

Other Grounds: Popular Genres and the Rhetoric of Anthropology, 1900-1940

Risa Applegarth

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of English and Comparative Literature.

Chapel Hill

2009

Approved by:

Dr. Jane Danielewicz

Dr. Erika Lindemann

Dr. Jordynn Jack

Dr. María DeGuzmán

Dr. Valerie Lambert

© 2009
Risa Applegarth
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Abstract

Other Grounds: Popular Genres and the Rhetoric of Anthropology, 1900-1940

Risa Applegarth

(Under the direction of Dr. Jane Danielewicz)

Other Grounds: Popular Genres and the Rhetoric of Anthropology, 1900-1940, examines how gender, race, and genre interact in a discipline's bid for scientific status. As anthropology professionalized early in the twentieth century, the ethnographic monograph became the primary site for legitimate scientific knowledge, and many practitioners—especially women and Native Americans—found their concerns and knowledge practices marginalized. These marginalized professionals responded creatively to the monograph's ascendance by developing alternative genres flexible and capacious enough to accommodate their intellectual and rhetorical goals. This study recovers a proliferation of alternative genres, including field autobiographies, folklore collections, and ethnographic novels, that rhetors created in the early twentieth century to access rhetorical resources unavailable in the discipline's privileged forms. I demonstrate that marginalized practitioners, including Gladys Reichard, Ruth Underhill, Ann Axtell Morris, Frank Applegate, Luther Standing Bear, and others, used these hybrid genres to influence professional practice and to intervene in broader debates taking place outside professional boundaries—debates, for instance, over indigenous land rights and federal Indian education policy. For scholars in rhetoric, this project offers a critical vocabulary for

analyzing spatial-rhetorical practices, by (1) connecting contemporary genre theory with studies of spatial rhetorics, (2) analyzing a range of spatial tropes and topoi, and (3) introducing for critical use such terms as *rhetorical scarcity*, *rhetorical trajectories*, and *rhetorical recruitment*. Ultimately, this project critiques the power of spatial representations to naturalize relations of domination, and recovers inventive rhetorical strategies that use spatial representations to call for—and create—knowledge that demands ethical response and action.

Dedication:

To my mother Joy and to my partner Matthew

Acknowledgements

Throughout this project I have benefited in immeasurable ways from the support of many people. First, to my advisor, Jane Danielewicz, I owe my deepest gratitude; her intellectual generosity, her unflagging mentorship, and her unwavering confidence in my work have made all the difference in my development as a scholar. I am also most grateful to Jordynn Jack for the intelligence and energy she brings to others' work. I hope I can be as generous a mentor to my own students as Jane and Jordynn have been to me. I thank María DeGuzmán for stretching my thinking, from my first graduate course to my final dissertation defense. My interest in anthropology, as a discipline and a discourse, was crystallized in Valerie Lambert's seminar on personhood, and she has shaped this project in important ways since that course. I thank Erika Lindemann for the good humor and good ideas she has shared with me throughout this undertaking. Finally, I thank Claudia Brown, my earliest mentor, and Carol Rutz, who pointed me in the direction of rhetoric and composition, which has turned out to be just the intellectual home I was looking for.

This project was supported by a Caroline H. and Thomas S. Royster, Jr. Fellowship from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I thank the Roysters and the UNC Graduate School for providing me with dedicated time for research, encouraging me to find broader audiences for my work, and helping me to hone my ideas through exchange in the interdisciplinary environment of the Society of Fellows.

Through several years of weekly meetings, the Rhet/Comp Writing Group at UNC has provided support, encouragement, insight, and critique, in such quantities and of such quality that I could not have completed this project without them. Sarah Hallenbeck, Heather Branstetter, Erin Branch, Stephanie Morgan, and Chelsea Redeker have been excellent readers, colleagues, and friends; they know my work as well as I do, and often articulate my arguments better than I do myself. I also thank Jillian Ball, Leslie Eager, Autumn Eakin, Daniel Lupton, and Kelly Ross, my dearest friends; by sharing meals, games, movies, and conversations over the years, they have ensured that my work has never become my only occupation.

The most longstanding debts are owed to my remarkable family, without whose support I would never have had the opportunity to go to college, let alone earn a Ph.D. To all of my family I extend my sincere thanks. Particularly crucial has been the support of my mother, Joy Maxine Sparks, who has made so many things possible for me. She is my model in every way, and I can only hope to match her curiosity, creativity, and warmth. To Dakota, Chenoa, Robert, and Avery I extend my deepest gratitude, for their generosity, encouragement, and humor; I am so proud of them all, as I know they are of me. Finally, I happily thank Matthew Loyd, the best partner, scholar, and friend, who convinces me that anything is possible and helps me make it so.

Table of Contents

Chapter

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| I. | Introduction: Genre, Space, and Professional Discourse..... | 1 |
| II. | Ethnographic Monographs: Genre Change and Rhetorical Scarcity..... | 33 |
| | Variation and Flexibility in Early Anthropological Discourse and Monographs, 1890-1920..... | 40 |
| | Malinowski Among the Anthropologists: Spatial- Rhetorical Strategies of <i>Argonauts</i> Reconsidered..... | 59 |
| | Rhetorical Scarcity: Genre Constraints in a Rhetorical Ecosystem..... | 82 |
| III. | 'Essentially American' Spaces: Rhetorical Space and Time in Native American Folklore Collections..... | 95 |
| | Native American Folklore Collections: Chronotopic Unconscious and Spatial Tropes..... | 102 |
| | Ethical Alternatives in the Folklore Collection Genre..... | 128 |
| IV. | Moving Homes: Indian Education in the Ethnographic Novel..... | 152 |
| | Exigencies: Indian Education and Professional Anthropology..... | 157 |
| | Hybrid Resources and Spatial Strategies..... | 166 |
| | Habitation, Movement, and Educational Trajectories..... | 182 |
| V. | Negotiating Space: Rhetorical Recruitment and Disciplinary Critique in Field Autobiographies..... | 205 |
| | Professional Positions: Morris, Reichard, and Institutional Status..... | 208 |
| | Field Autobiographies as a Genre..... | 213 |
| | Inhabiting the Field: Ethos and Rhetorical Recruitment in <i>Digging in Yucatan</i> and <i>Digging in the Southwest</i> | 220 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Addressing a Profession: Space and Methodology in <i>Spider-Woman</i> | 231 |
| Conclusion: Spatial Practices, Ethical Possibilities, and Gendered Institutions..... | 249 |
| References..... | 260 |

Chapter One

Introduction: Genre, Space, and Professional Discourse

“Who may be an anthropologist? Every man, woman and child that has sense and patience to observe, and that can honestly record the thing observed.”
--Otis Mason, “What is Anthropology?”, 1882

“In reviewing the work of the Society, it is noticeable that the majority of the papers represent the results of personal observation on the part of the authors. They are real contributions to knowledge.”
--Anita Newcomb McGee, “Historical Sketch of the Women’s Anthropological Society of America,” 1889

In his 1882 address to the Anthropological Society of Washington, Otis T. Mason staked out “the extent and boundaries” of the newly-formed discipline of anthropology (25). Those boundaries determined which elements within several “vast territories of knowledge” (37) were distinctly anthropological, but delimited potential practitioners of anthropology only in the loosest terms. Anyone could be an anthropologist, Mason suggested, who “has sense and patience to observe” and the capacity to “honestly record the thing observed” (26). Although “the anthropologist prosecute[s] his work ... by the most vigorous and exacting methods” (26), nevertheless, Mason assured his audience that anthropology was “a science in which there is no priesthood and laity, no sacred language; but one in which you are all both the investigator and the investigated” (42). In this portrayal, anthropology

demands “scientific” descriptions of one’s observations; yet because the emerging science aimed at a full account of human history, all capable observers would be needed to contribute meaningfully to so vast an intellectual project. A deep tension between openness and rigor was present in the discipline from its earliest moments of professionalization.

The Women’s Anthropological Society (WAS), also based in Washington, D.C., took seriously Mason’s claim. Organized in 1885 on the model of the Anthropological Society of Washington (ASW), and following what WAS Secretary Anita McGee would later call their “novel and hazardous idea” of forming a scientific society, the Women’s Anthropological Society drafted and adopted a constitution, elected officers, established procedural by-laws, created a Board of Directors, and organized standing committees “on Printing” and “on Communications.”¹ The society’s dual purpose was, “first, to open to women new fields for systematic investigation; second, to invite their cooperation in the development of the science of anthropology” (McGee 16).

As a society committed to *women’s* access to scientific inquiry, the WAS also had to negotiate a tension between openness and rigor; in particular, between upholding scientific standards and providing opportunities specifically for women to participate in scientific study.² To do so, the WAS characterized the “field” of anthropology through a modified set of spatial terms. Whereas Mason called for all qualified participants to help explore and organize the “vast territories of knowledge” awaiting scientific exploration, the Women’s Anthropological Society organized in order to “open” these territories specifically to women. These women characterize

anthropology not as vast, unexplored reaches in need of investigation, but instead as a space that *women* need to locate, open, and enter in order to access opportunities for scientific inquiry and intellectual work

One way the WAS authorized their participants as scientific researchers was by portraying anthropology as a welcoming science, demanding only an acute capacity for observation rather than specialized training. The WAS reprinted, in 1888, Mason's "What is Anthropology?" lecture explicitly to "direct the members in their work" (McGee 19), recontextualizing his arguments to authorize their own observation-based research as legitimate knowledge.³ In particular, Mason's claim about the capacity to observe and to record one's observations offered the women in the WAS a powerful means to ground their own knowledge claims. As Anita McGee reports⁴ in 1889, surveying the papers presented at society meetings, "the majority of the papers represent the results of personal observation on the part of the authors. They are real contributions to knowledge" (19). Thus through the newly emerging professional apparatus of anthropology, "personal observations" based on recreational travel could be reframed in WAS meetings as "real" knowledge; travel and leisure could be transformed into intellectual work and presented to the society as systematic, scientific research under titles such as "Korea," "Russia," "The Hawaiians," and "The Japanese." By portraying their access to distant places, even women who lacked formal scientific training authorized their own access, at least in part, to those "vast territories" of scientific knowledge that the new field of anthropology offered.

Yet the demand for rigor, for truly *scientific* observation, also established limits on the significance of the work these women produced and presented. Anthropological knowledge was legitimated not only by observation, but more specifically by textual representations which garnered agreement and established legitimacy insofar as they met the discursive norms of a broader community. The women of the WAS were more successful in authorizing their texts through firsthand observation than they were, ultimately, in legitimating their contributions in relation to a broader community of anthropologists. Significantly, few of the papers read at WAS meetings achieved circulation amongst the emerging anthropological community.⁵ Whereas the Anthropological Society of Washington sponsored its own journal, the *American Anthropologist*, to publish research presented at society meetings, the WAS lacked an institutional outlet to distribute their “real contributions to knowledge” to a larger anthropological audience. A difference of status distinguished these two early genres of anthropological research—the “paper,” which was read aloud at a meeting, and the published article, which was distributed far more widely.

The unequal status between these two societies points to a key problem faced by women who desired opportunities to undertake scientific inquiry. How could they take advantage of the emerging professional apparatus of the sciences—in the form of scholarly organizations, official membership, regular meetings, specialized periodicals, and so on—to legitimate their participation in activities long coded as masculine? How could they in fact *influence* scientific research through their participation? Would professionalized science offer clearer and more routine

avenues for women's entry into scientific work—for instance, into anthropology through the straightforward criterion of observing cultures or customs at firsthand? Or would institutionalized relations of power remain unchanged, so that even when women could claim to make “real contributions to knowledge” within their own organizations, those contributions would fail to influence further work if they were not located in the genres and the publication venues that mattered most?

The women who participated in the WAS attempted to address these questions by generating arguments to affirm the importance of their work and by producing portrayals of anthropology that could include them as practitioners. Their success in placing themselves within the new discipline is manifest in several ways: in their visibility as elected officers in the earliest decades of anthropology's professionalization (Lurie; Visweswaran; Parezo); in their incorporation into the first national anthropological society, the American Anthropological Association, upon its founding in 1902; and, especially, in the sizeable number of women who continued to enter anthropology over the first decades of the twentieth century, through graduate study and other means.

These women, the second generation of women whose writing for popular and professional audiences I examine in this project, continued to navigate the tensions between openness and rigor that are evident in the relationship between the WAS and the ASW. Although representations of space—demonstrating that one was *there* in person, observing firsthand—continued to serve as crucial resources for legitimating anthropological knowledge, the status of such representations was shaped by a variety of shifting factors between the turn of the twentieth century and

the onset of World War II. While the successful careers of nineteenth-century WAS members like Zelia Nuttall, Alice Fletcher, Erminnie Smith, and Matilda Coxe Stevenson led to a perception of anthropology as a “welcoming science,” women’s entry into many social sciences in the early twentieth century “unleashed fears of feminization” (Ross 394) that social scientists responded to with aggressively masculinized discursive practices and methodologies. Anthropologists, eager to secure newly-available research funding during the interwar period and to support their discipline’s claim to scientific status, created ever clearer boundaries throughout the early twentieth century to distinguish between legitimate practitioners and untrained amateurs. This project examines how female anthropologists addressed this narrowing discipline through the rhetorical resources of genre and space.

Rhetorical Practices in Early American Anthropology

Early American anthropology offers a rich case for investigations into gender, genre, the developing apparatus of professional anthropology, and the role of spatial representations in authorizing new scientific knowledge. How are relations of power maintained or effaced through the discursive practices of a particular community? How do genres shape the knowledge a discipline produces and the practices a discipline acknowledges? How do gender and genre intersect in professional discourse? How do spatial representations—for instance, in anthropological discourse, portrayals of “the field”—affect the production of knowledge? As many rhetorical scholars have argued (Gross; Fahnestock; Ceccarelli *Shaping*), scientific

knowledge is a rhetorical accomplishment, achieved, like all forms of knowledge, through the interaction between cultural institutions, rhetorical practices, and the material world. How do spatial tropes influence the creation of myriad forms of scientific knowledge? What spatial resources and rhetorical strategies for producing knowledge and grounding arguments are organized within a discipline's privileged genres? And at the borders of a scientific community, where women, people of color, and amateur practitioners are often relegated, what alternative rhetorical practices are generated?

Other Grounds: Popular Genres and the Rhetoric of Anthropology, 1900-1940 takes up these questions by examining a range of texts written by American anthropologists during that discipline's formative decades. The rhetors I consider in this project wrote ethnographic monographs, folklore collections, ethnographic novels, and field autobiographies in their efforts to shape the epistemological and ethical grounds of anthropological practice during a period when such practices were still far from determined. As I show, anthropological discourse took many forms over these decades. Boundaries between anthropology and related discourses—such as medicine and anatomy, folklore studies and history, psychology and sociology, as well as popular discourses of travel, adventure, and “Indian stories”—were defined and redefined, both by practitioners firmly committed to one body of knowledge and by individuals whose own interests ranged widely over these discursive arenas. Anthropology's methods for generating knowledge, practices for producing trained practitioners, and rhetorical strategies for garnering agreement, generating research problems, and directing increasing institutional resources were all in flux across the

first decades of the twentieth century. Drawing insights from genre theory, rhetorics of space, and feminist, historical, and rhetorical analyses of science, this project uncovers alternative rhetorical and epistemological practices that were marginalized in anthropology's bid for scientific status during this period of disciplinary transition.

In this project I advance two key arguments. First, I demonstrate that genres are epistemic, shaping the knowledge they are used to produce and deeply linked to professional discourse and disciplinary practice. Second, I argue that spatial representations have significant rhetorical power. The genres that anthropological writers adopted during the early twentieth century served strategic purposes, making particular spatial and rhetorical resources available to the rhetors who used them. These genres—as configurations of rhetorical strategies and as sites for rhetorical action—substantially shaped relationships between anthropological rhetors, their audiences, their objects of knowledge, and the discipline of anthropology they enacted. Focusing on the tensions, contradictions, and possibilities evident during this period of transformation, this project investigates the role of genre in discipline formation, the intersection between gender and genre in professional discourse, and the spatial tropes, spatial representations, and other spatial strategies anthropologists used to advance their arguments and address their audiences.

To substantiate these arguments, each of the remaining four chapters takes up a particular anthropological genre, assessing the spatial strategies the genre organizes and the forms of knowledge and rhetorical action that rhetors use the genre to accomplish. Chapter Two, “Genre Change and Rhetorical Scarcity in Ethnographic Monographs,” traces anthropology's transformation into “the science of culture” in

relation to corresponding changes in the discipline's privileged genre, the ethnographic monograph. The monograph genre helped anthropologists to simultaneously create and meet new demands for scientific rigor, and constrained anthropologists' legitimate audiences, arguments, and aims. Between 1900 and 1920, institutional boundaries solidified to distinguish legitimate and illegitimate practitioners, methods, and textual forms; in response to these narrowing professional boundaries, alternative genres proliferated.

Chapters Three, Four, and Five examine the popular, hybrid genres that many marginalized practitioners generated in the 1920s and 1930s to connect anthropological knowledge with broad audiences and public issues. Chapter Three, “‘Essentially American Spaces’: Rhetorical Space and Time in Native American Folklore Collections,” examines how rhetors adapt the spatial resources of a popular genre for divergent rhetorical ends. While many writers used spatial tropes of absence and containment to naturalize the destruction of Native American communities, other rhetors used the folklore collection genre to position whites and Native Americans in shared spaces that demanded ethical response and action. Chapter Four, “Moving Homes: Indian Education in the Ethnographic Novel,” analyzes how rhetors portray habitation, movement, and educational trajectories in ethnographic novels in order to intervene in widespread public debates over Indian education and federal Indian policy during the 1930s. Chapter Five, “Negotiating Space: Rhetorical Recruitment and Methodological Critique in Field Autobiographies,” examines how women anthropologists developed hybrid autobiographical forms that allowed them to position themselves strategically in

relation to the discipline of anthropology, writing themselves *into the field*, so to speak, and simultaneously advocating for change.

The project concludes by examining spatial representations in relation to the ethical production of knowledge. Given the widely recognized connection between knowledge-making practices and ethical considerations, what ethical possibilities are implied or enabled by spatial reasoning in scientific arguments? Spatial tropes—such as the *fields* and *frontiers* of knowledge, or the *cutting edge* of research—can naturalize physical and intellectual domination, lending historical choices the legitimacy of natural processes; consequently, they deserve particular consideration from rhetorical scholars. Drawing from the range of alternative practices recovered in previous chapters, the conclusion theorizes space as a rhetorical resource, intimately connected with the forms of knowledge texts produce and the ethical relationships they enable.

By recovering these alternative genres, and the spatial, rhetorical, and epistemological practices they organize, this project offers two significant interventions into contemporary scholarship in rhetoric. First, to ongoing scholarship examining genres in scientific and professional discourse, I contribute an account of the productivity of genre constraints. Through the concept of rhetorical scarcity, I describe how constraints that limited the range of arguments that could be located in the monograph were productive in multiple ways. As a constrained and rhetorically scarce site for action, the monograph was *institutionally* productive, able to meet a variety of new institutional needs. Yet this situation of scarcity also prompted a *proliferation* of hybrid forms, as the heterogeneous practitioners of

anthropology created new genres to meet their rhetorical needs. Second, this project intervenes by connecting genre theory with new research on rhetorics of space. My project historicizes the mechanisms through which a particular scientific community came to recognize some configurations of spatial relations as natural and conducive to knowledge production while de-legitimizing the spatial practices that grounded other forms of knowledge. This historical analysis enables me to argue that spatial tropes—such as the cherished scientific trope of objectivity as distance, or the trope of the Vanishing Indian, which gave such urgency to “salvage” anthropology—were not inevitable. Instead, such spatial tropes became prominent through their circulation in particular genres, where they served institutional aims, helping this discipline make its bid for scientific status.

My project extends current conversations in three major areas: rhetorical genre studies, spatial rhetorics, and histories of women in science. Extending theories of genre that understand genres as dynamic, responsive, and productive sites for rhetorical action, this project offers a detailed historical account of genre *change* over time in relation to a changing social and institutional context. In addition, responding to recent calls for improved accounts of how space functions in discourse, this project offers a genre-based theory of space as a rhetorical resource, particularly crucial as grounds for knowledge in scientific arguments. Finally, drawing from extensive work in feminist science studies, this project offers an account of how women’s status as participants in a scientific discipline gets re-negotiated over the course of professionalization. Furthermore, the project focuses the attention of feminist scholars in the history of rhetoric and the history of science on a neglected

era, the 1920s and 1930s, arguing that, during this period of profound social and intellectual upheaval, professionalization both enabled women's advances and marginalized their most significant intellectual innovations from the disciplinary mainstream.

Production of Disciplines and Disciplinary Knowledge through Genre

“Genre theory cannot be divorced from the history of genres, from the understanding of genres in history.”

