefore it is that I have no fear." (By this, it is said, the Bodhisatta meant the Sword of Knowledge, which was within him.)

Here on, the ogre fell a-thinking. "This young brahmin is speaking the truth and nothing but the truth," thought he. "Not a morsel so big as a pea could I digest of such a hero. I'll let him go." And so, in fear of his life, he let the Bodhisatta go free, saying, "Young brahmin, you are a lion among men; I will not eat you. Go forth from my hand, even as the moon from the jaws of Rahu, and return to gladden the hearts of your kinsfolk, your friends, and your country."

The Bodhisatta makes the ogre the fairy of the forest, returns to Benares and rules the country as a just king.

This Jataka story is beyond all doubt one of the primitive tar-baby stories par excellence. Its relation to the other India versions, to the European versions and to the American versions discussed later is absolutely definite. The five-point attack and stick-fast episode at five points on the giant with the sticky hair is the fundamental motif or baustein of the story as it is in the other versions. The numerous versions from various parts of the world that have a two, three, four, five or six-point attack with the corresponding stick-fast episode have also this fundamental motif. In our Jataka version the one caught fast at five points is a man, Prince Buddha. It is likewise a man in the two European versions, in three Spanish-American versions, two Portuguese versions from the Cape Verde Islands, three Anglo-African versions, in the Orinoco Indian version, and in one African version, thirteen in all, or 9% of the total. The one caught fast is a monkey instead of a man in two versions from India, in six Hispanic versions, the two versions from the Philippines, one Dutch Guiana version, and one African version, twelve in all, or 8% of the total. Buddha is born as a monkey in eleven of the five hundred and forty-seven Jatakas or Buddha birth stories. The identification of Buddha or the Prince of the Five Weapons with a monkey is therefore quite logical, and the relation of the Jataka 55 version and other tales where the one caught fast is a man with the versions in which a monkey is caught is quite evident.¹ As for the identification of the rabbit of the African and American versions with Buddha, Jacobs has already pointed out that in latter Buddhism the Bodhisatta is frequently honored as a hare or rabbit, and he has also pointed out that the Buddhistic influence in African religion and folklore is quite strong.²

The five-point attack and the stick-fast episode at the same five points, serially, with the dramatic elements of the initial attack and subsequent threats as the catch at each point occurs, constitute the most important, fundamental elements of the baustein of the tar-baby story.

¹ See Fansler 337. Of course I do not agree with Fansler in the opinion that the Philippine tar-baby versions are of direct India source.

² Indian Fairy Tales, 252—253.

This means that elements 25, 30 and 31 (or 31, 32, 33 and 34 combined) cannot be omitted. The exact statistics for these elements are the following: The reason for the beginning of the attack on the tar-figure is the fact that it will not reply, salute or get out of the way when told to do so (element 25) in 102 or 67% of the total number of 152 versions; the dramatic monologue that begins after the catch at the first point, "If you dont let go of my right hand I'll hit you with my left hand, etc." (element 30) occurs in 119 or 78% of the total; and the extraordinary multiple-point attack and catch in 136 or 90% of the total. An actual five-point attack and catch as in Jataka 55, in the other two Old India versions (2, 3), and in the two European versions (10, 11), occurs in 60 or 39% of the total number of versions.

The version from the Samyutta Nikaya (2) is even older than the Jataka version. It is two thousand years old. It is a little different from the versio princeps of the Jataka but it is certainly related to it. It is merely another ancient Hindu version of the tar-baby story. It is a monkey that is caught. Briefly the tale is as follows:

In a certain place in the Himalayas hunters used to place sticky plasters on the paths of monkeys to catch them. The wise monkeys, those that had control over their senses, avoided them; but when a foolish monkey passed by, one that had no control over his senses, he would seize the plaster with his hand and thus would be caught. Then thinking thus, "I will liberate my hand," he would seize the plaster with his second hand and thus would be caught. Then thinking again, "I will liberate both of my hands," he would push the plaster with one foot and that would be caught. Desiring then to liberate both hands and his foot, he would push the plaster with his second foot and this would also be caught. Finally thinking, "I will liberate both hands and feet," he would seize the sticky plaster with his mouth and this too would be caught. Thus caught at five points he would be taken by the hunters and killed.

The Jataka version Dr. Brown rejects because the one caught is a man and because the giant with the sticky hair is not a mere tar-baby as in Uncle Remus. Also because the escape is by a "bald and rather unconvincing bluff." But the Uncle Remus version is not the versio princeps of the tar-baby versions by any means, some of the best versions having a man or monkey caught and not a rabbit; and as for the escape, the facts of the matter are that in many a version there is no escape at all. The man or animal caught fast escapes alive in 116 or 76% of all the versions. In 26 or 17% of the versions it is specifically stated that the man or animal caught fast is killed. The figures are significant only for India (four versions or 44%), Europe (two or 100%), Cape Verde Islands (three or 100%), American Indians (6 or 23%). The Samyutta Nikaya version Dr. Brown rejects because it is a plain moral tale designed to show that "he who is ensnared by sin is held ever

tighter and tighter until at last he is destroyed." No matter what its purpose may be the fact remains that the five point attack and catch is there. The whole episode is so extraordinary and the similarity of the implied dramatic monologue with that of the Jataka 55 version is so striking that to me there is absolute evidence of a genetic relation.

There is a third ancient Hindu version, though not so old as the other two. The twelfth century version from Hemachandra's *Paricistaparvan* (3) is the following:

After a bloody quarrel between two monkeys over the females, the older of the two retires covered with wounds and completely exhausted. He comes to a rock from which bitumen is oozing. He begins to lick it thinking that it is water and his face sticks to it. He then tries to free his face and touches the bitumen with his hands, one after the other, and these stick also. Then he tries to free himself by touching the bitumen with his two feet and these stick also. There he remains and perishes miserably. The text ends thus: "In like manner sensual lust laying hold of man by one of his senses is sure to ruin his entire soul."

The relation to the version from the *Samyutta Nikaya* is clear even in the moral. It is indeed striking that the three Old India versions have the five-point attack and catch and the dramatic monologue fully developed. Apparently the baustein of the tar-baby story was well known in India two thousand years ago.

From India I have brought together also six modern versions. Five of them are clearly related to the ancient versions. The first version by Bodding (4) begins with a series of incidents about a jackal and a hen who were friends. Finally the jackal eats the hen and leaves the chicks orphans. He tries to eat the chicks also but they play several tricks on him and escape: he is burned in a fire-place like the wolf of the familiar wolf and seven kids story, the ants bite off some of his skin. Then he eats carp and they pass through him and come out whole leaving holes in his buttocks. To patch up the holes he goes to a shoemaker, but the shoemaker also covers up his anus. He then goes to a blacksmith and a hole is made with a hot poker. This incident is probably related to the hot poker punishment of the substitute animal of the Spanish-American versions.¹ The tar-baby episode comes at the end. A brief resumé follows:

The jackal then went to the village to eat fowls and the inhabitants ran away. But one old woman did not run away. She hid in the pigsty. When the jackal arrived he chased the fowls for all he was worth. He chased a cock to the pigsty where the old woman was hiding and when he saw her he asked her to catch it for him. She refused and he caught the cock himself, and then with a spice-

¹ See Appendix I, 38 and 46.

roller he knocked out all her teeth. Then he asked her to say *toyo*, but since she had no teeth she said *hoyo*. This pleased the jackal very much.

When the villagers heard what the jackal had done, they made a wax-woman resembling the old woman and placed her in the street. The jackal arrived singing and when he caught sight of the wax-woman he cried out to her, "Have a care, old woman! Get out of the way for me! Why have you blocked the road for me? Yesterday I knocked your teeth out. Are you not afraid? Beware! Get out of the way! If you don't I'll kick you and fix you in no time." She did not get out of the way and he kicked her. His foot stuck. Then the jackal said, "Take care, old woman! Let me go! Oh, mother, this old woman has caught hold of me! You unspeakable old woman, if you don't let me go, I shall give you a slap now." He gave her a slap and his paw stuck. Then the jackal said, "Oh, mother, this old woman has caught hold of my hand." And he slapped with the other paw and that stuck also. And when both his feet were stuck he exclaimed, "Oh, mother, this unspeakable old woman, she has caught hold of all my hands and feet! Take care, old woman, and let me go; otherwise I shall bite you." He bit her and his teeth also stuck to the wax.

The villagers then ran up and killed the jackal with a battle-axe. This modern India version has all the fundamental elements of the baustein: the initial "no reply" and not getting out of the way formula, the attack and catch at five points, and the dramatic monologue and accompanying threats are especially well developed. If we substitute a rabbit for a jackal and add the substitution episode, this version would be very similar to some of the best Spanish-American versions. The destroyer-thief and bully is killed in this version as in the two European versions. In 26 or 17% of the total number of 152 versions the one caught by a tar-baby is actually killed.

The second version by Bodding (5) is a fragmentary version of the first one.

Every day a jackal asked an old woman for a fowl. Her sons prepared an old woman of wax to catch him. The jackal arrives drumming with a twig he picked up on the way. He asks the wax-woman for a fowl and receiving no reply he throws the drumstick at her. It sticks to her. Then he runs up and kicks her and is caught by the leg. The sons find the jackal well caught, disentangle him, cram him with sand and allow him to escape. Then comes the hot poker incident.

In this version some details are lacking, but it is evidently related to the others, especially to (4) as we have stated. The attack and catch are at one point only, evidently an omission of the narrator. The throwing of the drum-stick at the wax-woman and its sticking to the wax is

apparently another version of the fifty arrows that stick to the giant with the sticky hair in the Jataka 55 version. We shall see this incident in other forms later.

The Bompas version (6) is also another form of the first version of Bodding (4). The initial adventures of the jackal and the hen and the hen and the chicks are lacking. Also the hot poker episode.

The jackal goes about destroying houses and eating all the chickens of a village. He meets an old woman and knocks out her teeth. The villagers make an image of an old woman, cover it with bird lime and place it in the street. The jackal appears and says, "Get out of my way. I knocked your teeth out yesterday and now I am going to kick you." He kicks with one foot and it sticks. He then strikes with the right hand and that sticks also. He strikes with his left hand and that also sticks. He then bites and his teeth and mouth stick. The villagers then come out and beat him to death.

The Gordon version (7) has a jackal caught by a wax-woman with movable hands and a basket of fruit to lure him. This tar-baby, usually female, with fruit, cakes or some other food, in a basket or in her hands appears in many other versions from other regions, and is especially important in the Lesser Antilles version where it occurs in five or 71% of the versions. The dramatic elements are lacking in the Gordon version and there is no multiple attack and catch. The jackal is caught all at once and that is all. He is found caught and is given a good beating. He is kept a prisoner, however, and a short time afterwards when another jackal passes by and asks why he is all swollen he says that it is because he is so fat from eating. He then induces the other jackal to take his place and get plenty to eat. Substitution takes place and the second jackal gets a good beating also. In this single case of substitution in the India versions, we have a definite and rather striking case of similarity between the India and Spanish-American versions. Substitution is the predominant feature of the Spanish-American versions. It occurs in 60% of the versions, and only in 14 and 8% respectively in the Anglo-African and African versions.

The version from the Indian Antiquary (8) is similar to many of the Spanish-American and Anglo-African versions, except that a fox is caught instead of a rabbit. In this version the fox is a thief who had been stealing garden produce, there is the initial "no reply" formula and the attack and catch are at five points with the usual dramatic monologue. The man who had set up the tar-baby then allows the fox to escape when the fox promises to marry him to the king's daughter. This incident may be a primitive form of the characteristic, "They wish to marry me to the king's daughter," and the "take my place" episode of the Spanish-American versions, isolated incidents that occur in many other tales of European origin.¹ In Fansler's Philippine version (65)

¹ See Appendix 43.

the liberated monkey actually manages to marry his master to a king's daughter, just as in many of the European tales a grateful animal or clever servant succeeds in obtaining for his master the hand of a princess.

Our last India version (9) lacks some of the fundamental elements of the baustein. A jackal is caught with a tar-doll buried in the ground. The jackal digs the ground to get it and is caught as he handles it. Some details are evidently lacking, there being no mention of the play of hands and feet. It is a poor fragmentary version of the tar-baby story.

Our nine India versions present a very simple and primitive pattern of the tar-baby story with the fundamental elements of the baustein that is found in the majority of the versions from all countries. The multiple attack and corresponding multiple catch are very well developed, as well indeed as in any of the best modern versions from Africa or America. The initial "no reply" formula is the predominant reason for the beginning of the attack (33%), and the dramatic monologue has become fixed, the threats of Prince Buddha of the Jataka 55 version of fifteen hundred years ago having become a fixed type of dramatic dialogue. The "no reply" formula occurs in 102 or 67% of all the versions, and it is especially well defined in the Spanish-American and Lesser Antilles versions, 83 and 86%, respectively, as against 56 and 54%, respectively in the Anglo-African and African versions. The dramatic monologue occurs in 119 or 78% of the total number of versions.

The India versions, both old and modern, have all the fundamental elements of the baustein of the tar-baby story as any one can see from the previous discussion and analysis of the various versions, the multiple-point attack and catch (five-point in four or 44% of the versions), the initial "no reply" formula, the dramatic monologue with the threats repeated after each catch, etc. But the India versions contain also some of the secondary elements of the modern versions, namely the incident of the marrying of the king's daughter, the substitution or the "take my place" incident, and the special allurements of a basket of sweets of the Gordon version. This woman with a basket of sweets becomes a plain sex attraction in some of the African and Anglo-African versions. And as a matter of fact we may have also in these versions an echo of the old Hindu moral lesson literally defined in the Jataka 55, Paricistaparvan and Samyutta Nikaya versions. In some of the African and Anglo-African versions the female tar-baby is a real sex attraction. When Brer Rabbit says to the female tar-baby in the Andros Island version (102) "Fancy I can kiss dis gyirl nice," he is to be identified with the sensual monkeys of the Samyutta Nikaya and Paricistaparvan versions. The Asiatic source of this female tar-baby attraction of the African and Anglo-African versions appears to be certain.

The evidence for the India origin of the tar-baby story is, therefore, quite strong. The three old versions, two of them being fifteen hundred and

two thousand years old, respectively, and one from the twelfth century, together with the five complete versions and one fragmentary modern version seem to me to prove the India origin beyond all doubt. The oriental sources of the European tales are so well known that it would be natural for me now to turn my attention to Europe. The heart of the tar-baby story, the primitive baustein, is found in India, old and modern, together with some of the secondary details. But there are many more secondary details or elements in the various versions of the tar-baby stories from Africa and America that are evidently of European source. This fact alone would be sufficient reason for looking for the European sources of the Anglo-African and Spanish-American versions of the tar-baby story. And to be sure, we find the tale in Europe as I have already indicated.

There are two European versions. The first one is the first tar-baby story collected in modern times anywhere, the Lithuanian version of Schleicher published in 1857 (10), twenty-three years before Uncle Remus. Folklorists that have discussed the tar-baby story heretofore do not even know of the existence of this valuable European version, the pioneer version from modern tradition and for that reason I give it below in its entirety in English translation. The tar-baby episode appears suddenly and dramatically at the end, pure and in all its splendor. To deny that it is a version of the tar-baby story because it has come down from India attached to another folktale would be the same as to say that a nugget of pure gold is not gold if it happens to be found imbedded in a lump containing also other precious metals. The story follows:

Nine brothers had but one sister. All nine were soldiers. When they left their sister, who at that time was still very young, the oldest brother bought her a gold ring. When the girl had grown up she found the ring in a chest and asked her mother, "Mother, who bought this ring and put it here?" The mother said, "My child, you have nine brothers and the eldest bought it for you." Then the girl begged her mother to allow her to put the ring on and pay a visit to her brothers. The mother consented, hitched a little colt to a little carriage, and the girl went away.

Soon she met a young hare who begged, "Onutte, little sister, let me ride with you." She let the hare get into the carriage and said to her, "Duck down behind." They rode on farther until they reached the sea where Laumes were bathing near the shore. When the Laumes saw her thus travelling with the hare they called out, "Come here to us, Onutte; come and bathe. Past us flows a river of milk and out of the shore red wine." But the hare warned her, "Onutte, little, sister, do not go to them. In the stream flow tears, and from the shore flows blood." Then a Laume sprang furiously from the water and pulled off the hare's hind feet.

They rode on still farther and another Laume called out, "Onutte, come and bathe with us. Past us flows a river of milk and from the shores flows red wine." But the hare warned her again not to go to them. Then the Laume sprang out of the water, seized the hare and threw her from the carriage. The young girl now rode a long distance along the water and when another Laume called out to her she really went to bathe with them. When she had undressed and wore only the ring the Laume said, "Onutte, little sister, I will change you into a louse and myself into a flea. The one who comes out of the water first will put on your beautiful clothes, but the one who is last must wear the old slimy skin." The Laume won, of course, and put on the fine clothes, while Onutte had to dress herself in the slimy skin. But she kept the ring on her finger and the Laume did not notice it.

Thus they went on farther, Onutte weeping bitterly. The Laume asked, "Where are you going?" Then she told the Laume that she was going on her way to pay her brothers a visit. Soon they reached a very large courtyard into which the Laume entered and asked, "Are there nine windows, nine tables, nine sauce-pans, nine dishes, and nine spoons?" And finally she said, "Are there nine brothers here?" The mistress answered, "Here there are neither nine windows, nor nine tables, nor nine sauce-pans, nor nine dishes, nor nine spoons, nor nine brothers." Then they rode on farther to another courtyard, and the Laume entered and asked as before. Here were the nine brothers. The eldest brother, who was standing by the window and heard the Laume speak, went to the other brothers and said to them, "That must be our sister."

Then the Laume was received with honor. They had her sit at the head of the table and she was richly entertained. Then the eldest brother said, "But who is that sitting in the carriage?" The Laume replied, "As I was passing along the seashore a Laume got in and I allowed her to ride with me." The brother then said, "Well, she can go the field and look after the horses." As she was watching them, the horses of her eldest brother refused to eat. Then she sang the following little song:

"Ah, my little horse, ah, my little brown one,
Why will you not eat the green grasses of the meadow?
Why will you not drink of the river's clear water?"

Then the horse began to speak and said:

"Why should I eat green grass?
Why drink the river's water?
That Laume, that witch, drinks wine with your brothers,
While you, your brother's sister,
Must look after the horses."

The eldest brother, who was now in the field, heard the song, and came up and said, "Laume, witch, come here and wash my head." Weeping bitterly she came up. While she was washing his head he saw the ring and asked, "Where did you get that ring?" Thereupon she related everything that had happened and how she had been betrayed by the Laume. The brother fell into a swoon from grief, and when he had come to his senses he took his sister home, bought her beautiful new clothes and had her wash herself clean and make herself tidy.

