

Heda Jason, Jerusalem:

Literary Documents of the Past and their Relation to Folk Literature

This* paper addresses itself to one of the questions posed by the editors of the present volume, namely: "Do texts with folkloric themes preserved from earlier times (i.e., written texts), and which are not precise, verbatim records of direct communication, belong to folklore?... Or, do contemporary texts (i.e. texts recorded in writing during the last 100–150 years) belong to folklore, even though they are excluded from direct communication by the very fact of their being recorded?"

*

Pursuing the literature of the last decade or two, growing concern with the definition and redefinition of the subject matter of our field of inquiry is conspicuous. This interest seems to be the result of a general feeling of unease which spread among scholars in the humanities in the wake of current problems. A search for "relevance" and "scientificity" is in fashion, and question marks are being appended to traditional goals, postulates and methods of inquiry.

There is no need here to review all the doubts and attempted redefinitions offered in our field. The present volume, to which we have been asked to contribute our opinions, will display a variety of views and trends and is, in itself, a result of this general unease. Therefore, allow me to begin with my own course of reasoning on the subject matter of our field of inquiry (see Jason 1969, 1975, 1977), passing on to a discussion of the problem of text-critique and, lastly, applying the results to a body of ancient texts.

* The author is here glad to thank to D. Segal and A. Kempinski, who commented on the manuscript; to Y. Avishur, U. Epstein and D. Shulman for bibliographical advice; and to R. Grafman for his editing.

1. What is folk literature?

What do I mean by "folk literature?" Let me explain this by sketching what I mean by "tradition", its mode of existence, the society of its bearers and its content.

1.1.1 Tradition. "Tradition" designates the process of transmission (1) in time = vertical transmission (from generation to generation) of cultural mentifacts; (b) the process of transmission in space = horizontal transmission = diffusion of the same mentifacts; and (c) unfortunately, for the clarity of our statements, the term "tradition" also designates the body of mentifacts which the "tradition" transmits.

1.1.2 "Folk" and "audio-visual". The tradition on which our field of inquiry focuses its attention is thought to be basically audio-visual; yet, some written forms also exist (for instance, graffiti); furthermore, the record of the past has reached us solely in a written state, and its possible oral origin is a matter of inquiry. Therefore, here I would prefer the term "folk" over "audio-visual" or "oral".

1.1.3 Society. By "folk-tradition" I mean the audio-visual tradition found in complex, literate societies, i.e. societies possessing two traditions: a written tradition of the centers and higher strata which may be understood as Redfield's (1956, ch. III) "great tradition", with all the resulting possibilities of accumulation of knowledge and contact over the ages and in retrospect (see Parsons 1966: 26-27, 51-52 and Goody 1968, 1977), and an audio-visual tradition, the "little tradition" of the lower strata and smaller ethno-linguistic units in a larger framework.

Tribal, non-literate societies possess only one sort of tradition, which is necessarily audio-visual, and that should be described and defined separately. Its qualities in relation to the rest of the society's culture will differ from the qualities of the audio-visual tradition in literate, complex societies (see Kroeber and Parsons [1958] for the distinction between culture and society, and Radin [1915, 1926, 1954-5, 1955, 1956] on the literature of the non-literate societies).

Note 1: The concept of "great" and "little" tradition includes both the body of mentifacts and the processes of transmission.

Note 2: The interrelations of the written and the audio-visual traditions, and the interrelations between different ethnic traditions both written and audio-visual in a concrete case are a field of inquiry and not a matter of definitions and postulates (consider, for instance, the Hindu "great" tradition and the Indian tribal "little" audio-visual traditions).

1.1.4. Subject matter. The various phenomena with which our field deals can be divided into technical and symbolic traditions. Technical tradition includes behavior designed to produce necessities of life: food, clothing, shelter, health, warfare. Symbolic tradition organizes technical behavior to various degrees of abstraction, from social and economic organization to belief and religion to philosophic and artistic expression; as the complexity of a society grows, these latter tend to become more and more detached and independent.

