

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

A Picasso of Perspectives on Formulaic Language

Frog, Mr.

The Milman Parry Collection of Oral Literature, Harvard University
2022-05-07

Frog , M & Lamb , W 2022 , A Picasso of Perspectives on Formulaic Language . in M Frog & W Lamb (eds) , Weathered Words : Formulaic Language and Verbal Art . Publications of the Milman Parry Collection of Oral Literature , vol. 6 , The Milman Parry Collection of Oral Literature , Harvard University , Cambridge (MA) , pp. 1 21 .

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/353912>

cc_by_nc_nd
publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

WEATHERED WORDS



FORMULAIC LANGUAGE AND VERBAL ART

EDITED BY

FROG AND LAMB

Publications of the Milman Parry Collection
of Oral Literature No. 6

WEATHERED WORDS

WEATHERED WORDS
FORMULAIC LANGUAGE AND VERBAL ART

edited by
Frog
and
William Lamb

Published by
THE MILMAN PARRY COLLECTION OF ORAL LITERATURE
Harvard University

Distributed by
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, England
2022

Weathered Words: Formulaic Language and Verbal Art

Published by The Milman Parry Collection of Oral Literature, Harvard University
Distributed by Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, England
Copyright © 2022 The Milman Parry Collection of Oral Literature
All rights reserved

EDITORIAL TEAM OF THE MILMAN PARRY COLLECTION

Managing Editors: Stephen Mitchell and Gregory Nagy
Executive Editors: Casey Dué and David Elmer

PRODUCTION TEAM OF THE CENTER FOR HELLENIC STUDIES

Production Manager for Publications: Jill Curry Robbins
Web Producer: Noel Spencer
Cover Design: Joni Godlove
Production: Kristin Murphy Romano

ON THE COVER

Pablo Picasso, *Violin and Grapes*. Céret and Sorgues, spring-summer 1912. The Museum of Modern Art, New York, NY, inv. no. 32.1960. Mrs. David M. Levy Bequest. © 2022 Estate of Pablo Picasso / Artists Rights Society (ARS), New York.
Digital Image © The Museum of Modern Art, Licensed by SCALA / Art Resource, NY.

ISBN: 978-0-674-27839-4

Library of Congress Control Number: 2022934846

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ix

PRELUDE

1. A Picasso of Perspectives on Formulaic Language 1
by Frog and William Lamb

PART I. ORAL-FORMULAIC THEORY AND BEYOND

2. Formulas in Oral Epics: The Dynamics of Metre,
Memory, and Meaning 23
by Karl Reichl

3. Of *Scopas* and Scribes: Reshaping Oral-Formulaic Theory in
Old English Literary Studies 49
by Stephen C. E. Hopkins

4. *Vlach Paupers*: Formula and Layers of Meaning 81
by Sonja Petrović

5. Humans as Formulaic Beings 103
by Anatoly Liberman

PART II. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

6. Multiform Theory 115
by Frog

Table of Contents

7. Formulas and Scribal Memory: A Case Study of Text-Critical Variants as Examples of Category-Triggering 147
by Raymond F. Person, Jr.
8. *We Don't Support; We Observe*: Epithets and Modifiers in a Vernacular Formulaic Genre 173
by Koenraad Kuiper and David Leaper
9. From Motif to Multiword Expression: The Development of Formulaic Language in Gaelic Traditional Narrative 193
by William Lamb

PART III. LANGUAGE AND FORM

10. Form and Formulae in Rotenese Oral Poetry 221
by James J. Fox
11. Formula and Structure: Ways of Expressing Names in the Northern Runosong Tradition 243
by Jukka Saarinen
12. Poetic Formulae in Icelandic Post-Medieval *pulur*: Transatlantic Migration 259
by Yelena Sesselja Helgadóttir

PART IV. EXPLORATIONS AT THE BOUNDARIES

13. *I Am a Fan of Hilarity*: Possible Directions for Oral-Formulaic Theory and the Study of Stand-Up Comedy 291
by Ian Brodie
14. Formulas in Neo-Latin Poetry as a Means to Language Enrichment and Self-Representation: Language Tips and Sociolinguistics in Justus Lipsius' Poems 313
by Hans Nollet
15. Rhythmic Fillers in Ifugao *hudhuds* 331
by Sergei B. Klimenko

PART V. CONSTRUCTING WORLDS OF DISCOURSE

16. Formulaic Expression in Olonets Karelian Laments: Textual and Musical Structures in the Composition of Non-Metrical Oral Poetry	363
by Viliina Silvonen	
17. <i>Morozko</i> : Russian Folktale Formulas in British Translations . .	385
by Tatiana Bogrdanova	
18. Opening and Closing Formulas in Tales Told in England. . . .	411
by Jonathan Roper	
<i>Index of Persons</i>	435
<i>General Index</i>	437

Acknowledgements

The concept of this volume and several of its chapters grew out of an international seminar-workshop held on 17–19 May 2017 in Helsinki, Finland: “Formula: Units of Speech—‘Words’ of Verbal Art,” organized by Folklore Studies, University of Helsinki, and the Finnish Literature Society (SKS). Several chapters of this book (2, 5, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17) are developed from papers published for circulation prior to the event (in *Formula: Units of Speech—‘Words’ of Verbal Art: Working Papers of the Seminar-Workshop*, Helsinki, 2017). We thank the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies and the Academy of Finland research project “Mythology, Verbal Art and Authority in Social Impact” (2016–2021) for their generous support towards this event.

Producing an edited book such as the present one relies on the cooperation, hard work and goodwill of numerous individuals. We thank Prof. David Elmer and the editorial board of the Milman Parry Collection of Oral Literature series at Harvard University Press for their belief in the project and their valuable assistance. We are grateful for the comments of two anonymous reviewers, which have strengthened many of the contributions and the manuscript as a whole. We also thank Jesse Barber for preparing the index, as well as Jill Curry Robbins and the team at the Center for Hellenic Studies for shepherding the book through the production process.

Finally, we thank the authors of this volume, who were all so willing to discuss and develop their chapters as the book advanced toward publication. Their enthusiasm, dedication, and insightful conversation have made this work a pleasure.

