

Sound Structure as Social Structure

Author(s): Steven Feld

Source: *Ethnomusicology*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Sep., 1984), pp. 383-409

Published by: University of Illinois Press on behalf of Society for Ethnomusicology

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/851232>

Accessed: 27-08-2016 15:57 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Society for Ethnomusicology, *University of Illinois Press* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Ethnomusicology*

SYMPOSIUM ON COMPARATIVE SOCIOMUSICOLOGY

SOUND STRUCTURE AS SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Steven Feld

In this paper I address two questions: What are the major ways that the classless and generally egalitarian features of one small-scale society reveal themselves in the structure of organized sounds? What are the major ways that these same features reveal themselves in the social organization and ideology of soundmakers and soundmaking? By providing an overview of these areas I hope to illuminate some dimensions of a sociology of sound for the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea, a traditionally nonstratified society where egalitarian features seem significant to sound structure, and where inequalities also are clearly represented in the distribution of expressive resources for men and women.

My concern with these problems derives from a preoccupation with merging ethnomusicological questions (the cultural study of the shared meanings of musical sounds) with sociomusical ones (the study of musical sounds from perspectives of the social structure and social organization of resources, makers, and occasions). My work of the last few years (Feld 1981, 1982, 1983) attempts to understand the most salient lessons about the structure and meaning of Kaluli sounds and ways they are inseparable from the fabric of Kaluli social life and thought, where they are taken for granted as everyday reality by members of this society. My title alludes to a perspective that considers structured sound as “un fait social total,” in the sense that sociologists like Durkheim, Mauss, G. H. Mead, and Schutz stress the primacy of symbolic action in an ongoing intersubjective lifeworld, and the ways engagement in symbolic action continually builds and shapes actors’ perceptions and meanings.

My title also alludes to another paper, Song structure and social structure, one of Alan Lomax’s seminal cantometric reports (Lomax 1962). This reference is meant to locate this paper, and the Kaluli pattern it reports, in a larger comparative framework for the sociomusical analysis of classless and egalitarian societies. In doing so I also want to reconsider Lomax’s rationale for why we should compare sociomusical systems, and what we can compare from one to the next.

For Lomax the “principal message of music concerns a fairly limited and crude set of patterns” (1962:450); as a form of human behavior music should be

seen as highly patterned, regular, and redundant in each society, yielding stable structures. Lomax suggested that cantometrics provide profiles for each of these societal musical norms. Moreover, "these stable structures correspond to and represent patterns of interpersonal relationship which are fundamental in the various forms of social organization" (1962:449). Or, as he later put it, the "salient features of songs are symbols for the key institutions of society such as the sexual division of labor and the state" (1976:9). Lomax suggested that songs identify, represent, or otherwise reinforce the core structures of society. By comparing distinct patterns of vocalizing, Lomax attempted to construct world stylistic maps, raise questions of evolutionary sequence, and correlate dimensions of performance style with basic data on techno-economic complexity, mode of production, and social organization for a world ethnographic sample.

In Lomax's conception comparative research is fundamental to knowing how properties of singing style (musical behavior rather than musical content) significantly co-vary with social institutions and other levels of cultural behavior. The expectation all along was for highly patterned shapes for each culture, because "singing is viewed as an act of communicative behavior that must conform to a culture's standard of performance if it is to achieve its social ends" (Lomax 1976:11).

Compare what? Lomax compared samples of ten songs from four hundred cultures and correlated the codings with social structural data profiles from Murdock's cross-cultural surveys and the Human Relations Area Files (Murdock 1967, 1969). The small sample size of songs per society was justified by Lomax's belief that each society has highly standardized and highly redundant performance models. "Cantometrics is a study of these standardized models, which describe singing rather than song. Therefore, it is not primarily concerned with complete collections and descriptions, but with locating provable regularities and patterns, in the fashion of science" (Lomax 1976:17). Lomax's 37 coding dimensions attempt to factor all significant universal elements of song performance style on gradient scales.

Lomax's major report was greeted with mixed enthusiasm. Sample size and time depth, compatibility of song data with social structural data, psychocultural reductionism, inferential history, reading correlation as causation, intracultural and areal variability, and the extent to which the coding system normalized raters in ways which constrain the accuracy of pattern judgement were all causes of critical discussion surrounding this monumental work. Much of the criticism focused on method and data interpretation, and not upon Lomax's basic hypotheses about music as a universal public communication of social identity.

Whatever one's reaction to *Folk Song Style and Culture*, the publication of the cantometrics training tapes and coding book (Lomax 1976) must be greeted as a major event in the history of comparative musical research. Few researchers ever make their methods so available to others, and we should be grateful to

Lomax for these materials. Over the past few years I have listened to the tapes, learned Lomax's core examples, and tried to apply his parameters to a society and musical system I know well from intensive field research. I began with a sample of about 700 Kaluli songs and reduced this number to 500 after removing single performer renditions or other reliability problems. What cantometrics has taught me about those 500 songs is that they display so much intracultural variability and subtlety that it is virtually impossible to code a normalized profile for them. To construct a typical cantometric profile what I really need is *only* ten songs, but the problem is, which ten?¹ How can I maintain the integrity of patterns discoverable in large bodies of data when the cantometrics system seems to sacrifice so much significant data in order to objectify a "core pattern?"

After wrestling with the training tapes (an example of one of my specific problems, with the social organization of the vocal group, follows), I still feel that Lomax is asking many of the right questions about music and social institutions, but the mechanics of cantometrics crunches them in ways that cannot satisfy the researcher accustomed to intensive field work, in-depth analysis, and grounded ethnographic theory. So I go back to the initial question: compare what?

My suggestion is true heresy to many committed comparativists, but I think we need to pioneer a qualitative and intensive comparative sociomusicology, without reified and objectified musical and social structural trait lists, without unsituated laminations of variously collected and historically ungrounded materials. Comparative sociomusicology should take the tough questions and sort them out with the best materials available for detailed comparison: the thorough, long-term, historically and ethnographically situated case study. The meaningful comparisons are going to be the ones between the most radically contextualized case examples, and not between decontextualized trait lists.

The data needed to begin this kind of comparative sociomusicology are statements of pattern for single societies, focusing on stylistic integrity, sociomusical coherence, and the role of music in role differentiation. For this the best etic input will have to be the most thorough emic data. By this I mean that broad meaningful comparisons will have to be based on accurate, detailed, careful local ethnographic models. So to start, the best way to answer Lomax's questions about the systematic nature of musical representation in social organization is to study them on the ground, in the field, up close, over long periods of time, where sound structures are observably and undeniably socially structured.

A FRAMEWORK

While my firm belief is that the basis for comparing the social life of sounds must be qualitative and derived from intensive local research, I also believe that

such comparisons can be framed in general domains that do not oversimplify the culturally specific dimensions of every sociomusical reality. I propose then six broad areas of inquiry into music as a total social fact, into the social life of organized sounds. Each area is meant to open up a related set of socially and musically situated questions that see sound structures as socially structured, sound organizations as socially organized, meanings of sounds as socially meaningful. For each of the six rubrics I elaborate some rudimentary questions; the lists are not meant to be exhaustive in any sense.

Competence

1. Who can make sounds/music, and who can interpret/use them?
2. What is the pattern of musical acquisition and learning?
3. Are there stratifications of skill and knowledge? What types? How are they sanctioned, recognized, and maintained?
4. Is musical acquisition assumed to be unproblematic? A necessity?
5. Do ideologies of "talent" determine or constrain acquisition and competence?
6. What is the relationship between competence, skill, and desire for music?
7. What are the differences between production and reception skills, for individuals, across social groups?

