

Dances of Hostility and Friendship: Embodied Histories of Group Relations in the Agusanen Manobo Spirit-Possession (*Yana-an*) Ritual

Jose S. Buenconsejo

“Every other (one) is every (bit) other.”

—Derrida, *The Gift of Death*

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the complex, aesthetic embodiment of a particular history of group relations. It investigates how the form or materiality of ritual séance—constituted by dance, music, speech, and acts—reflects changes in the political economy. The paper deals with Agusanen Manobo séance (yana-an) as a channel for embodying the Agusan Manobo’s rich cultural imagination of “others.” Agusan Manobos are indigenous people, most of whom are now Christians and who live in middle Agusan Valley. Their “imaginary others” are distant outsiders with whom the Manobos owe some kind of affinity because of a more or less shared historical experience based upon concrete social exchange practices.

The paper examines two kinds of social relations: (1) Manobos vis-à-vis other indigenous peoples, and (2) Manobos vis-à-vis the Visayan speaking settlers. It demonstrates that the nature of the first social relation is symmetrical or egalitarian. This contrasts with the second, which is asymmetrical. The paper shows that Agusan Manobo yana-an makes reflexive, visceral statements about these social relations, enabling ritual participants to define their social identity and reconstrue the newer asymmetrical Manobo-Visayan relations back to its original equalizing one.

In the book *Domination and the Arts of Resistance* (1990), James Scott distinguishes between the “public” or “official” transcript and the “hidden” or “fugitive.” He defines the former as “an open interaction between subordinates and those who dominate” and the latter as “a discourse that takes place ‘offstage,’ beyond the direct observation by power holders” (2). While the book does not reify this conceptual opposition into immutable categories, showing on the contrary the volatility of the “hidden transcript” that can almost always “steam-off” as a breakthrough or rupture whenever there is an authorized public performance, Scott’s book mainly investigates the relationality of discourse in the context of power, hegemony, resistance, and subordination. In the course of his explication, he exposes the contradictions and tensions of power that historicizes the notion of culture, arguing that subordinates draw upon the “hidden transcript” as a refuge from suffering because it is itself a form of negating the exercise of domination (114).

A reading of the argument above clearly manifests Scott’s theory on the notion of voice or agency and his engagement with the problem, how this can, in performance, destabilize structural contexts of domination. Building upon an earlier work on the moral economy of Malaysian peasant resistance (1985), Scott’s work evidently resonates with much of the present writings in the human sciences that are concerned with how power produces, reproduces, or is constitutive of dynamic social processes called cultures. While recuperating the notion of subjectivity makes Scott a “post-structuralist,” the assumptions of the methods he used, however, suggest a covert modernism (i.e., a thinking associated with empiricism and positivism). This is particularly indicated, for example, in the systematicity by which he aspires to generate a cross-cultural metalanguage to talk about discourse and power and his employment of the concept of discursive negation that he claims is embodied in the “hidden transcript.” The idea of conceptual negation suggests the relationality of signs (of power), a matter well articulated by Saussure almost a century ago and so well exploited by Levi-Strauss, but for a universalist end, during the 1960s. The concept of relationality means that identities of signs are “positively identified” or meaningful only in reference to other signs that those identities negate, differ, or defer. Jacques Derrida extends the notion by calling the absences, by which signs (writing and speech) are identified, “traces.”

Indeed, many of the works written after Saussure, from Levi-Strauss to Derrida, are reworkings of this already familiar theme on the relationality of signs in the context of sign-systems to which they are parts. In a recent work *Power and Intimacy in the Christian Philippines* (1999), for example, Fenella Cannell also applies the concept. However, she does not construe the relationality of identity/difference in terms of abstract mentalist categories *a la* Levi-Strauss, but in terms of *performance* by which the articulation of that relationality is canalized. Cannell lucidly argues that when peasants in Bikol (i.e., the social self) parody song performances of the wealthy and the affluent (i.e., the peasants' "imaginary others") or watch glamorous transvestite beauty shows from afar, they draw social boundaries of their identity as a people "who have nothing." Their parodic performances, in other words, enable the awareness or recognition of the depravity or the lack of the self, a negation that the "imaginary others" are perceived to possess.

Along the same line, I shall explore in this paper how the performance of difference or alterity re-presents, via a complex, multisensorial event, the boundaries of self-other. I shall illustrate this proposition with an analysis of ritual *séance* forms that include speech, song, dance, numerous effervescent symbols, and numinous ritual acts redolent with rhythm and poetry. In particular, this paper is about the Agusanen Manobo *séance* (*yana-an*) and how it embodies a people's rich cultural imagination of "others," a presencing so to speak that, in the last instance, is relationally meaningful to the social self. Manobo others are distant outsiders with whom the Manobos owe some kind of affinity because of a more or less shared historical experience based upon concrete social exchange practices.

Agusanen Manobos are indigenous people, most of whom are now Christians. They live in a town in middle Agusan Valley in Eastern Mindanao Island. I did field research there in 1991, 1996, and 1997. In contemporary everyday life, Manobos refer to outsiders as *kena taga dini* (not from here). They include neighboring indigenous groups living in the hilly mountains of Bukidnon and the up-river parts of Davao, and most especially, the recent Visayan-speaking settlers from the coasts of Mindanao and Central Philippine Islands. Agusanen Manobos have related with these two kinds of outsiders by marriage, war, and trading—the resultant social relations

of which was either more or less symmetrical (i.e., Agusanen Manobo relations with their neighboring indigenous groups) or asymmetrical (Manobo relations with the Visayan-speaking settlers).¹

Agusanen Manobo relations with neighboring indigenous groups are symmetrical because both are engaged with more or less the same set of economic subsistence activities—dry rice cultivation, hunting, food gathering, simple barter, and so on. These crucially do not generate surpluses and hence less political-economic stratification in general (cf. Yengoyan’s work 1964 on the Mandayas of Upper Agusan River with Buenconsejo 1999). In contrast, Manobo and Visayan relations are unequal because the latter were the ones who brought, from the seacoasts to Manoboland in the interior, the practices of alienating labor for wages and of accumulating capital (i.e., the important means of production) that Manobos do not logically own and control. The new economy, therefore, tipped the balance and created a political asymmetry, transforming what used to be equalizing group relationships between Manobos and neighboring indigenous groups (see Buenconsejo 1999 for more account on this topic). Given these changes in material practices, how would ritual forms, assuming these are sensory aesthetizations of everyday social interactions, reflect the transformation of an old economy to a new one? That is, what can this transformation in socio-economic exchange tell us about a local cultural imagination that reveals a historical experience of the “real” that is both so fictive and materially-grounded at the same time?

