

IS THERE AN ANCIENT GNOME IN BEOWULF LINE 4?

Robert P. Creed

scyld scefing sceabe[na]. the three

core of line 4 of **Beowulf** (=Ms. line 132R04).¹ Lines 1 to 3 of the poem form a sort of proem, an invocation of the past, of great kings and princes forward in brave deeds. But with line 4 the singer seems to find the right way to begin the great song.

Why begin with Scyld? In answer to such a question the Anglo-Saxon singer might have replied something like this: Scyld is the ancestor of the Scyldings, the Danes, the people whose hall was invaded by Grendel and Grendel's mother. Where **better** to begin? Then the singer proves his point with genealogy. Scyld begets Beowulf, Beowulf begets Healfdene, Healfdene begets Hrothgar, who builds the hall. It's really all very simple and orderly.

Or is it? In line 4 Scyld seems to be the son of Scef, for that is what the formative **-ing** denotes in Anglo-Saxon genealogies. But Scef never ruled the **folc**, or at least the **Beowulf**-poet doesn't seem to know of his reign. At lines 15 and 16a the singer says that there was a time before Scyld when the folk endured **aldor[]ase**--the lacuna between **r** and the second **a** is usually, correctly, I think, filled by **le**, giving **aldor[le]ase**, "lordless". But let me put this passage into its context, lines 12 to 19:

ðæm eafera þæs æfter cenned
 ʒeong in ʒeardum þone ʒod sende
 folce to frofre fýrenðearfe onʒeat
 þ hie ær druʒon aldor[]ase.
 lanʒe hpile him þæs liffrea
 puldres pealdend þoroldare forʒeaf.
 beowulf þæs breme blæd þide sprang
 scyldes eafera scedelandum in.
 (132R11-18)

"To-that-one (and 'that-one' can only be Scyld) an offspring was brought-forth, young in the enclosed places. That-one (the offspring) God sent as consolation to folk. He (God) perceived that they previously endured lord(less) for a long time. To-them for-that Lord-of-life, glory's Wielder, gave support-in-the-world. Beowulf was famed; **blæd** widely sprang. Scyld's offspring was in **Scede**-lands."

Lines 43 to 46 further complicate the problem:

Nalæs hi hine læssan lacum teodan
 þeodʒestreonum þon [þa dyd]on
 þe hine æt frumsceafte forð onsendon
 ænne ofer yðe umborþe/[s]ende

"Not-at-all did-they-provide him with less gifts, possessions of the people, than those did who him at the beginning sent forth alone over waves, being-a-child."

Who sent him forth at the beginning? Scef, his father? No, unnamed persons or beings, simply [þa]. Such treatment has often been taken to indicate that Scyld was an orphan. But in line 4 we have been told what seems to be the name of the father of this supposed orphan.

The riddle acquires another degree of complexity when we consult early genealogies, as scholars have been doing for a long time. The genealogy that is probably

closest in time to the poem is the one in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle of 855 A.D.² According to the genealogy in texts B and C, **Sceaf . . . pæs 3eboren on þære earce Noés. . . .** Five generations later, Itermon begot **Sceldwea**. It seems that the genealogist has a different notion from the **Beowulf**-poet's concerning Scyld's parentage. But perhaps the former offers a way out of the problem. Since the **Beowulf**-poet knows Heremod, and knows him as a king who, like Sigmund, became an exile, the time of Heremod's exile might be taken to account for the **lan3e hpile** when the folk was **aldor[]ase**. Part of the riddle of the opening lines of **Beowulf** might be solved by Heremod's exile.

The cost of this solution, however, seems to be the bestowal of **two** fathers on Scyld--Scef and Heremod, unless, of course, the **-in3** in **scefin3** here indicates either simply **association with** rather than paternity, or a remoter kinship.

