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In the Čihil Țūți the parrot is introduced as a narrator, in order
that people "can be amused by hearing these stories" (az šīn-
dan-i in ȟikāyât mašţūf bāšand)². That is the spontaneous func-
tion of the folk-tale. From ancient times the story-teller has been
able to hold the attention of and to fascinate his public making
it part of the atmosphere of his stories, so that it suffered with
the hero in times of distress and triumphed with him, when his
wisdom and presence of mind and luck made him reach his
goal. One was amused, but educated at the same time, because
the didactic often went together with pure entertainment. The
Manichaean was for example had a clear understanding hereof
and apparently employed to a great extent folk-tales in their parables.
One evident case is the story of the Pearl-borer known exclusively
from Burzō’s preface to Kahila wa Dinna that was adopted by
the religious teaching and given an allegorical explanation
(xwycq’wy), thus serving a higher purpose³. This double aim
is possibly particularly indicated by the Middle Iranian verb
wifrās- "teach, tell", that in a Manichaean text is used to signify
the activity of the story-teller, the minstrel (gōsān)⁴. But the enter-

---

1 I. e. Type 564 ("The Magic Providing Purse and "Out, Bay, out of the Sack!")
p. 206 in Antal Anrhe–Stith Thompson, The Types of the Folk Tale, A Classifi-
cation and Bibliography, PF Communications N:o 184, Helsinki 1961.
3 W. B. Henning, Sogdian Tales, BSOAS XI, p. 466 f.
4 Mary Boyce, The Parthian gōsān and Iranian Minstrel Tradition, Juras 1957,
p. 11 f. and 17 f.
tainment has been the essential, in many cases even the only aim. In the Greek and Latin literature, where the definition of the folk-tale hardly has deviated much from that of the present time, “old wives” or “nurses’ stories” (γραῦων, τινῶν μὺσοι, Platon, anilis fabella, Cicero, Horatius, anilis fabula, Quintilian, etc.) are mentioned with a certain condescension. Whether these sayings express the common view as regards folk-tales or not, they do show that the purely entertaining story has been well-known in ancient times. How far back in the history of culture in general that has been the case, is, however, on the other hand difficult to clarify. From ancient Egypt for instance several collections of tales are known, among which the oldest one, the Tale of the Shipwrecked Man, dates from about 2000–1700 B.C. But both as regards this and other Egyptian tales such as The Enchanted Prince and especially The Two Brothers treated in detail by C. W. v. Sydow, it is hardly possible to decide, whether it is secular literature or parts of a ritual pattern the origin and cultic position of which has fallen into oblivion.

The same uncertainty dominates the judgement of the Accadian texts, the Epic of Gilgamesh, that goes back to a Sumerian source and among other things illustrates the battle to win the life-giving plant, a plant that is able to make the old young again, and the Tale of Etana with the account of the endeavor to achieve the plant of birth, and partly also the Old Testament. It is, however, quite obvious that these and similar texts contain several of the elements and motifs that later on became typical features of the

---

folk-tale. The Aramaic fragments of the Ahiqar-novel from Elephantine\(^{10}\) are a proof of the popularity of the folk-tale among the Jews of the 5th century B.C.

Among the Iranians the non-religious heroic legend and the folk-tale, the literary relationship of which is very narrow, evidently has roots as far back as the times before the actual formation of government under the Achaemenids. Thus folk-tale motifs are present in the heroic tradition incorporated in the Yashts and altogether in the stories of the Kayanian cycle. The existence of a secular literature of entertainment orally handed down through generations and with an especially fertile dissemination during the Parthian epoch must be regarded as an established fact\(^{11}\). Non-Iranian sources such as Chares of Mytilene (the Median story of Zariadres and Odatis, communicated by Athenaeus\(^{12}\)), Herodotus, Ktesias and Xenophon\(^{13}\) bear witness of this living tradition, the remains of which, now established in writing, have been handed down in the Middle Iranian secular works, the Karnamak-i Artaxsir-i Papakan, the Abiyalkar-i Zarera, the Draxt asirik (a fine piece of munazara-literature\(^{14}\)), and the New Persian reproductions of most of this material in Firdausi's Shahnami\(^{15}\). But to this original literature the tales from India, a great if not the greatest centre of the dissemination of the literary

---

\(^{10}\) With the correct historical succession of Sanherib (סנחריב) or Shamash-shuma-Sumu-ri, e.g. p. 63, line 3 and p. 67, line 2 in Arthur Ungnad, Aramäische Papyrus aus Elephantine, Leipzig 1911) and Ashurbanipal (Asarhaddon, ibid. p. 63, line 5). A translation of the Aramaic text p. 168 f. in F. C. Conybeare, J. Rendel Harris and Agnes Smith Lewis, The Story of Ahiqar, Cambridge 1913.


\(^{13}\) See e.g. Arthur Christensen, Heldesgting og Fortellingslitteratur hos Iranerne I Oldtiden, København 1935, p. 67 ff.


folk-tale, were added under the later Sasanids. The cultural contact, which caused this dissemination, is by the secular Sasanian čatrang-nāmāk, that relates the explanation through Vazurgmīhr of the game of chess, demanded by the Indian king Dēvśarm (cf. Olaf Hansen, Zum mittelpersischen Vičārišn ī Čatrang, Glückstadt 1935, p. 13–16), if a heavy tribute should be avoided, correctly thought to belong to the time of Xusrav I Anōšakruvān. In the introduction and transmission, however, of the Indian tale, that also outside its original collection influenced Persian literature as for instance the Letter of Tansar\(^\text{16}\), the Persians played a part of enormously extensive significance in the history of the folk-tale, also the European. So in the now lost Pahlavi Hazār Afsānak, one of the sources of the “1001 Nights”, a considerable amount of Indian material was included, but besides a reference to the completed frameworks such as the Pañcatantra, that was translated by Burzōī into Pahlavi and further – as Kalīla wa Dimna – into Arabic (by Ibn-ul-Muqaffa‘), into Hebrew and into most European languages, including Danish (1618 A.D.), adapted in Persia as Anvār-i Suhailī and ‘Īyār-i dānīš, “The Touchstone of Knowledge” and imitated in the Marzubān-nāmā, and such as the Šukasaptati, that as Tūṭī-nāmā exists in the redaction of Naḵšabī from the 14th century, in the shorter redaction of Qādirī from the 17th century, and in the anonymous popular book the Čihī Tūṭī, will be quite sufficient to demonstrate the extent of the Iranian literary activity. But also in the original Persian frameworks and collections of stories and tales such as the Baxtīyār-nāmā and the Bahār-i dānīš, Delhi 1651, the Indian heritage is unmistakable.

