

1931

New Mexican Versions of the Tar-Baby Story

Aurelio M. Espinosa

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmq>

Recommended Citation

Espinosa, Aurelio M.. "New Mexican Versions of the Tar-Baby Story." *New Mexico Quarterly* 1, 2 (1931).
<https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmq/vol1/iss2/3>

This Contents is brought to you for free and open access by the University of New Mexico Press at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New Mexico Quarterly* by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

New Mexican Versions of the Tar-Baby Story

By AURELIO M. ESPINOSA

MOST Americans, both adults and young, are acquainted with some version of the tar-baby story. The best known version is the one first published by Joel Chandler Harris in 1880, in his popular book, *Uncle Remus, His Songs and His Sayings*.¹ This version was collected by Harris among the negroes of Georgia and for that reason it was considered a distinctly negro tale, and most scholars believed that it was a tale of African source. Soon it was discovered in many parts of the world and versions similar to the Harris version began to appear from Africa, India, the American Indians, the Philippines, and all parts of America. Within the last few years many versions have been collected and published from North, Central, and South Spanish America.

In the year 1888, eight years after the publication of Harris' "wonderful tar-baby story" and when many similar versions had already appeared from Africa and America, the English folklorist, Joseph Jacobs, published an English translation of the fifteen hundred or more years old Jataka 55 version from India and showed that it was a tale that contained the fundamental motif of the tar-baby story.² He expressed the opinion that the tale was of oriental origin, specifically from India, and since then the theory of the African origin of the tale has gradually lost ground. Since 1912, when the first Spanish-American versions from New Mexico, Mexico, and other parts of Spanish America began to be collected and published, and especially when the dis-

1. New and revised edition, New York, 1924, pages 7-11, and 16-19.

2. *The Earliest English Version of the Fables of Bidpai*, London, 1888. Introduction pp. xlv-xlvi, and *Indian Fairy Tales*, London and New York, 1910, pp 194-198, and 251-253.

tinguished American folklorist, Elsie Clews Parsons, discovered and published the important Portuguese versions from the Cape Verde Islands, where the tar-baby story was attached to the story of the master-thief, a well-known oriental and European tale. Professor Boas, of Columbia University, Dr. Parsons and I have gradually abandoned the theory of the African origin of the tale in question.³

The last defender of the African origin of the tar-baby story was Dr. Norman Brown in an article published in *The Atlantic Monthly* for September, 1922. He made a study of some sixty versions from various parts of the world, not taking into account any of the then known Spanish-American versions and not knowing of the existence of any European versions, however, and after a series of ingenious affirmations and denials he comes to the conclusion that the tale is essentially African in character and definitely of African source. I shall not at present go into the weakness of his arguments, the chief of which is his failure to take into consideration the relations between the old and modern India versions and other modern versions.

In an extensive study recently published in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*, *Notes on the Origin and History of the Tar-Baby Story*, I have made a careful analysis of the outstanding elements of some one hundred and fifty-six versions of the tar-baby story, classified the tales according to their geographical distribution, and have studied comparatively the outstanding elements in their relation to African, Indian, Oriental, and European tradition, and I have come to the following conclusions:

3. Professor Boas published two excellent Mexican versions with important comments in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore* XXV, 204-214, 235-241, and 247-260. See also his opinions in *The Romantic Review* XVI, 199-207. Dr. Parsons published her Portuguese versions from the Cape Verde Islands in her publication, *Folk-Lore from the Cape Verde Islands* I, 90-94. See also her articles in *Folk-Lore* XXX, 227-234, and in *Journal of American Folk-Lore* XXX, 330.

4. Volume XLIII, No. 168, January-March, 1930. A brief resume of this study together with the European versions of the tale, the Lithuanian version of Schleicher and my own version from Castile, both cited later in the present article, was published in the London review, *Folk-Lore*, XL, 1929, 217-227.

