ORAL TRADITION

Volume 3, Number 1-2 January-May, 1988

Slavica

Volume 3 January-May 1988 Number 1-2

Slavica Publishers, Inc.

For a complete catalog of books from Slavica, with prices and ordering information, write to:

Slavica Publishers, Inc.
P.O. Box 14388
Columbus, Ohio 43214

ISSN: 0883-5365

Oral Tradition seeks to provide a comparative and interdisciplinary focus for studies in oral literature and related fields by publishing research and scholarship on the creation, transmission, and interpretation of all forms of oral traditional expression. As well as essays treating certifiably oral traditions, *OT* presents investigations of the relationships between oral and written traditions, as well as brief accounts of important fieldwork, a Symposium section (in which scholars may reply at some length to prior essays), review articles, occasional transcriptions and translations of oral texts, a digest of work in progress, and a regular column for notices of conferences and other matters of interest. In addition, occasional issues will include an ongoing annotated bibliography of relevant research and the annual Albert Lord and Milman Parry Lectures on Oral Tradition. *OT* welcomes contributions on all oral literatures, on all literatures directly influenced by oral traditions, and on non-literary oral traditions. Submissions must follow the list-of reference format (style sheet available on request) and must be accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope for return or for mailing of proofs; all quotations of primary materials must be made in the original language(s) with following English translations. Authors should submit two copies of all manuscripts. Most contributions will be reviewed by at least one specialist reader and one member of the editorial board before a final decision is reached. Review essays, announcements, and contributions to the Symposium section will be evaluated by the editor in consultation with the board.

Oral Tradition will appear three times per year, in January, May, and October. Annual subscription charges are $20 for individuals and $35 for libraries and other institutions.

All manuscripts, books for review, items for the annual bibliography, and editorial correspondence should be directed to the editor, John Miles Foley, Center for Studies in Oral Tradition, 301 Read Hall, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211.

Subscriptions and related inquiries should be sent to Slavica Publishers, P.O. Box 14388, Columbus, OH 43214.

Printed in the United States of America.

EDITORIAL BOARD

EDITORIAL BOARD

This issue of *Oral Tradition*,
Volume 3, Numbers i-ii (1988),

is dedicated to

MILTON D. GLICK

in acknowledgment of his contribution
to the field of studies in oral tradition.

Contents

Editor's Column

With the present double issue (volume 3, numbers i-ii), *Oral Tradition* returns to the format of a miscellany, that is, of a collection of essays on a wide selection of traditions intended to familiarize specialists with parallel or analogous developments outside of their home areas. The next number (3, iii) will be a special issue, edited by Issa Boullata, on Arabic oral traditions, and will include twelve essays by eminent scholars from the Near East, Europe, and the United States. In the fourth year of its existence, *OT* will feature essays on Italian lullabies, African praise poetry, the musical background of Romanian oral narrative, Central Asian epic, and numerous other subjects; part of one number will also be devoted to translations of core writings by Marcel Jousse, V. V. Radlov, and Matija Murko, all scholars who were important influences on Milman Parry and the evolution of the oral theory.

Within these pages the reader will find the second and concluding installments of two state-of-the-art, or survey, essays: Mark Edwards on ancient Greek and Alexandra Hennessey Olsen on Old English (see, respectively, *OT* 1, ii:171-230 and 1, iii: 548-606 for the initial sections). Similarly, Brynley Roberts, Librarian at Aberystwyth, offers a thorough account of oral traditional studies in Welsh. In addition to these three surveys, the present issue offers three analytical essays. Olga Davidson probes the formulaic structure of the Persian *Shâhnâma* of Ferdowsi, Richard Swiderski considers the interdependency of orality and literacy in a south Indian tradition, and Victor Mair looks at the impact of the Buddhist storytelling tradition on the development of written vernacular literature in Chinese.

The annotated bibliography of research and scholarship, which follows the six essays, now extends through 1985. It has profited from the readership's suggestions and contributions, but we continue to ask for your assistance in making this research tool as useful as possible. Please send *OT* two copies of all relevant

publications for review and annotation, and feel free to suggest other titles we should be including. Our reviews in fact begin with this issue, as does the Symposium section. David Henige inaugurates this latter feature with a query about the terminological barrier that stands between disciplines in the area of oral tradition. We hope that others will want to take advantage of the Symposium venue, which is intended for reactions to current scholarship or policies, and which is open to all.

Finally, it is a pleasure and an honor to dedicate this issue of *Oral Tradition* to *Milton D. Glick*, formerly Dean of Arts and Sciences at the University of Missouri/Columbia and now Provost at Iowa State University. In a commitment to broad humanistic research and scholarship, Dr. Glick, himself a chemist by training, was the moving force in establishing the Center for Studies in Oral Tradition at Missouri, and thus in supporting not only *OT* but also the Lord Monograph Series and the Encyclopedia of Oral Traditions. Our readership, and all those associated with the interdisciplinary field of oral studies, owe him a profound and continuing debt.

John Miles Foley, Editor

Oral Tradition, 3/1-2 (1988): 11-60

Homer and Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part II[1]

Mark W. Edwards

§6. Studies of specific formulae

This section deals with the usage and adaptation of individual formulae, and with the availability of formulae for particular concepts. It does not cover studies of the meaning of obscure words, or how much significance a formulaic expression might retain in conventional usage (see §7), or the location of formulae within the verse (see §3).

The discussion is arranged in four parts: name-epithet formulae; epithets; common-nouns and epithets; verbs.

1. Name-epithet formulae

The fundamental work was Milman Parry's first monograph, published in 1928 (M. Parry 1971). Parry listed the commonest proper name and epithet formulae after the mid-verse caesura (10-13) and after the caesura in the fourth foot (15-16), and gave tables showing the formulae of different lengths for eleven major gods and heroes in the nominative case (39) and the genitive case (57). He also listed the proper name and epithet formulae for heroines (97f.), for the Greek race (101), for other peoples (99ff.), and for countries (106-9).

Page 1959 lists formulae for Priam (241-42), Hector (248-51), Patroclus (286), Helen (287), Alexander/Paris (290f.), Aeneas (291), the Achaeans (242-48), the Trojans (251f.) and Ilium/Troy (292-94).

Bowra 1960 examines the epithets for Troy and other cities to determine if the meanings are appropriate, his work including a listing of the formulae by metrical shape. He does not use the material to determine how far the formulaic system is complete, or list the metrical variants which preserve or violate economy. He

finds the meanings usually appropriate but not illuminating. (See also Pinsent 1984, in §7.) Allison 1969 lists and analyzes all Homeric phrases which contain a geographic or ethnic name.

Bowra 1961 studies the three overlapping formulae for the Greeks, ἐϋκνήμιδες ᾽Αχαιοί, ᾽Αρήϊοι υἷες ᾽Αχαιῶν, and ἀριστῆες Παναχαιῶν and concludes that the first dates from late Mycenaean times, the alternative expressions being developed later; he does not discuss why the alternatives arose. Severyns 1970 lists the different epithets for Achaeans in various grammatical cases and discusses a few of the epithets for places and for heroines and goddesses.

Edwards 1966 (148ff.) deals with name-epithet formulae in various positions in the verse. Hooker 1967 studies name-epithet formulae where the epithet ends in -τα (ἱππότα Νέστωρ etc.), listing their position in the verse. He concludes that the forms were nominative in origin, not taken over from vocatives. Hainsworth 1968 points out some characteristics of the systems of formulae for personal names which do not appear in common-noun formulae, and Hainsworth 1978 discusses the process of sorting and selection of formulae for proper names. Watts 1969 presents charts showing the epithets for Hector and for swords and spears. Stanford 1969 suggests that the conjunctions of words in some formulae are chosen for euphonic reasons. Muñoz Valle 1974 (53-70) categorizes the formulaic expressions of various lengths and positions in the verse which include Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.

Austin's well-known book (1975), after a rather contentious account of the state of Homeric criticism at that time ("Contemporary orthodoxy now absolves Homer of all responsibility for his individual words as cleanly as Page absolves Homeric man of responsibility for his actions," 12), tabulates the usage of the names of Odysseus, Penelope, and Telemachus in the *Odyssey* with and without epithets (25ff.), and the usage of the epithet πεπνυμένος (74ff.).

Mureddu 1983, in order to determine if Hesiod uses the same formulae as Homer under the same metrical conditions, examines name and epithet formulae in all grammatical cases and verse-positions for Uranus (heaven), Gaea (earth), Oceanus, Olympus, Poseidon, Zeus, Eris, Nyx, Athena (omitting ὀβριμοπάτρη), Hera, Aphrodite, Persephone, Demeter, and Artemis (as well as for "men," "gods," the sea, and sexual union).

She finds a remarkable overall unity in the Homeric and Hesiodic usages.

Sale 1984 studies the sets of formulae used for the home of the gods, based on words both for Olympus and for Ouranos. The Olympus formulaic sets are far more extensive; for instance, there are three formulae for "gods in Olympian homes" and eighteen for Olympus itself, whereas the Ouranos set has one and four respectively. Sale 1987 studies the *Iliad* formulae for place, for instance "to Troy" and "in the Greek camp." He holds that a high level of formulaic usage means that formulae for the idea were abundant, whereas a low level means that few or no formulae were available. The set of formulae meaning "in the Greek camp" shows a great deal of extension (i. e., formulae are provided for almost all purposes), and good economy (there is little overlap). Sale's approach is important, in that he includes (for instance) in the formulaic set "in the camp" phrases meaning "beside the swift ships" and "by the ship-sterns" (but not "in the huts," as this is said to refer to the buildings, not the encampment). In an appendix Sale gives "most of the groups and formulaic sets for the places where the action of the *Iliad* occurs: the Greek camp at the ships, the battlefield, the Troad itself, Troy-city. The charts, but not the Appendix, include Olympus." The lists are subdivided into motion-to, locative, and motion-from. The motion-to set shows extension and economy; so do the locatives, except for "in Troy," which is much less formulaic. "This means that when Homer was composing the *Iliad* there were few or no formulae available to him meaning 'in Troy-city'." In motion-from, relatively few formulae are available for "from the Greek camp," and *none* for "from Troy-city." These results must be taken very seriously.

2. Epithets

The major work on the epithets used with the names of heroes is Amory Parry 1973. Though her principal concern was the meaning of ἀμύμων, besides listing and examining the usages of this epithet with the many characters with which it is employed she also listed (Appendix II) the occurrences of the following epithets, giving in each case a brief account of the context: ἰσόθεος φώς, ἐΰς (ἠΰς) ἀντίθεος, θεοειδής, μεγάθυμος, ἴφθιμος, δαΐφρων, ἄλκιμος, ἀγλαός, and "looking like the

gods." Appendix III gives similar data on διογενής, διοτρεφής, and on κλυτός and κλειτός and their compounds. There is also information on δειλός (43 n.1) and ἀγαυός (50 n.1).

In an earlier work, M. Parry 1928 (1971) gave lists of generic epithets (89-90) and of epithets found with only one hero (92). Page 1959 (269-70) examined the use of φαίδιμος, ὄβριμος, ἀγλαός, and ἄλκιμος. Bergson 1956 considers the synonymous and metrically equivalent pair of epithets ποδώκης and ποδάρκης, and points out that the former occurs in various circumstances whereas the latter survives only in ποδάρκης δῖος ᾽Αχιλλεύς and but for this would probably have disappeared. Μελαίνης and κελαινῆς (genitives) occur as similar doublets in the tragedians, following the Homeric example. Pope 1960 (129-35) lists and discusses the epithets of Odysseus in the *Iliad*, *Iliad* Book 10, and the *Odyssey*, concluding that some were discarded because their meaning was no longer acceptable (and was thus still of some importance.) Edwards 1966 (168ff.) discusses epithets occurring after the bucolic diaeresis.

Cramer 1974 points out that ἐσθλός, usually taken to be the alternative for δῖος before Odysseus's name when an initial vowel is required by the meter, actually occurs for this hero only in the phrase πατὴρ ἐμὸς ἐσθλὸς ᾽Οδυσσεύς (3 times), and suggests it "ought to be read as an expanded and modified form of πατέρ᾽ ἐσθλόν" (79), the epithet applying not to Odysseus but to πατήρ. "[T]he phrase (by itself) ἐσθλὸς ᾽Οδυσσεύς ought to disappear from oral theory" (79). Cramer does not note, however, that πατὴρ ἐμός occurs in the same position in the verse twice when *not* followed by Odysseus' name (and πατὴρ δ᾽ ἐμός five times), so the likelihood is that the longer phrase is thought of as a combination of two shorter ones and his point is not valid.

Whallon 1979 discusses the usage of ἀνδροφόνος, ἱππόδαμος, and ἀντίθεος, all used for more than one hero. Parry thought that epithets develop from being "particularized" (i.e. relevant to context) to "distinctive" (used for one person alone, relevant to context), then to "ornamental" (one person, not relevant to context) and finally "generic" (used for more than one hero). Whallon suggests that ἀνδροφόνος was replacing ἱππόδαμος for Hector (they occur eleven and five times respectively) because at the time of the *Iliad* contextual relevance was growing, and Hector in fact kills 27 opponents to Diomedes' 20

and Odysseus' 18; this epithet is never found with the latter two names.

Janko 1981 examines the usage of ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως, in various cases and positions; usually ἤματα πάντα follows. He indicates how archaic and innovative elements in the forms of the expression are retained side by side.

3. Common-nouns and epithets

The major work is Paraskevaides 1984, in which the author lists sets of noun-epithet formulae expressing the same concept, dividing them into two groups: synonymous nouns sharing the same epithets (e.g. the set including ξίφος ὀξύ and φάσγανον ὀξύ), and synonymous nouns with different epithets (e.g. ἀσπίδα ταυρείην and σάκος αἴολον). For each phrase he gives the metrical shape, the position(s) in the verse, and the number of occurrences in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The listings are arranged under 103 English subheads, including some abstractions (for instance, "brightness," "riches," "sorrow," "wrath," "youth"). The reasons for the arrangement of the set of formulae for each concept are not very clear, but an alphabetical list of the English subheads is provided at the end of the book. The work has been done with care, but caution must be exercised in using it for some purposes, as it suffers from the weakness of one-verse concordances; for example, ἀσπίδα ταυρείην is said to occur once only (85), at the beginning of the verse (*Iliad* 13.163), but ἀσπίδα πάντοσ' ἐΐσην | ταυρείην (*Iliad* 13.160-61) may also be relevant. Paraskevaides has interesting ideas on lack of economy (140), and a useful bibliography.

The pioneering work in this area was Gray 1947, a study of the formulae for sea, shield, and helmet; her work contains very valuable insights, but her division of formulae into "traditional" and "individual" has become dubious since Hainsworth 1968 showed the extent of mobility and modification of formulae.

Pope 1963 reviews Parry's ideas, pointing out the inadequacy of the name-epithet systems for covering all grammatical cases and numbers and the main metrical shapes, and examines the common-noun plus epithet formulae in the *Iliad* similes. He finds a total of 379 different noun-epithet combinations, of which only 53 occur in the main body of the poem. He concludes that the poet must be capable of composing without the aid of a stock of traditional formulae. Hainsworth 1968 examines and lists all

common-noun + epithet formulae which appear in the metrical form - ⏑ ⏑ - ⏒ and ⏑ ⏑ - ⏒, showing what different positions in the verse they can take and how their metrical shape can he modified. Hainsworth's earlier work (1962 and 1964) is also relevant.

In what follows, work done on noun-epithet formulae for particular concepts is listed in alphabetical order of the English expression. To save space, concepts covered by Paraskevaides alone are not included.

Boundary: As part of a study of the meaning of πεῖραρ Bergren 1975 lists and examines the formulae in which it occurs in Homer and Hesiod as well as in later poetry.

Bow: Paraskevaides 1984:86; Page 1959:278-80.

Chariot: Paraskevaides 1984:49; Page 1959:280.

City: Cole 1977 lists and comments on the words for this concept in Homer and early Greek lyric, including the epithets and prepositions used with them.

Fire: Paraskevaides 1984:74; Hainsworth 1958 studies the formulaic usages and connotations of φλόξ and other words for "fire" in Homer, showing that this word does not occur in the *Odyssey* because it is traditionally associated with certain heroes and circumstances which are not pertinent to that poem.

Earth: Haslam 1976; Mureddu 1983:23.

Food and Drink: Chantraine 1964 examines the usage of certain nouns with these meanings and the formulae in which they occur, as part of a study of their relationship to verbs from the same roots.

Gods: Mureddu 1983:37.

Heart: Combellack 1975 examines the use of epithets with φρένες to see if Agamemnon's heart is "black" in *Iliad* 1.103 because he is angry or because hearts are generically so, full of black blood; and shows that the epithet is used where appropriate to add the sense "stirred by emotion" (*Iliad* 20.35 being a possible exception).

Helmet: Paraskevaides 1984:27; Gray 1947; Hainsworth 1978.

Horses: M. Parry 1971:113.

Human beings: Paraskevaides 1984:55; M. Parry 1971:114; Mureddu 1983:32.

Night: Mureddu 1983:64.

Room: Paraskevaides 1984:47; Hainsworth 1978 discusses the epithets associated with θάλαμος.

Ruler: Paraskevaides 1984:96; Wathelet 1979 categorizes the

formulaic uses of ἄναξ and its derivatives ἄνασσα and ἄνασσω (for gods and heroes), and those of βασιλεύς (for gods only) in Homer and Hesiod, concluding that the sense of the two words drew closer together as the formulaic tradition developed; βασιλεύς, a word of unknown origin, gained ground, and the formulaic usages suggest it is linked to the administration of justice. Hooker 1979 notes that ἄναξ in *Odyssey* 4.87-88 is applied not to a god or hero but to the master of a servant.

Sea: Paraskevaides 1984:35; Gray 1947; Page 1959:225-30; Mureddu 1983:67; Schmiel 1984.

Shield: Paraskevaides 1984:84; M. Parry 1971:115; Gray 1947; Page 1959:270-71; Whallon 1966 points out that Ajax's shield is always a σάκος, Hector's always an ἄσπις (though with other heroes little distinction seems to be made), so the nouns do not form parts of a single formulaic system.

Ships: M. Parry 1971:109; Alexanderson 1970 examines all formulaic expressions for ships, including the different grammatical cases, metrical shapes, and epithets separated from nouns, and also instances of the same idea (e.g. "to the ships") expressed by different formulae. He finds a widely-extended system, with phrases often extending over the caesurae; economy is not absolute, because of certain overlapping phrases developed through analogy, some of which are preferred in special contexts or a particular place in the verse. He does not discuss the possible relevance of the meaning to the context. See also Sale 1987.

Sky: Page 1959:230-31; Mureddu 1983:21; Sale 1984.

Spear: Paraskevaides 1984:22; Page 1959:238ff.; Whallon 1966;Watts 1969; Shannon 1975 includes a brief section on the usages of the spear-words μελίη, ἐϋμμελίης, and μείλινος; Schmiel 1984.

Strife: Mureddu 1983:62.

Sword: Paraskevaides 1984:20; Page 1959:277-78; Watts 1969.

Wine: Paraskevaides 1984:68; Page 1959:231; Severyns 1946:86-93 lists the different formulae used, indicating whether the digamma before οἶνος is observed or neglected; Vivante 1982.

Year: Emlyn-Jones 1967 rejected the view that ἐνιαυτός means "the space of a year" and ἔτος "one of a series of years," claiming that they are used indifferently according to metrical requirements. This was convincingly countered by Beekes 1970, who quotes all the instances of both words and shows that ἔτος is *always* used with a numeral in formulaic instances, whereas ἐνιαντός is

recurrently used with εἰς; he holds that ἐνιαυτός meant "the day on which the year cycle is completed," and its occasional use with a numeral is an encroachment (presumably arising from analogy) on the regular usage of ἔτος.

4. Verbs

Milman Parry (1971:45f.) gave examples of how verbs and verbal phrases of certain metrical shapes precede name-epithet formulae, and listed some of the formulae for "suffer woes" used in various metrical conditions (310-11). Woodlock 1981 lists and examines all noun-verb expressions in the *Iliad* which occur between the C1 and C2 caesurae and the end of the verse. Paraskevaides 1984 (127-31) illustrates some of the ways in which formulae containing a verb can be modified.

The largest-scale study of a particular verb is Muellner 1976, a work important for its methodology, for its demonstrations of the "play of formulae" (the ways they are transformed, adapted, and modified for aesthetic effect), and for its results. Muellner studies the usage of the verb εὔχομαι, usually translated as "pray," "boast," "profess." He classifies the formulae for prayers which include this verb, showing the transformations and adaptations they undergo, and determines the meaning in these contexts as "speak/say sacredly." A similar classification of the verb's secular uses (and its alternations with φημί) suggests the rendering "say (proudly, accurately, contentiously)"; the single legal use (*Iliad* 18.499) seems to mean (by Mycenaean Greek parallels) "say" or perhaps "state." An important part of the value of Muellner's work is his sympathetic appreciation of Homer's mastery of the formulaic style and his consciousness of the aesthetic effects of manipulation and usage: "Formulas are not clichés, receptacles of cant, or merely convenient phrases to help a faltering performer. They are metrical combinations of words in which the heritage of the primordial past could achieve its highest potential for the expression of living poetic meaning" (140). He allows himself expressions such as "the contextual and formal constraints . . . are being played with for expressive purposes" (23), "The pressure of this variation aesthetic on the poet's resources generates many new combinations" (25), "the existence of such doublets makes sense in terms of poetic performance. They are virtuoso pieces in which the composer . . . displays his ability not simply to form single

lines from smaller units but to re-use with elegantly slight alteration . . . whole groups of lines" (57). Muellner's work is alone of its kind, on this scale, and we need more like it.

Mureddu 1983 (115-21) gives an account of the formulae for sexual union in Homer and Hesiod. Haslam 1976 discusses the usages of λείβω and εἴβω, γαῖα and αἶα, and shows that the variant forms developed for metrical reasons.

A good deal of work has been done on the various expressions used to introduce or conclude direct speech. (Expressions including "winged words" are discussed in §7 part 5, and the phrase ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαξε in §7 part 6.) Combellack 1939, examining places where the usual "so spoke..." formulae are not used at the end of a speech, studied the three usual classes of such formulae; he found that the omission is due to unusual temporal or local relationships, not textual corruption. Krarup 1941 listed the occurrences of ὅ σφιν ἐϋ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν (which he finds to be used in circumstances of fright and danger) and ὣς ἔφαθ' οἱ δ' ἆρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ. Fournier 1946 studied φημί, ἀγορεύω, ἐρέω, and εἶπον in particular, finding no differences in sense and listing the formulaic usages. Stokes 1966 compares the speech formulas of the *Iliad* with those of the *Odyssey*, finding a high degree of similarity, and examines those which occur in only one poem. Edwards 1968 categorizes and comments upon the formulaic expressions which introduce direct speech, in three groups. The first consists of expressions where the sense of the verb is straightforwardly "addressed" or "answered" (sometimes qualified by an adverb or participle); these are subdivided according to semantic content and metrical shape. In the second group, expressions with a verb of more specific sense (e.g. "reproached") are listed. Finally, anomalous expressions are listed according to their occurrence in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Edwards 1969 discusses the usage of the various formulaic expressions for "X answered," starting from three passages where different forms occur in close succession with the name of the same Homeric character. He concludes that in general the principle of economy is maintained, though there are certain unsurprising irregularities and in a few instances a liking for variation may be suspected; the textual tradition may also sometimes be responsible for irregularities. Patzer 1972 (15-26) lists and discusses the formulae for "so he spoke," with their metrical, syntactical, and semantic variants.

Scully 1984 examines the formulae for deliberation used in the *Iliad*, especially those which include ὀχθήσας and μερμηρίζειν, finding a significant difference in usage in the case of Achilles; in Books 16 and 22 "we see by formulaic comparison that he is lifted up out of the common language and suspended between man and god, both because he uses stereotypic patterns which outline choice in a manner that differs from other heroes and because he is associated with other patterns generally employed for the gods" (24). An earlier article (Audiat 1947) had listed the formulaic usages of ὀχθήσας and examined the passages, concluding that the meanings include "irritated," "anxious," and "astonished" (and combinations of the three).

Note

[1]§§1-5 of this survey appeared in *Oral Tradition* 1 (1986):171-230. §9, which was listed at the beginning of the survey as "Homer and the Criticism of Oral Poetry," will be postponed to a later date.

References

Alexanderson 1970

B. Alexanderson. "Homeric Formulae for Ships." *Eranos*, 68:1-46.

Allison 1969

E. P. Allison. "Geographic and Ethnic Formulas in Homer and the Catalogue of Ships." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 29:2233A.

Amory Parry 1973

A. Amory Parry. *Blameless Aegisthus: A Study of* ἀμύμων *and Other Homeric Epithets* (*Mnemosyne*, Supplement 26). Leiden: Brill.

Audiat 1947

J. Audiat. "Une Formule homérique, μέγ' ὀχθήσας" *Revue des études anciennes,* 49:41-57.

Austin 1975

N. Austin. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bartonek 1959

A. Bartonek. "Die Wortparallelen αὐδή and φωνή in der archaischen epischen Sprache." *Sborník Prací Filosofické Fak. Brnenské Univ. Rada archeol. klas.*, 4:67-76.

Beekes 1970

R. S. P. Beekes. "ἔτος and ἐνιαυτός in Homeric formulas." *Glotta*, 47:138-43.

Bergren 1975

A. Bergren. *The Etymology and Usage of ΠΕΙΡΑΡ in Early Greek Poetry*.

American Classical Studies, 2. State College, PA: American Philological Association and Commercial Printing.

Bergson 1956
L. Bergson. "Eine Bemerkung zur Ökonomie der poetischen Kunstsprache." *Eranos*, 54:68-71.

Bowra 1960
C. M. Bowra. "Homeric Epithets for Troy." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 80:16-23.

Bowra 1961
_____. "ἐϋκνήμιδες ᾽Αχαιοί." *Mnemosyne*, 14:97-110.

Calhoun 1935
G. M. Calhoun. "The Art of Formula in Homer— ἔπεα πτερόεντα." *Classical Philology*, 30:215-27.

Chantraine 1964
P. Chantraine. "Les Noms d'action répondant aux verbes signifiant 'manger' et 'boire' chez Homére: ἐδητύς, βρῶσις, βρωτύς, βρώμη, πόσις, ποτής." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 59:11-23.

Cole 1977
D. R. Cole. "Asty and Polis: 'City' in Early Greek." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 37:6460A.

Combellack 1939
F. M. Combellack. "Omitted Speech Formulas in Homer." *University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, 12:43-56.

Combellack 1975
_____. "Agamemnon's Black Heart." *Grazer Beiträge*, 4:81-87.

Cramer 1974
O. C. Cramer. "Ulysses the Good? What is the Formula at *Od*. 2.71, 3.98, 4.328?" *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 104:77-80.

Cretia 1960
P. Cretia. "La Mer chez Homère." *Studii Classice*, 2:309-16 (in Rumanian with French summary).

Edwards 1966
M. W. Edwards. "Some Features of Homeric Craftsmanship." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 97:115-79.

Edwards 1968
_____. "Homeric Speech Introductions." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 74:1-36.

Edwards 1969
_____. "On Some 'Answering' Expressions in Homer." *Classical Philology*, 64:81-87.

Emlyn-Jones 1967
C. J. Emlyn-Jones. "ἔτος and ἐνιαυτός in Homeric Formulas." *Glotta*, 45:156-61.

Fournier 1946
H. Fournier. "Formules homériques de référence avec verbe 'dire'." *Revue de Philologie*, 20:29-68.

Gray 1947
D. H. F. Gray. “Homeric Epithets for Things.” *Classical Quarterly*, 61:109-21.
Hainsworth 1958
J. B. Hainsworth. “No Flames in the *Odyssey*.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 68:49-56.
Hainsworth 1960
_____. “Ἄπτερος μῦθος: A Concealed False Division?” *Glotta*, 38:263-68.
Hainsworth 1962
_____. “The Homeric Formula and the Problem of Its Transmission.” *Bulletin of the London Institute of Classical Studies*, 9:57-68.
Hainsworth 1964
_____. “Structure and Content in Epic Formulae: The Question of the Unique Expression.” *Classical Quarterly*, 14:155-64.
Hainsworth 1968
_____. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Hainsworth 1978
_____. “Good and Bad Formulae.” In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Ed. B. C. Fenik. Leiden: Brill. pp. 41-50.
Haslam 1976
M. W. Haslam. “Homeric Words and Homeric Metre: Two Doublets Examined (λείβω/εἴβω, γαῖα/αἶα).” *Glotta*, 54:201-11.
Hinterlechner 1953
W. Hinterlechner. *Typische und untypische Verwendung der homerischen Epitheta*. Dissertation (Wien).
Holoka 1983
J. P. Holoka. “ ‘Looking Darkly’ (ὑπόδρα ἰδών): Reflections on Status and Decorum in Homer.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 113:1-16.
Hooker 1979
J. T. Hooker. “Homeric Nominatives in -τα.” *Glotta*, 45:14-23.
Hooker 1979
_____. “A Note on ἄναξ.” *Živa antika*, 29:260.
Janko 1981
R. Janko. “‘Αθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως: The Genealogy of a Formula.” *Mnemosyne*, 34:382-85.
Krarup 1941
P. Krarup. “Beobachtungen zur Typik and Technik einiger homerischer Gesprächsformeln.” *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 4:230-47.
Liveris 1960
A. Liveris. *Les Epithètes chez Homère*. Athens.
Muellner 1976
L. C. Muellner. *The Meaning of Homeric* εὔχομαι *Through Its Formulas*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 13. Innsbruck: Becvar.
Munoz Valle 1974
I. Muñoz Valle. *Investigaciones sobre el estilo formular épico y sobre la lengua de Homero*. Valencia: Editorial Bello.

Mureddu 1983
P. Mureddu. *Formula e tradizione nella poesia di Esiodo*. Filologia e critica, 46. Rome: Edizione del'Ateneo.
Page 1959
D. L. Page. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Paraskevaides 1984
H. A. Paraskevaides. *The Use of Synonyms in Homeric Formulaic Diction*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
M. Parry 1971
Milman Parry. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. A. Parry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Patzer 1970
H. Patzer. *Dichterische Kunst und poetisches Handwerk im homerischen Epos*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
Pope 1960
M. W. M. Pope. "Athena's Development in Homeric Epic." *American Journal of Philology*, 81:113-35.
Pope 1963
_____. "The Parry-Lord Theory of Homeric Composition." *Acta Classica*, 6:1-21.
Sale 1984
W. M. Sale. "Homeric Olympus and Its Formulae." *American Journal of Philology*, 105:1-28.
Sale 1987
_____. "The Formularity of the Place-Names in the *Iliad*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 117 (TBP).
Schmiel 1984
R. Schmiel. "Metrically-interchangeable Formulae and Phrase-clusters in Homer." *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 9.3.34-38.
Scully 1984
S. Scully. "The Language of Achilles: The ὀχθήσας Formulas." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 114:11-27.
Severyns 1946
A. Severyns. *Homère II: Le Poète et son oeuvre*. Brussels: Lebègue.
Severyns 1970
_____. "Homeric Formulas and Achaean History." *Bucknell Review*,18.1:26-36.
Shannon 1975
R. S. Shannon. *The Arms of Achilles and Homeric Compositional Technique*. (*Mnemosyne*, Supplement 36). Leiden: Brill.
Stanford 1969
W. B. Stanford. "Euphonic Reasons for the Choice of Homeric Formulae?" *Hermathena*, 108:14-17.
Stokes 1966
W. R. Stokes. "Studies in Homeric Formulas." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 37:465A.

Van der Valk 1966
M. H. A. L. H. van der Valk. "The Formulaic Character of Homeric Poetry." *L'Antiquité classique*, 35:5-70.
Vivante 1975
P. Vivante. "On Homer's Winged Words." *Classical Quarterly*, 25:1-12.
Vivante 1982
_____. "The Syntax of Homer's Epithets of Wine." *Glotta*, 60:13-23.
Wathelet 1968
P. Wathelet, "Les Verbes ἐρύω and ἔρυμαι dans les formules de l'épopée." In *Studio Mycenaea* (Proceedings of the Mycenaean Symposium. Ed. by A. Bartonek. Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Burnensis Facultatis Philosophica, Brno. Fac. Philos., 127). Brno: Purkynme. pp. 105-11.
Wathelet 1979
_____. "Mycénien et grec d'Homère: ἄναξ et βασιλεύς dans la tradition formulaire de l'épopée grecque." *Živa antika*, 29:25-40.
Watts 1969
A. C. Watts. *The Lyre and the Harp: A Comparative Reconsideration of Oral Tradition in Homer and Old English Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Whallon 1961
W. Whallon. "The Homeric Epithets." *Yale Classical Studies*, 17:97-142.
Whallon 1966
_____. "The Shield of Ajax." *Yale Classical Studies*, 19:7-36.
Whallon 1969
_____. *Formula, Character and Context*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Whallon 1979
_____. "Is Hector *androphonos*?" In *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to B. M. W. Knox*. Berlin: de Gruyter. pp. 19-24.
Woodlock 1981
L. T. Woodlock. "Noun-verb Associations and the Formula in Homer's *Iliad*." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 42:683A.

§7. Formulae and meaning

This section lists works which discuss how much meaning should be attributed to recurrent formulaic expressions. It therefore includes the problems of whether a formula retains any real meaning in conventional uses, and how apparently inappropriate uses of a formula can be explained. Works dealing primarily with the meaning of obscure words are not included.

After a general section, separate parts deal with five well-known "irrational" uses of a formula: "blameless Aegisthus;" Penelope's "fat" hand; the beggar Irus's "lady mother;" and with two expressions which may or may not have special significance, "winged" and "unwinged" words and ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ'

ὀνόμαζε. A final section covers work on the special topics of whether Homer was limited by formulaic style when he wished to express new ideas, and to what extent characterization is conveyed by formulaic language or the absence of it.

1. General

In his excellent introduction to his edition of his father's work Adam Parry points out that the demonstration that epithets and even phrases in Homer are chosen for their metrical convenience, not their appropriateness to the context, is the feature of his work that "has aroused most disagreement, even antagonism, for it has seemed to many to deny the poetry the possibility of artistic expression" (M. Parry 1971:xxvi). A. Parry further notes that (lv, note 2) M. Parry "seemed to believe that the ornamental epithet had virtually no meaning at all: it was a sort of noble or heroic padding." In his long chapter "The Meaning of the Epithet in Epic Poetry" (1971:118-72), Parry insisted that fixed epithets are an aid to versification, not chosen for their relevance to the immediate context, and quoted in support the earlier statements of Düntzer, expressed as long ago as 1862 (see Latacz 1979:88; above, Part I, §1), that the poet could not choose an epithet with a view both to its signification and to its metrical value (124). Parry disagrees strongly (125, 129) with the emotional effect Ruskin attributed to the juxtaposition of "the earth . . . our mother still—fruitful, life-giving" (φυσίζοος αἶα) with the death of Castor and Pollux (*Iliad* 3.243). For Parry, an epithet "becomes ornamental when its meaning loses any value of its own and becomes so involved with the idea of the substantive that the two can no longer he separated. The fixed epithet then adds to the combination of substantive and epithet an element of nobility and grandeur, but no more than that" (127). In a later article (1971:240-50) Parry examined ornamental "glosses," Homeric words whose meaning is unknown or doubtful, showing that they survived even after their meaning was forgotten because of their metrical convenience. Sheppard 1935 and 1936 are good examples of the kind of approach that Parry was combatting.

Parry's basic ideas are reasserted in Combellack 1959, an influential article in which the author sets out to illustrate that "one result of Milman Parry's work on the Homeric style has been to remove from the literary study of the Homeric poems an entire

area of normal literary criticism" (193). With reference to Ruskin's comment, "if Parry is correct in his analysis . . . we can no longer with any confidence urge that the adjective φυσίζοος was deliberately chosen by the poet because of any kind of peculiar appropriateness of meaning" (197). Similarly, it is dangerous to think of any usages as mock-heroic or used in parody. Combellack "do[es] not want to be understood as arguing that . . . Homer never used an epithet with deliberate artistic purpose, or as opposing the general theory that Homer sometimes used his formulary language in a wondrously skillful way" (207); but "the hard fact is that in this post-Parry era critics are no longer in a position to distinguish the passages in which Homer is merely using a convenient formula from those in which he has consciously and cunningly chosen *le mot juste*" (208).

Later Combellack returns to the topic (1965) with a collection of passages "where it seems that the poet has been led away from logic because he is involved in a common formulary situation" (41), in particular some instances where swiftness is stressed although it is inappropriate to the context, and the repeated statements that the victorious Hector stripped the armor from Patroclus (though it was actually Apollo's work). Combellack concludes with the view that we can never understand what use Homer has made of his tradition because we cannot compare him with his predecessors and contemporaries: "The new in literature can be discovered only by comparison with the old, and if the old is not in existence the comparison is impossible" (55). In an article on "invented" Homeric characters and episodes Combellack (1976:53-55) accepts that very occasionally a modification or manipulation of a formula may occur because of its inappropriateness in a context; for example, Zeus becomes "lightning-gatherer" instead of the usual "cloud-gatherer" when he is explicitly said to be *clearing away* the clouds (*Iliad* 16.298), and Achilles becomes "great-hearted" instead of "swift-footed" when the next verse begins with "to the feet" (*Iliad* 23.168).

In a long and rather loosely written article Whallon (1961) sets out "to show the literary value of certain epithets in the *Iliad* and the Odyssey" (97); he lists the epithets for 15 characters in both poems, plus "equestrians" and some patronymics, and shows that they have meaning in some contexts, but pays no regard to metrical necessity or special effect. Whallon 1965 maintains that formulaic epithets for Iliadic heroes are true to individual character

but indifferent to context, whereas kennings in *Beowulf* are true to generic character but significantly appropriate to context. He compares the two kinds of formulae in detail.

Bowra 1962 (31) lists some instances where a standard expression may be modified in particular circumstances. He suggests that even fixed epithets, despite their familiarity, emphasize the words to which they are attached, and help the swift flow of the narrative (34); the repeated verses also are far from devoid of poetic effect, and may have different effects in different circumstances. Rosenmeyer 1965 (296-97) discusses the views of Parry and others on the force of ornamental epithets, and finds Combellack's views too restrictive; the conventional phrases are the poetry itself—"The bard regards his poetic phrase as indistinguishable from poetic substance" (297).

In my article on arrangement of words in the verse (Edwards 1966) I include a discussion of the force of ornamental adjectives used in the runover position (138-46), between the A and B caesurae (153-54), and between the B and C caesurae (164-66). My conclusion is that "a significant sense can occasionally be attributed to ornamental adjectives and conventional phrases, and that this should be considered possibly intentional on the poet's part" (177). In a later article (Edwards 1968b) I examine the usage of formulae in *Iliad* 18 in an attempt to identify special effects of emphasis and meaning; Segal 1971 does the same for Andromache's speech at *Iliad* 22.437-76.

Stanford 1971 points out some of the weaknesses in Parry's arguments for the virtual meaninglessness of fixed epithets, with brief mention of the occasional use of incongruous epithets, not because they are meaningless, but just in order to keep the verse going.

In the first part of an important article A. Parry (1972:1-9) raises the question of the consciousness of Homer's audience: how much significance should the ideal member of Homer's audience attribute to the formulaic expressions? M. Parry suggested that because of repetition, set phrases do not bear an individual meaning, and consciousness cannot focus on them; epithets used of more than one hero cannot tell us anything unique about each one. But there seems to be some appropriateness in ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν for Agamemnon (particularly since it is in an unusual position) and δῖος for Achilles in *Iliad* 1.7. Because the epithets are chosen for metrical convenience does not mean that they lack meaning.

In this second part of this article (9-22) the author argues that the direct addresses of the poet (usually to Patroclus, Menelaus, and Eumaeus) signify emotion, or at least a special appropriateness to the character. Matthews 1980 holds that metrical or otherwise non-aesthetic reasons are responsible. In a section on "Narrative: The Poet's Voice" in my book on Homer (1987:37-38), I lean towards Parry's view.

Vivante has published a number of works on the meaning of Homeric epithets. In one article (1973) he argues that epithets express some naturally inherent property, a broad identity rather than a qualification. When predication of qualities is needed, it is done by a verb or sentence. He also lists the epithets meaning "strong" (160 n. 6), "swift" (161 n. 7), and "wise" (161 N. 8), showing that they are rarely used predicatively. In a later article (1980) he is concerned not with the meaning (or lack of meaning) of an epithet, but with the difference caused by its presence or absence; he asks: "What difference does it make to our perception of a sentence whether there is an epithet or not?" (157). He examines a number of examples, and finds that the epithets are "poetically essential in giving us a sense of extension, as if their very length were suggestive of actual space" (158-59). Vivante 1982a, a full-length work devoted to epithets in Homer, points out that an epithet refers to an intrinsic quality of the object ("hollow ship"), irrelevant to narrative occasion; this gives a poetic effect. Epithets are used in passages of description rather than in narrative or in direct speech. Clusters of epithets and the recurrence of epithets are studied (in a rather obscure section). Vivante also studies certain noun-epithet expressions in their context, asserting the difference made by the use of an epithet (*not* the significance of the epithet), definitions of epithet, and explanations of the contrast between ornamental and significant epithets, dealing harshly with M. Parry and most subsequent scholars. Much of what Vivante says is hard to follow, but he is correct in asserting that the presence of an epithet may well mean more than simply that it fills a gap in the verse. Vivante 1982b again asks: "Why do nouns have an epithet in Homer? When do they lack it?" (13), and concludes: "I maintain that the presence or absence of the epithet is intimately connected (a) with the syntactic function which is most intrinsic to the noun, (b) with the distinctness of the sentence in which the noun occurs" (14). He studies the epithets for "wine" in all grammatical cases, showing

that use of an epithet is commonest in the accusative and least frequent in the nominative; this shows a syntactic preference.

Bowra 1960 examines the epithets for Troy and other cities to determine if the meanings are appropriate, his work including a collection of formulae arranged by metrical shape. He does not, however, use the information to determine how far they go to complete the system or list the metrical variants which preserve or violate economy. He finds the epithets usually appropriate but not illuminating. Pinsent 1984 examines the epithets used (in the *Iliad* only) for Troy, for the Trojans and for the Greeks, to see if any differences can be found which might throw light on the dates at which the two peoples entered the epic language. Not surprisingly, he finds this impossible: "Formulaic epithets are devised and employed for metrical and not for historical reasons. The Achaeans are very frequently referred to with formulaic epithets because the metrical shape of the word meant that it was most usually employed in the second half of the hexameter, where the use of a formulaic epithet made it easier to fit it in. The Trojans, like the Argives and the Danaans, are metrically more flexible, and so less frequently require the assistance of a formulaic epithet" (150). Some of the methodology may not be quite sound, but the collection of information is useful.

Muñoz Valle 1974 (87-100) examines the formulaic expressions for Athena, including τέκος, κούρη, and θυγάτηρ, to see if they are synonyms, concluding that though the words have different connotations these are neutralized in formulaic usages and are used according to metrical convenience. Redfield 1979 analyzes the meanings and usage of words in formulae in *Iliad* 1.1-7, including style and poetic devices; he finds familiar diction used in unusual ways. Schwabl 1979 I have not seen. Floyd 1980 discusses the usage and meaning of κλέος ἄφθιτον in early Greek, together with those of the Vedic *śrávah . . . áksitam*; he concludes that the idea they share is "poetically preserved fame," posthumous in Greek but in Vedic associated with wealth and guaranteed by the gods. Tsagarakis 1982:32-46 discusses the usage of ὀξυόεντι and χαλκείῳ after ἔγκεϊ, and some phrases for Odysseus, suggesting that one ornamental epithet may be chosen over another because of its meaning. There is a good section on modifications of formulaic phrasing in Macleod 1982 (40-42). Cosset 1983 examines the usage of the formulae πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς, Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω, and μητιέτα Ζεύς, concludes that in almost

all cases μῆτις retains some significance and the character makes use of the qualities suggested by the formula. Schmiel 1984 tests the "equivalent" epithets (see Part I, §3, p. 194) for "spear" and "sea," finding that in most cases the poet chooses the epithet most appropriate to the context; therefore the meaning must retain some significance. Finally, one should note a return almost to the view of Sheppard in a recent review of G. S. Kirk's *Iliad* commentary, which remarks that "Πηληϊάδεω [*Iliad* 1.1] gets no comment, despite the central role that the absent Peleus plays in Achilles' heart (reaching its memorable climax in Book 24)" (*Classical Review*, 36 [1986]:2).

2. "Blameless Aegisthus"

Milman Parry (1971:122) quoted Eustathius' explanation (probably from Aristarchus) of the use of ἀμύμων "blameless" for the wicked Aegisthus (*Odyssey* 1.29): "not referring to his crimes, but to his natural virtues: he had high birth, beauty, intelligence, and other things of the same sort." Parry himself thought that in such apparently illogical cases "the poet simply used certain epithets as ornaments without ever thinking that his audience would try to relate them to the circumstances of the moment. In some of the cases it so fell out that the idea of the epithet and the meaning of the sentence could not be reconciled" (124).

Amory Parry 1973 took this particular instance of apparently illogical usage as the foundation for an exhaustive study of the epithets of heroes. She found the meaning "blameless" to be unsatisfactory, both in the contexts in which the word occurs and etymologically, and concluded the original meaning was not moral but something like "beautiful in body," and the rendering "handsome" best accounts for the course of development; the connotation "good" was acquired early in the tradition, and supplanted the other in a few traditional phrases (157). Her general —and very reasonable—conclusion was that the audience never became as insensitive to the meaning of epithets as Parry claims; laudatory epithets to some extent retain their different connotations, and ἀμύμων, μεγάθυμος, and ἄλκιμος (for example) are not synonyms. Ἀμύμων is thus not in fact inappropriate for Aegisthus when its proper meaning is understood.

Lowenstam 1981 (44-45) divides the applications of ἀμύμων into three categories: practices (e.g. dancing); practitioners

collectively (seers etc.) and specifically (individuals); and products of practices (objects or abstractions). He finds the common denominator to be "skillful, cunning." Aegisthus is five times called δολόμητις, so in his case ἀμύμων can be translated "crafty." He thus finds none of the famous instances of illogical use is really inappropriate. In conclusion, he quotes *Iliad* 2.265-66, where the weedy Thersites' shoulders are not "broad" as usual but a periphrasis is used, as also for a woman's shoulders in *Odyssey* 8.527-29.

Combellack 1982 refers to the old commentators' explanation of inappropriate epithets, that they mean "not at that time but by nature," and suggests that in the cases of ἀμύμων for Aegisthus and Pandarus the doctrine be reversed, and interpreted "not by nature, but at that time" (361). Aegisthus is correct in exacting vengeance for a wrong done to his father, and in the context this is the important aspect; similarly in the case of Pandarus (*Iliad* 4.89) ἀμύμων "can be interpreted as referring to a particular aspect of this personage in the particular context in which the adjective occurs" (371)—Pandarus is a skillful archer. This suggests a deliberate choice of epithets, not a careless one. Combellack's idea is new and very interesting; perhaps it could he taken even further, by suggesting that it is significant that at the time the epithet is applied to the characters it is pertinent to them in Combellack's sense, but neither of the characters has yet performed the action for which he incurs censure; it may be highly relevant that Aegisthus is not given the epithet *after* we are told of his killing Agamemnon, nor Pandarus *after* he has loosed his truce-breaking shot against Menelaus.

3. Penelope's "fat hand"

The usage of *Odyssey* 21.6, where Penelope takes up the bronze, ivory-handled key of her store-room χειρὶ παχείῃ "with her powerful hand" —a formula otherwise used for heroes—was mentioned by Milman Parry (1971:151) as an example of an expression usually perfectly acceptable, but odd in a certain instance, demonstrating that the poet's audience cared little for the sense of the epithet. Schlesinger 1969 explains that Penelope carries the key "'in (her) fist,' that is, in her clenched, 'thick' hand" (236), either because it is heavy, or to conceal it from the servant women. He shows that the phrase is generally used of grasping a weapon. Wyatt 1978 points out that at *Odyssey* 18.195

Athena makes Penelope taller and πάσσονα "stouter," and her "powerful" hand here reminds us of her beauty; her hand is singled out because it is highly visible in this scene, and the expression could better be rendered "plump, well-turned." Later he added supporting evidence from Modern Greek (Wyatt 1983). Lowenstam 1981 (43-44) prefers the translation "strong hand," and adds that Penelope is twice given the epithet ἰφθίμη "strong;" this is clearly a positive quality. Eide 1980 I have not seen.

4. Irus' "Lady mother"

Milman Parry referred to the surprising use of πότνια μήτηρ "lady mother" for the mother of the beggar Irus (*Odyssey* 18.6), grouping it with Penelope's "fat hand" (1971:151; see last section) as an indication that the audience paid little attention to the meaning of the epithet. Combellack 1959 (204) discusses the view that humor or parody is intended—"Of course, for all we know, Homer may have meant πότνια μήτηρ to be a jolly misuse of a dignified formula, and his audience may have grinned with him" (204)—but feels that since Parry's discoveries there is just no means of being certain. Lowenstam 1981 (40-43) divides the adjectives occurring with "mother" into five categories, and feels that since the others refer to proper social behavior and marital status, not rank, there is no reason to suppose that the πότνια category should be different. He therefore takes the meaning to be "wedded mother," which also has etymological support. Irus is a legitimate child. There are, however, some difficulties in reconciling this meaning with the common application of the epithet to goddesses, including those who are virgin.

5. "Winged" and "unwinged" words

Calhoun 1935 (the article is a good example of the dilemma of an older scholar able to accept Milman Parry's discoveries in theory but not always their direct results for the poems) held that the famous "winged words" phrase indicated heightened emotional situations. He examined all the occurrences and their contexts, including MSS variants. Parry responded (M. Parry 1971:414-18; published in 1937) by repeating his own view that the phrase is used when the character who is to speak has been the subject of the last verses, so that the use of his name in the line would he clumsy" (414); no other formula fills this need, and so the choice is

purely metrical; emotion there may be, but so there is in most speeches.

Combellack 1950 (a short but wide-ranging and thoughtful article) reminds us that the scholia say the meaning is "swift; for nothing is swifter than speech" (21). The metaphor is generally agreed to be that of the flight of a bird from speaker to listener; the alternative explanation, the feathered tip of an arrow, is not usually accepted. Are winged words peculiar in some way? No; for Parry's rebuttal of Calhoun is fair. So there is nothing special about the 124 instances of "winged" words; "All words are winged, but Homer happens to mention that fact only now and then" (23). Some scholars thought the phrase means that words fly away and are lost, and Combellack inclines towards this view, which is supported by the scholia on *Iliad* 16.101: "for words disappear, being winged." Perhaps Homer is reminding us not that words are swift, but that they are evanescent—an implied contrast with deeds. The unfamiliarity of writing lends special point to this. "How melancholy it is that this man whose life must have been devoted largely or entirely to words and not to deeds should have felt impelled to remind his listeners 124 times that while the deeds of the heroes of the Trojan War would remain forever in men's minds, his own words were winged ephemerids doomed to die almost as soon as they were spoken. And yet these great deeds of the heroes who won and the heroes who lost at Troy owe their immortality to Homer's words that die" (25).

Hainsworth 1960 argues that the obscure phrase ἄπτερος . . . μῦθος, used four times in the *Odyssey* after a speech by a male to a female who does not reply, is not (as others have held) contrasted with "winged words" to give the meaning "she was silent." Some ancient commentators held that the phrase means "swift to persuade," and this meaning of ἄπτερος may have arisen from a misunderstanding of ἔπεα πτερόεντα as ἔπε᾽ ἀπτερόεντα without change of meaning. Van der Valk 1966 (59-64) returns to the meaning "her words remain unwinged," i.e. the hearer does not give voice to her thoughts. Latacz 1968 also discusses the meaning of this phrase.

Vivante 1975 holds that the phrase is not really a metaphor, as words do fly from mouth to ears: "Words are winged on the strength of their own nature, and not because they serve some alleged purpose. They fly out when the situation allows it, when there is an opening in the action or a moment of release, and not

for any definite purpose" (4, n. 1); "Words have wings when they seem to fly out on their own account, unsolicited by any question, unconditioned by the necessities of dialogue, unenforced by any overriding need" (5). The idea may seem a little fanciful, but Vivante quotes good examples of sudden inspiration of speech, such as the sight of Helen (*Iliad* 3.155), Achilles' pity for Patroclus (*Iliad* 16.6), and his surprise at the sight of Athena (*Iliad* 1.201). D'Avino 1980-81, giving a lengthy review of the question and of the meaning of ἔπος/ἔπεα, and of the resonances of the formula, concludes "il problema della loro interpretazione va tenuto distinto per motivi di metodo da quello della formula, anche se i risultati devono non essere incongruenti, e possono avvalorarsi a vicenda" (117); there is no reason to give the prefix ἀ- in ἄπτερος other than a privative sense. In the fifth volume of the recent Mondadori commentary on the *Odyssey*, Russo (1985:161-63) reviews the bibliography of the question and accepts "swift" for ἄπτερος.

6. Ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε

The modern debate began with Calhoun 1935, in which the author listed and examined the occurrences and suggested that the phrase expressed "emotion, and earnest, affectionate, or cordial address" (224). He thought it was the use of ἐξονόμαζε that conveyed this, and did not consider the (probably much more likely) contribution of the phrases which usually precede ἔν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί or χειρί τέ μιν κατέρεξεν.

Jacobsohn 1935 concerned himself mainly with whether the phrase is an example of *hysteron-proteron*, and decided it was not. In his article on "winged words" (1971:414-18) Parry responded to Calhoun that the phrase was used, instead of some other, "purely for grammatical reasons" (416), and pointed out that it also occurs several times in parallel with ἐνένιπεν "rebuke."

Couch 1937 analyzed in detail the 43 occurrences of the formula, and concluded that in most cases it is used to introduce the words of a god or mortal who enjoys superiority over the person addressed. In instances in which the two parties are equals, or the speaker is inferior, the speaker has some moral superiority in the circumstances or is in the privileged position of a petitioner. Couch found no recognizable difference in sense in the eleven verses in which the phrase is prefixed by ἔν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί. Both

touching and naming a person are likely to carry emphasis, and Couch is very probably right. The formula is included in Edwards' analysis of speech-introductions (1968a:10-11) and considered to be used primarily between intimates, but occasionally in contempt.

D'Avino 1969 points out that ὀνομάζω in Herodotus and other authors sometimes means "translate into words," and after a review of other scholars' work and the uses of the word and its cognates concludes that in the Homeric phrase ἐξονομάζω means "formulare compiutamente un discorso" (32). Munoz Valle 1971 (and 1974:43-52), in a sensible and comprehensive article, collects the occurrences of the expression (17 in the *Iliad*, 25 in the *Odyssey*) and divides them into four categories according to whether the following speech begins with a name in the vocative, a common noun (e.g. "stranger") or an adjective in the vocative (this is the largest group), a verb in the imperative or second-person indicative without a vocative, or none of the above (two instances only, both in the *Odyssey*). He also lists the views of former scholars, dividing them into those who hold that the second part of the expression is merely synonymous with the first, and those who think it once had the meaning "addressed by name." He himself proposes that the latter part once meant "addressed by name," but became fossilized and evolved into the instances where no name was used, finally degenerating into his last category, which has no vocative and no second-person verbs. Muñoz Valle holds (sensibly) that different meanings must be accepted in different contexts and reflect different stages in development, but that they must not be used to identify periods of composition or different authors.

7. The expression of new ideas, and characterization by language

A. Parry 1956 argues that "the formulaic character of Homer's language means that everything in the world is regularly presented as all men (all men within the poem, that is) commonly perceive it" (3). This applies to speech too: "Since the economy of the formulaic style confines speech to accepted patterns which all men assume to be true, there need never be a fundamental distinction between speech and reality; or between thought and reality" (4). But Achilles' superb speech in reply to Odysseus at *Iliad* 9.308ff. is concerned with "the awful distance between appearance and reality" (4). Achilles has no language in which to express his disillusionment; instead, he expresses it by "misusing the language he disposes of. He asks questions that cannot be

answered and makes demands that cannot be met. He uses conventional expressions where we least expect him to . . .” (6). Parry’s deductions are questionable, and he gives virtually no examples of misuse of the conventional language. Reeve 1973 draws attention to some of the weaknesses in Parry’s argument. Claus 1975 realizes that the formulae “do not describe or create a perfect and inflexible world of thought patterns that can be regarded as reality” (16), and though aware of some of the problems in Parry’s article, takes up the question whether Achilles sees the ideals of his society as false (again without detailed reference to usage of formulae). In an interesting recent article Nimis 1986 reviews both the question of Achilles’ alienation and that of his language, using up-to-date critical theories: “Achilles’ speeches can be said to be examples of . . . rule-changing creativity . . . [H]e is a sign-producer who wishes to change the ‘code,’ to articulate a meaning for whose communication and accurate reception no adequate conventions exist as yet. . . .The dilemma of Achilles, therefore, is not peculiar to formulaic diction or any other signifying system” (219). Nimis concludes, reasonably enough, “to essentialize the ‘meaning’ of the poem into a statement of some transcendent truth or other is to put the poet in a position relative to his society which is just as theoretically impossible for him as it is for Achilles. Homer’s ‘stance’ in the poem is complex, and, like Achilles’ own speeches and actions, contradictory” (224).

Hogan 1976, starting out from A. Parry’s idea, studies occurrences of redundant πρίν, where the actual clause introduced by the word is preceded by a redundant adverbial use of the same word. Four of the eighteen examples in the *Iliad* are in the speeches of Achilles himself, two more have him as subject or object of the subordinate clause, two are attributed to him by other speakers, and one is addressed to him. “The repeated use by Achilles of this figure and its attribution by others to him very nearly make it a personal stylistic mannerism” (306). One wonders if the statistics are significant enough to bear this weight. Starting again from A. Parry’s idea, Duban 1981 examines the language of Hector in his duels with Ajax and with Achilles (and also the language of the Paris-Menelaus duel), and finds three characteristics: a preoccupation with fame; frequent use of the verb “to know”; and a periodic and rhetorical balance when he is in control of the situation. Duban also refers to Bassett’s

comments on the picturesque language Hector uses, and considers that these features add up to the "exaggerated sense of his own capacities which is Hektor's trademark" (98).

Friedrich and Redfield 1978 compare 897 lines of the speeches of Achilles in the *Iliad* with about the same number spoken by others in his presence, in search of individual personality traits which they think can be determined despite formula and meter. After a brief theoretical criticism of A. Parry 1956, they examine nine distinctive features of Achilles' speech, divided under the headings of rhetoric, discourse, and syntax/lexicon. Particularly characteristic of Achilles' speeches are richness of detail, cumulative series, vividness in depicting hypothetical images, and "poetic directness." Narrative is relatively unimportant in Achilles' speeches, and he is relatively brief. Asyndeton, however, is significantly frequent, contributing to his "abrupt, informal, forceful way of speaking" (279), and he uses more elaborate vocative expressions, more titles, and more terms of abuse. He also makes significantly greater use of the emotive particles ἦ and δή, which "add a tone of certainty, urgency, pathos, or irony" (282); there is also a higher frequency of μοι and lower frequency of τοι, a distribution "consistent with Achilles' first-person, self-declaratory rhetorical stance—so often contrasted with the second-person, persuasive stance of counter-speakers" (282). Achilles' speeches also show a much more frequent use of νῦν δέ (26 times against 7 in the control sample), which is "consistent with his combination of imagination and realism; his mind goes out into a world of possibility, and then abruptly returns to the situation before him" (283). These results are very interesting; a similar comparative study of enjambement, word-positioning, and sentence-length would probably reveal further idiosyncracies in Achilles' speeches. (See now Griffin 1986.)

Messing 1981 challenges the above results on the grounds that the sample is inadequate, the text is insecure, and the methodology in applying stylometric criteria is defective. His objections are met (adequately, I think) in Friedrich and Redfield 1981. Scully 1984 also finds differences in the language of Achilles (see §6, part 4).

Holoka 1983 lists and examines the 26 occurrences of ὑπόδρα ἰδών, finding that the phrase conveys anger or annoyance at "an infraction of propriety" (16), often directed towards a subordinate.

References

Amory Parry 1973
A. Amory Parry. *Blameless Aegisthus: A Study of* ἀμύμων *and Other Homeric Epithets*. Leiden: Brill.

Bergren 1975
A. Bergren. *The Etymology and Usage of* πεῖραρ *in Early Greek Poetry*. American Classical Studies, 2. State College: American Philological Association and Commercial Printing.

Bowra 1960
C. M. Bowra. "Homeric Epithets for Troy." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 80:16-23.