Form

1. What are the material musical means and how are they organized into recognizable codes?
2. How are musical means distributed across settings and participants?
3. What are the preferred aesthetic orderings?
4. What are the boundaries of perceived forms? What does it mean to be wrong, incorrect, or otherwise marginal from the standpoint of code flexibility and use?
5. How flexible, arbitrary, elastic, adaptable, open is musical form? How resistant to changes, internal or external pressures, or other historical forces?

Performance

1. What are the relationships between makers and materials?
2. What is the relationship between individual and collective expressive forms and performance settings?
3. How are forms coordinated in performance? How adaptable and elastic is musical form when manipulated by different performers at a single moment in time or over time?

4. How do cooperative and competitive social relations emerge in performance? What meanings do these have for performers and audience?
5. How do performances achieve pragmatic (evocative, persuasive, manipulative) ends, if at all?

Environment

1. What resources does the environment provide? How are they exploited? What relationships exist between resources, exploitation, and the material means and social occasions for performance?
2. Are there co-evolutionary patterns, ecological and aesthetic, linking the environment and sound patterns, materials, situations?
3. What are the visual-auditory-sensate relationships between people and environment, and how is this pattern related to expressive means and ends?
4. What myths or models scaffold the perception of the environment? Are these related or complimentary to conceptions of person, society, expressive resources?
5. What mystical or cosmological associations with the environment support, contradict, or otherwise relate to the socioeconomic context of musical beliefs and occasions?

Theory

1. What are the sources of authority, wisdom, and legitimacy about sounds and music? Who can know about sound?
2. Is musical knowledge public, private, ritual, esoteric?
3. What dimensions of musical thought are verbalized? Taught verbally? Non-verbally?
4. Is theory necessary? How detached can theory be from practice? What varieties of knowledge and activity count as musical or aesthetic theory? How is music rationalized?

Value and Equality

1. Who values and evaluates sounds? Who can be valued and evaluated as a maker of sounds?
2. How are expressive resources distributed, specifically among men and women, young and old? How do stratifications emerge?
3. How do balances and imbalances manifest themselves in expressive ideology and performance?
4. Do sounds deceive? Mystify? Who? Why?
5. Are sounds secret? Powerful? For whom? Why?

6. How do musical materials or performances mark or maintain social differences? How are such differences interpreted? How are they sustained? Broken or ruptured? Accepted or resisted?

These questions, and the six domains that head them, are intended as an approach to integrating the microscopic, ethnographically detailed analyses of musical lives, with an arena of comparable, general, relevant issues that will help us compare sociomusical realities and practices. After a brief orientation to the Kaluli, I summarize the most salient issues in the six named areas. By providing key Kaluli metaphors and concepts for each of these areas, I hope to stay true to an emic Kaluli sociology of sound, to the Kaluli articulation and construction of a sociomusical coherence system. At the same time, use of this simple comparative grid will, I hope, make the Kaluli pattern more available to contrast, comparison, and question in terms of the larger issues surrounding classless, small-scale, relatively egalitarian societies.

THE KALULI PEOPLE

Twelve hundred Kaluli people live in the tropical rain forest of the Great Papuan Plateau in the Southern Highlands Province of Papua New Guinea.² On several hundred square miles of rich land, at an altitude of about two thousand feet, they hunt, fish, gather, and tend land-intensive swidden gardens that yield sweet potatoes, taro, pandanus, pumpkin, bananas, and many other fruits and vegetables. Their staple food is sago, processed from wild palms that grow in shallow swamps and creeks branching off of larger river arteries that flow downward from Mt. Bosavi, the collapsed cone of an extinct volcano reaching eight thousand feet (E. L. Schieffelin 1976).

Kaluli live in about twenty distinct longhouse communities; in each, most people reside in a single communal house, comprising some fifteen families (sixty to eighty people). Social life for the village is centered around the house, where primary face to face interaction occupies most time people are not in their gardens, on the trails, visiting relatives in other communities, or staying at small garden homes or sago camps for major food processing activities.

This is a classless society. There are no social or occupational specializations, stratifications, or ranks. There are no professions, no ascribed or achieved statuses that form the basis for social differentiation. All Kaluli are assumed by their fellows to have equal social potential and endowment, which is theirs to make of as best they can. Adults are responsible for getting what they want and need out of daily affairs; assistance through friendship and networks of social relations is of primary importance for all Kaluli.

This is also a generally egalitarian society in matters economic and political. There are no appointed or elected leaders, spokesmen, chiefs, bosses, control-

lers, or middlemen. People hunt, gather, garden, and work to produce what they need, taking care of themselves and their associates through extensive cooperation in food sharing and labor assistance. There is little inequality in material rewards for goods or labor because the goods are the only products; sharing in labor or production continually positions people within reciprocity groups built upon kin, extended family, or friendship ties. There is also little accumulation of goods, rewards, or prestige, and no highly valued jobs or roles automatically rewarded by prestige or material objects. In such a system, egalitarianism refers to a general lack of deference to persons, roles, categories, or groups based on power, position, or material ownership.

Additionally, Kaluli seem less sexually polarized than other classless societies at the middle range of techno-economic complexity; that is, societies which mix some partial hunter-gatherer mode of existence with a major amount of herding, fishing, or horticulture. This type of society varies greatly in sexual equality, from hostility to mutualism (Schlegel 1977:5). While Kaluli men and women have different and often exclusive spheres of daily life (E. L. Schieffelin 1976:122–124; B. B. Schieffelin 1979), the degree of sexual antagonism and animosity widely reported in the Highlands of Papua New Guinea (see Brown and Buchbinder 1976, M. Strathern 1972) is not present among the Kaluli. Many domains of control and production are cooperative. Bridewealth negotiations and marital arrangements (usually sister-exchange) are the most obvious arena where men can cultivate authority and make decisions that expressly control women.

THE KALULI SOCIOMUSICAL PATTERN

Competence

For Kaluli there is no “music,” only sounds, arranged in categories shared to greater or lesser degrees by natural, animal, and human agents. Knowledge of these categories is widespread, tacit background for everyday life in the forest. No hierarchies of sound types are imposed, no rationales constructed for differentiating human-made sounds from those of other sources. It is broadly assumed that every Kaluli must become a competent maker, recognizer, user, and interpreter of natural and cultural sound patterns. Not only does physical adaptation to the rain forest demand and favor acute auditory perceptual skills; Kaluli have developed the kind of ideological and aesthetic scaffolds for these skills that humanize them and provide a coherent cultural framework for their acquisition. This is precisely the point of co-evolution: physical imperatives alone do not explain adaptation; societies invent mutually supportive adaptive strategies linking nature and culture.

Acquisition of skill in song, weeping, whooping, cheering, humming,

drumming, bird call and animal identification, as well as environmental sound recognition, are all fundamentally related. Kaluli assume that the acquisition of skill in symbolic modes for expression of sound, as well as the natural recognition of sound, is unproblematic, naturally required of all social beings. In fact these are very much considered like the acquisition of verbal or gestural competence, requiring similar adult input, engagement, interaction, and explicit "showing" instruction (B. B. Schieffelin 1979). While we in the West assume some sort of necessity for symbolic competence in the verbal and gestural modes, we assume no such thing for other varieties of symbolic competence, and therefore utilize culturally invested notions (like "talent") to explain or rationalize stratifications in awareness, expressive production, and interpretation. Nothing parallel exists among the Kaluli.

