

Introduction

Introduction to the Revised and Supplemented Edition

Hans-Jörg Uther

This edition of *The Types of International Folktales* updates the comprehensively revised 2004 catalogue of international tale types (ATU, for Aarne/Thompson/Uther). In the past twenty years, a number of new type catalogs have appeared, especially in Europe, which have expanded our knowledge of folk tales, their dissemination, and their various functions in the transmission process. It therefore seems only logical to revise and update the ATU Type catalog. The structure of entries of the earlier edition remains largely unchanged, but I have added the category **Catalogs** to the **Literature/Variants** rubric in order to emphasize the importance of these bibliographical works. Since type catalogs document the most important collections, the specification of individual variants can be omitted. Variants are only mentioned when no type catalog for the region exists. Moreover, it should be obvious that the ATU cannot cover all variants of a tale type. However, central traditions in the respective countries and regions should be recognizable. Four more tale types were added to the new tale types introduced in 2004 (214**, 425O, 653C, 756A*) without overloading the existing taxonomy. It must still be taken into account that the taxonomy was developed specifically for (Northern) European folk tales, with relevant references to comparable narratives in Europe and cultures influenced by Europe. In this respect, not all themes, narrative plots, and motifs known worldwide can be found in the index. As has been shown, individual classification systems in Africa, Asia, and both North and South America have proven their worth and capture their regional, linguistic, and cultural peculiarities.

Unavoidable post-colonial echoes are observable in the entries owing to the history of research and its categorizations. The early publications for many countries, regions, and cultures often did not appear in the original languages but in English, French, or German. Even if the authenticity was reduced by a translation and the admission criteria did not necessarily reflect the worldview of the indigenous population, but rather the worldview of their editors, it seemed necessary not to ignore these early editions for reasons of the history of science. In addition, many collections were organized in relation to geopolitical borders set by colonial powers, such as India, that left the diversity of cultures there invisible. Others cover huge geographical areas, even on the scope of whole continents, visible in the lists of Literature/Catalogs/Variants.

I have retained the list of **Geographical and Ethnic Terms** given in the third volume as the basis for the notes within the **Variants** section for historical reasons and as a tribute to the early catalog makers. However, the 2024 edition contains today's terms when specifying the region or language, updating historical terms. The list is therefore not in alphabetical order, but in a rough geographical order and can change between language and region: There are 60 entries for Europe, 75 for Asia, 34 for America, 53 for Africa. The gaps and inconsistencies in the enumeration that are significant for users of the type catalog are not accidental, but result from the state of the source material. Undoubtedly, there is an imbalance in the density of the evidence, giving the impression that small ethnic groups often predominate, while other large geographical areas such as India are not specified. That is and remains a shortcoming.

Only printed materials are documented in the type catalog, although these are often based on archival sources. A detailed inventory of the records from field research in archives is still missing. In the **Selected References to Online Archives and Associated Materials** section I have put together a selection of important articles on the digital presentation of archival sources. After all, digital development has made tremendous progress in recent years. Various archival holdings are now available digitally and are therefore easily accessible.

Finally, I would like to thank the Kalevala Society Foundation and Frog, the editor-in-chief of the series FF Communications, for the opportunity to once again revise and update the ATU. This work would not have come about if I had not received help from different parts of the world. In addition to the researchers already mentioned in the introduction of 2004, I would like to mention the following: Hans-Hermann Bartens, Göttingen; Braulio do Nascimento, Rio de Janeiro; Camiño Noia Campos, Vigo; Paulo Correia, Lisboa; Elguja Dadunaschvili, Tbilisi; Mamatqul Juraev, Tashkent; Kogi Kato, Tokyo; Gabriele Keller, Freiburg; Bengt af Klintberg, Stockholm; Churram Rachimov, Tashkent; Udo Reinhardt, Mainz; Christoph Schmitt, Rostock; Angelika Schreurs, Düsseldorf; Lubomir Sůva, Göttingen.