A Picasso of Perspectives on Formulaic Language

FROG, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
WILLIAM LAMB, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

FORMULAIC PHRASEOLOGY presents the epitome of words worn and weathered by trial and the tests of time. Scholarship on weathered words is, by nature, exceptionally diverse and interdisciplinary. Verbal art is in focus here, and this volume appears in the Publications of the Milman Parry Collection of Oral Literature. Given the centrality of Oral-Formulaic Theory (OFT, also called “Oral Theory”¹) in discussions of verbal art—a paradigm initiated by Parry himself—it is addressed directly in some chapters and indirectly in most others. Yet, this is not a book about OFT per se. Weathered words are but a part of it and OFT is, itself, but a part of scholarship on weathered words. Rather, the present volume displays a diversity of approaches to, and perspectives on, a phenomenon of language, rather than trying to obscure that phenomenon behind one theoretical arc. Each contribution has its own scope and degree of abstraction, and brings particular aspects of formulaic language into focus. Of course, no volume on such a diverse topic as formulaic language can be all-encompassing, but the eighteen chapters presented here highlight aspects of the phenomenon that may be eclipsed elsewhere. It is worth noting that the contributions diverge not only in style, but sometimes even in the way they choose to define

¹ Whereas the term “oral-formulaic” spread principally through the title of an article by Francis Peabody Magoun, Jr. (1953), Albert Bates Lord did not use the term “oral-formulaic theory” and referred to OFT instead as “oral theory” (e.g. 1960:5; 1995:167), which established it as a synonym for OFT from 1960 onwards. A few scholars now use “Oral-Formulaic Theory” for Lord’s and other early forms of OFT and use “Oral Theory” for its developments from mainly the 1990s and thereafter (a terminological distinction erroneously attributed to John Miles Foley in Acker 1998:xiv–xv). Owing to continuities in the gradual evolution of OFT research as it was refined, revised, and its scope of concerns expanded without a clear break, we distinguish Lord’s formalization below as “Classic OFT.”

Prelude

“formula” and related phenomena. As such, these chapters offer eighteen overlapping frames that complement one another both in their convergences and their contrasts. While they view formulaicity from multifarious angles, they unite in a Picasso of perspectives on which the reader can reflect and draw insight.

1. Background

A deep-rooted and enduring division exists between approaches to formulaic language in oral poetry and in other forms of human discourse. This gap emerged subtly and has been maintained on both sides, owing in large part to ideologies about poetry that now seem dated. Almost accidentally, the divide formed through the notion that poetry and language use more generally are somehow separate, so research was done on one or the other in isolation. Nevertheless, the divide was gradually recognized as illusory and approaches on both sides have begun to converge in recent decades: there has been a growing interest in interdisciplinary perspectives on weathered words. The present volume is a consequence of this interest beginning to precipitate into open discussion.

1.1 Classic Oral-Formulaic Theory and reification of the divide

The divide that became such an obstacle to cohesive discussion was not always there. The study of recurrent phraseology in any particular language was initially integrated. It may be tempting to assign the divide to modern disciplinary diversification, which centrally developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, but it is not so straightforward. The divide did not begin as a segregation of poetic from non-poetic discourse. It was initially a pragmatic division of focus. Formulaic language in non-poetic discourse was primarily studied in the researchers’ own languages—modern Germanic and Romance languages in the West. In these languages, poetry is generally seen as a literary art, in which unique expression is valorized. From that perspective, poetry is not deemed useful for studying conventional phraseology. Although studies of weathered words in oral poetry were unambiguously concerned with conventional phraseology, the traditions surveyed were in other languages and the studies were predominantly descriptive; recurrent phraseology was not theorized in these works to any great extent. However, that changed with Oral-Formulaic Theory.

Scholarship on formulaic language diversified as a result of the remarkable success story of OFT in Western scholarship. OFT was built on Milman Parry’s studies of formulaic language in Homeric epics (e.g. 1928), which engaged an

ongoing debate about whether these epics were oral or written (see also Foley 1988). The central idea was that long epics are not memorized texts: they are composed in performance, using a conventional phraseology that is pre-fitted to particular metrical positions. At the time, one of the more enduring questions of Western literature was whether Homer's poems were originally oral or literate. Parry's theory was that, if the phraseology of an epic was predominantly formulaic, it had been composed orally.

Parry went through the Homeric canon, identifying instances of phraseology that recurred in the same metrical positions of a line, and described what he found as formulae. This led him to define a formula as "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea" (Parry 1930:80, emphasis removed; adapted from Parry 1928:16). Parry's model had only modest impact at first, but it was further developed by Albert Bates Lord, whose dissertation (1949) produced a stir of interest in Harvard circles. Subsequently, Lord formalized OFT in his *Singer of Tales* (1960), introduced as "Parry's oral theory" (1960:5, also 12), and this produced a boom of discussion internationally. Lord's *magnum opus* propagates Parry's definition of formula, which is explicitly linked to meter (1960:4), and more generally frames formulaic language as a phenomenon distinctive of metered verse improvised within a tradition—what Lord described as *composition in performance*.

Lord's formalization can be distinguished as *Classic OFT*. Its international spread across the next two decades was remarkable. Karl Reichl (this volume) points out that Parry saw his definition as specifically for Homeric poetry; it was not meant to be universal and was rapidly considered too narrow even for Homeric poetry (Hainsworth 1968). Parry's statistical method for assessing the orality of a text based on formulaic density was also widely debated and shown to be problematic (Russo 1976). Nevertheless, the central idea of a relationship between formulaic language and improvisation was generally upheld. OFT was widely embraced and, already during its initial boom, it was energetically adapted to an ever-increasing variety of traditions, from stanzaically structured ballads (Holzapfel 1969) to prose narration (Bruford 1966). OFT gradually assimilated and superseded alternative approaches to how formulaic language works in practice. This does not mean that OFT became the only approach to verbal art—far from it. OFT was received enthusiastically because it provided a model for versification as language production, rather than simply for identifying and analyzing formal units (even if that is what much early OFT research did). Postmodernism was working its way through academia, bringing situations and contexts into focus for considering variation and interpretation that precipitated into, for example, the so-called performance-oriented turn (cf. Bauman 1975 [1984]; Ben Amos and Golstein 1975). OFT aligned with such interests:

Prelude

unlike other approaches, it accounted for how performers can perform verbal art *in situ*, advancing far beyond Parry's original questions about the Homeric poems.

Prior to *The Singer of Tales*, formulae in prose verbal art had received scattered attention (e.g. Nutt 1890:448–450, 497; Thompson 1951:457–459). Yet, they were viewed collectively under the aegis of “style,” not in terms of formal or functional features that would bring them into research focus and invite comparative analysis. Scattered applications of Classic OFT and its concepts to prose did not gain footing. Consequently, such formulae might be acknowledged, but discussions tended to remain both fragmented and also isolated from poetry, focusing on particular formulae or types thereof. Without gaining coherence, let alone momentum, discussions about formulaic language in prose verbal art remained relatively undeveloped (e.g. Lüthi 1990:57–67; Sävborg 2018).