A basic Kaluli metaphor embodies the construction of a cultural ideal for competence; this is the notion of "hard." Myth has it that the world was once mushy and soft; *alin* the goura pigeon and *ode:n* the scrub turkey together stamped on the ground, "making it hard," so life could flourish. The model for social life recapitulates the model for the world. Infants are "soft"; their bodies and bones must "harden." A "hard" person is one who is strong, assertive, and not a witch (witches have soft yellow hearts). Children do not eat soft, mushy foods until their bodies and language "harden." "Hard talk" is grammatical and appropriate speech, the talk that gets one what is needed in social interaction (Feld and B. B. Schieffelin 1982). When a song "hardens," coalescing poetic and performative structures, people are moved to tears (Feld 1982:211–212).

"Hard" (*halaido*) then means social competence, physical maturity, verbal competence, sound competence; control of energies, ability to perform, influence outcomes, take control over one's life, invoke proper social strategies. It is assumed that the acquisition and development of social and intellectual skills is the natural "hardening" process that all Kaluli go through. This central metaphor links land, body, maturity, control, vitality, language, aesthetics, and social action. For Kaluli, "hardness" is a core element of personhood.

Clearly not all Kaluli desire, develop, or attain uniform or even vaguely identical competencies in the composition of songs and poetic texts, the performance of songs or drumming, or funerary weeping. Some men and women compose hundreds of songs in a lifetime, perform often, provide insightful exegesis of texts, and discourse on musical matters in ways that extend far beyond the assumed or recognized abilities of others. Two factors seem important to interpret correctly the meaning of this variation. First, the actual spread of competencies in production skill is greatly downplayed by Kaluli in relation to the much less stratified competencies in meaningful interpretation. Second, Kaluli assume that differentiation in song performance and composition are explained by interest and desire, and not by special biological endowment or talent. My remarks to the effect that certain people seemed to compose, perform,

or drum more than others were usually met by Kaluli with nonchalant replies citing the obvious: some garden more than others, some often make netbags, some cook well, others know about building houses, and so forth. In sum, Kaluli seem to have no investment in rationalizing differences in competence; they simply assume that skills for interpreting and making sounds are naturally acquired and required, and that with instruction and encouragement, all children will learn to sing and compose as part of their general socialization.

Form

Most all Kaluli sound expression is vocal, dependent on a strong interplay of poetic and melodic elements. Five types of song exist, one of unique invention (*gisalo*) and four borrowed from neighbors (*heyalo*, *ko:luba*, *sabio*, *owo*:). Each of these is organized by pentatonic principles; reductions to three- and four-tone variants are common, and there is evidence of melodic convergence paralleling the history and diffusion of these four styles in the Bosavi area (Feld i.p.). Kaluli compose in three of these five forms (*gisalo*, *heyalo*, *ko:luba*); the other two styles consist of closed sets (*sabio*, *owo*:). *Gisalo* is limited to ceremonial and seance occasions and is composed only by men. *Heyalo* and *ko:luba* are composed for ceremonies but widely sung during everyday work and leisure activities. Only in the case of *heyalo* do men and women participate equally as composers.

Cutting across these song forms are other varieties and means of sound expression: women's sung-texted-weeping (*sa-ye:lab*), and cheering (*uwo:lab*), men's whooping (*ulab*), and instrumental drumming (*ilib*) and bamboo jaw's harp playing (*uluna*). Three other rattle instruments (*sologa*, seed-pod rattle; *degegado*, crayfish claw rattle; *sob*, mussel shell rattle) are used for ceremonial accompaniment to songs. Only the *sologa* is used more casually for accompaniment; additionally it is the only one of these instruments used by women.

Beyond a taxonomy of expressive forms, and the distribution of expressive means in song, poetics, instruments, and performance, one very significant generalization can be made about all Kaluli sound forms: no Kaluli sounds are performed unison. Kaluli know quite well what unison is because missionaries have tried to get them to sing this way for twelve years and church leaders have been taught to count "one—two—three" before each song. Aside from church activities (where only the most committed Christians can actually manage this new form of vocal organization) it is rare to hear anything approaching unison sung by Kaluli or emitted from any sound sources in their environment.

Kaluli sound preferences, modeled consciously on bird sounds and the rest of the forest environment, involve extensive overlapping and alternation, layering parts and sounds in coordinated nondiscrete textures. In Western musical terms there is much canon and hocket. In cantometric terms, from Lomax's

characterization of the social organization of the vocal group (1976:86,177–180), three patterns are found: interlock, overlap, and alternation. Interlock is the term Lomax uses for the social organization of musical groups with an equality of parts, common among acephalous bands of hunter-gatherers or noncomplex forest societies. Lomax finds that overlap is most typical of larger societies with herd animals and a somewhat more complex production system. He cites alternation of parts as more characteristic of societies with clear divisions of parts and productive systems (Lomax 1976:86).

Listening to Kaluli songs makes it clear that no one of these three characterizations predominates; there seems to be an equal mix of all three. At the same time, the Kaluli techno-economic picture does not follow any of the three Lomax cites as typically matching these sound types. The main generalization for Kaluli social organization of the vocal group is that interlock, overlap, and alternation are equally salient, precisely to the exclusion of unison forms. Lomax (1976:86) cites unison as “the simplest technique of coordinating effort”; he finds it “resorted to everywhere but most prominent in the performances of small tribal societies, especially among planters without large herd animals.” While this techno-economic characterization is closer to Kaluli society than any of the others cited above, Kaluli sound organization simply lacks a unison principle altogether.

Like the use of “hardness” to characterize a Kaluli ideal of social competence, there is also a metaphor that draws together the dimensions of interlock, overlap, and alternation which are so important in Kaluli soundmaking style. This is *dulugu ganalan*, “lift-up-over sound.” Parts, sounds, whether few or many, must constantly “lift-up-over” one another; one cannot speak of sounds “leading” or “following” or “starting” or “finishing.” Human soundmaking must stagger in layers, like bird calls, or arch up and over, like waterfalls. The idea is more spatio-acoustic than visual; Kaluli like all sounds to be dense, compacted, without breaks, pauses, or silences (Feld 1983). When two people sing together, the subtleties of the shifting lengths of overlap (or, in the case of a leader and a group, the nuances in the alternation) are the locus of aesthetic play and tension. In the forest, sounds constantly shift figure and ground; examples of continually staggered alternations and overlaps, at times sounding completely interlocked and seamless, are abundant. For Kaluli this is the naturally coherent organizing model for soundmaking, whether human, animal, or environmental: a constant textural densification constructed from “lift-up-over sounds.”

Performance

The performance of all Kaluli sound expression focuses upon collective texture and coordination of layered parts. No competitive agendas play out

through song performance; the value of layering, juxtaposing, arching, "lifting-up-over," and densifying are conceived as social activity. Even when the situation involves a single voice, the sound is coordinated with the surrounding acoustic features of the environment; this is particularly so when Kaluli sing at work.

At Kaluli ceremonies composed songs are sung all night long by members of a visiting community at the longhouse of their hosts. The hosts find the song texts in particular to be sad and evocative because they concentrate on maps and images of the places in the immediate, surrounding forest, places to which the hosts have a sentimental attachment. The performance usually provokes the hosts to tears, and to a sung-melodic-weeping performed in polyphony with the ongoing song to which they are responding. The intense grief and sadness experienced by the hosts results from their being reminded of the dead who have lived, worked, and shared many experiences with them at the places sequentially mentioned in the song (E. L. Schieffelin 1976, 1979; Feld 1982).

It would appear that this sort of evocation in performance might create a tremendous focus on the composer and performer of the song as an individual creator. Indeed, direct social manipulation is involved in composing a song that might move a specific individual to tears. At the same time, these are not the features of a song that Kaluli stress; they prefer to cast the whole activity into an explicit social and community-wide message framework, largely through imagery of land, the central Kaluli metaphor for the accumulation and meaning of social experience relating, sharing, and being with others in the forest.