Bowra 1962
_____. "Style." In *A Companion to Homer*. Ed. A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings. London: Macmillan. pp. 26-37.

Calhoun 1935
G. M. Calhoun. "The Art of Formula in Homer—ἔπεα πτερόεντα." *Classical Philology*, 30:215-27.

Claus 1975
D. B. Claus. "*Aidôs* in the Language of Achilles." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 105:13-28.

Combellack 1950
F. M. Combellack. "Words that Die." *Classical Journal*, 46:21-26.

Combellack 1959
_____. "Milman Parry and Homeric Artistry." *Comparative Literature*, 11:193-208.

Combellack 1965
_____. "Some Formulary Illogicalities in Homer." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 96:41-56.

Combellack 1975
_____. "Agamemnon's Black Heart." *Grazer Beiträge*, 4:81-87.

Combellack 1976
_____. "Homer the Innovator." *Classical Philology*, 71:44-55.

Combellack 1982
_____. "Two Blameless Homeric Characters." *American Journal of Philology*, 103:361-72.

Cosset 1983
E. Cosset. "Tradition formulaire et originalité homérique: réflexions sur trois épithètes de l'*Iliade*." *Revue des études grecques*, 96:269-74.

Couch 1937
H. N. Couch. "A Prelude to Speech in Homer." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 68:129-40.

D'Avino 1969
R. D'Avino. "La funzionalità di ὀνομάζω e la formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε." *Studia classica et orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata*. Rome: Istituto di Glottologia. vol. 2:7-33.

D'Avino 1980-81
_____. "Messagio verbale e tradizione orale: hom. ἔπεα πτερόεντα." *Helikon*, 20-21:87-117.
Duban 1981
J. M. Duban. "Les Duels majeurs de 1'*Iliad*e et le langage d'Hector." *Les Etudes classiques*, 49:97-124.
Edwards 1966
M. W. Edwards. "Some Features of Homeric Craftsmanship." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 97:115-79.
Edwards 1968a
_____. "Homeric Speech Introductions." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 74:1-36.
Edwards 1968b
_____."Some Stylistic Notes on *Iliad* 18." *American Journal of Philology*, 89:257-83.
Edwards 1969
_____. "On Some 'Answering' Expressions in Homer." *Classical Philology*, 64:81-87.
Edwards 1987
_____. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Eide 1980
T. Eide. "A Note on the Homeric χειρί παχείη." *Symbolae Osloenses*, 55:23-26.
Floyd 1980
E. D. Floyd. "*Kleos aphthiton*: An Indo-European Perspective on Early Greek Poetry." *Glotta*, 58:133-57.
Friedrich and Redfield 1978
P. Friedrich and J. Redfield. "Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles." *Language*, 54:263-87.
Friedrich and Redfield 1981
_____. "Contra Messing." *Language*, 57:901-03.
Griffin 1986
J. Griffin. "Words and Speakers in Homer." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 106:36-57.
Hainsworth 1960
J. B. Hainsworth. "Ἄπτερος μῦθος : A Conealed False Division?" *Glotta*, 38:263-68.
Hainsworth 1972
_____. "The Homeric Formula and the Problem of Its Transmission." *Bulletin of the London Institute of Classical Studies*, 9:57-68.
Hainsworth 1978
_____. "Good and Bad Formulae." In *Homer*: *Tradition and Invention*. Ed. B. C. Fenik. Leiden: Brill. pp. 41-50.
Hogan 1976
J. C. Hogan. "Double πρίν and the Language of Achilles." *Classical Journal*, 71:305-10.

Holoka 1983
J. P. Holoka. "'Looking Darkly' (ὑπόδρα ἰδών): Reflections on Status and Decorum in Homer." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 113:1-16.
Jacobsohn 1935
H. Jacobsohn. "Zum homerischen ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἐκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 62:132-40.
Latacz 1968
J. Latacz. "᾽Απτερος μῦθος — ἄπτερος φάτις: ungeflügelte Wörte?" *Glotta*, 46:27-47.
Lowenstam 1981
S. Lowenstam. "Irus' 'Queenly' Mother and the Problem of the Irrational Use of Homeric Epithets." *Pacific Coast Philology*, 16.1:39-47.
Macleod 1982
C. W. Macleod. *Homer: Iliad Book XXIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Matthews 1980
V. J. Matthews. "Metrical Reasons for Apostrophe in Homer." *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 5:93-99.
Messing 1981
G. M. Messing. "On Weighing Achilles' Winged Words." *Language*, 57:888-900.
Muñoz Valle 1971
I. Muñoz Valle. "Interpretación de ia fórmula homérica ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε." *Emerita*, 39:305-14.
Muñoz Valle 1974
_____. *Investigaciones sobre el estilo formular épico y sobre la lengua de Homero*. Valencia: Editorial Bello.
Nimis 1986
S. Nimis. "The Language of Achilles: Construction vs. Representation." *Classical World*, 79:217-25.
A. Parry 1956
A. Parry. "The Language of Achilles." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 87:1-7.
A. Parry 1972
_____. "Language and Characterization in Homer." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 76:1-22.
M. Parry 1971
Milman Parry. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. A. Parry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Pinsent 1984
J. Pinsent. "The Trojans in the Iliad." In *The Trojan War*. Ed. L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press. pp. 137-62.
Redfield 1979
J. M. Redfield. "The Proem of the *Iliad*: Homer's Art." *Classical Philology*, 74:95-110.
Reeve 1973
M. D. Reeve. "The Language of Achilles." *Classical Quarterly*, 23:193-95.

Rosenmeyer 1965
T. G. Rosenmeyer. "The Formula in Early Greek Poetry." *Arion*, 4:295-311.
Russo 1985
J. Russo. *Omero: Odissea vol. V*. Milan: Mondadore.
Schlesinger 1969
A. C. Schlesinger. "Penelope's Hand." *Classical Philology*, 64:236-37.
Schmiel 1984
R. Schmiel. "Metrically-interchangeable Formulae and Phrase-clusters in Homer." *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 9.3:34-38.
Schwabl 1979
H. Schwabl. "Τὸ πρόβλημα τῶν παραδοσιακῶν μορφῶν σύνθεσης στὸν Ὅμηρο." Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Ἀθηνῶν, 27:94-106.
Segal 1971
C. P. Segal. "Andromache's *Anagnorisis*: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22:437-76." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 75:33-57.
Sheppard 1935
J. T. Sheppard. "Zeus-Loved Achilles: A Contribution to the Study of Stock Epithets in Homer's *Iliad*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 55:113-23.
Sheppard 1936
_____. "Great-hearted Odysseus: A Contribution to the Study of 'Stock Epithets' in Homer's *Odyssey*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 56:36-47.
Stanford 1971
W. B. Stanford. "Remarks on the Collected Works of Milman Parry." *Hermathena*, 112:36-51.
Teodorescu 1939
S. Teodorescu. "Die formelhaften Wendungen bei Homer: Formel and Wiederholung." *Rivista Clasica Bucuresti*, 11/12 (1939-40):38-91.
Tsagarakis 1982
O. Tsagarakis. *Form and Content in Homer*. (*Hermes* Einzelschriften, 46). Wiesbaden: Steiner.
Van der Valk 1966
M. van der Valk. "The Formulaic Character of Homeric Poetry and the Relation between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *L'Antiquite classique*, 35:5-70.
Vivante 1973
P. Vivante. "On Poetry and Language in Homer." *Ramus*, 2:143-62.
Vivante 1975
_____. "On Homer's Winged Words." *Classical Quarterly*, 25:1-12.
Vivante 1980
_____. "Men's Epithets in Homer: An Essay in Poetic Syntax." *Glotta*, 58:157-72.
Vivante 1982a
_____. *The Epithets in Homer: A Study in Poetic Values*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Vivante 1982b
_____. "The Syntax of Homer's Epithets of Wine." *Glotta*, 60:13-23.

Wathelet 1974
P. Wathelet, "Les Phéniciens dans la composition formulaire de l'épopée." *Revue belge de philologie*, 52:5-14.
Whallon 1961
W. Whallon. "The Homeric Epithets." *Yale Classical Studies*, 17:97-142.
Whallon 1965
_____. "Formulas for Heroes in the *Iliad* and in *Beowulf*." *Modern Philology*, 63:95-104.
Whallon 1969
_____. *Formula, Character and Context*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Wyatt 1978
W. F. Wyatt. "Penelope's Fat Hand (*Od*. 21.6-7)." *Classical Philology*, 73:343-44.
Wyatt 1983
_____. "Elpida's Fat Hand." *Classical Philology*, 78:234-35.

§8. Analyses of formulae

This section lists studies which identify the formulae in passages of early epic, and work done on methods of estimating the density of formulae and their results.

Even before Milman Parry, the repeated expressions in early epic had aroused the interest of scholars, and much diligent work had been done. The concordance to the *Iliad* by Prendergast/Marzullo (1962) and that to the *Odyssey* and *Homeric Hymns* by Dunbar/Marzullo (1962)—first issued in 1875 and 1880 respectively—print the entire line in which each word in the poems occurs; unfortunately some very common words are omitted. Schmidt 1885 (dedicated to Schliemann) listed, in alphabetical order, Homeric repetitions of at least 6 morae in length, including (unlike most of the older concordances) those which enjamb into the following line. The work is still useful. For quick reference when reading Homer, the editions of van Leeuwen (1912-13, 1917) are convenient, as they include marginal notations of parallel passages.

For Hesiod, Paulson's index (1890) merely listed the Hesiodic references for each word in the Hesiodic poems. The larger version of Rzach's edition (1902) listed the Homeric parallels. Kretschmer 1913 listed the expressions repeated within each Hesiodic poem and within the Hesiodic corpus (using Rzach's 1908 edition of the *Catalogue*), in each case dividing them according to length and metrical position. Several good concordances are now available,

including the *Shield of Heracles* and the Hesiodic fragments: Minton 1976, which follows the model of Prendergast and Dunbar but with no words omitted; and Tebben 1977a, a keyword-in-context computer-based work. Hofinger 1978 is a lexicon rather than a concordance, but has a Supplement (1985) including the latest fragments. Tebben has also produced (1977b) a keyword-in-context concordance to the *Homeric Hymns*. Much earlier, Windisch 1867 had listed the Homeric parallels in the *Homeric Hymns*, and Brandt 1888 those in the *Batrachomyomachia*.

Milman Parry included formulaic analyses of two Homeric passages in his published work, and a number of other scholars have been stimulated to similar and more extensive analyses, usually with the purpose of calculating the relative density of formulae in an effort to determine if a given work was orally composed. Notopoulos and Pavese also sought to show differences between Ionian and mainland formulae (see §4). The following analyses of formulae in early epic have been published.

Homer: *Iliad*: 1.1-25; Parry 1971:301ff.
1.1-7; Russo 1963:241-46.
1.1-15; Lord 1960:143.
1.1-5; Lord 1967:27ff.
2.87-94; Ingalls 1979:106-9.
5.45-47, 56-58, 65-69; Hainsworth 1968:110ff.
10 (entire); Querbach 1971.
12 (entire); Natunewicz 1970.
16 (entire); Querbach 1971.
16.586-610; Hainsworth 1981:16-17.
18.285-309; Russo 1976:45-47.
18.590-606; Gutzwiller 1977.
20.164-168; Lord 1967:28.
24.762-5; Hainsworth 1968:110ff.

Odyssey: 1.1-25; Parry 1971:301ff.
8.266-366; Di Donato 1969.
17.303-27; Russo 1976:42-43.

Line-references for all expressions occurring twice in the *Iliad* or twice in the *Odyssey* are printed in Strasser 1984:81-138.

Hesiod: *Theogony*: 1-25, 676-700; Minton 1975:36-44.

521-557; Hainsworth 1981:17-18.

Works and Days: 42-68; Hainsworth 1981:18.

Shield: 77-101; Hainsworth 1981:19.

An unpublished analysis of the first 100 lines of each poem is referred to in Notopoulos 1960:180 note 13. All three poems and the principal fragments have been analyzed by Pavese; the results are summarized in Pavese 1974:32ff., 1981:235. Hesiodic formulae not found in Homer are printed in Pavese 1972:123-63 and 165-77.

Homeric Hymns: (all); Cantilena 1982.
Apollo 1-18; Notopoulos 1962:356ff.
Aphrodite: Preziosi 1966.
Demeter: Richardson 1974.

Epic Cycle:
Cypria fr. 6K; Notopoulos 1964:28ff.
Thebais fr. 2K; Notopoulos 1964:28ff.
Little Iliad fr. 19 Allen; Notopoulos 1964:28ff.
Thebais frr. 1-5; Burkert 1981:47f.

Batrachomyomachia (all): Brandt 1888.
197-201: Lord 1967:27.

Panyassis: McLeod 1966.

Delphic Oracles: McLeod 1961.

Inscriptions: Notopoulos 1960:195.
Di Tillio 1969.

The principles of identification and counting of formulae have changed with greater experience, and the work is best traced in chronological order. Milman Parry (1971:301-4) printed his famous analyses of the first 25 lines of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, putting "a solid line beneath those word-groups which are found elsewhere in the poems unchanged, and a broken line under the phrases which are of the same type as others" (301). Criticisms can be made of Parry's method, for instance on the grounds that he ignored part of his own definition of a formula—"under the same metrical

conditions"—when he included parallel phrases occurring in another part of the verse and juxtapositions of words with no grammatical connection (e.g., his notes on ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν and θεῶν ἔριδι). The first use made of Parry's discoveries by another scholar was Chantraine 1932, a study of formulaic usage in *Iliad* 1, listing repeated verses and beautifully demonstrating the changes and adaptations—the "play of formulae" (127). This article is still an excellent introduction to the working of formulae.

Lord 1960 (143) repeated the analysis of the first 15 lines of the *Iliad*, making some changes (for instance, he avoided Parry's errors in method but still did not indicate changes of position in the verse). Lord 1967 (27) repeats the analysis of *Iliad* 1-5, with further changes in line 5. He also analyzes *Batrachomyomachia* 197-201, and gives figures for density of formulae in Serbo-Croatian and other non-Greek poetry.

Notopoulos 1960 (195-96) analyzes the formulae in a few early inscriptions (the Perachora inscriptions, the Mantiklos bronze, the Dipylon vase [on which now see Watkins 1976:437-38], and Nestor's cup from Pitecusa). Notopoulos 1962 (354-57) analyzes the *Hymn to Apollo* 1-18, marking formulae in Parry's fashion and including even single words in the same position and the shortest phrases (e.g. καί ῥα at the start of verse). Notopoulos has since been criticized for this, and for counting as formulaic those lines which contain only one formula.

Russo 1963 (241-46) comments on the repeated expressions in *Iliad* 1.1-7, particularly from the point of view of their metrical position and shape. Krafft 1963 (163-96) lists Hesiodic phrases which occur more than once in Homer; those which occur only once in Homer; and phrases repeated only within Hesiod's works. In each he arranges the phrases according to their metrical position. Preziosi 1966 lists, in order of their occurrence, formulae in the *Hymn to Aphrodite* which: (I) are also found in Homer; (II) are analogous to formulae found in Homer; (III) are found more than once within the *Hymn*; and (IV) are analogous to other formulae in the *Hymn*. She improves upon Notopoulos' analyses by returning to Parry's principle of not including phrases of less than five syllables which are not noun-epithet combinations, and identifies phrases which occur in a different position in the line. Again reverting to Parry, she counts as analogous formulae only expressions in which at least one important word is identical. Statistics on the formulaic content of the *Hymn*, calculated

according to metra, are included.

In a detailed criticism of Notopoulos' work, Kirk 1966 points out that "some method of indicating the amount of formular material within the verse is necessary if . . . quantitative comparison is to have much value" (156, n. 2). In another criticism, G. P. Edwards 1971 (40-45) points out weaknesses in statistics given by Notopoulos 1960, and goes on to suggest a different method of evaluating the degree of formularity.

Minton 1975 gives a good discussion of the meaning of "formula density" at last, criticizing (very fairly) many previous statistical results and attempting to obtain greater precision. Minton analyzes the verse into the four (less often three) blocks between the three caesurae (see §2, 176-80); he then computes the percentage of formulae on the basis of these half-line, quarter-line, and occasionally one-third-line blocks. In his analysis, Minton still counts only phrases of the same metrical length (despite Hainsworth's new definition of a formula; see §3, 190-91), though he allows repetition from a different part of the line and change in the order of words; phrases "must be articulated into one or more of the metrical-rhythmic segments along which the poet constructs his line" (32), which eliminates the occasional enjambing formula. These principles ought perhaps to be slightly modified, but they represent a great advance on previous attempts to compute formula density.

In other work, McLeod 1961 lists the formulae from Homer, Hesiod, and the Epic Cycle which are found in the older Delphic oracles, and McLeod 1966 those in the fragments of Panyassis. Allison 1969 lists Homeric phrases containing "a geographic or ethnic name and the word to which that name is most closely related grammatically," together with repetitions of one or both words in the same metrical position. Di Donato 1969 (290-93) describes the formulae and analogical formulae in the Song of Demodocus (*Odyssey* 8.266-366). Natunewicz 1970 "presents, on separate pages, each of the lines of *Iliad* [12]. With the exception of [12].20 and 167 and approximately half of an additional 13 lines, similar formulaic phrases or formulae which appear elsewhere in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are given for each line." Querbach 1971 presents texts of *Iliad* 10 and 16 indicating all formulae and "formulaic systems" (= analogical formulae) which recur in the same metrical position in Homer; "particular attention is paid to the various expansions and combinations of the minimal length

units." He also gives an alphabetical listing of all formulas and formulaic systems identified, and density statistics, including "tabulations showing the amount and kind of formulaic material found at various positions in the line and in various types of text."

Pavese 1972 (123-65) lists (according to metrical position) the non-Homeric formulae in Hesiod which: (1) recur only in Hesiod; (2) recur in Hesiod, the *Homeric Hymns*, and other archaic epic; (3) recur in archaic elegiac; (4) occur in Hesiod, the *Hymns*, archaic epic, and archaic elegiac; and (5) are reflected in lyric. Pavese 1974 (32-33) gives figures for the percentage of verses in Hesiod which contain formulae, the number of non-Homeric formulae in Hesiod, and the percentage of verses containing formulae in the *Hymns* and in archaic elegiac verse. Pavese 1981 (235) gives a table of figures for formulae in the *Theogony* and the two parts of the *Hymn to Apollo* arranged according to their recurrence in Homer, Hesiod, the *Hymns*, and elegiac verse.

Gutzwiller 1977 identifies phrases which occur elsewhere in early epic and are in the same metrical position, using a dotted line to indicate analogous words.

In his edition of the *Hymn to Demeter*, Richardson 1974 lists formulaic parallels in Homer, Hesiod, and other early epic and elegy, indicating whether the occurrence is in the same position in the verse. He also lists phrases which have parallels in Hesiod but not in Homer (35-38), parallels with the *Hymn to Aphrodite* (42), and new or modified formulae (46-52).

Russo 1976 analyzes *Odyssey* 303-27 and *Iliad* 18.285-309, giving (cautiously) percentages for density; J. J. Duggan's contribution to the discussion following this paper (63-65) makes particularly good points about the problems of formulaic analysis.

Work has also been done on the special topic of Homeric similes. Pope 1963 (14-17) studied the noun-epithet combinations in the similes of the *Iliad*, finding 379 in all, of which only 53 recur in the rest of the poem. Hogan 1966 includes a discussion of the types of formulaic flexibility, "compares formulae and formulaic patterns from the similes with their narrative counterparts," and discusses the distribution of formulae found in the similes, finding that the similes of the *Iliad* have a considerable number in common with the *Iliad* narrative, and those simile motifs (e.g. sailing, plowing, flooding) which do not occur in the *Iliad* narrative have formulaic parallels in the narrative of the *Odyssey*. Thus "there is no reason to suppose, as some have done, that [the

similes] are special or 'late' accretions." Ingalls 1972 presents and compares the formulae and analogical formulae in 20 similes with those in a control passage (*Iliad* 1.1-100), using a rather wider definition of formula than Parry's; he gives a statistical table recording "both the number of morae repeated verbatim and the number of formulae morae [*sic*] including analogues; these numbers are also expressed as a percentage of 24." He found no significant difference between the formular texture of "late" similes and that of a passage of normal narrative. Ingalls 1979 further discusses these results (reducing the sample of similes from 20 to 11), with detailed statistical tables and a formulaic analysis of *Iliad* 2.87-94.

Burkert 1981 (47-48) underlines formulae in the fragments of the *Thebaid*, listing where they recur. Hainsworth 1981 points out that part of the problem of calculating the density of formulae in a passage is the question of analogical formulae. In his own analyses of *Iliad* 16.584-609, *Theogony* 521-57, *Works and Days* 42-68, and *Shield of Heracles* 77-101 he uses Minton's criteria for calculation.

In the most extensive analysis so far published, Cantilena 1982 presents a text of the *Homeric Hymns* with underlinings indicating expressions recurring in Homer, Hesiod, and other early epic down to Panyassis, some archaic inscriptions, and some Delphic oracles. He also provides a running commentary on the formulaic usage, and listings of the formulaic density of each line and of the formulaic density of each Hymn (calculated according to Minton's method), giving minimum and maximum figures according to whether traditional phrases are included as well as formulae (he uses "formula" for an expression recurring in the same metrical position, "traditional phrase" for one recurring in a different position; his criteria for identifying formulae are explained on 74-81). He also gives figures for formulaic density of the longer Hymns according to Notopoulos's method (which he justifiably criticizes, 84ff.). Cantilena also provides a list of formulae, arranged alphabetically in the following groups: (1) formulae made up of combinations or juxtapositions of formulae occurring in Homer and/or Hesiod; (2) formulae analogical to those occurring in Homer and/or Hesiod; (3) those which recur partially in Homer and/or Hesiod; (4) those which are partially analogical to those found in Homer and/or Hesiod; (5) other formulae; (6) formulae not yet listed which occur within the Hymns.

Ramersdorfer 1981 holds that "no one could dispute that it is possible, in the case of similar or identical verses, half-verses, and

word-groups, to establish in which place the proper verbal unity is better preserved, or where some kind of impropriety arises" (7). He sets out to distinguish between primary and secondary occurrences of word-groups, making the distinction on the grounds of more or less suitable usages and being careful not to associate this with chronology. He restricts his investigation to word-groups which occur once in *Iliad* 1-10 and once or more in other early Greek epic, finding 771 such groups in all and examining each, dividing them into various categories. I am not convinced that such a distinction is possible.

Finally, in a very significant monograph, Strasser 1984 announces the completion of a computerized listing of repeated word-groups in Homer, Hesiod (including the *Shield* and the fragments), the *Homeric Hymns*, and the fragments of the epic cycle. In a lucid exposition of the principles on which the listing has been made he explains that by "repeated" he means occurring at least twice in the corpus studied; by "word-group" he means two or more words syntactically linked (up to the practical limit, set at one verse plus the first three words of the next). The listing is arranged by morphemes, so that all cases of nouns and forms of verbs appear together, and even prefixed forms (κλυτός ἀμφιγυνήεις appears with ἀγακλυτός ἀ and περικλυτός ἀ). As examples of his work Strasser prints (33-36) the first four pages of an alphabetical listing of repeated word-groups (ἀάατος ἄεθλος to ἀγαθός δίδωμι κακός) and a reference-list of word-groups which occur twice (only) in the *Iliad* or twice (only) in the *Odyssey* (84-138). The monograph also contains tables showing the distribution of repeated word-groups in individual works, the frequency and spread of repetitions, and a comparison of repetitions within the *Iliad* and within the *Odyssey*. There are also good discussions of "economy," the ways in which word-groups are adapted, the influence of sound, and other relevant points. Strasser hopes to make the complete listing available in machine-readable form. The impressive way in which Strasser handles his material encourages the hope of exciting results from his work.

Mention must also be made of the recent development of computer programs permitting a rapid search for one or more words in the database of Greek literature provided by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, which has been created under the direction of Professor T. F. Brunner (University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA 92717). The best-known of these programs are

the Ibycus produced by Dr. David Packard (Packard Humanities Institute, 300 Second St., Los Altos, CA 94022), and the UNIX-based system developed on the initiative of the Department of the Classics at Harvard University. These programs provide revolutionary opportunities for research which so far have barely begun to be exploited (see §10).

References

Allison 1969
E. P. Allison. "Geographic and Ethnic Formulas in Homer and the Catalogue of Ships." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 29:2233A.

Brandt 1888
P. Brandt. *Corpusculum Poesis Epicae Graecae Ludibundae*. I. Leipzig: Teubner.

Burkert 1981
W. Burkert. "Seven Against Thebes: An Oral Tradition between Babylonian Magic and Greek Literature." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-80 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 29-48.

Cantilena 1982
M. Cantilena. *Ricerche sulla dizione epica I. Per uno studio della formularità degli* Inni Omerici. Rome: Ateneo.

Chantraine 1932
P. Chantraine. "Remarques sur 1'emploi des formules dans le premier chant de 1'*Iliad*e." *Revue des études grecques*, 45:121-54.

Di Donato 1969
R. Di Donato. "Problemi di tecnica formulare e poesia orale nell'epica greca arcaica." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, 38:243-94.

Di Trillio 1969
Z. Di Tillio. "Confronti formulari e lessicali tra le iscrizioni esametriche ed elegiache dal VII al V sec. a.C. e l'epos arcaico: I Iscrizioni sepolcrali." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 7:45-73.

Dunbar/Marzullo 1962
H. Dunbar. *A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey of Homer; Completely revised and enlarged by B. Marzullo*. Hildesheim: Olm.

Edwards 1971
G. P. Edwards. *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gutzwiller 1977
K. J. Gutzwiller. "Homer and Ariadne." *Classical Journal*, 73:32-36.

Hainsworth 1981
J. B. Hainsworth. "Critici di oralità nella poesia arcaica non omerica." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-30 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M.

Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova Editrice Antenore. pp. 3-27.

Hogan 1966

J. C. Hogan. "The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 27:1352A.

Hofinger 1978

M. Hofluger. *Lexicon Hesiodeum cum indice inverso*. Leiden: Brill.

Ingalls 1972

W. B. Ingalls. "Studies in Homeric Formulae: Linguistic Lateness and Formular Irregularity in the Homeric *Iliad*." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 33.1:738A.

Ingalls 1979

_____. "Formular Density in the Similes of the *Iliad*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 109:87-109.

Kirk 1966

G. S. Kirk. "Formular Language and Oral Quality." *Yale Classical Studies*, 20:153-74.

Krafft 1963

F. Krafft. *Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod*. Hypomnemata, 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Kretschmer 1913

P. F. Kretschmer. *De iteratis Hesiodeis*. Bratislava: Schles. Volkzeitung.

Lord 1960

A. B. Lord. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lord 1967

_____. "Homer as Oral Poet." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 72:1-46.

McLeod 1961

W. E. McLeod. "Oral Bards at Delphi." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 92:317-25.

McLeod 1966

_____. "Studies on Panyassis—An Heroic Poet of the Fifth Century." *Phoenix*, 20:95-110.

Minton 1975

W. W. Minton. "The Frequency and Structuring of Traditional Formulas in Hesiod's *Theogony*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 79:26-54.

Minton 1976

_____. *Concordance to the Hesiodic Corpus*. Leiden: Brill.

Natunewicz 1970

M. A. T. Natunewicz. "Formulae and Formulaic Phrases in *Iliad* M." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 31:2896-97A.

Notopoulos 1960

J. A. Notopoulos. "Homer, Hesiod, and the Achaean Heritage of Oral Poetry." *Hesperia*, 29:177-97.

Notopoulos 1962

_____. "The Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry." *American Journal of Philology*, 83:337-68.

Parry 1971
M. Parry. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. A. Parry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Paulson 1890
J. Paulson. *Index Hesiodeus*. Lund. (photographically reproduced, Hildesheim: Olm, 1962.)
Pavese 1972
C. O. Pavese. *Tradizioni e generi poetici della grecia arcaica*. Filologia e critica, 12. Rome: Edizioni del'Ateneo.
Pavese 1974
_____. *Studi sulla tradizione epica rapsodica*. Filologia e critica, 13. Rome: Edizioni del'Ateneo.
Pavese 1981
_____. "Poesia ellenica e cultura orale (Esiodo, gli 'Inni' e la tradizione orale)." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orate: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-80 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 231-59.
Pope 1963
M. W. M. Pope. "The Parry-Lord Theory of Homeric Composition." *Acta Classica*, 6:1-21.
Prendergast/Marzullo 1962
L. Prendergast. *A Complete Concordance to the Iliad of Homer; Completely revised and enlarged by B. Marzullo*. Hildesheim: Olm.
Preziosi 1966
P. G. Preziosi. "The *Homeric Hymn* to *Aphrodite*: An Oral Analysis." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 71:171-204.
Querbach 1971
C. W. Querbach. "A Formulaic Analysis of Books Ten and Sixteen of the *Iliad*." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 31:6576A.
Ramersdorfer 1981
H. Ramersdorfer. *Singuläre Iterata der Ilias*. Königstein/Ts: Hain.
Richardson 1974
N. J. Richardson. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Russo 1963
J. A. Russo. "A Closer Look at Homeric Formulas." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 94:235-47.
Russo 1976
_____. "Is 'Oral' or 'Aural' Composition the Cause of Homer's Formulaic Style?" In *Oral Literature and the Formula*. Ed. B. A. Stolz and R. S. Shannon. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. pp. 31-54.
Rzach 1902
A. Rzach. *Hesiodi Carmina (Editio Maior)*. Leipzig: Teubner.
Schmidt 1885
C. E. Schmidt. *Parallel-Homer: oder Index aller homerischen Iterati in lexikalischer Anordnung*. New impression, 1965. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Strasser 1984
F. X. Strasser. *Zu den Iterata der frühgriechischen Epik*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 156. Königstein/Ts: Hain.
Tebben 1977a
J. R. Tebben. *Hesiod-Konkordanz: A Computer Concordance to Hesiod*. Hildesheim: Olm.
Tebben 1977b
_____. *Homer-Konkordanz: A Computer Concordance to the Homeric Hymns*. Hildesheim: Olm.
van Leeuwen 1912-13
J. van Leeuwen. *Ilias: cum Prolegomenis, Notis Criticis, Commentariis Exegeticis*. 2 vols. Leiden: Sijthoff.
van Leeuwen 1917
_____. *Odyssea: cum Notis Criticis, Commentariis Exegeticis, Indicibus ad utrumque Epos Pertinentes*. 2 vols. Leiden: Sijthoff.
Watkins 1976
C. Watkins. "Syntax and Metrics in the Dipylon Vase Inscription." In *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to L. R. Palmer on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Ed. A. M. Davies and W. Meid. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 16. Innsbruck: Becvar.
Windisch 1867
G. E. O. Windisch. *De Hymnis Homericis Maioribus*. Leipzig: Teubner.

[Section 9 will appear in a later issue of *Oral Tradition*.]

§10. Future directions

This is an exciting time for Homerists. New commentaries are attempting to consolidate the advances of the past, new directions for further study have been opened up, and new research tools have become available. Advances in our understanding of formulaic usage are being put to use in appreciation of Homeric poetry, and there are improved possibilities for further research.

A new multi-author commentary on the *Odyssey* has already appeared in Italian (Mondadore: Milan), and an English version is being prepared for Oxford University Press. The first volume of a new commentary on the *Iliad*, by G. S. Kirk, is already available (1985), and further volumes by Kirk and others will be published by Cambridge University Press within about two years. Many of the scholars responsible for these joint efforts have pioneered work on Homeric formulae; besides Kirk, J. B. Hainsworth, A. Heubeck, A. Hoekstra, R. Janko, N. J. Richardson, and J. Russo are identified with distinguished contributions in this area.

Erbse's massive edition (1969-) of the scholia to the *Iliad* is now complete except for the second volume of the indices, and the final volume of van der Valk's edition of Eustathius' commentary (1971-87) has just appeared. The *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (1955-) is producing fascicles at an accelerated rate, and has now reached ἐπαμύντωρ. In recent years, M. L. West has provided up-to-date commentaries on Hesiod's *Theogony* (1966) and *Works and Days* (1978), together with an edition of the Hesiodic fragments (Merkelbach and West 1967) and immensely useful books on the Orphic poems (1983) and the *Catalogue of Women* (1985). Stephanie West's *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (1967) has provided easy access to what is known of the texts before they were edited by the Alexandrian scholars. A recent book (Apthorp 1980) marks a revival of interest in the textual tradition of the Homeric poems. The availability of texts on computer databases and the new capabilities for word-search (see §8) will also facilitate further studies in Homer's formulaic usage and vocabulary.

The following suggestions for future directions which studies of Homeric formulae might take are, I am afraid, very subjective; in particular, I know that they do not do justice to the area of linguistics and the great contributions made to our knowledge by the work of Gregory Nagy and his students. What I say below represents certain approaches, especially recent ones, which I think are valuable and should be exploited further. I also mention a number of projects which I have long thought interesting, but which I have not been able either to work on myself or to make attractive to graduate students.

1. Though not specifically concerned with formulae, an important recent article by J. Griffin (1986) identifies differences in vocabulary between the narrative and the speeches in Homeric epic. Griffin finds that many abstract nouns, particularly those conveying moral judgments, emotional states, and some personal qualities, occur only in direct speech; some words are used only by a speaker about himself or herself; many negative epithets (beginning with alpha-privative) occur only or mainly in speeches; and superlative forms of adjectives are much commoner in speech. He suggests "that the language of Homer is a less uniform thing than some oralists have tended to suggest" (50).

In the latter part of the same article Griffin, following up the interest Homer shows in different kinds of oratory (*Iliad* 3.209-24),

compares the vocabularies of Achilles and Agamemnon, finding that of the former "much richer and more interesting" (51). (Here he is expanding the work of Friedrich and Redfield; see §7.) Achilles' speeches include more asseveration, more exaggeration, more numerous and longer similes, and a more imaginative vocabulary. In an Appendix, Griffin lists words which occur only in Achilles' speeches and only in those of Agamemnon. This kind of analysis must be extended to the speeches of other characters, and is also relevant for study of the direct-speech books of the *Odyssey* (see below). Length and structure of sentences, use of enjambment, and emphatic positioning of words in the speeches of different characters might well be compared in addition to vocabulary—any attentive reader of the *Iliad* notices what striking effects Achilles can produce by these means.

2. There has been other recent work on Homeric vocabulary, a rich field for study. A recent monograph by Kumpf (1984) lists in separate indexes all words which occur only once in Homer (listed alphabetically and in order of occurrence), those which are proper names, and those which do not occur elsewhere in Greek, giving statistical tables for each book of the poem, a comparison of frequency between *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and list of passages of 100 lines or more without a *hapax*. A paper on Homeric vocabulary by N. J. Richardson (1987) has just appeared. The work of Strasser on repeated word-groups in Homer (1984; see §8) is also relevant.

3. J. B. Hainsworth opened up a number of very important ways of investigating Homeric formulae which have not yet been fully exploited. Postlethwaite has applied the results of Hainsworth's study of the flexibility of formulae to the last book of the *Odyssey* and to the *Homeric Hymns* (see §4, 210, 215-16), and his work needs evaluation and extension. So do the results of Hainsworth's 1978 article on sorting and selection of formulae (see §4, 208-9), and the work of Hainsworth 1976 and Janko 1981 on clustering of words and formulae (see §3, 197, 194-95).

4. Much more research is needed on the placing of formulae within the verse. Some basic work has been done on the relationship of formulae, sense-units, and metrical cola (see §3, 197-201), but usually we cannot tell which words or phrases in a sentence came to the poet's mind first, when the (apparently) non-formulaic parts were shaped to lead up to ready-made formulae, and when formulae were modified in order to allow for

the positioning of special or unconventional words and phrases. How are sentences which are semantically basically identical adapted to fit proper names of different shape? If Achilles, after all, had been named "Agamemnon," or if his father had been named Laertes instead of Peleus (thus changing the form of his patronymic), a good many verses of the *Iliad* would have had to be reshaped. Related to this is Russo's work on the preferred positions of certain grammatical forms, irrespective of their metrical shape (Russo 1963, see §3, 202, and also Minton 1965, §3, 202-3).

Here the ability to program a computer would be a great advantage, so that one could (for instance) compare all instances of a verb following the B caesura and scanning u _ u u (e.g. ἀμείβετο), and all instances of participles in that position scanning u _ (e.g. ἰδών).

A particularly interesting part of such a study would be a comparison of sentences and clauses which start at the C caesura (= bucolic diaeresis). Many years ago (in Edwards 1966:167-76; see §3, 198-99) I made a preliminary investigation, and tentatively suggested that the flexibility and skill shown by the poet within the restriction of these five syllables might be a characteristic of Homer himself. In Edwards 1968:276, n. 28 (§3, *ibid.*) I gave some rough statistics for pauses in sense at this position in *Iliad* 18, but much more work is needed.

5. More research could well be done on the structure of complex sentences, which is very clearly connected with techniques of oral composition and delivery. Usually in Homer the main clause of a sentence comes first, the simplest structure for both composer and audience. In what circumstances are subordinate clauses placed ahead of the main clause? What kinds of clauses? Are there differences between narrative and speech, or between different speakers? In Edwards 1966 (123-24; see §3, 198-99) I gave some figures on subordinate clauses and participial phrases occurring before the main clause in *Iliad* 1 and *Odyssey* 17, and this primitive effort should be extended (perhaps by computer). Clayman 1981 gathered statistics on sentence length in all Greek hexameter poetry from the eighth to the second centuries B.C., measured by number of words, number of syllables, number of phonemes, number and percentage of sentences which are punctuated at verse-end, and number and percentage of one-line sentences in each work, and her results might assist such further

study. It is unfortunate that she did not separate narrative and speech.

6. In the four books of the *Odyssey* in which Odysseus takes over as narrator, many of the regular formulae must be adapted to the first person instead of third. What happens when this cannot be done? If the hero had agreed to eat when Circe served him dinner (*Odyssey* 10.371-72), what could have been done about changing the normal οἳ δ' ἐπὶ ὀνείαθ' ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον to the first person plural? How has the expression of ideas been altered because of the first-person narrator? Are there any indications that the text as we have it has been adapted from a version not narrated by Odysseus himself?

7. The statistics for preferred positions in the hexameter of words of various metrical shapes, which were prepared by O'Neill on the basis of thousand-line samples, should be revised (with the help of a computer) for the complete text of the poems, along the lines indicated by Dyer (see §2, 180-81).

8. A short article by M. D. Reeve (1972) examines Odysseus' almost verbatim repetition to Achilles of Agamemnon's offer of restitution (*Iliad* 9.264-99), and decides on the evidence of two adapted verses that it must have been composed *before* the preceding speech of Agamemnon (9.122-57). Similar comparisons might well be made of all cases where a passage is repeated in more or less identical language, to see how formulae and other expressions are adapted for necessary changes, for instance from third-person verb-forms to first. Such verbatim repetitions raise the questions, as Reeve in fact does, of whether blocks of lines, and even whole tales, were incorporated into the monumental epic.

9. There is room for more studies of the use and non-use of available formulae, with the aim of better appreciating where the poet has adopted, modified, or avoided conventional diction. I attempted to do this for *Iliad* 18 many years ago (1968; see §3, 199), and this approach is one of the aims of the new Cambridge *Iliad* commentary, but there will surely be room for more to be done.

10. Little use seems to have been made of Stephanie West's edition of Ptolemaic papyri, and no recent work has appeared on Homeric quotations in pre-Alexandrian authors (except for Labarbe 1949). Careful study of the papyri and the scholia, from the

viewpoint of our present knowledge of formulaic usage, might give us a better idea of the nature and interrelationships of pre-Alexandrian texts of Homer, perhaps even a sounder hypothesis about the date and circumstances of the writing down of the text, and how, where, and why later copies of it were made.

11. Finally, in many cases an advance made recently by a particular author needs careful review, assessment, and extension. I think especially of the theoretical approach taken by Nagler 1974 (see §3, 192); of Muellner's study of the meaning and use of a particular verb (1976; see §6); of Janko's major work on the comparative diction of Homer, Hesiod, and the *Hymns* (1982; see §4, 217-18); and of the approach recently taken by Sale (1984, 1987; see §6), which could well be much more widely applied.

* * * * *

It may seem odd that nothing has been said above about progress towards determining to what extent Homeric composition was oral. Everyone agrees that archaic epic—like much later Greek literature—was intended to be heard rather than read, and Homer of course was oral in that sense. Few scholars doubt that the conventions of Homeric diction and narrative structure were developed in a non-literate society, and that this must be taken into account for a proper understanding of the poems. Beyond this I do not see that we can go at the moment. We simply do not yet know enough about so many stylistic features of Homer, Hesiod, and the early *Homeric Hymns* to enable significant comparisons to be made with the poems of later, indubitably literate composers. Investigation of enjambment alone, without further study of sentence-structure, proved of little use for distinguishing Homeric from undeniably literate composers (see §5, 223-29), and statistics of formulaic usage are a difficult tool to handle (see §8). It may well be that usage of type-scenes of a regular structure—a study which Milman Parry was entering upon at the time of his death—will provide a better answer to this problem. But discussion of this must await a survey of research on Homeric type-scenes, which will appear in this journal at a future date.

Stanford University

References

Apthorp 1980
M. J. Apthorp. *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Clayman 1981
D. L. Clayman. "Sentence Length in Greek Hexameter Poetry." In *Hexameter Studies*, 11. Ed. R. Grotjahn. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Erbse 1969
H. Erbse. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Griffin 1986
J. Griffin. "Homeric Words and Speakers." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 106:36-57.

Kirk 1985
G. S. Kirk. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kumpf 1984
M. M. Kumpf. *Four Indices of the Homeric Hapax Legomena; together with Statistical Data*. Hildesheim: Olm.

Labarbe 1949
J. Labarbe. *L'Homère de Platon*. Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres.

Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. Ed. B. Snell and H. Erbse. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Merkelbach and West 1967
R. Merkelbach and M. L. West. *Fragmenta Hesiodea*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Reeve 1972
D. Reeve. "Two Notes on *Iliad* 9." *Classical Quarterly*, 22:1-4.

Richardson 1987
N. J. Richardson. "The Individuality of Homer's Language." In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Ed. J. M. Bremer et al. Amsterdam: Grüner. pp. 165-84.

Van der Valk 1971
M. van der Valk. *Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*. Leiden: Brill.

M. L. West 1966
M. L. West. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: Clarendon.

M. L. West 1978
_____. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford: Clarendon.

M. L. West 1983
_____. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford: Clarendon.

M. L.West 1985
_____. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*. Oxford: Clarendon.
S. West 1967
S. West. *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*. Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Oral Tradition, 3/1-2 (1988): 61-87

Oral Tradition and Welsh Literature: A Description and Survey

Brynley F. Roberts

The earliest Welsh literary tradition was, of necessity, an oral one. Written Welsh, in its extant forms, appears first in marginalia, explanatory notes, and glosses in the eighth century A.D. in an orthography which is obviously derived from Latin. This and similar material, representing the Old Welsh period of the language and found in Latin manuscripts of the eighth to late eleventh centuries, has an ecclesiastical and scholastic context (Jackson 1953:31-75; Evans 1982). The glosses are on familiar texts, there are extended explications of technical treatises on weights and measures and a fragment of a translation of a Latin computus, but records of grants and transfers of lands and gifts, made in accordance with Welsh customary law, serve to remind us that writing in the vernacular was not restricted to non-native, or Latin, matters. The Latin-based orthography of Old Welsh is also used for the earliest records of Cornish and Breton and reflects the interests and needs of a common "Celtic" church attempting to use the vernaculars in a written form not only for technical or book-learning but also for the recording of native oral culture for whatever purpose. Haycock (1981:96) rightly observes that the existence of an orthographic model in Latin which could be adapted to the vernaculars must have considerably facilitated their writing. The measure of literacy in monastic circles coming into contact with forms of native culture is the fountain-head of Welsh written literature. It reveals itself not only in book-learning and snatches of religious poetry but also in a fragment of a speech poem which probably derives from an oral tale (Williams 1933a), though the evidence does not suggest that the contact between the two cultures was as deep or as fruitful as was the case in early Ireland.

Side by side with the Latin book-learning of the "Celtic" church, and subsequently the European Roman church, there existed a tradition of native learning which represented Welsh culture in the broadest sense. The general term for this body of learning was *cyfarwyddyd*, the etymology of which suggests "seeing, perception, guidance, knowledge"; its experts were *cyfarwyddiaid* (sg. *cyfarwydd*), the knowledgeable within the society who could advise and instruct according to custom and tradition. (In Modern Welsh *cyfarwydd* is an adjective, "familiar with"; *cyfarwyddyd* a noun, "directions, instructions.") That the *cyfarwyddiaid* were recognized, if not as a specific class, certainly as having a perceived function, is suggested by the earliest attestation of the word in a ninth-century grant where the *cimarguitheit* are those who know the details of rent due on a parcel of land (Jenkins and Owen 1983:53-54), while later examples show that the body of knowledge held by *cyfarwyddiaid* was more extensive than legal rights and dues. It was, rather, a complex corpus of traditional lore necessary for society to function (Roberts 1976b; Sims-Williams 1985; Edel 1983), and as such would have included history, genealogies and origin narratives, topography, boundaries and geography, religious myths, tribal and family lore, antiquities and legends, social and legal procedures, and medicine, all of which would have been presented in a variety of forms ranging from panegyric verse to gnomic poetry, catalogues in rhyme, and narratives both verse and prose, all serving as "cultural orientation" (Sims-Williams 1985:101).

The "literary" aspects of *cyfarwyddyd* appear to have been the prerogative of the bards, who together with mediciners and lawyers formed the learned classes in medieval Welsh society (Mac Cana 1970). A bardic triad notes the three features which give a poet amplitude—knowledge of histories, poetry, and heroic verse, and though little is known of the detailed content and organization of bardic education in the medieval period, the bare statement of the triad is given substance in a late medieval treatise, found only in an English version, which describes the three memories (*y tri chof*) of the bards as knowledge of history, language, and genealogies (Bromwich 1974:52). Such knowledge was transmitted in oral narrative forms which audiences came to recognize less as information than entertainment (Edel 1983), as is suggested by the later semantic development of *cyfarwyddyd* in Middle Welsh where it is commonly used for "story, narrative," and *cyfarwydd* for

"storyteller." Little is known of the social context or professional organization of storytelling though there is a glimpse in the tale of *Math* which suggests that it was still one of the bardic functions (Mac Cana 1980; Ford 1975-76). The evidence relating to the functions of the analogous Irish *filid* is more clearly attested (Binchy 1961; Murphy 1961; Mac Cana 1980) and here, as indeed in any discussion of the interaction of oral and written narrative in Welsh, one turns to Irish for patterns and more coherent testimonies. Nevertheless, there were significant differences in social developments and extraneous influences between the two countries, and one cannot press the analogies too hard. In the Welsh story which is the last of *The Four Branches of the Mabinogi*, Gwydion seeks entry to the court of another king and achieves his purpose by disguising himself and his entourage as bards. Having warmly welcomed and supped his guests, the king turns to Gwydion:

> "We would enjoy a *cyfarwyddyd* (tale) from one of those young men."
>
> "Our custom, Lord," said Gwydion, "the first night one comes to a nobleman is that the chief bard should speak. I'll gladly tell you a tale."

And Gwydion entertained the court with pleasant tales and storytelling (Jones and Jones 1948:56-57; Williams 1930:68-69). This reference is capable of more than one interpretation, and its context as an episode in a tale of trickery and guile must not be lost sight of, but for the author, it appears, storytelling was one of the roles of the lower grade of poets (or apprentices) and the master-poet would become storyteller only on special occasions or perhaps for certain categories of narrative. Welsh court poetry of the twelfth to fourteenth centuries contains many literary references which reveal the extent of the poets' familiarity with traditional studies, but they never refer to themselves as storytellers, and while later poets, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, sometimes portray themselves as reading and studying with their patrons, their role seems to be that of genealogist and historian rather than narrator of tales (Rowlands 1985). There is no narrative poetry in Middle Welsh (the ballad tradition is modern), but the poets' involvement in storytelling may be inferred from a tradition of chant-fable narrative which, it has been suggested, existed in medieval Wales.

There are a number of poems, or fragments of poems, which are dialogues or persona-poems. The latter, for the most part associated with the names of Llywarch Hen and Heledd, and stemming from the Welsh-English conflicts of the ninth to tenth centuries, are lyrics on the themes of heroic behavior, of loneliness and old age, and of desolation, while the former are greetings and catalogues. It has been proposed in a persuasive hypothesis (Williams 1933a and b) that such poems are the speech elements of stories where the emotionally charged episodes, boasts, laments, soliloquies, and dialogues, as well as formal introductory greetings, were recounted in verse, which was copied into manuscripts, while the narrative passages were recited in prose which, being less stable in form and able to be re-created at will, was not given a fixed written form. This explanation of the Welsh speech poems was suggested by a narrative pattern found in Irish in, e.g. the Ulster Cycle of tales, which are in prose interspersed with verses which usually repeat what has already been said in prose. However, these verses appear to be secondary and may be found in more than one prose context so that the Irish pattern is more fluid and not strictly analogous to what has been proposed for the Welsh poems. Some are self-contained poems which require not so much a narrative setting as a traditional context which need not be explicitly stated; others are unintelligible without some form of narrative background, which may nevertheless not have been fixed (Rowland 1985). Taken as a genre, however, these speech poems point to bardic involvement in oral storytelling, though the function of the verse element is less clearly understood than was formerly presumed.

These verses, usually in three- or four-line stanzas termed *englynion*, are of considerable artistry and emotional intensity and cannot be regarded as popular "folk poetry." Their style, allusions, *topoi*, and metrical forms point to the professional bards as authors, while the progression and structure of many poems reveal them to be discrete compositions. One of their distinctive features is the use of a high degree of repetition of phrase or line where a minimum of variation—often the end-rhyme word—provides for the movement from one stanza to the next. This "incremental repetition" (Jackson 1941) is neither formulaic nor "popular," and it is better regarded as a controlled compositional feature which the best poets can employ to heighten the emotional impact of a lyric by creating a cumulative effect or by delaying the resolution of

tension. Repetition can, of course, be used unimaginatively and as a mechanical means of composition, and that there are examples of such use in the Welsh *englynion* cannot be denied. Nevertheless, in most cases it seems to be regarded as a stylistic device which was intended to enhance the literary effect of a poem. The poems may also make use of stereotyped epithets or phrases, but these are not metrical features and are intended as allusions and connotations. Welsh bardic poetry, and this is the only kind which has been preserved from the medieval period—though there are different classes, e.g. panegyric, religious, prophetic, persona-poems, antiquarian—seems to have been orally composed, but this does not imply that poems were improvised. The Irish evidence (Ó Coileáin 1978), in broad not specific terms, seems apposite, for Welsh court poetry seems to have been composed in a literary but unwritten way and poems had a fixed form which was memorized. Many of the compositions are metrically intricate and use conventional phrases highly charged in the literary tradition, but they are not formulaic and the poems appear to have retained both their structure and lexis with minimum change. Native Welsh literary tradition appears to have been oral down to the fifteenth century and to have been dependent on bards composing orally and on a class of performers (*datgeiniaid*) declaiming by rote their compositions (Williams 1969:5-7). Religious poetry and learned allusions show that native poets and clerics who had mastered the literary conventions were in contact, sometimes in rivalry, with the Latin book-learning of the Church (Haycock 1981), but the literacy of that shared world seems to have affected very little the adjacent oral world of native court poetry which laid greater stress on memorizing (cf. Lord 1960:134-35). The Gododdin poem, attributed to the sixth-century Aneirin, may have been copied in the ninth century but is now extant in a single manuscript of c. 1250. This copy has been held to represent two early variant forms of an oral "text" which seem to be viewed almost as an oral expression of a manuscript stemma, as though the variants were oral deviations from a standard text (Williams 1938; Jackson 1969). Recent work, some of it as yet unpublished, may show that we should think rather of a continuing oral tradition and that the "textual" tradition of a sixth-century poem did not bifurcate but was constantly being added to by contemporary poets up to the time of its first writing. The poetry attributed to the roughly contemporary poet Taliesin, found in the Book of Taliesin, an early

fourteenth-century manuscript, is in "good textual repair" (Haycock 1981:93), and this fact, equally true of twelfth- and thirteenth-century court poetry, would suggest that while a learned class existed to transmit and control this material, its form could be retained with little variation so that when the poems were given written form there was comparatively little textual corruption. Where variant texts occur, differences can usually be explained as the results of faulty memory reversifying according to the strict rules which govern Welsh prosody. Collections of court poetry were made by monastic scribes for lay patrons in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but though family poetry books had become a recognized way of preserving praise of patrons by the sixteenth century, oral presentation and preservation were probably more common until antiquarian scribes sought to salvage what they could from a declining bardic order. The tradition of classical poetry which uses archaic vocabulary, intricate metrical forms, and strictly controlled patterns of complex alliteration has survived as a living art in modern Wales. The ability to compose poems in traditional style without recourse to pen and paper, to recall phrases, lines, and whole passages of verse, to take part in competitions of extempore composing, is not uncommon. The strength of the tradition is that it "plays against the audience's memory of poetry" (Fry 1981:282, but in a different context), and the modern participant in or the audience of poetic competitions (a popular weekly radio program) would not have found the composing and memorizing of medieval Welsh bards particularly strange.

Orality, allied to conventional similes, metaphors, allusions, and epithets, can co-exist with fixed forms and memorizing in a culture which nevertheless may live adjacent to a literate book-based society. The result for medieval Welsh literature is that the work of the earliest poets (Aneirin, Taliesin) exist in single manuscripts and the works of the court poets in only two collections, while there are scores of copies of translations of religious and historical works and of the laws. Traditional Welsh literature achieves written form comparatively late, in few manuscripts and in single versions of texts, and it was first recorded, one assumes, by non-practitioners. This last feature may not be of crucial importance in the case of court and learned bardic poetry which had a fixed form, but it is of significance when one considers the body of lore described above.

Cyfarwyddyd as a coherent corpus is now irretrievably lost, but its outlines can be re-created to some degree by recovering those fragments which appear in other contexts or forms (Bromwich 1954). The most comprehensive of these is the Triads of the Island of Britain, a collection of references to mythic, legendary, and heroic lore reduced to its minimum expression and organized as groups of triads under a common description (Bromwich 1961). The collection may have been compiled as a mnemonic index and a method of easy retrieval of information to assist the bards who used names, epithets, and references to adventures as allusions to enrich their praise of patrons, but the collection has strong antiquarian overtones and the arrangement of the material in the White Book version suggests that the editor was more book-man than poet (Hamp 1981-82). Bromwich has observed that the poetic allusions to this material show real familiarity with the narrative tradition up to about the beginning of the thirteenth century but that thereafter the allusions seem to lack a true awareness of the context of names and epithets. The "Stanzas of the Graves" is a collection of versified legend associated with particular sites and localities (Jones 1967). Other evidence of *cyfarwyddyd* (geographical, historical, the Welsh heroic age in particular) can be salvaged from Gildas' *De Excidio Britanniae, Historia Brittonum* (often ascribed to the ninth-century Nennius), Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* and *Vita Merlini*, Gerald of Wales, some *vitae sanctorum*. In these cases the information is transmitted not by its exponents but by secondary authorities who may or may not have been in close contact with *cyfarwyddiaid* and with native culture. These works are being produced for a non-native audience and there is inevitably some degree of interpretation, adaptation, or authorial interference. Each author has to be viewed by his own attitudes. Gildas' critical response to the retreat of the Romans from Britain was not that of the *cyfarwyddiaid* who used the same event to explain the founding of Brittany, but there is no doubt that "Nennius'" prophetic view of the ultimate defeat of the white dragon of the Saxons by the red dragon of the Britons derives from and reflects native hopes.

The earliest example of traditional narrative history has been preserved not in Welsh but in the Latin of the *Historia Brittonum*. The writer had barely enough Latin for his needs, and his account of the reception of the Saxons by the love-sick British king Vortigern echoes the phrases and commonplaces of the Welsh

cyfarwyddyd which he retells. The simple narrative probably owes as much to the author's grasp of Latin as to an oral style, but the desire to give names to every character, protagonists or merely functions, the high proportion of dialogue passages and the triple-staged altercation, the explanation of place-names, the appeal to contemporary evidence ("et nusquam apparuerunt *usque in hodiernum diem*, et arx non aedificata est *usque hodie*") (Morris 1980:9), and the conflict of single protagonists all underline the narrative's oral antecedents. It opens with the traditional form of opening statement of extant Welsh prose tales (*Guorthigirnus regnavit in Brittania*) (Morris 1980:67; Mac Cana 1973:107-9; Watkins 1977-78:394), but the *cyfarwyddyd* is interwoven with an ecclesiastical account of the Life and Miracles of St Germanus. It is the first example of the interplay of Welsh oral tradition with Latin writing (*Hic est finis Guorthigirni, ut in Libro beati Germani repperi. Alii autum aliter dixerunt*) (Morris 1980:47). The story is characteristic of the whole, for part of the value, and danger, of the *Historia Brittonum* is that it is an attempt to fuse the two historical traditions by one who seems not to have appreciated their incongruity.

Geoffrey of Monmouth was a more conscious author, writing in a different period for a different audience. We must believe that he was well aware of what he was doing and that all his sources were adapted and managed for his own purpose. The extent to which he drew on Welsh traditions in the *Historia Regum* is debatable, but it is not likely that any of his extended narratives reflect so faithfully a single Welsh tale as does the *Historia Brittonum*. Nevertheless, there was sufficient evidence here for Welsh readers to recognize their own historical tradition and to claim that there were gaps or inconsistencies which could be rectified in Welsh translations (Roberts 1973). Thus one thirteenth-century translator inserted a complete tale which he obviously felt Geoffrey should not have omitted. Its traditional oral source is made clear in the sentence which the translator added to Geoffrey's opening: "Beli Fawr son of Manogan had three sons, Lludd, Caswallawn, and Nynhiaw. *And according to the cyfarwyddyd Llefelys was a fourth son*" (Roberts 1975:1). *Cyfarwyddyd* here is the traditional tale of Lludd and his brother Llefelys which the translator inserts into his translation of the *Historia*, but although it had an existence as an oral narrative, as some independent references confirm, it is retold here not by a

cyfarwydd but by a monastic translator and thus although being in Welsh, it is, like "Nennius'" Latin story of Vortigern, one stage removed from its proper context, and is the work not of a performer but an auditor in another literary tradition. The Tale of Lludd and Llefelys subsequently appears as an independent story, *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys* (*The Encounter of Lludd and Llefelys*) in the two manuscripts which contain copies of those prose tales usually referred to in modern usage as *Mabinogion* (Roberts 1975; Jones and Jones 1948), but this "Mabinogion" version is not parallel to the "historia" version but a development of it. The existing oral *cyfarwyddyd* was not given written form, but the version found in the Welsh "Historia" worked up and provided with consciously literary features. The "author" of the "Historia" version presented the tale in as condensed and skeletal a form as possible and as befitted the context which he gave it. In its "Mabinogion" version the tale is expanded not so much by the addition of new material but by elaborating the style and introducing phrases to evoke audience response. In spite of these embellishments the *Cyfranc* still contains some "latinisms" natural to a translator, and though it is traditional in its vocabulary and clichés, and closer in syntax to the style of the *cyfarwyddyd* than is the more artificial style of the translators, the unimaginative treatment of its theme suggests that the "author" drew little from the springs of oral storytelling (Roberts 1975:xxxi-xxxii).