As I will demonstrate below, Manobo rituals—especially the more elaborate ones that use the paired drum and gong—dramatize face-to-face encounters of participants from different places, that is, people whose roles in ritual performance can be construed differentially: between ritual sponsors and medium’s families, hosts and guests, healers and patients, or simply between the self and the “not from here” (*dili taga diri*). Rituals refract the difference—emergent to these actual meetings—between selves and others. The latter become embodied as distant presences or spirits called “not one of us” (*dili ingon nato*). The Manobo warrior and the Visayan *amigo* spirits are good examples. These “imaginary others” become more familiar through the death of a sacrificial substitute (*saliling*), rhetorical human appeal for pity (*kæ-at*), “harmonizing speech”

(*panubad-tubad*), and through the colorful display of “burnt” ritual gifts known as *sinugbahan*.

At the outset, the ritual enactment of self-other confrontations is thoroughly gestural. Dance-rhythm (*lisag*), played on the drum and gong and which accompanies the medium’s trance dances, provokes the spirit to “pass by” (*baja*) or “visit” the medium’s body. It invokes the general ritual narrative about spirit-outsiders becoming more human by means of a willful Manobo language of sharing and sociability. While Manobo spirits have stood as symbols of authority in the past, new Manobo spirits have been incarnated, bespeaking Visayan ideological, material domination. It is in ritual that one can see, therefore, how Visayan domination or hegemony has been inscribed on the Manobo social body. Yet, as I shall argue, this is not simply a passive receptacle waiting to be mindlessly filled with contents, but an active performative channel—the ritual representations that they themselves make—for Manobos to reflexively look into their own selves. The “looking into” objectifies hegemony and, in the process, rupturing and contesting it (cf. Comaroff 1985).

This paper, the argument of which will be supported by translated texts from a single ritual documented *in situ*, will be divided into two parts. In the first, I shall discuss the older Manobo ritual practice, particularly the embodiment of the male Manobo elder spirit whose presence has stood for Agusanen Manobo social relations with neighboring indigenous peoples (particularly those living in the mountains of Bukidnon). This spirit-presence is a symbol of Manobo customary law, a notion that is displayed in the symbolic exchange of sacrificial blood during rituals. In empirical social life, the exchange happened either through exogamous marriages between the Agusanen Manobos and the neighboring indigenous peoples from the mountains or as a result of risky, war-like behavior called *minangadjew*. This hostile behavior resulted in the “ambush” style intertribal warfare of the *baganis* (warriors) in the past. Blood is a salient indexical sign of Manobo indigeneity, a sign of shared substance that binds the social body or clan. When incarnated in ritual, the Manobo spirit would almost always desire to dance the *sa-ut* (war dance), the “motto” rhythm of which he is associated.² In the second part, I shall talk about the newer, hybrid Manobo ritual that is practised only by

bilingual mediums living in the town. When possessed by their spirit-familiars, these town mediums juxtapose the speaking of Manobo and Visayan, drink San Miguel Beer or orange soda, eat food that is cooked with salt and spices and placed on a table. These features point to a new form of material life. Instead of the infused sound of drum and gong, bilingual mediums dance to a war rhythm simulated on the guitar.

**INDIGENEITY AND BLOOD RELATIONS:
MALE ELDER EMBODIMENT AND *LISAG*
(DANCE-RHYTHM)**

In the archaic form of Manobo *yana-an*, spirit-helpers are drawn into the ritual space by the sound of the drum and gong, the sight of the betel nut offerings and the various objects that evoke spirit-presences such as ritual beverage, cigarettes, coins, and ceremonial clothing. Furthermore, it should be noted that aside from such material embodiments, spirits are more importantly pulled into the ritual space by the participants' forceful rhetorical appeal to the spirits to pity them. These acts reflexively define Manobo society in relation to outsiders by means of negation and then by its mimetic transformation, during which the difference is transcended and transformed into a similarity. Spirit helpers, for example, are addressed as "not one of us" (spirits are not human beings), but by pulling them into the ritual space as beings who take pity on the supplicants, human beings exert agency and transform the outsider-spirits into a "one of them," thereby transforming the outsiders into insiders within the familiar Manobo language of reciprocity or moral economy. Through the exercise of Manobo agency, hostile outsider spirits are talked to as if they are persons who have names and human-like attributes. The mimetic play of difference and similarity in identity forms is a very central theme that is highlighted during any Manobo ritual performance. As already mentioned above, it refracts the meeting of actual people from different households during a ritual, especially during a pig sacrifice.

Like song, which articulates the exterior speech of spirits via the interior breath of the medium,³ the notion of transgression, which conflates the boundary between the bodies of the socio-centric self

and its imaginary others, is palpably demonstrated in the medium's dance. The intrusion is iconically depicted by the narrative in which the hostility of the outsider-spirit is transformed into one of human sociability. This idea should also be understood, at the empirical level, as the actual meeting of people from different families during ritual—ritual sponsors or hosts for instance, encountering the medium's family and other guests. The spirit's hostility is "domesticated" so to speak, a process of infusion occurs—outside going inside—when the medium dances around the ritual offerings. In the dance, s/he glances sideways as if looking for enemies, a gesture of hostility which—through the repetitive, dizzying, whirling vortex of body movements around the food offerings—symbolically metamorphoses into an agreeable collectivity. The exterior hostile spirit becomes hospitable because of the gifts.

The dancing in a circle occurs in the first part of the ritual when the food offerings are still raw and in the second part when these are cooked. The dances are interspersed, "seven times" in each of the two parts, between conversations among ritual participants. Through these dances the spirit in the medium's body is said to "pass by" (*baja*) the ritual space, a momentous rupture of the "sacred" into the everyday world that is akin to what is called elsewhere as a "spirit attack" or the "invasion of the other." To signify the almost always potential harm that such "passing by" can mean to the families attending the ritual, possessed mediums execute threatening predatory gestures that suggest "eating up" (root /*ke-en*/) the sick patient and the other participants. This spirit's transgression, however, is deflected by the animal sacrifice: a chicken, a pig, or even a native chicken's egg. In animal sacrifices, the possessed medium would usually drink the blood of the pig immediately after this has been killed or bite the neck of a live chicken to convey the image of nature intruding into Manobo society. Manobos believe that the death of the sacrifice is substituted for the life of the sick patient. Yet because no ritual speech is uttered at the moment of killing the sacrifice, the death of the sacrifice can also mean that Manobo human society is not responsible for such death or that no human will is enacted in the act.⁴

Furthermore, the image of the infusion of in and out resembles the structure of the dance-rhythm (*lisag*) that accompanies the medium's dances.

Dance Rhythm from the Mountain (*Tinaga-untod*) Played on Drum and Gong Pair

Drum (one male player)

Gong (two female players)

1 right hand striking center of drumhead with thin stick

2 left hand tapping rim of drumhead without stick: "open" sound "closed" sound

3 one player tapping rim of gong with pair of thin sticks

4 one player striking boss of gong with thick piece of wood

(*Pattern A is the main pattern and is therefore played more often; Pattern B is played as some kind of a “unit marker,” signaling the contingent shifts in the direction of the medium’s dance.)