Within a vast international discussion, OFT was flexed and developed in numerous ways. “Formula” became a trending term, which calved away from Parry's definition and was applied to almost any recurrent feature in lines (“syntactic formula,” “structural formula,” “metrical formula,” etc.). Lord's *Singer of Tales* stood like a Maypole at the center of dynamic debate, and OFT rapidly evolved as a result. OFT sought to account for formulaic language, but also the content units that Parry called *themes*, and the whole text-types that Lord called *songs*. Its amorphousness allowed it to absorb approaches to similar units like a sponge. OFT's terminology became interdisciplinary, and earlier expressions like *locus communis*, *commonplace*, *cliché*, and *phrase* were replaced by *formula*. With such shifts in terminology, once separate discussions came into dialogue with OFT. Eventually, OFT became so encompassing that different approaches were considered to be integrated with it, rather than in competition. Although *The Singer of Tales* stood as a monolith in the midst of this heterogeneity, Classic OFT accounted for only one type of oral poetry: line-by-line improvisation in a periodic meter (e.g. Finnegan 1977:ch. 3). It became the *de facto* framework for analyzing formulaic language in verbal art, yet its conditions were obstacles for traditions that did not fit the profile. Ultimately, OFT's implicit ideology—that a formula is a phenomenon specific to oral, metered poetry—reified the divide in research on formulaic language at large.

OFT has evolved considerably since Lord's *Singer of Tales*. Around 1990, the movement to approach and understand forms of verbal art on their own terms reached a critical mass. Rejecting prescriptive Western models of poetics, Dell Hymes' *ethnography of speaking* (e.g. 1981) and Denis Tedlock's *ethnopoetics* (e.g. 1983) deconstructed the long-presumed contrast between “poetry” and “prose.” They reconceptualized versification by explicating the organizational principles underlying certain forms of Native American verbal art. Their work was not aimed

at formula research per se, but its implications pulled the rug out from under Parry's criterion of "under the same metrical conditions" (1928:16; 1930:80; Lord 1960:4). Interest shifted from formulae as poetic compositional building-blocks to their variation and meaningfulness in tradition-dependent patterns of use. Consequently, "formula" became more flexibly conceived "as an integer of traditional meaning" in much OFT research (Foley and Ramey 2012: 80).

OFT scholars began to move beyond propositional meanings. John Miles Foley was particularly influential here, through his development of a semiotic approach to the production and reception of expressions in oral tradition. His theory of *immanent art* (1991) built on the study of formal units developed in OFT to account for their propositional, but also their connotative semantics, which can be highly distinct within verbal art. Foley's work, and that of similar scholars, fed back into the sea of OFT research. Terminological distinctions from OFT developed in some networks and dissolved in others. "Oral-Formulaic Theory," or its variation "Oral Theory," stuck most widely to refer to frameworks for how formulae and themes "work" in a tradition. Immanent art, on the other hand, has become more commonly discussed as the *traditional referentiality* of such units (cf. Foley 1991:6–8).² Foley (1995) later systematically synthesized immanent art with OFT, Richard Bauman's theory of performance (e.g. 1984), Dell Hymes's ethnography of speaking (1981), and Denis Tedlock's ethnopoetics (1983). All of these approaches remain distinguishable, but through their centers rather than their boundaries; they have enriched one another at their sites of intersection and overlap.

The turn to tradition-dependent meanings revived interest in OFT and stimulated adaptations to traditions that did not fit the profile of Classic OFT. Polarized oppositions of "memorized" and "improvised," as well as "oral" and "written," were breaking down. Scholars adapted OFT as a tool for exploring regularities in different forms of verbal art without presuming or testing the sort of "composition in performance" emblematic of Classic OFT's models (Harvilahti 1992; cf. also Lord 1995), as well as in written text transmission, in traditions where "oral improvisation has changed its locus" (Parks 1986:650; see also Doane 1994). Foley's theoretical work contributed to this process. At the same time, the turn towards semantics was a turn away from defining abstract

² Traditional referentiality is sometimes conceived through "intertextuality," although it is better seen as a response to the latter. Intertextuality developed in literature studies as a way of viewing meaning in texts through their networks of relationships to one another, customarily approached as independent of an interpreter. Traditional referentiality localized meaning in units of expression as signs (e.g. Foley 1991:7), as what could otherwise be described as the indexicality of those signs, which Foley developed in an experience-based framework rather than treating it as having an objective existence (esp. Foley 1995:47–59).

Prelude

concepts like formula. Foley, for example, did concentrated work on formulaic language (e.g. 1990), but later found meanings came into better focus through performers' emic concept of a "word" as a unit of utterance, rather than as an orthographic unit (e.g. 2002:11–21). "Word" cut past technicalities of how to define a formula or theme. This avoided rather than developed a theory of what constitutes formulaic language versus something else, but the performance-centered concept of "word" provided a new instrument for talking about weathered words and the "loads" of meaning that they may carry, theorized through traditional referentiality. On the other hand, Parry's formula definition remains prominent in OFT (e.g. Foley 2002:110–112) and Lord's *Singer of Tales* is still the most common point of entry for scholars interested in formulaicity in verbal art.

1.2. Evolution across the gap

While OFT underwent its boom and evolution from the 1960s onward, research on recurrent phraseology also developed in leaps and bounds on the far side of the divide. In linguistics, partly due to the emphasis on structuralism in the mid-twentieth century—and generative syntax in particular (e.g. Chomsky 1957)—conventional expressions were seen as relatively insignificant for understanding language. However, situated language began to come into focus from the late 1960s, with the rise in functionalist and corpus-based studies (Bybee 2006), while new fields began taking shape at the intersections of linguistics and anthropology and of linguistics and sociology. These developments reached a watershed in the 1970s and set the stage for the next half-century of research (Pawley 2007).

Earlier research had commonly focused only on idioms that deviate in some way from the meaning, syntax, or lexicon of "normal" speech. The crucial development in the second half of the twentieth century was reconceptualizing formulaic language as also including phraseology analyzable through the lexicon and grammar. This development combined with new methodologies and changing interests to give new life to approaches focused on the linguistic lexicon within an objectified model of language. In parallel with this, the rise of interest in socially situated language and its links to social behavior and interaction came into focus at a multidisciplinary nexus that can be broadly described as discourse studies. These two trajectories of development can be viewed as at the extremes, with a continuum of research between them, but they are significant for understanding the different ways that formulaic language became conceived and understood. Research focused on language as an objective entity brought formulaic language into focus as a *formulaic sequence*, i.e. as constituted of multiple words or perhaps morphemes that collectively form a regular

linguistic unit; the conception of such a sequence then gradually developed to include constructions more abstract than lexemes alone. At the other end of the continuum, research focused on situated discourse began looking beyond linguistic signs to include paralinguistic features like intonation and gesture, functions in interpersonal interaction, and so forth (Pawley 2009), which led such features to be considered in combination with lexemes as formulae. Formulaic language was sometimes conceived in incompatible ways, and these proliferated in parallel to the various uses of “formula” in OFT on the far side of the divide.