Then the eldest brother told the others how the Laume had betrayed their sister, and said, "What kind of torture shall we inflict on the Laume?" Then they took a horse, covered it with tar, placed it close to the door, and cried out, "Laume, witch, come out." The Laume answered, "Oh, master, I cannot, for there is a horse standing in front of the door." "Strike it with your hand so that it will go away," said the brothers. The Laume struck and her hand remained stuck to the tar. The brothers then said, "Strike the horse with your other hand." The Laume struck and her other hand remained stuck also. Then the brothers said again, "Kick the horse with your foot." She did so and her foot remained stuck also. "Strike with the other foot," said the brothers. She did and that also remained stuck. At last she had to strike with her belly and that also stuck. Then the brothers took a good whip, whipped the horse and said:

"Run, my little horse,
Run, my little brown one,
Over the heath,
Down to the sea,
To wash yourself off."

The Lithuanian tales belong for the most part to the general European folklore, as everybody knows, and many of them are derived from Oriental sources. The possibility that the tar-baby episode just read could go from Africa to Lithuania is very, very remote, and the probability that it has come from India together with many other folktales is quite certain. The fact that it has come down attached to another folktale is nothing extraordinary. In fact the tar-baby story appears attached to all kinds of folktales and folktale incidents. In two of the Cape Verde versions of Dr. Parsons (47, 48) the tar-baby story appears attached to the tale of the master-thief. The tar-baby episode is after all very simple and its presence in other tales where the problem of catching a thief, a bully, or of doing away with any evil-doer, such as the witch of the Lithuanian tale, the destroying monkey of the India tale of Bompas (6), or the destroying and boastful giant of the Castilian tale (11), is not only logical and natural, but the very thing one should expect in folklore.

The Lithuanian version has, of course, the fundamental baustein of the tar-baby story complete, the five-point attack and catch, the initial "will not get out of the way" formula, and the dramatic elements. The dramatic monologue does not occur as such because the witch attacks at each point upon the command of the brothers. This seems a curious version of the dramatic monologue and threats that are repeated by the one who is being caught in other versions of the tale, but there can be no doubt about the relation between the two forms of the monologue. Surely this Lithuanian version of the tar-baby story is as interesting and as important as the Uncle Remus version if not more so, and it is very much of a mystery that it has not been known to those who have studied the tale before.

I now give an English translation of the other European version of the tar-baby story known to me, my own Castilian version found in the province of Ávila in 1920 and published in my "Cuentos populares españoles" (II). This version is in some respects a close parallel to the Jataka 55 version from India, and in the actual form of the dramatic monologue a very close parallel to many of the Spanish-American versions.

Once upon a time there were a husband and wife who were very rich and had no children. And the wife was wont to say, "Alas, if the Lord would only give us a son as big and as strong as Sampson so that he could consume our wealth!" And she repeated this so many times that the Lord gave her a son as big and as strong as Sampson. And when they baptized him they had him named Sampson.

The child grew rapidly and when he reached manhood he ate three pigs, three bushel of chick-peas and a bushel of bread a day. In a short while he consumed all their wealth and his parents were left poor. The parents said then, "Now we are going to get him a large hoe so that he can go to work and earn his own living." They had the hoe made and three men were sent for it but they could not lift it. Sampson went then and picked it up easily and said, "This is the way you do it. You are all worthless." He picked it up as if it were a mazard berry and all were greatly surprised.

He then took his hoe and started on his journey. He would find work as a servant in many places but since he ate all the food in one day all would dismiss him the second day, and finally nobody would take him as a servant. All were afraid of him and when they passed near him all would take their hats off. Since no one would have anything to do with him, he went at last to the king's palace and went about digging up the gardens and destroying nearly everything. But no one dared to say anything to him. The king then called his knights and said to them, "What a time we are having with this man! How are we going to get rid of him?" And

they finally agreed to send many armed knights on horseback to fight with him and kill him. The knights, armed with their best weapons, went to meet Sampson. And Sampson at once caught one of the horses by the tail and striking furiously here and there with the horse he soon killed all the knights. He then went to the palace and said to the king, "Well, I have killed them all."

Then they decided to make a tar-man to catch him. They made the tar-man and placed it near the palace. Sampson passed by and because the tar-man did not make a bow to him he said, "Are you going to make a bow to me? If you don't, I'll hit you. Are you going to make a bow to me? If you don't, I'll hit you." And when the tar-man did not make a bow to him, Sampson gave him a blow with his right hand and it stuck. Then he said to him, "Are you going to make a bow to me? If you don't, I'll hit you. Are you going to make a bow to me? If you don't, I'll hit you." He then gave him a blow with his left hand and it stuck. He then said to the tar-man, "Will you let go of my hands? If you don't, I'll hit you with my foot. Will you let go of my hands? If you don't, I'll hit you with my foot." He then gave him a kick and the foot stuck. Thereupon he became very angry and said to the tar-man, "Will you let go of my hands and my foot? If you don't, I'll hit you with the other foot. Will you let go of my hands and my foot? If you don't, I'll hit you with the other foot." And he gave him a kick with the other foot and that stuck also. Angrier than ever, he addressed the tar-man thus, "Will you let go of my two hands and my two feet? If you don't, I'll hit you with my belly. Will you let go of my two hands and my two feet? If you don't I'll hit you with my belly." And he struck him with his belly and that stuck also. And since he was now so well stuck they easily caught him and killed him.

Again we find the unmistakable tar-baby story and attached to another European folktale, in this case, the story of the precociously strong youth similar in the beginning to the well known story of John the Bear.¹ There is even a little of the real biblical Sampson story in the killing of the knights with a horse caught by the tail which brings to memory the death of the thousand Phillistines by Sampson with the jaw of an ass. Probably the name suggested the biblical analog. The stick-fast episode at five points with the detailed dramatic elements is a close parallel to the Jataka 55 version. There are of course some

¹ It is similar in the beginning to many a European version of John the Bear or some such hero. The Greek tale of Hahn II, 75, *Das Bärenkind*, has a series of incidents at the beginning quite similar to those of the first part of our Castilian tar-baby story. The incident of the young boy who eats everything and destroys everything appears also in a Porto-Rican folktale. Mason-Espinosa PRF II, 35.

differences of detail. In the Jataka version Prince Buddha is stuck at five points to a giant with sticky hair, while in the Castilian version the destroying giant is himself caught by the ordinary tar-baby of the numerous versions from all parts of the world. The details of the dramatic monologue are the best told of any version known to me. The threat after the attack and catch at each point is repeated always. With the exception of the repetition, the actual details of the dramatic monologue are very similar to those of the Spanish-American versions. One can hardly escape the conclusion that the dramatic monologue of our Castilian version is the prototype version par excellence of all the Spanish American versions. As for the no-escape ending I have already pointed out that it is by no means rare in the various versions. In 26 versions or 17% of the total, the one caught fast is actually killed. The attack on the tar-baby begins with the "no salute" episode, and this is strikingly similar to the frequent "no reply" formula of the Spanish-American and Anglo-African versions.

The presence of the tar-baby story attached to another European folktale in the Lithuanian version, in the Castilian version, and also in the two Cape Verde versions already cited, seems to me to be ample evidence for the theory suggested by Dr. Parsons that one of the ways the tar-baby story entered Europe was as an attachment to other folktales. The fact is that the tar-baby story appears in Europe and in characteristically European dress and setting, and it also appears under similar circumstances in the two Portuguese versions from the Cape Verde Islands. In all four cases it is a man that is caught by a bucket of tar, a tarred man or giant, a tarred horse, or an actual modern tar-baby, gradually and in multiple-point fashion as in the Jataka 55 version. The two European versions together with the two Cape Verde Islands versions are four important links in the chain of the story's evolution. Equally important links are to be found in the versions from Hispanic America.

Two false assumptions must disappear, therefore, from our minds as we continue the study of our problem: the idea that the tale has not been found in Europe, and the idea that it is of African origin. The three old India versions, two of them fifteen hundred and two thousand years old, respectively, the six modern India versions, and the two European versions, all studied already, are most certainly not of Africa source. Having found the tar-baby story fully developed in India and Europe let us now turn our attention to the versions from the Hispanic world, since the story has been found in Spain.¹

Outside of India and Europe the best versions of the tale are from Hispanic America. Even in the popularity of the tale Hispanic America

¹ In Appendix I, 21, I give another tar-baby, or rather tarred-horse, version from Spain, already mentioned and not included in my study.

does not yield to any country. From the Spanish-speaking countries alone I have found thirty-five versions, while from the Anglo-African regions, which have been explored far more in search of folklore, there are only thirty-six. I cannot, of course, go into a study of all the thirty-five Spanish-American versions. I will cite either briefly or in detail a few that seem to me to be outstanding both as characteristic versions from Spanish-America and as links in the India-Europe-America evolution of the story, and then I shall attempt to characterize the Spanish-American versions as a whole.

The two long tales of the rabbit and coyote cycle published by Professor Boas from Pochutla and Oaxaca, Mexico, are of the best that we have from Spanish-America and typical of the group as a whole (16, 17). Both narrate numerous adventures of the rabbit and the coyote, the last named animal appearing always in the place of the poor foolish jackal of the India folktales or the stupid wolf of the Aesopic and general European tales and fables. That this whole cycle of the rabbit and the coyote may be of European source, probably Spanish, is to me quite evident. The stupid wolf and the clever rabbit are commonplace in the folktales from Spain. In some cases the fox is the stupid animal and the toad the clever one.¹ In the two Mexican versions the European incidents are numerous. In both the tar-baby episode appears at the beginning. This part of the Pochutla version (16) is the following:

There was a woman who had a chile-garden; and every day she went to watch it because a rabbit ate much of it. Upon the advice of an ant she sets up four little wax-monkeys at the entrance of the wall where the rabbit entered, two on each side.

The rabbit arrived and when he saw the first wax-monkey he said, "See here, little monkey of wax! If you do not let me pass, I'll box your ears." And he boxed his ears and his little hand stuck fast. He said again, "Look here, little mokey of wax! If you do not let me pass, I have another hand, and I'll box your ears again." And he boxed his ears, and the other little hand stuck fast. He said again, "Look here, little monkey of wax! If you don't let go of my little hands I'll kick you." And he kicked him and his little foot stuck fast. He said again, "Look here, little monkey of wax! If you don't let go of my hands and my foot, I'll kick you again. I have another little foot."

At this point the daughter arrived and said to the rabbit, "Ah, it must be you who eats my chile! Now I'll get even with you. She put him in a net and took him to the house. She hung him in the middle of the house and went to fetch boiling water to throw over him. In the meantime a coyote passed by, and as soon as the rabbit saw him he began to cry out, "I am too small and I don't want to

¹ See *Cuentos* 215, and especially tales 228—231.

get married! How can they marry me by force?" The coyote drew near and asked the rabbit what the trouble was. The rabbit explained that he was in the net because they wanted to marry him to a very pretty girl and he did not want to marry. Coyote said then that he would marry the pretty girl if the rabbit would let him get into the net. He got into the net and the rabbit escaped.

When the old woman found the coyote she said, "Ah, how did the rabbit turn into a coyote!" She put the pot of water over the fire, and when it was boiling she poured it over the coyote's hind quarters. The coyote was badly burnt and ran away rolling and rolling himself on the road.

The rabbit plays many more tricks on the coyote: throws prickly pears into his mouth, leaves him taking care of the baby (wasps) and the wasps sting him, takes him to get the cheese (moon) out of the pond, etc., etc. These incidents are for the most part of European source as I have already stated. The tar-baby story which comes at the beginning is one of the best from any region. The presence of four wax-monkeys instead of one is not a unique feature of this Pochutla version. It is found also in the New Mexican versions and there it is explained. In both of the Mexican versions the attack and catch are at four points and the dramatic monologue is especially well defined. The substitution of the coyote for the rabbit, however, is not a characteristic of this individual tale, but a special feature of the Spanish-American versions (60%). In India substitution occurs in only one of the versions (7). In the two Mexican versions the rabbit escapes by deceiving the coyote into believing that they are to marry him to a pretty girl, the king's daughter in other Spanish-American versions (11 or 31% of the versions have one or the other). The escape of the rabbit through substitution is the outstanding trait of the Spanish-American versions while in the Anglo-African versions the escape through the mock-plea is the outstanding feature (20 or 56% of the versions). Both have the escape of the animal caught as the principal characteristic, but in the Spanish-American versions it is through substitution while in the Anglo-African versions it is through the mock-plea. There is some similarity between the incident of the rabbit who says they are to marry him to a pretty girl, the king's daughter in other Spanish-American versions and a common European incident in other folktales, and the incident of the India version (8) where the fox that had been caught by a tar-baby is allowed to go free when it promises the man to help him to marry the daughter of a king. And a relation between all these incidents of the tar-baby versions seems probable in view of the fact that in Fansler's Philippine version (65) a monkey that is caught by a tar-baby actually helps the man who allowed him his freedom out of mere pity to find and marry a king's daughter, as we have already pointed out in our study of the India version. If

we substitute a man, several men, several animals, or a clever servant for the monkey of the Phillipine version we will have a commonplace incident of many a European folktale.¹

My New-Mexican Spanish version (18) is very similar to the Mexican versions from Pochutla and Oaxaca. It resembles especially the Pochutla version in that there are three wax-monkeys (the Pochutla version has four) instead of one, but in view of the fact that their presence in the tale is for a definite purpose I believe that the New Mexican version is a more complete and primitive form of the Spanish-American tar-baby story than the Pochutla version. The Pochutla version fails to explain the presence of the four wax-monkeys as does the New Mexican version the three. Briefly, the New Mexican version is as follows:

A farmer had a fine vegetable garden and a rabbit came every night to steal the vegetables. To catch him he set up three wax-men at three different corners of the garden.

As soon as it was dark the rabbit arrived and seeing one of the wax-men he became frightened and addressed him thus, "Please don't kill me. Let us run a race from here to the other corner. If you win you can kill me and if I win you will let me go." The wax-man made no reply so the rabbit thought he had accepted the wager. "Here we go," said the rabbit, and he started to run as fast as he could. On arriving at the other corner of the garden he stopped and saw in front of him the second wax-man, and thinking that he had been beaten he said, "Well you beat me this time; but please give me another chance." He started to run again as fast as he could. On arriving at the third corner of the garden he stopped before the third wax-man. "You must be the devil himself if you can beat a rabbit running," said the rabbit greatly surprised. And very angry he added, "But before I give up let us have a fist fight in order to decide who is the braver of the two." As he spoke thus he raised his right hand and gave him a hard blow. His hand stuck. "Let go, let go," said the rabbit; "if you don't let go I'll hit you again." And he gave the wax-man a blow with his other hand and that stuck also. The rabbit then got very angry and gave the wax-man a kick. His leg stuck. Then the rabbit got very, very angry, and said to the wax-man, "I still have one leg left and in order that you may realize what a brave man I am, I am going to give you a good beating." Then he gave him a kick with his last leg and that stuck also.

But even then the rabbit did not give up, and he said to the wax-man, "I suppose you think that because I am caught by my hands and feet I cannot defend myself. You are badly mistaken for I still have my head." And saying this he gave the wax-man a bump with his head and his head stuck also.

¹ See Cuentos 9, 142.

The next day the farmer found the rabbit well caught and took him home. His wife had already prepared a vessel of boiling water and the rabbit said to himself, "Surely I am going to die now. They are going to put me in boiling water." But they left the rabbit outside tied and went into the house for a moment.

In the meantime a coyote passed by looking for the rabbit to eat him. The moment he saw the rabbit he said, "What are you doing here, friend rabbit? Let us go out for a walk." "Oh, no," said the rabbit. "Don't you see those kettles boiling on the stove? They are going to have a big dinner here in a few moments and I have been invited. If you wish to take my place come here and untie me and stay here until they come." "All right," said the coyote, and he untied the rabbit and remained in his place. The rabbit escaped immediately. When the man and the woman came out to kill and cook the rabbit the man said, "How this rabbit has grown! We are certainly going to have a fine feast. Let us throw it in the hot water so it will be well cooked." Coyote thought they were going to take him to the feast. They lifted him up and threw him into the boiling water. When coyote realized what they were doing with him he jumped out all scalded and with half his skin peeled off and ran away in search of the rabbit.

Then follow a series of incidents, some of them similar to those of the Pochutla version. The version is another typical Spanish-American version, with the presence of the three wax-men explained, the usual "no reply" formula, the five-point attack and catch, the dramatic monologue well defined, and the series of incidents characteristic of many Spanish-American rabbit and coyote tales. The several wax-figures, however, is not a characteristic of the Spanish-American versions. In the majority of them there is only the usual single tar-baby. The episode of the several tar-babies and the incident of the race is found only in the New Mexican version just read.

My New Mexican MS (19) version is very similar to the one given above, but there is only one tar-baby and the incident of the race is lacking. Coyote substitutes, and is scalded with hot water again.

If we leave out the multiplicity of the tar-figures the great majority of the Spanish-American versions are very similar to the Mexican and New Mexican Spanish versions given above. A rabbit (25 times or 71% of the versions), a monkey (3 times or 9%), or less frequently another animal, steals garden produce from a field and is caught at four or five points by a tar-baby, a coyote (11 times or 31%), a tiger (4 times or 11%), or some other animal, substitutes and is scalded with hot water (7 times or 20% of the versions) or stuck with a hot poker (7 times or 20% of the versions). The initial "no reply" formula is the rule (29 times or 83% of the versions), and the dramatic monologue is especially well defined (26 times or 74% of the versions).

In another Mexican version from Oaxaca (34) several wax-monkeys are placed on fruit trees to catch a greedy monkey, but in the subsequent six-point attack and catch, two hands, two feet, head and tail, no mention is made of more than one. In this version there is also the usual Spanish-American substitution and the fox that substitutes is burned with a hot poker and dies from the injuries. The scalding with hot water and the burning with a hot poker of the hind quarters of the substitute animal are, together with the substitution, a Spanish-American characteristic. As we have already seen, scalding and burning with hot water and a hot poker occur together in 14 or 40% of the versions. The scalding with hot water occurs only in the Spanish-American versions, while burning with a hot poker occurs also in 3 or 42% of the Lesser Antilles versions and once in the American-Indian versions, evidently from Spanish influence. The Lesser Antilles have also a large percentage of substitution, 42%, the outstanding feature of the Spanish-American versions, 60%, while the American-Indian versions, that have many features of the Spanish-American versions from which they are probably derived, have 23% substitution. The Anglo-African and African versions have 14 and 8%, respectively.