We are **left** with these possibilities. The **Beowulf**-poet does not resolve them. The most we can say is that he tells us, first, that Scyld is an **in3** of Scef; second, that there was a time before Scyld's reign when the **folc** was lordless; and third; that Scyld came over the waves while still a child. The **Beowulf**-poet says nothing more of Scef and nothing at all that might lead us to believe that Scef ruled the folk. Nor does the poet, unlike the West Saxon genealogists and the author of the prologue to the **Prose Edda**, place Heremod in **any** genealogy. The **Beowulf**-poet begins with Scyld Scefing. And Scyld Scefing--along with **sceapan**--as I shall try to show, is indeed a very important beginning for the folk.

scyld scefin3 sceape[na]: the three words alliterate. The **Beowulf**-poet takes the

first word, and probably the second, to be a proper noun, a name. But, as every student knows, all three words are also common nouns: **shield**, **sheaf**, **scather**. The first two members of the series have a reflex in Modern English directly traceable to the Old English simplexes. The third member of the series has a reflex that has been affected by the **North** Germanic form. So only two of the three now alliterate exactly as they do in **Beowulf**. But to alliterate in **Beowulf** all three words must have alliterated **before Beowulf**, or at least before the recording of that poem. And when we check the Indo-European roots of **shield**, **sheaf**, and **scathe**, we find that the roots alliterate.

Pokorny links the Greek word ἀσχηθής, "uninjured"--the α-prefix is privative--and Middle Irish **scīth**, "fatigued", with several Germanic forms, such as Gothic **skapjan**, that are related to the third member of the series, **sceaþa**. These few but significant cognates are listed under the root **skēth-**, **skōth-**.³

Pokorny lists only Serbian **čupa**, "bunch", and Russian **чупъ** and Czech **čup**, "tuft"--again a short but significant list--under (s)keup-, **skeub(h)-**, the entry under which Old English **scēaf** appears.⁴ Watkins adds Old Norse **skoft**, "hair of the head" and, with loss of s-, Middle Dutch **hoppe**, the **hop** plant.⁵ The **sheaf** word, Pokorny says, is derived from a root for which cognates are known only in Germanic and Slavic.⁶ Cognates for the **scathe** word, as we have seen, are recorded in three Indo-European languages, again all of them Western, that is, European rather than Asian, branches.

The many cognates of I. (s)kel-, including Old English **sciold**, take up three and a half pages in Pokorny.⁷ The meaning

of the root is "to cut". A shield is, then, something **cut**, something sliced off, sometimes a "small piece", as in Sanskrit **kalá**. The cognate Greek verb **σκάλλω** means "scrape, chop, dig", whereas the Thracian cognate **σκάλη** means "sword" or "knife". Latin **culter**, "knife", shows, as do a number of cognates, loss of the initial s-.

The loss in some cognates of the first phoneme of the cluster, s- before the -k-, points up the familiar but very important fact that a simple s, or s plus any **other** consonant, does **not** alliterate with sc (pronounced š) in **Beowulf**. The sc-, from earlier sk-, is, then, a heritage from Indo-European times, a heritage passed down to the **Beowulf**-poet and on to us.

The Indo-European roots of **scyld-scef-sceapa** (i.e., (s)kel-, (s)keup-, and skēth-) could have been bound together during the period of the Indo-European linguistic community. But, at **whatever** point the alliterative binding took place, it was the people who were to become the proto-Germans who worked out a way to **keep** the words together.

Alliterating formulas occur in other early traditional poetry. **ἔπος** and **ἔργον**, for example, are collocated a number of times in the **Iliad** and **Odyssey**. Their Indo-European roots, ***uek̥uōs-** and **ueg-**, alliterate. But the collocation of **ἔργον τε ἔπος τε**, to quote one of its forms, does not **control** the line in which it appears; that is, Homer can use this formula without having to build his **line** around it. Homer's tradition had selected syllable **length** as the most basic feature of the poetic line.

The proto-Germans, on the other hand, selected from the features inherent in the Indo-European syllable first **stress** and then **alliteration** as the bases of their traditional poetic line. This selection made it possible

for them to **keep together** (s)kel-, (s)keup-, and skēth- both as the core of a verse line and as a capsule of information.

The meaning of each of the three words from line 4 of **Beowulf**, taken individually, seems both clear and ancient. The possibility of ancient association exists. The question now is, do the three words, none of which is a verb, convey or seem to convey meaning as a group? But before I take up this question with scyld-scefin3-sceap[na], I want to try to establish the idea of the capsule of information. To do so, I turn to another alliterative group in **Beowulf**, this time not a trio but a pair.

