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Introduction

For a few years I found myself in a kind of catharsis via fairy tales and well written children stories, and poetry as well by meaningful coincidences that is called as “synchronicity” in Jungian terms. Then I come to the point that there was a connection between “good hearted” character of folktales and “catharsis” in Aristotelian terms of “pity” and “fear”.

In this study, I would like to analyse Hungarian folktales according to the concept of “catharsis in tales”. I also mention how catharsis process in folktales works in practice and emphasize the value of a new therapeutic method. Fairy tale therapy method is a kind of well-planned systematic way of catharsis process and is able to help people cope with real life. One of my main aims is to show catharsis process in folktales via analyses of Hungarian folktales and consider them as “metaphoric moral stories” that fits to lives of adults as much as children’s imagination.

In the first chapter titled as “Tales”; I introduce the notion of tales by explaining definitions of the terms and classification methods. In the second chapter named “Catharsis”; I focus on the ideas of Aristotle and discuss how catharsis is achieved in Greek tragedies and their functions. In the third chapter called “Catharsis in Folktales”; I take Propp’s morphology model and use it as an example to establish my point of folktales and tragedies having common structures in the process of catharsis. I also mention the differences between Aristotelian model of tragedy and folktales. In the fourth chapter named “Analysis of Folktale Samples”; I bring in my research on folktales by reintroducing the notion of catharsis and pointing out that the catharsis process can be found and works in folktales as well. In the “Conclusion” part; I summarize and list the ideas that I discussed in this study.
I. Tales

The Definition and Classification of Folktales

Story-telling

The life span of each individual is a kind of “story” whether it is recorded and published as a biography or not. We “experience” by stories of ourselves and others’. In order to cause a “better world”, we need to talk about common ethics which have no clear recipe for “truth”, but we all have a common sense up to each unique event that is related to the whole story. Thus, while searching the truth we learn by stories; stories of us, stories of around us or stories of far away people and of course, stories of fictional characters. This is the way readers experience the most.

Experience of “story readers” comes from a kind of certain education of “emotions” that is related to the term, “catharsis” by Aristotle. Aristotle focuses on emotions while he is explaining his model of tragedy. David Ross defines the “heart” in question as “central sense-organ” and “the central organ of perception” according to ideas of Aristotle. While discussing ideas of Aristotle about “dreams”, Ross argues that during the sleep, the movement becomes actual and this is the act of imagination. “The physiological condition of this is that the repercussion in the sense-organ has to be transmitted, with the blood, by the ‘connate spirit’ to the central sense-organ, the heart.”\(^1\) Aristotle maintains, that “dreams are the work of imagination” and “the critical faculty is in abeyance owing to the pressure of the blood on the heart, the central organ of perception. Thus in sleep we habitually take images for percepts, and to do this is to dream.”\(^2\)

In this study, I want to show that catharsis process is also possible if we apply Aristotelian tragedy model to folktales. Furthermore, these fictional stories that are called as “folktales” are both “symbolic” and “organic” just like the languages. Their symbolic structure offers a kind of catharsis even in the most surrealistic events of the plot. And organic structure of

---


\(^2\) Ibid.
tales means that they are created collectively and have been changed in time by various narrators. Thus, folktales differ from many other fictional stories that are created by individuals. On the other hand, “Poetry is finer and more philosophical than history; for poetry expresses the universal, and history only the particular”\(^3\), says Aristotle. Catharsis process occurs on a scene that is close to reality; on the other hand, similarity to reality is just because the “need” of “convincing”. “For the purposes of poetry a convincing impossibility is preferable to an unconvincing possibility”, says Aristotle. Thus, empathy to the main character of any “story”, whether it is a tragedy or folktale, does not requires “possibility” as a prior condition. Thus, audiences of a play could cry while watching it; even though they all already knew that it is not “real”; but fictional; at least it is not happening there at the same time. Cutting onions also makes most of the people cry. However, a good novel, play, or as I discuss here, a folktale is able to touch universal part of human by stories that are created by words and make them cry. Aristotle suggests a certain kind of tragedy model for catharsis process in order to balance extreme emotions especially unwanted ones like “fear”. But of course, Aristotle has aims based on his ethics, so he suggests watching tragedy; instead of cutting onions. Aristotle aims the experience that can be gained from stories of others’. However, Plato is against “representation of representation”. Plato argues that non-physical forms that he calls as “ideas” are the most accurate ultimate reality. Thus, what we directly experience is “representation” according to Plato. While, Plato argues that “rhetoric” was the art of “directing the soul by means of speech” and it may be risky according to Plato, because the “imitator” does not know anything about true existence; but the appearance only.\(^4\) In this study, I want to underline organic feature of folktales as well as their surrealistic symbols that works as metaphorical way in the process of catharsis and show that “the imitator”, as authorship of folktales, is a kind of collective mind that keeps stable patterns in the story; but also transform it just like in the organic process of languages.

Folktales are certain stories that are fictional; but created and evaluated by whole societies, instead of individuals. Folktales are symbolic surreal stories created by the collective mind. Symbolic structure, surreal elements and common prototypes of various folktales and how catharsis process works within folktales will be discussed in this study. The definitions of main terms will be described and interpreted then I will explain the functions of tales and

catharsis in folktales by using the samples of Hungarian folktales which are very popular all over the world and also have the main common characteristics and “functions” of folktales in the sense of Propp.

Rhetoric and story-telling is an art according to Aristotle. All humans had created stories and told them to next generations in history of humankind. “The art of story-telling has been cultivated in all ages and among all nations of which we have any record; it is the outcome of an instinct implanted universally in the human mind. By means of a story the savage philosopher accounts for her/his own existence and that of all the phenomena which surround her/him.

Stories are diverse; however, we can classify them as Aristotle and many other literary theorists have done before. “The art of story-telling unites with the kindred arts of dance and song to form the epic or the drama, or develops under the complex influences of modern life into the prose romance and the novel. These in their various ways are its ultimate expression; and the loftiest genius has found no fitter vehicle to convey its lessons of truth and beauty.”

Tales

Tales are also stories that have main common characteristics. However, there are many different definitions of tales according to various sources:

- “A tale is a story, often involving magic or exciting events.” (Collins Dictionary)
- “A fictitious or true narrative or story, especially one that is imaginatively recounted, a number or total.” (Oxford Dictionary)
- “A story, especially one that might be invented or difficult to believe.” (Cambridge Dictionary)

Besides its negative meanings that include “not real” in daily use of the term “tale” because of its surrealistic properties, on the contrary, the tales consist oldest story patterns that are “narrated” to generations, while evaluating into different forms just like a piece of art work that is a kind of “anonymous literature”.

Fairy Tales and Wonder Tales

There are many ways to classify tales. The basic distinction is related to authorship of the tales. There are many fairy tales that are created by certain authors (for example Hans Christian Andersen) or collectors (for example Grimm brothers) or even narrators (for example Aesop); while, “folktales” pass down orally by various unknown narrators in traditions of folks. One of the main sub-genre of folktales is “fairy tales” or “wonder tales” which I study in this thesis. However, “fairy tales” or fables are also created by certain authors as well, as I mentioned before. Fairy tales are more related to surreal elements like fairies, of course. “A fairy tale, wonder tale, magic tale, or Märchen is a folklore genre that takes the form of a short story that typically features entities such as dwarfs, dragons, elves, fairies, giants, gnomes, goblins, griffins, mermaids, talking animals, trolls, unicorns, or witches, and usually magic or enchantments.”

The distinction between fairy and wonder tales is not so clear; but wonder tales have a wider scope. “Some say that “fairy tale” is the wrong name for magical folktales. It was used in Spanish and in French, but in German and Italian, there is no word “fairy.” There is no allusion to a fairy. And many so-called fairy tales don’t even have any fairies. A “wonder tale” has a wider, broader meaning, so it could take place in any location, not just in the ancient woods of the Grimm’s stories, like “Snow White,” or in the fantasy realms of the Celtic tales with “little people.”

The emphasis on “unreal” is also mentioned by many folklorists. “Some folklorists use the German term Märchen or “wonder tale” to refer to the fairy tale. In his classic reference book, the 1977 [1946] edition of The Folktale, Thompson defines a wonder tale as: ‘A tale of some length involving a succession of motifs or episodes. It moves in an unreal world without definite locality or definite creatures and is filled with the marvellous. In this never-never land … the characters and motifs of fairy tales are simple and archetypal … and include magical helpers, often talking horses, or wild animals, or birds.’”

---

8 Ibid.
I will discuss folktales as “collectively created stories” here and I want to show that common functions of this certain type of tales have similarities with tragedy model of Aristotle in this study. In spite of the fact that tales and especially most of the folktales have surrealistic elements, there is no obstacle for human mind, which is programmed for symbolic thinking, is able to use language and also apply any surreal symbol of a folktale to their own lives.

**Folktales**

Folktales are surreal symbolic stories that are created collectively. Folktales were studied before by many scholars as well. It is good to remind some definitions of folktales according to a study of Andrea Katalin Szilagy, Comparative Analysis of a Selection of Hungarian Folktales in English:

“In The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales, the literary approach to studying folktales is defined using Max Luthi as an example, and Robyn McCallum makes the following observation about his work: [He] focuses on those formal stylistic features which characterize the genre and which ... function thematically ... supported by close textual analysis of particular tales and their variants [and he] largely ignore[s] the social and cultural contexts of particular retellings, focusing instead on those story elements and motifs which remain stable despite progressive retellings...[he] avoids imposing specific meanings on individual tales.

Key to this definition is the analysis of the texts of particular tales and their variants to draw conclusions about the tales' timelessness. Though other approaches—sociological, historical, cultural, and so on—are equally valid, I have chosen to investigate the selected tales within a literary context as this is the perspective that most intrigues me.

The Oxford Companion to Fairy Tales makes a distinction between the two: The terms have distinct etymologies and meanings. The words fairy tale can refer to both a category of oral folktale and a genre of prose literature. The term folktale is reserved for any tale deriving from or existing in oral tradition and is generally preferred by folklorists and anthropologists.
Literary scholars tend to use the word [sic] fairy tale to refer to a genre of prose literature, which may or may not be based on oral tradition.”

Maria Tatar argues that fairy tales were “metaphoric devices” as I discuss in chapter that is titled as “Symbolism in Fairy tales and Folktales”. The distinction between fairy tales and folktales is also defined according to fairy tales’ surreal elements that are sharply separated from “earthy realism” and folktales’ “narrators”:

“According to Martin Hallett and Barbara Karasek, in Folk and Fairy Tales, a "folktale means exactly what it says: it's a tale of the folk ./.../ the common people of a nation - and the important point to realize here is that the 'common people' were, in the past, generally illiterate. Consequently, their tales were orally transmitted". Perry Nodelman and Mavis Reimer define folktales simply as "stories that circulated orally". Maria Tatar discusses a continuum between supernatural and natural settings: The term folktale traditionally has been used in two senses. On the one hand., folktale refers to oral narratives that circulate among the folk; on the other it designates a specific set of tales, namely oral narratives that take place among the folk, that is, in a realistic setting with naturalistic details.... The term fairy tale, by contrast, has been associated with both oral and literary traditions but is above all reserved for narratives set in a fictional world where preternatural events and supernatural intervention are taken wholly for granted. A fairy tale can thus belong to the category of folktales, but it stands in contrast to the folktale, which is sharply biased in favor of earthy realism.”

In conclusion, folktales are like trees whose roots reach subconscious collective mind of communities and they are the “subjects” of literary theory, as well as both folklore and anthropology. Folktales are tales deriving from oral tradition according to folklorists and anthropologists. While, their surreal and symbolic structure is more discussed by literary theorists.

---

9 Szilagy, Andrea Katalin: Comparative Analysis of a Selection of Hungarian Folktales in English, 2003 (Download: 20.02.2018).
10 Ibid.
Classification of Folktales

Folktales are classified by both literary theorists and folklorists according to their different specialities. Motifs of the folktales were prior elements that are focused on while categorizing and collecting them systematically at the beginning.

Antti Amatus Aarne, folklorist, has classified the tales according to their various motifs and numbered them under his own labelling catalog system:

“Aarne, as he worked out the tale-typing system, anticipated the classification of separate episodes and motifs of a tale, and in some instances had to treat material in this way, but mainly he avoided this procedure. Usually a complete tale was the basis for each type. Each type was assigned a number (most of his original numbers are still used) and secondarily a name. The numbering system was continuous for the entire index which was made up of three groups of tales, each with subgroups. They were the “regular folktales,” humorous tales, and animal tales. Cross-references indicated when a given tale might have been grouped differently.”

“It was Thompson’s experience in classifying, or in trying to classify, tales of regions outside the area covered by the tale-type index begun by Aarne, which led him to devise the motif-indexing system which can be applied to the folklore of any part of the world. His work on American Indian tales was a decisive factor in trying to overcome the limitations of the tale-type index.”\textsuperscript{11}

Hans-Jörg Uther has also defined different types of folktales. “The AT-number system was updated and expanded in 2004 with the publication of The Types of International Folktales: A Classification and Bibliography by Hans-Jörg Uther.”\textsuperscript{12}

Uther summarized the categories of folktales due to Aarne’s classification according to motifs of folktales: The motifs are arranged in the following groups: A. Mythological Motifs,

Uther also defined classification according to the international tale type catalog in his study and he also mentioned Hungarian folktales that include the samples of folktales of this study: “Most of the catalogs adopt the traditional ordering system according to genres, but partly also document new narrative types and motifs with local diffusion (ecotypes) including their variants in accordance with the system. Among these are, for instance, the Greek (Megas 1978; Angelopoulos/Brouskou 1994, 1999; Angelopoulos/Kaplanoglou/Katrinaki 2004, 2007), Hungarian (MNK 1982ff.), Frisian (van der Kooi 1984), Spanish (Camarena/Chevalier 1995ff.), Aragonese (González Sanz 1996, 2004), Catalan (Oriol/Pujol 2003, 2008), Portuguese (Cardigos 2006) type catalogs or the huge compendium of the folktale in the Arab world (El-Shamy 2004).”