This structure, found in the musical transcription above, condenses a host of referents. On the one hand, the dance-rhythm is played on a pair of drum and gong, the former is made up of elements that are emblematic of the mountain world (plant and animal skin) while the latter, elements from the sea coasts (metal). Mythic mountain and sea worlds are outside of human society, but they are brought into the center where they fuse to re-order symbolically the social confusion. On the other hand, two contrastive rhythms are played in each instrumental pair, producing a materiality of sonic rhythms based on the principle of interlocking the rhythmic colors within each of the instrument and without, i.e., between the drum (*gimbae*) and the gong (*agung*). The drum which initiates the “music” is played by a male, his right hand slapping the drum’s membrane with a pair of long thin sticks while his left bare hand strikes the other side. This produces an alternation of stopped and open sounds. The gong, which follows the pattern established by the drum, is played by two women, the first playing the boss of the gong with a short thick stick, the second playing the rim of the gong with a pair of long thin sticks. The interlocking of the rhythms embodies the idea of juxtaposing opposed, albeit complementary, sounds that symbolize the cooperation of two women (pounding the gong) and one man (the drummer). This cooperation can be no other than an aestheticized image of the social practice of polygynous marriage where co-wives

(*duwey*) cooperate with the male to maintain the household economy. They suppress individuality to create a greater unity, performing the embodied idea of cooperative rhythmic work.

Rhythm accompanying the medium's dance is called *tinaga-untod*. Literally, this means "of the mountain" and, by extension, "on the style of the rhythm that is metonymic of the indigenous peoples living there." Manobos describe the quality of the rhythm as "hard" and "heavy" during the first part of the ritual when offerings are still raw. The same rhythm is played during the killing of the animal sacrifice. During the second part, when the medium elevates the food offerings (*bajaw*), now cooked, the *tinaga-untod* rhythm becomes "soft" and "light" (*beteng-beteng*). Elevating cooked food while dancing is the most beautiful act of any Manobo ritual séance. The gesture symbolically "sacralizes" the food that the medium then passes around the audience as an act of sharing, hospitality, and friendship. The qualitative distinction between "hard" and "soft" is important because "hardness" connotes hostility, while "softness," familiarity/solidarity.

Such distinction parallels the discourse about possession. During the first part of the ritual, the mediums' bodies are said to experience more trembling. In the first entry, the spirit is perceived (among other tropes) to be a "heavy" cold mass of air entering through the mediums' heads moving downward. In this ritual part, the possession act is done inside the Manobo house with its door slightly open. The entry of the spirit erases the ordinary *ginhawa* (breath or vital consciousness) of the mediums as its external force permeates their whole bodies (see Buenconsejo 1999). Ritual participants describe that to attend a Manobo ritual is like going into a dream. They also see this as a space where their *ginhawa* becomes agreeable to the will of others (*dumahan te kabebet-en*). In contrast, mediums do not manifest strong bodily contractions during the commencement of the second part of the ritual. Unlike the hostile, hard sentiments displayed in the first part when the sacrifice is killed, the feeling of lightness is suggested by the mediums' dances during the second part.⁵ Instead of the threatening gestures of hostile spirits, the already "domesticated" spirit/medium sanctifies the food offerings and the charismas (*bantog*) of ritual participants. This gesture resembles the Cebuano *sinulog* dance (see Ness 1992).

Sometimes, the medium does an exhibitionistic dance at around the time when the food is elevated. S/he waves a sharp machete in the air as if teasing and testing the audience whether they will fear him/her or not. Manobos verbalize that they will not get hurt at that time because their bodies have just been symbolically smeared with sacrificial blood (*panlihas*) and, thus, are already immune to the spirits' malevolent gaze. In other words, humans and spirits have already become familiar with each other. Indeed, the killing of the animal substitute in the first part of the ritual is instrumental in the transformation of the outsider-spirit's hostility into one of joy (*dejag*) in the second part.

The type of spirit who usually dances at around the time the animal sacrifice is killed is the Manobo male elder spirit. His character resembles that of the warrior (*bagani*). It is for this reason that this spirit dances the hard, hostile rhythm in the first part of the ritual. During ritual conversations, the *bagani* male-elder spirit speaks in a fast, halting Manobo. He walks to and fro with a wobble and a bent back in front of the ritual gifts. After the sacrifice is killed, the divination of the sacrificial blood takes place, and the medium ceremonially meets the head of the family sponsoring the ritual. The medium offers him a drink, and the difference between self and other is confirmed.

Conversation with the Manobo Male Elder

(The chicken is killed/sacrificed by members of the family sponsoring the ritual. Meanwhile, the ritual interpreter utters a magical spell as he sprinkles lime on the betel quid offerings by the window. Medium faces the patients.)

Ritual Interpreter: *Ah, tik-tik yejag, ne iyan da migdejag, ah te umagad te⁶*

Ah, sprinkle happiness, that which makes happy, ah the soul of

si-e daduwa'n ka bata, he man su, ejaw ko pa iyan, natuman en man te inajew.

these two children, yes since, as I say, inajew had been realized.

Na, ikatuyo ko ne pagtik-tik, ne iyan da nakatid, ah sihan balati-an te si-e daduwa.

So my third sprinkling, that which has pushed, ah the bad feelings of these two.

(Chicken sacrifice is given to the medium)

Ritual Interpreter: *E, ay pasayloha key, ka-inteki. E, bæ ka nu,*
Forgive us. How little the animal sacrifice is. Never mind...

su tenged te ka apiki, tenged te kawad-on, kan kan egpaka-iling key,

because of poverty, because of loss/ nothingness. That is what we say.

te degi'n kuwa new, kakuyangan iyan. Ka-inteki iyan.

How plenty are our shortcomings for you, that lack. How little that is.

Sadangay, kiyo en si mato-o.

We're sorry. It's up to you.

(Medium wipes sacrificial blood on the patient's forehead.)

Ritual Interpreter: *Ah, hid-hiden ko si-eni yangesa, ejaw te pa, kan ingkuwa, si-eni inajew,*

Ah, I will wipe this blood which, as I say, will realize that ritual, this inajew.

kan en kan tima-an, e te kalibrehan.

That is the sign of freedom.

(Medium looks at the blood and places it on the window sill, where the other ritual offerings are placed.)

Ritual Interpreter: *Sadangay, egyuhod a't atubangan. Ah, degi'n kuyan,*

Please, I'm kneeling before you. Ah, there's plenty of lack,

*egpa-ila ko iyo ne degi'n kuyang, pero tenged
te ka-apiki,*

a recognition that there's plenty of lack. But
because of the shortcoming,

tenged te kapitsido . . .

because of indigence . . .

Medium (Male Elder speaks): *Hhm, hmmm, na kay apoq kena
kay'n dugadihanan si-eni.*

Hhm, hhm. So, my child, don't joke about
this.

