



---

Music and Language

Author(s): Steven Feld and Aaron A. Fox

Source: *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 23 (1994), pp. 25-53

Published by: [Annual Reviews](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2156005>

Accessed: 04/02/2014 09:21

---

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

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.



*Annual Reviews* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Annual Review of Anthropology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# MUSIC AND LANGUAGE

*Steven Feld and Aaron A. Fox*

Department of Anthropology, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712

KEY WORDS: ethnomusicology, poetics, song, lament, voice

---

## TOWARD A MUSICO-LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

In recent years, work in ethnomusicology has moved decisively toward a fully anthropological perspective. Rhetorically evolving from an anthropology of music (229) to a musical anthropology (297), from the study of music *and* or *in* culture, society, and history to the study of music *as* culture, society, and history (28, 34, 35, 70, 91, 116, 127, 230, 250, 265, 268, 272, 298, 346, 347), ethnomusicological perspectives are increasingly social, linking the structure and practice of musical performances and styles with music's deep embeddedness in local and translocal forms of social imagination, activity, and experience. These shifts parallel similar movements in linguistic anthropology that emphasize the social, pragmatic, and emotional constitution of linguistic structures emerging in discourse, performance, textuality, and poetics. Although these latter shifts have been well chronicled recently (e.g. 17, 18, 25, 47, 99, 109, 119, 217, 218, 354), it has been twenty years since the last review of developments in ethnomusicology and musical anthropology appeared in this journal (227).

In that review, McLeod predicted that the relationship between musical and linguistic approaches to culture would be crucial to a future of more rigorously contextualized ethnographic descriptions of musical behavior. The descriptive and analytic issues she raised, however, have developed both beyond and

---

<sup>1</sup>

This review treats only English language sources. The large and important literature on music and language in French and German would require a separate paper to survey.

counter to her focus on the application of formal linguistic models to musical analysis. This review focuses on these new developments and their historical antecedents to suggest the outlines of a more complexly integrated musico-linguistic anthropology of sound communication. In doing so, we seek to link two discourses on voice. One is a phenomenological concern with voice as the embodiment of spoken and sung performance, and the other is a more metaphorical sense of voice as a key representational trope for social position and power (14).

The relationship of music to language is an enormously broad area of research. Ethnomusicological surveys (88, 243, 261) and substantial musical, linguistic, and literary dissertations (124, 150, 255) indicate how this vast interdisciplinary literature links research in musicology, acoustics, linguistics, literary studies, philosophy, psychology, and anthropology, and continues to inspire conferences, symposia, and research across these disciplines. We begin this review by tracing historical trajectories of thought about language and music in terms of four major predications: music as language, language in music, music in language, and language about music.<sup>2</sup> Next, we discuss attempts to integrate these four arenas through semiotics and sociomusicology, prominent themes in 1980s ethnomusicology. Finally, we examine recent trends in monographic writing and genre analysis, which demonstrate the empirical complexity and theoretical potential of the ethnographic approach to intersections of language and music. This ethnographic literature in particular demonstrates the relevance of a refigured anthropology of the speaking and singing voice to key issues in contemporary social theory.

## MUSIC AND LANGUAGE: HISTORICAL TRAJECTORIES AND MAJOR ISSUES

Radically divergent perspectives and courses of development mark the literature on the relationship of music and language. But taken as a whole, the literature has tended toward programmatic speculation and suggestive analogies directed from linguistic structures to musical ones (e.g. the language of music, musical syntax, the grammar of a particular musical style, or the identification of deep and surface structures in a particular music genre). This approach follows trends evident in the social sciences, where linguistics has often been idealized as a source of methodological rigor, discovery procedures, and formal models (61, 88, 195:54–96, 197:138–47, 222, 242). Many

---

2

Of course, these predications do not capture the total range of concerns linking music and language, such as the relatively smaller literatures on linguistic-musical analogs in diffusion (143), bi- and multilingualism and musicality (318), and the intertwined biological origins of language and music (198, 261).

approaches to music have been predicated on a linguistic analogy where musical sound is viewed as an autonomous formal domain, abstractable as hierarchical structure or cognitive process. Musical structures are thus taken as generally analogous to grammatical categories or processes that can be analyzed using linguistic approaches to syntax, morphology, and phonology. We consider these analogies under the heading of “music as language.”

Critiques of formal cognitive and structuralist models in linguistics and linguistic anthropology are clearly evident in the growth of discourse-centered (354) and pragmatic (314) approaches, the ethnography of speaking (19, 20, 153), performance studies (16), sociolinguistics (82), ethnopoeitics (154, 312, 336), and studies of language socialization (254). At some historical distance, these critiques have also been registered in ethnomusicological approaches (28, 30, 31, 94, 296, 297). Following from these developments, perspectives on “language in music” contrast a more empirical functionalism to the formalist cognitivism of the “music as language” research. Concerns with language in music focus on the phenomenological intertwining of language and music in verbal art, song texts, and musical performance. Emphases on “music in language” focus on the musical dimensions of prosody and paralanguage (e.g. voice quality, dynamics, and tempo). “Language about music” calls attention to the omnipresence of aesthetic and technical discourses about music. These three perspectives embrace both contrasts and interfaces between the communicative and social functions of musical and verbal discourse.

These approaches can also be set in a larger ethnomusicological context of research on indexical and isomorphic relationships between musical genres, forms, and performance styles and their directly associated social categories and institutions, including gender (128, 184, 289), social class (221, 259, 332, 361), and ethnicity (36, 177, 319). Such analyses of concrete social correlations are in places theoretically or methodologically analogous to a variety of approaches in linguistic pragmatics and sociolinguistics (319), even when they don’t substantively explore music-language relationships or matters of musical semantics.

From a broader perspective, the formal parallelism and informational redundancy of musical structures, musically structured song texts, performances, and musically structured kinesic forms such as dance (163–166, 199, 213, 248, 253, 260, 322) exemplify and expand what Jakobson (157) called the poetic and metalinguistic functions in language (153, 219). In this view, musically structured communication suppresses verbal referentiality in order to reveal the formal and pragmatic ordering of messages, codes, and communicative contexts. Music’s formal redundancy and auto-referentiality heighten poetic texts and produce a musical metalanguage (15, 94, 142, 209). The extension from discourse structures to social function draws on Prague School poetics (157–159, 255), especially as mediated through the ethnography of speaking.

It draws as well on the Boasian tradition in both language and music studies as represented by Sapir and Herzog (133–136, 284–287). This metasemiotic perspective, analogous to the ethnography of speaking and the discourse-centered approach in linguistics (309, 310, 312, 354), brings together formal and functional analysis and implies attention to the entire range of communicative modalities and genres in a particular society.

Related to divisions between cognitivist formalism and phenomenological functionalism, the music and language literature also represents a wide range of opinions on the nature and accessibility of musical meaning. The entrenched theoretical division between absolutist and referentialist positions is a frequently recurring theme (67, 90, 93, 137, 233). Absolutist views, deeply rooted in Western musical aesthetics, stress music's non-referentiality and locate musical meaning in an individual listener's cognitive processing of implicative patterns of musical form (10, 194, 233, 235, 236, 267). Such views, which claim that musical meaning is strictly syntactic, have been compatible with formal cognitivist linguistic models (81, 267, 276, 320). The absolutist perspective has been only minimally concerned with fundamentally social aspects of musical meaning (137, 305).

Referentialist views hold that music symbolizes extramusical (i.e. linguistically translatable) concepts, objects, or affects, implying the possibility of a musical semantics (203). Both absolutists and referentialists may or may not also hold the expressionist position, which holds that music communicates (whether syntactically or referentially) within the domain of human emotion, by contrast with language's capacity to communicate about conceptualization (66, 137, 233, 285, 299). As a Western folk-theory of musical meaning, expressionism is a common feature of many otherwise fundamentally divergent theories of musical significance. The distinction between musically encoded feeling and linguistically encoded thought, with its concomitant claim that musical meaning is somehow ineffable, is frequently advanced in both cognitive and social accounts of the music-language relationship.

From a cross-cultural and ethnographic perspective, the main positions in the musical meaning debate oversimplify the communicational complexity and interpretive density of real verbal and musical experience (137, 178, 203). Absolutist positions on musical meaning are typically falsified by the ubiquitous intertwining of musical and verbal communication in song texts (31, 358), by prosodics (136), or by discourse about music (90, 357). Another important base for critique is philosophical and anthropological work problematizing the cross-cultural validity of Western models of emotion and strict opposition between cognition and affect that underlies these positions (52, 137, 218). And as a further example of complex empirical challenges, we could ask how typifications provided in the absolutist-referentialist-expressionist scheme could begin to account for meaning production in musical speech surrogates

(37, 53, 56, 64, 71, 135, 252, 256, 263, 325, 350, 351, 363:189–96). These phenomena, which might warrant a fifth predication of “music about language,” involve the transposition of linguistic tonal and temporal contours to surrogate articulatory modes, like humming or whistling, or musical media, like drums or flutes. Abridging systems, where a limited array of phonemic elements are imitated by the surrogate, and logographic or ideographic systems, where the surrogate sound symbolizes a concept without an intermediary connection to the phonemic structure of the base language, are both well described (252, 325, 350). Surrogates may alternate between a signal mode, where texts are more formulaic or stereotypic, and a speech mode, where more novel utterances are produced. They may also alternate with a variety of musical modes. Hence, surrogate media may easily mix referential and non-referential messages with a complex interplay of metalingual and metamusical signs.

## MUSIC AS LANGUAGE: LANGUAGE MODELS

Previous reviews (51, 88, 120, 261) have observed a duality in the music-language literature. On the one hand, the research literature emphasizes application of formal analytic linguistic models to music. On the other hand, it emphasizes research into the phenomenological intertwining of musical and linguistic phenomena in four areas: musical speech surrogates, the musical structuring of linguistic supra-segmentals, verbal discourse about musical meaning, and song texts. From the first perspective, music is considered amenable to the analytic techniques and models developed for linguistic phonology and syntax. This position is often sustained by analogies between the distributional organization of musical pitch and the phonetic organization of language (61, 62, 149, 150, 160, 242, 244, 245, 249, 280, 323). Analogies between the harmonic or metrical or motivic organization of musical works and the syntactic organization of language, deeply rooted in Western musical theory (241, 261), have been the basis for the enormous influence of generative syntactic theory on cognitivist music theory and ethnomusicology. Work in this tradition has produced numerous musical grammars, or formal descriptions of the phrasal, harmonic, and metric syntax of musical pieces and styles (22, 28, 38, 62, 63, 68, 81, 83, 125, 144, 151, 182, 194, 201, 204, 264, 267, 280, 288, 315, 331). Lerdahl & Jackendoff’s (194) work, with its provocative claims about universals, musical competence, and the hierarchical and language-like nature of musical cognition, intuition, and information processing, has been particularly influential in setting agendas for generative analyses of musical form.

Both distributional and generative structural approaches have been criticized from the perspective of an anthropological approach to music, for their

reification of musical sound structure as a decontextualized code (27, 31, 88, 90, 121) and for their bias toward the hierarchical, architectonic, and metrically regular art music traditions of Western Europe and, to a lesser extent, other stratified complex societies (261). They have also been criticized for their emphasis on discrete, macro-syntactic (melody, rhythm, tonality, mode), score-centric, and transcribed/transcribable dimensions of musical products while excluding gradient, nuanced, emergent, oral/aural, or micro-parameters of musical process like pitch, texture, timbre, tempo, dynamics, and performance (40, 121, 172, 178, 202, 267, 302, 304). Additionally, these critiques of textual reification have called attention to the individualistic conception of musical competence and socialization in cognitive modeling (27, 31, 90, 220, 305).