The following features of the Spanish-American versions occur with less frequency and have in some cases very definite geographical limitations:

The one caught by a tar-baby is a man, as in the Jataka 55, the two European and other versions, in three versions, all three from the Greater Antilles, two from Santo Domingo, (12 and 14) and one from Porto Rico (21). In all three cases the man caught is a thief, there is the usual single tar-baby, the reason for the beginning of the attack is the "no reply" incident, the attack and catch are at 3, 5 and 3 points, respectively, the man escapes in all three and there is no substitution. In 13 or 9% of the total number of 152 versions the one caught by a tar-baby is a man. The presence of a man instead of the usual animal, 140 or 92% of the total, in the Jataka version from India and in the two European versions tends to show that this was a primitive feature of some of the India versions. This primitive feature of a man being caught instead of the more usual animal may account for the fact that in two Cape Verde versions the original tar-baby pattern has been confused with the tale of the master-thief.

The one caught is a monkey in three Spanish-American versions, two Mexican versions (34, 36), and the Chilean version (20). It is rather remarkable that a monkey appears as the animal caught in two versions from India, in three Spanish-American versions, in all three Brazilian versions (50, 51, 52), in the two Phillipine versions (65, 66), in only one African version and not in a single case of the 36 Anglo-African versions. The India monkey appears practically only in the Hispanic world. As we have already pointed out the monkey represents

Buddha in eleven of the Jataka or Buddha birth stories. The presence of a monkey in a sufficiently large number of versions, two from India, six from Hispanic America, two from the Philippines where Spanish influence is strong, seems to point again to a source that began in India and travelled to Europe and from Spain and Portugal to Hispanic America and other lands.

Tar-baby is attacked because he is set up with a pack of cards and refuses to play cards or to pay when the new-comer wins after playing alone in six Spanish-American versions, and in no other versions of the tar-baby story known to me. This is another characteristic of the Spanish-American versions. The incident occurs in four Porto-Rican versions (22, 24, 26, 29), the version from Colombia (45), and the Chilean version (20).

A brief outline of the Chilean version, the best of the six that has the card-playing episode, follows:

There was once a king who was very, very rich, and who owned a monkey that was very, very naughty. Every night the monkey used to steal some of his master's best jerked beef in order to eat it with his companions.

The king suspected that his chief officer was the thief and went with him to the cellar and complained about the thefts. The officer could not explain the matter and the king accused him openly, saying to him, "I will give you two days to catch the thief, and if during that time you cannot catch him you will pay for the thefts with your head." The officer was greatly grieved and did not know what to do.

Finally he decided to consult a witch who was said to have a pact with the devil. The witch advised him to make a tar-monkey and to set it up near a hole through which they suspected the thief had entered the cellar, and to place a pack of cards in the hands of the tar-monkey and a lighted candle on one side and a pile of money on the other. The officer did exactly what the witch advised.

During the night the monkey went down into the cellar, and the moment he saw the tar-monkey with the deck of cards and the pile of money he said to himself, "To-night I am going to win all that money and then I am going to have a good time." Then he said to the tar-monkey, "Well, here I am, friend! Let us toss up a coin to see who deals." He picked up a coin, threw it up and said, "Heads or tails . . . Tails. All right. You deal." The tar-monkey said nothing and did not move, so the monkey continued, "I see no reason for getting mad. Go ahead and play. If you don't I'll give you a beating and take the money away from you."

After waiting for a moment the monkey became impatient and took the cards himself. He drew two cards and said, "Which one

are you betting on?" There was no reply and he said, "Well, if you don't wish to bet I will. I'll bet a hundred dollars on the ace of diamonds." The tar-monkey did not say a word and the monkey played until he won all the money. Then he was going away with all the money, but suddenly he turned back and said to the tar-monkey. "You really ought to give me more money because you still owe me a lot." There was no reply and the monkey got furious and gave the tar-monkey a terrible blow knocking him down from the chair on which he was sitting. But his right hand stuck. "Let me go or I'll give you another blow that will make you spit blood," said the monkey angrily. The monkey then struck a hard blow with his left hand, and that stuck also. The monkey then said, "If you don't let me go, I'll give you a kick that will make your nose bleed." He gave him a kick and his foot stuck. Then he gave him a kick with his left foot, and that stuck also. Then he lashed the tar-monkey with his tail, and his tail stuck also. And lastly he struck him with his belly, and his belly stuck also. Only his head remained free, and he said then to the tar-monkey, "Look here, little monkey dear, I'll give you all the money I won from you, all the money I had myself, and all the money you want besides, if you let me go." There was no reply. He then struck the tar-monkey with his head as hard as he could, and his head also stuck.

The next day the monkey was found caught and the king ordered that he should be tied to a tree so that two caldrons of hot water would be poured over him and a hot poker stuck in his flesh. The monkey was tied to the tree when a lion passed by and inquired what the trouble was. And the monkey replied, "It is this way, brother lion, they want me to eat a whole calf. Why don't you stay and eat the calf yourself?" The lion consented and in a moment he untied the monkey and allowed him to tie him in his place.

Soon two men arrived with two caldrons of hot water and a red-hot poker. "Goodness! You were first a monkey and now you are a lion," said one of the men. The lion thought that they were asking him if he wanted to eat the calf and said, "Yes, indeed, I want to eat it." Immediately they poured the two caldrons of hot water over him and before he knew what was happening they also stuck him with the hot poker. The poor lion made a violent effort and broke the strings that held him. Then he ran away roaring through the forests from pain and anger.

One of the Cuban versions is of special interest because the animal caught fast with a tar-baby is a bird, a sparrow (31). It is the only case in the 152 versions studied.¹

¹ The mere incident of a bird being caught by means of a pole or a branch of a tree smeared with tar or bird-lime, however, is quite common in European folklore. It is the usual way of catching the dove (enchanted princess)

There was once a Chinaman who had a garden where he had planted among other things a few cundiamor plants (a sort of climbing vine). As soon as the fruit ripened the sparrows would eat it. In order to catch them the Chinaman set up a rag-doll all covered with chapapote (a sort of asphalt) near the cundiamor plants. Early in the morning while the Chinaman was looking out from his hut a sparrow came flying and lit on the fence near the plants and observed the tar-baby quite astonished. He was a little distrustful and greeted the tar-baby very politely. When tar-baby did not reply he said, "This fellow has a bad temper. I think I had better not go near him." He then flew to another garden.

The Chinaman was a little disappointed and that night he placed some ripe cundiamor plants on one of the shoulders of the tar-baby. The sparrow arrived again and seeing the ripe and delicious fruit on one of the shoulders of the tar-baby and only green fruit on the plants he approached and said, "Good morning, friend." Receiving no reply he flew right over the tar-baby and said, "Look out, friend! If you don't take good care of that cundiamor I'll eat it." Finally he flew near and began to peck at the cundiamor and it tasted so good that he lit on the tar-baby to eat at ease. Both of his legs stuck fast but he was eating so voraciously that at first he did not notice it.

When he was through eating he tried to fly and could not. Thinking that the tar-baby was holding him he spoke to him thus, "Let me go before I get warmed up and give you a good beating." He then made a great effort to fly and both of his wings stuck. Then he began to insult the tar-baby, threatening to kill him if he did not let go. He gave him a peck and his beak stuck. Then he struck with his body and all his body stuck. The Chinaman then came out and removed him from the tar-baby. But his feathers were all stuck together and he could not fly. The cat came and ate him.

This special type is a new development that merely gives us additional evidence of the popularity of the tale in Spanish-America. It has the multiple attack and catch, at six points, although when caught at the first two points it is not actually an attack, the initial "no reply" formula, and the dramatic monologue with the corresponding threats. The version presents us a primitive pattern of the story, the bare fundamentals of the baustein, with no substitution and with none of the numerous incidents so commonly found in the typical versions from Spanish-America.

in the well known European tale of the negress and the enchanted princess, the Spanish *La negra y la paloma*, *Cuentos* 120. See Romero XIV, 44; Cosquin in RTP XXVIII, 341; FLJ III, 290—293; Braga I, 83. In these tales the dove is caught the moment it lights on the tarred branch. The incident has no relation at all with the tar-baby story.

Another version from Cuba is also worthy of note, although it lacks most of the fundamental elements of the *baustein* (32):

Two farmers have vegetable gardens, and one of them, envious of the other one, sends a trained rabbit to eat and destroy the neighbor's vegetables. The farmer suspects the trick and sets up a bucket of tar in the garden in place of a bucket of fresh turnips that he was accustomed to leave there. The rabbit appears and falls into the bucket and gets stuck at once. His master whistles to him to come home but he is stuck fast. He struggles to escape but only gets deeper and deeper into the tar. The owner of the garden finds him caught and kills him.

This extraordinary version shows confusion with the tale of the master thief to the point that there is no play of hands and feet at all, but the thief is caught all at once by falling into the bucket of tar as in the typical tale of the master-thief in the versions of the *Book of the Seven Sages*. The tar-bucket appears also in other versions of the tar-baby story, in one of the Cape Verde versions (48), and in two Anglo-African versions (III, II9), but in all three of these we have the usual multiple-point attack and catch episodes, gradually and with the dramatic monologue and threats, the "no reply" formula, etc., as if the bucket of tar were a real tar-baby. In these versions the bucket of tar has been actually personified in order that it may fit with the traditional tar-baby type, whereas in the Cuban version the tar-bucket episode of the tale of the master-thief has remained unchanged in an actual tar-baby story. But in the Cuban version there is also confusion with another European tale, that of the two envious brothers or neighbors.¹ Once more we have the tar-baby story attached to other European tales.

One of the versions collected by Mr. Andrade from Santo Domingo (13) must be treated apart because it is the only one of the thirty-five Spanish-American versions that is definitely related to a known African form of the tar-baby story:

A husband and wife had a piece of land, but the husband was so lazy that he refused to work on it. Finally the wife got a friend to help her plant some rice in the land. But as soon as the rice was ripe and good to eat the lazy husband began to steal it. He had a cave near the field where he had taken salt, lard, and a pot. And every night he would come out and steal rice from the field.

One day the woman met her friend and said, "Compadre, some one is stealing my rice." And the friend replied, "Compadre, that is my compadre, your husband." "It cannot be he," said the woman, "because I know that he sleeps over there in the cave." And the friend replied, "But I know that it is he, and I am going to show you how we can catch him."

¹ See *Cuentos* 172—176.

So then they made a tar-man. When the lazy husband looked out of the cave he saw the tar-man and said, "There is the thief, the man who has been stealing the rice." Then he went out and said to the tar-man, "Good night! Good night!" And when the tar-man did not reply he said, "Friend, do you want me to give you a punch in the neck?" And he gave him a punch and his hand stuck. Then he said, "Friend, let go of me or I'll give you another punch." And he struck again and his other hand remained stuck. "All right! If you don't let go I'll give you a kick." He gave him a kick and his foot stuck. Then he said, "Friend, let go of me or I'll give you a blow with my head." He struck with his head and his head stuck. Then he said, "Let go of me, friend, or I'll give you a push with my belly." And he gave him a fierce push with his belly and his belly stuck also.

The next day the wife and the friend went to the field and found the lazy husband well caught. She got a switch and gave him a good beating. Then she took him off the tar-man. "Did I not tell you it was your husband?" said the compadre. "Yes, compadre, and I really ought to kill him," said the woman.

That is the end of the tar-baby episode. There follows another tale attached to the tar-baby episode, the curious story of the skull that asks for something to eat from a glutton, one that appears detached in Porto Rico and is strikingly similar to one of my peninsular Spanish tales.¹

This tar-baby version from Santo Domingo is a somewhat fragmentary version of the well known West African version of Barker and Sinclair (127) of the man who steals from his wife and children and when discovered, after being caught with a tar-man, changes himself into a spider, a tale that is found in almost identical form in an Anglo-African version from Jamaica (92). In the African and Anglo-African versions the husband-thief plays dead and comes to steal from the grave, while in the Santo Domingo version we are told that he sleeps in a cave near the rice field. This is the only important point of divergence. All three tales are different forms of the same tale, probably of African provenience. The African and Anglo-African versions are discussed later.

If we turn our attention to the Portuguese versions from Brazil and the Cape Verde Islands we find three somewhat different types. The Brazilian versions of Pimentel and Romero (50, 51) and the Cape Verde version number 33 (49) are different from most of the Hispanic versions in that the one robbed and the thief are partners in the garden from which one of them steals. In this respect these versions seem to show African influence. The partnership element is decidedly African. If we count also the African versions where the animals are in partner-

¹ Mason-Espinosa, PRF II, 19, and Cuentos 46.

ship digging a well it occurs in 14 or 54 % of the African versions. It is found also in four or 11% of the Anglo-African versions, but in these it is not always clearly and definitely defined as partnership. As for the rest, the above Brazilian and Cape Verde versions are of the usual type of the tar-baby story as a detached pattern. In the Brazilian versions a monkey is caught at five points, killed, and in one of them eaten. In the Cape Verde version a wolf is caught by another wolf, his nephew, and burned together with the tar-baby. In all three we have the fundamentals of the baustein, the multiple attack and catch, the initial "no reply" formula, the thief element and the male tar-baby, the dramatic monologue, but neither substitution, the outstanding Spanish-American characteristic, nor the mock-plea, the outstanding Anglo-African feature.

Two of the Cape Verde versions (47, 48) have the tar-baby episode attached to the tale of the master-thief as we have already indicated at the beginning of this article. In both versions the thief is a man, of course. In one of them (47) the thief is caught by a tar-man in the usual way at four points, "no reply" formula, dramatic monologue, etc. In the second version (48) the thief is caught by a tar barrel. This is of course the usual bucket of tar of the tale of the master-thief, but in our Cape Verde version the thief attacks in the usual manner, as if the barrel of tar were a real tar-man, is caught in the usual fashion at four points, etc., exactly as in the other version. In both the thief has his head cut off by the son as in the tale of the master-thief. There follow in both various incidents, in general those of the versions of the tale of the master-thief and others of European source.

These two Cape Verde versions are rather remarkable examples of one of the ways by which the tar-baby story has come down from India to Europe and from Europe to the Cape Verde Islands attached to other folktales, in this case specifically the tale of the master-thief. These two versions seem to me to be as important as the European versions as links in the chain of versions that have come down from India to European tradition and from Europe to the Cape Verde Islands and perhaps other lands.

Our sixth Portuguese version is just as interesting and important. The Brazilian version of Santa-Anna Nery (52) is the following:

A monkey steals oranges from an orange grove. The owner of the orange grove sets up a wax-monkey on one of the trees. The monkey arrives and says to the wax-monkey, "Give me an orange." Receiving neither the orange nor a reply he gets angry, picks up a stone and throws it at the wax-monkey. The stone sticks to the wax-monkey. Then an orange falls from the tree and the monkey eats it, thinking that his command had been obeyed after throwing the stone. He then asks for another orange. He does not get it so he throws another stone at the wax-monkey, and that stone sticks also.

No more oranges fall so the monkey gets very angry, climbs up the tree and gives the wax-monkey a good kick. His foot sticks. Then the monkey attacks in the usual manner with his hands and both stick. He still fights to free himself and both monkey and wax-monkey fall together to the ground. He finally escapes all battered up.

What is the importance of this Brazilian version? The fact that it has the incident of the throwing of the stones, two stones, that stick to the tar-baby. This is not a new development, but a modern form of the episode of the fifty arrows that the Prince of the Five Weapons, Buddha himself, shot at the giant with the sticky hair and which stuck, before the attack and stick-fast at five points, in the Jataka 55 version of some fifteen hundred years ago. In the second modern India version of Bodding (5) we have also an echo of the arrows episode when the angry jackal first throws a drum-stick at the wax-woman and that sticks to the wax. Again we find in the modern versions not only the primitive baustein of the tar-baby story from India, but also some of the secondary details of the India versions.

Somewhat similar to this is the Orinoco Indian version of Koch-Grünberg (53), probably of Portuguese origin. Instead of the drum-stick of the Bodding version, or the two stones of the Santa-Anna Nery version, or the fifty arrows of the Jataka 55 version, the Indian Makunaïma of the Orinoco version throws his blow-gun at a magic trap set up by the man-eating giant Piaïma, and it is caught in the trap. Then follows the attack and catch at four points. There is no initial "no reply" formula, the attacker being a bully who throws the blow-gun as soon as he sees the magic trap and begins the attack at once after that, and there is no dramatic monologue. It is a man who is caught as in the Jataka and in the European versions. Makunaïma is then taken home by Piaïma and is about to be killed, but escapes by saying to the magic basket where he was put what he had heard his captor say when he put him in it, "Open your mouth, your big mouth."

With the exception of the initial "no reply" formula and the dramatic monologue, which is barely suggested with the words, "Then he wished to destroy the trap with his other foot, etc." this South-American Indian version contains the fundamental elements of the baustein, and I believe that the incident of the throwing of the blow-gun at the trap that is caught before the usual attack and stick-fast episode is not an accidental, independent development, but again a survival of the episode of the arrows that stick to the giant with the sticky hair of the Jataka version. It is merely another form of the similar incident of the two stones that stick to the wax-monkey of the Santa-Anna Nery version.

The seven versions from the Lesser Antilles are of special interest and importance because as a geographical group near the Spanish-American and Anglo-African groups they present a group that has no definite and

clearly original features, but shows rather a blending of Spanish-American and African characteristics. There are three versions from Trinidad, two from Martinique, and one each from St. Vincent and St. Lucia.

In general the Lesser Antilles versions present a brief detached pattern of the tar-baby story that contains all the elements of the baustein, the initial "no reply" formula in all, the dramatic monologue and threats in six of the seven, the attack and stick-fast episode at four or five points, omitted in only one version (58) but taken for granted in view of the end of the tale. A few special features have been fully developed, but none of them are original. The female tar-baby, an African and Anglo-African feature, is found in four or 56% of the versions, but the actual courtship episode occurs only in one (54). The partnership element, one of the members of the family being the thief, another African trait, does not occur at all, but curiously enough the stealing of water from a well and often soiling it, elements that usually belong to the partnership feature of the African and Anglo-African versions, occur in five or 71% of the versions. However, the well that is dug by the animals in common, except the hare or rabbit who does not work and later steals, in the African and Anglo-African versions, belongs to a king in the Lesser Antilles versions. Another outstanding feature of the Anglo-African versions, the mock-plea, and one that is also found in the African versions, does not occur at all in the Lesser Antilles. On the other hand, substitution, the outstanding characteristic of the Spanish-American versions, and an element of European tradition, is found in three or 42% of the Lesser Antilles versions, and the hot poker incident, another Spanish-American characteristic, occurs in the three cases of substitution and is suggested in a fourth version. The specific reason given to the tiger by the rabbit to secure the substitution, "They give plenty of food," also a Spanish-American feature and one specifically of European source, is found in two of the three cases of substitution. In both cases the rabbit tells the tiger that they are going to give him an ox to eat, a detail that has an exact parallel in the Chilean version (20).

