



REPLY TO D'HUY ET AL.:

Navigating biases and charting new ground in the cultural diffusion of folktales

Eugenio Bortolini^{a,b,1}, Luca Pagani^{c,d}, Enrico R. Crema^e, Stefania Sarno^f, Chiara Barbieri^g, Alessio Boattini^f, Marco Sazzini^f, Sara Graça da Silva^h, Gessica Martiniⁱ, Mait Metspalu^c, Davide Pettener^f, Donata Luiselli^f, and Jamshid J. Tehrani^{i,1}

In their letter, d'Huy et al. (1) challenge the novelty of our study (2), and question the reliability of some of our results in the light of previous folkloric research and geographic biases in the Aarne Thompson Uther (ATU) index (3). In our reply we explain how their criticisms are already largely addressed in our paper (2) or based on misunderstandings that we clarify below.

As we make clear in our report (2), the idea that the diffusion of folktales might be linked to migration histories is in fact a very old one, and certainly not one we claim for ourselves. Our study investigates this issue at the genomic level rather than using single genetic markers. We show how newly available whole-genome sequences from diverse human populations can be used to tease apart the effects of demic movements and cultural diffusion on the international distribution of folktales at different geographic scales. Our results demonstrate that it is particularly difficult to disentangle the explanatory power of genetic variability from spatial proximity beyond ~4,000 km due to the smothering effects of isolation by distance. D'Huy et al. (1) overlook this finding, which has significant implications for the studies they cite and highlights the importance of comparing multiple models to draw inferences about the processes that have generated cross-cultural patterns.

D'Huy et al.'s (1) criticisms concerning the Eurocentric bias of the ATU Index simply reiterate limitations that are already explicitly stated in our paper [and prominently displayed in our figure 1 (2)], and ignore

the steps taken to ameliorate them. These involved establishing a minimum threshold of folktale richness for inclusion in the dataset, excluding Africa from the correlation models with genomic variability, and ensuring a uniform geographic distribution of sampled populations across Eurasia. Consequently, the correlations we report between folktale, genomic, and spatial distances controlling for linguistic barriers—which form the core part of our results—are not biased by the underrepresentation of African populations in the ATU Index.

The rest of d'Huy et al.'s (1) letter disputes reconstructions of the spread of a few individual tales, which are presented in a small and openly tentative section of our *Results* (2). Like us, d'Huy et al. (1) draw attention to discrepancies between some of our results and those of previous studies [ironically, in light of the above, ours suggest a less Eurocentric view of folktale diffusion, as pointed out in our *SI Appendix* (2)]. Notably d'Huy et al. (1) do not engage with (or object to) our methodological approach, except for making the point that the results might be improved with more data. Of course we agree, and in fact outline potential strategies to test our findings in future research [see our *Discussion* section and *SI Appendix* (2)]. Moreover, by making our research fully replicable, we would welcome efforts by d'Huy and colleagues and other researchers to extend our analyses, and capitalize on the rich opportunities for inferring patterns of cultural diffusion in the genomic era.

-
- 1 d'Huy J, Le Quellec J-L, Berezkin Y, Lajoye P, Uther H-J (2017) Studying folktale diffusion needs unbiased dataset. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 114:E8555.
 2 Bortolini E, et al. (2017) Inferring patterns of folktale diffusion using genomic data. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 114:9140–9145.
 3 Uther HJ (2004) *The Types of International Folktales: A Classification and Bibliography. Based on the System of Antti Aarne and Stith Thompson* (Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, Helsinki).

^aDepartment of Cultural Heritage, University of Bologna, 48121 Ravenna, Italy; ^bDepartment of Humanities, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 08005 Barcelona, Spain; ^cEstonian Biocentre, 51010 Tartu, Estonia; ^dDepartment of Biology, University of Padova, 35131 Padua, Italy; ^eDepartment of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Cambridge, CB2 3DZ Cambridge, United Kingdom; ^fLaboratory of Molecular Anthropology, Department of Biological, Geological, and Environmental Sciences, University of Bologna, 40126 Bologna, Italy; ^gDepartment of Linguistic and Cultural Evolution, Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History, 07745 Jena, Germany; ^hInstitute for the Study of Literature and Tradition, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, New University of Lisbon, 1069-061 Lisbon, Portugal; and ⁱCentre for the Coevolution of Biology and Culture, Department of Anthropology, Durham University, DH1 3LE Durham, United Kingdom

Author contributions: E.B., L.P., E.R.C., S.S., C.B., A.B., M.S., S.G.d.S., G.M., M.M., D.P., D.L., and J.J.T. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

¹To whom correspondence may be addressed. Email: eugenio.bortolini2@unibo.it or jamie.tehrani@durham.ac.uk.