All of these classification systems regard folktales as cultural treasures to be recorded systematically and transformed from “oral” into “literal” traditions. “Indexes that follow a generally accepted standard have contributed to establish interdependencies between oral and literary traditions and help determine original sources, stylistic dependencies, and the reception of individual narratives as well as entire text collections: "This would enable folklore archives and institutions around the world to use similar language in their indexing, archiving and retrieval of folklore data", as Lauri Honko wrote. The last twenty years have shown that discussions about ancient knowledge hidden in the archives are not only a memory of past. It still is useful for exploring the opinions and the worldviews of our ancestors and also for our own.”

14 Ibid.
The classification according to motifs of folktales is not accepted by Formalist school and Vladimir Propp was the most popular folklorist of this school that recommends structural forms of classifying the folktales. “The tale type index was criticized by Vladimir Propp of the Formalist school of the 1920s for ignoring the functions of the motifs by which they are classified. Furthermore, Propp contended that using a "macro-level" analysis means that the stories that share motifs might not be classified together, while stories with wide divergences may be grouped under one tale type because the index must select some features as salient.”¹⁵ “Similarly, Alan Dundes points out that "Aarne’s mistake was not classifying tales on the basis of narrative plot rather than [on characters]" because "the same tale can be told with either animal or human characters".¹⁶

Motif of the folktales can be change in time and seen in various forms; but the main pattern of the story remains. “The Pussy Cat Princess” and “Fisher Joe” are folktales samples that keep similar patterns; but have different motifs as I will discuss in the IV. chapter named “Analysis of Folktale Examples”.

The classification of Formalist school gives more common patterns of folktales and it is much easier to see the similarities and main differences between folktale and Aristotelian model of tragedy by the help of functionalist approach to folktales in this study. “One of the main objectives of modern narrative research is the observation of narrative tradition in its live environment. The Russian school pioneered in the field in the early 20th century. (...) sociology of narrative tradition focused on narrator’s personality, repertoire, worldview and the social environment as a whole; later the focus was shifted to the aspects of function, performance, communication, reception and gender specification."¹⁷

Creators of the folktales are not alive today; on the other hand, tales were carried between generations “in context” by the narrators of oral culture. While language represents the meaning; folktales represent the “common” symbolic stories of life experiences. However, this representational approach is criticized by Derrida. Derrida argues “Language is structure, and its structure is not that of the extramental world. The end result for Derrida is

¹⁶ Ibid.
that literature— and indeed language itself—is not at all ‘representational’ or ‘expressive’ of something outside itself.”

However, catharsis works in an “potential extratextual support.” Readers or audiences have to interpret the story according to their own world while adopting the common “symbols” into their own experiences. Roland Barthes argues that all texts include this support. “Barthes has pointed out that any interpretation of a text has to move outside the text so as to refer to the reader: the text has no meaning until someone reads it, and to make sense it must be interpreted, which is to say related to the reader’s world.”

While any text, including tales and tragedies, keeps the potential of various interpretations; some stories like folktales have common elements in their structure just like languages. Ferdinand de Saussure and also many intellectuals like Roland Barthes, Jacques Lacan, and Claude Lévi-Strauss adopted this theory into their ideas. "Just as each individual organism shares certain features with other organisms of its type, and species that resemble each other belong to the same genus, the individual work is similar to other works of its form and homologous literary forms belong to the same genre." The most widely known work carried out in this tradition is Vladimir Propp's ‘Morphology of the Folktale’.”

Ong argues that “Sound resists reduction to an ‘object’ or an ‘icon’—it is an on-going event, as has been seen. Moreover, the divorce between poem and context would be difficult to imagine in an oral culture.” On contrast, Saussure argues: “In separating language from speaking we are at the same time separating: what is social from what is individual; and what is essential from what is accessory and more or less accidental. Language is not a function of the speaker; it is a product that is passively assimilated by the individual.” “Whereas speech is heterogeneous, language, as defined, is homogeneous. It is a system of signs in which the only essential thing is the union of meanings and sound-images, and in which both parts of the sign are psychological.” According to structuralist intellectuals: “Language may be analysed as a formal system of differential elements, apart from the messy dialectics

---

19 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
of real-time production and comprehension.” Today these ideas are mostly represented by Noam Chomsky: “All humans share the same underlying linguistic structure, irrespective of sociocultural differences.”24 “Chomsky's nativist, internalist view of language is consistent with the philosophical school of "rationalism", and is contrasted with the anti-nativist, externalist view of language, which is consistent with the philosophical school of "empiricism".

General Structure of Folktales

Functions of Folktales

Vladimir Propp explains the roots of his term “morphology” and gives some clues about his methodology: “Where the naive empiricist sees only disjointed facts, the empiricist-philosopher recognizes a law. I noticed a law in a small and narrow area—one type of folktale, but it occurred to me even then that the discovery of this law could also be of some general importance. The word morphology was not borrowed from manuals of botany whose chief purpose is classification, or from grammatical treatises; it came from the writings of Goethe, who used this unifying term in the title of his works on botany and osteology.”25

“Morphology is first named as such in Goethe’s notes of 1796. But he only fully lays out the position as an account of the form and transformation of organisms in the 1817 Zur Morphologie.”26 Goethe introduced his term “morphology” after his travel to Italy between 1786-1788. He was introducing himself as “Johann Philipp Möller” while gaining some experience about ‘other’ cultures during his travel. “Goethe has more time to think and focus on science and culture after his travel to Italy. Goethe thinks that cultural elements are like living organisms because they are beyond history and anonymous.”27

26 Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy – (https://www.iep.utm.edu/goethe/#H4)
The main idea of Goethe’s classification depends on a unique law: “Morphology reveals the laws of transformation according to which nature produces one part through another and achieves the most diversified forms through the modification of a single organ.”

Goethe’s term of “morphology” is not limited in the area of botany, nor flowers; but Propp applied it to the fairy tales as well. Propp describes the term “morphology” in the paragraph above, in his study named “Theory and History of Folklore”, as a “unifying” term and Propp emphasizes “general laws” in his statement; that is very parallel to “the laws of transformation” that Goethe mentions above. Thus, I focus on some common patterns that repeats in various folktales, instead of the classification based on motifs that can be seen in many different forms during the time, nor “original” oldest form of a folktale; but “repeating pattern” of the folktales that is seen in any place of earth and during in any time; while taking “exception” folktales as a rule of “falsifiability” as a term of Karl Popper. Propp has studied Russian folktales that Alexander Nikolayevich Afanasyev had collected; however, his results are valid in general universally that is parallel to his main aim and it is possible to apply it to other folktales as well.

Vladimir Propp’s “Fairy Tale Functions”, which are based upon a Russian formalist approach to Russian folktales and fairy tales, after the initial situation is depicted, the tale takes the following sequence:

1. A member of a family leaves home (the hero is introduced);
2. An interdiction is addressed to the hero (’don’t go there’, ‘go to this place’);
3. The interdiction is violated (villain enters the tale);
4. The villain makes an attempt at reconnaissance (either villain tries to find the children/jewels etc.; or intended victim questions the villain);
5. The villain gains information about the victim;
6. The villain attempts to deceive the victim to take possession of victim or victim’s belongings (trickery; villain disguised, tries to win confidence of victim);
7. Victim taken in by deception, unwittingly helping the enemy;
8. Villain causes harm/injury to family member (by abduction, theft of magical agent, spoiling crops, plunders in other forms, causes a disappearance, expels someone, casts spell

---

28 Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy – (https://www.iep.utm.edu/goethe/#H4)
on someone, substitutes child etc., commits murder, imprisons/detains someone, threatens forced marriage, provides nightly torments); Alternatively, a member of family lacks something or desires something (magical potion etc.);
9. Misfortune or lack is made known, (hero is dispatched, hears call for help etc./ alternative is that victimized hero is sent away, freed from imprisonment);
10. Seeker agrees to, or decides upon counter-action;
11. Hero leaves home;
12. Hero is tested, interrogated, attacked etc., preparing the way for his/her receiving magical agent or helper (donor);
13. Hero reacts to actions of future donor (withstands/fails the test, frees captive, reconciles disputants, performs service, uses adversary’s powers against them);
14. Hero acquires use of a magical agent (directly transferred, located, purchased, prepared, spontaneously appears, eaten/drank, help offered by other characters);
15. Hero is transferred, delivered or led to whereabouts of an object of the search;
16. Hero and villain join in direct combat;
17. Hero is branded (wounded/mark, receives ring or scarf);
18. Villain is defeated (killed in combat, defeated in contest, killed while asleep, banished);
19. Initial misfortune or lack is resolved (object of search distributed, spell broken, slain person revived, captive freed);
20. Hero returns;
21. Hero is pursued (pursuer tries to kill, eat, undermine the hero);
22. Hero is rescued from pursuit (obstacles delay pursuer, hero hides or is hidden, hero transforms unrecognizably, hero saved from attempt on his/her life);
23. Hero unrecognized, arrives home or in another country;
24. False hero presents unfounded claims;
25. Difficult task proposed to the hero (trial by ordeal, riddles, test of strength/endurance, other tasks);
26. Task is resolved;
27. Hero is recognized (by mark, brand, or thing given to him/her);
28. False hero or villain is exposed;
29. Hero is given a new appearance (is made whole, handsome, new garments etc.);
30. Villain is punished;
31. Hero marries and ascends the throne (is rewarded/promoted).²⁹

These common functions of folktales are defined after a long study of Russian folktales; while they are so common that many folktales over the earth, including Hungarian folktales have these commons in their structure as well. There is also a recent study that gives detailed interpretations of morphology of Propp and Boldizsár Ildikó, whom I will also mention in chapter named “Catharsis in Folktales”. Katalin Zóka, who has studied the tradition of tales in modern literature, focuses on the Hungarian folktales. Katalin Zóka underlines Propp’s “functions” and their relationship to the “characters” and also “order of the events” that is also important in catharsis process that I will discuss in “Catharsis in Folktales” part of this study.

Propp’s 31 functions of folktales is not only the issue of social scientists but also an issue in literature. Katalin Zóka explains “time order of the functions” and “characters of the functions” in “morphology” of Vladimir Propp:

“Martinkó András in Világirodalmi Lexikon. According to him the tale had been moved away from the religious-mythical faith; it makes the transcendent vulgar and exiles it into the world of fantasy. The stories cannot be applied to typological analysis or working out structuralist and semiotic tale models, as there are less stereotypes in them that are suitable for classifying.

The theory of Martinkó András is disproved by Ildikó Boldizsár’s notions, which was built on Vlagyimir Jakovlevics Propp’s views about morphology worked out for magic tales. Propp’s interpretation about the magic tale’s synchronic and diachronic analysis based on the discovery of the smallest components (morpheme), because without them it cannot be worked out comparative researches. Propp chooses those invariant tale components that according to their syntagmatic relationship contain the structure of the tale and it can be found from tale to tale. It shows that the specificality of the magic tale is given not by the motifs but those structural units around which the tale motifs are grouped. Propp states that the function of the tale characters are constant independently from the fact that who and how carries it out. The number of the functions are 31.

According to Propp the order of the functions are always the same and this truthfulness does not relate to the literature tales. Not every tales contain all the functions but despite missing functions, their order remain. Beside the 31 functions the characters of the functions are also constant. Propp defines seven characters (the antihero, the donor, the character who helps, the tzarine/her father, the person who helps somebody to start his road, the hero and the false hero). All the seven characters have well-defined role as they are suitable for many functions. So, Propp analyzed the tales from three aspects: on one hand the time order of the functions; on the other hand, from the point of the constant characters. Analysing the characters and the functions’ and their orders’ relationship Propp had a conclusion that ‘all the magic tales belong to one type’.

Folktales are also defined according to plot and cause of events so that social scientists went further while differentiating folktales from other tales. This works of “classification” are important studies that contribute to Propp’s “unification of folktales” that I discussed. Studies of Boldizsár Ildikó shows that that the form changes but the “magical worldview” remains even in the folktales which are not in their previous original forms as Katalin Zőka discusses:

“The two main points of the theory of Ildikó Boldizsár are Propp’s morphology and János Honti’s theory which was worked out in her book titled ‘Varázslás és fogyókúra’. In this volume tales are analyzed as genre with particular worldviews and attributes of form while using the results of different disciplines present in the research.

Propp’s categories (functions, roles, characters and their features) are analyzed not from historically-grammatically, but content point of view. Using Propp’s categories above all it can be claimed that it does not analyze the role of the different functions in the narrative structure but thematic, semantic context so trying to give new comparative views beyond morphological analysis. Its aim is to define those poetical attributes that make tale to a tale, paraphrases to the basic form of the tale and looking through its varieties, in other words the further living of the folktale in literature. In the comparison it observes the changes of the structure of the tale, the different units, wonder and the magical worldview. Based on this
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view the theory makes difference between 5 categories. According to the divergence from the basic form of the categorization: the adapted tale remains the characteristic features of morphological and worldviewing attributes, the main difference is in a stylistic sense; the ‘inverse-substituting’ tale diverses from the basic form as far as form and worldview are concerned; in the case of the assimilated-specialized tale the form changes but the worldview remains.

To the tale typology of Ildikó Boldizsár was added to further viewpoints by Timárné Hunya Tünde in her study in order to highlight the main differences between tales and folktales. She states that the plot of the tale is much more difficult, the cause of the events is a kind of inner force (mental/inner crisis, wish etc.). While in the folktale the fate of the hero is determined by the ‘absent-state’ and the hero is put to the test in order to reach his or her aims, the hero of the tales is uncertain and is not characterized by his or her action. The stress is on the description of the psychological process instead of the description of the acts and deeds. The goals of the hero are also much more complex and abstract. The characters of the tales cannot be divided into bad and good ones as we can find this categorization in folktales; the characters in the tales are much more complex, their personalities are ‘individualized’, they are not typical ones. Their characterisation is more varied and is in contrast with the static features. It is very frequent that the hero is a child with its purity and innocence, the harmonic relationship with Nature, the wish to know the universe, which are expressed in his/her pondering attitude. The child’s way as he/she is looking the way of the world is innocent, his or her worldview is not influenced by the adults’ rational way of thinking.”