Note 1: Thus defined, the concept of "tradition" more or less overlaps the concept of "culture" (see Parsons [1951] for the classification of the phenomena, and Kroeber and Kluckhohn [1952] for definitions of culture).

Note 2: Due to the chance of historical development of science and organization of the academic institutions in various countries, scholars engaging in investigation of tradition (= "culture", "Culture and society", "man in general") have preferred to call themselves variously ethnographers, ethnologists, cultural anthropologists, folklorists, Volkskundler, etc., with special terms for those of us engaging in specific subfields, such as ethnomusicologists or ethnopoeticians (for a description by countries see Jason. n.d.).

1.1.5. Artistic tradition. Folk literature, folk music, folk dance and visual folk art are the most independent mentifacts, and can be viewed as a group of phenomena, sharing special – artistic – qualities. These arts tend to supply building materials for the formation of social and religious customs (rites) rituals (as differentiated from technical customs, i.e. technical know-how which is also transmitted by audio-visual tradition).

While there is no doubt that all parts of the tradition, culture are interdependent, at some level, and that they developed together, there is no other possibility for serious research but to disentangle the various parts and submit each one separately to close examination. It is a matter of personal preference and of specific training as to which of the fields and subfields an investigator chooses to work in. It is true that, as the fields multiply and more specific skills are needed to master any one of them, synthesizing grows more and more difficult. Yet "there is no substitute for hard work", as the modern Indian motto goes...

Turning specifically to folk literature (ethnopoetry) as my chosen subfield, let me attempt to describe it on the basis of the foregoing discussion:

1.2.1. Folk literature is literature, i.e. a work of art and not just a document, cultural or historical, or a "communication".

1.2.2 Folk literature exists in literate societies; oral literature of non-literate societies has to be especially considered (see Radin 1955. 1956).

1.2.3 Folk literature *exists* in its performance before an audience and *consists* of a text, and aural and kinetic components; sometimes requisites (folk art) are added (as in folk theatre).

Note 1: The fixation of a work of folk literature in writing or on a sound-recording is a partial "snap-shot" of the work, not the work itself; fixation of a work on a motion picture film is a complete "snap-shot" of it, but still not the work itself (see de Saussure, ch. VI 1–2, for a similar problem in language).

1.2.4 Folk literature is improvised art. The improvisation is made according to a certain unconscious "ethnopoetic canon" or "canon of folk literature" consisting of a vocabulary of simple contentual units and a set of rules combining simple units into more complex units (see Jason and Segal 1977).

1.2.5 Folk literature being improvised art, the individual work varies from performance to performance; the ethno-poetic canon, however, remains stable. The canon is unconscious, wherefore the performer cannot willingly either invent it or change its components. As a result, no development of folk literature, its genres or plots can be observed since the first works on record, despite the individual work's quality of variability. For practical purposes, folk literature appears to be an invariant category (see Jason and Kempinski, n.d.).

2. The problem of text-critique

We possess an immense body of material (= sources), reaching as far back as the very beginning of writing. Ancient and medieval literatures abound in motifs, episodes and whole plots strongly resembling content units of similar scope, found in contemporary oral literature. What is the significance of this? The folklorist ponders whether these old works can supply historical depth to his oral works. Are they the source of modern oral literature? Or, on the contrary, is oral literature the source from which these old works drew their substance? What does the existence of these old works teach us of the nature of oral literature in general? The historian, again, asks whether an epic- or legend-like work tells of historical events, or whether it is pure fiction? What is the relation to real history, for instance, of the ancient Indian epics, or the biblical stories? What is the nature of the tradition which shaped these ancient works and kept interest in them alive?

The answer to such queries can be given on the basis of a developed text-critique and an ethno-poetic theory.

Let us first sketch very roughly the possibility of relations between an oral text and its written counterpart.

