

Steven FELD

Abstract

Dichotomous typologies of society (small-scale/large-scale), social organization (homogeneous/heterogeneous) as well as techno-economic complexity (non-industrial/industrial) do little to explain the dynamics of oral and literate processes of culture. In the case of the Kaluli of Papua New Guinea there are many musical and performative features bearing superficial similarity to the typifications of an oral/non-linear/ear/acoustic space "consciousness". They must be explained not as consequences of orality, but as products of local history (invention, adaptation, response and use), which are found in literate traditions as well. Musical traits become meaningful through socio-cultural processes. The notion of "orality" as a "state of mind" is misleading in that it dismisses the meanings that characterize music in societies of oral tradition.

(Abstract by Yamaguti)

I begin with a remark attributed to Sigmund Freud: "analogies do not explain anything, but they do make you feel at home". Quite bluntly, this is what I have come to feel about the explanatory utility of the ideas of "oral culture" and "auditory man". Although I once believed that there were fundamental differences between symbolic systems based on literate versus oral transmission, field research in a small-scale, traditionally non-literate society has convinced me that the theories of Edmund Carpenter, Marshall McLuhan, and Walter Ong explain little about the dynamics of oral tradition. On the contrary, I am persuaded that "orality" does not determine, fix, or cause differences in world view or consciousness, differences that the above authors have claimed to exist in the logics of musical and linguistic codes and practices that exemplify different modes of transmission.

The position or thesis widely associated with Carpenter, McLuhan, and Ong is briefly as follows²⁾: reality is constituted as what communication codes structure from our perceptions. The nature of each experience depends on coding and decoding, and these processes take place in different sensory modes (like the visual, verbal, or musical) and are presented in different media (like speech, print, song, painting, film). McLuhan's empirical data for claims about the uniqueness of oral consciousness are largely drawn from generalizing Edmund Carpenter's Eskimo research observations, and projecting them to all small-scale oral tradition societies, regardless of unique histories and circumstances.

Carpenter's grand statements about "oral culture" generalize Dorothy Lee's linguistic relativity essays. As a result, both Carpenter and McLuhan's writings, particularly during the 1950's at the height of activities at the University of Toronto's Centre for Culture and Technology, show indications of strong versions of the Whorfian hypothesis that language predisposes choices of interpretation because categories of thought and experience are directly unconsciously sensed and felt in the

linguistic code.

Perhaps the most famous paper by Lee is "Codifications of reality: lineal and non-lineal". After its original publication (Lee 1950) it was reprinted in Explorations, the journal Carpenter and McLuhan edited, and reprinted a second time in the very well known anthology of key articles from the nine years of that journal's existence (Carpenter and McLuhan eds. 1960). At about the same time it was reprinted in a collection of Lee's essays (Lee 1959). This paper concerns "the unexamined assumption that [their] actions are based on the prediction of a lineal reality" (Lee 1960:154). Lee cites Western analytic preoccupation with causality, with state change, with temporal connection, means and ends, and purpose. She links these preoccupations to common English figures of speech like "line of thought", "course of action", and "direction of an argument". She sees these following from notions of chronological time, sequences, and plot. Then, reanalyzing language data supplied by Malinowski for the Trobriand Islands, Lee questions the emphasis on "circular villages" where the Trobriand language seemingly speaks more literally of an "aggregate of bumps". In doing so Lee questions both translation and perception, implying that linguistic connectives, locatives, and sequentiality are just supplied by the ethnographer from his own categories of experience and reality. These categories do not, she argues, show in any way that the Trobrianders conceptualize time and space the same way, or assume lineality to acts, events, or physical contexts.

McLuhan and Carpenter generalized this idea to claim that the great divide between oral and literate was a fundamental matter of consciousness and world view, with the nonlinear psyche representing orality, and the lineal psyche representing literacy. McLuhan and followers never hesitated to assert this notion in the most dramatic of terms. "Until writing was invented we lived in acoustic space, where all backwards people still live: boundless, directionless, the dark of the mind, the world of emotion, primordial intuition" (McLuhan, cited in Finnegan 1980:255). And Ong writes: "Changes in the media of communications restructure man's sense of the universe in which he lives and his very sense of what his thought itself is. They restructure, moreover, his own psyche..." (1974:167).