Folktales include more typical characters compare to tales according to Timárné Hunya Tünde and they have typical moral “functions”. Sharp distinctions between “good and bad” stereotypes of characters in folktales offer “empathy” to the main character in the process of catharsis as well, even though a “pure-minded” main character of folktale stands at an “extreme” point compare to “well-mannered” main character of Aristotelian model of tragedy that I will discuss in the second chapter named “Catharsis”.

Timárné Hunya Tünde also emphasises “causes” of the events and “actions” in folktales. Tales more focus on psychological process instead of “the description of the acts”; while in
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folktales acts are more important. “Tragedy is a mimesis not of persons but of actions and life”\textsuperscript{32}, Aristotle says. Thus, folktales fit well in tragedy model of Aristotle.

**Symbolism in Fairy Tales and Folktales**

Sigmund Freud can be called as “symbolist” due to his ideas about dream interpretation; and his symbolism that is based on “fixity of symbols”. However, Freud suggests a kind of interpretation unique for each individual, even though his main goal was common representations for dreams in his tenet of “fixity of symbols”: “The quantum of psychic energy by which the critical activity is thus reduced, and by which the intensity of self-observation may be increased, varies considerably according to the subject-matter upon which the attention is to be fixed. The first step in the application of this procedure teaches us that one cannot make the dream as a whole the object of one's attention, but only the individual components of its content. If I ask a patient who is as yet unpractised: ‘What occurs to you in connection with this dream?’ he is unable, as a rule, to fix upon anything in his psychic field of vision.

I must first dissect the dream for him; then, in connection with each fragment, he gives me a number of ideas which may be described as the thoughts behind this part of the dream. In this first and important condition, then, the method of dream-interpretation which I employ diverges from the popular, historical and legendary method of interpretation by symbolism and approaches more nearly to the second or cipher method. Like this, it is an interpretation in detail, not en masse; like this, it conceives the dream, from the outset, as something built up, as a conglomerate of psychic formations.”\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{33} Freud, Sigmund: The Interpretation of Dreams. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1918.
Freud’s symbolic approach is not limited in dreams only, but fairy tales as well. While, Carl Gustav Jung carried this symbolic view to a more general area from “sexual” determinism of Freud and Jung used the term “archetype” to explain human psyche. “Sigmund Freud speculated that fairy-tale symbolism is the fossilized residue of primordial sexual metaphors; and Carl Jung submitted that symbols express immanent archetypes of the human psyche. Such early approaches assume that symbols convey fixed meanings, and they disregard the effects of folklore variation on meanings.”

Being full of magic or general lack of distinction between humans and animals are some common characteristic of fairy tales that can be seen in any culture in the world. Most of the anthropologists share the idea of “unnatural” elements and do not expect to find any centre of origin, even though many has seen India as that centre. “The general aspects and many motifs are unquestionably ancient in society and, as the story of Cinderella shows, are widespread throughout the world.”

Andrew Lang describes metaphorical structure of fairy tales with a beautiful metaphor in his introduction to an important study called “Cinderella”, which includes different folktale variants of same pattern of a certain story: “Märchen is a kaleidoscope: the incidents are the bits of coloured glass. Shaken, they fall into a variety of attractive forms; some forms are fitter than others, survive more powerfully, and are more widely spread.”

Symbols are fixed because they are the “residues” of a “hypothetical ‘primal language’ according to Freud. Whether it depends on Freud’s “sexual” reading of symbols or Max Müller’s “solar” reading of symbols according to their respective definitions of the “primal
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metaphors”, symbols are mostly seen as related to “fixed” meanings. For instance, Erich Fromm expanded Freud’s view of fixed symbols into the notion that “symbolism is a conventional language”. “Memorably, he spars with Freud as he chooses to interpret “Little Red Riding Hood” in light of “the male-female conflict” rather than through the oedipal lens.”37

“Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm did take variation into account. They conceived Märchen in terms of immanent blueprints incessantly recreated in myriad retellings, but they never tried to make sense of the themes by means of the variants. This path was taken by folklorists influenced by Freud. Alan Dundes proposed to harness tale variants to grasp symbolic equivalences, and he pioneered the study of folk metaphors. But Dundes focused on preset Freudian symbols, a trend that Bengt Holbek followed. To this day, the prospect of addressing fairy-tale symbolism beyond Freud’s assumption of fixed translations remains elusive. Nevertheless, the basic tools are available. Maria Tatar remarked that fairy tales are metaphoric devices, and Claude Lévi-Strauss pointed out that metaphors—in switching terms that belong to different codes—lay bare the broader semantic field underlying each transposition. Müller, Freud, Dundes, Tatar, and Lévi-Strauss variously glimpsed metaphoric patterns in tale variations.”38

The Brothers Grimm argue that different variations appeared to them more noteworthy than they are to those who see in them nothing more than alterations and distortions of a once extant archetype [eines einmal dagewesenen Urbildes]. “At the onset of the systematic collection and study of Märchen, Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm explicitly held the view that folktale retellings are meaningful variations on stable patterns.”39 Freud’s influence is also seen on ideas of Maria Tatar; as she argues that “In the fairy-tale world, the figurative or metaphorical dimension of language takes on literal meaning. Ideas become matter.”40

“Alan Dundes submits that it should be possible to “unlock” the “symbolic code in folktales.” He does grant that Freudian readings “typically /.../ give the appearance of being
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arbitrary, subjective, and unsubstantiated,” but he also points out that folktale variation can be called upon for the “empirical verification of purported symbolic equations.” If a number of motifs can fill the same slot in a tale, then those allomotifs should be symbolically equivalent. By comparing them, “we may gain access to implicit native formulations of symbolic equivalences.”

When Holbek gets around to mapping allomotifs in one tale, he writes: “It makes no difference whether the queen is eating roses, onions or apples ...” “Bengt Holbek assumes that the “symbolic” elements in fairy tales “convey feelings rather than thoughts”; and since symbols are “vivid emotional impressions,” interpretation consists in retracing all the “marvelous” fairy-tale elements back to the real-world referents of such impressions. That is, “every element [in a fairy tale] may be read as pertaining to real life.” This leaves “no room at all for the so-called supernatural beings, the witches, fairies, dragons, ogres, etc.,” since—as he stresses—“they represent aspects of real persons.”

The real-world referents that Holbek mentions are basic elements in catharsis process in order to empathy to the main character of the folktale. Most of the “adventures” in folktales represents “being maturation into adulthood” according to Francisco Vaz de Silva and also Joseph Campbell. Their “primal metaphor” is a kind of synchronized development of the hero and audience. This is also a kind of catharsis process that I discuss in this study.

Propp’s insights call for a comment that “The first has to do with metaphor as a structural fairy-tale feature. Propp showed that fairy-tale adventures are journeys in space, their overarching theme being maturation into adulthood. Note that these two features correlate: fairy tales depict spatial journeys in order to talk about maturation processes. Differently put, fairy tales use the concreteness of spatial journeys to reason about maturation processes. This is a basic metaphorical process.” Francisco Vaz da Silva gives an example to this maturation process: “Little Red Riding Hood” (ATU 333), a story about a girl who walks into the woods and becomes a young woman. “Comparing the allomotifs in tale variants is crucial for determining the active metaphors; and such metaphors likely use sensorial imagery to convey abstract propositions.”
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“structure of the tale demands that the hero leave home at any cost”; hence, the narrative develops along the “route of the hero.”“44 “A fairy tale is likely to present the maturation of the protagonist, with whom both teller and audience tend to identify.”“45

Folktales share a symbolic structure, whether it is based on a primal metaphor (the Sun, desires, maturation, etc.) or not. Moreover, its symbolic readings can be relevant to each audience due to their unique life experiences and ideas. Communities share “common representations” while using the language in daily life. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson note that “most of our understanding of time is a metaphorical version of our understanding of motion in space.”“46 Lakoff and Johnson explains this harmony between the human nature and “conventional metaphors”: “Many of our experiences and activities are metaphorical in nature and that much of our conceptual system is structured by metaphor. Since we see similarities in terms of the categories of our conceptual system and in terms of the natural kinds of experiences we have (both of which may be metaphorical), it follows that many of the similarities that we perceive are a result of conventional metaphors that are part of our conceptual system.”“47

In this chapter I have discussed definition and classification of folktales and common elements of folktales based on a kind of fixed model of folktales in order to compare them with fixed model of tragedy in Aristotelian terms, by referencing previous studies, including the recent studies about folktales. In the second chapter I will discuss term of “catharsis”.
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II. Catharsis

Tragedy

The basic definition of “tragedy is “form of drama based on human suffering that invokes an accompanying catharsis or pleasure in audiences.” The term of “catharsis” which is associated with Aristotle; even though Aristotle's theory of catharsis is a response to Plato's negative view of artistic mimesis on an audience. Thus, tragedy is usually characterized by the term of “catharsis”.

However, Aristotle did not define the meaning of "catharsis" properly in his works, including “The Poetics”. While, Aristotle uses that term in the definition of “tragedy” in the Poetics. “Aristotle proceeds to define tragedy. It is ‘the imitation of an action that is good and also complete in itself and of some magnitude; in language with pleasurable accessories, each kind brought in separately in the parts of the work; in a dramatic, not in a narrative form; with incidents arousing pity and fear wherewith to accomplish its purgation of such emotions.”

*Aristotle's definition of tragedy:* “Ἐστὶν οὖν τραγῳδία μίμησις πράξεως σπουδαίας καὶ τελείας, μέγεθος ἐχούσης, ἠδυσμένῳ λόγῳ, χορίς ἐκάστῳ τὸν εἰδῶν ἐν τοῖς μορίοις, δρώντων καὶ οὐ δι’ ἀπαγγελίας, δι’ ἐλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν”

The description of “tragedy” above according to Aristotle is translated by using similar words that refer to similar meanings in various sources and translations:

“Tragedy is a « mimesis » of an action that is serious, complete in itself and of a certain magnitude; in language embellished with pleasurable accessories, each kind being found in separate parts of the work; in a dramatic not in a narrative form; through pity and fear effecting the proper katharsis of such painful emotions”.49

49 Spiegel, Nathan: The Nature of Katharsis according to Aristotle. A Reconsideration, 1965. (Download Date: 03.04.2018)
And another translation by Ingram Bywater:

"A tragedy, then, is the imitation of an action that is serious and also, as having magnitude, complete in itself; in language with pleasurable accessories, each kind brought in separately in the parts of the work; in a dramatic, not in a narrative form; with incidents arousing pity and fear, wherewith to accomplish its catharsis of such emotions."

**Catharsis**

Catharsis (κάθαρσις) process is not defined clearly in Poetics as it is discussed; however, there is a general use of the term that means “purification” that is also criticized:

“Let us quote F.L.Lucas at length on the meaning of catharsis: ‘First, there has been age-long controversy about Aristotle’s meaning, though it has almost always been accepted that whatever he meant was profoundly right. Many, for example, have translated Catharsis as ‘purification’, ‘Correction or refinement’ or the like. There is strong evidence that Catharsis means, not ‘Purification’, but ‘Purgation’ - a medical term (Aristotle was a son of a Physician.) Yet, owing to changes in medical thought, ‘Purgation’ has become radically misleading to modern minds. Inevitably we think of purgatives and complete evacuations of water products; and then outraged critics ask why our emotions should be so ill-treated. But Catharsis means ‘Purgation’, not in the modern, but in the older, wider English sense which includes the partial removal of excess ‘humours’. The theory is as old as the school of Hippocrates that on a due balance … of these humours depend the health of body and mind alike.” (F.L.Lucas) To translate Catharsis simply as purgation today is misleading owing to the change of meaning which the word has undergone. The theory of humours is outdated in the medical science. ‘Purgation’ has assumed different meanings. It is no longer what Aristotle had in mind. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to translate Catharsis as ‘moderating’ or ‘tempering’ of the passions. But such translation, as F.L.Lucas suggests, ‘keeps the sense but loses the metaphor’. However, when it is not possible to keep up both, the meaning and the metaphor, it is better to maintain the meaning and sacrifice the metaphor in translating Catharsis as ‘moderating’ or ‘tempering’. The passions to be moderated are those of pity and fear. The pity and fear to be moderated is, again, of specific kinds. There
can never be an excess in the pity that results into a useful action. But there can be too much of pity as an intense and helpless feeling, and there can be also too much of self-pity which is not a praise-worthy virtue. The Catharsis or moderation of such forms of pity ought to be achieved in the theatre or otherwise when possible, for such moderation keeps the mind in a healthy state of balance.”

According to many scholars “catharsis” of Aristotle helps the audience to purge of strong emotions by giving them a “pleasant relief”. “Others interpret Aristotle's treatment of catharsis to mean that we leave the theatre feeling emotionally spent -- the pity and terror of our real lives has been released in theatre, placed on a scape-goat and successfully ‘dealt with’ for awhile.”

The term of “catharsis” is interpreted in so various forms that it is possible to distinguish between at least six different groups of interpretations:

- medical interpretations and interpretations of catharsis as a natural process of discharge/release or outlet of emotions,
- catharsis conceived of as emotional and intellectual clarification,
- moral interpretations, including interpretations of catharsis as an education of the emotions,
- catharsis conceived of as the experience of emotional relief,
- aesthetic interpretations or interpretations of a dramatic or structural nature,
- complex or ‘holistic’ interpretations of catharsis”

Actually, catharsis is not purifying from all “bad” emotions nor “emotional relief”; but balance them while taking the “meaning” of the story via sympathy to the main character in order to gain experience.

