

KNO-005 · Oral Language and Transmission

KNO · Ways of Knowing

Juan Segurola

v0.1 · EN

All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

Ask how people remembered before writing and three assumptions arrive with the question: that remembering was the difficulty, that writing was the solution, that oral transmission is one thing. KNO-005 asks a narrower question instead: given a body of knowledge, a community and no graphic support, what determines how much survives a generation, and at what cost? It distinguishes six modes whose fidelity differs sharply, from casual report to institutionally checked recitation, treated as categories rather than stages. It examines the two poles: the singer who composes instead of memorising, and the community that recites in permuted orders so that corruption becomes audible. It weighs what long chains demonstrably carry against the conditions under which a deep time claim is testable, and revisits the great divide thesis. It closes on the asymmetry: a tradition never recorded leaves nothing to excavate.

In 60 Seconds

Oral transmission is not one practice but a family of techniques, and they are not comparable technologies. Casual report degrades quickly, because nothing in the practice resists that. Institutionally checked recitation is the strongest oral fidelity regime known. What produces the difference is constraint, not effort. A line of verse in a strong tradition is held at once by metre, by rhyme or alliteration, by melody, by the imagery of its scene, by the formulaic phrasing of its metrical slot and by narrative sequence. Each alone leaves many options; together they often leave one, so a performer who cannot recall a line regenerates one that fits. Three consequences follow: fidelity is domain specific, unconstrained prose is the fragile case, and fidelity and creativity are settings rather than opposites. At one pole the South Slavic singer builds a different performance each time, same plot and different words, and does not experience it as failure. At the other, specialists recite a text in systematically permuted orders, so that a corruption is exposed by disagreement between the recitation forms: redundancy used for error detection, without any theory of information.

Why This Question Matters

A prominent mid twentieth century argument held that alphabetic literacy restructures thought, enabling logic, history and scepticism oral cultures cannot sustain. Comparative work replaced that autonomous model with one in which what literacy does depends on the practices it is embedded in, so no general consequence follows from the technology alone. Treating oral transmission as a stage flatters writing, crediting it with solving a problem the strong oral regimes had already solved, and obscures what writing did change: cost, portability, random access and the recording of the arbitrary. And each loss takes with it whatever was held only in one language and only in memory.

1. A badly posed question

How did people remember things before writing is a question that has an answer, and the answer is misleading, because the question smuggles in three assumptions. It assumes that remembering was the difficulty. It assumes that writing was the solution to that difficulty. And it assumes that oral transmission is a single thing about which one general statement can be made.

None of the three survives inspection. Oral societies did not principally struggle to retain knowledge; many of them retained specific bodies of knowledge with high fidelity, by the mechanisms section 3 describes. The earliest uses of writing that survive are largely administrative rather than mnemonic, which is a statement about what survives and not a single motive for its adoption. And the practices lumped together as oral tradition differ from one another more than any of them differs from writing.

The better question is narrower and answerable. Given a body of knowledge, a community and no graphic support, what mechanisms determine how much of it survives a generation, and what do those mechanisms cost.

Where That Leaves Us

The familiar question assumes that remembering was the difficulty, that writing solved it, and that oral transmission is a single thing. None of the three holds. What the earliest surviving writing shows is a fact about what survives rather than a motive for adoption. A narrower question replaces it, and answering that one starts by refusing to treat oral transmission as one practice.

2. Six modes, not one

As in KNO-004, the divisions below classify what a practice does. They are not stages and they do not form a sequence.

Casual report. One person tells another what happened. Fidelity tends to be low and to degrade quickly, because nothing in the practice is arranged to resist that; where a casual account happens to be repeated under constraint it behaves differently. This is the mode that transmission chain experiments in psychology usually study, and it is the mode least like the traditions that carry knowledge over centuries.

Narrative tradition. Stories transmitted across generations with a stable plot skeleton and unstable surface. What persists is structure, character function and sequence. Wording does not persist and is not expected to. Comparative phylogenetic work on folktale corpora treats exactly this signal, using the stable skeleton to reconstruct descent, and finds recoverable lineage across very long chains (Graça da Silva and Tehrani 2016).