--Michael McKeon

If “old” concepts of genre tended to treat genres as conventional sets of formal, textual features, as classificatory devices, and as static and constraining forms (Devitt “Generalizing”), then newer theories of genre depart significantly from earlier models. In rhetoric, composition, and communication studies, genre has become, over the past few decades, a major category of analysis and a growing subfield of theory and research. Although this growing body of research is richly varied, in general, recent genre scholars have thoroughly rejected classificatory, static, and restrictive models of genre, replacing “container” models with theories of genre that emphasize social action, subject formation, and knowledge production.

One major source for many of the re-theorizations of genre I examine below has been the work of Russian language philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin. The translation and publication of Bakhtin's theories of language and genre, especially “The Problem of Speech Genres” in 1986, stimulated genre scholarship by offering a thoroughly social theory of language. Bakhtin conceptualized language as

fundamentally responsive and genres as typified utterances produced in response to unique social and discursive scenarios. Writers and speakers achieve meaning, action, and subject-formation by creating new utterances in relation to the utterances of others. Such a philosophy of language supported subsequent articulations of genre by scholars in rhetoric, communication, and composition, in particular because “Bakhtinian notions of dialogism and the addressivity of speech indicate the degree to which individual texts act as links between previous texts and the inevitable response of others” (Artemeva 20). In Bakhtin’s model, speech genres are responsive to prior utterances but *not* wholly constraining: “genres are subject to free creative reformulation ... [but] to use a genre freely and creatively is not the same as to create a genre from the beginning” (*Speech Genres* 80). Thus Bakhtin positions genres at the intersection between unique, unrepeatable, individual utterances and broad social forms that structure responses and make meaning possible, using the concept of genre to theorize a relationship between creativity and constraint.

Since Bakhtin, many genre theorists have redefined genres as productive sites and as typified social actions, rather than containers for thought or formalized sets of rules. Carolyn Miller’s oft-cited definition of genres as typified social actions based in recurrent situations has grounded much of this research. Genres are productive, Miller suggests, because they help rhetors identify strategies for achieving social and rhetorical actions; by construing a situation as recurrent, rhetors orient themselves toward possible actions based on previous rhetorical responses to similar situations (“Genre as Social Action”). Other theorists have likewise suggested that genres are useful precisely *because* they constrain a rhetor’s possibilities. Coe, for instance,

drawing on theories of form from Burke and Foucault, suggests that genres are “both constraining and generative—or, better said, generative because constraining” (“An Arousing and Fulfillment of Desires” 185). Similarly, Freadman develops the concept of ‘uptake’ to emphasize the relations between rhetors and audiences that genres create; by calling for a particular kind of response from a reader, genres in fact *produce* readers as participants, as members of a language game who simultaneously act and interact through the genres they use. Using such definitions, genre scholars have repeatedly examined what genres *enable* and *produce*, demonstrating, for instance, that genres orient readers and writers, ground many kinds of social and rhetorical action, and enable the coordination of activity within a community and the communication of knowledge across communities (Bazerman “Systems of Genre,” “Singular Utterances”; Freadman “Anyone for Tennis?”; Devitt *Writing Genres*; Berkenkotter and Huckin “Rethinking Genre”).

Newer theories conceive of genres as dynamic, responsive formations. Schryer’s influential formulation of genres as “stabilized-for-now or stabilized-enough sites of social and ideological action” (“Records” 204) emphasizes the flexibility of genres. Such flexibility enables rhetors to respond, through genre, to perpetually shifting rhetorical circumstances. Consequently, studies of genre over the last few decades have argued that genres are not ossified forms but flexible “constellations of regulated, improvisational strategies” (Schryer, “Walking” 450) that rhetors adapt to their varying rhetorical needs (Markel; Berkenkotter and Huckin “Rethinking Genre”).

Since genres are responsive, dynamic sites of rhetorical and social action, these sites are not and cannot be value-free. Genres not only enable actions, but, more precisely, they enable actions to take a particular shape; as Schryer notes, genres are “inherently ideological; they embody the unexamined or tacit way of performing some social action” (“Lab” 108). Indeed, the actions that genres enable are always inflected with—and intersect with—the power relations that structure the broader social world where genres are enacted. Legal genres, for instance, can create obligations that extend beyond the immediate community of genre users; medical genres often constitute patients in relations of dependence relative to the expertise and autonomy of medical practitioners (Devitt, Bawarshi, and Reiff). As many scholars have shown, genres are ideological structures that both reflect and shape relations of power through the social and rhetorical actions they are used to produce (Bawarshi “The Genre Function”; Berkenkotter and Huckin “Rethinking Genre”; Coe; Coe, Lingard, and Teslenko; Devitt, Bawarshi, and Reiff; Helscher; Prior; Schacker; Sharer “Genre Work”). Genres normalize and reproduce relations of power and stabilize the worldviews they imply—for instance, by constructing some people as knowers while positioning other people as consumers or objects of knowledge (Henze) and by authorizing certain versions of reality at the expense of other versions (Kain). In early American anthropology, for instance, the monograph genre became increasingly rigid, permitting a narrowing range of arguments and methods for knowledge production; such rigidity enabled this genre to serve institutional imperatives to differentiate between legitimate anthropologists and mere adventurers and amateurs.

Many scholars, especially in studies of scientific and professional rhetoric, have identified the production of knowledge as one major rhetorical action located in genres (Swales; Bazerman *Shaping*; Bazerman, Little, and Chavkin; Gross *Communicating Science*; Markel; Paré). Genres and the textual practices they organize are crucial in the construction of “objectivity” in scientific and technical discourses (Little); genres mediate the dense interpersonal and communicative environment and make inventive, knowledge-making activity possible (Bazerman *Languages*). As Berkenkotter and Huckin have argued, “Knowledge production is carried out and codified largely through generic forms of writing: lab reports, working papers, reviews, grant proposals, technical reports, conference papers, journal articles, monographs, and so on” (“Rethinking” 476). Not only knowledge is produced through genres in scientific and disciplinary discourse, but shared attitudes toward appropriate kinds of knowledge-making practices are produced as well; genres “are intimately linked to a discipline’s methodology” and typically “conform to a discipline’s norms, values, and ideology” (Berkenkotter and Huckin “Rethinking” 476). Consequently, the genres a discipline uses to generate appropriate, methodologically-sound knowledge also function as mechanisms for *disciplining* the knowledge that members of the community create. By privileging the ethnographic monograph as the primary site for anthropological knowledge production, for example, the professionalizing community of early American anthropology was able to categorize alternative knowledge-making practices—located in various genres apart from the monograph—as peripheral to the discipline, or outside its boundaries altogether. In this way disciplinary communities can minimize the influence of

alternative practices and critiques, which, if located in atypical genres, can be dismissed as unrelated to the discipline's central concerns.

As this example makes clear, genres serve a range of functions in relation to disciplinary discourse, beyond the practices of knowledge-making. Broadly, genres mediate and coordinate a whole range of activities in disciplinary and professional communities (Bazerman and Paradis; Berkenkotter and Huckin *Genre Knowledge*; Bhatia; Devitt *Writing Genres*; Journet; Little; Miller "Rhetorical Communities"; Orlikowski and Yates; Paré and Smart "Observing"; Schryer "Walking"; Spinuzzi). As Bazerman, Little, and Chavkin explain, "because they can create joint attention and alignment, genres are one of the key mechanisms that people have used to create and to maintain larger forms of social organization" (456). For instance, genres constitute subjects as participants or non-participants of particular discourse communities; typically, "to do business within a specific community, we occupy the subject position offered by the genre or genres at hand" (Helscher 29). Disciplinary communities thus use genres not only to produce knowledge or generate agreement, but also to determine—and to reinforce—distinctions between community insiders and outsiders. Appropriate production of a privileged genre, like the ethnographic monograph, can become a key criterion for admission, a device for admitting or denying entrance to potential practitioners; indeed, the development of anthropology over the early twentieth century suggests that such a function of genre can be crucial component of a field's professionalization and establishment in the academy.

Scholars have recently begun to focus particular attention on the role of genres in negotiations of status and power within scientific and professional

communities. As Christian Nelson reminds rhetoricians, “knowledge is inevitably, inescapably produced by interested parties” (160), produced for specific purposes and within what Lave and Wenger have called “communities of practice.” Just as one community often enjoys higher status at the expense of a related community, the genres that discourse communities deploy can help to maintain status distinctions between knowledge-making practices and practitioners (Schryer “Lab”). Consequently, genres are crucial sites for understanding how power operates in an organization, profession, or disciplinary community, not only because “genres encourage certain actions and discourage others” but also because “people in an organization do not have equal rights to authorship of all genres nor are the texts different people produce equally likely to be regarded as [legitimate or appropriate] genres” (Winsor “Ordering Work” 156).

By reconfiguring genres as sites for a range of rhetorical actions in relation to scientific and disciplinary discourse—including knowledge production, subject formation, and community boundary maintenance—these scholars have outlined the importance of examining “both the stories disciplines tell and the way they discard them” (Wells “Spandrels” 49). Such work raises new questions about how genres emerge, change, and disappear, as they enable a range of disciplinary practices. Although Miller’s early definition of genre acknowledged that genres “change, evolve, and decay” (163), nevertheless, a great deal of subsequent research has focused on the social actions accomplished by established genres. One product of Miller’s useful definition, with its focus on typified and recurrent action, is that “much genre research and theory over the past twenty years has concentrated on

texts that are routine, recurring forms of discourse” (Kain 376). Genre scholarship, with a few recent exceptions (Henze; Sharer “Genre Work”; Kain), has tended to focus on genres that are stable and recurrent rather than amorphous and ephemeral. Consequently, few studies have actually demonstrated a key element of genre theory: the capacity of genres to change in response to changes in their contexts of use. Despite the potential insights available to scholars who link genres with the changing life of a developing community, very few scholars have traced genre changes in relation to broader social changes (Tynianov; Zhu).

My project addresses this need by examining how genres emerge, change, and disappear over time. Like Anne Cranny-Francis, I suggest that scholars can “explore in the changes to or developments of genres, changes in the social life of which texts are a crucial part” (110). *Other Grounds* offers just such an exploration. By analyzing the range of genres that anthropologists developed—and, for the most part, discarded—while making a bid for scientific status, this project demonstrates the crucial role of genres in disciplinary transformations. Furthermore, this project links genre change to broad social and institutional factors. Anthropology’s disciplinary transition was related to historical factors, such as the post-WWI increase in funding for *scientific* social research, and genre played a central role in the subsequent efforts of disciplinary insiders to lay claim to these research funds by policing legitimate scientific practice. Thus, institutional change was inflected and supported by changes in the monograph genre, and in the alternative forms of knowledge and disciplinary practice enacted in folklore collections, ethnographic novels, and field autobiographies as well. As genres change, emerge, and disappear, how do these

changes intersect with the myriad functions that scholars have associated with genres in disciplinary discourse? In addressing this question, this project also undertakes to correct scholars' over-emphasis on stable and recurrent genres, in order to better understand how genres as rhetorical structures intersect with social, institutional, and material conditions.

Additionally, although scholars recognize that genres mediate activity within professional, scientific, and academic discourse communities, far less attention has been paid to the function of genre *between* communities (Ceccarelli *Shaping*; Kain). If scholars hope to account fully for the myriad ways genres mediate, manage, shape, and *locate* rhetorical activity, we need, as Kain suggests in a recent study, "to ask how genres function at the boundaries of communities and contexts" (406). This project takes up the further question of how genres influence the process of boundary formation itself. As Coe has pointed out, discourse communities often "preserve their boundaries, their integrity...by restricting the communication of those who have not learned the standard forms" (185). How do genres position potential members of a disciplinary community, in relation to one another, to the discipline itself, and to both popular and professional audiences? How can marginalized members remake genres to establish a place for themselves and to redraw disciplinary boundaries in more inclusive ways?

Combining genre research with attention to power in disciplinary discourse requires the development of a critical stance. Coe called for such a stance in 1994, challenging scholars to investigate how genres organize power: "What sorts of communication does the genre encourage, what sorts does it constrain against? Does

it empower some people while silencing others? [...] What are the political and ethical implications of the rhetorical situation constructed, persona embodied, audience invoked and context of situation assumed by a particular genre?" (186). As Paré and Smart have pointed out, genres can function as a "negative heuristic," a device for determining whose participation matters and whose concerns lie outside community boundaries. In tracing the role of genres within the development of anthropological discourse, this project shows how marginalized practitioners—especially women, Native Americans, and scientific amateurs—created hybrid genres and rhetorical spaces where they could connect scientific knowledge with broad audiences and public concerns.

Space as Textual Representation and Rhetorical Resource

"The ability of anthropologists to get us to take what they say seriously [depends upon] their capacity to convince us that what they say is a result of their having ... truly 'been there.'"

--Clifford Geertz, *Works and Lives*, 1988

In his bestselling book *Works and Lives*, anthropologist Clifford Geertz recalls what others have also noted about anthropological discourse: its unique reliance upon *being there*.⁶ Making knowledge in anthropology originates in *occupying space*: an observer goes into the field, where she simultaneously observes and participates in the social life of a specific community. Such firsthand encounters become knowledge through their translation into rhetorical products; in monographs and other academic genres, representations of the space of fieldwork authenticate the text

as anthropological knowledge.⁷ My project exploits this central disciplinary practice to show how representations of space function rhetorically.

Classical rhetors attended to spatial considerations, notably in Simonides' legendary spatial memory and in the *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*, where orators are advised to use spatial devices to aid in recall.⁸ Contemporary scholars in rhetoric have begun investigating space through two primary approaches: "rhetorics of space," which examines how *material sites* influence rhetorical performance and even constitute arguments in themselves, and "spatial rhetorics," which analyzes *representations of space* within texts, where space often functions as a category of relation invoked but unnoticed in verbal arguments.⁹ Both strands of research highlight the subtlety with which space works rhetorically, shaping attitudes, influencing actions, and inducing identification, often without arousing audience awareness of its effects. Though below I briefly review recent work in rhetorics of space, I situate my own project in relation to spatial rhetorics, asking how anthropological *texts* organize spatial relations and deploy spatial tropes in creating knowledge.

Rhetorics of Space

Scholarship on the rhetorics of space resists conceptualizing space as neutral, either as an expanse of emptiness or as a fixed position charted by coordinates. Instead, this work draws from theories that understand space as a product of cultural practices, an achievement shaped by human actions, material objects, and social and rhetorical practices (de Certeau; LeFebvre; Massey; Rose; Soja *Postmodern*

Geographies and *Thirdspace*). In the words of Henri LeFebvre, space is “not a thing but rather a set of relations between things” (83). Taking up these theories of space, a growing body of rhetorical scholarship examines how material sites and spaces function rhetorically. Memorials, for instance, are material sites that locate, generate, and shape collective memories, collective identities, and powerful accounts of a shared past (Blair; Blair and Michel “Commemorating” and “Reproducing”; Ehrenhaus; Gallagher; Haines; Katriel; Rosenfield; Elizabethada Wright; Zelizer). Built environments of all sorts, including urban spaces, commercial buildings, and spaces emblematic of the ‘public sphere,’ have been analyzed by rhetorical scholars, who argue that material environments impact rhetorical performance, shape social practices, and enact rhetorical actions (Ackerman; Corey; Dickinson “Joe’s”; Ehrenhaus; Fleming “Streets”; Goodstein; Hattenhauer; Van Mersbergen). Even ostensibly ‘natural’ environments, such as national parks and landscapes, nevertheless exert rhetorical influence, by inviting collective identification (Clark) and by organizing relationships between rhetors and audiences in ways that powerfully affect rhetorical performance (Eves). Because “rhetorical practices create and maintain the space of their own operation” (Stormer 214), scholars have increasingly subjected such spaces to investigation.

Spatial Rhetorics and Blurring the Textual/Material Boundary

In comparison with the enormous interest in rhetorical studies of material spaces, far fewer scholars have examined “spatial rhetorics,” that is, textual representations of spaces and spatial relations. Those who have done so have

highlighted the power of spatial representations to shape arguments in subtle but significant ways. For instance, texts contain chronotopes, or normative orientations to space and time, that can delimit the relevant boundaries of a rhetor's argument; such spatial configurations support implicit claims and premises that are often difficult to contest (Jack "Chronotopes" and "Space, Time, Memory"). Rhetorical scholar Nedra Reynolds has likewise demonstrated the power of spatial metaphors to become invisible—especially when such metaphors circulate in discourse, disengaged from actual material spaces ("Composition's Imagined Geographies," *Geographies*, "Cultural Geography").

Several feminist scholars have examined "rhetorical space" in an effort to blur an untenable distinction between discursive practices and the material world. Rhetorical space includes "both the cultural and material arrangement, whether intended or fortuitous, of space" (Mountford 42). These scholars have demonstrated the power of spatial representations to support powerful arguments about who belongs, who does not, and what bodies and practices are appropriate within a particular material and rhetorical site (Enoch "A Woman's Place"; Johnson *Gender*). As philosopher Lorraine Code explains, "rhetorical spaces are mapped so as to produce uneven possibilities of establishing credibility and being heard" (xv). Thus rhetorical spaces include the material environments—parlors, classrooms, pulpits, and stages—where women have endeavored to position their bodies to speak, and, at the same time, the discursive realms that women have struggled to access and influence (Johnson "Reigning" and *Gender*; Flores; Mountford; Susan Wood). In focusing attention on the materiality *and* discursivity of space, feminist scholars have

critiqued the material *and* discursive mechanisms by which some bodies are denied access to rhetorical outlets and some environments are identified as unsuitable locations for certain speaking bodies.

My project takes up this strand of feminist critique. I analyze textual representations of space—how anthropological writers organized spatial relations in monographs and in a range of alternative genres—precisely because textual representations and material realities are mutually dependent. Through spatial representations, anthropologists grounded knowledge claims, delimited relevant audiences, and, at times, offered ethical alternatives to exploitative knowledge practices. All of these textual practices had material consequences, both within the discipline of anthropology and among the Native American communities upon whom that discipline depended. As Gregory Clark reminds rhetorical scholars, “*Land* becomes *landscape* when it is assigned the role of symbol, and as symbol it functions rhetorically” (9). My approach considers how material spaces, once transformed into symbols, are deployed discursively in arguments—arguments about who belongs to a community, who fits in a particular space, and what practices are appropriate there.

Finally, this project also connects spatial representations to genre theory, where scholars repeatedly deploy spatial metaphors to understand genres but have yet to develop a theory of how spatial relations and spatial representations are themselves organized by genres.¹⁰ Bazerman, Little, and Chavkin, for instance, write that “each genre has a typical set of contents—things it includes within its boundaries” (457) and argue that genres open up an “informational landscape”

(459); elsewhere, Bazerman refers to genres as “frames for social action [and] environments for learning, [as] the familiar places we go to to create intelligible communicative actions [...] and the guideposts we use to explore the unfamiliar” (“Life of Genre” 19). These metaphors, while provocative, stop short of offering scholars a theory of how space functions rhetorically in genres. Drawing especially upon the work of genre theorist Anis Bawarshi, who conceptualizes genres as locations for rhetorical action and subject formation, my project connects genre theory and spatial rhetorics by theorizing space as a rhetorical resource, located in and organized by genres.

In anthropology, for instance, space has frequently functioned in discourse as a resource for establishing who does and does not inhabit the same worlds—for distinguishing *then* and *there* from *here* and *now*. Furthermore, space—in the form of pristine landscapes, corrupt reservations, and “primitive” environmentalism—has historically figured prominently in portrayals of Native American communities by anthropologists and others (Krech). My approach, which treats spatial representations as rhetorical resources for the production of particular forms of knowledge, is thus particularly useful for analyzing anthropological discourse, where space grounds knowledge practices and where ethical relations, enacted through spatial relations, are particularly vivid.

Gender in Histories of Rhetorical and Scientific Innovation

“Feminist ethnography has focused either on setting the record straight about women or on revising anthropological categories. It has not produced either unconventional forms of writing or a developed reflection on ethnographic textuality.”

--James Clifford, Introduction to *Writing Culture*, 1986

Contemporary anthropologist James Clifford’s mis-characterization of women’s contributions to the practice of ethnography is rather striking. Not only were Clifford’s contemporaneous feminist anthropologists highly and increasingly visible during the 1980s, but furthermore, Clifford’s overall project—generating more critical and reflexive forms of anthropological knowledge—is one with which many feminist anthropologists have sympathized.¹¹ But such mischaracterization, even by scholars who wish to treat women’s contributions fairly, is aided by practices of historical erasure that have persistently minimized, obscured, and erased women’s contributions to many fields of knowledge. My project is situated within ongoing feminist recovery efforts, which aim to generate accounts that include women’s substantial contributions to rhetorical practice and to scientific inquiry.