The case of *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys* cannot be paralleled in the other Mabinogion tales, which have no earlier extant written antecedents, but it is an instructive general example which gives a frame of reference to discuss the relationship of these stories with traditional oral narratives. By "Mabinogion" is meant some eleven stories in Middle Welsh which are of native origin (Mac Cana 1977; Jones 1976; Roberts 1976a and b). Though found in the same two manuscripts (fragments of some tales are found elsewhere also), they do not constitute a collection but have different bases—myth, legend, historical tradition, Arthurian, etc., and were composed in their present forms at different times. The earliest, *Culwch and Olwen* and *The Four Branches of the Mabinogi*, belong to the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries; the others, *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys, The Dream of Maxen, Owein, Geraint and Enid,* and *Peredur*, appear to belong to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, while *The Dream of Rhonabwy* is probably the latest of all. The Tale of Taliesin, not being found in the two medieval

manuscripts which contain these tales, is not regarded as one of the "Mabinogion," but this is no more than an accident of preservation and its base lies securely in traditional stories (Williams 1957; Wood 1981, 1982), though unlike the others, this contains passages of verse declaimed by the bard Taliesin interspersed with the prose narrative (Ford 1977). There is no doubt that the content of these tales is traditional, in that their motifs and themes can be recognized as those of international popular tales (Jackson 1961) and many of their episodes and characters as legendary Welsh (Bromwich 1974). These sometimes appear as allusions in other sources, e.g. Triads, poems in the Book of Taliesin etc., and differences between what is recorded in the tales and these point to the existence of oral variants of the same tradition. Within the tales themselves, doublets of certain episodes probably reflect different oral versions. But the texts of the tales, complete or in fragmentary forms, show very little significant variation and are in a single manuscript tradition, so that we must infer in most cases (*Owein* and *The Dream of Maxen* are ambiguous) a unique composed version, not a series of derivatives from oral versions as seems to be the case in the versions of the Irish epic *Táin Bó Cuailnge* (Bromwich 1974; Melia 1974). The most thoroughly analyzed of the tales is *The Four Branches of the Mabinogi* (Jarman 1974: Jones 1976), but the complexity encountered here is merely the problem of the relationship of these tales to underlying oral narratives writ large. It seems always to have been accepted that individually (or collectively in the case of *The Four Branches*) these tales are the work of single authors, but what is difficult to resolve are questions such as whether these authors may be regarded as *cyfarwyddiaid*, whether the stories are oral traditional tales which have been given written form or whether they were conceived as written compositions which may have taken elements from a number of sources, and what changes may have occurred in the change of medium from spoken to written.

In one or two cases the text itself may offer guidance. Middle Welsh had more than one word for story or narrative in addition to *cyfarwyddyd*. The unmarked term is *chwedl* (etymologically, "that which is told") and other terms may have denoted particular types, e.g. *ymddiddan*, dialogues; *cyfranc*, encounter; *hanes*, history, origin tale; *mabinogi*, tale of youth, of a hero. *Ystoria* (Latin *historia*) is used specifically for stories of

written origin, and by implication a literary composition or one not part of the stock-in-trade of the oral storyteller (Roberts 1974). *The Dream of Rhonabwy* (Richards 1948) has a colophon which claims that the wealth of descriptive detail which "this ystoria" contains was the reason "why no one, neither bard nor *cyfarwydd* knows the Dream without a book" (Jones and Jones 1948:152). The *Dream*, it would appear, was not narrated orally by traditional storytellers but read from a book; its text was fixed, allowing for no variation, and it was beyond the powers of memorization of poets or reciters who would normally have been assisted by metrical and stylistic forms to re-create their material. That the *Dream* is a conscious composition is confirmed by its satire of contemporary literary conventions and by the adroit manipulation of traditional themes which characterizes this remarkable work. Its themes can be recognized easily, but within the body of the tale, that is apart from its frame, these are not used as elements of composition in a progressive fashion; the result is that the story, lacking both a traditional and a devised coherent structure, makes satirical comment on recognized modes of composition. Its descriptive passages and its style of narration use the conventional phrases and patterns found in other Welsh written tales, but take them to extremes. If the style of the other Welsh tales has developed from oral style, what marks the *Dream* is its conscious imitation and exaggeration of some elements in oral storytelling. The equation "ystoria" = book, and by implication fixed, non-traditional text, becomes of further significance when one notes its use in *Geraint* and *Peredur*, two stories discussed below.

Robert C. Culley, writing on oral tradition and Biblical studies (1986:56), expressed the problem facing students of Middle Welsh literature admirably: "Almost all agree that the Bible [for our context "Welsh tales"] probably has oral antecedents, but there is little agreement on the extent to which oral composition and transmission have actually left their mark on the text or the degree to which one might be able to establish this lineage." One of the greatest difficulties is the small data-base which has been preserved for us. The individual tales are not long and they normally exist in only two manuscript copies, so that though there is an obvious element of phrase and thematic repetition discernible in them, studies of "formulaic" density within a single text are not possible. One can, of course, examine "formulas" and more especially formulaic structure (themes or type-scenes) in the tales as a

corpus, but whatever conclusions might be drawn from such a study would be suspect until the chronological and literary relationships between them have been better assessed. The attention that has been paid to motif and thematic analysis of the Mabinogion stories has arisen from an implicit recognition of their traditional origins, but less regard has been had for these as compositional elements, and it is in this area that evidence for orality is to be sought. Nor is it clear to what extent these tales are literary retellings of existing oral texts or new compositions (or reassembly of fragments) based on traditional material. A narrative structure based on an oral thematic substratum may point to analogous stories in other oral cultures which would suggest that these tales existed previously (Melia 1972). There is little doubt that *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys* reflects the shape of a traditional tale, whatever may have been its significance (Roberts 1975; Dumézil 1955). Hunt (1973-74) has drawn attention to the folktale structure of *Owein*, and it is easy to believe that the first part of *The Dream of Maxen* had a prior existence (Brewer-Jones 1975; for *Culhwch and Olwen* see Henry 1968 and for *The Four Branches* see Ó Coileáin 1977-78b, Hanson-Smith 1981-82). The most ambitious attempt to postulate an earlier narrative structure for a Welsh tale was W. J. Gruffydd's reconstruction of *The Four Branches of the Mabinogi* as a heroic biography, based on his interpretation of Irish saga, but it is probably true to say that this is too ambitious and comprehensive to be convincing.

The defects in coherent structure or rational progression which critics have discovered in *The Four Branches* have been attributed to deterioration and contamination over a long period of oral transmission preceding the penultimate or extant version, during which time the logic or "meaning" of the tale may have been lost (Gruffydd 1928, 1953), while other scholars have regarded these tales as the work of amateurs of an antiquarian bent or as compilations of sometimes unrelated materials (Jackson 1961; Mac Cana 1958). In recent years interest has moved away from the study of the historical origins of these stories, and together with an acceptance of individual authorship has grown an awareness of authorial intent so that what were previously viewed as deficiencies in structure are now perceived as features of composition which point to thematic developments and parallelisms, while the composed shape of each tale as it stands in the text is of greater importance than the re-creation of an ideal or uncontaminated

traditional version. (For "non-traditional" structural analyses see Jones 1986, Ford 1977, 1981-82, and more literary analyses by Bollard 1974-75, 1983, McKenna 1980, Gantz 1979.)

Cyfarwyddyd had always been recorded by non-active bearers of tradition or those standing outside the stream of Welsh learning; and as the tales passed from the hands of their proper guardians, the poets, they lost their traditional significance and became free to become the vehicles for the purposes for which their new "authors" wished to deploy them. Though all these texts are anonymous, in them traditional narrative becomes personalized (Jones 1980), and each story must be read in the light of what can be learned of the author's intent. Shepherd (1979) speaks of the emancipation of story in the twelfth century, Slotkin (1983) of encoding. The Mabinogion stories will have different intentions and will use traditional material in different ways. The change from the oral to the written medium has implications for style (see below and Roberts 1984) and for the movement of narrative (Bromwich 1974; Lord 1960:130-34; Chaytor 1945:48-82). But underlying these changes is the more basic one of a change of cultural attitude. The "author" is not as bound to his tradition as the *cyfarwydd*. He is free to derive his inspiration from a broader spectrum of influences, and his material ceases to be that of his community to be transmitted but his own to be interpreted or utilized. The freedom of interpretation this change allows us, however, must be exercised within the bounds of our ignorance, since very little is known of these "authors," of the context and of the audience of the written stories, features which must be aspects of their intentionality.

The Mabinogion tales have always been highly regarded by critics for their stylistic virtues, which have been held to derive from oral storytelling techniques. Unlike Ireland, however, Wales now has no developed storytelling tradition which could provide a stylistic model by which to assess Middle Welsh tales, and we must attempt to draw from the Irish and other oral conventions features which may help us to postulate the oral basis of the written style of the tales and to recognize the changes brought about by the new medium (Ó Coileáin 1977-78a:33-34). Oral style is marked by a high degree of repetition of theme, episode, and phrase, by dialogue, by color of description and hyperbole, by comparisons and metaphors, all of which are part of the storyteller's equipment. The essence of his art is its orality, that is

its sentence patterns, its vocabulary, its ability to use the resources of polished, perhaps even slightly archaic, speech, but it depends not so much on personal ability for its basis as on its conventions. Though strictly speaking a formula is a metrical device in oral poetry, prose storytellers use stereotyped forms of expression, variable combinations of words and phrases to express commonplaces, so that prose tales have what may be termed a formulaic quality, e.g. to denote undefined passage of time or a period of time, to give greeting or farewell, to open and close sections of tales or their beginnings and endings (Morgan 1951). Themes, or stereotyped narrative situations, will also be expressed in a similar way at each occurrence. These are rhetorical and functional devices which are normally brief. They may, however, if the situation requires, be developed and extended as a string of adjectives, often compounded and alliterating, or as a sequence of balanced rhythmical clauses, which a storyteller can memorize even if neither he nor his audience fully understands these "runs." The audience recognizes conventional features of the art, and there is no doubt that listeners appreciate the skill and excitement of the "run" and observe the mastery of varying verbal and sentence patterns which characterizes oral art. Simplicity of plot and characterization are counterbalanced by the oral and aural features of the style, which for the best performers are enhanced by the conventions and not dominated by them.

The exuberance and formulaic nature of oral style may be reflected in some sixteenth-century compositions termed *areithiau pros* ("prose orations") (Jones 1934). Though the majority of these appear to be self-conscious exercises in Renaissance rhetoric and abundance of language, some appear to be closer to a folk tradition and to retain in their themes and style oral features seen more clearly here than in the Middle Welsh tales (Roberts 1976b). The stories are marked by a constraint and conciseness which are designed more for the reader than the auditor, but which may suddenly flash into light with a group of adjectives and which use dialogue not simply for enlivening effect but as a narrative device. These are "formulas" (i.e. repeated phrases) but they are almost always controlled. This style, more suggestive of the study than the hall, is the result of tempering and toning down the *cyfarwydd*'s oral style and is one of the aspects of the change of medium. In short, all the Mabinogion tales would appear to use traditional material. Some reflect in their narrative structure

existing tales while others may be compilations, but though all reveal traces of oral origins in aspects of their construction and style (Jones 1984), none would appear to be strictly based on any particular oral telling (for *Hanes Taliesin*, perhaps a "comparatively late synthesis of material," see Wood 1981:243). There will inevitably be disagreement as to how any particular text was produced, but there is now a consensus that the Mabinogion are to be viewed essentially as literary compositions by "authors" who were not oral *cyfarwyddiaid* but who were familiar with their storytelling stylistics.

This literary style is, at its first appearance, a self-assured, fluent, and mature style. Lord (1960:134) has claimed that "a superior written style is the development of generations. When a tradition or an individual goes from oral to written, he, or it, goes from an adult mature style of one kind to a faltering and embryonic style of another sort." The few Old Welsh texts which remain can be regarded as examples of such a faltering prose style which nevertheless gained in fluency in the Old Welsh computus, and it is significant that by the end of the eleventh century when the composite text *Breint Teilo* (*The Privilege of the Church of St. Teilo*) was written (Davies 1975), Welsh prose had achieved more than the rudiments of style. It has been claimed that "in most countries where there are traces of a change from an oral to a literary tradition, development seems due to the intermediary of those trained to some degree in a foreign literary tradition," and Lord's example (1960:138) of the Yugoslav written epic as being developed not from oral tradition but an extension of Italian literary tradition is illustrative of this. The foreign literary tradition may, of course, be adjacent to the native and there is no doubt that the early development of written prose in Ireland was the result of fruitful interaction between the native learned class and the Church. It has been argued (Mac Cana 1977) that the situation in Wales was different, that oral narratives were of lower status and that monastic involvement in native culture was later, with the result that narrative prose was a late development (Evans 1982). The necessary fertilization came not from the ecclesiastical milieu but from the multi-cultured mixed (Anglo-Norman, English, Welsh) society of southeast Wales. It is, however, difficult to divorce the practice of writing from the Church, and the role of clerical Latin-trained writers as translators must have been one element in the development of writing Welsh in extended texts.

The origins of *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys*, described above, suggest an avenue. But this version, it was claimed, showed little evidence of any underlying oral style, nor do the Latin translators in general reveal any great familiarity with the oral conventions. Mac Cana (1977:13) has described the problem of adapting oral to written speech not so much as "that of transferring individual words and sentences from discourse to vellum as of coming to terms with a diction and style which are proper to the spoken word and adjusting the prodigality of the oral mode to the unavoidable economy of the earliest manuscripts." We have seen that the first attempts at writing Welsh prose occurred in an intellectual milieu for resolving difficulties in some technical treatises but more significantly for recording agreements and legal decisions. *Breint Teilo*, the earliest part of which was written c. 950-c. 1090 (Davies 1975:133), was soon followed by the law books, the earliest copies of which are found in manuscripts of the late twelfth century (Latin) and the early thirteenth century (Welsh). But it is generally agreed that the Latin A text is a version of a Welsh prototype and that some of the tractates which make up the law books are as old as the tenth century. Native law, its practice and statement, was an oral activity, and Owen (1974) has shown not only that *Breint Teilo* and the law books reflect customary terminology and categories in their specialized vocabulary but that they contain clear oral stylistic features. The writers of these texts use a variety of styles—narrative, dramatic, historical, catalogues, rhetorical devices (e.g. contrast, doublets, alliteration, metaphors), and traditional elements (e.g. triads, proverbs). Lewis (1930) proposed many years ago that the origins of Welsh prose were to be sought in the law schools. Legal training owed less to schools of classical rhetoric (as he proposed), however, than to the place of the laws within that broad body of traditional and oral learning termed *cyfarwyddyd*. Archaic sections in the law books contain, incongruously in our eyes, fragments of legend and dynastic traditions, sometimes associated with verse stanzas. *Cyfarwyddyd* was all of a piece, but it appears that the first aspect of oral learning to be transferred to writing in an extended form was the legal, in the form of independent tractates. The lawyers, not "trained in a foreign literary tradition" but closely associated with the poets as a learned class, reacting perhaps to developments in England and to needs at home, were the necessary intermediaries

who would enable narrative prose to be a fully matured instrument at its first appearance.

The written form of *cyfarwydd* prose (Thomson 1968:xcviii-cii) became the accepted literary vehicle, with its own set of conventions and clearly marked apart from other Middle Welsh prose styles, for Welsh narrative throughout the Middle Welsh period. Its strength may be appreciated when one sees it used for translations of Anglo-Norman *chansons de geste* and for new Welsh versions of Old French romances. Reference has already been made to the stories of *Peredur, Owein,* and *Geraint*, all three of which have some relationship with three romances by Chrétien de Troyes, *Perceval, Li chevalier au lion, Erec et Enide*. There is a wide variety of views on the nature of these relationships, but the Welsh texts may be retellings of the romances which have become adapted to native narrative structures and composed in the written *cyfarwydd* style (Roberts 1983, 1987). There seems no reason to believe that the extant Welsh versions derive directly from oral tales (though these may have been the antecedents of the French texts) and they are surely better regarded as literary works. Thus Hunt (1973-74), having stressed the oral origins of *Owein*, nevertheless concludes his study with the view that an antiquarian entertainer refurbished Chrétien's poem and that the preservation of the Welsh story is a "late and essentially bookish affair." Edel (1981-82) finds clear evidence for orality in *Peredur* but regards the text as an oral (I would say "literary *cyfarwydd* style") retelling of *Perceval*. This style makes its last appearance in the Welsh adaptation of *The Seven Sages of Rome* (Lewis 1925), and thereafter literary prose followed another path.

Oral storytelling continued but the deterioration in the status of the tales, which had begun in the medieval period, continued. We cannot assess whether there was any change in the manner of recitation, but categories of tales were apparently lost. The sixteenth-century chronicler Ells Gruffydd (Jones 1960) used a wide range of written sources in Welsh, English, and French in his compendious history of the world, but he frequently draws on Welsh material for which no other literary source is known and which appears to be derived from his own familiarity with a living oral tradition. Gruffydd has his own idiosyncratic style which has largely obliterated traces of a more traditional medium, but his ability to blend narratives of historical tradition with his translations and paraphrases from recognized texts suggests that he

found these in a recognizably coherent historical framework. Other specific references to storytelling also suggest that history is the central theme. A sixteenth-century account describes gatherings "where theire harpers and crowthers singe them songs of the doeings of their auncestors" (Williams 1949), and in the same period a Welsh author exiled in Italy recalls the entertainments of his native land, viz. poetry and old men who could relate orally every notable and praiseworthy deed performed in ancient Wales (Williams 1949). One suspects that the historical aspect of traditional learning increasingly engaged the attention of the professional poets and their patrons by the sixteenth century, but that the debates regarding the authenticity of the British history led to greater emphasis being laid on the written sources, most of which represent Welsh adaptations of Geoffrey of Monmouth, others being contemporary English and Latin chronicles. History inevitably became the domain of book-learning, and the oral historical tradition further declined so that all that can be recovered in the early modern period is local family lore (Jones 1955) and anecdotes found as jottings in manuscripts (Jones 1970). Antiquarians made compilations—e.g. tales of giants by John David Rhŷs in the sixteenth century (Owen 1917) and a combination of fake-lore and genuine tradition by the eighteenth-century Edward Williams (1848)—and descriptions by nineteenth-century and recent folklore fieldworkers suggest that a tradition of storytelling and of oral entertainment lived on until conditions changed the nature of rural society and lessened the need of the agricultural community for shared effort. The best of the nineteenth-century collectors was John Rhŷs, who not only prints tales verbatim but also gives the context in which they were told. The evidence of one of his informants (Rhŷs 1901, I:78-80) is suggestive in that it distinguishes between two storytellers by the nature of their repertoire and also refers to another as "the 'Old Guide'," which appears to be a translation of "yr Hen Gyfarwydd." If this is so, then this society had retained both the traditional nomenclature and the vestiges of a functional organization of storytelling, but Rhŷs's normal experience (1901:Preface 1) was that he "could not get a single story of any length from the mouths of his fellow countrymen in the 1870's." Modern collectors (Jones 1930; Gwyndaf 1970, 1980) report few if any *Märchen*. There are no collections of oral narratives between Ells Gruffydd and the nineteenth-century folklorists and romantics, but the fragments

found here and there in manuscripts (Jones 1955; Jones 1970) confirm the impression of an oral narrative tradition in decline.

Controlled collection and the study of folk tradition have developed significantly since the establishment of the Welsh Folk Museum at St. Fagan's near Cardiff in 1946. Gwyndaf (1970, 1980, 1984) has described the categories represented in the folk narrative collection and a motif-index is in preparation. One hopes that the greater accessibility of the corpus will lead researchers to study more closely than has been possible hitherto not only the motifs but the stylistics and registers of the narratives, their contexts and the role of audience response. Much of this material is anecdotal, humorous, and brief; texts of any length are rare, and there is little scope for compositional analysis. There is, however, an area of oral culture which has always been regarded as particularly Welsh, but which has had almost no examination by students of orality.

Since the mid-eighteenth century Wales has been predominantly a land of evangelical nonconformists in religion. Preaching has occupied a central place in chapel worship, and public prayer, by ordained ministers and lay people, has been extempore. Both activities provide very clear examples of oral compositional techniques and of the ways in which these are acquired. Extempore prayer is highly "formulaic" and depends a great deal on the cultural resonance of words and phrases; its exponents reveal a range of mastery of these techniques which the "audience" recognizes. Extempore prayers are by nature fluid in structure and cannot be compared to narratives. Nevertheless, an analysis would reveal a structure based on a fairly constant order of variable petitions, and at a prayer meeting held on a specific occasion (harvest thanksgiving, missionary meeting, New Year, etc.) prayers acquire a sequence of expected petitions. Based on personal meditation, prayers are not prepared verbally in detail but are orally composed (though in some cases passages may be memorized verbatim). Sermons, however, are composed in the study and are usually prepared in note-form. To that extent, both in the development of its matter and in its expression the sermon has become a fixed form and will be structured in what has become a traditional pattern; but within these limits the preacher will re-create his sermon each occasion he delivers it, varying its emphases, altering its rhetoric and dramatic features, retaining some passages verbatim while composing others afresh.

The variation, or the delivery of a "new" sermon, arises from his own intention, but it would be idle to pretend that the response of his congregation (heard or sensed by him) does not have a role in the ever-changing character of the sermon (Brewer 1967). To hear the same sermon preached two or three times by the same preacher gives a good insight into what the oral storyteller means when he insists that there is no significance in the variants between versions noted by literate observers (Lord 1960:28). Sermons are rigidly structured, their rhetorical devices are capable of analysis both by composition and by function, and they can be learned and reproduced by listeners. The oral tradition of Welsh nonconformity is now in its final stages of decline, but until comparatively recently it was the only contemporary Welsh oral tradition. An analysis of its forms, of the interacting roles of locutor and audience, and of the social patterns of acquiring skills would, *mutatis mutandis*, do much to illuminate the storytelling tradition of a culture which has lost it. It would, of course, be of value for its own sake as a study of orality.

Little sustained work has been done on the oral antecedents of Middle Welsh narratives. Studies of formulaic repetition and structure have, almost by definition, been carried out on verse epics and Slotkin (1977) has rightly objected to the use of the term "formula" to denote simply any verbal repetition. But in almost all applications of the theory to national literatures, "the starting point has been a modification of the original conception, adjusted to suit the demands of the particular language being studied and the tradition in which it was being performed" (Rosenberg 1981:443). Rosenberg here also raises the question whether the oral formula is exclusively a poetic device. There are difficulties in attempting to adapt classical Parry-Lord analyses to prose narratives such as are characteristic of the Welsh narrative tradition, but a study, using a rigorous methodology, of repeated phrases and their thematic contexts would be very useful. Sioned Davies' unpublished Oxford DPhil dissertation (1983) is an important step in this direction, and Jones (1986) breaks new ground in his Appendix on "stylistic structure," but in view of the literary nature of the Welsh stories which has been stressed above, any aesthetic evaluation will have to take account of the

way an earlier formulaic technique has been used in this written literature (Lord 1974:201-10).

National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth

References

Binchy 1961
D. A. Binchy. "The Background of Early Irish Literature." *Studia Hibernica*, 1:7-18.

Bollard 1974-75
J. K. Bollard. "The Structure of the Four Branches of Mabinogi." *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, 250-76.

Bollard 1983
_____. "The Role of Myth and Tradition in *The Four Branches of the Mabinogi*." *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*, 6:67-86.

Brewer 1967
George W. Brewer. "Traddodiad llafar" (Oral Tradition). *Y Traethodydd*, 60-86.

Brewer and Jones 1975
_____ and B. L. Jones. "Popular Tale Motifs and Historical Tradition." *Medium Ævum*, 44:23-30.

Bromwich 1954
Rachel Bromwich. "The Character of the Early Welsh Tradition." In *Studies in Early British History*. Ed. H.M. & N.K. Chadwick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 83-136.

Bromwich 1961
_____. *Trioedd ynys Prydein: The Welsh Triads*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.

Bromwich and Williams 1972
_____and Ifor Williams. *The Beginnings of Welsh Poetry*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.

Bromwich 1974
_____. "Traddodiad llafar y chwedlau" (The Oral Tradition of the Tales). In *Y traddodiad rhyddiaith yn yr oesau canol*. Ed. Geraint Bowen. Llandysul: Gower. pp. 146-75.

Chaytor 1945
H. J. Chaytor. *From Script to Print*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culley 1986
Robert C. Culley. "Oral Tradition and Biblical Studies." *Oral Tradition*, 1:30-65.

Davies 1975
Wendy Davies. "Breint Teilo." *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 26:123-37.

Dumézil 1955
Georges Dumézil. "Triades de calamités et triades de delits à valeur trifonctionnelle chez divers peuples indo-européens." *Latomus*, 14:173-85.
Edel 1981-82
Doris Edel. "Rhai sylwadau ar *Peredur* a pherthynas y chwedl Gymraeg a *Perceval* Chrétien" (Remarks on *Peredur* and the Relationship of the Welsh Story with Chretien's *Perceval*). *Llên Cymru*, 14:52-63.
Edel 1983
_____. "The Catalogues in *Culhwch ac Olwen* and Insular Celtic Learning." *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 30:253-67.
Evans 1982
D. Simon Evans. *Llafar a llyfr yn yr hen gyfnod* (*Oral and Book in the Old Period*). Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Ford 1975-76
Patrick K. Ford. "The Poet as *Cyfarwydd* in Early Welsh Tradition." *Studia Celtica*, 10-11:152-62.
Ford 1977
_____. *The Mabinogi and Other Medieval Welsh Tales*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Ford 1981-82
_____. "Prolegomena to a Reading of the *Mabinogi*: 'Pwyll' and 'Manawydan'." *Studia Celtica*, 16-17:110-25.
Fry 1981
Donald K. Fry. "The Memory of Caedmon." In *Oral Traditional Literature*. Ed. John M. Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 282-93.
Gantz 1979
Jeffrey Gantz. "Thematic Structure in the Four Branches of the Mabinogi." *Medium Ævum*, 47:247-54.
Gruffydd 1928
W. J. Gruffydd. *Math vab Mathonwy*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Gruffydd 1953
_____. *Rhiannon*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Gwyndaf 1970
Robin Gwyndaf. "Chwedlau gwerin Cymru: Welsh Folktales." *Amgueddfa*, 6:14-24.
Gwyndaf 1980
_____. "The Welsh Folk-Narrative Tradition." In *Folklore Studies in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Brewer. pp. 218-25.
Gwyndaf 1984
_____. "A Story Without End: The Folk Narrative Tradition of the Children of Wales." In *Loughborough 88. Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Seminar on Children's Literature*. Ed. F. Keyse. pp. 53-71.
Hamp 1981-82
Eric P. Hamp. "On the Justification of Ordering in *TYP*." *Studia Celtica*, 16-17:126-34.
Hanson-Smith 1981-82
Elizabeth Hanson-Smith. "*Pwyll Prince of Dyfed*: The Narrative Structure." *Studia Celtica*, 16-17:126-34.

Haycock 1981
Marged Haycock. "Early Welsh Poetry." In *Memory and Poetic Structure*. London: Middlesex Polytechnic. pp. 91-135.
Henry 1968
P. L. Henry. "Culhwch and Owwen—Some Aspects of Style and Structure." *Studia Celtica*, 3:30-38.
Hunt 1973—74
Tony Hunt. "The Art of *Iarlles y Ffynnawn* and the European *Volksmärchen*." *Studia Celtica*, 8-9:107-20.
Jackson 1941
Kenneth H. Jackson. "Incremental Repetition in the Early Welsh Englyn." *Speculum*, 16:304-21.
Jackson 1953
_____. *Language and History in Early Britain*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Jackson 1961
_____. *The International Popular Tale and Early Welsh Tradition*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Jackson 1969
_____. *The Gododdin*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Jarman 1974
A. O. H. Jarman. "Pedair Caine y Mabinogi." In *Y traddodiad rhyddiaith yn yr oesau canol*. Ed. Geraint Bowen. Llandysul: Gomer. pp. 83-142.
Jenkins and Owen 1983
Dafydd Jenkins and Morfydd E. Owen. "The Welsh Marginalia in the Lichfield Gospels. Part I." *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*, 5:37-66.
Jones 1930
T. Gwynn Jones. *Welsh Folklore and Folk Custom*. London: Methuen. New ed. 1979.
Jones 1934
D. Gwenallt Jones. *Yr Areithiau Pros* (*Prose Orations*). Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Jones and Jones 1948
Gwyn Jones and Thomas Jones. *The Mabinogion*. London: Everyman.
Jones 1955
Francis Jones. "Family Tales from Dyfed." *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*, 1953:61-83.
Jones 1960
Thomas Jones. "A Welsh Chronicler in Tudor England." *Welsh History Review*, 1:1-17. (cf. Roberts 1975:22).
Jones 1967
_____. "The Black Book of Carmarthen Stanzas of the Graves." *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 53:93-137.
Jones 1970
_____. "Y stori werin yng Nghymru" (The Folktale in Wales). *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion*:16-32.

Jones 1976
Glyn E. Jones. "Early Prose: The Mabinogi." In *A Guide to Welsh Literature*. Ed. A. O. H. Jarman and G. R. Hughes. I. Swansea: Christopher Davies. pp. 189-202.

Jones 1980
Robin F. Jones. "The Precocity of Anglo-Norman and the *Voyage of Saint Brendan*." In *The Nature of Medieval Narrative*. Ed. M. Grunmann-Gaudet and R. F. Jones. Lexington: French Forum. pp. 145-58.

Jones 1984
Bedwyr Lewis Jones. "Gladly Would We Have a Tale." In *Loughborough 83. Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Seminar on Children's Literature*. Ed. F. Keyse. pp. 23-32.

Jones 1986
R. M. Jones. "Narrative Structure in Medieval Welsh Prose." *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Celtic Studies*, Oxford 1988. pp. 171-98.

Lord 1960
Albert B. Lord. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lord 1974
_____. "Perspectives on Recent Work on Oral Literature." *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 10:187-210.

Lewis 1925
Henry Lewis. *Chwedleu Seith Doethon Rufein*. Wrecsam: Hughes.

Lewis 1930
Saunders Lewis. *Braslun o hanes llenyddiaeth Gymraeg* (*An Outline of Welsh Literary History*). Cardiff: Wales University Press.

Mac Cana 1958
Proinsias Mac Cana. *Branwen Daughter of Llyr*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.

Mac Cana 1970
_____. "The Three Languages and the Three Laws." *Studia Celtica*, 5:64-78.

Mac Cana 1973
_____. "On Celtic Word-Order and the Welsh 'Abnormal' Sentence." *Eriu*, 24:90-120.

Mac Cana 1977
_____. *The Mabinogi*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.

Mac Cana 1980
_____. *The Learned Tales of Medieval Ireland*. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.

McKenna 1980
Catherine McKenna. "The Theme of Sovereignty in *Pwyll*." *Bulletin Board of Celtic Studies*, 29:35-52.

Melia 1972
Daniel F. Melia. "Narrative Structure in Irish Saga." Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard University).

Melia 1974
_____. "Parallel Versions of 'The Boyhood Deeds of Cuchulainn'." *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 10:211-26.
Morgan 1951
T. J. Morgan. "Rhyddiaith Gymraeg" (Welsh Prose). *Ysgrifau Llenyddol*. London: Griffiths. pp. 130-202.
Morris 1980
John Morris. *Nennius: British History and the Welsh Annals*. Chichester: Phillimore.
Murphy 1961
Gerard Murphy. *Saga and Myth in Ancient Ireland*. Dublin: Cultural Relations Committee. New ed. 1971.
Ó Coileáin 1977-78a
Sean Ó Coileáin. "Oral or Literary? Some Strands in the Argument." *Studia Hibernica*, 17-18:7-35.
Ó Coileáin 1977-78b
_____. "A Thematic Study of the Tale *Pwyll Pendeuic Dyuet*." *Stadia Celtica*, 12-13:78-82.
Ó Coileáin 1978
_____. "Irish Saga Literature." In *Heroic Epic and Saga*. Ed. Felix J. Oinas. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 172-92.
Owen 1917
Hugh Owen. "Peniarth MS 118." *Y Cymmrodor*, 27:115-52.
Owen 1974
Morfydd E. Owen. "Y Cyfreithiau" (The Laws). In *Y traddodiad rhyddiaith yn yr oesau canol*. Ed. Geraint Bowen. Llandysul: Comer. pp. 196-244.
Rhŷs 1901
John Rhŷs. *Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Richards 1948
Melville Richards. *Breudwyt Ronabwy*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Roberts 1973
Brynley F. Roberts. "The Treatment of Personal Names in the Early Welsh Versions of *Historia Regum Britanniae*." *Bulletin Board of Celtic Studies*, 25:274-90.
Roberts 1974
_____. "Ystoria." *Bulletin Board of Celtic Studies*, 26:13-20.
Roberts 1975
_____. *Cyfranc Lludd a Llefelys*. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.
Roberts 1976a
_____. "Geoffrey of Monmouth and Welsh Historical Tradition." *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 20:29-40.
Roberts 1976b
_____. "Tales and Romances." In *A Guide to Welsh Literature*. Ed. A. O. H. Jarman and G. R. Hughes. I. Swansea: Christopher Davies. pp. 203-43.

Roberts 1983
_____. "The Welsh Romance of the *Lady of the Fountain* (Owein)." In *The Legend of Arthur in the Middle Ages*. Ed. P. B. Grout et al. Cambridge: Brewer. pp. 170-82.
Roberts 1984
_____. "From Traditional Tale to Literary Story: Middle Welsh Prose Narratives." In *The Craft of Fiction*. Ed. Leigh A. Arrathoon. Rochester: Solaris Press. pp. 211-30.
Roberts 1987
_____. "Dosbarthu chwedlau Cymraeg Canol" (Classifying Medieval Welsh Tales). *Ysgrifau Beirniadol*, 15 (forthcoming).
Rosenberg 1981
Bruce A. Rosenberg. "Oral Literature in the Middle Ages." In *Oral Traditional Literature*. Ed. John M. Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 440-50.
Rowland 1985
Jenny Rowland. "The Prose Setting of Early Welsh *englynion chwedlonol*." *Eriu*, 36:29-43.
Rowlands 1985
E. I. Rowlands. "Bardic Lore and Education." *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 32:143-55.
Shepherd 1979
G. T. Shepherd. "The Emancipation of Story in the Twelfth Century." In *Medieval Narrative*. Ed. H. Bekker-Nielsen. Odense: Odense University Press. pp. 44-57.
Sims-Williams 1985
Patrick Sims-Williams. "Some Functions of Origin Stories in Early Medieval Wales." In *History and Heroic Tale: A Symposium*. Ed. Tore Nybery et al. Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag.
Slotkin 1977
Edgar M. Slotkin. "Evidence of Oral Composition in Middle Irish Saga." Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard University).
Slotkin 1983
"Folkloristics and Celtic Philology: A Theoretical Model." In *Celtic Folklore and Christianity*. Ed. P. K. Ford. Los Angeles: University of California. pp. 213-25.
Thomson 1968
R. L. Thomson. *Owein*. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies.
Watkins 1977-78
T. Arwyn Watkins. "Trefn yn y frawddeg Gymraeg" (Order in the Welsh Sentence). *Studia Celtica*, 12-13:367-95.
Williams 1848
Taliesin Williams. *Iolo Manuscripts*. Llandovery: Rees.
Williams 1930
Ifor Williams. *Pedeir Keinc y Mabinogi*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.

Williams 1933a
_____. "Tri englyn y Juvencus" (The Three Juvencus Stanzas). *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 6:101-10. Rpt. in Bromwich and Williams 1972:89-100.
Williams 1933b
_____. "The Poems of Llywarch Hen." *Proceedings of the British Academy*. Rpt. in Bromwich and Williams 1972:122-54.
Williams 1938
_____. *Canu Aneirin*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Williams 1949
_____. *Hen Chwedlau* (Old Tales). Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Williams 1957
_____. *Chwedl Taliesin*. Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Williams 1969
G. J. Williams. *Agweddau ar hanes dysg Gymraeg* (*Aspects of Welsh Learning*). Ed. Aneirin Lewis. Cardiff: Wales University Press.
Wood 1981
Juliette Wood. "The Elphin Section of Hanes Taliesin." *Etudes celtiques*, 18:229-44.
Wood 1982
_____. "The Folklore Background of the Gwion Bach Section of Hanes Taliesin." *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 29:621-34.

Oral Tradition, 3/1-2 (1988): 88-105

A Formulaic Analysis of Samples Taken from the *Shâhnâma* of Firdowsi

O. M. Davidson

Milman Parry's working definition of the formula is as follows: "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea" (1971:272). This definition, devised by Parry on the basis of his work on Homeric poetry, before he even started work on the living poetry of the South Slavic tradition, has proved both useful and enduring despite the need of one small adjustment. Ironically, this adjustment has been prompted at least partly by the evidence of Homeric poetry itself: it can be shown that the metrical conditions of the formula can vary, although this variation itself is systematic (Ingalls 1972:111-14). Thus it may be useful to revise the phrase "under the same metrical conditions" in Parry's working definition and to read instead "under fixed metrical conditions." It is also useful to stress the phrase "to express a given essential idea," since this aspect of Parry's definition has often been undervalued or even missed altogether.

For Parry, the formula is not simply a repeated phrase that is repeated merely for its metrical utility (1971:304), rather it is the expression of a traditional *theme*. To quote Parry, "the formulas in any poetry are due, so far as their ideas go, to the theme, their rhythm is fixed by the verse-form, but their art is that of the poets who made them and of the poets who kept them" (1971:272). For the word "theme," I cite the working definition of Albert Lord: "a subject unit, a group of ideas, regularly employed by a singer, not merely in any given poem, but in the poetry as a whole" (1938:440; 1974:206-7). In other words, the Parry-Lord theory of oral poetry is founded on the proposition that the traditional formula is a direct expression of the traditional theme; in oral poetry, there is a formulaic system that corresponds

to a thematic system.[1] In a recent book by Ruth Finnegan (1977), however, which purports to present the overall subject of oral poetry to the general reader, this basic aspect of the Parry-Lord definition of the formula goes unmentioned. She consistently treats the formula as if it were merely a repeated phrase, repeated simply for its metrical utility. In discussing Homeric epithets, for example, she writes that they "are often combined with other formulaic phrases—repeated word-groups—which have the right metrical qualities to fit the [given] part of the line" (1977:59). In the same context, she quotes Parry for support: "in composing [the poet] will do no more than put together for his needs phrases which he has often heard or used himself, and which, grouping themselves *in accordance with a fixed pattern of thought* [emphasis mine], come naturally to make the sentence and the verse" (Parry 1971:270). We see here that Parry is saying much more than Finnegan: the formula is not just a phrase that the poet is free to choose according to his metrical needs,[2] since the formulas are regulated by the traditional themes of the poet's composition. By contrast, Finnegan seems to assume that formulas and themes are separate ingredients in the poet's repertoire: "*As well as* formulaic phrases and sequences [emphasis mine], the bard has in his repertoire a number of set themes which he can draw on to form the structure of his poem" (1977:64). Working on the assumption that formulas are simply stock phrases repeated to fill metrical needs, Finnegan offers the following criticism of the Parry-Lord theory of oral poetry: "Does it really add to our understanding of the style or process of composition in a given piece to name certain repeated patterns of words, sounds or meanings as 'formulae'? Or to suggest that the characteristic of oral style is that such formulae are 'all-pervasive' (as in Lord 1960:47)?" (Finnegan 1977:71). In light of what I have adduced from the writings of Parry and Lord, I find this criticism unfounded; if the formula is the building-block of a system of traditional oral poetic expression, then I cannot find fault with Lord's observation that formulas are "all-pervasive" in oral poetry.

Another important point of disagreement between Finnegan and Lord is her insistence that, on the basis of what we know of oral poetry in such cultures as that of the Bantu of South Africa (both Zulu and Xhosa), the oral poet can not only *compose* poetry but also *write it down* (Finnegan 1977:70, citing the work on Bantu oral poetry by Opland 1971). It is tempting, of course, to extend

such findings to medieval European poetry, where the fundamentals of what is freely acknowledged as oral poetry are preserved and transmitted by *literati* in the context of a vigorous scribal tradition. Finnegan's point of contention with Lord provides ammunition for medievalists like Larry Benson, who has argued that an Old English poem like the *Beowulf* cannot be considered oral poetry on the basis of the formulas that we find as its building-blocks, simply because we can find comparable levels of formulaic behavior in other Old English poems which were clearly written compositions and some of which were even translations from Latin originals. As Benson concludes, "To prove that an Old English poem is formulaic is only to prove that it is an Old English poem, and to show that such work has a high or low percentage of formulas reveals nothing about whether or not it is a literate composition, though it may tell us something about the skill with which a particular poet uses the tradition" (1966:336).

There is an important modification of Benson's position, however, that has been proposed by Michael Zwettler: applying the work of the medievalist H. J. Chaytor (1967:10-13 and chapters 4 and 6), Zwettler argues that even when an Old English poem is written down, it is not meant to be *read* by an individual but to be *performed* before an audience (1978:15-19). In other words, as he points out, there is no such thing as an "audience of readers" in medieval European poetry (1978:15-19). To quote Chaytor: "the whole technique [. . .] presupposed [. . .] a hearing, not a reading public" (1967:13). The mechanics of this poetry, written or not, are those of oral poetry. Zwettler extends this principle to pre-Islamic Arabic poetry, and I for my part hope to extend it to the New Persian poetry of Ferdowsi, by arguing that the building-blocks of his *Shâhnâma* are formulaic. If the argument is successful, there is room for arguing further that this poetry is based on the mechanics of oral poetry.[3]

The *Shâhnâma* or "Book of Kings" of Ferdowsi, reportedly completed about A.D. 1010, is the authoritative version of the national epic of the Iranians, presenting itself as an all-inclusive narration of the reigns of the whole line of Iranian shahs from the primordial founders all the way down to the last of the Sassanian dynasty.[4] As Mary Boyce has shown, there is a lengthy prehistory of Iranian oral poetic traditions on the subject of the reigns of shahs (1957), and there are numerous references in the *Shâhnâma* itself to the oral performance of such traditions by wise men who

are heard by the poet Ferdowsi.[5] Besides such sources, however, the *Shâhnâma* also claims another source, a "Book of Kings" that Ferdowsi acquired through "a friend" (Davidson 1985:111-12). As I have argued in detail elsewhere, the *Shâhnâma* not only claims as its sources the combination of many performances and one archetypal "book": it also presents itself as a combination of performance and book, so much so that performance and book are actually interchangeable concepts in the *Shâhnâma* (Davidson 1985:121). In other words, the very notion of a book, both the "archetype" claimed by Ferdowsi and the *Shâhnâma* of Ferdowsi itself, is represented in terms of performance.[6]

In order to present my argument that the building-blocks of his *Shâhnâma* are formulaic, I have used as a test-case a passage concerning the theme of writing a letter. This theme is particularly appropriate for my present purposes, since the notion of reading and writing is not incompatible, in the poetics of the *Shâhnâma*, with the notion of oral performance.

What I hope to illustrate with the formulaic analysis of one passage is that every word in this given passage can be generated on the basis of parallel phraseology expressing parallel themes. The degree of regularity and economy[7] in the arrangement of phraseology will be clearly suggestive of formulaic behavior. Moreover, as we shall see, the regularity extends to the actual variation of phraseology. This factor may well be an important additional clue to the formulaic nature of Ferdowsi's *Shâhnâma*. As Parry and Lord had noticed in their fieldwork on Yugoslav oral poetry, *each new performance/recomposition of a song involved variation in the deployment of formulas*. This principle has been applied successfully by Michael Zwettler in his study of classical Arabic poetry (1978). He extends the observations of the Romance philologist Ramón Menéndez Pidal, who had drawn attention to the curious fact that three of the earliest manuscript versions of the *Chanson de Roland* do not share a single identical verse with each other (Menéndez Pidal 1960:60-63), and who had inferred from this and other such facts that this kind of poetry, is "a poetry that lives through variants" (Zwettler 1978:189). "How ironic," Zwettler remarks, "that scholars of Arabic poetry have so often cast doubt upon the 'authenticity' and 'genuineness' of this or that verse, poem, or body of poems, or, sometimes, of pre-Islamic poetry in general, because they have found it impossible to establish an 'original version'" (1978:189).

In a related passage he writes:

> The multiplicity of variants and attributions and of formulaic phrases and elements attested for the great majority of classical Arabic poems may undermine our confidence in ever establishing an "author's original version" —as indeed they should! But they ought to convince us that we do have a voluminous record of a genuine and on-going oral poetic tradition (even if in its latest stages), such as no other nation can match in breadth of content and scrupulosity of collection and documentation. (Zwettler 1978:212)

The conscientiousness of those who preserved all these variants in their editions is a reflection of an attitude that we also witness in the context of the *Hadîth*, and Zwettler insists that the editors' quest for authenticity by way of examining and collecting all variants was due not so much to any need of determining the author but to the desire of recovering the authentic poetic traditions of Bedouin poetry (1978:203).

The same principle of variation, I propose, can also be applied to the text tradition of the *Shâhnâma*. We must note, however, an important difference between the patterns of variation in the text of the *Shâhnâma*, as revealed by its textual tradition, and those in the Arabic poetry studied by Zwettler. In the case of the Arabic evidence, the variants seem to have been collected *while* the given poem was evolving into a fixed text in the process of continual performance/recomposition. In the case of the *Shâhnâma*, on the other hand, the variants seem to have gone on accumulating even after the composition had become a fixed text by way of writing. Thus I suggest that, side-by-side with the written transmission of the text, the oral transmission of poetry continued as well. Each new performance could have entailed recomposition, and the oral poetry could have continually influenced the text.

In that case, however, we cannot reconstruct the original composition of Ferdowsi, if it really kept getting recomposed with each new performance in a living oral tradition. All we can say about the original is that if it is capable of being recomposed, it too must be a product of oral composition. And the continual recomposition on the level of form was matched by recomposition on the level of content, leading to new accretions that are

anachronistic to the ideology of earlier layers.[8] We may compare the accretion of Muslim elements in the pre-Islamic poetic traditions studied by Zwettler:

> . . . we must reconsider the alleged "inconsistencies," "anachronism," and "Islamic emendations" that do crop up in our received texts and have so frequently been adduced as proof of the "corruption" of the tradition. Such phenomena as the introduction of post-Islamic expressions or other neologisms into archaic poems, elimination of pagan theophoric names or substitution of the name Allâh, allusions to Qur'ânic passages or Islamic concepts or rituals, and so on, can all legitimately be seen as a natural result of the circumstance that versions of those poems were derived from oral renditions performed by Muslim renderants conditioned now to the sensibilities of Muslim audiences. (Zwettler 1978:221)

Similarly, we find the accretion and eventual dominance of Shîite elements in the poetry of Ferdowsi, originally aimed at Sunni audiences (Davidson 1985:110-111). But even if we cannot reconstruct the original composition, its authenticity or authority as tradition could still survive the countless accretions and reshapings of each recomposition in performance. That is the nature of oral poetry.

Let us begin, then, with the passage that I have selected from the *Shâhnâma* concerning the theme of letter-writing. Applying the dictum of Parry and Lord that the formula is the expression of a given theme, I shall compare this passage with others involving the same context of letter-writing. My purpose is to test whether these passages, involving a regular system of thematic development, also involve a regular system of phraseology, which would be indicative of formulaic behavior. The passage in question is the following (each hemistich of the couplet, shaped o - - o - - o - - o - , will be shown as a separate line).[9]

#1.1 cho ân nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht
#1.2 padid âvarid andaru khub o zesht
#1.3 nakhost âfarin kard bar kerdegâr
#1.4 kazu did nik o bad-e ruzegâr

V 141.984-85

#1.1 He quickly had a reply written to that letter,
#1.2 in which he showed himself both gentle and harsh.
#1.3 First he praised God the omnipotent,
#1.4 who grants him good and bad fortune.

As we shall see, every word in this passage, to which I shall refer henceforth as #1, can be generated on the basis of parallel passages involving the same context of letter-writing. But first, it is important to add that even the *sequence* of the four hemistichs in #1 is indicative of formulaic behavior. I have found parallels of sequential arrangement in the following four passages (##2-5), each likewise involving four hemistichs:

#2.1 marân *nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht*
#2.2 beyârast qartâsrâ chun behesht
#2.3 *nakhost âfarin kard bar* dâdgar
#2.4 khodâvand-e mardi o dâd o honar

VII 94.1603-4

#2.1 He quickly had a reply written to that very letter
#2.2 on a leaf that was decorated like paradise.
#2.3 First he praised God the all-just,
#2.4 lord of mankind and justice and knowledge.

#3.1 marân *nâmarâ* khub *pâsokh nevesht*
#3.2 sokhanhây-e bâ maghz o farrokh nevesht
#3.3 *nakhost âfarin kard bar kerdegâr*
#3.4 jehândâr dâdâr parvardegâr

VII 9.46-47

#3.1 She had a good reply written to that very letter.
#3.2 She had words written with substance and happiness.
#3.3 First she praised God the omnipotent,
#3.4 possessor of the world, distributor of justice, the all-powerful.

#4.1 be eyvân shod o nâma *pâsokh nevesht*
#4.2 bebâgh-e bozorgi derakhti bekesht

#4.3 *nakhost âfarin kard bar kerdegâr*
#4.4 *kazu* bud rowshan del o bakhtyâr

IV 266.887-88

#4.1 He went to the palace and had a letter written in reply.
#4.2 In the garden of greatness he planted a tree.
#4.3 First he praised God the omnipotent,
#4.4 from whom there is clarity of mind and good fortune.

#5.1 dabir-e kher admand benvesht khub
#5.2 *padid âvarid andaru* zesht o khub
#5.3 *nakhost âfarin kard bar* dâdgar
#5.4 *kazu did* paydâ begiti honar

II 110.636-37

#5.1 A wise scribe wrote well [a letter],
#5.2 in which he showed himself both harsh and gentle.
#5.3 First he praised God the all-just,
#5.4 who makes manifest knowledge in the world.

The italics provided for these four passages show the word-for-word correspondences with the first passage. These correspondences are not just a matter of repetitions: rather, as we shall see, they indicate a system of regular word-placement. From the further correspondences that we are about to explore, it will become clear that the regularity is not a matter of modeling one set of phrases on another, but rather of generating fixed phraseological patterns from fixed thought-patterns. Such a process is the essence of formulaic behavior as described by Michael Nagler (1974).

In the case of the first hemistich of #1 (#1.1), the parallelisms provided by #2.1/#3.1/#4.1 account for every word except the first:

#1.1 cho *ân nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht*
#2.1 marân *nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht*
#3.1 marân *nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht*
#4.1 be eyvân shod o nâma *pâsokh nevesht*

Even for the first word, we can find other passages with the same word in a parallel context of letter-writing:

#6.1 *cho ân nâma* benvesht nazdik-e shâh
#6.2 gozin kard guyanda'i zân sepâh
VIII 372.957
#6.1 Then he had a letter written to the shah.
#6.2 He chose a singer from among his army.

#7.1 *cho* â*n nâmar*â u beman bar bekhwând
#7.2 por az âb dide hami sar feshând
IX 264.164
#7.1 When he read that letter out loud to me,
#7.2 my eyes began to shed tears.

In the case of the second hemistich of #1 (#1.2), the parallelisms provided by #5.2 account for every word except the last three:

#1.1 cho ân nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht
#1.2 *padid âvarid andaru* khub o zesht
#5.1 dabir-e kheradmand benvesht khub
#5.2 *padid âvarid andaru* zesht o khub

The order of *zesht o khub* at #5.2 allows rhyming with . . . *khub* at #5.1, while the inverse order of *khub o zesht* allows rhyming with . . . *nevesht* at #1.1. But the order of *khub o zesht* after *padid âvarid andaru* at #1.2 is just as regular as the order of *zesht o khub* that we see after the same phrase at #5.2. For example, we may compare the following passage:

#8.1 pas *ân nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht*
#8.2 *padidâr* kard *andaru khub o zesht*
VII 395.1593
#8.1 Then he had a reply written to that letter,
#8.2 in which he showed himself to be gentle and harsh.

The parallelism between #8.2 and #1.2 extends beyond the phraseological match *padid . . . andaru khub o zesht*. It involves also the identical rhyme of final . . . *o zesht*/ . . . *nevesht* at

#8.2/1 and #1.2/1. Even more, it involves the phraseological match . . . *ân nâmarâ zud pâsokh* . . . preceding the final rhyming . . . *nevesht* at #8.1 and #1.1. I append the following further parallels to #1.1:

#1.1 *cho ân nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht*
#9.1 marân *nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht*
VII 20.250
#10.1 marân *nâmarâ* khub *pâsokh* nebesht
VIII 375.1009
#10.1* *marân nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht*
VIII 375.1009 mss. I, IV, VI
#10.1** *marân nâmarâ zud pâsokh* nebesht
VII 375.1009 ms. K
#9.1 He quickly had a reply written to that letter.
#10.1 He had a good reply written to that letter.
#10.1* He quickly had a reply written to that letter.
#10.1** He quickly had a reply written to that letter.

#10.1*** marân *nâmarâ* khub *pâsokh nevesht*
VIII 375.1009 ms.L
#11.1 *marân nâmarâ* niz *pâsokh nevesht*
IX 130.2044
#11.1* hamân *nâmarâ zud pâsokh nevesht*
IX 130.2044 mss. I, IV
#11.1** hamân *nâmarâ* niz *pâsokh nevesht*
IX 130.2044 mss. I, IV
#12.1 hamân *nâmarâ zud pâsokh* nebesht
VIII 418n20
#10.1*** He had a good reply written to that letter.
#11.1 Again he had a reply written to that letter.
#11.1* He quickly had a reply written to that very letter.
#11.1** Again he had a reply written to that very letter.
#12.1 He quickly had a reply written to that very letter.

It is worth noting that the variations that we find between variant lines in different manuscripts correspond to those between variant lines in different passages; compare #10.1* and #10.1*** to #2.1

and #3.1, or #10.1* and #10.1** to #3.1 and #10.1. In other words, it seems that, at least in the case of these variations in phraseology between one manuscript reading and another, the patterns of regular interchangeability suggest formulaic behavior.

We have by now accounted for every word in the first two hemistichs of #1, and we are ready to move on to the next two. The first of these two, the third hemistich, explicitly narrates the first and foremost theme in the contents of any stylized letter in the *Shâhnâma*, praise of God the omnipotent:

#1.3 *nakhost âfarin kard bar kerdegâr*
#1.3 First he praised God the all-just.

It should come as no surprise, then, that there are numerous exact parallels to be found. There is also a common variant, which is actually attested even as a manuscript variant for #1:

#1.3* *nakhost âfarin kard bar dâdgar*
variant of above, ms. K

Instead of listing the numerous exact parallels to #1.3 (two instances of which we have already seen at #3.3 and #4.3) and to #1.3* (two instances of which we have already seen at #2.3 and #5.3), it would be more instructive to consider the third hemistich together with the fourth.

At #1.4 and #1.4*, the final word has to rhyme with the final . . . *kerdegâr* and . . . *dâdgar* of #1.3 and #1.3* respectively. If we take #1.3 and #1.4 together, we find the following exact parallel:

#1.3 *nakhost âfarin kard bar kerdegâr*
#1.4 *kazu did nik o bad-e ruzegâr*
#13.1 *nakhost âfarin kard bar kerdegâr*
#13.2 *kazu did nik o bad-e ruzegâr*
IX 313.34
#13.1 First he praised God the omnipotent,
#13.2 who grants him good and bad fortune.

With the second hemistich of this one passage we have at last succeeded in accounting for every single word of the four hemistichs of #1 in terms of formal and functional parallels in

other passages involving the themes of letter-writing. Another exact parallel to the couplet #1.3/4 comes from a variant in one of the four original passages that we have considered:

#4.3 *nakhost âfarin kard bar kerdegâr*
#4.4 *kazu* bud rowshan del o bakhtyâr
IV 266.888
#4.4* *kazu did nik o bad-e ruzegâr*
IV 266.888 mss. K, I, IV, VI
#4.4* who grants him good and bad fortune.

There is still another exact parallel from another variant:

#14.1 *nakhost âfarin kard bar dâdgar*
#14.2 *kazu did* mardi o bakht o honar
IX 129.230
#14.1* *nakhost âfarin kard bar kerdegâr*
#14.2* *kazu did nik o bad-e ruzegâr*

#14.1 First he praised God the all-just,
#14.2 from whom there is manliness, fortune, and wisdom.
#14.1* First he praised God the omnipotent,
#14.2* who grants him good and bad fortune.

Now we turn to the variant of #1.3/4:

#1.3* *nakhost âfarin kard bar* dâdgar

#1.4* khodâvand-e piruziy-o zur o farr
V 141.985 ms. K
#1.3* First he praised God the all-just,
#1.4* lord of victory, chiefs, and luminous glory [*farr*].

At first, #1.4* seems idiosyncratic, but if we take a sample of hemistichs that rhyme only with either

nakhost âfarin kard bar dâdgar (#1.3*)

or

nakhost âfarin kard bar kerdegâr (#1.3),

we shall see that the wording of #1.4* belongs to the overall system of phraseology that has characterized all the passages surveyed so far. In what follows, parallelisms among phrases to be found in hemistichs that rhyme with the type #1.3* (. . . *dâdgar*) will be marked with an underline, in contrast to parallelisms with the phrases of #1.1/2/3/4, which have all along been marked with italics. The first example to be compared comes from a variant in one of the four original passages that we have considered:

#1.4* khodâvand-e piruziy-o zur o farr

#2.4 khodâvand-e mardi o dâd o honar

VII 94.1604

#2.4* khodâvand-e piruz o dâd o honar

VII 94.1604 ms. L

#2.4* lord of victory, justice, and wisdom.

We note the close parallelism with the following example (to repeat, the hemistichs that are now being considered rhyme with a preceding hemistich that is identical in phraseology to #1.3*):

#14.2 kazu did mardi o bakht o honar

IX 129.2030

We have already considered a variant of this hemistich, #14.2*, which corresponds exactly to the phraseology of #1.4:

#14.2* *kazu did nik o bad-e ruzegar*

IX 129.2030 VI

To repeat, the crucial difference in this variant is that it rhymes with the phraseology that we saw in #1.4, whereas #14.2 rhymes with the phraseology that we are now examining, parallel to what we saw in #1.4*. Yet another example of the latter type is the following:

#15.2 kazu did niruy o farr o honar

III 59.901

#15.2 from whom there is strength, luminous glory (*farr*), and wisdom.

This line has a manuscript variant with a striking formal parallelism to the phraseology of #1.4*, our point of departure:

#15.2* kazu did piruziy-o ruzegâr

III 59.901 ms. VI

#15.2* who grants him victory and fortune.

In fact, since we have already seen that

khodâvand-e

and

kazu did

are interchangeable (#2.4 and #14.2), the only difference between #1.4* and #15.2* is the final phraseology that effects the rhyme with the preceding

nakhost âfarin kardbar dâdgar

and

nakhost âfarin kardbar kerdegâr

respectively. We come to the conclusion that the phraseology marked by the underlines is actually a part of the system of the phraseology marked by the italics:

#1.4* khodâvand-e piruziy-o zur o farr
#2.4* khodâvand-e piruz o dâd o honar
#2.4 khodâvand-e mardi o dâd o honar
#14.2 *kazu did* mardi o bakht o honar
#5.4 *kazu did* paydâ begiti honar
#15.2 *kazu did* niruy o farr o honar
#15.2* *kazu did* piruziy-o *ruzegâr*

#16.2 *kazu* gasht piruz be *ruzegâr* (III 45.663)

#16.2* *kazu*yast piruz be *ruzegâr* (III 45.663 mss. I, IV)
#16.2, who gives glory to one's fortune.
16.2*

#13.2 *kazu did nik o bad-e ruzegâr*
#14.2* *kazu did nik o bad-e ruzegâr*
#4.4* *kazu did nik o bad-e ruzegâr*

What I hope to have illustrated, to repeat, with this exercise in the formulaic analysis of one passage is that every word in this given passage can be generated on the basis of parallel phraseology expressing parallel themes. We have noted the degree of regularity and economy in the arrangement of phraseology, a quality which is clearly suggestive of formulaic language behavior.

Having observed on a small scale the principles of variation in the text tradition of the *Shâhnâma*, I note the need for similar investigations on a larger scale. An exhaustive study, of course, is at this point impossible, since there is no available centralized collection of all the variants as could be collected from the entire textual tradition. Such a collection would be a monumental task indeed! Still, the limited experiment of formulaic analysis that I have attempted illustrates the principle of compositional variation as reflected by textual variation.

As another illustration, however limited, let us consider the ornamental epithet *shir'owzhan* "lion-slayer" and its variant *ru'intan* "brazen-bodied." The two are isometric, in that they are always found in identical metrical positions within the *bayt* [hemistich] of the *mutâgarib*, the canonical meter of the *Shâhnâma*:

o - - o - - o - - o -
[*a*]
[*b*]
[*c*]

Let us number these positions *a*, *b*, *c*, as indicated above. The number of occurences of these two epithets in the entire *Shâhnâma* is as follows:

	a	*b*	*c*
shir'owzhan	1	16	5
ru'intan	1	2	10

The numbers for the occurrences are based on the figures gleaned from the Paris edition of the *Shâhnâma* as checked against the Moscow edition. In one passage (VI 51.679), however, at position *c*, manuscript K of the Moscow edition reads *ru'intan* instead of *shir'owzhan*, which we read for this passage in all other manuscripts used by the Moscow edition.

From the overall patterns of distribution here, we see that K in this case is just as "correct" as the other manuscripts, and that such textual factors as manuscript predominance cannot settle the matter. The examples could be multiplied hundreds and even thousands of times, and by then we would start to see clearly that there are legitimate formulaic variants attested for vast portions of the *Shâhnâma*. We may postpone any questions about how these considerations may affect our evaluation of the Moscow edition. What is important for now is that even a limited test reveals such patterns of variation in the text of the *Shâhnâma*—the surest available sign that we are dealing with oral poetry.