Later, as OFT research moved away from concerns about the role of formulae in composition at the rate of performance, researchers in other fields were realizing the variety and density of prefabricated linguistic units and constructions in everyday talk. Considerable work has occurred from a variety of angles on formal typologies and meanings or functions in discourse: questions of how humans produce and interpret language are now in focus.

Alison Wray’s work has proven particularly influential in recent decades. Through Wray’s principle of *needs-only analysis*, she articulated how formulaic phraseology alleviates the cognitive load involved in producing and interpreting language (2008:17–20). According to this principle, people will not normally analyze units of language in the flow of spoken or written discourse beyond what is necessary to interpret the message. In other words, they do not expend additional cognitive effort without a motivation of “need” (Wray 2008:130–132). This principle operates irrespective of how people learn a formulaic sequence; it is inconsequential whether they learn it holistically (without cognizance of its constituents) or by analyzing the sequence and only gradually internalizing it as a unit. This approach leads to her oft-repeated definition of a formulaic sequence, which has had wide-ranging utility:

[It is] a sequence, continuous or discontinuous, of words or other elements, which is, or appears to be, prefabricated: that is, stored and retrieved whole from memory at the time of use, rather than being subject to generation or analysis by the language grammar.

Wray 2002:9

More concisely, Wray describes the formula and formulaic sequence in terms of a *morpheme-equivalent unit* or *MEU* (2008:11–12), a concept that has proven particularly influential in recent years. Wray’s innovative approach synthesizes long-developing discussions across the field of linguistics and related disciplines. She also presents it in an accessible way, which has facilitated its spread

Prelude

in numerous directions, becoming both an instrument and emblem of changes in formulaic language scholarship.

1.3. Convergence and communication

Already decades ago, attempts were being made to bridge different branches of research on weathered words (e.g. Kiparsky 1976; Kuiper and Haggo 1984). Some innovations in OFT research drew directly on research from across the divide (e.g. Acker 1983; 1998) and OFT also fed into research in other fields, for example, cognitive psychology (Rubin 1995). Such efforts never bloomed into open discussion, but the landscape has changed in recent decades. Independent developments on each side have led to a convergence of definitions and interests. However different their backgrounds and terminology, Foley's and Wray's approaches are fully aligned: a formula is a "word" of the register describable "as an integer of traditional meaning," corresponding to a "morpheme-equivalent unit" (cf. also Kuiper 2009). The convergence gives rise to both compatibility and relevance. The relevance, however, is most easily recognized from the side of verbal art research, because entry points into current, accessible, and broad discussions on formulaic language in other fields are easier to find. Weathered words have moved from the spotlight in research on verbal art, so concentrated discussions are fewer, narrower, and often embedded in a broader discussion, and books with "formula" or "formulaic" in the title have only been appearing on the other side of the divide. It is thus unsurprising that, for those attempting to engage with OFT from another perspective, Lord's and Parry's work remains as the main frame of reference (e.g. Wray 2008:ch. 4; Rubin 1995).

Although the gap persists, scholars' attitudes have changed in recent decades, especially among those working with verbal art. Repeated stumbling over Parry's definition generated a need for something better suited to a broader range of verbal art, for which Foley's broad concept of "word" provided a patch, but has not provided a solution for a more nuanced analytical tool. Refocusing on situational meaning in OFT research has also driven interdisciplinarity. Engagement across the divide has been facilitated by the convergence of interests and alignment in approaches to weathered words.

The present volume has emerged on this background and brings into focus the variety of current research on weathered words in verbal art. Some of the chapters focus on formulae that align fully with Parry's definition, while others focus on recurrent elements that fall well outside of it. This volume introduces current research on a phenomenon of multidisciplinary interest, with the hope that it will stimulate future discussion and innovation. The trend in current research on verbal art has been the exploration of situation-specific meanings,

but such a focus requires accounting for both the formal and semiotic aspects of language. It is at this broad intersection that the present volume is positioned.

2. Organization

The contributions to this book could be grouped a dozen different ways. With each arrangement, connections between chapters are juxtaposed by unavoidable contrasts. We offer what we believe is the best arrangement, in five sections of three to four chapters each. OFT is still the dominant framework in Western scholarship for investigating how verbal art “works” in performance; therefore, it is appropriate to open this collection with the section, *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Beyond*. Each subsequent section brings a particular topic into focus that is of central concern for the collection. After considering some general perspectives on formulaic language in verbal art, and OFT as a widespread framework, the collection highlights additional theories and methodologies in formula research. Sections are organized around the role of the verse form in structuring formulae, the limits of formulaic language, and its roles in constructing different forms of discourse.

2.1. Oral-Formulaic Theory and beyond

In “Formulas in Oral Epics: The Dynamics of Meter, Memory, and Meaning,” Karl Reichl opens Part I of the volume with perspectives on formulaic language going back to Parry’s seminal work and explores its dimensions through more recent understandings. He then grapples with several issues that run through the book: the relationship of formulae to meter; the role of memory in performance; the significance of formulaic language in practice; and the possibility for long stretches of text to be more or less fixed even in an otherwise highly variable form of verbal art. Reichl provides valuable insights into these topics by considering poetry and song in the Kirghiz epic tradition.

Since the nineteenth century, scholarship on Old English alliterative poetry has discussed formulaic language and it has been an important nexus for advancing formula research. OFT’s foundations are situated upon studies of Homeric and South Slavic epic poetry. Both poetic traditions are organized by similar metrical systems, based on counting syllables or syllables and their quantities. In contrast, Old English verse uses a stress-based system, where the number of syllables can vary. Furthermore, the meter requires alliteration, which drives variation in word choice. Parry’s definition of formula was not transferable to this poetry without adaptation, which produced rich discussions about how to define and distinguish concepts like formula, and how different concepts

Prelude

of OFT relate to it. In “Of *Scopas* and Scribes: Reshaping Oral-Formulaic Theory in Old English Literary Studies,” Steven C. E. Hopkins elucidates the history of this rich vein of research, which exemplifies how OFT was adapted to one poetic tradition after the next. Hopkins introduces the reader to a vital arena of OFT research, one that also provided an abundance of valuable perspectives on oral-written interaction—some of the most significant insights produced to date.