Introduction to the 2004 Edition

Hans-Jörg Uther

The system of European tale types designed by Antti Aarne (1910) was twice revised by Stith Thompson (1928, 1961), who expanded it to cover traditional tales in the region from Europe to India and incorporated the results of the research that was then available. The present catalog of international tale types (ATU, for Aarne/Thompson/Uther) constitutes a fundamentally new edition with extensive additions and innovations. It attempts to meet the objections of previous critics of the Aarne/Thompson catalog (AaTh) without forsaking the traditional principles of how the tale types are presented. Criticisms of AaTh have covered the following major points:

1. A typology of narratives implies an exact, scientific scheme, a situation that does not exist in narrative tradition in the real world.
2. The definitions of genres and the classification according to characters are often neither thematically nor structurally consistent. For example, no distinct genre is represented by AaTh 850–999, *Novelle* (Romantic Tales).
3. The concentration of the “Finnish School” on nineteenth-century oral tradition relegated literary sources to a secondary position and often obscured important older forms and occurrences of the tale types.
4. The system encompassed only European narrative tradition, with relevant material from western Asia and European settlements in other regions. Even within Europe, the traditions were documented unevenly. Documentation varied considerably from place to place, and for some (for example, Denmark and Russia) no information was provided at all. Evidence from Portugal, and from eastern and southeastern Europe, was often missing. The narrative traditions of small ethnic groups (e.g. Basques, Ladini, Frisians, Sorbs) were not, or not sufficiently, documented.
5. The presentation of separate localized types with only a few variants each unnecessarily obscured both the picture of their place in tradition and the classification system of the catalog as a whole.
6. References to relevant scholarly literature were often missing.
7. References to variants were usually taken from older collections, not from new ones.
8. The descriptions of the tale types were in many cases too brief, too often imprecise, and too often centered unjustly only on the male characters.
9. The inclusion of so-called irregular types was dubious.
10. Too much of the documentation for the existence of many of the types lay in archive texts that were difficult to access.

The ATU has eliminated or mitigated these faults. It is an effective tool that permits international tale types to be located quickly, thus providing a historical-comparative orientation toward folktale research for scholars in all disciplines that touch on popular traditions.

The descriptions of the tale types have been completely rewritten and made more precise based on all the results of research available up to approximately 2003. The essential research cited for each type includes extensive documentation of its international distribution as well as monographic works on that type or the cycle of types to which it belongs. The list of catalogs and variants used for reference has been enlarged considerably and includes type and motif catalogs still in press. More than two hundred and fifty new types have been added, which appear throughout the different sections. Note has been made of the many types scattered throughout the various sections of the AaTh catalog whose internal properties or structural similarities and affinities with other types had previously been overlooked. Types from the AaTh catalog that were limited to a single ethnic group, and for which no more information is available, have been excised (they can still be found in the regional catalogs), except when they have reached a significant temporal, ethnic, or geographic distribution. Likewise the adoption of types or subtypes listed in regional catalogs into the ATU has been limited: many oikotypes have been integrated into widely-distributed types with significant regional variations (an oikotypical substratum), rather than as additional types or numbered subtypes. Many types with very brief or diffuse descriptions have also been eliminated, particularly when the texts turned out to be heterogeneous and subsequent regional catalogs failed to show that they had any structural or functional unity.

Each “tale type” presented here consists of a number, title, and a description of its contents, and must be understood to be flexible. It is not a constant unit of measure or a way to refer to lifeless material from the past. Instead, as part of a greater dynamic, it is adaptable, and can be integrated into new thematic compositions and media. The background for this model of narrative alteration and innovation is evident in a change of paradigm that took place in recent decades in historical-comparative folktale research, a change that has necessarily affected the nature of this new catalog. Earlier research had been handicapped by a shortage of necessary information regarding historical and recent narrative material, especially from Europe, in all the genres (fables, animal tales, religious legends, ordinary folktales, jests, and cumulative tales). In such a system it was impossible to document all oral and literary forms with a worldwide distribution. The genre-based structure of the AaTh catalog, and the thematic conception that this implied, made this impossible. Even the utilization of the word “Märchen” as equivalent to “folktale” indicated a confusion of literary genres. The Grimm brothers serve as an example here: under “Märchen” they included all the contents of their *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*: etiologies, fables, animal tales, moralistic stories, jests, exempla, religious and other legends, and various mixed forms such as humorous religious tales and humorous magic tales. While all these genres were represented in the AaTh catalog, history has shown that folk narratives from outside Europe fit its