“Aristotle treats both the spiritual and medical katharsis as a natural process. In nature there is an attraction of opposites. We see in nature two basic, opposite processes: absorption and
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expulsion (δέχεσθαι καὶ ἀφιέναι); we absorb air, water, food and the like, and expel their products. The situation in the spiritual realm is comparable. The soul absorbs different impressions, experiences, etc., and stores up παθήματα: travail, pains, all the bitterness of life and the helplessness of man. By means of contact with tragedy they are attracted from the depths of the soul and express themselves in a compassionate sigh (ἔλεος, οίκτος) and psychic shock (ὕππληξις). Although the percipient may think he is stunned by the tragic fate of the dramatic characters, he is in fact weeping for himself. Commoved by the fate of the hero, he actually experiences in the depths of his heart his own pain and sorrow. In the depths of the soul itself are pains and torments.”

**Model of Aristotelian Tragedy**

In order to talk about the term of catharsis, it is better to look over “ethics” of Aristotle. “States of character are formed from similar activities” according to Aristotle and “a good action” is “the right thing to do in the circumstances with good motive.”

A virtue can be a feeling, a capacity, or a disposition according to ideas of Aristotle: “Virtue cannot be a feeling like appetite-for-pleasure, anger, fear; we do not call men good or bad, praise or blame them, for feeling these; nor do they involve choice; nor are they the maintenance of an attitude, but mere passive affections. Nor, for similar reasons, can virtue be a mere capacity. It must therefore be a disposition, developed out of a capacity by the proper exercise of that capacity.” On the other hand, only relevant elements are not just “capacity” and “feelings”, but “extremes” are also relative issues: “There is an objective or arithmetical mean between extremes. But there is also a mean ‘relatively to us’ which is different for different people.”

“Wisdom is central to Aristotle's view of tragedy and the tragic hero's experience: the tragic experience is not meaningless, and its meaning, at the conclusion, is not wasted on the tragic hero; only the tragic experience itself completes the hero's journey to a deeper understanding of him or herself and the workings of the cosmos.”
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Catharsis is not simply ‘releasing’, ‘relief’, nor totally ‘purifying’ from all emotions; but helps “temperate” emotions; especially bad feelings like fear. Symbolic catharsis in psychology is only one interpretation of catharsis that focus on only the emotional result on audience; but not the ‘ethical’ experience that is the main aim of tragedy model of Aristotle. On the other hand, the “altruistic moral motivation” of Aristotle is seen in almost each folktale; moreover the main characters are also ordinary people whom are easy to get empathy like the main character prototype of Aristotelian tragedy model.

“Desire” is very related to “meaning”; thus, if mind do not want anything, nothing had any meaning. At the beginning of the tales, there is always a desire or a quest or a search; this goal oriented structure is common in folktales. The goal is usually the reason in folktales.

While the hero achieves her/his goal, the reader/audience has a kind of empathy to the main character and put themselves in her/his place. This process is simply called as “catharsis” today; but for sure this Aristotelian term has a deeper aim in ethics of Aristotle.

Sympathy to the main character is a must for catharsis process according to Aristotle. “We should feel it the hero must be ‘like our selves,’ but this is because without some degree of likeness we cannot feel sympathetic fear for him.”

Aristotle focused on one certain emotion, that is “fear”. “Pity” is the result of “fear” according to Aristotle. If we do not avoid of something by the help of “fear”; we can not have any “pity” to anyone; because there would be lack of “emotion”, even though there were an empathy. If you have pity to distant people, instead of your own family members, etc., it is much better according to ethics of Aristotle. Thus, the more love between subject/object means that the more pity, and also more fear to loose/not to achieve/reach/find anything. For sure, both emotions are painful for the subject and both of them exist in many folktales as well as in tragedies.

Brave and goal oriented character is awarded in tales in general; thus the lack of something in the beginning of the story offer an “unusual” cause and effect order; which is
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understandable by symbols within the same “order” of reason and result or in other terms “cause and effect”.

Main Features of Tragedies for Catharsis

Aristotle explains some features of tragedies and recommends a certain model of tragedy in the Poetics. Aristotle emphasizes “acts” and event orders in his work; tragedy is a mimesis not of persons but of actions and life. However, Aristotle also describes the features of “characters” of tragedy: “With regard to ‘character’ four rules are laid down. The characters must be good (though, as we have seen, not too good); they must be appropriate—e.g. to their sex; they must be like the legendary original; they must be consistent even if it be only in inconsistency. Above all, in character as in plot the necessary or the probable must be aimed at; speech and action must flow from character. For the proper way of indicating the ‘thought’ of the persons of the drama Aristotle refers us to the Rhetoric. What he has to say about ‘diction’ is partly an interesting analysis of the ‘parts of speech,’ partly a number of suggestions as to how poetry is to combine clearness with dignity by a judicious admixture of ordinary language with unusual forms, and above all with metaphor. ‘This is the one thing that cannot be learnt from others; and it is also a sign of genius, since a good metaphor implies an intuitive perception of the similarity in dissimilars.”

Furthermore, the less description of the main character helps catharsis, especially in written form that offer more focus on the events. And written text also causes flexible imagination which fits persons own background or dreams better than “already defined” images provide. However, tragedy gains similar features as “life experience”; just because “space and time” is used like in real life when it is “staged”. The form of the “story” is always another issue for both tragedies and folktales. “The means appropriate to the group are rhythm, language, and tune, and what these have in common is temporal succession, as opposed to the spatial extension by which painting and sculpture produce their effects. Visible spatial phenomena of course play their part in drama, but in Aristotle’s opinion this is a very subsidiary part; he would, we may conjecture, have thought it no great loss if the actors did their work behind a screen.”
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On the other hand, many tale narrators argue that the narrator should be with the audiences. But, “giving experience” and causing “empathy” which are the basic aims of catharsis are both common in tragedy and folktales in any form. Thus, tales could be in written form in spite of the fact that they were “recorded” orally for hundreds of years.

“‘The writer’s audience is always a fiction.’ The writer must set up a role in which absent and often unknown readers can cast themselves. Even in writing to a close friend I have to fictionalize a mood for him, to which he is expected to conform. The reader must also fictionalize the writer. When my friend reads my letter, I may be in an entirely different frame of mind from when I wrote it. Indeed, I may very well be dead. For a text to convey its message, it does not matter whether the author is dead or alive.”61

Actually, stories are not simply make others imagine what is described by words; but “transform” a certain order of events by the help of spoken, manual or written symbols. Thus, the form of the story is not prior element in catharsis whether it is a tragedy nor folktale.

In conclusion, the main function of catharsis process is feeding the mind via stories that reveal emotions. According to Aristotle, most proper type of story for catharsis is tragedy. However, if we apply Aristotelian model of tragedy on folktales, it is possible to say that folktales also cause catharsis that I will discuss in the third chapter.
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III. Catharsis in Folktales

Function of Catharsis in ‘Tragedy’ and ‘Folktale’

Meaning is the soul of language and language is the body of meaning. This “infinite mind-matter” duality of “meaning” and the “words” is “understandable” in their own contexts which are subjective and unique for each individual. These contexts are based on “cause and effect order” which occurs analytically as time and space in Cartesian system. While there is only “representation” of time and space in dreams which also include “understandable meaning” are other sources of experience. There is another source of experience as well; they are fictional stories that are also based on “cause and effect order”. Thus, “stories” are common “symbols” of life that gives us “experience” via “language” which is also accessible for each body in audio/written/symbolic form, even though they diverse etymologically. Words as representatives of meanings have a universal structure when they are replaced in a certain context like “tales”. Folktales have also common elements that I discussed and they also help to gain experience via catharsis. I want to compare tragedy and folktales according to Aristotle’s recipe for catharsis in tragedy and main structure of folktales; and show catharsis in folktales.

Good endings are not necessity according to ethical perspective of Aristotle. Ethics is related to the choices of the character; not his general personality in tragedies; while ethics is related to both general personality of the character and their choices in defined events in folktales.

In his recipe of tragedy Aristotle suggests fictional stories which cause emotional change on audiences and at the same time offer life experience and gives an ethical message which is represented via cause and effect order of the story. The background of the main character allows readers purify from also “judgements” in many modern tragedies; while folktales share stricter universal elements and rules that were created by communities in time.

Moral motivation must be altruistic according to Aristotle. Ethics in folktales have common elements; while in tragedies it has various forms up to unique events that help to gain experience without living them in daily life. “Reading around the theme of friendship in the texts available to us from the tale tradition of the Carpathian Basin offers us a remarkable analysis in a philosophical sense, without the conclusions being expressed in concrete
philosophical terms. So the question is how we can show the philosophical meaning of the tales that deal in whole or in part with the theme of friendship while also preserving the special spiritual world and the formal structure of the tale. How is it possible that the tale variants developed in closed peasant communities lead us to conclusions about friendship of identical or similar value to those formulated in the teachings of Cicero or Aristotle two thousand years ago?

Folktales are task oriented stories; and the task is achieved determinedly in the end. The main character follows a path up to her/his aim; so that she/he gets over obstacles and task is resolved. “Pity” which is based on an altruistic view is awarded at the end of the tale, while this pity may also cause disadvantageous effects that turn into cause of an advantageous effect or reward in many folktales and fairy tales. The main character is kind-hearted and usually “pity” is awarded morally, “unfair” events were at the beginning of the story; then are overcome by the character who also gives experience to reader/audience/observer but with “good end” that is an award of love.

“Love” is usually is the reward of the task in folktales and fairy tales; that cause the motivation to act in an altruistic way. Just like religions or ideologies like humanism, etc. tales also suggests a path avoiding harm fellows; but act individually.

Folktales consists sister/brotherhood in four ways:

1- The sisters/brothers are the aim of the story (The main character leaves home to search them due to lack of sisters/brothers)
2- The sisters/brothers are the symbolic characters who had failed the task previously (The main character tries after her/his sisters/brothers and achieves the task)
3- The sisters/brothers are the symbolic donor characters (They help the main character to manage the task)
4- The sisters/brothers are hostile but they are also saved (The main character do not any harm to her/his sisters/brothers; but she/he could be victim)

Cause and effect order in tragedies are more similar to histories and includes several events that are caused by both free will and destiny of the main character. “History describes events in which the necessary sequence of effect on cause is obscured by a thousand casual interventions; poetry, and particularly tragedy, depicts the inevitable dependence of destiny on character.” ⁶³

There is a cause and effect order in also folktales; but the events have ordinary or surreal elements that share symbolic structure that can even cause more empathy than any cause and effect order which is based on realistic events could offer. The main characters of the folktales are usually ordinary people who experiences surrealistic experiences; while the historical characters of tragedies are more defined strictly compared to the tale characters. However, the less probability reproduces more “universals that offer a generic truth that particular instances can not”. “Tragedy for Aristotle a mimesis that offers just such a ‘broad outline’ of the truth through the universals it represents.” ⁶⁴

Aristotle argues “In addition to which, we urge that the irrational sometimes does not violate reason; just as it is probable that a thing may happen contrary to probability.” ⁶⁵ Thus, while tragedies represent more universals compared to history, the folktales symbolize more universals compared to tragedies.

Folktale is a collective symbolic story that catharsis works in a bit different way compared to tragedy. Probability, necessity and rationality in Aristotelian model of tragedy turns into surrealistic symbols that represents elements in our daily reality and cause catharsis. Tales consist cause and effect, morally good manner character, misfortune that cause both “pity” and “fear”, which all Aristotle suggests for a good tragedy, as most proper story type for catharsis. While tragedy was the highest form of drama up to Aristotle, he does not exclude comedy nor epic poetry from catharsis process. Furthermore, reason is not violated by “wonder”; but this “wonder” has limits and they can only be seen as “fictional coincidence” in tragedy according to Aristotle. Even though tales have a “miraculous” surreal structure compared to tragedies (According to Aristotle, tragedies are limited fictions which is a result

of narrator’s main aim: imitation), the symbolic structure of “miracles” create a wider area where they are introduced to reality via catharsis.

*Similarities between tragedy and folktale*

The two story types both include a “cause-effect order” that has a certain moral aim. Main character is ordinary person in both many tragedies and folktales. However, Aristotle prefers “highly renowned” characters for tragedy. On the other hand, “empathy with” or “sympathy to” the main character is even easier in folktales starts with misfortune of a man like ourselves; compare to tragedies with historical characters.

*Differences between tragedy and folktale*

Tragedies consist “possible” events; while folktales are more surreal. However, surrealistic features give folktales symbolic structure; so they become more universal and easy to empathy by interpretation of “meaning” in an hermeneutical method. Tragedies share tragic endings; while folktales share good endings. However, Aristotle does not exclude other types of drama from catharsis. Moreover, any “extreme cruelty” at the beginning or middle of a folktale can reveal emotions and cause “catharsis”.

There is a gift as “good end” in general structure of folktale; while tragedy ends with misfortune. Misfortune or lack of something which both cause “desire” is always at the beginning and satisfied via “wonder” at the end of tales and behaviours based on “pity” of the main character is the “reason” of this gift in tales. Misfortune in tragedies is also related to moral acts; but not general behaviours of the main character, and plot is based on moral acts of the character in folktales as well and it gives a “goal” in catharsis process. Thus, tales are applied to therapy methods; but tragedies are not. In conclusion, tales cause purification of “fear” via “desire”.

“Pity” has a different role in folktales compare to tragedies that tales cause “pity” for the main character at the beginning; while “pity” is a result at the end of tragedies. Besides, behaviours related to “pity” of the protagonist is awarded within the plot of tales. However, “pity” is an emotion like “fear” and “desire” which is a kind of obstacle of “rational mind” if it has an extreme level according to Aristotle, as I discussed in the second chapter. Tragedy
helps to gain “experience” without living the events in real life and its method is “showing” in mind (or stage them visually); instead of telling pure ideas directly. “Character is that which reveals moral purpose, showing what kind of things a man chooses or avoids. Speechs, therefore, do not make this manifest /.../” This experience must be cruel in order to reveal emotions. On the other hand, “depth” of societies which are formed as “myths”, “legends”, “folktales” and even “religions” do not exclude “wonder”, and emotions like “pity” and “desire”, so that “good end” and extreme “absurdity” also cause a kind of catharsis as “purification of “fear” or “balance of emotions” in terms of “catharsis”.