2.1. The supposed oral antecedent and its written heir

2.1.1 The written text can be intended as a more or less exact recording of the text of an oral performance. Such are, for instance, "Homer" dictating the Iliad to a scribe (see Lord 1960: 124-138); Herodotus' recording tales from the Egyptian priests (see, for example, the Rhapsodist's Thief story, II, 121); narrative materials recorded in the Talmud; Grimms' fairy tales.

2.1.2 The written text may be a more or less free rewriting of an oral composition, thus being transformed into a new work of literature, the creation of a poet. Such, for instance, are the Akkadian 12-tablet version of the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, from the end of the 2nd millennium BC, signed by one Sin-liqi-unninni (Jacobsen 1976: 195); Apuleius' *Golden Ass*; medieval novellino and collections of exempla; publications of folk literature by the anonymous compilers of the chapbooks; the works of romanticists (Andersen, Pushkin, etc.).

2.1.3 An otherwise individual work may utilize in a smaller or larger measure, motifs from folk literature and realia from folk belief and technical tradition as building stones, by breaking down the original "folk"-product into smaller units. Such is Vergil's *Aeneid*; in contemporary literature, Mann's *Joseph and his Brothers*, and Joyce's *Ulysses*.

2.1.4 A poet writes his work consciously in imitation of oral literature; such a work may even amount to a conscious fake. Works of this sort are known to have been composed during the Romantic period: Scott's ballads; Hoffmann's fairy tales; Mazhuranich's *Smrt Smail-Age Chengicha*; the libretto of Mozart's *Magic Flute*; Tchaikowsky's *Swan Lake*, etc.

Careful text-criticism is often needed to distinguish between compositions of the sort of 2.1.2 and that of 2.1.4.

2.1.5 A work of folk literature in the framework of historical writing could be

2.1.5.1 An entire folk narrative (epic, legend, novella), related of a historical or pseudo-historical personage, embedded in an otherwise historical work;

2.1.5.2 Various legendary traits, not amounting to a whole plot, ascribed to historical personages.

Both sorts of ethnopoetic materials are found, for instance, in the biblical historical books, Assyrian annals, Herodotus' accounts; medieval chronicles and saint's legends; anecdotes on contemporaries, and in rumors thought to be true.

2.2 *The written source and its oral derivative*

Vice versa: the passing of works from written antecedents to oral circulation is much more difficult to determine. It is a field open to wide (and often wild...) speculation: anything prior to our time is not observable, and the investigation of contemporary facts demands systematic, careful, painstaking and time-consuming field observations. The quoting of random examples of this or that behavior of narrators cannot replace systematic study. In order to achieve results which could, with some degree of verisimilitude, be projected into the past, the phenomena will have to be systematically explored over a wide range of cultures, and common patterns worked out. This has not been done so far. The problem is complicated even further by the fact that its understanding depends on our grasp of the nature and patterns of the process of tradition and transmission in general, and these are so far an almost untouched field of inquiry.¹

The discussion of transmission from written to oral presentation has so far centered on two foci:

2.2.1 The role of the preacher in medieval and modern times in Europe and the Middle East; the preacher transforms the written text into an oral performance;

¹ Lord's (1960) investigation is the best we know of in this field; Sokolov's (1924), Azadovskij's (1926), Nikiforov's (1930), Dogh's (1962), and Stockmann's (1963) works deal with the biology of ethnopoetry; The recent work done on the "performance" aspect by US scholars is not based on systematic field work and therefore does not add to the clarification of the issues (see Goldstein and Ben-Amos 1975).