Despite criticisms, generative musical syntax has stimulated a reemergent psychomusicology focused on the cognitive bases of musical knowledge, understanding, and composition (190, 191, 267, 300, 327). Psychomusicology explores questions about ineffability of musical experience as compared to linguistic knowledge and communication, and about the cognitive processes that give rise to (one kind of) musical meaning. This perspective has suggested empirical approaches to problems that are central to the tradition of philosophical musical aesthetics (52, 67, 113, 137, 189, 233, 379). Such problems, when refigured in social terms, remain significant for musical anthropology as it grapples with the particular cultural functions of music in relation to language and other communicative modalities.

Cognitivist perspectives have tried to approach the question of uniquely musical forms of consciousness and experience. Despite this potential relevance, cognitivist approaches to music are somewhat removed from engagement with ethnomusicology and anthropology, and from the empirical complexity of real musical discourse. This follows a similar divergence between cognitive and social perspectives on language. An important agenda for contemporary musical anthropology is the reintegration of sophisticated cognitivist approaches with grounded social investigation (11, 12, 29, 32, 81, 182).

## MUSIC IN LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE IN MUSIC

An alternative strand in the history of discussions of music and language involves empirical inquiry into the phenomenological intertwining of musical and linguistic parameters in situated acts of communication. This view has focused on the cross-cultural ubiquity of texted vocal music (210), on musical speech surrogates (325, 350), on intermediate poetic and performative forms and genres, and on means of articulation that call attention to the boundaries of speech and song (93, 126, 207), such as chant, recitative, *sprechgesang* (sung



speech), *sprechstimme* (dynamically, rhythmically, and intonationally heightened speech), preaching, and lamentation.

Some key areas of empirical research have included the comparative phonetics of spoken and sung genres (62, 142, 328, 329, 364, 372, 373); issues of voice quality and the acoustics of the singing voice (102, 162, 277–279, 303, 329, 330, 337); complex forms like Swiss yodel (376, 377), Tibetan and Mongolian biphonic overtone singing (258, 321, 343, 378), and Inuit vocal games (21, 59, 244); comparisons between the poetic organization of song texts and the musical structure of their settings; and the linkage of text and tune in compositional formulae (4, 43, 79:47–58; 136, 138, 215, 246, 311, 372, 373). Other issues include distinctions and continua between semantically meaningful song texts and the various uses of meaningless vocables (105, 141, 142, 224), and the mutual influences of musical and linguistic structures (83, 142, 215, 277, 278). Especially important are determinate relationships between speech intonation and musical melody, for example, in the song and instrumental traditions of societies with tonal languages (4, 58, 133, 193, 206, 252, 269, 281, 290, 371) or in Native South American microtonal pitch rising (139, 297).

This empirical, form and function approach to language in music is perhaps the most important historical antecedent for contemporary musico-linguistic ethnography. Among other aspects, this rubric subsumes the study of the meaning and structure of song texts, arguably the most widely used musical data throughout the social sciences. Although countless ethnographers, sociologists, and cultural critics have referred to the verbal content of sung texts as evocative poetic performances, these verbal texts have been especially important for anthropologists working from the perspective of contemporary cultural poetics (1, 2, 46, 48, 97, 100, 131, 185, 186, 219, 220, 301, 344, 345, 365), and for bridging textual and musical dimensions in cultural studies approaches to contemporary popular music (103, 108, 112, 123, 225, 304, 361).

Ethnographic treatments of song texts have tended to treat songs as verbal art, and to background the question of why and how certain texts are sung (14, 108, 209, 304). A central focus for the language in music perspective is the question of how a particular expressive economy models distinctions and continua between speech and song styles, or between song-speech genres and their functions and contexts (69, 70, 94, 95, 103, 115, 142, 155, 295–297, 311, 352, 358, 359). Issues include the relative stability of song forms and topics (142, 229:187ff, 297); the selection and alteration of spoken language in song (94, 103, 142, 297, 352); the social indexing of gender, authority, age, and class through speech and song genres (1, 94, 115, 123, 175, 177, 272, 273, 297, 306, 307, 352); and the role of song in language-learning and pedagogy (220, 297, 370).



Another perspective on language and music, which we would label a music in language approach, comes from linguists and literary theorists working with discourse prosodics, stylistics, and the (ethno)poetics of verbal art. Here the focus is on the musical—that is, suprasegmental, iconic, or non-discrete—dimensions of spoken discourse. These include rhythm, meter, pausing, and other durational and stress phenomena in speech and verbal art (62, 73, 87, 142, 144, 156, 181, 294, 306, 308, 336, 368, 369), as well as issues of voice quality and timbre (73, 192, 238, 352). Linguistic work has also focused on the continua of relative tonal stability and contour stylization which cross-cut speech intonation and sung melody (39–41, 43, 76, 110, 187, 364), linking musical melody and linguistic intonation to an iconic, emotional level of meaning that is complexly interwoven with discrete, segmentable, conventional levels of linguistic organization (40, 42, 187, 188, 226, 366). Other researchers have looked at phonological modifications of vowel quality in sung versus spoken articulation (50, 94, 142, 328, 330), and at phenomena of phonaesthesia and phonetic sound symbolism, again emphasizing an iconic, gradient stratum of linguistic meaning that tends to be heightened in poetic and sung discourse (15, 42, 94, 105, 161, 273, 340, 366). Whether oriented to social and functionalist concerns (73, 75, 142, 226, 368, 369) or to cognitivist perspectives (87, 144, 156), the variety of empirical work in discourse prosodics suggests the importance of music in language approaches to a reintegration of linguistic and musical research.

## LANGUAGE ABOUT MUSIC

Since the late 1970s an additional perspective on the language and music relationship has emerged in ethnomusicology, to some extent circumventing the earlier debates about form and function, cognition and feeling, linguistic models, and the prosodics and poetics of speech and song. Though strongly influenced by earlier developments in ethnosemantics and cognitive anthropology, this work has emphasized the social indexicality and cultural symbolism of discourse about music, rather than abstract cognitive semantic domains. Perspectives that focus on functional or formal oppositions between speech and music may obscure the poetic and pragmatic connections between the two modalities. By contrast, the language about music perspective is predicated on the fact that people talk about music, and that music interacts with naturally occurring verbal discourse, not only in song texts, verbal art, and the prosodic, musical structuring of speech, but also in the interpretive, theoretical, and evaluative discourses surrounding musical experiences.

Ethnomusicologists and philosophers have often stressed the difficulty of translating musical meaning into verbal analytic discourse (31, 90, 125, 299, 302, 357). Recent approaches have focused on spontaneous or elicited oral

discourse about music, often in small-scale societies, where there was no prior investigation of culturally specific music theories (89, 94, 173, 180, 262, 282, 297, 326, 335, 374, 375). Zemp analyzes how such oral discourse may encode remarkably complex technical systems of theoretical knowledge about musical structures and compositional principles in the instrumental (panpipe) music of a Solomon Islands society (374, 375). Extending this perspective to vocal and instrumental music, Feld analyzes the technical and metaphoric discourse linking musical practices to other forms of social and ecological knowledge in a Papua New Guinea rainforest community (89, 92, 94, 96). Turning to complex social formations, Kingsbury (180) demonstrates the pragmatic social efficacy of verbal evaluations that ostensibly are detached judgments of musical talent in an American music conservatory. Finally, interviews conducted by the Music in Daily Life project (72) indicate an enormous range of idiocultural diversity in verbal engagement and reflection on American musical experiences. These analyses argue for the abstract and pragmatic ways music and verbal experience are intertwined in the dialectical processes of emergence, maintenance, and change in social life.

## SEMIOTICS AND SOCIOMUSICOLOGY

Since the 1970s two convergent perspectives have pursued integrations of form and function in musico-linguistic analysis. The first follows from developments in Saussurian and Peircian semiotics (90, 245, 324, 334). The second, dubbed sociomusicology by Keil in the early 1960s (229:221ff), developed distinctly in the early 1980s (91, 174, 272). Musical semiotics emerged with a predominantly musicological orientation, and like linguistic semiotics it developed the kinds of formalist, cognitive, and structural biases discussed in our music as language section above. Nattiez (242, 243, 245) stresses the possibility of a neutral segmentation of musical sound structure, abstracted from social and cognitive contexts of musical production and reception (88, 90, 121, 202). Nattiez's more recent work (243, 245) invokes the Peircian semiotic concept of multiple interpretants, and rhetorically stresses the importance of modeling musical meaning from the neutral level to the levels of creation (*poesis*) and reception (*esthesis*), even arguing for a semiotics of discourse about music. But Nattiez's empirical analyses remain focused on the distributional properties of a limited number of sonic parameters in prescriptively notated scores of Western art musics (179). Inspired by Peircian semiotics, Boilés (38) and Karbusicky (168, 169) have offered more processual accounts of the sign typologies implicated in varieties of musical meaning. With Nattiez, these accounts share an emphasis on terminological definitions and abstraction, as do even more explicitly sociological and historical semiotic perspectives (122, 333).

By contrast, a more eclectic blend of semiotic concepts has emerged in recent ethnographic work. Peirce's second trichotomy, which delineates iconic, indexical, or symbolic relationships between signs and objects, has stimulated research bringing together sign-object-interpretant relationships with issues of semiotic function within and across expressive genres (231, 316). The concept of semiotic iconicity, for example, posits a formal resemblance between sign and object. This notion has been applied to the study of tropes of repetition, coherence, and naturalization across musical, linguistic, visual, and kinesic modalities. Iconicity has been shown to create stylistic cultural linkages between experience, knowledge, and interpretation (23, 92, 96, 173, 175, 219, 273, 344).

Drawing on semiotics to develop a discourse-centered perspective on culture, Urban (352–354) stresses that discourse styles are both objective arrangements of sign-object relations and conceptual arrangements of interpretants. His work shows how native Brazilian speech styles with multiple social indexical meanings are iconically represented in other musical and linguistic genres and styles. These icons meta-semiotically reframe their prior indexical meanings, to create, challenge, and restore sociability. Urban's Peircian perspective seems especially well-suited for formally describing the varieties of musical and linguistic signification inherent in natural discourse, including syntactic, mimetic, ostensive, associational, evocative, and referential meanings (90, 313).

Studies of musical symbolism rarely invoke the Peircian trichotomy; however, they often trace interactions between the concrete semiotic mechanics of musical and linguistic discourse (especially indexical and iconic relationships), and generalized and abstracted concepts and affects (symbols). Ethnographers have attended to the processes by which concrete acoustic signs (e.g. musical pieces, forms, techniques, styles, tones of voice, phonetic and instrumental icons of natural or mythic sounds, and sonic poetic tropes) become public, articulate, and powerful symbolic condensations of diffuse or inchoate social sentiments and identities (15, 92, 94, 96, 97, 173, 176, 177, 228a, 273, 297, 348).