Formulaic composition in performance. The mode described by Parry and Lord for South Slavic epic and applied to Homeric material. The singer does not reproduce a text. He builds one, live, from a repertoire of metrically shaped formulas and recurrent themes, and builds a different one on the next occasion (Lord 2019). The same song, on this account, is a type rather than a text, and asking whether a performance is accurate is asking the wrong question of the practice.

Constrained poetic transmission. Verse held stable by simultaneous constraints: metre, rhyme, alliteration, melody, imagery and formulaic phrasing acting at once. The constraints do not help the singer try harder. They cut down the space of things that could go in a slot until very few candidates fit, which is why partial recall reconstructs rather than fails (Rubin 1995).

Ritual verbatim transmission. Speech whose value depends on exact wording, transmitted with the explicit aim of zero change. Fidelity here is a social requirement enforced by training and by sanction, not a property of the material.

Institutionally checked transmission. Verbatim transmission with an added apparatus for detecting corruption, taught to specialists over years, in which the text is recited in deliberately altered orders so that any error becomes audible. This is the strongest oral fidelity regime known and it is discussed in section 4.

The reason for six categories again is that a single word conceals the differences that matter. Casual report and checked recitation are both oral, and they are not comparable technologies.

Where That Leaves Us

Six modes are separated by what a practice does, not by where it stands in a sequence: casual report, narrative tradition, composition in performance, constrained verse, ritual verbatim speech and institutionally checked recitation. The divisions are classifications and not stages, and the two extremes are both oral without being comparable technologies. What they do not yet explain is why the strong cases hold together at all.

3. Fidelity is built from constraint, not effort

The central finding of the cognitive work on oral traditions is that stability comes from the simultaneous action of multiple constraints, each individually weak.

A line of verse in a strong tradition is constrained by its metre, by its position in a rhyme or alliteration scheme, by the melodic line it is sung to, by the imagery of the scene it belongs to, by the formulaic phrasing available for that metrical slot, and by the narrative sequence. Any one of these leaves many options. All of them together often leave one. A performer who cannot recall a line does not draw a blank; the constraints regenerate a line that fits, and the regenerated line is frequently the original or close to it (Rubin 1995).

Three consequences follow, and they explain most of the apparent paradoxes in the field.

First, **fidelity is domain specific**. The same community can transmit a genealogy with near perfect accuracy and a piece of practical instruction badly, because one is embedded in a constraint structure and the other is not.

Second, **unconstrained prose is the fragile case**. It has almost none of the machinery above, which is why traditions that must be preserved tend to be versified, sung, or bound to fixed formulas even when their content is not poetic. Prose that is held by other constraints, such as a fixed liturgical order, is not fragile in the same way.

Third, **fidelity and creativity are not opposites but different settings**. Composition in performance sacrifices verbatim stability and buys unlimited productivity. Checked recitation sacrifices productivity and buys near verbatim stability. Both are oral, and a society may run both at once for different bodies of content.

Where That Leaves Us

Stability comes from many individually weak constraints acting at once, which together often leave one option where each alone leaves many, so a performer who cannot recall a line regenerates one that fits. The regenerated line is frequently the original, which is not the same as always. Fidelity is therefore domain specific, unconstrained prose is the fragile case, and the clearest cases of each setting are the two poles.

4. The two poles

4.1 The singer who does not memorise

Parry and Lord's fieldwork established that the South Slavic epic singer, asked to repeat a song, produces a performance of similar length and identical plot with substantially different wording, and does not experience this as a failure. He is not reciting; he is composing within a system (Lord 2019).

The result reframes a great deal. It means that the question of whether an oral tradition preserves an original text may be empty for entire genres, because there was no original text. It also means that stability at the level of plot, character and theme is compatible with instability at the level of words, so a tradition can be highly conservative about what happens and indifferent about how it is said.