There are two instances in **Beowulf** of the alliterating pair I shall designate by their infinitives, **habban** and **healdan**. The first instance occurs in line 658: **hafa nu 7 3eheald husa selest** (147R04). The second instance occurs at line 2430: **heold mec 7 hāefde hredel cyn[in3]** (187R03). The pair also occurs in line 2 of the metrical portion of the charm listed in Dobbie as #9: **and hafa þæt feoh and heald þæt feoh**.⁸ What is interesting about this capsule is that we recognize it **not** because we learned it from **Beowulf** or the Old English charm, but, most probably, because we have heard it or read it in the marriage ceremony. It has come to us from a very different source, but we certainly recognize the pair "to have and to hold" as a pair when we hear or read them, whether in **Beowulf** or elsewhere. What **Beowulf** confirms for us is that the alliterative binding has held through more than a millenium of linguistic change.

I think this is an extraordinarily important fact. **To have** has been bound to **to hold** in both verse and prose for a traceable period of a millenium and more. The next step is to try to discover whether

habban and **healdan** joined forces even before **Beowulf**. Again it turns out that we are dealing with a pair that had the possibility of teaming up even before the proto-Germanic period. **Habban** is derived from the root **kap-**, "to grasp", exemplified by Latin **capiō**. Pokorny lists other cognates, all beginning with the appropriate **k** sound, ranging from Sanskrit to Irish.⁹ **Healdan** is derived from the root **5. kel-**, "to drive, to set in rapid motion". Pokorny relates Sanskrit **kāláyati**, "he drives", Greek **κέλλω**, "I drive (a ship onto land)" and Latin **celer**, "rapid"--all beginning with the **k** sound.¹⁰ (I wonder whether what has become a formula for marriage might not have begun as one for cattle-lifting!)

It is, of course, not only the alliterative bond that has kept **to have and to hold** together. It is the meaning (or meanings) of these words as well. **To have** is one thing--possession--but **to hold** probably suggests one area or field of meanings for us--embracing, supporting, clinging to--and a partially overlapping but somewhat different field of meanings for the Anglo-Saxons, a field in which the sense of **guarding** and **ruling** dominates. But regardless of some semantic shifting over the last millenium, the alliterating pair remains a pair for us as for the **Beowulf**-poet.

What meanings work along with the alliterative bond to bind **scyld-scef-sceapa** together? Pokorny gives us the most generalized sense: **cut, bunch** or **tuft**, and **injure**. If it were not for the third idea, **injure**, it would be possible simply to take **cut** and **bunch** as a reference to the technique of harvesting. But the series ends with the image of **harming**. And it begins with the image of **cutting**, perhaps later of **slicing something off** that becomes, in Germanic at least, a means of defense.

The middle term is the easiest to deal with. It is an Indo-European agricultural word. In **Beowulf** line 4, that word is flanked by the cutter-defender and the injurer. **Cut** or **shield**, **sheaf**, **scather**: can we read these words as a capsule? Let me try the following: the **sheaf**, symbolizing agriculture, is likely to tempt those who would either destroy the crops or steal the harvest for their own use. The **sheaf** therefore requires-- "begets", the **-in₃** of **scefin₃** seems to say-- a **shield**, originally one who cuts: something which or someone who will defend the crops from the **scathers**.

Now there is no question that the **Beowulf**-poet knows of Scyld as a **person**, a vigorous warrior. But, apart from, possibly, lines 4 and 5, the poet says nothing about him either as a **defender** in general or as a defender of crops in particular. But perhaps nothing **need** be said, or said directly, of Scyld's defense of the sheaf. It is, after all, the **mead**-seats from which Scyld deprives crowds of scathers. And **mead**, we know, is an Indo-European word with cognates as far east as Sanskrit and as far west as (Old) Irish. The cognates of **médhu** designate both **honey** and a sweet alcoholic **drink** usually made from honey.¹¹ In Homer the cognate word, μέθυ, designates a sweet wine. Whether wine or mead, it is a drink that draws men together. It is also a drink that takes time to prepare and thus requires some settling down. Now the very word from which our **settle** is derived is the second element of **meodusetla** in line 5. And its kin-word, the verb **sittan**, will soon be heard in line 9, **ymsittendra**.

In the **Beowulf**-poet's telling, Scyld arrives in the midst of a settled community that contains certain persons who gather to drink mead. If there are mead-drinkers,

there must be mead-makers, but there is no Anglo-Saxon Hesiod to sing of such work. The poem is concerned not with the makers, whether farmers who gather in the sheaves or the makers of mead from honey, but rather with those who defend, who shield, the workers. If there are those who shield, there are also the scathers, who must be driven from the community. Still others must be frightened (**e3sode**); others must be taught to obey even across the waters (**ofer hronrade**). Scyld does all these things and thus becomes the **3od cýning3** of line 11. He is, as I see him, **the bringer of order to the gatherings of men**. He must use force to do so, as lines 4 to 6a make clear. But he is also the bringer of a peaceful succession when his son, Beowulf, is born. When he has accomplished all these things, he departs in his own ripeness, to **3escaephile** (132V04). All will be well for more than two generations, until his great-grandson, Hrothgar, builds the great mead-hall in which to gather around himself the warband his harrying-luck (**heresped**, 133R17) has drawn to him.