In the Lesser Antilles versions the animal that substitutes is not the typical coyote of the Spanish-American versions (11 or 52% of all the cases of substitution), but the tiger of the Porto-Rican and Colombia versions. In Chile it is a lion.

There is one feature that is dominant in the versions from the Lesser Antilles, although it is an element found also in Spanish-American, African and other versions, the tar-baby, usually female, that has some kind of food to entice the hungry animal, cakes and tea or chocolate, bread and fish, etc. It is found in five or 71% of the versions and it actually causes the initial attack and catch at the first point in three of the five: "no reply" and greed for the food together. In an India version (7) the female tar-baby entices a jackal with a basket of sweets in her hands; in three Spanish-American versions from Porto Rico the

tar-baby has a cheese, a loaf of bread, and a bottle of wine, respectively, in her hands; in three African versions the tar-baby has fruit or food in her hands or near by; in one Anglo-African version from Antigua (116) the tar-baby has sweets as in the India version; in a Cuban version (31) the tar-baby has fruit on one of his shoulders; and in one Portuguese version from Brazil (51) the tar-baby has bananas placed on his head.

In one of the versions (59) the tar-baby has dice and money and the rabbit who arrives to steal wants to gamble. This is evidently a variant of the cards and money episode characteristic of the Spanish-American versions (6 or 17% of the versions).

One of the versions deserves special notice, the one from St. Vincent (57), because it has one of the longest and most complicated dramatic monologues of any of the versions known to me. The attack and catch begin at two points, but after that the animal, a cat, struggles to throw the tar-baby into the well and gets caught from head to foot. There is no substitution and the king says in the end that he is going to eat the cat. A brief resumé follows:

There was once a king who had a well and some one was stealing the water. He set up a tar-baby and placed it standing near the well. In one hand the tar-baby had a loaf of bread and in the other one a slice of fish.

About eleven o'clock at night the thief, a cat, arrived, saw the tar-baby and, startled said, "Good evening, sir." The tar-baby did not reply, so the cat continued, "I am only taking a walk around and I want to ask you for some water." The tar-baby would not say a word. Then the thief said, "What sort of a man are you, a living man or a dead man?" But the tar-baby would not speak. So the thief said then, "Well, I'll have to find out who you are." He walked right up to the tar-baby and looked very closely because it was dark. Then he said, "Oh! I see now what you are. Massah king only put you there to frighten me, but you could not or would not. You are no good here." Saying this he hit him a slap on the jaw. His hand stuck. "You look very gummy," said the cat. "Let go of me. If you don't let go of me I'll give you another slap." And he slapped him again and his other hand stuck also. Then Ba Nancy, the cat, said to the tar-baby, "What do you mean by this? You will not let me go? I'll fling you over into the well if you will not let me go. Massah king sent you here to hold me, and you are holding me, but I am going to throw you into the well and both of us have to go." And trying to throw the tar-baby into the well and struggling to get away he got stuck more until he was well stuck from head to foot.

The next morning the king came and said, "Ah! I have caught the thief and his bones will make my bread today. Here you are." And he gave him a grip on the shoulder and took him out and held him by the hair and took him to his home.

The versions from the Lesser Antilles, therefore, have developed fully one special feature, the tar-baby with food of some kind to entice the hungry thief, which, however, is a feature found in many other versions; they have in general the outstanding and secondary features of the Spanish-American and Anglo-African (and of course African) versions, — substitution, hot poker and gambling incidents of the former, female tar-baby and courtship, and water-stealing episode of the latter. This is a remarkable case of the presence of mixed traditions from different sources, especially Spanish-American, African and Anglo-African, with very little originality in recent, local development. In view of the geographical location of the islands with the infiltration of Spanish, Negro, French, English and other racial elements that have contributed each its share of tradition they seem to furnish a most interesting field for studies in folkloristic geography.

The four versions from Dutch Guiana are clearly related to those from the Lesser Antilles, but in some respects are quite different. Even more so than the Lesser Antilles versions they present a rather primitive and simple version of the baustein. There is no substitution, the outstanding feature of the Spanish-American versions, found also in 42% of the Lesser Antilles versions, in any of the four. Thieves steal from the garden of a king (three or 75% of the versions) instead of the well of a king (five or 71% of the Lesser Antilles versions); the initial "no reply" and dramatic monologue occur in all four; and the attack and catch are at five points (two versions), four points (one version), and one point (one version). There is no female tar-baby, and no animal partnership. The tar-baby has corn or cakes in two versions. The animal thief is a spider in three of the four versions, probably an African feature. It occurs only once in the seven versions from the Lesser Antilles, but three times in the African versions. In the fourth version the animal thief is a monkey as in the Brazilian and other versions.

In all four versions from Dutch Guiana the animal caught by a tar-baby escapes alive although in two of them (61, 62) the spider gets a good beating. A definite summary of the secondary features of the versions points to the following sources: The spider-thief is an African feature, the king as the owner of the garden in three versions is similar to the king as the owner of the well in the Lesser Antilles versions, but the vegetable stealing and the water stealing are Spanish-American and African characteristics, respectively. The absence of the female tar-baby points to Spanish-American influence, but the absence of substitution is puzzling, especially in view of its presence in three of the Lesser Antilles version. The monkey as the animal caught in one of the versions is a Brazilian or general Hispanic feature. The tar-baby with food in its hands in two of the four versions may point to Lesser Antilles influence for in the Lesser Antilles versions the incident occurs in five

of the seven or 71% of the versions, although the incident occurs sporadically in versions from all the groups as I have already pointed out. The Dutch Guiana versions, in short, are related to the African, Lesser Antilles and Spanish-American versions in some of their secondary features.

There is one version from Dutch Guiana, however, that calls for special comment because the spider caught by a tar-baby escapes through the ruse of one of his sons who sings and prophecies the death and ruin of all if father spider is killed. This special and original ruse which reminds one of the common-place mock-plea "Don't throw me into the briar-patch" of the Anglo-African versions, the mock-plea "Don't swing me by the tail" of the African versions, and the deceiving words of the rabbit when he wishes to entice the coyote or tiger to take his place in the Spanish-American versions, is certainly a unique feature in the versions from Dutch Guiana and one of the most original of the secondary features of any of the tar-baby versions known to me. It may be compared to the coming to life of the dead animal in the Taos Indian versions discussed later, in originality and special individual development. I suspect that the ruse is of African, probably Anglo-African or Hispanic-African source, although a direct European source does not seem remote. This interesting version follows (63):

The king had a place where there were all kinds of fruit, plantains, and other kinds of food. But outsiders were stealing the fruit and the food. So the king had a large tar-baby put up inside the yard.

The thief was friend Anansi. He came at night and when he saw the doll he approached it and said with flattery, "Father, how are you?" There was no reply. He then said, "If you don't speak to me I'll slap you." The doll did not speak and Anansi struck him one blow. His hand stuck. He said then, "If you don't release me I'll give you another with my other hand." Anansi struck him with the other hand, and that hand stuck too. Then he said, "If you don't release me I'll butt you." Anansi butted him and his head stuck. He said then, "If you don't release me I'll kick you." Anansi kicked him. But he could do nothing more because his head, his hands and his feet were caught. There he remained stuck until they came and found him.

Then they announced that Anansi was the thief and the king said he would kill him. But before Anansi was going to die he sent for his children and said, "My children, you see I am about to die. What are you going to do for me?" Each one of his children told him a nonsensical thing. But finally the youngest one spoke to him and said, "Father, you know what I am going to do? I am going to hide in the top of a tall tree where they will put you to kill you. And I shall sing:

They are killing Anansi!
 They are killing Anansi!
 The country will be flooded.
 All the people will die.
 The king himself will perish.
 Anansi alone will remain."

Thus he did. And when the king heard the voice singing he said, "What is that?" Anansi replied, "Tye! Listen, my King. God himself pleads for me." The king said, "It is not true. A thief must be punished." Anansi said, "Tye! You will hear, my King, that it is the truth, because God will plead again for me." Soon they heard the voice again:

"They are killing Anansi!
 They are killing Anansi!
 The entire country will be flooded.
 All the people will die.
 The king himself will perish.
 Anansi alone will remain.

Then the king grew alarmed. He was afraid, and so he came to free Anansi.

The two Philippine versions are also attached to other European tales (65, 66). In the actual tar-baby episode they show a very primitive and simple pattern. In both of them a monkey is caught by a tar-baby at four points. There are the usual "no reply" formula at the start, the threats and dramatic monologue, and the monkey escapes alive. In one of the versions (66) the liberated monkey helps his liberator to find and marry a king's daughter, a version of the similar incident in one of the modern India versions (8) where the captor of a fox allows her her freedom when fox promises to marry him to a king's daughter. As we have already indicated in the discussion of that version, the incidents may have some relation to the somewhat different incident of the deceiving words of the rabbit in the Spanish-American versions to induce substitution, "They wish to marry me to a king's daughter" or "They wish to marry me to a pretty girl."

I believe that both of the Philippine versions are of European source, probably directly Spanish, although the possibility of direct transmission from India through Buddhistic channels may not seem remote. After a careful examination of the tales of Fansler's excellent volume and the scholarly notes that accompany it, I am strongly inclined to the first view. Too many of the tales show a definite European and often specifically Spanish source for one to take the second view seriously. In view of the fact that the tar-baby story has been found in Spain and also in another part of Europe, and in view of the fact that versions

of the tar-baby story have been found wherever the Spanish and Portuguese have colonized and lived how can we seriously doubt that they have been transmitted directly from Spain and Portugal to all parts of the Hispanic world?

The American-Indian versions are of special interest and importance. In general they show a closer relation to the Spanish-American than to the African or Anglo-African versions. The tar-baby story seems to be as popular and well known among the American Indians as among the Africans. I have brought together for the present study 26 versions from Africa and 23 from the North American-Indians. The Orinoco version from South America makes the total of the American Indian versions 24. This version I have already studied in connection with the Brazilian Portuguese versions to which it is apparently related. The 23 American-Indian versions that I shall now study are all from North America. Some definite statistics are necessary here.

The one robbed or who sets up the tar-baby is a human being in 56% or more of the versions from India (78%), Europe (100%), Spanish-America (77%), Portuguese versions (83%), Lesser Antilles (86%), Dutch Guiana (100%), Philippines (100%), Orinoco (100%), and the American Indians (56%). In the African and Anglo-African versions it is under 43%, Anglo-Africa 33%, Africa 42%. The African and Anglo-African versions show a tendency to substitute an animal for a man even in this element of the tale. In the case of the one caught by a tar-baby the Lesser Antilles, Dutch Guiana, Philippine and American-Indian versions have 100% animals, while the African, Anglo-African and Spanish-American versions show a definite preference for an animal with 96, 94 and 91%, respectively. India and the Portuguese versions have 89 and 67%, respectively. In Europe the one caught is a human being in both cases. As to the specific animal caught, the American-Indian versions follow the general tradition of Spanish-America, Anglo-Africa, Africa and the Lesser Antilles with a rabbit in 56% of the versions. Spanish-America and the Lesser Antilles lead with 71%. Anglo-Africa and Africa have 66 and 62%, respectively. In the Philippines it is a monkey in both versions, as we have already stated, and in the Portuguese versions the monkey appears in 50% of the versions.

With respect to what the thief steals, the American-Indian versions seem to follow African and Anglo-African tradition. The animal-thief steals water from a well and sometimes pollutes the water in 7 or 30% of the versions, as compared with 31, 39 and 71%, respectively in the African, Anglo-African, and Lesser Antilles versions. This element does not occur at all in the India, European, Spanish-American, Portuguese and Orinoco versions. In the majority of these versions the thief steals fruit or vegetables from a garden as we have already stated in discussing them. In the Spanish-American versions the percentage is 94.

In the American-Indian versions tar-baby is male in 14 or 61% of the

versions, while in the Spanish-American and Portuguese versions the percentages are 91 and 83, respectively. In Africa the tar-baby is male in only six or 23% of the versions, while in the Anglo-African versions the percentage rises to 56%, evidently through Spanish-American and general European influence, because the female tar-baby and the courtship incident are special features of the African and Anglo-African versions.

What about substitution, the outstanding feature of the Spanish-American versions? We have already called attention to the fact that it occurs in 21 or 60% of the Spanish-American versions and in 3 or 42% of the Lesser Antilles versions, as against 5 or 14% of the Anglo-African and 2 or 8% of the African versions. This element is, therefore, very rare in both the African and Anglo-African versions. But in the American-Indian versions, through Spanish-American influence undoubtedly, we find five or 22% substitution. The substitute animal is a coyote only in the Spanish-American and American-Indian versions, 31 and 13%, respectively, showing again the Spanish-American influence in the Indian versions. The special hot poker punishment of the Spanish-American versions occurs in one American-Indian version and in three Lesser Antilles versions but is unknown in Africa and Anglo-Africa.

The mock-plea, the outstanding feature of the Anglo-African versions, occurs in 5 or 22% of the American-Indian versions. In Spanish-America it is found in only 3 or 9% of the versions. In four of the five cases in which it is found in the American-Indian versions it is the typical Anglo-African "don't throw me into the briar-patch" formula. This special type of mock-plea is not found in Africa and in Spanish-America it is found only once.

We see, therefore, in the American-Indian versions a crossing of African and Anglo-African influences on the one side, stealing water from a well, special type of mock-plea, and Spanish-American and perhaps ultimately European influences on the other side, substitute animal, the total absence of the female tar-baby and the courtship incident, and especially the fact that in the Indian versions just as in the Spanish-American versions the tar-baby story is only a part, a special episode of a series of rabbit-coyote-and-other-animals tales in which most of the incidents are clearly of European source. It should be born in mind that we are dealing with groups of versions that are after all very closely related, and it is not at all unlikely that the Anglo-African and even the African versions known to us have undergone European influence through Spain and Portugal since the XVIth century and even earlier, long before some of the versions of the tar-baby story were carried to America by African slaves. That the Indian versions represent fundamentally Spanish and, in their final source, European traditions is, in my mind, quite evident. But I believe that it is equally

evident that some of the American-Indian versions and even some of the Spanish-American versions have received at least slight influence from the Anglo-African versions. This influence may have entered American-Indian tradition directly or through the Spanish-American versions.

There are some American-Indian versions that deserve special treatment. A version from the Shasta Indians of Oregon (87) is of special importance because it is a close parallel to the Jataka 55 version from India and to the Spanish version from Castile (10) in the initial incidents of the attack on the tar-man or giant. In all three cases the one caught fast by a tar-man or tarred giant is not a thief but a bully who goes out to seek and attack the giant with the sticky hair (Jataka 55), the tar-baby that will not greet him (Castilian version), or Pitch the Bad Man (Shasta Indian version). In fact Pitch the Bad Man is a personification and defies the coyote who attacks him, just as the giant with the sticky hair defies the Prince of the Five Weapons, Buddha himself, in the Jataka version of fifteen hundred years ago. In the India and Castile versions there is a five point attack and a consequent stick-fast episode at five points, while in the Indian version there is a seven-point attack and catch. The Shasta Indian version follows:

One day the coyote heard that Pitch, the Bad Man, was coming. The coyote was not afraid and when he saw him he went right out to meet him and said to him, "No matter who you are I can whip you." Pitch, the Bad Man, replied, "I can't fight with my hands."

The coyote at once struck him with his fist, and his fist stuck fast. Then he said to Pitch, "If I strike you with my left hand I'll kill you." "Go ahead and do it!" answered Pitch. The coyote then struck him with his left hand and that stuck fast also. At this point the coyote became very angry and said to Pitch, "Now I am going to kick you." And Pitch replied, "All right, go ahead and kick!" The coyote kicked and his foot stuck fast. "Now surely if I kick you with my left foot, I'll kill you," threatened the coyote. But Pitch only mocked, "Go ahead and do it! Kick with your left foot!" The coyote kicked again and his left foot stuck fast also.

When the coyote saw that both of his hands and feet were stuck fast to Pitch he shouted at the top of his voice, "Now I am going to lash you with my tail!" He did and his tail stuck fast. Then he shouted to Pitch, "I am now going to strike you with my ear and kill you." He struck Pitch with his ear and that stuck fast also. And lastly the coyote threatened to kill Pitch by bumping him with his head. He gave him a terrible blow with his head, but his head stuck fast also.

The coyote was now stuck to Pitch and could not pry himself loose. After a while his friend, the spider, came along and saw his predicament. "How can I help you?" he inquired. "Cut my hand away, but don't cut it," said the coyote. "It will be easier to burn

it away," said the spider. "Oh, no!" said the coyote. "Scrape it away!" The spider did so and after a while the coyote became free.

A pitch stump has evidently been personified here, because in two more cases the American-Indian versions have a pitch stump instead of the usual tar-baby. In the Anglo-African versions a tarred stump occurs four times.

But the American Indian versions have also some claims, and very powerful claims, to originality in their contribution to the modern versions of the tar-baby story. Certainly among the most original modern versions of the story to be found anywhere are to be included the Pueblo Indian versions from Taos, New Mexico, which I have received in manuscript from Dr. Parsons. The four Taos versions are clearly of Spanish origin. In three of the versions (72, 73, 74) a rabbit steals garden produce and is caught in the usual manner with a tar-figure. In the fourth version (75) a bat is caught with a piece of buffalo hide. In the first three the initial "no reply" incident and the dramatic monologue occur, and the attack and catch are at four or five points. In no case does the animal escape alive. But after being killed the animal comes to life again. I give below one of these extraordinary versions (74):

There was once an old Mexican woman whose husband was living and they had a very pretty girl. A rabbit was doing a lot of damage in their garden and they did not know what to do. The rabbit never came out for the old man. He put down traps but could not catch him. He found the rabbit hole. Finally he said to his wife, "My wife, I don't know what to do, this rabbit is damaging our garden so much. But tomorrow I am going after wood and I will get some piñón gum."

Next morning early he went and got some gum, made a little image and put it in the garden at night.

The rabbit came out and saw this piñón gum image. "Who are you? Who are you?" said the rabbit. "If you don't talk I am going to hit you. I am going to hit you." He hit him with his right hand. It stuck. "What do you think? Do you think I have only this one?" He hit him with his left hand, and that stuck. Then he hit him with his feet. Both feet stuck. Then he hit him with his head, and that stuck also. Now he was stuck altogether.

The old man got up early and found the rabbit caught. He told his wife to prepare hot water to clean the rabbit and to cook it with chile. "I want it cooked tender, very well done," he said.