4.2 The community that builds a checksum

At the opposite pole are transmission regimes designed to make error detectable rather than merely improbable. The Vedic recitation tradition of South Asia is the standard example. Alongside continuous recitation, specialists learn to recite the same text in systematically permuted orders, word by word in isolation, then in overlapping pairs, then in more elaborate interleaved patterns. Because a corruption changes what the permuted forms produce, disagreement between the recitation forms exposes it.

The structural point is worth stating in general terms. This is redundancy used for error detection: the same content encoded several ways, so that a fault in one encoding is visible against the others. It is the same principle that underlies checksums in data transmission, arrived at without any theory of information and maintained by institutional training over a very long period.

The caution attached to this example belongs in the text and not only in a footnote. This article describes the technique because it is well attested in the specialist literature on South Asian recitation; the specific sources listed in the accompanying bibliography have been verified as publications but their treatment of these particular recitation forms has not been confirmed directly, and that is recorded in the uncertainty list.

Where That Leaves Us

At one pole the singer composes within a system, producing the same plot in different words without treating that as failure. At the other, recitation in permuted orders turns a corruption into disagreement between forms, which is redundancy used for error detection. The sources listed here are verified as publications, not as treating these particular forms. What such chains carry across very long spans is a separate question.

5. Depth: what long chains can carry

Two lines of evidence bear on how much survives very long oral transmission, and they support different degrees of confidence.

Reconstructible lineage. Phylogenetic comparison of folktale corpora treats tales as heritable traits and reconstructs descent from their distribution across languages, recovering signal that the authors interpret as reaching Proto Indo European depth (Graça da Silva and Tehrani 2016). **The result is model dependent:** it follows from the phylogenetic method and the tale coding those

authors adopt, and other codings and models are argued in that literature. What it supports is that some structural features survive extremely long chains. It does not establish that any particular content in any particular tale is old.

Correspondence with independently dated events. A stronger and more contested claim is that specific oral traditions encode information about events datable by other means. Aboriginal Australian traditions describing the inundation of coastal land have been compared with the post glacial sea level curve and argued to preserve knowledge of coastlines drowned more than seven thousand years ago (Nunn and Reid 2016). **That is a published hypothesis and it is reported here as one**, not as an established correspondence.

The methodological problem with claims of this type is general and was set out before this case: deep time oral claims are structurally difficult both to disprove and to believe, because the evidence that would confirm them and the evidence that would refute them are often the same evidence read differently (Henige 2009). No published rebuttal specifically addressing the Australian coastal argument was located during the preparation of this article, which is a statement about this search and not an endorsement.

Recent work extends the approach to volcanism and to geological features, again reading oral traditions against independently dated events (Franks, Nunn and McCallum 2024; Franks et al. 2025). The field is small and its authorship overlaps, which is itself relevant when weighing how independent the confirmations are.

The defensible position is narrow. Long oral chains demonstrably carry structural signal. Claims that a particular tradition encodes a particular dated event are testable only where an independent date exists, and their strength depends entirely on how tightly the tradition constrains the event, which is usually not very tightly.

Where That Leaves Us

Long chains demonstrably carry structural signal, and that is the whole of what the phylogenetic result supports: it is model dependent and establishes nothing about the age of any particular content. A claim that a tradition encodes a dated event is testable only where an independent date exists, and this literature is small with overlapping authorship. A stronger claim about writing itself follows.

6. The great divide, and the criticism it drew

A prominent mid twentieth century argument held that alphabetic literacy restructures thought, enabling logic, history, scepticism and cumulative critique that oral cultures cannot sustain (Goody and Watt 1963). A related account described orality and literacy as distinct modes of consciousness, with writing restructuring the mind that acquires it (Ong 2013).

The thesis drew sustained criticism from comparative work. The principal critique replaced the autonomous model, in which literacy is a uniform technology with uniform cognitive effects, with an ideological model, in which what literacy does depends on the social practices it is embedded in, so that different literacies in different institutions produce different effects and no general consequence follows from the technology alone (Street 1984).