When Kaluli men sat down with me after a ceremony to talk about the songs and their meanings, they always stressed the social rather than individual motivation of song poetics. There is always collective sorrow it seems, because of the underlying assumption that audience members will empathize with whomever is moved to tears. This derives from the feeling of common experience among those people who share a longhouse and surrounding forest community. Over and beyond ties of direct close kin, Kaluli feel deeply connected by the places they have lived, gardened, worked, exchanged, and travelled together.

Soundmaking provides no format for the assertion of power, dominance, or personal excellence at the cost of others. The recognition of skill in composition and performance is clear, and its pragmatic outcome is the weeping of the hosts. Despite all this, competition is not a major agenda in the ceremonies, and the provocation involved is not a manipulation for the sake of power. The Kaluli construction of a performance is really activity in concert rather than activity involving sequential solo performances. Individuality is not played up the way it might be; costumes in fact conceal identities, so only the voice singles out the singer.

If "lift-up-over sound" and "hardness" are the central metaphors for the form of and competence in soundmaking, then its central metaphor for perform-

ance is "flow" (*e:be:lan*). Like a waterway situated next to you in the forest, whose water "flows" beyond perceptual immediacy although you know it is still moving at other locations, sound must have a physical presence at its moment of performance and a staying power that carries it beyond the moment, so that it flows in your mind, and stays with you beyond the boundaries of the immediate event. Performance, like the substance of sound, must be dense, layered, collective, thick in connotation and resonance; this is what makes it "flow."

Environment

For the Kaluli, the Bosavi tropical rain forest environment takes on several levels of meaning and abstraction. In the most basic sense the environment is like a tuning fork, providing well-known signals that mark and coordinate daily life. Space, time, and seasons are marked and interpreted according to sounds. Sounds give indexical information about forest height, depth, and distance. The time it takes a sound to travel through various kinds of bush; the echoes through land formations, waterfalls, and rivers; the layers of bird sound in the canopy and at forest openings;—all these provide clock and spatial information to the accustomed inhabitant of the rainforest. Daily cycles of bird presence, migration cycles throughout the year, as well as cycles of cicadas and insects are taken by Kaluli as indicators of location, season, and time of day. These signals have different auditory appearances from the village longhouse, from the forest edge, from the gardens, from the trails, or from forest depths. Rather than counting months or moons, Kaluli conceive seasons and cycles largely in terms of changes in vegetation, changes in bird presence, sounds of high and low water accumulation, or white water runoff in relation to rainfall. Numerous sounds then are continually available and interpreted by Kaluli as the clocks of quotidian reality in the forest.

At another, clearly related level, the forest is a model of balance, of plenty, of resources, of death and life and cyclical regeneration, of birds, animals, plants and waters in mutual dependence. In effect, a model of what is natural, given as normal, predictable; a model for human life and a challenge to it, since human relationships and society depend on co-existence and management of the forest, through maintenance and exploitation of its resources. Additionally, it is on this basis that Kaluli explicitly rationalize the form and performance of song and human sound with metaphoric ideals about the layering of bird calls and insect swells, the flowing of waters, arching of waterfalls, and general relationship between perceptual immediacy and what lies beyond.

Another level of forest-Kaluli relationship is more mystical. Kaluli believe that two co-extensive realities, one visible, the other a reflection, comprise the world. In the reflection or mirrored realm men may appear as wild pigs and women as wild cassowaries high on the hills of Bosavi. The dead return as "gone

reflections'' (*ane mama*) to the visible, usually in the form of birds in the forest treetops. Thus the immediate village area is surrounded with the presence, through voices and sounds, of friends and relatives. Because birds sing, whistle, say their names, make a lot of noise, weep, or speak, they provide a simultaneous index of the environment as well as a deeper symbolic understanding about self, place, and time.

Beyond these notions—tuning fork, model, mystery—there is also a deeply pleasurable aspect to the way Kaluli approach the forest, which couples a sentimentality based on land as mediator of identity (E. L. Schieffelin 1976:29–45) and an outright enjoyment of the soundscape. Kaluli find the forest good to listen to, and good to sing with as well. Improvised human duets with birds, cicadas, or other forest sounds are not uncommon everyday events. Sometimes people will find themselves a waterfall just for the pleasure of singing with a shimmering accompaniment. Again, the co-evolutionary tendencies for ecology and aesthetics: Kaluli not only take inspiration from, listen to, and enjoy the forest, but become part of it, which ultimately intensifies their sentiments about it.

In sum, the Kaluli relationship with the forest is neither antagonistic nor destructive, patterns that are typical among some swidden horticulturalists. Little ecological pressure, extremely low population density, no competition for resources, and constantly available food (fish, fowl, vegetables) all contribute to easy material extraction and exploitation of the environment. At the same time, the mystical, pleasurable, and tuning-fork dimensions of the forest-Kaluli relationship reinforce this materialist basis. In all, the forest is a *mama*, a "reflection," or mirror for social relationships, particularly as mediated through the poetic imagery of songs that concern maps, lands and identities (Feld 1982:150–156), as well as through formal structure and singing style.

Theory

For Kaluli, the theory and concepts of where sounds come from and how they can be organized, and, particularly, what they mean, is not contained in esoteric knowledge or in a body of private lore controlled or circulated by specialists. Myths about human-bird transformations explain the origins of categories of sounds that humans share with each other and with the natural world, namely, weeping, song, poetics, whistling, talking, noise, mimicry. These myths frame the meanings of sounds in terms of the range of social sentiments associated with categories of bird-spirit "reflections." No special occasions are required for their telling, and no constraints exist on who may tell or hear them. All in fact are quite short and even Kaluli who don't volunteer to narrate them can certainly recount the punchline or general point to each. These myths are central to the meaning and theory of sounds for Kaluli; the facts of

their codification as myths and their quality as charters for social reality speaks to their collective importance.

While the general social outlines linking sounds and sentiments are revealed in myths, Kaluli theory about sound organization goes quite a bit further (Feld 1981). Kaluli are energetically verbal about song, composition, and matters of musical form; to discuss sound they principally rely on lexical and discourse metaphors. All Kaluli terms for water motion, waterway parts, and particularly waterfalls are polysemous with the semantic field of sound. Terms for intervals, contours, and other structural aspects of song form are invented this way. Song parts are metaphorized as bends of waters, or branching structures of trees.

A number of other theoretical notions are even less specialized or marked; while myths and musical terminology code theoretical ideas about what sounds mean and how they are organized, not all Kaluli have much occasion to recite stories or discourse about compositional matters. But all Kaluli know what sounds can mean, what they can bring forth in social occasions, and how they must be interpreted. Kaluli share a cultural logic for organizing their listening experiences, and the extent to which that logic is systematic is the extent to which it must be treated as musical theory, a foundation for Kaluli musical epistemology, or a Kaluli theory of musical interpretation.

Like the duality of the cosmos already mentioned, Kaluli assume dualities to all expressive forms; the idea is conventionally expressed by the notions of "inside" (*sa*), and "underneath" (*hega*). Intentionally symbolic behaviors are not transparent; they must be interpreted, and the act of interpreting them is what the Kaluli call finding the "inside" or "underneath." Sometimes these meanings are quite conventional. Even so, the interpretive turn Kaluli take is one that assumes concentration, attention, and active listening.