Acts which includes “courage”, “singleness of purpose” and in most of tales (both fairy tales and folktales) “pity” is awarded at the end of the plot. “Rational mind” is capable of transform “miracles” into “daily life experience” because of their symbolic structure as a heritage of stories which are as ancient as language which is an another symbolic structure as I discussed in the first chapter.

Catharsis is also possible in folktales as well as catharsis in tragedy of Aristotelian model as I discussed. Both tragedy and tale consist cause and effect order and offer a kind of indirect experience to the reader/audience. While “necessity” and “probability” in tragedy cause empathy towards the main character in tragedy, tales offer an empathy via symbolism in tales. Ethics of Aristotle suggests a “balance” between “extremes”; the daily life is also “in between” Phoenix and dragons (we do not have extreme enemies, nor donors in reality); so that tragedy model of Aristotle includes realistic stories. However, other main typical features of Aristotelian tragedy model that serves the main goal of tragedy due to ethics of Aristotle are also seen in folktales that are known as mostly didactic stories of folks. Moral ideas of folktales match very well with altruistic elements of Aristotelian ethics. Furthermore, folktales share some common elements that cause more universal properties compare to tragedies created by individuals.

Folktales, which are created and transformed by communities resist the ideas of Plato. Plato refuses to gain any experience that comes from “limited perspective of any individual”. While Aristotle argues that not only our own experiences in life, but stories that offer various alternative forms of “events and choices” are also the source of experience for intelligent
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beings. Folktales also include various forms of “events and choices” that are key components of Aristotelian tragedy model.

“Plato and Aristotle are key figures in early literary theory who considered literature as simply one form of representation.” 67 While tales usually consist surrealistic universal codes that are easily adapted to personal daily lives of readers/audiences via capacity of human of using symbolistic elements like language. Thus, only “probability” criteria is violated in catharsis process in folktales; however, “symbolic structure” of tales compensate this criteria of Aristotle and by this way, the “representations” in folktales helps to teach moral values which is a necessity up to Aristotle. “Aristotle deemed mimesis as natural to man, therefore considered representations as necessary for people's learning and being in the world. Plato believed that representation needs therefore, to be controlled and monitored due to possible dangers resulting in its ability to foster antisocial emotions or encourage imitation of evil.” 68

Catharsis helps “temperate” emotions; especially bad feelings like fear and the “altruistic moral motivation” of Aristotle matches almost each folktale as I discussed before. While, ethics of Aristotle is based on both theory and practice, and also production.

“All action aims at something other than itself, and from its tendency to produce this it derives its value.” 69 According to Aristotle, any action or any production aim at some good, whence ‘good’ is defined as “at which all things aim’. Thus, one of the important ‘production’ is tragedy which includes also ‘actions’ in its content. Tales, which are another type of stories are also ‘productions’ that includes fictional ‘actions’. However, folktales are ‘productions’ of communities instead of individuals. Their authorship includes hundreds of “editor narrators” and “translator audiences”. Thus, folktales share a more advantageous ground against Plato who suggests to avoid from ‘productions’ of individual authorities that ‘tells’ what goodness is or risk of “misguide of rhetoricians” or “imitation of evil”.

Aristotle does not sacrifice “practice” and “production” in order to avoid “imitation of evil”:

“Aristotle argues that ‘good’ has no meaning common to all its applications. He argues, as he might have argued about any Platonic Form, that there is no Form of good separate from
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its particular manifestations; and that if there were it would be useless for practical purposes; the good for man is the widest good the contemplation of which will aid us in our daily life.”  

“The true difference between history and tragedy is that one relates what happened, the other what may happen. Poetry therefore, is a more philosophical and higher thing than history: for poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular.” Here is so tragedy offers “various” forms of “applications” of unique practices that serves our daily lives. Folktales also offer various “fictional” forms of “applications”, and even in a more “universal symbolic” form compare to tragedy that is a particular “work” of an individual. Moreover, folktales are recorded verbal; but serve in both orally and written form in people’s experience and learning.

‘Folktales’ in Practice: Tale Therapy Method

I want to take method of “fairy tale therapy” and some social researches as a kind of proof of what I discussed here about the functions of catharsis process in folktales by examples. Many of the folktales are symbolic stories that represents some quests of our daily lives. We can achieve our goals and overcome any obstacle by taking the protagonists of fairy tales or folktales as role models. Main characters of folktales are good hearted and determined in general as I discussed in the previous part of the study. Not only the quantity of characters; symbolic situations, events and even materials have equivalent reflections in real life as well. The main difference between folktales and other stories is not only “miracles” nor “happy endings, but their ages. Tales are organic just like the languages. And folktales are older than any living thing around us. Thus, folktales and especially fairy tales which are more surrealistic folktales have a common pattern that fits the tasks in our everyday lives. Folklorist Vladimir Propp had identified this pattern as “functions of fairy tales” as I discussed in the first chapter. Hero, villain, helper, donor, object of "lack" or quest; all follow a similar pattern in fairy tales and in life as well. If you have a good grasp of fairy tales (reading symbols and having a huge collection of tales) you can choose most similar pattern that fits your daily life or you can visit a tale therapist instead.
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“I often see at the first therapy session that there is a perfect ‘match’ between the life of the person sitting face to face with me and the fairy tale chosen by him or her: the tale tells the story of his or her life almost word for word, motif by motif. But it is very rare that this obvious connection is seen also by the client. However, in fairy tale therapy, the therapist is not meant to make this connection obvious or translate the tale for the clients, but instead to encourage an inner process by mediating the tale to them so that they find a connection between their own secret or unknown inner paths and the tale”

fairy tale therapist Ildikó Boldizsár says. Thus, there is an hermeneutic process “working” in fairy tale therapies that are unique for each individual; very similar to method of Freud, in his terms: “the intensity of self-observation” that I discussed in the first chapter.

This hermeneutic method is also underlined in studies of Péter Bálint: “What offers itself to us as a starting point for analysis is much rather an understanding of the tale situation (which is established at the very beginning of the tale by the relating of the problem of destiny and the disturbance of the hero’s life) and the hero’s understanding of the task required to solve the problems of his destiny, and in this context to grasp (or under- stand) the existential character of the hero. The tale situation created by the tale teller is fundamental in deciding the appearance of the hero in the world, or the arrival to and from the ‘otherworld’ and the way of life of the community in their environment, and any special circumstances prevailing (living under a curse, poverty, being an orphan, living in servitude, etc.). The tale starts with the hero’s attempts to discover his partly visible and partly hidden existential nature for himself. In this process of discovery (self-understanding) he must make use of all powers of enchantment, ‘greater knowledge’ and previously initiated helpers, (who either appear to the hero in a dream or who come out from behind a screen on the tale’s stage)...”

“Snow White” is an ancient fairy tale that can be interpreted in various ways. The “glass coffin” can be interpreted as the “sky” above us or the “apple” sounds like the same symbol in another ancient story. The truthful mirror, the helpful hunter, the gold-mining dwarfs and the apple are all “symbols” in the tale that represent an element in our daily lives, according to Boldizsár: “As a first step, the important thing is rather to begin working with the
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“location” where the problem has occurred. We can only answer the question “why has this person ended up in a glass coffin and how can he or she get out of it?” if we recognise ourselves in that glass coffin.”

Fairy tale therapy is a new interactive verbal therapeutic method that allows the client to receive “the message” of his/her own unique situation via a common pattern by the help of an interpreter. I do not want to take” fairy tale therapy” as an “new age” method because I am a firm believer in words and stories. But here, I want to make a distinction between folktales and mythological stories. Stories of Daphne, a sunflower, Odin and Zeus are different types of stories that are studied by many experts. Myth is closely related to the Jungian method of dream interpretation according to Joseph Campbell. This interpretation method is applied to folktales as well by tale therapists. Folktales share even more common structure if we compare a Märchen and a Greek fairy tale. Still, both myths and tales are pure stories that could help individuals in their daily lives. Ildikó Boldizsár says that “good ends” give clients hope and patience while they are struggling a problem. And believes that are free from “fear” usually cause better motivation and successful results as well.

Folktales give experience just like tragedies in written or audio form or when they are staged. The social studies show that listening to “stories” give experience sometimes even more than personal experiences. The biological studies also show that “visual imagery and visual perception draw on most of the same neural machinery in brain”.

Some researchers like Schank, Abelson and their colleagues went even further and argued that “stories about one's experiences, and the experiences of others, are the fundamental constituents of human memory, knowledge, and social communication.” “Virtually all human knowledge is based on stories constructed around past experiences and new experiences are interpreted in terms of old stories.”
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IV. Analysis of Folktale Samples

Characteristics of Hungarian Folktales

Hungarian folktales are rich in motifs and plots and they also match well to fairy tale functions of Vladimir Propp; thus these stories offer a fix pattern to apply Aristotelian model of catharsis.

The word “mese” which means “tale” in Hungarian language, derives from “mesl” etymologically. “The word ‘mesl’ that is originates from Abyssinia means ‘tale, example, pattern, model, comparison, anecdote’. First it passes through Aramaic as ‘masla’, then Hebrew as ‘mashal’, then Arabic as ‘mesel’, then Persian and Turkish as ‘masal’. This word also passes through to Hungarian language as ‘mese’”.  79

Hungarian folktales carry animism, determinism and “the harmonious combination of miraculous and rational elements” according to Boldizsár. Shamanic elements in Hungarian folktales is also one of their feature that folklorists and experts emphasize. “Hungarian folktales preserved the motif of a tree without a top, or the sky-high tree, from shamanic rituals dating from before the Magyar conquest, which has to be climbed in order to get something with healing or rejuvenating powers. Climbing the sky-high tree symbolises the victory of life over death. The motif of the protagonist’s being cut into pieces over and over again, as well as the motif of his death and rebirth, go back to the same period, just as the trials in folktales. In my view, these latter gauge the ability of a person to cross boundaries. The ancient motifs of spinning castles, the milky pond, the mountain of the world (the glass mountain), the water of life and death, and uniting with the magic steed are all recurring themes in Hungarian folktales.”  80

Corpus of Hungarian folktales, which have features like very strict cause and effect relation, moral characters, metaphoric miracles and “courage”, “pity” and “strength of purpose” as an awarded behaviour, is a very good example of “tale catharsis”. Thus, these folktales are used in some applied methods of therapies as well.

Analysis of Hungarian Folktales in terms of Catharsis

**Title of the Tale:** The Musical Silver Goat

**Source:** Illyés, Gyula: Once Upon A Time, Corvina Press, Budapest, 1964.

**Analysis:** main character is an ordinary person, misfortune and lack of something in the beginning, donor, cause-effect order, empathy, experience and “direct” ethical message about altruistic behaviour within tale, surrealistic features, happy ending.

The folktale begins with specific information about the king, who likes music. Here, both the “king” and the “music” can be read symbolically and literally as well. “Kings”, in folktales, are usually related to cosmos, nature, the God figure, universe, etc.; neither a real king nor a rich person. Thus, the “palace” of the king symbolizes the Earth with “alabaster walls”. And the main character, whose task is to protect the walls, destroys some part of it, and then is punished by the king. “Misfortune” comes at the beginning of the folktale. The main character, again, acts due to lack of something at the beginning, which fits to Propp’s diagram of functions.

The donor is, at the same time, the reward in this folktale. Cause and effect order of the events carry the main character to the happy end that matches with the last function of Propp: “Hero marries and ascends the throne.”\(^{81}\) These events have less surrealistic causes and reasons. Hungarian folktales contain more samples that have this typical realistic features. However, this folktale also includes surrealistic elements as “magical agent”\(^{82}\) like a “musical goat”, which brings the mythical story of Pan to mind. In spite of the fact that it is less possible to have a musical goat in reality, it is easier to transform its symbolic meaning into our own reality which is unique for each individual according to their world views.

Catharsis process starts at the beginning of the folktale. The main character, in other words, the “hero” is an ordinary common person and it gives a kind of advantage to empathy with the protagonist. It is even easier to feel “pity” for the main character, who is complaining about inequality and very common problems of life. “We should feel it the hero must be like
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\(^{82}\) Ibid.
our selves…”83 Thus, when sympathy is gained, catharsis process works during the folktale; especially while hero is in a dungeon and is suffering because of something morally wrong he has done. Aristotle suggests that the main character, who is not “evil” nor “too wise” personality, is supposed to act or behave in a morally bad way and is supposed to be punished due to this behaviour in a proper tragedy. This folktale is a very good example of this cause and effect order of Aristotelian model of tragedy. Aristotle argues that cause and effect order of the events ought to “show” the main idea of tragedy in question. However, Aristotle recommends avoiding of manifesting the main idea directly in speech of the story: “Speeches, therefore, do not make this manifest…”84 The main character reveals moral purpose by showing what to choose or avoid in this folktale; but conversations, too, manifest the main idea that love is the greatest value.

The theme is not based on usual conflicts like one between a dragon and a hero; but between a “forgiving” king and a hero. Thus, it symbolizes a kind of inner conflict and feeds the mind of audiences/readers in this way. The main thought is based on altruistic moral messages, which matches with the ethics of Aristotle here just like in most of the folktales.

***

Title of the Tale: The Old Man’s Vineyard


Analysis: main character is an ordinary person, donor, cause-effect order, empathy, altruistic behaviour, “pity”, surrealistic features, happy ending.