Music is often invoked as a key metaphor for the symbolic in philosophical and anthropological approaches to the social and cultural significance of aesthetics (111:11, 137, 189, 196, 291, 360, 379). This is because of music's association with ritual and performative contexts, its informational redundancy, its poetic intensification of verbal texts, its formalization of bodily movements in dance, and its social and temporal coordination of participants in music-making. Here semiotics, via semantics and pragmatics, finds its common ground with a comparative, cross-cultural sociomusicology. Feld (91) and Roseman (272) take up this trajectory by suggesting six areas of inquiry that might serve as a comparative matrix for analyzing the social

structuring of musical symbols in classless societies: competence, form, performance, environment, theory, and social value/equality. These rubrics, in parallel to similar proposals in sociolinguistics (153), probe the interface between forms of linguistic and musical expression, forms of social organization, the social organization of musical production, and cultural ideologies of knowledge, value, and power.

Fused with other concerns from practice theory (44, 45) these rubrics have been brought to bear on the social functions of music in a variety of social formations: as an emblem of social identity (97, 123, 348, 362, 363), as a medium for socialization (28, 219, 296, 297, 370), as a site of material and ideological production (180, 225, 304, 361), as a model for social understandings and evocations of place and history (94, 273), as a modality for the construction and critique of gender and class relations (45, 69, 70, 94, 95, 103, 115, 225, 362, 363), and as an idiom for metaphysical experience (15, 94, 273, 338).

## FROM ACOUSTICS TO ETHNOGRAPHY: REFIGURING SONG AND SPEECH

The significance of music and language interactions can also be traced through a more specific historical trajectory that led to the development of a new genre of musico-linguistic ethnography in the 1980s. Thirty years earlier, speech and song were implicitly assumed to be normative poles of a single objective continuum of sonic communication, bounded on one end by the notion of sound as articulated sense, and on the other end by the notion of sound as pure tone. Toward the pole of maximum sense one might imagine more deliberate, projected, and articulate varieties of staged formal speech, sliding toward variants of informal, conversational, and more intonationally dynamic speech. From here the continuum moves toward sung speech and then merges into song forms. The most basic of these forms is typically syllabic song, characterized by one melodic tone and one rhythmic pulse per verbal syllable. The next contrast is with melismatic song, where more than one tone and pulse are articulated for each or any syllable. At the final, maximally song pole of the continuum, one finds vocables or other forms of vocalization with little or no linguistically referential, even if phonologically conventional, material. In this general scheme referentiality serves as the bottom line in the distinction between speech and song. This scheme paralleled larger 1950s philosophical or information-cybernetic preoccupations with logical communicational models of music and language (234:5–21; 239), musicological distinctions between musical feeling and referential intellection (299), and linguistic and stylistic concerns with the gradience between expression and reference (292).

List's (207) analysis of speech and song boundaries moved beyond these bipolar models by proposing a hemispheric map, overlaid by a diamond with speech and song as north and south poles, and monotone and *sprechstimme* as east and west poles. Tracing four routes from these ideal points, List proposed that from the north to the east, speech travels a continuum that passes through recitation to monotone by decreasing intonational dynamics. Continuing from east to south, expansion of scalar structure moves monotone through chant and on toward song. In parallel, at the other side of the diamond, from north to west speech travels a continuum that passes through intoned recitation to *sprechstimme* by increasing intonational dynamics. And from the west to the south pole, stability of pitch moves from *sprechstimme* through intonational chant to song. To exemplify the classificatory and analytic ideal types and particular points along these continua, List provided both sonographic pitch tracks and conventional musical transcriptions.

Although List recognized problems adapting his framework to sung forms in tonal languages, he did not consider other problems inherent in focusing entirely on acoustic common denominators of melody and pitch. Prominently absent here is any mapping of sounds in time, examining the interaction of melody and pitch with rhythm (237). Also absent is any discussion of prosody, voice quality, timbre, texture, grain, (65, 86, 317), or other dimensions of vocal performance that intersect both the tonal and temporal planes, fundamentally adding significant features that differentiate or link speech and song.

Searching for another kind of taxonomy, one open to additional levels of acoustic and expressive patterning, Lomax (209–211) looked beyond linguistics to music's analogs with paralinguistic phenomena (26, 342). With his cantometrics song measures, Lomax focused not on acoustic ideal types but on properties of singing styles. Coding 37 levels of musical behavior in a sample of over 400 musical traditions, Lomax attempted to correlate the most highly patterned and redundant song performance features with HRAF data on social structure as well as economic and political institutions for the same groups. With his provocative claim that song be viewed as danced speech (209), and his later forays into choreometrics (213) and parlametrics (212), Lomax placed speech-song forms in an even more ambitious framework of the evolutionary taxonomy of expressive culture (214), recently integrated into a computer database called Global Jukebox. For many researchers, Lomax's most interesting contribution is his exploration of how redundancy underlies song's power to create consensus and solidarity in ritual interactions (142, 227). Ideas of this sort overshadow cantometrics' many methodological problems, which include conflation of sample time depths, compatibility of song coding and HRAF societal data, inferential history by reading correlation as causation, and lack of concern with intracultural and areal variation (85, 91).

These taxonomic and classificatory urges to normatively define and measure speech, song, or in-between forms on the basis of formal and gradient acoustic regularities were not the unique preserve of ethnomusicologists or linguists in the 1960s. Their work took place in the broader context of scientific invention and experimentation with sound analysis and synthesis (78, 145, 205). But the first generation of speech and music synthesis also yielded other kinds of research documents. At the same moment speech scientists programmed their synthesizers to articulate the difference between “recognize speech” and “wreck a nice beach,” sound-poets taught theirs to playfully transform Professor Henry Higgins’ perfectly enunciated “Why can’t the English teach their children how to speak?” into the mangled cyber-slur “Why can’t the linguists teach their computers not to lisp?” In an experiment no less intellectually engaging than the Bell Telephone Laboratories 1962 effort to have a synthesizer sing “A Bicycle Built for Two,” Dodge (80) used early synthesis technology to manipulate sounds from monotone to melodic expansion and back, recitation to sung-speech and back, free rhythm to metrics and back, in each case stopping at numerous articulatory points along the way. “Speech Songs,” his exploration of synthesis as analysis, has the synthesizer alternating monotonic and melodic zigzags of syllabic cybersong beginning with the phrase of Mark Strand’s poem “When I am with you I am two places at once.” One quickly senses that Dodge’s “two places at once” are speech and song, text and tune, melody and monotone, sound and meaning, form and content, reference and expression.

Dodge’s exploration of these “two places” also resonates both with Lévi-Strauss’ mythic dictum that the proof of the analysis is in the synthesis, and with an earlier Boasian-Sapirian concern with the simultaneously material-physical and aesthetic-emotive basis of poesis and aesthetics. These ideas were developed in Herzog’s empirical work on text and tune (133, 134), his masterful survey of song (136), and Jakobson’s concern with sound shape, parallelism, and markedness (158, 159, 161). Particularly significant to both Herzog and Jakobson was the coincident parallelism of textual and melodic stanzas, and the parallel organization of the foot of poetic meter and the measure of musical rhythm. As early as 1932 Jakobson took an interest in the universal analogy between a phoneme and the articulatory phonetic realizations it takes in speech, and a musical tone value and its potential pitch realizations (160). Herzog (136) likewise insisted on the universality of the line or phrase as the basic principle of textual and musical sub-division. Recognizing that these line or phrase sub-divisions may be marked either by formal structures of closure (grammatical or melodic-cadential) or by breath pause, Herzog even seems to have anticipated the important contemporary discussion between Hymes (154) and Tedlock (336) concerning the relative significance of textual-grammatical



vs oral-performative markers of structure in ethnopoetic (and by extension, ethnomusicological) translation and representation (308, 368).

Many of Herzog's and Jakobson's concerns were reincarnated in the ethnomusicological research of the 1970s and 1980s. Like ethnography generally, this work began to draw on eclectic mixes of cognitive, structuralist, semiotic, symbolic, hermeneutic, historical, and praxis approaches in cultural and social theory. As approaches to language had become more deeply constituted in ethnographic studies of speaking and verbal art as performance, approaches to speech-song intersections likewise shifted toward the ethnography of musical performance (24, 228). Blacking's *How Musical is Man?* (28) cleverly attempted to capture this motion linking form and pragmatics by parallel chapter title shifts. For example, "Music in Culture and Society" became "Society and Culture in Music," and "Humanly Organized Sound" became "Soundly Organized Humanity." In short, ethnomusicology through the 1970s and 1980s moved from asking how sound reflects social structure to how musical performance embodies and articulates social imagination and practices, how sonic organizations are total social facts, saturated with messages about time, place, feeling, style, belonging, and identity.

The maturation of this interdisciplinary trend can be seen in the increasing blend and synthesis of musical and linguistic research in ethnographic monographs (e.g. 15, 94, 173, 185, 273, 297, 338). These monographs rely on the complexity of the worlds they seek to interpret to create the terms of an emerging genre, one that brings phenomenological premises about the creative and expressive nature of experience together with ethnographic exploration that makes no technical or analytic compromise on musical and linguistic detail. Each monograph stretches previous conceptions of how language and music might be related in local performance practices, and explores problems of musico-linguistic representation and evocation. For example, Basso links the processual and performative dimensions of Kalapalo (Brazil) myth and ritual through the power of sound symbolism (15). Roseman demonstrates how Temiar (peninsular Malaysia) trance healing emerges as a fusion of medical and musical imagination and gendered practice (273). Kratz analyzes structural and temporal alternations of speech and song in Okiek (Kenya) women's initiation ceremonies, showing how affect and persuasion are forged in ritual (185). Titon analyzes the full array of speech, chant, and song practices in a Appalachian Baptist church (Virginia), interpreting how the efficacy of their performances constitutes religious belief and community consciousness (338). Seeger shows the multiple ways Suyá (Brazil) discourse genres of speech, instruction, and song are interrelated in ceremonial performance (297). Feld shows how Kaluli (Papua New Guinea) lament, poetics, and song are complexly related to their natural historical and cosmological origins in bird voice symbolism (94). Finally, Keil's search for the significance of Tiv (Nigeria)



song led to a critique of aesthetic theory and evocation of the material and performed expressions of Tiv being and energy (173). In these writings, the emergent focus on transformative and affecting powers of ritual performance moves earlier music-language questions forcefully toward a processual symbology and hermeneutics of voice, self, and action. Likewise, the focus on sound and synesthesia (interactions across visual-sonic-movement modes) further relocates music-language concerns in an anthropology of the senses and of sensual experience. In these ways musico-linguistic ethnography participates fully in the recent trends in ethnographic writing to forcefully link voice, experience, self, body, gender, and agency.

## STYLIZING SUNG-SPOKEN INTERSECTIONS: THE LAMENT GENRE

Current developments in the analysis of speech-song interactions also can be scrutinized through refigurations of genre studies. The lamentation genre includes verbal-vocal (and occasionally verbal-vocal-instrumental; e.g. 5, 251) performances typically labeled lament, ritual wailing, sung-texted-weeping, keen, mourning song, dirge, eulogy, and elegy. Approaches to understanding the structure and significance of forms within the lamentation genre have brought together a variety of anthropological, musical, linguistic, and folkloristic issues. These concern oral and literate traditions, performance of verbal arts, gendering of genre, fixity-plasticity-hybridity of genres, and interpenetrations of speech and song, as well textual history, improvisation, memorization, and oral formulae (6, 7, 60, 62, 94, 95, 115, 130, 146, 147, 171, 247, 307, 339, 352). Lament varieties are reported throughout many regions of the world, and in some cases have a long history of comparative analysis, for example, in European folklore and ethnomusicology (148, 170, 208). Newer comparative questions about semiotic universals and the cultural specificity of the ritual wailing variants of the genre have also been raised (50, 94, 95, 115, 353). Yet the overwhelming significance of lamentation is hardly confined to issues about intersecting musical and linguistic codes, folkloric genres, or comparison. Lament stylizations performatively embody and express complex social issues connecting largely female gendered discourses on death, morality, and memory to aesthetic and political thematization of loss and pain, resistance and social reproduction, and to ritual performance of emotion (1, 3, 49, 50, 54, 55, 94, 95, 117, 132, 146, 167, 301, 340, 341, 344).