When it was cooked the old woman put the dish on the table. They began to eat. "Be careful; don't drop any soup from your mouth," he said. As they were eating, the old woman dropped some soup from her mouth, and the rabbit came to life and ran away, upsetting all the dishes. "I told you not to drop any soup," said the old man, and they fell to quarreling over it.

In another one of the Taos versions (72) a drop of blood falls from the dead rabbit before being cooked, and then he comes to life again and runs away. This coming back to life of the animal after being killed, and even cooked, is unknown to me outside of these four Taos versions. It is the outstanding feature of all the American-Indian tar-baby stories and apparently the Indian contribution to the Spanish-American form of the tale. It is specifically a Pueblo Indian contribution from Taos. A search for more versions from the various Indian pueblos of New Mexico would reveal whether this contribution belongs to the Taos versions only or whether it is a general Pueblo Indian addition to the baustein of the tar-baby story taken from Spanish-American tradition.

After the somewhat detailed examination already made of the outstanding characteristics of the India, European, Cape Verde, Brazilian, Spanish-American, Lesser Antillean, Dutch Guiana, Orinoco, Philippine, and American-Indian versions of the tar-baby story, with a few examples of the most important and usual types, and after the detailed comparisons that I have made with the Anglo-African and African versions, it may seem unnecessary for me to examine these separately. But even at the risk of repeating in part some statements already made I will examine them briefly in order to show clearly the relation of the African and Anglo-African versions to those from India and other regions, particularly the European and Spanish-American, on the one hand, and the relation between the two African groups on the other hand.

In general the Anglo-African and African groups represent a greater variety of details in the secondary elements of the tale and at the same time greater simplicity in the individual version as a whole. In the fundamental details of the baustein both the African and Anglo-African versions are of the general India-European-Spanish-American-Portuguese type: a thief or mischief-maker is caught at four or five points by means of a tar-baby; the initial "no reply", "no salute", or getting out of the way incidents (when it is not the courtship scene, which is specifically African); the dramatic monologue, and the death or escape of the animal caught. Let us examine first the Anglo-African versions.

In my previous comparisons I have already called attention to the outstanding features of the Anglo-African versions as a group. To the fundamental baustein they have added or continued from India through African tradition the following secondary elements: the female tar-baby and the courtship episode which in some versions explains the preliminary attack on the tar-baby, the special type of mock-plea "don't throw me into the briar-patch," the stealing of water from a well that belongs to a group of animals or that has been dug by them instead of garden produce, and the partnership element or family group of dramatic characters, one of the partners or one of the members of the family being the thief. Of these four features, the first one, the female

tar-baby and the subsequent courtship do not occur in the European-Spanish-American-Portuguese-Philippine types, but it is found in India, for example in the modern Gordon version (7), and it suggested in the Samyutta Nikaya (2) and Paricistaparvan (3) versions. It is, therefore, an originally Hindu incident that has found full development in the Anglo-African versions, 8 of the 36 or 22%, and also of the African, 4 or 15%, forgotten in other parts of the world. The second element, the special type of mock-plea, "Don't throw me into the briar-patch," may be of Anglo-African invention, 18 of the 36 versions or 50%. It also exists in Spanish-America, 1 or 3%, and in the American-Indian versions, 4 or 17%, probably through Anglo-African influence. This special type of mock-plea does not occur in the African tales. The third feature, the stealing of water from a well and often polluting it, and it is a rabbit that does it most of the time, we may consider also, at least provisionally, as a real Anglo-African and also African contribution to the tar-baby tale. It is not found to my knowledge in European folklore. In the Anglo-African versions it is found in 14 or 39%, in the African 8 or 31%. In this respect the Lesser Antilles versions have the greatest African influence, if this incident is really African, with 5 of the 7 or 71%. The American-Indian versions have also Anglo-African influence here, 7 or 30%. The third feature, the partnership element, is also a distinguishing feature that may be of African source. This element occurs in 14 or 54% of the African versions, in 4 or 11% of the Anglo-African, and in 2 or 33% of the Portuguese versions.

It is difficult to give a typical Anglo-African version in spite of the four distinguishing and characteristic features above mentioned. The fact that the animal caught is a rabbit is not a special characteristic of the Anglo-African or African versions. Spanish-America and the Lesser Antilles have the highest percentage of the rabbit, 71%, Anglo-Africa and Africa follow with 66 and 62%, respectively. The special type of mock-plea which occurs in 50% of the versions and the female tar-baby and courtship episode are the only features that are really outstanding. The Harris "wonderful tar-baby story" lacks the second of these two features. In fact it has none of the African characteristics outside of the special type of mock-plea. The story follows, told in plain English:

One day after Brer Rabbit had fooled him with the calamus root Brer Fox set up a tar-baby in the middle of the road, and then he hid in the bushes to see what would happen. He didn't wait very long, for by and by there came Brer Rabbit pacing down the road. When he came upon the tar-baby he stood up on his hind legs very much astonished. "Good morning!" said Brer Rabbit. "Nice weather this morning!" Tar-baby made no reply. "Are you deaf?" said Brer Rabbit. "If you are I can holler louder." Tar-baby kept still and Brer Rabbit said, "You are stuck up, that is what you

are. And I am going to cure you. I am going to teach you to talk to respectable people if it is the last thing I do. If you don't take off your hat and tell me 'How do you do' I am going to kill you."

Brer Rabbit kept on asking and the tar-baby made no reply. Finally he raised his fist and struck tar-baby on the side of the head. It stuck. "If you don't let me loose I'll knock you again," said Brer Rabbit, and saying this he struck with his other hand, and that stuck also. "Turn me loose or I'll knock the stuffing out of you," said Brer Rabbit, and he struck with his feet and they also stuck. Then he cried to the tar-baby to let him go otherwise he would butt him with his head. And he butted and his head stuck.

At that moment Brer Fox came out and laughed and laughed until he could laugh no more. He went then to prepare the fire to roast Brer Rabbit. "I don't care what you do with me, Brer Fox," said Brer Rabbit. "You can roast me if you want to, but don't fling me into that briar-patch." Brer Fox in turn threatened to hang, to skin and to drown Brer Rabbit, and Brer Rabbit consented to everything except that he be thrown into the briar-patch. Brer Fox then caught him by the hind legs and threw him into the briar-patch. In this way he escaped.

The story is well told, but the fact remains that of the four characteristics of the Anglo-African versions already mentioned, this version has only one, the special type of mock-plea, "Don't throw me into the briar-patch." Curiously enough the initial cause for the attack on the tar-baby is absolutely European, "no reply" and "no salute" exactly as in my Castilian version. The version is not one of the best of the Anglo-African versions and certainly not a typical one when it has only one of the four dominant characteristics of those versions. If we complete the version, making the rabbit specifically a thief the Uncle Remus version is similar to other Anglo-African and Spanish-American versions, if in these last we omit the substitution and subsequent incidents. Of such a general type, however, the Anglo-African versions are not numerous. The following may be classified as such: (94, 108, 117, 120). The number would be increased if we were to add the versions where the animal caught is specifically a thief who steals water from a well.

The typical Anglo-African versions are, therefore, of other types. One of the most important is the type where the thief steals water from a well or spring. The well belongs to a group of animals that own it or have dug it, or specifically to a certain person. There are 14 of the 36 Anglo-African versions that belong to this type, or 39%. In these 14 versions it is the rabbit that steals the water and often pollutes 13 times, or in 93% of the cases. Not all these stories end in the same way, however. The variety of details in the various Anglo-African versions, even in a recognized type such as the above, is indeed extraordinary. In four of the fourteen we have the female tar-baby and the courtship

scene, and in these four the rabbit escapes through the mock-plea into the briar-patch. In the remaining ten of the water-stealing and polluting versions the rabbit is caught in nine and Anansi, the spider, in one by the usual male tar-baby in the usual manner; and in eight of the versions the rabbit escapes also into the briar-patch through the mock-plea. These fourteen water-stealing and polluting versions, or 39% of the total of the Anglo-African versions, four of which have also the African and Anglo-African female tar-baby and courtship scene, represent, therefore a specifically Anglo-African type. There are four more versions that have the female tar-baby and courtship scene, although of a different type, making the total number of versions with female tar-baby and courtship scene 8 or 22% of the total. This then is the outstanding Anglo-African type of tar-baby version, water-stealing with the animal partnership and often with the female tar-baby and courtship.

Special features of the Anglo-African versions are the following: Instead of a tar-baby we have a tarred stump in four versions and a bucket of tar in two versions. The tarred stump has a hat on in two cases. A tarred stump appears also in three American-Indian versions. The bucket of tar is of course the traditional bucket of tar of the European versions of the tale of the master-thief. The witch-baby of the African versions appears only once in the 36 Anglo-African versions, Parsons, Andros Islands (102). The one caught in this version is a man and he is caught through the courtship episode. There are three cases of a man being caught in the Anglo-African versions or 8% of the total. There are 13 in the 152 versions studied or 9%, our 3 from Anglo-Africa, 3 from Spanish-America, 2 from Europe (100%), 2 Portuguese, 1 from India, 1 from the Orinoco Indians, and 1 from Africa.

The rabbit as the thief and offender appears in the Spanish-American versions in all types in 25 or 71% of the versions, whereas in the Anglo-African versions the percentage is 66 and in the African 62. But in the Anglo-African versions it is predominantly a rabbit, in the water-stealing and polluting versions, 13 of the 14 or 93%, while in the total number of versions of other types the rabbit appears only in 11 of the 22 cases, or 41%. Substitution, the outstanding feature of the Spanish-American versions, 60%, and which appears also in great proportions in the Lesser Antilles versions, 42%, and occurs in the American-Indian versions through Spanish-American influence in 22% of the versions, is found in only 14% of the Anglo-African versions.

To resume, then, we find only one special and general type of Anglo-African tar-baby version, the one that has the water-stealing and polluting incidents and often the female tar-baby and courtship scene, 39% of the versions. But there are four outstanding characteristics, secondary elements that have been fully developed, even if some go back to India as a source: the water-stealing and polluting incidents, the

partnership or family group of dramatic characters, the female tar-baby and courtship incident, and the special type of mock-plea, "Don't throw me into the briar-patch."

As for individual types there are at least two that deserve special mention. In a Jamaica version of Beckwith (91) Tacoomah and Anansi are neighbors and farmers.

When Anansi has eaten all his produce he begins to steal from Tacoomah. Tacoomah prepares a tarred stump and Anansi is caught in the usual manner at five points. A goat then passes by, and Anansi asks him to buck the stump. The goat bucks the tarred stump and his head sticks while Anansi's head comes off. Anansi then asks him to kick the stump with his feet. The goat does so and his feet stick while Anansi's two hands come off. He then asks the goat to push, and he pushes and his two front feet stick while Anansi's two feet come off.

Anansi then goes home and the next day he and Tacoomah find the goat stuck. The goat tells Tacoomah the true story, but Tacoomah does not believe him. They kill the goat and eat it.

This remarkable version is in reality two tar-baby versions in one. The last part, the goat that is gradually stuck fast to the tarred stump upon orders from Anansi is exactly like the stick-fast episode of the Lithuanian version, where the laume or witch is stuck fast as she strikes in the usual fashion with hands, feet and stomach on the tarred horse upon the advise and orders of the oldest brother. The idea of Anansi coming off the tarred stump while the goat is being stuck, however, is quite original and extraordinary. There are two more Anglo-African versions quite similar to this (124, 125), both from the Philadelphia Negroes, in which a goat and a racoon are the substitute animals that get stuck while the animal first caught gets loose, but the versions are fragmentary and there is no detailed and gradual point by point catch and release. I know of no other versions that have this extraordinary incident. In one Spanish-American (37), and in the African version of Chatelain (128), however, the animal that comes to help the one first caught gets caught also; two become caught fast.

There is another Jamaican version, also by Beckwith (92), that deserves special mention, not because it is unique among the tar-baby versions, but because it is an Anglo-African version from Africa. In view of the fact that the similarity between the Anglo-African and African versions is not as pronounced as we should expect, if we think of the possibility of direct relation and direct transmission from Africa, this version is of special interest and importance. This is in my opinion one Anglo-African tar-baby version that has certainly come directly from Africa. The possibility that the version could have developed in Anglo-Africa and travelled from America to Africa seems to me quite remote. A similar version has been found in Santo Domingo (13), one

that I have already given and discussed. I give the Anglo-African version complete:

Once Mrs. Anansi had a large field which she planted with peas. Anansi her husband was so lazy that he would never do any work. And he was so afraid they would give him none of the peas that he pretended to be sick. After about nine days he called his wife and children and told them he was going to die. As a last request he asked them to bury him in the field of peas and to leave a hole in the coffin so that he could watch the peas for them even when dead. So he pretended he was dead and they buried him. Every night at twelve o'clock he came out of the coffin, picked a bundle of peas, boiled it, ate it and then went back into the grave to rest. Mrs. Anansi was surprised to see all her peas being stolen.

One day her eldest son said to her, "Mother, I bet you it's my father stealing those peas." At that Mrs. Anansi got into a temper, and said, "How could you expect your dead father to rob the peas?" He replied, "Well, mother, I will prove it to you." He got some tar and painted a stump with it at the head of the grave and put a hat on it. When Anansi came out for this midnight feast he saw this thing standing in the ground. "Good evening, sir," he said. He received no reply and again, "Good evening, sir," he said. Still there was no reply, so he said to him, "If you don't speak to me I'll kick you." He raised his foot and kicked the stump and it stuck. "Let me go, let me go, sir, or I'll knock you down with my right hand." That hand stuck fast. "If you don't let me go, I'll hit you with my left hand." That hand stuck also. He then raised his left foot and gave the stump a terrible blow. That foot stuck also. Anansi was suspended in the air and had to remain there till morning. He was so ashamed that he climbed up beneath the rafters and there he is to this day.

I now give the African version with which it is most certainly related, and this will serve at the same time as one of the best examples, although not typical, of the African tar-baby stories which we are now going to examine. It is one of the fascinating African tales published by Barker and Sinclair (127).

Egya Anansi was a very skillful farmer. He, with his wife and son, set to work one year to prepare a farm, much larger than any they had previously worked. Anansi, however, was an exceedingly selfish and greedy man, and when the harvest was ready he called his wife and son to him and said, "We have all three worked hard to prepare these fields. We will now gather in the harvest and pack it away in our barns. When that is done we shall be in need of a rest. I propose that you and our son should go back to our home in the village and remain there at ease for two or three weeks. I have to go to the coast on very urgent business." Anansi's wife

and son thought this a very good plan. They went straight back to their village, leaving the cunning husband who did not have the slightest intention of going on his proposed journey.

Instead, he built himself a very comfortable hut near the farm, supplied it with all manner of cooking utensils, gathered in a large store of the corn and vegetables from the barn and prepared for a solitary feast. This went on for a fortnight. By that time Anansi's son thought it was time for him to go and weed the farm. He accordingly went there and worked several hours on it. While passing the barn he looked in, and great was his surprise to see that more than half of their harvest was gone. Returning to the village he told the people there what had happened, and they helped him to make a rubber-man. When evening came they took it to the farm and put it in the fields to frighten the thieves.

When all was dark Anansi came as usual to fetch more food. On his way to the barn he saw the figure of the man and was at first very much frightened. Finding that the man did not move, however, he approached and said, "What do you want here?" There was no answer and he repeated his question. Again there was no answer and Anansi became very angry and dealt the figure a blow on the cheek with his right hand. It stuck. "How dare you hold my hand?" he exclaimed. "Let me go at once or I shall hit you again." He then hit the figure with his left hand, which also stuck. He then tried to disengage himself by pushing against it with his knees and body, until, finally, knees, body, hands and head were all firmly attached to the rubber-man. When his son came out with the other villagers to catch the robber they were astonished to find that the evil-doer was Anansi himself. He, on the other hand, was so ashamed to be caught in the act of greediness that he changed himself into a spider and took refuge in a dark corner of the ceiling lest any one should see him. Since then spiders have always been found in dark, dusty corners, where people are not likely to notice them.

It is hardly necessary to point out the similarity between the two versions. Their identity is beyond question. The version of Cronise-Ward (129) is another African form of the Barker-Sinclair version. The husband who plays dead is merely given a good beating in this version and he does not become a spider. I have already pointed out that one of the Santo Domingo versions (13) is also a fragmentary form of the African story. Here we have, then, a case of definite relationship between the African and the Spanish-American versions from the Greater Antilles. But it is the only definite and absolutely sure case. In other cases we have often a general similarity of some incidents, especially those that are related to the fundamental elements of the tale which are of course almost identical in all the 152 versions studied. This definite case of

relationship between the African and American versions is a very exceptional case, an individual version, and certainly not a type. Some of the special characteristics of the African versions are precisely of this character, individual and not outstanding features of general types.

Let us now examine the African versions as a group. There are 26 versions from all parts of Africa.

In about the same proportion as the Anglo-African versions the dramatic characters involved are animals. In the case of the one caught by a tar-baby it is a man only once, the case of the man who became a spider in the version just given. The animal partnership occurs in a larger proportion than any other group, showing that it is a distinctly African feature. The figures are: Africa 14 of the 26 versions or 56%, Anglo-Africa 4 or 11%, and the Portuguese versions 2 or 33%. The water-stealing episode occurs in 8 or 31% of the versions, apparently an African and Anglo-African feature also, but it is more frequent in the Lesser Antilles, 71%, and Anglo-Africa, 39%. Among the American-Indians it is 30 %, perhaps through Anglo-African or Hispanic-African influence. The incident is actually unknown in the Spanish-American versions that have otherwise influenced the American-Indian versions, perhaps have been their common source. The water-stealing episode, as a matter of fact, does not occur at all in the India-Europe-Hispanic-America-Philippine groups.

The female tar-baby is found in greater proportion than in the Anglo-African versions, 35% as against 22%, but not as commonly as in India or the Lesser Antilles, where the figures are 44% and 42%, respectively. The courtship episode, however, not merely suggested but actually acted and causing the catch at the first point, is apparently an African and Anglo-African feature, 15 and 22%, respectively. In the Lesser Antilles we have 14%, but as such it is unknown in the other groups. In two cases the courtship episode is more than mere courtship. It is the case of the sensual monkey (in one case it is a spider in the African versions) of the India versions of the Samyutta Nikaya (2) and Paricistaparvan (3) versions. In one of the versions (146) the female tar-baby is described as being made with beautiful neck and breasts and the spider sticks as he approaches to touch it through amorous impulse. In the other version, Chatelain's version from Angola (128), several female tar-figures similarly prepared are placed on a tree. A monkey and a hare court them, serenade them, and finally the sensual monkey jumps up to embrace one of them and remains stuck. The hare goes up to help and remains stuck also. I give below a resumé of the stick fast episode of this extraordinary African female tar-baby and courtship version.