In rhetorical studies, a large and growing body of research has attempted to counteract such processes of erasure. Feminist historians of rhetoric have not only recovered in rich detail women’s contributions to rhetorical theory, rhetorical practice, and rhetorical education, across a range of contexts, periods, and countries, but have also used such projects to fundamentally revise the meaning of “rhetor,” “rhetoric,” “theory,” “education,” and other terms fundamental to the field (Biesecker; Bizzell “Opportunities”; Campbell; Donawerth “Poaching”; Eldred and

Mortensen; Enoch *Refiguring*; Gere; Glenn; Logan; Lunsford; Royster; Wertheimer). These scholars have shown that revising our histories to include women's practices often requires revising our methods of research and our conceptions of significance as well (Bizzell "Feminist Methods"; Enos; Collins). My project contributes to this ongoing effort by locating innovative rhetorical practices in early American anthropology, where women such as Gladys Reichard, Ruth Underhill, Ann Axtell Morris, and others wrote experimental ethnographic texts that allowed them to link their anthropological expertise with broad issues of public concern.

In revisiting the arguments that women, people of color, and scientific amateurs made on the borders between professional anthropology and popular science, this project also contributes to feminist scholarship in the history of science. Science, as a prestige discourse, is of particular interest to feminist historians, who want to create histories that include women and thus disable the kinds of marginalization that is enabled by claims that "there were no women there." Many studies have uncovered women's significance as popularizers of scientific knowledge (Bonta; Gates; Gates and Shteir; George); as popularizers, women have not only disseminated scientific knowledge created by others, but in fact have circulated their "own form[s] of knowledge, shaped in relation to the needs of audiences beyond elite and learned" communities (Gates and Shteir 4). By addressing non-specialist audiences, scientific popularizers have actively "defined and redefined" (10) knowledge in ways that challenge many assumptions of specialist scientific communities.

Additionally, a growing number of contemporary scholars have investigated women's scientific pursuits in professional contexts (Fitzpatrick; Furner; Jack *Science*; Kass-Simon, Farnes, and Nash; Keller; Rossiter; Silverberg; Tillery; Wells *Dead House*). This work demonstrates that women—across disciplines and generations, as physicians, physicists, economists, sociologists, and in many other roles—have contributed substantially to scientific inquiry and, although largely forgotten or misremembered, have been responsible for a range of scientific innovations. Disciplinary professionalization has simultaneously enabled and constrained women's participation in sciences since the late nineteenth century. Rossiter, for instance, demonstrates that professionalized science promoted an even more highly masculinized public face in the early twentieth century than it had previously; yet, at the same time, professionalization provided women with relatively clear avenues into scientific participation, though that participation was seriously limited in most disciplines.¹² This body of feminist scholarship has provided a much richer understanding of women's substantial contributions to scientific research. My project extends this research by investigating how women's participation in a social scientific field was shaped by disciplinary change.

Finally, this project contributes to emerging rhetorical scholarship on women's professional and rhetorical practices during the interwar period, a time of intense change in American public life. These decades witnessed profound changes in women's possibilities within public and professional arenas. Scholars have begun to turn to the 1920s and 1930s to chart the complex ways in which women participated as public speakers, community organizers, leftist activists, anti-war

demonstrators, and as professional scientists and social scientists to a degree unforeseen previously (George, Weiser, and Zepernick; Mastrangelo; Sharer “Genre Work” and *Vote*; Strickland). My project extends this research by tracing women’s rhetorical practices in relation to anthropology’s disciplinary transformations and in relation to broader public issues, such as debates over Indian education and Indian policy, that animated public life during these decades. Such an approach underscores the contradictory nature of professionalization, which both enabled women’s advances and marginalized their most significant intellectual contributions.

Ultimately, *Other Grounds* offers an historical and rhetorical analysis of women’s contributions to an emerging social science, across popular and professional arenas, and over the course of this community’s transformation into a professional, academic discipline. What my project constructs is not just a history of forgotten practitioners, but a theory of how gender and genre interact in a discipline in the process of becoming both a science and a profession. By analyzing the spatial strategies, rhetorical practices, and public uses of a range of anthropological genres, this project charts relationships between space and ethics, between genres and disciplinary transformations, and between academic communities and broad popular constituencies. It finds that, in the end, the epistemological and ethical practices that took precedence in early American anthropology were not inevitable. Instead, heterogeneous early-twentieth-century practitioners of anthropology developed many alternative genres, locations where they linked anthropology with public engagement and ethical practice, writing in an effort to construct other grounds for social scientific knowledge.

¹ Anita Newcomb McGee was part of an eminent Washington family; her father was a well-known astronomer, and she was educated herself at the medical school at Columbian (later George Washington) University and did further post-graduate work at Johns Hopkins. She was among the very few practicing women physicians in Washington, D.C. at the end of the nineteenth century. After her death in 1940, she was buried in Arlington National Cemetery because of her service as head of the nursing corps during the Spanish-American war; she was the first woman to earn the rank of Acting Assistant Surgeon in the U.S. Army. She was also married to W J McGee, an eminent anthropologist and member of the Anthropological Society of Washington. See Emma McGee's 1915 biography of her brother, W J McGee. At early meetings, the Women's Anthropological Society also established aims for their organization and clarified requirements for membership, challenges that were particularly difficult for the first scientific society in the U.S. to be established and maintained entirely by women. Meetings were typically held in the reception rooms of Columbian University, which would later become George Washington University. Regular meetings took place every second Saturday between the first of November and end of May and were primarily spent in the reading of anthropological papers by society members; at annual meetings, new elections were held and the outgoing president of the society delivered an address. Refreshments were prohibited, by by-law, except at the annual meeting, indicating these women's reluctance to engage in activities that would trivialize the scientific work they perceived as their main project. Explaining that "the policy of the Society has been to maintain a high standard of membership, one result of which is a practical limitation in numbers" (Anita McGee 18), the WAS also maintained that, "At the same time, any thinking, intelligent woman, likely to take practical interest in the work, is gladly welcomed" (18). Membership was initially quite small, with one honorary member and twenty-one active members instated during the society's first year; by 1889, the society had grown to include six honorary, fourteen corresponding, and forty-five active members.

² The Women's Anthropological Society justified its existence as a distinct organization, in a city that already housed the most prominent national anthropological society, the ASW, by pointing to women's more limited opportunities to pursue professional or scientific training. "Under existing conditions," Anita McGee explains, "we are satisfied to work out our own problems in anticipation of the time when science shall regard only the work, not the worker" (16-17). Although pursuing their own intellectual work, the women of the WAS also linked their project to anthropology more broadly, by inviting members of the ASW to speak at their meetings occasionally and by justifying their research in relation to that larger community.

³ They also used Mason's categories of anthropological research to connect their specific studies to the broader project of anthropology. The specific subdivisions within the "vast territories of knowledge" that Mason traces are resituated, through republication, so that they serve WAS members in particular "as a guide to the branches of the subject requiring investigation" (Anita McGee 19). Using this document, the women who shared papers at the regular meetings of their own anthropological society could link their particular research projects with the overarching organization of anthropological inquiry laid out in Mason's lecture, identifying their work within "ethnological," "archaeological," "historical" anthropological research, and so on.

⁴ McGee's report, titled "Historical Sketch of the Women's Anthropological Society of America," was read at the annual meeting of the Women's Anthropological Society in 1889 and was subsequently published in a WAS report and in *Science*, the official journal of the American Academy for the Advancement of Science.

⁵ This lack of an outlet for publication was a substantial barrier for the long-term professional possibilities of most of the women who contributed their research to the WAS. Although the WAS hoped to publish a volume of its proceedings, Anita McGee noted in 1889 that "the material for it is considerably diminished by the publication elsewhere of several valuable contributions" (19)—

especially of the work of the society's most widely-known members, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, WAS President, and Alice C. Fletcher, both of whom published their research through the Bureau of American Ethnology, in *Science*, in the *Journal of American Folklore*, and elsewhere. Most other contributors to the WAS meetings were less successful than Fletcher and Stevenson at transferring their research into the new avenues for publication and circulation.

⁶ Of the many anthropologists since the 1980s who have examined anthropology as a textual and representational practice, see especially Behar *Translated and Vulnerable*; Behar and Gordon; Clifford "On Ethnographic"; Clifford and Marcus; Coffey; Gatewood; Hammersley; Manganaro *Modernist*; Marcus; Marcus and Cushman; Marcus and Fischer; Rabinow; Rosaldo; Visweswaran *Fictions*. For one recent attempt to reclaim the epistemological authority of fieldwork experiences, felt to be eroded by such examinations, see Borneman and Hammoudi.

⁷ On the representation of space in the creation of ethnographic authority, see especially Clifford "Spatial Practices"; Fabian *Time and the Other*; Thornton "Imagine Yourself" and "Rhetoric."

⁸ See Bizzell and Herzberg 243-282; Crowley and Hawhee 316-320.

⁹ There is not yet an agreed upon way to refer to these two distinct approaches to the study of space in rhetoric. Those who study material sites *as* rhetorical and in relation to rhetorical practices refer to these studies in various ways, but generally distinguish their work from the research of those who study rhetorics *about* space. The distinction is a common one, though the terms here—spatial rhetorics vs. rhetorics of space—are my own.

¹⁰ The link between genre and rhetorical situation has prompted interest in how situations are spatial. Amy Devitt, for instance, points to the intimacy between the concept of the rhetorical situation and new concepts of genre ("Generalizing") and Jenny Edbauer expands the spatial dimensions of "rhetorical situation" further into a theory of rhetorical ecologies (Edbauer).

¹¹ For critiques of Clifford's introduction to *Writing Culture*, see Gordon "Writing Culture"; Pels and Nencel; hooks.

¹² Within anthropology, the prominence of Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict has had numerous consequences for the accurate rendering of women's importance in anthropology's history. Nancy Parezo outlines many of the marginalization tactics at work in portrayals of Mead and Benedict as exceptions and as 'daughters of Boas'; their prominence obscures the contributions of so many others, and their casting as 'daughters' minimizes how innovative much of their work and the work of their women colleagues in fact was. Much feminist scholarship in anthropology and history has recovered the significance of marginalized or forgotten women anthropologists, such as Zelia Nuttall, Alice Fletcher, Elsie Clews Parsons, and many women of Mead and Benedict's generation. See Banner; Sally Cole "Introduction" and *Ruth Landes*; Deacon; Fitzpatrick; Gacs et. al.; Gordon "Among Women"; Hoefel; Irwin-Williams; Lamphere "Feminist Anthropology" and "Gladys Reichard Among the Navajo"; Lavender; Lepowsky; Lurie; Parezo *Hidden Scholars*; Zumwalt.

Chapter Two

Ethnographic Monographs: Genre Change and Rhetorical Scarcity

“Imagine yourself suddenly set down surrounded by all your gear, alone on a tropical beach close to a native village, while the launch or dinghy which has brought you sails away out of sight. Since you take up your abode in the compound of some neighboring white man, trader or missionary, you have nothing to do, but to start at once on your ethnographic work. Imagine further that you are a beginner, without previous experience, with nothing to guide you and no one to help you.”

--Bronislaw Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, 1922

“A new mode of action requires a mythical charter, and Malinowski in his prime developed a personal myth which his followers passed on to later generations.”

--Adam Kuper, 1996

“The opening chapter of *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* was not simply a methodological prescription; ... it was a ‘mythic charter’ for what was to become the central ritual of social anthropology. A motivating myth for ‘apprentice ethnographers,’ it reassured them that a difficult and even dangerous task was possible.”

--George W. Stocking, Jr., 1991

Asking his readers to imagine themselves “suddenly set down...alone on a tropical beach” while the vessel that brought them “sails away out of sight,” Malinowski creates, in his 1922 classic *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, a scene of

profound isolation. Furthermore, because even a temporary residence “in the compound of some neighboring white man” is inaccessible once the boat has left, there is for the potential ethnographer “nothing to do, but to start at once on your ethnographic work.” Thus isolation itself becomes the catalyst for ethnographic research in Malinowski’s narrative. Deliberately separating himself from any “neighboring white man” and placing himself “on a tropical beach close to a native village,” Malinowski constructs what he describes elsewhere in *Argonauts* as “proper conditions for ethnographic work” (6). For a beginner, with no previous experience, “nothing to guide” and “no one to help,” this situation of isolation becomes a rite of initiation: even a novice ethnographer, positioned appropriately close to a native village and distant from white traders and missionaries, can proceed with the ethnographic work and emerge from the experience as a member of the anthropological community.

Malinowski’s account of how to begin has, in turn, been recast by later anthropologists as constituting a crucial disciplinary origin. The epigraphs from Kuper and Stocking exemplify a widely circulated discourse that characterizes Malinowski as the creator of a new “mythic charter” for anthropology, both in Britain and the United States.¹ In particular, the scene of isolation on the beach—“Imagine yourself set down...”—and the broader statement of method from which the scene is drawn have figured prominently for decades in anthropologists’ accounts of their disciplinary past. Malinowski has been called the “patriarch of modernist anthropology” (Stocking Rev. of *The Early Works* 184), the “originator and paragon” of participant observation as ethnographic method (Sillitoe 403), the “pivotal

transitional figure” between nineteenth and twentieth-century anthropology (Vickery 52), and has been invoked as an originator of “functionalism and fieldwork” as well as of “the monograph as literary genre” (Fardon 573). *The Argonauts of the Western Pacific* as a classic ethnographic monograph has been particularly crucial as a point of origin, often characterized as having “had a dramatic effect upon the way anthropologists in England and the United States shaped their texts” (Manganaro *Modernist* 4-5). Clifford Geertz has referred to Malinowski’s experience in the Trobriand Islands as “the most famous, and certainly the most mythicized, stretch of field work in the history of the discipline: the paradigm journey to the paradigm elsewhere” (75). In myriad ways, Malinowski’s representation of fieldwork—as a deliberate, isolated, and dramatic encounter with *other* people in *another* place—has been perceived by later anthropologists as itself germinal and originary. Both Malinowski’s construction of the ethnographic scene of encounter and later anthropologists’ construction of Malinowski—as fieldworker, writer, and methodological innovator—establish isolation as a point of departure, a place from which to proceed.

In contrast, both rhetorical scholarship broadly and genre theory more specifically assume that beginnings always take place *in medias res*, amidst ongoing historical, social, and discursive processes. As contemporary genre theorist Anis Bawarshi has argued, to begin is to perform “at once an act of initiation and an act of continuation” (*Genre and the Invention* 2). Bakhtin likewise argues that language is constituted through *response*, insofar as discourse is linked perpetually and unavoidably with other discourse, with others’ utterances. Both theorists

recommend resisting the impulse to mythologize the heroic writer who creates meaning out of a blank space or a blank screen, isolated from the discursive and material contexts that surround him. Instead, we can better understand social action and the creation of meaning by recognizing, in Edward Said's words, that every "text stands to the side of, next to or between the bulk of all other works—not in a line with them, not in a line of descent from them" (10). For Bawarshi and others, the concept of genre provides a mechanism for placing texts into just such relations, not of linear descent but of mutual interaction and influence.

Genres, as typified ways of acting in response to recurrent rhetorical situations, simultaneously "position and condition discursive behavior in such a way as to preclude a sense of beginnings as unprecedented, unmediated, unmarked scenes of origin" (Bawarshi *Genre and the Invention* 7). In this sense, rather than instituting a new textual form, Malinowski's myth-making *Argonauts* can be seen as taking place *within* a genre, in relation to earlier monographs that, in Bawarshi's terms, both "positioned" Malinowski's work meaningfully and "conditioned" readers' understanding. Instead of accepting *Argonauts* as a point of origin,² then, I draw upon the insights of rhetorical genre studies to situate this anthropological classic within ongoing processes—of discipline formation, knowledge production and genre change.

In such a genre-based analysis of anthropology's history, the influence of Malinowski and Boas is still evident—not only through their work teaching, mentoring, and sponsoring the work of younger cohorts of anthropologists, but also through their production and distribution of many of the textual forms that shaped

anthropological knowledge.³ This genre-based approach is not meant to contest Malinowski's importance or even his rhetorical virtuosity in *Argonauts*. Instead, I suggest that much of *Argonauts*' particular significance arises *through* genre, that is, through the relations of similarity and difference Malinowski establishes by situating his text with a broader discursive arena inhabited by monographs, travelogues, and other relevantly similar and dissimilar texts.⁴

Through genre analysis, the rhetorical choices of Boas, Malinowski, and other writers are re-situated so that a different story of anthropological development can be told, one that explains an institutional rather than a primarily individual history. A genre-based history of anthropology reveals the diffuse and cumulative effects of textual practices and consequently makes visible a much greater number and variety of contributors—including those whose work I examine in later chapters. In analyzing the rhetorical strategies of *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, I position Malinowski's text alongside dozens of monographs published both before and after 1922, in order to understand how the genre of the ethnographic monograph functioned within a professional community undergoing transformation, and how the genre itself changed over time in relation to that disciplinary transformation. This argument identifies the monograph as a transitional genre, closely linked in both form and function to the shifting needs of a discipline undergoing substantial reorganization between the turn of the twentieth century and the onset of World War II.

Over the course of the decades between 1900 and 1940, the theories, methodologies, institutional resources, practitioners and problems of anthropology

all shifted dramatically. In the late nineteenth century, Anglo-American anthropology relied heavily upon the framework of social evolution, felt its greatest need was for reliable data, and depended on the work of interested amateurs and semi-professional scientists, for almost no Ph.D.s in anthropology were granted before the turn of the century. By the early 1940s and the onset of World War II, anthropology's professional association had grown so large that specialized organizations and publications were developed to meet the needs of members in specific subfields. Credentials, institutional positions, and research funding all became far more important features of disciplinary life, and the evolutionary framework had been thoroughly supplanted by the culture concept, which anthropology exported not only to other academic disciplines but circulated into general usage as well.⁵

While this chapter will discuss briefly many of the historical causes for these transformations—such as the emergence of major research institutions like the National Research Council, which offered, in the form of funding, strong incentives to professionalization—its primary goal is to understand these disciplinary transformations in relation to anthropologists' privileged genre, the ethnographic monograph. Recontextualizing *Argonauts* within the ongoing development of the monograph genre, I ask a series of questions about the role of this genre in anthropology's disciplinary history. Because so little attention has been paid to monographs *before* Malinowski's, the first task of this chapter is descriptive: what did early ethnographic monographs look like and accomplish? In relation to the early form of the genre, what was significant, both rhetorically and institutionally, about

the particular discursive choices Malinowski made in *Argonauts*? In the second half of the chapter, I address a series of questions regarding the relation between anthropology as a profession and its privileged forms of discourse. How was anthropology's increasing professionalization marked in, and influenced by, its most privileged discursive form, the ethnographic monograph? As the practitioners and practices of anthropology shifted, in what ways did anthropology's discursive practices, epistemological assumptions, and ethical stances also shift? Finally, what can a re-contextualization of Malinowski, *among* professionalizing anthropologists and *within* a context of disciplinary transition, tell us about the role of rhetoric and genre in a community making a bid for scientific status?

I address these questions in the three sections that follow, tracing changes within the ethnographic monograph genre across time and linking these changes to the genre's function within an emergent disciplinary community. The first section below analyzes early monographs to understand how anthropological knowledge was located in monographs even before Malinowski's dramatic, myth-building contribution. Here I define ethnographic monographs as extensive texts that create new knowledge and share that knowledge with the anthropological community, and I analyze these generic attributes in relation to the state of anthropology as a profession during this early period. In the second section, I perform an analysis of *Argonauts* that links the success of this monograph with the situation of professionalizing anthropology between 1920 and 1930, during a decade when institutional structures, research apparatus, and disciplinary membership in anthropology all experienced significant shifts. In the final section, I suggest that the

trajectory of this genre—from flexible, variable, and capacious to more rigorously bounded and policed—corresponds to specific disciplinary transformations taking place between the turn of the twentieth century and the onset of World War II.

In order to link these genre shifts with shifts in the professional community, I develop a concept I term “rhetorical scarcity.” This concept links genre *constraints* with genre *function* within a disciplinary community. I use the term “rhetorical scarcity” to indicate a genre that constructs highly constrained relations between audiences, rhetors, and objects of discourse. These constraints enable the genre to function in performing the community’s boundary work,⁶ and allow genre users to manage the *value* of rhetorical elements and epistemological products in relation to one another. This final section uses the concept of rhetorical scarcity to suggest that the ethnographic monograph was a location for knowledge that became increasingly constrained after 1920. Such constraints emerged not primarily in response to Malinowski’s mythic charter, but instead because they allowed the genre to function institutionally, limiting anthropological membership and delimiting anthropologists’ relationships with their audiences and the subjects of their knowledge.

Variation and Flexibility in Early Anthropological Discourse and Monographs, 1890-1920

Anthropological discourse in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century was extremely variable and wide-ranging. The topics considered anthropological, the manner and the institutions in which these topics were discussed and researched,

and the practitioners who constituted the anthropological community were all exceedingly varied. This context of discursive diversity shaped the rhetorical contours of the early ethnographic monograph as a genre. To accommodate the diversity of knowledge-making practices that anthropologists engaged in between the 1890s and (roughly) 1920, a highly flexible and loosely-bounded site was necessary; early ethnographic monographs provided just such a site for the creation of knowledge and the constitution of a diverse anthropological community.