Brandeis University

Notes

[1] For an excellent survey of recent scholarship on the interrelationship of formula and theme, see Cantilena 1982:41-73. On p. 56, he offers this summary: "Ogni formula, dalla più stereotipa alla più consapevolmente usata, è motivata semanticamente."

[2]Cf. Finnegan 1977:62: "He can select what he wishes from the common stock of formulae, and can choose slightly different terms that fit his metre ... and vary the details."

[3]I have presented various arguments for the oral heritage of the *Shâhnâma* of Ferdowsi in Davidson 1985; in this previous article, however, the formulaic nature of the diction of the *Shâhnâma* was not examined.

[4]For documentation of the authoritative status of the *Shâhnâma* as the national epic of the Iranians, see Davidson 1985:103-5.

[5]For a collection of such passages in the *Shâhnâma*, see Davidson 1985:112-16.

[6]Note especially the myth, discussed in Davidson 1985:122-23, about the survival of the "archetype" on the occasion of a grand performance where the "archetype's" scattered "fragments" are reassembled.

[7]For this concept, see Lord 1960:53.

[8]Such a possibility is emotionally and sarcastically resisted by Minovi (1972:110).

[9]In the following paragraphs, I adhere to the policy of showing each hemistich as a separate line: I have transcribed the passages so as to show metrical length. Translations have been provided. In terms of New Persian metrics, the full line or *bayt* is divided into metrically equal *misraᶜ-s*. The name of the meter used in the *Shâhnâma* is *mutaqârib*.

References

Benson 1966
L. Benson. "The Literary Character of Anglo-Saxon Formulaic Poetry." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 81:334-41.

Boyce 1957
M. Boyce. "The Parthian Gôsân and the Iranian Minstrel Tradition." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 18:10-45.

Cantilena 1982
M. Cantilena. *Ricerche sulla dizione epica. I: Per uno studio della formularità degli Inni Omerici*. Rome: Ateneo.

Chaytor 1967
H. J. Chaytor. *From Script to Print: An Introduction to Medieval Vernacular Literature*. New York: October House.

Davidson 1985
O. M. Davidson. "The Crown-Bestower in the Iranian Book of Kings." In *Papers In Honour of Professor Mary Boyce*. Acta Iranica, 24. Leiden: Brill. pp. 61-148.

Finnegan 1977
R. Finnegan. *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ingalls 1972
W. B. Ingalls. "Another Dimension of Homeric Formula." *Phoenix*, 24:1-12.

Lord 1938
A. B. Lord. "Homer and Huso II: Narrative Inconsistencies in Homer and Oral Poetry." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 69:439-45.

Lord 1974 (1975)

_____. "Perspectives on Recent Work on Oral Literature." In *Oral Literature: Seven Essays*. Ed. Joseph J. Duggan. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press. pp. 1-24.

Menéndez Pidal 1960

R. Menéndez Pidal. *La Chanson de Roland et la tradition épique des Francs*. 2nd ed. trans. by I. M. Cluzel. Paris: A. & J. Picard.

Nagler 1974

M. Nagler. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Opland 1971

J. Opland. "*Scop* and *Imbongi*: Anglo-Saxon and Bantu Oral Poets." *English Studies in Africa*, 14:161-78.

Parry 1971

A. Parry, ed. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Zwettler 1978

M. Zwettler. *The Oral Tradition of Classical Arabic Poetry: Its Character and Implications*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Oral Tradition, 3/1-2 (1988): 106-21

The Buddhist Tradition of Prosimetric Oral Narrative in Chinese Literature

Victor H. Mair

Since 1972 I have been involved in an extensive investigation of a T'ang period (618-906) form of illustrated Chinese storytelling known as *chuan-pien,* literally "turning [scrolls with painted scenes of] transformational [manifestations]." I have also made an in-depth study of a genre of written popular literature called *pien-wen* ("transformation texts") that derived from the oral stories presented by *chuan-pien* performers. The subject matter of these tales was initially Buddhist, but Chinese historical and legendary material came to be used soon after the introduction of the storytelling form from India (via Central Asia). The results of my investigations have been or will be published in, among others, the following works: *Tun-huang Popular Narratives* (1983b), *T'ang Transformation Texts* (1988b), *Painting and Performance: Chinese Picture Recitation, Its Indian Genesis, and Analogues Elsewhere* (1988a), and numerous articles. Additional references may be found in the bibliographies and notes to these publications.

The purpose of the present article is to examine the crucial impact of the Buddhist storytelling tradition upon the development of written vernacular literature (both fiction and drama) in China. In particular, it seeks to explain how and why the characteristically Indian prosimetric or chantefable form (alternating prose and verse) came to be an identifying feature of the vast majority of Chinese popular literary genres. Basically, there are two questions that need to be answered. Why did transformation texts come into being during the T'ang period? And why did they apparently die out in the Northern Sung period (960-1126)?

One very good reason why transformations may have become popular during the T'ang period is that it was the very time when foreign cultural influence had reached a peak in China: "The

vogue for foreign clothes, foreign food, and foreign music was especially prevalent in the eighth century, but no part of the T'ang era was free from it" (Schafer 1963:28). And, of foreign influences in the T'ang period, by far the most pervasive was Buddhism. As Arthur Wright and Denis Twitchett have written, "it is obvious to the most casually interested that during the T'ang dynasty Buddhism suffused T'ang life, penetrated every segment of Chinese society to a degree that it had not done before and was never to do again" (1973:18).

Paul Demiéville has already hinted, in a brief but perceptive note, that Buddhism was responsible for the rise of Chinese vernacular literature in a very general way:

> There is scarcely any doubt that the source of this remarkable development is to be sought in Buddhism, which had an overwhelming influence during the T'ang dynasty and whose egalitarian doctrine and propaganda were directed to the people at large, without distinction of class and culture (1974:186).

Buddhism in India had served to diminish the ill effects of the caste system. In China, too, it acted as a social leveler. Anyone who believed could praise the Buddha and the Bodhisattvas through whatever means were available to him—road-building, printing of charms, donation of art-work, copying of sutras (scriptures), recitation of prayers, and so on. All interested souls were welcomed and encouraged to attend religious lectures which were skillfully aimed at the level of understanding of widely varying audiences. Buddhist authorities and lay organizations were involved in various educational enterprises directed towards the common people. Theoretically, everyone was equal within the *saṇgha* (community). And anyone could enter the Western Paradise through a profession of faith. People from all walks of life and all social classes could leave their families *(ch'u-chia,* Sanskrit *pravraj)* to become monks and nuns. What is more, they might remain celibate and hence fail to produce offspring—the worst possible sin for a filial Chinese son or daughter. For these reasons—and many others—Buddhism was damned by the establishment as being un-Chinese and destructive to the *status in quo* of the social fabric. But by the middle of the T'ang period the damage (or the benefit) had been irreparably done: the social effect of the penetration of Buddhist ideals and institutions into all

reaches of Chinese life was ineradicable. One of the results of that penetration was the creation of a climate favorable to the development of popular literature. For its adherents, there were now viable and religiously legitimized literary alternatives to the classically sanctioned modes of history, poetry, and *belles lettres*. With the passage of time, the originally Buddhist nature of these profound social and literary changes would be forgotten. Of course, there were many other social, political, and economic factors involved in the explosive spread of popular culture during the T'ang. I stress here the importance of Buddhism in this expansion of the popular realm because it is so often totally ignored.

One of the most profound changes wrought upon literature in China by Buddhism was the subtle devaluation of the written word vis-à-vis the spoken. In a discussion of the apparent absence of epic poetry and the relatively late occurrence of drama in China, Achilles Fang has emphasized the traditional pre-eminence of the written word over the spoken (1965:196-99). Poetry that deserved the name was strangely always written and not oral. Without being adequately informed of the actual historical development of Chinese literature or the true nature of demotic Chinese languages, Max Weber offered some extremely penetrating remarks on the relationship between the written and the spoken word in China:

> The stock of written symbols remained far richer than the stock of monosyllabic words, which was inevitably quite delimited. Hence, all phantasy and ardor fled from the poor and formalistic intellectualism of the spoken word and into the quiet beauty of the written symbols. The usual poetic speech was held fundamentally subordinate to the script. Not speaking but writing and reading were valued artistically and considered as worthy of a gentleman, for they were receptive of the artful products of script. *Speech remained truly an affair of the plebs.* This contrasts sharply with Hellenism, to which conversation meant everything and a translation into the style of the dialogue was the adequate form of all experience and contemplation. In China the very finest blossoms of literary culture lingered, so to speak, deaf and mute in their silken splendor. They were valued far higher than was the art of drama, which, characteristically, flowered

> during the period of the Mongols [1280-1367]. (1964:124)

The contrast with Hellenism is similar to that with the Indian tradition where oral discourse "meant everything." It was Buddhism which injected this radically new approach to literature in Chinese society.

There is evidence in the *Collected Major Edicts of the T'ang* (Sung Min-ch'iu 1959:588) that the government tried to stop the activities of folk religious storytellers at about the same time they first became prominent. An edict of the fourth month of the year 731 forbids "monks and nuns" from going out in the villages to tell stories and engage in other unseemly activities. "Except for lecturing on the *vinaya* (discipline), all else is forbidden to monks and nuns." It is possible that the government may have been ill-informed about who was doing the storytelling in the countryside. For it is very likely that those who were engaged in storytelling in the villages were not really formally ordained monks and nuns at all but lay, semi-professional entertainers.[1] It seems more probable that the edict was worded as it is for legalistic purposes *(viz.,* to put the folk religious storytellers and popular priests—essentially lay figures—completely beyond the pale of legitimate activity). In the tightly structured, hierarchically ordered society that was the goal of all Chinese monarchs, unsanctioned religious activity was liable to be viewed as "cultic," "seditious," or even "rebellious."

In an edict of the seventh month in the year 714, the emperor declares that he has heard Buddhism has been corrupted because, among other things, "in the wards and alleys, [the 'monks'] have been opening 'layouts' and writing [uncanonical] scriptures." The expression "opening 'layouts'" *(k'ai p'u)* is extremely suggestive[2] because it might refer to the display of pictures used to illustrate oral narratives. In the next recorded edict, dated the eleventh month of 715, the emperor complains that these undisciplined "monks" create other, minor scriptures, falsely ascribing them to the Buddha himself. In all of these edicts, the emperor shows himself to be genuinely worried about the harmful effects of such activities. On a deeper level, what the emperor's concern actually reveals is the inability of the government to control the massive spread of folk and popular Buddhism among the people. To the fundamentally Confucian rulers of China, non-elite Buddhism was a subversive threat.

Yet the impact of Buddhist narrative on the shape of Chinese popular literature was revolutionary and long-lasting. In order to assess this impact accurately, it is necessary to sketch briefly the pre-Buddhist characteristics of Chinese narrative. It cannot be denied that China, from a very early time, possessed written historical narrative. The *Chronicle of Tso (Tso-chuan)* and the *Records of the Grand Historian (Shih-chi)* are illustrious examples of the glorious Chinese tradition in that sphere. But whether or not China possessed a vital tradition of *fictional* narrative before the introduction of Buddhism is a moot point. Since it seems, from our own experience, that fictionalizing is a natural human impulse, there should be no reason to believe that the Chinese were unsusceptible to it. And yet, on the other hand, there was a strong current of thought traceable to at least the Chou period (c. 1030-221 Before International Era) which worked to counter any incipient growth of fiction. This is what I call the historicization of narrative in China. Regardless of their origins, there was a tendency for established narrative accounts to become literalized. The characters were made into actual historical personages and were provided with plausible biographies. In Chinese mythology, this tendency manifested itself as a sort of reverse euhemerization, such that the gods and their wonderful stories were swiftly written down as proper historical figures and events. Of course, all this was going on under the auspices of officialdom and at elite levels of culture. Unfortunately, it was these circles who determined the picture of Chinese society before the T'ang period upon which we must rely almost exclusively. There may well have been a flourishing tradition of myth, legend, and storytelling in early China, but the historical record does little to enlighten us about its characteristics because the bias of the Confucian literati was strongly against such trivial pursuits. At the same time, the archeological record is still very sketchy on these matters and is insufficient to enable us to piece together the fragments into a coherent whole. There is still no evidence of professional storytelling in China before the T'ang.[3]

The existence of such works as the *Spring and Autumn Annals of Wu and Yüeh (Wu Yüeh ch'un-ch'iu)* and *Lost Book of Yueh (Yüeh chüeh shu)*[4] indicates that, with the Han period (206 B.I.E.-8 I.E.), the historicizing tendency gradually came to loosen its iron grip on narrative. The embellishment and shaping of history for literary purposes shows that an opposite urge was slowly

becoming recognizable and acted upon. Before long, it was possible for such a work as "Southeastward Flies the Peacock" *(K'ung-ch'üeh tung-nan fei)* to appear. Although this is a ballad, it is highly unusual at such an early date[5] in China as an example of extended narrative with a literary rather than a historical intent.

B. L. Riftin, in his *Istoricheskaya epopeye fol'klornaya traditsiya v Kitae* (1970), showed that anecdotes relating to the Three Kingdoms period (221-64) were still in circulation as isolated stories during the time of Kan Pao (fourth century) and Liu I-ch'ing (403-44). It was during the T'ang, however, that they began to form connected cycles, a phenomenon which Riftin associates, correctly in my opinion, with the simultaneous rise of *pien-wen*. Průšek, however, disagrees:

> I think it would be more correct to see in it a consequence of the rise at that time of a class of professional storytellers who required artistically worked up narratives of relatively greater length. And so they had to resort to book inspiration with which they could eventually supplement elements taken over from the oral tradition. (1967:8)

But Průšek's explanation is unsatisfying because one still wishes to know how to account for the rise of the professional storyteller in the T'ang. The superiority of Riftin's view on this problem is that it directly points to the factor which accounts best both for the appearance of connected narratives *and* for the rise of professional storytellers. That is the large-scale activity of overt Buddhist evangelism from the late Six Dynasties (222-588) period on. In comparison with what they encountered in China, the Buddhist preachers (both lay and clerical) from India brought with them extremely advanced and elaborate narrative techniques. These sophisticated techniques exerted themselves first in the religious sphere but gradually a process of secularization set in whereby Buddho-Indian narrative traditions were transferred to the whole of the popular literary realm of China. This elaboration and extension of the Chinese narrative potential occurred first orally, then, from about the middle of the eighth century on, it began to manifest itself in written form as well. Once Buddhist narrative techniques had taken deep root in Chinese soil, it was natural that a hybrid tradition would emerge. Viewed thus, there is nothing strange or mysterious about the rather sudden appearance of

extended fictional narrative in the T'ang and its flowering in the Sung and Yüan (1280-1367). Naturally, Chinese society at large was also undergoing profound internal change during the period in question and this too must have contributed substantially to the relaxation of the inhibiting effect upon the growth of fiction that strict Confucian values had once imposed. The distaste and distrust of nonhistorical narrative modes so vigorously advanced by stern Confucianists slowly came to be ignored by certain newly solidified social classes. Although the role of Buddhism in the rearrangement of social groupings and forces during this period is a sufficiently complicated subject to merit separate treatment, it seems not implausible that the effect of the massive diffusion of Buddhist thought and organization throughout Chinese society, particularly among the lower levels, must have been enormous. Hence it is conceivable that the narrative revolution which occurred during the T'ang period was—in large measure—Buddhist-inspired, both sociologically and literarily.

But why, then, if Buddhist narrative was so important during the T'ang, did it seem to die out in the Sung? In his *History of Chinese Popular Literature* (1938:I.269), Cheng Chen-to makes the statement that *pien-wen* were prohibited by government order during the reign of Chen-tsung (998-1022) of the Sung dynasty.[6] This has been accepted as virtual dogma by most later scholars. But Cheng gave no proof for his assertion nor has anyone else ever done so. Lacking adequate documentation, I have tried myself to substantiate Cheng's statement but have been unsuccessful in doing so.[7] It appears that, rather than any specific proscriptions against *pien* storytelling and written *pien-wen,* the clear recognition of their Buddhist origins and associations caused them to suffer a setback in the general suppressions of Buddhism which occurred in the years 845 and 972. But more important still in the nominal demise of *pien* storytelling and *pien-wen* was the gradual Sinification of prosimetric storytelling with or without pictures. The evidence is abundant that, while the name *pien-wen* nearly disappeared from China after the Sung, the form flourished spectacularly. Indeed, it may well be said that the disuse of the clearly Buddhist designation *pien* in favor of such indigenously Chinese-sounding expressions as *p'ing-hua* ("expository tale"), *chu-kung-tiao* ("medley"), and so forth, is an index of its thorough domestication.

The names *pien, pien-wen,* and *pien-hsiang* ("transformation tableau") had such a decidedly Buddhist ring about them that the very use of these terms would have been unwise in a time of anti-Buddhist government activity such as the persecution of 845 and frowned upon in an introverted, proto-nationalistic climate such as existed during much of the Sung period. The Buddhist connotations of "transformations" were simply too evident to be ignored.[8] For anyone who has read extensively in Chinese Buddhist literature—both canonical and popular—it is impossible to escape this conclusion: *pien* as a literary and artistic phenomenon is Buddhist-inspired. If *pien* as a literary genre were being used in its strictly normal sense(s) as a Chinese word (i.e., without any Buddhist overtones), it does not seem likely that the name would have disappeared so abruptly at the beginning of the Sung dynasty. The Sung was a period of introspective assessment and assimilation. Much of the best of Buddhist doctrine was absorbed into neo-Confucianism. Likewise, forms of storytelling and lecturing that were overtly Buddhist during the T'ang period gradually lost their (foreign) religious flavor during the course of the Sung. The decisive effect of these developments was heightened by the fact that the Central Asian route through which much popular Buddhist inspiration and nourishment flowed into China was blocked by the Muslims and the Tanguts. The internationalism of the T'ang was no more, except along the southeast coast in scattered port cities. We read in the decree in which the Buddhist proscription of 845 was announced:

> We therefore ordain the destruction of 4600 temples, the secularization of 260,500 monks and nuns who henceforth shall pay the semi-annual taxes, the destruction of some 40,000 shrines, the confiscation of millions of acres of arable land, the manumission of 150,000 slaves, both male and female, who shall henceforth pay the semi-annual taxes. *The monks and nuns shall be under the control of the bureau for foreign affairs in order to make it obvious that this is a foreign religion.* As to the Nestorians and the Zoroastrians, they shall be compelled to return to secular life lest they contaminate any longer the customs of China. (Goodrich 1969:130, italics mine)

As Goodrich rightly observes, "Buddhism by now was Chinese and could not perish. " (1969:130). But there is no doubt that the changing political and intellectual climate had a profound effect on the ability and willingness of the Chinese people to tolerate markedly foreign cultural entities. In 635, the court had given Nestorian Christianity its blessing:

> The meaning of the teaching has been carefully examined: it is mysterious, wonderful, calm; it fixes the essentials of life and perfection; it is the salvation of living beings; it is the wealth of man. It is right that it should spread through the empire. Therefore let the local officials build a monastery in the I-ning quarter with twenty-one regular monks. (Moule 1930:65)

But, by the end of 845, Nestorianism was virtually extinct in China. It is no coincidence that, given such a climate, the foreign-sounding name *pien-wen* all but disappeared from Chinese languages.

An equally important explanatory cause of the demise of *pien-wen* in China is the decline of the source of Buddhist inspiration not only in Central Asia but ultimately in India itself. We know that, with the coming of the Turks to Kāshgar sometime before 1000 I.E. and to Khotan in 1006, the Buddho-Indianized culture of Central Asia rapidly withered away. And, already in the eleventh century, Mahmud of Ghazni had begun the Muslim raids on India itself. Hence the apparent disappearance of overtly Buddhist storytelling known as *pien* in China is part of a general pattern of the vicissitudes of Buddhism as a whole. Just as there grew up uniquely Chinese schools of Buddhism such as Pure Land, Zen, and T'ien-t'ai through the process of Sinicization, so there arose storytelling forms related to *pien* but better suited to the Chinese environment and taste. Eventually *pien* would seem to disappear altogether, though we now know that it lived on in numerous Sinicized forms of popular entertainment.[9] And, while Buddhism as a whole manifestly did not die out in China, a good number of its most important philosophical tenets were tacitly adopted by neo-Confucian thinkers and are now barely recognizable as Buddhist *per se*. Hence, though the name "transformation," in the sense of "storytelling with pictures," seems to have been eclipsed from the written Chinese vocabulary sometime during the Northern Sung, there is concrete proof[10] that the form itself

survived into the Yuan, the Ming (1368-1644), and even the Ch'ing (1644-1911).

Demiéville believed that, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, *pien* storytelling went out from the monasteries and into the public places (1952:570). All of the information which I have gathered[11] indicates that transformations were being told outside of the monasteries—by laymen and laywomen entertainers as well as by quasi-monks—from their very beginnings in China. What did take place during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, rather, was the increased secularization and Sinicization of this Buddhistic form of storytelling. It appears, indeed, to have been secularized and Sinicized to such a degree that, by the thirteenth century, picture recitation was no longer recognized as essentially Buddhistic, its religiously charged name *(pien)* having been dropped abruptly in the second half of the tenth century.[12]

There is a crucial passage in T'ao Tsung-i's (c. 1330-1400) *Records Made while Resting from Plowing* which, by the very fact of its misleadingness, allows us to gain some insight into the level of knowledge during the Yüan period regarding various types of orally performed literature in the preceding few dynasties:

> In the T'ang, there were "transmissions of the exotic," i.e., classical tales *(ch'uan-ch'i),* in the Sung "dramatic cantos" *(hsi-ch'ü),* "sung jests" *(ch'ang-hun),* and "lyric tales" *(tz'u-shuo).* In the Chin (1115-1234), there were "court texts" *(yüan-pen),* "variety plays" *(tsa-chü)* , and "medleys" *(chu-kung-tiao).* "Court texts" and "variety plays" are actually one and the same. (1959:306)

There can be little doubt that T'ao regarded *ch'uan-ch'i as* a type of oral performance. And yet all that we know of *ch'uan-ch'i* in the T'ang tells us that this is simply untrue, for at that time the term essentially meant "classical language short story."[13] The Ming period critic, Hu Ying-lin (fl. 1509), was certainly justified when he accused T'ao Tsung-i of misusing the term in the passage under discussion (1940:II.1a). The later Ming usage of the term to refer to a type of drama bears no immediate relevance to the question we are confronting here which is, basically, one of asking how a supposedly intelligent critic of the Yuan could so abuse such an important literary designation from the T'ang. One possible explanation which might be suggested is that T'ao was using

ch'uan-ch'i in the Sung sense where it could refer to a type of oral tale.[14] Another is that he actually was referring to transformations *(pien)* but did not know the correct name for them. For reasons which I have outlined earlier in this article, after the Five Dynasties period (907-60), the term *pien-wen* seems largely to have dropped out of circulation except for a unique reference (c. 1237) to it as being a heretical Manichean phenomenon.[15] The other genres referred to by T'ao are unmistakably in the line of descent from *pien-wen.*[16] T'ao knew well that, so far as China was concerned, these mostly prosimetric genres found their ancestral origins in the T'ang and he also knew well that *ch'uan-ch'i* was a type of story current in the T'ang. In order to give his exposition a (false) sense of completeness, I submit that it is not improbable that T'ao might have succumbed to the temptation to fudge his history just a bit. That T'ao's misuse of the term *ch'uan-ch'i was* no accident can be demonstrated by examination of another passage in *Records Made while Resting from Plowing* in which the same curious assertion is repeated:

> When the "tare-gathering officials" *(pai-kuan)* [of the Han period who collected gossip and anecdotes *(hsiao-shuo)* on the streets] died out, then the "transmissions of the exotic" *(ch'uan-ch'i)* arose. The "transmissions of the exotic" having arisen, they were succeeded by "dramatic cantos" *(hsi-ch'ü).* During the Chin period and the beginning of the [Yüan] dynasty, ballads *(yüeh-fu)* were comparable to the current of Sung lyrics *(Sung-tz'u),* and "transmissions of the exotic" were comparable to the modification of Sung dramatic cantos. As transmitted in the world, they were called "variety plays" *(tsa-chü).* (T'ao Tsung-i 1959:332)

On the basis of this confused and sketchy passage, T'ao's competence as a historian of narrative literature deserves to be questioned. Still, the possibility that by *ch'uan-ch'i* he meant *pien-wen* (whose name he most probably would not have known) persists.

We have seen that, before the arrival of Buddhism in China, the public posture of orthodox Confucianism was inimical to myth, legend, and storytelling. At the close of the Later Han dynasty in 220 I.E., Confucianism was temporarily eclipsed by Taoism and

then Buddhism. Its stranglehold on society relaxed for several centuries during which foreign dynasties ruled in North China, the climate was ripe for innovation in philosophy, religion, and a wide spectrum of the arts. The oral arts were no exception. Under the influence of the vibrant and rich Buddhist storytelling tradition that originated in India and passed through Central Asia, Chinese storytellers created a series of novel narrational and dramatic genres. The prosimetric form and a new-found propensity for fantasy were fundamental elements of these genres (Mair 1983a:1-27). And both of these elements are central to the lay Buddhist storytelling form of *chuan-pien*. Hence, though *chuan-pien* and *pien-wen* nominally waned after the T'ang period, their impact on Chinese oral and performing arts was indelible.

Glossary

Ch'a-t'u pen Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh shih 插圖本中國文學史

ch'ang-hun 唱諢

Chen-tsung 眞宗

Cheng Chen-to 鄭振鐸

Ch'o-keng lu 輟耕錄

chu-kung-tiao 諸宮調

ch'u-chia 出家

chuan-pien 轉變

ch'uan-ch'i 傳奇

Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai 佛祖歷代通載

Fo-tsu t'ung-chi 佛祖統記

hsi-ch'ü 戲曲

hsiao-shuo 小說

Hsü tzu-chih t'ung-chien 續資治通鑑

Hu Ying-lin 胡應麟

k'ai p'u 開鋪
Kan Pao 干寶
K'ung-ch'üeh tung-nan fei 孔雀東南飛
Liu I-ch'ing 劉義慶
pai-kuan 稗官
Pi Yüan 畢沅
pien 變
pien-hsiang 變相
pien-wen 變文
p'ing-hua 評話
Sung Min-ch'iu 宋敏求
Sung-tz'u 宋詞
Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經
T'ang ta chao-ling chi 唐大詔令集
T'ao Tsung-i 陶宗儀
tsa-chü 雜劇
tz'u-shuo 詞說
Wu Yüeh ch'un-ch'iu 吳越春秋
yüan-pen 院本
Yüeh chüeh shu 越絕書
yüeh-fu 樂府

University of Pennsylvania

Notes

[1]Cf. chapters five and six of *T'ang Transformation Texts*.

[2]See my discussion of the term *p'u* as a denominator of illustrations for storytelling in chapters two and four of *Picture Recitation*, chapter three of *T'ang Transformation Texts*, and my article entitled "Records of Transformation Tableaux" (1986). It is possible, though less likely, that *p'u* might also mean "stall" or "shop" in this context.

[3]Cf. Y. W. Ma's important article entitled "The Beginnings of Professional Storytelling in China: A Critique of Current Theories and Evidence" (1976).

[4]The meaning of this title is disputed (*Book on the Demise of Yüeh?*).

[5]Though it was supposedly popular as a song at the end of the Han (early third century), "Southeastward Flies the Peacock" probably did not take its present written shape until about the fifth century.

[6]The same claim was repeated in *Cheng's Ch'a-t'u pen Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh shih [Illustrated History of Chinese Literature]* (1957:450).

[7]1 have checked all the edicts for Chen-tsung's reign that I could lay my hands on, as well as the annals in the official *Sung History*. Also cf. *Fo-tsu t'ung-chi [Unified Chronology of the Buddhist Patriarchate]* in *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō (The Tripitaka in Chinese)*, vol. 49, text 2035, pp. 402a-408b; *Fo-tsu li-tai t'ung-tsai [Comprehensive Records of the Buddhist Patriarchate through Successive Dynasties]* in *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō*, vol. 49, text 2036, pp. 660c-661c; and Pi Yüan, *Hsü tzu-chih t'ung-chien [Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government, Continuation]* (Peking: Ku-chi ch'u-pan-she, 1957), vol. 1, pp. 463-808. My suspicion is that the reasons for the demise of the transformations and transformation texts during the Sung period were much more subtle than overt suppression.

[8]The Sanskrit antecedents of Chinese Buddhist *pien* are given in *T'ang Transformation Texts*, chapter two (Mair 1988b).

[9]See my article entitled "The Contributions of Transformation Texts (*pien-wen*) to Later Chinese Popular Literature" (forthcoming).

[10]Adduced in the introduction to *Picture Recitation* (Mair 1988a).

[11]See chapter six of *T'ang Transformation Texts* (Mair 1988b).

[12]Except in such outlying and strongly Buddhist areas as Tun-huang (remote northwest China), where it continued in use through the first third of the eleventh century.

[13]For a brief discussion of the term *ch'uan-ch'i,* see Mair 1978.

[14]This seems unlikely, however, because T'ao specifically links *ch'uan-ch'i* to the T'ang and offers a separate genre for the Sung itself.

[15]Cited in chapter six of *T'ang Transformation Texts* (Mair 1988b). By this time, even establishment Buddhists, ever eager to please their Confucian overlords, had disavowed *pien* storytelling.

[16]See the beginning of Mair, "The Contributions of Transformation Texts" (forthcoming).

References

Cheng 1938
Cheng Chen-to. *Chung-Kuo su-wen-hsüeh shih*. vol. 1. Changsha: Commercial Press.

Cheng 1957
_____. *Ch'a-t'u pen Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh shih [Illustrated History of Chinese Literature]*. Peking: Tso-chia ch'u-pan-she.

Demiéville 1952
Paul Demiéville. "Les débuts de la littérature en Chinois vulgaire." *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Comptes Rendus*, November-December:570.

Demiéville 1974
_____. "Tun-huang Texts." In *Dictionary of Oriental Literatures*, vol. I: *East Asia*. Ed. by Zbigniew Słupski, under the general editorship of Jaroslav Průšek. New York: Basic Books.

Fang 1965
Achilles Fang. "Out of China." *Poetry* 107.3:196-99.

Goodrich 1969
L. Carrington Goodrich. *A Short History of the Chinese People*. New York: Harper and Row.

Hu 1940
Hu Ying-lin. "Chuang-yüeh wei-t'an (Small Talk from Chuang-yüeh)." In *Shao-shih shan-fang ch'ü k'ao [Examination of Cantos from the Mountain Study with Few Rooms]*. vol. 2. Shanghai: Chung-hua shu-chu.

Ma 1976
Y. W. Ma. "The Beginnings of Professional Storytelling in China: A Critique of Current Theories and Evidence." In *Etudes d'histoire et de littérature chinoises offertes au Professeur Jaroslav Průšek*, Bibliothèque de 1'lnstitut des Hautes Etudes Chinoises, vol. 24. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. pp. 227-45.

Mair 1978
Victor H. Mair. "Scroll Presentation in the T'ang Dynasty." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 38.1:41n19.

Mair 1983a
_____. "The Narrative Revolution in Chinese Literature: Ontological Presuppositions." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews*, 5.1:1-27.

Mair 1983b
_____. *Tun-huang Popular Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mair 1986
_____. "Records of Transformation Tableaux." *T'oung Pao*, 72:3-43.

Mair 1988a
_____. *Painting and Performance: Chinese Picture Recitation, Its Indian Genesis, and Analogues Elsewhere*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Mair 1988b
_____. *T'ang Transformation Texts: A Study of the Buddhist Contribution to the Rise of Vernacular Fiction and Drama in China*.

Harvard-Yenching Monograph Series, 28. Cambridge: Harvard University Council on East Asian Studies.

Mair forthcoming

_____. "The Contributions of Transformation Texts (*pien wen*) to Later Chinese Popular Literature."

Moule 1930

Arthur Christopher Moule. *Christians in China: Before the Year 1550*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: Macmillan.

Průšek 1967

Jaroslav Průšek. *The Origins and Authors of the hua-pen*. Prague: Oriental Institute.

Riftin 1970

B. L. Riftin. *Istoricheskaya epopeye fol'klornaya traditsiya v Kitae*. Moscow: Nauka.

Schafer 1963

Edward H. Schafer. *The Golden Peaches of Samarkand: A Study of T'ang Exotics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sung 1959

Sung Min-ch'iu. *T'ang to chao-ling chi* (comp. 1070). Peking: Commercial Press.

Táo 1959

T'ao Tsung-i. *Ch'o-keng lu*. Peking: Chung-hua shu-chü.

Weber 1964

Max Weber. In *The Religion of China: Confucianism and Taoism*. Trans. and ed. Hans H. Gerth, intro. C. K. Yang. New York: The Free Press.

Wright and Twitchett 1973

Arthur Wright and Denis Twitchett. *Perspectives on the T'ang*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Oral Tradition, 3/1-2 (1988): 122-37

Oral Text: A South Indian Instance

Richard M. Swiderski

Once they both exist, orality and literacy are never independent of each other. There are traces of oral composition in written and printed texts, and written structures appear constantly in oral speech. The detection of oral influences in written texts and of written forms in oral texts requires a precise sense of what constitutes "the oral" and "the written." Making this distinction and applying it to special cases reveals cultural trends previously unnoticed. Walter J. Ong (1982:115) has discussed the tenacity of orality in the written English of the Tudor period by identifying those elements of written texts which are "oral" in nature: "use of epithets, balance, antithesis, formulary structures, and commonplace materials." Classical rhetoric, on the other hand, was the art of forcing speech to conform to priorities born in writing. Or in McLuhan's gnomic phrasing, "No one ever made a grammatical error in a pre-literate society" (1962:238).

Textual and ethnographic researches into the nature of orality have so far ignored circumstances wherein orality coexists with literacy and has not been completely swamped by written or printed speech forms. Milman Parry's important discovery that the oral antecedents of a written text are visible in attributes of the text itself has tended to obscure oral-literate coexistence by making it appear that the oral state simply was "written down" to make that text. But the very fact that Parry could make his discovery (since we are not tempted to consider his "orality" just an epiphenomenon of writing) means that something of the oral has persisted *along with* as well as through writing, to be recognized as oral elements in texts. The oral does not just disappear with writing, nor does it simply engage in states of mutual influence once writing and print are established. Orality and literacy are interdependent in a variety of fascinating ways.

This interdependence cannot be discerned in purely textual studies. Texts might betray oral-formulaic attributes without disclosing what sort of correspondence existed between speech and writing in the formation of the text or afterward. If there are any special textual marks of interdependence they have yet to be determined. Situations in which orality and literacy interact and influence each other must be observed and recorded in order to show the role of either. The classical texts which Parry and his followers examined no longer exist in this arrangement, nor do many of the other static texts studied by oral-formulaic methods. An examination of a present-day instance of oral-literate interaction will constitute a new type of ethnographic research and a contribution to the study of oral literature.

Stanley Tambiah in his pioneering study of literacy in a Thai Buddhist village (1968) has pointed to the complex interaction between mastery of written texts and oral improvisation in the Buddhist monks' presentation of doctrine: the doctrine is perpetuated by ever-constant written texts being constantly recast in oral exposition. Tambiah explicitly rejected the "great tradition-little tradition" characterization, which would set the written words of the monks off against the oral words of the people (1970:370-72), but sees in the activities of the literate cadres a traditional interdependence between textual prescription and ritual performance. Charles Keyes (1983:8-9) has developed Tambiah's argument, and together with other contributors to the volume on karma he coedited, has shown that this oral-literate interdependence is to be found in other South and Southeast Asian cultures, both Hindu and Buddhist.

It is instructive to examine both textually and ethnographically a Christian instance of literacy-orality interdependence in the same area. The state of Kerala in the southeast of India has the most literate population in the entire country. The literacy rate (about 60 percent) is much higher than the India average (29 percent, *Malayala Manorama Yearbook* 1984:407); the numbers of presses, newspapers, and books published are all large in proportion to the size of the population. One factor contributing to this has been the strong Christian presence in Kerala, nearly one-quarter of the approximately 25 million. Christian missionaries set up the first presses in Kerala and issued from them the first books and periodicals (Veliparambil 1981). But prior to the arrival of European Christians there were native

Christians in Kerala, the descendants of converts baptized by St. Thomas during the first century A.D. These Syrian Christians, reinforced by later missions from Syria and Persia, had adapted Christianity to Kerala Hinduism to a degree which exasperated the Roman Church hierarchy (Brown 1982:92-108). Among the adaptations to Kerala conditions were a liturgy and perhaps other texts originally written in the Syriac language but soon translated or transposed into Malayalam.

Today Syrian Christians possess a body of traditional "folk songs" sung at weddings, in honor of churches, and to accompany celebratory dances such as *maargamkali*. These songs are best known by the members of a Syrian Christian sub-group called the Knanaya. These people claim to have originated in a Syrian religious and trade mission led by Knayi Thommen (Thomas of Cana) which arrived in Kerala in 345 A.D. The Knanaya maintain that they have obeyed the original instructions of the Patriarch of Antioch and have preserved the pure "blood" and culture of their native land. During the parlous centuries which have intervened, the Knanaya themselves have been split into Roman Catholic and Jacobite (Eastern Christian) denominations while remaining ever loyal to their ideal of group endogamy. The current state of the "old songs" among the Knanaya is a subtle blend of orality and literacy which may itself be archaic.

In 1911 a full repertory of the "old songs" was copied down (or copied out) and published by P. U. Lukose in a book which Knanaya Catholics have reprinted several times, most recently in 1980. Lukose's preface is vague about the sources of the songs, citing mainly "ancient manuscripts." It is quite evident that he did not take the songs down directly from the singing of individual singers or collate the texts from a series of singers. Instead he already had written texts in the palm-leaf manuscripts held by ancient Syrian Christian families.

These texts were incised with a stylus upon the dried surface of the leaf of the coconut palm, the marks then darkened with black ink. This was the sole means of written transmission available to the literate prior to the introduction of print. Manuscripts and printed texts of any sort are notoriously short-lived in the climate of Kerala, with its long hot dry season followed by the protracted intense rain of the monsoon. Termites or "white ants" quickly devour any wood or pulp materials not naturally resistant to insect mandibles. The manuscripts which

Lukose examined were the temporary repositories of the songs copied and recopied generation after generation. On June 3, 1985, Mr. V. O. Abraham of Kottayam allowed me to examine some palm-leaf manuscripts of the wedding songs in his possession. He regretted that he had so few: the others in his family's possession had been locked up inside the parental home for years and were beyond recovery when the house was again opened.

My examination of Mr. Abraham's surviving manuscripts revealed the service that Lukose had performed for his community. It was not to print out the texts on paper, because the paper books produced were if anything flimsier than the palm-leaf manuscripts. The five editions required since the first printing in 1911 have been necessary to replace degenerating books, not to spread knowledge of the songs far and wide. Lukose cast the songs in a material far more lasting than palm leaves or paper: metal type. The original chases of type are stored and brought into service whenever a new edition is required. Succeeding bishops may add their prefaces (distinguishable by the slight differences in the type used as styles change and typographic mannerisms are dropped), but the text of the songs is now cast in type alloy which the insects and weather can attack in vain. Mr. E. T. Lukose of Chingavanam has in a similar manner preserved the text of an important church history, *The History of the Indian Churches of St. Thomas* (1869) by E. M. Phillipose, which his grandfather had translated into Malayalam and set in type. In the absence of offset photolithography, keeping the type chases is the most effective way of preserving valued written texts against natural ravages.

Mr. Abraham's manuscripts correspond verbatim with Lukose's book in the instances I was able to check. The preservation of the song texts passed from the palm-leaf manuscript into type and there were perpetuated more efficiently but not more elegantly than in the manuscripts. The movement from manuscript into print was not motivated by a fear the songs might die out if not made over into print. This idea is the result of Western typocentrism, the assumption that print makes its contents immortal, and shows a failure to appreciate the stability of texts in oral transmission, or at least a failure to appreciate people's feeling of assurance that oral transmission is stable.

Typocentric bias artificializes the sense of an oral text. The study of English ballads, for instance, is preoccupied with

determining variants and trying to establish earlier and later texts (Hendron 1961). Variants exist only because the stable moment of the printed text allows a fixed determination of words and meter. The folk community might not even distinguish one major ballad from another. Print makes labeling and numbering of ballads possible. The belief that a song is "preserved" in print is ironic, since the song is its own performance and that performance is not preserved. All that remains is scholarly invention. When a community deliberately sets down its songs in print, it is not always to render them into textual icons or to preserve them in the absence of an active singing tradition. From the community's viewpoint it is just as well to let irrelevant songs die out.

Print is, however, integrated into living oral tradition. Lukose's book cannot stand as a "collection" of the old songs. In the first place the book is the printed continuation of an existing written-oral tradition and not a first written record of oral songs; in the second place the book exists only within the context of that tradition. There is much the book does not say. It does not give melodies or describe occasions of singing because all this is obvious to those who have any use for the printed texts. The book perpetuates a written text with a very special relationship to oral performance.

The written-oral tradition whose continuation the book facilitates is the singing of wedding songs. The Syrian Christians preserved an elaborate series of wedding customs which surrounded the formal church service with several weeks of ritual and feasting (Swiderski 1986). The Kerala anthropologist Ananthakrishna Ayyer obtained detailed accounts of these customs from Christians of different denominations during the 1920's. His account (1926) has been seconded and extended by the writings of P. J. Thomas (1935), who glossed the songs with reference to practices. Though the history of the rituals' development is difficult to trace, it is clear that they are the result of Near Eastern, particularly Jewish, elements combining with native Hindu elements. The songs are sung for the ceremonial adornment of the bride with henna on the eve of the wedding (*mailanjiri*), at the first shaving of the bridegroom (*anthamcharthu*), at the decoration of the marriage *pandal* or canopy, at the reception after the wedding, while the bride's mother blesses the pair, during the exhibition of the couples' wedding gifts, and for a ceremony called *adachathura*, a few days after the wedding, when the bride's mother and other

female relatives plead with the bridegroom to open the bridal chamber.

The women of both the bride's and groom's families sing the songs in chorus. They sit in rows upon the floor of the *pandal* and sing in unison. A strict sexual division is maintained throughout the wedding as throughout traditional Indian life. It is a woman's accomplishment to know the songs well. Mothers coach daughters in singing from early youth and take pride in the girls' precocious mastery of the texts. Men may learn the songs as well, but never with such deliberateness, perfection, and concentration as the women. The women sing and the men listen and join in.

The written or printed form of the songs is completely integrated into the transmission of performance. Mothers teach their daughters from Lukose's book as they did once from the palm-leaf manuscripts. Though children and adults have memorized the songs completely, they must have the book while singing. They are willing to sing out of the wedding context, but only with the book. It need not be open to the song being performed, just present. Thus elderly women who had sung the same songs in weddings all their lives would not begin to sing until assured that a copy of Lukose was in the vicinity. Two young girls who had won prizes in competitions began singing a wedding song but then halted when their mother reminded them they must have the book. An elderly couple began to intone the Mar Thommen *pattu*, the first song in Lukose's compilation, as they hunted through the rafters of their thatched house, the main storage place for documents, in search of their copy of Lukose. Women singing in wedding choruses have the book with them. Every Knanaya household has a copy somewhere.

During the Jacobite and Catholic church services the priest chants the liturgy, which he knows by memory, from a book open before him. In their customary singing the Christian women have created their own secular version of the sacred service. Book-dependence has become the defining standard of wedding song.

The analogy to priestly practice is not the most compelling reason for this interdependence of orality and text. That must be sought in the nature of the weddings themselves. Weddings were the occasion of alliance between kinship groupings. The sumptuous feasts and gift-giving were the beginnings of exchange and trade between groups perhaps set apart from each other by distance.

Kerala is a land severely divided by its topography. In order to avoid incest, Christians had to look outside their own immediate communities for marriage partners and thus form or reassert alliances with other distant settlements. Since the songs were performed publicly at weddings by women singing together, they had to be consistent, to be one sign of the unity achieved in the wedding, first within the respective families and then within the entire wedding party. There could be no disagreement between groups and individuals over the wording of the songs. The natural differentiation of songs in a purely oral culture would have been quite audible when two parties came together and tried to sing the songs. The resultant dissonance would have been damaging to the desired social harmony. The social circumstances of the wedding required a stabilizing device. Something had to regulate the texts and make each group's sense of oral stability subject to a standard, reducing confrontations at the most vulnerable moment. A woman starting in to sing the songs did not want the realization of isolation but the experience of Christian and Knanaya community inherent in knowing precisely the same words as a woman from another village. Not only the text, but the oral text, had to be standardized. Book-dependent singing was the result.

The current texts of the songs themselves are a product of this engineered social harmony of weddings. Internal linguistic evidence, the historical state of the Malayalam language, and the presence of Portuguese loanwords in the texts (Choondal 1983:54-55; 81-88) date the "old songs" to the seventeenth century. There were Christian songs prior to this point—they were sung by native Christian communities to greet foreign bishops (Hosten 1928:122-24)—but the songs which Lukose printed and which are sung today were composed in a post-contact language. Their language, prosody, and subjects make them appear to be the works of literate priests rather than the spontaneous outpourings of folk bards. Scholars of Malayalam literature, even Christian scholars, disdain to discuss the songs at all, or relegate them to the lowest rank: "they are not good examples of sublime poetry or folksongs of Kerala" (Choondal 1980:39).

The *Mailanjipattu*, the second song in Lukose's collection (1980:2-4) is sung as the bride receives an application of henna to her palms and the soles of her feet. Syrian Christians say (as does the text) that this is a reminder that Eve walked on her feet to take the forbidden fruit and handed it to Adam with her hands.

The adornment is a common cosmetic practice in India and the Near East among all social and religious groups and is not associated strictly with weddings. But the Christians have made it their own.

The song is divided into five *padams*, or parts. The first *padam*, for example, is as follows.

1. māŕānarul ceytīlōkēyannu niŕavēri
2. ēŕŕinalguṇaṅṅalellāṁ bhramimēlorēṭaṁ
3. orumayuṭayōṅ pērumakoṇḍu karuti maṇpiṭiccu
4. piṭicca karuvilaṭakkam nēṭi puŕattu tukal potiṅṅu
5. tukalakmē cōranīrum elluṁ māṁsadhatukkal
6. bhratikaḷkku vātilaṅǰum navadvāraṅṅaḷāyattu
7. raṇḍāṭu nālum nāluviralkku čuvappunakhaṇḍal pattu
8. pattuṭayoṅeŕayakattuṭayōnāya koṭuttuṇarttyōrātmāvum
9. ātmāvum koṭuttu perumiṭṭōrābhamennu
10. enašēšaminniccāllāmunniniṇḍaḷ kēḷppin

By the command of the Lord man (lit. world-dweller) was made
endowed with all qualities out of chaos
came unity. To prepare for the birth He grasped mud
and with a tool shaped it into a mass.
Within it the blood flowed and the muscles were arrayed.
For prosperity God's place was housed amid the nine apertures.
Two hands, ten fingers with nails all red
the ten all afire, and the dancing soul was granted.
The soul bestowed, powerful Adam
without hesitation made heard the very first words.

This is not the place for a detailed investigation of the doctrine or of the prosody of the songs. That would be the task of a much more philological study. The idea of the creation owes something to the Book of Genesis, but even more to Hindu conceptions of the human frame and life. The reference to "vātilaǰum navadvaraṅṅaḷ," "great room [God's dwelling] among the nine [bodily] apertures," evokes a line in the Krishnagatha composed by the fifteenth-century Nambudiri (Brahman) poet Cherusseri. The author of the *Mailanjippattu* simply substituted the Christian God for Krishna in Cherusseri's phrase, and apparently was more eager to call attention to his knowledge of an outstanding monument of

Malayalam literature than to preserve strict Christian dogma. Further evidence of the song writer's literary motives is the number of Sanskritisms, notably *ātmāvum* ("soul"), which Cherusseri, identifying himself as a Malayalam poet, preferred to avoid.

Off against the certainty of Krishnagatha reference is the uncertainty of the Biblical references. There was no written Malayalam Bible prior to 1811 (George 1972:62). Bibles in Syriac and in European languages were available before that time, but do not seem to have exercised a decisive effect upon the language and doctrine of the song. Perhaps it is best to assume that the author of the *Mailanjipattu* knew the Bible only as refracted through legendry and was guided by the poetic standards rather than by a wish to adhere to any Bible text. Certainly the burning red of the nails and the words first uttered by the created being, both connoting the power which surges out of the freshly endowed body, are more consistent with a poetic imagery of popular Hinduism than with the Biblical description of the creation. The red nails of the male—characteristic of Hindu votaries today—connote a generative power while the red on the palms and soles of the female is, as both the fourth *padam* and some commentators declare, a reminder of Eve's sinfulness. Perhaps here we are simply lacking part of the ritual context: males (instead of or in addition to females) receive henna in some Near Eastern wedding rituals, and may have in earlier Knanaya practice. The male generativity is positive, while the female is negative and smothered beneath a label of sin. In fact henna is an erotic enhancement for both sexes. None of this derives from the Bible and the ideas would be discouraged by a knowledge of Biblical teachings and imagery.

The prosody of the song does not follow any of the classic Malayalam meters. The Malayalam folk songs collected prior to the spread of literacy include some wedding songs, *kalyanampattvkal* (Nair 1967:41), but they clearly were not the model for the Syrian Christian songs. The meter is free and loose, though it may move into conformity with meters of Biblical psalms. The song has characteristics of oral composition: repetitions in the form of carry-overs from one line to the next in lines 3-4 (*piṭiccu-piṭicca*), 7-8 (*pattu-pattu*), and 8-9 (*ātmāvum-ātmāvum*), and simple repetitions within and among lines, 4-5 (*tukal-tukkal*), 7 (*nālum-nālu*), 8 (*..tayōn-..tayōn*), and 8-9 (*koṭuttu-koṭuttu*), but

these may be in imitation of the style of the Hindu Malayalam folksongs, which were often imitated by literate poets.

Another oral element in the *mailanjiri* song text is the presence of stock phrases, from the beginning "māŕānarul" to "vātilańǰum navadvāraṅṅaḷ and "čuvappunakhaṇḍal." Several of these repetitions are Sanskritisms. Ramanujan (1973:46), analyzing the poetics of medieval Kannada devotional poetry, has pointed to effective use of Sanskrit words and quotations in these oral folk compositions. The presence of Sanskritisms in the Syrian Christian songs does not automatically exclude them from the category of folksong. They complicate the issue: the Sanskritisms may be the author's attempt to imitate folksongs or an attempt to render existing folksongs more literary. The Sanskritisms are not used consistently throughout the text, nor are they accompanied by others one might expect to find or by the epithets and names which Malayalam ballads and folksongs contain in abundance.

The authors of these texts may have been imitating a written source which was itself oral in some features, such as a Malayalam version of the Bible. Choondal in his translation of this text (1983:35) seems so taken with the Biblical quality that he gives the ending of King James Genesis 2:7 without even bothering to translate the difficult Sanskritic Malayalam. The source and inspiration of this text must be thoroughly investigated in another study. It has all the earmarks of a written composition whose author(s) were subject to a number of influences, including written and oral folksongs, Malayalam and Sanskrit religious texts, and perhaps specific model wedding songs oral or written in Syriac, Tamil, or Malayalam.

However the songs may have originated, they soon were fixed in the peculiar ecology of writing and orality that comprises their current practice and perpetuation. The Knanaya today call the songs *puthanapattukal*, "old songs," and believe that they are of ancient origin because of their archaic language and their references to ancient events. Some even claim that the songs were translated from Syriac originals. Few of the people who sing the songs today know exactly what they mean. When I asked singers to explain a song in Malayalam, they resorted to describing the wedding ritual which the song accompanies or offered only the most general account of the text. Those knowing English or Hindi were incapable of providing consistent translations. The only songs which people understood reasonably well were simple prayers such

as the first song in Lukose's volume, the Mar Thommen *pattu*, which is sung throughout the ceremonies, and the historical songs, especially *Nalloruosalem*, "The Good Jerusalem," which describes the voyage of Knayi Thommen and his companions to revive Christianity in Malabar. The songs record Knanaya historical dogma: an elderly man I asked about the origins of the Knanaya sang *Nalloruosalem* as he searched for a copy of his book. The historical songs also serve as a "catechism" to teach children community history through texts of obvious venerability. The Knanaya diocese of Kottayam has published texts which ask catechism questions about the history in the songs. But those songs not connected with basic issues of community identity are the province of scholars and remain simply revered words in rhythm to the singers.

For most of the singers the songs exist on the page and yet off the page at the same time. Though preserved in type and as print, the words are not expected to mean as printed words mean. The criteria which Malayalam readers apply to the printed words of newspapers and books do not apply to the text of the old songs. The words are allowed to rest unmeaning and formulaic in their nest of paper. When they are sung during the wedding, they are an oral tradition passed on for generations. The singers see no contradiction in this.

The Knanaya assume the songs were handed down orally for many generations. Print is an auxiliary which confirms oral purity. The Knanaya do not recognize the variations and transformations of oral transmission. It is basic to their sense of communal identity that they have been able to transmit the same texts from the remotest era of the past down to the present. *The present day performance of the songs—and not the form of the texts—confirms the agelessness of the community.* Even if the songs can be shown to have been composed in writing during the seventeenth century, that merely was one way-station in an ongoing tradition. Written and oral texts are locked together in timeless verification of community experience. The oral tradition has the stability of print, which is the stability of the community. This concept of community history is itself typical of a "print" culture. The Knanaya invest orality with the integrity of print: oral performances are spontaneous yet always the same and refer back to their origins. The Knanaya experience their own unshakable historical authenticity when they sing the songs together on the

right occasions. Their sense of the songs' antiquity emerges out of the ritual moment of performance. But unlike mere oral performances the songs stand in print outside the moment of singing and are charged with the ancientness of that moment.

The oral text of the songs is manifest in performance. Neither orality nor textuality alone determines this. The wedding customs are the context for both text and its performance. Any account of the oral text must move back to focus upon the circumstances of performance. The stability of the printed texts seems to guarantee a perfectly routine singing each time. The sense of a permanent and ancient text is united with a sense of uniform communal memory in the singing of the wedding songs. But the singing itself is just an appearance.

Lukose's texts are not printed with music but only with indications of change in tune. The music is in the singing. The absence of these indications of course is consistent with the impression of the text's unchangingness: all the singers know and transmit the same melody to the next generation. Something in the tradition of the community keeps the singing the same everywhere.

But when the women sing the songs alone, they sing them differently from each other. It is difficult to persuade them to sing alone. Women asked to sing will summon a friend or relative to join them. I asked each of three elderly women to sing the Mar Thommen *pattu* in the presence of the others. Each offered the same text with a strikingly different melody. Yet when they sang the same text together, they merged into a common melody which was again different from what any one of them had sung. Different groups of women exhibited the same divergence and convergence. The converged melody of one group was not the same as that of another separate group.

It is not so much that the same melodies have been passed down over the centuries orally accompanying the transmission of the written texts. The convergence of the group in singing is what has been passed down and remains the same. Whatever melody is the result emerges from their coming together. The melody is inherent in the social context of performance. Women from different areas who have learned different styles of singing blend their voices in a common performance signaled by the stable text. It will always be the same performance and will give the impression of having been the same in performance. The

"writtenness" of the text projects the attributes of its orality; the performed orality has the sameness of writing.

Signs of a comparable oral text among South Indian Jews appear in the growing literature on their traditional wedding songs. P. M. Jussaye (1986) and Marcia Walerstein (1982), each of whom has made a field study of the customs of Cochini Jews, report that the wedding songs are recorded in notebooks kept by the women. Neither provides information on the transmission of the songs from one generation to the next or details of sung performance. The nature of the oral text transmission in this community may be impossible to determine. Most of the Cochini Jews have migrated to Israel. According to Walerstein, who has attended their weddings there, though the older women continue to sing the Malayalam wedding songs from memory and from notebooks, the younger generation prefer popular Israeli songs in Hebrew. The Knanaya claim an affinity with the Cochini Jews: a comparative study of the content of the wedding songs of both groups would be very instructive. Weil (1982) has adduced a few common features as evidence of "cultural symmetry" between the Knanaya and Cochini Jews. More exhaustive study might reveal that the Knanaya oral text is but one example of a *type* of oral tradition to literate peoples of South India. There is the even more tantilizing possibility of Near Eastern connections. The Knanaya oral text may just be the most visible instance.

Since the performance of the wedding songs is (for the Knanaya) the same as the text, it is not surprising that with the means now available the performance has also been "written," that is filmed and taped. In 1980 the folklorist Chummar Choondal produced a film, "Suriani Kristianikalude Kalyanam" ("Marriage Celebrations of Saint Thomas Christians in India"). The film is a cursory and somewhat fanciful re-creation of a Knanaya upperclass marriage of an earlier age: the wedding party arrives by boat and leaves the church ground in procession, the married couple atop an elephant. For this film Father Jacob Vellian supervised the recording of some wedding songs. He subsequently issued a cassette tape of the sound track with a few additional numbers. Most of the selections are *a capella* choruses with only a chime to mark the time, but one in particular, *Nalloruosalem*, has a full orchestration that makes it sound like a movie musical song. Colleagues in the church have criticized Father Vellian for this production. He maintains that he used "authentic" Syrian Church

melodies throughout and adhered faithfully to Lukose's text.

The tape has become a runaway success among the Knanaya, and has sold out repeatedly at the Kottayam diocese bookstore. Cassette tapes and not records are the main means of popular music dissemination in Kerala, and with this tape the old songs have taken their place among movie musical soundtracks which are the mainstay of popular music. While the audience for the songs is small by comparison with the audience even for other types of Christian popular music, the recording has assumed a special place. Pop music fills the air in Kerala. Young people want to play songs at their weddings. The old songs in themselves are irrelevant and incomprehensible; the rites are no longer performed or have degenerated into horseplay. There is a great deal of drinking at weddings. The tape allows anyone, even poor people, to present pop music that is also appropriate to the wedding. The performances on the tape are so accomplished that they set a standard. Those who want to sing can sing along with the tape. It is just a slight change from the commanding choral singing of the old days. I attended weddings during which the tape played on without any connection to rituals, in fact without any rituals. By entering the electronic medium, the oral text lingers even after the wedding rites for which it was contrived have passed away. In Kenya, Australia, and America, Knanaya are wed to the sound of the ancient songs, all the more ancient because the songs have become as deathless in perfomance as they are in text.

The interdependence of orality and literacy in a text has in the old songs of the Knanaya found a consummation in recording, which eliminates all uncertainty and change. The relationship between the two is special to the wedding, the purpose of the wedding, and the cultural meaning of the wedding. Oral texts hold together the two dimensions of experience to form a cultural icon. For the Knanaya it is an icon of permanence and rigid consistency. Other oral texts will characterize the cultures of their performance. They offer a new dimension in the study of oral literature (a very meaningful phrase) which can now proceed to the role of orality in the electronic media. Writing and media do not extinguish orality but become its partner in the perpetuation and transformation of cultural traditions.

Holliston, Massachusetts

References

Ayyer 1928
Ananthakrishna Ayyer. *Social Anthropology of the Syrian Christians*. Ernakulam: Cochin Government Press.

Brown 1982
Lester Brown. *The Indian Christians of St. Thomas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Choondal 1980
Chummar Choondal. *Kerala Folk Literature*. Trichur: Kerala Folklore Academy.

Choondal 1983
_____. *Christian Folk Songs*. Trichur: Kerala Folklore Academy.

George 1972
K. M. George. *Western Influence on Malayalam Language and Literature*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

Goody 1968
Jack Goody. *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gough 1968
Kathleen Gough. "Literacy in Kērala." In *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. Ed. J. Goody. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 132-60.

Hendron 1961
Joseph W. Hendron. "The Scholar and the Ballad Singer." In *The Critics and the Ballad*. Ed. MacEdward Leach and Tristram P. Coffin. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 3-11.

Hosten 1928
Henry Hasten. [Remarks on an article by T. K. Joseph]. "Thomas Cana." *Indian Antiquary*, 57:117-24.

Jussaye 1986
P. M. Jussaye. "The Songs of Eravayi." In *Jews in India*. Ed. Jacob Timberg. New York: Advent. pp. 145-60.

Keyes 1983
Charles Keyes. "Introduction: Popular Ideas of Karma." In *Karma: An Anthropological Inquiry*. Ed. Charles F. Keyes and E. Valentine Daniel. Berkeley: University of California Press. pp. 1-24.

Lukose 1980
P. U. Lukose. *Puthanapattukal [The Ancient Songs of the Syrian Christians of Malabar]*. Kottayam: Catholic Mission Press.