The folktale is based on the very common stereotype of “father and his three sons”. The competition between the youngest son and the elder sons is the main plot of the folktale. This kind of folktales has a hidden symbolic message to new generations in order to motivate “folks”. The father figure in this folktale, too, symbolizes cosmos, the God, universal laws, etc. While, “elder brothers” are not actually “brothers”, but they symbolize “others” (other folks, older generations or simply other people) and they “show” behaviours that should be

avoided. The main character, here again, is an ordinary person and this is an advantage for empathy and catharsis process. The youngest son achieves what the “others” failed. The folktale gives an altruistic moral message by showing the attitude of the main character, who feels pity for the frog unlike his brothers. Audience/readers do not pity the misfortune of the hero in this folktale, because the hero, himself shows what to choose or how to act without failing during the cause and effect order of events. “Pity” may cause disadvantageous effects that turn into cause of a reward in some folktales and fairy tales as I have discussed before. Snow White and some folktales which Ignác Kúnos collected are well known examples of this type of fairy tales. However, “pity” of hero is directly awarded right after his acts that include pity in this folktale. The donor is the one whom the hero has helped before because of his good manner. It is one of the typical features in folktales as Propp shows them at the 12th, 13th and 14th functions of the fairy tales in his table: “12. Hero is tested, interrogated, attacked etc., preparing the way for his/her receiving magical agent or helper (donor); 13. Hero reacts to actions of future donor (withstands/fails the test, frees captive, reconciles disputants, performs service, uses adversary’s powers against them); 14. Hero acquires use of a magical agent (directly transferred, located, purchased, prepared, spontaneously appears, eaten/drunk, help offered by other characters)”

This folktale consists closer enemies that Aristotle prefers for the ideal plot for tragedy: “The person who plans or does the tragic deed must be a friend or relative of him to whom it is (or is to be) done, not an enemy nor indifferent to him.” Brothers of the hero are a kind of “villains” whom the hero combats indirectly while achieving his tasks by the help of magical agents that he gained because of his moral behaviour.

The hero withstands the test so; we did not cry at the beginning nor at the middle of the folktale; however, the term of “catharsis” does not mean emotional relief; but has a kind of experience from stories that give moral lessons by the help of emotions as I have discussed it in the second chapter. “Wisdom is central to Aristotle's view of tragedy and the tragic hero's experience…” Here, audiences/readers do not have pity on the main character (except the misfortune of the family at the beginning); but the behaviour of the main
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character and order of the events show what to choose and what to avoid by the help of “thrill” which is the dominant emotion of audiences/readers in this folktale.

Surrealistic features of this folktale are much more compared to the previous folktale. Talking animals, magical agents and tough tasks present in the folktale as symbolic objects and situations that can be interpreted in various forms due to each individual’s own unique world view and experiences in a hermeneutic way.

***

**Title of the Tale:** The Star-Eyed Shepherd

**Source:** Benedek, Elek: A Csillagszemű Juhász, TKK, Debrecen & The Kecskemét Film Studio, 2017.

**Analysis:** main character is an ordinary person, empathy, hero leaves home in the beginning, magical agent, surrealistic features, cause-effect order, experience, altruistic behaviour within tale, happy ending.

Here’s journey starts by his declaration to his parents that he wanted to leave home to seek his fortune. This is one of the typical beginnings of many folktales right after the story starter rhyme. Here there is not a misfortune but lack of something that is required to be searched for. Adventure begins with the inner motive of the main character, who is an ordinary person in this folktale, too. That is, it becomes easier to feel empathy towards the main character. Even today in our daily lives, many people leave their origin families to seek their fortune “outside”.

The star-eyed shepherd finds out a kind of magical agent; his flute which symbolizes “his talent and attitudes” by coincidences that are following a path of cause and effect order. Soon after, when hero meets the king, the misfortune of the character keeps the story fluent and cause emotions like “pity” and “thrill” as cathartic influence on the audiences/readers.

Unlike the main character at the folktale titled “Musical Silver Goat”, the protagonist in this folktale withstands the tests that are created by the king who symbolizes “villain” in terms of Propp in this story. The “cruel” king demands for appreciation from people and blessings from God. There is a kind of indirect combat with the villain and the hero. The king also
creates a “test of strength” in terms of Propp. The main character who is goal oriented just like in most of the folktales as I have discussed before in the third chapter, withstands this second test, too. The hero marries and ascends the throne in the end that matches to the last function of Propp’s diagram: “Hero is rewarded/promoted.”

The main character waits for the owner of the sheep and does not give up his love for money in the folktale. This kind of altruistic behaviour is recommended by Aristotle for proper tragedies; but as a “one-off fault” of the main character, who fails instead of withstanding them or some error of judgment: “The proper tragic hero, then, is ‘the intermediate kind of personage, a man not pre-eminently virtuous and just, whose misfortune, however, is brought upon him not by vice and depravity but by some error of judgment—a man, too, who is in the enjoyment of great reputation and prosperity.” “Error of judgement” is also present in folktales in the form of “first two attempts of the hero” or “two elder sisters/brothers”.

***

Title of the Tale: The Pussycat Princess

Source: The Kecskemé Film Studio, 2017.

Analysis: empathy, lack of something in the beginning, donor, cause-effect order, experience and surrealistic features, happy ending.

The folktale begins right after the start up phrase with a typical beginning of many folktales that include a plot about king, sultan, etc. and a kind of competition between his three daughters/sons. Rivalry in question is not so cruel as to lead to antagonism in this folktale. However, the story is based on competition between brothers.

The main character of the folktale experiences some certain events in cause and effect order by his goal oriented character even though it reflects a passive behaviour in this folktale. The youngest son does accept the ideas of the cat although they are illogical; instead of
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underestimating the donor. Thus, the donor turns into reward as the main goal of the hero in the beginning of the tale.

The hero achieves his task in the end by the help of the donor and his reaction to actions of the donor and also to future reward of the folktale. Here, again, the 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th function of the fairy tales according to Propp’s diagram can be seen: “12. Hero is tested, interrogated, attacked etc., preparing the way for his/her receiving magical agent or helper (donor); 13. Hero reacts to actions of future donor (withstands/fails the test, frees captive, reconciles disputants, performs service, uses adversary’s powers against them); 14. Hero acquires use of a magical agent (directly transferred, located, purchased, prepared, spontaneously appears, eaten/drunk, help offered by other characters); 15. Hero is transferred, delivered or led to whereabouts of an object of the search”90

The main character, who is not an ordinary person, is still a sympathetic figure for the audiences/readers to feel empathy. His brothers and their fiancées symbolize others and cat princess represents “loved one” of ours who is better than others’ up to us. Thus, the tale offers empathy to the main character and it becomes easier to share his emotions for the audiences/readers during the flow of the events, which include typical triple cycle of repeating patterns of fairy tales.

***

Title of the Tale: Fisher Joe

Source: Jones, W. Henry: The Folktales of the Magyars, 1889.

Analysis: main character is an ordinary person, cause-effect order, empathy, experience and “direct” ethical message about altruistic behaviour within tale, surrealistic features, donor, task oriented, good ending.

The folktale begins with the misfortune of the main character who is an ordinary person; thus it is easier to empathy with for audiences/readers. “Fishing” symbolizes “seeking his own fortune” that is a common pattern of hero’s journey in folktales. However, the hero rewarded/promoted in the middle of this folktale; instead of in the end. While, the main
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conflict of the story is based on a task of “defend”, instead of “reach”. There is a similar pattern that “donor” also represents “reward” of the hero; just like the previous folktale titled “The Pussycat Princess”, even though the motifs of the two tales are different. The hero reacts in a positive way to the help of donor in this folktale, too. While, this folktale includes “direct” ethical messages about altruistic behaviours like “setting table for poor” and “avoiding from envy” by the help of religious figures. “Aristotle is bound to give the preference to plot, which is character-in-action.”

Therefore, acts of the main character and conversations should “show” the main thought of the story according to Aristotle.

The tragedy of the hero is related to his “error of judgement” in the sense of Aristotle; in other words, “wrong decision” that is inviting the baron who is his “villain” in terms of Propp. The hero achieves his tasks by the help of magical agents which the donor offers; instead of a direct combat with the villain in this folktale. These illogical tasks consist of quests that are all related to “time” that is impossible to interfere with. However, the hero achieves them by surrealist methods that can be interpreted as various symbolic forms during the process of catharsis while reading/listening/watching the folktale.
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V. Conclusion

There is a phrase, a question indeed, “Who knows a lot; the one who travels more or the one who reads more?” Direct experience and indirect experience could be gained from others’ stories by both observation and empathy which occur with also fictional characters.

Folktales which are verbal elements of different cultures are also universal semantic forms of “literary culture”. Folktales are not simply part of children’s literature; these surreal stories give some clues about daily lives as well. The benefit of empathy that is related to catharsis process in folktales are also used in tale therapy methods.

Catharsis process is possible in both tragedy and folktale; so they both offer a kind of “experience” via stories. According to Aristotle, men in general enjoy seeing a likeness between nature and imitation. The stories, in the form of poetry, are the imitations of action and all success and failure depends on actions according to Aristotle. But tragedy is an imitation not only of a complete action, but of events terrible and pitiful. Aristotle argues that these kinds of events produce more effect. “/…/ the rousing of the emotions by poetry has an effect upon the whole personality of the spectator or reader and on his emotional behaviour in real life.”92 It should satisfy the moral sense and it is proper for tragedies call forth pity or fear. It is also possible in folktales to feel pity for the main character at the beginning or middle of the story, especially if they are common people like us.

A good film does not only consist of its convincing special effects, but also of its plot. We feel pity for the protagonist when they get wounded, even though we are sure that it is fake-blood. Thus, audiences reveal their emotions and are so convinced that they begin to feel empathy toward the characters even though they do know that they are watching/reading a fictitious story and they are aware of it not being real. Plot, character and thought are previous elements for catharsis according to Aristotle. Aristotle emphasizes “reversal of fortune” of the main character while explaining his model of tragedy: “Every true tragedy implies, indeed, a change from happiness to unhappiness or from unhappiness to happiness…”93

Folktales and tragedies play an important role in societies. They are one of the representations of culture, they have artistic and also practical moral values in communities. Stories are—and always have been—part of the culture available for the most. The notion of the Aristotelian model of catharsis is a useful tool in this sense. In conclusion, catharsis process is possible in folktales, as much as in tragedies. Catharsis is the balance of emotions while taking a kind of moral experience from the stories of the others. The “other” is a fictional character that the audience/reader feel empathy to. Empathy to someone, who is not close to us is possible by emotions; especially fear. “Fear” develops not only during our own direct experiences, but also when we put ourselves in the position of someone else. This is the process of catharsis. We are able to be in this process without being convinced that the story is real. Extreme surreal elements of folktales also cause feelings like “thrill”, besides “fear”, although it is obvious that story is not real.

Furthermore, humans have the potential of symbolic thinking; for instance, our linguistic capacity. Thus, symbolic structure of folktales offer a different kind of catharsis compared to tragedies. Catharsis in folktales is more metaphoric and these kind of stories are easy to apply to our own unique realities in hermeneutic way according to our world views and perceptions that is related to our unique contexts. The misfortune of an ordinary common person at the beginning of the story offers highly sympathetic elements right from the start of the folktales. The events that follow the path of cause and effect order and thoughts which are the most important ingredients of Aristotelian model of tragedy are present in also folktales. Thus, folktales, which are stories created by collective mind cause an experience of catharsis as well as in tragedies.
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Appendix 1

The Musical Silver Goat

Once upon a time there was an old king who liked music. He had a huge palace built, the very walls of which were of alabaster. That is, the palace was so beautiful that anyone passing by could not help stopping to admire it but touched its smooth shining walls with his hands.

And the king was very anxious about his palace. He had it watched by sentinels, day and night, lest any passer-by dare soil the smooth White walls or, God forbid, bescribble them. On a cold winter night, a sentinel again stood watch at the palace wall. It was a wonderful moonlit night and very, very cold. What a fine life these great lords lead, the soldier thought to himself bitterly. While a poor man has to freeze out here in the dark, the rich wrap themselves up in warm blankets or sit at the fireplace and don’t care a rap about the outside world. But then, what could a poor man like him do? If his lord the king says: “Go out there, my lad, and stand guard,” he must obey. Order is order, and that’s all there is to it.

Time and again he rubbed his hands and blew on his fingertips, but little good it did him. The moon shone, the snow crunched under his feet, and he thought that if he were the king he would now be asleep in a warm room and the king would be cursing the weather out here. No, it wouldn’t be right, for in this case he himself would be cursed by the king standing guard in his stead. Damn it all-nothing is right in this big world! So he walked on, up and down, up and down, and the moon shone and its light was thrown back by the White alabaster walls.

Then, all of a sudden, the soldier stopped. A queer idea had flashed across his mind. Let the world at large know at last how hard it goes with the poor! He picked up a piece of charcoal from the ground and wrote on the wall, in big scrawling letters:

He who has Money has the world at his feet,
He who has none, he has nothing to eat!
For some time, he dwelt on his wisdom, feasting his eyes on his own scrawling. It did not even occur to him that the king had had him placed here for the very purpose of watching over the walls. And now he of all people had soiled them!

Early in the morning the officers came to check whether all had been well during the night. They saw the scrawled letters on the wall, so they asked the soldier who had done it. Poor man, what could he tell them? He admitted having written the saying on the wall. He said he did it because he was convinced that money rules the world.

He was escorted before the king, and the king asked:
“So it is only money you want?”
“Yes, Your Majesty,” answered the soldier boldly.
“Then you shall die!”

However, the soldier’s straightforward answer appealed to the princess, and so did, for that matter, his looks. She asked her father, the king, to pardon him.
“All right,” said the king. “I shall not do him any harm. Let Money itself give him a lesson for his insolence.”

Now the king had a large garden which stretched from his palace way down to the outskirts of the city. As a punishment, he had the sentinel walled in there, in a dungeon under the stone fence. And since the soldier had complained that he had no money, the king had heaps of money, gold and silver coins, given to him. Now he would have the wherewithal to entertain himself; he would have everything in the world-money!

The princess grew sadder and sadder. What should she do?
There was a goldsmith in the city. She looked him up and asked his advice. The goldsmith was a poor man. The same night he went to see the place where the soldier had been walled in. He made a hole in the stone fence and called to the soldier to give him some of the gold and silver coins and, in return, he would hand in food for him regularly. The soldier agreed, of course. Meanwhile, the princess racked her brains how she could appease her father. At long last she had an idea.