I. The original baustein or primitive form of the tar-baby story as established from the study of one hundred and fifty-six versions with all their constituent elements was probably of the following type:

1. A man has a garden or orchard.
2. A certain animal—a jackal, a monkey, a hare, or a rabbit—comes to the garden or orchard after night to steal garden produce or fruit.
3. The man wishes to catch the thief and sets up a tar-figure, usually a tar-monkey, a tar-man, a witch-baby, or fetish.
4. The animal thief approaches the garden or orchard 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 begins the attack, striking first with the right hand or paw.
6. This sticks or is held fast, and the animal begins the dramatic monologue—"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 fight continue, and the animal is finally caught fast at four (two hands and two feet) or five (two hands and two feet, and head or stomach), or even six (two hands and two feet, and head and stomach) points.
8. The next day the man finds his thief caught fast.
9. The animal escapes alive.

II. Very early, however, there developed another type where all the dramatic characters are human. In general, this second type is exactly like the above, except that the animal-thief is substituted by a human destroyer, bully or mischief-maker. We know of at least two European versions of the tale, the Lithuanian version of August Schlei-cher and the versions from Castile, and both of them belong to this human dramatic-character type. The Jataka 55 version, the fifteen hundred or more years old Buddhistic version from India, is also of this type.⁵

5. Some folklorists believe that the *Uncle Remus* version published in 1880 was translated and transmitted to other countries as a popular, traditional tale. Nothing could be more absurd. The versions now found in various parts of the world are traditional and have nothing to do with the published versions. The Lithuanian

III. The tar-baby story originated in India. From India the original baustein, already differentiated to some extent into two or three types, passed into Europe, and later into Africa, perhaps by way of Egypt. The probability of the early transmission of the tale into Europe is based principally on the evidence of the two European versions, both so strikingly similar to the Jataka 55 version, which is the primitive tar-baby story par excellence, both in form and age. We are certainly justified in assuming that a tale that is at least fifteen hundred years old is a more primitive version than the modern versions. Furthermore, the India version from the *Samyutta Nikaya*, a tale at least two thousand years old, furnishes us with another India version older than any other form known to us, a tale where a monkey is caught in the usual manner with sticky plaster.⁶ The dramatic dialogues have a perfect and almost identical development in the Castilian version, in the Jataka 55 version, and in some of the best versions from Spanish-America.

IV. From Europe the tale was transmitted to Spanish-America, especially from Spain and Portugal, and also to Africa, in the XVIth century. The European versions of India origin and the African versions of the same origin meet in Africa, and from Africa both India-African and India-Europe-African versions are transmitted by African

6. *Samyutta Nikaya*, edited by Leon Feer, *Pali Text Society*, London, 1898, V. iii, 7.

version of August Schleicher was published in the year 1857, twenty-three years before Uncle Remus, in his *Litauische Marchen, Sprichworte, Ratsel und Lieder*, pp. 35-37. Why folklorists who have heretofore discussed the problem of the origin of the tale were ignorant of its existence I do not know. The tale is confused with and attached to the story of the child deceived by a witch, but the actual and fundamental tar-baby baustein is there in all its primitive form and splendor. My own Castilian version was collected in Spain in 1920 and published in my *Cuentos populares españoles* (three volumes, Stanford University, California, 1923-1926), I, no. 35. This version is attached to the tale of the precociously strong man, in the beginning something like the tale of John the Bear, *Cuentos populares españoles* II, nos. 133-135. The two versions from the Cape Verde Islands, published by Dr. Parsons, are attached to the tale of the master-thief, as already indicated.

slaves and by Europeans to all parts of America. From Spain the tale also goes to the Philippines. The American versions are of European and African origin, their primitive source being, of course, India. The India-European type prevails, but the Spanish-African types, African types that have come under the influence of the Spanish types or vice-versa, are not entirely negligible, and even the purely African types have in some special cases found their way to America, especially North America and the Antilles.

V. The modern versions show interesting developments in certain secondary details, but even these are often already suggested in the old India versions. The female tar-baby, a characteristic of the modern African versions, the marrying the king's daughter, a characteristic of the Spanish-American versions and definitely of European source, the objects that are thrown at the tar-man or tar-figure and that stick before the regular attack, are all definitely outlined or suggested in the old and modern India versions. These and other elements not found in the primitive baustein established above may often differ considerably in the modern versions, and may in some cases reveal the racial characteristics or spirit of a people, but they count for little as baustein determining factors.