With the possible exception of certain forms of religious discourse, notably sermon preaching performances (77, 104, 274, 283, 338), lament is the most prominent and widespread discourse genre where one can comparatively study stylized progressions moving back and forth on all continua relating the speaking and singing voice. This alone makes lamentation an important locus of

research on questions of the boundaries of speech and song, in both genre-specific and performance-specific terms. But to make matters even more complex, many forms of lament simultaneously move along a continuum from relatively cried semi-melodic fragments with vocables or text, to more texted recitation and/or singing while continuously or intermittently weeping. The continua of tuneful and textual performance in lamentation are often further stylized together with “icons of crying” like voiced inhalation, cry breaks or sobs, falsetto vowels, and creaky voice, features that are linked indexically to the emotional states and affective projection of lament performance (353, 354). Across these stylistic variations, lamentation performances are occasion-specific to funerals or contexts of loss (including, importantly, marriages); thus, they are universally charged with evocative and emotive significance, albeit often producing highly specific local discourses on abandonment, transition, and renewal that are aesthetically central to distinct social constructions of memory.

Lamentation forms can be placed in the broader social and cultural framework of the anthropology of mortuary rituals. Contemporary anthologies, syntheses, ethnographies, and critiques on this topic (33, 57, 74, 76a, 152, 183, 232, 257, 271, 275) grapple with how “death provides occasions and materials for a symbolic discourse on life” (152:9). This perspective follows the insights of several theorists; the early progression is Hertz (129), van Gennep (355), Durkheim (84), Radcliffe-Brown (266), Mauss (223). Later theorists (114, 349) developed and extended Hertz’s often cited admonition that “death must be given its due if it is not to continue its ravages within the group” (129:51). This due, as Hertz emphasized, is the force of social obligation compelling the collectivity to participate in compulsory acts that mark and honor the social nature of death. Mortuary activities thus involve expressive and physical actions to remove the presence of death while inventing the tone of the deceased’s memory projection for the future. Performed acts of remembering oppose the imagined horror of forgetting. They simultaneously renew and potentially amplify both the sociability and solidarity forged by participation, and the emotional exhaustion, enmity, and antipathy forged by contemplating loss.

Despite the theoretical and ethnographic sophistication of this line of social and cultural inquiry, the actual discursive means (i.e. the laments) constituting these symbolic discourses on life have not been fully described or analyzed in the mortuary ritual literature. Even when texts are presented and analyzed, weeping and wailing references are often entirely casual. The terms *cry*, *wail*, and *lamentation* are often found interchangeably, usually with no mention of what is or isn’t sung or texted, what these expressions are locally called, and how obligatory or socially significant they are. Crying is often represented as an obvious and natural occurrence, which in many cases makes it uncritically

gendered as female (cf. 216). Much of the social anthropological literature lacks a view of the discursive materials and performative display of lamentation as part of, and not superfluous to, the ritually gendered production and circulation of memory and emotion.

Lamentation can be approached as an interpenetration of the full range of possibilities for the vocal stylization of affective performance (3, 50, 95, 132, 167, 340, 341, 367). In this respect lamentation is distinct from other vocal-verbal performance genres and from other kinds of cried responses to pain or distress. Musical features that participate in lament stylizations include pitch selection and range, stylization of melody contour and metric and rhythmic groups, correspondence of phrase group and breath point, degree of phrasal and sub-phrasal repetition, and amount of improvisation. Linguistic features that participate in this stylization range from pure sound vocalizations to the use of conventional well-formed words, and from ellipsis and formulaic phrases to full syntactic constructions. Additional structural variables include line length and format; phonological, syntactic, and semantic micro- and macro-parallelism; and correspondence of line and sub-line units with breath points and melodic contours. Sung-texted lamentations are characterized by intersections of melodic and rhythmic aspects of tune with phonological and syntactic aspects of text, mostly marked in the organization of phrases, breath groups, and lines.

These sung-texted dimensions are further stylized by the kinds of crying that bracket or bundle with the verbal-vocal articulation. Urban (353, 354) has isolated four “icons of crying” found in ritual wailing: the cry break, the voiced inhalation, creaky voice, and the falsetto vowel. These involve performative stylizations of voice qualities, which articulate and embody heightened emotional states.

These dimensions of stylization in the lament form take on a great cultural variety of performative manifestations. Some forms are more clearly spoken, narrated, or recited strictly in a speaking voice, often with a highly stylized intonational contour. Others are more sung and marked by a stylization of melodic contour and rhythmic formula. Others are more principally cried, and thus stylistically marked by a distinctly non-speaking and non-singing voice. Cross-cutting dimensions of voice modality, some lament texts are more improvised, formulaic, or composed-in-performance, while others are more fixed, pre-composed, and/or memorized. Thus, laments need also be scrutinized for the extent to which they uphold or challenge assumptions within oral-formulaic theory about variable texts and authentic versions. Likewise, laments can be scrutinized for the extent to which they are occasion-dependent and composed in performance rather than memorized or composed prior to performance (98, 101).

Some varieties of lament have no referential content at all but are enunciated as phonologically conventional vocables (115). Others are in conversational everyday speech (95) and still others use more formal speech registers, marked by formal metric schemes (167). Ethnographic accounts that closely examine the metalinguistics and etymologies of lamentation also reveal ways these genres are marked in relation to other speech or song forms, or marked for gender, for affective and emotional voice qualities, or other indications of local associations relating sadness and emotion to human expressive sound (3, 50, 95, 132, 340, 354).

Although lamentation forms are locally considered as distinct types of vocalization and expression, studies have begun to explore complex interactions of stylized weeping signals and other dimensions of lamentation as they intersect or appear within other genres, like narrative (117, 140) and song (9, 94). The necessity of understanding the complementarity of lamentation with other speech and song genres has been taken up by several authors (3, 115, 146, 352).

Another trend in recent analyses of lament concerns the value of acoustic transcription and micro-analysis of performance to understanding the intersection of affective and aesthetic vocal signals. Urban (353, 354), Briggs (50), Tolbert (340), and Vaughan (356) use a variety of recent digitizing, spectrographic, and pitch-tracking technologies to examine details of lament vocalization. Adding to Urban's characterization of the crying voice, Tolbert (340) and Vaughan (356) show how increased vibrato, changes in pitch, phrase length, and rhythmic density map into the temporal progression of Karelian (Finland) lament, heightening affective dimensions of performance. Briggs (50) raises additional questions about iconic and indexical dimensions of affecting performance and gendered expression in the dialogic interaction of Warao (Venezuela) vocal tempo, pitch, and timbre.

Many lament forms are principally monophonic, maximizing the social distinctiveness of a solo voice performing a personal text. But recent attention has turned to cases where members of a group lament simultaneously, typically in heterophony (simultaneous performances involving different texts vocalized to variations of a single melody), or in more structured polyphonic, responsorial, or antiphonal forms. In these cases distinct melodic and textual parts are performed in dialogic patterns of multi-voice alternation, or leader-chorus alternation, or alternation with vocal overlap. Other variants of this pattern involve additional dialogic complexities in the interaction of overlapping or interlocking voices. Patterns of multi-voice performance, regardless of musical or textual complexities, produce possibilities for performed intertextuality, where the spatio-temporal character of multiple voice utterances is indexical to a process of emergence as a cohesive, jointly produced text. In-

tertextuality points to the process of simultaneously cooperative or competitive production of texts (50, 95, 132).

Recent studies by Briggs (49, 50), Feld (95), and Serematakis (301) analyze how complexities of gendered participation relationship in lament performance are simultaneously encoded through polyphony and intertextuality. Within and across performances, the continual alternating and overlapping of voices in Warao, Kaluli, and Maniat (Greece) women's sung-texted-weeping interlock to produce a layered musicality matched by a layered intertextuality. Even though each voice laments distinctly, the cumulative interaction between voices draws the temporal process of the mourning event and its participants into a more dialogic arena. Intertextuality thereby links unique and distinct voices thematizing highly salient personal, collective, emotional, and social concerns. As might be expected, these texts draw significantly on highly affect-laden lexical or discourse areas (e.g. place names; personal names and relationship terms; rhetorical questions to the deceased or audience; accusations; remembrance formulae; allegorical, metaphorical, or veiled speech; indirectness; social criticism and transgressive commentary; and appropriation or recontextualization of prior discourses). Vocal polyphony and intertextuality reveal the power of spontaneous joint performance to co-articulate personal and collective biography and memory.

## CONCLUSION

Trends toward ethnographic studies of the interpenetration of music and language contribute strongly to the developing emphasis in sociocultural anthropology on the poetics and pragmatics of expressive performance (18). At the same time, detailed musico-linguistic ethnographies offer a critique of certain trends in both sociocultural and linguistic anthropology toward an over-textualized conception of voice and an overly discursive conception of the social construction of meaning. This critique traces the consequences of music's phenomenological distinctiveness from language, leading toward deeper exploration of polysemous, associative, iconic, presentational, ostensive, reflexive, ludic, emotive, and embodied dimensions of sociability. Music's poetic de-referentializing of language heightens the symbolic efficacy of its affecting discourse, making it a sensitive gauge of both traditional and emergent forms of sociability and identity, and a key resource in both the construction and the critical inversion of social order (8, 15, 50, 69, 70, 92, 142, 173, 174, 178). Perhaps this is why Lévi-Strauss' *The Raw and the Cooked* (196) is the only anthropological work audacious enough ever to bear the dedication "To Music." Ironically, when all is said and sung, it was the structuralist tradition that made anthropology and linguistics pay attention to the social immanence of

music's supreme mystery, the grooving redundancy of elegant structuring that affectively connects the singularity of form to the multiplicity of sense.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For years of dialogue on many of the issues discussed here we thank Joel Sherzer and Greg Urban. We also thank Cindie McLemore and Tony Woodbury for coaching us on recent linguistic research in discourse prosodics and intonation, but don't hold them responsible for our lack of comprehensiveness in this area.

