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Introduction.

Ultimately these “Tales of a Parrot” come from the Sanskrit Sukasaptati, of which there are two versions (W. Pertsch, “Ueber Nachschabi’s Papageienbuch,” Zeitschrift d. deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Bd. 21, 1867, page 505, and Bd. 22, page 568). For the longer version of 70 tales one may consult Lassen’s “Anthologia Sanskirta,” pp. 38-45 (Bonn 1838) or Wortham’s translation, “The Enchanted Parrot being a selection from the Suka Saptati or the Seventy Tales of a Parrot” (London 1911); and for the shorter R. Schmidt’s editions (Leipzig 1893 and Kiel 1894). Students may consult also S. J. Warren’s “Het Origineel der Sukasaptati” (Album Kern, pp. 97-99, Leiden, 1903.) From the longer Sanskrit recension was derived Nakhshabi’s Persian version, the Tuti Nameh compiled in 1329 A.D. Nakhshabi alludes to an earlier Persian version which is no longer extant. Gerrans’ “Tales of a Parrot done into English from a Persian MS. entitled Tooti—Nameh,” (London 1792), translate 12 of Nakhshabi’s 52 tales. From Nakhshabi’s text many later versions are derived,—an enlarged Turkish version by Sary Abdullah Efendi; a metrical Persian text by Hamid Lahori (J. R. A. S. IX, page 163) and a simpler and shorter prose version by Mhd. Qadiri, (of date 1208 A.H., 1793 A.D.) which can be read in Gladwin’s “The Tooti Nameh or Tales of a Parrot in the Persian language with an English translation, Calcutta 1800, London 1801”. A later English translation from the Persian is A. C. Stephen’s Tooti Name, Fairy Tales of a Parrot” (London 1892).

Only 12 of Nakhshabi’s 52 tales occur in the Malay recensions, and the framework of Nakhshabi’s and Qadiri texts differs from the Malay, in that unlike the Malay (and the Sanskrit) they make the parrot tell his master of his wife’s leaning to frailty and his master kills her.

According to Ethe’s catalogue of Persian MSS., in the Bodleian Library, (col. 424), there is another Persian redaction by Abu-al-fadl later than Nakhshabi’s text.

There are two Dakhani versions, called Tuti-nameh, one in verse composed in 1639 A.D. by Awari from Nakhshabi’s text and another by Ghowwashi. According to Garcin de Tassy’s “Histoire de la litterature hindouie et hindoustanie,” 2nd ed., page 25, there is at least one other Dakhani prose version and an anonymous Hindi version. The Hindustani Tota Kahani by Haidari (alias Haidar-Bakhsh) was composed in 1801 A.D. from Qadiri’s
abridgement (id., I, page 550) but used also Nakhshabi’s text for amplifications and contains episodes not found in the Malay recension:— it has been translated into English (G. Snell’s The Tota-Kahani, London 1877). Garcin de Tassy further mentions 19th century printed Hindustani texts called Hikayat sukh ba sukhl, Tota itihas and Suka bahattari.


There are Javanese recensions in prose and verse (totally different from the Malay) and also Bugis and Macassar versions. The Javanese romance, Angling Darma, is said to contain two important tales, Nos. 7 and 16 of L. A. and R. in my table:—of that romance the Malay version is the Hikayat Indra Jaya or Ht. Bikrama Ditya Jaya (or Wijaya) or Ht. Shahi-Mardan, and in the edition printed at Weltevreden in 1916 it is tales 6 and 16 of the present work which occur, and tale 7 is not found.