2.2.2 Self reading and, as a variant, listening to another person's reading aloud (observations such as brought by Noy 1963:19, show how problematic this argument may be); it was mostly chapbook literature which reached the common public.²

2.3 *The Framework*

Such is the general framework in which every text, written or oral, has to find its place. In order, however, to consider a text in this framework, its inherent "ethnopoeticity" has to be ascertained. When the investigator records a work by himself, there can be no doubt whether it is audio-visual or not — he has heard and seen the performance. To ascertain other qualities of the work, however, a well-defined ethnopoetic theory is requisite. Is the text which the investigator recorded an ethnopoetic work, or just part of a casual conversation? The investigator's theory should help answer this question.

A more complex case of text-critique is represented by a fellow-investigator's recording. I must take for granted data which the others supply on the performance, for I cannot check him — a performance being a non-reproducible event. As a decided majority of texts have been recorded manually, without sound-tape equipment, the quality of the resulting text must be examined carefully. To what extent is it complete, or does it summarize the words of the narrator (the summarizing of verse texts is impractical, so long as the verse form is retained; but sometimes narrative works, though performed in verse, are recorded in prose); to what extent is the style that of the recorder; etc. The quality of the text will depend on the recorder's skill, aims and the theories followed.

Further back in history we encounter texts which have not been recorded in the field but were written or composed according to the tastes and abilities of the writer/poet. How can we know that these texts indeed have anything to do with folk literature? The usual method is to cite contentual similarities. In my opinion this is not satisfying, especially for the purposes of the historian. Can real life-situations not be similar to tale-events? Could our theory here aid the historian in distinguishing the two? And what can we, ethnopoeticians, ethnologists and anthropologists, learn from ancient texts, the ethnopoeticity of which we have (somehow or other) ascertained? Supposing we have a good ethnopoetic theory (as I believe we do in ethnopoetic grammar — see above, para. 1.2.4) and using it we can sort our texts which have a relation to ethnopoetry (in the sense described above, para. 1.2), then we could gain historical depth of several millennia for the evaluation of the literary product of the audio-visual tradition (see Jason and Kempinski, n.d., for an attempt to summarize and draw conclusions from, an aspect of findings of this sort from Ancient Near Eastern literatures). This

² There is some information about special professional and semi-professional performers in the high cultures of Asia who are reported as being literate and combining certain sorts of written works with folk tradition in an audiovisual performance; this audio-visual work may again be fixed in writing. This phenomenon should be kept apart from the perpetuation of tradition by learning of written works by heart, as is the case with Indian classical literature, the Zend-Avesta and the Koran (see for Turkey Eberhard 19 and Korogly 1979; for India Staal 1961 and Arunachalam 1976; for China Riffin 19; for Japan Kishibe 1966: III, 3). The whole subject needs systematic inquiry before anything definite can be said.

historical depth could throw new light, for instance, on the problem of the development of folk literature or on the relations of folk literature to other aspects of the society of its bearers, contemporaneous or past, and to their psychic make-up (see discussion in Jason 1977:277-280).

To return to the historian, I believe that the existing ethnoepoetic theory, and the development of its tools as anticipated, will help in answering the historian's queries as to the nature of certain texts in his sources and documents; religious texts and documents in particular can be profitably investigated with the aid of ethnoepoetic tools (the reasons underlying this are still a point for inquiry; see below, para. 3). A thorough examination, with the help of ethnoepoetic tools, can demonstrate whether a certain text has a relation to folk literature or is a record of actual events; or, it can help solve philological text-critical problems otherwise unsolvable. The same cannot, unfortunately, be said of the tradition which produced the texts, as ethnoepoetics has not yet sufficiently investigated the nature of audio-visual tradition (see above, para. 1.1 and note 1).

3. Ancient Near Eastern Literature

The Ancient Near East left us a rich record of writings, among them *belles lettres* and historical compositions.³ Some of these show similarities in content with folk literature, others feature a formulaic style strongly resembling that of modern ethnoepoetic works from the same area (see, f.i., Jason 1977, Example 2c). What does this mean? Is it due to accident? Or should we suppose an orderly relationship between the two, of whatever nature and direction this relationship may be?