Ritual Interpreter: *Ah, kena man pedem, kena pedem ne unsujanan,
ah kabata-an kew en*

Ah, it shouldn't have been, shouldn't have
been a chick.

*iyang, di ay klaro gajed ne wada man gajed
egkahimo.*

How young is that sacrifice. It clearly
shows that there's nothing we can do.

Solamente, importante du-en, ne . . .

For that single reason, it's important there,
that . . .

The sacrificial blood forms a central part of the elder's performance. Through the blood, he reinstitutes symbolic exchange between humans and spirits, an exchange that speaks to the actual meeting of human ritual participants, as I have already mentioned above, and hence speaks to the general ethos of camaraderie that pervades any Manobo animal sacrifice ritual. If only a chicken is sacrificed, participants would usually belong to one family. If a pig is sacrificed, participants would usually come from different households, a gathering that Manobos call *bayak*. The blood symbol, therefore, embodies the idea of sociability in which households get linked to each other and in which the autonomy of the family is simultaneously redefined. The sacrificial blood congeals, an image that points to the integrity of the family sponsoring the ritual. Through this material, ritual participants divine for signs causing the illnesses plaguing the

family; these are said to be inscribed on the blood, the symbol of the family/clan identity. Furthermore, it is usually after the killing of the sacrifice that the male elder would remark about members of the family who are already distant from the group as not being seen and are, therefore, away from that body. No doubt, the sacrificial blood symbolically marks the group as a unit, enabling the sentiment of “lightness” just mentioned.⁷ Manobos say that they do/speak *panubad-tubad* during rituals. This “responding to,” “returning the force of speech,” or simply “answering back” creates the effect of a dialogue, a negotiation between insider-outsider families or, at the broadest interpretive level, a conversation between them (i.e., ritual participants or human society) and the Other (i.e. other ritual participants or nature).

However, in the context of asymmetrical Visayan-Manobo political economy, to be explained shortly, this “harmonization”—which parallels the interlocking male-female labor embodied in the drum and gong dance rhythm and the older, reciprocal type of symbolic exchange—has been difficult to sustain. Visayan-brought material practices have given rise to a newer type of hybrid ritual in which the negotiable presence of the male elder Manobo-speaking spirit is juxtaposed with the presence of the Visayan spirit who stands for a rather inflexible will (*bu-ot*). To appreciate how this spirit came about, it is imperative to discuss further the Visayan material practices and the history of Manobo-Visayan encounters that gave rise to the embodiment of that Visayan spirit.

VISAYAN SETTLER HEGEMONY, ITS SPIRIT EMBODIMENT

As true elsewhere in the country, the introduction of modern practices to Manoboland entailed the profound restructuring of the Manobo cultural landscape and the indigenous people’s subjection to the colonial and postcolonial powers. All these were facilitated by the immigrants from the coasts of Northern Mindanao and the Central Visayan Islands. The former spoke the language Butwanon and the latter, Cebuano and Hiligaynon. But owing to the fact that they all speak Cebuano at present, the *lingua franca* of Manoboland, they are lumped together as *Bisaya*.

These people served as colonial and postcolonial go-betweens. It was from them, particularly the original coastal Butwanon, that Manobos learned to refer to themselves as “Manobos.” The word /man/ + /obo/ referred to the people living inland (Elkins qtd. in Burton-Montilla 58). Until around the 1950s, the term was strongly pejorative. The word had, and continues to have, diverse connotations such as backwardness, lack of Western education, gullibility, and savagery. These were referents that the outsiders’ civilizing-missionizing projects erased to naturalize history and justify a local modern practice of domination. Manobos alternatively describe themselves with neutral terms such as *tumandek* (autochthonous people of the land) or simply *Agusanen* (people of Agusan Valley).⁸

Coastal Filipinos from northeast of the island and the Central Philippine islands immigrated in huge numbers to this riverine and forested frontier (at the foot of the central Cordillera) in search of wage labor in logging companies from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s. Most of the Visayan settlers were poor and came from the peasantry, but their Visayan identity gave them the privileged access to and control of the symbolic capital of coastal, lowland Christian culture. This culture was characterized by a local form of modernity that featured material practices, such as Western alphabetic literacy, monotheistic Christianity, cosmopolitan health system, a different form of land tenure, sedentarization, and most importantly, cash economy. These practices had undermined the older form of Manobo authority that mediums, nonetheless, still exhibit in contemporary rituals. The research area became a town (during the 1960s) only after the rainforests were cleared and when the Visayans, who labored for the logging company, opted to stay behind (see Vitug 1993). Though Manobos were aware of the use of money-commodity as a medium of exchange, it was only when they started to alienate their labor—i.e., sold it as a commodity by working in logging companies and government bureaucracies—that they became thoroughly imbricated in the cash economy (see Buenconsejo 1999).

Agusanen Manobos refer to Visayan-speaking people as “from the seacoasts” (*dagatnen*) or “baptized” (*binenyagan*). Socio-economic relationship with them has resulted in, what is also so ubiquitous throughout the Philippines as *compadrazgo* (ritual kinship), a hierarchical social relationship that forms enduring neighborhood friendships.⁹ Furthermore, the inland-coastal exchange relationship

has generated the bilingual use of both Manobo and Visayan in everyday life. Bilingualism forms an important component of contemporary Manobo social life. It is part of modern Manobo cultural hybridity that is characterized by a juxtaposition of old and new material practices (for example, going to church and watching T.V. on Sundays and attending a ritual séance on that same day).

Because Manobo *yana-an* ritual is a form of a sensory perception of social reality, this syncretic type of Manobo ritual would also reflect such material practices and exchange relations. It is, however, practised only by bilingual mediums who live in places where actual coastal people have settled (i.e., among town Manobos). This indicates how salient symbolic language forms are vis-à-vis the material world. Bilingual rituals cannot be found in the barrios where Manobo language is still being used in the households. The Visayan-speaking spirit is incarnated in such rituals to give “voice” to the transculturated, bilingual Manobos. While display of betel nuts chew, rice grains, and eggs invoke the mountain spirits, presences from the seacoasts are invoked by Mallorca (white liquor with a vapor they liken to the smell of the sea), beer and soda (for the new type of ritual), shiny round coins, and cigarettes.¹⁰ These are placed on a table, along with the sacrificial meat that is cooked with salt and spices.

Furthermore, instead of the drum and gong, the new ritual form uses the guitar, an indexical symbol of Visayan culture. This use changes the function of the dance-accompanying instrument in relation to the narrative of symbolic exchange discussed above. First, unlike the pairing of the drum and gong (of the older ritual form), which symbolizes the unity, balance, and complementarity of male-female labor—that cooperative behavior necessary for the older subsistence economy—the use of the guitar is not attributed with such meaning. In fact, this instrument is associated with the ubiquitous acculturated type of song in simple harmonic language generically known as *kanta* (Cebuano song) or its many variants with Cebuano texts, from *composo* (narrative songs) and *balitao* (sung verbal repartee) in the past to the tear-jerking sentimental love songs in Tagalog heard over the radio, karaoke, and KTV. Because of its capacity to play rhythmic Western chord progressions, the guitar accompanies modern *kanta* in local popular singing contests (*amateuran*) held in the plaza or in front of neighborhood *sari-sari* stores. It is equally known to accompany songs sold as commodities bought and sold in town markets along the national highway.