The variability that marked anthropology during this transitional period was linked to still earlier periods of pre-professional anthropology in the U.S. Throughout the nineteenth century, pre-professional anthropology was shaped by a variety of (sometimes competing) intellectual, social, and political currents: by the early research of naturalists like Thomas Jefferson, whose studies of American Indians attempted to deflect European criticisms of the American environment as inferior, for instance, as well as that of physician Daniel Brinton, whose studies of race and civilization supported scientific racism.⁷ Nineteenth-century anthropology was shaped as well by the political desire of the new country to assert a national identity, to rationalize treaty-breaking and westward expansion, and to control, intellectually and militarily, an ever-larger national landscape.⁸

Thus a great deal of the earliest anthropological research in the U.S. was carried out under the auspices of government-sponsored expeditions and military campaigns. After the Civil War, a series of geological, topographical, and, eventually, ethnological surveys of new territorial acquisitions in the West resulted in the creation, in 1879, of the Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE), directed by

Major John Wesley Powell, scientist, Civil War hero, and famous explorer of the Colorado River.⁹ Powell's development of a large-scale and well-staffed program of field research over the next two decades, and his success at winning Congressional appropriations for the BAE by arguing for the strategic importance of anthropological studies of American Indians, made him a crucial forerunner to the academic discipline of anthropology that was to develop over the first two decades of the twentieth century. The institutional apparatus Powell generated through the Bureau—for instance, by providing early publication venues for anthropological studies, in the form of yearly Bureau of American Ethnology *Annual Reports* and *Bulletins*, as well as the *Contributions to North American Ethnology* series between 1881 and 1894—provided the impetus, the personnel, and the institutional resources and funding that enabled anthropology's nascent professionalization.¹⁰

Turn-of-the-Century Anthropological Discourse

The first volume of the *American Anthropologist*, begun in 1888 under the auspices of the Anthropological Society of Washington and continued after 1902 as the official journal of the American Anthropological Association, reflects the variety that characterized early, professionalizing anthropology around the turn of the twentieth-century. Topics researched in the first volume include material culture, religious rituals, human physical development, language variation, theories of evolution, and historical migration; specific publications range from “Anthropological Notes on the Human Hand” to “The Development of Time-Keeping in Greece and Rome,” from “Discontinuities in Nature's Methods,” a

philosophical argument that human brains evolved through processes different from the evolutionary processes shaping animal intelligence, to “Games of Washington Children,” which surveys, as exhaustively as possible, the games played by white European-American children in Washington, D.C.

Contributors to the first *American Anthropologist* included professional researchers and amateur investigators from varied backgrounds, again mirroring the diversity of the larger anthropological community during the late nineteenth-century. Several had military backgrounds; most had served in the Civil War and some, such as Colonel Frank Austin Seely, Major John Wesley Powell, and Colonel Garrick Mallery, had turned their military careers into long-term engagement with anthropological discussions through the newly-forming anthropological societies. Several contributors were trained as physicians, including Frank Baker, an M.D. who was a Professor of Anatomy at Georgetown and who was among the original founders of the Anthropological Society of Washington.

Very few anthropological researchers at this point could be considered professionals, employed primarily as anthropologists; those few who did earn a living through anthropological research include Powell, as director of the Bureau of American Ethnology, and Daniel Brinton, who was trained as a physician but held a Professorship in Ethnology and Archaeology at the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia. More typical were amateurs like Henry Wetherbee Henshaw, whose path to anthropology was an exceedingly common one: from early studies in natural history and ornithology to eventual field research among American Indians, and from “playing Indian” in the woods as a child to later collecting material artifacts

and ethnological and linguistic data for the Smithsonian and the Bureau of American Ethnology.¹¹

One consequence of this discursive variability was that lines between professional discourse and popular discourse were blurred. In part because the early discipline welcomed all interested contributors to their emergent community, the publication of research in general-interest periodicals was common practice. As contemporary anthropologist Kamala Visweswaran has noted, during the late nineteenth century, it was often “difficult to distinguish the articles that appeared in the *American Anthropologist* or the *Journal of American Folklore* from those appearing in more popular fora” (90). In early anthropological discourse, the vocabulary and stylistic features used to communicate with insiders was not sharply delineated from that used to share research with outsiders. Such blurred distinctions between popular and professional discourse certainly reflect the varied makeup of the anthropological community; they also indicate the breadth of anthropologists’ early conception of audience. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century, a great variety of individuals—government officials and legislators, missionaries and social workers, natural historians, traders, art collectors, museum staff, readers of popular fiction, and so on—seemed to have a stake, or at least an interest, in anthropological research.¹²

The location of late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century anthropology at the intersection between divergent intellectual traditions helps to explain this situation of discursive variability. Drawing both intellectual resources and personnel from natural sciences such as geology, natural history, zoology, and

paleontology, from evolutionary science, from history and folklore studies, and from pre-professional versions of the fields that would later become psychology, economics, and political science, anthropology from its earliest formations in the Bureau of American Ethnology and through the first two decades of the twentieth century was a highly miscellaneous practice.

Early Monograph Genre

This discursive variability strongly influenced the development of the ethnographic monograph as a central genre in anthropological knowledge-making. Although highly varied, early monographs in anthropology functioned as a genre in that they constituted a location for certain rhetorical actions: namely, to create new knowledge, to position that knowledge within a developing anthropological map, and to disseminate knowledge to a broad anthropological community, which, around the turn into the twentieth century, had boundaries that were yet scarcely visible.

In this characterization, I capture the diversity of early anthropological discourse by taking seriously Carolyn Miller's suggestion that we define genres not by what they *look like*, but what they *do*. That is, genres should be identified in relation to their function within a discourse community, by the purposes they serve among the rhetors and audiences who use them, rather than by formal characteristics such as length or the presence or absence of any particular trait.¹³ Genre theorist Anis Bawarshi likewise suggests that genres be conceptualized not as sets of rules or formal features, but as locations for rhetorical action. This approach focuses on the

resources for argumentation and knowledge-formation that genres make available to rhetors. Because conceptualizing genres as locations for rhetorical action resists identifying any single characteristic that a given text *must* have to “count” as an instance of a particular genre, this approach is particularly appropriate for analyzing the enormous variability and diversity that marked anthropological discourse during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. An action-oriented concept of genre, capable of accounting for flexibility, is necessary in order to recognize that variation—in form, content, publication venue, method, and so forth—was among the most crucial characteristics of the early ethnographic monograph genre.

Instead of discounting monographs as too varied to “count” as a genre, I suggest that potential for variation—in length, stance, method, form, and other measures—is one of the characteristics of the early ethnographic monograph genre that is most crucial for its function within anthropologists’ developing discourse community. Thus, following Miller and Bawarshi, I argue that monographs accomplished two primary social actions: creating new anthropological knowledge and disseminating that knowledge amongst the anthropological community. In this way, ethnographic monographs around the turn of the twentieth century constituted a very loosely-formed site for these activities; this looseness is among the genre’s most significant attributes. Early anthropological monographs constituted a site for knowledge production that, crucially, was flexible and capacious enough to accommodate the variety of forms of anthropological knowledge that marked the earliest decades of the discipline’s emergence.

Ethnographic monographs, by performing the central disciplinary activities of creation and distribution of knowledge, were closely connected to the ongoing formation of the discipline; changes in the genre correspond to changes in disciplinary standards for what counted as “new knowledge” and who counted as a “peer.” During early disciplinary fluctuations, between the 1890s and 1920, the monograph genre was capable of accommodating multiple conceptions of knowledge and many varieties of peers as readers.

Although I focus particularly upon this diversity, certain commonalities *can* be identified among early anthropological monographs. Two, in particular, are addressed below. First, most early monographs allow researchers to display collections of data to others, prioritizing the researcher’s direct role in collecting such data. Second, these early monographs enable researchers to situate those collections within a bounded, physical space, in relation to an imagined map. This map evoked to frame anthropological research is global, complete, and coherent, capable of providing a full portrait of human history, in its linguistic, cultural, material, and archaeological dimensions. These two key commonalities—the tendency of monographs to prioritize collection and to situate knowledge spatially—indicate the implicit importance of *space* as a means for legitimation of new anthropological knowledge: new knowledge is collected at firsthand, “on the spot,” so to speak, and earns its value in relation to a larger project of anthropological mapping.

Monograph Flexibility and Variety

The variety of texts that early anthropologists referred to as monographs offers some indication of the flexibility of the early monograph genre. In reviews, notes, and bibliographic articles published in the early twentieth century in the major professional journals of American anthropology, the *Journal of American Folklore* and the *American Anthropologist*, the term “monograph” denotes an extensive treatment of a linguistic, ethnological, archaeological, or historical topic engaged with the range of interests anthropologists maintained. “Extensive” is relative, ranging from the 1500 page treatment Gatschet afforded Klamath ethnology and language in “The Klamath Indians of Southwestern Oregon” (1890) to the thirty-page article produced by Alfred Kroeber out of his dissertation, the first Ph.D. that Boas directed at Columbia, in 1901. Relative to what was known at the time about Kroeber’s topic, “Decorative Symbolism of the Arapaho,” Kroeber’s thirty pages constituted an appropriately exhaustive treatment to merit identification as a monograph by Kroeber’s colleagues.

During these decades when circulation of new knowledge was particularly important, mode or venue for publication mattered significantly less than it would eventually. Early monographs might be published by a commercial publisher, an academic institution, a government organization, a scientific or special-interest society, within the pages of a scholarly journal, or as part of an ongoing series sponsored by a museum or other scholarly institution. Alexander Chamberlain, for instance, who was himself the first person in the U.S. to earn a Ph.D. in anthropology, at Clark University, cites a variety of monographs in two bibliographic

essays in 1905 and 1910 for the *Journal of American Folklore*. Monographs include collections of folklore, such as Waldemar Bogoras' "The Folk-Lore of Northeastern Asia as Compared with that of Northwestern America," which comprised roughly 120-pages in the *American Anthropologist* and was "based on [Bogoras'] personal investigations" of some "500 tales from the peoples of N. E. Asia, including the Asiatic Eskimo" (Chamberlain 1910: 116-117). Major works issued as reports by the Bureau of American Ethnology are included, such as Albert Gatschet's 1890 "The Klamath Indians of Southwestern Oregon" and Alice Fletcher's 1904 publication of "The Hako: A Pawnee Ceremony," which was printed as Part II of the *Twenty-Second Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*. Additionally, research published by or conducted under the auspices of museums is included, such as John Swanton's work on the Haida for the American Museum of Natural History, or Boas' book *The Social Organization and Religious Ceremonials of the Kwakiutl Indians* (1897), which was issued in 1895 within a report for the U.S. National Museum, and then bound, unrevised, and republished as a stand-alone monograph in 1897. Extensive new research that appeared in an institution's ongoing "Contributions," "Memoirs," or "Bulletins" publication series is included, such as Boas' 1901 "The Eskimo of Baffin Land and Hudson Bay," published in the *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, vol. xiv, and Clark Wissler and D. C. Duvall's *The Mythology of the Blackfoot Indians*, published in the *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History* in 1909.

Early monographs addressed, topically, every area of anthropology, including the traditional "four-fields" of linguistics, physical anthropology, archaeology, and

ethnology, as well as studies of folklore, material culture, and historical studies. Often a monograph addressed multiple anthropological issues within one text; Frank Speck's 1909 monograph, *Ethnology of the Yuchi Indians*, for instance, includes linguistic materials, a long account of Yuchi material culture, with drawings of such objects as basketry patterns, tools, and jewelry, and ethnological information such as music, social organization, and religious beliefs.

Monographs were also written by the same great variety of practitioners who characterized the broader discipline. These practitioners included a sizeable number of amateurs who were neither paid for their research nor professionally trained as anthropologists. Although a number of new anthropology departments were created between 1890 and 1920 to provide professional training to anthropologists, the tradition of amateur participation in anthropological research waned only gradually over these decades, as the need for researchers continued to outpace the limited production of professional anthropologists throughout the 1900s and 1910s.¹⁴

The writing and research activities of Alice Cunningham Fletcher exemplify the career possibilities for an amateur anthropologist during the decades immediately before and after the turn of the twentieth century. Fletcher was not trained as a scientist, but in her middle-age "became interested" in American Indians and in the anthropological research of the Peabody Museum at Harvard and proceeded to enter the field (Hough "Alice Cunningham Fletcher" 254). Trained only by "extensive reading" (Hough 254), Fletcher began in the early 1880s to undertake research among the Sioux, Omaha, Winnebago, and Pawnee in loose association with the museum and to publish that research in Peabody Museum reports, in the

proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and in other new publication venues. Between 1895 and 1917, Fletcher also published a number of monographs, including her monumental 1911 collaboration with Francis La Flesche, *The Omaha Tribe*. Although an amateur, Fletcher was elected Vice President of Section H (Anthropology) for the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1896, President of the Anthropological Society of Washington in 1903, and President of the American Folklore Society in 1905. Her career trajectory—beginning in romantic interest in Indians, proceeding through self-training via museum study and fieldwork, followed by her increasing involvement in emerging professional and scientific associations and in government-sponsored research through the BAE, and finally, the publication and circulation of her research in the venues that were created and supported by these developing organizations—charts, if not a perfectly typical path for an amateur anthropologist, at least one wholly characteristic of amateur involvement in the developing apparatus of professional anthropology.¹⁵

Monographs were, of course, also published by professionals holding positions as faculty at universities and at museums, such as Franz Boas at Columbia, Alfred Kroeber at the University of California, and Frank Speck at the University Museum of Philadelphia.¹⁶ Professional researchers also included those carrying out work for the Bureau of American Ethnology or the U.S. Geological Survey, such as Albert S. Gatschet, who was among the original group of field researchers hired by Powell in 1879; his major monograph, *The Klamath Indians of Southwestern Oregon* was

published by the U.S. Geological Survey in 1890 in the Survey's *Contributions to North American Ethnology* series.

The rhetorical and social actions that monographs accomplished included the creation of new anthropological knowledge, but the methods anthropologists deployed in early monographs are, again, quite variable. Although “fieldwork” was a particular emphasis of Boas in training generations of anthropologists during his four decades at Columbia,¹⁷ fieldwork was by no means universal in its meaning or its application in producing monographs during this formative period. Among those anthropologists who did rely upon some form of fieldwork to create a monograph,¹⁸ in practice “fieldwork” as method might mean a number of things: touring through a region finding bilingual informants who would discuss customs, beliefs, and rituals, as Boas’ did often in his fieldwork among the Indians of the Northwestern Coast;¹⁹ remaining in one village for a length of time collecting firsthand reports from a number of informants, as Elsie Clews Parsons often did among the Pueblo; or recording chants, songs, and stories in an indigenous language and then achieving translation through the paid services of a bilingual interpreter, as, for example, Pliny Earle Goddard did in creating his 1904 monograph, *Hupa Texts*.²⁰

Generic Commonalities

Clearly, the boundaries of what could be considered “extensive new knowledge” were rather open in the emerging profession of anthropology during the decades surrounding the turn of the twentieth century. The text’s length, publication outlet, topic, and method and the institutional position of its writer were all varied.

Nevertheless, two common characteristics of these wide-ranging texts ensured that monographs *did* perform the repeated actions of creating extensive new knowledge and distributing knowledge among a relevant community of anthropologists.

First, early monographs prioritized the firsthand collection of data. Despite variations in method, the majority of monographs published between the 1890s and 1920 create anthropological knowledge by collecting data, whether from informants or from observation, as texts or as artifacts. Although explicit statements of method were infrequent in monographs of this era, on those occasions when anthropologists did include methodological statements, they argued for the superiority of firsthand collection over earlier forms of knowledge-production. Goddard, for instance, critiques the repetition of errors that occurs when anthropologists merely read others' accounts, rather than going to the field to gather data at firsthand:

Stephen Powers' account of the Hupa... contains some facts, but on the whole is misleading. Professor Otis T. Mason's article on the Ray collection...is fairly accurate, although the errors of Powers and others have been retained and a few new ones have been added. This inevitably happens when one writes without having visited a tribe concerning which so little is known. (*Life and Culture of the Hupa* 3)

In contrast to the inaccuracy enabled when interpretations rest on secondhand information, Goddard's firsthand access to Hupa people legitimates his monograph as accurate knowledge. Unlike earlier anthropologists, content to remain in their studies, Goddard writes that the texts collected in *his* monograph "were taken down from the lips of the narrator in the presence of an interpreter who made sure that all

was recorded in proper order” (*Hupa Texts* 93). Direct access to the bodies of the Hupa—“the lips of the narrator,” which stand in synecdochally for the living bodies of many Hupa informants—legitimizes Goddard’s monograph, and many others, as constituting valid and new anthropological knowledge.

Second, early ethnographic monographs almost invariably situate the community being studied *in space*, in relation to a broad cultural, archaeological, and linguistic map that was being developed through the feverish collecting activities of anthropologists during this period. Many monographs from this period begin with a spatial orientation meant to position the community being studied in relation to other tribes and, often, within regional or national frames. Boas, for instance, begins his 1897 monograph, *The Social Organization and the Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl Indians*, with a section that defines the spatial boundaries and describes the geographical territory of “The Indian Tribes of the North Pacific Coast” in detail:

The region inhabited by these people is a mountainous coast intersected by innumerable sounds and fiords and studded with islands, large and small. Thus intercourse along the coast by means of canoes is very easy, while access to the inland is difficult on account of the rugged hills and the density of the woods. A few fiords cut deep into the mainland, and the valleys which open into them give access to the heart of the high ranges which separate the coast from the highlands of the interior, forming an effectual barrier between the people of the interior and those of the coast. [...] Extending our view a little beyond the territory defined above, the passes along which the

streams of culture flowed most easily were the Columbia River in the south and the pass leading along Salmon and Bella Coola rivers to Dean Inlet and Bentinck Arm. (317)

This geographical description of the broader region, encompassing the multiple tribes who inhabit the North Pacific Coast, delimits spatial boundaries for his monograph. Boas describes geographical features—the fiords and mountain peaks, the density of wooded hillsides and the scarcity of mountain passes—that have *naturally* separated cultures in this region from the contact of outsiders. In selecting this particular group of cultures for his study, Boas seems to be simply adopting the cultural distinctions that have arisen naturally out of the geographical features of the North Pacific Coast.

In this way, Boas' monograph, like many others, uses *topographia* or detailed geographical description to both construct boundaries around a particular community and to link that community to a larger project of anthropological mapping. Here, detailed geographical description essentially makes the physical landscape into a rationale for the selection of an object of study; mountains and fiords indicate natural rather than artificial boundaries for one's monograph. At the same time, spatial description enables the anthropologist to forge links between a focused regional study and the vast project of creating a detailed, complete, coherent map of human cultures. Geographical details also provide a frame for the knowledge constructed by any particular monograph, suggesting that knowledge within the frame bears a meaningful relation to both larger and smaller frames. For instance, the specific tribe of the Kwakiutl is nested within the regional frame of the North Pacific Coast, which in turn is linked with other indigenous communities

existing inside national (Canadian, American) or continental (North American) boundaries. Through such detailed spatial descriptions, the knowledge produced and circulated by a monograph is meaningfully *bounded* and yet simultaneously *articulated*, linked, within an encompassing anthropological map.²¹

Early Monographs and Disciplinary Needs

By providing anthropologists with a location for the rhetorical actions of producing extensive new knowledge and distributing that knowledge within a diverse anthropological community, the early monograph genre served an important institutional role. That this genre-location was marked primarily by variation and flexibility reflects the situation of American anthropology as a discipline in transition between 1890 and 1920. During these decades, the amateur scientists, military personnel, museum collectors, and government officials who had generated the field of anthropology in the late nineteenth century continued to participate in the discipline, even as anthropology's center of gravity shifted toward universities. The field experiences and ethnographic knowledge of these earliest practitioners provided an important intellectual resource throughout this institutional transition. Alongside early amateur and semi-professional practitioners, over the first two decades of the twentieth century, more and more anthropologists earned Ph.D.s and learned anthropology as an academic discipline in university classrooms. The early anthropological community created the monograph as a genre capable of accommodating these varied intellectual and methodological currents.

In addition to variability and flexibility, early monographs also demonstrate two key commonalities that further support the institutional needs of anthropology as an emergent academic discipline. The monograph's focus on collection of data from the field and its use of geographical description to position knowledge spatially are both linked to perceived disciplinary needs during these decades. One such need was for more reliable and more self-consciously *scientific* data on linguistic and cultural variety. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, earlier reports from traders, soldiers, and missionaries were increasingly construed as unreliable and insufficiently scientific, either due to the biases of reporters who aimed to convert or conquer rather than observe indigenous communities, or due to their lack of engagement with the problems that guided "scientific" anthropological investigations. The need for better and more complete empirical data was related to Franz Boas' anti-racist intellectual agenda; copious and careful data was required to counter the highly persuasive framework of social evolution, which nineteenth century scientists had used to provide intellectual justification for racist generalizations.²² Consequently, fieldwork was prioritized, as was accumulation of empirical evidence of variation in order to construct as complete a picture as possible of human history.