She had all the treasure in the dungeon carried away by the goldsmith. In this way, the walled-in prisoner did not starve; in fact, he felt tolerably well. The goldsmith was a master
craftsman; he welded the gold and silver coins and made a goat out of them—a goat that was empty inside so that a man could sit down in it. What is more, the goat could make such wonderful music that anybody who heard it completely forgot about his troubles and could only listen to the sweet music. Having given the finishing touch to his masterpiece, the goldsmith removed the masonry of the prison Wall at the edge of the garden and pushed in the goat for the soldier, so that in his gloomy hours he might amuse himself with it and listen to the music it made.

And amuse himself he did, whenever he had the prison creeps. On such occasions, he wound up the musical box hidden in the goat and listened to the sweet sounds that came out of it. He did so particularly when he heard steps in the garden, for he knew that the king alone had free access to it.

One day, when the king was walking in his garden, he happened to pass the place where the soldier was immured. He heard something, as though strains of sweet music were coming out of nowhere. What could it be? And where did it come from? He looked this way and that, but could not see a thing.

Next day he went to walk in the garden with his daughter and his minister. The soldier-boy, down there in the dungeon, must have been in high spirits, because he made the goat sound with a vengeance.

“Now, I must really find out where this music comes from,” said the king. He had a good look at the place, but he had long since forgotten about the soldier who once had been walled in at his command because he had soiled the palace wall with some scrawled adage. Nevertheless, he sent for masons and ordered them to dig up the ground about the place where he heard the music.

The masons dug away, they dug, and lo! they hit upon the subterranean chamber in which, a long long time ago, the soldier had been buried alive. But look as they might, they saw nothing but a silver goat. And the wonderful sounds of music practically poured forth from it and would not cease.
The king lifted up the musical goat and carried it into his palace room. There they examined it from front and back, but were unable to find out how it could sound so wonderfully. The king then noticed that there was a keyhole in the goat’s belly. They tried to open it, but they had no key to it. Thereupon the king sent for the goldsmiths of his city—but it was all of no avail; they could not do the job. Finally, the king sent for the very goldsmith who had made the goat. And this master craftsman did open the lock at the king’s command.

The king opened his eyes wide when he saw a live soldier step out of the goat.

“Who are you?” the king snapped at him.

The soldier stood at attention.

“Your Majesty, I am the sentinel Your Majesty had walled in at the time because I wrote upon the palace wall that money rules the world. Well, it doesn’t...”

The king shook hands with him.

“What then is worth more than money?” he asked.

The soldier looked at the goldsmith who was standing at the king’s side and said:

“Secondly, a friend in need, who is a friend indeed.”

“Why secondly?” asked the king. “What comes first? What is of greater value?”

The soldier’s gaze now rested on the princess. And he said:

“The first and greatest thing is when a man wins a woman’s love.”

The princess flushed crimson red, but the king only laughed at his soldier’s wit. Now he understood all that had happened. And then he, too, had an idea. He decided, there and then, to give his daughter in marriage to the soldier. Soon a great wedding was made to which no musicians had to be invited because the silver goat made the music for three days and three nights and next day, too, from early morn to dewy eve.
Appendix 2

The Old Man’s Vineyard

Once upon a time in a far land, there lived a poor man who has three sons. Poor man had a tiny vineyard, he had no more than that. And he got his vineyard as if it were gold. His sons were those who have the task to stand and watch over the vineyard all day and all night.

One morning it was his oldest sun’s turn to guard the vineyard and the boy sat down and started to eat. While he was eating a frog come and sat in front of him, and said, “Hi! Give me a bite of your bread, young man. I haven’t eaten for two long weeks.” “When pigs learn to fly!”, said the young fellow and chased the frog away. The frog left in silence and the boy felt fast asleep. When he woke again the vineyard had been so badly scattered that the boy was filled with fear.

Next day the middle boy went to the vineyard. He, too, was asked for bread by the frog, but he also chased the frog away and threwed a stone at the beast. Then he laid down, fell asleep and when he awoke, less than half, the vineyard remained.

“Hey,”, the poor man warned, “all we have is that tiny vineyard and they can’t even look after that!” Then the youngest boy said “Worry not, father, what is left will be safe now for I shall guard it.” So the youngest son went to the vineyard, sat down to eat and a frog came and asked him for bread. But of course, he takes some then he broke up a crust and gave it happily to the frog, “Eat, frog, for you, one of God’s creatures, too.” “You are a good boy and you will be rewarded for your kindness in time. Now I shall give you one copper, one silver and one golden rod. During the night three horses will come, one of them will be copper, one silver and one will be in golden colour. They will come to trample your vines; but if you strike them with these rods, they will be attained in an instant.

The night came at last and the three horses came and started to kick the vine stocks and crushed the grapes. But the youngest son was soon to act and hit them with all three rods. Then the horses were attained and stood instead like three simple sheeps.
“Don’t hurt us!”, the horses pleaded, “When you need help, wave the rods in the air and we will appear.
Then the boy went home. But the youngest son decided not to tell his brothers and his father of what had happened that night. All three was surprised by the crop that was so abandoned that they could barely gathered it and no one in the village had vines as rich as that.

Time passed slowly by and one day the king decided to erect a pine tree outside the church, then he placed a golden sprit of rosemary at the top point of the tree and told the world that he would give his daughter’s hand in marriage to the first man who could snatch the golden rosemary from the top point of tree. All men had tried their hand but none could jump higher than half that is required. And when all of them had crept the way in shame, a fine fellow appeared on a copper-head horse; he wore a copper helmet so his face could not be seen. Then he speeds on his horse, let it high in the air, snatch the golden rosemary and rode away. The copper knight was the poor man’s youngest son of course. He went home in his tatty clothes and was sitting in the corner when his father and two brothers returned to the house, because they, too, had witnessed the contest. His brothers told to the youngest one what they had seen.

“I, too, saw what happened.”
“But, how is that so?”
“Because I stood at top of the fence and watched from there.”

His brothers were so furious that they smashed the fence to stop him watch again.

The next Sunday, the king placed a golden apple on an even taller tree. Many men had tried their hand but all again in vain. But as they walked the way in shame, a knight appeared at back of a silver-head horse and the knight wore a silver helmet to hide his face. With one jump he grabbed the golden apple and vanished. By the time his father and brothers returned, the youngest son was sitting in the corner again. They quickly regarded him again what they had seen which is invisible to him from the corner.

“Oh, I saw them better than both of you.”
“How is that so?”
“I climbed the top of pig’s lair roof.”
The brothers were so furious that they tore the pig’s liar down to stop him watching from there again.
The third Sunday came and the king put a golden scarf at top the tallest pine tree. And it was the poor man’s youngest son who again snatched the scarf. He escaped without them recognize again, because he rode a golden-head horse and wore a golden helmet to hide his face. At home the brothers both told what they had seen.
“‘I saw them better than you.’”
“‘How is that so?’”
“‘Where from? From at top of the house’s roof, of course.’”
His brothers were so furious that then they tore the roof to pieces.

Meanwhile the king declared that the knight should appear who had taken the golden rosemary, the golden apple and the golden scarf. But the days became weeks, the weeks became months and no one came forth. Then the king summoned all the men in the land to his palace. But the famous knight was still not among them. All of them gone and a young man appeared with hair and clothes of gleaming gold, the golden rosemary in his hat, he leads his horse with golden scarf and he had the golden apple in his hand. Thank Heaven, he had appeared at last. The king was delighted and the princess overjoyed. The wedding was helded very next day. The king gave the knight half of his kingdom and they all lived happily ever after.
Once upon a time there lived a poor man. He had only one son and a wife. One day his son said, “Father, I am going to leave home and seek my fortune. “Son, be sure take the path, whether there is no mug”. Then his parents gave the boy food and said farewell. The boy walked and walked. He walked his way across seven lands, he did not stop until he arrived a lush green meadow where he saw a flock of sheep grazen unattended. “Those sheep were all left alone. I should watch over them until the shepherd returns” he thought. The time passed but no shepherd appeared. The boy stays with the sheep until he ran out of food. He thought he should take the sheep to the local town and sell few of them to buy some food for himself. The boy walked down into the town and sold some of the lambs to the local butcher, he then uses the money to purchase all he needed and settle down with the sheep at the town.

A king also lived in this town and he was a very cruel king indeed. He was so cruel that people were executed for not saying him “Bless you” whenever he happened to sneeze. One Sunday morning the king sneezed unusually loudly and all of his soldiers rode all over the country to order the common people to say “Bless you, highness, your very good health.” The young shepherd was still out in the meadow watching his flock when the soldiers rode up to him and ordered him to bless the king, but he refused to obey until the king granted him the hand of his beautiful daughter. So the soldiers caught the shepherd boy off to the palace and presented him to the king. The king’s beautiful daughter was also there when they arrived and she liked the young shepherd but said nothing of it to anyone.

Then the king addressed the shepherd saying,
“Will you not bless me, your king, and wish me good health?”
“I will not, your Highness, even if you have me killed; that I happily would if you let me marry your beautiful daughter.”
“A lonely shepherd boy like you will never marry my beautiful daughter!”

Then he ordered his soldiers to throw the shepherd boy to the hungry, wild pigs. There, the shepherd boy took out his flute and played many tunes to the fat pigs and the pigs like the music so much that they began to dance. The shepherd made them dance until the
pigs began to sweat and also tired that they felt fast asleep. Then the star-eyed shepherd felt
tired, too and laid his head down for the night. In the morning the marchal went to see if the
boy was still alive and when he saw that he was, he took him before the king again.

“Now, young shepherd wish that God blessed me and give me good health.”
“I will not, your Majesty, not until you grant your daughter’s hand, not even if you throw
me into the pit.
“Guards! Throw him into the pit with the side blades!”
“If I fast fell down into the pit,” the shepherd thought, “the blades will cut me to the shreds.”
The soldiers asked him again, “Well, will you now ask the God to bless the king and wish
him good health?”
“Wait one minute, my good man, leave me alone for a moment while I think.”

So the soldiers left the star-eyed shepherd alone. The young shepherd stuck his crook into
the ground and put his hat on the top of crook. He shouted to the soldiers, “Now you can
come in and do with me what you will for I shall never wish the God bless the king and give
him good health!”, then he swiftly hid himself in the dark corner. The soldiers saw the crook
and the hat of shepherd boy; so they threwed them into the pit. The candle down in the pit
went out and so they thought the poor shepherd had landed on it and died.

The very next morning the marchal went out to check the pit. He heard a pretty tune playing
on a flute inside. “What I heard come this mean?” It is impossible that the shepherd is playing
his flute; so he opens the door of the house and saw the shepherd there merrily blowing his
flute.

He locked the door on the shepherd and run back to the king.
“Your Royal Highness, the star-eyed shepherd is still alive!”
“Bring him before me, once!”, the king demanded.
The shepherd was again presented and the king again told him, “Ask the God bless me and
wish me good health.”
“I will never do such a thing until I can marry your daughter even if you have me thrown to
the owls.
“Take him to the tower. He will soon beg the God to bless me and wish me good health
when the hungry owls pick out his starry eyes.”
So they took the shepherd boy to a chamber in the tower. But as soon as the door has closed, he took out his flute and began to play and a miraculous thing happened. All the animals in the tower began to dance to his merry tune. The animals screeched and the young shepherd made them dance till they all went tired. Then they all pulled themselves away and fell fast asleep. And the shepherd joined them and slept until morning.

The next morning the marchal went up to the tower. He opened the door to see the boy sitting there and laughing at the results of his content. The marchal went quickly back to his master.
“Your Highness, the shepherd is laughing as happily as he owns the all land.”
“What an interesting boy he is! Bring him here, at once.”
“It is true that you can not be killed. Now, sit in the golden carriage.”

So the shepherd boy sat in the golden carriage and they drove deep into the silver forest. And the king asked,
“Tell me, shepherd, if I gave you this splendid silver forest, would you ask the God to bless me and wish me good health?”
“No, Your Royal Highness, I would not. It is not the silver forest that I long for, but your daughter.”
Then they drove further and came to a golden pond in which all the fishes and water creatures were made of purest gold. Then the king asked once more,
“If I gave you this pond, would you ask the God bless me and wish me good health?”
“No, never, Your Royal Highness.”
“Then, let’s drive on!”
They soon arrived a wonderful meadow that made of marble and there was standing a palace which has walls made of sparkling diamonds. It thoroughly was a beautiful palace.
“Now, shepherd, ask God that bless me and wish me a very good health.”
“I will not, Your Royal Highness, until I can marry your daughter.”
“What a terrible fellow you are?!?”
And there is nothing else left could done. The king let it to be known that his daughter would marry the star-eyed shepherd and the wedding would be in two days time. He warmly welcomed all his subjects to the feast and offered them good food and fine wine and all the men in the kingdom attended along there with their wives.
The table was full of delicious food including hot pepper that made the old king sneeze. Then the shepherd begun to say

“May the God bless you, Highness, and give you good health!”

“May the God bless you, Highness, and give you good health!”

“May the God bless you, Highness, and give you good health!”

And he said it over and over until the king interrupted,

“Stop telling me that, son-in-law! If you stop saying it, I will grant you all I have, my country and my kingdom, too.”

And the king gave all these things to star-eyed shepherd whose both parents moved to the palace where all lived happily ever after.
Appendix 4

The Pussycat Princess

Once upon a time, there lived a king and the king had three sons. All three princes were at marrying age and so that their father told them to find themselves wives. He threwed his three sticks in the air, one for each son and said, “Wherever your stick falls, is way you find your bride. The eldest son’s stick felt towards a young baroness. The middle son’s stick felt towards a young countess. Well, the youngest son’s stick felt towards the dark forest.