McLuhan 1962
Marshall McLuhan. *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Nair 1967
P. K. Parameswaram Nair. *History of Malayalam Literature*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

Ong 1982
Walter J. Ong. *Orality and Literacy*. London: Methuen.

Ramanujan 1973
A. K. Ramanujan. *Speaking of Shiva*. Baltimore: Penguin.
Swiderski 1986
Richard M. Swiderski. *A Realm of Custom: Knanaya Wedding Discourse* (manuscript).
Tambiah 1968
Stanley Tambiah. "Literacy in a Buddhist Village in North-East Thailand." In *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. Ed. J. Goody. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 85-131.
Tambiah 1970
_____. *Buddhism and the Spirit Cults in Northeast Thailand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thomas 1935
P. J. Thomas. *Malayala Sahithyavum Chrisityanikalum [The Marriage Customs and Songs of the Syrian Christians]*. Kottayam: Mannanam.
Veliparambil 1981
George Veliparambil. "Early Printing and the Origin of the Press in Kerala: Contributions of Christian Missionaries." In *Christian Heritage of Kerala*. Ed. K. J. John. Cochin: Kerala Times. pp. 161-68.
Walerstein 1982
Marcia Walerstein. "The Cochini Jewish Wedding of the Malabar Community in India and Israel: Change in Custom, Symbol and Meaning." In *The Sephardi and Oriental Jewish Heritage*. Ed. Issachar Ben-Ami. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press. pp. 529-50.
Weil 1982
Shalva Weil. "Symmetry between Christians and Jews in India: The Cnanite Christians and the Cochin Jews of Kerala." *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 16.2:175-96.

Oral Tradition, 3/1-2 (1988): 138-90

Oral—Formulaic Research in Old English Studies: II

Alexandra Hennessey Olsen

The first four sections of this study, which appeared in the May 1986 issue of *Oral Tradition*, considered several problems. The initial one discussed whether Old English poetry was composed orally or in writing and whether it was presented to a listening audience or to an audience of readers, and the second reviewed the origin and development of the study of oral composition in Old English. The third section studied the basic units of oral composition, the formula and the formulaic system, and the fourth the level above the formula, that of the theme and type-scene.

This second half of the study has five parts beginning with V, "Levels Above the Theme," which discusses Ring Structure, the Envelope Pattern, and mythic structures. Section VI, "The Case Against the Oral-Formulaic Theory," treats scholarly objections either to the idea of formularity or to the idea that Old English poetry might have been composed orally. It also confronts the controversies as to whether formulaic poetry can be artistic and whether literate formulaic composition can exist. Section VII, "The Comparative Method," discusses the studies of other literatures which have been used to illuminate Old English poetry, emphasizing that scholars must be aware of differences as well as similarities. It also considers the way that the comparative method illuminates two questions: whether all oral-formulaic poetry must be improvisational or whether it can be memorial, and how the Germanic and the Graeco-Roman Christian traditions came together in Old English poetry. Section VIII, "Present Trends in Oral-Formulaic Research," discusses current trends which reopen questions about such points as the nature of the formula and the influence of linguistic theory on the oral-formulaic theory. Section

IX, "Future Directions," focuses on work which should introduce a new and productive era in oral-formulaic studies in Old English.

V. Levels Above the Theme

Speaking of oral-formulaic elements in ancient Greek, H. Ward Tonsfeldt points out that "ring composition . . . is 'pervasively present' in the literature suspected to be oral, and 'relatively absent' in later literature. The structures are occasionally made by repeating actual formulae, but more often a single verb and most frequently a substantive or idea is the unit of repetition. As a technique of oral composition, ring structure would seem to operate on the next level of complexity above the theme." (1977:443) Tonsfeldt argues that ring structures are used in *Beowulf* in a way similar to that typical of the Homeric poems and that "the repetitious arrangement of narrative elements within a nearly static structure is the essence of the poet's technique" (452). John D. Niles (1979) has also discussed ring structure in *Beowulf*, suggesting that the poet used it to give order to his most important points and arguing that it is a type of patterning that must have been useful to an improvising scop or a performer who recited memorized poems.

As in the case of aural patterning, most of the work on the higher structures of Old English poetry has been done, not by oral-formulaists, but by those scholars whose work runs parallel, but is not identical, to the oral-formulaic theory. The earliest such work is Adeline C. Bartlett's *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry,* which identifies the envelope pattern, "any logically unified group of verses bound together by the repetition at the end of (1) words or (2) ideas or (3) words and ideas which are employed at the beginning" (1935:9). She argues that "for appreciation of this Anglo-Saxon poetic style, . . . a basic assumption [is] that the tapestry is not purely Germanic but is woven from both Germanic and classical threads and follows both Germanic and classical patterns" (110). Constance B. Hieatt has recently studied the artistic use of the envelope patterns in *Beowulf* (1975) and *Judith* (1980).[1] In respect to *Beowulf* she notes that ten of the manuscript divisions are bounded by envelope patterns and suggests that the divisions confirm that the envelope patterns were significant elements in the composition of *Beowulf*. In respect to *Judith*, she notes that the envelope patterns and the hypermetric lines demonstrate the poet's artistry. She also points out that most

Old English poems "make use of hypermetrics, with or without accompanying envelope patterns or similar reinforcing devices, to draw attention to significant symbols, key concepts, central themes, ironies, and so forth" (1980:252).

The rhetorical level above that of the theme that has most interested oral-formulaists has been that of myth. Albert B. Lord has argued that the value of oral poetry comes from "the myth, or myths, which first determined the themes of oral narrative poetry, which provided the story material and gave it significance. For the myths brought it into being and kept it living long after they themselves had officially been declared dead." (1959:6) He suggests that "the enriching of meaning of a theme or song. . . comes directly from the myth and is *inevitable* in all traditional narrative song" (1). Lord notes that "the essential patterns of. . . mythic subjects" like the initiatory hero and the returning hero "survive and form the meaningful frame of many oral traditional epics" (1980b:145), including *Beowulf*: "The interlocking of these two patterns from the deep past of the story, modulating from the hopeful eternal return of the cyclical myth of annual renewal, through the death of the substitute, to the eventual acceptance of man's mortality, provides a mythic base both for the triumph of Beowulf over the evil generations of Cain and for the inevitable death of the hero in old age, still fighting against destructive forces" (1980a:141). Michael N. Nagler also reads *Beowulf* in the context of its mythic background, pointing out that "when epics, especially 'primary' or oral epics, follow the same myth they seem to show parallelism not only in themes, plot, and the larger framework of narrative organization, but often in the most surprising and unpredictable details" (1980:144). In addition to studying the sleep-feast theme in *Beowulf*, Joanne De Lavan (1981) argues that the formulaic systems are organized in such a way that there is a relationship between formulaic content and mythic content.

Thomas A. Shippey and Daniel R. Barnes have analyzed *Beowulf* in terms of the morphological structure proposed by Vladimir Propp and have suggested that *Beowulf* has larger traditional patterns than many scholars have noted. Shippey, influenced by Francis P. Magoun, Jr.'s study of the presence of oral formulas in Old English poetry, wishes to extend our knowledge of Old English formularity by discussing the narrative level of *Beowulf*. He contends that analyzing *Beowulf* in Propp's

terms shows "a kind of formulaic, controlled structure in the poem's narrative" (1969:10). Barnes suggests generally that Propp's morphology helps us understand oral-derived poems like *Beowulf* and in particular that the study of morphological functions helps "to delineate more precisely those areas in which the poet as conscious artist. . . is free to create, as opposed to those which have been bequeathed to him by oral tradition and which remain substantially unaffected" (1970:432).

Several critics have given warnings about the tendency of critics to be naive in the search for oral origins and mythic backgrounds of medieval narrative. Francis L. Utley warns scholars that "casual appeal to 'oral tradition' can be . . . a device to slow down genuine criticism, genuine consideration of the poet's own creativity" (1960:104-5), suggesting that scholars concerned with Old and Middle English works must be sensitive both to the poets' use of oral-formulaic and mythic elements and to their artistic handling of the materials. Bruce A. Rosenberg (1974) specifically challenges Barnes' application of Proppian morphology to *Beowulf* because he feels that it is an inappropriate standard by which to judge a literary work as opposed to a folktale.

VI. The Case Against the Oral-Formulaic Theory

Jeff Opland observes that "many critics of Parry and Lord have denied this theory a sympathetic hearing" and that "the excesses of Magoun and his supporters, as well as the weaknesses in some of Lord's arguments, have tended to bring the whole 'oral theory' into disrepute, so that a charged atmosphere now exists in medieval or classical studies in which it is difficult to discuss any aspect of the oral origins of the western European literatures with objectivity" (1980a:2). An example of such "excesses" lies in the two articles in which Magoun uses the oral-formulaic theory to divide *Beowulf* into shorter poems. In the first article, Magoun argues that in ll. 2069-2199 of *Beowulf*, "an anthologizing scribe" (1958:100) inserted material that was not fully relevant into an existing poem; in the second, he maintains that "the Béowulf material in manuscript Cotton Vitellius A. XV" was compiled from "independent songs by different singers" (1963:127). Opland points out that Magoun has a tendency to "assume that the Anglo-Saxon poetic tradition can be reduced to a simple monolithic definition" (1980:10), a tendency shown in Magoun's 1963 argument that few

oral poets compose cyclic poems whereas our extant *Beowulf* is cyclic, with the result that he believes that *Beowulf* is a composite.

Indeed, Magoun's overstatements have been countered by arguments made by oral-formulaists. Charles Witke (1966) observes that the passage between 2069 and 2199 can be explained as normal to find in a poem composed orally. In a more important argument, Robert P. Creed uses formulaic evidence from *Beowulf* itself to disprove the validity of Magoun's "dismemberment of the poem as it has come down to us" (1966:131). He contends that *Beowulf* itself indicates that the Anglo-Saxons liked cyclic poems on the adventures of a single hero and that although "the organizing principle implied both in *wél-hwelċ ȝecwæþ* and in the whole passage may be more primitive than that proclaimed in the opening lines of the *Iliad*" (135), it is such a principle. Since "it is almost the only notion of structure mentioned or alluded to within the corpus of Old English poetry," students of *Beowulf* should "give to this hint a priority higher than generalizations based on our study of other traditional poetries" (135).

Some scholars have expressed opposition to Magoun's extremism rather than to the oral-formulaic theory itself. Kemp Malone, for example, criticizes Magoun's views about Cædmon because they "spring from his dictum that 'formulas are created only slowly and no one singer ever invents many, often none at all'," a "dictum [that] works well enough when applied to a singer who keeps to the traditional themes but does not work at all when applied to a singer who breaks with tradition by choosing Christian themes. Whoever composed the first Christian song in English had to make up his formulas as he went along." (1961:195) —as Caedmon is traditionally credited with having done.

The opposition to the oral-formulaic theory includes folklorists and linguists, even though the studies of other folklorists and linguists have helped validate aspects of the theory. Roger D. Abrahams, for example, a folklorist who collects oral texts, argues that the oral-formulaists use "naive and outdated models of the socio-psychological experience of composition and performance" (1978:9) and that the theory is only a hypothesis that does not describe reality. In the course of a linguistic study of the metrical systems of Old English poetry, J. Kerling argues that the oral-formulaic theory is invalid because Old English poetry is merely "the spoken language tidied up" (1982:129). In a similar vein, John Schwetman, who performs a transformational analysis of

10% of the extant Old English poetry, argues that "the oral-formulaic theory seems an unnecessary complication" (1980:98).

Critics who are interested in the classical and Patristic backgrounds of Old English poetry tend either to ignore the oral-formulaic theory or to dismiss it as untenable. James W. Earl, for example, says that although "the heroic school of *Andreas* criticism is still alive and well," it merely "reflects the old opinion" and provides "a tribute to the Anglo-centric world view" (1980:167), criticizing those who say that "the power of Old English poetry derives solely or mainly from its Germanic primitiveness in relation to the other Christian literature of the early Middle Ages" (89) without countering the arguments specifically. Wormald (1978) says that the oral-formulaic theory has no relevance to Old English studies because formulas appear in literate contexts and therefore that the composition of *Beowulf* during performance seems unlikely. In a study claiming to show how Alcuin would have read *Beowulf*, Whitney F. Bolton states that he has refuted the oral-formulaic theory of the composition of Old English poetry by showing that Alcuin is formulaic although he is "not in any way oral; on the contrary, his formularity is strictly literary" (1978:62); he adds in a footnote that "both the theory and the bibliography of oral formulism are, in their different ways, unreal" (62), with no explanation of what he means.

In addition to simply dismissing the theory, Bolton tries to counter the very idea that oral formulas exist in Old English poetry, primarily by confusing the ideas of repetition and the formula. In reference to the phrase "on þæm dæge þysses lifes" ("on that day of this life"), he states that the Latin equivalent occurs in prose texts so that the formula "is not necessarily either poetic or oral" (63). G. C. Britton (1974), in an attempt to prove that *Genesis B* was of written origin, ignores the oral-formulaic theory while calling attention to the poet's habit of repetition and near-repetition, and James L. Rosier argues that the "contiguous recurrence of forms" in many Old English poems differs from oral formulas, defining the former as "clustered, varied, and sustained figurations" which are found in "structurally distinct narrative units" (1977:199). The attempt to disprove the existence of formulas is most closely linked to the criticism of H. L. Rogers (see, for example, his 1971 review of Ann Chalmers Watts' *The Lyre and the Harp*). Rogers attacks Magoun's definition of the formula (ignoring refinements of the definition made between the

publication of Magoun's article in 1953 and that of his own in 1966) as a way to attack the oral-formulaic theory itself. In a psycholinguistic argument aimed at showing that the formula is without existential reality, he argues that "the fatal weakness in it was engendered by Parry's constant preoccupation with hypothetical psychology, with the poet's supposed mental processes, and by Parry's belief that an 'idea' could infallibly be separated from its 'expression'" (1966a:90-91). He further argues that "as semantic theory and linguistic psychology, this is quite unacceptable. Words do not 'mean ideas'; speakers can hardly be said to 'think of ideas'; the theory that 'real meanings' are a kind of mental 'reflex action' will not stand examination. The crucial and specific objection, though, is that Lord is supposing the singers to have certain ideas, when the testimony of the singers themselves points . . . to a lack of analytical self-awareness." (92) Because oral singers are unable to reify their own formulaic poetic language and discuss their poetry critically, Rogers dismisses the oral-formulaic theory and its application to Old English studies. As Carol Edwards points out, "to argue as Rogers does, that the singers' inability to discuss these structures means that they don't exist, is to argue that performers are somehow more adept than scholars at categorizing their own material" (1983:157).

In many cases, the argument against the oral-formulaic theory is caused by concern about "how far an 'oral-formulaic style' is indeed a sign of 'oral composition'" (Finnegan 1977:69). Rogers, concerned not only about the applicability of Parry's and Magoun's definitions of the formula to Old English poetry but also about the accuracy of the Serbo-Croatian analog and the division between oral and written poetry, has argued that "the formula is an unreliable touchstone" (1966b:199) for differences between oral and written poetry. P. R. Orton examines the manuscript presentation of the *Soul and Body* poems and argues that "comparison of the texts in their deployment of certain scribal devices . . . reveals a number of correspondences" (1979:173), with the result that it is unlikely that oral transmission accounts for the differences between the versions. In another study, Orton (1983) argues that scholars should not use verses from poems composed later than *Cædmon's Hymn* to prove the formularity thereof because the formularity of such phrases might have arisen after the composition of the *Hymn* rather than before and therefore have been purely literate. Many of the arguments against the

oral-formulaic theory, however, are directed against orality, in part because Anglo-Saxonists—ignoring such works as Lord's "Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts" (1953), which argues that orality and artistry are not incompatible—believe that *Beowulf* is too artistic to have been composed orally. Larry D. Benson (1970), for example, argues that oral-formulaic studies deny the originality of the *Beowulf* poet and that the poet is both traditional and artistic.

The question about the relationship between formularity of diction and artistry has been an issue in Old English studies since before the oral-formulaic theory came to the fore. In 1929, William F. Bryan examined "the epithetic compound folk-names in *Beowulf*" in order "to determine to what extent these names were formed or selected by the poet because of their appropriateness to their particular context, and to what extent they were used as purely general, stylistic devices or as forced by the exigencies of poetic form, especially by the demands of alliteration" (120). He argues that "in *Beowulf* there are occasions when the exigencies of the verse-form forced the poet to a somewhat mechanical use of purely conventional words and phrases; but, on the whole, there is no question as to the fresh vigor and effectiveness of his phraseology" and that "no aspect of his artistry seems . . . more notable than his sure mastery of such stubborn material as folk- and national names" (134). In a similar argument, Storms, who accepts the premise that *Beowulf* was improvised during performance, studies fifteen compounded names that occur in twenty-nine instances in *Beowulf* and concludes that "their use is justified, not only as far as sense and metre is concerned, but also as to poetic connotation and artistic significance" (1957:22).

In contrast to Storms, many scholars argue that oral composition and literary artistry are incompatible. Ralph W. V. Elliott, although primarily interested in showing the artistry of Middle English romance, says of *Beowulf* that "no amount of fashionable emphasis upon the 'oral-formulaic' nature of Old English poetry can explain such art away" (1961:65). In a study of *Maldon*, Elliott argues that "even where situations are similar and formulaic verses recur, . . . the final poetic result differs in every case. It is the context which determines the singer's choice of word and phrase." (1962:54) He feels that the best Old English poets were "masters of their conventions, not slaves" (55).

In 1978, Rudy Spraycar re-examined the oral-formulaic theory as applied to medieval literature, specifically the arguments

that formularity of diction proves orality of composition and that poems from different traditions can be compared in an attempt "to show how various formulaic techniques can underscore overall poetic structure" (388). Many scholars who have accepted the application of formulaic techniques to classical and medieval poetry have emphasized how those techniques actually underscore the artistry of the poems. In Homeric studies, Joseph A. Russo has pointed out that "the truly gifted oral poet finds himself no more restricted in handling his subject matter than was Shakespeare in having to write in iambic pentameter, and he is just as free to produce great poetry" (1963:247). Russo's view is echoed in Old English studies by James P. Holoka, who argues that *The Wife's Lament* and *The Husband's Message* are composed not of formulas but of the "allusive verbal nuances one associates with literate artistry" (1976:571), which are undoubtedly the result of the poet's planning but which are not incompatible with the oral origins of the poems: a singer would have been able to remember "a set piece of some one hundred verses; he could review, polish, revise, rework until finally his method closely approximated that of his more educated counterpart. Thus, short, elegiac poems could conceivably attain a fixity indistinguishable from that of a written text." (572)

Stanley B. Greenfield was one of the first Anglo-Saxonists to call attention to the fact that formularity is compatible with artistry and that Anglo-Saxonists needed to pay close attention to the artistry of the texts rather than merely listing formulaic devices. In his seminal study of the theme of Exile, he states that he intends to show how *The Wife's Lament* and *Christ I* develop Exile thematically and structurally in order "to extend Mr. Magoun's investigation into the subject of conventionality in Old English poetry, with the hope that still further studies will blossom forth and enlarge our understanding and appreciation of the aesthetic values of that poetry" (1955:206). In an equally important study (1963), Greenfield analyzes the syntax of one sentence of *The Wanderer*, arguing on the basis of his analysis that an Old English poet "could use and did use, consciously or unconsciously, these linguistic counters, as he did diction, formulas, and themes, to contribute uniquely, in many cases, to his poetic effect" (378). The study demonstrates that "despite the fact that Old English poetry is highly conventional, stylized, and formulaic, it was possible . . . for the poets writing in that tradition to be

individual in their stylistic talent" (373). Later, in "The Canons of Old English Criticism" (1967a), Greenfield points to weaknesses in the critical methodology of Creed, Whallon, and Cassidy, and he observes that because oral theorists concentrate on formulaic repetition, they concentrate "on the phrasing and 'grammetrical' patterns that a poem has in common with other poems rather than on the appropriateness of those patterns in their immediate context" (142). Greenfield states as axiomatic that "even if a poem like *Beowulf* were to be convincingly demonstrated as of oral composition . . . the case for abandoning standard critical techniques in analyses of its poetic values remains unproved" (143-44) and that "close analysis of verbal and grammatical patterns is . . . not incompatible with the nature of Old English poetry; and understanding of the special techniques of that poetry rather helps the critic, as it enabled the Anglo-Saxon auditor, to evaluate the effectiveness of individual instances" (154-55). His aesthetic investigation continued in "Grendel's Approach to Heorot" (1967b), in which he maintains that "the poet's manipulation of diction and syntax achieves subtle poetic effects" and that the verse and syntactic formulas were only "counters for the Old English poet to use either conventionally, in the worst sense of that word, or brilliantly and strikingly, as the *Beowulf* poet has used them in presenting Grendel's approach to Heorot" (283). In his second book, *The Interpretation of Old English Poems* (1972), Greenfield examines lexical, formulaic, and dictional matters, pointing out that the formulaic nature of Old English poetry does not "militate against our praising a scop for having chosen *le mot juste*" (31) and arguing convincingly that Old English poetry is both formulaic and artistic.

Like Greenfield, Godfrid Storms has identified formularity and artistry as compatible, contending that although "a traditional and formulaic style is of great technical assistance to less gifted poets . . ., the influence of tradition does not prevent the poet from expressing the particular meaning and the special tone demanded by the occasion" (1963:171), and, like Greenfield, illustrating the way that the *Beowulf* poet has manipulated traditional diction for artistic purposes. Storms also argues that an oral performance would not prevent an audience from appreciating the artistry of a poem like *Beowulf* "at a first hearing. Poetry was one of their principal entertainments; it was frequently and generally practiced . . . . An audience trained and educated to make their own songs

and to listen to those of others would certainly have developed an ear for poetry and would . . . appreciate the finer points of a popular art." (1966:136)

As Greenfield has shown, part of the artistry of Old English poetry comes from the manipulation of formulaic language; in a related argument, John W. Ehrstine suggests that the aesthetic appeal of Old English poetry derives from the fact that it "is more oral than . . . modern English verse" (1965:151). He states that "the modern investigations into formulaic diction and structural analysis have probably provided us our first opportunity of fully seeing the technique and brilliance of a poem such as *Beowulf*" (162) and of appreciating its excellence. Rosier (1963) points out that although formulaic alliterative poetry places certain limitations on a poet, a good poet could use the formulaic elements artistically, a position echoed by Lars Malmberg, who states that "originality was well within the power of good Anglo-Saxon poets" (1973:223; see also Reinhard 1976). Likewise, Bernard Van't Hul and Dennis S. Mitchell contend that the description of the eagle in *The Battle of Brunanburh* is unique in our extant corpus and that the poet "seems capable of evoking other than purely literary responses, and ought therefore to be considered a rather more original literary artist than much of previous criticism has allowed" (1980:390). Robert W. Hanning (1973) argues that the use of words with roots *dæl-* and *scear* proves that a poet could manipulate his formulaic poetic diction and themes for artistic purpose. In a related study Claude Schneider suggests that terms like æþ*eling*, *bealdor*, *ealdor*, *eorl*, *hæle*þ, þ*egn*, þ*eoden*, and *wiga* in poems like *Juliana* contrast Christian and heroic values, thereby countering "a not infrequent observation in criticism about Old English Christian poems [which] holds that a body of diction which was inherited from a Germanic, military and heroic past forced the poets to describe Christian characters inappropriately in terms belonging to the ideals of a warrior society" (1978:107).

Pierre-Eric Monnin has argued that comparison of the *Meters of Boethius* with their source "shows variations that are in fact too numerous and substantial to allow for the idea of a versifier solely concerned with the prosodic correctness of a close rendering" so that we may assume that the poet was familiar "with the motifs and movements recurrent in oral-formulaic poetry" (1979:347) and was evidently concerned with artistry. Donald K. Fry (1968) suggests that an awareness of formularity heightens our appreciation

of the artistry of a poem like *Beowulf*, whose poet uses his traditional diction and his themes and type-scenes aesthetically, and Isaacs (1968) uses oral-formulaic techniques to analyze Old English poetics. Isaacs argues that since the oral-formulaic theory has demonstrated how Old English poems were composed, the time has come to "re-examine the art of the *Beowulf* poet and other Anglo-Saxon singers within the framework of their poetic conventions, examining the conventional formulas and themes they use in order that we may find the methods of composition in a narrower sense" (1967:215). He suggests that formulas and themes had both denotations and connotations, the latter "evoked from the common store of suggestions, emotional and intellectual, that the particular formulas and themes hold in the hearts and minds of hearers and singers" (216), maintaining in particular that the poetic use of personification shows us how Old English poets manipulate their conventional poetic devices for artistic effect.

Alain Renoir has been especially sensitive to what Isaacs calls the connotative and denotative (that is, the traditional and the particular) meanings of oral-formulaic poetic elements. In a study of Grendel's approach to Heorot, he points out that "under the conditions of oral-formulaic composition and presentation, the *Beowulf* poet masterfully succeeds not only in selecting immediately effective details but also in presenting them from such points of view as are likely to arouse the most appropriate emotional reactions in the audience" (1962b:158). His study of Grendel's approach demonstrates that the poet's technique is basically cinematographic, and he makes a similar point in respect to the artistry of *Judith*, arguing in particular that "in actual recitation, both the accompanying music and the intonations of the voice must have lent an audible quality to the sounds which are so powerfully suggested by the visual elements of the poem" (1962a:153). In "The Heroic Oath in *Beowulf*, the *Chanson de Roland*, and the *Nibelungenlied*" (1963), Renoir examines a stock feature as the source of action in the poems and shows how three poets manipulate the same heroic commonplace using oral-formulaic devices of composition for different artistic purposes. Renoir and many other oral-formulaists are interested in what Opland has recently called "the *exploitation* of tradition, . . . the deliberate use of a traditional element in order to extend or deny its relevance in altered circumstances" (1984:45).

The concern over the relationship between formularity and artistry" is related to another concern that scholars have voiced about the oral-formulaic theory, namely, the relationship between formularity and written composition, with what Ute Schwab has called "the transformation of oral poetry into literature" (1983:5). Thomas G. Rosenmeyer has pointed out that literate poets "use patterns that are identical with formulas" (1965:303), with the result that readers are unsure about the orality of ancient Greek poems, and the same idea has been voiced by Claes Schaar in respect to Old English studies. Schaar argues that it is not necessary "to assume that all formulaic Old English poetry is oral" because "there is some internal evidence pointing to a literary, a lettered, origin of at least a certain group of formulaic Anglo-Saxon poems, those composed by Cynewulf and some of those associated with him" (1956:303). He finds it inconceivable that the use of formulaic patterns would have been abandoned when writing was introduced, a point reiterated by Anglo-Saxonists like Adrien Bonjour (1957b), who feels that there must have been an intermediate state between purely oral and purely literate poetry and that the *Beowulf* poet, like Cynewulf, was "a lettered author" using traditional formulaic techniques (1957a:573; see also Bonjour 1958).

The idea that oral-formulaic poetry must have been improvised during performance has exercised many Anglo-Saxonists, such as Malone, who argued that "the use of traditional diction is one thing; improvisation is something else again. The two need not go together and in *Beowulf* they most emphatically do not" (1960:204). Arthur G. Brodeur contended that an Old English poet could have been both a trained *scop* and a literate poet: "The language of *Beowulf* . . . indicates that its author had been trained as a professional scop; and it is most unlikely that a man so trained should ever lose the ability to express himself in the conventional modes of traditional poetry under the influence of a Christian education" (1959:4). Like many other Anglo-Saxonists, he believes that Magoun's doctrine that a literate poet could not have composed formulaically is incorrect. Jackson J. Campbell points out that "the history of the Old English poetic conventions after the introduction of the tradition of written literature must have been very complex, . . . for lettered men at some period began writing and singing in the native form, introducing ideas and narrative material from Latin literature" (1960:87) and suggests

that formulaic elements undoubtedly remained after poets became literate.

Alistair Campbell spoke in 1962 of "the literate formulaic poet" (75), and O'Neil noted that from internal evidence, we can only "separate the traditional formulaic poetry from the non-formulaic" (1962:596). Robert E. Diamond contributed several studies of formulaic diction, noting that his analysis of Cynewulf s diction shows that the poems were composed "in the traditional formulaic style" (1959:228), although "it is impossible to determine whether the Cynewulf poems were composed orally and written down by a scribe, were composed with pen in hand in the ordinary modern way, or were composed by a learned poet who was making use of the traditional poetic formulas handed down to him from an age when all poems were oral" (229). In a study of the metrical Psalms, a body of material which he assumes represents a literary but formulaic translation, Diamond suggests that "detailed analysis of . . . [the poet's] diction makes one fact very clear: much of his choice of words depends more on mechanical considerations than on taste or 'inspiration'" (1963:8). He even suggests that it is "likely that there is more of this element of mechanical compulsion in even the great Anglo-Saxon poems than is usually recognized" (8).

A turning point in the controversy came in 1966 with the publication of Larry D. Benson's "The Literary Character of Anglo-Saxon Formulaic Poetry," an article of great importance which has influenced the course of Old English studies ever since. Benson comments that "there are many for whom the demonstration that the techniques of analyzing oral verse can be applied to Old English poetry is proof that this poetry was itself orally composed" (334). By an analysis of the metrical preface to the *Pastoral Care*, *Riddle 85*, *The Phoenix*, and *The Meters of Boethius*, all of which are demonstrably literate, Benson shows that "to prove that an Old English poem is formulaic is only to prove that it is an Old English poem" (336) and that "not only can literate poets write formulaic verse, they can write it pen in hand in the same way any writer observes a literary tradition" (337). He argues that "because Old English poetry is formulaic, our study of it must begin with the exciting and useful techniques developed by students of oral verse; but because this poetry is also literature, our study need not end there" and that "a recognition that Old English poetry is both formulaic and lettered would lead to an

even more exciting and fruitful development in our discipline" (340).

Benson's work paralleled that in classical and other medieval languages, for in 1966 G. S. Kirk argued that the contrast between "oral" and "literate" composition was causing confusion because "literate composition has come to stand as the only alternative to oral poetry . . ., [whereas] a truer and less confusing antithesis . . . is between natural composition in a formular tradition (that is, 'oral poetry' in its primary sense) and deliberate, self-conscious composition in a formular style, whether with the aid of writing or not" (174). Similarly, in Old French studies, Stephen G. Nichols (echoing Rychner 1955) had argued in 1961 that *The Song of Roland* was written down by someone who had been trained in oral-formulaic techniques and who reorganized parts of the poem, a point reiterated by Spraycar in 1976 when he observed that the oral-formulaic style of *Roland* suggests that a literate redactor adapted a traditional narrative for his own purposes.

In articles which were published in the same year as Benson's, Jackson Campbell, R. F. Lawrence, and E. G. Stanley made similar statements about written formulaic poetry, although without Benson's impressive documentary evidence. Campbell asserts that "the formulaic technique . . . throve in the period of post-conversion learning. The fact that lettered, even learned, men composed poetry of this type, using all the characteristics of the formulaic style, is incontrovertible. . . . We cannot assume, simply because there are an appreciable number of formulas in the poem, that the poem was composed orally. We have too many formulaic poems where the poet obviously translated a Latin original very closely." (1966:191) He adds that Anglo-Saxonists need to approach Old English poetry carefully because "in many formulaic poems a conscious rhetorical artificer is at work" (201). Lawrence (1966), responding to the fact that Creed (1959) used different formulas to rewrite a passage from *Beowulf*, wonders whether, since Creed is able to use oral-formulaic techniques, an "Anglo-Saxon monk [might] have done likewise" (178) in an even more effective manner. Stanley (1966) argues that there were two stages in the development of formulaic diction, oral and written, warning that genuine preliterate poetry may not help us to understand Old English poetry, which he assumes to be literate.

In the late 1960's many scholars examined the question of literate formulaic composition in Old English. Morton W.

Bloomfield considered that although our extant *Beowulf* was not orally composed, "there can be no question but that an oral tradition lies behind it" (1968:15). Brodeur (1968), acknowledging that all Old English poems are highly formulaic, argues that literate poets would have been able to compose formulaically and that *Andreas* resembles *Beowulf* not because the two poems derived from a common oral-formulaic tradition but because the poet of the former was familiar with the latter. In 1969, Marcia Bullard voiced her objections to the fact that the oral-formulaic theory differentiates between "formulaic" and "literary" composition, and Whallon suggested that the idea that a poem can be formulaic and lettered means that oral-formulaic texts were not necessarily dictated: "as soon as we entertain editors and interpolators, all of them able to compose formulaic poetry in the manner that had been widely known and customary, the illiterate bard and his amanuensis no longer have the place of honor" (1969:470).

In an article from 1969 that incorporates Benson's thesis, Helmut A. Hatzfeld maintained that medieval poets, whether composing orally or in writing, utilized traditional conventions and that literate artists used a formulaic style derived from an earlier oral tradition. In the 1970's, many scholars began their work with the assumption that Old English poetry was both formulaic and lettered. In a response to Magoun's theory that *Beowulf* is a collation of three separate poems, Brodeur comments that the "argument is obviously dependent upon the assumption that the author of *Beowulf* was a 'folksinger, composing extemporaneously without benefit of writing materials'—an assumption . . . which many competent critics reject" (1970:14); he dismisses, in other words, a necessary connection between formularity and orality. In a study of *The Meters of Boethius*, John W. Conlee (1970) states that Old English poetry was created in a literate tradition which had assimilated the formulaic style, and Allan A. Metcalf (1970) uses the theories advanced by Benson to study the *Meters* as a formulaic and lettered poem and to show how the poet used his traditional poetic elements to turn prose into poetry. Influenced by the "argument that it would be possible in certain conditions for a literate person to write formulaic poetry" (1970:97), Lawrence extends the analysis to the Middle English *Wars of Alexander*, considering both its formularity and its learned literary elements. Hoyt N. Duggan also uses Benson's ideas to argue that the same poem is both formulaic and literate, stating that "the *Wars*-poet

was able to do with pen and ink what generations of oral poets had done in extemporaneous performances. He did not just draw on a tradition of formulaic diction or borrow fixed formulas from other poems but wrote formulaically" (1976:281). The Middle English studies are of interest to Anglo-Saxonists because they suggest that poetry can be both formulaic and lettered.[2]

Alistair Campbell uses the idea that Old English poetry is both formulaic and lettered to contend not simply that *Beowulf* was a written work, but also that it was influenced by Virgil and other classical texts. He suggests that "the style of *Beowulf*, with its artistic control of the formula, its avoidance of long repetitions and its careful building of paragraphs, recalls, not so much oral epic verse, as the sophisticated development of the Homeric style found in late Greek epic" (1971:292). Thomas Gardner, like Campbell viewing the *Beowulf* poet as literate, suggests that oral formulas used in literary works "must have been expected and enjoyed by at least some of the 'consumers' of the poem" (1973:111) and that the use of formulas may have resembled puns. Gardner argues, however, that because the poet "was not a prisoner of the oral-formulaic tradition" but "was free to think about the words he was using" (121), he must have been literate. J. D. A. Ogilvy and Donald C. Baker have recently stated that "the formulaic qualities of Old English are of a kind that has its origin in nonliterate poetry" but that "the great majority of scholars would maintain that *Beowulf*'s enormous variety of epithet would in itself likely preclude oral composition of the poem" (1983:193).

In the 1970's scholars found reasons to agree with Benson's thesis that Old English poetry is both formulaic and lettered. Thomas E. Hart attempts to show that "numerous repetitions of words, formulae, other collocations, and themes in 'Beowulf' are governed by extensive and mathematically precise tectonic . . . patterns" (1972:2). He suggests that his findings demonstrate that *Beowulf* was not composed orally, a statement echoed throughout the 1970's by scholars like Whitman, who in 1975 asserted that no extant Old English poetry was composed orally. Anatoly Liberman (1977) argues that an original oral tradition had given way to a stage in which poets used oral-formulaic materials like themes to compose written poems aesthetically, and in another article (1978) he specifically criticizes those who try to prove the oral origin of *Beowulf*. Richard C. Payne suggests that the survival of formulaic

poetry in Old English demonstrates that the formulaic tradition was continued in monastic settings, arguing in particular that "the question of oral versus written methods of actual composition can be seen as an anachronistic and inappropriate one, since our own rigid distinction between oral and literary modes was not shared in that [monastic] environment. . . . It seems likely that most poems were produced by authors with pen in hand, though frequent communal reading of such works must be assumed to maintain the vitality of the formulaic tradition." (1977:46) Michael Lapidge finds corroboration of Benson's thesis in the Latin poetry of Aldhelm, which contains "certain repeated features which might properly be called 'formulas,' that is, 'groups of words which are regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea'" (1979:225). He suggests that since "literate poets writing in Latin could make continual use of formulas . . ., it is surely not inconceivable that Old English poets might do so as well" (229-30).

In addition, scholars were motivated by Benson's work to re-examine Old English poetic techniques and poems other than *Beowulf*. Richard A. Lewis, observing that Old English poetry gives evidence of formularity as well as literate craftsmanship, reasons that "the poets quite consciously retained metrical and stylistic conventions from the earlier period while uniting them to real changes in narrative syntax and the language generally" (1975:589), especially plurilinear alliteration. Shippey (1972) discusses the poets of the *Psalter* and *The Meters of Boethius* as literate translators who worked formulaically; Metcalf points out that "the Old English poet used only one verse form and the traditional vocabulary that went with it" (1973:3) whether composing a vernacular poem or translating a Latin source; and Edward M. Palumbo (1977) studies *Guthlac A* and *B*, finding evidence that formularity and literacy were compatible and indeed suggesting that the literate poet of *B* used more formulas than the poet of *A*, who may have been illiterate.

The result of this line of investigation has been the "realization that many a presumably-written work includes elements clearly typical of oral-formulaic composition" (Renoir 1976b:338) because "oral-formulaic features are necessary but not sufficient to demonstrate orality within a formulaic tradition" (Renoir 1978:101). Such texts have come to be called "transitional texts," defined as texts which "show the characteristics of oral

composition, although they might have been composed pen in hand and subject to overall planning which the process of additive oral composition does not permit" (Curschmann 1967:45). Not all scholars, however, accept the premise that transitional texts can and do exist. Barnes, following the distinction between oral epic and written fiction proposed by Northrop Frye, comments that "the most distinctive feature of oral narrative—that which immediately differentiates it from literary narrative—is the simple, self-evident fact that it *is* 'oral' and *not* 'written'" (1979:9). As a result, he argues that Frye's "valid and useful" distinction means that "we must accordingly rule out the possibility of any such thing as a 'transitional text.' . . . We must accept a given narrative as *either* oral *or* written, and never somehow a combination of both." (10) Barnes' overly rigid distinction is clearly of little use to Anglo-Saxonists, but his idea has been stated by other scholars as well. Miletich points out that the distinction between oral and written works "appears of prime importance for those critics who maintain that a different criterion must be employed for a proper critical understanding of orally composed works, namely a separate system of oral poetics" (1976:111). Lord argues that the question as to whether formulas exist outside of oral traditional poetry might be answered by using more precise definitions: "If one discovers repeated phrases in texts known not to be oral traditional texts, then they should be called repeated phrases rather than formulas. . . . When one has said that, however, while one has clarified the terminology, one has not clarified the situation in the texts nor answered the question"; he also maintains that "one must consider not only repetitions as such but the specific formulas used, or ideas expressed by them" (1974:204).

Recent studies on contemporary poetry have found examples of literate poets who write formulaic poetry, that is, examples of transitional texts. Opland points out that "literacy is a fairly recent development among the urban Bantu, and the written literature is in its infancy. But literate Bantu poets are using traditional praise songs as a basis for their poetry. . . . Their poetry conforms metrically and stylistically to the traditional praise poems sung by the *imbongi*." (1971:177) In an investigation of Serbo-Croatian texts, Haymes has shown that Bishop Njegoš wrote "in conscious and direct imitation of a living tradition," a fact which suggests that it is "possible that much medieval formulaic poetry was composed in the same way" (1980:400). Miletich has

made an even more interesting suggestion based on his study of Serbo-Croatian texts, that there are actually three categories of poetry; oral, written, and "texts composed by learned writers who have either deliberately imitated, i.e., written '*na narodnu*,' 'in the style of' the oral narrative tradition or who have created literary epics by drawing to some degree on the folk tradition" (1978:345). Such work helps to validate an approach that treats "the hybrid products now extant in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts" (Opland 1980b:43) as transitional texts.

Haymes points out that the study of such transitional texts is of value because "the written poem can . . . tell us much about the tradition of oral poetry alive at the time it was composed, even if the surviving poem itself was the product of a writing poet who only imitated the oral style" (1981:342). As a result, this kind of investigation parallels the study of the possible oral composition and transmission of our extant Old English poems—for example, Christopher Knipp's study of the formulaic and repetitive structure of *Beowulf*, which he feels proves the poem's oral composition because "in oral poetry it is not possible to 'turn back' and savour a fine moment with the eye" (1972:778); Robert D. Stevick's concern (1965) that scholars need to determine both the extent of the formularity of *The Seafarer* and the manner of composition of the poem; or Alison G. Jones' argument that *Daniel* and *Azarias* provide "evidence for oral transmission of verse" while leaving "the question of method of composition the problem it has always been" (1966:95).

VII. The Comparative Method

Just as comparative studies have helped Anglo-Saxonists learn that transitional texts do indeed exist, so they have illuminated many aspects of Old English poetry. Renoir points out that cases exist "where the comparatist may do at least as well by working within the factual oral-formulaic context as he would within the hypothetical chronological context" (1981c:424). The comparative method was first used to illuminate Homer by comparing him to Serbo-Croatian poets, as Lord says, "to reconstruct more exactly Homer's milieu, his tradition, his technique" (1936:113) and, for example, to illuminate his style by showing that "necessary enjambement is more frequent in Homer than in the Southslavic poetry" because "Homeric style is richer in traditional devices for carrying the thought beyond the end of the line" (1948:123). Kirk

warns Homeric scholars that "inferences based on modern oral traditions must be founded on a . . . careful assessment of the true nature of those traditions" (1960:281), and David E. Bynum (1969) has also warned that scholars must be aware of differences as well as similarities, noting, for example, that what is called oral epic poetry in one region is not necessarily the same as what is called oral epic poetry in other regions.

Despite such caveats, however, the comparative method continues to be used to illuminate Old English poetry, and Renoir (1966) suggests that such an approach is extremely valuable because it reduces scholarly dependence on finding literary models for extant texts. Serbo-Croatian poetry has provided an extremely productive analog for Old English; Foley, for example, has used poems in the Parry-Lord collection to explain problems concerning the unity of the *Odyssey* and *Beowulf*, emphasizing that "the creation and re-creation of oral epic is an ongoing *process*, and our concept of narrativity must take account of that distinction" (1981b:300). Recently, Foley and Barbara Kerewsky-Halpern (1976) have published field research that has helped scholars appreciate both the *guslar* and other oral poets. Other Indo-European traditions have also provided useful analogs. Arthur T. Hatto (1973) has compared Old English and Middle High German texts to Kirghiz heroic poetry, which he describes as improvisational.

The most useful Indo-European analogs for Old English poetry are found in the cognate evidence of other Germanic peoples and in the poetry of the Finns. Magoun (1954) examines four versions of Hygelac's raid on the Rhine, three of which are in Latin, and concludes that the story must have circulated orally before the composition of any of the texts. Tauno F. Mustanoja (1959) reviews evidence about the manner of presentation of Finnish popular poetry in order to suggest how ancient Germanic poetry may have been presented, and Creed reinterprets *Widsith* as follows: "There was a singer at Ermanaric's court. There was also one at Alboin's court two centuries later. There was also one whose song we have in the Exeter Book. All were indeed wide-ranging. And all were, in a way, one, because each was, while he lived, the living voice of Germanic oral tradition." (1975:384) Some scholars have compared the Old English and Old Norse traditions; George Clark (1973), for example, shows that *Njalssaga* and *Beowulf* both use a common Germanic narrative

pattern about dragon-slaying, and Renoir applies the comparative context of South Germanic—including Old English—oral poetry to the *Hildebrandslied*, arguing that the usual definition of the word *fragment* can be inadequate "when applied to the critical interpretation of literary works not composed here and now in our own language" (1981a:49). Three scholars have updated Sievers' study of Old English and Old Saxon formulas. Kellogg points out that "the close similarity between the formulas of *Heliand* and those of the Anglo-Saxon corpus reflects the extreme conservatism of the South Germanic alliterative tradition" (1965:72); Michael J. Capek (1970) suggests that comparison of Old English and Old Saxon formulas shows that they have a common origin but developed differently in the two languages; and Roland Zanni (1980) studies the way that South Germanic formulaic phraseology was adapted to religious purposes.

A profitable non-Indo-European analog for Old English poetry has been found in texts from various African cultures. Margaret E. Goldsmith argues that research shows that poetry composed in the Congo resembles heroic Germanic poetry and that it proves that there was a cultural change after the Conversion of England which "altered the function of heroic poetry, and at the same time inevitably changed the meaning of traditional secular symbols" (1970:64) so that we must regard the extant Old English poetry as literate and learned. Hazel Carter (1974) attempts to show that Shona praise poetry resembles Old English poetry more closely than does Scandinavian skaldic poetry and therefore provides a more useful analog than the latter. The most important comparative studies on African and Old English poetry have been performed by Opland, who proposed numerous ideas in early articles and developed them more fully in his 1980 *Anglo-Saxon Oral Poetry: A Study of the Traditions*. In 1973, he pointed out that "a study of local oral traditions can lead us to understand through first-hand experience a phenomenon that is an all-too-misunderstood aspect of mediaeval life" (88), and he studied in particular the Xhosa "tribal poet, or *imbongi*, who generally has the ability to compose his poetry while he is performing, on the spur of the moment" (1975:186). In 1977, he compared Cædmon to the Xhosa poet Ntsikana to validate his assertion that the Xhosa tradition can illuminate medieval oral traditions, and he has further compared Bantu eulogy and medieval formulaic poetry, concluding that "the Anglo-Saxon *scop*, like the

Norse skald and the Irish *fili*, was a vatic eulogizer originally serving a sacral ruler" (1980c:304). One advantage of Opland's scholarship has been that it has helped scholars realize that the oral-formulaic theory must explain not just long epics, but indeed all oral poetry. It has also led him to propose that the Germanic peoples had practices similar to those of the Xhosa and that the most important form of common Germanic poetry was "eulogistic poems of the court or tribal poet" (1980a:38) like those found in South Africa, an intriguing idea which should lead to fruitful debate in the future.

The comparative method has shed light on the tangled problems of oral-formulaic studies, namely, whether all oral-formulaic poetry must be improvisational or whether a memorial tradition can be a genuinely oral one. Before Parry introduced the idea that poetry could be transmitted by improvisation, scholars had assumed that the transmission of medieval oral poetry must have been memorial (see, for example, Heusler 1969). As recently as 1965, Sisam was able to argue that *Beowulf* was "composed without writing, and recited from memory by trained entertainers until it was recorded" (67) since he did not accept the Parry-Lord theory that all oral poetry must be improvised because "what is important is not the oral performance but rather the composition *during* performance" (Lord 1960:5).

In a recent essay, Lord re-examines the question of the role of memorization in oral-formulaic poetry, pointing out that Serbo-Croatian singers "compose their verses by means of formulas. They remember phrases," but "this 'remembering'" is "as unconscious as our use of certain phrases in ordinary speech, and should be distinguished from 'memorization'" (1981:451). Lord indicates that he has been "speaking of the Serbo-Croatian tradition, of sung epic narrative, but the principle is applicable in those other traditions which are composed and performed in the same manner as the Serbo-Croatian" (459). The important phrase here is "in the same manner as the Serbo-Croatian"; an important question is whether the Serbo-Croatian analog holds for all oral traditions, and Anglo-Saxonists should remember that Homeric thrift is not applicable to the Old English formula. Lord points out that there are "cases where a poem is composed in the poet's head without benefit of writing—and memorized and recited. This applies to short poems. . ." (460) rather than to long epics, and Anglo-Saxonists should also remember that many poems of the Old

English corpus are short and should not be compared to long epic (cp. Foley 1983).

In 1969 Alan Jabbour pointed out that "no attention has been given to the possibility of any kind of transmission but oral-improvisational or textual," even though "folklorists have long recognized the presence . . . of stability as well as variation and of memory as well as improvisation in the oral transmission of poetry" (177); he notes that oral tradition includes some forms that are primarily memorial and others that are primarily improvisational. Arguing that the Serbo-Croatian analog is not appropriate for comparative study of Old English oral poetry, Jabbour proposed that the British ballad tradition is the appropriate analog. In a study of the Germanic *Heldenlied*, Haymes made an argument similar to Jabbour's, suggesting that, not only is "not all formulaic poetry . . . oral," but also there is "oral poetry which is not formulaic and not improvisational" (1976:49) but which is memorized.

Haymes finds evidence for a memorial tradition of oral poetry in Germanic tradition, and several scholars have adduced evidence for memorial transmission in other traditions as well. Opland argues that "one unfortunate result of Lord's definition of an oral poet . . . is that it focused attention on the improvising singer and ignored completely the memorizer. A study of contemporary Xhosa poetry reveals . . . that memorizers do exist . . . [and] that these poets have a significant role to play in the full oral tradition." (1973:90) Opland believes that "the facts of the Xhosa tradition call for a broader definition of oral poetry, one that would include a variety of non-literate poetic activities" (90). He states that "we need to break free of the monolithic view of oral poetic traditions derived from Parry and Lord" (90), a call also made by John D. Smith. Smith writes that there is an epic tradition in west India which resembles Yugoslav epic but is not improvisational: "in the epic of Pābūji we have an oral epic which is non-improvisatory but formulaic (and also thematic)" (1977:150). In this memorized text, he identifies "identical or closely related phrases [which] recur very frequently in every performance" (147), although he has not yet published close analyses of the formulas and themes for the benefit of those who are unable to read the epic. As a result, his suggestions are tentative, and his research is at the point where Opland's was when he first identified the Xhosa analog: more study

of the Pābūji epic is needed before we can be certain that it provides a good parallel for Old English poetry.

The comparative method is also of use in the study of Old English verse because, as Edward B. Irving, Jr., says, the poetry "was formed by the collision of two cultures and is always. . . a mixed kind of poetry" (1967:153). The fact that certain poems merge heroic and Christian elements has long been noticed by Anglo-Saxonists. Diamond, for example, notes that the section of *The Dream of the Rood* that describes the crucifixion includes most of the heroic diction; he believes that when the poet "set himself to compose a song on a Christian subject, it was natural that diction reflecting an earlier society should creep in" because "a poet who was accustomed to compose songs on heroic subjects would quite naturally apply all the old heroic epithets and formulas to his matter" (1958:5). Rosemary Woolf argues that heroic formulas were used only for decorative purposes in Christian poetry except when applied to the devil, who, "because of the characteristics already attributed to him by the Church Fathers . . . had natural affinities with characters in both northern mythology and northern literature" (1968:164). Lester Faigley (1978) calls attention to the fact that Cynewulf uses formulaic diction appropriately to describe religious subjects, and Lisa Kiser comments that "interpreting Old English poetry . . . often requires of us an ability to see how individual poets succeeded in making this synthesis work, how their skillful manipulations of the native word-hoard stretch the language of Germanic antiquity far enough to meet and enter new conceptual worlds" (1984:65).

Many Anglo-Saxonists have been concerned with the way that the Old English poets who composed poetry about Christian subjects adapted the native verse-form to their purposes (see, for example, Derolez 1961) and achieved "the happy blend of Christian sentiment and traditional method in the telling of a story [which] is a distinctive characteristic of Old English literature" (Norman 1969:3). Kenneth A. Bleeth (1969) suggests that *Juliana* exemplifies Cynewulf s skill in adapting the Old English poetic language to depict material drawn from Patristic sources, and in a discussion of the Germanic background of Old English poetry, Milton McC. Gatch (1971) takes into account the use of formulaic elements in the poems. Walter H. Beale argues that scholars must be aware of both "the tradition of formulaic composition, with its origins in Germanic oral poetry" and "the learned Latin rhetorical

tradition, with its origins in the Hellenistic schools and the Church Fathers" (1979:134), and especially of the devices "through which diverse rhetorical traditions were fused and made one" (142).

A number of studies published in the 1970's and 1980's have made us more aware of the composite tradition of Old English poetry, the seminal one being Cherniss' 1972 *Ingeld and Christ: Heroic Concepts and Values in Old English Christian Poetry*, which demonstrates conclusively that "one finds within single poems both Germanic and Christian concepts and motifs" (8) and contends that scholars do not need to show that the Christian poems are "totally formulaic or orally composed so long as we can agree that they are heavily influenced by the tradition of oral-formulaic composition" (20). In 1981, Alexandra Hennessey Olsen argued that the *Guthlac* poems of the *Exeter Book* express the religious ideas derived from Latin works formulaically, and Daniel G. Calder maintained that Cynewulf worked within the old formulaic poetic tradition and "embraced the centuries-old habits of diction and style the Germanic invaders brought to England in the fifth century. Cynewulf is manifestly a literate poet, but the style he adopted was originally both oral and formulaic, and by his time it had crystallized into a stable, though expressive, manner" (1981:11). In a 1983 study, Earl R. Anderson pointed out that "Cynewulf's integration of concepts and details from various sources has a reflex in his style of composition, . . . a blend of Germanic formulaic techniques with Latin rhetorical patterns and with a syntactic control also characteristic of his Latin sources" (24-25), and in 1984 Olsen studied the verbs of speech in the poems of the Cynewulf canon in comparison to those of the sources and analogs to show the effect of formulaic composition on the literary artistry of the Old English versions of traditional narratives.

VIII. Present Trends in Oral-Formulaic Research

One of the values of studying scholarship which uses the composite technique is that one realizes that the oral-formulaic theory has at last gained acceptance in Anglo-Saxon studies, whether one argues as Joseph Harris does in respect to Old Norse studies that "the term 'Oral Theory' seems a desirable loosening of 'oral-formulaic theory'" (1983:234), thereby emphasizing the orality of the poetry, or whether one argues as Olsen does that "the term 'formulaic composition' rather than 'oral-formulaic composition'" should be used because "the question of orality is irrelevant"

(1984:158) to the study of certain poems. Even scholars like Kiser and Bleeth, who acknowledge that one must be aware of both sides of the composite tradition but who deal almost exclusively with the Christian Latin side of the poetry, feel the necessity at least to pay lip-service to the importance of the oral-formulaic theory. It seems reasonable, therefore, to say that the current trends in oral-formulaic research—which re-open questions about the nature of the formula, the possible orality of the poetry, the influence of linguistic theory on the oral-formulaic theory, and many other points—will be as influential in future Old English studies as the research of the last thirty-odd years has been.

In 1956 Lord pointed out that "an awareness of sound patterns is of particular use to the scholar in trying to answer the question as to why a singer has chosen one formula rather than another which might have served his purpose just as well" (304), but sound patterns have been little studied as oral elements. In a 1975 study of ancient Greek, Berkley Peabody reminded students of oral-formulaic epic about the amount of work that needs to be done on traditional elements other than formulas and themes. Peabody argues that there are five "tests" for an oral traditional narrative: "The *phonemic test* requires consistency in the patterns of language-sounds used by a singer. . . . The *formulaic test* requires consistency in the patterns of word-forms used by a singer. . . . The *enjambement test* requires consistency in the patterns of syntactic periods used by a singer. . . . The *thematic test* requires consistency in the patterns of lexical clumps used by a singer. . . . The *song test* requires consistency in the patterns of discourse generated by a singer." (3-4) He argues that the formulaic test has been overemphasized to the detriment of the study of the other areas. Peabody's study influenced a 1981 article by Creed that deals with the same five levels in respect to *Beowulf*, with a particular emphasis on sound-patterning, Peabody's phonemic test. Creed points out that Peabody's study is "a systematic approach to the study of techniques when words are *heard*, not seen, *sounded*, not written. . . . Peabody relentlessly forces us to ask, is our way of apprehending the situation that of traditional, of *aural* societies?" (1981:194-95) Creed suggests that the most important impact of Peabody's study for those interested in Germanic oral tradition is "to remind us how much remains to be done in the exploration of sound-patterning, localization, syntax, clustering. . . . The idea of the *Beowulf*-poet as a *singer* can be

tested in new ways." (214) Influenced by both Peabody and Creed, Foley has argued that a profitable new approach to oral literature involves "the demonstration of *sound-patterns*. . . , recurrence of sounds at the level of individual words and even smaller units" (1980b:75). He points out that Peabody and Creed "assign sound-patterning its own place in the hierarchy of traditional structures in ancient Greek and Old English, respectively, thus freeing it from dependence on the formula and viewing it as a dynamic process in itself" (75).

In addition to the five levels of oral traditional narrative outlined by Peabody, scholars have suggested the existence of other levels. Susan Wittig, for example, using tagmemic grammar to explain how formulaic systems work, argues that traditional narratives consist of a "hierarchical structure of narrative patterns" above the level of the formula consisting of "the type-scene, the motifeme, . . . the syntagmeme, . . . [and the] episode" (1978:106). Jean Ritzke-Rutherford (1981) suggests that Old and Middle English alliterative poetry had six levels—the formula, the formulaic system, the motif, the type-scene, the theme, and the cluster, this last unit consisting of a group of words which expresses a given idea but is not restricted to a form, sequence, or number of lines and which demonstrates that there is continuity between Old and Middle English alliterative poetry. Foley suggests that there is a level of formulaic discourse which he calls the "responsion" and which he maintains explains why in some cases a "half-line structure" has "superseded its whole-line counterpart, a modulation to which the hybrid matrix of the [Serbo-Croatian] decasyllable is always potentially subject" (1980c:285). Agreeing with A. J. Bliss' 1971 argument that one does not need to eliminate single half-lines in Old English poems by emendation, Foley suggests that "'responsion' of root-related words" similar to that in the Serbo-Croatian wisdom poetry "is a motivating force behind at least eight of the twenty-six half-lines in Junius" (287). He later defines "responsion" as "morphemic repetition" (1981d:78), arguing that "rather than being attached to a certain narrative event or pattern and echoing traditionally against other occurrences of the event or pattern, these words respond to proximate partners, lexical relatives usually no more than twenty lines away" and that "many rhetorical figures thought by some critics to be direct borrowings from Latin authors can be derived from the interaction

between responsion and other aspects of Germanic verse form" (1980a:132).

Foley contends that in Old English oral poetry, there are "(1) metrical and (2) verbal formulas and systems" as well as "a 'responsion' of stressed elements which may or may not be involved in verbal formulas" (1980d:49) and that themes have both "the abstract pattern of action, situation, or detail" and "morphemic redundancy" (50). His analysis allows him to posit four levels of traditional formulaic patterns, "(1) metrical formulas and systems, (2) verbal formulas and systems, (3) responsion between nearby elements, and (4) theme" (50). He argues that "each structure is dependent in various ways upon the natural language characteristics of Old English, and while they may be in differing degrees compared to analogs in Serbo-Croatian and Greek, they are also tradition-dependent and therefore deserving of their own definitions and dynamics" (50). His study leads him to suggest that Anglo-Saxonists must use two criteria when they apply the comparative method. The first is "the criterion of *tradition-dependence*, which demands an examination of the differences as well as the similarities among the . . . oral poetries to be compared" (47), a criterion somewhat similar to that applied to Homeric research by Adam Parry, who points out "an external difference in the traditions of ancient Greek and Yugoslav poetry" (1966:212). Foley's second criterion is "*genre-dependence*, the extent to which the poems . . . match in genre" (1980d:47).

Stating that the comparative method "must *compare* rather than *reduce*" (53), Foley applies his own insights in two excellent articles about minor genres in Old English and Serbo-Croatian. In a study of sound patterns (1980b), he points out that charms depend for their efficacy on sound patterns during oral performance, and he later (1981a) specifically compares charms in Old English and Yugoslav, pointing out that their power depends on their sound. He also makes a careful tradition-dependent study of *Beowulf*, arguing that "the primary site for consistency and patterning is in Old English not the colon of syllabic extent and internal structure but the *stress maximum position* and *secondary stress maximum position*. The SM and SSM have a finite length; each consists of the root of either a single, uncompounded word or an element of a compound—in other words, each is usually a single morpheme. . . . The result will then agree with what has been observed in Old English: a lower percentage of classically

defined formulas and a higher index of variability among systems" (1980a:120).