In recent decades lively interest in these questions has risen among Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical scholars. An entire "oral tradition"-school has evolved in Biblical studies in Scandinavia, and tools of literary analysis of all sorts are being applied to the texts. Several journals are wholly devoted to the subject (see *Linguistica Biblica* and *Semeia*), and others hasten to publish work of this sort. The discussions center on three main points: (a) the nature of the tradition which produced the ancient texts; (b) stylistic similarities between ancient written texts and modern ethnoepoetry; and (c) analyses of individual texts the content of which resembles that of modern ethnoepoetic works.

3.1 Society. Ancient Near Eastern society was complex, with corporations of sophisticated scribes, bearers of written tradition ("great tradition"). This tradition was shared by all Ancient Near Eastern societies (with the exception of Egypt, which was marginal due to its relative geographical isolation till approximately the end of the 3rd millennium B.C.; when contacts with the Semitic world became closer both cultures were already fully developed).

³ Works of literature in the Sumerian, Babylonian, Assyrian and West Semitic languages, as well as in Hittite are listed by Borger (1967-1975) who gives full data on publications, transcriptions, translations and investigations of each work. Not all tablets, stored in museums, have already been deciphered; and many of the deciphered texts are still available only in cuneiform script, waiting for transcription and translation. That is especially true of the large archive (about 18,000 tablets!) of the ancient city of Ebla (south of Aleppo, Syria) stemming from the 24th-22nd centuries B.C., and only recently discovered.

3.2 Tradition. To which sort of tradition does Ancient Near Eastern literature belong? There is no doubt about its written nature, i.e. the existence of a learned written tradition which carried this literature for at least one or two millennia. The ultimate origin of this literature, however, is not documented. Theoreticians of literary history suppose an audio-visual origin of these works and of literature in general; historians and philologists, intimately familiar with the material, suppose it to be the product of a learned literary tradition. Thus the question is still open: have the scribes taken over an audio-visual tradition? If so, have they taken it over partly or in its entirety? Or have gifted scribes-poets composed and recomposed works of their own invention? Whence did the Hittite and Ancient Israelite historiographic genre evolve (Cancik 1976)? Are the stories in the Books of Judges and Samuel historical accounts, more or less exact, or epic narratives (i.e. poetic fiction)? Who produced the formulaic (in Lord's [1960] sense) poetry of the Babylonian hymns and Biblical Psalms? Did a bard sing of the exploits of Gilgamesh, Etana, Lugalbanda or Tukulti-Ninurta I? Or are these works – found on cuneiform tablets – literary and historical compositions of sophisticated literati?

In the Ancient Near Eastern record itself, I could detect only two quotations which could (very conditionally!) be interpreted as describing a bard singing epic (?) poetry:

- (1) [A feast on the table of the god Baal is described]

“... [One] did rise, [one] chanted and sang,
The cymbals were in the hands of the minstrel,
The sweet-voiced hero sang,
Over Baal in the recesses of Zephon.”

(Ugaritic poem, ca. 14th century B.C.; Gibson 1978:46, lines 18–21)

- (2) The second instance describes David as a minstrel singing to Saul:

“... And it came to pass, when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, that David took a harp, and played with his hand: so Saul was refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him.” (I Samuel 16:23); “... And the evil spirit from the Lord was upon Saul, as he sat in his house with his javelin in his hand: and David played with his hand.” (I Samuel 19:9).

Nowhere is it noted what sort of songs or music Baal's minstrel sang or David played to Saul. These could have been epic songs, but equally well, lyric songs of praise (in Baal's case it would be a hymn).

If the thesis of an audio-visual basis for this literature is accepted, new questions arise: was this a folk tradition (“little” tradition), or undifferentiated tradition stemming from the proto-literate period of Ancient Near Eastern culture? Who were the bearers of this tradition? Average bards with “everyone” as audience? Or was it a tradition of a restricted group: priests, “prophets”, scribes or other professional groups? To quote an example: the Talmudic *aggadah*, apocryphal legend and very early Christian legend seem to have been, at least partially, an audio-visual tradition of restricted circles of literati with clerical and “prophetic” affinities.