The young men all left the palace and the youngest one was very said. He had no idea where he would find a bride in the thick forest. And as he was walking in the forest, he met a small pussycat that walked behind him. The young prince spoke to the pussycat and said, “My royal father told me to travel to forest where I would find my bride, but I can’t see again, anyone near.”

“Don’t worry, I will marry you.”

The prince could not return home until he promises to marry the pussycat.

The other princes had already arrived back. And their father asked them each what they told of their bride. The eldest one said that he found a baroness, and the middle son said that he found a countess. Well, the youngest one asked them to wait and see.

Then the king ordered all the three grooms to bunch a beautiful bouquet from their beloved. The two elder ones went happily, but the youngest one was very said. When he reached the edge of the forest, the pussycat was already waiting for him.

“My dear betrothed, you look so unhappy. Tell me, why you so sad?”

“How wouldn’t I be said when my royal father has ordered us all to bring a bouquet from our young fiancées? Now, what could I bring from a pussycat?”

“Don’t worry. Just lie down and take a rest.”

Then the pussycat scratches the tree and many more pussycats appeared. One of them brought silver flowers, another golden flowers and the third brought diamond flowers. And the bride arranged them all in a beautiful bouquet.
The other two princes were already at home, when the young prince has arrived yet. The king said that the bouquets were truly beautiful, but the most beautiful of all belonged to the youngest son. They all asked him to tell the name of his bride to be. But he asked them, too, wait and see.

Days passed and soon became a week when the king ordered his sons to go their brides and fetch an handkerchief each. The young princes all left, but the youngest one was very sad. By the time he reached the edge of the forest, the pussycat was already waiting for him.

“My dear betrothed, you look so unhappy. Tell me, why are you so sad?”

“How wouldn’t I be said when my royal father has ordered us all to bring a handkerchief from our young fiancees? But a pussycat can not weep.”

“Don’t worry. Just lie down and take a rest.”

The pussycat scratches the tree and once again many more pussycats appeared. One of them brought silver yarn, another brought golden yarn and the third gave diamond yarn. And the pussycat bride weaved them together.

When he arrived to the palace, the king expected all three handkerchiefs. He told the oldest boys that theirs were quite pretty, but he told the youngest son that his was the prettiest of all.

Weeks passed and soon became a month when the king told his sons to bring their fiancees to the palace. The two elder boys went happily, while the youngest one became sadder then ever before. How could he possibly take the pussycat home? His pussycat bride was waiting for him at the edge of the forest.

“Dear betrothed, you look so unhappy. Tell me, why are you so sad?”

“How wouldn’t I be said when my royal father has ordered us all to fetch our brides? Now, how can I present a pussycat to the palace?”

“Don’t worry. Just lie down and take a rest.”

The youngest prince thought that he would never sleep, but at last he fell into a slumber. When he awoke, he was very worried. But the young princess told him that it was she who was in form of pussycat whom he betrothed. But she had been under a curse and live like that, until a young man asked for her hand in marriage. “I was a pussycat and you asked me to marry you, so I turn back into a princess.”
A wonderful coach was awaiting for them with a proud coachman and fine horses. So the prince sat in the carriage with his princess and travel back to the palace in regal style. The wedding party was already on the way in the palace, when the guards came to the king and told him that a king had arrived from another country. When the young couple arrived, the king soon saw that they were his son and his beautiful bride. They were all amazed to discover that the youngest princess bride was the most beautiful of them all. Then they all sang and danced, and danced and sang until the wedding party was done. And this is where my story ends.
Here was once a poor man, who had nothing in the world but his wife and an unhappy son Joe. His continual and his only care was how to keep them: so he determined to go fishing, and thus to keep them from day to day upon whatever the Lord brought to his net. Suddenly both the old folks died and left the unhappy son by himself; he went behind the oven and did not come out till both father and mother were buried; he sat three days behind the oven, and then remembered that his father had kept them by fishing; so he got up, took his net, and went fishing below the weir: there he fished till the skin began to peel off the palms of his hands, and never caught so much as one fish. At last he said, “I will cast my net once more, and then I will never do so again.” So he cast his net for the last time and drew to shore a golden fish. While he was going home he thought he would give it to the lord of the manor, so that perhaps he might grant a day's wages for it. When he got home he took down a plate from the rack, took the fish from his bag, and laid it upon the plate; but the fish slipped off the plate and changed into a lovely girl, who said, “I am thine, and you are mine, love.” The moment after she asked, “Joe, did your father leave you anything?” “We had something”, replied her husband; “but my father was poor and he sold everything; but”, continued he, “do you see that high mountain yonder? it is not sold yet, for it is too steep and no one would have it.” Then said his wife, “Let's go for a walk and look over the mountain.”

So they went all over it, length and breadth, from furrow to furrow. When they came to a furrow in the middle his wife said, “Let us sit down on a ridge, my love, and rest a little.” They sat down, and Joe laid his head on his wife's lap and fell asleep. She then slipped off her cloak, made it into a pillow, drew herself away, and laid Joe upon the pillow without waking him. She rose, went away, uncoiled a large whip and cracked it. The crack was heard over seven times seven countries. In a moment as many dragons as existed came forth. “What are your Majesty's commands?” said they. “My commands are these”, replied she: “you see this place —build a palace here, finer than any that exists in the world; and whatever is needed in it must be there: stables for eight bullocks and the bullocks in them, with two men to tend them; stalls for eight horses and the horses in them, and two grooms to tend them; six stacks in the yard, and twelve threshers in the barn.” She was greatly delighted when she saw her order completed, and thanked God that He had given her what He had promised. “I
shall now go”, said she, “and wake my husband.” When she came to him he was still asleep. “Get up, my love”, said she, “look after the threshers, the grooms, the oxen, and see that all do their work, and that all the work be done, and give your orders to the labourers; and now, my love, let us go into the house and see that all is right. You give your orders to the men-servants, and I will give mine to the maids. We have now enough to live on”; and Joe thanked God for His blessings. He then told his wife that he would invite the lord of the manor to dine with him on Whit Sunday. “Don't leave me”, replied his wife; “for if he catches sight of me you will lose me. I will see that the table is laid and all is ready; but a maid shall wait on you. I will retire into an inner room lest he should see me.”

Joe ordered the carriage and six, seated himself in it, the coachman sat on the box, and away they went to the lord's house; they arrived at the gate, Joe got out, went through the gate, and saw three stonemasons at work in the yard; he greeted them and they returned the greeting. “Just look”, remarked one of them, what Joe has become and how miserable he used to be!”

He entered the castle, and went into the lord's room. “Good day, my lord.” “God bless you, Joe, what news?” “I have come to ask your lordship to dine with me on Whit Sunday, and we shall be very pleased to see you.” “I will come, Joe”; they then said good-bye and parted.

After Joe had gone the lord came into the courtyard, and the three masons asked him “What did Joe want?” “He has invited me to dine with him,” was the reply, “and I am going.” “Of course; you must go,” said one of them, “that you may see what sort of a house he keeps.”

The lord set out in his carriage and four, with the coachman in front, and arrived at the palace. Joe ran out to meet him, they saluted each other, and entered arm in arm. They dined, and all went well till the lord asked, “Well, Joe, and where is your wife?” “She is busy,” said Joe. “But I should like to see her”, explained the baron. “She is rather shy when in men's society” said Joe. They enjoyed themselves, lighted their pipes and went for a walk over the palace. Then said the baron to his servant, “Order the carriage at once”; it arrived, and Joe and he said “Farewell.” As the baron went through the gate he looked back and saw Joe's wife standing at one of the windows, and at once fell so deeply in love with her that he became dangerously ill; when he arrived at home the footmen were obliged to carry him from his carriage and lay him in his bed.

At daybreak the three masons arrived and began to work. They waited for their master. As he did not appear, “I will go and see what's the matter with him”, said one of them, “for he
always came out at 8 a.m.” So the mason went in and saluted the baron, but got no reply. You are ill, my lord,” said he. “I am”, said the baron, “for Joe has such a pretty wife, and if I can't get her I shall die.” The mason went out and the three consulted together as to what was best to be done. One of them proposed a task for Joe, i.e. that a large stone column which stood before one of the windows should be pulled down, the plot planted with vines, the grapes to ripen over night, and the next morning a goblet of wine should be made from their juice and be placed on the master's table; if this was not done Joe was to lose his wife. So one of them went in to the baron and told him of their plan, remarking that Joe could not do that, and so he would lose his wife. A groom was sent on horseback for Joe, who came at once, and asked what his lordship desired. The baron then told him the task he had to propose and the penalty. Poor Joe was so downcast that he left without even saying a good-bye, threw himself into his carriage, and went home. “Well, my love”, asked his wife, “what does he want?” “Want?”, replied her husband, “he ordered me to pull down the stone column in front of his window. Since my father was not a working-man, how could I do any work? Nor is that all. I am to plant the place with vines, the grapes have to ripen, and I am to make a goblet of wine, to be placed on his table at daybreak; and if I fail I am to lose you.”

“Your smallest trouble ought to be greater than that”, said his wife. “Eat and drink, go to bed and have a good rest, and all will be well.” When night came she went out into the farmyard, uncoiled her whip, gave a crack, which was heard over seven times seven countries, and immediately all the dragons appeared. “What are your Majesty's commands?” She then told them what her husband required, and in the morning Joe had the goblet of wine, which he took on horseback lest he should be late; he opened the baron's window, and, as nobody was there, he placed the goblet on the table, closed the window, and returned home.

At daybreak the baron turned in his bed. The bright light reflected by the goblet met his eyes, and had such an effect on him that he fell back in his bed, and got worse and worse.

The three masons arrived and wondered why their master did not appear. Said the tallest to the middle one, “I taught him something yesterday; now you must teach him something else.” “Well”, said the middle one, “my idea is this, that Joe shall build a silver bridge in front of the gate during the night, plant both ends with all kinds of trees, and that the trees be filled with all kinds of birds singing and twittering in the morning.” They warrant he won't do that, and so he will lose his wife. When the baron came out they communicated their plan;
he at once sent for Joe and told him what he required. Joe went away without even saying good-bye, he was so sad. When he got home he told his wife what the baron wanted this time. “Don't trouble yourself, my love”, said his wife, “eat and drink and get a good rest, all shall be well.” At night she cracked her whip and ordered the dragons to do all that was required, and so at daybreak all was done. The birds made such a noise that the whole of the village was awakened by them. One nightingale loudly and clearly to the baron sang, “Whatever God has given to some one else that you must not covet; be satisfied with what has been given to you.” The baron awoke and turned over, and, hearing the loud singing of the birds, rose and looked out of the window. The glare of the silver bridge opposite the gate blinded him, and he fell back in bed and got worse and worse. When the three masons arrived they could not enter, for the splendour of the silver bridge dazzled them, and they were obliged to enter by another gate.

As they were working, the shortest said to the middle one, “Go and see why his lordship does not come out; perhaps he is worse.” He went in and found the baron worse than ever. Then said the shortest, “I thought of something, my lord, which he will never be able to do, and so you will get his wife.” “What is that, mason?” demanded the baron. “It is this, my lord”, said the mason, “that he shall ask God to dinner on Palm Sunday, and that he can’t do, and so he will lose his wife.” “If you can get Joe's wife for me you shall have all this property”, said the baron. “It's ours, then”, said they, “for he can't do that.” Joe was sent for, and came at once to know what was required of him. “My orders are these”, replied the baron, “that you invite God to dinner on Palm Sunday to my house; if you do not your wife is lost.” Poor Joe went out without saying good-bye, jumped into his carriage, and returned home dreadfully miserable. When his wife asked him what was the matter he told her of the baron's commands. “Go on”, said his wife; “bring me that foal, the yearling, the most wretched one of all, put upon it an old saddle and silver harness on its head, and then get on its back.” He did so, said good-bye, and the wretched yearling darted off at once straight to heaven. By the time it arrived there it had become quite a beautiful horse. When Joe reached the gates of Paradise he tied his horse to a stake, knocked at the door, which opened, and he went in and greeted the Almighty. St. Peter received him, and asked him why he had come. “I've come”, said he, “to invite God to dinner at my lord's on Palm Sunday.” “Tell him from me”, said the deity, “that I will come, and tell him that he is to sow a plot with barley, and that it will ripen, and that I will eat bread made of it at dinner. That a cow is to be taken to the bull today, and that I will eat the flesh of the calf for my dinner.”
With this Joe took leave, and the foal flew downward. As they went Joe was like to fall head-foremost off, and called upon the deity. St. Peter told him not to fear, it was all right; he would fall on his feet. When Joe arrived at home the barley was waving in the breeze and the cow was in calf. “Well, wife,” said he, “I will go to the baron's and give him the message.” So he went, knocked at the door, and entered the room. “Don't come a step further”, cried the baron. “I don't intend to”, said Joe: “I’ve come to tell you I have executed your commands, and mind you don't blame me for what will happen. The deity has sent you this message: you are to sow a plot with barley, and of it make bread for His dinner. A cow is to go to the bull, and of the calf's flesh He will eat.” The baron became thoughtful. “Don't worry yourself, my lord,” said Joe, “you have worried me enough, it is your turn now;” and so he said “good-bye”, and went off home: when he got there the barley-bread was baking and the veal was roasting.

At this moment the deity and St. Peter arrived from heaven and were on their way to the baron's, who the moment he saw them called out to his servant, “Lock the gate, and do not let them in.” Then said the deity, “Let us go back to the poor man's home, and have dinner there.” When they reached the foot of the mountain St. Peter was told to look, back and say what he saw, and lo! the whole of the baron's property was a sheet of water. “Now,” said the deity to St. Peter, “let us go on, for the mountain is high, and difficult to ascend.” When they arrived at Joe's he rushed out with outspread arms, fell to the ground, and kissed the sole of the deity's foot. He entered and sat down to dinner, so did Joe and his wife and also St. Peter. Then said God to Joe, “Set a table in this world for the poor and miserable, and you shall have one laid for you in the world to come; and now good-bye: you shall live in joy, and in each other's love.”

They are living still if they have not died since. May they be your guests tomorrow!