A further extension, or analogy, relates these vastly different "structurings" to dominant sense modalities: oral and non-lineal are linked to dominance of ear, while literate and oral is associated with dominance of the eye. Carpenter and McLuhan write that in "literate culture ... to be real a thing must be visible, and preferably constant. We trust the eye, not the ear" (1960:65). In contrast oral culture or "auditory man" lived in "acoustic space". They write: "Auditory space has no point of favored focus. It's a sphere without fixed boundaries, space made by the thing itself, not space containing the thing. It is not pictorial space, boxed in, but dynamic, always in flux, creating its dimensions moment by moment. It has no fixed boundaries, it is indifferent to background..." (1960:67). And Ong adds: "oral-aural man, with his keen sense of the word as an indication of action and power, tended to think of the universe itself in terms of operations and sound. For technological man, actuality tends to be an object -- something to be seen (and to some extent touched), something passive, something man operates on" (1974:169).

Extending the dichotomy of oral/ear/non-lineal vs. literate/eye/

lineal, Ong writes of a further parallel: the difference between "simultaneity" and "sequentiality". Moreover, "vision depersonalizes. Speech personalizes.... The emergence of alphabetic typography is associated with a great intensification of spatial awareness..." (1974:171). As evidence Ong cites the development of linear perspective in painting, the development of maps, Copernican cosmology, and Newtonian physics. Carpenter and McLuhan earlier developed the same notion: "The medieval world tried to channel the acoustic via Gregorian and liturgical chant, but it expanded into the visual world, and the resulting bulge or usurpation probably had much to do with the creation of 'perspective' painting. For pure visual space is flat, about 180 degrees, while pure acoustic space is spherical. Perspective translated into visual terms the depths of acoustic space" (1960:70).

In short, we have here a series of oral/literate dichotomies: ear/eye, non-linear/lineal, acoustic space/pictorial space, boundless/bounded, simultaneous/sequential; and these are asserted to be the parameters of two radically different psyches. The argument seems to say that orality and literacy shape different experiences and realities because symbolic systems and media of communications determine what and how we conceive, and these media and modes of communication are themselves reflections of their oral (ear, non-linear, simultaneous, dynamic) or literate (eye, lineal, sequential, static) formulation and transmission.

As Ruth Finnegan points out in her book Oral poetry (1980), these oral/literate dichotomies are often confounded and analogized with a number of other simplified dualisms that are sometimes posed as explanations for social or psychic difference, namely:

nonindustrial/industrial,
 small-scale/large-scale,
 organic/artificial,
 stable/turbulent
 conformist/individual
 homogeneous/heterogeneous,
 communal/egocentric,
Gemeinschaft/Gesellschaft,
 integrated/detached.

Along lines suggested by Professor Finnegan, I would like to demonstrate some ways that these confounding typologies of society, social organization, techno-economic complexity, and symbolic focus do little to explain the dynamics of oral and literate processes, but rather, simply blur or push aside social detail, historical accuracy, and the complexities of oral-literate interactions for the sake of sweeping generalizations that do not provide real evidence for the assertion that oral/literate are fundamentally different states of mind. I will do this in the context of my own ethnographic, linguistic, and musical understanding of the Kaluli people of Papua New Guinea, with whom I lived and did research in 1976-1977, 1982, and 1984.

The Kaluli are a small group (about 1200) of hunters and swidden horticulturalists living in a remote tropical rainforest environment in an interior area of Papua New Guinea known as the Great Papuan Plateau. This area is technically in the Southern Highlands Province of the country, but the Kaluli people are physically and culturally less like Papua

New Guinea's famous Highlanders than they are like less well known lowland forest people who produce sago as their staple crop and simultaneously maintain large gardens and supplement their food supply by regular hunting and fishing (for general ethnographic information, see Schieffelin 1976). The Kaluli had little substantial contact with non-Papua New Guineans until after World War II; their lands only became accessible to outsiders (via a small airstrip) in the mid-1960's, and permanent resident missionaries arrived in the early 1970's. It is only in the last years that they have had substantial contact with the local government.