Through this forwarding and preserving work the foundation so to speak for an international comparative folk-tale research was created. The tale passed on in this manner was of course the literary one (“Kunstmärchen”) that could be traced back to

\(^{16}\) Cf. Mary Boyce, The Indian Fables in the Letter of Tansar, Asia Major N. S. V, 1955, p. 50 ff.

\(^{17}\) See for instance Arthur Christensen, op. cit. p. 51 ff. and Emmanuel Cosquin, Le Prologue-cadre des Milles et Une Nuits, les Légendes Perses et le Livre d’Esther, Paris 1909, p. 11 (of the offsetprint). To a certain and presumably not less important extent this intermediary rôle of the Iranians has to be shared with the Manichaeans, cf. e. g. D. M. Lanğ, The Wisdom of Balahvar, London 1957, p. 24 f. and p. 65.
its written source. But this also gets decisive importance for the study of oral tales, partly because the latter have taken over a considerable number of motifs and elements of style from the literary collections\(^{18}\), and partly as it is a well-known phenomenon that a literary tradition at an early stage can be interrupted and thereafter through centuries orally be handed down from generation to generation without greater deviations from the original source\(^{19}\). There exists an interaction between the literary and the oral tradition which claims appropriate consideration of both lines\(^{20}\). In this way the Indo-Persian collections become of direct importance to the study also of the European folk-tales. As a branch of scholarly activity this study is of recent date. A wakening interest in the folk-tale is indicated in the 16th century by Francesco Straparola’s collection of 73 tales (Le piacevoli notti, Venice 1550 and 1553), in the 17th century by The Pentamerone of Giambattista Basile (published 1634–1636 in Naples after his death) and Charles Perrault’s collection (Contes de ma Mère l’Oye) from the end of the century, and in the 18th century by the German Johann Karl August Musäus’ Volksmärchen der Deutschen (1782–1786)\(^{21}\), but it was not until the great collection “Kinder- und Hausmärchen” by the brothers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm in the 19th century (Vol. I 1812, Vol. II 1815) that an actual scholarly study of the structure, genesis, migrations etc. of the folk-tales could be introduced\(^{22}\). Although the research of the folk-tale as such is of a comparatively recent date, it has non the less already developed into several schools distinct in their own right. The brothers Grimm, the founders and leading re-

\(^{18}\) Cf. e. g. Türkische Märchen. Herausgegeben von Fr. Giese, Jena 1925, p. 1.


\(^{20}\) Albert Wesselski (1871–1939) for instance considered the written document the only object of study, see especially his Versuch einer Theorie des Märchens, Prager deutsche Studien, Hef t 45, Reichenberg i. B. 1931, p. 145–166. Against this book e. g. Walter Anderson, Zu Albert Wesselski’s Angriffe auf die finnische folkloristische Forschungsmethode, Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis (Dorpatensis) B XXXVIII:3, Tartu 1935.

\(^{21}\) See Max Lüthi, Märchen, Stuttgart 1962, p. 40 ff.

\(^{22}\) Cf. Inger M. Boberg, Folkemindesforskningsens Historie, København 1953, p. 23 ff.
representatives of the so-called Aryan theory, realized the reason for the often surprising agreements between the bodies of folk-tales of widely different cultures in a common prehistoric origin, of whose myths the tales are reminiscences. In 1859 Theodor Benfey with his German translation of the Pañcatantra inaugurated the Indian theory, according to which all tales with a few exceptions and apart from the animal tales, that were believed to originate from Greece (Aesop), had come from the homeland of Buddhism. Thanks to the endeavour of the two most prominent pupils of Benfey, the German Reinhold Köhler and the Frenchman Emmanuel Cosquin, this theory achieved wide propagation and still is, with the necessary modifications and the realization of the all too obvious onesidedness of the school, a predominant factor in the study of folk-tales. And it would indeed be absurd to deny that India is the original homeland of many, but by no means all, folk-tales, and that tales are able to wander from country to country, often along strange roads and through the intermediary role of one single individual. The Norwegian scholar Reidar Th. Christiansen mentions a convincing case, “where an Irish story, published by Patrick Kennedy, a Lapp story told in Norway, and one told among the American Indians are practically identical. The use of a proper name reveals that the Lapp story was taken from a Danish translation of the Irish tale, and the Indian version was originally told by an Irish immigrant”24. But this, of course, does not involve that comparatively identical tales always can and must be traced back to the same source. Considering the fact that human life develops to a large extent along similar courses, even where the cultural differences are enormous, and that human ideals in many ways get a common stamp, it is unthinkable that more or less identical folk-tale motifs should not be able to take shape in all corners of the world and independently of each other. This so-called polygenetic theory is already hinted at by Wilhelm Grimm in 1856 and was made a

23 Cf. Alfred Forke, Die indischen Märchen und ihre Bedeutung für die vergleichende Märchenforschung, Berlin 1911, p. 18 (the Midas-story). Forke's attitude towards Benfey's theory is critical.