**Any *Annual Review* chapter, as well as any article cited in an *Annual Review* chapter, may be purchased from the Annual Reviews Preprints and Reprints service. 1-800-347-8007; 415-259-5017; email: arpr@class.org**

#### Literature Cited

1. Abu-Lughod L. 1986. *Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
2. Abu-Lughod L. 1990. Shifting politics in Bedouin love poetry. See Ref. 217, pp. 24–45
3. Abu-Lughod L. 1993. Islam and the gendered discourses of death. *Int. J. Mid. East. Stud.* 25:187–205
4. Agawu VK. 1984. The impact of language on musical composition in Ghana: an introduction to the compositional style of Ephraim Amu. *Ethnomusicology* 28(1): 37–74
5. Agawu VK. 1988. Music in the funeral traditions of the Akpafu. *Ethnomusicology* 32(1):75–105
6. Ajuwon B. 1981. Lament for the dead as a universal folk tradition. *Fabula* 22:272–80
7. Alexiou M. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
8. Attali J. 1985. *Noise: The Political Economy of Music*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
9. Auerbach S. 1987. From singing to lamenting: women's musical role in a Greek village. See Ref. 184, pp. 25–43
10. Austerlitz R. 1983. Meaning in music: Is music like a language and if so, how? *Am. J. Semiot.* 2(3):1–11
11. Baily J. 1985. Music structure and human movement. In *Musical Structure and Cognition*, ed. P Howell, I Cross, R West, pp. 237–58. London: Academic
12. Baily J. 1988. Anthropological and psychological approaches to the study of music theory and musical cognition. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 20:114–24
13. Barnouw E. 1989. *International Encyclopedia of Communication*, ed. E Barnouw, Vol. 1–4. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
14. Barthes R. 1977. The grain of the voice. In *Image—Music—Text*, pp. 179–89. London: Fontana
15. Basso EB. 1985. *A Musical View of the Universe: Kalapalo Myth and Ritual Performances*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
16. Bauman R. 1977. *Verbal Art as Performance*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland
17. Bauman R, ed. 1992. *Folklore, Cultural Performances, and Popular Entertainments: A Communications-Centered Handbook*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
18. Bauman R, Briggs CL. 1990. Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 19:59–88
19. Bauman R, Sherzer J. 1975. The ethnography of speaking. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 4:95–119
20. Bauman R, Sherzer J, eds. 1989. *Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press. 2nd ed.
21. Beaudry N. 1978. Toward transcription and analysis of Inuit throat-games: macro-structure. *Ethnomusicology* 22(2):261–73
22. Becker A, Becker J. 1979. A grammar of the musical genre *srepegan*. *J. Music Theory* 23(1):1–43
23. Becker J, Becker A. 1981. A musical icon: power and meaning in Javanese gamelan music. See Ref. 324, pp. 203–16
24. Béhague G, ed. 1984. *Performance Practice*. New York: Greenwood



25. Besnier N. 1990. Language and affect. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 19:419–52
26. Birdwhistell R. 1970. *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
27. Blacking J. 1971. Deep and surface structures in Venda music. *Yearb. Int. Folk Music Counc.* 3:91–108
28. Blacking J. 1973. *How Musical Is Man?* Seattle: Univ. Wash. Press
29. Blacking J, ed. 1977. *The Anthropology of the Body*. London: Academic
30. Blacking J. 1981. The problem of 'ethnic' perceptions in the semiotics of music. See Ref. 324, pp. 184–94
31. Blacking J. 1982. The structure of musical discourse: the problem of the song text. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 14:15–23
32. Blacking J. 1992. The biology of music making. See Ref. 240, pp. 301–14
33. Bloch M, Parry J, eds. 1982. *Death and the Regeneration of Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
34. Blum S. 1975. Toward a social history of musicological technique. *Ethnomusicology* 19(2):207–32
35. Blum S, Bohlman PV, Neuman DM, eds. 1991. *Ethnomusicology and Modern Music History*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
36. Bohlman PV. 1988. *The Study of Folk Music in the Modern World*. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
37. Boilés C. 1967. Tepehua thought-song: a case of semantic signalling. *Ethnomusicology* 11(3):267–91
38. Boilés C. 1982. Processes of musical semiosis. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 14:24–44
39. Bolinger D. 1978. Intonation across languages. In *Universals of Human Language*. Vol. 2: *Phonology*, ed. J Greenberg, pp. 471–524. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
40. Bolinger D. 1986. *Intonation and its Parts: Melody in Spoken English*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
41. Bolinger D. 1989. *Intonation and its Uses*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
42. Bolinger D. 1992. Sound symbolism. In *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, ed. W Bright, 4:28–30. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
43. Boswell G. 1977. Pitch: musical and verbal in folksong. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 9:80–88
44. Bourdieu P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
45. Bourdieu P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
46. Brenneis DL. 1987. Performing passions: aesthetics and politics in an occasionally egalitarian community. *Am. Ethnol.* 14(2): 236–50
47. Brenneis DL. 1988. Language and disputing. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 17:221–38
48. Briggs CL. 1988. *Competence in Performance: The Creativity of Tradition in Mexican Verbal Art*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
49. Briggs CL. 1992. Since I am a woman I will chastise my relatives: gender, reported speech, and the (re)production of social relations in Warao ritual wailing. *Am. Ethnol.* 19(2):337–61
50. Briggs CL. 1993. Personal sentiments and polyphonic voices in Warao women's ritual wailing: music and poetics in a critical and collective discourse. *Am. Anthropol.* 95(4):929–57
51. Bright W. 1963. Language and music: areas for cooperation. *Ethnomusicology* 7(1): 23–32
52. Burrows D. 1990. *Sound, Speech and Music*. Amherst: Univ. Mass. Press
53. Busnel RG. 1966. Information in the human whistled language and sea mammal whistling. In *Whales, Dolphins, and Porpoises*, ed. K Norris, pp. 544–68. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
54. Caraveli A. 1986. The bitter wounding: the lament as social protest in rural Greece. In *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*, ed. J Dubisch, pp. 169–94. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
55. Caraveli-Chaves A. 1980. Bridge between worlds: the Greek women's lament as communicative event. *J. Am. Folklore* 93:129–57
56. Carrington J. 1971. The talking drums of Africa. *Sci. Am.* 225(6):90–94
57. Cederroth S, Corlin C, Lindstrom J, eds. 1988. *On the Meaning of Death: Essays on Mortuary Rituals and Eschatological Beliefs*. Uppsala Stud. Cult. Anthropol. 8. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell
58. Chao YR. 1956. Tones, intonation, song, chanting, recitative, tonal composition, and atonal composition in Chinese. See Ref. 118, pp. 52–59
59. Charron C. 1978. Toward transcription and analysis of Inuit throat-games: micro-structure. *Ethnomusicology* 22(2):245–59
60. Chenoweth V. 1968. Managalasi mourning songs. *Ethnomusicology* 12(3):415–18
61. Chenoweth V. 1972. *Melodic Perception and Analysis*. Papua New Guinea: Summer Inst. Linguist.
62. Chenoweth V. 1979. *The Usarufas and their music*. Summer Inst. Ling. Mus. Anthropol., Dallas, Texas
63. Chenoweth V, Bee D. 1971. Comparative-generative models of a New Guinea melodic structure. *Am. Anthropol.* 73:773–82
64. Chernoff JM. 1979. *African Rhythm and African Sensibility*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
65. Cogan R, Escot P. 1976. *Sonic Design: The*



- Nature of Sound and Music*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
66. Coker W. 1972. *Music and Meaning*. New York: Free Press
  67. Cooke D. 1959. *The Language of Music*. London: Oxford Univ. Press
  68. Cooper R. 1977. Abstract structure and the Indian raga system. *Ethnomusicology* 21(1):1–32
  69. Coplan D. 1987. Eloquent knowledge: Lesotho migrants' songs and the anthropology of experience. *Am. Ethnol.* 14(3):413–33
  70. Coplan D. 1988. Musical understanding: the ethnoaesthetics of migrant workers' poetic song in Lesotho. *Ethnomusicology* 32(3):337–68
  71. Cowan GM. 1948. Mazateco whistle speech. *Language* 24:280–86
  72. Crafts S, Cavicchi D, Keil C. 1993. *My Music*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan Univ. Press
  73. Crystal D. 1971. Prosodic and paralinguistic correlates of social categories. In *Social Anthropology and Language*, ed. E Ardenner, pp. 185–206. ASA Monogr. London: Tavistock
  74. Damon F, Wagner R, eds. 1989. *Death Rituals and Life in Societies of the Kula Ring*. DeKalb: N. Ill. Univ. Press
  75. Danes F. 1960. Sentence intonation from a functional point of view. *Word* 16:34–54
  76. Danes F. 1984. Review of Gardiner. *Lang. Soc.* 13(1):113–17
  - 76a. Danforth LM. 1982. *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
  77. Davis GL. 1985. *I Got the Word in Me and I Can Sing It, You Know: A Study of the Performed African-American Sermon*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  78. Deutsch HA. 1976. *Synthesis: An Introduction to the History, Theory, and Practice of Electronic Music*. New York: Alfred
  79. Dixon RMW. 1980. *The Languages of Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  80. Dodge C. 1980. Speech songs. In *Text-Sound Texts*, ed. R Kostelanetz, pp. 362–64. New York: Morrow
  81. Dowling WJ, Harwood DL. 1986. *Music Cognition*. Orlando, FL: Academic
  82. Duranti A. 1988. Ethnography of speaking: toward a linguistics of the praxis. In *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey*. Vol. 4: *Language: The Socio-Cultural Context*, ed. FJ Newmeyer, pp. 210–28. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  83. Durbin MA. 1971. Transformational models applied to musical analysis: theoretical possibilities. *Ethnomusicology* 15(3):353–62
  84. Durkheim E. 1965. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. New York: Free Press
  85. Erickson E. 1976. Tradition and evolution in song style. *Behav. Sci. Res.* 11(1):277–308
  86. Erickson R. 1975. *Sound Structure in Music*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
  87. Evans JR, Clynes M, eds. 1986. *Rhythm in Psychological, Linguistic, and Musical Processes*. Springfield, IL: Thomas
  88. Feld S. 1974. Linguistic models in ethnomusicology. *Ethnomusicology* 18(2):197–217
  89. Feld S. 1981. 'Flow like a waterfall': the metaphors of Kaluli musical theory. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 13:22–47
  90. Feld S. 1984. Communication, music, and speech about music. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 16:1–18
  91. Feld S. 1984. Sound structure as social structure. *Ethnomusicology* 28(3):383–409
  92. Feld S. 1988. Aesthetics as iconicity of style, or 'lift-up-over sounding': getting into the Kaluli groove. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 20:74–113
  93. Feld S. 1989. Sound. See Ref. 13, 4:101–7
  94. Feld S. 1990. *Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics and Song in Kaluli Expression*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press. 2nd ed.
  95. Feld S. 1990. Wept thoughts: the voicing of Kaluli memories. *Oral Tradit.* 5(2–3):241–66
  96. Feld S. 1991. Sound as a symbolic system: the Kaluli drum. In *The Varieties of Sensory Experience: A Sourcebook in the Anthropology of the Senses*, ed. D Howes, pp. 79–99. Toronto: Univ. Toronto Press
  97. Fernandez JW. 1986. Syllogisms of association: some modern extensions of Asturian deepsong. In *Persuasions and Performances: The Play of Tropes in Culture*, ed. J Fernandez, pp. 103–28. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
  98. Finnegan R. 1988. *Literacy and Orality*. Oxford: Blackwell
  99. Finnegan R. 1992. *Oral Traditions and the Verbal Arts: A Guide to Research Practices*. London: Routledge
  100. Firth R, with McLean M. 1990. *Tikopia Songs: Poetic and Musical Art of a Polynesian People of the Solomon Islands*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  101. Foley JM. 1988. *The Theory of Oral Composition*. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
  102. Fonagy I. 1981. Emotions, voice, and music. In *Research Aspects of Singing*, 3:51–79. Royal Swedish Academy of Music
  103. Fox A. 1992. The jukebox of history: narratives of loss and desire in the discourse of country music. *Pop. Music* 11(1):53–72
  104. Franklin CL. 1989. *Give Me This Mountain: Life History and Selected Sermons*, ed. JT Titon. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
  105. Frisbie C. 1980. Vocables in Navajo cere-