From Scyld's mead-seats to Hrothgar's mead-hall is a matter of about 62 lines and four generations in **Beowulf**. I think it took somewhat longer than that. I have been hinting that Scyld symbolizes what has been called "the Neolithic Revolution," the time of the settling down of humankind to grow crops. I believe that it is possible that these early lines in **Beowulf** keep a memory of those distant times and a reminder that agriculture needs protection and thus breeds warfare. The Neolithic Revolution seems to have come to the Indo-Europeans while they were still a community, before the period of migration. The evidence lies in common terms for sowing, for grain or corn, grind-

ing, and so on. Such words make it clear that the Indo-European speakers talked of sowing, for example.

But sowing seed is only the beginning of the process. The end comes months later and requires some settling down to await the harvest. How many times on their way to becoming the proto-Germans did these Indo-European speakers settle down to sow and wait? How many times did they do so only to have their harvests stolen or burned by their enemies? Of course, we simply do not know. What we **do** know is that there is a capsule in line 4 of **Beowulf** that seems to deal with the problem by turning it into a gnome. We also know that, eventually, this branch of the Indo-European linguistic community settled down on the shores of the Baltic and North Sea to farm.

A long time later, perhaps two and a half millenia, some of the descendants of these seaside settlers began to move further westward, crossing the North Sea into Roman Brittania, forced by various pressures to become nomads again. Once more, I suggest, the most important part of their baggage was the alliterating gnome **scýld-scefin3-sceapan**.

It should be kept in mind that **Beowulf** is an old song sung in a new land. It is an old song because it sings not of the folk fighting in and for Brittania, the new land, but first of Scyld and then of Beowulf fighting and winning in Denmark, whence some of the **folc** came. I take it as proven that not only does the **language** of the song have ancient roots, but so also does the **verse-dialect**, the special dialect every performer, would-be performer, and, to some extent, silent listener learned in order to keep in mind and mouth at least some of the things that were important to the **folc**. Some proof

of the prior existence of the verse-dialect is carved on the Gallehus horn, made before the Anglo-Saxons crossed the North Sea heading westward, and in cognate Germanic, particularly Scandinavian, verse-lines recorded after the Anglo-Saxon crossing.

Much more can be said about this verse-dialect. I shall only say that, if you do not think this dialect is one that an illiterate can learn to speak properly--observing the metrical constraints--you should listen to the great Yugoslavian singer Avdo Međedović, speaking decasyllabic line after decasyllabic line, many of them bound together by elaborate sound-patterning, and singing faster than we normally speak.¹² Like Avdo Međedović, the early Indo-Europeans were illiterate. A community has to invent a language and is likely to speak it for a very long time before getting around to inventing or adapting a system of notation--what we exalt as **writing**.

Through traditional poetry, which was first and for a very long time a most important survival mechanism of the **folc**, I have tried to make my way back to one of the most important beginnings of the **folc**. The magic words are, again, **scyld-seafing-sceapa**. One of the ways that survival mechanism operates is by turning concepts into characters, **a** shield into **King Scyld**. "Sheaves beget scathers and need shields," one of our linguistic forebears may have remarked to another as they struggled to defend their crops against the people in whose land they had begun to settle. The memory of such an alliterating gnome survives, I think, in **Beowulf**, in the old song sung in a new settlement.

In **Beowulf** the song is set around the northern waterways, **ofer hronrade**. That is far enough back for the tradition as the

singer knew it. But Scyld, as we have seen, could not have brought the knowledge of agriculture for the first time to the Germanic folk settling in Denmark. The proto-Germans had brought that with themselves on their trek across Europe. Scyld's message is older than King Scyld, just as his ship is a later addition to the telling. The ancient tale was, however, neither forgotten nor obscured: it was relocated. Such a process of relocating may well have gone on in every Indo-European poetry as the singers moved further and further from each other in time and space.