main factor by the French scholar Joseph Bédier (especially in
the introduction to his Les fabliaux, Paris 1893) and by the an-
thropological school, represented above all by the Englishmen
Andrew Lang and E. B. Tylor. Although, then, it cannot in
any way be ignored, it seems on the other hand doubtful, whether
its use has got any ratio in cases, where it concerns long, in-
geniously constructed tales, the episodes of which follow in the
same sequence, with the same number of acting persons, and
the same course of action, that is to say with one essentially
identical basic stamp. If a thing like that, however, really is at
hand, it is reasonable to suppose that the folk-tale somehow has
been taken over or brought from somewhere else, and it must
be the task of the scholar through a critical study of the accessible
material both to elucidate the roads and means of the migration
and to examine, whether the motif or the series of motifs during
that process has received such additions and modifications that
the tale as regards each particular people at the same time be-
comes a source for a deeper understanding of the religious and
cultural history. But before a study of that kind can be introduced,
an extensive work of collecting must be undertaken. By the
stressing and practical accomplishment of this, already widely
carried out, the Finnish (Finnish-Scandinavian-American) school
of Kaarle Krohn (1863-1933) and Antti Aarne (1867-1925) with
their historical-geographical method and the establishment
(1907, together with the Dane Axel Olrik and the Swede C. W. v.
Sydow) of the international organization of folklore scholars (FF,
Folklore Fellows) has acquired lasting merits. The considerable
number of folk-tale monographs that already has been published
by this school, is one of the most important conditions for Antti
Aarne-Stith Thompson, The Types of the Folktales and Stith
Thompson's Motif-Index. But these indices cannot become a

25 About the different theories cf. Antti Aarne, Leitfaden der vergleichenden
Märchenforschung, FF Communications N:o 13, Hamina 1913, p. 1 f., Stith
Thompson, The Folktales p. 367 ff., Max Lüthi, Märchen, 1962, p. 51 ff., and idem,
Das europäische Volksmärchen, Bern 1947, p. 98 ff.

26 About this method see especially Antti Aarne, op. cit. and Kaarle Krohn,
Die folkloristische Arbeitsmethode, Oslo 1926.


28 Motif-Index of Folk-Literature. A Classification of Narrative Elements in
real tool in the service of study illustrating the genesis and possible migrations of each tale, until much greater consideration has been shown for the Oriental and especially the Iranian folk-tales, for "die Fortschritte der Iranistik beispielsweise hat man halbstarrig jahrzehntelang nicht mehr zur Kenntnis genommen", as the folklore scholar Leopold Schmidt has it. And yet much has already been done. An important material is to be found in for example Oskar Mann's Kurdisch-persische Forschungen and in the publications of Arthur Christensen, Henri Massé, W. Ivanow, D. L. R. Lorimer, A. Bricteux and Georg Morgenstierne, and these collections have lately been greatly enlarged in Iran herself thanks to the indefatigable activity of Kūhi Kirmānī (Čahārdā afsānā az afsānāhā-yi rūstā'ī-yi Irān, Tehrān 1935, in the later editions, e.g. Tehrān 1933/1954 Pānzādā af. az af.-yi rūstā'ī-yi Irān, i. e. plus "Pīsār-i šayyād", "The Son of the Hunter", the first story) and above all Šubšt (especially Afsānāhā-yi kuhan I and II, Afsānāhā I and II, Afsānāhā-yi bāstānī and Dīvān-i Bālḵ). Of great importance now is also the activity of the Idārā-yi kull-i mūzāhā wa farhang-i 'āmmā (Dr. Š. Kiyā) of the Hunarhā-yi zibā-yi kūšār (cf. the folk-tales Nārañj wa turān, Namakī, Div wa mard-i tarsū, and Šutur-i zārin pp. 163–184 in Publication No. 2 of the Intisārat-i idārā-yi farhang-i 'āmmā, Tehrān 1341).

By means of this material alone it is possible to form a clearer picture of the distribution of a majority of the types of the folk-tale. One example out of many is just the folk-tales treating of magic objects, the Iranian versions of which have nowhere been utilized, that is to say AT 563 ("The Table, the Ass, and the Stick", 3 magic objects, sometimes—in secondary variants—4), 564 (2 magic objects), and 565 ("The Magic Mill", one magic object). Antti Aarne, who treated all three types in a monograph


19 Die Volkserzählung, Berlin 1903, p. 17.

20 Cf. the references p. 15 ff. in Arthur Christensen, Märchen aus Iran, Jena 1939. A considerable number of Soviet publications can now be added to this list e.g. Pervoleskoe skazki, Moskva 1960, Afganskie skazki, Moskva 1955, Tadžikskie skazki, Moskva 1961, the dialect studies of V. S. Sokolova, T. N. Pakhalina, M. S. Andreyev-E. M. Peškereva, I. I. Zarubin, Č. X. Bakaev etc.

31 Antti Aarne—Stith Thompson, The Types of the Folktale p. 205–207.
from 1911\textsuperscript{32}, was inclined to consider Europe their country of origin\textsuperscript{33}, whereas Kaarle Krohn\textsuperscript{34} and Waldemar Liungman\textsuperscript{35} thought that the structure of 563 and 564 as opposed to 565\textsuperscript{36} pointed to the east, India and the Near East. Tales of that kind have undoubtedly existed from the dawn of civilization. Assisted by the magic object man was able to procure all which actual life denied him, happy days, revenge over injustice, admiration etc. Already Herodotus (III, 17–18) knew about "The Table of the Sun" (Ἡ τράπεζα τοῦ ἡλίου), a meadow (Ἄμεων) in Ethiopia that spontaneously supplied boiled meat of all kinds, and in Krates’ comedy Ꭰήθη (also from the 5th century) a table that laid itself, is mentioned\textsuperscript{37}. Versions of the types 563 and 564 are widely disseminated and known\textsuperscript{38} in Finnish, Estonian, Livonian, Lithuanian, Lappish, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic, Scottish, Irish, English, French, Catalan, Dutch, Flemish, German, Italian, Rumanian, Hungarian, Czech, Slovenian, Serbo-croatian, Polish, Bulgarian\textsuperscript{39}, Russian, Greek, Georgian\textsuperscript{40}, Turkish\textsuperscript{41}, Ka-


\textsuperscript{33} Ibid. p. 83 ff.