The oldest transcript of the Malay Hikayat Bayan Budiman is a fragment of 14 pages in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, which belonged to Edward Pococke, the orientalist, (1604-1691) and dates from about 1600 A.D. (“Catalogue of the Malay MSS., in the Bodleian Library” by Greentree and Nicholson; Oxford 1910, p. 3, No. 2). Pococke was chaplain to the English “Turkey Merchants” at Aleppo from 1630 to 1635 and chaplain at Constantinople from 1637 till 1640: in both places he collected Arabic, Hebrew, Armenian, Samaritan and other manuscripts. His collection of 420 oriental MSS., was bought by the University of Oxford in 1693 for £600. These few pages of the Ht. Bayan Budiman contain tales 1, 2 and 3 in that order and evidently represent the recension from which MSS. L., A. and R. of my table are derived. The old wrapper with its description “Malaica quaedam folia imperfecta” also has a note written in a 16th or early 17th century hand: “This is the Mola tounge Spoke by the Molaianes in the Sou(th) Seases, the coste of Vormeo”. The watermark of the paper points to the same date as the handwriting. And inside the wrapper is an account from 1598-1600 of “Cloathes Receaved for the privy Accompt of my Mr. Ferdinando Clotterbooke per me Thomas Wade”:— there was a Ferdinando Clotterbooke of St. Martin’s London who died in 1582 but his son of the same name was alive in 1615.

The Bodleian fragment is printed in Appendix (d) with the old spelling preserved. For the spelling further bears out the antiquity of the MS. The main points are:
(1) Sometimes take the place of modern e.g. which is nearer the Skt. arttha than the modern harta stands often for ngapa əŋkau ēngkau is written & əŋkau ēngkau is written & occurs for i.e. izin, probably a slip for is used (correctly) in Sanskrit words where modern usage prefers e.g. 

(2) Several old forms occur:— əŋapa = mēngapa upama; an usual form mēngingit (perhaps a copyist's error) from pingit; tuhan-ku for tuan-ku; bēniaga for bēniaga; on p. 3 kēnyahuit, perhaps an error for kēтаhui; and ada ada-nya-kah?

(3) The vowel is mostly omitted in final syllables but as in other old MSS. the rule is not strictly observed and kayu, layu, muka pērdana are found.

(4) The pēpēt sound is represented sometimes by alif but oftener by wau; (in the body of a word — um is of course an archaic form of the modern — əm):— surambi, kumarau, gumalatok, karing, kākaseh panunggu and once, probably by analogy from forms like binatang, with ya, — filobang. 

(5) A peculiarity is that wau, perhaps because it had been adopted for the pēpēt sound, is frequently omitted even in the penultimate:— budi, suka, duka-lah, duli, muda, In the first three examples the Sanskrit
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has a short vowel, but this will not explain the omission of the vowel in the last two, unless indeed it be due to erroneous analogy.

(6) There is carelessness in spelling words with suffixes kata-ku, kata-mu, bapa-ku, bapa-mu, kata-nya, pada-nya, diri-nya, hati-nya, salama-nya, ibu-nya, pergilelah, and so on.

(7) The vowel on which stress falls is inserted:—

kēbēnaran-nya, hidupi; balaskan, sahut-nya, bālaskan, kalakān, kalān, sahut-nya, balaskan, hidupi; often with disregard to the rule requiring the insertion of the vowel in the penultimate, —

katakan, saudagar.

(8) The vowel is omitted even from the penultimate when it is short and not stressed:—

sangkaran, hadapan, berbandang.

(9) The tashdid, which has been said to distinguish MSS, from Acheh, (J. R. A. S., S. B. No. 36 pp. 88 89,) is not found.

(10) The double kk is not employed:—

kēbajikan, berbaiki.

(11) Vowel points are not inserted.

The fragment preserves several readings corrupted in the other texts I have read, i.e., tērsērling instead of tērsēlam (p. 31), kongkong where later versions read kang and kaki (p. 31), kēlēnggarakan where A reads heraukan, p. 40) As in most old MSS. court language is not strictly observed: titah does not occur and patek is rare.
Apparently Werndly, whose grammar was published in 1736 A.D., refers to the Malay recension, when he mentions the *Ht. Bayan*, “a story of the ingenuity of the bird we call a parrotquet”.