Second, the guitar is only one instrument invoking both the mountain and sea world spirits rather than two instruments that sonically display the fusion of drum and gong. As I have mentioned earlier, the materials of the instruments (plant and animal skin for the drum and metal for the gong) stand for specific places in the cosmology that is bounded by the mountain and sea worlds. Instead of this balance, one could even argue that the monopolizing role of the guitar already suggests the Visayan domination of Manoboland.

Third, the opposition of the quality of “hard” and “soft” rhythms simulated on the guitar does not correlate with the general bipartite narrative of spirit-intrusion-then-domestication-of-spirit sequence. In fact, the hard rhythm (on the guitar called *sa-ut*) can be played in either of the two ritual parts in the new ritual, as long as the medium wishes to dance it.¹¹ Finally, the *sa-ut* rhythm on the guitar is not referred to as *tinaga-untod* (as in the drum and gong) but as *binaylan* (in the manner of the baylan). As a corollary, it is inferred that the mountain spirit no longer plays the primary authoritative and legitimizing role in ritual performance. In other words, by calling the guitar rhythm simply *binaylan*, the locus of indigenous ritual authority dissipates. In fact, that authority now comes from the seacoast which the Visayan spirit enacts. The old idea that authority resides in the mythic mountain is, therefore, consequently undermined.

Indeed, the use of the guitar strongly indicates a profound, corollary change in Manobo consciousness. Rather than viewing the mountain as a source of health, authority now emanates from the seacoasts, formerly the source of disease, contagion, and death. Manobo-Visayan relations deal with capital and its accumulation, a medium that is relationally opposed to the exchange of symbolic blood and its equal sharing entailment. Because the Manobos are not in control of capital and the generation of surplus values that stockpile into more capital, creates a context of wealth inequality and of the inevitable hierarchical social relations between Visayans and Manobos. The Visayan spirit is constitutive of such gap in the structural arrangement.

During ritual conversations, the Visayan-speaking spirit conveys an entirely different performance from the male elder mentioned before. While the sight of an animal sacrifice—a pig or a chicken—as a symbolical-material object of exchange pleases the elder (because the sacrifice encapsulates the idea of negotiability),¹² the

Visayan spirit does not stand for such exchange because of unequal social relations. It is for this reason that the Visayan spirit is addressed as an *amigo*, a friend. The Visayan is someone who has no blood relation with Manobos. This is a crucial distinction. Blood differentiates the non-kin *amigo* spirit from the *apoq* (grandfather), by which the male Manobo elder is addressed. Thus, Manobos perceive more distance between themselves and the Visayans in comparison with other indigenous people living in the mountainside of the Manobo cosmos. The more remote origin of the Visayans manifests in the spirit's ritual performance. The distance is signified in two ways. First, the Visayan spirit uses incomplete or elliptical sentences, suggesting the Manobo's non-fluency in the imported Visayan language. Second, and more important, the Visayan spirit is the one who offers glasses of liquor to participants who are *outsiders to the Manobo patriline*. Note that this is opposite the elder who gives a drink to the head of the Manobo family sponsoring the ritual.

The Visayan speaking spirit, of course, speaks Visayan. But the audience and ritual interpreter who respond to him do not speak Visayan but Manobo (even though, as a bilingual group, they know the Visayan language very well).¹³ This manifests the hierarchical use of language with Visayan occupying superior position. It is crucial to take note that, unlike the male elder, the Visayan spirit does not demand a symbolic payment for the transgression committed by the patients' family against the spiritworld. Instead, the Visayan spirit articulates the idea of punishing the transgressor as demonstrated in the following transcripts.

Conversation with Visayan Speaking Spirit

Medium: *Kining uban, amigo, nasuko.*

This other spirit, my friend, got angry.¹⁴

Patient's relative: *Tinu-od na.*

Correct.

Medium: *Nasuko amigo. Pero kami dili.*

Got angry my friend. But we aren't.¹⁵

Patient's father: (to Jok-jok) *Penek ka.*

Keep silent.

Medium: *Pero, amigo, kanang pina-agi sa mga abyan amigo nga dili ma-o,*

But, my friend, that way of the spirits which is not done properly,

masuko kami amigo. Hhm.

we get angry, angry my friend. Hhm.

Ritual Interpreter: *Ang uban nga abyan, kanang tag-an-tag-an, way klaro.*

Other spirit companions, those who guess their words, are dubious.¹⁶

Medium: *Kana amigo ma-ayo ra man kana, pero . . . kadtong nag-agi amigo nga*

That my friend will be good that, but . . . in those past days my friend,

adlaw, naglapas sila.

they trespassed.¹⁷

Ritual Interpreter: *Sayop man sila kay, wala may order nila*

They made a mistake, since they didn't have any order

nga i-adto sa hospital. Gitagalan pa sila ug tulo ka adlaw.

to bring sick to the hospital. They were given three days to stay put.

Medium: *Kinahanglan amigo.*

It's necessary my friend.

Kung dili na kini amigo,

If this (spirit helper) will no longer assume **responsibility**, my friend,

Ritual Interpreter: *Kung mosurindir siya, kana ayha pa,*

If they surrender, that is the time

kay motudlo man sila nga i-adto didto.

when the spirits will suggest that they can bring the patients there.

Pero kay nakalapas man si Pare Edwino, ma-o na nga, ma-o na'y ilang . . .

But since Brother Edwino made a mistake, that is why, that is their . . .

Medium: *Kana gisilutan, amigo! nga kana gipa-ila. Ma-o kana. **That was punished my friend!** That happened so they will realize. Indeed.*

Patient's father's wife's mother: *Lagi, nasi ing-andiya't hospital.*
Correct, the sick were brought to the hospital instead.

Kontra't mge bisaya, anged te si-e.

The Visayans are against this, (like) this ritual.

Medium: *nga gi . . . unsa kana? Kini.*
that . . . what happened? Here.

Other ritual participants: *Masud-ong, mabuhat.*
(The ritual) can be contemplated upon, can be made.

Medium: *Kini, buhat-buhay amigo. Kay walay . . . unsa kadto?*
This (ritual), ritual my friend. Because there was no . . . what was that?

walay mga kumplito amigo diha kaninyo.

(The ritual) wasn't complete in preparation there my friend.

Hhm, kini wala pa. Wala kini.

Hhm, this one wan't there. None of this.