Further animating this perceived need for better data was the myth of the Vanishing Indian, which lent urgency to anthropologists' collecting activities. This long-cherished American myth²³ maintained that European American and Native American cultures were incompatible and that, tragically but inevitably, Native Americans would vanish upon contact with whites. As a widely-circulated racist

fiction, the myth of the Vanishing Indian provided a rhetorical resource for anthropologists, who repeatedly defined their work as a race to collect cultural and linguistic data that was rapidly disappearing. This project to collect as much anthropological information as possible from cultures imagined as perpetually on the brink of disappearing has been famously called “the anthropology of salvage” (Gruber). “Salvage” helped to generate a sense of shared purpose for anthropologists as a developing discipline. Additionally, the perceived need to gather more complete data also promoted a sense of collaboration among varied practitioners in anthropology. Because the space to be covered was so large, anthropologists constructed a community meant to welcome anyone capable of contributing in some way to the creation of a complete picture of human history, before the indigenous communities, presumed to represent that history, irrevocably disappeared.

The monograph genre that I have described above as very loosely constrained served the perceived needs of this diverse discourse community. So, too, do the commonalities that link texts in this highly variable genre: gathering data at firsthand, positioning knowledge in space in relation to a larger, complete map of human variety. These practices link the earlier mapping projects of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of American Ethnology with the emergent, academic, direction of professionalizing anthropology. The goal that coordinated such a variety of anthropological research was the creation of a complete map, and monographs enabled the pursuit of this collective goal while accommodating the diversity of practitioners who pursued it. Fieldwork and geographical description, two space-based commonalities in this genre, helped anthropologists, working in

different areas, with different training and backgrounds, to *perceive* their disparate activities as related. Early monographs thus helped to constitute anthropologists as a disciplinary community while simultaneously, through the genre's flexibility and variety, making it possible for a wide range of practitioners to inhabit the community's loose boundaries.

Malinowski Among the Anthropologists: Spatial-Rhetorical Strategies of *Argonauts* Reconsidered

Early anthropological monographs provide the context that enables us to understand more clearly the rhetorical contributions of *Argonauts*. For decades before and after the 1922 publication of *Argonauts*, monographs continued to function as a location for producing extensive new knowledge and for distributing knowledge to the anthropological community. Yet many of these terms came under revision around 1920. After 1920, the parameters of “new knowledge” and of the “anthropological community” were redefined, and such changes were reflected in the changing genre of the ethnographic monograph. In what follows, I analyze *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* to reposition Malinowski's “mythic charter” in relation to the earlier monograph genre and to broad disciplinary changes taking place in anthropology during the 1920s and 1930s. I locate the continuities that link *Argonauts* with the ongoing tradition of ethnographic monographs and analyze the rhetorical innovations that would become so influential. What Malinowski offers, in the end, is a narrowed ethnographic monograph, a location for rhetorical action that permitted less flexibility and established clearer distinctions between legitimate and

illegitimate practice. But these generic innovations were influential not primarily because of Malinowski's individual rhetorical prowess, but because a narrowed ethnographic monograph met important new institutional needs.

Spatial-Rhetorical Continuities: Early Monographs and Malinowski

Despite the tendency of historians of anthropology to characterize *Argonauts* as a dramatic departure, charting a new course for anthropology, in fact Malinowski's monograph shares important features that establish continuity between his text and the earlier monograph genre. A few recent anthropologists have emphasized intellectual continuities between Malinowski's work and that of his forerunners and contemporaries;²⁴ my analysis of *Argonauts* suggests that not only intellectual but also rhetorical characteristics recur. *Argonauts* emerged not in mythic isolation but in clear relation to the earlier monograph genre, a relation particularly evident in Malinowski's rhetorical use of spatial strategies, like the rhetoric of "vanishing" and the use of geographical frames, to support his knowledge claims.

One major continuity created by Malinowski's spatial-rhetorical strategies is his deployment of the rhetoric of "vanishing," as he does in the opening sentence of *Argonauts'* Foreword:

Ethnology is in the sadly ludicrous, not to say tragic, position, that at the very moment when it begins to put its workshop in order, to forge its proper tools, to start ready for work on its appointed task, the material of its study melts away with hopeless rapidity. Just now, when the methods and aims of scientific field ethnology have taken

shape, when men fully trained for the work have begun to travel into savage countries and study their inhabitants—these die away under our very eyes. (xv)

In describing a situation in which anthropological material “melts away with hopeless rapidity,” and in concluding that such a situation is “sadly ludicrous,” even “tragic” *for anthropology*, Malinowski achieves two related rhetorical effects. First, he uses an imagined spatial *absence* to generate urgency. Because he portrays indigenous cultures “like a mirage, vanishing almost as soon as perceived” (xv), Malinowski is able to assert that “the need for energetic work is urgent, and the time is short” (xvi). Second, he casts the entire array of indigenous cultures in existence as anthropological material, material that belongs to anthropologists but perversely disappears at the moment anthropologists arrive to study it. This construction is evident in the multiple clauses in each sentence that establish anthropology’s preparedness—putting its workshop in order, forging its proper tools, training men for fieldwork, sending them into “savage countries.” These preparations to take on anthropology’s “appointed task” are abruptly undercut by the sudden disappearance of anthropological “material.” The spatial positioning of indigenous communities and bodies that disappear “under [the] very eyes” of anthropologists—like specimens under a microscope—further reinforces Malinowski’s implicit argument that varieties of human culture exist *for the purpose* of being studied by anthropologists, and belong to anthropology’s disciplinary terrain.

Additional spatial-rhetorical practices evident in *Argonauts* also link Malinowski’s text to earlier monographs. Like earlier writers of monographs,

Malinowski uses detailed geographical description to mark the boundaries of his investigations and to position that research within broader regional and national frames of reference. Indeed, most of the first chapter of *Argonauts* is devoted to such detailed geographical description (27-48). Malinowski frames his study initially in relation to the entire region of New Guinea,

a mountainous island-continent, very difficult of access in its interior, and also at certain portions of the coast, where barrier reefs, swamps and rocks practically prevent landing or even approach for native craft. [...] The high hills, the impregnable fastnesses in swampy flats and shores where landing was difficult and dangerous, would give easy protection to the aborigines, and discourage the influx of migrators. (27)

Like Boas' account of the geophysical features separating cultures of the North Pacific Coast from one another, Malinowski here describes mountains, dense vegetation, and other geophysical features that isolate this region. Such geographical isolation suggests the appropriateness of the Trobriand Islands for study: their boundaries apparently emerge naturally from the geographical landscape, and imply that the communities inhabiting these islands have remained intact, unchanged by contact with European and American colonial influence. Malinowski, again like Boas and earlier writers of monographs, proceeds telescopically:

The geographical area of which the book treats is limited to the Archipelagoes lying off the eastern end of New Guinea. Even within

this, the main field of research was in one district, that of the
Trobriand Islands. This, however, has been studied minutely. (xvi)

Creating a telescopic vision—narrowing closer and closer while maintaining that the part reflects the whole—is a spatial-rhetorical strategy that delimits meaningful boundaries. In this instance, telescoping allows Malinowski to assert the completeness of his ethnographic information; within “minute” boundaries, Malinowski has covered “the whole extent of the tribal culture of one district” (xvi). Telescoping asserts at the same time a link between minute study of one district and the broader region that encompasses it.

A sequence of nested maps distributed throughout the introduction and opening chapter visually reinforce this telescopic process linking the minute—the village—with the larger project of anthropological mapping. First, a map depicting the whole of Eastern New Guinea precedes the introduction; next, a closer map, narrowly framed around the Gulf of Papua and the northern end of the archipelago, precedes the first chapter. This is followed by a still more tightly framed map, titled “The Kula District,” which delimits the series of islands linked by the institution, the Kula Ring, that Malinowski describes in the book. A fourth map placed a few pages later finally narrows the frame to the level of a single large island, Boyowa, with the nearest neighboring islands visible and the village of Kiriwina, where Malinowski primarily lived while conducting field research, clearly marked. These maps maintain a birds-eye-view of the region, island, and village under investigation, positioning Malinowski simultaneously spatially—high above, capable of visually

encompassing the region—and epistemologically, as a powerful knower looming above the site of his ethnographic “material.”

Fieldwork “Off the Verandah”: Spatial Requirements for Knowledge

Throughout the bulk of *Argonauts* Malinowski does not remain at such a height, of course, but positions himself very deliberately in relation to the Trobriand Islanders whose communities constitute the field of his research. The field—the plane of community life inhabited by an ethnographer, as a deliberate outsider—represents a further spatial resource Malinowski draws on to inhabit a position of epistemological authority. Malinowski’s portrayal of fieldwork constitutes both a link with earlier monographs and his most significant generic departure. Fieldwork was a fundamental knowledge-making practice already embedded in the discipline’s primary genre. Being *in the field* to collect data firsthand was a mechanism for generating new anthropological knowledge in earlier monographs, and certainly Malinowski follows this tradition of locating authority in field experience.

But Malinowski’s methodological statement in *Argonauts* attaches many explicit requirements to the term “fieldwork.” In *Argonauts*, Malinowski uses spatial-rhetorical strategies to prescribe degrees of closeness and separation, to designate forms for textual representation of field experience, and to institute far more rigorous distinctions between what counts as fieldwork—and constitutes an ethnographic monograph—and what does not.

In articulating a more rigid definition of fieldwork, Malinowski acknowledges that *being there* is crucial, but asserts that *simply* being there is insufficient. “There is

all the difference,” he argues, “between a sporadic plunging into the company of natives, and being really in contact with them” (7); *Argonauts* attempts to document that difference extensively. To support his contention that merely *being there* does not produce accurate ethnographic knowledge, Malinowski constructs missionaries, traders, and amateur ethnographers as foils for the scientific anthropologist. He critiques the “average practical man, whether administrator, missionary, or trader” (5) who “had lived for years in the place with constant opportunities of observing the natives and communicating with them,” and yet “hardly knew one thing about them really well” (5). Their “untrained minds” and their “biased and pre-judged opinions” (5), as well as a tendency to treat “with a self-satisfied frivolity what is really serious to the ethnographer” (6), make traders, missionaries, colonial agents, and amateur ethnographers all equally incapable of creating useful, truly scientific anthropological knowledge. Malinowski’s extensive statement of method, which encompasses the first twenty-five pages of *Argonauts* and recurs sporadically in later chapters, takes pain to establish that not all field experiences generate equally valid knowledge, and that “scientific, methodic inquiry can give us results far more abundant and of better quality than those of even the best amateur’s work” (xv). Earlier monographs reflected the range of acceptable practices that were collectively considered “fieldwork.” *Argonauts*, in contrast, specifies a more precise meaning for the term “fieldwork,” aggressively maintaining that simply being in the field, as a trader, traveler, or amateur, was insufficient.

Conducting the research activities that *do* constitute proper scientific fieldwork, Malinowski asserts, demands not only inhabiting the field, but also

positioning oneself in precise ways. Of the three “principles of method” that Malinowski offers to provide the “secret of effective field-work,” the key to the “ethnographer’s magic” (6), the most crucial, he explains, is to place oneself in the “proper conditions for ethnographic work” (6). Becoming an ethnographer, in fact, seems largely to rest upon placing oneself into appropriate configurations of distance and closeness: distant from other whites, and as near as possible to native life. The “proper conditions” for creating reliable ethnographic knowledge “consist mainly in cutting oneself off from the company of other white men, and remaining in as close contact with the natives as possible” (6). This contact “really can only be achieved by camping right in their villages” (6). Malinowski famously characterized this spatial requirement a few years later in *Myth in Primitive Psychology*, where he wrote that the anthropologist must “relinquish his comfortable position...on the verandah...where he has been accustomed to collect statements from informants...[and] go out into the villages” (147). Earlier methods of fieldwork that relied primarily upon collecting information at firsthand from informants become redefined as insufficient. They are insufficient precisely because such research practices fail to eliminate distance between ethnographic subjects and ethnographers as thoroughly as possible.

Placing oneself into a position of nearness to another culture—moving off the verandah and into the village—enables what Malinowski calls “the ethnographer’s magic” (6), his ability to capture “the imponderabilia of actual life” (20). Indeed, once the ethnographer is properly positioned, knowledge appears to follow naturally. Upon moving his tent into the village of Omarakana, Malinowski finds that at once

he “began to take part, in a way, in the village life, to look forward to the important or festive events, to take personal interest in the gossip and the developments of the small village occurrences” (7). Rather than laboring to elicit information from “paid, and often bored, informant[s]” (7), Malinowski asserts that his placement within the village afforded him natural access to all manner of data:

intimate details of family life, of toilet, cooking, taking of meals; ... the arrangements for the day's work, people starting on their errands, or groups of men and women busy at some manufacturing tasks. Quarrels, jokes, family scenes, events usually trivial, sometimes dramatic but always significant, formed the atmosphere of my daily life, as well as of theirs. (7)

Because all these minute occurrences add up to the “imponderabilia” of everyday life, all the events of the village, trivial or dramatic, count as “always significant” material for the ethnographer. And it is the act of deliberately working “entirely alone, living for the greater part of the time right in the villages” (xvi) that makes the whole social world accessible. Deliberately positioning his tent in the village, Malinowski “had constantly the daily life of the natives before my eyes, while accidental, dramatic occurrences, deaths, quarrels, village brawls, public and ceremonial events, could not escape my notice” (xvi-xvii). The entirety of the social world becomes accessible, according to *Argonauts*, through the ethnographer's proper spatial configuration.

Moving “off the verandah” was a spatial practice that was also meant to aggressively erase the natural distance that kept “Europeans” and “primitives” apart.

Malinowski reassures the “intending field-worker” (xix) that it is acceptable to position oneself *near* “a white man’s compound” which can serve as “a refuge in times of sickness and surfeit of native” (6). But he warns that such a “refuge” should be far enough away to be inconvenient, so the ethnographer will be forced to engage in the life of the village:

For the native is not the natural companion for a white man, and after you have been working with him for several hours, seeing how he does his gardens, or letting him tell you items of folk-lore, or discussing his customs, you will naturally hanker after the company of your own kind. (7)

In this sense the spatial position Malinowski advocates as necessary for adequate fieldwork is also an attempt to compensate for a more fundamental difference that keeps “the native” and the “white man” apart. Closeness is enforced to overcome not only distance but also *difference*.

The dynamic between distance and closeness finally inflects the metaphor Malinowski creates to explain the process of making ethnographic knowledge. The transformation of field experience into convincing scientific knowledge is characterized as a traversal of profound distances:

In Ethnography, the distance is often enormous between the brute material of information ... and the final authoritative presentation of results. The Ethnographer has to traverse this distance in the laborious years between the moment when he sets foot upon a native beach, and

makes his first attempts to get into touch with the natives, and the time when he writes down the final version of his results. (3-4)

Here Malinowski's reference to "brute material" reminds his readers that anthropological data is contained within the bodies, languages, and community practices of "primitive" cultures. As he writes elsewhere, anthropologists' data is "embodied in the most elusive of all materials; the human being" (11). Characterizing anthropological data as contained within—even masked by—the raced bodies of cultural others helps Malinowski to emphasize what he portrays as the enormous difficulty of the anthropologists' task. Over "laborious years" and out of only "brute material," the ethnographer must "traverse the distance" between the confusion and disorientation of one's arrival on a "native beach" and the ultimate production of orderly, complete, and convincing public knowledge. The spatial terms Malinowski uses to describe this process constructs an analogous relation between the two activities he prioritizes: embodied travel to distant villages, and the intellectual labor of turning observations into scientific results.

In sum, Malinowski argues in *Argonauts* that anthropologists must inhabit a particular set of conditions in order to produce knowledge. Writing an ethnographic monograph, in turn, acquires clear spatial requirements. Malinowski's influential methodological statements specifically exclude practices that were located legitimately in earlier anthropological monographs. In opposition to the enormous variability and flexibility, both methodological and rhetorical, of the early monograph genre, Malinowski creates a model that distinguishes carefully between

appropriate and inappropriate methods, textual practices, and disciplinary practitioners. Insisting on integrated observations and carefully formulated methods statements, Malinowski sets new parameters for the construction of new knowledge in monographs.

First, monographs must clarify “by what actual experiences” (3) the anthropologist’s data were collected. In *Argonauts* Malinowski asserts that “only such ethnographic sources are of unquestionable scientific value” are those in which the line between observation and interpretation has been strictly observed *and* indicated textually. Only in such accounts can a reader “visualize with perfect precision the conditions under which the work was done” (3). Knowledge of the ethnographic “conditions”—namely, the duration of the field experience and the intimacy with the native community achieved by the ethnographer—allow the reader to judge the value of the ethnographic data presented. Through this textual requirement—that “actual experiences” and the “conditions under which the work was done” find representation within the monograph—Malinowski embeds within the monograph genre a set of criteria which readers can then use to determine a monograph’s value.

Next, the presentation of “brute material” in a monograph is insufficient; to create knowledge, Malinowski insists that data must be integrated, interpreted, or otherwise transformed through the analytical activity of the anthropologist. This contrasts significantly with earlier monographs, whose writers perceived the distribution of newly-collected, uninterpreted data as itself a worthy intellectual effort, clearly counting as new knowledge.²⁵ Instead, Malinowski specifically

excludes mere collection from the knowledge-making activities of the genre. He states, for instance, in his 1916 article “Baloma: The Spirits of the Dead in the Trobriands,” which was written in Australia between two extended field expeditions in the Trobriands, that it is not “possible to wrap up in a blanket a certain number of ‘facts as you find them’ and bring them all back for the home student to generalize upon” (1916: 238). Instead, “fieldwork consists only and exclusively in the interpretation of the chaotic social reality” (1916: 238). In this way, Malinowski defines “fieldwork” *against* mere collection, and at the same time re-defines the ethnographic monograph in opposition to the collection of texts and data that had been a major part of knowledge-making in earlier monographs.

***Argonauts* as Methodological Exemplar**

Modeled on *Argonauts*, then, the genre of the ethnographic monograph was substantially re-oriented after 1922. In place of the flexibility and capaciousness of the earlier genre, new ethnographic monographs required a long-term, intensive, “minute study,” undertaken “off the verandah” in proper conditions of closeness. The intensity, duration, and closeness of the ethnographic encounter all affect the value of the fieldwork for producing knowledge. These features became embedded in the monograph genre as a self-referential set of criteria for distinguishing between accurate, scientific knowledge and mere anthropological dabbling, in part because *Argonauts* was self-consciously a teaching text for new anthropologists.

Methodological explicitness constitutes one of *Argonauts* primary deviations from earlier practice and one of the main reasons for its long-term influence in

anthropology. Whereas earlier monograph writers generally glossed their methodologies in a few sentences, Malinowski devotes his entire twenty-five-page introduction to an extended statement of methodology, and embeds further discussion in passages throughout the text. This extensive treatment of method was not initially perceived as important—an indication of the degree to which other anthropologists believed they were already practicing what Malinowski was preaching. Edward Gifford, for instance, praised *Argonauts* at length in his review for the *American Anthropologist*, but critiqued Malinowski's habit of “dwell[ing] frequently and at great length on ethnographical method” (102). Although “the layman” might welcome such “lengthy expositions of method,” Gifford warns his readers that “the professional anthropologist will perhaps regard as pedantry” Malinowski's discussion of “those matters of method which must be obvious to every properly trained ethnologist” (102). Yet Malinowski's unusually explicit and extensive discussion of method is precisely what later scholars point to in order to explain *Argonauts* continuing relevance for anthropology.²⁶

In fact, Malinowski's explicitness about methodology and his portrayal of his experience as exemplary invite readers to interact with *Argonauts* as a teaching text. Malinowski makes himself a model for students and potential anthropologists in a number of ways, as when he proposes to describe “an Ethnographer's tribulations, as lived through by myself” (4) in order to “throw light on the question” (4) of what precisely an anthropologist does in the field to create knowledge. He directs many of his methodological statements explicitly toward students, musing that “it may be interesting for intending field-workers to observe that I carried out my ethnographic

research for six years ... on little more than £250 a year,” which was sufficient not only for “all the expenses of travel and research, such as fares, wages to native servants, payments of interpreters,” but also enough to “collect a fair amount of ethnographic specimens” (xix). His frugality is offered as a model and an injunction: potential anthropologists should undertake (even modestly) sponsored fieldwork—rather than, for instance, dabbling in ethnographic research or funding collection activities through paid positions in government or colonial administration. Furthermore, Malinowski’s photographs are captioned in ways that reinforce his status as a model: Plate 1 reveals “The Ethnographer’s Tent on the Beach of Nu’Agasi”; the caption of another image identifies “the ethnographer’s tent” in the background. Through such exemplifying rhetorical maneuvers, “The Ethnographer” becomes an archetype, Malinowski its embodiment.²⁷

Malinowski’s discursive choices draw attention to his contributions as a model for “intending field-workers” and help to instantiate the process of mythicization surrounding his work. But institutional as well as rhetorical factors enabled Malinowski’s “mythic charter” to gain broad influence. As Marcus and Fischer have noted, “the reading and teaching of exemplary ethnographic texts” became “the major means of conveying to students what anthropologists do” (21). Institutional factors—such as Malinowski’s success in gaining an influential teaching position at the London School of Economics, alongside the growing importance of university training to the professional discipline of anthropology—heightened the value of Malinowski’s example. His methodological advice, which early reviewers like Gifford felt merely repeated what others already knew and practiced,

nevertheless made *Argonauts* particularly useful as a teaching text during a period when university instruction was increasingly valuable.²⁸ Directly addressing the “intending field-worker,” outlining what to *do* in the field to generate authoritative cultural knowledge, and doing so far more extensively than the relatively sparse statements of method in most monographs: these discursive choices intersected with institutional factors and enabled Malinowski’s text to influence successive generations of new, university-trained anthropologists.