Some recent critical studies have addressed the question of the nature of the Old English formula. Elizabeth S. Sklar (1975), studying the use in *Maldon* of rhymed formulas like those found in Layamon's *Brut*, implicitly calls for a new theory about Old English formulas to account for rhymed Middle English formulas. Foley points out that "the books and articles stimulated by Lord's *The Singer of Tales* have modified his original insights into an oversimplified model, a *synchronic* bundle of formulas complete in itself, whole, and integral. As Lord and others, especially Peabody, have said repeatedly, however, they are describing a *tradition* rather than one or a group of texts, and a tradition is nothing if not also *diachronic* rather than synchronic only" (1979:10). He emphasizes that we must "develop definitions and models for traditional units that are both faithful to each literature . . . and, in broad terms, comparable to those posited for other literatures" (11). In an important study, Anita Riedinger attempts "to isolate the characteristics of the formula within the Old English, rather than the Homeric, poetic tradition" (1985:294), also identifying a formulaic level she calls a "set," which she defines as "the repetition of one general concept + one system + one function" (317); the idea needs further exploration and refinement but is extremely promising. In another article, Foley uses computer analysis to provide a new approach to the formularity of *Beowulf*. His computer study shows that "*Beowulf* reveals, upon computer analysis, conclusive evidence of a single rhythmic template which generates 94% of all lines metrically recoverable from the unique manuscript and the Thorkelin transcriptions" (1976:207) and that "the metrical template in Anglo-Saxon . . . is by nature an oral-aural template" (219). His work enables him to propose a new definition of the Old English formula: "A verbal formula in Old English poetry is a recurrent substitutable phrase one half-line in length which results from the intersection of two compositional parameters—a morphemic focus at positions of metrical stress and a limited number of metrical formulas" (1981e:274).

Because of the oral-aural nature of *Beowulf*, Foley speculates that even literate Old English poets must have "depended to a much more significant degree on aural intake and oral output than on visual apprehension and written expression" (1976:220) than do modern poets, so that Old English poems must be approached as

oral. Rosenberg suggests that more study of contemporary oral literature would assist medievalists in their quest to define the formula and to determine which works are oral: "Is the oral formula a poetic device exclusively? Professor Ilhan Başgöz has found formulas among the prose narrative *hikaye* of Turkey which are not metrical at all—at least not metrically organized throughout the performance—and actually many of these narratives are blends of poetry and prose." (1981:444) He also argues that oral narrative can be non-traditional and that oral poets composing original songs may not contribute to a tradition, suggesting that "the folklorist or anthropologist will tell us more about the responses and expectations of the traditional audience . . . . The cognitive psychologist can help us understand the dynamics of the input, storage, and retrieval processes in memory." (448) In just such a study, David C. Rubin discusses cognitive psychology, especially "coding, [which] refers to what is stored in memory during learning" (1981:174) and which determines what people remember accurately and what they remember erroneously. Similarly, Fry discusses Bede's story of Cædmon in terms of theories that memory is divided into perception and recall and that Homer played an educative role in his society. Speaking of Old English poetry, Fry points out that "the scholars did not memorize the poems and then write them down. Rather they wrote them down from Cædmon's memory in order to memorize them for themselves. . . . The scholars feed Cædmon sacred narrative and/or doctrine, and he manufactures palatable verse, which they record and memorize." (1981:289) Fry's studies produce a revolutionary theory for oral-formulaic studies in Old English, namely that "the English church used written poetry as an educational device, transmitted largely in memorized form. And Cædmon and his memory began the whole process." (288) He postulates that "Anglo-Saxon Christian poets . . . wrote in the inherited formulaic style, whose familiarity and formal properties made the poems easy to memorize. Christian learning spread through an illiterate population by means of memory and recitation, all radiating from an author's original manuscript. . . . The manuscript of a traditional society, of the nonliterate Anglo-Saxons, was memory." (291)

Several scholars have proposed new ideas about oral-formulaic research which promise to be of influence in the future. Joshua H. Bonner argues that scholars should define the "grammar" which

was used during the Old English period rather than look for explanations of literary devices in Latin rhetorical handbooks, and should study the poetry in terms of both the grammatical and the oral-formulaic theories. He suggests that "to imply that the Germanic oral traditions, poetic and forensic, could not have developed grammatical devices which enhance poetic expression and the power to persuade closes off fruitful avenues of enquiry" (1976:226). His article has the potential to revolutionize Old English studies should scholars follow his advice. Francelia Clark calls for a more careful application of the terminology concerning themes and type-scenes to Old English poetry, arguing that themes as Lord defines them are not found in *Beowulf*; like Foley, she points out that "the oral theory is expanding to show us that oral literatures are composed on different principles, that Serbo-Croatian epic is *a* model but not *the* model" (1981:189) and calls for tradition-dependent research on oral-formulaic features. Olsen has reasoned that it is probable that Old English poetry affected Anglo-Latin prose because both were composed in the same monasteries, with the result that "the relationship between Old English poetry and Latin prose is far more complex than has hitherto been assumed" (1983:273), a suggestion that should promote more dynamic study of both Anglo-Latin and Old English works. In a brilliant study of *The Husband's Message*, Renoir argues that we must read Old English poetry with an awareness of both its oral-formulaic nature and "the context of its original manuscript text" (1981b:75) because there is a deliberate contrast between the message of the poem and "the disheartening prospect evoked by the logic of the presumed external situation" (76) in the manuscript. Although Nist in 1957 called attention to the fact that "*Beowulf*, as transmitted in *Vitellius A.xv*, indicates its accentual system by means of word division, its line organization by means of periods, and its semantic interpretation and frequently its scansional and sound-pattern details by means of acute accent marks" (338), thus showing that the manuscript itself was set up to perpetuate the oral tradition of *Beowulf*, Renoir's article reminds Anglo-Saxonists that they must be sensitive to many contexts—including that of the manuscripts—as they seek to understand Old English poetry. In particular, Renoir reminds us that "familiarity with oral-formulaic elements will enable us to sense much more through association than is explicitly stated in a text composed within the oral-formulaic tradition" (1987:541).

IX. Future Directions

At the beginning of this study, I posed certain questions addressed during the controversy over the oral-formulaic nature of Old English poetry. Were the poems composed orally or in writing? Were they improvised during performance or composed beforehand and memorized? Were they heard by their audience or read in manuscript form? Was the most important influence on their style and content a native tradition deriving from the common Germanic past or a learned Latin rhetorical tradition? What is the relationship between their possible orality and their obvious aesthetic excellence? Although these questions have not been answered to the satisfaction of all scholars, it seems possible that they may be in the future with the work of a new generation of scholars, unprejudiced by the controversies of the past. Foley points out that the "pioneering statements" of the oral-formulaic theory were "in need of elaboration and, in some areas, of recasting" (1983:184), and the "elaboration" and "recasting" have been done by such scholars as Foley, Fry, Creed, and Renoir, although there remains more of both to do.

In the area of research concerning the nature of the Old English oral formula, Bynum has challenged oral-formulaists to bypass the work of Magoun and his followers and to re-examine Parry's definition of the formula and apply it to Old English poetry. He argues that "even a moderately strict constructionist of Parry's method must admit that work in Anglo-Saxon *has yet to be begun* in a mode faithful to the original model. And until Parry's own method (rather than the mechanistically imitative, unreasoning one devised by Magoun) has actually been applied to the one text in Anglo-Saxon that is by its genre clearly appropriate to the Parry Test, namely *Beowulf*, and the results of that application are carefully compared with Parry's results for Homer, there can be no basis for speculation about the orality of any other texts in Anglo-Saxon within the framework of the Parry theory." (1978:10-11) This challenge suggests that Anglo-Saxonists need to study the formulas in *Beowulf* again to determine both their relationship to Homer's formulas and their tradition-dependent nature. Lord comments that "in Anglo-Saxon research needs to be done not merely in numbers of formulas . . . but also, and more particularly in specific formulas. . . . It would be useful to know . . . what formulas are common to *Beowulf* and

to the religious poems. . . . It would be helpful to know what formulas occur only in the religious poems—and so forth. The purpose is to determine not only whether a tradition exists but what its content is." (1974:204) Although Lord made this call more than ten years ago, the research is still to be done. In addition, there is a need for studies that discuss the functions played by formulas in various poems, research like that carried out by Sharon Elizabeth Butler in her 1976 dissertation, "Distribution and Rhetorical Function of Formulas in Cynewulf's Signed Poems," and by Olsen in *Speech, Song, and Poetic Craft: The Artistry of the Cynewulf Canon* (1984).

Linguistic study has made many contributions which have in turn enabled scholars to develop more precise definitions of the formula, and it seems likely that linguistics will continue to help us understand oral-formulaic composition in the future. Janet Duthie Collins, for example, points out that because Old English poetry was oral, it had to conform to ordinary speech patterns in order to communicate its ideas and theorizes that "for Old English the poetic works of one man should present related linguistic profiles" and that "no two poets, even though of the same time period, should show exactly the same linguistic profile. Idiosyncratic differences in usage should distinguish between two poets." (1983:534) Although, as Fry points out, we must be careful not to deny "the essence of formulaic poetry, its function as a group activity, as a means of education and cohesion with tribal associates, alive and ancestral" because "the traditional poet performs with diction and structures borrowed from others, within inherited patterns" and because "isolating the traditional poet within his own corpus smacks of Romantic and post-Romantic notions of poetry and unique genius" (1979:3), the linguistic perception that there are "idiosyncratic differences in usage" should help us refine the definition of the formula.

Disciplines other than linguistics have influenced Old English oral-formulaic research and should continue to do so. Creed argues that one must study the composition of *Beowulf* as part of "an all-embracing attempt to theorize about natural language communication" (1987:140). Analyzing *Beowulf* in terms of Information Theory, and arguing that "*Beowulf* represents a point of contact between two different technologies," the oral and the written, he states that *Beowulf* is "a link to one of the most powerful forces that have shaped ourselves and our cultures:

memorable speech" (140, 157). The application of Information Theory to other Old English poems should provide fruitful insights about the intersection of oral and written poetry.

Rosenberg (1981) has stated that he wishes to encourage scholars to re-examine living oral traditions in order to understand how medieval poetry may have been composed, but few medievalists perform such research. Foley, an expert in Serbo-Croatian studies as well as in Old English, has proposed a broadening of the Yugoslav model for oral poetry. He suggests that an appropriate model, which "diverges from the Parry-Lord orthodoxy on a number of issues," comes from "the Christian oral epic in the South Slavic tradition, as opposed to the longer Muslim epic . . . that Lord has made the primary and nearly exclusive comparand in his studies" (1983:189). Foley suggests that poets like the Yugoslav oral poets in the Christian tradition "composed some of the more finely-worked Anglo-Saxon poems, and in particular the shorter lyrics" (202), and that the briefer oral songs "add a crucially important dimension to the comparison by illustrating how a poet can in fact combine oral traditional structure with a literary sensitivity to produce memorable poetry" (214). Fieldwork should continue to provide us with such insights into the oral-formulaic nature of Old English poetry.

Anglo-Saxonists interested in the traditional and formulaic nature of Old English poetry need to make more use of computers in their discussions of formularity. One model is that proposed by Foley for Serbo-Croatian and other texts; he argues that since "the key to understanding the text is to recreate the poem, and for oral traditional epic recreating the poem means reinvesting the text with traditional meaning" (1984:83), a computer can be used to restore "traditional context to a work" (85) by researching occurrences of a particular pattern in the data bank. He suggests that a similar procedure could be used to illuminate ancient Greek and Old English texts. In his computer study that identifies the metrical formula, Foley points out that computer analysis can show whether "the same rhythmic idea pervades . . . the entire poetic corpus" (1976:219). Since the study leads Foley to conclude that Old English poetry may indeed have been composed orally, and since the question of orality is still a vexed one, it seems reasonable that further computer studies of the metrical formulas of Old English poetry—particularly of the poems of Cynewulf, which have always been problematic because of the runic signatures—

should be made to validate, expand, or deny the validity of Foley's research. In addition, scholars who are interested in the orality of various texts should expand the schema of oral-formulaic structure used by Peabody and Creed to make it applicable to other poems in the corpus, again especially the poems of Cynewulf. If the five tests are indeed "tests of traditional orality" (Creed 1981:197), then they should demonstrate whether the poems of Cynewulf are oral or written. Creed points out that "what is at stake is *Beowulf*'s relationship both to the past of the Indo-European linguistic community . . . and also to us" and an understanding of the entire range of Old English poetry, both oral and written, would help us understand the "diachronic depth" (207) of all Old English poems.

Foley argues that future Old English and oral-formulaic research should involve "an increased awareness of methodological preliminaries in oral studies," and he proposes "that three principles be observed in formulating this kind of comparison: tradition-dependence, genre-dependence, and text-dependence" (1985:68). In addition, in an effort to open oral literature research up to "ideas of poetics and critical methodology" (1981c:144), he proposes "a 'program for reading' traditional texts" (122) depending on whether the text exists in a manuscript, a taped recording, or some other medium and whether it is definitely of oral provenance or simply oral-derived. Following Gregory Nagy (1979) in Homeric studies, Foley argues that scholars must recognize "that a traditional text is not simply a synchronic latticework . . . but also a diachronic document of great age and depth." (124) Foley reminds us that "it does not follow that tradition, even *oral* tradition, ends with the poet's or culture's first draught of literacy . . . . What continues . . . is some vestige of orality and some vestige of tradition. . . . Texts which exhibit undeniably oral traditional features, no matter how uncertain a provenance a fair examination of their known history may produce, cannot be treated as or classed with literary works of a much later time." (127-28)

Another promising method lies in a more sophisticated use of the composite method than many scholars have made, an appreciation of the complex mixture of traditions that lies behind, for example, formulaic hagiographic poetry. With the growing sophistication of oral-formulaic studies, it seems that there should be a corresponding sophistication in the study of classical and Patristic backgrounds of Old English poetry so that a blend of the two methods would help us to understand the poetry in new and

exciting ways. For example, Kathryn Hume's excellent analysis of the theme of the hall in Old English poetry, which shows that "when chaos and violence take the form of a definite antagonist, a malignant being, its dwelling becomes an anti-hall" (1974:68), could be merged with oral-formulaic thematic studies to explain the theme in its widest possible context. Or, to take another example, Peter R. Schroeder's insight that "Old English art and poetry are outgrowths or expressions of the same culture, and that similarities between the two may result from an identical aesthetic impulse" (1974:185) could be expanded to construct an interdisciplinary analogy of great value. As Schroeder observes, "we sense a difference between Old English (or more generally, early Germanic) poetry and other, at least equally Christian literatures" (195-96), and "a great deal of work must still be done to define a stylistic tradition that can include *Beowulf*, *Exodus*, and the Eddic poems" (197), and the use of the composite method, as well as greater sophistication in oral-formulaic studies as suggested by scholars like Creed and Foley, should, in the future, help define that tradition. Renoir points out that "certain rhetorical features are clearly oral-formulaic, but we have thus far devised no test capable of demonstrating to everybody's satisfaction that any particular poem was composed either orally or in writing" (539); it is to be hoped that as we enter this new era of oral-formulaic studies, scholars will devise such tests, as well as tests that will provide definitive answers to the other questions concerning oral-formularity in Old English poetry.

University of Denver

Notes

[1]In a 1987 article that appeared after this essay was written, Hieatt makes a further contribution to the study of the envelope pattern as "an important rhetorical device arising out of the formulaic nature of oral poetry" (256).

[2]See further the survey article on oral studies and Middle English literature by Ward Parks, in *Oral Tradition*, 1:636-94.

References

Abrahams 1978
: Robert D. Abrahams. "License to Repeat and Be Predictable." *Folklore Preprints Series*, 6:1-13.

Anderson 1983
: Earl R. Anderson. *Cynewulf: Structure, Style, and Theme in His Poetry*. London: Associated University Press.

Barnes 1970
: Daniel R. Barnes. "Folktale Morphology and the Structure of *Beowulf*." *Speculum*, 45:416-34.

Barnes 1979
: _____. "Toward the Establishment of Principles for the Study of Folklore and Literature." *Southern Folklore Quarterly*, 43:5-16.

Bartlett 1935
: Adeline C. Bartlett. *The Larger Rhetorical Patterns in Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 122. Morningside Heights, NY: Columbia University Press.

Beale 1979
: Walter H. Beale. "Rhetoric in the Old English Verse-Paragraph." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 80:133-42.

Benson 1966
: Larry D. Benson. "The Literary Character of Anglo-Saxon Formulaic Poetry." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 81:334-41.

Benson 1970
: _____. "The Originality of *Beowulf*." In *The Interpretation of Narrative: Theory and Practice*, ed. Morton W. Bloomfield. Harvard English Studies, 1. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press. pp. 1-44.

Bleeth 1969
: Kenneth A. Bleeth. "*Juliana*, 647-52." *Medium Ævum*, 38:119-22.

Bliss 1971
: A. J. Bliss. "Single Half-Lines in Old English Poetry." *Notes & Queries*, 18:442-49.

Bloomfield 1968
: Morton W. Bloomfield. "Understanding Old English Poetry." *Annuale Mediaevale*, 9:5-25.

Bolton 1978
: Whitney F. Bolton. *Alcuin and "Beowulf": An Eighth-Century View*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Bonjour 1957a
: Adrien Bonjour. "*Beowulf* and the Beasts of Battle." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 72:563-73.

Bonjour 1957b
: _____. "Poésie hérolque du moyen âge et critique littéraire." *Romania*, 78:243-55.

Bonjour 1958
: _____. "*Beowulf* et l'épopée anglo-saxonne." *La Table ronde*, 132:140-51.

Bonner 1976
Joshua H. Bonner. "Toward a Unified Critical Approach to Old English Poetic Composition." *Modern Philology*, 73:219-28.

Britton 1974
G. C. Britton. "Repetition and Contrast in the Old English *Later Genesis*." *Neophilologus*, 58:66-73.

Brodeur 1959
Arthur G. Brodeur. *The Art of* "*Beowulf*." Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brodeur 1968
_____. "A Study of Diction and Style in Three Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poems." in *Nordica et Anglica: Studies in Honor of Stefán Einarsson*, ed. Allan H. Orrick. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 97-114.

Brodeur 1970
_____. "*Beowulf* One Poem or Three?" In *Medieval Literature and Folklore Studies: Essays in Honor of Francis Lee Utley*, ed. Jerome Mandel and Bruce A. Rosenberg. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. pp. 3-26.

Bryan 1929
William F. Bryan. "Epithetic Compound Folk-Names in *Beowulf*." In *Studies in English Philology: A Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber*, ed. Kemp Malone and Martin B. Ruud. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. pp. 120-34.

Bullard 1969
Marcia Bullard. "Some Objections to the Formulaic Theory of the Composition of Anglo-Saxon Poetry." *Bulletin of the Rocky Mountain Modern Language Association*, 21:11-16.

Butler 1976
Sharon Elizabeth Butler. "Distribution and Rhetorical Functions of Formulas in Cynewulf's Signed Poems." Ph.D. dissertation (University of Western Ontario).

Bynum 1969
David E. Bynum. "The Generic Nature of Oral Epic Poetry." *Genre*, 2:236-58.

Bynum 1978
_____. *The Daemon in the Wood: A Study of Oral Narrative Patterns*. Publications of the Milman Parry Collection, Monograph Series, 1. Cambridge, MA: Center for the Study of Oral Literature; dist. by Harvard University Press.

Calder 1981
Daniel G. Calder. *Cynewulf*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Campbell 1962
Alistair Campbell. Review of Albert B. Lord's *The Singer of Tales*. *Modern Language Review*, 57:75-76.

Campbell 1971
_____. "The Use in *Beowulf* of Earlier Heroic Verse." In *England Before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 283-92.

Campbell 1960
Jackson J. Campbell. "Oral Poetry in *The Seafarer*." *Speculum*, 35:87-96.
Campbell 1966
_____. "Learned Rhetoric in Old English Poetry." *Modern Philology*, 63:189-201.
Capek 1970
Michael J. Capek. "A Note on Formula Development in Old Saxon." *Modern Philology*, 67:357-63.
Carter 1974
Hazel Carter. "Poetry and Society: Aspects of Shona, Old English and Old Norse Literature." *Zambezia*, 3:11-25.
Cherniss 1972
Michael D. Cherniss. *Ingeld and Christ: Heroic Concepts and Values in Old English Christian Poetry*. The Hague: Mouton.
Clark 1981
Francelia Clark. "Flyting in *Beowulf* and Rebuke in *The Song of Bagdad*: The Question of Theme." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 164-93.
Clark 1973
George Clark. "*Beowulf* and *Njálssaga*." In *Proceedings of the First International Saga Conference, University of Edinburgh*, 1971, ed. Peter Foote, Hermann Pálsson, and Desmond Slay. London: Viking Society for Northern Research, University College. pp. 66-87.
Collins 198$
Janet Duthie Collins. 1983. "Cynewulf or Cynewulfian?" *The Ninth LACUS Forum, 1983*, ed. John Morreall. Columbia, SC: Hornbeam Press. pp. 532-39.
Conlee 1970
John W. Conlee. "A Note on Verse Composition in the *Meters of Boethius*." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 71:576-85.
Creed 1959
Robert P. Creed. "The Making of an Anglo-Saxon Poem." *English Literary History*, 26:445-54. Rpt. with "Additional Remarks" in *The Beowulf Poet: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Donald K. Fry. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968. pp. 141-53.
Creed 1966
_____. "wél-hwelć ȝecwæþ. . .': The Singer as Architect." *Tennessee Studies in Literature*, 11:131-43.
Creed 1975
_____. "Widsith's Journey Through Germanic Tradition." In *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Essays in Appreciation for John C. McGalliard*, ed. Lewis E. Nicholson and Dolores W. Frese. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. pp. 376-87.
Creed 1981
_____. "The *Beowulf*-Poet: Master of Sound Patterning." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 194-216.

Creed 1987

_____. "*Beowulf* on the Brink: Information Theory as Key to the Origins of the Poem." In *Comparative Research on Oral Traditions: A Memorial for Milman Parry*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 139-60.

Curschmann 1967

Michael Curschmann. "Oral Poetry in Mediaeval English, French, and German Literature: Some Notes on Recent Research." *Speculum*, 42:36-52.

De Lavan 1981

Joanne De Lavan. "Feasts and Anti-Feasts in *Beowulf* and the *Odyssey*." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 235-61.

Derolez 1961

R. Derolez. "Anglo-Saxon Literature: 'Attic' or 'Asiatic'? Old English Poetry and its Latin Background." *English Studies Today*, 2:93-105.

Diamond 1958

Robert E. Diamond. "Heroic Diction in *The Dream of the Rood*." In *Studies in Honor of John Wilcox*, ed. A. Doyle Wallace and Woodburn O. Ross. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. pp. 3-7.

Diamond 1959

_____. "The Diction of the Signed Poems of Cynewulf." *Philological Quarterly*, 38:228-41.

Diamond 1963

_____. *The Diction of the Anglo-Saxon Metrical Psalms*. Janus Linguarum, Series Practica, 10. The Hague: Mouton.

Duggan 1976

Hoyt N. Duggan. "The Rôle of Formulas in the Dissemination of a Middle English Alliterative Romance." *Studies in Bibliography*, 29:265-88.

Duggan 1977

_____. "Strophic Patterns in Middle English Alliterative Poetry." *Modern Philology*, 74:223-47.

Earl 1980

James W. Earl. "The Typological Structure of *Andreas*." In *Old English Literature in Context: Ten Essays*, ed. John D. Niles. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer. pp. 66-89 and 167-70.

Edwards 1983

Carol L. Edwards. "The Parry-Lord Theory Meets Operational Structuralism." *Journal of American Folklore*, 96:151-69.

Ehrstine 1965

John W. Ehrstine. "Patterns of Sound in Anglo-Saxon Poetry." *Research Studies* (Washington State Univ.), 33:151-62.

Elliott 1961

Ralph W. V. Elliott. "Landscape and Rhetoric in the Middle-English Alliterative Poetry." *Melbourne Critical Review*, 4:65-76.

Elliott 1962

_____. "Byrhtnoth and Hildebrand: A Study in Heroic Technique." *Comparative Literature*, 14:53-70.

Faigley 1978 (for 1976-77)
Lester Faigley. "New Wine in Old Bottles; The Conflict of Style in Old English Religious Poetry." *Proceedings of the Linguistic Circle of Manitoba and North Dakota*, 16-17:14-15.

Finnegan 1977
Ruth H. Finnegan. *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance, and Social Context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foley 1976
John Miles Foley. "Formula and Theme in Old English Poetry." In *Oral Literature and the Formula*, ed. Benjamin A. Stolz and Richard S. Shannon. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies, University of Michigan. pp. 207-38.

Foley 1979
_____. "Formulaic Befuddlement: Traditional Oral Phraseology and Comparative Prosody." In *In Geardagum*, 3:7-17.

Foley 1980a
_____. "*Beowulf* and Traditional Narrative Song: The Potential and Limits of Comparison." In *Old English Literature in Context: Ten Essays*, ed. John D. Niles. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer. pp. 117-36 and 173-78.

Foley 1980b
_____. "Epic and Charm in Old English and Serbo-Croatian Oral Tradition." *Comparative Criticism*, 2:71-92.

Foley 1980c
_____. "Hybrid Prosody and Single Half-lines in Old English and Serbo-Croatian Poetry." *Neophilologus*, 64:284-89.

Foley 1980d
_____. "The Viability of the Comparative Method in Oral Literature Research." *The Comparatist*, 4:47-56.

Foley 1981a
_____. *"Læcdom* and *Bajanje*: A Comparative Study of Old English and Serbo-Croatian Charms." *Centerpoint*, 4:33-40.

Foley 198l b
_____. "Narrativity in *Beowulf*, the *Odyssey*, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song." In *Proceedings of the IXth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association, 1: Classical Models in Literature*, ed. Zoran Konstantinović, Warren Anderson, and Walter Dietze. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 49. Innsbruck: University of Innsbruck. pp. 295-301.

Foley 1981c
_____. "Oral Texts, Traditional Texts: Poetics and Critical Methods." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies*, 15:122-45.

Foley 1981d
_____. "The Oral Theory in Context." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 27-122.

Foley 1981e
_____. "Tradition-dependent and -independent Features in Oral Literature: A Comparative View of the Formula." In *Oral Traditional*

Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 262-81.

Foley 1983

_____. "Literary Art and Oral Tradition in Old English and Serbian Poetry." *Anglo-Saxon England*, 12:183-214.

Foley 1984 (for 1981)

_____. "Editing Oral Epic Texts: Theory and Practice." *Text*, 1:75-94.

Foley 1985

_____. "Introduction." In his *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research: An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography*. Garland Folklore Bibliographies, 6. New York: Garland. pp. 3-77.

Foley and Kerewsky-Halpern 1976

_____. and Barbara Kerewsky-Halpern. "'Udovica Jana': A Case Study of an Oral Performance." *Slavonic and East European Review*, 54:11-23.

Fry 1968

Donald K. Fry. "The Artistry of *Beowulf*." In *The Beowulf Poet: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Donald K. Fry. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. pp. 1-7.

Fry 1979

_____. "Old English Formulaic Statistics." In *In Geardagum*, 3:1-6.

Fry 1981

_____. "The Memory of Cædmon." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 282-93.

Gardner 1973

Thomas Gardner. "How Free Was the *Beowulf* Poet?" *Modern Philology*, 71:111-27.

Catch 1971

Milton McC. Gatch. *Loyalties and Traditions: Man and His World in Old English Literature*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Goldsmith 1970

Margaret E. Goldsmith. *The Mode and Meaning of Beowulf*. London: Athlone Press.

Greenfield 1955

Stanley B. Greenfield. "The Formulaic Expression of the Theme of 'Exile' in Anglo-Saxon Poetry." *Speculum*, 30:200-6.

Greenfield 1963

_____. "Syntactic Analysis and Old English Poetry." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 64:373-78.

Greenfield 1967a

_____. "The Canons of Old English Criticism." *English Literary History*, 34:141-55.

Greenfield 1967b

_____. "Grendel's Approach to Heorot: Syntax and Poetry." In *Old English Poetry: Fifteen Essays*, ed. Robert P. Creed. Providence: Brown University Press. pp. 275-84.

Greenfield 1972

_____. *The Interpretation of Old English Poems*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hanning 1973

Robert W. Hanning. "Sharing, Dividing, Depriving—The Verbal Ironies of Grendel's Last Visit to Heorot." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 15:203-13.

Harris 1983

Joseph Harris. "Eddic Poetry as Oral Poetry: The Evidence of Parallel Passages in the Helgi Poems for Questions of Composition and Performance." In *Edda: A Collection of Essays*, ed. Robert J. Glendinning and Haraldur Bessason. University of Manitoba Icelandic Studies, 4. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press. pp. 210-42.

Hart 1972

Thomas E. Hart. "Tectonic Design, Formulaic Craft, and Literary Execution: The Episodes of Finn and Ingeld in '*Beowulf*'." *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 2:1-61.

Hatto 1973

Arthur T. Hatto. "Germanic and Kirgiz Heroic Poetry: Some Comparisons and Contrasts." In *Deutung und Bedeutung: Studies in German and Comparative Literature Presented to Karl-Werner Maurer*, ed. Brigitte Schludermann, Victor G. Doerksen, Robert J. Glendinning, and Evelyn Scherabon Firchow. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 19-33.

Hatzfeld 1969

Helmut A. Hatzfeld. "Les Etudes de style et la littérature médiévale." In *Mélanges offerts à Rita Lejeune, professeur à l'Université de Liège*, 2. Gembloux: Duculot. pp. 1601-11.

Haymes 1976

Edward R. Haymes. "Oral Poetry and the Germanic *Heldenlied*." *Rice University Studies*, 62:47-54.

Haymes 1980

_____. "Formulaic Density and Bishop Njegoš." *Comparative Literature*, 32:390-401.

Haymes 1981

_____. "Oral Composition in Middle High German Epic Poetry." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 341-46.

Heusler 1969

Andreas Heusler. "Das Nibelungenlied and die Epenfrage." *Kleine Schriften*, 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 132-54.

Hieatt 1975

Constance B. Hieatt. "Envelope Patterns and the Structure of *Beowulf*." *English Studies in Canada*, 1:250-65.

Hieatt 1980

_____. "*Judith* and the Literary Function of Old English Hypermetric Lines." *Studia Neophilologica*, 52:251-57.

Hieatt 1987

_____. "On Envelope Patterns (Ancient and—Relatively—Modern) and Nonce Formulas." In *Comparative Research on Oral Traditions: A*

Memorial for Milman Parry, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 245-58.

Holoka 1976
James P. Holoka. "The Oral Formula and Anglo-Saxon Elegy: Some Misgivings." *Neophilologus*, 60:570-76.

Hume 1974
Kathryn Hume. "The Concept of the Hall in Old English Poetry." *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3:63-74.

Irving 1967
Edward B. Irving, Jr. "Image and Meaning in the Elegies." In *Old English Poetry: Fifteen Essays*, ed. Robert P. Creed. Providence: Brown University Press. pp. 153-66.

Isaacs 1967
Neil D. Isaacs. "The Convention of Personification in *Beowulf*." In *Old English Poetry: Fifteen Essays*, ed. Robert P. Creed. Providence: Brown University Press. pp. 215-48.

Isaacs 1968
_____. "Progressive Identifications: The Structural Principle of *The Dream of the Rood*." In *Structural Principles in Old English Poetry*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. pp. 3-18.

Jabbour 1969
Alan Jabbour. "Memorial Transmission in Old English Poetry." *Chaucer Review*, 3:174-90.

Johnson 1975
James D. Johnson. "'The Hero on the Beach' in the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 76:271-81.

Jones 1966
Alison G. Jones. "*Daniel* and *Azarias* as Evidence for the Oral-Formulaic Character of Old English Poetry." *Medium Ævum*, 35:95-102.

Kellogg 1965
Robert L. Kellogg. "The South Germanic Oral Tradition." In *Franciplegius: Medieval and Linguistic Studies in Honor of Francis Peabody Magoun, Jr.*, ed. Jess B. Bessinger, Jr., and Robert P. Creed. New York: New York University Press. pp. 66-74.

Kerling 1982
J. Kerling. "Sievers and Scops: A Revaluation of Old English Poetic Techniques." *Dutch Quarterly Review of Anglo-American Letters*, 12:125-40.

Kirk 1960
G. S. Kirk. "Homer and Modern Oral Poetry: Some Confusions." *Classical Quarterly*, n.s. 10:271-81.

Kirk 1966
_____. "Formular Language and Oral Quality." *Yale Classical Studies*, 20:155-74.

Kiser 1984
Lisa J. Kiser. "*Andreas* and the *Lifes Weg*: Convention and Innovation in Old English Metaphor." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 85:65-75.

Knipp 1972
Christopher Knipp. "*Beowulf* 2210b-2323: Repetition in the Description

of the Dragon's Hoard." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 73:775-85.

Lapidge 1979

Michael Lapidge. "Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse." *Comparative Literature*, 31:209-31.

Lawrence 1966

R. F. Lawrence. "The Formulaic Theory and its Application to English Alliterative Poetry." In *Essays on Style and Language*, ed. Roger Fowler. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. pp. 166-83.

Lawrence 1970

_____. "Formula and Rhythm in *The Wars of Alexander*." English Studies, 5:97-112.

Lewis 1975

Richard A. Lewis. "Plurilinear Alliteration in Old English Poetry." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 16:589-602.

Liberman 1977

Anatoly Liberman. "The Concept of 'Literary Theme'." *Enclitic*, 1:49-56.

Liberman 1978

_____. "The Oral-Formulaic Theory and the Style of Old Icelandic Poetry." In *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics/3: Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics (University of Texas at Austin, April 5-9, 1976),* ed. John Weinstock. Austin: University of Texas. pp. 442-53.

Lord 1936

Albert B. Lord. "Homer and Huso I: The Singer's Rests in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 67:106-13.

Lord 1948

_____. "Homer and Huso III: Enjambement in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 79:113-24.

Lord 1953

_____. "Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 84:124-34.

Lord 1956

_____. "The Role of Sound Patterns in Serbocroatian Epic." In *For Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Morris Halle. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 301-5.

Lord 1959

_____. "The Poetics of Oral Creation." In *Comparative Literature: Proceedings of the Second Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*, 1, ed. Werner P. Friederich. UNC Studies in Comparative Literature, 23. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. pp. 1-6.

Lord 1960

_____. *The Singer of Tales*. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, 24. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press. Rpt. New York: Atheneum, 1968 et seq.

Lord 1974

_____. "Perspectives on Recent Work on Oral Literature." *Forum for*

Modern Language Studies, 10:187-210.

Lord 1980a

_____. "Interlocking Mythic Patterns in *Beowulf*." In *Old English Literature in Context: Ten Essays*, ed. John D. Niles. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer. pp. 137-42 and 178.

Lord 1980b

_____. "The Mythic Component in Oral Traditional Epic: Its Origins and Significance." *Proceedings of the Comparative Literature Symposium* (Texas Tech University), 11:145-61.

Lord 1981

_____. "Memory, Fixity, and Genre in Oral Traditional Poetries." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 451-61.

Magoun 1954

Francis P. Magoun, Jr. "Béowulf and King Hygelác in the Netherlands: Lost Anglo-Saxon Verse-Stories about this Event." *English Studies*, 35:193-204.

Magoun 1958

_____. "*Béowulf A*': A Folk Variant." *Arv: Journal of Scandinavian Folklore*, 14:95-101.

Magoun 1963

_____. "*Béowulf B*: A Folk-Poem on Béowulf's Death." In *Early English and Norse Studies Presented to Hugh Smith in Honour of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Arthur Brown and Peter Foote. London: Methuen. pp. 127-40.

Mahnberg 1973

Lars Malmberg. "Poetic Originality in *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer*." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 74:220-23.

Malone 1960

Kemp Malone. Review of Godfrid Storms' *Compounded Names of Peoples in "Beowulf," a Study in the Diction of a Great Poet*. *English Studies*, 41:200-5.

Malone 1961

_____. "Cædmon and English Poetry." *Modern Language Notes*, 76:193-95.

Metcalf 1970

Allan A. Metcalf. "On the Authorship and Originality of the *Meters of Boethius*." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 71:185-87.

Metcalf 1973

_____. *Poetic Diction in the Old English Meters of Boethius*. The Hague: Mouton.

Miletich 1976

John S. Miletich. "The Quest for the 'Formula': A Comparative Reappraisal." *Modern Philology*, 74:111-23.

Miletich 1978

_____. "Oral-Traditional Style and Learned Literature: A New Perspective." *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*, 3:345-56.

Monnin 1979
Pierre-Eric Monnin. "Poetic Improvements in the Old English *Meters of Boethius*." *English Studies*, 60:346-60.
Mustanoja 1959
Tauno Mustanoja. "The Presentation of Ancient Germanic Poetry: Looking for Parallels." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 60:1-11.
Nagler 1980
Michael N. Nagler. "*Beowulf* in the Context of Myth." In *Old English Literature in Context: Ten Essays*, ed. John D. Niles. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer. pp. 143-56 and 178-81.
Nagy 1979
Gregory Nagy. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
Nichols 1961
Stephen G. Nichols. *Formulaic Diction and Thematic Composition in the Chanson de Roland*. Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, 36. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Niles 1979
John D. Niles. "Ring Composition and the Structure of *Beowulf*." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 94:924-35.
Nist 1957
John A. Nist. "Textual Elements in the Beourulf Manuscript." *Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters*, 42:331-38.
Norman 1969
Frederick Norman. "The Early Germanic Background of Old English Verse." In *Medieval Literature and Civilization: Studies in Memory of G. N. Garmonsway*, ed. Derek A. Pearsall and Ronald A. Waldron. London: University of London Press. pp. 3-27.
Ogilvy and Baker 1983
J. D. A. Ogilvy and Donald C. Baker. *Reading Beowulf: An Introduction to the Poem, Its Background, and Its Style*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Olsen 1981
Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. *Guthlac of Croyland: A Study of Heroic Hagiography*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
Olsen 1983
_____. "Old English Poetry and Latin Prose: The Reverse Context." *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 34:273-82.
Olsen 1984
_____. *Speech, Song, and Poetic Craft: The Artistry of the Cynewulf Canon*. American University Studies, series 4; English Language and Literature, 15. New York: Peter Lang.
Olsen 1987
_____. "Literary Artistry and the Oral-Formulaic Tradition: The Case of Gower's *Appolinus of Tyre*." In *Comparative Research on Oral Traditions: A Memorial for Milman Parry*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 493-509.
O'Neil 1960
Wayne A. O'Neil. "Another Look at Oral Poetry in *The Seafarer*."

Speculum, 35:596-600.

Opland 1971

Jeff Opland. "'Scop' and 'Imbongi'—Anglo-Saxon and Bantu Oral Poets." *English Studies in Africa*, 14:161-78.

Opland 1973

_____. "African Phenomena Relevant to a Study of the European Middle Ages: Oral Tradition." *English Studies in Africa*, 16:87-90.

Opland 1975

_____. *"Imbongi Nezibongo:* The Xhosa Tribal Poet and the Contemporary Poetic Tradition." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 90:185-208.

Opland 1977

_____. "Cædmon and Ntsikana: Anglo-Saxon and Xhosa Traditional Poets." *Annals of the Grahamstown Historical Society*, 56-65.

Opland 1980a

_____. *Anglo-Saxon Oral Poetry: A Study of the Traditions*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Opland 1980b

_____. "From Horseback to Monastic Cell: The Impact on English Literature of the Introduction to Writing." In *Old English Literature in Context: Ten Essays*, ed. John D. Niles. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer. pp. 30-43.

Opland 1980c

_____. "Southeastern Bantu Eulogy and Early Indo-European Poetry." *Research in African Literatures*, 11:295-307.

Opland 1984

_____. "*Scop* and *Imbongi* III: The Exploitation of Tradition." In *The Word-Singers*, ed. Norman Simms. Hamilton, New Zealand: Outrigger Publishers. pp. 44-59.

Orton 1979

P. R. Orton. "The OE 'Soul and Body': A Further Examination." *Medium Ævum*, 48:173-97.

Orton 1983

_____. "Cædmon and Christian History." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 84:163-70.

Palumbo 1977

Edward Palumbo. *The Literary Use of Formulas in "Guthlac II" and their Relation to Felix's "Vita Sancti Guthlaci*." De Proprietatibus Litterarum, Series Practica, 37. The Hague: Mouton.

Parry 1966

Adam Parry. "Have We Homer's *Iliad*?" *Yale Classical Studies*, 20:177-216.

Payne 1977

Richard C. Payne. "Formulaic Poetry in Old English and Its Backgrounds." *Studies in Medieval Culture*, 11:41-49.

Peabody 1975

Berkley Peabody. *The Winged Word: A Study in the Technique of Ancient Greek Oral Composition as Seen Principally through Hesiod's Works and Days*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Reinhard 1976
Mariann Reinhard. *On the Semantic Relevance of the Alliterative Collocations in Beowulf*. Schweizer Anglistische Arbeiten, 92. Bern: A. Francke.
Renoir 1962a
Alain Renoir. "*Judith* and the Limits of Poetry." *English Studies*, 43:145-55.
Renoir 1962b
_____. "Point of View and Design for Terror in *Beowulf*." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 63:154-67.
Renoir 1963
_____"The Heroic Oath in *Beowulf*, the *Chanson de Roland*, and the *Nibelungenlied*." In *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield. Eugene: University of Oregon Press. pp. 237-66.
Renoir 1966
_____. "Originality, Influence, Imitation: Two Mediaeval Phases." In *Proceedings of the IVth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*, 2. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 737-46.
Renoir 1976a
_____. "Christ Ihesu's Beasts of Battle: A Note on Oral-Formulaic Theme Survival." *Neophilologus*, 60:455-59.
Renoir 1976b
_____. "Oral Theme and Written Texts." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 3:337-46.
Renoir 1978
_____. "*Beowulf* A Contextual Introduction to its Contents and Techniques." In *Heroic Epic and Saga*, ed. Felix J. Oinas. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 99-119.
Renoir 1981a
_____. "Fragment: An Oral-Formulaic Nondefinition." In *Fragments: Incompletion and Discontinuity*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman. *New York Literary Forum*, 8-9:39-50.
Renoir 1981b
_____. "The Least Elegiac of the Elegies: A Contextual Glance at *The Husband's Message*." *Studia Neophilologica*, 53:69-76.
Renoir 1981c
Alain Renoir. "Oral-Formulaic Context: Implications for the Comparative Criticism of Mediaeval Texts." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 416-39.
Renoir 1987
_____. "Repetition, Oral-Formulaic Style, and Affective Impact in Mediaeval Poetry: A Tentative Illustration." In *Comparative Research on Oral Traditions: A Memorial for Milman Parry*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 533-48.
Riedinger 1985
Anita Riedinger. "The Old English Formula in Context." *Speculum*, 60:294-317.

Ritzke-Rutherford 1981
_____. "Formulaic Microstructure: The Cluster." In *The Alliterative Movie Arthure: A Reassessment of the Poem*, ed. Karl H. Göller. Arthurian Studies, 3. London: D. S. Brewer. pp. 70-82 and 167-69.

Rogers 1966a
H. L. Rogers. "The Crypto-Psychological Character of the Oral Formula." *English Studies*, 47:89-102.

Rogers 1966b
_____. "The Oral Composition of Epic: Some Current Ideas Examined." In *Proceedings and Papers of the Tenth Congress of the Australasian Universities' Language and Literature Association (AULLA) Held at the University of Auckland. 2-9 February 1966*, ed. Peter Dane. Auckland: University of Auckland. pp. 193-201.

Rogers 1971
_____. Review of Ann Chalmers Watts' *The Lyre and the Harp: A Comparative Reconstruction of Oral Tradition in Homer and Old English Epic Poetry*. *Review of English Studies*, 22:465-66.

Rosenberg 1974
Bruce A. Rosenberg. "Folktale Morphology and the Structure of *Beowulf:* A Counterproposal." *Journal of the Folklore Institute*, 11:199-209.

Rosenberg 1981
_____. "Oral Literature in the Middle Ages." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*, ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus, OH: Slavica. pp. 440-50.

Rosenmeyer 1965
Thomas G. Rosenmeyer. "The Formula in Early Greek Poetry." *Arion*, o.s. 4:295-311.

Rosier 1963
James L. Rosier. "The Uses of Association: Hands and Feasts in *Beowulf*." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 78:8-14.

Rosier 1977
_____. "Generative Composition in *Beowulf*." *English Studies*, 58:193-203.

Rubin 1981
David C. Rubin. "Cognitive Processes and Oral Tradition." In *International Musicological Society, Report of the 13th Congress, Berkeley 1977*. Kassel: Barenreiter. pp. 173-80.

Russo 1963
Joseph A. Russo. "A Closer Look at Homeric Formulas." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 94:235-47.

Rychner 1955
Jean Rychner. *La Chanson de geste. Essai sur l'art épique des jongleurs*. Geneva and Lille: E. Droz and Giard.

Schaar 1956
Claes Schaar. "On a New Theory of Old English Poetic Diction." *Neophilologus*, 40:301-5.

Schneider 1978
Claude Schneider. "Cynewulf's Devaluation of Heroic Tradition in *Juliana*." *Anglo-Saxon England*, 7:107-18.

Schroeder 1974
Peter R. Schroeder. "Stylistic Analogues Between Old English Art and Poetry." *Viator*, 5:185-97.
Schwab 1983
Ute Schwab. "The Miracles of Cædmon." *English Studies*, 64:1-17.
Schwetman 1980
John Schwetman. "The Formulaic Nature of Old English Poetry: A Linguistic Analysis." *Linguistics in Literature*, 5:71-109.
Shippey 1969
Thomas A. Shippey. "The Fairy-Tale Structure of '*Beowulf*'." *Notes & Queries*, 214:2-11.
Shippey 1972
_____. *Old English Verse*. London: Hutchinson University Library.
Sisam 1965
Kenneth Sisam. *The Structure of Beowulf*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Sklar 1975
Elizabeth S. Sklar. "*The Battle of Maldon* and the Popular Tradition: Some Rhymed Formulas." *Philological Quarterly*, 54:409-18.
Smith 1977
John D. Smith. "The Singer or the Song? A Reassessment of Lord's 'Oral Theory'." *Man: Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, n.s. 12:141-53.
Spraycar 1976
Rudy Spraycar. "*La Chanson de Roland*: An Oral Poem?" *Olifant*, 4:63-74.
Spraycar 1978
_____. "A Reconsideration of the Oral-Formulaic Theory." *Olifant*, 5:387-88.
Stanley 1966
E. G. Stanley. "*Beowulf*." In *Continuations and Beginnings: Studies in Old English Literature*, ed. Eric G. Stanley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons. pp. 104-41.
Stevick 1965
Robert D. Stevick. "The Text and the Composition of *The Seafarer*." *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 80:332-36.
Storms 1957
Godfrid Storms. *Compounded Names of Peoples in Beowulf, a Study in the Diction of a Great Poet*. Utrecht-Nijmegen: Dekker en Van de Vegt N.V.
Storms 1963
_____. "The Subjectivity of the Style of *Beowulf*." In *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield. Eugene: University of Oregon Press. pp. 171-86.
Storms 1966
_____. Review of Adrien Bonjour's *Twelve Beowulf Papers 1940-1960. English Studies*, 47:135-40.
Tonsfeldt 1977
H. Ward Tonsfeldt. "Ring Structure in *Beowulf*." *Neophilologus*, 61:443-52.

Utley 1960
Francis L. Utley. "Folklore, Myth, and Ritual." In *Critical Approaches to Medieval Literature*, ed. Dorothy Bethurum. New York: Columbia University Press. pp. 83-109.

Van't Hul and Mitchell 1980
Bernard Van't Hul and Dennis S. Mitchell. "'Artificial Poetry' and Sea Eagles: A Note on 'þone hasupadan/ earn æftan hwit,' lines 62b and 63a of 'The Battle of Brunanburh'." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 81:390-94.

Waldron 1957
Ronald A. Waldron. "Oral-Formulaic Technique and Middle English Alliterative Poetry." *Speculum*, 32:792-804.

Whallon 1969
William Whallon. "Who Wrote Down the Formulaic Poem?" In *Proceedings of the Vth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*, ed. Nikola Banašević. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger. pp. 469-72.

Whitman 1975
F. H. Whitman. "The Meaning of 'Formulaic' in Old English Verse Composition." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 76:529-37.

Witke 1966
Charles Witke. "*Beowulf* 2069-2199: A Variant?" *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 67:113-17.

Wittig 1978
Susan Wittig. *Stylistic and Narrative Structures in the Middle English Romances*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Woolf 1968
Rosemary Woolf. "The Devil in Old English Poetry." In *Essential Articles for the Study of Old English Poetry*, ed. Jess B. Bessinger, Jr., and Stanley J. Kahrl. Hamden, CT: Archon Books. pp. 164-79.

Wormald 1978
Patrick Wormald. "Bede, Beowulf, and the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxon Aristocracy." In *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England: Papers in Honour of the Birth of Bede, Given at Cornell University in 1973 and 1974*, ed. Robert T. Farrell, a special issue of *British Archaeological Reports*, 46:32-95.

Zanni 1980
Roland Zanni. *Heliand, Genesis and das Altenglische. Die altsächische Stabreimdichtung im Spannungsfeld zwischen germanischer Oraltradition and altenglischer Bibelepik*. Quellen and Forschungen zur Sprach- and Kulturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, N.F. 76. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Oral Tradition, 3/1-2 (1988): 191-228

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY TO 1985

Lee Edgar Tyler
with the assistance of Sarah Feeny

This compilation, the second installment of *Oral Tradition*'s continuing annotated bibliography of research and scholarship relevant to the field, seeks to accomplish the same goals as its predecessor: first, to continue John Miles Foley's comprehensive bibliography, *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research* (Garland, 1985) by listing and annotating as many resources addressing the Parry-Lord theory of oral composition as possible; and second, to expand that compilation's scope to cover even more areas of interest to the scholar of oral traditional literature and related forms. While the emphasis of the bibliography remains on the oral-formulaic theory, we have once again included entries addressing approaches other than the Parry-Lord Theory.

In an effort to make this listing as useful as possible to the scholar, we have extended coverage through 1985; thus the annual publication of our installments will henceforth run approximately two years in arrears of the date of publication.

Once again, we ask that *all authors contribute regularly by sending two copies of recent publications to the editor*. The extremely heterogeneous nature of scholarship on oral traditions necessitates the compilation of resources from most continents and in many languages. Our own research resources will prove insufficient to create and sustain an effective reference tool without the assistance and participation of the people for whom the bibliography was created—its users. Your articles and books will receive annotation in forthcoming bibliographies; your books and monographs will be listed in our "Books Received" column annually and will also be eligible for published review.

Your suggestions, additions, recommendations, and especially your publications are welcome. We seek to provide a genuinely useful and worthy service to the community of scholars of oral traditions, and hope that the current and future listings serve to answer your bibliographical needs.

For the first *OT* installment, see volume 1, issue iii (October 1986): 767-808.

Area Abbreviations

AB	Albanian	ARM	Armenian
AF	African	AU	Australian
AG	Ancient Greek	BA	Barbar
AI	American Indian	BB	Bibliography
AL	American Literature	BG	Byzantine Greek
AN	Afghan	BH	Bahamian
AND	Andaman Islands	BI	Bible
ANR	Anglo-Norman	BL	Blues (see also MU: Music)
AR	Arabic	BQ	Basque

BR	British
BU	Bulgarian
BY	Babylonian
CC	Concordance
CH	Chinese
CN	Contemporary Poetry & Fiction
CP	Comparative
CZ	Czech
DN	Danish
EG	Egyptian
EK	Eskimo
ES	Estonian
ET	Ethiopian
FA	Faroese
FB	Folk Ballad
FK	Folklore
FM	Film
FN	Finnish
FP	Folk-preaching
FR	French (later than OF)
FU	Fulani
GM	Germanic
HA	Haitian
HB	Hebrew
HI	Hispanic
HN	Hindi
HT	Hittite
HW	Hawaiian
HY	Hungarian
IE	Indo-European
IN	(Asian) Indian
IR	Iranian
IS	Islamic
IT	Italian
JP	Japanese
JV	Javanese
KR	Kirghiz
KZ	Kazakh
LA	Latvian
LG	Languedoc
LT	Latin
ME	Middle English
MG	Modern Greek
MHG	Middle High German
MI	Modern Irish
MK	Molokan
ML	Melanesian
MN	Mongol
MU	Music
MY	Mayan
NR	Narte
NW	Norwegian
OE	Old English
OF	Old French
OHG	Old High German
OI	Old Irish
OLF	Old Low Franconian
ON	Old Norse (Old Icelandic)
OS	Ostyak
OSX	Old Saxon
PO	Polish
PR	Persian
PT	Print Technology
RM	Romanian
RU	Russian
SAI	South American Indian
SC	Serbo-Croatian
SCN	Scandinavian
SK	Sanskrit
ST	Scots
SU	Sumerian
SW	Swedish
TB	Tibetan
TD	Toda
TH	Theory
TI	Thai
TK	Turkish (& the Turkic languages)
TU	Tunisian
UG	Ugaritic
UK	Ukrainian
US	United States
UZ	Uzbek
VG	Vogul
WI	(British) West Indies
WL	Welsh
YI	Yiddish

1. Alden 1983 (AG)

Maureen Alden. "When Did Achilles Come Back?" In *Mélanges Edouard Delebecque*. Aix-en-Provence: Publications Université de Provence. pp. 3-9.

Addresses the problem of Achilles' return to battle in the *Iliad*, concluding that the epic contains three versions of the story, one in which the return is precipitated by the embassy of Book IX, one in which he returns upon the firing of a ship and the entreaty of Patroclus, and one in which he returns to avenge the death of Patroclus.

2. Alden 1985 (1E, AG, OI, CP)

_____. "The Role of Calypso in the Odyssey." *Antike und Abendland*, 31:97-107.

Argues that the *Odyssey*-poet did not invent Calypso but that analogs with the *Taín Bó Cuailnge* suggest that he drew upon traditional sources of Indo-European origin.

3. d'Alquen and Trevers 1984 (OHG, OLF, CP)

Richard d'Alquen and Hans-Georg Trevers. "The Lay of Hildebrand: A Case for a Low German Written Original." *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur altern Germanistik*, 22:12-72.

Posits a confluence of Low- and High-German written and oral versions of the *Hildebrandslied* which "are not necessarily translations of each other in various dialects" (19), but which nonetheless suggest the influence of Anglo-Saxon or Low German poetics. Provides orthographic, dialectological, and formulaic evidence to suggest a "Franconian connection" which "points to Old Low Franconian more consistently than Saxon as the dialect of the original" (72).

4. Allen 1984 (ME)

Rosamund Allen. *King Horn: An Edition Based on Cambridge University Library MS Gg. 4.27 (2)*. Garland Medieval Texts, A. S. G. Edwards, General Editor. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

This edition contains an extensive analysis of the textual transmission of *King Horn*, including discussions on the textual tradition, analyses of variation (conscious and unconscious variation are treated separately), and unresolvable residual variants of the manuscripts.

5. Andersen 1985 (FB, ST, FA, BR, TH)

Flemming G. Andersen. *Commonplace and Creativity*. Odense University Studies from the Medieval Centre, vol. 1. Odense: Odense University Press.

The first comprehensive study of oral-formulaic narrative technique in the traditional ballads of England and Scotland, this work offers a new definition of the ballad formula in which "formulas combine narrative and supra-narrative functions, and are characterized by variation on the narrative level, and stability on the supra-narrative level. *Ideally*, formulas can thus be seen to operate on three levels in all" (pp. 33-34): the supra-narrative or associative level, the level of formulaic lines and stanzas (the surface structure level), and the deep structure level, or that of the basic narrative idea. Part I of the book is dedicated to the development of this definition. Part II describes the narrative function of ballad formulas, including discussion of the linear and stanzaic formulas and the "formulaic situation" (pp. 59-67), with special emphasis placed upon the role of the formula in ballad transmission. Part III deals with the supra-narrative function of the ballad formula and analyzes separately the introductory, situational, transitional, and conclusion types, noting that, while the specifics of the ballad formula cannot be transferred from one tradition to another due to significant differences in subject matter, "this particular stylistic function of formulaic diction may be a characteristic feature of traditional balladry in general" (p. 285). Part IV is an application of the author's ideas to ballad texts from Falkland, Gloucestershire, and Aberdeen.

6. Armistead 1977 (HI)

Samuel G. Armistead. "Two Further Citations of the *Libro de Buen Amor* in Lope García de Salazar's *Bienandanzas e Fortunes*." *La Corónica* 5, ii:75-77.

Describes two additional citations of Juan Ruiz's masterpiece *Libro de Buen Amor* in the works of Salazar, one a free rendering of quatrain 71, the other a closer rendering of quatrain 105b-c attributed to Solomon, that suggest a considerable literate transmission of the material from the fourteenth through the seventeenth centuries.

7. Armistead 1981 (HI, US)

_____. "Hispanic Folk Literature Among the *Isleños*." In *Perspectives on Ethnicity in New Orleans*. Ed. John Cooke and Mackie J-V. Blanton. New Orleans: The Committee on Ethnicity in New Orleans. pp. 21-31.

Describes examples of forms of oral literature, including the *décima*, *coplas*, cumulative song, counting rhyme, riddles, folktales, and memorates from the Isleño people of St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana. Discusses social and geographic influences on the transmission of the traditionally Hispanic forms to the present day Isleño population.

8. Armistead 1982 (HI, MG, CP)

_____. "Greek Elements in Judeo-Spanish Traditional Poetry." *Laographia*, 32:134-64.

Studies the presence of six folktale types with Greek analogs in the Judeo-Spanish Romancero tradition, concluding that "...hypothetical Sephardic contact with the Hellenic traditional ballad did indeed take place and it was to result in a significant thematic enrichment of the Judeo-Spanish Romancero" (137).

9. Armistead 1983a (HI, US, FK)

_____. "Spanish Riddles from St. Bernard Parish." *Louisiana Folklore Miscellany*, 5, iii: 1-8.

Describes the author's new collection of nine riddles from the Isleño oral tradition first collected in the St. Bernard Parish of Louisiana and published by Raymand R. MacCurdy in 1948.

10. Armistead 1983b (HI, FB)

_____. "The Ballad of *Celinos* at Uña de Quintana (In the Footsteps of Americo Castro)." In *Essays on Hispanic Literature in Honor of Edmund L. King*. Ed. Sylvia Molloy and Luis Fernandez Cifuentes. London: Tamesis. pp. 13-21.

An account of the author's fieldwork in collecting three repetitions of *Celinos*, a modern peninsular romance that is derived from an unquestionably epic source, from performances by the folk poet Dona Martina of Uña, Spain on July 22, 1980. He compares these repetitions with a text collected by Don Americo Castro in 1912.

11. Armistead 1984 (HI)

_____. "The Initial Verses of the *Cantar de Mio Cid*." *La Corónica*, 12, ii:178-86.

Studies the *Crónica de Veinte Reyes* (Chronicle of Twenty Kings) in the beginning of the *Cantar de Mio Cid* and provides transcriptions of the passages from the *Cantar* discussed, concluding that "...in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, the famous initial verses of the *Cantar* were still circulating in the oral tradition" (182).

12. Armistead and Katz 1974 (HI)

_____ and Israel J. Katz. "Tres cuentos tradiciónales de la Provincia de Soria." *Celtiberia*, 47:7-20.

Descriptions of three traditional "cuentos" representative of the popular oral tradition of the province of Soria, Spain, collected in 1973. The first and second are variants of the "Love Like Salt"/"Cinderella" narrative type, and the third is representative of the "Three Golden Sons" type.

13. Armistead and Katz 1979 (HI)

_____. "El Romancero tradiciónal en la Provincia de Soria." *Celtiberia*, 58:163-72.

Descriptions of five traditional romances from the oral tradition of Soria collected in 1972, with background information on collection procedures and methodologies.

14. Armistead and Monroe 1984 (HI)

_____ and James T. Monroe. "A New Version of *La Morica De Antequera*." *La Corónica*, 12, ii:228-40.

A description of a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century manuscript found in a convent wall in Albacete, Spain during construction in 1982 that contains the longest known variant of *La Morica Garrida de Antequera*. They address the problem of oral and literate textual transmission, concluding that "not to take into account the possibility, indeed the probability, of such lost texts and intermediate versions is to remain limited to a distorted, chronologically and culturally subjective view of the problems of textual transmission in early Hispanic literature" (236).

15. Armistead and Silverman 1980 (HI)

_____ and Joseph H. Silverman. "El Romancero entre los Sefardíes de Holanda." In *Etudes de philologie romane et d'histoire littéraire offertes à Jules Horrent*. Ed. Jean Marie d'Heur and Nicoletta Cherubini. Liège: Gedit. pp. 535-41.

Describes three variants of the Sephardic romance *Jardín de amadores* found in a Brussels manuscript of the seventeenth century and suggests the significance of their coincidental lines and structure.