The Malay version has been variously entitled the *Hikayat Budiman*, *Ht. Khojah Maimun*, *Ht. Khojah Mubarak* and *Chérita Taifah*. At the beginning it purports to be a translation from the Persian. Twice in tale 20 of our text and in the colophon the translation from Persian into Malay is ascribed to one Kadli Hassan; and once in the text and in the colophon the date 773 A.H. (1371 A.D.) is given. In MSS. B and C the same information is given at the beginning of tale 13, in the preface to tales 21 and 24 and in the colophon.

A glance at the comparative table I have borrowed from Brandes’ paper, “Iets over het Papegaai-boek” (Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-Land-en Volkenkunde, Deel XLI, 1899) will show however that the Malay does not follow closely Nakhshabi’s text.

The book is now almost unknown to Peninsular Malays, but its former popularity is evinced by the large number of MSS. at London, Leiden, Paris and Batavia. Van der Tuuk’s “Account of the Malay MSS. belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society ("Miscellaneous Papers on Indo-China", Second Series, Vol. II, page 6) mentions two MSS. of the *Hikayat* belonging to that Society, and two belonging to the India Office. Since van der Tuuk’s time, the Royal Asiatic Society has acquired three more MSS. of the work, Maxwell Malay MSS. Nos. 4, 18 (containing 22 tales) and 46 (J. R. A. S. 1899 pp. 121-9).

The 2 MSS. belonging to the India Office Mr. C. O. Blagden has been kind enough to examine and he has sent me 30 pp. of extracts. They are excellent MSS., which, as van der Tuuk remarked, seem to belong to one and the same recension. The extracts agree almost word for word with my text though in places there is considerable variation e.g. Tale XV. In 2604 (285) there are 22 tales which follow the order of A and R, and like them omit the tale of “The son worse than the father”. The MS. is entitled *Chérita Khojah Mubarak* and was written in 1223 A.H. Mr. Blagden considers it the better of the two India Office MSS. MS 2606 (327) is entitled *Chérita Taifa*. The introduction explains that it belonged to Sultan Zainu’d-din ibni Marhum Muhammad Shah of Trengganu, and that it or copies of it were sanctioned to be used by the Bendahara, Raja Indra Bongsu, Sultan Zain al-din ibn Marhum Muhammad Shah 1 Though this name does not appear in the usual list of Sultans of Trengganu, Mr. Blagden says there is no doubt as to the reading in this MS.
Temenggong, Laksamana and Shahbandar: they read it in sorrow and at feasts for its style and contents. It contains only the first ten stories in the order of L, A and R. It belonged once to John Leyden (1775-1811 A.D.) The colophon states it like MS. 2604 was copied in A.H. 1223 (1808) but originally di-riwayatkan in A.H. 1008 (1599) in the year wau on the 18th Saaban on a Sunday. This date 1599 corresponds closely with the date ascribed to Bodley’s MS.

Mr. Blagden has also examined Maxwell 18 in the Library of the Royal Asiatic Society. It would appear to commence with the chémpérling story like MS. Cc. After that comes the story of Khojah Maimun. Then come, following our order, Tales 1, 2, the story of Sultan Ibrahim bin Adham, tales 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 23.

Juynboll’s “Catalogus” of the Malay MSS. in the Leiden Library (E. J. Brill 1899, page 125-131) records 3 MSS., one of which is van der Tuuk’s. I am greatly indebted to Professor Dr. Snouck Hurgronje for having been kind enough to search these MSS. for the lacuna in Tale XXIV: but neither of the MSS. contains quite the text of my recension of the tale. Van Ronkel’s “Catalogus” (Nijhoff 1909) gives an account (page 81-84) of 6 MSS. in the Library of the Batavian Society: Cabaton’s “Catalogus sommaire des MSS. indiens, indo-chinois et malayo-poly­nesiens” (Paris 1912) in the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, mentions three MSS., (MS. Malayo-Pol., Nos. 76, 77, 78; Malais-Javanais 43, 44 and 45), the first and third of the 19th century and the second of the 18th century: the third is called the Ht. Khojah Maimun and is described as a different redaction of the Ht. Bayan Budiman.