I went to live with the Kaluli because I was interested in forest people. My interests in small-scale forest societies were fueled by two undergraduate teachers: Colin Turnbull and Edmund Carpenter. Exposure to their work about African Mbuti (Pygmies) and North American Inuit (Eskimo) made me acutely interested in the relationship between environment, sensory processes, and aesthetic expression. I particularly felt that as forest dwellers, the Kaluli must be acutely aware of sound, and able to use sound to advantage over vision. I was convinced that in a rainforest environment, auditory adaptation -- in biological survival terms -- must co-evolve with expressive traditions and the local sense of identity and self-consciousness. Over the last 10 years I have studied the way Kaluli language, music, and aesthetics are interconnected and interdependent. This has not taken the form of a general musical ethnography -- with emphasis on instruments, functions, performances, social roles -- but a study of sound as a cultural system, a system of symbols that articulate and embody deeply felt meanings through verbal and musical conception and action, while simultaneously linked to sensory processes, to environmental awareness, and to physical adaptation. In short, my object has been to look at all the ways that social meanings might be articulated through the production, reception, response, and interpretation of sound, and this is what places me in some position to critically consider whether McLuhan, Carpenter, and Ong's typifications of "oral culture" and "auditory man" really stand up to ethnographic verification in a society that seems such an exemplary token of their "oral" paradigm.

In fact the surface information seems an impressive version of Carpenter and McLuhan's famous dictum: "In preliterate cultures the binding power of the oral tradition is so strong that the eye is subservient to the ear" (1960:65). I discovered (Feld 1982) that Kaluli classify a large portion of their local environment according to sound, that they can locate distance, hunt, reckon space, and cycles of seasons and daily time by sounds. The Kaluli language is enormously rich in onomatopoeic and iconic devices, and Kaluli claim that the tones of their scales come from bird calls; they sing with, to and about birds, cicadas and waterfalls; they have an elaborate taxonomy of sounds based on water metaphors and these are utilized as theoretical concepts to explain and discuss music. All of these features are linked in a cosmology where birds and humans are transformations of each other, living in different planes of visible and invisible reality that is always transcended and linked by the everyday production and perception of sounds (Feld 1981a, 1982, 1984; Schieffelin 1976). In all of these ways the Kaluli certainly typify a dominance and acute orientation to sound. But two questions must be posed: 1) can it be clearly shown that this acute sonic orientation is a consequence of orality (or, as some might have it, of non-lit-

eracy)?; and 2) moreover, does the polar notion of orality/literacy in any way clarify the dynamics of Kaluli sensory and cognitive processes, sound/meaning articulations, or social evolution? In both cases I must answer in the negative, and I want to now give some brief examples from Kaluli musical structure, theory, and performance practice that have some bearing on McLuhan, Carpenter, and Ong's contention that the oral/literate divide indicates two forms of consciousness, or psychic states of mind.

Ear/eye

On the surface Kaluli society is obviously oriented toward the ear. Oral arts are more elaborated than visual ones. At a more fundamental material level, it can be said without question that the forest environment creates an important basic condition of all Kaluli daily life: one cannot see far into the forest, and once in the forest, one cannot see far at all. The ability to reckon height, depth, distance, and location from sound cues in the absence or minimal presence of visual cues is thus a primary imperative of Kaluli biocultural adaptation. Sweeping this broad pattern of learning and adaptation into the background in order to posit orality as a principal determinant of such oral/aural primacy is not particularly useful. If these conditions were primarily determined by orality, similar abilities would be found in a substantial number of oral tradition societies of widely varying environmental types. It seems more reasonable that social skills involving a component of acute auditory awareness are more deeply related to the intertwined imperatives of forest life and the desire to develop a cultural rationale for the "naturalness" of these phenomena.

The fact that Kaluli must and do depend on their ears, and that this dependency is elaborated into artistic/expressive forms and aesthetic ideologies (Feld 1982) does not constitute evidence that the eye and visual sense is subservient or unimportant. To indulge in using the same sort of verbal phrases that often constitute McLuhan's evidence, Kaluli are fond of saying "I saw it with my eyes" (síyo: ba:ba:) in order to indicate in the strongest manner their sense of belief. They commonly say "we'll see" (a:ná ba:ba:no:) in the same way English speakers use this phrase. There is no good evidence that seeing is any less connected to believing for Kaluli than is hearing. The Kaluli term for "ask" is literally "heard + see" (dabuboba).

Rather than posit a dominance of Kaluli ear over eye, it seems more likely that the accurate description of the interaction of the two involves a notion of metaphor, or trope that is developed in complementary ways across sensory/expressive modalities. For instance: Kaluli need to LOOK and MOVE like birds as much as they need to SING and SOUND like them. And these interrelated forms of expression, though perhaps more elaborated in song poetics and performance than costume or dance, are nevertheless completely interdependent in Kaluli ceremonies (Schieffelin 1976; Feld 1982). Another example comes from the area of Kaluli musical theory, where the concept of sound turns out to be metaphorically carried by a combined (though predominantly visual) image: waterfalls (Feld 1981a). Kaluli call all melodic contours and intervals by names of waterfall and waterway types; a portion of these names are onomatopoeic as well. Again we have a heightened interaction of oral/visual conceptualization and use, rather than a dominance of one over the

other.