Although OFT research built especially upon South Slavic epic as a living oral tradition, this has not been the only approach to that poetry. The turn from detailing the formal operation of language units to how their meanings and associations are constructed is also not exclusive to OFT. In “*Vlach Paupers*: Formula and Layers of Meaning,” Sonja Petrović pursues these issues across several genres of South Slavic traditions. She offers a fresh and innovative perspective that complements Classic OFT research. Conducting a case study of one particular formula, she traces both its connections to historical social environments and its uses in different genres.

Anatoly Liberman brings the discussions of this section to a close by looking at formulaicity as a broad and fundamental phenomenon. In “Humans as Formulaic Beings,” Liberman offers a wide, comparative context for the emergence of OFT, and he reminds us that formulae can be explored in diverse forms, rather than exclusively as a linguistic phenomenon. His learned discussion provides nuanced perspectives on how and why people engage with formulaic language, and significant observations about how patterns in idiom may change over the course of history.

2.2. Methodological approaches

Methodology is another key focus of formula research. Relevant scholarship has encompassed the theories that underpin analyses and interpretations, but also the strategies and procedures that form methods proper. Both concerns are advanced in Part II, “Methodological Approaches.” Discussion is launched by Frog, who takes up *multiform theory*, which was initially formulated by Anneli and Lauri Honko (1995; 1998) as part of an alternative to OFT. The Honkos felt that their theory of linguistic multiforms could better account for certain phenomena of variation and flexibility in verbal art. In “Multiform Theory,” Frog introduces this theory and its history, proposing that it reflects a basic linguistic phenomenon—one not limited to poetry. He distinguishes the multiform from the formula in its complexity and polysemic capability, arguing that it is a complementary type of unit, and also compatible with OFT.

In a similar strand, Raymond F. Person, Jr. considers the theory of *category triggering* presented by Gail Jefferson (1996). Category triggering concerns how

the production of language in discourse activates networks of association in vocabulary. Jefferson's theory accounts for patterns and variation in conversational language, like when using a wrong word that is linked by sound or sense to the one intended. In "Formulas and Scribal Memory: A Case Study of Text-Critical Variants as Examples of Category-Triggering," Person combines this theory with OFT and its expansions through Foley's work, offering valuable insights into variations made by scribes in copying ancient biblical texts and Greek epics. This chapter illustrates the importance of balancing approaches to flexibility in language use with the sources for particular traditions, as well as relevant questions that the sources are equipped to answer.

The rise of meanings in formula research on verbal art has given little attention to how formulaic language may be used to structure relations between the performer and what is referred to, reflecting his or her stance toward it—i.e. stance-taking. Koenraad Kuiper and David Leaper investigate stance-taking in sports commentators' formulaic epithets, referring to players and the feats of local and foreign teams. In "*We Don't Support; We Observe: Epithets and Modifiers in a Vernacular Formulaic Genre*," they offer a sophisticated quantitative analysis of formulaic language in sports commentary, situating their discussion in relation to OFT research on epic. This chapter introduces the valuable concept of *formulaic genre*. Whereas Classic OFT's methodology built on statistical surveys of formulae and used formulaic density as a litmus test for orality, formulaic genre is a descriptive term for a verbal genre characterized by a high density of formulaic language, irrespective of whether it is oral or written (see also Kuiper 2009). Kuiper and Leaper illustrate how quantitative methods can be used to determine whether structures of social relations are built into formula usage.

Statistical methods are also at the forefront in William Lamb's "From Motif to Multiword Expression: The Development of Formulaic Language in Gaelic Traditional Narrative." An issue widely debated in Classic OFT research was the relationship between formulaic language and so-called themes, units of narrative content. Lamb takes up a corresponding question in prose narration. Using a corpus of traditional tales featuring motif annotation by Stith Thompson (MacKay 1940), Lamb explores how formulaic language links to international tale motifs and how these relations vary by genre. In this way, he attempts to provide an empirical basis for two proposed factors underlying the development of formulae: recurrence and semantic distinctiveness.

2.3. Language and form

Part III focuses upon relationships between formulaic language and the organizing principles of poetic discourse. The organizing principles of many

Prelude

traditions of oral poetry diverge from Homeric and South Slavic epics far more than Old English verse. James J. Fox starts off the section with “Form and Formulae in Rotenese Oral Poetry,” in which he introduces formula constructions in a tradition of canonical parallelism that lacks periodic meter. In canonical parallelism, lexical pairs regularly recur in parallel lines. Fox elucidates how this type of lexical pair functions as a unified formula and reveals how sets of such formulaic pairings can develop complex patterning across a series of lines. Fox connects with the preceding section on methodology by presenting his system for mapping pairs through stretches of poetry. He then situates the operation of these formulaic pairings in relation to Roman Jakobson’s approaches to poetics.

Naming formulae were central to Parry’s (1928) early theorizations, in which he explored their fixity and variation, semantics, and patterns in their metrical structures. In “Formula and Structure: Ways of Expressing Names in the Northern Runosong Tradition,” Jukka Saarinen takes up this classic topic in his study of how naming formulae are structured in so-called Kalevala-meter poetry. This poetry’s short epic form led poems to be remembered and performed as “texts” rather than as improvised compositions in performance. It has a regular syllabic rhythm with often only two to four words per line, which stabilizes its phraseology. Saarinen shows that naming in this poetry follows formal patterns and outlines a typology of syntactic-metrical types, each of which he describes as a *formula system*, adapting a concept initially outlined by Parry (1928; 1930; cf. Lord 1960:35, 47–48; see also *syntactic formula* in Russo 1963). Saarinen considers how the dominance of particular metrical-structural formulae led to new formulations on the same pattern—i.e. they are generated within the framework of an established syntactic type.

To understand the relationship between formulae and poetic structure, it is valuable to examine what happens to them when they move between poetic systems. Yelena Sesselja Helgadóttir examines this phenomenon in “Formulae across the North Atlantic (from Continental Scandinavia to Iceland).” She traces the movement of formulaic language across genres and closely related languages, which may sometimes allow etymological translation and other times require alternative phrasing. Her study offers valuable insights into how language interacts with the organizing principles of a poetic form. She describes how the loss of a poetic feature like alliteration or rhyme in the movement of a formula to a new poetic system may be “compensated” by another poetic feature, revealing that such compensation may occur even when it is not necessarily required by the new metrical environment.