This matters for the series and not only for the topic. The great divide has the same shape as the error KNO-004 identified in the study of writing systems, in a different domain: a real distinction is converted into a ladder, one side is treated as the destination, and everything on the other side is redescribed as a deficit. The correction is the same in both cases. Ask what a system does and for whom, and stop asking what it was on the way to becoming.

Where That Leaves Us

The argument that alphabetic literacy restructures thought was met by comparative work replacing the autonomous model with one in which what literacy does depends on the practices it is embedded in, so that no general consequence follows from the technology alone. That refutes a general claim rather than showing literacy changes nothing. Refusing the deficit framing does not dispose of the real costs.

7. Cost, and what the mode cannot do

Refusing the deficit framing does not mean pretending there are no limits.

Cost in people. Strong oral fidelity is expensive. It requires specialists, years of training, institutional continuity and social arrangements that reward exact transmission. When those arrangements fail, the capability disappears within a generation. The costs of the two are of different kinds and this article does not compare them per unit of content preserved, which would require a measure neither tradition supplies.

Retrieval is usually sequential. Content is retrieved by working through the structure that holds it, which is efficient for whole units and poor for arbitrary lookup. Traditions that build indexing devices into the structure, such as fixed enumerations or place sequences, reduce that cost without escaping it.

Poor for the arbitrary. The constraint machinery of section 3 works because content has structure. Long lists of unmotivated particulars, exact quantities and arbitrary strings are what it stabilises worst, and the traditions that do carry such material tend to have given it an artificial structure first. It is not a coincidence that the earliest writing recorded quantities and names.

Loss is usually irreversible. This is the asymmetry that distinguishes oral from graphic transmission most sharply. A lost manuscript may be recovered, copied elsewhere, or excavated. A tradition that was never recorded leaves nothing when its last speakers stop; where recordings or transcriptions were made, what survives is a record of the tradition rather than the tradition. Language endangerment is therefore not only a linguistic concern: network analysis of endangered languages identifies geographic concentrations where loss is structurally driven by contact patterns rather than distributed evenly (Lee, Siew and Ng 2022), and each loss takes with it whatever was held only in that language and only in memory.

Where That Leaves Us

Strong oral fidelity is expensive in specialists, training and institutional continuity, and the capability disappears within a generation when those fail. Retrieval runs sequentially, arbitrary particulars are what it stabilises worst, and loss is usually irreversible. The article does not compare the two modes per unit of content preserved, because neither supplies that measure. Some of this the evidence cannot settle at all.

8. What the evidence cannot settle

Fidelity before observation. Measured fidelity in oral traditions comes from traditions observed by researchers, which are traditions that survived to be observed. Nothing corrects for the practices that failed, so estimates of what oral transmission can achieve are biased upward by survivorship.

Age of any particular content. Structural methods date lineages, not utterances. A tale type may be ancient while every word in a recorded version is recent, and no method currently distinguishes an old element from a well integrated new one within a living tradition.

The verbatim question for undocumented traditions. Whether a tradition transmitted verbatim can only be established where multiple independent versions were recorded before the tradition was disturbed. For most of the historical record this condition is not met.

The categories. As in KNO-004, the six modes in section 2 are analytic instruments. Real practices mix them, and a single community can move content between modes deliberately.

Where That Leaves Us

Four limits stand. Measured fidelity comes only from traditions that survived to be observed, so the estimates are biased upward. Structural methods date lineages and not utterances. Verbatim transmission is demonstrable only where independent versions were recorded before the tradition was disturbed. The six modes are instruments that real practices mix. What survives those limits is what the article will conclude.

9. Conclusion

Oral transmission is not what preceded writing. It is a family of techniques for holding knowledge in a population, ranging from practices with almost no error control to practices with error control that writing did not improve upon for a very long time. Its strong forms achieve their fidelity by constraining what can be said, which is why they favour verse, formula and song, and why they fail on arbitrary detail.

Treating it as a stage produces two errors at once. It flatters writing, by crediting it with solving a problem that the strong oral regimes had already solved for their own content, and it obscures what writing actually changed, which was cost, portability, random access and the ability to record the arbitrary. Those are large changes. They are not the same as making thought possible.