Lineal/non-lineal

In the structure and performance of all Kaluli songs there is one major feature that is instantly felt: the lack of a unison principle. Kaluli know what unison is; missionaries have tried to get them to sing this way for fifteen years! But their own way of vocalizing, in groups of all sizes, with or without rattle accompaniment, involves extensive alternation and overlap, layering parts and sounds in coordinated textures. In Western musical terms, one hears much canon and hocket; speaking less musicologically (and perhaps more accurately), one would describe all Kaluli musical practice as shifting patterns of interlock, overlap, and alternation (examples can be heard on Feld 1981b and 1985). Kaluli call this kind of soundmaking "lift-up-over-sound" (dulugu ganalan). Whether few or many, parts and sounds must "lift-up-over" one another; Kaluli do not speak of a "chain" of sound or parts "leading" or "following", as we might. The idea is acoustically spatial and Kaluli prefer sounds to be dense, compact, without breaks, pauses, or silences. When two people sing together, the subtleties of the shifting length of overlap (or with a leader and group, the nuances of the alternations) are the locus of aesthetic play and tension. Kaluli consciously rationalize this pattern on the model of the forest, where sounds constantly shift in figure and ground, and where continually staggered alternations and overlaps (at times sounding completely interlocked and seamless) are abundant. For Kaluli, the natural model for soundmaking is this dense forest texture of "lift-up-over-sounds".

On the surface this might seem like a good example of the ear over eye, spatialized non-lineal over lineal reality proposed by McLuhan and company. But on closer examination there are contradictions and complexities that make the general explanatory utility of such notions limited. It turns out that the kind of form/performance model described above is as dependent upon lineal sequentiality as it is upon simultaneity. Kaluli singers are quite aware of time, and refer to all of these kinds of overlap, again, in terms of visual models of water flow and the lines of forest paths. And the organization of the songs concerns tree parts: "trunks" (mo:) are the refrains (same melody and text), while "branches" (dun) are verses (same melody with changed text). "Lift-up-over-sounds" are as much temporally as spatially understood; singers have a definite sense of the musical line, phrase, and regular internal units. What we call a "line" is even termed a "stick" or "twig" and with the hands Kaluli will "line up" these "sticks" to show how the "trunk" reaches the "branches".

The notion of lineal/non-lineal does not seem terribly important to explaining what is unique or primary about this kind of musical ideology and praxis, and I find it dubious that citing orality as the determinant of such expressive features and forms helps to explain anything, since the complex relationship of spatial, temporal, visual, and oral concepts and practices can be found in the architecture of many musics, from many societies, and many periods. Certain musical features, like the development of a melody by repetition of a short phrase at a lower or higher contour, are widespread in both oral and literate traditions, and even within a single system (or, for that matter, a single piece) there may be shifts in orientation to spatial and temporal features that might be

"read" or "analyzed" as indicators of either lineal or non-lineal orientation. While the "lift-up-over" structural and performance orientation of the Kaluli seems to fit the idea of "acoustic space" rather well, the latter does not explain the former, nor does it make sense to say that this idea is found in Kaluli music as a consequence of orality. The Kaluli ideas, and the diverse formal and performative features they refer to, are coherent precisely because of the way they utilize a logic to reveal consistency in features that can appear inconsistent or contradictory from other logical standpoints. This logic is not given, cognitively or any other way, by the state of being oral rather than literate; in other words, the historical, environmental, and biocultural conditions which promote and lend to successful adaptation do not necessarily produce the same adaptive strategies in similar circumstances. Certain features of the Kaluli situation are unique, others can be generalized, but that ratio is complicated, and is not clarified by considering orality/ literacy as the dependent variable in the evolution of consciousness.

Stable/dynamic

It has been argued that oral traditions are stable and literate ones are turbulent. While these terms are quite confusing because they are occasionally reversed (as in the equally typical McLuhanish argument that oral societies are dynamic [=unbounded] and literate ones are static [=bounded]), the sense of "stable" that concerns me here is the implication that oral transmission involves a high degree of stereotypy, redundancy, and predictability in terms of formal parameters and levels of internal variation and flux. Again, we see that the Kaluli situation upholds this notion on the surface, and then presents us with a multitude of contradictions and complexities as soon as we inquire more deeply into local history.