thematically-oriented sections only in part and often with difficulty. This is particularly true of myths, epics, legends, and etiological accounts, and also of lesser genres such as anecdotes, jokes, rumors, and genres such as life history, family history, and refugee experiences that have been studied only recently. For these genres, some other system is needed. Some of them have been partly documented in the *Motif-Index of Folk Literature* (1955–1958); this could be expanded, as has been done for the narrative traditions of small indigenous ethnic groups of South America in the motif catalog of Johannes Wilbert and Karin Simoneau (1992). Alternatively, an independent thematic detail-analysis could be used, as it has for example for the Balsa narratives of Ghana (by Rüdiger Schott [1993–1996, 2001, 2003]) and for the Pokomo of Kenya (by Thomas Geider [1990]).

Up until the 1960s, folktale scholars generally believed that oral traditions had existed unchanged for centuries, and thus provided an important source of evidence for the belief systems of their ancestors. Thus, oral traditions constituted a more important source for national identity than did later written sources. This romantic valuation, which originated during the 19th century and continued into the 20th, a period of intense nationalization in Europe, had a lasting influence on the perceived importance of the documentation of oral tradition. While Antti Aarne had essentially ignored older, literary sources, Stith Thompson sometimes made reference to important literary texts by Boccaccio, Chaucer, Basile, and Johannes Pauli. However, knowledge of the existence of this literary dissemination played too minor a role when the spread and development of the traditions were assessed. Written sources were for the most part undervalued. The oldest written texts, particularly of animal tales, were often dismissed as a subtype or an “irregular” form. Although such treatments reveal deficiencies in the ahistorical treatment of documents, this problem cannot be remedied within the tale type numbering system. In modern times the perspective is different, and written sources are valued more highly.

As we now know, many so-called oral narratives have a rich literary history. Some can be traced back to works of literature, in which the fantasy of *homo narrans* can be seen in new adaptations that are responses to the changes in the function of the tale. This is particularly true, for example, of the fables associated with the name Aesop and for similar narratives from oriental traditions. Other examples of literary genres important for oral tradition include medieval Arabic jests, European exempla and farce, and the fabliaux and novelle of the late Middle Ages, all of which entered early modern literature. These narratives are completely different from the numerous etiological tales of pre-literate peoples. For historical reasons, the existing numbering system for the tale types has been retained here – there was no need to reinvent the wheel. Although the definitions of a tale type as a self-sufficient narrative, and of a motif as the smallest unit within such a narrative, have often been criticized for their imprecision, these are nevertheless useful terms to describe the relationships among a large number of narratives with different functional and formal attributes from a variety of ethnic groups, time periods, and genres. The general distinction of a motif as one of the elements of

a tale (that is, a statement about an actor, an object, or an incident) is separated here from its content. In fact, a motif can be a combination of all three of these elements, for example, when a woman uses a magic gift to cause a change in the situation. “Motif” thus has a broad definition that enables it to be used as a basis for literary and ethnological research. It is a narrative unit, and as such is subject to a dynamic that determines with which other motifs it can be combined. Thus motifs constitute the basic building blocks of narratives. On pragmatic grounds, a clear distinction between motif and type is not possible because the boundaries are not distinct. With this attitude, a monographic investigation can distinguish between content and theme and still consider form and function as the properties that determine the narrative’s genre.