A monkey and a hare steal from a leopard's orchard. Upon the advise of an old man the leopard digs holes under a tree to catch them but does not succeed. Then the old man advises the leopard to make wooden images of girls. "We shall make images; images

of girls, with their eyes, with their breasts, with their ears, with their noses, with their mouths. Thou shalt pierce their ears and put on earrings; thou shalt fetch beads and red-wood; thou shalt smear the red-wood; thou shalt tap gum of the wild fig-tree, and smear too; small ropes also thou shalt fetch. Thou, Mr. Leopard, thou shalt climb up the tree and set up the images."

The hare and the monkey arrive when the images are set up. When the hare sees the images he says to the monkey, "Ah, friend! O Monkey! Come to see the girls who are up on the tree." As soon as the monkey saw them he said to them, "You girls, how do you do?" They did not reply. "Are you ashamed?" continued the monkey. They made no reply. "Are you hungry?" added the monkey. Still there was no reply. Then the hare said, "Eh, friend! What have you at home?" "I have a sheep at home," said the monkey. "And what have you at home?" said the monkey. "I have a hog at home," said the hare.

They went home, killed the pig, cut it and put it in the pot. They prepared a meal and took it with a jug of water and a mat to the tree.

"You girls come down and we shall eat now," said the monkey. They did not come down. "Are you bashful?" said the monkey. They did not reply. Then he said to the hare, "Let us go, please, for they are bashful with us."

When they went away the leopard came out and ate and drank everything. Then the hare arrived and called to the monkey, "Eh, friend, the girls have eaten." Then they go home and come back, the monkey bringing his banjo. They begin to play and dance. "You girls, come down and we will dance," said the monkey and the hare. They did not come down. Then the monkey played the banjo and danced. Then he jumped up to the girls and as he was going to smack (smacking of stomachs, an Angola dance custom) he stuck to the gum. Then he cried out to the hare, "O friend! Come and see this young woman holding me." The hare throws the banjo on the ground and goes up to smack. He gets stuck on the gum also, and says, "Woe to me! We are stuck, comrade!"

The leopard arrives, gives them both a good beating and takes them home in a bag. In the end both escape.

A witch-baby catches the animal-thief three times in the African versions, as against one case each from Anglo-Africa, Spanish-America, and the American-Indians. The case of the female figure with movable hands that catches the animal-thief in the Gordon version from India (7) we might also consider a female witch-baby, but it is not so stated in the tale.

The tarred stump and bucket of tar of the Anglo-African (and rarely also of the American-Indian and Hispanic versions, no tarred stump in

the last) does not occur at all in the African versions. The two cases of a bucket of tar in the Anglo-African versions are evidently under European influence, perhaps through Hispanic or Hispanic-African traditions.

In 5 of the 26 versions, 19%, the animal-thief is not caught by a tar-baby at all but by a live tortoise. This live tortoise trap does not occur in any of the versions of any other group, except the Mauritius version, which is evidently of African origin. In one of the tortoise-trap versions, the Zambesian version (151) the tortoise catches with its own hands a hare that comes to steal water and point by point as in the usual multiple-point attack and catch versions, while in the four remaining cases and also in the Mauritius version the tortoise is smeared with tar or some other sticky substance so that it is really a tar-baby.

In a greater proportion than in any other group, except the Lesser Antilles, the African versions omit the initial "no reply" incident, and the animal through mere greediness is caught at the first point when he approaches to eat or drink, 7 versions or 27%. In the Lesser Antilles the percentage is 28 and in India 22. Here we have a definite relation in secondary incidents between Africa and India, and I have no hesitation in saying that I believe India is the source.

The mock-plea, the outstanding feature of the Anglo-African versions, 56%, is found in 8 or 31% of the African versions; but curiously enough the outstanding Anglo-African type of mock-plea, "Don't throw me into the briar-patch," which occurs in 18 of the 20 Anglo-African cases of mock-plea, never occurs. The nearest approach is the mock-plea of the Zambesian version (151) where the hare that has been captured by a live tortoise begs that he should not be thrown against a tree for he will surely die. Two of the cases, the two versions by Honey from South Africa (132, 133), present a new type of mock-plea, "Don't swing me by the tail (greased)."

If we take into consideration both occurrence and proportion of occurrence we find that the outstanding features of the African versions are: the female tar-baby with its courtship episode (also an Anglo-African feature); the animal partnership and water-stealing incidents (also Anglo-African); the live-tortoise trap; and in a small degree the special type of mock-plea, "Don't swing me by the tail (greased)," and the playing-dead episode. Of all these features, the female tar-baby has been developed more fully in Africa, but it is certainly of Hindu origin as I have already stated. The courtship incident may be merely a development of the moral suggested in the Samyutta Nikaya and Paricistaparvan versions. From the view point of development in the modern versions, however, the female tar-baby and courtship episode combined are specifically African and Anglo-African characteristics. The water-stealing and animal partnership are also specifically African and Anglo-African characteristics. The mock-plea is common to both, but the

actual kind of pleas are different. The tortoise trap and the hare playing-dead incident are specifically African. The African versions, therefore, are similar to the Anglo-African versions in only three features that are not common to the other groups, the female tar-baby and courtship incident, the water-stealing and polluting incident, with the animal-partnership involved, and the mock-plea in the general sense.

The version from Mauritius of Baissac (152) I have already cited. It belongs clearly with the African water-stealing and polluting type and has also the tarred tortoise. The well from which the hare steals the water and which it pollutes, however, belongs to a king, as in the Lesser Antilles, and not to the animals in partnership. There is of course no substitution and the hare is killed outright after the tortoise walks into the presence of the king with it stuck to its back. In most of the African versions of this type the tortoise arrives with the hare stuck to its back also, but it often escapes alive, eight times through the mock-plea.

The outstanding features of the various groups may be more clearly envisaged from the following chart. A double $\times\times$ indicates full development and a numerically dominant characteristic, a single \times indicates development but a numerically unimportant characteristic. A blank space indicates total absence of the element in question, and an (\times) an occurrence numerically insignificant to the point that it may be considered absent.

If in the above chart of special features we put the emphasis only on the double letters we see at a glance that the really significant contributions to the original, primitive baustein of the tar-baby story are very few. Spanish-America has inherited the India-Europe tradition and added and fully developed the substitution element and the special types of punishment for the substitute animal. Spanish-America, Anglo-Africa and the American-Indians have substituted a rabbit or hare for the monkey, jackal or other animal of the Hindu tales. Africa and Anglo-Africa have developed and added the mock-plea and female tar-baby and courtship episodes. Africa alone has developed the live-tortoise trap. Africa and Anglo-Africa, and above all the Lesser Antilles, have developed fully the water-stealing element. The American Indians of Taos have added the incident of the coming back to life of the dead animal.

IV

STATISTICAL TABLES OF THE VARIOUS ELEMENTS OR INCIDENTS FOUND IN THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-TWO VERSIONS STUDIED

The various elements or incidents, fifty-six in number, are classified and numbered, giving the number of occurrences and the percentages of occurrences for each item, both from the view-point of the total number of one hundred and fifty-two versions and from the view-point of the number of versions in each one of the geographical or racial groups.

	India versions	European	Spanish-American	Portuguese	Orinoco	Lesser Antilles	Dutch Guiana	Philippines	American-Indian	Anglo-African	African	Mauritius
<i>Total versions</i> 152												
1. The one who sets up the tar-baby is a man or woman: 90 or 59%	9 78%	2 100%	35 77%	6 83%	1 100%	7 86%	4 100%	2 100%	23 52%	36 33%	26 42%	1 100%
2. The one who sets up the tar-baby is an animal: 58 or 38%	2 22%		8 23%	1 17%		1 14%		2 39%	9 39%	24 66%	13 50%	
3. Just animals (in partnership or not): 18 or 12%									2 9%	7 19%	9 35%	
4. It is a tiger: 8 or 5%			6 17%			1 14%			9 9%	1 3%		
5. It is a fox or wolf: 13 or 9%				1 17%					1 4%	11 30%		
6. The one caught fast by the tar-baby is a man: 13 or 9%	1 11%	2 100%	3 9%	2 33%	1 100%				4 4%	3 8%	1 4%	
7. It is an animal: 139 or 91%	8 89%		32 91%	4 67%		7 100%	4 100%	2 100%	23 100%	33 92%	25 96%	1 100%
8. It is a rabbit (or hare in the African versions): 85 or 56%	1 11%		25 71%			5 71%			13 56%	24 66%	16 62%	1 100%
9. It is a monkey: 12 or 8%	2 22%		3 9%	3 50%			1 25%	2 100%			1 4%	
10. The one caught fast by the tar-baby is a thief: 132 or 87%	4 44%		33 94%	6 100%		6 86%	4 100%	2 100%	17 73%	34 94%	25 96%	1 100%
11. He steals fruit or vegetables or just food: 98 or 64%	4 44%		33 94%	4 67%		3 42%	4 100%	2 100%	9 39%	21 58%	18 69%	
12. He steals water from a well or spring and sometimes pollutes the water: 35 or 23%						5 71%			7 30%	14 39%	8 31%	1 100%

	India versions	European	Spanish-American	Portuguese	Orinoco	Lesser Antilles	Dutch Guiana	Philippines	American-Indian	Anglo-African	African	Mauritius
<i>Total versions</i> 152	9	2	35	6	1	7	4	2	23	36	26	1
24. It is just a trap, the character of it not well defined: 4 or 3%			1 3%		1 100%					1 3%	1 4%	
25. Reason for beginning the attack: Because tar-baby will not reply, greet the new-comer or get out of the way: 102 or 67%	3	2	29	6		6	4	2	15	20	14	1
	33%	100%	83%	100%		86%	100%	100%	65%	56%	54%	100%
26. Because the thief wishes to eat or drink and he begins to get stuck doing it: 15 or 11%	2		1			2			1	2	7	
	22%		3%			28%			4%	6%	27%	
27. Because tar-baby will not play cards: 6 or 4%			6									
			17%									
28. Because the new-comer is going to make love to tar-baby (female): 13 or 9%						1				8	4	
						14%				22%	15%	
29. He sees tar-baby or looks for it and attacks at once: 8 or 5%	1				1					1	1	
	11%				100%				2	3%	4%	
30. The dramatic monologue, "If you don't let go of my right hand I'll hit you with my left hand, etc." 121 or 80%	5	2	26	6		6	4	2	13	34	22	1
	55%	100%	74%	100%		86%	100%	100%	56%	94%	85%	100%
31. Caught fast at five points: hands and feet, and head (or mouth) or stomach: 60 or 39%	4	2	12	1		1			13	19	7	1
	44%	100%	34%	17%		14%			56%	53%	27%	100%

	India versions	European	Spanish-American	Portuguese	Orinoco	Lesser Antilles	Dutch Guiana	Philippines	American-Indian	Anglo-African	African	Mauritius
<i>Total versions</i> 152	9	2	35	6	1	7	4	2	23	36	26	1
32. Caught fast at four points: hands and feet: 39 or 25%	2 22%		8 23%	4 67%	1 100%	2 28%	1 25%	2 100%	5 22%	7 19%	7 27%	
33. Caught at six points: hands and feet, head and stomach: 25 or 16%			6 17%	1 17%		2 28%	2 50%		2 9%	5 14%	7 27%	
34. Caught fast at two or three points: 12 or 8%			5 14%			1 14%	1 25%		1 4%	3 8%	1 4%	
35. Just caught; whole body at once or no details: 11 or 7%	2 22%		2 6%			1 14%			1 4%	1 3%	4 15%	
36. Animal that goes to help the one first caught gets caught also. Two caught fast: 2 or 1%			1 3%								1 4%	
37. Animal first caught gets loose at each point as the animal that helps attacks and gets caught 3 or 2%										3 8%		
38. Substitution. Take my place: 37 or 24%	1 11%		21 60%			3 42%			5 22%	5 14%	2 8%	
39. The one who substitutes is a man: 2 or 1%									1 4%			
40. The one who substitutes is an animal: 35 or 23%	1 11%		21 60%			3 42%			4 17%	5 14%	1 4%	
41. It is a coyote: 14 or 9%			11 31%						3 13%			

	India versions	European	Spanish-American	Portuguese	Orinoco	Lesser Antilles	Dutch Guiana	Philippines	American-Indian	Anglo-African	African	Mauritius
<i>Total versions</i> 152	9	2	35	6	1	7	4	2	23	36	26	1
42. It is a tiger: 7 or 5%			4 11%			3 42%						
43. "They want, me to marry the king's daughter", or "They want me to marry a pretty girl." 13 or 9%			11 31%			1 14%				1 3%		
44. "They give plenty of food, chicken, etc." 13 or 9%			6 17%			2 28%			4 17%	1 3%		
45. The substitute animal is scalded with hot water: 7 or 5%			7 20%									
46. The substitute animal is stuck with a hot poker, sometimes in the anus: 11 or 7%			7 20%			3 42%			1 4%			
47. Mock-plea of the one caught fast: 38 or 25%	1 11%		3 9%			1 14%			5 22%	20 56%	8 31%	
48. "Don't throw me into the briar-patch": 23 or 15%			1 3%						4 17%	18 50%		
49. "Don't swing me by the tail (greased)": 2 or 1%											2 8%	
50. The one caught fast escapes alive: 116 or 76%	5 55%		32 91%	3 50%	1 100%	4 57%	4 100%	2 100%	16 70%	30 83%	19 73%	
51. The one caught fast is killed: 26 or 17%	4 44%	2 100%	3 9%	3 50%					7 30%	1 3%	5 19%	1

Fractions of percentage are not given. The tables attempt to give a complete outline and account of all the different elements that enter into the formation of all the one hundred and fifty-two versions or different folktales, the elements or incidents of the original, primitive baustein as well as all the secondary and even some apparently insignificant incidents.

V

THE BAUSTEIN

There are no set rules for the determination of the fundamental, primitive motif of a folktale. Folklorists, scientists in any field of investigation, are frequently in disagreement with respect to method and interpretation. Figures alone do not always tell us the whole story, but numerical superiority cannot be disregarded. Frequency in the appearance of certain elements of a tale in widely separated regions that have had cultural relations and folktale transmission is certainly to be considered as an important factor in the theoretical reconstruction of the dominant and primitive features of any folktale. Chronology is also of paramount importance. There is no question in my mind about the relation of the modern versions of the tar-baby story with the Jataka 55, Samyutta Nikaya, and Paricistaparvan versions from India, for example, and I have not hesitated to study them together with the rest of the one hundred and fifty-two versions, but at the same time these three old versions are of greater importance than any three or even a score of the modern versions. It is true that a modern version taken from oral tradition may often have elements that are as old as those recorded in versions that are over a thousand years old, but nevertheless, early recorded versions have always a great weight in comparative studies.

In view of the fact that we have only three old versions in a study of one hundred and fifty-two, all we can do is to study them together with the rest. With the exception of the three ancient versions from India all the versions studied are popular versions collected in modern times, the first one being the European version of Schleicher published in 1857. That a large majority of the one hundred and fifty-two versions contain the primitive and fundamental elements of the baustein is in my opinion beyond question. Just what elements enter into the baustein one cannot state with categorical precision. In my statistical tables in Part IV, I give the complete data for the fifty-six items, elements or incidents that enter into the formation of all the versions studied. Some of these incidents are numerically insignificant for the versions as a whole and are most certainly special characteristics of the modern versions of certain definite regions, the African live-tortoise trap, for example (item 20). It is no easy task to determine what constitutes numerical superiority to the point that one may consider a given element as general to the majority of the versions and as part of the bau-

stein. After a courageous attempt to include in the baustein all those items that appear in more than 50% of the versions, I found that only ten elements went over that figure, and I was gratified to see that these ten actually occur in 57% or more of the versions. But for the sake of still greater accuracy in the determination of the constitutive elements of the baustein I have disregarded the three lowest in frequency, items 1, 8, and 15. I have then combined 1 and 2 into one element (although they may be kept apart if one wishes), 15 and 16 into one element (tar-baby being then either male or female), and 31, 32, 33 into one element (this giving us the multiple attack and catch at four, five or six points). The result is nine different elements (element HH is merely another form of H with the multiple attack and catch more inclusive and more general) that actually occur in 64% or more of the versions. This high frequency of occurrence, from 64 to 97%, seems to me to justify my considering them the constitutive elements of the baustein.

A statistical outline of the nine different and combined elements that apparently constitute the baustein of the tar-baby story follows:

Element A:	Items 1 and 2.	
	Item 1. The one who sets up the tar-baby is a man	90 or 59%
	Item 2. It is an animal	58 or 38%
	Items 1 and 2 combined. The one who sets up the tar-baby is a man or an animal	148 or 97%
Element B:	Item 7. The one caught fast by the tar-baby is a thief	132 or 87%
Element D:	Item 11. He steals fruit or vegetables or just food	98 or 64%
Element E:	Items 15 and 16.	
	Item 15. Tar-baby is male	92 or 60%
	Item 16. Tar-baby is female	27 or 18%
	Items 15 and 16 combined. It is a tar-baby, male or female	119 or 78%
Element F:	Item 25. The attack begins because tar-baby will not reply, greet the new-comer, or get out of the way when asked to do so.	102 or 67%
Element G:	Item 3. The dramatic monologue	121 or 80%
Element H:	Items 31, 32, and 33 combined. The attack and catch episode at five (31), four (32), or six (33) points	124 or 82%
Element HH:	Items 31, 32, 33, and 34 combined. The attack and catch episode at two, three, four, five or six points. Just a multiple attack and catch	136 or 90%
Element I:	Item 50. The one caught fast escapes alive	116 or 76%

The original baustein or primitive and fundamental version of the tar-baby story was probably of the following type:

1. A man or an animal has a garden or orchard, or just food put away somewhere.
2. A certain animal (a jackal, a monkey, a hare or rabbit, etc.) comes night after night to steal the garden produce, the fruit or the food.
3. The man or animal wishes to catch the thief and sets up a tar-figure, male or female (tar-man, tar-woman, tar-monkey, etc.).
4. The thief approaches to steal and when he sees the tar-figure he tries to engage him in conversation or tells him to get out of the way.
5. Receiving no reply the animal-thief begins the attack, striking first with the right hand or paw.
6. This sticks or is held fast and the animal then begins the dramatic monologue with the usual threats, "If you don't let go of my right hand I'll hit you with my left hand, etc."
7. The dramatic monologue and the attacks continue, and the thief is finally caught fast at four (two hands and two feet), five (two hands and two feet, and head or stomach), or even six points (two hands and two feet, head and stomach) points.
8. The next day the man or animal finds his thief well caught.
9. Although frequently punished the animal-thief escapes alive.