But the kernel of the tale was not lost. At moments of crisis we are apt to cast our memories back to similar situations in the past. So may the embattled Anglo-Saxon farmers attempting to settle in Brittainia. But those farmers had something that we do not, a verse-dialect that puts actions into a coherent narrative. Such putting-together must, I think, have been one of the functions of traditional **epos**. And that function was not only to keep information but also, as line 14 says, to provide **folce to frofre** (132R13, "consolation for the folk").

While I was preparing this paper and mulling over what I have called the gnostic capsule in line 4, I happened to read Richard E. Leakey's and Roger Lewin's **People of the Lake**, a scientific narrative that begins with a hominid community of some two and a half million years ago and ends with the Neolithic Revolution. The final chapter of **People of the Lake** seems to me to provide the best possible commentary on the gnostic capsule in **Beowulf**.

The turning point in our history (that is, the history of humankind) came with the invention of an economy that allowed a previously nomadic people to

live in large numbers in villages supported by an abundance of husbanded food (when the harvest was good). Gatherer-hunters generally live in small bands (around twenty-five people), move around regularly, and have no more possessions than they can carry on their back. They also limit their birth rate to once every four years so as to fit in with...the band's mobility in moving to new locations every few weeks. Once an abundant supply of food is available in a single place, these constraints are lifted. Birth rate can increase, the population therefore starts to grow, and people can accumulate possessions.¹³

Leakey and Lewin continue:

As soon as people depend on anything so discrete as a standing crop, then there is advantage to be had in purloining one's neighbor's crops. Naturally, the community under threat will fight furiously to keep what is theirs because without the harvest they are lost: a new crop of food takes at least a year to be ready. . . .¹⁴

Enter, into the Leakey and Lewin scenario, the **sheaf** and the **scather**! The third character waits only a moment in the wings. Leakey and Lewin present him just a few pages later:

When human communities become large, social stratification, including chiefs and leaders, appear inevitable, especially in societies placing particular emphasis on material wealth. Such a social structure is, of course, well suited--even essential--to waging organized conflict. Without a powerful leader it would be impossible to rouse the enthusiasm of the masses into an efficient army. Ironically, the one characteristic that must have been vital in the evolution of a gathering-and-hunting economy in early humans--cooperation--was also crucial to organized warfare!¹⁵

I am well aware that Leakey and Lewin are sketching here part of their argument against Raymond Dart, Konrad Lorenz, and so on--against those who main-

tain that humankind is naturally aggressive. I find it worthy of further rumination that line 4 of **Beowulf**, possibly because of alliteration and certainly after a semantic shift, suggests that sheaves need to be shielded, not stolen. There is aggression elsewhere in **Beowulf**. Indeed, Hrothgar in the days of his vigor has success in **harrying** (**heresped**, line 64 and 133R17), that is, aggressive warfare. Yet even he wanted to **lock** his people **about** (**be[1]eac**, line 1770 and 171V16-17), to **bend** (for this seems to be the meaning of the Indo-European root, **l. leug-**¹⁶) protection around the folk. And the folk turn out to be, in the very next line, **manizū mæzþa** (line 1771, 171V17), a reflex all but identical with the first half of line 5. The old story repeats itself!

In putting together this paper and an earlier one, I have begun to follow a certain method. The method makes three requirements of the passage studied. All three requirements must be met before one can have some assurance that he has found an ancient gnome. The first requirement is that the source be in the earliest recorded form of the language. In cases in which the document itself seems to be a copy of an earlier document, as is the case with the extensive Homeric texts or Cotton Vitellius A. xv, the language of the document must be close to that of the earliest records. The second criterion or requirement is that the syllables of the passage be linked in the manner of the traditional verse-dialect of the language. The third criterion is the significance of the word-group or capsule **as a group**, admittedly the hardest criterion to define. I have tried to give an example of significance in the foregoing paper. I think that significance will usually mean social, ethical, or econom-

ic information, or some combination of these categories.

How much of what I have been saying would the **Beowulf**-poet have understood? How conscious might he have been of the importance of the capsule I have been analyzing? The obvious answer is, of course, that we don't know. But there is another way of phrasing the question: what did the **Beowulf**-poet **need** to know or understand about the Indo-European linguistic community and the beginnings of Indo-European agriculture? The answer--exactly as much as the Germanic tradition, with its powerfully suggestive capsules in the verse-dialect, told him.