\textsuperscript{34} Übersicht über einige Resultate der Märchenforschung, FF Communications N:o 96, Helsinki 1931, p. 52 f.


\textsuperscript{36} Especially in the form with the etiological addition explaining the salt of the sea. Zoroastrian Iran at least would hardly have tolerated such a profanation of the water. According to the Rivāyats for instance the mere crossing of the sea requires atonement (tējšn) (cf. Ervad Manockji Rustamji Unvala, Dārāb Hormazdār’s Rivāyat Vol. II, Bombay 1922, p. 159, line 1), and a traveller from Iran to India is expressly complimented, because he returns “by way of land” (az rāh-i xuškān, ibid. p. 450, line 6). It is a significant fact that this story is found neither in India nor among the tales borrowed by Indonesians, Africans, and American Indians (cf. Stith Thompson The Folktale p. 290).


\textsuperscript{38} Cf. – when no other reference is given – Aarne-Thompson, The Types of the Folktale p. 205–206.


\textsuperscript{40} Ibid. p. 358.

\textsuperscript{41} Here also p. 296 f. In Proben der Volksliteratur der türkischen Stämme. Herausgegeben von Dr. W. Radloff, VIII. Teil. Mundarten der Osmanen gesammelt und übersetzt von Dr. Ignaz Káno, St. Petersburg 1899 ("The Story of the Coffee-House Owner Ōmār", Kāvālū Ūmār, containing two magic objects, a skin
Bardian, Berber, Aramaic, Arabic, Indian, Indonesian, Franco-American, English-American, Spanish-American, among the American Indians, the Eskimos, the Africans, and the gipsies. The Iranian material that may be added is:

2) Mām āt nābōs (Mām ū nāvāsā), “Aunt (Grandmother) and Nephew (Grandchild)”, 2 Šūgūnī tales.
3) “Lazy Hama”, an Āwromānī tale, unpublished.
4) Buzī, “The Little Goat”.

(to sit upon) (post) and a candlestick (ṣambān), put, however, into a local (Asia Minor) tale. In The Types of the Folktales p. 206 it is placed under the heading “Turkestan”. Another Turksic example: Mischoar-taratische Volksdichtung gesammelt und herausgegeben von Eino Kalhhka, Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne 105, Helsinki 1953, p. 30–48.

42 A. Dirr, Kaukasische Märchen, Jena 1922, p. 115–117.


48 Wolfgang Lentz, Pamir-Dialekte. I. Materialien zur Kenntnis der Schugul-Gruppe, Göttingen 1933, p. 73–83 and p. 88–94. Similar folk-tales are also known in Sarṭolī (Dr. T. N. Fakhūli, Mokvva, in Hiterta).


Of these versions\(^{61}\), however, nrs. 3, 4, and 5 can at once he left out of consideration here, even if magic objects occur in all of them. Nr. 3 is about a poor old woman and her son Lazy Hama, who refrained from killing a snake\(^{62}\) that he had bought in a closed box at the market for his mother's last money. Out of gratitude the snake, the son of the king of the snakes, invites the boy to go and ask for the ring of the king of the snakes (kilkawânâw šâw mûrâ), as the ring is able to procure food. On his way home Hama meets a dervish who possesses a stick (wûkûza) that can knock one's enemy to pieces, "be he demon or human". They exchange objects, and a little later Hama gets the ring back by the help of the stick, wins the daughter of the king and becomes king himself. In its present form this folk-tale is a variant of AT 560 (The Magic Ring)\(^{63}\), secondarily enlarged with motif D 881.2 (Recovery of magic object by use of magic cudgel) from AT 563 (or 564). The fraudulent acquisition of the ring after the exchange (cf. AT 569) is besides a well-known motif, to be found already in the Jâataka-literature and later in the Mongolian Siddhi Kûr\(^{64}\).

In the story about the mendacious goat, related by Šubhi, AT 563 is on the other hand evidently present. Three sons of a tailor, who because of the untrue reports of the goat have been driven away from home, separately obtain a magic object as a reward for faithful service. By the help of the stick of the youngest son the two other sons get their things back from a thievish inn-keeper. In this special shape, which is due to Şâdiq Hidâyat (cf. Afsânâhâ p. 45, the note), one has, concerning both course of action, persons, and terminology, to do with an exact reproduction of tale nr. 36 in the collection of the brothers Grimm (Tischchen deck dich, Goldesel und Knüppel aus dem Sack), with the one and only deviation that "Tischchen" in the Persian version has

---

\(^{61}\) Other Persian literary examples (of Indian origin) are mentioned by Emmanuel Cosquin, Contes populaires de Lorraine, Tome II, p. 86.

\(^{62}\) As for the type-element 560 1 d (The hero rescues a snake), see Stith Thompson and Warren E. Roberts, FFC 180, p. 84.

\(^{63}\) A detailed study of this type is Antti Aarne, Vergleichende Märchenforschungen, Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne XXV, Helsingfors 1908, p. 3–82.

been substituted with “pot” (díg) and “spoon” (kağır). Being so there can be no doubt at all that the Grimm-version, which has been well-known to Şādiq Hidāyat, is the direct literary prototype.

As to the Čihil Tûtî tale, finally, the “Sa’d and Sa’il”, it represents a mixture of the types AT 567 (The Magic Bird-heart) and 518 (Heirs Quarrelling Over Magic Objects). The latter type is, as Liungman (op cit. p. 141) rightly remarks, to be regarded as a motif that is introduced in order to carry the plot happily on. In “Sa’d and Sa’il” its secondary position is the more obvious, as it is left out in most popular versions, for example both in Armenian, Georgian, and Armənān. As genuine Iranian representatives of the pure tale treating of magic objects thus only remain the Tājikī and Şughnī versions.

