

Since about 3,000 journals make up the master list of sources always consulted, there is often the frustrating situation of finding a desirable reference but without access to the source. Sometimes the authors are members of MLA and can be contacted by using the addresses in the MLA Directory sent to the members each year. Furthermore PMLA itself sometimes publishes articles on Folklore. Thus I recommend that individual subscribers become members of the Modern Language Association and order the Bibliography with their membership.

However, even if you do not subscribe individually, at least it is advisable that the library you frequent orders it. For years I have kept up my membership in MLA mainly for the annual bibliography. Despite the increases in membership fees and the decision to charge extra for the bibliography, I feel it is worth supporting the MLA for its excellent work in making the productions of scholars all over the world known.

Maybe it is impossible to keep up with everything that is going on in our fields, but with such a bibliography available we have no excuse for not knowing at least in general what is being done.

David R. Mayer
Nanzan University
Nagoya, Japan

FOLEY, JOHN MILES. *Oral-formulaic Theory and Research. An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography.* Garland Folklore Bibliographies, volume 6, ed. by A. Dundes. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1985. Xvi+718 pp. Introduction, area index. Hardcover US\$-48.00 ISBN 0-8240-9148-5.

"The field of oral literature is tremendously exciting . . . a . . . vital area . . . both in the academic disciplines which gave it birth and as a fledgeling in its own right" (p. 4). It was moving to see the enthusiasm of a scholar for his chosen field of inquiry, even in such a dry enterprise as a bibliography. Parry & Lord's ideas and concepts form surely an important contribution to the investigation of the texture in oral literature; a bibliography of works written on the subject is to be warmly welcomed.

The reviewed work is really addressed to philologists, classical and medieval, and to historians, not to folklorists. One may then wonder why the author choose to publish it in a series of folkloric bibliographies. The author, who from his initial interest in the natural sciences turned to philology and choose Old English as his special field of interest (p. x) is *not* a folklorist (see statements in his Introduction, such as: "given the lack of simple and customary author-centered, chronological, or thematic definition of the field" [p. 5] . . . "the written texts on which most of us have cut our critical teeth . . ." [p. 68]). This training explains the author's perspective and the lacunae in his familiarity with both the materials and research that relate to oral literature. So it happened that he mistook Parry & Lord's theories for "research of oral literature" in general.

Folklorists see things somewhat differently from philologists. Parry & Lord's work was surely a breakthrough in Homeric studies; but in the framework of folkloristics—although Lord's book is a most valuable contribution—it is but one in a series of studies of the patterned and formulaic nature of oral literature, an interest which started with late 19th century Russian scholarship, and was echoed by Central European scholarship in the beginning of the 20th century, and very much developed by the

Russian Formalists in the first quarter of this century. Thus, even the study of the specific field of the formulaic nature of oral literature is not identical with Parry & Lord's concepts.

The subject encompassed by the bibliography is labeled "discipline." If the author's reference was to the research of oral literature in general, the label would fit. But as it is, the reference is only to one theory of many, and thus this label is not appropriate. If the bibliography really intended to cover the whole field of oral literature research, then the 1800 entries included in the bibliography (p. 4) would represent just a drop in the sea, and the selection made could not be justified by any criterion. As it stands, the Parry & Lord theory deals with just one level of oral literary work, the texture, and even there with one aspect only, namely the formula in oral verse (see Jason and Segal 1977, Introduction; Jason 1977, ch. 10). If we substituted "Parry & Lord's oral formula theory" for every occurrence of the phrase, "oral literature research," in the Introduction, that would put things into proper perspective. Let us note, in passing that Lord's concept of "theme" has nothing to do with the "formula" and belongs to the level of narrative syntax. It is a rather rough concept, not yet worked out, but surely worth pursuing, possibly in the framework of the so called morphological studies initiated by the Russian Formalists. Thus, "formula" and "theme" should not be confused only because both have been proposed by the same scholar.