Some early advocates of narrative classification envisioned an exact system like that of the natural sciences, analogous to biological classification; this vision was later influenced by semantic and structural research. That hope for exactness must be seen as a product of the wishful thinking of the time. Nevertheless, narratives must be analyzed not arbitrarily but according to structural considerations. Just as genres of narrative are only intellectual constructs, so, then, is any typology. Broad definitions permit similar themes and plots to be included, so that, in the course of the history of the origins and development of a tradition, its different functions can be discerned. A precise analysis guarantees that variations in narrative tradition will not be reduced to a simple multicultural homogeneity. The ATU type catalog is a bibliographic tool that characterizes such diversity, represented by published narratives of different ethnic groups and time periods, with a description of each type followed by references to catalogs, texts, and published research. Paradoxically, a description of a tale type can show its various and changing structural elements, but not its meanings or functions. Nor can such a description show the variation in the motifs contained in the individual texts, variation that is essential for understanding the narrative’s age, the process of its transmission, and its importance in tradition.

The list of potential sources includes historical works of various degrees of popularity, such as calendars, magazines, and popular books read for educational purposes, language study, or pleasure. In the past, European tradition unjustly dominated the international tale type catalog. Where this imbalance continues into the ATU, it is due not to any ethnocentric ideology, but merely reflects the present state of knowledge. For many countries and regions, the systematic classification of narrative tradition has only recently begun.

The Construction of the Type Catalog

Because of the need for compatibility with the many old and new regional and international folktale catalogs, the **type numbers** that have been in use for nearly one hundred years remain unchanged. However, in the AaTh catalog, some types were noted in more than one place, creating unnecessary duplication. Thompson had taken these from regional catalogs without realizing that

the same type had already been assigned a different place. Many of the articles in the *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* (EM) have pointed out these mistakes. Only in a few places was it necessary to move a type number from its original place to an entirely new one (for example, AaTh 1587 has become ATU 927D). The differentiation between regular and irregular tale types (those that were printed in a smaller letters) in AaTh was problematic at best. The so-called “irregular” types often proved to be unnecessary in cases where they were not found to exist among other ethnic groups. In other cases, these types turned out to be surprisingly important: their oral tradition was a secondary development dependent on a wide literary tradition, which could sometimes be traced back to Greek or Roman antiquity. Every type important enough to be listed in ATU is considered a “regular” type.

Nevertheless, for some of the existing type numbers, their continued presence is a result of compromises. In particular, some have become shorthand references for a whole cycle of tales (e.g. Types 425 and 510). Many catalogs have listed texts under these numbers instead of under the relevant subtypes. Often, divergent events or motifs at the beginning or end of these subtypes have been used as criteria for separating them from the general tale type. Other AaTh-subtypes have been grouped together into ATU-types because of their structural elements, for example the subtypes that constitute Types 425ff., 910ff., 1968ff., 1920ff., and 1960ff. To document narratives that were especially difficult to classify, the designation “miscellaneous type” has been used. Such miscellaneous or heterogeneous types can be described only by their theme, which is expressed through a common structure. Sometimes the best solution has been to provide a summary of a single text as an example.

In the past, the list of subtypes was usually constructed ahistorically, according to some principle other than chronological order. Thompson’s ordering principles, and his practice of designating subtypes or types limited to restricted regions by using letters such as A, B, C, A*, B*, C*, or simply through * or **, are problematic. Here in ATU such notations have no consistent significance: the letters or asterisks are not necessarily intended to represent either a separate type or a dependent subtype. Each description represents an independent tale type that has been documented among at least three ethnic groups or over a long time period. Only by using these criteria was it possible to incorporate new tale types with a significant traditional basis, without destroying the old numbering system.

The **titles** of the tale types have been partly revised, and the **descriptions** of the plots have been completely rewritten and expanded. For reference, the former titles are also listed. There were many reasons for enlarging the summaries. Most importantly, it was necessary to correct gender biases in the characterization of the main actors, and to be explicit about sexual elements and themes (in contrast to the general AaTh description, “obscene”). In many cases, small mistakes or serious errors had to be corrected. The new type descriptions have been written with the following principles in mind: The main characters, both active and passive, and

their opponents, must be named, and the tale's actions and objects and especially its situation must be recognizable. The description of each tale type is based on monographic studies and on the texts that have been classified for the archive of the office of the *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* in Göttingen. In addition, the extensive concordance which this office has developed, and which includes most of the national tale type and motif catalogs, has been utilized. The description of each type offers a basic summary, a minimal framework that includes the tale's central structure and contents along with its most important characters. Evidence of the tale's significant variation is also noted. Terms that alternated in AaTh (e.g. ape vs. monkey) have been standardized. Others have been changed because of a shift of meaning (e.g. ass has become donkey), and unclear language has been made more precise.