Genre Narrowing After *Argonauts*

By his death in 1943, Malinowski’s influence over field methods and the textual production of monographs was widely acknowledged and routinely elaborated. Contemporaries suggested that his particular formulation of the fieldwork method had “produced integrated descriptions instead of loosely classified catalogues of traits” and who argued that “the average quality of anthropological field work and ethnographic reporting has risen appreciably as a consequence of Malinowski’s influence” (Murdock 444). But the form of the monograph Malinowski established was more limited in many ways than the flexible monograph genre that preceded it.

A variety of materials from the 1920s and 1930s indicate the influence of this text in *narrowing* the production and reception of later monographs. Reviews of others’ monographs, for instance, indicate that demands were heightened, for both the production of anthropological knowledge through fieldwork and its distribution through monographs. Merely collecting texts from informants and circulating them

through monographs became far less common in the 1920s and 1930s. Although Boas continued to produce this model of monograph, for instance, in his established position as the venerable father of American anthropology, his 1932 *Bella Bella Tales* nevertheless drew the critique that, as a monograph, the book tells readers “nothing of the Bella Bella, not even where they live” (Raglan). Although Boas’ position in American anthropology was by the 1930s unassailable,²⁹ nevertheless, even his works were judged against the tightening generic boundaries governing the production of ethnographic monographs.³⁰

New methodological priorities that gave even greater weight to Malinowski’s particular, intensive form of fieldwork provoked other anthropologists to reshape how they went about their investigations. Ruth Bunzel, for instance, one of Boas’ most promising students at Columbia, produced an innovative and widely praised monograph, *The Pueblo Potter*, published in 1929 out of her 1924-1925 dissertation field research. What made *The Pueblo Potter* remarkable to reviewers was Bunzel’s innovative use of fieldwork to investigate questions of artistic design in Pueblo pottery that previous generations would have examined in museums. One such reviewer, Frans Olbrechts, who was a Boas-trained anthropologist like Bunzel, particularly praises Bunzel’s use of fieldwork methods:

Such problems as imagination and inspiration, criticism and self-criticism, sources of design, symbolism and interpretation have here been handled, not, as was up till now so often the case, by someone whose only store of information was Museum specimens, or by someone who, on a field-trip of a general ethnological nature, has

picked up some haphazard bits of information on art, but by one who went to the Southwest with the object of solving this special problem.

(314)

Olbrechts praises Bunzel's monograph specifically for its use of a problem-focused, intensive fieldwork method to address *even* those questions of design and material culture that were previously examined in museums. Rather than analyzing only a "store of information" housed in a museum or "haphazard bits of information on art," Bunzel's monograph provides an integrated interpretation of Pueblo design, authorized and valued as knowledge according to the new rigors of intensive fieldwork methodology.

A more striking example of how new disciplinary priorities influenced monograph production and reception is visible in the response of academic anthropologists to Margaret Mead's enormously successful book, *Coming of Age in Samoa*. Reviews of books, such as Mead's, that deviated even marginally from the emergent methodological and rhetorical norms further indicate the presence of newly clarified generic boundaries in the 1920s and 1930s. *Coming of Age in Samoa*, like *Argonauts*, has been read and re-read throughout the twentieth century; it was first published in 1928 and was republished, with a new preface by Mead, every decade afterward until her death in 1978.³¹ One reason for its wide readership is that Mead modified her rhetorical choices to create a work of academic ethnography that would—like Malinowski's book—find an audience among educated nonspecialists.³² Although popular reviews were exceedingly positive, and have been borne out by the book's continuing popularity, initial scholarly reviews of *Coming of Age in Samoa*

delineated carefully and critically the variety of ways in which her text deviated from newly established norms for creation of knowledge in an ethnographic monograph. The reviews indicate, then, the degree to which the genre of the ethnographic monograph was becoming more tightly constrained over the course of the 1920s and 1930s.

Like *Argonauts*, *Coming of Age in Samoa* is clearly an ethnographic monograph and a work of academic scholarship.³³ For instance, Mead's acknowledgements, like those of mainstream academic monographs, name the individuals and institutions whose presence and support legitimate the scholarly quality of her work; she names Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict, Herbert Gregory, the Board of Fellowships of the National Research Council, and others who surround her work with institutional endorsements. Most importantly, *Coming of Age in Samoa* produces its knowledge through ethnographic fieldwork, in Malinowski's limited sense of the word, and, like other new monographs, uses fieldwork data to create an integrated, interpretive argument, rather than presenting ethnographic information for its own sake. These and other features assert *Coming of Age in Samoa* as an ethnographic monograph, undertaking to produce extensive new knowledge and to share it with the community of anthropologists.

Despite marking her text as a work of academic knowledge, Mead *does* adopt some discursive and rhetorical variations to ensure that her monograph could be legible to outsider audiences as well. In a later preface Mead explains that the text was not written "as a popular book," although she chose deliberately to write it "without the paraphernalia of scholarship designed to mystify the lay reader and

confound one's colleagues" (Preface, 1973 edition, n.p.). The book's Foreword, by Boas, is clearly aimed at non-anthropologists, as it patiently explains to a lay audience what anthropologists already know and points out what the audience should find interesting in Mead's book. And although Mead follows ethnographic field methods, she relegates most of her methodological information to a series of Appendices. In the main body of the text, she includes only the briefest statements to characterize her relationship with the subjects of her study and to authorize her research. The main body of the book is characterized by Mead's use of nontechnical language, where Mead generates evidence for the book's knowledge claims through narrative and evocative description; she relegates to the appendices many figures, tabulations, and charts that constitute the voice of academic social science. Mead's rhetorical strategies do not, in fact, deviate very significantly from Malinowski's, who also relies upon evocation and narrative and who, like Mead, meant his book to be readable and so relegated technical documents like tables and figures to the book's margins. Yet even Mead's minor divergences from the narrower monograph genre received comment from scholarly reviewers.

Popular reviews of *Coming of Age in Samoa* were exceedingly positive. The *New York Times* sounded a typical effusive note:

As Miss Mead's careful scientific work deserves the most earnest tribute, so her method of presenting its results calls for the highest praise. Her book ... is sympathetic throughout, warmly human yet never sentimental, frank with the clean, clear frankness of the scientist, unbiased in its judgment, richly readable in its style. (Nov. 4, 1928: 18)

These points of praise suggest a balance between Mead's "scientific work" and its "presentation," her scientific frankness and stylistic elegance, and thus register Mead's success in addressing two audiences at once—nonspecialists as well as other scientists.

Academic reviewers, on the other hand, were decidedly mixed in their assessment of Mead's success in balancing scientific work with the book's obvious popular appeal. Although Ruth Benedict, Mead's close friend, mentor, and confidant, praises *Coming of Age in Samoa* nearly unqualifiedly in her review for the *Journal of Philosophy*, other scholarly reviewers, while registering the book's readability and interest, were much more pointed in their critiques. Robert Lowie, another Boas'-trained anthropologist from Columbia, who reviewed the book for the *American Anthropologist*, constructs *Coming of Age in Samoa* primarily as a series of deviations from normal anthropological practice. He writes that Mead "deliberately set herself a task distinct from the traditional ethnographer's" (532) and that she "ignore[ed] the conventional descriptive pattern of a monograph" (532). Although such characterizations might be read as acknowledging *Coming of Age in Samoa* as experimental, in fact the accumulation of these and similar assertions creates a different effect: that of an authority rigorously registering deviations from a norm. This is evident, for instance, when Lowie notes that Mead describes her methods in an appendix, which he suggests "might more suitably appear as an introduction" (532). He also critiques Mead's "further depart[ure] from ordinary practice in pointing a moral" (532), which he points out to register clear disapproval of Mead's overall project. As he begins to name the book's "moral," he interrupts himself,

explaining that “Dr. Mead has not been quite ingenuous in her applied anthropology and fortunately readers of this journal are not concerned with pedagogical sermonizing” (532). Having eroded Mead’s authority and the authority of her knowledge by detailing these deviations, Lowie proceeds to uncover what he perceives as discrepancies between the body of the monograph and its appendices. He claims epistemological authority for himself instead, announcing, for instance, that “On some points made by Dr. Mead I must frankly avow skepticism” (534), skepticism he justifies through reference to his own fieldwork, not in Samoa, but among North American Plains Indians (534). Mead’s generic deviations, however slight, provide cause for Lowie to reposition her as misguided or mistaken and himself as a more reliable authority.

An unidentified reviewer for *Pacific Affairs* also notes Mead’s deviations from new norms for fieldwork, deviations which undermine her authority. This reviewer lays particular emphasis on the brevity of Mead’s field research, which falls short of the repeated and lengthy excursions recommended by Malinowski for intensive fieldwork:

Dr. Mead spent nine months in Samoa. She went into the country without a knowledge of the language. We ask, along with some Polynesians, how can a foreigner who must learn the language get from the people with certainty the truth of their most intimate personal affairs? (225)

This reviewer’s critique—that Mead has lived only nine months in Samoa and consequently has not sufficiently erased the distance between her and the Samoans

she has studied—would scarcely have been leveled at the work of earlier anthropologists, for whom the meaning of “fieldwork” and the requirements of the monograph were both far more flexible.

Robert Redfield, reviewing *Coming of Age in Samoa* for the *American Journal of Sociology*, offers a similar critique, suggesting Mead’s monograph, though readable, hardly conforms to new ideas about what a monograph does. In Redfield’s determination “the book is not, however, so much an ethnological monograph as a laboratory exercise. The cultural milieu is hardly sketched” (729). Mead’s perceived failure to meet norms for the monograph prompts both reviewers to identify others whose authority to make knowledge surpasses Mead’s. The *Pacific Affairs* reviewer places Mead’s nine months in Samoa against the greater authority of “a cultivated and much-traveled Polynesian” (225), who questions Mead’s data: “I, who speak their language and am of their blood, could not get these facts from them. Some of them I fear are not facts, but ‘yes-es’ carelessly given, or given to be agreeable” (225). And Redfield, in concluding his review, suggests that “a little Malinowski, stirred in, would have helped” (730). Such reviews of *Coming of Age in Samoa* indicate that, even by 1928, the standards for achieving authority and generating new knowledge through fieldwork had shifted and more stringent requirements were being enforced within the anthropological community.

Thus Mead’s deviations, however slight, from the emerging form of the new ethnographic monograph were confirmed as *deviations* through the attention of scholarly reviewers. Overall, these reviews enact an institutional process of policing. What they police is not Mead herself; she was a credentialed, if young, scholar, and

her mentor, Boas, was unassailable. Instead, reviewers position themselves as arbiters of proper monograph form; they shore up genre boundaries that in an earlier era had been indistinct. Interestingly, these reviews largely do not take up the issue of whether Mead ought or ought not to make her research intelligible to a lay audience; instead, they assume that, whatever audience she addresses, an anthropologist's authority as a knowledge-maker depends upon her adherence to norms of fieldwork and monograph creation. Their corrections to Mead's deviations can be seen as an attempt to push ethnographic representation toward a more clearly bounded center, a center newly symbolized by *Argonauts*.

Rhetorical Scarcity: Genre Constraints in a Rhetorical Ecosystem

This analysis of *Argonauts* within the genre context created by earlier, more flexible monographs reframes Malinowski's influence within the developing profession. By restricting fieldwork as a method and the monograph as a knowledge-making genre, *Argonauts* narrowed the boundaries of legitimate professional practice. In short, while the monograph genre continued to be a major location for the creation and circulation of new knowledge, *Argonauts* redefined "new knowledge" and "the anthropological community" in more restrictive ways. This text was influential because such restrictions were *useful* to anthropologists as they navigated new institutional and professional realities in the 1920s and 1930s.

To conceptualize this relationship between genre constraints and the needs of a professional community, I advance a new concept for rhetorical genre studies that I

call “rhetorical scarcity.” “Rhetorical scarcity” names a situation of constraint; a rhetorically scarce genre is one that allocates limited rhetorical resources, constructs highly constrained relationships between rhetors and audiences, and acknowledges few rhetorical aims as legitimate. Understanding the monograph genre as increasingly—and deliberately—scarce reveals the crucial function of rhetorical constraint in fostering professionalization.

The concept of rhetorical scarcity responds specifically to the rich body of contemporary genre theory that understands genres in spatial and ecological terms. Several contemporary theorists of genre have conceptualized genres spatially. Catherine Schryer, for instance, calls genre a “stabilized-for-now or stabilized-enough site of social and ideological action” (“Records” 107). Charles Bazerman offers a series of spatial metaphors to understand how genres function, explaining that:

Genres are not just forms. Genres are forms of life, ways of being. They are *frames* for social action. They are *environments* for learning. They are *locations* within which meaning is constructed. [...] Genres are the familiar *places* we go to create intelligible communicative action with each other and the *guideposts* we use to explore the unfamiliar. (“Life of Genre” 19, emphasis added)

These theorists resist viewing genres as formulaic, pre-determined sets of rules and lists of traits. Instead, spatial terms—frames, environments, locations, places, sites, and so on—enable genre scholars to position writers within networks of meaning. They suggest that not isolation but *relation* marks any beginning, any innovation, any

individual creation of meaning. Furthermore, spatial concepts of genre provide a way to link discursive spheres; rhetors move amongst a variety of “genred discursive spaces” (Bazerman “Genre and Identity” 15), and in the process ensure that popular, academic, governmental, and other discursive realms interact.

Most useful for my concept of rhetorical scarcity is Anis Bawarshi’s work theorizing genres not only spatially but ecologically. Genres function like ecosystems insofar as they allocate certain rhetorical resources and enable rhetors to adopt positions, articulate stances, and construct relations with particular audiences. As ecosystems, genres have boundaries, meaningful yet mutable, which shape “social and rhetorical conditions” (*Genre and the Invention* 8) of possibility:

Just as natural ecosystems sustain certain forms of life, so genres maintain rhetorical conditions that sustain certain forms of life—ways of discursively and materially organizing, knowing, experiencing, acting, and relating in the world. (*Genre and the Invention* 9)

An ecological model of genre also captures the dynamic of stability and change through which rhetors communicate meaningfully and re-shape the environments in which they participate; as ecosystems, genres are not “static backdrops” (9) but shifting sites where “social and rhetorical conditions are constantly being reproduced and transformed”(9) through the rhetorical actions of genre-users.

Drawing specifically from Bawarshi’s ecological model of genre, rhetorical scarcity offers scholars in rhetoric a way to link genre constraints and “ecological” boundaries with professional transformations and institutional demands. Rhetorical resources, strategies for knowledge-making, possibilities for subject formation—these

all flow less easily into and out of an ecosystem with less permeable boundaries. Furthermore, a site defined expansively and inclusively is likely to make a greater variety of rhetorical resources available to practitioners. Genre narrowing, which redraws closer boundaries around a smaller center, produces a situation of heightened scarcity for genre users, as fewer resources become available *inside* the genre's new boundaries.

The concept of rhetorical scarcity also introduces into genre theory inflections from a different register: that of economics. Rhetorical resources, in an economic sense, can have greater or lesser value; in fact, a situation of scarcity typically increases the value of certain resources. Furthermore, both scarcity and value can be artificially manipulated by changes to a market. Access to resources can be limited by erecting firmer boundaries or by delimiting the market in a new way, such that participants who were previously inside find themselves outside newly drawn boundaries. The economic inflections of "rhetorical scarcity" thus focus attention on power and access, reminding rhetoricians that access to resources is mediated by relations of power. A disciplinary community in particular, by defining its own boundaries in terms of membership and legitimate participation, can constrain access to rhetorical resources, increasing value by creating a situation of scarcity. To clarify this concept, I apply it in what follows to the institutional situation of professionalizing anthropology in the early twentieth century.

Rhetorical Scarcity and the Demands of Professionalization

After about 1920, the monograph genre became a rhetorically scarce site for knowledge production within the professionalizing discipline of anthropology. Amidst changing institutional realities, the rhetorically restricted monograph genre accomplished several things: it differentiated between disciplinary insiders and outsiders, consolidated the influence of universities, and distinguished anthropology from other professionalizing social sciences.

An enormous surge in research funding during the 1920s and 1930s created rapidly changing institutional conditions during this period. Institutions like the Rockefeller Foundation allocated massive sums of money to fund research, especially rigorously empirical *scientific* social research that could improve the human condition. Competition for research funds from Rockefeller philanthropies, from the National Research Council, and from the Social Science Research Council pushed all social sciences during this period toward heightened emphasis on empiricism and scientific rigor.³⁴ To compete for these funds, anthropology sought greater methodological coherence and clearer boundaries separating this discipline from other social sciences. Furthermore, the ongoing presence of a large number of amateurs within the ranks of anthropologists weakened their discipline's case; Boas stated the danger of "lay members ... outnumber[ing] the scientific contributors" to anthropology as early as 1902, when he argued in favor of creating the American Anthropological Association as an exclusively professional organization.³⁵ Although professionalization was already underway after the turn to the twentieth century, it rapidly increased in the 1910s and 1920s as anthropologists attempted to distinguish

legitimate from illegitimate practitioners and to support their bid for status amongst other rigorous scientific disciplines. The narrowed ethnographic monograph provided a crucial location for anthropologists to make their case, because of its restrictive concept of fieldwork and its explicit denunciation of the “sporadic plunging” method of field research associated with untrained amateurs.

Additionally, the research funding available from the NRC, the SSRC, and other research-focused and philanthropic institutions contributed to anthropology’s institutional shift away from museums and toward universities. Before World War I, museums had been “the most important single institutional employers of anthropologists” (Stocking “Philanthropoids” 181); after 1920, universities became anthropologists’ most significant institutional homes (Collier and Tschopik). The number of Ph.D.s in anthropology granted grew rapidly, particularly after 1920, as the earliest group of students to earn Ph.D.s in the 1900s and 1910s established new departments and began training graduate students of their own. Consequently, the Ph.D. became an increasingly important credential. The production of a monograph along narrowed lines, based on an extended period of fieldwork, likewise emerged as a crucial criterion for distinguishing between legitimately trained professional anthropologists and the adventurers, amateurs, and eccentrics who had long participated in the field. The interwar period also saw “considerable heightening of subdisciplinary specialization” (Stocking “Philanthropoids” 210); although the “four-field” approach was still the ideal in American anthropology, greater demands on training for each particular subdiscipline meant that, in practice, few anthropologists

were able to research across the diverging subfields of cultural anthropology, linguistics, physical anthropology, and archaeology.³⁶

In short, the new form of the monograph met a variety of institutional needs. The monograph after 1920 redefined fieldwork as intensive, long-term, and devoted entirely to observation—rather than a part-time practice one could undertake while engaged in mission work or colonial administration, or alongside one’s domestic duties as the wife of a trader on an Indian reservation, for instance. Consequently, this narrowed ethnographic monograph consolidated power in universities, which could provide training for fieldworkers, could fund appropriate field research, and could then award a credential to those who followed this standardized practice. Legitimate anthropologists became a more narrowly defined group of practitioners: those who could commit entirely to the pursuit of anthropological research and who could secure university sponsorship and earn a university-granted credential. At the same time, by establishing more stringent criteria for fieldwork, the narrower monograph genre could de-legitimize amateurs, for whom field experiences had previously offered an avenue into the discipline. The traversal of that long distance Malinowski charted—the distance between the “imponderabilia” of everyday life observed during long-term, intensive field research and the transformation of field research into an ethnographic monograph—became an initiation ritual for anthropologists. The narrowed boundaries of the ethnographic monograph also narrowed the boundaries of the professional community, and many practitioners found themselves left out of both locations.

In conclusion, the concept of rhetorical scarcity helps us see where generic *inflexibility* achieves the goals of a professional community. Through this concept, we can thus trace genre change—from flexible to rigid—alongside institutional change—from the ‘welcoming science’ to a rigorously social scientific academic discipline. Yet as subsequent chapters will demonstrate, the rhetorical scarcity of the ethnographic monograph had further, unanticipated consequences. The rigidity of the monograph masked the ongoing heterogeneity of purpose among practitioners of anthropology; as a result, one particularly significant consequence of rhetorical scarcity was the proliferation of alternative genres, such as the ethnographic novels, field autobiographies, and folklore collections I analyze in subsequent chapters. Anthropologists on the margins of new centers for professional power responded to this situation of scarcity by developing new hybrid and popular genres, which they used throughout the 1920s and 1930s to address audiences, ground arguments, and otherwise locate rhetorical actions that the ethnographic monograph could not accommodate.