VI. The African versions are originally from India, like all the others. The female tar-baby, which is, of course, already found in the India versions, found a special development in the African versions. Only the water-stealing incident and animal partnership, the live-tortoise trap, and the insignificant mock-plea ("Don't swing me by the tail") are characteristic of the African and not of the India versions.

VII. The Anglo-African versions are of the ordinary original baustein type, and have in common with the African versions a full development of the female tar-baby and courtship episode. The mock-plea is also common to both

groups, but the pleas are not of the same type. The animal or family group of characters is also characteristic of both groups. But the tortoise trap is found only in Africa. The Anglo-African versions, therefore, show a genetic relation in some cases with the versions from Africa. The conclusion is that the Anglo-African versions come from European sources, probably Spanish and Portuguese on the one hand, and from Hispanic-African and purely African sources on the other. The Uncle Remus type of version, curiously enough, shows none of the outstanding African or Anglo-African characteristics with the single exception of the mock-plea.

VIII. The Hispanic-American versions are of European origin. Of the entire number of Hispanic-American versions, thirty-eight (thirty-five from Spanish-America and three from Brazil), not a single one has the female tar-baby and courtship episode characteristic of the African and Anglo-African versions. Two more important African characteristics,—the water-stealing episode (also Anglo-African) and the live-tortoise trap,—are also totally absent. Only three have the mock-plea, which is also characteristic of the African and Anglo-African versions, although probably of European source, and only one has the special type of Anglo-African mock-plea,—“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 punishment of the substitute animal, coyote or fox, by scalding with hot water or burning with a hot poker, the tar-baby that will not play cards, most of which are characteristically European,—are conspicuously absent from the African and Anglo-African versions.

The versions from the Greater Antilles, Cuba, Porto Rico, and Santo Domingo are characteristically of the Spanish-American or Hispanic-American type. Those from

the Lesser Antilles, on the other hand, belong to both groups.

IX. The American-Indian versions are characteristically Hispanic-American, and have none of the special features of the African or Anglo-African versions in any marked degree, except the water-stealing episode. The female tar-baby and courtship episode appears once, and the mock-plea four times. Substitution, the outstanding Spanish-American characteristic, is an important feature. On the other hand the Indians have received the Spanish-American form of the tar-baby story and contributed to it one of the most original episodes of any version from any country, the coming to life of the dead animal episode of the Taos versions.⁷

But in spite of the above conclusions, and in my opinion they are scientifically established, the problem of the origin and diffusion of the tar-baby story throughout the world is of such transcendental importance that additional evidence is always welcome. That the tale originated in India and that from India it traveled to Europe are facts that seem to me definitely established. The best and most original forms of the tale are from old India, and the two European versions are certainly related to them. On the other hand there seems to be no doubt about the relation between the Castilian version and many versions from Spanish-America. In view of the importance of the Castilian version and the popularity of the tale in Hispanic America, it is desirable to collect more versions from Spain and from Spanish-America. In my bibliography there are only two Spanish versions from New Mexico. Dr. Elsie Clews Parsons, on the other hand, has collected five versions from the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, and four of these have some of the most original features of any tar-baby versions known to

7. I give one of these versions later.

me.⁸ It is with the hope that folklorists may collect other Spanish and Indian versions from New Mexico that may throw more light on our problems of origin and diffusion that I beg to call special attention to the New Mexican versions, both Spanish and Indian, as well as to the peninsular Spanish tale from Castile collected by me in 1920.

The first New Mexican Spanish version of the tar-baby story known to folklorists is the one collected by me in 1910, and published in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore* XXIV, 419-422. It has the episode of the race attached to the tar-baby story as an introduction, and, as is the case with many of the Spanish-American and American-Indian versions, the tar-baby episode is only part of a series of incidents in which the rabbit plays several tricks on the dumb coyote. In other words it is only the principal episode of the numerous ones that constitute the tales of the coyote and rabbit cycle. The majority of these episodes are clearly of European source. The second New Mexican Spanish version I have in manuscript form. It is of the general Spanish-American type without the introductory race. The race occurs, however, in one of the Mexican versions published by Professor Boas, the Oaxaca version. I give the first New Mexican Spanish version below, first in the original New Mexican Spanish as published in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore* and then in a free English translation.