- monial music. *Ethnomusicology* 24(3): 347–92
106. Frisbie C, ed. 1980. *Southwestern Indian Ritual Drama*. Albuquerque: Univ. N. Mex. Press
  107. Frisbie C, ed. 1986. *Explorations in Ethnomusicology: Essays in Honor of David P. McAllester*. Detroit: Detroit Monogr. Musicol.
  108. Frith S. 1988. Why do songs have words? In *Music for Pleasure*, ed. S Frith, pp. 105–28. London: Routledge
  109. Gal S. 1989. Language and political economy. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 18:345–67
  110. Gardiner DB. 1980. *Intonation and Music: The Semantics of Czech Prosody*. Bloomington, IN: Phylssardt
  111. Geertz C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic
  112. Gilroy P. 1991. 'There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack': *The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  113. Goodman N. 1976. *Languages of Art*. Indianapolis: Hackett. 2nd ed.
  114. Goody J. 1962. *Death, Property, and the Ancestors*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
  115. Graham L. 1986. Three modes of Shavante vocal expression: wailing, collective singing, and political oratory. See Ref. 310, pp. 83–118
  116. Grenier L, Guibault J. 1990. 'Authority' revisited: the 'other' in anthropology and popular music studies. *Ethnomusicology* 34(3):381–98
  117. Grima B. 1992. *The Performance of Emotion Among Paxtun Women*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
  118. Halle M, Lunt HG, McLean H, Van Schooneveld CH, eds. 1956. For *Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*. The Hague: Mouton
  119. Hanks W. 1989. Text and textuality. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 18:95–127
  120. Harweg R. 1968. Language and music: an immanent and sign theoretic approach. *Found. Lang.* 4:270–81
  121. Hatten RS. 1980. Nattiez's semiology of music: flaws in the new science. *Semiotica* 31(1–2):139–55
  122. Hatten RS. 1987. Style, motivation, and markedness. See Ref. 293, pp. 408–29
  123. Hebdige D. 1979. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. New York: Methuen
  124. Henrotte GA. 1988. *Language, linguistics, and music: a source study*. PhD thesis. Univ. Calif., Berkeley
  125. Herndon M. 1974. Analysis: the herding of sacred cows? *Ethnomusicology* 18:219–62
  126. Herndon M. 1989. Song. See Ref. 13, 4:98–101
  127. Herndon M, McLeod N. 1979. *Music as Culture*. Norwood, PA: Norwood
  128. Herndon M, Ziegler S, eds. 1990. *Music, Gender, and Culture*. Wilhelmshaven: Florian Noetzel Verlag
  129. Hertz R. 1960. A contribution to the study of the collective representation of death. In *Death and the Right Hand*, ed. R Hertz, pp. 27–86. New York: Free Press
  130. Herzfeld M. 1981. Performative categories and symbols of passage in rural Greece. *J. Am. Folklore* 94:44–57
  131. Herzfeld M. 1985. *The Poetics of Manhood: Contest and Identity in a Cretan Mountain Village*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
  132. Herzfeld M. 1993. In defiance of destiny: the management of time and gender at a Cretan funeral. *Am. Ethnol.* 20(2):241–255
  133. Herzog G. 1934. Speech melody and primitive music. *Music Q.* 20:452–66
  134. Herzog G. 1942. Text and melody in primitive music. *Bull. Am. Musicol. Soc.* 6:10–11
  135. Herzog G. 1945. Drum signalling in a West African tribe. *Word* 1:217–38
  136. Herzog G. 1950. Song. In *Funk & Wagnall's Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend*, ed. M Leach, 2:1032–50. New York: Funk & Wagnall's
  137. Higgins KM. 1991. *The Music of Our Lives*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
  138. Hill CA, Podstavsky S. 1976. The interfacing of language and music in Hausa praise-singing. *Ethnomusicology* 20(3): 535–40
  139. Hill JD. 1993. *Keepers of the Sacred Chants: The Poetics of Ritual Power in an Amazonian Society*. Tucson: Univ. Ariz. Press
  140. Hill JH. 1990. Weeping as a meta-signal in a Mexicano woman's narrative. In *Native Latin American Cultures Through Their Discourse*, ed. EB Basso, pp. 29–49. Bloomington: Folklore Inst., Indiana Univ.
  141. Hinton L. 1980. Vocables in Havasupai song. See Ref. 106, pp. 275–305
  142. Hinton L. 1984. *Havasupai Songs: A Linguistic Perspective*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag
  143. Hinton L. 1986. Musical diffusion and linguistic diffusion. See Ref. 107, pp. 11–24
  144. Hinton L. 1990. Song metrics. In *Berkeley Linguistics Society: Proc. 16th Annu. Meet., Special Session on General Topics in Am. Indian Ling.*, pp. 51–60. Berkeley: Dept. Ling., Univ. Calif., Berkeley
  145. Holmes JD. 1985. *Electronic and Experimental Music*. New York: Scribners
  146. Holst-Warhaft G. 1992. *Dangerous Voices: Women's Laments and Greek Literature*. New York: Routledge
  147. Honko L. 1974. Balto-Finnic lament poetry. *Stud. Fennica* 17:9–61
  148. Honko L. 1980. The lament: problems of genre, structure, and reproduction. In

- Genre, Structure and Reproduction in Oral Literature*, ed. L Honko, V Voigt, pp. 21–40. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado
149. Hosokawa S. 1984. How Saussurian is music? In *Musical Grammars and Computer Analysis*, ed. M Baroni, L Callegari, pp. 155–63. Firenze: Olschki
  150. Houghton C. 1984. *Structure in language and music: a linguistic approach*. PhD thesis. Stanford Univ.
  151. Hughes DW. 1988. Deep structure and surface structure in Javanese music: a grammar of *gendhing lampah*. *Ethnomusicology* 32(1):23–74
  152. Humphreys SC, King H, eds. 1981. *Mortality and Immortality: The Anthropology and Archeology of Death*. London: Academic
  153. Hymes D. 1974. *Foundations of Sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  154. Hymes D. 1981. 'In Vain I Tried to Tell You': *Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  155. Irvine J. 1990. Registering affect: heteroglossia in the linguistic expression of emotion. See Ref. 217, pp. 126–61
  156. Jackendoff R. 1989. A comparison of rhythmic structures in music and language. See Ref. 181, pp. 15–44
  157. Jakobson R. 1960. Concluding statement: linguistics and poetics. See Ref. 292, pp. 350–77
  158. Jakobson R. 1985. *Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time*, ed. K Pomorska, S Rudy. Oxford: Blackwell
  159. Jakobson R. 1987. *Language in Literature*, ed. K Pomorska, S Rudy. Cambridge, MA: Belknap
  160. Jakobson R. 1987. Musicology and linguistics. See Ref. 159, pp. 455–57
  161. Jakobson R, Waugh LR. 1979. *The Sound Shape of Language*. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
  162. Johnson A. 1984. Voice physiology and ethnomusicology: physiological and acoustical studies of the Swedish herding song. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 16:42–66
  163. Kaeppler A. 1978. Dance in anthropological perspective. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 7: 31–49
  164. Kaeppler A. 1986. Cultural analysis, linguistic analogies, and the study of dance in anthropological perspective. See Ref. 107, pp. 25–34
  165. Kaeppler A. 1989. Dance. See Ref. 13, 1:450–54
  166. Kaeppler A. 1991. American approaches to the study of dance. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 23:11–22
  167. Kaeppler A. 1993. Poetics and politics of Tongan laments and eulogies. *Am. Ethnol.* 20(3):474–501
  168. Karbusicky V. 1987. The index sign in music. *Semiotica* 66(1–3):22–36
  169. Karbusicky V. 1987. Signification in music: a metaphor? See Ref. 293, pp. 430–44
  170. Kaufman N. 1990. Lamentations from four continents, after materials from Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. *Int. Folklore Rev.* 7:22–29
  171. Kaufman N, Kaufman D. 1988. *Funeral and Other Lamentations in Bulgaria*. Sofia: Bulgarian Acad. Sci. (In Bulgarian with English précis)
  172. Keil C. 1966. Motion and feeling through music. *J. Aesthet. Art Crit.* 24:337–49
  173. Keil C. 1979. *Tiv Song*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  174. Keil C. 1984. Response to Feld and Roseman. *Ethnomusicology* 28(3):446–49
  175. Keil C. 1985. People's music comparatively: style and stereotype, class and hegemony. *Dialect. Anthropol.* 10:119–30
  176. Keil C. 1987. Participatory discrepancies and the power of music. *Cult. Anthropol.* 2(3):275–83
  177. Keil C. 1991. *Urban Blues*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 2nd ed.
  178. Keil C, Feld S. 1994. *Music Grooves*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  179. Keiler A. 1981. Two views of musical semiotics. See Ref. 324, pp. 138–68
  180. Kingsbury H. 1988. *Music, Talent and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System*. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press
  181. Kiparsky P, Youmans G, eds. 1989. *Phonetics and Phonology*. Vol. 1: *Rhythm and Meter*. San Diego: Academic
  182. Kippen J. 1987. An ethnomusicological approach to the analysis of musical cognition. *Music Percept.* 5(2):173–96
  183. Kligman G. 1988. *The Wedding of the Dead: Ritual, Poetics, and Popular Culture in Transylvania*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
  184. Koskoff E, ed. 1987. *Women and Music in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New York: Greenwood
  185. Kratz CA. 1994. *Affecting Performance: Meaning, Movement, and Experience in Okiek Women's Initiation*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Inst. Press
  186. Kuipers J. 1990. *Power in Performance: The Creation of Textual Authority in Weyewa Ritual Speech*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  187. Ladd DR. 1980. *The Structure of Intonational Meaning: Evidence From English*. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
  188. Ladd DR. 1990. Intonation: emotion vs. grammar. *Language* 66(4):806–16
  189. Langer S. 1957. *Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press. 3rd ed.
  190. Laske O. 1977. *Music, Memory, and Thought: Explorations in Cognitive Musi-*