In the Şughnī tales a raven (xūrn) whose life had been spared is the giver of the magic objects. In both cases four things are mentioned, a not unusual widening of the main type AT 563 with the three objects, in the first one a pot (bög), an ass (šār), a cloth (rımūl = rū-māl) that gives nuts (γύζ) and mulberries (tūd), and a stick (kāndālā) by the help of which the objects are regained, in the second one a hen (t̄ax) that every day lays 300

---

65 According to Şublī (Afsānālā p. 45, the note) the terminology as regards the third magic object oscillates between ērumāq and šāpar. But in all cases the source must be the same one.


68 Åge Meyer Benedictsen–Arthur Christensen, Les dialectes d’Armənān et de Pāwā, Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser VI, 2, København 1921, p. 86–95. In the Baxtlyārī version of Lorimer (Persian Tales. Written Down for the First Time in the Original Kermānī and Bakhtīārī and Translated by D. L. R. Lorimer and E. O. Lorimer, London 1919, nr. XXXI, p. 197 ff.), however, the episode has been included, with the same three magic objects as in the Čihil Tûtî: 1) purse, 2) carpet, 3) box with surmā (ed. Bogdānov p. 44, line 2: ambānēt (in Lorimer’s unpublished text hambān), γάλακτα (γάλτα) (Baxtlyārī qalṭā), surmādān (Baxt. surmādān). In the Baxtlyārī story the names of the boys are Ahmad and Mahmad. For the Armənān and Baxtlyārī quotations I am in a great debt of gratitude to my friend Dr. D. N. Mackenzie, London.

eggs (si sād tārmūrx), a millstone (xūrdōrdždžir) that procures
wheat-flour (zhindām yōudž) and pea flour (māxīn yōudž), an
ass (markāh) that gives gold (tillā), and finally a stick (kunduk)
that as usual wins back what had been stolen.

In the Tājiki folk-tale (AT 564, two magic objects) a bird again
is acting as a giver:

Laklak.

Bud nabud yak bača bud. Vay hamroxi modarāš dar kanori
daryo60 zindagi mekard. Onho xele61 kambayal budand. Bača
har rūz ba saydi zoyu muryohī62 maşyul meşud. Yak zamon
čand rūz pay dar ham šikori ū baror63 nagirift, pisaru modar
hexěrok mondand. Nihoyat rūze yak Laklak ba dom aftod.
Bača kordro tez karda, onro kuştant64 šud. Nogoh Laklak ba
gap daromad: Maro nakušt aozod kun, har či65 xohī, baroyat
muhiyo mekunam. Ba kišvari man biyo, ba tu yak čiži ajib
mebahxam. Kišvari tu kuʃost? pursid bača. Maro giriʃta, ba bom

60 -yo = -bji, cf. V. S. Rastorgueva, A Short Sketch of Tadjik Grammar (Transl.
and Ed. by Herbert H. Paper), Publications of the Indiana University Research
Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics 28, 1963, p. 11 [− Kratkiy
očerk grammatiki tadžikskogo yazyla p. 534 in M. V. Raximi i L. V. Uspešskaya,
Tadžiksko-russkiy slovar', Moskva 1954].
61 Cf. Rastorgueva op. cit. p. 11 and G. Lazard, Caractères distinctifs de la
langue tadjik, BSI. de Paris LII, 1956, p. 126 ff.
62 The real (ethnolinguistic) meaning of zoy (ziy) is not quite clear. According
to Professor Mu弱势 it is the name of a corvus-species (Hooded Crow, Raven), but
also Magpie ("the one with the long tail") has been suggested to me. In his A
Provisional Check-List of the Birds of Iran (Tehrān Dānsīgāh, Publications No 405,
Tehrān 1337, p. 17) S. H. Jervis Read has chosen zāy as the name of the Jay and
zāyēh as the name of the Magpie. About muryo bi cf. M. Sotooede, Farhang-e
Gilaš, Teheran 1954, p. 234 (morqābi = Anas pl. platybrynchos L.). For this
species Jervis Read, op. cit. p. 4, has urdak-i ma'mūli (Mallard).
63 baror (barār) is unknown in Fārsī.
64 As for the future participle with the suffix -i cf. Rastorgueva op. cit. p. 81
and G. Lazard op. cit. p. 161 f. Now also Manfred Lorenz, Participle Constructions
as a Characteristic Distinguishing the Tadjik Language from the Persian, XXVI
International Congress of Orientalists, Papers of the Delegation of the German
Democratic Republic p. 2 f.
65 či > či, used = čh, often met with in dialects, e. g. O. Mann–Karl Hadum, Kurdisch-Persische Forschungen Abt. III, Bd. I, 1926, p. 151 b.
2*
بارویه شار ده، بین، کی مان ب کادم تارف مپرام. آنا، کیشواری مان دار حامن تارف است. باخا ب موداراش ملیحات کرد هار دو قاریق دودان، کی لکلاکرو کوشا خوراند هام، از کامبیالی بیچ وقت خالوش نامه‌سافند، اگر یرو سار دیهاند، شواد، کی لکلاک او‌هورو خساخت کناد.

باخا ب ب ریم بارومادا، لکلاکرو سار دود. لکلاک ب سیح شارق پاریا راک.

باخا بوشاد، حامون زامون اس پاسی بیبارومادا، بی تارفی شارق راون شود.

راک، راک، یویی لکلاکرو بیچ یوفتا ناتانونیل. اخیر یاک رامای بوزرو دعچر شود.

یویی رامای کی؟ - پورسید یویی چپون.

یویی رامای لکلاک - گوتفت چپون.

یویی صدی لکلاک کویست؟

یور از چپونی گیسندبون پورسید - یروپد بود بوزبون.

باخا بوژ قاند واقی دیگر روه گاستا، رامای گیسندرو وویارد.

یویی رامای کی?