Sounds have "insides" and "underneath" because they often are heard as the reflected images of birds; birds in turn are spirits, and the particular set of emotional and personal associations with spirits, spirit places, and the like are deeply forceful for Kaluli. Additionally, poetic song texts are cast in a language of "bird sound words" (*o:be: go:no: to*), and these have various conventional and deeply ambiguous "underneath" which involve a variety of obfuscatory, mystifying, and evocative devices (analyzed in Feld 1982:138–144). In short, Kaluli listeners are not passive participants in symbolic affairs; they perform a kind of active social work based on the interpretive assumption that there is always a reflected "inside" or "underneath" meaning to sounds. Interpretation is a necessary, active component in the social life of Kaluli sounds, bridging individual competence with realms of theory and epistemology.

Kaluli exhibit marked divergences in the propensity to verbalize about song or poetics. Many Kaluli, including both men and women who have composed many songs, simply do not go in for extensive verbalization about song. Elder men tend to be the most talkative and intellectually invested in this kind of

discourse and interpretation, and their enjoyment of this has no doubt been prompted by several years of dialogue with E. L. Schieffelin and myself, although I greatly doubt that the kinds of discussions we've had with Kaluli were absent before our arrival in Bosavi. Again I would point out that differences in predisposition to musical discussion and exegesis derives ostensibly from interest and personal desire; no traditional positions, ascribed social roles, honorific status, or rewards are involved.

In short, for Kaluli, theory is not an activity that takes place at a remove from compositional, performative, or interpretive practice. All are deeply associated, and theoretical ideas about musical form are part of the realm of acquired competencies assumed to be essential for Kaluli.

Value and Equality

Soundmaking is highly valued and considered necessary for survival, expression, and social interaction for all Kaluli men and women. At the same time there are obvious inequalities in the pragmatic ends these resources achieve. Kaluli maintain that two kinds of structured sound forms, weeping and song, emerged together in myth (Feld 1982:20–43). These are separate but complementary structurings of sound for social evocation. Women's funerary weeping, which turns into wept song, is considered by Kaluli to be the closest sound form to being or becoming a bird, as it expresses immediate sorrows over loss and abandonment. Men's ceremonial *gisalo* song, which ultimately moves listeners to weeping, is composed and performed as a deliberate provocation of the fears and emotions of its listeners. Both forms derive from the same source (bird sound) and reach the same ends, bringing forth deep emotion about loss and abandonment in the context of village-wide public rituals. Women are highly valued and evaluated as funerary weepers, and men are highly valued and evaluated for composing and performing persuasive *gisalo* songs. In both cases a reputation may develop for individual performers, at least in the immediate circumstances surrounding an event; this sort of reputation does not seem to lead to any marked consequences in terms of social prestige.

No such male-female complementarity exists for other Kaluli expressive forms, that is, forms not invented by Kaluli but borrowed by them from neighboring groups. The oldest addition to the ceremonial song repertoire is *heyalo*; here in fact there is a great deal of female compositional activity, but the ceremony is the domain of men. Young men often compose quite a number of songs in the *heyalo* format before tackling the more poetically and melodically demanding *gisalo* form. Young men perform but do not compose *sabio*, a song form from the Lake Kutubu area to the East, introduced by carriers working on government patrols to Bosavi in the 1950s. *Ko:luba* was imported into the Kaluli area in the mid-1960s; men perform and compose in this style but there are very

few compositions by women, although some women with family ties to the area from which *ko:luba* derives know quite a number of the songs and sing them for work. *Iwo:* is a fixed cycle of songs sung the night before killing pigs; it has an explicit women's counterpart called *kelekeliyoba*, sung the morning after the ceremony. These songs also use fixed formulae with only new placenames and pig names added by the singers.

In terms of instruments, hand drums and bamboo jaw's harps are relatively recent introductions to the Bosavi area, although the latter is said to replace a monochordic mouthbow, whose history is uncertain. Both instruments are only available to men; drumming takes place before or during ceremonial activity, and the jaw's harp is associated with the personal recreation of young men. The drum involves magical construction secrets which are kept from women; even though it is not hidden from their sight, women do not touch the instrument (Feld 1983). Even so, the dimensions of drum secrets seem to be nothing like the secret character of flutes and garamuts reported elsewhere in Papua New Guinea (Gourlay 1975). Of the three rattle instruments used for ceremonial accompaniment, only one is shared with women (*sologa*), while the one used for *gisalo*, the *sob*, is clearly considered secret, and should not be touched by women. Women are not aware of the mystical events through which the cane handles (*olo:se:se:lo:*) of these instruments are passed on to Kaluli men from spirit mediums (E. L. Schieffelin 1976:214).

One other major soundmaking resource does return us to a very basic male-female complementarity; these are the matched pair of demonstrative and assertive collective sounds called *ulab*, ('says u') and *uwo:lab*, ('says uwo:'). For men *ulab* is a loud group whoop, celebrating the call of the eagle *usulage*, a booming UUU! For women, *uwo:lab* is a raucous group cheer, celebrating the call of the Superb Bird of Paradise *uwo:lo*, a screeching U-WO:O! These two birds are prominent spirit representations of Kaluli men and women, and the group soundmaking usually takes place when men collectively work or prepare for a ceremony, or when women cheer during a ceremony.

The complementary distribution of *gisalo* and weeping, whooping and cheering speak for the way Kaluli men and women have coordinated separate expressive spheres that are related and mutually significant in modes of appeal and assertion. At the same time the distribution of instrumental and ceremonial song resources clearly points to the way Kaluli men have appropriated and control new expressive resources.

Finally, it is important to note the clear inequalities in what it is that these expressive resources allow men and women to achieve, symbolically and pragmatically. For men, the composition and performance of ceremonial songs creates a grand social focus around them and their powers of evocation. Ceremonial action of this sort is the height of Kaluli stagecraft, drama, and collective celebration (E. L. Schieffelin 1976:172-196, Feld 1982:163-216).

Gisalo is the most powerful of these, but *heyalo* and *ko:luba* achieve the same effect for men. In all three the performance may be so moving that a woman will lose her heart to the dancer, wish to elope, and follow him home. Drumming can contribute to the same social power (Feld 1983).

What weeping achieves for women is far less sweeping. It certainly creates a social focus on women as performers, and that focus is significant in validating the role weepers play in articulating community sentiments. But no persuasive social ends and no long-term changes in social life are effected by weeping; largely it is an intensely aesthetic public display of personal grief.

If there is a key Kaluli metaphor that sums up male-female relations generally, and male-female expressive means and ends specifically, it is the rather ambiguous term *ko:li*, "different." While this was about the most common term I heard men use when speaking of women, or women use when speaking of men, it certainly means different things from the relative vantage points, and can have positive ("different" in the sense of new, exciting, valuable), flat ("different" in the sense of bland, not quite right) or neutral connotations. Kaluli recognize real social difference, but there is often little that is negative or antagonistic in that recognition. At the same time, male ideology clearly casts women's differences in a dangerous light: aversion to menstrual blood and belief that women drain male energy are rationales for taboos and other social practices which reproduce beliefs in and actions against female contamination. The tensions and contradictions found here parallel the duality of expressive domains, which have both a complementary dimension (song-weeping, whooping-cheering) and an overlay of male-appropriated new resources.

Discussion

To round out the shape of the Kaluli pattern, I organize a summary around three questions:

- (1) How are the obvious egalitarian features of Kaluli life marked within the organizing schemes of Kaluli sound structures and soundmaking?
- (2) How is the most obvious form of Kaluli inequality (men over women) marked and resolved within the organizing schemes of Kaluli sound structures and soundmaking?
- (3) How does the Kaluli pattern fit into the broader comparative framework of Papua New Guinea societies?