EL CONEJO Y EL COYOTE

Éste era un labrador que tenía una güerta y ya no si aviguaba con un conejo que li hacía mucho daño todo el tiempo. Y lo pior era que li hacía el dabo de nochi. Pa espantalo y pa juyentalo hizo el labrador tres espantajos tan grandes como un hombre y los puso en tres esquinas de la güerta.

8. One is published in her work *Tewa Tales*, New York, 1926, No. 69. The other four Dr. Parsons has kindly sent to me in manuscript versions.

Nomás escureció y se jué el conejito pa la güerta comu hacia toa las nochis, pero esta vez se vido de repente delante di unue los espantajos y mucho se espantó. Creyó el conejo que era por nadá juir porque estaba muy cerca del que él creiba que era un hombre, y le dijo:—No me mates. Ya te vide. Vamos a correr di aquí a la otra esquina e la güerta y si me ganas me matas; pero si yo te gano me das libre. El espantajo no respondía, pero como no le hizo nada creyó el conejo qui había ceeutau el desafío.

—Pus vamos—dijo el conejo, y echó a correr sin voltiar la cara. Pero redemente, al al llegar a la otra esquina se topó con lotro espantajo y pensó que era el hombre qui había llegau antes dél.—¡Aque carajo, ya me ganates!—le dijo el conejo.—Pero dami otra chanza. Vamos a correr otra vez, y si esta vez me ganas haces lo que quieras conmigo. Así habló el conejo y echuá correr con toa sus juerzas y lo más recio que podía. Al llegar a lotra esquina sincontro con último espantajo y creyó que el hombre li había vultua ganar.

El conejo, muy espantau, le dijo al espantajo:—Por vi e quien que ya me volvites a fregar. Tú sí eres el diablo. Onde le ganas a correr a un conejo, ¿quién serás? Pero, mira, vamos al moquete y veremos quien es más hombre. Diciendo esto levantó el conejo la mano y le pegún moqueti al espantajo. El espantaju era de cera y sé le pegó la mano al conejo.—Suelta, suelta,—le dijo el conejo.—Si no me sueltas te doy otro moquete. Y como la mano pegada no se soltaba le dió el conejo con lotra mano y éso también se pegó. Entonces el conejo, muy nojau, le dió con una pata, peru ésa se le pegó también. Más nojau que nunca le dijo el conejo:—Tuavía me qued' una pata, y pa que veas que soy hombre con ésta te voy arreglar. Y le dió una patada con última pata y se le prendió tamién. Tuavía no se dió el conejo por vencido y le diju al espantajo:—Piensas que porque me tienes agarrau e los pies y e las manos no me

queda con que defenderme, pero stas equivocau que tuavía me queda la cabeza. Y diciendo esto le dió conella un cabezazo, pero sólo sirvió de que se le prendiera tamién en la cera.

Otro día en la mañana cuando jué el labrador al campo pa ver su güerta hallual probé conejo bien pegau al espantajo y lu agarró pa lleváselo pa su casa. Lu amarró muy bien y se jué pa su casa. Cuando llego el hombre a su casa tenía la mujer lagua hirviendo, y el probe del conejo dijo:— Ora sí vor a morir. Seguro qui ai me van a sancochar.

Peru antes de matalo lo dejaron amarrau cerca e la estufa y entraron un rato pa dentro. En esto llegó el coyote buscandu al conejito pa comérselo. Pa engañar al conejo le dijo:—¿Qué stas haciendu aquí, amigo conejito? Ven conmigo para ir a pasiarnos.—No,—le dijo el conejo;—mira esos peroles hirviendo sobre l'estufa. Aquí van a tener orita la comida y mi han convidau. Si tú quieres tomar mi lugar ven y desátame y aquí mismo te quedas tú hasta que vengan por ti.—Sta güeno,—dijo el coyote, y lo soltó y se echó en el mismo lugar del conejo a esperar que vinieran envitalu a comer. El conejito muy contento se escapó.