Where That Leaves Us

Oral transmission is a family of techniques rather than a stage before writing, and its strong forms buy fidelity by constraining what can be said. Treating it as a stage flatters writing and obscures what writing did change: cost, portability, random access and the arbitrary. Those are large changes and not the same as making thought possible. What is established, and how, follows.

What We Know, and How

Cognitive work on strong traditions establishes that stability comes from many individually weak constraints acting at once — metre, melody, formula, imagery and narrative sequence — which together often leave one option where each alone leaves many. Parry and Lord's fieldwork shows a singer producing the same plot at similar length in substantially different words without treating it as failure. Vedic permutation recitation shows a community making error detectable rather than merely improbable.

What We Still Don't Know

Measured fidelity comes only from traditions that survived to be observed, and nothing corrects for the practices that failed, so estimates of what oral transmission can achieve are biased upward. Structural methods date lineages rather than utterances, so a tale type may be ancient while every recorded word is recent. Whether a given tradition transmitted verbatim can be settled only where independent versions were recorded before it was disturbed.

What Could Change Our Minds

Independent versions of a tradition recorded before it was disturbed would move the verbatim question from method to evidence. A method able to distinguish an old element from a well integrated new one inside a living tradition would do the same for the age of content. The phylogenetic results are model dependent, and other codings argued in that literature could revise how deep the recoverable signal reaches.

If You Remember Only One Thing

Strong oral fidelity is produced by constraining what can be said rather than by trying harder to remember it, which is why it favours verse and fails on arbitrary detail.

Related Articles

- KNO-003 · *From Marks to Symbols*
- KNO-004 · *From Symbols to Writing*

References

Franks, Leigh, Patrick D. Nunn, y Adrian McCallum. 2024. «The selective geography of volcanism in oral traditions». *Quaternary Research* 122: 1–17. DOI 10.1017/qua.2024.29. Franks, Leigh, Patrick D. Nunn, Adrian McCallum, y Gertz, Janine. 2025. «Stories in Stone». *Geoheritage* 17 (2): art. 73. DOI 10.1007/s12371-025-01116-2. Goody, Jack, y Ian Watt. 1963. «The Consequences of Literacy». *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5 (3): 304–345. DOI 10.1017/S0010417500001730. Graça da Silva, Sara, y Jamshid J. Tehrani. 2016. «Comparative phylogenetic analyses uncover the ancient roots of Indo-European folktales». *Royal Society Open Science* 3 (1): art. 150645. DOI 10.1098/rsos.150645. Henige, David. 2009. «Impossible to Disprove Yet Impossible to Believe: The Unforgiving Epistemology of Deep-Time Oral Tradition». *History in Africa* 36: 127–234. DOI 10.1353/hia.2010.0014. Lee, Nala H., Cynthia S. Q. Siew, y Nadine H. N. Ng. 2022. «The network nature of language endangerment hotspots». *Scientific Reports* 12: art. 10803. DOI 10.1038/s41598-022-14479-1. Lord, Albert B. 2019. *The Singer of Tales*. Ed. David F. Elmer. 3.^a ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. ISBN 978-0-674-97573-6. Primera edición 1960. Nunn, Patrick D., y Nicholas J. Reid. 2016. «Aboriginal Memories of Inundation of the Australian Coast Dating from More than 7000 Years Ago». *Australian Geographer* 47 (1). DOI 10.1080/00049182.2015.1077539. Ong, Walter J. 2013. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. 30.^o aniversario, con dos ensayos de John Hartley. London: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-53838-1. Rubin, David C. 1995. *Memory in Oral Traditions: The Cognitive Psychology of Epic, Ballads, and Counting-out Rhymes*. New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-19-508211-1. Rústica 1997, ISBN 978-0-19-512032-5. Staal, Frits. 1986. *The Fidelity of Oral Tradition and the Origins of Science*. Amsterdam: North-

Holland / Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen. ISBN 0-444-85669-2. Street, Brian V. 1984. *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge Studies in Oral and Literate Culture 9. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0-521-24785-3.