"... in egalitarian societies the division of labor by sex has led to complementarity and not female subservience; ... women lost their equal status when they lost control over the products of their work" (Leacock

1978a:79, see also Leacock 1978b, 1977). Leacock's examination of hunter-gatherer and horticultural economics shows that women foraged and furnished as much if not more basic resources to hunter-gatherer life than men did. Moreover they distributed the food to networks of kin as well as nuclear families. Societies which typically mix hunting and gathering substrata with a dominant horticultural practice partially share in the pattern Leacock describes, and present a wide range of egalitarian tendencies as well as unequal or contradictory ones. Schlegel's (1977) notion that theories of sexual stratification must account for person-to-person relations and ideology as well as person-to-goods relations is clearly essential if we are to understand societies like the Kaluli that are more politically and economically egalitarian than sexually so. This is also important because Kaluli have the economic resources to produce a surplus far beyond subsistence needs. The theory that stratification systematically co-varies with surplus has been recently dismantled by both Marxists and non-Marxists, largely in favor of theories that see stratification more closely related to population dynamics (Cancian 1976).

Given all this, one thing we can clearly predict is that a society like the Kaluli with such a combination of demographic characteristics as low density, easy subsistence, ecological diversity, and economic resources like combined hunting, fishing, sago production, and gardening, will not neatly match idealized social-economic-technological characterizations like "hunter-gatherer," "horticultural," "peasant," and so forth. Our expectation therefore should be for complex, and ambiguous or contradictory tendencies in sociomusical practice as well as social organization. This seems to be the case in several regards. On the one hand, the image of deep mutualism and co-aesthetic relationship with the forest ecology is reminiscent of hunter-gatherers like the pygmies of the Ituri (summarized, from Turnbull, in Lomax 1962). The general situation for competence, musical form and performance, environment and theory depicts an emphasis on cooperation, complementarity, autonomy, valuing self in relation to others and to ecology. It is easy to imagine how these musical beliefs, structures, and actions can be coherent within an egalitarian societal framework, and how they can be locally perceived and sustained within that framework.

At the same time there are imbalances in the distribution of expressive resources between men and women; more significantly, there are differences in the pragmatic ends served by these resources. Men can mystify, impress, persuade, and even win women, but what are women getting from weeping at funerals and singing at work besides personal enjoyment, fulfillment, and general social solidarity? Male-female inequalities then are definitely marked in the sphere of musical organization, but to push the qualitative point, it also is important to realize that the form in which they are marked does not involve secret instruments stolen from women in mythic times, does not involve deception maintenance, does not involve daily antagonisms, and does not

involve sanctions of personal violence. All of these variants, found elsewhere in Papua New Guinea, are not manifest in the Kaluli situation.

A final way to scrutinize the pattern of male-female inequalities in the Kaluli pattern is to look at the larger Papua New Guinea ethnographic situation through a widespread social institution where inequalities are ideologically and practically enacted: male initiation cults. In an introduction to a recent collection of essays on this topic Roger Keesing (1982:7-11) summarizes some of the prominent themes involved in Papua New Guinea cult activity. These include the idea that men and women are physically and psychologically different, that the fluids and essences of women are potentially if not actually harmful to men, that boys must be subjected to rigorous initiations so that they will not be weak, that male homosexual activity is essential to the ideology of sexual separation and the creation of differentiated men, and that residential separation of males is necessary in order to avoid female contamination.

A central feature of many of these cults is secret instruments, particularly flutes. K. A. Gourlay has devoted a monograph to the distribution, symbolism, and meaning of these instruments, showing that the male secrecy surrounding their use is a central component of the deception of women, and a central revelation during the rites.

Maintenance of secrecy is linked closely with the men's deception of the women and uninitiated youths through explanations given about the mysterious sounds. . . . For those to whom the secrets have been revealed, emphasis is on maintaining the deception (1975:102).

The Kaluli seem to have practiced (until 1964) an extremely moderate variant of this pattern, without traumatic, violent rituals, or secret flutes; it was called the *bau a*. In an essay on this institution, E. L. Schieffelin (1982) argues that this was not an initiation cult because there was no formal status change involved and because novices assumed no submissive and dependent role. Nevertheless,

The *bau a* exhibited many features typical of a male initiation program, including the seclusion of the members, ritual activity aimed at promoting growth and enhancing male qualities, and the teaching of secret lore (E. L. Schieffelin 1982:156).

The *bau a* stressed hunting activities, promotion of strength including homosexual intercourse to promote growth, long expeditions, and development of knowledge of the forest geography, flora and fauna. The ideological stance toward women was clear: “. . . Kaluli believe that women have a debilitating influence on men. A man who has had too much to do with women is likely to lose his stamina, become fatigued on the trail” (E. L. Schieffelin 1982:178). Moreover,

To non-participants, and in particular women, the *bau a* was presented as a mystically powerful and dangerous institution (ibid:163).

The *bau a* was in earshot of the village longhouse, so women heard sounds of the men; this was supposed to be tantalizing. While women pretended not to know any of the secret aspects of what was going on, some in fact knew quite a bit about it (ibid:163). But the *bau a* “. . . expressed what men liked best about themselves, what they stood for and wanted to be . . .”(ibid:166).

For the young men, the *bau a* removes them from the margins of social attention and thrusts them to its center; they emerge from seclusion in their best and most appealing cultural image (ibid:194).

In other words, they emerge as controlled, energetic, good hunters, knowledgeable about the forest, including the spirits who reside there. They also emerge supplying a large amount of cooked meat to members of their own and the surrounding communities, thereby placing them all in their debt.

The differences between the *bau a* and some of the other traumatic separation rites practiced in the Papua New Guinea Highlands is clearly underscored by societal differences. Complex initiations with grades, alliances, and the like require large populations. Although the *bau a* was symbolically and ritually elaborate and complex, it had none of the stratified complexities of graded initiations common for many of the other societies summarized by Keesing (1982) and discussed in the literature.

Ecological pressures, root crop intensification, and increasing population density are common in many Papua New Guinea Highlands societies. A major shift toward intensive cultivation increases the burdens on women, and seems to be accompanied in many societies by increased male control through appropriation of the products of women's labor. The Kaluli, by contrast, are low in production, lacking in ecological pressures and crop intensification. They are not competing for food or territory, and their population size is stable. Men's hunting, clearing and gardening activities seem complementary to women's gardening and sago-making work. This produces none of the competition necessary for the organization and maintenance of a "big man" social system exchanging women and their products.

While the *bau a* shares many surface features with initiation cults in Papua New Guinea, it appears to have been a more subdued variant of most of the institutions discussed in the literature surrounding issues of male-female relations (Keesing 1982, Allen 1967, Gourlay 1975, Langness 1974, Murphy 1959, A. Strathern 1970). Kaluli men seem far more interested in impressing women than in maintaining hostilities with them. Ceremonial song, costuming and performance, hunting and providing meat for exchange are the activities males most cultivate and use for impressing women. These activities are not filled with the

preoccupations reported elsewhere: maintaining separateness, antagonism, keeping ritual secrets, using secret instruments which are forbidden to women under penalty of rape or murder. Kaluli seem to promote male mystique without promoting extensive female deception. The lack of secret instruments, so pivotal to ritual deception, was replaced by whooping and singing at the *bau a*; women could hear this from the distance, but its purpose was to excite and impress, not so much to deceive. Here, as in ceremonies, Kaluli men assume an evocative stance toward both women *and other men*. Toward women that evocation translates as power through difference while toward men that evocation translates as solidarity and nostalgia.