Ritual Interpreter: *O kay unta dungan na sila.*

Yes, since they should have been done together.¹⁸

Medium: *Kung kana na, na-a nay makita.*

If they were together, there would have been some result which can be seen.

Medium: *Na-ay balay-balay diri ba.*

There should have been an altar here.¹⁹

Unya kompleto magdungan kini . . . baboy.

Then this will be completely done together . . . with the pig.

Medium: *Pero kami amigo, wala. Dili kami magkinahanglan, basta motabang kami.*

But we my friend, (we ask for) nothing. We don't need, we'll just help.

Hhm. Motabang kami kutob sa mahimo. Mo-unsang kana? Kini amigo mga engkanto,

Hhm. We'll help as long as we can. What will that do? These spirits my friend,²⁰

dili nga kana mga Satanas. Huh! Gani man, amigo, kanang mga da-utan ug mga unsa kana . . . ?

those are not from Satan. Huh! In fact, my friend, those evil spirits and what else . . . ?

Ritual Interpreter: *Huna-huna.*

(Bad) Mind.

This notion of disciplining infers a vertical social relation that is evident in contemporary everyday Manobo relations with the Visayans. Most of the Manobos in the town, for example, have extended domestic services, in one way or the other, to comparatively affluent Visayan families. Their services are exchanged for favors, such as getting job appointments, loan of money, advice on government bureaucratic work, and so on. Furthermore, Manobos have experienced the “domineering” behavior of public school teachers, of local government officials, and of their *kumpares* and *kumadres*, their bosses with whom they have dealt with through informal, small-scale, trading alliances. Besides, Visayans numerically dominate Western-based ideological apparatuses such as the school, church, and government bureaucracies.

In the excerpt of a ritual conversation above, the Visayan spirit gives advice (*pagtulun-an*), asserts an explicitly commanding authority, threatens the audience with his wrath, does not accept forgiveness, and is almost always temperamental and difficult to please. All these traits indicate Manobo perception of actual Visayan settlers with whom they have interacted with in real life. The low Manobo economic power puts them in the subordinate position, even if they try to participate in contemporary social life. The inequality and non-access of the Manobos to the Visayan technologies of power amount almost to ideological silencing. This is interestingly represented in the mute spirit which is also and only incarnated in places where Visayans have settled.²¹

The ritual excerpt above demonstrates the Manobo perception of the rather inflexible authority that the Visayan spirit embodies. In this curing ritual, the conversation revolves around the mistake of the patient's father who had undermined the authority of the spirit when he brought his ill children to the hospital instead of observing ritual taboos.²² Rather than be appeased through the negotiability of exchange by means of symbolic gifts and the animal sacrifice, the "hard to please" Visayan spirit repeatedly places the blame on the patients' father. This insistence prompts the interpreter, who referees the spirit-human dialogue, to remark that humans, indeed, have difficulty in "answering back" (*panubad-tubad*). It is during such moments that Manobos recognize the difference between the Manobo elder and the Visayan spirit.²³

The mimesis of the adamant Visayan spirit enables the Manobos to objectify the unequal relations between them and the Visayan settlers. In other words, through the performance, the Manobos identify "their" blood-related Manobo male elder, who is more open to negotiation by means of symbolic gifts,²⁴ and the Visayan speaking spirit, who has a more oppressive will.²⁵ Such *recognition* triggers a process of looking into social life as a form of reconstrual. It opens a contingent space where experience is objectified. Through the power of the mime, Manobos get hold of historical experiences at close range and transform them into objects for comprehending. By doing so, Manobos express social agency (cf. Iletto 1989, Comaroff 1985 and 1992, Scott 1990, Stoller 1995, and Tsing 1993).

In the last ritual excerpt below, it becomes apparent how real, yet so fictive or imaginative, such representation is in the context of

the history of material inequality. This occurs in the penultimate act before the medium's fall. The father of the patient receives the consecrated food which, together with an uttered magical spell, rechannels back the old cosmic order. Through this, the participants suddenly realize what is, in fact, absent or missing. The patient's father cries as he does this, performing an act of mourning. The loss triggers the remembrance of the bird spirit in the medium's body. The bird spirit is no longer incarnated because the patient's father's brother who owned the spirit is dead. Nonetheless, the lost voice is momentarily recovered, a vocal presence, which floods the ritual space with strong memories of the past. The remembrance defines the living present: their current misery and material deprivation, the patient's father who has lost his way, the knowledge of ritual lore seemingly abandoned. I argue that these are all redefinitions of history that, as this paper tries to explicate, are covertly contestatory of Manobo contemporary predicament. After the loss of the phantom bird spirit, which stands as an icon of the once forested cultural landscape, a spirit voice re-enters. It makes a simple but commanding and emphatic statement. It is the voice of the Visayan spirit, urging them to remember the ritual at present. But then the Visayan voice is contested. An audience member makes another plea addressed to that spirit for help. The ghost of the bird spirit can only utter a vocal rupture, a faint noise, at that point. The phantom spirit voice fades out. It can no longer be fully recovered in ritual time. The medium falls, ending another performance that for the Manobos always attempts to dramatize the invasion of imaginary others that will rejuvenate for them those equalizing social exchange relations.

Interpolations of Bird and Visayan Spirits

(Ritual interpreter gives food to the patient's parents.)

Ritual Interpreter: *Na, dawaton si-eni inhakyad te si-e daduwa,*
So, I will receive this offering for these two
children,

iyan da nadawat kan kinabuhi'n madejew, ah
te si-e daduwa, he-o man su madejew en man.
that which has been received, the good health
of these two. Yes, since they will get well.

Patient's father (murmuring and crying): *Tabangi a da si-e pambati-en si-e kabata-an,*
Help me in easing the sickness of these children.

ibetang ne anged te inbetang . . . kabata-an,
I will place the good health of the children.

inggad da ma't madejew te kahintang, hina-ut tabangan key nu.
I wish that their state will be good. I wish that you will help us.

(Bird spirit owned by patient's father's brother enters.)

(Medium cries.)

Ritual Interpreter: *E ay, Otoq Winnie. Malised.Engka-ana't.*
Inggad man kuwa, puli te
Brother Winnie. How difficult. That is difficult indeed. Even if it is difficult, just

pudo na'n da mge bata. Na se nu man ne migsajo ka man migkuwa, panew.
bring (life to) all the children. It's your fault for leaving us early.

Haq ka kunte-en ki Pare Edwino, ne'g kajahaw-jahaw te kuwa,
Look at Brother Edwino now, who wanders aimlessly around,

te buhi kew da pa iyan, kagawasan si-e kabata-an.
had you been here now, (there would have been) freedom for these children.

Patient's grandmother 1: *Kena'g kataga-taga puli en*
(He) doesn't know (the tradition), so he just

egkapahospital.
brought the patients to the hospital.