Kaluli claim to have originated one song form, gisalo, and one form of spontaneous improvised sung-weeping, sa-ya:lo:. These are melodically related, as well as mythically related (Feld 1982). Additionally, Kaluli have borrowed four other song forms, each with its own pentatonic format: these four melodic patterns are clearly differentiated from the single pattern that Kaluli claim to have originated for their own gisalo and sa-ya:lo:. Of the four borrowed song patterns, two (iwō: and sabio) involve closed sets; Kaluli have memorized about 50 of each type but do no new composition in these styles. Two others (heyalo and ko:luba) are the basis for new compositions. In these two styles one is able to observe a most interesting process: melodic convergence. Comparing fifty years of compositions in these melodic forms with those of the completely stable gisalo and sa-ya:lo: forms, we see that the Kaluli have taken these two scale patterns (anhemitonic pentatonic, with reductions to four and three tone variants) and created several new versions that more closely resemble their own. This "gisalo-ization" of heyalo and ko:luba is further complicated by the relationship of the composer's home area with the direction from which the newer songs have come (for details and analysis see Feld 1985). So while it is possible to generally characterize gisalo and sa-ya:lo: as stable, there is also much musical change and dynamism, on the order of complexity of linguistic dialect flux, related to geography, contact history, and patterns of ongoing interaction within and across communities. The kind of style, genre, or formal

dynamism studied by historical musicologists for literate traditions, or traditions involving major oral/literate transformations, is equally available in the Kaluli musical scene, while it is simultaneously possible to study the role of formally stable and conservative elements in musical form and the transmission/composition process.

Conclusion

Professor Finnegan (1980) has already argued that there is no special and distinct oral poetic style; oral and written symbolism overlap greatly in variety such that forms of repetition, parallelism, prosody, and formulae cannot be simultaneously a consequence of orality yet so widely distributed in oral, literate, and merged/merging traditions. Surely the same must be said for music: it is impossible to come up with a list of formal traits that only characterize musics of oral tradition. Along these lines I have tried to argue that major analogous parameters to the idea of formal musical traits (ear dominance, non-lineality, stability) are also conveniences that have little explanatory force. It is equally futile to claim that what makes musics of oral tradition "oral" is internal musical traits or special features of an oral psyche or consciousness that gives rise to these special traits. If "orality" was in fact such a determinant or limiting condition on mental processes as revealed in musical form, we would expect far less variety in the music of small-scale societies, and far less variety in its forms of composition and transmission than has already been documented.

In the Kaluli case there are many musical and performative features that bear either superficial or strong similarity to the typifications of oral/nonlinear/ear/acoustic space "consciousness" as described by McLuhan, Carpenter, Ong and their associates. While these features are indeed real and meaningful for the Kaluli, it only trivializes their significance to claim that they can be explained as consequences of "orality". These features, traits, and processes, and the contingent subtleties and contradictions that one inevitably uncovers in studying them, are products of local history -- by which I mean products of invention, adaptation, response, and use. Some of these features cannot be found to characterize other oral tradition societies; some can be found in certain literate traditions. What is important, ultimately, is not the musical traits, but the socio-historical processes through which they become meaningful. For the Kaluli, my contention is that these meanings are far more complex than can be reduced to "orality", ear dominance, non-lineality, acoustic space, and so forth. If anything, I am tempted to say that the notions of the oral psyche, oral consciousness, or "orality" as a "state of mind" are most misleading and dangerous in the way they dismiss rather than address the meanings, uses, and creative inventions that characterize music in societies of oral tradition.

Notes

- 1) This essay was prepared for oral delivery at the Tôkyô ICTM colloquium "The oral and the literate in music with emphasis on Japanese musical traditions". I wrote it on airplanes between Papua New Guinea, the USA, and Japan and revised it in Tôkyô after helpful

consultations with Professors Tokumaru Yoshihiko and Yamaguchi Osamu. As such this is not an extended scholarly survey of the topic but a personal reflection, colored by two factors: first, my immediate context was a return from six months in the field with the Kaluli; second, I was concerned that as one of the only participants in the colloquium with extensive experience in a very small-scale technologically primitive society, my Kaluli work represented a case study of the most ideal, contained, stable example of an oral tradition. As such I wanted to write about those problems of definitions and typifications of "orality" and "oral cultures" that I knew might be assumed or less scrutinized in the many colloquium discussions which focused on oral-literate interactions, particularly in Asia.