In Raffles’ Library, Singapore, there are two MSS., one (Logan Library 296) better than any described in Brandes’ paper and table, and the other (Raffles Ref. 472) identical with Brandes’ A (his best MS.) in order and contents and sounder perhaps on the whole in textual readings. The present text is based on these two Singapore MS., called respectively L. dated A.H. 1269 (A.D. 1852) and R dated A.H. 1266 (A.D. 1849), and has been further collated with Brandes’ A (van der Wall Coll. 174; No. LXX of van Ronkel’s Catalogue). Doubtful passages e.g. in tales 15, 21, 23 and the conclusion have also been collated with another but inferior MS. (Collectie Br. 545: No. LXVIII of the same Catalogue) which I have called Cc., as it is a copy of Brandes’ C. i.e. of van der Tuuk’s MS. For the loan of A, and Cc. I am greatly indebted to the Batavian Society. The beginning of every tale has further been collated with extracts from I. O. 2604 and 2606 kindly supplied by Mr. C. O. Blagden. Tales 2, 6, 12 and 17
have been collated with versions printed by Niemann in his “Bloemlezing”, (5th edition 1906, pp. 208-224), and the comparison has confirmed the high value of the two Singapore texts:—Niemann’s redaction was based on a collation of the 4 MSS., belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society, London, and the Indian Office Library (id., pp. 48, 49). Tale 15 has been collated with S. P. G. Kruyt’s *Hikayat Bibi Sabariah* (Delft 1891).

Redactions of tales 3, 8, 15, 17, 20 and 21 are also found in the (unpublished) longer version of the *Ht. Bakhtiar*, and of the tales 2, 12 and 13 in Gonggrip’s *Kalila dan Damina* (Brandes’ “Nadere Opmerkingen over de Maleische Bewerkingen van de Geschiedenis der 10 Vizieren, “T. I. T. L. Vk., Dl. XXXVIII, pp. 191-273). Tale 8 would seem to be the model of Mr. Laidlaw’s “Story of Kheruddin”, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Straits Branch, Journal 46, 1909, pp. 27-57. The introduction has been printed in de Hollander’s “Bloemlezing”: tales 8 and 20 by van der Tuuk in the 7th volume of Meursingh’s “Maleisch Leesboek”; tale 15 by van der Tuuk (Amsterdam 1866). The whole *Hikayat* has never been printed before.

In the Batavian MS., LXIX of van Ronkel’s “Catalogus”, the parrot, before telling his tales, dilates on the pangs of the grave and the pains of hell,—the appendix to 15° in other versions. The order of the tales is 15°, 17, 16, 24 and 11. Some of the tales, especially 11, are altered considerably. In tale 11 the prince is called عزر ناوي عفتريوي of the land ^زبس. Two sons of a vizier go to seek the dream-princess and get locked up by an old man who mistakes their talk for lunatic raving. The daughter of the old man, Siti Sara, sends them dainties by her maid Dalimah. They discover in Siti Sara the princess of their quest. One of them takes back her portrait; and the Mantri and Mangkubumi come and fetch her to marry the prince. One day at a hunt the prince kills a deer and seeing her fawns bewails her childlessness and goes off to the island of Birama Dewa. The princess dresses as a man and under the name of دٽٽٽٖجعفكاا اندرَا مو٩ٙٽٽ sails after her spouse, plays chess with him, wins all kinds of things from him including a mare, which becomes with foal: then passing herself off as the mistress of the sea-captain دٽٽٖجعفكاا اندرَا مو٩ٙٽ she sleeps with the prince, and finally still unrecognized returns him his mare and ring and departs. After some time the princess bears a son. So she has contrived to fulfil the prince’s command that on his return he shall find a son, a foal by his mare and his ring on his own