- cology. Pittsburgh: Music Dept., Univ. Pittsburgh
191. Laske O, ed. 1986. Cognitive musicology. Special Issue of *J. Integr. Stud. Artif. Intell. Cogn. Sci. Appl. Epistemol.* 3(3)
  192. Laver J. 1980. *The Phonetic Description of Voice Quality*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  193. Leben WR. 1985. On the correspondence between linguistic tone and musical melody. In *African Linguistics: Essays in Memory of M.W.K. Semikenke*, ed. DL Goyvaerts, pp. 335–43. Amsterdam: Benjamins
  194. Lerdahl F, Jackendoff R. 1983. *A Generative Theory of Tonal Music*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
  195. Lévi-Strauss C. 1963. *Structural Anthropology*. New York: Doubleday
  196. Lévi-Strauss C. 1969. *The Raw and the Cooked*. New York: Harper
  197. Lévi-Strauss C. 1985. *The View From Afar*. New York: Basic
  198. Levman B. 1992. The genesis of music and language. *Ethnomusicology* 36(2):147–70
  199. Lewis JL. 1992. *Ring of Liberation*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  200. Liberman M, McLemore C, eds. 1992. *Proceedings of the IRCS Workshop on Prosody in Natural Speech*. IRCS Report No. 92–37. Philadelphia: Inst. Res. Cogn. Sci., Univ. Penn.
  201. Lidov D. 1975. *On the Musical Phrase*. Monogr. sémiol. anal. music., No. 1. Montréal: Groupe Rech. Sémiol. Music., Univ. Montréal
  202. Lidov D. 1977. Nattiez's semiotics of music. *Can. J. Res. Semiotics* 5(2):13–54
  203. Lidov D. 1980. Musical and verbal semantics. *Semiotica* 31(3/4):369–91
  204. Lindblom B, Sundberg J. 1975. A generative theory of Swedish nursery tunes. *Actes du 1er congrès international de sémiotique musicale*, pp. 111–24. Pesaro: Cent. Iniziative Cult.
  205. Linggard R. 1985. *Electronic Synthesis of Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  206. List G. 1961. Speech melody and song melody in central Thailand. *Ethnomusicology* 5:16–32
  207. List G. 1963. The boundaries of speech and song. *Ethnomusicology* 7(1):1–16
  208. Lloyd AL. 1980. Lament. In *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. S Sadie, pp. 407–10. London: Macmillan
  209. Lomax A. 1967. Special features of the sung communication. In *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts: Proc. 1966 Annu. Spring Meet. Am. Ethnol. Soc.*, ed. J Helm, pp. 109–27. Seattle: Univ. Wash. Press
  210. Lomax A. 1968. *Folk Song Style and Culture*. Washington, DC: Am. Acad. Advance. Sci.
  211. Lomax A. 1977. *Cantometrics: An Approach to the Anthropology of Music*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Extension Media Center
  212. Lomax A. 1977. A stylistic analysis of speaking. *Lang. Soc.* 6(1):5–36
  213. Lomax A, Bartenieff I, Paulay F. 1969. Choreometrics: a method for the study of cross-cultural pattern in film. *Res. Film* 6(6):505–17
  214. Lomax A, Berkowitz N. 1972. An evolutionary taxonomy of culture. *Science* 177: 228–39
  215. Longacre RE, Chenoweth V. 1986. Discourse as music. *Word* 37(1):125–39
  216. Lutz C. 1988. *Unnatural Emotions*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  217. Lutz C, Abu-Lughod L, eds. 1990. *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. New York: Cambridge Univ Press
  218. Lutz C, White GM. 1986. The anthropology of emotions. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 15:405–36
  219. Mannheim B. 1986. Popular song and popular grammar, poetry and metalanage. *Word* 37(1–2):45–75
  220. Mannheim B. 1987. Couplets and oblique contexts: the social organization of a folksong. *Text* 7(3):265–88
  221. Marothy J. 1974. *Music and the Bourgeois, Music and the Proletariat*. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado
  222. Matthews PH. 1982. Formalization. In *Linguistic Controversies: Essays in Linguistic Theory and Practice in Honor of F.R. Palmer*, ed. D Crystal, pp. 1–15. London: Arnold
  223. Mauss M. 1979. The physical effect on the individual of the idea of death suggested by the collectivity. In *Sociology and Psychology*, ed. M Mauss, pp. 35–56. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
  224. McAllester DP. 1954. *Enemy way music*. Pap. Peabody Mus. Am. Archaeol. Ethnol. 41(3). Cambridge, MA: Peabody Mus., Harvard Univ.
  225. McClary S. 1991. *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality*. Minneapolis: Univ. Minn. Press
  226. McLemore CA. 1991. *The pragmatic interpretation of English intonation: sorority speech*. PhD thesis. Univ. Texas, Austin
  227. McLeod N. 1974. Ethnomusicological research and anthropology. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 3:99–115
  228. McLeod N, Herndon M, eds. 1980. *The Ethnography of Musical Performance*. Norwood, PA: Norwood
  - 228a. Meintjes L. 1990. Paul Simon's Graceland, South Africa, and the mediation of musical meaning. *Ethnomusicology* 34(1):37–73

229. Merriam A. 1964. *The Anthropology of Music*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern Univ. Press
230. Merriam A. 1975. Ethnomusicology today. *Curr. Musicol.* 20:50–66
231. Mertz E, Parmentier R, eds. 1985. *Semiotic Mediation: Sociocultural and Psychological Perspectives*. Orlando, FL: Academic
232. Metcalf P, Huntington R. 1991. *Celebrations of Death: The Anthropology of Mortuary Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 2nd ed.
233. Meyer L. 1956. *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
234. Meyer L. 1967. Meaning in music and information theory. In *Music, the Arts, and Ideas*, ed. L Meyer, pp. 5–21. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
235. Meyer L. 1973. *Explaining Music*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
236. Meyer L. 1989. *Style in Music*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
237. Meyer L, Cooper G. 1960. *The Rhythmic Structure of Music*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
238. Miller CA. 1992. Prosodic aspects of M.L. King's 'I Have A Dream' speech. See Ref. 200, pp. 129–37
239. Moles A. 1968. *Information Theory and Esthetic Perception*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
240. Myers H, ed. 1992. *Ethnomusicology: An Introduction*. New York: Norton
241. Narmour E. 1977. *Beyond Schenkerism*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
242. Nattiez JJ. 1972. Linguistics: a new approach for musical analysis? *Int. Rev. Aesthet. Sociol. Music* 4(1):51–67
243. Nattiez JJ. 1977. The contribution of musical semiotics to the semiotic discussion in general. In *A Perfursion of Signs*, ed. TA Sebeok, pp. 121–42. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
244. Nattiez JJ. 1983. Some aspects of Inuit vocal games. *Ethnomusicology* 27(3):457–75
245. Nattiez JJ. 1990. *Music and Discourse: Toward a Semiology of Music*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
246. Nelson K. 1985. *The Art of Reciting Qur'an*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
247. Nenola-Kallio A. 1982. *Studies in Ingrian Laments. Folklore Fellows Communication* 234. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia
248. Ness SA. 1992. *Body, Movement, and Culture*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
249. Nettl B. 1958. Some linguistic approaches to musical analysis. *J. Int. Folk Music Counc.* 10:37–41
250. Nettl B, Bohlman PV, eds. 1991. *Comparative Musicology and the Anthropology of Music: Essays on the History of Ethnomusicology*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
251. Nketia JHK. 1969. *Funeral Dirges of the Akan People*. New York: Greenwood
252. Nketia JHK. 1971. Surrogate languages of Africa. In *Current Trends in Linguistics*, ed. TA Sebeok, 7:699–732. The Hague: Mouton
253. Novack CJ. 1990. *Sharing the Dance: Contact Improvisation and American Culture*. Madison: Univ. Wisc. Press
254. Ochs E, Schieffelin B. 1984. Language acquisition and socialization: three developmental stories and their implications. In *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*, ed. RA Shweder, RA LeVine, pp. 276–320. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
255. Oliva J. 1977. *Structure of music and structure of language: a semiotic study*. PhD thesis. State Univ. NY, Buffalo
256. Ong W. 1977. African talking drums and oral noetics. *New Lit. Hist.* 8(3):411–29
257. Palgi P, Abramovitch H. 1984. Death: a cross-cultural perspective. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 13:385–417
258. Pegg C. 1992. Mongolian conceptualizations of overtone singing (*xöömii*). *Br. J. Ethnomusicol.* 1:31–54
259. Peña M. 1985. *The Texas-Mexican Conjunto: History of a Working-Class Music*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
260. Pierce A. 1987. Music and movement. See Ref. 293, pp. 514–35
261. Powers HS. 1980. Language models and musical analysis. *Ethnomusicology* 24(1): 1–61
262. Powers WK. 1980. Oglala song terminology. *Sel. Rep. Ethnomusicol.* 3(2):23–41
263. Pugh-Kitingan J. 1977. Huli language and instrumental performance. *Ethnomusicology* 21(2):205–32
264. Prociuk P. 1981. The deep structure of Ukrainian hardship songs. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 13:82–96
265. Qureshi R. 1987. Musical sound and contextual input: a performance model for musical analysis. *Ethnomusicology* 31(1):56–86
266. Radcliffe-Brown AR. 1964. *The Andaman Islanders*. New York: Free Press
267. Raffman D. 1990. *Language, Music, and Mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
268. Rice T. 1987. Toward the remodeling of ethnomusicology, and responses. *Ethnomusicology* 31(3):469–16
269. Richards P. 1972. A quantitative analysis of the relationship between speech tone and melody in a Hausa song. *Afr. Lang. Stud.* 13:137–61
270. Richman B. 1980. Did human speech originate in coordinated vocal music? *Semiotica* 32(3/4):233–44
271. Rosaldo R. 1984. Grief and the head-hunter's rage: on the cultural force of emotions. In *Text, Play and Story: The Con-*