As unfortunately ethnopoetics, and ethnology in general, have not done much to investigate the processes of tradition, most of the work done by Bible and other scholars is unsupported by facts (see Nielsen 1954 for an early report on the Scandinavian school of “oral tradition” in Bible studies and Culley 1976 for current works and newer bibliography on the subject).

As the investigation of the tradition ("biology of ethnopoetics", study of "performance") cannot at present enlighten us on the relations between Ancient Near Eastern literature and folk literature, we must turn to ethnopoetic analysis. Work in this direction has been carried out in two fields: analysis of the style of a corpus of texts, and analysis of narration in individual works.

3.3 Style. Most studies of poetic features and of style of ancient literature have been carried out with more or less success, using either Lord's concepts (1960) or concepts of general poetics (see, f.i. Alonso-Schoekel 1971 and Moor 1978). Cancik (1976) attempted a very rough literary (not ethnopoetic!) analysis of Hittite and Ancient Israelite historiographic writing; such analysis should help to sort out historical facts and literary conventions in the ancient texts.

3.4 Narration. Studies of narrative structure of individual works have been carried out with the tools of modern literary and ethnopoetic theories, themselves based on concepts taken from linguistics and logic. These studies have demonstrated beyond doubt that the texts are amenable to such analysis and that it can yield interesting results. Let us quote, by way of example, an analysis of the syntactic and semantic patterns of the story of David and Goliath (I Samuel 17 — see Jason 1979). It was possible to analyze the story fully by existing ethnopoetic tools and, as a result, it could be assigned to a particular ethnopoetic sub-genre. In the case of the David-story, analysis also led to a proposed solution for a philologic problem in I Samuel 17: the question of the integrity and priority of the Masoretic text over the Septuagint version of the story. Thereby also, a feature of the Biblical tradition could be elucidated: In the Masoretic text, David is twice introduced to Saul and twice offered Saul's daughter in marriage (I Samuel 16:14–23 and 18:20–28; 17:12–31, 55–58 and 18:1–5). The Septuagint deleted the duplications in chapter 17 and thereby facilitates the flow of narration in the Book of Samuel as a whole. The Masoretic text, then, may testify to a tradition knowing of separate narratives (in prose or verse) which form a cycle (and which is therefore apt to repeat incidents, rather than comprising a single continuous narrative); such a state of affairs corresponds to the features of an epic folk (audio-visual) tradition. (For further examples of studies of individual works, see Cooper 1975; Guettgemanns 1978 and *Linguistica Biblica* 1971 ff. and *Semeita* 1975; Gurney 1972; Jason 1977, 1980; Lai 1974; Marin 1971; Marin and Chabrol 1974.)

3.5 Repertoire. An attempt to arrive at an overall picture has been made by Jason and Kempinski (n.d.): Ancient Near Eastern texts which show a contentual similarity to modern folk tales were assembled and indexed according to types and motifs, and their genre was defined. The literary system which emerged proved to be similar to the system of modern folk literature found in the same geographic area.

3.6 Text-critique. The results of inquiries discussed in paras. 3.3–3.5 point to a non-uniform relationship of the ancient texts to folk literature. This relationship covers the whole range from near exact recordings to free recomposition. The Story of the Poor Man of Nippur, the Biblical Psalms, the Talmudic narratives and early Christian legend are examples of rather exact recording; the 12-tablet version the *Epic of Gilgamesh* by Sin-liqi-unnini (the growth process of which is documented from the Sumerian epic

songs onward), and the Book of Samuel are examples of recomposed works. Fakes (para. 2.1.4) can today hardly be distinguished from other forms; the aspect of the use of broken-down contentual ethnopoetic elements in composing new works has not been investigated for Ancient Near Eastern literature. Thus, no generalizations should be made; rather, each work or cycle of works should be examined in itself.