This is in no sense to belittle the **Beowulf**-poet. The best way to do that, I think, is to imagine him listening to Vergil and attempting to borrow from the Roman poet. **Beowulf** is, simply, more significant than the **Aeneid**, because the **Beowulf**-poet was, as Vergil was not, directly in touch with the oral tradition of his forefathers.

There is another dimension to the question I have raised. David Bynum in a brilliant recent book, **The Daemon in the Wood**, has reminded us that one touchstone of Milman Parry's analysis of traditional oral style was what Albert Lord was later to phrase as "a tension of essences."¹⁷ As I understand the matter, a singer will feel this tension whether or not his conscious mind can deal in any rational way with every detail of what he sings. The tension will lead him, at times, to sing of things that puzzle him when he is prosaically asked about them.

I think that, if we asked the singer of **Beowulf** to explain just why he began with **scyld scefing sceaþe[na]**, he might have answered, because that is where the

song begins. There is no need for him to speculate, as I have been doing, on Indo-European paleoanthropology. As the bearer of oral tradition, as a performer in the verse-dialect that held fast to important information even as the shape of that information subtly shifted over millenia, he is the bearer of much more than he need consciously speculate about. It is enough that he, as one voice of his tradition, has kept so much in the telling.

NOTES

1

The unbracketed letters and symbols of the text of **Beowulf** quoted in this paper are always those visible in the **photographs of Beowulf Reproduced in Facsimile from the Unique Manuscript British Museum Ms. Cotton Vitellius A. xv**, transliterated and annotated by Julius Zupitza, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Early English Text Society, Oxford University Press, 1959). The bracketed letters are supplied from a single additional source, the photographs on pp. 1 to 90 of **The Thorkelin Transcripts of Beowulf in Facsimile**, ed. Kemp Malone (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1951), the first volume in *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*. Line numbers are of two sorts: first, the standard **verse-line** numbers as in, e.g., the edition of Fr. Klaeber, **Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg** (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1950f.), and, second, **manuscript** line numbers according to the following code: three numerals indicate the manuscript folio number followed by R or V to indicate **recto** or **verso**; the letter is then followed by a two-digit line indicator, 01 for line 1, 11 for line 11 and so on. The folio numbers follow the new official British Museum/Library numbering listed on pp. xvi-xvii of Zupitza-Davis.

For example, "scyld scefinȝ sceaþe[na]" is verse-line 4 and 132R04.

2

See **Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel**, ed. John Earle, revised by Charles Plummer, reissued with a Bibliographical Note by Dorothy Whitelock (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952f.), p. 67, where the entries of two (texts B and C) of many of the variant chronicles record the ancient genealogies of the Anglo-Saxon kings.

3

Julius Pokorny, **Indogermanisches étymologisches Wörterbuch**, vol. 1 (Bern and Munich, 1959), p. 950.

4

Ibid., p. 956

5

See **skeup-** in Calvert Watkins, "Indo-European Roots," in **The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language**, ed. William Morris (Boston, 1969f.), p. 1540.

6

Pokorny, p. 956.

7

Ibid., pp. 923-27.

8

Elliott van Kirk Dobbie, ed., **The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems** (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), p. 125.

9

Pokorny, pp. 527-28.

10

Ibid., p. 548.

11

Ibid., p. 707.

12

It is a pleasure to acknowledge here my thanks to David E. Bynum, Curator of Harvard's Milman Parry Collection of Oral Literature, for making available to me a tape of Avdo Međedović performing a lengthy passage from his 13,331-line song, **Osmanbeg Delibegović and Pavičević Luka**, recorded by Milman Parry and Albert Lord on July 17-20 and August 1-3, 1935. Professor Lord discusses Avdo Međedović's traditional oral art in Volume 3 of **Serbo-Croatian Heroic Songs**, Albert B. Lord and David E. Bynum,

eds. and trans. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1974), pp. 3-12 and 13-34.

13

Richard E. Leakey and Roger Lewin, **People of the Lake: Mankind and Its Beginnings** (Garden City, New York: Anchor Press, 1978), p. 278.

14

Ibid., p. 279.

15

Ibid., pp. 280-81.

16

Pokorny, **l. leug-**, pp. 685-86.

17

See David E. Bynum, **The Daemon in the Wood: A Study of Oral Narrative Patterns** (Cambridge: The Center for Study of Oral Literature, 1978), *passim*, but particularly pp. 3-31. Lord's phrase occurs in Albert B. Lord, **The Singer of Tales** (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 97.