Some may object to the inclusion of Element D in the original baustein, believing that Element C, just a thief in general without specifying the nature of the theft, suffices. This is a matter of opinion. The water-stealing versions, which are 23% of the total of 152, are of African elaboration and I do not believe that they belong to the baustein. For that reason I prefer the specific theft of garden produce or food in general as the stolen elements in the baustein. As a matter of fact some of the outstanding and best old and modern versions have no thief at all, as I have many times indicated, but I believe such versions are early elaborations from the primitive baustein, Jataka 55, my Castilian version, or the Orinoco version, for example.

From the original baustein other types soon developed, for example the type in which all the dramatic characters are human, the female tar-baby and courtship type, the substitution type, the water-stealing and polluting type, and probably the type in which the thief escapes through a ruse. Confusion with other tales also begins early, for example confusion with the tale of the master-thief and with the John the Bear type. The Jataka 55 version and the two European versions, the Lithuanian and the Castilian, belong to an all-human characters type developed very early in India. But apparently the animal-thief type existed before in India, for the Samyutta Nikaya version, which is the oldest of all (probably two thousand years old) is not very different from the theoretical baustein already established. The primitive types appear already differentiated in India in the oldest version known. The confusion with the tale of the master-thief begins early also, probably in India. The two examples from the Cape Verde Islands may come from India through European tradition.

Other developments are of less importance in the study of the tale. We may call them secondary elements, although some of them are already suggested in the ancient versions. As I have already stated, the female tar-baby, the courtship episode, the substitution element, the marrying the king's daughter, the objects that are thrown at the tar-figure and that stick before the regular multiple attack and catch, are elements definitely outlined or suggested in the ancient and modern India versions, and developed fully in versions from other countries later. All of these elements we can very properly call the secondary elements that characterize the modern versions, the special contributions of the people of the various geographical and racial groups to the original baustein that has been transmitted from India through direct and indirect channels. These secondary elements are precisely those that may often differ considerably in the modern versions, elements that sometimes, at least in their full development, may reveal the racial characteristics or spirit of a race or people, but which count for little as baustein-determining factors in the scientific study of folktales. The great differences in these secondary details and also the frequent confusion with other folktales create the pitfalls into which the inexperienced folklorist easily falls and loses sight of the dominant features or baustein of a folktale.

From the following chart it will be clearly seen how utterly illogical it is to suppose for a moment that the versions from the various groups studied are not related. India, Spanish-America, the Portuguese versions, Lesser Antilles, Dutch Guiana, the Philippines, the American-Indians, Anglo-Africa and Africa have all, absolutely all the elements of the baustein in most of the versions, the lowest figure being 33% for Element F in the India versions, and the figure 100% occurring for all the elements of the various groups forty-three times. Europe lacks four of the nine elements, Orinoco six and Mauritius two. This is to be expected when we have only two versions from Europe and only one each from the last two regions. Element H, items 31, 32, 33, the multiple attack and catch, the most significant and most important features of the tar-baby story, are found in all, absolutely all the groups.

CONCLUSIONS

India is the original home of the tar-baby story. From India the original baustein already differentiated into two or three types passed into Europe, and later into Africa. In Europe the all-human characters type prevailed, and the tale was confused with the tale of the master-thief and other folktales. In Africa the tale developed soon certain special features, the female tar-baby and courtship elements, which are, of course, of India origin, and other African traits, such as the mock-plea, the animal or family group of dramatic characters with

	India versions	European	Spanish-American	Portuguese	Orinoco	Lesser Antilles	Dutch Guiana	Philippines	American-Indian	Anglo-African	African	Mauritius
<i>Total versions</i> 152	9	2	35	6	1	7	4	2	23	36	26	1
Element A: Items 1 and 2	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	91%	100%	92%	100%
Element B: Item 7	89%		91%	67%		100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	96%	100%
Element C: Item 10	44%		94%	100%		86%	100%	100%	73%	94%	96%	100%
Element D: Item 11	44%		94%	67%		42%	100%	100%	39%	58%	69%	
Element E: Items 15 and 16	67%	50%	94%	83%		100%	100%	100%	74%	78%	60%	
Element F: Item 25	33%	100%	83%	100%		86%	100%	100%	65%	56%	54%	100%
Element G: Item 30	55%	100%	74%	100%		86%	100%	100%	56%	94%	85%	100%
Element H: Items 31, 32, 33	66%	100%	63%	100%		71%	75%	100%	87%	86%	81%	100%
Element I: Item 50	55%		91%	50%		57%	100%	100%	70%	83%	73%	100%

the water-stealing episode, and the live-tortoise trap. From Europe the tale travels to Africa directly from Spain and Portugal, and at the same time to Hispanic America and the Philippines. The African slaves then bring to America the Hispanic-African forms of the tale. The American versions, if we include here the versions from all the western continent, are of European, European-African, and African origin. The India-European types prevail, but the Hispanic-African types, Hispanic types that have come under the influence of African versions in Africa, are of not a little importance, and even the purely African forms have in some special cases found their way to America, especially North America. The version of the man who became a spider of Barker-Sinclair is a case in point, for as I have already shown, it has another African form in the Cronise-Ward version and is, therefore, certainly African, and it occurs in practically the same form in Jamaica and in a similar version in Santo Domingo.

The Hispanic-American versions are of European origin. Of the thirty-eight Hispanic-American versions studied (35 from Spanish-America and 3 from Brazil) not a single one has the female tar-baby and courtship episode characteristic of the African and Anglo-African versions. Two more outstanding African characteristics, the water-stealing element (both African and Anglo-African), and the live-tortoise trap, are also totally absent. Only three of the thirty-eight have the mock-plea characteristic of the African and Anglo-African versions, and only one has the special Anglo-African type "Don't throw me into the briar-patch." On the other hand, the outstanding features of the Hispanic-American versions, substitution and the ruse involved, the special punishments of the substitute animal, coyote, fox, or lion being scalded with hot water or burned with a hot poker, the tar-baby that will not play cards, most of which elements are characteristically European, are all conspicuously absent from the African and Anglo-African, except substitution, which evidently through Spanish influence appears in a few versions.

The Portuguese versions from Hispanic America like the three Cape Verde versions are even more specifically India-European in character and have none of the special secondary features of the Spanish-American versions. The African or Anglo-African source of the Hispanic-American versions of the tar-baby story is absolutely out of the question. They are fundamentally of Hispanic origin. If in two or three of the thirty-eight versions one finds significant or insignificant African or Anglo-African elements it proves nothing concerning their origin as a whole. The Santo Domingo version many times cited (13) is certainly of African source. I believe that it is the rare specimen of a tale that has come directly from Africa to Santo Domingo and Jamaica in slightly variant forms. In view of the great mingling of the races in certain parts of Hispanic-America the insignificance of the African and Anglo-African

influence in Hispanic folklore is indeed extraordinary. The theories that Professor Boas and I have held for many years concerning the vigor of European tradition, specifically Hispanic in this case, in Hispanic America is proved beyond all doubt in the study of the tar-baby story.

The American-Indian versions are characteristically Hispanic-American and have none of the special features of the African and Anglo-African versions to any marked degree, with the exception of the water-stealing element. The outstanding feature of the Spanish-American versions, substitution, occurs in five or 22% of the versions. The African and Anglo-African female tar-baby and courtship element is found in only one version. The only significant Anglo-African influence appears, therefore, in the water-stealing episode. The Indians, however, have taken the Spanish-American form of the tar-baby story with the Anglo-African influence above noted and contributed to it one of the most original features of any version or versions from any country, the episode of the coming to life of the dead animal of the Taos versions.

The Lesser Antilles are conspicuously lacking in originality. They have the special Spanish-American features of substitution and the punishment of the substitute animal, and the special African and Anglo-African feature of water-stealing by a rabbit, but curiously enough the well from which the rabbit steals water belongs not to the animals in partnership as in the African and Anglo-African versions, but to the king. This feature appears also in the Mauritius version. In a Bahama version and in three of the four versions from Dutch Guiana the king is the owner of a garden from which the rabbit steals. In the case of the water-stealing episode the Lesser Antilles versions are more African than Africa, 71% as against 31%.

The versions from Dutch Guiana present a very simple and primitive pattern with features from Spanish-America, Africa, Anglo-Africa, and the Lesser Antilles. The Lesser Antilles influence is perhaps the strongest. One original feature appears, the ruse of the son of the spider who saves the father by singing and prophesying the death and ruin of all and everything in case he is killed.

The Philippine versions are specifically of the simple and primitive India-European pattern and are probably of direct Spanish source.

The Cape Verde Islands versions also represent a simple India-European pattern, but confused with the tale of the master-thief, as already noted, in two of the versions, and in a third version there seems to be a slight African or Hispanic-African influence.

The Anglo-African versions are of the ordinary original baustein type and have in common with the African versions from which some of them are derived a full development of the female tar-baby and courtship episode. This may be of Hindu source as I have already indicated, but if it is a characteristic of the African race some of the Anglo-African and African versions depict it admirably. The mock-plea is another im-

portant feature common to both groups, but the pleas are not of the same type. The animal partnership or family group of dramatic characters is also common to both groups. The Anglo-African versions show, therefore, a genetic relation to the African versions, but as a matter of fact there is only one case of definite, direct transmission from Africa, the Jamaica version of the African version of Barker-Sinclair already cited. The influence of the Hispanic forms is clearly seen in the few cases of substitution (5 or 14%), the bucket of tar (2 or 6%) and other less significant details. The Anglo-African versions, therefore, are derived from purely African and Hispanic-African sources on the one hand, and from European sources through Spanish-America on the other hand. The Uncle Remus type, curiously enough, does not show any of the outstanding African or Anglo-African features with the single exception of the mock-plea.

The African versions are of course originally of Hindu source like all the others. As I have already pointed out they have in common with the Anglo-African versions the female tar-baby and courtship episode, the water-stealing episode and animal partnership, and the mock-plea. But the mock pleas are not of the same type. The only feature of the African tales not found in other groups at all is the live-tortoise trap. I have already stated my belief that the female tar-baby and courtship episode is a development of the moral of the India tales of the Samyutta Nikaya and Paricistaparvan about the sensual monkeys. And the special mock-pleas of the Anglo-African and African versions being different, they are most certainly not related. It appears that the only outstanding and unquestionably African and Anglo-African element is the animal partnership and water-stealing and polluting episode. Africa alone develops the live-tortoise tar-trap.

The case for India as the original home of the tar-baby story is founded, therefore, on scientific evidence, on the evidence derived from a careful examination and study of one hundred and fifty-two versions, all those that we could obtain from India, Europe, various parts of Africa and Mauritius, the Philippines, the Cape Verde Islands, the Negroes of the United States and the islands of the Southern States, the Greater and Lesser Antilles and other islands of the Carribean Sea, New Mexico, Mexico, Central America, Colombia, Venezuela, Chile, Brazil and Dutch Guiana, the North American Indians, and the Indians of the Orinoco in South America.

APPENDIX I

THE EUROPEAN AND ORIENTAL ORIGIN OF SOME OF THE DOMINANT
SECONDARY ELEMENTS OF THE VARIOUS TYPES OF VERSIONS OF THE
TAR-BABY STORY

In my discussion of the important secondary elements that characterize the different group versions of the tar-baby story I have often stated that they are for the most part of European and ultimately of India origin. As I have already stated, some of the dominant characteristic elements of the various versions are specifically local and of recent development and are often indicative of the special characteristic traits or spirit of a race or people. The live-tortoise tar-trap, for example, is certainly an African element, a secondary incident contributed by the Africans to the baustein of the primitive tale. The coming to life of the dead animal in the Taos Indian versions is likewise an Indian contribution and one probably derived from their own traditions. But nevertheless, many of the outstanding features of the tar-baby story as found in various parts of the world and which do not belong to the baustein are developed from traditions existing as early as the baustein of the tar-baby story itself. Many of these are commonly found in the folktales of Europe and India, others have developed in Europe only. The Spanish-American versions, especially, have developed as dominant secondary features some folktale incidents that are characteristically European. In the following pages I list some of the more important characteristic features of the various groups that are not part of the baustein and which are clearly of European and in some cases of Oriental source. The numbers refer to the numbers of the elements in question as listed in the statistical tables of Part IV.

19. Tar-baby is not a tar-baby, but a bucket of tar. This trap for catching a thief is so commonly used in the versions of the tale of the master-thief that I hardly need to call attention to the fact that it is a well known European and Oriental incident. The tar-bucket appears in most of the versions listed by Chauvin for the Oriental group, VIII, 185—186, and it likewise appears in most of the Medieval versions of the Book of the Seven Sages. In the XIIIth century Latin version, *Historia Septem Sapientum* II, 49—54, the poor thief who had been the king's treasurer is caught in a bucket of pitch, bitumen, glue and resin. "Et tu interim cuppam latam et profundam calenti imple bitumine, resa, pice et glutine, quam foramini introrsus opponas." In the *Ystoire Sept Sages* P, 88—89, we are told that a bucket of glue and other sticky substances was placed to catch the master-thief: "de pège et de gluz et aultre mixtion de cole."

The story of the master-thief being so well known in Oriental and European folklore and the incident of the catching of the thief with

a tar-bucket so closely related to the incidents of the baustein of the tar-baby story it was natural to confuse the two, and that is exactly what has happened. In the two Cape Verde versions already studied the whole tale of the master-thief has been confused with the baustein of the tar-baby story. On the other hand the tar-baby story has taken from the tale of the master-thief the catch with a bucket of tar, the baustein of the tar-baby story itself remaining intact and the thief attacking the bucket of tar in the usual manner as if it were a real tar-baby as I have already pointed out.

21. Tar-baby is a tarred horse. This is a feature of the Lithuanian version only. But it occurs also in another thief-catching story from Europe, and one that may be indirectly related to the tar-baby story. I did not include it in my study because it has none of the elements of the baustein of the tar-baby story, but it is clear that the device of catching a thief or mischief-maker by means of a tarred horse is well known in European folklore. As a matter of fact it is not altogether impossible that the African live-tortoise tar-trap may be related to the European live-horse tar-trap. The tarred horse used to catch the thief in a European folktale occurs in an Asturian tradition mentioned by R. Menéndez Pidal in *Romania* XIX, 376—377. In discussing the origin of the word *xana*, Asturian for water-nymph, he tells the incident of one of these water-nymphs being caught by a tarred horse. I have recently asked my distinguished friend for more details about the incident and he writes me as follows: "Es una anécdota cuyo desenlace, si es que lo tenía, no lo recuerdo. Sólo conservo en la memoria que unos mozos vieron una noche varias xanas junto a una fuente cabalgando los caballos que allí pastaban, y como no pudieron acercarse a ellas, para la noche siguiente cubrieron de pez el lomo de un caballo, y así, cuando la xana se montó en él, quedó presa en la pez y pudieron apoderarse de ella."

This fragmentary account tells us the story of a water-nymph that was in the habit of riding at night on the horses of a certain farm. To catch her the owners put tar on a horse and the nymph rode the horse and could not get off afterwards. In view of the fact that the nymph was not a thief but rather one that rode the horses at night it is doubtful whether the play of hands and feet was part of the original tale. It is merely a related tale that has the element of the tarred horse with none of the baustein of the tar-baby story. The tarred horse used to catch a thief or mischief-maker, as part of the tar-baby story or independently of it, seems to be a well known European tradition.

38. Substitution. This is the outstanding characteristic of the Spanish-American versions, 60%. From Spanish-America it has gone to other regions: Lesser Antilles 42%, American-Indians 22%, Anglo-Africa 14%. Africa alone has received it directly from India (Africa 8%, India 11%).

Substitution in European and Spanish-American folklore is of very

common occurrence, and it often occurs in circumstances very similar to those of the tar-baby story. In the Spanish-American folktales it is especially common in the tales of Juan Bobo, Pedro de Urdemales, and other picaresque tales. Juan Bobo or Pedro de Urdemalas is a trickster or general mischief-maker, sometimes specifically a thief, and when he is finally caught he is usually put into a sack to be taken to the river to be drowned. At that point there appears another person who takes his place when the mischief-maker tells him that they are to marry him to the king's daughter. All these details are practically identical to those of the substitution of the coyote or some other animal for the rabbit that is caught in the typical Spanish-American tar-baby versions. The parallelism is extraordinary and there can be no doubt about the relation of the incidents. From the European and Spanish tales where substitution occurred the motif has been transferred to the tar-baby story, a development that also occurred in India if we may judge from the Gordon version (7), and which has undergone a special elaboration in Spanish-America.¹

The confusion of the picaresque tales of Juan Bobo and the tar-baby story in Spanish-America has apparently been such that in one of the Porto-Rican tar-baby versions (21) it is Juan Bobo himself who is caught by means of a tar-baby.

Substitution in the folklore of Europe and Spanish-America has to be considered with elements 43, "They wish to marry me to the king's daughter," and 44, "They give me plenty of food," because these are usually the deceiving words that induce the person or animal that happens to pass by to substitute for the one first caught. The whole incident of the substitution and the deceiving tricks used for the substitution to take place are the same in the numerous versions of European and Spanish-American folktales and in the Spanish-American tar-baby versions. I will give only a few typical examples. In the European and

¹ The whole idea of substitution and the punishment of the substitute, both elements together, probably came to Europe as a folklore theme already developed in India in various types of folktales. A very good example of the general type is found in *Panchatantra* I, iv. A man who wishes to punish his adulterous wife ties her to a post so she may not go to her lover. He goes away for a while to consider what punishment is best. In the meantime a woman friend, a barber's wife, arrives and hears of the wife's plight. She offers to substitute for a while so that the adulterous wife may again go out to meet her lover. Substitution takes place just as in the Spanish-American tar-baby versions. The angry husband returns and finds the other woman whom he thinks to be his wife. He speaks to her and asks her to promise not to go with other men again before releasing her. The barber's wife becomes frightened and does not reply for fear he will detect the deceit. But angered all the more the husband takes a knife and cuts off her nose. Later when the husband finds his wife unharmed she makes him believe the gods restored her nose on account of her innocence.

Spanish-American picaresque tales the dramatic characters are all human as a rule.

Among the oldest examples is the one from Grimm-Schmeller, *La-teinische Gedichte des X und XI Jahrh.* 376—377. The Unibos plays many tricks on people until he is shut up in a barrel by three men. He begins to call out, "They are forcing honors and power upon me," and a swineherd hears him and substitutes.

In Straparola I, 2, a prevost hires a robber to bring him a priest in a sack. The robber goes to mass and dressed in ecclesiastical robes he stands by the sack and says, "Who wants to go to paradise?" The priest gets into the sack and is taken by the robber to the prevost. There is no actual substitution here because no one gets out of the sack, but the trick is similar to the ones used in the substitution incident.