As a final note I wish to publicly thank Professor Yamaguchi Osamu, who on very short notice orally translated my entire essay into Japanese during the course of the colloquium. In the process of our discussions as to how certain ideas and concepts should be translated, he helped me to clarify and specify many points on which I was too ambiguous. I am also grateful to Professors Ruth Finnegan and Kawada Junzô for reminding me of certain African parallels to the Kaluli data, and to Professor Leo Treitler for his reminders that one need not throw the baby out with the bath water.

- 2) When I speak generally of the work of McLuhan, Carpenter, and Ong, I am thinking of the following, in addition to those books from which I have taken specific quotations: McLuhan 1963, McLuhan 1967, McLuhan and Parker 1968, Carpenter 1972, Carpenter 1973, and Ong 1967.

References

Carpenter, Edmund

1972 Oh, what a blow that phantom gave me! New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

1973 Eskimo realities. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Carpenter, Edmund; McLuhan, Marshall

1960 "Acoustic space". In Carpenter and McLuhan eds. 1960:65-70.

Carpenter, Edmund; McLuhan, Marshall eds.

1960 Explorations in communications: an anthology. Boston: Beacon Press.

Feld, Steven

1981a "'Flow like a waterfall': the metaphors of Kaluli musical theory". Yearbook for traditional music 13:22-47.

1981b Music of the Kaluli (disc and notes). Boroko: Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies.

1982 Sound and sentiment: birds, weeping, poetics, and song in Kaluli expression. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

1984 "Sound structure as social structure". Ethnomusicology 28(3): 383-409.

1985 Kaluli weeping and song (disc and notes). Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag (Musicaphon: Music of Oceania).

- Finnegan, Ruth
1980 Oral poetry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Dorothy
1950 Codifications of reality: lineal and non-lineal. Psychosomatic medicine. Reprinted in Lee 1959:105-120. Abridged and Reprinted in Carpenter and McLuhan eds. 1960:136-154.
1959 Freedom and culture. Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- McLuhan, Marshall
1963 Understanding media: the extensions of man. New York: McGraw-Hill.
1967 Verbi-voco-visual explorations. New York: Something Else Press.
- McLuhan, Marshall; Parker, Harley
1968 Through the vanishing point: space in poetry and painting. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ong, Walter
1967 The presence of the word. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
1974 "The history and future of the verbal media". In Silverman ed. 1974:165-183.
- Schieffelin, Edward L.
1976 The sorrow of the lonely and the burning of the dancers. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Silverman, A. ed.
1974 Human communication: theoretical explorations. New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates.

Discussion: chaired by Tsuge Gen'ichi

1. Different modes of knowledge transmission in relation to different perceptions.

Kawada: Your consideration of the two types of perception, visual versus acoustic, inspires us to think about many important issues concerning our theme. For example, when we perceive only acoustic sensations with little visual perception as in the story-telling performed in the darkness among the Mosi in West Africa, it seems to arouse a rich or imagination within the minds of the listeners. On the other hand, acoustic perception is somehow related to culturally patterned historical consciousness. This is especially the case with non-literate societies where history is told on ceremonial occasions, quite in contrast to literate societies where history is written down as facts.

According to my observation, there are basically two modes of transmission of knowledge and/or communication from generation to generation: 1) unperishable -- as written documents on paper, drawn figures on stones, or built-up monuments (pyramids, shrines, etc.);

and 2) perishable -- as oral tradition or something else which can be transmitted through repetition (repeated performance, periodically repeated construction of a wooden shrine, etc.). In this sense, it seems important to have a wider perspective than the oral and visual sense modalities in order to discuss our concern with the oral and the literate. For instance, we will have to consider other sensations such as smell and taste.

Feld: Since we know that different races place different emphases on the senses, as pointed out by Carpenter and McLuhan, it is necessary to take such a step. One good example may be attained by making research on performances in darkness.

Yamaguti: In light of the Japanese example suggested by Kawada concerning the term kikizake ("to hear sake; to test sake by tasting), I am anxious to know the Kaluli term for the verb "smell".

Feld: The Kaluli say "to hear the odor".

Waterhouse: In every language, many terms have their own etymologies which have little to do with the present usage. These are matters of historical concern and may not be of cultural significance.

Ellingson: In India also, there seem to be many connotations of the term "hear", which may be significant both historically and culturally.