2.4. Explorations at the boundaries

Part IV, “Explorations at the Boundaries,” carries discussions of weathered words to the peripheries of formulaic language. Ian Brodie leads the section by investigating formulaic language in stand-up comedy. He focuses, in particular, on how language crystallizes in stand-up performance routines and how situationally motivated variation for such language works in the genre. In “*I Am a Fan of Hilarity: Possible Directions for Oral-Formulaic Theory and the Study of Stand-Up Comedy*,” Brodie illuminates the process of choosing between competing phrases as strategic choices for humorous effect. Bringing choice and variation into focus leads formulae to be framed as units in the lexicon that are used like non-formula units. This highlights the fuzzy boundary between whether particular units are or are not formulae.

Classic OFT was built on an idea that poets use phraseology pre-fitted to metrical positions in order to produce metrically well-formed lines at the rate of performance. Hans Nollet reveals that such recycling of weathered words can also occur in quite different traditions. In “*Formulas in Neo-Latin Poetry as a Means to Language Enrichment and Self-Representation: Language Tips and Sociolinguistics in Justus Lipsius’ Poems*,” Nollet illustrates that a corresponding motivation of ensuring the metricity of lines is found among Neo-Latin literary poets. Such practices were directed both towards displaying erudition and avoiding metrical mistakes. Neo-Latin poets composed in Classical Latin meters, which included rules related to syllabic quantities that were no longer distinguished in spoken Latin, which made the reuse of tried and tested turns of phrase from earlier poets the surest means to prevent an acoustically—but not analytically—unperceivable metrical error. These weathered words operate as formulae, but are not the formulae of an *oral* poetic idiom. This chapter situates some of the most basic perspectives on recurrent phraseology in oral poetry in relation to a formally identical phenomenon in literate compositions, where Nollet situates it in contradistinction to contemporary ideas of plagiarism.

Although most approaches to formulaic language stress the expression as forming a unit of meaning, Sergei Klimenko brings into focus *rhythmic fillers*. These have functional roles in regulating the flow of language in performance, but, because they do not communicate propositional meaning, they were sometimes omitted from early transcriptions of oral poetry. In “*Rhythmic Fillers in Ifugao hudhuds*,” Klimenko applies a sophisticated linguistic approach to the operation of language in sung performance and reveals the importance of these fillers for realizing verse form. A filler of this type does not correspond to an

Prelude

“integer of meaning,” or to a “morpheme-equivalent unit,” yet Milman Parry (1928) argued that the epithet “swift-footed” could equally be used as a formulaic metrical filler, accompanying the name “Achilles” to complete required line positions without contextual meaning. Like the preceding chapters in this section, Klimenko’s study explores weathered words at the boundaries of what is commonly addressed as formulaic language in verbal art.

2.5. Constructing worlds of discourse

The final section of the volume, Part V, considers what formulae do and how they operate, both formally and at the level of texture. In “Formulaic Expression in Olonets Karelian Laments: Textual and Musical Structures in the Composition of Non-Metrical Oral Poetry,” Viliina Silvonen explores how linguistic and musical units are combined during the composition in performance of a regional form of Karelian laments. These laments are a form of sung, non-metrical poetry. Formulae may be structured through alliteration, but their length is flexible: such flexibility operates in tandem with the different durations of melodic units. Silvonen’s investigation leads to the valuable observation that formulaic density and verbal regularity vary considerably between expressions that are personal to the performer and those that are ritually required in every lament of a particular type.

Formulaic language in genres of prose storytelling has been widely acknowledged but rarely received concentrated attention as a broad phenomenon. The density and use of weathered words in such genres vary, but they are particularly prominent in the Russian tradition. Tatiana Bogrdanova explores how translators have engaged with the highly formulaic quality of these folktales by comparing multiple translations of a particular collection. In “Folklore Formulas in Arthur Ransome’s *Old Peter’s Russian Tales* (1916),” Bogrdanova reveals how different renderings of formulaic language can manipulate a reader’s experience of the text, and she considers how translators encode cultural differences in narration.

Although weathered words in folktales may be less researched, some—such as *Once upon a time*—have vast resonance for the genre. This section, and the book, ends with Jonathan Roper’s investigation of key formulae in English fairytales. In “Opening and Closing Formulas in Tales Told in England,” Roper reveals the functional differences of common formulae in structuring narration, as well as their potential to evolve on the oral-written continuum. He shows that a single complex formula may travel between very different cultural environments, and maintain features belonging to one, but not the other. In addition to variation through elaboration and simplification, Roper makes the important

observation that, even when formulae originate in prose, they may exhibit poetic structuring at a phrasal level, a point of note that underscores the false division between “poetry” and “prose.”

3. Warp and Weft

The five sections of *Weathered Words* move through general overviews, theoretical discussions, and case studies, to explore the limits of what might be considered formulae and the broader discourses constructed through them. Some of the threads of the individual chapters may be self-evident, yet others may escape view in the course of reading, especially when a particular chapter is read in isolation. In order to help readers to anticipate and map the diverse connections, the more prominent of these threads are briefly mentioned here.

3.1. The metrical criterion of Parry’s definition of formula

The scholars of Old English poetry discussed by Hopkins were amongst the first to wrestle with the metricality condition of Parry’s formula definition. This condition has been an obstacle for those working with oral poetry regularly organized on principles other than periodic meter, such as parallelism in the study by Fox, or poetry in which particular organizing principles are not uniformly applied, such as the traditions covered by Silvonen and Yelena Sesselja Helgadóttir. Parry’s definition has remained a stumbling block to adaptations of OFT to prose, because scholars may feel that the failure to meet Parry’s criterion of metrical conditions needs to be justified (cf. Lamb 2015; Sävborg 2018). More specifically, discussions of prose formulae are often disconnected from questions of how language is produced in performance, as seen in Roper’s study, where language production is simply not relevant. Reichl highlights the disconnection between Parry’s intentions, when formulating his definition, and its dissemination through *The Singer of Tales*. What often remains unrecognized is that Parry’s criterion of “under the same metrical conditions” (1928:16; 1930:80) derives directly from his original methodology for identifying formulae by looking for the recurrence of words in the same metrical positions—i.e. his definition is a description of the things his method would find (Frog 2014:41; cf. Wray 2008:94–97). Without that criterion, however, Parry’s definition as “a group of words which is regularly employed ... to express a given essential idea” (1928:16; 1930:80) corresponds to Wray’s morpheme-equivalent unit (2008:12). While the issue of Parry’s metrical criterion is often in the background of research, it is worth foregrounding here; it is widely encountered, and duly considered in some of the chapters of the current book.