In Mullenhoff 463, the hero of the story is imprisoned in a barrel. He cries out, "They are going to marry me to the king's daughter." A herdsman substitutes.

In Parsons, Cape Verde 18, the trickster hero is put into a sack and is about to be killed. He cries out, "I don't want to marry the king's daughter because I can not eat with knife and fork." A herdsman substitutes and is cast into the sea.

In a version from Brittany in RTP IX, 346, the devil is imprisoned in a sack by Pierre. The devil cries out, "I refuse to marry the king's daughter," and a rag-dealer substitutes and is cast into the sea.

In Bladé III, 104—119, the picaresque hero is also caught and put into a sack to be drowned. He calls out, "They want to marry me to the king's daughter," and one who is passing by substitutes and is drowned.

In a Celtic folktale, Jacobs 4, 59—61, a trickster is caught and put into a sack. He calls out, "I don't want to marry the king's daughter." A farmer who happens to pass by substitutes and is thrown into a lake and drowned.

As a last example from Europe I will cite the one from my "Cuentos", 174, Juanito Malastrampas. Juanito is caught and put in a sack to be drowned. While the sack is left near a tavern for a moment Juanito begins to complain, "Alas! Alas! They want me to marry the king's daughter, and I refuse to do it." A shepherd substitutes and is drowned.

The examples where the deceiving words are slightly different but the episode practically the same are even more numerous. To this category belong Archivio I, 203, where the hero is captured and put into a sack, and after crying out, "They want to make me pope," he induces a shepherd to substitute.

I will now give a few examples from Spanish-America.

In a Porto-Rican folktale, Mason-Espinosa, PRF II, 2c, the hero is finally caught and imprisoned in a sack. He calls out, "I don't want to marry the king's daughter," and a man passing by substitutes and is killed.

In Espinosa VII, 14, Pedro de Urdemalas is caught and imprisoned in a sack. He calls out, "I don't want to marry the king's daughter because she is blind of one eye." A man who is passing by substitutes and is drowned.

In another New Mexican Spanish folktale, the tale of *Los dos compadres*, BDR IV, 111, the poor compadre is caught and put into a sack to be drowned. He calls out also, "I do not want to marry the king's daughter because she is blind of one eye," and one who is passing by substitutes.

Incident 44, "They give me plenty of food," is also found in connection with substitution in European and Spanish-American folktales outside of the tar-baby story. The Aesopic fable of the fox and the wolf, *Collectas IX*, in which the fox escapes from a well and the wolf goes down at the same time to seek cheese (the moon) is really a prototype version of this incident. In a form identical with that of the Spanish-American tar-baby versions it is found in a Cape Verde version, *Parsons, Cape Verde 21*.

45. The substitute animal is scalded with hot water. This incident, characteristic of the Spanish-American versions, is most certainly of European origin. The best and oldest example I have is the one from the *Roman de Renard* (ed. Martin, III, 335—343). The wolf wants to become a monk and sticks his head through a hole to be tonsured. The fox pours boiling water on his neck.

In a Lettish folktale, *Boehm-Specht 147—148*, a man concealed under a trough hears the wolf and hare plotting to rob him. He goes home and prepares hot water, which he pours on the wolf who is the first to appear to steal sheep.

46. The substitute animal is stuck with a hot poker, sometimes specifically in the anus.

This incident is also of Oriental and European source. I have already called attention to its presence in a modern India version (4), where the jackal has swallowed carp and they go through his buttocks, and after being patched up by a shoemaker has to have a blacksmith make a hole for the anal orifice with a hot poker. The incident occurs also in the India version (5) which is a variant of (4).

In a Portuguese version, *Coelho VII*, the wolf, the fox and the rabbit help a man to prepare a feast after various other incidents. The man then kills the rabbit, drags the fox through the fire and sticks a hot poker through the anus of the wolf. The jackal of the India tales is the wolf of the European tales, and the wolf of the European tales is the poor, stupid coyote of our Spanish-American folktales.

Coelho IX is slightly different, but it interests us even more because like some of the Spanish-American tar-baby versions it has both the hot water and the hot poker incidents. A man and his wife prepare a feast and send the wolf and fox to get provisions. When the feast is

ready the animals see a caldron of hot water and a red hot poker and ask what they are for. The woman says that they are to cook the chicken. The man then pours the hot water on the wolf, and the woman sticks the hot poker into the eyes of the fox.

ADDENDA

I

When my article was already in press I received volume 88 of the *Bulletin of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Myths and Tales of the Southeastern Indians* by J. R. Swanton, Washington, 1929. On pages 68, 110—111, 161, 208—209, 258—259, there are six new Indian versions not included in my study. That brings the total of American Indian versions to twenty-nine, and the total of tar-baby versions to one hundred and fiftyeight. These six new Indian versions do not change the conclusions of my study in any way although the percentages of occurrence for the Indian versions are slightly modified. Element 38, substitution, for example, the outstanding trait of the Spanish-American versions, is changed from 5 out of 23 or 22% to 7 out of 29 or 24% in the Indian versions. The changes in the other details are insignificant. These versions are of the general American Indian type already established with no special or new features. All have the stick-fast episode at four or five points, rabbit is the thief in all, the dramatic monologue occurs in three of the six, the special Anglo-African mock-plea, element 48, occurs in only one version, a Natchez Indian version, and there is no female tar-baby in any of the versions. In four versions rabbit steals ordinary garden produce and in two water, from a well.

II

When my article was in press there appeared a brief and interesting article, "The Tar-Baby Story", in *American Literature* II, 72—88, by Professor Ruth I. Cline of Bridgewater College. Although on page 74 she states that she has examined only 50 to 60 versions there is cited a third century India literary version translated from Sanskrit into Chinese which I have not seen. It is very similar to Jataka 55. Professor Cline seems to believe in the India origin of the tar-baby story, and her article is on the whole an attempt to prove a relationship between Jataka 55 and Jataka 20, starting from the belief that the tar-baby was originally a water-sprite as in Jataka 20, where Buddha, born as a king of the monkeys suspects the presence of a water-ogre in a certain lake, does not go down to drink and is not caught by the ogre. The suggestion that there may be an actual connection between the two Jatakas because the ogres are physically similar and because Buddha teaches the same lesson to both ogres seems to me the weakest part of the argument because all ogres as described in folktales are physically similar and Buddha teaches practically the same lessons and even in words that are very much the same in several of the Jatakas.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Amaury Talbot: P. Amaury Talbot, *In the Shadow of the Bush*, London, 1912.
- Andrade: Manuel J. Andrade, *Folk-Lore from the Dominican Republic Memoir XXIII*, American Folklore Society, New York, 1930. In press.
- Archivio: *Archivio per lo studio delle tradizioi popolari*, 22 vols., Torino, 1882—1903.
- Bachmann: F. Bachmann, *Nyalia Märchen*, in *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* VI.
- Baissac: Charles Baissac, *Le Folk-Lore de l'Isle-Maurice, Pars*, 1888.
- Barbosa Rodrigues: João Barbosa Rodrigues, *Poranduba amazonense*, Riode Janeiro, 1890.
- Barker-Sinclair: W. H. Barker and Cecilia Sinclair, *West African Folktales*, London, 1917.
- BDR: *Bulletin de dialectologie romane*, 4 vols., Bruxelles, 1909—1914.
- Beckwith: Martha Warren Beckwith, *Jamaica Anansi Stories, Memoir XVII*, American Folk-lorety Socie, New York, 1924.
- Bédier: Joseph Bédier, *Les fabliaux*, 4th éd., Paris, 1925.
- Bertoldo: Bertoldo, Bertoldino y Cacaseno, by C. Della Croce, Barcelona, s. a.
- Bladé: Jean François Bladé. *Contes populaires de la Gascogne*, 3 vols., Paris, 1886.
- Boas, *Indianische Sagen*: Fanz Boas, *Indianische Sagen von der Nord-Pacifischen Küste Amerikas*, Berlin, 1895.
- Boas, Notes: Franz Boas, *Notes on Mexican Folk-Lore*, in *JAFL*, XXV, 204—260.
- Bodding: O. M. Bodding, *Santal Folk Tales*, 2 vols., Oslo, 1925—1927.
- Boehm-Specht: M. Boehm und F. Specht, *Litauische Märchen*, Jena, 1924.
- Bompas: Cecil Henry Bompas, *Folk-Lore of the Santal Parganas*, London, 1909.
- Braga: Theophilo Braga, *Contos tradicionaes do povo portuguez*, 2 vols., Porto, s. a.
- Brown: W. Norman Brown, *The Tar-Baby Story at Home*, in *Scientific Monthly* XV, 228—234.
- Campbell: J. F. Campbell, *Popular Tales of the West Highlands*, 4 vols., London, 1893.
- Cardoso-Pinto: M. Cardoso Martha e Augusto Pinto, *Folklore do concello da Figuerira da Foz*, 2 vols., Espozende, 1910—1912.

- Chatelain: Heli Chatelain, Folk-Tales of Angola, Memoir, I, American Folk-lore Society, Boston 1894.
- Chauvin: Victor Chauvin, Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes, I—VIII, Liège, 1892—1904.
- Christensen: A. M. H. Christensen, Afro-American Folk-Lore, Boston, 1892.
- Coehlo: F. Adolpho Coehlo, Contos populares portu-
guezes, Lisboa, 1879.
- Collectas: Fábulas collectas de Alonso de Poggio y de
otros, pages cxi-cxxxii of Isopo (facsimile
edition of Spanish 1489 text), Madrid, 1929.
- Cosquin: Emmanuel Cosquin, Contes populaires de Lor-
raine, 2 vols., Paris, 1886—1887.
- Cronise-Ward: F. M. Cronise and H. W. Ward, Cunnie Rabbit,
Mr. Spider and the other Beef, New York and
London, 1903.
- Cuentos: Aurelio M. Espinosa, Cuentos populares espa-
ñoles, recogidos de la tradición oral de España,
etc., 3 vols., Stanford University, 1923—1926.
- Dähnhardt: Oskar Dähnhardt, Natursagen, 4 vols., Leipzig
und Berlin, 1907—1912.
- Dasent, Fjeld; George Webbe Dasent, Tales from the Fjeld,
London, 1874.
- Dennet: R. E. Dennet, Notes on the Folk-Lore of the
Fjort, London, 1898.
- Edwards: Charles L. Edwards, Bahama Songs and Stories,
Boston and New York, 1887.
- Ellis 2: A. B. Ellis, The E'we-Speaking Peoples,
London, 1894.
- Espinosa III: Aurelio M. Espinosa, New-Mexican Spanish
Folk-Lore III: Folk-Tales in JAFI, XXIV,
397—444.
- Espinosa VII: Aurelio M. Espinosa, New-Mexican Spanish
Folk-Lore VII: More Folk-Tales, in JAFI,
XXVII, 119—147.
- Fansler: Dean S. Fansler, Filipino Popular Tales,
Memoir XII, American Folk-lore Society,
New York, 1921.
- Fauset: Arthur Huff Fauset, Negro Folk-Tales from
the South, in JAFI, XI, 213—303.
- FCM: Field Columbian Museum, Anthropological Se-
ries, 16 vols., Chicago, 1895.
- Ferrer-Ginart: Andreu Ferrer Ginart, Rondaies de Menorca,
Ciudadella, 1914.
- FL: Folk-Lore, London, 1890.

- FLJ: The Folk-Lore Journal, 7 vols., London, 1883—1889.
- Fortier: Alcée Fortier, Louisiana Folk-Tales, Memoir II, American Folk-lore Society, Boston, 1895.
- Foulet: Lucien Foulet, Le roman de Renard, Paris, 1914.
- Goddard: Pliny Earle Goddard, Myths and Tales from The San Carlos Apache, Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of National History, XXIV, 1, New York, 1918.
- Gordon: E. M. Gordon, Indian Folk-Tales, London, 1909.
- Hahn: J. G. von Hahn, Griechische und albanesische Märchen, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1864.
- Harris 1: Joel Chandler Harris, Uncle Remus, his Songs and his Sayings, New York and London, 1924.
- Harris 2: Joel Chandler Harris, Nights with Uncle Remus, Boston and New York, 1911.
- Historia septem sapientium II: Historia septem sapientum II (Dolopathos), ed. Alfons Hilka, Heidelberg, 1913.
- Honeyġ: James Albert Honeyġ, South-African Folk-Tales, New York, 1910.
- Indian Antiquary: Indian Antiquary, Bombay, 1872.
- Isopo: Fábulas de Esopo, Reproducción en facsímile de la primera edición de 1489, Real Academia Española, Madrid, 1929.
- Jacobs 3: Joseph Jacobs, Indian Fairy Tales, London, 1892; new edition, London, 1910.
- Jacobs, Bidpai: Joseph Jacobs, The Earliest English Version of the Fables of Bidpai, London, 1888.
- JAFL: Journal of American Folk-Lore, Boston-New York, 1888.
- Jataka: The Jataka or Stories of Buddha's former Births, ed. E. B. Cowell, 6 vols., Cambridge, 1895—1907.
- Johnston: Sir Harry Johnston, Liberia, 2 vols., London, 1906.
- Jones: Charles C. Jones, Negro Myths from the Georgia Coast, Boston and New York, 1888.
- Junod: Henri A. Junod, Les chants et les contes des Ba-Ronga de la Baie de Delagoa, Lausanne, 1897.
- Koch-Grünberg 1: Theodor Koch-Grünberg, Vom Roroima zum Orinoco, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1916.
- Kootz-Kretschmer: Elise Kootz-Kretschmer, Die Safwa, 2 vols., Berlin, 1929.
- Laval, Cuentos: Ramón A. Laval, Cuentos populares en Chile, Santiago, 1923.

- Lederbogen: W. Lederbogen, Duala Fables, in *Journal of The African Society* XIII, 1904.
- Mason-Espinosa PRF: J. Alden Mason, Porto-Rican Folk-Lore: Folk-Tales, edited by Aurelio M. Espinosa, in *JAFL*, XXXIV, 143—208; XXXV, 1—61; XXXVII, 247—344; XXXVIII, 507—618; XXXIX, 227—369; XL, 313—414; XLII, 85—156.
- Meinhof: Karl Meinhof, *Afrikanische Märchen*, Jena, 1921.
- Mitterrutzner: C. Mitterrutzner, *Die Sprache der Beri in Zentral-Africa*, Brixen, 1867.
- Mockler-Ferryman: A. F. Mockler-Ferryman, *British Nigeria*, London, 1902.
- Mooney: James Mooney, *Myths of the Cherokee*, XIXth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology Washington, 1879.
- Müllenhoff: K. Müllenhoff, *Sagen, Märchen und Lieder der Herzogtümer Schleswig, Holstein und Lauenburg*, Kiel, 1845.
- Nassau: Robert H. Nassau, *Where Animals Talk*, Boston 1912.
- Panchatantra: Panchatantra, ed. Theodor Benfey, Leipzig, 1895.
- Paricistaparvan: Hemachandra, *Paricistaparvan*, ed Hermann Jacobi, *Bibliotheca Indica*, Calcutta, 1883.
- Parsons, Andros: Elsie Clews Parsons, *Folk-Tales of Andros Island, Bahamas*, Memoir XIII, American Folk-lore Society, New York, 1918.
- Parsons, Cape Verde: Elsie Clews Parsons, *Folk-Lore from the Cape Verde Islands*, 2 vols., Memoir XV, American Folk-lore Society New York, 1924.
- Parsons, Sea Islands: Elsie Clews Parsons, *Folk-Lore of the Sea Islands, South Carolina*, Memoir XVI American Folk-lore Society, New York, 1923.
- Parsons, Taos MSS: Elsie Clews Parsons, *Manuscript copies of folk-tales from Taos, New Mexico*.
- Parsons, Tewa: Elsie Clews Parsons, *Tewa Tales*, Memoir XIX, American Folk-lore Society, New York, 1926.
- Pimentel: Figueiredo Pimentel, *Historias da Avósinha*, Rio de Janeiro, 1921.
- Portell Vilá: Herminio Portell Vilá, *Cuentos populares cubanos* (in manuscript and still being collected).
- Preuss: Konrad Theodor Preuss, *Die Nayarit Expedition I*, Leipzig, 1912.
- Pröhle: Heinrich Pröhle, *Kinder- und Volksmärchen*, Leipzig, 1853.

- Radin-Espinosa: Paul Radin, *El folklore de Oaxaca*, publicado por Aurelio M. Espinosa, *Anales de la Escuela Internacional de Arqueología y Etnología Americanas*, Habana, 1917.
- Rivière: J. Rivière, *Contes populaires de la Kabylie du Djurdjura*, Paris, 1882.
- Roman de Renard: *Le Roman de Renard*, ed. Ernest Martin, 2 vols., Strassbourg-Paris, 1882.
- Romania: Romania, Paris, 1872.
- Romans sept sages P: *Les sept sages de Rome*, ed. Gaston Paris, Paris, 1876.
- Romero: Sylvio Romero, *Contos populares do Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, 1907.
- RTP: *Revue des traditions populaires*, 34 vols., Paris, 1886—1919.
- Samyutta Nikaya: Samyutta Nikaya, ed. Leon Feer, in *Pali Text Society*, London, 1898.
- Santa-Anna Nery: F. J. de Santa-Anna Nery, *Folk-Lore Brésilien*, Paris, 1889.
- Sapir, Takelma: Edward Sapir, *Takelma Texts*, University of Pennsylvania Anthropological Publications II, 1909.
- Sapir, Yana: Edward Sapir, *Yana Texts*, University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology IX, 1910.
- Schleicher: August Schleicher, *Litauische Märchen, Sprichworte, Rätsel und Lieder*, Weimar, 1857.
- Schultze: Leonard Schultze, *Aus Namaland und Kalahari*, Jena, 1907.
- Scientific Monthly: *The Scientific Monthly*, New York, 1908.
- Smith-Dale: Edwin W. Smith and A. M. Dale, *The Ila-Speaking Peoples of Northern Rhodesia*.
- Speck, Taskigi: Frank G. Speck, *The Creek Indians of Taskigi Town*, in *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association II*.
- Speck, Yuchi: Frank G. Speck, *Ethnology of the Yuchi Indians*, University of Pennsylvania Anthropological Publications I, 1909.
- Straparola: G. F. Straparola, *Le piacevoli notti*, ed. Louveau De Larivey, 2 vols., Paris, 1857.
- Tía Panchita: Carmen Lyra, *Los cuentos de mi Tía Panchita*, San José, Costa Rica, 1926.
- Tremearne: A. J. N. Tremearne, *Hausa Superstitions and Customs*, London, 1913.
- ZFE: *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, Berlin, 1869.