¹ Although Malinowski is primarily associated with British anthropology, his “mythic charter” has functioned across national anthropological traditions to such a degree that his work merits this examination even in a project focused on American anthropology. Bronislaw Malinowski (1884 – 1942) was Polish and was particularly identified with the functionalist school of British anthropology; in his foreword to the third edition of *The Sexual Life of Savages* Malinowski wrote in 1932 that “the magnificent title of the Functional School of Anthropology has been bestowed by myself, in a way on myself, and to a large extent out of my own sense of irresponsibility” (xxix). His long fieldwork in the Trobriand Islands during 1915-1916 and 1917-1918 was continued for so long in part because World War I prevented him from returning to Poland. After publishing *Argonauts* he taught at the London School of Economics, intermittently at first, then gaining in 1927 a Chair in Anthropology in LSE, which, in part through Malinowski’s ability to attract students to the school, became a major center for training a new generation of British anthropologists. Malinowski’s influence certainly reached into the United States as well. American students, such as Hortense Powdermaker, studied with him in London, and his Rockefeller-sponsored U.S. lecture tour in 1926 introduced his ideas and his personality directly to a generation of American anthropologists. He was on sabbatical from the London School of Economics in 1938 in the United States when he was (again) stranded by the outbreak of World War II; he taught at Yale and was still in New Haven when he died in 1942 (Kuper 18). American anthropologists of the Boasian school sometimes considered Malinowski’s “innovations” mere restatements of a fieldwork orientation Boas had already established in the United States (see, for instance, Kluckhohn), but extensive references to Malinowski in American publications such as the *American Anthropologist*, in reviews of American anthropologists’ work, and in assessments of the discipline during the 1930s underscore his relevance for my discussions of the rhetorical and institutional changes underway in American anthropology between 1900 and 1940. For biographical information and accounts of Malinowski’s importance to the discipline, see Donald Fisher “Rockefeller”; Gellner; Kaberry; Kluckhohn; Kuper; Murdock; Patterson; Silverman *Totems*; Young. On Malinowski’s writing, see Fardon; Geertz; Manganaro “Textual Play”; Stocking “Maclay” and “Ethnographer’s Magic”; and Thornton and Skalnik.

² Recent scholars in the history of anthropology, recognizing the overemphasis on revolution that disguises ongoing continuities, have attempted to situate Malinowski, Boas, and other founding fathers within historical contexts that highlight continuity rather than dramatic isolation and rupture. See especially Darnell *And Along Came Boas* and *Invisible Genealogies*; Strathern.

³ On Boas’ importance to anthropology, see Darnell *And Along Came Boas* and *Invisible Genealogies*; Patterson; Stocking “Ideas and Institutions,” *Race, Language, and Culture*, and *Shaping*; Silverman *Totems*. For recent revisitations of Boas’ importance to ongoing work in anthropology, see Bashkow; Bunzl; Frank; Handler. On Boas’ anti-racism and his importance as a political, pro-feminist, and pro-human rights figure, see Hyatt; Liss; Stocking *Race, Language, and Culture* and *Shaping*; for a particularly vehement defense, see Lewis.

⁴ This chapter offers for anthropologists an account of the transformations by which ethnography came to be the research process, fieldwork the method, and the ethnographic monograph the primary form for scholarship in anthropology—a process that has not yet been fully traced by historians of anthropology; see Marcus and Fischer, who note that “The transition to the ethnographic method has a complex history which has not yet been written” (19).

⁵ On the circulation of the culture concept, see Elliott; Evans; Hegeman; Manganaro *Modernist and Culture*; Martin.

⁶ On “boundary work,” see Gieryn; Lay.

⁷ See Dippie; Haller; Hallowell; Thomas.

⁸ See Fabian *Time and the Work of Anthropology*; Grek-Martin; Hinsley *Savages*; Michaelson; Patterson; Thomas. Wolfe, though focused on the Australian context, provides a highly useful critique of the shared logics of anthropology and colonialism.

⁹ See Cotkin 51-60; Dellenbaugh; "John Wesley Powell"; WJ McGee "Powell"; Stegner; Worster.

¹⁰ See Fowler; Darnell "Professionalization" and *And Along Came Boas*. Darnell considers the creation of the BAE the instantiation of professional anthropology; through Bureau employment, it was possible after 1879 to support oneself as an ethnological field researcher. I consider the creation of the Bureau and its institutional development in the late nineteenth-century as the *onset* of anthropology's process of professionalization, rather than its culmination; anthropology was not an academic discipline for almost two generations more, with teaching in universities and museums only beginning around 1900 and gaining momentum until, by 1920, the discipline of anthropology was clearly and thoroughly both professional and academic.

¹¹ Hodge and Merriam.

¹² See Carr; Philip Deloria; Dilworth *Imagining*; Dippie; Thomas; Manganaro *Modernist and Culture*; Evans; Pfister.

¹³ Contemporary historian and librarian/archivist Jay Bernstein, for instance, defines monographs primarily by length: as a scholarly text longer than journal articles but shorter than books (Bernstein 554) and characterized primarily by its mode of publication in an ongoing series that "bears the imprimature not only of the press but also of the sponsoring department" (554). His analysis of anthropological genres does indicate some awareness that texts are not only published but also *used* insofar as he positions articles, monographs, and books relative to the "cutting edge of research" (554). But he treats research genres ahistorically and acontextually by using a late twentieth-century understanding of research and knowledge-making to characterize late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century anthropological research (554).

¹⁴ The number of institutions granting Ph.D.s in anthropology increased gradually between the 1890s and 1920s. Clark University granted the first Ph.D. in anthropology to A. F. Chamberlain in 1891, who had studied with Daniel Brinton and Franz Boas at Clark even though the university did not have a department of anthropology. Harvard University granted Ph.D.s in anthropology to George Dorsey in 1894, Frank Russell in 1898, Roland Dixon and John Swanton in 1900, William Curtis Farabee and George Byron Gordon in 1903, Alfred Tozzer in 1904, and Herbert Spinden in 1909; anthropological instruction at Harvard took place primarily through the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology throughout this period. Boas began teaching graduate anthropology at Columbia University in 1896, and in 1899 created at Columbia the first graduate department of anthropology, which was a powerful force in the movement toward the academic professionalization of anthropology. Alfred Kroeber was the first student to receive a Ph.D. under Boas' instruction at Columbia, in 1901; he shortly became head of a new graduate department of anthropology established at the University of California through the financial support of Phoebe Apperson Hearst, which in turn became an important institution training graduate students and granting Ph.D.s. As this pattern continued—newly credentialed anthropologists left from major centers of instruction at Columbia, California, and Harvard to head new graduate programs in anthropology at other institutions—the number of Ph.D.s granted in anthropology increased rapidly. Between 1891 and 1900, seven Ph.D.s in anthropology were granted in the United States; that number doubled in the next decade, with 14 new Ph.D.s granted between 1901 and 1910. Between 1911 and 1920, an additional 20 Ph.D.s in anthropology were granted in the U.S., and that figure doubled again over the next decade, with 42 new Ph.D.s granted between 1921 and 1930. For information on dissertation titles and degree-granting institutions, see Bernstein.

¹⁵ See Clifton 213-224; Hough "Alice Cunningham Fletcher"; Mark.

¹⁶ Although Speck conducted his field research among the Yuchi primarily under Boas' direction and through BAE funding, when the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania hired Speck as a museum faculty member in 1908, they also conferred Speck's Ph.D. and published his dissertation as a monograph.

¹⁷ See Darnell *And Along Came Boas*; Stocking *Shaping and Race, Language, Culture*; Herskovitz.

¹⁸ A smaller subset of early monograph writers did *not* rely upon some form of fieldwork, but performed analyses of physical specimens or material artifacts to create new anthropological knowledge. The methods used to create knowledge in physical anthropology include elaborate configurations of physical measurements, either of living people or their exhumed remains, tabulated, analyzed statistically, and organized into extensive tables, as exemplified in H. B. Ferris's 1916 monograph, *The Indians of Cuzco and the Apurimac*, which reinforces measurement data with hundreds of photographs of the indigenous people whose bodies have been tabulated in accompanying figures. Other monographs in material culture were written by a researcher with firsthand access to a museum's collection. In these instances, although fieldwork—going *there* to get data or have an experience that will produce knowledge—is not privileged, the firsthand encounter with an artifact or a person is still seen as creating the conditions of possibility for new knowledge. Consequently, some early dissertations, while clearly meant to contribute new knowledge to the developing discipline of anthropology, were not based on data collected in the field. For instance, Karl Haeberlin's dissertation, published in 1915 by the *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association*, uses data on Hopi and Pueblo cultures supplied in previous publications by Washington Mathews, Jesse Walter Fewkes, Frank Hamilton Cushing, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, and through Haeberlin's correspondence with Herbert J. Spinden and Pliny Earle Goddard as evidence to discount an ethnological theory and method that had been recently advanced by Graebner "and his school." See Haeberlin.

¹⁹ Boas' long-standing relationship with George Hunt, who was both informant and collector for much of Boas' work in the Pacific Northwest, has been well documented; see especially Berman; Rohner. In minor ways, Boas' acknowledged Hunt's role in his work, as for instance in his 1897 *Social Organization and Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl Indians*, where he writes that his research is "based on personal observations and on notes made by Mr. George Hunt."

²⁰ Goddard's statement of the linguistic method is this: "Connected texts furnish the most satisfactory material from which to discover the structure of the grammar. Many verb forms and peculiar usages are met with in texts which one would never discover by questioning. The more delicate shades of meaning of individual words are brought out by the aid of texts" (91). Goddard also prints a phonetic key, with interlineal translation followed by free translation of each folk tale or song. Whatever the method, writers of monographs only occasionally identified their method formally or elaborated on their reasons for selecting it. Goddard, for instance, states only that "The information contained in this paper was obtained mostly during a residence on the Hoopa Valley Reservation from March, 1897, to August, 1900. Additional facts, gleaned during several visits to that region since that time, have been added. [...] It has been the sole object to record things seen by the author and information obtained at first hand from the Indians" ("Hupa Texts" 3).

²¹ The striking pervasiveness of actual visual maps in monographs during this period offers further evidence of the use of space to unify varied knowledge-making projects into a larger disciplinary project of mapping.

²² See Darnell *Along Came*; Haller; Hoefel; Stocking "Ideas and Institutions," *Race, Language, Culture and Shaping*; Williams.

²³ See Dippie especially; also Philip Deloria; Carr; Clifton; Holm; Hoxie; Krech; Carter Jones Meyer.

²⁴ See especially Strathern; Stocking "Maclay".

²⁵ See, for instance, Boas' *many* volumes that primarily collect texts for future analysis: *Chinook Texts*, *Kathlamet Texts*, *Kwakiutl Texts* first and second series, with George Hunt, *Tsimshian Texts*, *Kutenai Tales*, *Kwakiutl Tales*, *Folk-Tales of Salishan*, *Bella Bella Texts*, and others.

²⁶ See Clifford; Clifford and Marcus; Geertz; Manganaro *Culture* and "Textual Play"; Marcus; Marcus and Cushman; Marcus and Fischer; Stocking "Maclay" and "Ethnographer's Magic"; Strathern; Thornton "Imagine Yourself."

²⁷ Geertz has made a similar observation concerning Malinowski's self-mythologizing in *Works and Lives*.

²⁸ As Marcus and Fischer argue, "ethnography has been the initiatory activity which has launched careers and established reputations. The significance of the expectation that all neophyte anthropologists should be tested by fieldwork in a foreign language, culture, and living arrangement cannot be overemphasized. ... [An] often romanticized ethnographic fellowship is what all anthropologists share" (21).

²⁹ After 1901, Boas' students established most new departments of anthropology in the U.S., and his empirical, historicist, anti-racist agenda for anthropology had set the course for the discipline between 1900 and World War II. On Boas' unassailable position of importance in anthropology after 1920, see Stocking "Ideas and Institutions"; on the importance of Boas' thinking more generally to American anthropology, see Darnell *And Along Came Boas* and *Invisible Genealogies*.

³⁰ Boas was sometimes critiqued after his death for not writing true ethnographic monographs; see White. He continued to publish text collections as one of his primary forms of scholarship. Writing un-integrated, non-intensive, informant-based rather than observation-based monographs positioned much of Boas' scholarship in folklore studies, which was itself becoming increasingly distinct from anthropology. See Darnell "American Anthropology".

³¹ After 1928, *Coming of Age in Samoa* was republished with a new preface by Mead in 1939, 1949, 1953, 1961, and 1973.

³² On Malinowski's efforts to find a popular or "commercial" publisher for *Argonauts*, see Stocking "Maclay"; Young. On Margaret Mead's parallel efforts to find a publisher for *Coming of Age in Samoa*, see Banner; Lutkehaus.

³³ Anthropologist Derek Freeman has argued vehemently against the legitimacy of Mead's scholarship in *Coming of Age in Samoa*, in a series of books and articles, which have been critiqued in turn by other anthropologists. See Côté; Feinberg; Freeman *Mead and Samoa* and *Fateful Hoaxing*; Holmes; Levy; Marshall; Orans; Patience and Smith; Shankman; Shore. Despite the depth of criticism leveled against Freeman's claims, Freeman has failed to respond to the most substantive of these critiques, and has published scholarship that seems to blend evidence with speculation, such that his position is highly eroded from the standpoint of *ethos*. As one reviewer puts it, these instances of unreliability in his own research and his refusals to engage with others' critiques of his research "leave the critical reader skeptical of even his most mundane claims" (Côté). But one effect of these critiques has been that it is now difficult to refer to Mead or her work without at least, as I am, footnoting the controversies surrounding her Samoan work.

³⁴ See Brown and Van Keuren; Donald Fisher "Rockefeller" and *Fundamental*; Furner; Haskell; Lageman; Reingold; Richardson and Fisher; Ross; Rossiter; Silverberg *Gender and American Social Science*; Solovey; Worcester.

³⁵ The fuller statement of Boas' argument against including amateurs in the professional association was delivered as an address to the Anthropological Society of Washington in 1902 and printed later the same year in *Science*:

A difficult problem often arises among those societies which are most successful in popularizing the subject matter of their science, because the lay members largely outnumber the scientific contributors. Whenever this is the case there is a tendency towards lowering the scientific value of discussion. [...] The greater the public interest in a science, and the less technical knowledge it appears to require, the greater is the danger that meetings may assume the character of popular lectures. Anthropology is one of the sciences in which this danger is ever imminent. (Boas "Foundation" 805).

The AAA was nevertheless formed along the inclusive lines opposed by Boas, who continued to work to install anthropology on academic, professional footing throughout his career. Malinowski's anti-amateur position is also quite explicit in *Argonauts*, where he writes:

The research which has been done on native races by men of academic training has proved beyond doubt and cavil that scientific, methodic inquiry can give us results far more abundant and of better quality than those of even the best amateur's work. (xv)

³⁶ The American Anthropological Association was incorporated in 1902 as an inclusive society, welcome to all interested parties, regardless of subfield or professional/amateur status, though not without vigorous debate (Stocking "Founding"). The Linguistic Society of America was created in 1917, followed in 1930 by the American Association of Physical Anthropologists and the Society of American Archaeologists in 1935.

Chapter Three

‘Essentially American’ Spaces: Rhetorical Space and Time in Native American Folklore Collections

“Our generation offers the last chance for doing what Mr. Curtis has done. The Indian as he has hitherto been is on the point of passing away.... It would be a veritable calamity if a vivid and truthful record of these conditions were not kept.”

--Theodore Roosevelt, Foreword to Edward Curtis’s *The North American Indian*, Volume One, 1907.

“*Land* becomes *landscape* when it is assigned the role of symbol, and as symbol it functions rhetorically.”

--Gregory Clark, *Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme from Kenneth Burke*, 2004.

While Edward Curtis spent two decades travelling the continent in pursuit of the goal Roosevelt alludes to above—that is, creating a “vivid and truthful record” of “The North American Indian” through photographs and descriptive text—he brought along trunk-loads of costumes to outfit those Native Americans who, regrettably, failed to wear traditional garb. He not only added costumes, masks, and poses to the famous Indian photographs he published in his twenty-volume opus, *The North American Indian*, but he also removed from his romantic, sepia-toned prints any suggestion of the influence of “civilization” among the tribes he photographed—removing, for example, suspenders, cowboy boots, cars, and other “foreign” objects from prints of the images he captured.¹

The ethnographic genre I examine in this chapter functioned frequently as a textual corollary to Edward Curtis's famous photographic work. Ethnography, like photography, promises to capture *what's there*, and academic and popular collections of Native American folklore reassured their readers that they contained cultural artifacts that were *collected* in the field, not created in a writer's imagination. But both visual and textual images often reflect desires as much as realities. And although the folklore collection genre explicitly aimed to preserve cultures imagined to be immensely valuable and rapidly vanishing, the genre also offered rhetorical resources for profoundly re-imagining national space. As a genre—that is, as a recurring site of rhetorical action—folklore collections did not so much *record* as they *remade* Native Americans and national landscapes to support ideological goals: preserving indigenous cultures as relics and as powerful symbols to support a myth of American indigeneity.²

The genre does so by transforming *land* into powerful, evocative, and empty American *landscapes*. As Gregory Clark reminds us, both material spaces and their textual representations can be given symbolic meanings that make them capable of functioning rhetorically, not only in support of explicit arguments, but more broadly as strategies for, in Burke's terms, "influencing attitudes" or "inducing actions" (Burke 1950: 41). In folklore collections, this imaginative transformation is enacted through specific spatial tropes and through the genre's underlying *chronotopes*, or normative orientations to space and time. Through spatial topoi of progress, evacuation, and containment, and a primary chronotope that orients the genre toward a romantic and distant native past, folklore collections throughout the early

twentieth century naturalized Native American absence. Through these spatial rhetorical strategies, folklore collections as a genre imagined the United States as a nation emptied, naturally, of indigenous presence.

Like the photographic project of Edward Curtis, and like the field autobiographies and ethnographic novels I examine in other chapters, the folklore collection genre lies at the intersection between popular discourse and academic knowledge production. Collections of Native American folklore were immensely popular during the first few decades of the twentieth century; major popular publishers such as Scribners, Lippincott, Knopf, and Houghton Mifflin, along with numerous regional presses, published dozens of such collections for popular audiences who were more widely and intensely interested in Native American lives and legends during the early twentieth century than during any previous period. But such collections were not only popular. The activity of collecting indigenous oral texts was one of the primary practices of *academic* knowledge production during the early twentieth century.³ Popular folklore collections were widely read and frequently published, and academic folklore collections were fundamental to the field of anthropology during the early decades of the twentieth century.

Consequently, the folklore collection genre serves as an important site for examining space as a rhetorical resource that diverse genres make available for widely varying ends and arguments. The impulse toward collection and preservation unites popular and academic collections of Native American folklore, and indicates the genre's alignment with widespread phenomena of the early twentieth-century: the intense competition among museums around the world for artifacts from ancient

Native American tribes; the “Indian craze” among middle-class tourists and upper-class art collectors who purchased Native American art and artifacts from train depots and art dealers; and the project of ethnographic “salvage” that gave such urgency and intensity to anthropological research during the early twentieth century.⁴ The folklore collection genre is significant as a site of rhetorical action that manifests an extremely widespread cultural construction in the turn-of-the-century United States: the construction of Native Americans as valuable and vanishing.⁵ As I argue below, this construction relied upon a set of interrelated spatial tropes to naturalize Native American “vanishing” and to mask its existence *as* a construction. This chapter asks: What are the primary spatial tropes and *chronotopes*, or underlying orientations to space and time, that circulated through the folklore collection genre? And how were those spatial strategies linked to rhetorical ends? That is, what ideological positions and implicit arguments did the genre’s representations of space and orientations toward space/time support? What attitudes and actions did they enable?

In response to these questions, this chapter advances two arguments about the functions of space as a rhetorical resource in the folklore collection genre. First, I argue that folklore collections circulated spatial tropes that portrayed U.S. landscapes as fundamentally—*essentially*—American. This popular genre used representations of space to support a nationalist argument about the natural legitimacy of European American occupation of the continent, repeatedly deploying spatial tropes of evacuation, progress, and containment to suggest that Native Americans naturally vanished from landscapes that were essentially and legitimately *American*. Academic

and popular folklore collections, like the Edward Curtis photographs that shared their impulse to *preserve*, actively *created* native cultures as vanishing relics and national space as naturally vacant.