3.7 New problems. Lastly, we may report on an unpublished work which has uncovered new problems in ethnopoetic theory. While analyzing ancient works, it was noticed that the ethnopoetic models developed so far (Propp 1928 and Skaftymov 1924) are inadequate to cope with the material. On the basis of ancient and similar (in plot) modern works, a new model has been devised (Jason 1980), but it too has proved unsatisfactory. The problem of level emerges, and it turns out that, contrary to accepted opinions, Skaftymov's model for the Russian epics and Propp's model for the heroic fairy tale seem to be on different levels concerning the organization of the work, due to differing organization of epics and of fairy tales. These insights have triggered a new set of problems in the investigation of both the fairy tale and the folk epic.

*

Returning to the question asked at the beginning of our discussion of the nature of the ancient texts, we may restate the problem as follows: a relationship between ethnopoetic texts and certain texts preserved from earlier times can indeed be established; yet this relationship is complex. Ethnopoetic theory can assist in solving text-critical and philological problems of ancient texts; the solutions will in turn, provide historical depth to ethnopoetic studies and may uncover new problems to be solved by ethnopoetry. Ancient texts should not, however, be taken as primary material on which to develop ethnopoetic theory; only texts, the audio-visual nature of which is securely documented, should serve as a basis for problem solving.

References

- Alonso-Schoekel, Luis. *Das Alte Testament als literarisches Kunstwerk*. Koeln: Bachem. 1971
- Arunachalam, M. *Ballad Poetry*. Tiruchitrambalam (India): Gandhi Vidyalayam. 1976
- Azadovskij, Mark. *Eine sibirische Maerchenearzaehlerin*. FFC 68. Helsinki. Engl. tr. 1926 Austin, Texas, 1974.
- Borger, Rykle. *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur*. 3 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter. 1967-75
- Cancik, Hubert. *Grundzuege der hethitischen und alttestamentlichen Geschichtsschreibung*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 1976
- Cooper, J.S. Structure, Humor and Satire in the Poor Man of Nippur. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 27, 163-174. 1975
- Culley, Robert C. (ed.). *Oral Tradition and Old Testament Studies* (Semeia, vol. 5). 1976

- Dégh, Linda. *Maerchen, Erzähler und Erzählgemeinschaft*. Berlin: Akademie (Engl. translation: *Folktales and Society*, Bloomington 1969).
1962
- Eberhard, Wolfram. *Minstrel Tales from Southeastern Turkey*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1955
- Gibson, J.C.L. (ed. and trnsl.). *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Edinburgh: Clark.
1977
- Goody, J.R. *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1977
- (ed.). *Literacy in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1968
- Guettgemanns, Erhardt. *Einführung in die Linguistik fuer Textwissenschaftler*. Bonn: Linguistica Biblica.
1978
- Goldstein, Kenneth and Dan Ben-Amos (eds.). *Folklore: Performance and Communication*. Approaches to Semiotics vol. 40. The Hague: Mouton.
1975
- Gurney, O.R. The Tale of the Poor Man of Nippur and its Folktale Parallels. *Anatolian Studies* 22, 149–158.
1972
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. *The Treasures of Darkness; a History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
1976
- Jason, Heda. A Multidimensional Approach to Oral Literature. *Current Anthropology* 10, 413–426.
1969
- 1975 *Ethnopoetics: A Multilingual Terminology*. Jerusalem: Israel Ethnographic Society.
- 1977a *Ethnopoetry: Form, Content, Function*. Bonn: Linguistica Biblica.
- 1977b Der Zinsgroschen: Analyse der Erzählstruktur. *Linguistica Biblica* No. 41/42, 49–87.
- 1979 The Story of David and Goliath: A Folk Epic? *Biblica* 60, 36–70.
- 1980a Ilja of Murom and Tzar Kalin. A Proposal for a Model for the Narrative Structure of an Epic Struggle. Forthcoming in *Slavica Hierosolymitana*.
- 1980b The Poor Man of Nippur: An Ethnopoetic Analysis. Forthcoming in the *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*.
- n.d. Paths to Folk Literature*. (Ms.)
- Jason, Heda and Aharon Kempinski. How Old are Folktales? Forthcoming in the *Proceedings of the VII Congress of Folk-Narrative Research* (Edinburgh. Aug 1979).
- Jason, Heda and Dmitri Segal (eds.). *Patterns in Oral Literature*. The Hague: Mouton.
1977
- Kishibe, Shigco. *Traditional Music of Japan*. Tokio.
1966
- Korogly, H.G. (ed.). *Emrah i Sel'vi, Neobyknovennye priključenija Karaoglana i drugie tureckie narodnye povesti* [Emrah and Selvi, the extraordinary adventures of Karaoglan, and other Turkish popular stories]. Moscow: Nauka.
1979
- Kroeber, A.L. and Clyde Kluckhohn. *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
1952
- Lai, Pham hu'u. Sinn-Erzeugung durch den Glauben: Widerlegte/Begründete religiöse Autoritäten: Strukturelle Analyse von Matth 27, 57–28, 20 *Linguistica Biblica* No. 32, 1–37.
1974
- Lord, Albert B. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
1960
- Marin, Louis. *Semiotique de la Passion. Topiques et figures*. Paris: Aubier.
1971