Ritual Interpreter: (coughs) *Kæ man ka-iling-iling si-e kabata-an,*
That is why the children are like this (now),

haq ka kuwa, Ling-ling
you look (at them), Ling-ling (i.e., a relative
who recently got cured from madness)

*ķunte-en. Man da, ne pig-iling ķo bag-o ka-
uli-uli.*
at present. That is that, say I, that girl who
just recently returned from madness.

Patient's grandmother 1: *Aw na-uli-an en.*
And who has been cured.

Medium: *Ayoha ninyo ķana.*
Do that (ritual) well.

Ritual Interpreter: *Adangay, egtabang ķew en iyan.:*
Please, help us indeed.

(Medium cries.)

Ritual Interpreter: *Dejawa nu sadangay. Hinangyu-ay ķew.*
Please cure the children. Let's help each
other.

Patient's grandmother 2: *Mandalingan e't du-en.*
That's the Mandalingan there.

Ritual Interpreter: *E, ķa'gķuwa ķeham ķi Otoq Winnie,
Mandalingan.*
That which possesses Brother Winnie,
Mandalingan.

*Sadangay, eghandemķew da gajed, egsengeg
ķuwa ķew da gajed tabang.*
Please, you're being remembered, indeed
you will hear us and help us.

*Na, mayaw-ey te . . . maywa-ey te mabigsahan
si Pare Edwino, ne medu-en du-en kew . . .*

So, it's bad that Brother Edwino will lose
the way, that you are there . . .

(The medium falls.)

Medium: Hiiiiiii!

CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have explored how the introduction of new and modern material practices by Visayan-speaking settlers to the middle Agusan Valley had corresponding “effects” in the form and materiality of Agusan Manobo ritual. By specifically locating the site of these cultural transformations in expressive culture, particularly in the complex, multisensorial event of ritual, I have shown how imperative it is to consider aspects of culture that deal specifically with aesthetics, symbols, the body and its senses, and that play an extremely important constitutive role in any social life. Rather than merely treating the said aspects as by-products of political economies or simply “epiphenomenal,” I have demonstrated that genres such as dance, song, speech, and music can reveal most how people intimately link their lives with historical experiences, embodying visceral perceptions of self-other, and with a cultural imagination that is, nonetheless, still rooted in the complex flows of immediate political economies.

In the older subsistence economy, patterns of cooperative behavior (at the household level) are expressed in the male-female interlocking rhythm of drum and gong sounds. This provides a “music” that accompanies possession gestures, carrying with them resonant symbolic meanings about self-other, host-guest encounters, or nature and human society at another level. Because this rhythm—called *tinaga-untod* (of the mountain)—is played during the incarnation of the Manobo-speaking male elder warrior who embodies the idea of symbolic blood exchange, its performance in ritual realizes the authority of the customary law of the elders. The male spirit is addressed as *apoq* (grandfather).

With the onslaught of modern, Visayan-introduced, capitalist political economy, however, a new form of Manobo ritual emerged. This is a hybrid, the result of a process during which the dominating Visayan-speaking spirit is presented along with the Manobo-speaking one. The latter speaks the authority founded upon a negotiable customary law that espouses ideas of “harmonizing” (*panubad-tubad*) exchange and sacrificing. In contrast, the Visayan spirit’s performativity depicts a more inflexible will. I have argued that this suggests hierarchy, political, economic asymmetry, even some kind of negative reciprocity that, nevertheless, has been negotiated or made familiar through the non-blood relationship of friendship. The Visayan-speaking spirit is addressed as “*amigo*,” a term that expresses the valence of related terms *kumare* or *kumpare* and which are used by persons (Manobos and Visayans alike) having *compadrazgo* relationships (see Buenconsejo 1999). The *amigo* spirit dances to a rhythm called *binaylan* played on the guitar, in front of a table where food indexicals of Visayan society are ceremoniously displayed. In all Manobo rituals, it is clear that participants construct and articulate social boundaries between them and the “not one of us” (*dili ingon nato*). Yet I pointed out as well that the “not one of us” are refractions of actual people who are “not from here” (*dili taga diri*).

In conclusion, spirit-possession is a narrative by which Manobos appropriate images of a lived historical experience. By getting hold of the likeness of Visayan authority, I have argued that the Manobos do not simply accept that authority, even though it may seem at the surface that they do. In fact, the statement addressed to the Visayan spirit, “please have pity on us” is an act of resistance, a rupture parallel to Scott’s “hidden transcript” that has made a breakthrough in a public ritual form. The rupture objectifies the cruel political economy, enunciating a moral weapon that Manobos use to face Visayan capital. It speaks about a morality that contests the modern medium of exchange, a medium antithetical to the older Manobo code of sacrificing that symbolic exchange and sharing of ritual séance institute.

ENDNOTES

¹Burton-Montilla’s archeological diggings in La Paz, a neighboring town, indicate that continuous trade had existed between inland Manobos

and coastal Butwanon at least since 2,000 B.C. (51). This was, however, slow compared to the coastal native communities that had access to the busy maritime Southeast Asian trade and to the world capitalism of Western Europe beginning the 17th century.

²For the concept of “motto,” see Rouget (1985).

³Unfortunately, we cannot go into the discussion about song and transgression because this is a topic that is too broad for the purposes of this paper.

⁴Derrida (1995) attributes such act instead to the notion of “absolute responsibility” that recognizes the engagement of beings in the world to the experience of the infinite.

⁵Cf., e.g., with the feeling of lightness after the release of Ilongot passion *liget*, see Rosaldo (1980).

⁶The following orthographic conventions are used to represent the ritual texts. The five letters (1) a, (2) æ, (3) e, (4) i, and (5) u represent seven vowel phonemes of the (Agusan) Manobo Umayam dialect, as follows: The letter æ represents the phoneme /æ/ as in the English word “cat.” The letter e represents either the vowel phoneme /e/ or /i/. The letter i represents either vowel phoneme /i/ or /ü/. The seventeen consonant phonemes will be represented by the following letters and symbols: (1) b, (2) k, (3) d, (4) g, (5) h, (6) l, (7) m, (8) n, (9) ng (i.e., /h/) (10) p, (11) r, (12) s, (13) t, (14) w, (15) y, (16) j, and (17) q. The last phoneme represents the glottal stop phoneme in word final position, after either a stressed or an unstressed vowel. In mid-position, the glottal stop is represented by -, i.e., (1) between two consecutive vowels as in *ka-iling* and (2) between a consonant and vowel as in *ted-em*, *udas-udas*, and *huna-huna-on*. There is no attempt to represent vowel length and stress in the orthography.

⁷As found in most indigenous Southeast Asian etiologies, a sick person is described as lacking blood. The notion of blood rejuvenating the life of the family draws a parallel.

⁸Recently, Manobos have begun using the term *lumad* in referring to themselves. Such use is embedded in the politics of cultural recognition—naively celebratory, if not romanticizing—that is initiated by government and non-governmental organizations working in Mindanao. *Lumad* refers to the non-Islamic indigenous people of Mindanao. Like the term *manobo* of the past, the name-sign *lumad* suggests group relations. Agusanen Manobos constructs a sense of their ethnicity via an exterior language.