Cuando el hombre y la mujer salieron a ver su conejo pa matalu y cocelo dijo el hombre:—Mir' hija, comu ha crecido este conejo. Éste sí que va hacer una güena fiesta. Vamos echalua l' olla pa que se cueza bien. El coyote pensó que lu iban a llevar a la fiesta. El hombre y la mujer lo levantaron y lu echaron en lague hirviendo. El coyote, cuando vido lo que le sucedía, pegún brincó, y aunque medio pelau se le scapó al labrador y se juá buscar al conejo muy nojau.

RABBIT AND COYOTE

Once there was a man who had a fine vegetable garden. A rabbit was doing great damage to the garden during night time and the farmer did not know what to do. After

thinking over the matter he set up three wax-figures as large as men at three different corners of the garden.

As soon as night came Rabbit went to the garden as was his custom and became frightened when he saw before him one of the wax-men. He was already too close to him, however, and decided there was no use in running away. For that reason he said to the wax-man, "Please don't kill me. Let us run a race from here to the other corner of the garden. If you win you can kill me; but if I win I am free." The wax-man did not say a word and Rabbit thought that it meant that he agreed to run the race.

"Here we go," said Rabbit; and started to run as fast as he could. When he arrived at the other corner of the garden he stopped before the second wax-man and thought the man had beaten him in the race. "By gum, you beat me!" cried out Rabbit, almost exhausted. "But, please give me one more chance. Let us run another race and if then you beat me I'll give up." Thus spoke Rabbit and he started to run again as fast as his legs could carry him. He arrived at the third corner of the garden and stopped immediately before the third wax-man. Again he thought the man had won the race.

Rabbit was greatly frightened and he said to the wax-man, "Again you beat me! Holy smokes, man! You must be the very devil when you can beat a rabbit running! But, look here; let us have a fist fight. That is the best way to find out who is the braver of the two." Saying this he raised his right hand and struck the wax-man a heavy blow. His hand stuck to the wax-man. "Let go, let go, for if you don't I'll strike you with my other hand," exclaimed Rabbit. The right hand did not come off, so Rabbit struck the wax-man with his left hand, and that stuck also. At this point Rabbit became very angry and he gave the wax-man a terrible kick. His leg stuck. Angrier than ever he said to the wax-man, "I still have one leg, and in order that you

may know that I am a real man I am going to fix you right now." He then gave the wax-man another terrible kick with the other leg, and that stuck also. Rabbit did not give up even then. Instead, he said to the wax-man, boiling with anger, "Do you think that just because you have me caught by the hands and feet I can't defend myself? If you do you are terribly mistaken because I still have my head left." He then gave the wax-man a terrific bump with his head, and that also stuck.

The next day when the farmer went out to the garden he found the poor rabbit caught fast to the wax-man. He pulled him off and took him home to make a meal of him.

When he arrived his wife began to prepare the hot water to boil him. The man then tied the rabbit and left him outside for a moment. In the meantime Coyote passed by and said to Rabbit, "What are you doing here? Let us go out for a walk." "I should say not," replied Rabbit; "they are going to have a big dinner here very soon and I have been invited. If you want to take my place untie me and then you can stay here until they come for you." "Sure I will," said Coyote. Immediately he untied Rabbit and put himself in the same place waiting for the dinner-hour. Rabbit was greatly pleased and ran away.

When the man went out to get Rabbit in order to boil him he said to his wife, "Gracious goodness, how this rabbit has grown! We are certainly going to have a fine meal! Let us put him into the boiler." Coyote believed all the time that they were going to take him to the feast. The man and his wife picked up Coyote and threw him into the boiling water. When Coyote realized what it was all about he certainly gave an awful howl, and he jumped out of the boiler as quickly as he could. He ran away to the forest in search of the rabbit, although nearly half of his skin had peeled off.