3.2. Formula and poetics

We can identify the relation of poetics and formulae as another thread woven through certain chapters here. Part III, “Language and Form,” examines the relationship between organizing principles of poetic form and the shape of formulae. Fox and Saarinen bring particular types of formulae into focus, and Yelena Sesselja Helgadóttir highlights what occurs as they move between poetic systems, yet the dynamics of weathered words in relation to poetic principles is a recurrent topic through the volume. Hopkins introduces the relationship between formulaic language, alliteration, and a rhetorical figure known as the “kenning” in Old English and Old Norse poetics. Frog sketches the relationships between poetic form and formula as a frame for considering types of variation, as well as more complex structures in which formulae participate. Klimenko explores the role of non-semantic fillers that complete what would otherwise be gaps in the flow of a performance. Nollet draws attention to literary uses of phraseology pre-fitted to meter. Silvonen and Roper each discuss formulae that are internally structured through alliteration or rhyme, independent of the surrounding unmetred discourse. The relationship between formulaic language and poetic form was of central interest already for Parry, but considerations of such phenomena have evolved considerably since that time. Now, they extend even to poetically organized formulae occurring in prose.

3.3. Fixity and variation

Alongside discussions of form are discussions of formula fixity and variation. Both fixity and variation concern weathered words of different sorts of scope, from a simple formulaic sequence to a stretch of language communicating one of OFT’s themes. While most of the contributions examine how individual formulae vary—a fairly bread-and-butter topic—certain contributions highlight the phenomenon that Lord (1960:58–60) called a *run*. This is a term established by Alfred Nutt (1890:448–449) for stretches of recurrent text in metered or unmetred discourse that he, and later Lord, considered characteristic of oral traditions. More recently, multiform theory allows runs to be viewed in relation to a broader range of phenomena, as shown by Frog. Multiform theory focuses on complex verbal frameworks in the mind of a performer that work to produce stretches of discourse longer than a single line. These *linguistic multiforms* may also operate as *macro-formulae*, expressing a regular unit of narrative content, for instance. Shorter poetic forms with greater text stability were not initially well-suited to analysis through Classic OFT’s focus on formulae within a verse line, yet their composition and variation becomes compatible with OFT when attention is on these larger units (see also Lord 1995:ch. 6).

Reichl highlights that Classic OFT's idea of "composition in performance" is linked not just to the long epic form, but more directly to the epic traditions on which it was developed. He reveals that the Kirghiz long epic form is characterized by long sequences of text that are reproduced with a high degree of fixity at a verbal level. Ian Brodie applies Anna-Leena Siikala's (1984 [1990]) concept of *crystallization* to understand how units of narration are linked together in the mind of a narrator. This concept avoids viewing fixed and free as a binary opposition, allowing a spectrum on which fixed memorization and free generative reformulation are extremes. Silvonen also uses this concept, well established in Finnish scholarship, to discuss the relative fixity of both individual formulae and complex formal units on a hierarchy of different scopes. The more complex units have remained outside of the interests of Classic OFT research, but both these and the phenomenon of crystallization have special relevance to unmeasured forms of discourse.

3.4. Formulaic density

Salient to explorations on the relative fixity of runs and other long stretches of verbal art is formulaic density. The chapters in this volume do not adopt the spurious notion that formulaic density can be used to index a performance's "orality," but rather that it varies meaningfully across performances and genres of oral tradition. For example, Kuiper and Leaper observe that formulaic density is higher in so-called "calling" commentary of sports commentators—the play-by-play presentation of ongoing action—than in "color" commentary. In the latter, the pace is more relaxed and the topics more variable. Similarly, Silvonen observes that formulaic density is higher in ritual sections of Karelian laments than in non-ritual sections, where a performer may present a broader range of information. Lamb's statistical analysis produces complementary results in traditions of Gaelic storytelling. He finds a clear correlation between formulaic density and the recurrence of traditional motifs, and also shows that formulaic density varies, more generally, across different narrative genres. These discussions, in their turn, provide interesting frames of reference for considering comments on particular cases and examples in other chapters.

3.5. Oral and written discourse

In recent decades, scrutinizing the relationships between different forms of discourse (e.g. speech and writing) has become an independent research domain (see Biber and Conrad 2009). Several contributions to this volume engage with the topic in different ways. Issues of fixity and variation become particularly interesting in medieval and ancient *oral-derived texts* that have been produced

Prelude

at the intersection of oral tradition and writing technologies (Foley 1990:5). In addition to the initial process of writing out such texts, copyists may consciously or unconsciously vary these texts based on their own competence in the tradition, a phenomenon known as *scribal performance* (Ready 2019:203–215). As noted above, Hopkins surveys the rich discussions on this topic in research on Old English poetry, while Person explores its manifestation in biblical Hebrew and Homeric poetry. Classic OFT spread in an environment where orality was synonymous with the authenticity of tradition, yet the reality of many traditions is that there is interplay of composition, transmission, and re-composition between written text and oral practice. This is exemplified in the post-medieval poetry discussed by Yelena Sesselja Helgadóttir, as well as in the lively manuscript traditions of Iceland (Sävborg 2018) and Gaelic Scotland and Ireland (Bruford 1966; Lamb 2013), and in the English fairytales analyzed by Roper. So many tales were preserved in manuscripts and publications edited and recomposed for a literate audience that, inevitably, these literate stories reciprocally become the stuff of oral performers.

For Bogrdanova, this phenomenon is carried to yet another level; formulae rooted in the oral background of the Russian tale tradition are mediated, adapted, or omitted in the translation of these tales for popular English versions. Brodie, on the other hand, addresses stand-up comedy, where scripts may be formulated through a written medium to be performed orally, with the intention of appearing spontaneous. Alternatively, Nollet looks at parallels between formulaic language use, as described through OFT, and the reuse of phraseology in written poetry among Neo-Latin poets. When the topic of oral and written discourse is brought into focus across these chapters, their numerous and complementary perspectives provide a vibrant dialogue for the reader.

4. Cubism

In the wake of increasing institutional emphasis on bibliometrics and associated de-emphasis of monographs, books comprised of articles or chapters by diverse authors have been on the rise in the humanities. Even when they are systematically designed, and chapters strictly assigned, readers may perceive such books as lacking coherence. To an extent, this is due to the normal diversity found across individual authors' knowledge, interests, experience, and emphases. Yet, diversity can be unified and unifying. This is important to acknowledge because reader expectations are key to how a book is read and received. For instance, if realism is assumed as a frame of reference, a Picasso may look childish or aberrant; Carl Jung (1932 [1966]) observes that, if received from a patient, some of Picasso's works would be considered symptomatic of schizophrenia. As will

be obvious from this introduction, rather than pruning divergences, we have nurtured diversity. In each chapter, the object of weathered words is taken up in different materials, bringing a particular aspect of a phenomenon, theory, or method into focus. Each chapter makes a valuable contribution to the topic of formulaic language. Together, these diverse and juxtaposed representations form a portrait of *Weathered Words*.