⁹This is expressed in the fictive *compadrazgo* relationship which is so ubiquitous in the Philippines. For some classic articles related to this subject, see Hollnsteiner (1973) and Kaut (1961).

¹⁰Burton-Montilla had documented this type of hybrid Manobo ritual where there is a display of candies, biscuits, and sweet glutinous rice cakes. These foods are all associated with people from the coasts.

¹¹This dance rhythm heard on the guitar is described as “in the old style” (Cebuano, *kinara-an*), because it is already associated with Manobo ritual that, in the context of Visayan modernity, has already assumed the status and connotations of being a thing of the past. Nonetheless, I describe this rhythm as “new” because I am comparing it with the drum and gong pair of the older ritual form.

¹²The pig—along with other prestigious goods from the coast such as bossed gongs—was the medium of exchange among Manobo households before money-commodity came into full circulation. See Garvan (1941).

¹³Sometimes the ritual interpreter speaks in Visayan, but he does this when he also talks to the audience.

¹⁴The “other” spirit referred to here is the Manobo-speaking spirit.

¹⁵Referring to the Visayan speaking spirit.

¹⁶The interpreter validates the officiating medium’s authority here, by saying that other mediums are a hoax.

¹⁷The medium reminds the participants of the ritual taboo violation again.

¹⁸The interpreter is suggesting here that the preparations for the rituals of the Inajew and the personal spirit, Sul___an, should have been planned simultaneously.

¹⁹Referring to the simulated house where food offerings are placed for the spirits. See Chapter 3 of Buenconsejo (1999).

²⁰The medium uses the term *engkanto* because the spirit speaking in the medium is Visayan.

²¹Like the Visayan-speaking spirit, the mute spirit incarnates only among mediums who live in places where Visayans are settling. Because coastal Visayan speakers have exercised control of the discourse and material life in the research area, the “voice” of the mute spirit indicates the effect of hegemony on the body. Yet, while the Visayan-spirit voice “accepts” that imported hegemony, the gestures—often violent and incoherent—of the mute spirit show bodily ruptures that seem to resist the excesses of that ideological imposition. Meanwhile, Manobo-speaking spirits feel shame as they face the allure of the glamour, wealth, and capital of the encroaching Visayans. I have documented Manobo spirits who show such sentiments. However, because of space limitation, I would not be able to show them here.

²²The patients’ father brought them to the hospital upon the pressure of Visayan neighbors. This was against the ritual taboo which demands that the patients have to be confined inside the house where the ritual was held for three days. This stipulation was explicitly stated in the first ritual of the sequence of three rituals performed for the patients.

²³I argue that Manobos do not become Visayans when they mimic the latter, and it is not true that they suffer from “colonial mentality” or that their

culture becomes deculturated when they imitate the Visayans. This is a naive and common assumption elsewhere.

²⁴These are domesticated animals whose human owners worked hard to raise them.

²⁵For a related process in the performative act, see Cannell (1995).

WORKS CITED

- Arcilla, Jose S., S.J. "Urios and the Bagani of Agusan, 1875-1900." *Kinaadman* 6 (1984): 235-47.
- Attali, Jacques. *Noise: The Political Economy of Music. Theory and History of Literature*. Vol. 16. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1985.
- Buenconsejo, Jose. "Songs and Gifts at the Colonial Frontier: The Aesthetics of Agusan Manobo Spirit-Possession Ritual, Philippines." Ph.D. Dissertation. U of Pennsylvania, 1999.
- Cannell, Fenella. *Power and Intimacy in the Christian Philippines*. Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- . "The Power of Appearances: Beauty, Mimicry, and Transformation in Bicol." *Discrepant Histories: Translocal Essays on Filipino Cultures*. Ed. Vicente Rafael. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1995.
- Comaroff, Jean. *Body of Power: Spirit of Resistance of a South African People*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1985.
- Comaroff, Jean and John. *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination. Studies in the Ethnographic Imagination*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview P, 1992.
- Derrida, Jacques. *The Gift of Death*. Trans. David Wills. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1995.
- Garvan, John M. *The Manobos of Mindanao. Memoirs of the National Academy of Science*. Vol. 23. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1941.
- Hart, Donn. *Compadrinazgo: Ritual Kinship in the Philippines*. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois UP, 1977.
- Hollnsteiner, Mary. "Reciprocity in the Lowland Philippines." *Four Readings on Philippine Values*. Ed. Frank Lynch and Alfonso de Guzman. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila UP, 1973. 69-92.
- Ileto, Reynaldo Clemenña. *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines, 1840-1910*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila UP, 1989.
- Kaut, Charles. "Utang na loob: a system of contractual obligation among Tagalogs." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 17 (1961): 256-72.

- Montilla-Burton, Erlinda. "The Impact of Modern Medical Intervention on The Agusan Manobo Medical System of the Philippines." Ph.D. dissertation. U of Pittsburgh, 1983.
- Ness, Sally Ann. *Body, Movement, and Culture: Kinesthetic and Visual Symbolism in a Philippine Community*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1992.
- Rafael, Vincente L., ed. *Discrepant Histories : Translocal Essays on Filipino Cultures*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1995.
- Rosaldo, Michelle Z. *Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot Notions of Self and Social Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- Roseman, Marina. "'Pure Products Go Crazy': Rainforest Healing in a Nation-State." *The Performance of Healing*. Ed. Carol Laderman and Marina Roseman. New York and London: Routledge, 1996. 233-69.
- Rouget, Gilbert. *Music and Trance*. Trans. Bruhnilde Biebuyck. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1985.
- Schreurs, Peter, M.S.C. *Caraga Antigua: The Hispanization and Christianization of Agusan, Surigao, and Davao*. Cebu City: U of San Carlos P, 1989.
- Scott, James. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1990.
- . *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1990.
- Stoller, Paul. *Embodying Colonial Memories: Spirit Possession, Power, and the Hauka in West Africa*. New York and London: Routledge, 1995.
- Taussig, Michael T. *Mimesis and Alterity: a Particular History of the Senses*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. *In the Realm of the Diamond Queen: Marginality in an Out-of-the-way Place*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.
- Vitug, Marites Danguilan. *The Politics of Logging: Power from the Forest*. Manila: Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism, 1993.
- Yengoyan, Aram. "Environment, Shifting Cultivation, and Social Organization Among the Mandaya of Eastern Mindanao, Philippines." Ph.D. Dissertation. U of Chicago, 1964.

Jose S. Buenconsejo teaches ethnomusicology and music history at the College of Music, University of the Philippines at Diliman. He received his master's degree in Music from the University of Hawaii at Manoa in 1993 and his Ph.D. in Music from the University of Pennsylvania in 1999.