یویی رامای لکلاک.

یویی صدی لکلاک کویست?

یویی یاف با تی چی دارکور؟ - بی یویی یروپد پورسید چپون.

باخا بچپون چی چلِبی یویی دومی وی افتودانی لکلاک، باروی چی یرو عید کاردناش و چی وا‌دا دودانی یرو گوتفت دود.

از رامای مان دو تارد گیسند گیر، - گوفت چپون، - بی شوتوری تأسفید مان ساور شودا، بی تارفی شارق رافت گیر. واقعه کی یا قاشر لکلاک مرسی، دار نازدی دارفو ژا تی پوسونرو میئینی.

گیسندرو ماراب ساغون دهع ناتارسیدا، بی دارفو دارامید راک.

فیکری تو چی، مان از لکلاک چی ایلیم کونم؟ - پورسید باخا.

داستارخونی پورن‌مانتاسرو ایلیم کون، - گوتفت چپون.

66 In Tājīk the present stem of dodan is written either deh- (dih-) or dih-.
67 Cf. Raximî-Uspenskaya op. cit. p. 82 sub bašad: hama ba kino rafandan, 逋 bašad dar xona mond, “they all went to the cinema, (but) he for his part stayed at home”.
70 About the treatment of ‘ in Tājīk cf. Lazard op. cit. p. 128. The writing of the word here indicates the lengthening of the preceding vowel, without, however, omitting the ‘. Cf. yoqen (= vâqf) < vâqf’a.
Bača ba čupon minnaltori bayon karda, gūsfandoni dodagijū́rō giriftu ba šūtur savor šuda, ba sūī qasri Laklak rayon gvardid. Ba nazdı darvozai qasr rasida bud, ki yakhora az darvoza du sag ba ū hamla kard. Bača ba peši har kadomaš yaktogi gūsfand partofta ba darvoza bennalol daromada raft.

Bača on tarafta rafta, Laklakro dīda mond va az šūtur faromada, bo ū voxūrdi kard.

Yod dori, – guft bača, – man turo az dom ozod karda hudem, aknun ba mamlakači tu omadam.

X ayr, man ba tu či diham? – pursid Laklak.

Ba man dastarxoni purne'matatro deh! – xohiš kard bača.

Xub, – guft Laklak, – tu maro nakušta ozod kardi, man ham turo ba maqṣadat merasonam.

Laklak xohiši bačaro ijo kard. Bača ba Laklak rahmat gufta, ba rohi omadagiaš gašta, raftan girift. Vay ba peši hamon gūs-fandboni maslıhat dodagī rasida, dastarxonro nışon dod.


32 Also used in Colloquial Persian.

33 Concerning the use and meaning of mondan cf. Lazard op. cit. p. 167 and Rastorgueva, A Short Sketch p. 86.

34 The suffix -akak (cf. R. L. Nemenova, Kratkly őčerk grammatiki tadžikskogo yazyka p. 547 in Y. I. Kaloutarov, Kratkly tadžiksko-russkily slovar', Moskva 1955) undoubtedly here gives the word an additional meaning in the direction of something fine, nice and neat.

35 kašida giriftan, “enlever (un véhicule à quelqu'un)”, Lazard p. 168.
36 ovarda dodan, “apporter (et donner)”, ibid, p. 168.
Pisaram, ba peşı Laklak ravu voqearo gufta deh! – guft modaraş ba baça. Baça az nav robi mamlakati Laklakro peş girift va ba’di ğand vaqţı ba peşı çuponi güşfandbon rasida, voqearo gufta dod. Çupon guft:
Dar in bora ba Laklak çize nagûy. Vay yak kadui bisyor ajoibe dorad, tu faqat az vay hamon kaduyaşro iltimos kun. Baça ba peşı Laklak omada, pas az pursupos, kaduyaşro iltimos kard.
Laklak iltimosi baçaro rad nakard. Baça kaduro girifta, ba nazdi hamon güşfandbon omad. Çupon kaduro ba rûli zamin monda faryod kard:
Üy, az kadu baroed!!
Aknun fahmidi-mi\textsuperscript{78}, in kadu baroi či darkor ast? – pursid çupon. Ha, fahmidam, –javob dod baça va xesta, ba xoanaşon ravon şud. Vay bargaşta omadu rest ba peşî podşoh rafta, dastarxonî purmeňnaťaşro talab kard. Podşoh dar yazab şuda, farmon dod, ki ūro peş kundand. On vaqţı baça kaduro ba zamin monda guft:
Üy, az kadu baroed!!
Az daruni kadu odamoni kaltakdor baromada, podşohro kaltakküb kardand. Posbononi podşoh tarsida, gurextand. Podşoh zori karda guft:
Bas, bas, rahm kun, dastarxonatro medîham!
Baça dastarxonro girifta guft: Ba kadu daroed!
Odamoni kaltakdor yoib şudand.
Baça dastarxon va kadui ajoibro girifta, ba peşî modaraş omad.
Az hamon vaqţ sar karda modaru pisar az hej kas natarsida, şodu xurram zindagi karda gaştand.


The Stork.

Once upon a time there was a boy. He lived together with his mother on the bank of a river. They were very poor. Every day the boy was busy hunting crows and ducks. Once for some days successively his hunting was not in luck, (and) the son and mother were without food. Finally one day a stork fell into the trap. Having sharpened his knife the boy was going to kill it. Suddenly the stork began to speak: Set me at liberty without killing me, (and) whatever you want, I will arrange for you. Come to my country (and) I will give you something unusual.