References

- Acker, P. 1983. *Levels of Formulaic Composition in Old English and Old Icelandic Verse*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Brown University.
- . 1998. *Revising Oral Theory: Formulaic Composition in Old English and Old Icelandic Verse*. New York.
- Bauman, R. 1975 [1984]. *Verbal Art as Performance*. Prospect Heights, Brooklyn.
- Ben Amos, D., and Goldstein, K., eds. 1975. *Folklore: Performance and Communication*. Approaches to Semiotics 40. The Hague.
- Biber, D., and Conrad, S. 2009. *Register, Genre and Style*. Cambridge.
- Bruford, A. 1966. "Gaelic Folk-tales and Mediæval Romances: A Study of the Early Modern Irish Romantic Tales and Their Oral Derivatives." *Béaloideas* 34:i-285.
- Bybee, J. "From Usage to Grammar: The Mind's Response to Repetition." *Language* 82(4):711-733.
- Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague.
- Doane, A. N. 1994. "The Ethnography of Scribal Writing and Anglo-Saxon Poetry: Scribe as Performer." *Oral Tradition* 9(2):420-439.
- Finnegan, R. 1977. *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context*. Cambridge.
- Foley, J. M. 1990. *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. Los Angeles.
- . 1991. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington.
- . 1995. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Bloomington.
- . 2002. *How to Read an Oral Poem*. Urbana.
- Foley, J. M., and Ramey, P. 2012. "Oral Theory and Medieval Studies." In *Medieval Oral Literature*, ed. K. Reichl, 71-102. Berlin.
- Frog, ed. 2017. *Formula: Units of Speech—'Words' of Verbal Art: Working Papers of the Seminar-Workshop, 17th-19th May 2017, Helsinki, Finland*. Folkloristiikan Toimite 21. Helsinki.
- Hainsworth, J. B. 1968. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford.
- Harvilahti, L. 1992. *Kertovan runon keinot: Inkeriläisen runoepiikan tuottamisesta*. Helsinki.

Prelude

- Holzappel, O. 1969. *Studien zur Formelhaftigkeit der mittelalterlichen dänischen Volksballade*. PhD dissertation, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität zu Frankfurt am Main.
- Honko, L., and Honko, A. 1995. "Multiforms in Epic Composition." *XIth Congress of the International Society for Folk-Narrative Research (ISFNR), January 6-12, 1995, Mysore, India: Papers I-IV, II*, 207-240. Mysore.
- . 1998. "Multiforms in Epic Composition." In *The Epic: Oral and Written*, ed. L. Honko, J. Handoo, and J. M. Foley, 31-79. Mysore.
- Hymes, D. 1981. *"In Vain I Tried to Tell You": Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia.
- Jefferson, G. 1996. "On the Poetics of Everyday Talk." *Text and Performance Quarterly* 16(1):1-61.
- Jung, C. G. 1932. "Picasso." In *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature*, ed. Sir H. Kead, M. Fordham, and G. Adler, 135-141. London.
- Kiparsky, P. 1976. "Oral Poetry: Some Linguistic and Typological Considerations." In *Oral Literature and the Formula*, ed. B. A. Stolz and R. S. Shannon III, 73-106. Ann Arbor.
- Kuiper, K. 2009. *Formulaic Genres*. Basingstoke.
- Kuiper, K., and D. C. Haggio. 1984. "Livestock Auctions, Oral Poetry and Ordinary Language." *Language in Society* 13:205-234.
- Lamb, W. 2013. "Recitation or Re-Creation? A Reconsideration: Verbal Consistency in the Gaelic Storytelling of Duncan MacDonald." In *'A Guid Hairst': Collecting and Archiving Scottish Tradition*, ed. K. Campbell, W. Lamb, N. Martin, and G. West, 171-184. Maastricht.
- . 2015. "Verbal Formulas in Gaelic Traditional Narrative: Some Aspects of Their Form and Function." In *Registers of Communication*, ed. A. Agha and Frog, 225-246. Helsinki.
- Lord, A. B. 1949. *The Singer of Tales: A Study in the Processes of Composition of Yugoslav, Greek, and Germanic Oral Narrative Poetry*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Harvard University.
- . 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA.
- . 1995. *The Singer Resumes the Tale*. Ed. M. L. Lord. London.
- Lüthi, M. 1990. *Das Volksmärchen als Dichtung: Ästhetik und Anthropologie 2*. ed. Göttingen.
- MacKay, J. G. 1940. *More West Highland Tales*. Edinburgh.
- Magoun, F. P., Jr. 1953. "Oral-Formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry." *Speculum* 28:446-467.
- Nutt, A. ("chiefly"). 1890. "Notes." In *Folk and Hero Tales*, ed. and trans. D. MacInnes, 395-491. London.

- Parks, W. 1986. "The Oral-Formulaic Theory in Middle English Studies." *Oral Tradition* 1(3):636–694.
- Parry, M. 1928. *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère*. Paris. [Translation available in M. Parry, *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, ed. A. Parry 1971, 1–190. Oxford.]
- . 1930. "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making I: Homer and Homeric Style." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 41:73–147.
- Pawley, A. 2007. "Developments in the Study of Formulaic Language Since 1970: A Personal View." In *Phraseology and Culture in English*, ed. P. Skandera, 3–45. Berlin.
- . 2009. "Grammarians' Languages versus Humanists' Languages and the Place of Speech Act Formulas in Models of Linguistic Competence." In *Formulaic Language I–II*, ed. R. Corrigan, E. A. Moravcsik, H. Ouali, and K. M. Wheatley, 1:3–26. Amsterdam.
- Ready, J. L. 2019. *Orality, Textuality, and the Homeric Epics: An Interdisciplinary Study of Oral Texts, Dictated Texts, and Wild Texts*. Oxford.
- Rubin, D. C. 1995. *Memory in Oral Traditions: The Cognitive Psychology of Epic, Ballads and Counting-out Rhymes*. Oxford.
- Russo, J. A. 1963. "A Closer Look at Homeric Formulas." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 94:235–247.
- . 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 III, 31–54. Ann Arbor.
- Sävborg, D. 2018. "The Formula in Icelandic Saga Prose." *Saga-Book* 42:51–86.
- Siikala, A.-L. 1984. *Interpreting Oral Narrative*. Trans S. Sinisalo 1990. FF Communications 245. Helsinki.
- Tedlock, D. 1983. *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation*. Philadelphia.
- Thompson, S. 1951. *The Folktale*. New York.
- Wray, A. 2002. *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge.
- . 2008. *Formulaic Language: Pushing the Boundaries*. Oxford.