Our New Mexican Spanish version is, of course, of Spanish source as is the case with most of the Spanish-

American versions. In these as well as in most of the American-Negro versions we have coyote and rabbit instead of the all human characters or man and jackal (monkey, hare or some other animal) of the old and modern versions from India. Joseph Jacobs has perhaps explained correctly how it is that a rabbit has entered in the India and Africa versions (and perhaps also the early European versions) instead of the Buddha of the Jataka 55 version. Buddha is venerated as a hare in the latter Buddhistic traditions and in fact in one of the old Jatakas Buddha is transported to the moon as a hare on account of a great deed of sacrifice.⁹ But in any case the Spanish-American tales of the coyote and rabbit cycle are for the most part of European source. This opinion I have held since I first began to study these materials twenty years ago.¹⁰ Not only the tar-baby episode but all the other episodes of this cycle so extensively developed in American-Spanish and American-Indian tales are for the most part of European, specifically Spanish, source. Professor Boas seems to be of the same opinion, for he states: "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 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."¹¹

Surely there must exist among the Spanish-speaking people of New Mexico more versions of the tales of the coyote and rabbit cycle with the tar-baby episode. A careful search may even result in finding a version similar to the peninsular Spanish tale collected by me in Castile and which I give below.

9. See *The Earliest English Version of the Fables of Bidpai*, cited at the beginning of this article, and also his edition of *Caxton's Aesop*, London, 1889, I, 113, and 136-137.

10. *Journal of American Folk-Lore* XXIV, 397-398, and XXVII, 211-212, 216-218.

11. *Journal of American Folk-Lore* XXV, 254.

The Pueblo Indian versions of the tar-baby story that we have from New Mexico are more numerous, thanks to the efforts of Dr. Elsie Clews Parsons. The four manuscript versions from Taos that she has sent me are of special interest on account of the extraordinary way the tale ends. In other respects the versions are of the ordinary primitive baustein type and I believe they are derived from Spanish versions brought to New Mexico in the XVIth century. I have myself collected XVIth century Spanish ballads among the Pueblo Indians of Isleta and undoubtedly they are found in Taos and the other Pueblos. The presence of tar-baby stories of Spanish source among the Pueblos is, therefore, to be expected. Indeed the studies of Professor Boas and Dr. Parsons show that there are many folk tales and traditions among the Pueblo Indians of Spanish provenience.¹² An extended investigation into the traditions and folk tales and ballads of Spanish source that may be still found among the Pueblo Indians, particularly those who are old and speak Spanish, is one of the desiderata of American folk-lore. Dr. Parsons has suggested that I undertake this task myself, and I hope that I will soon find the time to do so. I now give with Dr. Parsons' permission one of her manuscript versions from the Taos Pueblo. It is the same version published by me in my extensive study in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore*.

THE RABBIT THAT WAS KILLED AND COOKED AND CAME TO LIFE AGAIN

Once there lived a husband and wife who had a very pretty daughter. They had a vegetable garden and Rabbit was doing a lot of damage in it. They did not know what to do. The man set up traps, but could not catch him.

12. See: Parsons, *Tewa Tales*, already cited, Introduction; Parsons in *Journal of American Folk-Lore* XXXI, 216-255; Parsons and Boas, *Ibid.*, XXXIII, 47-72; Boas, *Ibid.*, XXXV, 62-98.

One day he found the rabbit hole and said to his wife, "Wife, I don't know what to do. This rabbit is doing too much damage in our garden. But tomorrow I am going after wood and I am going to get some *piñon* gum."

The next morning he got up very early and went and got some gum, made a little figure out of it and placed it in the garden at night.

Rabbit came out as soon as the man left and saw the gum-figure. "Who are you? Who are you?" said Rabbit. The gum-figure did not reply so Rabbit continued, "Who are you? Who are you? If you don't reply I am going to hit you." He struck a blow with his right hand. It stuck. "What do you think? Do you think I have only this hand?" said Rabbit. He struck another blow with his left hand. It stuck also. "What do you think? Do you think I can't defend myself?" said Rabbit. And saying this he struck another blow with his right foot, then another one with his left, and both feet stuck. In order to free himself Rabbit then struck the gum-figure with his head, but his head stuck also. Rabbit was now stuck altogether.

The next morning the man got up early and found Rabbit stuck fast. He killed it and took it home and told his wife to prepare hot water, clean Rabbit well and cook it with *chile*. "I want it cooked tender, very well done," he said.