CONCLUSION

Keil argues that:

The great force shaping music and its meaning is social inequality specifically as it manifests itself in four directions at once: The dominance of some men over other men, of men over nature, of men over women, and of some societies over other societies. Among those remaining primitive peoples who have managed to maintain the social, natural, and sexual equalities, I assume that "music" is a vital part of that maintenance. Indeed, in such societies what we call music-dance-ritual-religion-ecology seem to be fused into nearly one homeostatic system, symbolizing nothing or everthing (1979:1).

The Kaluli seem both to uphold and to contradict these three statements. First, social inequality is not the main force shaping music and its meaning for Kaluli. The dominance of some men over other men, of men over nature, and of society over other societies is not a major theme in the content of Kaluli songs, not related to the occasions of their performance, and not related to the social organization or performance styles of song makers. At the same time we have seen that social inequality of men over women is clearly manifest among Kaluli despite other complementary and cooperative tendencies. This inequality is sociomusically marked in two ways: differential expressive resources of men and women, and differential social-pragmatic ends those resources may serve. In all, social inequality is marked in some dimensions of Kaluli musical life but not in others; where the marking occurs, it is neither systematic nor without contradiction, particularly given the prominence Kaluli invest in the complementarity of song/weeping and whooping/cheering.

Keil's next statement also has validity for Kaluli, but again, the dictum is less than wholly applicable. Kaluli traditionally did maintain many social and natural equalities, and in their notions of competence, of form, of performance, of theory, and of the environment, many indications of equality and balance can be found. Indeed, it seems that "music" is a vital part of maintaining those concepts and those relations with each other and the environment.

Keil's final statement also makes a lot of sense for the Kaluli: the interpenetration of the environment with all Kaluli sound recognition and expression really does symbolize *everything* in some way: competence ("hardness"), form ("lift-up-over sound"), performance ("flow") are all tied together by theory (in myths of human/bird transformation). The success of Kaluli soundmaking as a deeply affective and emotional medium of communication is grounded in this invented coherence.

Moving to the general from the specific, my concerns with comparison have in great part been stimulated by reading Alan Lomax's work and by trying to apply his training tape examples and coding procedures to Kaluli data. I obviously differ from Lomax at the outset in a basic philosophical matter: I do not equate explanation with normative statistical correlations or causal analysis. I am more concerned with explaining the situated meanings of sound patterns in the intersubjectively created world of actors and actions, and I am concerned with the role local ideologies play in constituting and maintaining those local, specific sociological models of and for musical realities. I am therefore biased toward what Lomax calls the "narrow features" of both the stream and content of music, while his own focus is on grosser, objectifiable and redundant features of the behavioral stream. At the same time, I have argued that it is possible to conceive a set of comparative research questions that make use of local models and metaphors while at the same time identifying issues that have broader comparative value, concerning both the conceptual and material dimensions of musicality. While these six domains may look more like artifacts of the cultural-ideational sphere rather than the sociological, I have indicated that cultural constructs are essential precisely because of the way they lead to and provide local models for social structure (social roles, division of labor, stratification, and differentiation).

I have also stressed that there is not a yes/no issue about correlating song structure and social structure. Obviously such correlations are possible, whether undertaken in world sample quantitative terms or small-scale ethnographic ones. The issue is: how do we interpret such relationships, and how do we argue for what they mean? Lomax's tendency has been toward causal connections between social evolution and singing style. He argues for causal covariance from societal complexity to melodic interval complexity, text precision and rhythmic freedom. He argues for causal covariance from societal sexual restrictiveness to singing voice nasality, and social cohesion to choral cohesion.

The most complete and convincing quantitative reanalysis of cantometric data thus far, by one of Lomax's early statistical co-workers, uses multivariate techniques to argue for historical diffusionist rather than evolutionary interpretations of cantometric data. Many song features interpreted by Lomax to be correlates of evolutionary process can be explained almost exclusively by regional location (Erickson 1976). If culture history is enough to explain the kind of taxonomic variance Lomax originally found, Erickson insists that:

For nearly every major style in the cantometric taxonomy, a wide variation can be shown on the posited cultural/institutional correlates. By contrast, such styles do not often overstep the boundaries of their ethnohistoric homes. When they do, it appears to be in the context of an important event in history. The attempt to explain song in terms of some universal unilinear process of social evolution—for all that such a dimension can be shown to exist—is to over-simplify our understanding of this most human of behaviors (1976:307).

Erickson argues that song style is less a causative reflection of social institutions than an emblem of social identity. Lomax's early papers also stress the functional importance of song style as an indicator of social identity, thus:

... from the point of view of its social function, the primary effect of music is to give the listener a feeling of security, for it symbolizes the place where he was born, his earliest childhood satisfactions, his religious experience, his pleasure in community doings, his courtship and his work—any or all of these personality shaping experiences (1959:929).

The notion that the most general relationship between sound structures and social structures concerns identity has strong support from qualitative research, and certainly is a conclusion that could be derived from the Kaluli material, where musical structures frame the message: this is what we are, where we are, who we are. At the same time these musical structures more specifically move the listener to an interpretive plane beyond general messages about identity and boundaries to more explicit Kaluli semantics of sound. Here is where the listener "turns over" the sound organization of singing and poetics to find "underneath" about bird and spirit manifestations, and through these, "insides" of social emotion and world-sense coherence.

The Kaluli case makes it clear that it is difficult and confusing only to argue from objectified social structures to musical structures; the result is a net of reifications. Everything that is socially significant and institutionally real for Kaluli is not necessarily represented in musical order, occasions, or resources. One cannot directly predict the shape of the Kaluli musical system, singing style, or performance organization from their mode of production and techno-economic complexity. The Kaluli sociomusical system is varied in its resources and forms, and includes manifestations of musical features and style that can also be fully or partially found among societies of hunter-gatherers, horticulturalists, herders, planters, and even peasants (the most *unequalitarian* societies known to us; Fallers 1977).

At the same time, it is equally unappealing to reverse the argument, predicting social structures and modes of production from musical forms. Many similar surface musical forms are found in societies of widely varying social complexity, although the musical forms have greatly divergent meanings and identities in these separate historical and geographic settings. (Witness the use of *hocket* in the Renaissance.) In short, for all societies with similar techno-

economic-social features we might expect more musical variety than Lomax has indicated. Conversely, for all similar sound patterns and modes of musical production we might expect more social patterns to which they are significantly related. For any given society, everything that is socially salient will not necessarily be musically marked. But for all societies, everything that is musically salient will undoubtedly be socially marked, albeit in a great variety of ways, some more superfluous than others.

In a series of recent papers, Judith and Alton Becker have elaborated some of the meanings of "coherence" in symbolic systems (A. Becker 1979, J. Becker 1979, J. and A. Becker 1981). They follow Kenneth Burke, arguing that the naturally felt sense of experience in different symbolic modes is deeply tied to world-sense, to the construction of cultural boundaries, and to whole logical orientations to living and feeling. A central feature in this coherence building/maintaining process that sustains symbol making and interpretation, and thereby human cultures as we know them, is metaphor. "Metaphors gain power—and even cease being taken as metaphors—as they gain iconicity or 'naturalness' " (Becker and Becker 1981:203). In this paper I have also approached the coherence of Kaluli sound and social order through Kaluli metaphors (which indeed, are not metaphors to Kaluli, but simply what is real) while also trying to indicate that, as local sociocultural models, metaphors can and should be compared for what they tell us about possible coherences, possible sociomusical realities. It is my hope that a comparative sociomusicology will develop along these lines, elaborating not correlations of song structures and social structures, but coherences of sound structures as social structures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Revision of a paper read at the Society for Ethnomusicology annual meetings, Tallahassee, October 1983 at a session co-organized by Charles Keil and myself on Comparative Sociomusicology of Classless and Egalitarian Societies. Many of the issues discussed here have emerged through conversation with Charlie and been enhanced by our ongoing materialist-idealist dialogue. Comments at the SEM panel from Marina Roseman, John Blacking, and Tony Seeger were helpful in reformulating my remarks, as were comments from Simon Frith, Georgina Born, and Jody Berland at the Sociology of Music Conference at Trent University in August 1983. I am also grateful to John Shepherd for inviting me to present a version of this material there amongst sociologists and popular music researchers. For research support 1976–1977 and 1982 I am grateful to the National Endowment for the Arts, the University of Pennsylvania Research Foundation, the Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies, the Archives of Traditional Music, and the Anthropology Film Center. In Kaluli words, the typed symbols /e:/ and /o:/ equal ε and σ . Other letters carry their phonetic values; for orthography see Feld 1982:17–19.