Where is your country? asked the boy.
Take me, ascend the roof (and) release me. Look, in which direction I fly. There, in the same direction is my country.
The boy consulted his mother, and both came to the conclusion that if they killed the stork and even ate it, they would never be released from their poverty, (but) if they released the stork, it might make them happy.
The boy went onto the roof (and) released the stork. The stork flew off towards the east. The boy for his part at the same time went out after it (and) went in the direction of the east. He went and went, (but) could not find (as for yofta tavonistan cf. Rastorgueva, Sketch p. 79) the place of the stork. At last he came across a herd of goats.
Whose herd is this? – he asked the goat-herd.
This is the herd of the stork – the goat-herd said.
Where is the place of the stork?
Ask the shepherd about this, – the goat-herd answered.
The boy again went off for some time (and) came across a herd of sheep.
Whose herd is this?
This is the herd of the stork,
Where is the place of the stork?
What do you want there? – the shepherd asked instead of answering.
The boy informed the shepherd, how the stork had fallen into his trap, why he had set it at liberty, and what had been promised him.
Take two sheep from my herd, — the shepherd said, — mount my white camel (and) go on towards the east. When you arrive at the palace of the stork, you see the watch-dog(s) near the gate. Give the sheep to the dogs (and) enter the gate without fear. What do you think, what shall I ask the stork for? — the boy asked. Ask for the table-cloth that is full of good things, — the shepherd said.

The boy gave thanks to the shepherd, took the sheep that had been given to him, mounted the camel and went off towards the palace of the stork.

When he came near the gate of the palace, it happened that suddenly from the gate two dogs attacked him. The boy threw one sheep before each of them (and) entered the gate without hindrance. The boy went closer, caught sight of the stork and dismounted the camel (and) greeted it.

You recollect, — the boy said, — I set you at liberty from the trap, (and) now I have come to your kingdom. Fine, what can I give you? — the stork asked.

Give me the table-cloth that is full of good things! — the boy desired.

Good, — the stork said, — you set me at liberty without killing me, (and) I too will let you achieve your aim.

The stork let the boy have his wish. The boy thanked the stork, and taking the (same) way as he came he went off. When he came to the same shepherd that had given the advice, he showed him the table-cloth.

Table-cloth, be spread out! — the shepherd said.

In the same moment the table-cloth was spread out, and on it every kind of food appeared. The boy treated the shepherd, set out again and came after some time safe and sound to their house. From that very time on the mother and the boy were provided with food, and they were always thanking the stork. Now they so nicely treated every one who came to their house. It was not long before the rumour of the table-cloth that was full of good things, spread all over the kingdom. This piece of news also reached the king's ear. He ordered that they should take the table-cloth from the boy and bring it to him. They executed his order.
My son, go to the stork and tell it what has happened! – the mother said to the boy.
The boy again, making a short-cut, went to the kingdom of the
stork, and after some time he came to the shepherd (and) told
(him) what had happened.
The shepherd said: Do not say anything to the stork about this.
It has a most wonderful gourd, only ask that very gourd of it.
The boy came to the stork (and) after inquiring (how it was) he
asked for the gourd. The stork did not refuse the boy’s request.
Having taken the gourd the boy came to the same shepherd. The
shepherd put the gourd on the ground and called out:
Hey (cf. J. I. Kalontarov, Kratkiy tadžiksko-russkiy slovar’,
Moskva 1955, p. 484), go out of the gourd!!
Suddenly men with sticks came out of the gourd (and) beat the
boy. Being afraid the boy asked them to show mercy.
Go into the gourd! – the shepherd ordered. The men with the
sticks disappeared.
Did you now understand, what this gourd is useful for? – the
shepherd asked.
Yes, I understood, – the boy answered, and getting up he went
off to their house. Having come back he went straight to the king
(and) desired the table-cloth that was full of good things. The
king became angry (and) ordered that one should throw him
out. Then the boy put the gourd on the ground (and) said:
Hey, go out of the gourd!!
Out of the gourd came men with sticks (and) thrashed the king.
The guards of the king fled in fear. The king cried (and) said:
Enough, enough, show mercy, I will give (you) your table-cloth!
The boy took the table-cloth (and) said:
Go into the gourd!
The men with the sticks disappeared. The boy took the table-
cloth and the wonderful gourd (and) came to his mother. From
that very time on the mother and the son lived in joy and hap-
piness fearing nobody.

By analysing these Iranian versions the “table-cloth” of the
Tajiki story and the common type-element “The Bird as a Giver”
are of great importance. The “table-cloth” shows the point of
connexion with Europe\textsuperscript{79} and the "Bird as a Giver" with Russia. In the numerous different forms of AT 563 and 564 that Aarne refers to, a bird (crane, stork, snipe\textsuperscript{80} as a giver of the magic objects is found only in Russian versions of this folk-tale, as the example from Eastern Karelo-Finland\textsuperscript{81} like the folk-tale tradition of Eastern Finland on the whole must belong to the same group\textsuperscript{82}. In favour of Russian origin also speaks – as regards the Tajiki story – the fact that the table-cloth in the examples of the type with two magic objects (AT 564) mentioned by Aarne, only occurs in the Russian ones\textsuperscript{83}. In view of the Russian cultural influence in Central Asia during the last 100 years a relationship of that kind does not seem remarkable. Indeed birds are popular actors in the plot, above all waterfowls (håmsa\textsuperscript{84} and baka, a kind of heron, in the Hitopadesa\textsuperscript{85}), in Indian tales, with which one immediately might suppose a certain connexion, but never in the types dealt with here, just as the table-cloth as a magic object is wholly unknown\textsuperscript{86}, although the category of the food-giving "containers" otherwise is richly varied (box, melon, basket, shells, leaf or platter, branch, bag, bowl, cow, rice, ring, conch, mat, coat\textsuperscript{87}, earthen pot\textsuperscript{88}, and leather purse (in Dāṇḍin's Daśakumāraca-caritam, the adventure of Apahāravarman)). Con-