Turning to the bibliography itself, we find it lists works which deal with all subjects Parry & Lord happened to address (in itself a dubious way of classification!). In a sampling of ca. 10% of the entries (counting every 10th page, which gave 195 entries), 21% of the entries were found to deal with the formula theory proper, 5.1% deal with the "theme," and 24.6% with the problem of oral vs. written literary tradition. The remaining 49.3% of the entries were classed as "other;" these include such diverse topics as general Homeric, Old English, Old French, and Old Spanish scholarship; Serbo-Croatian philology; publications of epic texts of various cultures; anthologies of texts of various genres from several cultures; structural studies on the levels of narrative syntax and semantics; etc. Some of the entries appear to the reviewer utterly irrelevant to the subject of the bibliography; consider, e.g., on p. 595: "Ting, Nai-Tung. A Type Index of Chinese Folktales in the Oral Tradition and Major Works of Non-Religious Classical Literature, FFC 223 . . .," or on p. 632: "Whitaker, Richard E. A. Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature . . ." In the limited framework of 1800 entries, none of the mentioned topics could be treated exhaustively, and their inclusion is not justified but by mistaking the Parry & Lord's theory as comprising the whole field of folk literary research, all the rest is seen as only an appendix, of a more or less chance nature. Such an approach makes the bibliography superfluous for the folklorist; it misleads the philologist. Because almost half of the entries are taken from other fields, the information on what has indeed been written on Parry & Lord's oral formulaic theory is lost in a sea of irrelevant entries. And that is a pity. We would indeed like to know what has been done in this very important sub-field in various literatures and how the theory is developing.

The reviewer could not judge how complete the bibliography on specifically the formulaic theory is, as it involves many philological fields. However, the total lack of Russian and East European scholarship (Slavic, East German, Hungarian, Baltic, Rumanian) both older and contemporary, seems most disturbing. As this scholarship represents probably half of what has been written on oral literature, including structural studies, this lack does not seem justified. Folklorists will immediately notice this lack of East European scholarship; as the author nowhere states that it has been left out, this

lack will mislead philologists. Let us point out that the East German quarterly *Demos* publishes in German summaries of East European scholarship on folklore and ethnography. The only exception to this lacuna is the listing of a little of Serbo-Croatian scholarship. And even here, this "native" scholarship is by far not adequately represented. The reviewer found most surprising—and misleading—the statement that the Milman Parry Collection of Serbo-Croatian oral epics "offers a unique opportunity for those who would familiarize themselves with a living and well collected oral tradition" (p. 70). A rough calculation made by the reviewer showed that the Milman Parry collection with its 12,000 items makes about 5% of all material collected since the 16th century on the territory of what is today Yugoslavia, and collecting is still being carried out by the "native" institutions.

As to the arrangement of the entries in the bibliography, one would wish some systematization. A simple alphabetical list according to authors' names is a very unusual arrangement; probably, advice from a professional bibliographer would have helped. A folklorist would wish to find out, e.g., what has been written on the formula in ballad. The only index provided groups the entries by the language of the materials analysed. Here, a folklorist would wonder why the author went through the trouble of devising his own symbols for the various languages, when the folklorists have a well established system of symbols, based on language families (easily to find in any of the tale-monographs of the FFC series).

Lastly, the scientific community will surely welcome the announced journal *Oral Tradition* (planned by the University of Missouri, Columbia, from 1986 on), and devoted to oral literature (p. xiii). It will form an addition from an English speaking country to the well-established trilingual Germany-based *Fabula* and the France based *Cahiers de Littérature Orale* (by the way, these two journals do not figure in the list of periodicals used by the author in compiling the bibliography).

REFERENCES CITED:

JASON, Heda

1977 *Ethnopoetry: form, content, function*. Bonn: Linguistica Biblica.

JASON, Heda, Dimitri SEGAL, eds.

1977 *Patterns in oral literature*. World Anthropology. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Heda Jason
Jerusalem
Israel

JAPAN

RAZ, JACOB. *Audience and Actors. A Study of Their Interaction in the Japanese Theatre*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983. Xiv+307 pp. Appendices, bibliography, index. Paper Gld. 80,—. ISBN 90 04 06886 4.

An audience is "both aware and unaware of being an audience in the theatre," asserts the author. The audience, Raz continues, is "also conscious of being different and apart from the actor on stage . . ." (255). This gap between the audience and the actor creates tension: "the tension of the right distance between audience and actor in the theatre is the cornerstone of theatre experience" (256). The different perspectives of the audience and the actor are realized in different functions of the two, which