16. Armistead and Silverman 1985 (HI, MG)

_____. "Two Judeo-Spanish Riddles of Greek Origin." *Laographia*, 33:169-75.

Describes variants of two Judeo-Spanish riddles, one regarding a radish, the other a rooster, and provides analogs from the Greek tradition, arguing that "the Judeo-Spanish repertoire clearly reflects the diverse cultural contacts experienced by the Sephardim during the half millennium since they were forced to leave their Spanish homeland" (173).

17. Armistead et al. 1979 (HI)

_____, Israel J. Katz, and Joseph H. Silverman. "Judeo-Spanish Folk

Poetry from Morocco." *1979 Yearbook of the International Folk Music Council*, 11:59-75.

Describes eighteen versions of various Sephardic romances collected from the Moroccan oral tradition by Franz Boas and Zarita Nahon in 1930, providing transcriptions and edited text where appropriate. Musical annotations as well as information regarding the collection of the material, bibliographic and discographic data on recorded variants, and full annotations of recorded variants of lines are also provided.

18. Asagba 1985 (AF)

O. A. Asagba. "The Folk-Tale Structure in Amos Tutuola's *The Palm-Wine Drunkard*." *Lore and Language*, 4, i:31-39.

A discussion of the "folktale structure and content" of the contemporary Nigerian author Amos Tutuola's short novel *The Palm-Wine Drunkard* which illustrates the infusion of themes and motifs such as the quest, the "quarrel between heaven and earth," the trickster, and magical transformations into the literate compositions of authors who are the product of traditional cultures. Also provides a brief Proppian analysis of the structure of the novel and demonstrates Tutuola's "episodic linkage" of episodes, which approximates the aesthetics of oral tale-telling.

19. Bäuml 1984 (OF, MHG, OE, TH)

Franz Bäuml. "Medieval Texts and the Two Theories of Oral-Formulaic Composition: A Proposal for a Third Theory." *New Literary History*, 16:31-49.

Studies the structure of the theory of oral-formulaic composition with regard to primary and secondary oral cultures, critiques the theory with a view toward its application to medieval texts such as the *Rolandslied* and *Orendel*, and proposes a tertiary theory, with the written text as its basis, to place such texts "which never were part of the oral tradition in the sense of the Theory" (42) within their literary and sociohistorical contexts.

20. Bauman 1983 (FP, US)

Richard Bauman. *Let Your Words Be Few: Symbolism of Speaking and Silence among Seventeenth-Century Quakers*. Cambridge Studies in Oral and Literate Culture, 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

A brief monograph (168 pp.) discussing in detail the Quaker symbolism of speech and silence, the role of the preacher, the preacher's rhetoric, and the speech and silence of the Quaker meeting, with emphasis upon the movement's development of institutionalism from its charismatic origins.

21. Berlin 1983 (SU)

Adele Berlin. "Ethnopoetry and the Enmerkar Epics." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 103:17-24.

Provides an overview of the epic and its subtypes and discusses the narrative structure and anthropomorphic, zoomorphic, and spatio-temporal contexts of the performance of the Sumerian Enmerkar epics, concluding that the Sumerian epics "share the mode, narrative structure, and contentual aspects of other epics" and that "epics are not poeticized history. They use history-like elements for a purpose which is essentially nationalistic" (24).

22. Blong 1981 (ML)

Russell J. Blong. "Time of Darkness Legends and Volcanic Eruptions in Papua New Guinea." In Denoon 1981. pp. 141-50.

Cites evidence from various scientific methods of geological dating employed in determining the "Time of Darkness" resulting from volcanic eruptions in New Guinea and finds that variance of data in such studies is as least as significant as that acquired from sources in the oral traditions of the area. See Mai 1981.

23. Buchholz 1979 (ON)

Peter Buchholz. "Lügengeschichten? Wahrheit and Wunder in altisländischer 'Traditionstheorie'." *Vortrag vor der IV. Internationalen Saga-Konferenz, München 1979*. pp. 1-10.

Cites *Thorgils saga ok Haflitha* as evidence that the medieval storytellers and their audiences believed that the stories from the oral tradition were factual. Tradition permitted some degree of individual creativity but maintained the stability inherent to traditional forms. Also discusses pagan Scandinavian attitudes regarding the oral tradition and ideas about obtaining knowledge from the other world.

24. Bynum 1982 (BU, SC, BR, CP)

David Bynum. "The Dialectic of Narrative in a Bulgarian Ballad." In *Folklorica. Festschrift for Felix J. Oinas*. Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series, 141. Ed. Denis Sinor. Bloomington, IN: Research Center for Inner Asian Studies. pp. 59-71.

Maintains that the dialectical structure of a Bulgarian ballad relating the manner in which the legendary hero Marko came by his phenomenal strength and his magic sword, when contextualized with Serbo-Croatian and British comparands, suggests that "it may well be that both modern Bulgarian balladry and the philosophical tradition that comes down to us from Plato, from the classical revival, from Hegel, Marx, and from other modern

dialecticians both owe their organizing principles of contrastive reasoning to an oral tradition that was older in Europe than either modern poetry or ancient philosophy" (pp. 69-70).

25. Byock 1984 (ON)

Jesse L. Byock. "Saga Form, Oral Prehistory, and the Icelandic Social Context." *New Literary History*, 16:153-73.

Discusses the controversy regarding oral or literate origins of the Icelandic family sagas, examining in turn the social context of the sagas in the acephalous medieval Icelandic society, genre-wide studies of the saga form, and an alternative view in which Byock suggests that "saga form is built up from a series of small feuds, and these units do not follow fixed patterns" (166) and that "employing the elements of feud, the sagaman shaped his tale according to the choices and the logic of Icelandic procedure. The action unfolds within a societal setting that the sagaman shared with his audience" (167). Isolates three elements of "saga feud": conflict, resolution (both violent and non-violent), and advocacy, concluding that in the sagas the Icelanders created "a form of narrative sufficient to tell stories about themselves" (168).

26. Carnes 1985 (FK, BB)

Pack Carnes. *Fable Scholarship: An Annotated Bibliography*. Garland Folklore Series, Alan Dundes, General Editor. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

This bibliography contains 1457 annotations on books, articles, pamphlets, and dissertations through 1981; 1982 is partially covered. Comprehensive indexes on author, subject, fables, and tale-type are included.

27. Clover and Lindow 1985 (ON)

Carol J. Clover and John Lindow, eds. *Old Norse-Icelandic Literature: A Critical Guide*. Islandica, 45. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

A critical handbook on the corpus of Old Norse and Old Icelandic literature including references on the saga, the epic, and other oral or oral-derived genres.

28. Clunies Ross and Wild 1984 (AU)

Margaret Clunies Ross and Stephen A. Wild. "Formal Performance: The Relations of Music, Text and Dance in Arnthem Land Clan Songs." *Ethnomusicology*, 28:209-35.

Analyzes the effect of dance upon the musical and textual components of formal mortuary rites of the Arnhem Land aborigines. Concludes that such performances must be studied as an integrated whole, and emphasizes

interdisciplinary study "eliminating barriers between the component disciplines in the training of researchers" (210).

29. Curschmann 1984a (MHG)

Michael Curschmann. "Hören—Lesen—Sehen. Buch and Schriftlichkeit im Selbstverständnis der volksprachlichen literarischen Kultur Deutschlands um 1200." *Beiträge der Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 106:218-57.

Drawing upon works by Thomasin of Circlaria, Hartmann von Aue, and Wolfram von Eschenbach, he illustrates the interdependency of oral, literate, and pictorial representation of traditional subject matter.

30. Curschmann 1984b (ON)

_____. "The Prologue of Thidreks Saga: Thirteenth-Century Reflections on Oral-Traditional Literature." *Scandinavian Studies*, 56:140-51.

Discusses the description of a living oral tradition's poetry and prose by the author of Thidreks Saga. The Saga "builds on its own concept of orality and its role in human affairs" (146), including writing, oral composition, and memorization.

31. Damico 1984 (OE)

Helen Damico. *Beowulf's Wealhtheow and the Valkyrie Tradition*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Studies the treatment of Queen Wealhtheow in the Old English heroic epic *Beowulf*, emphasizing her archetypal qualities and the thematic composition of the Wealhtheow passages of the epic, and paying particular attention to details of traditional diction in her description. Discusses numerous parallels in both pagan and Christian Anglo-Saxon poems.

32. Davidson 1985 (IR)

Olga M. Davidson. "The Crown-Bestower in the Iranian Book of Kings." In *Papers in Honour of Mary Boyce*. Hommages et Opera Minora, 10. Leiden: E. J. Brill. pp. 61-148.

Part One is a diachronic study of the Indo-European origins of the Iranian *Shânâma (Book of Kings)*; Part Two is a synchronic study of the epic's traditional formulaic structure.

33. Delclos 1984 (OF)

Jean-Claude Delclos. "Encore le prologue des *Lais de Marie de France*." *Le Moyen âge*, 90:223-32.

Suggests the importance of understanding Marie de France's allusion to the Ancients in the context of the Prologue, in which verses 9-22 explain her purpose in writing the *Lais*. She does not conceal the oral character of the ancient songs she has heard in the recitations which inspired her, but affirms that they are equal in age, truth, and richness to her Latin sources.

34. Denoon 1981 (ML)

Donald Denoon, ed. *Oral Tradition in Melanesia*. Port Moresby, New Guinea: University of Papua, New Guinea and Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies.

A collection of sixteen essays on the oral traditions of Melanesia. Separately annotated are Waiko, Ruhan, Lacey (1981a, 1981b), Opeba, L. Farrall, Loeliger, S. Farrall, Gammage, Mai, Blong, Trompf, Latukefu, Kaniku, Oram, Koila, and Swadling. Includes numerous maps illustrating locations of various legends and migrations discussed in the essays.

35. Doctor 1985 (IN)

Doctor, R. "Gujerati Proverbs: An Analytical Study." *Lore and Language*, 4, i:1-30.

A brief analytical study of Gujerati folk proverbs of western India which discusses the proverb on two levels: that of the internal structure of the proverb itself and that of the argumentative application of the proverb to specific situations. Four sublevels of structure are treated: form of expression, substance of expression, substance of content (theme), and form of content (semiotics and logic). Illustrates how "Gujerati proverbs reflect the society and the ethos which gave rise to them" (2) and discusses the methods through which symbolic logic, linguistic philosophy, and semantics can provide new approaches to the study of proverbs.

36. Dollerup et al. 1984 (FK)

Cay Dollerup, Bengt Holbek, Ivan Reventlow, and Carsten Rosenberg Hansen. "The Ontological Status, the Formative Elements, the 'Filters' and Existences of Folktales." *Fabula: Journal of Folklore Studies*, 25, iii/iv:241-65.

Suggests that transmission of folktales is through "filters": "changes in terms of space, time and media where they come to exist in new dimensions. In these dimensions, the folktales are released in experiences, i.e. 'continua,' which are communal when the tales are told, and individual when the tales are read" (241). Compares Danish, Greek, and Turkish folktale versions of the theme "boy and girl get one another," demonstrating that the apparent

"sameness" of the narratives is superficial due to the transmission of the tales through "filters." Posits an "ideal tale" which can only be approached by comparative methodology and whose real nature can never be completely determined. Concludes that "to claim that there is identity between tales in different dimensions after they have passed through filters is meaningless—but then on the other hand, there is an indissoluble relationship between an 'ideal tale' and tales derived from it in other dimensions and 'continua'" (265).

37. Donaldson 1985 (AU)

Tamsin Donaldson. "Kids that Got Lost. Variation in Words of Ngiyampaa Songs." In *Problems and Solutions: Occasional Essays in Musicology Presented to Alice M. Moyle*. Ed. Jamie C. Kassler and Jill Stubington. Sydney: Hale and Iremonger. pp. 228-53.

Studies selectivity in the survival of social naming systems of the preliterate culture of the Aborigines in western New South Wales.

38. Dugaw 1984 (FB, US, BR)

Dianne M. Dugaw. "Anglo-American Folksong Reconsidered: The Interface of Oral and Written Forms." *Western Folklore*, 43:83-103.

Compares printed and oral texts of English and American versions of female warrior ballads and concludes that the variants "...printed as well as oral, vary the ballad in similar ways. That is, the commercially printed texts of *The Maid of Sorrow* exhibit the same range and kind of variation as the non-commercial oral ones. All four versions exhibit continuity, variation, and selection. Stylistically indistinguishable, all four versions clearly represent a single song tradition" (102).

39. Duggan 1984a (OF, HI)

Joseph J. Duggan. "The Manuscript Corpus of the Medieval Romance Epic." In *The Medieval Alexander Legend and Romance Epic: Essays in Honour of David J. A. Ross*. Ed. Peter Noble, Lucie Polak, and Claire Isoz. Milwood, New York, London, and Nedelin, Liechtenstein: Kraus International Publications. pp. 29-42.

Catalogs and describes the extant manuscripts of romance epics of the Middle Ages.

40. **Duggan 1984b (OF)**

_____. "Oral Performance, Writing, and the Textual Tradition of the Medieval Epic in the Romance Languages: The Example of the *Song of Roland*." *Parergon: Bulletin of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 2:79-95.

Discusses the interface of written and oral transmission of the *Song of Roland* and influences upon the extant manuscript corpus of the Old French epic.

41. Dukat 1977 (AG, CP)

Zdeslav Dukat. "Homerska ponavljanja u Maretić—Ivšićevu i Djurićevu prijevodu Homera." *Živa Antika*, 27, ii:323-36.

Discusses the translations of Homer by Toma Maretić and Miloš Djurić. After analyzing 30 groups of three or more verses appearing more than once in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, he concludes that Maretić succeeded in retaining the repetitiveness of the Homeric originals, while Djurić handled them more freely and thus lost from his translation the Homeric formulaic qualities, distorting the sense of style. Stjepan Ivšić, in his re-edition of Maretić, failed to change all identical verses in the same manner.

42. Dumézil 1983 (IE, OF, AG)

Georges Dumézil. *The Stakes of the Warrior*. Trans. David Weeks. Ed. Jaan Puhvel. Berkeley: University of California Press.

The English translation of the first third of Dumézil's second volume of *Mythe et Epopée* (Paris 1971).

43. Edmunds and Dundee 1984 (AG, FK, CP)

Lowell Edmunds and Alan Dundes, eds. *Oedipus: A Folklore Casebook*. New York: Garland Publishers.

Presents a comprehensive study of Oedipus folklore, establishing the universal quality of the Oedipus theme. Contains reportings of Oedipal themes in various oral literatures and examines their roots in oral tradition.

44. Emenanjọ 1984 (AF)

E. 'Nọlue Emenanjọ. The Anecdote as an Oral Genre: The Case in Igbo." *Folklore*, 95:171-76.

Provides folktale and joke comparands of anecdotes collected from the Igbo people of Nigeria, and discusses the generic problems associated with the study of anecdotes since "even in cultures where these genres [folktales, proverbs, other gnomic forms, folksongs and verses, riddles and tongue twisters] have been identified, it is not always the case that languages of these cultures have distinct, non-sentential names for each of the genres" (171).

45. Espinosa 1985 (AI, HI)

Espinosa, Aurelio M. *The Folklore of Spain in the American Southwest: Traditional Spanish Folk Literature in Northern New Mexico and Southern Colorado*. Ed. J. Manuel Espinosa. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press.

The first publication of Espinosa's compiled fieldwork from the late 1930s, this study describes the Spanish folk literature of a region of the American southwest that has been almost completely isolated from the rest of the Spanish-speaking world since its settlement in the late 16th century. Part One of the book, written by the author's son, J. Manuel Espinosa, is a biographical account of the career, fieldwork, and methodology of Aurelio M. Espinosa, the pioneer folklorist of Hispanic New Mexico. Part Two is a compilation of the senior Espinosa's fieldwork in the traditional Spanish folk literature of the area, covering folk ballads, religious folk literature, proverbs, folktales, and traditional religious and secular folk drama. Two appendices describe the Spanish dialects of the area and the nature of Spanish literary traditions among the Pueblo Indians. Also included are a comprehensive bibliography of the writings of Aurelio M. Espinosa and an extensive selective bibliography of works in the field.

46. L. Farrall 1981 (ML)

Lyndsay Farrall. "Knowledge and its Preservation in Oral Cultures." In Denoon 1981. pp. 71-87.

Demonstrates the reliability of seafaring instructions passed in various oral forms among sailors in the Pacific.

47. S. Farrall 1981 (OF)

Stephanie Farrall. "Sung and Written Epics—the Case of the *Song of Roland*" In Denoon 1981. pp. 101-14.

Discusses the survival in the oral tradition and the eventual literate recording of the medieval French traditions surrounding Charlemagne.

48. Foley 1984a (AG, US, SC, CP)

John Miles Foley. "The Price of Narrative Fiction: Genre, Myth, and Meaning in *Moby-Dick* and *The Odyssey*." *Thought*, 59:432-48.

Advances the idea of a reader-response approach to the literary epic, exemplified by *Moby-Dick*, and the oral traditional epic *The Odyssey*, an approach which must take into consideration the genre and mythic pattern of each work. Discusses *Moby-Dick* in terms of its genre (literary epic) and mythic patterns (the mythic qualities of the American whaling venture and the Promethean qualities of Ahab) and describes the traditional Indo-European epic structure of the "Return Song," the performance nature of the oral

tradition, and the value of the Serbo-Croatian analog in developing a reading context for *The Odyssey*: "To the extent that we faithfully recognize phraseological, narrative, and tale-type features as traditional and read the *Odyssey* in their light, we are becoming that original Homeric audience by according these reading signals their echoic due and by reinvesting them with their traditional significance" (443). Narration, a problem in *Moby-Dick*, provides for complexity and various levels of structure, but "at the necessary expense of a seemingly peripatetic, restless narrator" (446), while the *Odyssey*'s dialectical tension between the synchronic nature of performance and the diachrony of that performance's traditional context "is both the reward and the price of narrative fiction" (447) in the oral tradition.

49. Foley 1984b (OE, CP)

_____. "Genre(s) in the Making: Diction, Audience, and Text in the Old English *Seafarer*." *Poetics Today*, 4:683-706.

Considers two modes of generating meaning in the OE *Seafarer*—the traditional patterns that derive from a Germanic oral past and the poet's personal designs—that are woven into a single poetic fabric. Argues that these complementary modes, when viewed from a Receptionalist perspective, comprise not a *planctus*, *peregrinatio*, or any of the usual assortment of medieval genres into which the poem is forced, but rather an idiosyncratic "genre-in-the-making," a poetic type unique to Anglo-Saxon England in the period of transition from oral to oral-derived verbal art.

50. Foley 1984c (OE, CP)

_____. "*Beowulf* Oral Tradition behind the Manuscript." In *Approaches to Teaching Beowulf*. Ed. Jess B. Bessinger, Jr. and Robert F. Yeager. New York: Modern Language Association. pp. 130-36.

A general account of what is known or can be discerned about the Anglo-Saxon oral tradition from which *Beowulf* emerges.

51. Foley 1985a (BB, TH, CP)

_____. *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research: An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography*. Garland Folklore Bibliographies, 6. Alan Dundes, General Editor. New York and London: Garland Publishing.

The introduction contains a comprehensive history of scholarship and research in the field from its beginnings through 1982 and offers as suggestions for future work, three methodological principles for comparative criticism: *tradition-dependence*, a recognition of the unique features of each oral poetic tradition which in comparing works from different traditions "admits both similarities and differences concurrently, which places the general characteristics of oral structures alongside the particular forms they may take in a given literature" (69); *genre-dependence*, "demanding as grounds for comparison among traditions nothing less than the closest generic fit available, and,

further, calibrating any and all comparisons according to the comparability of the genres examined" (69), a principle which also "encourages comparison of genres if a basic congruity can be established" (69); and *text-dependence*, "the necessity to consider the exact nature of each text" (69) including the circumstances surrounding the collection, transmission, editing processes, and text diplomacy. The bibliography contains a comprehensive list of annotations on studies through 1982 in 100 language areas, as well as theory, bibliography, concordance, film, and music.

52. Foley 1985b (SC, OE, AG, PT)

_____. "Oral Narrative and Edition by Computer." In *Proceedings of the Xlth International Conference of the Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing*. Ed. Jacqueline Hamesse and Antonio Zampolli. Paris and Geneva: Champion and Slatkine. pp. 173-82.

A companion to earlier articles on establishing computerized editions of oral epic (see Foley 1981, 1982), this article presents examples of the phraseological and narrative analyses made possible by the text-processor HEURO.

53. Foley 1985c (IE, SC, AG, OE, CP)

_____. "Indoevropski metar i srpskohrvatski deseterac." *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane*, 15:339-44.

A brief description of the Indo-European background of the South Slavic decasyllable and of the implications of that history for the prosody and phraseology of the SC oral epic. References to other IE meters are included.

54. Gammage 1981 (ML, PT)

Bill Gammage. "Oral and Written Sources." In Denoon 1981. pp. 115-24.

Describes oral evidence of Papuan leaders from the Raubal Strike taken a generation after written accounts of the strikebreaking were published and establishes the accuracy of the informal oral sources.

55. Görög-Karady 1985 (HU)

Veronika Görög-Karady. "The Image of Gypsies in Hungarian Oral Literature." *New York Folklore*, 11:149-59.

Describes stories relating to the origins of the Gypsies in the Hungarian oral tradition and finds them to be of two types: one in which the Gypsies come into being through separation from the surrounding population and one in which they are created separately from all other races.

56. Gould 1985 (OE, ON, CP)

Kent Gould. "*Beowulf* and Folktale Morphology: God as Magical Donor." *Folklore*, 96:98-101.

Provides Icelandic analogs to the *Hrunting* element of *Beowulf* with emphasis upon the aspect of the donor of a gift, who "actually has two functions: testing and donating" (99). Sees the Christian God of the Anglo-Saxons becoming the "magical donor" with Beowulf's discovery of the giant sword after the failure of Hrunting because "He replaces Unferth's failed sword with an unfailing one, supplanting any heathen donors" (100). Concludes that a significant difference between pre-Christian and Christian myth is apparent in the Hrunting episode and its analogs, since in the Christian tradition the "magic is workable only when the man is pure and strong enough himself to put it to use" (99) and that such overlays of subsequent traditions illustrate, in the case of *Beowulf*, the "unique meld of ancient Germanic hero worship and recent Christian submission to God" (101).

57. Green and Pepicello 1984 (FK)

Thomas A. Green and W. J. Pepicello. "The Riddle Process." *Journal of American Folklore*, 97:189-203.

Discusses ambiguity in the riddling process on the levels of phonology, morphology, and syntax with regard to the "blocking element." Discusses potential factors influencing the origin and transmission of both grammatically- and metaphorically-based riddles.

58. Gurevich 1984 (CP, OE, ME, OF, LT)

Aaron J. Gurevich. "Oral and Written Culture in the Middle Ages: Two 'Peasant Visions' of the Late Twelfth-Early Thirteenth Centuries." *New Literary History*, 16:51-66.

Discusses the interaction of oral and literate traditions in two accounts of visions, one of which relies upon an oral account to substantiate its validity, while the other claims a written source, concluding "...if the historian does not seek the sources for this or that genre, or the genesis of particular motives, but wants rather to approach culture as an integration which actually functioned in the given society, at one and the same time reflecting its attitudes and forming them, he must admit that in fact only in such a symbiosis with the scholarly tradition could popular culture exist in the Middle Ages" (64-65).

59. Haggo and Kuiper 1983 (TH)

Douglas Haggo and Koenraad Kuiper. Review of *Conversational Routine*. Ed. Florian Coulmas. *Linguistics*, 21:531-51.

Criticizes the book for its inadequate handling of important material and goes

on to suggest an application of the Jackendorff generative theory of full entries to the question of formulae.

60. Haggo and Kuiper 1985 (FK)

_____. "Stock Auction Speech in Canada and New Zealand." In *Regionalism and National Identity*. Ed. Reginald Berry and James Acheson. Christchurch, NZ: Association for Canadian Studies. pp. 189-97.

Compares discursive structure, formulae, and prosody of livestock auctioneers in Canada and New Zealand with detailed descriptions of each, concluding that "...the similarities are largely due to their descent from a common ancestor. We take the differences to be the result of divergent development" (196).

61. Hale 1984 (AF)

Thomas A. Hale. "Kings, Scribes, and Bards: A Look at Signs of Survival for Keepers of the Oral Tradition among the Songhay-speaking Peoples of Niger." *Artes Populares*, 10-11:207-20.

Describes the declining social importance of the oral poets of the Songhay peoples of Niger and government efforts to preserve the tradition, suggesting that the tradition can be saved through the application of appropriate efforts.

62. Havelock 1984 (AG, AF, CP)

Eric A. Havelock. "Oral Composition in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles." *New Literary History*, 16:175-97.

Studies the nature of the Greek drama, which was composed in writing but performed orally and before a live audience and which demonstrates that acoustic echoes of the sort inherent to African oral traditional mnemonics played a significant role in its composition.

63. Hieatt 1984 (OE)

Constance B. Hieatt. "Modthrytho and Heremod: Intertwined Threads in the *Beowulf*-Poet's Web of Words." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 83:173-82.

Describes the traditional mythic identities of the bad rulers Modthrytho and Heremod and the influence of such identities on the reception of the poem. Suggests that the anagrammatic nature of their names may be significant, arguing that "...the connections between characters are multiple and often far more subtle than they might appear at first glance. However, attention to this particular parallel is especially helpful in that it provides, I believe, the solution to the most vexed difficulty in the passage concerned, the matter of the lady's name" (182).

64. Hieatt 1985 (OE, ON, GM)

_____. "Cædmon in Context: Transforming the Formula." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 84:485-97.

Compares creation hymns from Old Norse and Anglo-Saxon to *Cædmon's Hymn* with respect to formulaic composition and the use of motifs and themes to describe the manner in which pre-Christian poetics addresses Christian ideas. Noting that traditional Germanic poetry relates the creation in terms of earth being formed before heaven, she concludes that *Cædmon's Hymn* is an example of Lönnroth's "Creation theme" type-scene and that Cædmon expands "upon the formula's basic content [*eorthe*/*upheofon*] at the same time that it contradicts it" (496).

65. Huntsman 1981 (PL)

Judith Huntsman. "Butterfly Collecting in a Swamp: Suggestions for Studying Oral Narratives as Creative Art." *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 90:209-18.

Describes the oral traditions of Polynesia and emphasizes the contextual and performance aspects of studies in oral tradition. Notes that the views expressed by members of a culture toward their own oral traditions may not reconcile with objective findings by researchers, since many view any deviation from a definitive version of a tale to be a fault; in practice, however, she finds that there is a difference between what these subjects say and the manner in which they respond to live oral traditional performances.

66. Jackson 1982 (AF)

Michael Jackson. *Allegories of the Wilderness: Ethics and Ambiguity in Kuranko Narratives*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Based upon 230 narratives collected by the author in 1969-70, 1972, and 1979, this work discusses the function of oral narrative among the Kuranko society of Sierra Leone as a means of coping with everyday ethical problems and illustrates its importance as "a technique for investigating problems of correct action and moral discernment" (p. 24), emphasizing the nature of the particular storytelling event as a means to establish and maintain the norms of the Kuranko society at large.

67. J. D. Johnson 1983 (OE)

James D. Johnson. "A Note on the Substitution of 'Door' for 'Beach' in a Formulaic Theme." *Neophilologus*, 67:596-98.

Offers support for Renoir (1964) that the threshold of a door often functions in the formulaic theme of the "Hero on the Beach" as "a symbolic boundary between the lands of the living and the dead" (597).

68. J. W. Johnson 1985 (AF)

John William Johnson. *The Epic of Son-Yara: A West African Tradition*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

A study of the Manding oral traditional epic providing a text and translation of a performance by the *griot* Fa-Digi Sisoko in Kita, Western Mali, with complete data on the collection and discussion of the generic and poetic characteristics of the performance.

69. Kalinke 1984 (ON)

Marianne E. Kalinke. "*Sigurthar saga Jórsalafara*: The Fictionalization of Fact in *Morkinskinna*." *Scandinavian Studies*, 56:152-67.

Addresses the function of narrative intrusion in the saga, which she sees as a "conflation of history and fiction" (153) concluding that "the anonymous author transmits not only historical incident but also, and especially, an interpretation of historical incident. Moreover, the author creates pseudo-historical incident in order to make historical incident more vivid and hence more memorable" (165).

70. Kaniku 1981 (ML)

Anne Kaniku. "Milne Bay Women." In Denoon 1981. pp. 188-206.

Discusses the value of the oral tradition in recovering the histories of Melanesian women converts to Christianity who have been neglected in written accounts.

71. Kennedy 1984 (LT, PT)

William J. Kennedy. "Petrarchan Audiences and Print Technology." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 14:1-20.

Addresses the question of the literary reception and transmutation of the Petrarchan lyric upon its interaction with the emerging print culture of Europe.

72. Kinney 1985 (OE)

Clare Kinney. "The Needs of the Moment: Poetic Foregrounding as a Narrative Device in *Beowulf*." *Studies in Philology*, 82:295-314.

Describes narrative "moments" in *Beowulf* in which the poet "foregrounds" particular narrative sequences in order to lend immediacy to his tale, concluding that "*Beowulf* is full of potential tensions between the ultimately linear nature of the heroic poem and its tendency to generate spontaneous

alternative realities, near-autonomous parts which temporarily take over the narrative foreground and can only be ordered, retrospectively and synchronically, after the hero has died and his story has been closed" (314).

73. Kirwin 1985 (FK)

William Kirwin. "Folk Etymology: Remarks on Linguistic Problem-Solving and Who Does It." *Lore and Language*, 4, ii:18-24.

Discusses the motivation of language users to provide folk etymologies for uncommon terms and the transmission of these etymologies.

74. Kligman 1984 (RO)

Gail Kligman. "*The Rites of Women*: Oral Poetry, Ideology, and the Socialization of Peasant Women in Contemporary Romania." *Journal of American Folklore* 97:167-87.

Discusses the changing socioeconomic factors, especially the government's ideological emphasis upon sexual equality, surrounding the wedding rites of Romanian peasant women of Transylvania, concluding that peasant rites and their attendant attitudes are "in contrast to the primary concerns of state ideology, which is normative in scope but only operates at the formal institutional level" (186).

75. Koila 1981 (ML)

John Koila. "The Lala and Balawaia in Central Province." In Denoon 1981. pp. 231-39.

Discusses the roles of art, architecture, and language in establishing a cultural pattern upon which to evaluate a society's oral tradition.

76. Kuiper and Haggo 1985 (FK)

Koenraad Kuiper and Douglas Haggo. "On the Nature of Ice Hockey Commentaries." In *Regionalism and National Identity*. Ed. Reginald Berry and James Acheson. Christchurch, New Zealand: Association for Canadian Studies. pp. 167-75.

Demonstrates that the rules of discursive structure, a set of lexicalized oral formulae, and characteristic prosody identify the English of ice hockey commentaries as "an oral formulaic variety of English like other such varieties..." (167).

77. Kuiper and Tillis 1985 (FK)

Koenraad Kuiper and Frederick Tillis. "The Chant of the Tobacco

Auctioneer." *American Speech*, 60, ii:141-49.

Citing prosodic and musical evidence, describes the chant of American tobacco auctioneers of the Deep South as a joint product of the seventeenth-century British auctioneering drone and black slave music derived from West African tradition.

78. Lacey 1981a (ML)

Roderic Lacey. "Traditions of Origin and Migration: Some Enga Evidence." In Denoon 1981. pp. 45-56.

Describes genesis stories and migration lore of the oral tradition of the Enga people of Melanesia.

79. Lacey 1981b (ML)

_____. "Oral Sources and the Unwritten History of Papua New Guinea." In Denoon 1981. pp. 252-68.

Reviews scholarship to date relating to the history of the Papuans and calls for an interdisciplinary effort to employ historical studies in the service of the peoples involved.

80. Latukefu 1981 (ML)

Sione Latukefu. "Oral History and Pacific Islands Missionaries: The Case of the Methodist Mission in Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands." In Denoon 1981. pp. 175-87.

Cites oral evidence regarding the coming of Christian missionaries to the Solomon Islands and New Guinea and compares it with the written records maintained by the missionaries.

81. Laucirica 1985 (HI)

Julio Camarena Laucirica. "La bella durmiente en la tradición oral ibérica e iberoamericana." *Revista de Dialectologia y Tradiciónes Populares*, 40:261-78.

Gives an account of the transmission, diffusion, and literary treatment of the "Sleeping Beauty" legend in Iberian and Ibero-American oral tradition, discussing the confluence of oral and written traditions and analyzing multiforms of the tale.

82. Lawless 1983 (FP, US)

Elaine J. Lawless. "Shouting for the Lord: The Power of Women's Speech in the Pentecostal Religious Service." *Journal of American Folklore*, 96:439-59.

Based on fieldwork in a rural all-white Pentecostal congregation in south Indiana, this study discusses styles of women's preaching and resulting conflicts with Biblical teaching regarding the woman preacher and the status of women. Gives seven examples of women's "testimony" and lists formulaic phrases occurring in them, describing testimony structure and style.

83. Lawless 1985 (FK, US, TH)

_____. "Oral 'Character' and 'Literary' Art: A Call for a New Reciprocity Between Oral Literature and Folklore." *Western Folklore*, 44:77-98.

Discusses the application of the Parry-Lord theory to folklore studies and provides a summary of the major influences in the area. Utilizing the example of women's sermons as "oral art," she provides a methodology for applying the Parry-Lord theory to "non-metered, non-narrative oral forms of poetic creativity" (89) and calls for a "reassessment of both concept and terminology and a refusal to accept the dichotomy of oral 'character' and literary 'art'" (96).

84. Loeliger 1981 (BI, ML, PT, CP)

Carl Loeliger. "Oral Sources and Old Testament Texts." In Denoon 1981. pp. 88-100.

Discusses the methodologies of Biblical scholars in their studies regarding the interface of oral and written traditions in the Old Testament and the relevance of these methodologies to the study of Melanesian oral tradition.

85. Levine 1984 (AG)

David B. Levine. "Odysseus' Smiles." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 114:1-9.

Argues that instances of Odysseus' smiling, as an example of formulaic language, mark important structural points in Books 20-23, and further that such phraseology can contribute to individual characterization: "since the psychology behind Odysseus' smiles changes in accordance with the development of the narrative, we see how Homeric formulaic language can be charged with thematic meaning" (8-9).

86. Long 1984a (FK)

Eleanor R. Long. "How the Dog Got Its Days: A Skeptical Inquiry into Traditional Star and Weather Lore." *Western Folklore*, 43:256-64.

A cross-cultural study of the origin and transmission of folklore regarding the "dog days" of August and September, concluding that people in Western Europe and the United States have maintained in their extant oral traditions

ancient fundamental beliefs regarding decay and rottenness.

87. Long 1984b (FK)

_____. "If You Spill Salt, Then You Must Throw Some Over Your Shoulder... Unless You Were Going to do That Anyway." *Kentucky Folklore Record*, 30:97-108.

A description of beliefs regarding spilt salt in Western culture, suggesting that the beliefs have survived due to "patterns which are perceived and developed, not in the rational, but in the associative thought processes of the human mind" (106).

88. Long 1985 (FB, BR, US, MI, CP)

_____. "Ballad Classification and the 'Narrative Theme' Concept Together with a Thematic Index to Anglo-Irish-American Balladry." In *Ballad Research: The Stranger in Ballad Narrative and Other Topics*. Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference of the Kommission für Volksdichtung of the Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folklore. Ed. Hugh Shields. Dublin: Folk Music Society of Ireland. pp. 1-19.

Summarizes the history of attempts at systematic ballad classification, suggesting a return to classification by the repertories of individual singers and by the social contexts of particular performances. Defines the concepts of "narrative unit" and "thematic unit" and describes the manner in which the two operate in actual ballad composition. Provides as an appendix a "Thematic Index to the International Popular Ballad" which catalogs thematic and narrative units and various sub-types of narrative units identified during the process of the author's earlier research.

89. Lord 1983 (BU)

Albert Bates Lord. "Aspects of the Poetics of Bulgarian Oral Traditional Narrative Song." In *Literaturozanie i folkloristika v čest na 70-godišninata na akademik Pet'r Dinekov*. Sofia: Bulgarska Akademija na Naukite. pp. 353-59.

Decribes numerous examples of narrative song from the Bulgarian oral tradition and discusses their structure, formulaic nature, and compositional techniques.

90. Lord 1984 (SC, AL, CP)

_____. "The Battle of Kosovo in Albanian and Serbo-Croatian Oral Epic Songs." In *Studies on Kosovo*. Ed. Arshi Pipa and Sami Repishti. New York: Columbia University Press. pp. 65-83.

Describes the formulaic and thematic structures surrounding the Battle of Kosovo in Albanian and Serbo-Croatian oral traditional epics and discusses

the differences in treatment of an actual historical occurrence in the two separate Balkan oral traditions.

91. Lord 1985 (SC, MU)

_____. "Béla Bartók and Text Stanzas in Yugoslav Folk Music." In *Music and Context: Essays for John M. Ward*. Ed. Anne D. Shapiro. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Music. pp. 385-403.

Discusses Bartók's contribution to the study of Serbo-Croatian folk music and describes Serbo-Croatian couplet text stanzas and the adaptation of couplets to the traditional three-section melody; also describes the "interruption" of semantically and syntactically coherent verse lines by the singer Murat Zunić in performances recorded in 1935.

92. Mai 1981 (ML)

Paul Mai. "The 'Time of Darkness' or *Yuu Kuia*." In Denoon 1981. pp. 125-40.

Describes the oral evidence surrounding the *Yuu Kuia* period of relative darkness resulting from volcanic eruptions, among the highland peoples of New Guinea, suggesting that evidence from the oral tradition, while differing somewhat from tribe to tribe, is no less accurate than accounts from geological surveys of the area, which differ significantly depending upon the research methodology employed. See Blong 1981.

93. Maier 1982 (SU)

John R. Maier. "The 'Truth' of a Most Ancient Work: Interpreting a Poem Addressed to a Holy Place." *Centrum*, 2, i:27-44.

Describes a Sumerian cuneiform text composed by Priestess Enheduanna, daughter of Sargon, containing a temple hymn and suggests hermeneutical approaches toward its interpretation.

94. Mann 1984 (ON)

Jill Mann. "Proverbial Wisdom in the *Ysengrimus*." *New Literary History*, 16:93-109.

Describes traditional wisdom in the *Ysengrimus*, which is often pessimistic in its cautions against the efficacy of its own genre, samples of which "seem to claim validation through the seriousness of their surroundings. But in fact the context in which they are set [the epic], so far from validating them, cynically demonstrates their complete lack of connection with any experience that would give them true force" (106).

95. Martin 1984 (AG, LT, OI, CP)

Richard P. Martin. "Hesiod, Odysseus, and the Instruction of Princes." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 114:29-48.

Reinterprets the crux involving the two related passages at *Theogony* 79-93 and *Odyssey* 8.166-77 as parallel elements that "can be said to share a common *genre*, which generates the similar phrases in each place" (30). By comparing the Old Irish genre of *tecosc* ("instruction"), he argues that both the Hesiodic and the Homeric passages are instances of Prince-Instruction and that this generic matrix serves as a kind of deep structure for the common phraseology.

96. Nagy 1984 (FB, ME, ON, OI, CP)

Joseph Falaky Nagy. "Vengeful Music in Traditional Narrative." *Folklore*, 95:182-89.

Compares the Scandinavian/English ballad "The Two Sisters," the *Hymn to Hermes*, and Medieval Irish and Old Norse analogs to the "Singing Bone" narrative pattern, presenting "a structure of narrative motifs and associated ideas that appears in many separate traditions—a structure, or pattern, through the analysis of which we gain insights into the inner meanings of the various sources in which it occurs" (189).

97. Nagy 1985 (OI, IE, MI)

_____. *The Wisdom of the Outlaw: The Boyhood Deeds of Finn in Gaelic Narrative Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Argues for the essential consistency of the narratives of the boyhood deeds of Finn in the Gaelic tradition from the twelfth century through recent folktale versions collected in Ireland and Scotland, maintaining that such variations as have occurred have enriched the tradition's ideological significance. Suggests that the tales of Finn's boyhood deeds, while rooted in pre-history, express and preserve fundamental Indo-European and Celtic beliefs regarding passage into adulthood, the relationship between this world and "the other," outlawry, and the institution of the bards which transcend the specific historical situation of any particular audience or performance.

98. Nauer 1975 (US, PT)

Barbara Nauer. "Soundscript: A Way to Help Black Students to Write Standard English." *College English*, 36:586-88.

Describes a method by which mistakes made by black students in compositions due to oral residue are rectified by teacher re-dictation to students of their own corrected compositions, so as to facilitate better hearing of the "proper" sounds and thus achieve not only an improved revision of the originally submitted work, but also a realization on the part of the students of

the differences between dialectal and standard speech.

99. Nekljudov and Tömörceren 1985 (MN)

S. Ju. Nekljudov and Z. Tömörceren. *Mongolische Erzählungen über Geser*. Asiatische Forschungen, 92. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Text and German translation of Mongolian Geser oral performances collected in 1972.

100. Niditch 1985 (BI)

Susan Niditch. *Chaos to Cosmos: Studies in Biblical Patterns of Creation*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Discusses the five creation themes of Genesis chapters 1 through 11 as multiforms and treats the relation of genealogies to creation stories, the creation patterns of prophetic literature, and traditional literary themes.

101. Niles 1983 (OE)

John D. Niles. *Beowulf: The Poem and Its Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

An in-depth analysis of the Old English heroic epic *Beowulf* which addresses its place in the Old Germanic heroic tradition with special emphasis upon its oral traditional nature. Part I discusses *Beowulf* in its mythological and Christian contexts with particular attention to the aesthetics of composition and reception in a culture in which Christian and pagan concepts are coexistent. Part II addresses the Old English formulaic system, in which formula, ring composition, and "barbaric style" (a poetics relying primarily upon recognizable contrasts and integrity of familiar episodes) operate together to confer meaning. Taking these aspects of *Beowulf* into consideration, Part III goes on to discuss at length an interpretation of the poem, addressing in turn the elements of the mythic continuum of time in the traditional epic; the voice of the oral poet with respect to traditional knowledge and wisdom and the listening audience's reception of that voice; the concept of reciprocity, a "complex system of exchange that was at the heart of the social order" (p. 213) of which the social history of "heriot," or the bestowing of armor, is an example; thematic unity of the epic in which material that concerns characters and events other than those immediately touched upon by the narrative operates to broaden the poem's scope; and the theme of *Beowulf*, which he finds to be a contradiction "lodged in the recalcitrant breasts of human beings who in times of crisis find themselves unable to live up to the ideals to which their lips give assent" (p. 226).

102. Ó Catháin 1985 (MI)

Ó Catháin, Séamus, trans. and ed. *An Hour by the Hearth: Stories Told by*

Pádraig Eoghain Phádraig Mac an Luain. Folklore Studies, 14. Dublin: University College Press.

A compilation of the oral prose tales of one of Ireland's most noted storytellers collected in 1972 and 1973 and provided with extensive annotations, notes on dialect, and indexes of motif and type. Accompanied by a cassette tape of approximately sixty minutes containing the actual performances of Pádraig Eoghain Phádraig Mac an Luain.

103. Oinas 1983 (FI, IE)

Felix Oinas. "The Sower." *Journal of Folklore Research*, 20:83-88.

Describes two recorded versions of the Finnish folksong "The Sower," the first recorded in Ugric in 1883 and the second a defective recording of unknown date from North Karelia. Isolates two themes in the song: the hero's disappearance, which causes grain to stop growing, and his invitation to return, concluding that "it can be assumed that the Anatolian myth of the temporary disappearance of the fertility divinity migrated to the Greeks and, through several intermediaries, also to the north, reaching the Karelians and Finns via the Russians" (87).

104. Ojoade 1985 (AF)

J. Olowo Ojoade. "Hunter and Hunting in Yoruba Folklore." *Lore and Language*, 4, ii:36-54.

Describes seven themes surrounding the hunter and hunting in the Yoruba oral tradition and provides examples of each. Discusses the future of Yoruba lore and the changing role of the hunter, and predicts corresponding changes in the folk tradition.

105. Okafor 1983 (AF)

C. A. Okafor. *The Banished Child: A Study in Tonga Oral Literature*. London: The Folklore Society.

Summarizes and analyzes one hundred oral (spoken and sung) *cante-fables* collected in southern Zambia among the Tonga peoples as evidence that fables with human characters possess a wider scope of potential action than those with animal characters. Includes chapters on poetics, themes and episodes, multiforms, and the repertoires of individual storytellers.

106. Olsen 1983 (OE, LT, CP)

Alexandra Hennessey Olsen. "Old English Poetry and Latin Prose: The Reverse Context." *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 34:273-82.

Suggests that "Old English poetry composed, copied, and recited in English

monasteries affected the Latin prose written therein, providing what might be called a reverse context for the poetry which the Latin thereafter influenced" (273). Based upon the evidence of Old English manuscripts containing works in Latin, Bede's account of Cædmon, and statements by Alcuin regarding Latin and vernacular songs, she argues that the Latin context of Old English poetry may be one of both direct and of reverse influence" (280).

107. Olsen 1984 (OE)

_____. *Speech, Song, and Poetic Craft: The Artistry of the Cynewulf Canon*. New York and Berne: Peter Lang.

Analyzes the Cynewulf poems of the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records and their poetic tradition with special attention to textual transmission, cultural diglossia, translations of Latin original works, and the reinforcement of legends and hagiographies through poetic language.

108. Ong 1984 (LT, TH, PT)

Walter J. Ong. "Orality, Literacy, and Medieval Textualization." *New Literary History*, 16:1-12.

Describes the interactions between orality and literacy in the European Middle Ages and discusses primary and academic orality in terms of the cultural diglossia fostered by the compartmentalization of literate and oral facets of the culture. Traces this situation to the use of Latin, which "programmatically fostered orality but at the same time was so textualized that it appeared never to have been a grammatically malleable, unwritten tongue" (11).

109. Opeba 1981 (ML)

Willington Jojoga Opeba. "The Migration Traditions of the Sebaga Andere, Binandere and Jaua Tribes of the Orokaiva: The Need for Attention to Religion and Ideology." In Denoon 1981. pp. 57-70.

Discusses the oral traditions surrounding the migrations of the Orokaiva peoples of Melanesia in terms of the religious and cultural values of the respective tribes and their importance in the understanding and interpretation of evidence gathered through fieldwork.

110. Opland 1984 (AF, OE, CP)

Jeff Opland. "*Scop* and *Imbongi* III: The Exploitation of Tradition." In *The Word Singers: The Makers and the Making of Traditional Literatures*. Ed. Norman Simms. Hamilton, New Zealand: Outrigger Press. pp. 44-59.

Finds in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts and Xhosa oral poetry an "exploitation" of literary tradition by artists who possess an "objective awareness" of such traditions. Defines *exploitation* as "the deliberate use of a traditional element

in order to extend or deny its relevance in altered circumstances" (45). Cites examples of the Old English *Seafarer* and the contemporary Xhosa *imbongi* D. L. P. Yali-Manisi and discusses the functions of *scop* and *imbongi* in their respective societies, concluding that "in the altered social circumstances, Manisi exploits the tradition within which he operates to deliver his modern message. In a similar way, the Anglo-Saxon author of *The Seafarer* exploits traditional images for his own purposes in the altered conditions in England after its conversion to Christianity" (56).

111. Oram 1981 (ML)

Nigel Oram. The History of the Motu-speaking and the Koita-speaking Peoples According to their own Traditions." In Denoon 1981. pp. 207-30.

Reviews evidence from anthropological and historical studies surrounding the histories of the Motu- and Koita-speaking peoples of coastal Central Province and describes the oral traditions of these peoples that he recorded near Port Moresby over a period of ten years, substantiating the general accuracy of the oral tradition in this area.

112. Pandey 1971 (HN)

Shyam Manohar Pandey. "The Hindi Oral Epic *Canaini* or *Loriki*." *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica*, 2:191-210.

Describes the Hindi oral epic *Canaini* or *Loriki* in detail by chapters, and discusses its singers and their background, performance styles, themes, formulae, and metrics.

113. Paraskevaides 1984 (AG)

H. Paraskevaides. *The Use of Synonyms in the Homeric Formulaic Diction*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Lists synonymous nouns sharing epithets and those used with different epithets in Homer and discusses the poetic and metrical use of each, concluding that "the terms [epithets] are used without distinction of meaning" (p. 83).

114. Poe 1984 (OF)

Elizabeth Wilson Poe. "The Three Modalities of the Old Provençal Dawn Song." *Romance Philology*, 37, iii:259-72.

Suggests several minor variations to Pierre Bec's scheme of the standard *alba* or "Dawn Song" and provides modifications of his chart to adapt it to the *contre-aube* and the *Aube Pieuse*, or "Religious Alba."

115. Pope 1985 (AG)

Maurice Pope. "A Nonce-word in the *Iliad*." *Classical Quarterly* 35:1-8.

Discusses the implications of the translation of *panaopios*, arguing that Homer's use of repetition is his method of supplying detailed development of the character. Argues against the theory of oral formulation using the number of hapax legomena which appear unique to Homer as evidence of literary composition.

116. Reichl 1984 (UZ, OE, OF, IE, CP)

Karl Reichl. "Oral Tradition and Performance of the Uzbek and Karakalpak Epic Singers." In *Fragen der mongolischen Heldendichtung*, vol 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp. 613-43. With musical transcriptions.

Maintains that a common Indo-European tradition accounts for the similarities of the Uzbek oral epic with medieval European epic literature and demonstrates the Uzbek oral tradition to be a valid comparand for Old English and Old French.

117. Reichl 1985 (UZ)

_____, ed. *Rawšan: Ein usbekisches mündliches Epos*. Asiatische Forschungen, 76. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

A German translation of the Uzbek *Epic of Rawšan*.

118. Reidinger 1985 (OE)

Anita Reidinger. "The Old English Formula in Context." *Speculum*, 96:294-317.

Discusses the Old English formulaic system in terms of its traditional Germanic origins, sociocultural contexts, and thematic and poetic environments.

119. de Rhett 1984-85 (HI)

Beatriz Mariscal de Rhett. *La Muerte ocultada*. Romancero tradicional, XII. Diego Catalán, General Editor. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.

A study of the traditional pan-Hispanic romance "La Muerte ocultada" providing an introduction addressing octosyllabic and hexasyllabic versions, the history of the European ballad and romance, transmission of the text through Western Europe and America, and models of poetics. With musical transcriptions.

120. Ricci 1929 (OE)

Aldo Ricci. "The Chronology of Anglo-Saxon Poetry." *Review of English Studies*, 5:259-69.

Asserts that, substantial external evidence for the dates of most Anglo-Saxon poems being insufficient, "it has been found indispensible to turn to internal evidence, and see whether a study of the language, meter, style, etc., can lead to any useful conclusion, especially by comparison with the usage of such datable material—characters, glosses, certain inscriptions, the form of the names in Bede, etc.—as we possess" (259) in order to establish an Anglo-Saxon poetic chronology, offering three caveats in the application of the chronological tests of Morbach (1906) and Richter (1910): 1. "that the language of poetry is more archaic than that of prose" 2. that it is doubtful that "all the complicated rules elaborated by modern scholarship were strictly adhered to by all poets of all times" and 3. that with respect to short poems, meter is "not decisive" since "short poems furnish too few data to go upon" (259). Concludes that charms, gnomes, elegies, and epics are "pre-Christian types" and that "in varying degrees, we may actually reconstruct, or at least infer the forms of the originals. This will then give us a first group of poems, that we may conveniently call heroic. It comes first *logically* and ultimately chronologically, but it is independent of the difficulties raised by the dating of the actual MS *forms* of the poems" (265-66).

121. Ruhan 1981 (ML)

Antony Ruhan. "Preserving Traditions or Embalming Them? Oral Traditions, Wisdom, and Commitment." In Denoon 1981. pp. 31-44.

Describes wisdom forms of the oral traditions of preliterate Melanesian peoples and discusses their changing roles in the respective cultures.

122. Schmiel 1984 (AG)

R. Schmiel. "Metrically Interchangeable Formulae and Phrase-clusters in Homer." *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 9, iii:34-38.

In comparing occurrences of three pairs of equivalent formulae, the author illustrates that "suitability to the context is the best explanation for the choice of formula..." (37).

123. Scholz 1984 (MHG)

Manfred Gunter Scholz. "On Presentation and Reception Guidelines in the German Strophic Epic of the Late Middle Ages." *New Literary History*, 16:137-51.

Studies the application of marginal directions to readers in Middle High German manuscripts, suggesting that they may apply to lone readers as well as those reading for an audience, since the solitary reader may have actually

sung the strophes to himself. Notes that the verbs *hören* and *lesen* are most frequently used in these directions when referring to the audience, and that *sager* and *singen* appear most often in reference to the reciter.

124. Simpson 1985 (FK, BR)

Jacqueline Simpson. "The Lost Slinfold Bell: Some Functions of a Local Legend." *Lore and Language*, 4, i:57-67.

An analysis of a Sussex legend and its attendant motifs regarding a sunken church bell. Considering printed versions of the story which are "close to their oral sources and mercifully free from literary 'improvements'" (57), this essay discusses the significance of lost-bell legends which owe their appeal to a "coded message about the relationship of the secular and the sacred" (65) and applies its findings to the contemporary novel *The Bell* by Iris Murdoch.

125. Slotkin 1978 (OI)

Edgar M. Slotkin. "Medieval Irish Scribes and Fixed Texts." *Éigse*, 17:437-50.

Addresses the question of "to what extent a scribe copying a text received from oral tradition will tamper with that text" (443-44), utilizing Irish translations of Latin epics as a control. Concludes that "given the attitude of scribes toward their work, we can think of each one of their productions as a kind of multiform of the original" (450).

126. Smirnov 1984 (RU)

I. P. Smirnov. "On the Systematic-Diachronic Approach to Medieval Russian Culture of the Early Period." *New Literary History*, 16:111-36.

Discusses the early medieval Russian culture as a system in the Russian tradition and addresses the question of the nature of the relationship between its perception and conceptual thinking. Describes the nature and purposes of texts in the society, concluding that the nonaesthetic purpose of texts was such that the text "did not take the place of any reality but only of that reality which was referential and became conceptual, or conversely of that reality which was conceptual but which could or should be referential" (134).

127. Sowayan 1985 (AR)

Saad Abdullah Sowayan. *Nabaṭi Poetry: The Oral Poetry of Arabia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Discusses the social and cultural contexts of Nabaṭi poetry, which, according to the author, determine the salient features of this form of oral literature; describes the composition, transmission, and performance of the poetry with special attention to the role of orality and memory in its transmission, and compares Nabaṭi with classical Arabian poetry. Demonstrates the connections

between Nabaṭi and its ancient Pre-Islamic counterparts. While emphasizing the orality of the composition and transmission of the poetry, he challenges the applicability of the Parry-Lord theory to Nabaṭi, maintaining "that 'orality' does not always, or necessarily, mean 'oral-formulaic,' and that attempts to fit ancient Arabic poetry into this classification are in error" (p. 183).

128. Spear 1981 (AF)

Thomas Spear. "Oral Traditions: Whose History?" *History in Africa*, 8:165-81.

Summarizes previous work on the African oral tradition and describes modes of oral communication and their relationship to traditional thought and history, concluding that "we must accept that oral traditions exist within an oral mode of thought which, regardless of how irrational it may appear to us, is rational and coherent when understood on its own terms. The task of the historian is not to prune away the irrational, leaving what we judge to be rational, but to accept the whole as rational within a mode of thought that is different from ours and then to try to translate the rationality of that mode into the rationality of ours" (177).

129. Stiles 1985 (HI)

Neville Stiles. "Apuntes sobre la tradición oral indígena y su uso en la educación bilingüe-bicultural." *Winak: Boletín Intercultural,* 1:28-33.

Provides an brief overview of the qualities of oral tradition in general, with specific application to bilingual Guatemalan societies, and suggests the use of radio, cassette tapes, and when possible, the use of oral narrative accompanied by written texts for educational purposes in the schools of the indigenous bilingual community of Guatemalan Indians who still have considerable Mayan influences in their language and culture.

130. Stock 1984 (LT, AG, CP)

Brian Stock. "Medieval Literacy, Linguistic Theory, and Social Organization." *New Literary History*, 16:13-29.

Part One contrasts Boethius' and Peter Abelard's commentaries on the opening paragraph of Aristotle's *Peri ermeneias*, seeing language as the object of Boethius' commentary while to that of Abelard it was both object and subject. Part Two discusses the linguistic theories of each and places these theories in the context of medieval society. Part Three discusses the origins of the medieval interpretive stances and the theories of language upon which they were based. Part Four concludes the study with observations regarding the division of the medieval study of language into grammar, logic, and rhetoric and discusses medieval theories of interpretation.

131. Strutynski 1984 (IE, FK, GM, CP)

Udo Strutynski. "The Survival of Indo-European Mythology in Germanic Legendry: Toward an Interdisciplinary Nexus." *Journal of American Folklore*, 97:327-43.

Briefly traces the history of interdisciplinary studies in the Germanic context of Indo-European legends, offering the *couvade* as an example, and recommends an approach synthesizing the disciplines of ethnography, anthropology, and mythology in order to broaden the potential of folklore studies.

132. Swadling 1981 (ML)

Pamela Swadling. "The Settlement History of the Motu- and Kiota-speaking People of the Central Province, Papua New Guinea." In Denoon 1981. pp. 240-52.

Discusses archaeological methodologies for fieldwork in establishing dates for migration and settlement of preliterate peoples and the importance of the oral traditions of these peoples in such studies.

133. Tappe 1984 (RO, BR, FB, CP)

Eric Tappe. "A Rumanian Ballad and its English Adaptation." *Folklore*, 95:113-19.

Describes the adaptation of a ballad from the Transylvanian oral tradition, "The Clement Mason," by W.M.W. Call in his *Manoli: A Moldo-Wallachian Legend* published by *The Cornhill Magazine* in September 1862, in which the central motif is the interment of a woman in a castle wall. The conclusion offers two additional appearances of the legend in English fiction of the nineteenth century.

134. Toelken 1983 (FB, US, BR, CP)

Barre Toelken. "Context and Meaning in the Anglo-American Ballad." In *The Ballad and the Scholars: Approaches to Ballad Study*. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, UCLA. pp. 17-25.

Sees "textual and contextual approaches not as opposed alternatives but as mutually enriching modes of critical analysis" (33) and suggests five "contexts" (the human, the social, the cultural-psychological, the physical, and the occasional) in which any given ballad might be evaluated.

135. Trompf 1981 (ML)

Garry Trompf. "Oral Sources and the Study of Religious History in Papua New Guinea." In Denoon 1981. pp. 151-74.

Addresses the issue of the effects of doctrines taught by literate missionaries on the perception of religious ideas from the period before Christianity in Papua and suggests methodologies for the accurate recovery of such ideas in current fieldwork.

136. Vansina 1971 (AF)

Jan Vansina. "Once Upon a Time: Oral Traditions as History in Africa." *Daedalus*, 100:442-68.

Part One describes forms of oral historical account and the transmission of written and oral records; Part Two discusses problems in translating material from the oral tradition into written texts; and Part Three describes uses of the African oral tradition for historians.

137. Vargyas 1983 (FB, BY, CP)

Lajos Vargyas. *Hungarian Ballads and the European Ballad Tradition*. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.

A two-volume set, the first of which discusses the theoretical and historical background of European ballad studies in general and traces the development of the Hungarian ballad from its peasant Walloon and Northern French origins in the Middle Ages to the present, with special attention to transitional genres and to the relationship and differences between the ballad and the epic. The second volume includes historical and comparative essays on 134 Hungarian ballad types with examples of each, some including music notations.

138. Vīķis-Freibergs 1984 (LA, CP, TH)

Vaira Vīķis-Freibergs. "Creativity and Tradition in Oral Folklore or the Balance of Innovation and Repetition in the Oral Poet's Art." In *Cognitive Processes in the Perception of Art*. Ed. W. R. Crozier and A. J. Chapman. Amsterdam, New York: North-Holland Publishers. pp. 325-43.

Addresses the question of individual creativity by working "backward from the creative product to make inferences about the psychological processes that must have been at work in producing it" (325). Utilizing examples from the Latvian folksong, she describes the functional and technical qualities of the folk poet and concludes that the traditional *daina* ("folksinger") "is much more intent on expressing folk wisdom and beliefs about various aspects of the human condition than on giving vent to any personalized, individually subjective feelings" (341).

139. Wachsler 1985 (ON, OE, CP)

Arthur A. Wachsler. "Grettir's Fight with a Bear: Another Neglected Analogue of *Beowulf* in the *Grettis Saga Asmundarsonar*." *English Studies*,

5:381-90.

