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TOWARD A MUSICO-LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY

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), ethnomusical 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

---

1 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.\(^2\) 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), ethnopoetics (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 metalinguial 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-segments, 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 ethnohistory. 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 prosodies, 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 phonaesthesis 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 prosodies suggests the importance of music in language approaches to a reintegrating 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 prosodies and poetics of speech and song. Though strongly influenced by earlier developments in ethnomusicology, 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 Peircean 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 Peircean semiotic concept of multiple interpreters, and rhetorically stresses the importance of modeling musical meaning from the neutral level to the levels of creation (poeisis) and reception (esthesia), 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 Peircean semiotics, Boîlés (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 Peircean 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 Peircean 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 parlemetrics (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 ethnomusicological 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 thematicization 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 enunci-
ated as phonologically conventional vocables (115). Others are in conversa-
tional 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 interac-
tions 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 intersec-
tion of affective and aesthetic vocal signals. Urban (353, 354), Briggs (50),
Tolbert (340), and Vaughan (356) use a variety of recent digitizing, spectro-
graphic, and pitch-tracking technologies to examine details of lament vocaliza-
tion. 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 per-
formance and gendered expression in the dialogic interaction of Warao (Vene-
zuela) 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, typi-
cally 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 overlap-
ning or interlocking voices. Patterns of multi-voice performance, regardless of
musical or textual complexities, produce possibilities for performed intertextu-
ality, where the spatio-temporal character of multiple voice utterances is in-
dexical 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.
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