When Rabbit was well cooked the woman put the dish on the table. They began to eat. "Be careful not to drop any soup from your mouth," warned the husband. As they were eating the woman dropped some soup from her mouth, and Rabbit came to life again and ran away, upsetting all the dishes. "I told you not to drop any soup from your mouth," said the husband. And they quarreled and quarreled over the matter.

In another one of the Taos versions a drop of blood falls from the dead rabbit before being cooked, and then he comes

to life again and runs away.¹³ This coming back to life of the dead 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 the distinctly Indian contribution to the Spanish-American form of the tale. Apparently it is specifically a Pueblo Indian contribution. A search for more versions from the various Indian Pueblos of New Mexico, however, would show whether this contribution belongs to the Taos versions only or whether it is a general Pueblo Indian contribution, and it is indeed extraordinary and original, to the primitive form of the tale taken from Spanish-American tradition.¹³

The peninsular Spanish version of the tar-baby story collected by me in the province of Ávila, Ávila of Santa Teresa, in Old Castile in 1920, and published in my *Cuentos populares españoles* I, no. 35, is of special interest to folklorists, and in particular to those interested in Spanish-American folklore. It is not unlikely that a similar version may be found in New Mexico. In order to make it more widely known I reprint it below, first in the original Castilian dialect of San Esteban de Muñana, and then in English translation.

SANSON

Éstos eran unos señores que eran muy ricos y no tenían hijos. Y decía la mujer:—¡Ay, si Dios nos diera un hijo tan grande y tan fuerte como Sansón pa que nos comiera la hacienda! Y tanto estuvo diciendo eso que por fin Dios les dió un hijo tan grande y tan fuerte como Sansón. Y lo bautizaron y le puson el nombre de Sansón.

13. The incident of a person being killed or boiled in oil, or in human blood, and then coming to life again, rejuvenated, through magic and incantation, is, of course, well known in oriental and European folklore. See my *Cuentos populares españoles* II, No. 140, III, Nos. 169-170, Aarne-Thompson, *The Types of the Folk-Tale*, Helsinki, 1928, No. 531, *Folk-Lore* VII, 232-240, XIX, 61-62, Frazer, *Golden Bough* IV, 218.

Y fué creciendo el niño y cuando llegó a ser hombre se comía en un día tres cerdos, una fanega de garbanzos y una fanega de pan. Y ya en poco tiempo se comió toda la hacienda y los padres quedaron muy pobres. Y dijeron entonces los padres:—Ahora le vamos a hacer un azadón pa que vaya a trabajar y gane pa que coma. Y le hizón el azadón y fueron tres hombres por él, pero no pudón llevarlo. Y fué entonces Sansón y sigún llegó lo cogió con facilidad y dijo:—Esto se hace así. Ustedes no valen pa na. Y como lo cogió como coge una guinda todos se quedaron muy sorprendidos.

Y ya se echó el azadón al hombro y se fué camino adelante. Y llegaba a servir en las casas y trabajaba mucho, pero como se comía todo lo que había en la casa en un día todos le despedían al segundo día, y ya nadien le quería recibir. Y como todos le temblaban de miedo todos se quitaban el sombrero cuando le vían pasar.

Y ya viendo que nadien le quería recibir se fué al palacio del rey y anduvo cabando todos los jardines y todo con su azadón hasta que destrozó casi todo. Y nadien se atrevía a decirle na. Y ya llamó el rey a sus caballeros y les dijo:—¡Ay, señores, lo que nos pasa con este hombre! ¿Cómo vamos a librarnos de él?

Y ya acordaron enviar a muchos caballeros armaos y a caballo al campo a pelear todos juntos con él pa ver si le mataban. Y salieron los caballeros con sus mejores armas al campo a esperar a Sansón. Y Sansón llegó y cogió un caballo del rebo y empezó, ¡Pin, pin, plan, plan! y a todos los mató dándoles con el caballo.

Y volvió al palacio y le dijo al rey:—Güeno, pues ya los he matao a todos.