Describes similarities in the attacks of Grendel and those of a bear in *Grettis Saga* and concludes that the evidence "should lead to a reappraisal of the relevance of the *Grettis Saga* for the understanding of the *Beowulf* poet's use of folktales found in the Norse traditions" (390).

140. Waiko 1981 (ML)

John D. Waiko. "Binandere Oral Tradition: Sources and Problems." In Denoon 1981. pp. 11-30.

Describes the oral tradition of the Binandere people of Melanesia and discusses methodologies of fieldwork.

141. Weston 1985 (OE)

L. M. C. Weston. "The Language of Magic in Two Old English Metrical Charms." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen,* 86:176-86.

Discusses the interrelationship of the poetics of *Against a Sudden Stitch* and the *Nine Herbs Charm* and their magical purpose, addressing specifically their functional aesthetics which, through the use of rhythm, paradigmatic repetition, and fragmentation of action, combines ritual and poetry in such a manner as to alter the consciousness of the participants to produce a type of magical thought which "triggers changes in the healer, who with increased force of will causes changes in the physical world by non-physical means" (186).

142. Wilgus 1983 (FB, CP)

D. K. Wilgus. "The Comparative Approach." In *The Ballad and the Scholars: Approaches to Ballad Study*. Los Angeles: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, UCLA. pp. 1-28.

Argues that the comparative approach to ballad studies "can and should utilize any results that contribute to the understanding of the ballad as a product of humankind, just as the contextualist needs comparative evidence to prevent errors in interpretation" (21).

143. Wilgus 1985a (FB, MI, US)

_____. "The *Aisling* and the Cowboy: Some Unnoticed Influences of Irish Vision Poetry on Anglo-American Balladry." *Western Folklore*, 44:255-300.

Studies the influences of three types of Irish vision poetry, the love- or fairy-*aisling*, the prophecy *aisling*, and the allegorical *aisling*, in folk ballads of the western United States, concluding that geographical distances are "spanned by the tenacity of the folk tradition of which we are all a part..." (300).

144. Wilgus 1985b (FB, MI, CP)

_____. "The Catalogue of Irish Traditional Ballads in English." In *Ballad Research: The Stranger in Ballad Narrative and Other Topics*. Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference of the Kommission für Volksdichtung of the Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folclore. Ed. Hugh Shields. Dublin: Folk Music Society of Ireland. pp. 21-33.

Describes the background and format of the forthcoming *Catalogue of Irish Traditional Ballads in English*, providing examples from ballads on "Love Relations" and "Irish History."

145. Wilgus and Long 1985 (FB, US)

_____and Eleanor R. Long. "The *Blues Ballad* and the Genesis of Style in Traditional Ballad Song." In *Narrative Folksong: New Directions (Essays in Appreciation of W. Edson Richmond)*. Ed. Carol L. Edwards and Kathleen E. B. Manley. Boulder: Westview Press. pp. 437-82.

Describes the American "Blues Ballad" and provides examples from black and white American traditions, some with musical text. Discusses origins of the "Blues Ballad idea" in the two traditions and the traditions' interactions in the history of the American blues ballad.

146. Yazzie 1984 (AI)

Alfred W. Yazzie. *Navajo Oral Traditions* I, vol. 1. Ed. Jeri Eck. Rough Rock, AZ: Navajo Curriculum Center Press, Rough Rock Demonstration School.

An illustrated collection of Navajo myths containing elementary definitions and explanations of the oral traditional literature of the Navajo culture. Designed primarily for young readers.

147. Zumthor 1984 (TH)

Paul Zumthor. "The Text and the Voice." *New Literary History*, 16:67-92.

Defines communication and preservation as the two functions of the medieval text, describes modes of composition, and demonstrates to what degree voice and gesture function to impart meaning in oral performances, which he sees as more closely related to the dance than to a written text.

Oral Tradition, 3/1-2 (1988): 229-38

Oral, but Oral What? The Nomenclatures of Orality and Their Implications

David Henige

I

When I first noticed the announcement of the impending appearance of a journal to be named *Oral Tradition*, I was intrigued and gratified. As a historian I looked forward to welcoming a scholarly journal which would be devoted entirely to addressing issues of interest to students of oral societies, be they of the present or the past. When I later saw a list of the members of the Editorial Board, I was disappointed and disquieted to find not a single historian among them.

But as I contemplated what seemed an unwelcome turn of events, I realized that my first reaction had been reflexive and had been based on a perception which was neither mainstream nor necessarily beyond cavil. It seemed in fact that the issue had two distinct levels: one was that of nomenclature, the other a matter of attitude and operation. The two levels are hardly discrete, however; a great deal of osmosis takes place between them. On these grounds perhaps a few words on each might be in order, if only to initiate what could be a useful (and, I would argue, needed) colloquy.

In the past twenty-five years of so, "orality" has come into its own as a legitimate field of concern in a number of disciplines, including history—both the history of oral societies in various parts of the world and of the "underside" of contemporary history in "western" societies. It has also become of great interest to scholars in literature, psychology, anthropology, philosophy, and several other fields. It is no surprise then that, along the way, a number of distinct (and not so distinct) terms have sprung up to denote the various bodies of data being studied; but few, if any, of these

have managed either to capture the day or to convey unambiguously their focus and intent.

For instance, the terms "oral data" and "oral materials" are frequently used in one context or another, but have never been able to establish an out-of-context domain of their own in the lexicography. Perhaps they are too general, too vague, or simply too drab formulations to be able to live a life of their own successfully.

"Oral literature" on the other hand appears to be used quite frequently to describe—what? Anything from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, known to us only in their written forms, to oral recitations which, if ever written down at all, have been committed to writing only by modern students interested in them. "Oral literature" has also been used to describe the entire spectrum from unabashed stories, with no other aim but the amusement of the moment, to purportedly historical texts wielded for political advantage from one generation to the next. Finally, the term suffers an additional double handicap. It is oxymoronic to those etymologically inclined, who object that, by definition, "literature" cannot be oral; therefore there can be no "oral literature."

This is a quibble, worth mentioning but not worrying about, but the second handicap is more serious, at least from the point of view of the historian. This is the fact that historians, although they often (although perhaps not often enough) use written literature as historical sources, almost always fail to consider the literary (and indeed the oral) aspects of more explicitly historical sources (chronicles, biographies, narrative accounts of the past, and the like). That is, they neglect to place such writings of the past into their particular ambiances in order better to appreciate the conventions that governed their creation and form. The result is often either needless anachronism, undue credulity, or both.

"Oral poetry" at least is a term that is relatively clearly defined, to the extent, that is, that "poetry" itself is able to conjure images of a genre of expression with specific aims and particular forms. Here one problem is that, while many historians define "poetry" in such a way as practically to eliminate examples of it as potentially useful historical sources, many societies do not. Yet no source has been more thoroughly plumbed for possible historical content than the *Iliad*. So there is a paradox here as well.

Conversely, and somewhat oddly perhaps, "oral history" seems to be the single term that has managed to secure for itself a distinctive niche in this nomenclatural welter—odd, because in doing so it has given the term "history" an unusual new twist. To almost everyone, practitioners and observers alike, "oral history" nowadays refers to the practice of eliciting life histories, personal reminiscences from participants in events of note or simply from everyday people whose views, it is thought, can provide a needed antidote to an overly elitist perspective in most historiography. In this sense then, "oral history" scarcely deals with the past at all, but only with the length and breadth of the present generation.[1]

Finally we reach the term "oral tradition," to which I will give more extended attention, if only because my own background permits it and because it is the most widely—and variously—used term in the field. As an Africanist historian by training, interested in how non-literate societies were able (if able at all) to preserve memories of their past, I have probably been most influenced by the definition of "oral tradition" propounded by Jan Vansina in his book of the same name.[2] Trained as a medievalist, Vansina recognized that oral materials could be of potential value to historians, whether proverbs, poetry/songs, lengthy historicized texts, or epics. He urged historians to regard these materials in much the same way as they had traditionally regarded written documents—as capable of being exploited for both direct and indirect historical information.

Numberless historians during the next two decades, in Africa and elsewhere, followed this advice as they swarmed out among oral (or formerly oral) societies, collecting "texts" and subjecting them to analysis. In this process they developed both new views as to the historicity of the oral past and new ways and means of collecting and interpreting oral data, whatever their apparent nature. Responding to, and benefiting from, all this work, Vansina revised (or rather rewrote) his text, and in doing so provided it with a new title, *Oral Tradition as History*, to emphasize that he felt that the work done in the intervening twenty-five years had authenticated the use of oral materials as historical sources.[3] Even so, in *Oral Tradition as History*, Vansina defined oral traditions as "documents of the *present*" which "also embody a message from the past," recognizing the ineluctably Manichaean duality that bedevils oral data *when treated as historical sources*.[4]

I have myself tried to delimit "oral tradition(s)" as a genre by arguing that, regardless of their historicity, to qualify for that sobriquet, materials should have been transmitted over several generations and to some extent be the common property of a group of people.[5] I did this primarily in order to distinguish it from "testimony," which, by virtue of being the property of only a few individuals, seemed to me to lack the cachet (if sometimes dubious) that widespread belief and common acceptance grant to "oral tradition." Other historians have also given specific attention to defining "oral tradition" but few, if any, have used in their own work other terms to characterize the materials with which they have worked.

While the term has thus gained the overwhelming loyalty of historians, it is only one of many terms used by other students of orality. And when used by these latter, more often than not "oral tradition" refers to matter whose *historical* value is minimal. In other words, when the term appears in print, it becomes necessary to know who is using it in order to understand how it is likely to be intended. And while such a circumstance is frequently the case in scholarly discourse, this is by itself no reason why it should be ignored as a problem.

II

But nomenclatural difficulties often betray more substantive differences among those who seek greater or lesser truths. In fact such difficulties can be regarded as windows on less visible issues, in this case the disparity of *attitudes* towards oral materials. And here differences among disciplines come directly into play. Any text, whether it be written, oral, or even visual, is likely to provide different stimuli, depending on the needs and goals of those consulting it. In this respect it is possible to see marked differences in the ways that historians and others (to make a purely invidious dichotomy) treat, or wish to treat, oral materials.

Most historians commit themselves to seek their ends by attempting to understand as much as they can about what happened in the past and then by explaining why just those things happened and not any number of other things. In order to accomplish this, of course, they need first to discover sources for past events in which they can believe, and after that to ransack these sources for every bit of information that they construe (rightly or wrongly) as referring, directly or indirectly, to events

that actually took place, people who really existed, conditions that actually prevailed. Because of this primary goal[6] they tend to look at oral data quite differently, and in fact, often quite contrarily to, say, literary scholars.

The latter are intensely interested in such things as habits of expression or intimations of creative behavior or the effects of audience response. On the other hand historians—wrongly in most cases, I think—are reluctant to deal with any of these issues or ones like them. For instance, they can hardly—or should hardly—address the effects of performance on an oral text without confronting the inevitable, and inevitably unwelcome, results that such ruminations have on the goal of coming into contact with a real past. Ironically, although the bread and butter of historical inquiry is to discern and explain change, historians cannot abide the possibility of indeterminable changes in their own sources.

For historians, then, the vaunted superiority of the written word is less owing to their belief that somehow the ability to write enhances the ability to perceive and record the truth, than it is to the fact that, whether "right" or "wrong," the written word remains comfortingly unchanging over time, even if the ability to interpret it well often changes.

Historians who wish to believe in the historicity of the Trojan War must regard the *Iliad* either as dating from a time very close to such an event or as having been transmitted for several centuries virtually unchanged.[7] Conversely, literary historians seldom believe that they have grounds for the second belief and so, while they might not reject the notion that the *Iliad* has a germ of more or less accurate recollection of a "Trojan War," they would not be fain to suggest that this germ—even if it could be isolated—would be likely to serve as an accurate marker of specific historical events.[8] For them the *Iliad* is interesting above all as a literary, or rather literizing, composition, possibly as the culmination of a long period of orality which finally coalesced (with the "how" being more important than the "when" though hardly separated from it) into written form. For historians, the poem's value depends almost entirely on the extent to which they can tease out what they regard as specific historical information. And this in turn involves posing a largely differing set of questions.

In a sense this brings us back to the matter of nomenclature. For, if historians are pleased to argue that the *Iliad* can tell us something substantial about a place called Ilium in a time about

the beginning of the twelfth century B.C., they would portray it as "oral tradition" because it managed to convey historical information over some period of time to a point at which it was recorded. In that respect it was not unlike the kinds of information historians collect (or like to think they collect) in oral societies. To the extent that they grant historical value to the *Iliad*, they are also granting validity to the results of their own work.

But if the argument is accepted that, whatever historical insights the *Iliad* might provide, they relate to contemporary, probably eighth-century B.C., times, then historians—if I read them right—would think of the *Iliad*, or at least parts of it, as "oral literature," or even "oral history." It may have been widely known, but it was not transmitted as an unchanging text over any period of time (and so should probably not be referred to as "it". . .). By changing, by becoming a text more influenced by a continuing present than by a receding past, any oral *Iliad* forfeits being termed "oral tradition," as historians are accustomed to use the term.

A further nomenclatural issue with procedural implications relates to the effects that the mere passing of time might have on terminology. To take one example, historians in the eleventh and twelfth centuries (and in some cases the twentieth century) regarded much of the Icelandic saga literature as historical, and therefore as having been "oral tradition." Nowadays the tendency is to regard much of this material—that which dealt with Scandinavia rather than Iceland—as less an attempt to record and preserve the past accurately than as a form of literary expression that used real or putative historical events as points of departure—*raisons d'être* for literary composition, not unlike the *Iliad* or the *Chanson de Roland* or the Puranic texts of early India.

It proved difficult for nineteenth-century Nordic historians to reject the sagas and their counterparts as essentially historical texts because they wanted very much to believe what they said—nationalism served well to dull their critical faculties. As a result not a few intellectual gymnastics went into attempting to demonstrate how oral societies could, and did, go to great lengths to train specialists whose only function was to receive, memorize, and transmit in unchanged form stories (or, if you will, records) from the ever more remote and meaningless past.[9] As nationalism, at least Nordic nationalism, ebbed in this century, some historians, but more often literary critics, demonstrated the exiguity of this

point of view.[10] Consequently, the general (but hardly universal) belief today is that it is not really possible, however desirable, to posit a long history of unified kingship in, say, Sweden before the tenth century on the basis of the Ynglinga saga or similar compositions of much later provenance.[11]

III

These hard lessons resulted from, among other things, the greater—or at least the quicker—willingness of literary scholars to drink from the cup of comparison by drawing on work from one time or place in order to suggest tenable hypotheses for studying another time and place. Perhaps owing to the great mass of documentation available for their perusal, historians were rather less interested and less willing to draw on work done outside their own specialized interests, particularly if carried out among "primitive" societies. After all, they had sources galore which seemed quite capable of speaking for themselves after a little prodding. Of what possible interest could work in darkest Africa have for historians of Anglo-Saxon England (to cite but one of any number of possible permutations)? Indeed it was (and still is) common to regard historians of oral societies as species of anthropological wolf in sheep's clothing. Although not yet fully dead and buried, this notion has begun to give way to accepting the value of understanding not only the work of other historians in apparently remote pastures, but also of scholars from other disciplines, once thought of as bearing little relationship to historical inquiry.

But much remains to be done, and it still is not easy to see where the most likely meeting ground would be in this conflict of opinion. The differences are not only procedural but broadly philosophical as well. No group of scholars willingly rejects its sources, and historians are no exception. Moreover, as I suggested earlier, seeing at least some oral texts as fundamentally unhistorical, because of their propensity to change as time passes, undermines an entire ethic that has developed in at least one group of oral historians in the past few scholarly generations.[12] But, if a meeting of minds is not in the cards, a colloquy in which the respective arguments are made on behalf of, and as a result of input from, all contending parties is likely at least to crystallize discussion, eliminate the wearying repetition of stale arguments, and introduce comparative insights and issues.[13]

To this end the appearance of *Oral Tradition*, which promises to be eclectic in its content and approach, and which, it is hoped, will attract an audience at least as eclectic in its interests, bodes well for continuing and intensifying the study of oral data from and about the past, no matter what we care to call them. In its pages psychologists will be able to talk to historians, historians to literary critics, literary critics to Biblical scholars. . . . The present piece is intended as no more than an introductory salvo to such a polylog, and in it I hope that I have raised points that will strike the interest of all parties.

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Notes

[1]Not that oral history is entirely without its problems in this respect. See, for instance, Morrissey 1984. However, the *International Journal of Oral History* seldom belies its title by publishing studies which fall outside this more or less contemporary framework, particularly insofar as they relate to anti-elitist life histories.

[2]See Vansina 1965.

[3]See Vansina 1985.

[4]Vansina 1985:xii, with emphasis in the original.

[5]See Henige 1982:2-3.

[6]0f course some historians have become as interested in why their sources say what they (appear to) say as in that which is said, but this welcome departure cannot yet be said to be a trend, either among practitioners of oral history or among historians of oral societies. Perhaps it will never be, since in this case historians are co-creators of their own sources, a fact that is bound to inhibit their willingness—and certainly their ability—to question them as they might another body of materials.

[7]Whereas the Homeric compositions have been unceasingly subjected to scrutiny (not always critical scrutiny of course) for two centuries or more, the Vedic hymns and Puranic texts from early India have largely been the subject of pious attention, and the belief is still nearly universal that these texts (particularly the Vedic hymns) were "carried down in the memory for thousands of years" before being written down in precisely the form in which they had first been composed (see Roy 1977:8). Probably because the Vedic materials are regarded as scriptures, all arguments have been on their behalf rather than on behalf of the balance of evidence. For other studies on this issue, see Majumdar 1952:225-41. These discussions occur in a methodological vacuum, untainted by work done on similar materials. Consequently the same assertions and the same arguments recur endlessly.

[8]See Morris 1986.

[9]The idea that oral societies were typically interested enough in preserving and transmitting the details of an ever-growing and more cumbersome record of the past to create such classes of specialists to do just this was (is) of course not confined to Scandinavia, but was a part of the posture of accepting oral data as historically accurate in Oceania, parts of Africa, India, and elsewhere. It is a belief that can never be demonstrated, but a useful belief nonetheless.

[10]Early in this century Lauritz Weibull was one of the first to cast into doubt the intrinsic historical value of the *Heimskringla* and other sagas, and in so doing he aroused heated animosity on the part of his colleagues who did not care to have their illusions assaulted by means of textual criticism. See Arvidsson et al. 1977, and more generally, Kristjánsson 1975.

[11]The views on the Vedic and Puranic materials mentioned in note 7 are much imbued with the idea of Indian nationalism and/or Aryan purity and seem to reflect quite closely both the content and inspiration of the debate in Scandinavia and elsewhere in the nineteenth century. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*.

[12]I refer to the dismayingly large number of Africanist historians who are determined to believe whatever their oral sources seem to tell them and to compound the problem by declining to place these materials into the public domain where they belong. On this point see Henige 1980.

[13]Several interesting studies which demonstrate the efficacy of the multi-disciplinary approach are to be found in Congrès 1983.

References

Arvidsson et al. 1977
Rolf Arvidsson et al. "Source-criticism and Literary History: Lauritz Weibull, Heinrich Schück and Joseph Bédier." *Mediaeval Scandinavia*, 10:179-87.

Congrès 1983
Temps, mémoire, tradition au Moyen-Age: Actes du XIIIe Congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur publique. Aix-en-Provence.

Henige 1980
David Henige. "In Possession of the Author: The Problem of Source Monopoly in Oral Historiography." *International Journal of Oral History*, 1:181-94.

Henige 1982
Oral Historiography. London: Longman.

Kristjánsson 1975
Jónas Kristjánsson. "*Íslendingadrápa* and Oral Tradition" *Gripla*, 1:76-91.

Majumdar 1952
R. C. Majumdar, ed. *The History and Culture of the Indian People, I: The Vedic Age*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Morris 1986
Ian Morris. "The Use and Abuse of Homer." *Classical Antiquity*,

5:81-138.

Morrissey 1984
Charles T. Morrissey. “Riding a Mule through the ‘Terminological Jungle’: Oral History and Problems of Nomenclature.” *Oral History Review*, 12:13-28.

Roy 1977
S. B. Roy. “History and Chronology of the Ancient Sanskrit Literature.” *Hindutva*, 8.

Vansina 1965
Jan Vansina. *Oral Tradition*. Chicago: Aldine.

Vansina 1985
_____. *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Verma 1980
K. C. Verma. “Some Genuine Problems and their Deliberate Perpetuation.” In *Bias in Indian Historiography*. Ed. D. Devahuti. Delhi: D. K. Publications. pp. 42-55.

The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation, Dennis Tedlock. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983. xi + 365 pp. Illustrations; Appendices; Notes; Bibliography; Index; $15.95 (paper).

Tullio Maranhão
Rice University

Dennis Tedlock's book falls into the tradition initiated by the studies of Milman Parry and Albert Lord which called attention to the meaning potential of performance. Lord's insights (1960), obtained in the mythography of Yugoslav folk narratives, unravelled the performative importance of the Greek epic poems. Tedlock's ideas draw on contemporary communities where the storytelling is current, Zuni in New Mexico and Mayan Quiché in Guatemala, and reveal a great interest in style of narration and in phonography. The author examines the transformations that a narrative text undergoes from its written version to performance, from presentation to recording, and so on. The book is divided into four parts ("Transcription and Translation," "Poetics," "Hermeneutics," and "Toward Dialogue") and sixteen chapters. The main goal of Tedlock's argument is to show the iridescent effects of performance in oral narrative, both from the point of view of live delivery to an audience and of representation of that performance through different media such as the printed page or the tape-recorder. He works in the direction of developing techniques and strategies for accurately recording the narratives, and wishes to move beyond the realm of representation into that of presentation in which the mythographer's voice, rather than cannibalizing the native's, is given its proper due, that is, expresses itself as a component of the audience. This reduction of the mythographic loudness would create conditions for the emergence of dialogue within anthropology by breaking the monopoly of reporting on the part of the ethnographer/writer, and by creating a noble space in the anthropological essay for an *ipsis litteris*, or even better, an *ipsis verbis et sonus* presentation of the native's voice. The effort is kindred to several attempts to recast anthropology as a voice in dialogue with other voices, an interest which evolved in recent years as a kind of sequel to interpretive anthropology. The issue, however, resides in that we do not have yet a dialogical anthropology, and propositions such as Tedlock's, however stimulating they may be, cannot conceal their tentative nature. Tedlock indeed is aware of the experimental character of his endeavor and writes "toward dialogue" and about "the emergence of dialogical anthropology."

The chapters in Part 1 focus on transcription and translation. Here the author develops a notation for the transcription of "performance scripts" and proposes an "ethnopaleography" consisting in showing the ancient texts to the contemporary storytellers within the same cultural tradition in order to shed light on both the erstwhile and the coeval. In the second part he raises a serious objection to Derrida's deconstruction of language as a written undertaking. The French philosopher has argued that the linguistic unit at the root of our conception of language is the phoneme, not a sound but the viabilization of sound through a graphic unit. Tedlock presents arguments against the Aristotelian-Derridean way of thinking, and harnesses poesia back to its original oral tandem. He discusses a wide variety of performative maneuvers generating poetic meaning in Zuni and in Quiché. Part III takes us to the question of hermeneutics. Since the performative aspect of narrative is emphasized, the storyteller can be regarded at the same time as narrator

and interpreter. This naturally renders hermeneutics unfathomable, thereby opening the way for the next and final part of the book, on dialogue. Here the mythographer emerges as an interlocutor of the storyteller, and thus it would be the responsiblity of a dialogical anthropologist to acknowledge his role as participant in that dialogue, instead of recording the narrative as a pretending outside observer. Tedlock agrees that the transcription of the dialogue, no matter how accurate, loses a great deal, but undauntingly suggests that transcriptions can be transformed from the defensiveness brought about by precariousness into scripts for new performances. Thus, by eliminating the spurious element represented by the text, which becomes replaced by a score, the flow of dialogue would be re-established in its full recalcitrance against past and future.

Tedlock reminds us of the Malinowskian principle of kinship between anthropologist and missionary according to which the anthropologist's task is to translate the native's point of view to the Europeans while the missionaries translate in the opposite direction. However, we must keep in mind that the persuasive zeal of each translator is different, and that translation always betrays that which is translated by attempting to convey the said through the written, the narrative through essay, the life experience through a scientific explanation. Malinowski himself fell into the trap of representation—as have so many anthropologists who have begun to regard their métier as dialogical—by trying to write down the dialogues they had with the natives concerned with the verisimilitude of their accounts. The difficulty in the representation of dialogue begins with the founding document of dialogue, Plato's report of the debates entertained by Socrates. The reported dialogue is never the same as the dialogue, and the report written down is different in yet another way. Dialogue in process presupposes immediacy, open-endedness and wholeness. The written dialogue, in turn, is meditated by text, closed and fragmentary. Tedlock does not merely propose a more accurate procedure for transcribing dialogues, but suggests that the transcription be rendered as a score serving as the basis for future performances. (His style throughout the book is reminiscent of an author constantly aware of the performative aspects of his writing as well as of the difficulties brewing in the process of writing that which was said, of writing about saying, and of writing as closely as possible to speaking.)

Poetics and performance are but two angles in the polygon of reconstructed dialogue. The content of the discussion, the participants, as well as the several levels of cultural, social and historical encasement of the situation are also very important. Narrative is the stock-in-trade of Tedlock's notion of dialogue. Narration, however, does not mix well with dialogue. Narrative is the speech genre of the poet whose objective is to evoke collectively shared memories within a community of knowledge. Narrative is consensual, monological, and deeply underscored by play with time and space. The narrator tells what is already known, he speaks without the expectation of getting either replies or objections, he delivers a monological discourse which is always about another time and another place. In dialogue, on the contrary, there must be dissent for the conversation to proceed, the speech interventions must be shorter than narratives in order to allow for the frequent participation of all speakers, and the dimensions of time and space are blown away, as dialogue is self-referential and completely identified with the here and now of the communicative situation. Tedlock's book is very entertaining and represents a courageous and important step in the direction of reconstructed dialogue. The challenge which lies ahead is that of dialogue

itself, and the attempt to meet that challenge may dissolve anthropological discourse and the disciplinary identity of its authors, because in dialogue the themes for discussion are constantly renegotiated and the directions the conversation takes are unpredictable.

Reference

Lord 1960
Albert Bates Lord. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Commonplace and Creativity, Flemming G. Andersen. Odense University Studies from the Medieval Centre, vol. 1. Odense: Odense University Press, 1985. x + 404 pp. Preface; List of sources, abbreviations; Introduction; Summary in Danish; List of references; Index of ballads and songs; Index of names and topics.

William B. McCarthy
University of the Ozarks

In *Commonplace and Creativity* Flemming G. Andersen has provided an excellent analysis of the aesthetics of the Anglo-Scottish ballad. His principal subject is the artful use of commonplace phrases and stanzas by traditional singers in creative individual interpretations of the ballad tradition. In this discussion he restricts himself to the Anglo-Scottish tradition, eliminating Irish and American texts from consideration for methodological reasons, and asserting that some of the aesthetic elements he discusses are not even found in the related Danish tradition. He here provides far and away the most extensive analysis ever of the commonplace and of other such attractive elements of ballad style as incremental repetition, "leaping and lingering," and the renowned ballad objectivity. He is perhaps the first writer ever to do more than extend an invitation to share mystical contemplation of these mysterious and elusive qualities of Anglo-Scottish balladry which so caught the imagination of the late eighteenth century, affected the formulation of the Romantic aesthetic, and still capture our imagination today.

Andersen sees repetition as a structural mechanism with mnemonic as well as narrative and expressive functions. Incremental repetition is part of a system of five types of repetition. The first, repetition for emphasis (e.g. successive stanzas beginning "Word is to her father gone....Word is to her mother gone") is static. The other four are dynamic. What he calls narrative repetition (e.g. "She mounted and rode away....She mounted and rode home") frames narrative, while causative repetition (e.g. "Where will I get a bonny boy?...Here am I, a bonny boy") builds scenes. Ballad "leaping" is effected by recurrent repetition (e.g. "When he came to her gates....When she came to her father's gates"), which serves to mark the ends of scenes and link scene to scene. Ballad "lingering," on the other hand, he ties to progressive or incremental repetition building suspense.

The elements most commonly subject to repetition are the ballad commonplaces, that is, those phrases and stanzas repeated not only within individual ballads, but from version to version, ballad to ballad, across the tradition. Andersen reserves the term "formula" for his discussion of these commonplace phrases and stanzas. Dissatisfied with the substitutional model of formulaic diction he finds in Albert B. Lord's *The Singer of Tales* (1960) he creates a new, genre-specific model to deal with the complexities of the commonplace, or "formula family." The principal inspiration for this model seems to be Nagler's (1974) bi-level model in which a common gestalt on the deep level generates multiple allomorphs on the surface level. Andersen parts company with Nagler in admitting metrically diverse allomorphs and in insisting on a Chomskian semantic identity rather than a gestalt of unactualized common characteristics as the deep foundation of formula families. Moreover, his model seems to be more descriptive, while Nagler's is generative. This model, then, has a deep level comprising the basic narrative idea, and a surface level comprising the multitude of lines and stanzas in various ballads which express that single narrative idea. But over and above these levels Andersen posits a third supra-narrative level comprising the unified complex of associations that the formula family calls up. The actions described in commonplace lines and stanzas have definable emphases, overtones, implications, and significance, and create definable expectations. Calling up these associations is the supra-narrative function of formulas. The theory of supra-narrative functions is the most original contribution of the book, and over half of the text is given to cataloguing these functions.

Having presented his model, Andersen is then ready to define the ballad formula and formula family as "a recurrent, multiform unit expressing a significant narrative idea, with more or less pronounced supra-narrative function. And formulas may be grouped into families on the basis of similarity in form and identity of underlying narrative idea" (37). Thus, for example, to take a simple case, the WHAT NEWS, WHAT NEWS formula family is unified on the level of idea: somebody asks a messenger for the news. On the surface level the expression of the formula takes various forms, including among its many members both

> What news, what news, my little pages,
> What news hae ye brought to me?

from the quatrain ballad (Child 99M), and

> What news, what news, my auld beggar man,
> What news, what news, by sea or by lan?

from a couplet ballad (Child 17D). Other families are even more diverse on the surface level. But on the supra-narrative level the family is united again, for this formula always presages disaster. Sometimes the news itself tells of disaster; sometimes it tells of a confrontation which will prove disastrous. But even when the news seems good, disaster follows hard upon it. The supra-narrative function of this formula, then, is to create a mood of foreboding and suspense.

Andersen has identified only twenty-six such formula families in Anglo-Scottish balladry. Since the underlying idea is a narrative idea, the families tend to fall into four categories according to narrative function. Some provide introductions, some transitions, some conclusions, and some descriptions of situations. Folk and popular song includes many phrases with

the same idea content as the formula families: dressing in red, reading letters, making beds, dying and being buried, and so on. Non-formulaic expressions of these ideas can even be found in balladry. Such non-formulaic expressions cannot always be eliminated on the basis of diction, because on the surface level the formula is quite varied in its wording. But on the supra-narrative level the authentic formulas will express the affect of the family. "What news" will not be good news, and "looking over the castle wall" will not lead to a happy reunion. Moreover, the narrative idea will be expressed only in its proper place. An introductory formula such as "Sewing a silken seam" will not be part of a narrative situation, nor will a situational formula such as "He's taken her by the milkwhite hand" serve simply as a transition.

Andersen recognizes, of course, that ballad language includes formulaic diction beyond the formula family. He distinguishes the formula from the fixed phrase expletives such as "An ill death may you die," because these latter repetitions do not denote action, and do not change in phraseology. Inquits such as "Out and spoke..." vary only in the identification of the speaker, and serve as simple introductories, without any emotional overtones, as do phrases of time, such as "It fell about the Martinmas." Context-bound formulations are distinguished on the basis of their limitation to one ballad or complex of ballads, as the "Four Maries" stanza is associated only with *Mary Hamilton*. A closely related phenomenon is "context-bound formulaic diction," by which Andersen means a variation of a formula (in his sense of the word), but a variation particular to a single ballad complex, though multiform within that complex, as is the special variation of the WHAT NEWS formula in *Johnie Cock*. Finally, he dismisses stock epithets as "merely ornamental" and of "no significance for the ballad narrative" (26). This treatment of other levels of formulaic diction reveals the limit (and limitation?) of Andersen's work. Only members of formula families are "genuine ballad formulas" (40) in his system. But a common-sense approach would suggest that these others might also properly be called formulas, even if they must be distinguished carefully from the ballad element that Andersen has made the subject of his work. Moreover, a generative as opposed to a descriptive discussion of formulaic language in the ballad would need to account for all levels of formulaic diction.

The significance of particular formula families for creativity is summarized at the end of his discussion of narrative function. "Context-free formulas...belong to the entire ballad genre. It is within the latter category that ballad singers and their particular style come out most clearly.... 'Creativity' is revealed in the *degree* to which the singers are able to exploit the potential flexibility of formulaic diction.... Formulas are conservative, stabilizing elements because they are recurrent phrases, but because they are flexible units they are also a vehicle for the singer's personal interpretations of the ballad tradition" (100). Putting it another way, singers within the Anglo-Scottish tradition find greatest scope for artistry in sensitive utilization of formulaic diction to take skillful advantage of that diction's supra-narrative potential.

As narrative units these formula families do not have any counterpart, according to Andersen, in the cognate Scandanavian tradition. Even in Anglo-Scottish balladry most do not appear until the seventeenth century. Those which do appear in earlier texts, such as HE FELL LOW DOWN ON HIS KNEE, function differently in those early texts. In the Robin Hood and related ballads, for instance, "lines denoting the act of kneeling" (the deep idea) are accompanied by "lines specifying the significance of that act" (240).

In other words, the formula does not suffice to express both the narrative idea and the supra-narrative affect. Thus, in Child 119, "He kneled down vpon his kne" (action) is followed by "God zow saue, my lege lorde" (explicit statement of meaning of action).

Andersen establishes fairly convincingly that the formula is the principal medium of narrative in the classic ballads, and that such hallmarks of ballad style as objectivity and "leaping and lingering" are due to this technique of formula-based narrative. Yet, judging from the evidence of the earlier ballads, the system of formulas upon which classic ballad style depends evolved only in the British Isles and was not firmly in place until about 1650. If Andersen is right, then the classic ballad, in the form which caught the European imagination, was not a relic of some earlier era, but a product of the very age in which the great ballads were collected (c. 1650-1850). In short, what we have in Child are not "waifs and strays," but products of a golden age.

A study like Andersen's raises many questions for one interested in oral-formulaic studies. The positive content of the book seems to mesh well with current scholarship in the field. And yet he explicitly disassociates himself from the oral-formulaic approach. Why? Part of the problem seems to be that some have equated oral-formulaic studies exclusively with the Parry-Lord model. *The Singer of Tales* is indeed suggestive for scholars in many fields, but the model which it describes is, properly speaking, applicable chiefly to South Slavic and related traditions, including the Homeric. In applying and disputing the application of that model to balladry, Jones (1961) and Friedman (1961; 1983), among others, have become entangled in the bugaboo false dichotomy of improvised versus memorized. In this context Andersen's comparison of two texts of *Earl Crawford*, Child 229Aa and Child 229Ab, is instructive. Mrs. Thompson's text is so close to her mother's that most readers, including Andersen, would conclude that it is a memorized version of a text which her mother in turn had memorized. And yet her version is two stanzas longer, with enough differences in use of the formulas for Andersen to consider the daughter the more skillful balladeer, and to conclude that the two versions "present two distinct pictures of the two women as ballad singers and as tradition bearers" (91). Oral composition is not nearly so monolithic as certain readers of Lord would have us believe. The kind of creative recomposition Andersen describes should be able to find a place in any rational discussion of the oral process.

Andersen's book forces us to confront the crisis of terminology in oral-formulaic studies. As we discuss an ever-widening world of oral composition processes we still use two terms, *formula* and *theme*, which were hammered out in the development of the theory of one particular process—to say nothing of being inherently ambiguous to begin with. The "formulas" which Andersen describes are very unlike the formulas Parry first described (e.g., 1928). That difference seems to be one of the reasons Andersen parts company with the oral-formulaic school. Parry's formulas are substitutional and generative. Andersen's are descriptive and multiform; in fact, they are much more like the themes which Lord describes. A single idea is expressed in a multitude of possible ways, as in the theme. Furthermore, the supra-narrative function is closely related to the fixed affective value and foreshadowing function which Alain Renoir (e.g., 1980), among others, has been studying in epic themes, though Andersen does not cite Renoir in his bibliography. The chief difference from Renoir's method is that the supra-narrative function is ballad-specific rather than cultural and cross-cultural. Yet, despite these obvious similarities on all three levels

between theme and ballad commonplace, I cannot really fault Andersen for calling these units formulas. To apply the term *theme* to a six-syllable line such as "Sewing a silken seam" would take considerable chutzpah. *Formula* and *theme* are old skins. They cannot contain the new wine which is constantly being fermented in the oral vineyard.

Though obviously I do not agree with every point, I thoroughly enjoyed this book. The writing is engaging and clear, the insights are exciting, and even the cover is striking. In presenting his thesis Andersen is ever controlled and careful to avoid overstatement. His summaries of oral-formulaic theory in Part I are fair and generous, even when seasoned with disagreement. Throughout his discussion, notes at the foot of the page regularly and evenhandedly call attention to stray bits of data which do not fit neatly into his compartments. The exhaustive catalog of occurrences of each formula, designed for reference, goes beyond Child to include occurrences in later collections from England and Scotland as well. A final section of the book looks in detail at the use of formulaic stanzas in a wide sampling of English and Scottish texts. I recommend this book to anyone interested in the aesthetics of oral composition, and to anyone interested in the ballad (which should include any English-speaking student of the oral-formulaic approach to traditional verbal art).

References

Friedman 1961

Albert B. Friedman. "The Formulaic Improvisation Theory of Ballad Tradition—A Counterstatement." *Journal of American Folklore*, 74:113-15.

Friedman 1983

_____. "The Oral-Formulaic Theory of Balladry — A Re-Rebuttal." In *The Ballad Image: Essays Presented to Bertrand Harris Bronson*. Ed. James Porter. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore & Mythology, University of California, Los Angeles. pp. 215-40.

Jones 1961

James H. Jones. "Commonplace and Memorization in the Oral Tradition of the English and Scottish Popular Ballads." *Journal of American Folklore*, 74:97-112.

Lord 1960

Albert Bates Lord. *The Singer of Tales*. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, 24. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nagler 1974

Michael Nagler. *Spontaneity and Tradition. A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Parry 1928

Milman Parry. *L'Epithéte traditionnelle daus Homère: Essai sur un problème de style homérique*. Trans. Adam Parry as "The Traditional Epithet in Homer." In *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. Adam Parry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971, pp. 1-190.

Renoir 1980
Alain Renoir. “Oral-Formulaic Context: Implications for the Comparative Criticism of Mediaeval Texts.” In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*. Ed. John Miles Foley. Columbus: Slavica Publishers. pp. 416-39.

About the Authors

Olga M. Davidson (Brandeis University), a specialist in Persian literature and tradition, has also written a companion piece to the essay in this volume describing the oral heritage of the *Shâhnâma*.

Mark W. Edwards (Stanford University) is well known for his cogent analyses of Homer's traditional style.

Librarian at the University of Wisconsin/Madison, *David Henige* has contributed significantly to the study of African oral tradition and history, especially in his 1974 volume, *The Chronology of Oral Tradition: Quest for a Chimera*.

Victor H. Mair (University of Pennsylvania) specializes in Chinese literature; among his recent books are *Tun-huang Popular Narratives* (1983) and *T'ang Transformation Texts* (1988).

A member of the English department at the University of Denver, *Alexandra Hennessey Olsen* has written widely on Old and Middle English literature, particularly on their roots in oral tradition and in Latin literature.

Brynley F. Roberts (National Library of Wales) has contributed numerous articles and monographs to the study of Welsh literature, including a recent essay in *The Craft of Fiction* (1984) on the transition from traditional tale to literary story.

An unaffiliated scholar trained as a cultural anthropologist, *Richard Swiderski* has carried on fieldwork among the Knanaya. His full-length study of that people's rituals, *Blood Weddings*, will appear in both India and the United States in late 1988.

March 21-25, 1987

AN INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON VUK STEFANOVIĆ KARADŽIĆ: ORAL TRADITION AND LITERARY ART,
University of Missouri,
Columbia, Missouri

The symposium commemorated the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the great Serbian ethnographer, linguist, and collector of oral tradition.

Slobodan Markovuć (Belgrade), "Early Serbian Realism and Oral Creation-Patterns"
Mary P. Coote (San Francisco), "On Women's Songs"
Miroslav Marcovich (Illinois), "Decasyllabic Variations: Meter and Formula"
Barry B. Powell (Wisconsin), "How Homer Was Written Down: A Preliminary Report"
Barbara Wallach (Missouri), Response to Prof. Powell's paper
Zdeslav Dukat (Zagreb), "Smailagić Meho and Peleus' Achilles"
David E. Bynum (Cleveland State), "On Epic Meters"
Svetozar Petrović (Novi Sad), "Vuk Karadžić's Singers: Phenomena and Implications"
Albert B. Lord (Harvard). "Twentieth-Century Singers: Sounds and Implications"
Franc Zadravec (Ljubljana), "Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and the Slovenian Literary Program"
Joseph Conrad (Kansas), "Structure and Content of Serbo-Croatian Magical Charms"
Nada Milošević-Djordjević (Belgrade), "Oral and Literary Art in Vuk's 'Serbian Folk Tales'"
John Miles Foley (Missouri), "Tradition and Aesthetics in Songs Collected by Vuk Karadžić"
Barbara Kerewsky Halpern and Joel M. Halpern (Massachusetts), Film of *Life in a Serbian Village* (showing and discussion)
Svetozar Koljević (Sarajevo), "Repetition as Invention in Karadžić's Collections"
John S. Miletich (Utah), "The Vuk Canon and the Eclipse of South Slavic Traditions"

April 13-15. 1987

THE SECOND GREENBANK COLLOQUIUM: HOMER 1987
Greenbank House,
University of Liverpool

Gregory Nagy (Harvard), "The Epic Cycle"
M.J. Alden (The Queen's University of Belfast), "pseudea polla etumoisin homoia"

Tracey Rihll (Leeds), "The Power of *basileis*"
John Miles Foley (Missouri), "The Problem of Aesthetics in Oral Traditional Texts"
Kevin O'Nolan (University College Dublin), "Some Thoughts on the Poetics of Oral Composition"
M. M. Willcock (University College London), "Nervous Hesitation in the *Iliad*"
J. Pinsent (Liverpool), "The Odyssized *Iliad*"

July 6-9, 1987

THE STUDY OF ORAL TRADITION AND THE SOUTH SLAVS:
A SYMPOSIUM
School of Slavonic and East European Studies,
University of London

Svetozar Koljević (Sarajevo), "Vuk Karadžić and the Achievement of His Singers"
Nada Milošević (Belgrade), "The Poetics of the Oral Tradition of Vuk Karadžić"
Vilmos Voigt (Eotvos Loránd University, Budapest), "Primus inter pares: Why Was Vuk Karadžić the Most Influential Folklore Scholar in South-East Europe in the Nineteenth Century?"
Hannes Sihvo (Joensuu), "Reflections of Serbian Oral Poetry in Finnish Literature"
Celia Hawkesworth (London), "The Study of South Slav Oral Poetry in English"
Marija Kleut (Novi Sad), "The Classification of Serbo-Croat Epic Oral Songs Into Cycles: Reasons and Consequences"
John S. Miletich (Utah), "The Tradition of Croatian 'Folk' Poetry of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries Collected in Gradišće [Burgenland]: Notes for the Comparative Study of Literature"
Hatidža Krnjević (Belgrade), "The Collections of Oral Lyric (Women's Songs) Assembled and Published by Vuk Karadžić: The Earliest Ritualistic Layers"
Jelena Saulić (Belgrade), "Serbian Proverbs in the Karadžić Collection"
Thomas Butler (Oxford), "'Hasanaginica' and its European Reception"
Ivan Lozica (Zagreb), "Favoured and Neglected Genres in Oral Tradition"
Radmila Pešić (Belgrade), "Popular Epic Songs of the Oldest Period"
Anna-Leena Siikala (Helsinki), "Mythical History in Oral Epic"
Jovan Deretić (Belgrade), "The Oldest Song Cycles: Fact and Fancy"
Arthur Hatto (London), "What is an Heroic Lay? Some Reflections on the Germanic, Serbo-Croat, and Fula"
Felix Oinas (Indiana), "Finnish and Yugoslav Epic Songs"
Lauri Harvilahti (Helsinki), "Epic Poetry Cultures and the Use of Formula Technique: Some Problems of Definition"

John Miles Foley (Missouri), "South Slavic Oral Tradition in a Comparative Context"
Karl Reichl (Bonn), "Parallelism in South Slavic and Turkic Epic Poetry: Towards a Poetics of Formulaic Diction"
Roderick Beaton (King's College London), "Modern Greek and South Slavic Oral Tradition: Specific Contrasts and Theoretical Implications"
David E. Bynum (Cleveland), "Reflexes of Indo-European Myth in the South Slavic Tradition of Oral Epos"
Jan Knappert (London), "The Collection of Oral Literature in Africa"
Senni Timonen (Helsinki), "The Cult of the Virgin Mary: The Meeting of Great and Little Tradition in Karelian Oral Poetry"
Munib Maglajlić (Sarajevo), "The Singer Selim Salihović as Representative of the Living Tradition of Moslem Folksongs in Bosnia"
Leea Virtanen (Helsinki), "Singers on Their Songs: The Act of Singing as Perceived by Singers in the Setu Region (Estonia) Today"
Elizabeth Gunner (London), "The Dynamics of Singer and Audience in Contemporary Zulu Praise Poetry"
Said S. Samatar (Rutgers), "Oral Poetry and Political Dissent in Somali Society: The Hurgamo Series"
Slobodan Marković (Belgrade), "Aspects of Oral Creation during the Second World War"
Peter Levi (Oxford), "The Translation of Oral Epic: The Challenge of Marko the Prince"
R. Cockcroft (Nottingham), "The Concepts of Marginality and Centrality, and their Application to the Study of Heroic Narrative"
Seppo Knuuttila (Joensuu), "'The Blind Homer of the North': Educated/Elitist Metaphor in Descriptions of Folk Singers"
Michael Branch (London), "The Invention of a National Epic"
Alan Dundes (Berkeley), "Vuk Stefanović Karadžić's 'Zidanje Skadra' and the Measure of Meaning of a Ballad of the Balkans: From National Beginnings to International Ends in the Study of Folklore"
Albert Lord (Harvard), "Vuk's Impact on the Tradition: The Importance for Homer"

Popular Music in the Middle East, South Asia, and Southeast Asia
A Conference at the Society for the Humanities, Cornell University
April 25-26, 1986

Philip V. Bohlman
University of Illinois at Chicago

The study of popular music has long struggled to overcome the unpopularity accorded it by the Academy. Defined more by what it is not than what it is, popular music has been relegated to an unhappy realm, beyond the pale of tradition, oral or written, and wanting the discursive legitimacy of folk, art, or religious musics. Accordingly, popular music has too

often been the collective wastebasket into which were tossed styles of music ephemeral in content and barren of lasting value. A strange fate for a genre of music whose very name bespeaks a rather different judgment from that segment of society whose concerns lie more with practice than with theory.

With a shroud of questionable legitimacy surrounding popular music, it might seem a strange and thankless undertaking for the Society for the Humanities at Cornell University to sponsor a conference devoted to "Popular Music in the Middle East, South Asia, and Southeast Asia." But it was not the goal of the conference to redress some previous violation of sacred turf. Quite the contrary, the speakers at the conference, as representatives of different disciplines and area studies, interpreted the question of musical and geographic territory expansively, tugging at previously pejorative boundaries and in the end supplanting these with more auspicious confines, which at least proffered the possibility that a more concerted and comparative study of popular music may remove it from scholarly limbo in the foreseeable future.

It is hardly surprising that a conference of this scope avoided potentially restrictive definitions. Definition existed only in the form of example, and if example were to be taken as a criterion for the existence of popular music in the Middle East and Asia, it had to take into consideration a tremendous variety of popular repertoires. Thus, whereas the popular genres of one area might be very different from those of another, there was never any question that popular music was a noteworthy aspect of each region examined. Speakers, in fact, seemed to agree that popular music was a pervasive and worldwide phenomenon, one that transcended social stratification and failed to attend modernization and technological advancement in the slavish manner argued by critics of the cassette industry or the aural colonialism of the BBC World Service. Popular music has been and will continue to be a fact of musical life in remote village and urban center alike.

Diverse repertoires and styles admitted from the outset, most speakers at the Cornell conference chose to address their topics comparatively, contrasting popular music with specific genres that were generally not regarded as popular. Inevitably, this led to a recognition of changing musical styles, with popular music serving as an *avant-garde* for that which might subsequently emerge as traditional. In their studies of the Hiali epic traditions of Egypt, Dwight Reynolds and Susan Slyomovics used as the traditional underpinning of newly emerging popularity a genre of oral epic poetry known at least as early as the Islamic middle ages, when the fourteenth-century historian Ibn Khaldūn heard it among the tribes of North Africa. In contemporary Egypt, Hiali epic performances are at once traditional and popular. In Slyomovics's study, "The Poet as Outsider: Upper Egypt and Oral Epic Performance," the border between the traditional and the popular was clearly marked by a boundary between the singer and his audiences: he was by definition (and behavior) an outsider, whereas the epic he performed was essential to the audience's sense of its own extensive history and that of North Africa. In a paper entitled "Epic-Singing in Egypt: From Village to Studio and Back Again," Reynolds described a different performer-audience confrontation that has come to characterize the Hiali epic tradition, namely that between traditional epic singers and the Egyptian cassette industry. Although he admitted that the cassette industry necessarily effected change—for example, a version of many hours compressed to fit a few compact tapes—Reynolds stopped short of claiming that commercialization would suffocate tradition. Instead, the Hilali epics had spawned a new vitality, attracting the attention of new audiences and an international community of scholars while retaining their

essence as a "hopelessly folk" tradition. Other speakers, too, treated the cassette industry more kindly than is customary in ethnomusicology. Philip Yampoisky, surveying the industry in Indonesia, summarized the thoughts of many, claiming that recordings do not in themselves engender popularity, but instead become no more than the vehicle for a musical style that immanently has the potential to reach a broad audience.

Although Western notions, bombarded by the evanescence of hits and the ever-shifting Top-40, generally equate popular music with rapid change, the Middle Eastern and Asian genres examined by the speakers demonstrated a remarkable ability to check, if not mediate, certain types of change. The several types of Indian popular music, for example, embodied broader concerns for the rapprochement of religious differences and the quelling of sectarian violence. In his paper, "The Popular Expression of Religious Syncretism: The Bauls of Bengal as Bards of Brotherhood," Charles Capwell urged a historical assessment of this power of popular music, illustrating his case with the repertoires of a Bengali mendicant sect, the Bauls. Whereas their songs had once called for peace between Hindus and Buddhists, the Bauls of recent centuries have redirected their music toward Hindus and Muslims, and the social schism caused by the caste system. The massive Indian film industry, the largest in the world, used popular music to achieve similar ends. Alison Arnold's "Popular Music in the Indian Cinema" explored the conflation of Hindu and Muslim themes and musical genres within the same films, using as an exemplary text a screening of Amar Jeet's 1961 film, *Hum Dono* ["The Two of Us"]. Daniel Neuman elaborated on ideas posed by Arnold in his "The Impact of Popular Music on Other Genres," arguing that it was popularity itself that became traditional in Indian popular music, investing it with widespread power to influence classical and folk music in India.

Religious genres made various appearances as popular music throughout the conference; by the conclusion, indeed, there was general consensus that orally-transmitted religious music aspired toward the popular. Virginia Danielson's discussion of the late Egyptian singer, Umm Kulthūm, attributed one aspect of the singer's immense popularity to her knowledge of *tajwīd*, proper recitation of the *Qur'ān*. Kay Kaufman Shelemay focused on the stability of Hebrew prayer texts in the Syrian-Jewish performance of the Jewish paraliturgical tradition known as *pizmon*, which melodically drew from the popular music traditions most familiar to the practitioners. Prior to the departure of most Jewish communities from Syria in the 1940s, this meant the Arabic popular melos; in immigrant Syrian-Jewish communities, such as those Shelemay has studied in Brooklyn, the melodic superstructure might transform completely, with the performance of *pizmonim* functioning no differently in the community. In a contrasting case, Martin Hatch illustrated the ways in which Islamic religious dictum in Malaysia prescribed what popular music could not be, rechanneling the impulse for popularity into national styles, which in turn could more successfully abrogate ethnic differences in this pluralistic nation.

A final theme integrating the conference seemed to suggest that "the popular" was not really musical at its core, but derived from patterns of behavior and the ways music functioned with other cultural activities. Stephen Blum recalled from his research in Iran that informants often described popular musicians in relation not to specific repertoires, but to the ways they interacted with the public. Comparing descriptions of popular music from the fourteenth-century Maghreb and Middle East with more recent historical trends in Asia, Philip Bohlman concurred with Blum's situation of the popular in behavioral patterns, noting further that such patterns are not

limited to one region or historical period. John Pemberton, in contrast, chose as a case study the failure of twentieth-century Indonesian concert behavior—audiences sitting quietly in orderly chairs—to suit the popularity of traditional *gamelan* performances. Hiromi Lorraine Sakata, describing musical life among Afghan refugees in the United States, illustrated the power of popular music to centripetalize the shared behavior of even the most attenuated community.

The rich and diverse panoply of musical genres discussed during this conference shared one rather significant feature: they were neither wholly oral nor were they entirely written. Indeed, the various speakers seemed to posit that one possible approach to understanding popular music was to regard it as a musical interface for orality and literacy. The historical tenor of many papers, moreover, revealed that the interaction between oral and literate components of tradition was continuous. Traditional texts often receive oral performances; the inscription of oral versions through technology might only disseminate written versions, which then find new audiences and follow new traditional paths; literacy might undergird a popular genre during periods of rapid social change, deferring to orality during periods of more moderated musical change. This understanding of popular music as an interface that brings together diverse texts and contexts may well do more to explain why popular music is popular than have previous models insisting that popular music was somehow social aberration or aesthetic pablum. The traditional basis of popular music, too, might no longer appear to be simply dysfunctional; rather, the model of tradition suggested by popular music is a complex aggregate that refracts and shapes many traditions. In the end, the diverse perspectives brought to popular music by the speakers addressing the Cornell conference projected an unusually positive role for popular music, for it was a role that fitted the transmission, practice, and reception of all musics, wherever they might be traditional.

Variability in Oral Literature

Minna Skafte Jensen
University of Copenhapen

Les secondes journées d'étude en littérature orale were held in Paris, 23.-26.3.87, arranged by *Les Archives de la Littérature Orale Africaine* in collaboration with *The International Society for Folk Narrative Research*. Director of the congress was Veronika Görög-Karady of the ALOA.

The overall theme of the conference had in the preparatory papers been divided into the following subsections: variability and oral performance, variability and sociocultural context, historical dimensions of variability, variability and genres, from oral to written, and variability and analytical methods. The theme had called forth almost 50 contributions from 14 different countries in Europe, Africa, and America, and roughly a hundred and fifty persons attended. The conference was arranged so that most of the time two or even three papers were read simultaneously—a perhaps necessary but unsatisfactory procedure: when a conference is centered on a single topic one wants to attend all the papers. As a whole, however, the arrangement was a great success, with stimulating papers and lively discussions, and the very

abundance of contributions evoked a pleasant feeling of richness of both material and scholarly approach.

When research concentrates on variability, the tradition as such gets out of focus while each version of a story, a poem, etc., is analyzed for its meaning to the person who tells it and his/her audience. Lauri Honko (Turku) said: "People produce meaning, not versions" —thus stressing that any version has the right to be analyzed in its specific context, and not just as a more or less precise memorization of transmitted material. Thus synchrony, or even achrony, dominated many papers, while diachronic analysis, which was once so important (e.g. in the Finnish historical method), was almost non-existent at this conference. Of the papers I attended only one treated the development of a story in a classical stemmatological way, that by Claude Bremond —of all persons! And, as Giovanni Battista Bronzini (Bari) pointed out in the ensuing discussion, even his lecture could hardly be called historical.

Some of the most interesting papers discussed variability in direct relation to a specific corpus of texts. Thus, Christiane Seydou (Paris) gave us a brilliant interpretation of tales she collected among the Peul of Central Africa. She drew attention to the fact that among the recurrent motifs some exist in parallel male/female versions. To illustrate this, she discussed in detail a story about a father/a mother and his/her daughter, giving a lucid semantic analysis of both of these two main versions. The story, whatever its variants, is concerned with the life-experience of storyteller and audience, even if it takes place "once upon a time." The story pattern and the system of values involved were clearly distinguishable between the two sexes. The immediately following paper, by Bengt Holbek (Copenhagen), analyzed fairy tales collected in Denmark, most of them by Evald Tang Kristensen around 1900, and drew conclusions that in many respects confirmed Christiane Seydou's. Lutz Röhrich (Freiburg) even gave us two texts, a German story collected in Greifenhagen in the nineteenth century, and an African one recently collected from an Akan storyteller (Ivory Coast). Despite great differences in sociocultural context and morality, the two were clearly versions of the same type. Röhrich pointed out in detail how each version suited its cultural context, thus illustrating the flexibility of a traditional story.

The merits of the individual performer were programmatically underscored in William F. H. Nicolaisen's paper (Binghamton), which met with almost overwhelming agreement. Nicolaisen also emphasized a related theme, the rebellion against romantic and nationalistic trends. These perspectives, which were so important in the formative period of folkloristic research, seem now to have been unanimously discarded: Nicolaisen even put it as a paradox that in various collections in the world there are wonderful archives of folklore, collected for reasons that now seem all wrong. And in her paper, Linda Dégh (Bloomington) used "nationalistic" and "serious" as mutually exclusive terms.

There were, however, protests from some of the African participants; in the younger states of this formerly colonial part of the world, the interest in oral traditions is often very much concerned with origins and historicity, precisely the questions that are now disappearing from European and American studies. The reason is close at hand: in Africa the oral traditions are vitally important to the maintenance of local cultural identity against foreign influence; it is easy to be highbrow about nationalism if one lives in a culture that is firmly established as such. What to most white scholars is an object of disinterested research can be of such direct national importance in a

culture fighting to survive that a scholar cannot disregard the quest for origins.

In general, one of the most interesting features of the conference was the presence of African scholars studying their own traditions. Karim Traore (Burkina Faso, but at present Bayreuth) had critical remarks on the elegiac mode in the poetry of Léopold Sédar Senghor and maintained that even if the contradictions in the modern cities of Africa are such that they are hard to reconcile, African intellectuals have to accept the reality of their world and try to make the best of it. He spoke of the "second orality," that of the modern media, and suggested that African culture might pass directly from genuine, immediate orality to tape recorder and television, without necessarily having to pass through the printing press, which has been so dominant in the last four centuries of European culture.

For the folklorists of the conference, an overall concern appeared to be that of how to define their material: what texts are folk texts? In what ways are they distinguished from all other kinds of texts? Tekla Dömötör (Budapest) had a pregnant expression for the criteria to be used: "nowadays orality is out, anonymity is out, what counts are three factors: variance, importance of the community, and the fact that people do it for themselves, not for money."

There was also an ongoing discussion between scholars working with living traditions and those studying archival material. Since my own concern is with ancient Greek epic that is not even preserved in archives, it was difficult for me to understand why these groups of scholars could not simply find inspiration in each other's work in order to understand both types of texts better. And I was impressed by the glimpses that the conference allowed into the richness of epic traditions in Africa; thus to me, an especially interesting paper was that by Jean Dérivé, describing Dioula traditions from the Ivory Coast—there seems still to be wonderful possibilities of studying living epic traditions on a scale comparable to that of Homer.

Finally, I shall point to a couple of themes that were significantly absent: Marxist analysis and studies concerned with formulae. I do not think the word "formula" occurred at all, and the name of Marx was mentioned, I believe, only by Bronzini. Scholarship, like other aspects of Western culture, has its fashions!

The next congress of The International Society for Folk Narrative Research will take place in Budapest, 11.-17.6.1989. Its theme will be *Folk Narrative and Cultural Identity*. The following items are suggested as possible topics for papers: forms and social functions of folk narrative in history; modern storytelling; the aesthetics and poetics of folk narrative; typology of classification; and UNESCO's program for supporting folklore.