NOTES

1. Lomax (1976:16) maintains that "Generally, the more songs per culture we analyzed, the clearer the core style became." This is a difficult statement to evaluate. While it should be obvious

that larger samples indicate clearer patterns, the real issue is whether the cantometric scales factor out or blur too many significant sociomusical dimensions to begin with, thus insuring that the "core pattern" will be overly simple, and thereby making additional sample data superfluous.

2. I write in an ethnographic present of the late 1960s to mid-1970s, based on my work and that of two co-workers, ethnographer E. L. Schieffelin and linguist-ethnographer B. B. Schieffelin. Massive changes took place in Bosavi in the 1960s and 1970s; some of these are assessed in terms of cultural destruction in E. L. Schieffelin 1978. When I returned to the Kaluli in 1982 I found that evangelical Christianity, so strong by the mid-1970s, had lost much of its appeal. Kaluli tired of waiting for the second coming of Jesus Christ after so many years of being told to prepare for an imminent arrival. Some ceremonialism was reinvigorated, but there were new disruptions and changes related to outside contact, circulation of cash, and desire (largely through mission influence) for material Western goods. The changes that have taken place have differently affected the various longhouse communities, and differentials within communities are also clearly apparent. New forms of exploitation and confusion have spread, and cultural anxiety has heightened. While this essay does not touch on the implications of all this for Kaluli social organization, it is important to note that new forms of stratification are evident: Christianity has given status and advantage to a small few, cultivated high rewards for pastors, introduced cash and social differentiation, and greatly debased traditional personal autonomy for Kaluli.

REFERENCES CITED

- Allen, M. R.
1967 *Male Cults and Secret Initiations in Melanesia*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Becker, Alton
1979 "Communication Across Diversity," in A. L. Becker and Aram Yengoyan, eds., *The Imagination of Reality* (Norwood: Ablex), pp. 1-5.
- Becker, Judith
1979 "Time and Tune in Java," in A. L. Becker and Aram Yengoyan, eds., *The Imagination of Reality* (Norwood: Ablex), pp. 197-210.
- Becker, Judith and Alton
1981 "A Musical Icon: Power and Meaning in Javanese Gamelan Music," in Wendy Steiner, ed., *The Sign in Music and Literature* (Austin: University of Texas Press), pp. 203-215.
- Brown, Paula and Georgeda Buchbinder, eds.,
1976 *Man and Woman in the New Guinea Highlands*. Washington: American Anthropological Association.
- Cancian, Frank
1976 "Social Stratification," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 5:227-248.
- Erickson, Edwin
1976 "Tradition and Evolution in Song Style: A Reanalysis of Cantometric Data," *Behavior Science Research* 11(1):227-308.
- Fallers, Lloyd
1977 "Equality and Inequality in Human Societies," in S. Tax, ed., *Horizons in Anthropology* (Chicago: Aldine, 2nd. edition), pp. 257-268.
- Feld, Steven
1981 "'Flow like a Waterfall': The Metaphors of Kaluli Musical Theory," *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 13:22-47.
1982 *Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics, and Song in Kaluli Expression*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
1983 "Sound as a Symbolic System: The Kaluli Drum," *Bikmaus* 4(3):78-89.
i.p. *Kaluli Weeping and Song*. 12" stereo disc with notes in English and German. Kassel: Bärenreiter-Musicaphon.

Feld, Steven and Bambi B. Schieffelin

- 1982 "Hard Talk: The Functional Basis for Kaluli Discourse," in D. Tannen, ed., *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk* (Proceedings of the Georgetown University Roundtable in Linguistics and Languages, 1981). Washington: Georgetown University Press, pp. 351–371.

Gourlay, K. A.

- 1975 *Sound-producing Instruments in Traditional Society: A Study of Esoteric Instruments and their Role in Male-female Relations*. Port Moresby and Canberra: Australian National University-New Guinea Research Unit.

Keesing, Roger

- 1982 "Introduction," in Gilbert Herdt, ed., *Rituals of Manhood: Male Initiation in Papua New Guinea* (Berkeley: University of California Press) pp. 2–43.

Keil, Charles

- 1979 "Marxism as the Context for a Symbolic Analysis of Music," Paper presented at the Society for Ethnomusicology annual meeting, Montreal.

Leacock, Eleanor

- 1977 "Women in Egalitarian Societies," in Renate Bridenthal and Claudia Koonz, eds., *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
 1978a "Society and Gender," in Ethel Tobach and B. Rosoff, eds., *Genes and Gender* (New York: Gordian Press), pp. 75–85.
 1978b "Women's Status in Egalitarian Society: Implications for Social Evolution," *Current Anthropology* 19(2):247–275.

Langness, L. L.

- 1974 "Ritual Power and Male Dominance in the New Guinea Highlands," *Ethos* 2(3):189–212.

Lomax, Alan

- 1959 "Folk Song Style," *American Anthropologist* 61:927–954.
 1962 "Song Structure and Social Structure," *Ethnology* 1(1):425–451.
 1976 *Cantometrics: an Approach to the Anthropology of Music*. Berkeley: University of California, Extension Media Center.

Lomax, Alan, et. al.

- 1968 *Folk Song Style and Culture*. Washington: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Murdock, G. P.

- 1967 "Ethnographic Atlas: A Summary," *Ethnology* 6:109–236.
 1969 *Ethnographic Atlas*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Murphy, Robert

- 1959 "Social Structure and Sex Antagonism," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 15(2): 89–98.

Schieffelin, Bambi B.

- 1979 *How Kaluli Children Learn What To Say, What To Do, and How To Feel: An Ethnographic Approach to the Development of Communicative Competence*. Ph.D. diss., Columbia University.

Schieffelin, Edward L.

- 1976 *The Sorrow of the Lonely and the Burning of the Dancers*. New York: St. Martins Press.
 1978 "The End of Traditional Music, Dance, and Body Decoration in Bosavi, Papua New Guinea," (Discussion paper 30–32.) Boroko: Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies.
 1979 "Mediators as Metaphors: Moving a Man to Tears in Papua New Guinea," in A. L. Becker and Aram Yengoyan, eds., *The imagination of reality* (Norwood: Ablex), pp. 127–144.
 1982 "The *bau* a Ceremonial Hunting Lodge: An Alternative to Initiation," in Gilbert Herdt, ed., *Rituals of manhood: male initiation in Papua New Guinea* (Berkeley: University of California Press), pp. 155–200.

Schlegel, Alice

1977 "Toward a Theory of Sexual Stratification," in Alice Schlegel, ed., *Sexual Stratification* (New York: Columbia University Press), pp. 1–40.

Strathern, Andrew

1970 "Male Initiation in New Guinea Highlands Societies," *Ethnology* 9(4):373–379.

Strathern, Marilyn

1972 *Women In Between*. London: Seminar Press.