- struction and Reconstruction of Self and Society, ed. E Bruner, pp. 178–95. Washington, DC: Am. Ethnol. Soc.
272. Roseman M. 1984. The social structuring of sound among the Temiar of Peninsular Malaysia. *Ethnomusicology* 28(3):411–45
273. Roseman M. 1991. *Healing Sounds from the Malaysian Rainforest: Temiar Music and Meacine*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif Press
274. Rosenberg B. 1970. *The Art of the American Folk Preacher*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press
275. Rosenblatt P, Walsh R, Jackson A. 1976. *Grief and Mourning in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. New Haven, CT: HRAF Press
276. Rosner B, Meyer L. 1986. The perceptual roles of melodic process, contour and form. *Music Percept.* 4:1–39
277. Rouget G. 1966. African traditional non-prose forms: reciting, declaiming, singing, and strophic structures. In *Proc. Conf. Afr. Lang. Lit.*, April 28–30, pp. 45–58. Evanston, IL: Northwestern Univ. Press
278. Rouget G. 1971. Court songs and traditional history in the ancient kingdoms of Porto-Novo and Abomey. In *Essays on Music and History in Africa*, ed. K Wachsmann, pp. 27–64. Evanston, IL: Northwestern Univ. Press
279. Rouget G. 1977. Retrieving the world's disappearing music. *CNRS Res.* 5:38–48
280. Ruwet N. 1967. Linguistics and musicology. *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 19:79–87
281. Rycroft DK. 1983. The relationship between speech-tone and melody in Southern African music. In *South African Music Encyclopedia*, Vol. 2, ed. K Wachsmann, pp. 301–14. Cape Town: Cape Town/Oxford Univ. Press
282. Sakata HL. 1983. *Music in the Mind: The Concepts of Music and Musician in Afghanistan*. Kent, OH: Kent State Univ. Press
283. Samarin W. 1972. *Tongues of Men and Angels: The Religious Language of Pentecostalism*. New York: Macmillan
284. Sapir E. 1910. Song recitative in Paiute mythology. *J. Am. Folklore* 23:455–72
285. Sapir E. 1918. Representative music. *Mus. Q.* 4:161–67
286. Sapir E. 1921. The musical foundations of verse. *J. Engl. Germ. Philol.* 20:213–28
287. Sapir E. 1925. The sound patterns in language. *Language* 1:37–51
288. Sapir JD. 1969. Diola-Fogny funeral songs and the native critic. *Afr. Lang. Rev.* 8:176–91
289. Sarkissian M. 1992. Gender and music. See Ref. 240, pp. 337–48
290. Schneider M. 1961. Tone and tune in West African music. *Ethnomusicology* 5(3): 204–15
291. Schutz A. 1951. Making music together: a study in social relationship. *Soc. Res.* 18(1):76–97
292. Sebeok T, ed. 1960. *Style in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
293. Sebeok T, Umiker-Sebeok DJ, eds. 1987. *The Semiotic Web 1986*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
294. Sedelow WA, Sedelow SY, eds. 1983. *Computers in Language Research*. Vol. 2: *Notating the Language of Music and the (Pause) Rhythms of Speech*. Trends Ling. Stud. Monogr. 19. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
295. Seeger A. 1980. 'Sing for your sister': the structure and performance of Suyá akia. See Ref. 228, pp. 7–42
296. Seeger A. 1986. Oratory is spoken, myth is told, and song is sung, but they are all music to my ears. See Ref. 310, pp. 59–82
297. Seeger A. 1987. *Why Suyá Sing: A Musical Anthropology of an Amazonian People*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
298. Seeger A. 1992. Ethnography of music. See Ref. 240, pp. 88–109
299. Seeger C. 1977. Speech, music, and speech about music. In *Studies in Musicology, 1935–1975*, ed. C Seeger, pp. 16–30. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
300. Serafine ML. 1988. *Music as Cognition: The Development of Thought in Sound*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press
301. Seremataakis CN. 1991. *The Last Word: Women, Death, and Divination in Inner Mani*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
302. Shepherd J. 1977. The 'meaning' of music. See Ref. 305, pp. 53–68
303. Shepherd J. 1987. Music and male hegemony. In *Music and Society*, ed. R Leppert, S McClary, pp. 151–72. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
304. Shepherd J. 1991. *Music as Social Text*. Cambridge, UK: Polity
305. Shepherd J, Virden P, Vulliamy G, Wishart T. 1977. *Whose Music? A Sociology of Musical Languages*. London: Latimer
306. Sherzer J. 1983. *Kuna Ways of Speaking: An Ethnographic Perspective*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
307. Sherzer J. 1987. A diversity of voices: men's and women's speech in ethnographic perspective. In *Language, Gender and Sex in Comparative Perspective*, ed. SU Phillips, S Steele, C Tanz, pp. 95–120. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
308. Sherzer J. 1987. Poetic structuring of Kuna discourse: the line. See Ref. 312, pp. 103–39
309. Sherzer J. 1987. A discourse-centered approach to language and culture. *Am. Anthropol.* 89(2):295–309
310. Sherzer J, Urban G, eds. 1986. *Native South American Discourse*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
311. Sherzer J, Wicks SA. 1982. The intersec-

- tion of music and language in Kuna discourse. *Latin Am. Music Rev.* 3(2):147–64
312. Sherzer J, Woodbury A, eds. 1987. *Native American Discourse: Poetics and Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  313. Silverstein M. 1976. Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In *Meaning in Anthropology*, ed. KH Basso, H Selby, pp. 11–55. Albuquerque: Univ. N. Mex. Press
  314. Silverstein M. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In *The Elements: A Parasession On Linguistic Units and Levels*, ed. P Clyne, W Hanks, C Hofbauer, pp. 193–247. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  315. Singer A. 1974. The metrical structure of Macedonian dance. *Ethnomusicology* 18(3):379–404
  316. Singer M. 1984. *Man's Glassy Essence: Explorations in Semiotic Anthropology*. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
  317. Slawson W. 1985. *Sound Color*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
  318. Slobin M. 1986. Multilingualism in folk music cultures. See Ref. 107, pp. 3–10
  319. Slobin M. 1993. *Subcultural Sounds: Micromusics of the West*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan Univ. Press
  320. Sloboda JA. 1985. *The Musical Mind*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
  321. Smith H, Stevens K. 1967. Unique vocal abilities of certain Tibetan lamas. *Am. Anthropol.* 69:209–12
  322. Spencer P. 1985. *Society and the Dance*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press
  323. Springer G. 1956. Language and music: parallels and divergences. See Ref. 118, pp. 504–13
  324. Steiner W, ed. 1981. *The Sign in Music and Literature*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
  325. Stern T. 1957. Drum and whistle languages: an analysis of speech surrogates. *Am. Anthropol.* 59:487–506
  326. Stone R. 1981. Toward a Kpelle conceptualization of music performance. *J. Am. Folklore* 94(372):188–206
  327. Storr A. 1992. *Music and the Mind*. New York: Free Press
  328. Sundberg J. 1969. Articulatory differences between spoken and sung vowels. *Speech Transmission Lab. Q. Progr. Status Rep.* 1:33–46. Stockholm: Royal Inst. Technol.
  329. Sundberg J. 1977. The acoustics of the singing voice. *Sci. Am.* 231(3):82–91
  330. Sundberg J. 1987. *The Science of the Singing Voice*. Dekalb: N. Ill. Univ. Press
  331. Sundberg J, Lindblom B. 1976. Generative theories in language and music descriptions. *Cognition* 4(1):99–122
  332. Supicic I. 1987. *Music and Society: A Guide to the Sociology of Music*. New York: Pendragon
  333. Tagg P. 1982. Analysing popular music: theory, method, and practice. *Pop. Music* 2:37–68
  334. Tarasti E. 1987. Basic concepts of studies in musical signification: a report on a new international research project in semiotics of music. See Ref. 293, pp. 405–584
  335. Tedlock B. 1980. Songs of the Zuni Kachina Society: composition, rehearsal, and performance. See Ref. 106, pp. 7–35
  336. Tedlock D. 1983. *The Spoken Word and the Work of Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  337. Tilton JT. 1977. *Early Downhome Blues: A Musical and Cultural Analysis*. Urbana: Univ. Ill. Press
  338. Tilton JT. 1988. *Powerhouse for God: Speech, Chant and Song in an Appalachian Baptist Church*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
  339. Tiwary KM. 1978. Tuneful weeping: a mode of communication. *Frontiers* 3(3): 24–27
  340. Tolbert E. 1990. Women cry with words: symbolization of affect in the Karelian lament. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 22:80–105
  341. Tolbert E. 1990. Magico-religious power and gender in the Karelian lament. See Ref. 128, pp. 41–56
  342. Trager GL. 1958. Paralanguage: a first approximation. *Stud. Ling.* 13:1–12
  343. Tran Quang H, Guillo D. 1980. Original research and acoustical analysis in connection with the *xõmij* style of biphonic singing. In *Musical Voices of Asia*, ed. R Emmert, Y Minegishi, pp. 162–73. Tokyo: Heibonsha
  344. Trawick M. 1986. Iconicity in Paraiyar crying songs. In *Another Harmony: New Essays on the Folklore of India*, ed. AK Ramanujan, S Blackburn, pp. 294–344. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
  345. Trawick M. 1990. *Notes on Love in a Tamil Family*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press
  346. Turino T. 1989. The coherence of social style and musical creation among the Aymara in Southern Peru. *Ethnomusicology* 33(1):1–30
  347. Turino T. 1990. Structure, context, and strategy in musical ethnography. *Ethnomusicology* 34(3):399–412
  348. Turino T. 1993. *Moving Away from Silence: Music of the Peruvian Altiplano and the Experience of Urban Migration*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  349. Turner V. 1969. *The Ritual Process*. Chicago: Aldine
  350. Umiker DJ. 1974. Speech surrogates: drum and whistle systems. In *Current Trends in Linguistics*, ed. TA Sebeok, 12:497–536. The Hague: Mouton
  351. Umiker-Sebeok DJ, Sebeok TA, eds. 1976. *Speech Surrogates: Drum and Whistle Languages*, Vols. 1–2. The Hague: Mouton
  352. Urban G. 1985. The semiotics of two



- speech styles in Shokleng. See Ref. 231, pp. 311–29
353. Urban G. 1988. Ritual wailing in Amerindian Brazil. *Am. Anthropol.* 90:385–400
  354. Urban G. 1991. *A Discourse-Centered Approach to Culture*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press
  355. van Gennep A. 1960. *The Rites of Passage*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  356. Vaughan K. 1990. Exploring emotion in sub-structural aspects of Karelian lament: application of time series analysis to digitized melody. *Yearb. Tradit. Music* 22:106–22
  357. Wachsmann K. 1982. The changeability of musical experience. *Ethnomusicology* 26(2):197–216
  358. Wade B. 1976. Prolegomenon to the study of song texts. *Yearb. Int. Folk Music Counc.* 8:73–88
  359. Wadley S. 1991. Why does Ram Swarup sing? Song and speech in the North Indian epic *Dhola*. In *Gender, Genre, and Power in South Asian Expressive Traditions*, ed. A Appadurai, F Korom, M Mills, pp. 210–23. Philadelphia: Univ. Penn. Press
  360. Wagner R. 1986. *Symbols That Stand for Themselves*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  361. Walser R. 1993. *Running With the Devil: Power, Gender, and Madness in Heavy Metal Music*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan Univ. Press
  362. Waterman CA. 1990. 'Our tradition is a very modern tradition': popular music and the construction of pan-Yoruba identity. *Ethnomusicology* 34(3):367–80
  363. Waterman CA. 1990. *Jijú: A Social History and Ethnography of an African Popular Music*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press
  364. Waugh L, Van Schooneveld CH, eds. 1980. *The Melody of Language*. Baltimore: Univ. Park Press
  365. Weiner J. 1991. *The Empty Place*. Bloomington: Ind. Univ. Press
  366. Wescott RW. 1980. *Sound and Sense: Linguistic Essays on Phonosemic Subjects*. Lake Bluff, IL: Jupiter
  367. Wickett E. 1993. *For our destinies: the funerary laments of Upper Egypt*. PhD thesis. Univ. Penn.
  368. Woodbury AC. 1987. Rhetorical structure in a Central Alaskan Yupik Eskimo traditional narrative. See Ref. 312, pp. 176–239
  369. Woodbury AC. 1992. Prosodic elements and prosodic structures in natural discourse. See Ref. 200, pp. 241–53
  370. Yamada Y. 1983. Musical performance as a means of socialization among the Iatmoi. *Bikmaus* 4(3):2–16
  371. Yung B. 1983. Creative process in Cantonese opera. I: The role of linguistic tones. *Ethnomusicology* 27(1):29–48
  372. Yung B. 1983. Creative process in Cantonese opera. II: The process of *t'ien tz'u* (text-setting). *Ethnomusicology* 27(2):297–318
  373. Yung B. 1983. Creative process in Cantonese opera. III: The role of padding syllables. *Ethnomusicology* 27(3):439–56
  374. Zemp H. 1978. 'Are' are classification of musical types and instruments. *Ethnomusicology* 22(1):37–67
  375. Zemp H. 1979. Aspects of 'Are' are musical theory. *Ethnomusicology* 23(1):5–48
  376. Zemp H. 1987. *Head voice, chest voice*. Meudon: CNRS Audiovisuel. (Film)
  377. Zemp H. 1990. Visualizing music structure through animation: the making of the film *Head voice, chest voice*. *Vis. Anthropol.* 3:65–79
  378. Zemp H, Tran Quang H. 1989. *The song of harmonics*. Meudon: CNRS Audiovisuel (Film)
  379. Zuckerkandl V. 1956. *Sound and Symbol: Music and the External World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press