\textsuperscript{79} Antti Aarne, Die Zaubergaben, 1911, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid. p. 33, 34 and 36, and Emmanuel Cosquin, Contes populaires de Lorraine I, Paris 1887, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{81} Aarne, ibid. p. 13.
\textsuperscript{82} C. W. von Sydow, On the Spread of Tradition p. 38 f. In Selected Papers on Folklore, Copenhagen 1948. Even in Western Finland the influence of tales of Russian origin and type has been so strong that Swedish dialects have taken over the Russian word for a folk-tale (skazka), ibid. p. 40 and 55.
\textsuperscript{83} Aarne, Die Zaubergaben p. 51.
\textsuperscript{85} Hitopadesa, ed. Nārāyaṇa Bālakrīṣṇa Godabale & Kāśinātha Pāṇḍurang Parab, Bombay 1904, p. 113, line 24 f. and 116, line 5.
\textsuperscript{86} The only exception, quoted by Minevīm (cf. Stith Thompson and Warren E. Roberts, FFC 180, p. 85) is evidently quite modern.
\textsuperscript{87} Cf. Flora Annie Steel, Tales of the Punjab. Told by the People. London 1894, p. 361 and 385.
\textsuperscript{88} See Lal Behari Day, Folk-Tales of Bengal, London 1911, p. 54 (handl).
cerning the Iranian versions, and here especially the Tājīkī one, it will then be natural to consider at any rate their final shape a direct result of Russian influence. On the other hand the possibility can not be completely excluded that the Russian elements either represent the last stage of an oicotypification, "which consists of a certain unification of the variants within one and the same linguistic or cultural area on account of isolation from other areas"⁸⁹, or are substituting additions to an already definitely fixed oicotype⁹⁰. Ultimately this oicotype may go back to Indian sources, as the types AT 563 and 564 as mentioned are richly represented in these. But this can never be more than a mere possibility, because not even a critical examination of the complete Indo-Iranian material will be able to procure such criteria that unambiguously can explain the origin and migrations of the types. The same uncertainty also marks the attempts at fixing the types chronologically in proportion to each other. From his researches Aarne came to the result that the type with three magic objects had to be the primary one, but the presence in the Chinese Tripiṭaka (and in the Siddhi Kūr) of a fully elaborated version of AT 564⁹¹, and the fact that a folk-tale with preference complied with the law of the threefold repetition⁹², seem to render a definite determination on this point impossible. In other words this is to say that as for the folk-tale types here called attention to


⁹⁰ Cf. von Sydow’s definition of the word: "In the science of botany oecotype is a term used to denote a hereditary plant-variety adapted to a certain milieu (seashore, mountain-land, etc.) through natural selection amongst hereditarily dissimilar entities of the same species. When then in the field of traditions a widely spread tradition, such as a tale or a legend [i.e. saying], forms special types through isolation inside and suitability for certain culture districts, the term oecotype can also be used in the science of ethnology and folklore. One can distinguish between oecotypes of a higher or a lower order: (national, provincial, parochial etc.)" (P. 243, note 15 in Selected Papers on Folklore, 1948).

⁹¹ Édouard Chavannes, Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripiṭaka chinols IV, Paris 1934, p. 76 (Nr. 468), Aarne, Die Zaubergaben p. 71 f. Also the "secondary" form, however, with four objects occurs in the Chinese Tripiṭaka, Chavannes op. cit. p. 77 (Nr. 477).

no certain means can be found of forming a convincing explanation of their fate previous to the probable Russian influence, of which their present form is a direct result.

There still, however, remains the remark that the Täjiki folklore so to speak word for word goes together with the Uzbek folk-tale published by N. P. Ostroumov, Sarty. Etnografičeskie materialy II, Tashkent 1893, nr. 6, p. 32. But this tale undoubtedly renders old Iranian tradition, for the Sarts (now commonly called Uzbekis without distinction) are the originally Iranian, but linguistically turkified, principal population of Bukhara, Khiva, the Tashkent region and the Ferghana Valley, i.e. districts the culture of which historically and literarily is intimately linked up with Iran. Already Kāśyārī saw occasion to remark that "there is no Turk without a Tat, no cap without a head" (Tatsız Türk bolmas, bašsız börk bolmas, Divanī Līgat-it-Türk Tercümesı II, ed. Besim Atalay, Ankara 1940, p. 281). A purely Iranian origin is not contradicted by the fact that a few Uzbek words (kallak, -mī) are found in the Täjiki version, as the latter is adapted to the literary language that naturally enough is strongly open to influence from the above all lately more and more predominant Turkic peoples in the neighbouring republics and in Täjikistān herself. In comparison with the numerous Iranian linguistic elements in Uzbek, even in the pronunciation, this influence, however, is diminutive. In almost all fields of cultural life the Iranians of Transoxiana have been the leading people and exercised an influence that in many cases was surprisingly penetrating. This, not least, applies to the literary one that as an example made the Qarakhanids identify their national hero Alp Er Toğa (Toğa Alp Er) with the Turanian Afrāsīyāb, as whose descendants they regarded themselves. As

---

for the Turkic folk-tales this Iranian influence meant a continuous maintenance of Indo-European tradition\textsuperscript{97}, marked by Iranian nomina propria\textsuperscript{98} and elements of style. The Uzbek-Täjiki folktale is an additional manifestation of the distinctive character and strength of this tradition.


\textsuperscript{98} Cf. e.g. Die Märchenkarawane. Aus dem usbekischen Märchenschatz [a translation of Uzbekskie narodnye skazki, Taškent 1953], Berlin 1959, p. 60 ff. (Farxäd, Širin, Gulbahr etc.). Also the Iranian Wonder-Bird Simury, that so frequently appears in Uzbek tales, may be mentioned. A substitution with a "native" parallel (such as e. g. in the Arabic popular tradition 'Anqā, cf. Arthur Christensen, Les Kayanides, København 1932, p. 123, note 1 (Tā'ālibi)) does not take place. In the Jewish-Persian tradition of Bukhara יִנְדִּי is still used for "eagle, vulture", Lev. 11,13 (cf. W. Bacher, \textit{Zwei jüdisch-persische Dichter, Schahin und Irmani, Strassburg 1908, p. 97, note 2).