Y entonces acordaron hacer un hombre de pez pa cogerle. Y hizón el hombre de pez y lo pusón allí cerca del palacio. Y pasó por allí Sansón y como el hombre de pez no le hizo la venia al pasar volvió Sansón y le dijo:—¿Me haces la venia? Mira que te doy. ¿Me haces la venia? Mira que

te doy. Y como el hombre de pez no le hizo la venia le dió Sansón un puñetazo y se le quedó pegada la mano derecha. Y entonces le sigue diciendo:—¿Me haces la venia? Mira que te doy. ¿Me haces la venia? Mira que te doy. Y le dió con la mano izquierda y se le quedó pegada. Y entonces le dijo:—¿Me sueltas las manos? Mira que te doy con el pie. ¿Me sueltas las manos? Mira que te doy con el pie. Y le dió una patada y se le quedó pegao el pie. Y entonces ya muy enfadao le dice:—¿Me sueltas las dos manos y el pie? Mira que te doy con el otro pie. ¿Me sueltas las manos y el pie? Mira que te doy con el otro pie. Y le dió una patada con el otro pie y se le quedó pegao tambien. Y ya le dice:—¿Me sueltas las dos manos y los dos pies? Mira que te doy un tripazo. ¿Me sueltas las dos manos y los dos pies? Mira que te doy un tripazo. Y le dió un tripazo y se le pegó la tripa.

Y ya como estaba bien pegao allí cogieron y lo mataron.

SAMPSON THE GIANT

Once there were a husband and wife who were very rich and had no children. And the wife was wont to say, "If the Lord would only give us a son as big and strong as Sampson so that he could consume our wealth!" And she repeated this so often that finally the Lord heard her prayers and gave them a son as big and strong as Sampson. When they baptized him he was named Sampson.

The child grew up and when he reached manhood he ate three pigs, three bushels of chick-peas and a bushel of bread a day. In a short time he consumed all the wealth and the parents remained in poverty. Then the parents said, "Now we must get him a large hoe so that he can go away and make his living." The hoe was made and three men went to get it, but they could not carry it. Sampson then went after it, and as soon as he arrived he picked it up easily and said, "This is the way you do it. You are all worthless." He

picked it up just as if it were a mazard-berry, and all were greatly surprised.

He put the hoe on his shoulder and started on his way. He found work as a servant in many places and he worked very faithfully; but everywhere he would eat all the food in the house in one day so he was always asked to leave the second day. Finally no one wanted him. Everybody was afraid of him and all would take their hats off when he passed by.

When he saw that no one wanted to receive him he went to the king's palace and went about digging up everything in the gardens so that much damage was done. But no one dared to say a word to him. Finally the king called his knights and said to them, "What a time we are having with this man, gentlemen! How are we going to get rid of him?" They decided to send several knights well armed and on horseback to fight with him in the field and kill him.

The knights went out well armed and riding well-trained horses. Sampson met them and seizing one of the horses by the tail he began to deal blow after blow furiously until he killed all the knights with the horse. He then returned to the palace and said to the king, "Well, I have killed them all."

Thereupon they decided to make a tar-man to catch him. They prepared it and placed it near the palace.

Sampson soon passed by and, in view of the fact that the tar-man did not salute 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." The tar-man made no reply, so Sampson gave him a blow with his right hand, and it stuck fast. He then continued saying, "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." Again there was no reply, and Sampson struck the tar-man with his left hand. That stuck fast also. He then spoke thus, "Are you going to let go of my hands? If

you don't I'll hit you with my foot. Are you going to let go of my hands? If you don't I'll hit you with my foot." And he gave the tar-man a kick and his foot stuck fast. Sampson then became very angry and said, "Are you going to let go of my two hands and my foot? If you don't I'll hit you with the other foot. Are you going to let go of my two hands and my foot? If you don't I'll hit you with the other foot." And he gave him a kick with his left foot, and that stuck fast also. Angrier than ever, he shouted to the tar-man, "Are you going to let go of my hands and feet? If you don't I'll strike you with my belly. Are you going to let go of my hands and feet? If you don't I'll strike you with my belly." And he gave him a terrible blow with his belly, and his belly stuck fast.

He was so well stuck now that the king's knights came out and killed him.