Motif numbers, which provide additional orientation, have been listed in the appropriate places. For reasons of space they have not been repeated in a separate section. Only the most important motifs from Thompson's *Motif-Index* have been noted, although obviously many more motif numbers with few references might be pertinent, along with others that are too general to be of use for the analysis or description of tales (e.g. P600: *Customs*).

Under the rubric **Combinations** are listed the most important of the tales that belong to narrative cycles, or form combinations and contaminations. As a rule, only those are listed that occur in at least three examples. For types with a great number of combinations (for example, ATU 300, 1000ff., and 1960ff.), those with at least eight examples are listed first, and less common ones follow in a sequence of their own.

The rubric **Remarks** has been used to indicate important literary sources, and to convey information about the tale's age, place of origin, the extent of its tradition, or other distinctive features such as its occurrence in a cycle. When they have been published in many different editions which have had a continuous effect on the tale's history and development, the tale's well-known sources are cited only in general terms here and in the bibliography.

The rubric **Literature/Variants** governs two separate sections. First, in most cases, come the most important bibliographical sources in chronological order and international surveys of variants. These publications contain information about the tradition (its age, spread, and sources), or give important information about its structure. However, not every such reference is provided. Older works are omitted when they have been superseded by more recent research or when they have become obsolete. In addition, catalogs such as Frederic C. Tubach's of *exempla* (1969), and Ulrich Marzolph's of medieval Arabic jests (1992), are listed here when they consider the whole range of the tradition.

Then, on a new line, comes the evidence for the geographic spread of the tale type. This consists primarily of published type and motif catalogs for the various regions and ethnic and language groups (catalogs which in many cases offer further information about their general linguistic area). References to additional texts are to be found in the cited literature. For such regions, individual variants

are listed only when they postdate the catalog. One criterion for listing catalogs is that only the most recent catalog for a given region is listed when it refers to earlier ones. For example, for Italy, the catalog of A. M. Cirese and L. Serafini (1975) is sufficient, because it includes the references from all the earlier Italian catalogs (D'Aronco 1953, 1957; Lo Nigro 1957; Rotunda 1942). For ATU 300–451, instead of this, the more recent catalog of R. Aprile (2000) has been used, because it incorporates the material in Cirese/Serafini. Other Italian catalogs are used only rarely, when a type has not been adopted or recognized by Cirese/Serafini or Aprile. For Hungary, the primary catalogs are *Magyar népmesekatalógus* (MNK) and the *exempla* catalog of Ákos Dömötör (1992); the older catalogs of János Berze Nagy (1960) and Lajos György (1934) are cited only when the material does not appear in MNK, which used a different set of standards for inclusion. For Japan, Keigo Seki's catalog (1966) is not cited because it was integrated into Hiroko Ikeda's (1971). Catalogs have been listed when they document older literary sources that are not noted in works that restrict themselves to oral tradition. Some of these older variants were translated into different languages, and thus became important vehicles for the transmission of the tale. Even a catalog still unpublished (for example, for Portugal) may list at least one older variant in its evidence.

The list of variants for reference is particularly important when there is little or no bibliography for a particular tale type, or when the tale is confined to a very limited region. The classification of these texts was taken either directly from their places of publication or from catalogs, although some of these attributions have had to be corrected. Many come from the EM archive, which contains numerous international collections and also translations of tales from hard-to-read languages. Synchronic and diachronic considerations have gone into the selection of works cited. When no appropriate catalog was available, standard collections have been cited. Obviously, these can only be samples; unless a catalog has been created for a specific country, region, or language area, it is impossible to tell whether a tale type is well known there. Often only one version is known, sometimes more, but whether many are known (for example, in the German language area, in which collection has been relatively intense) is impossible to say without a special effort. This is due to the lack of standardization in the collection of narratives even within Europe; some catalogs or other sources that list variants include, for example, sub-literary versions from magazines and schoolbooks, while others confine themselves to orally-transmitted texts.