- Marin, Louis and Claude Chabrol. *Le recit evangelique*. Paris: Aubier.
1974
- Moor, J.C. de. The Art of Versification in Ugarit and Israel. Part I in: *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm on his Seventieth Birthday. Ed. by Y. Avishur and Y. Blau, pp. 119-150. Part II in: *Ugarit Forschungen* 10 (1978). 187-215.
1978
- Nielsen, Nicholas. *Oral Tradition*. London: SCM Press.
1954
- Nikiforov, Aleksandar I. Teprešnij zaonezkij kazkar-opovidač [The contemporary narrator in the Zaoneg district]. *Etnografičnij visnik*, no. 9, 143-186.
1930
- Noy, Dov (editor). *Jefet Schwili erzählt*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
1963
- Parsons, Talcott. *The Social System*. New York: Free Press.
1951
- Societies. Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice.
1966
- Propp, Vladimir Ia. *Morfologija skazki* [Morphology of the Folktale]. Leningrad: Academia. 21969, Moscow: Nauka. Engl. Tr. Bloomington 1958; 21968, Austin, Texas.
1928
- Radin, Paul. *Literary Aspects of North American Indian Mythology*. Canada Geological Survey, Museum Bulletin. No. 16. Ottawa.
1915
- 1926 *Literary Aspects of Winnebago Mythology*. Journal of American Folklore 39, 18-52.
- 1954-56 *The Evolution of an American Indian Prose Epic*. Basel.
1955 *The Literature of Primitive Peoples*. Diogenes 12, 1-28.
1956 *The Trickster: A Study in American Mythology*. New York.
- Redfield, Robert. *Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1956
- Riftin, B. *Istoriceskaja epopeja i fol'klornaja tradicija v Kitae* [The historic epopee and the folkloric tradition in China]. Moscow: Nauka.
1970
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. Tr. by W. Baskin. New York: The Philosophical Library.
1959
- Skaftymov, Aleksandr. *Poetika i genesis bylin* [Poetics and genesis of bylins]. Moscow: Yaksanov.
1924
- Sokolov, Boris. *Skaziteli* [Narrators]. Moscow: Gosizdat.
1924
- Staal, J.F. *Nambudiri Veda Recitation*. The Hague: Mouton.
1961
- Stockmann, Doris. *Der Volksgesang der Altmark*. Berlin: Akademie.
1963