The numbers of variants in each of the regions are not reported because the compilers of different catalogs have used different criteria for inclusion. Users of these catalogs know how arbitrary and questionable such figures can be, because no guidelines or standards exist to prevent variants derived recently from printed sources from inflating the numbers. The history of the use of such numbers alone has shown that their value is severely limited.

In many cases, the first publications for certain countries or regions appeared not in the original language but in some other one, usually English, French, or German. This reflects the conditions of research at the time and is a by-product

of the colonial environment that existed in the past. Even when the text's authenticity has been compromised by translation and the criteria for editing it reflect not that of the indigenous people but that of a foreign editor (which is also the case for many supposedly autochthonous collections), it is important, on scientific grounds, not to overlook this early evidence.

The **index** that concludes this work attempts to document only a limited range of the tale's contents: their most important subjects, plots, and motifs, including their actors and settings. Although it strives for completeness, this is in fact impossible, if only because many abstractions (e.g. qualities and abilities) are not evident in the text.

It was possible to complete this catalog in a mere four years only because support came from many places. Firstly, the substantial library and text archive of the office of the *Enzyklopädie des Marchens* in Göttingen provided a solid basis for the new descriptions of the international tale types. I am grateful to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, and the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters in Helsinki, for financial support. This enabled me to assemble a small editorial staff: Sabine Dinslage, Sigrid Fähmann, and Gudrun Schwibbe, and, to assist with the translation, Christine Goldberg; and student assistants, particularly Annika Schmidt, Petra Schulz, and Nadine Wagner. In addition I received considerable help from many colleagues and friends who continually answered my questions and provided valuable information about particular tale types. Their willingness to discuss difficult problems of arrangement, and to reconsider various tale catalogs, was essential to the successful completion of this work. I thank Jurjen van der Kooi (of Groningen), to whom I am especially indebted, and the following:

Anna Angelopoulos (Paris); Sue Bottigheimer (New York); Josiane Bru (Toulouse); Ursula Brunold-Bigler (Chur); Julio Camarena (Madrid); Isabel Cardigos (Faro); Linda Dégh (Bloomington); Enrica Delitala (Cagliari); Doroteja Dobрева (Sofia); Ákos Dömötör (†) (Budapest); Hasan El-Shamy (Bloomington); Helmut Fischer (Hennef); Viera Gašparíková (Bratislava); Walther Heissig (Bonn); Gun Herranen (Turku); Lauri Honko (†) (Helsinki/Turku); Gundula Hubrich-Messow (Sterup); Heda Jason (Jerusalem); Risto Järv (Tartu); Manouela Katri-naki (Athens); Bronislava Kerbelytė (Vilnius); Ulrike Kindl (Venice); Ines Köhler-Zülch (Göttingen); Monika Kropěj (Ljubljana); Teimuraz Kurdovanidze (Tbilisi); Reimund Kvideland (Bergen); Harlinda Lox (Gent); Fumiko Mamiya (Tokyo); Ulrich Marzolph (Göttingen); Wolfgang Mieder (Burlington); Gorg Mifsud Chircop (Valletta); Harold Neemann (Laramie); Wilhelm F. H. Nicolaisen (Aberdeen); Carme Oriol (Tarragona); Toshio Ozawa (Tokyo); Guntis Pakalns (Riga); Gerald Porter (Vaasa); Josep M. Pujol (Tarragona); Pirkko-Liisa Rausmaa (Helsinki); Lutz Röhrich (Freiburg); Leonardas Sauka (Vilnius); Rudolf Schenda (†) (Zürich); Sigrid Schmidt (Hildesheim); Ingo Schneider (Innsbruck); Rüdiger Schott (Bonn); Elisheva Schoenfeld (Haifa); Christine Shojaei Kawan (Göttingen); Anna-Leena Siikala (Helsinki); Dorotea Simonides (Opole); Stefaan Top (Antwerpen); Cătălina Velculescu (Bucharest); Vilmos Voigt (Budapest); Johannes Wilbert (Los Angeles).