Second, I show that these tropes, and the nationalist argument they supported, did not exhaust the spatial resources of the folklore collection genre. Not all folklore collections represented Native Americans through spatial tropes that suggested their inevitable absence, their romantic unreality, or their natural incompatibility within an industrializing United States; in fact, other writers used the genre to develop spatial tropes and ideological positions that contrasted sharply with such representations. Using a strategy I term “spatial specificity” alongside strategies of scale and position, these texts represent white ethnographers and Native Americans within situations marked by colonial histories and by the ongoing negotiation of intercultural relations.

To capture the complexity of these diverse uses of the folklore collection, I combine Carolyn Miller’s definition of genre as typified social action with Anis Bawarshi’s formulation of genre as a rhetorical ecosystem. In this definition, genres constitute—that is, simultaneously generate and constrain—rhetors’ possibilities for action, making certain rhetorical and epistemological resources available (but not others) and evolving through the writer’s use of the genre. Thus, although this chapter focuses on spatial resources within the folklore collection genre, the second half of the chapter demonstrates that neither the genre’s action nor its resources are wholly determined. Writers can, and do, deploy alternative spatial tropes, create

alternative arguments, and ultimately shift the rhetorical actions a particular genre achieves.

Using genre theory to approach these popular texts offers two primary benefits for addressing my research questions. First, this approach allows me to emphasize the combined effects of Native American folklore collections. The genre's repetition of signature spatial tropes results in *cumulative* effects that circulate repeatedly, and circulate more widely than any single text. Second, as genre scholars have demonstrated, genres are fundamentally *ideological* structures. They are powerful in part because they circulate sets of values, orientations, and beliefs *as common sense*, thus frequently masking their own ideological underpinning (Devitt *Writing*; Schacker; Schryer "Lab"; Winsor "Ordering"). Additionally, genres focus scholarly attention on historical and social concerns: "Studying the typical uses of rhetoric, and the forms that it takes in those uses, tells us less about the art of individual rhetors or the excellence of particular texts than it does about the character of a culture or an historical period" (Miller "Genre" 158). Thus genre study does not highlight excellent, exemplary rhetors. Instead, by focusing on shared social forms that vary over time, genre analysis makes rhetorical study broadly relevant to cultural and historical research. In this case, analyzing folklore collections as shared social forms that gained currency at a specific historical moment allows me to emphasize these collections not as aberrations, but as indicators of larger attitudes and actions: attitudes of nostalgia and romance, and repetitive constructions of Native Americans as naturally vanishing from American scenes.

Of the many spatial strategies examined in this project, this chapter focuses on how folklore collections: (1) represent Native American and European American individuals through spatial terms, such as *distance*, *nearness*, or *first-hand*, placing individuals into relative relationships, (2) use native and European American place-names, and (3) use figurative language depicting the sites and settings where Native American life and ethnographic work take place. These spatial strategies function in the genre as rhetorical resources. These resources are “rhetorical” through their significance as strategies of persuasion, their power as symbols that humans use in forming attitudes and inducing actions, in Kenneth Burke’s terms. In particular, these spatial strategies support the capacity of the folklore collection genre to circulate a powerful image of Native Americans inhabiting only the wild landscapes of a preindustrial past. The many writers of folklore collections I examine below used these spatial strategies to represent Native Americans as naturally absent from national landscapes, and to lend those landscapes greater power to move, and greater ability to support, the European Americans who came to inhabit them.

In the following sections I use recent theories of genre to describe, in Schryer’s term, the “chronotopic unconscious” of the folklore collection genre. I then discuss three dominant spatial strategies—tropes of vacated landscapes, revitalized American scenes, and contained sites of encounter with natives—that support the nationalist ideology circulated by the popular genre. The final section of the chapter shifts my analysis to collections of folklore that draw on the genre’s rhetorical resources for ends that differ sharply from most other popular folklore collections. This section underscores the spatial strategies used by Mary Austin,

Luther Standing Bear, and Frank Applegate to support their arguments in favor of regionalism and activism. These writers used spatial resources of the folklore collection genre in order to redefine the rhetorical situation of the ethnographer to include actions that exceed the activity of collection. Luther Standing Bear, for instance, responds directly to the tropes of containment and absence so prominent among popular collections of Native American folklore. Instead, Standing Bear situates the tales included in his *Stories of the Sioux* in a kind of mobile domestic space. Through his representations of Sioux mobility and habitation, Standing Bear presses against Sioux containment—both figurative and material—and insists upon Native American storytelling as a grounded practice among living communities, not the final gift of dying cultures to the Anglos who have supplanted them, as so many popular folklore collectors would have it. Frank Applegate's folklore collections draw on similar spatial-rhetorical strategies to argue that ethnographic knowledge demands ethical *involvement*, countering widespread representations of anthropological knowledge as a process of overcoming and then reinstating *distance*.

Native American Folklore Collections: Chronotopic Unconscious and Spatial Tropes

Folklore collections were extremely popular in the early twentieth century, but they are much less prominent in contemporary culture, so I want to pause here to clarify what I include in this genre and why. If I take seriously Carolyn Miller's redefinition of genres as typified social actions, then I cannot only describe this genre in terms of its formal features, but must indicate a recurrent social action that

collections of Native American folklore performed. What actions within this historical and social context did these texts accomplish?

Above all else, this genre performed the action of collection. These texts were designed for various audiences, but their impulse was consistently to bring together disparate fragments—legends, myths, short narratives, longer narrative sequences, variant representations of folk heroes, sometimes also oral poetry, traditional songs, or maxims—in order to preserve those fragments in a textual form. Preservation suggests the salvaging of something disappearing, rather than the maintenance of living cultures, and is an overriding action of this genre that I critique below. Because collections of Native American folklore *preserved* legends and myths, they functioned in a way analogous to museum collection of Native American artifacts: reframing indigenous art, displaying it to other communities, and incorporating it into a larger structure that alters the object's meaning and value.⁶ They circulated folklore texts outside the communities that gave them meaning, in almost precisely the same way museums have long alienated collectible objects from Native American cultures and reframed those objects as part of collections. Folklore collections also functioned analogously to museum collections in another way: by removing a cultural object from its context of use, they often reduced its meaning to something static and more easily assimilated into a single overarching narrative. Additionally, writers of folklore collections were paid for their publications; the process of publication of a body of texts transformed communally-created texts into authored objects. Sometimes writers of folklore collections attempted to transcribe single stories in the voice of native informants as faithfully as possible; more

frequently, folklore collections were written by white authors who drew freely upon their imaginations to fill out the details of a skeletal story, half-heard or half-remembered, or perhaps only “collected” from other books.

Chronotopic Unconscious of the Folklore Collection Genre

The actions and attitudes enacted by the folklore collection genre were enabled by an underlying chronotope through which the genre organized spatial and temporal relationships and treated those relationships as commonsensical. Contemporary genre theorist Catherine Schryer, drawing on Bakhtin’s concept of the *chronotope*, argues that specific genres produce distinct orientations to space and time. The term *chronotope* combines space, time, and value to indicate value-laden, *normative* orientations toward space and time. These orientations toward space and time are, crucially, often unspoken. Chronotopes contribute to the efforts of genre users to “control space and time” (81) by constructing and circulating particular, ideologically-freighted concepts of space and time as “common sense” (84).⁷

In the following pages I specify the “chronotopic unconscious” of the folklore collection genre and suggest that, in part, the embedded space/time orientation of the genre counteracted what many folklore collection writers saw as their goal: the preservation and revaluation of Native American cultures. The folklore collection functioned as a site for the production of knowledge of Native American cultures, but its underlying space/time orientation circulated an often implicit argument that there remained no *place* for Native American cultures within a U.S. context that imagined national space and identity as preeminently modern. Writers of folklore

collections circulated chronotopes that supported the ongoing project of European-American domination of indigenous cultures. These writers represented spaces and landscapes in ways that circulated a vision of national space that ignored Native Americans' persistent survival, denied white responsibility for the physical evacuation of Native Americans from their original habitations, and imagined a country emptied of Native American presence through natural processes.

A major feature of the folklore collection's chronotopic unconscious was the genre's commitment to creating a vision of *national* space. Folklore collections generally assumed that (white, Anglo-European) "civilization" replaces "savagery" through natural processes for which European-Americans were not responsible. The genre recuperated an indigenous past for the modern nation in particular through two spatial strategies: by using place-names to mark *progress*, and by maintaining structural divisions that separated Native American cultures from the nation's present.

Using European-American place names, which are sometimes linked to older, "Indian names," folklore collections simultaneously mark temporal progress in spatial terms and invoke an audience of literate, often wealthy,⁸ white European-Americans who are interested in *their* nation's picturesque—and decidedly prior—inhabitants. For instance, Marion Gridley describes her 1939 collection *Indian Legends of American Scenes* as a resource for readers to learn more about their country by learning the Indian legends associated with sites like the Grand Canyon or Crater Lake—in other words, those "scenic spots of the country [that] are certainly essentially American" (11). The "essentially American" character of the continent is

reinforced as folklore collections repeatedly use European-American place names to indicate borders, to mark states and national parks, and to refer to geographical features such as lakes and rivers. The Grand Canyon, California, Yosemite—these are represented as fundamentally *American* sites and scenes, mapped by European-American place-names, shared and experienced by a national collective.

When indigenous names are used, they are tagged to align with that overall European-American map. Charles Skinner, for example, begins his 1903 collection *American Myths and Legends* with a story set “[o]n the bank of the brook that bears the name of Vaughn, at Hallowell, Maine,” but that story takes place at a time “[w]hen the stream, then known as Bombahook, was first seen of white men” (13). In this way place-names create a sense of time as progressive: European-American place-names construct a national map laid over the evidence of *prior* indigenous habitation. Indian habitation is marked as something *preceding*, rather than simultaneous with, an explicitly American national space, while European-American names *re-place* indigenous names and mark the natural forward movement of time toward civilization. Caroline Cunningham, in her 1939 collection *The Talking Stone*, illustrates this space/time orientation when she announces to readers that her collection of Native American folklore depicts “America” as it was “before white man’s day” (3). Here the place-name “America” unites with the temporal term “before” to imply that a nation spanning from the Atlantic to the Pacific was simply waiting for “white men” to establish a dominion as natural and inevitable as the rising of the sun.

A complementary spatial strategy involves representing Native American myths and folk-tales as static and transparent objects capable of providing white readers with access to the prior times and distant places where Native Americans are found. The genre's typical structural divisions create this effect. An introduction, usually employing the first person and directly addressing the audience, is set against a series of tales either written in third person or narrated by an Indian character in an altered syntax meant to mark the tales' "native" authorship. "Indianness" is portrayed as inhering in these stories at the sentence level; writers often deploy simple sentence structures and rudimentary diction to insist that the tales remain distinct from the writer and to mark the tales as "collected" rather than composed. This separation between the author's voice in the introduction and the strangely-voiced folktales that follow lends a separate, intact reality to the stories, as though they were not also composed by the author while he sat at his desk, but found in the field, fully formed.

In representing Native American folktales as found rather than crafted, folklore collections also separate myths and legends from social contexts and from processes of variation, change, and use. Removed from these contexts, the stories appear static—like butterflies pinned to a board, or shards of pottery in a display case—and promise readers transparent access to previous times and distant places. Emma-Lindsay Squier, for example, in her 1924 *Children of the Twilight: Folk-Tales of the Indian Tribes*, encourages her readers to imagine a folk-tale "like one of the pieces of pottery fashioned by the San Diegeño Indians, crude, with a naïve inconsistency... yet possessed of a certain primitive beauty" (31). Repeatedly the writers of folklore

collections remind their readers never to imagine that the stories have value in their *truth*.⁹ Although authentic, they must be understood as “naïve” and “inconsistent”—if not patently *wrong* as explanations of the world. Instead, their value emerges from what they show readers about the primitive minds that created them.

The space/time orientation of the folklore collection genre is exemplified in John Hubert Cornyn’s introduction to his 1923 collection, *When the Camp Fire Burns*, where he concludes his introduction with the following exhortation to his audience:

May the reader read these stories with the same unbounded faith and never-flagging interest with which I listened to them in my boyhood; for they echo the faith of a race whose sun has already set. They embody the literature and philosophy of a people which has already disappeared, almost in our own day, from the face of the earth. They are feeble lights shining in the darkness of the early history of our own continent. (4)

As Cornyn makes clear, these stories are valuable for what they permit readers to *access*. Native American myths, legends, and folk-stories “embody,” and thus make available, “the literature and philosophy” of people whose literal bodies are perceived as already absent. The absence of living Native American bodies, and their replacement with textual objects, is represented as natural—not bloody and hard-fought, but as simple and inevitable as the setting of the sun. And while the stories return the writer to his own boyhood, they are meant to return readers to the past—not to their own childhoods, but to an earlier time and a vanished land which white Americans can *share*, through their collective re-claiming of indigenous

folklore as a national resource. Cornyn's introduction affirms that reclamation project, ending by taking emphatic possession of "our own continent."

The project of reclaiming an indigenous past in the service of a collective national identity is what the genre's underlying orientation to space and time enables. In the rest of this section, I describe the three specific spatial strategies the folklore collection genre uses to accomplish that reclamation. These collections use space to naturalize the forced removal of Native Americans from their lands and to erase white responsibility for that removal; to reimagine tribal lands as *national* American spaces; and to contain the sites and settings when European Americans and Native Americans encounter each other. Folklore collections represent time itself as having moved *past* indigenous people, and the land itself as having caused their evacuation.

Naturally Vacant Space

Charles M. Skinner published many folklore collections, including the 1903 book *American Myths and Legends* that I analyze here, and some of his titles, such as his 1899 collection *Myths and Legends of Our New Possessions and Protectorate*, point overtly to their ideological commitment to nation building. Folklorist Richard Dorson has linked folklore to nation-building projects in Ireland, Germany, Finland, Greece, and the Soviet Union (Dorson), and Skinner's work clearly contributes to such a project in the turn-of-the-century United States. Native American folklore collections as a genre contribute to nation-building by representing a coherent national space and by re-imagining Native American displacement to construct what

historian Brian Dippie has identified as an enabling, foundational myth of American indigeneity.

The first story in Skinner's *American Myths and Legends* shows clearly how representations of space can naturalize the historical processes by which the U.S. government and individual white settlers collaborated to rob land from Native Americans. "The Smoking Pine" describes an encounter between the "English" and "the red people" in Maine, locating this encounter in an imaginary past and making its outcome—the retreat of "the red people" into the setting sun—appear entirely natural.

Not long after an initial, peaceful encounter between "settlers" and Indians, the story produces a moment when, for an unspecified reason, "the Indians began ere long to peak away in body and lose the hold they had on life when they were free of all horizons" (13). The phrase "lose the hold they had on life" places "the Indians" in an odd realm between life and death, as though *individual* Indians live even though the *group* has moved into a liminal territory. Placing Indians in a realm between life and death is useful in the logic of this story because it enables the subsequent events: because these people can be collectively dead while individuals still live, they can (and do, in this story) *choose* to disappear from places they once inhabited.

The Indians' ultimate decision to disappear is activated by their leader, who recognizes the natural processes that are resulting in his people losing ground:

Their chief, Asonimo, realized, before many years had passed, that the place which his brothers had held in the land was no longer secure;

that although the white people might still smile and withhold their hands from wrath, the woods in which his fathers had chased the deer and the fields where the squaws had raised corn and fruits were not much longer to be called his own. (13-14)

Slippage between the figurative and the concrete sense of losing “the place” Indians have held supports the sense of inevitability that pervades this passage. Importantly, Asonimo himself understands this change as natural; he does not challenge the “fate,” which he tells his people has been “willed” by “The Great Spirit,” that they shall simply disappear from the “woods” and “fields” that have mysteriously ceased to belong to his people. The forbearance of “white people” who “smile and withhold their hands from wrath” is emphasized here; it is not violent occupation that activates the ensuing action in the tale, but a simple (if mysterious) transfer of ownership away from Asonimo’s people. Asonimo goes on to warn his people “how useless it would be to strive against their doom” (14) and gathers a group of English and “red men” together to “light the peace-pipe and smoke it...as a token that nevermore should strife befall between them” (14). The story figures “peace” as the natural elimination of Indians from lands that are “not much longer to be called [their] own” (14). European Americans who might *desire* the lands that (again, mysteriously) slip from the grasp of Asonimo’s people appear in this story only as friendly neighbors whose new rights of ownership are never in question.

Because Asonimo is the only clear actor in this drama of mysterious causes and natural processes, his final transformation *into landscape* crystallizes the desire of this story to make the disappearance of Native Americans both chosen and natural—

chosen, because inevitable. After gathering “settlers” and “red men” and calling for peace, Asinomo foretells the *unnatural* event that will make his body into a sign, embedded in the earth, and proclaiming perpetually that natural relations between whites and Native Americans require “friendship” enabled by the disappearance of Native Americans from the world.

And said he: ‘When I am gone a pine shall come from the earth above my body, and from that pine the smoke shall rise, for a sign of friendship that must always be between you.’ It was but a little later that Asonimo was struck dead by a thunderbolt near the spot where this council had been held. [...] He was put into the earth; and surely, as he had spoken, there grew from his grave, by and by, a pine that seemed to carry in its tough branches the stoutness of the life that had been ended there. [...] To his people, it] was a sign they dared not disobey. They ceased their murmurings against the newcomers in the land and went their way toward the setting sun—in sorrow, but in wonder. (14-15)

Native American death is first foretold by Native Americans, and achieved by natural events: struck by lightning, Asonimo dies at the time and place the sky itself determines. And that dead body, transformed into a pine, becomes eloquent as a symbol, infused with Asonimo’s specific life, but producing an entire argument that his people accept, and retreat. Skinner transforms the archetypal “noble savage” into a smoking pine, which functions as a persuasive symbol not only for Asonimo’s people, but for Skinner’s readers as well: the smoking pine symbolizes the *choice* of

Indians in the eastern U.S. to vacate their lands in the name of peace, and out of inherent respect for all such “natural” processes.

Where Skinner produces a smoking pine, other writers of folklore collections portray vast, empty spaces to testify to the natural disappearance of Native Americans throughout the country. Frank Bird Linderman, a popular and prolific writer of Native American folklore, published a series of collections in the early twentieth century that represent a similar process, through which Native Americans gradually, inevitably, and naturally retreat from American landscapes. As an epigraph for his 1920 collection, *Indian Old-Man Stories: More Sparks from War Eagle's Lodge Fire*, Linderman composes a poem that provides a compact but complex example of how space can be utterly divorced from empirical reality in order to absolve whites from responsibility for their relationships with Native Americans.

The brief poem is untitled, headed only by its dedication “To Little Bear (Chief of the Crees).” The first of two stanzas characterizes Little Bear in terms quite different from those Skinner uses for his hero, Asonimo. Linderman represents Little Bear as deeply hostile—“unrelenting/ In his deep, undying hate” (lines 3-4)—and “silent” and “sullen” (3) in contrast to Asonimo’s persuasive eloquence. But the second stanza, reproduced below, uses spatial figurations to create rhetorical effects very similar to those of Skinner’s “The Smoking Pine.” In particular, this stanza exploits the multiple meanings of positional terms like “backward” to portray the United States as an empty landscape that, like the eloquent smoking pine, expresses the naturalness of Native American absence:

Step by step and ever backward

O'er the ground his fathers trod;
Fighting e'er, and e'er invoking
Strength and peace from Pagan god—
Gone his greatness and his freedom;
Grinning want alone remains;
Bison skulls and wallows mock him

On his old, ancestral plains. (Linderman *More Sparks* n.p., lines 9-16)

In several ways, this second stanza remakes both the Native American and the European American occupation of the continent. The traditional narrative of European progress is revised here into a narrative of Native American regression: “Step by step and ever backward” (9) produces a complementary trajectory to match the traditional narrative of forward European progress. The phrase marks and amplifies what was believed to be Native American “regression,” using a term, “backward,” that is simultaneously spatial, temporal, and moral. Thus the opening line of the second stanza portrays Native Americans moving backward (that is, westward) across the continent, backward into prehistoric time, and backward into increasing savagery.

This three-part image of regression complements another image *not* reproduced in the poem: the unstoppable wave of Manifest Destiny used repeatedly to represent the forward march of modernizing white civilization westward across the continent. But in representing this trajectory of Native American regression across national space, *instead* of the more typical, matching trope of white progress, this epigraph denies European American responsibility even more fully than the

concept of Manifest Destiny manages. That is, the poem imagines a kind of natural evacuation of “ancestral plains” (16), which succeeds in emptying the continent of Native American presence while denying that European Americans inhabit those vacated lands. It imagines lands simply left empty, and ignores even the historical fact of European American “settlement,” which is itself a euphemism that covers over individual and governmental acts of violent land theft. Rather than figuring colonial *occupation* of the continent, this poem uses spatial terms to invoke and to naturalize a nation-wide *absence* of Native Americans.

In part the poem denies European American occupation by refiguring the desirability of the landscape itself. The closing image of the “bison skulls and wallows” (15) reconstructs the fertile lands of the central North American plains as an empty, dusty desert. By combining the plains’ bison with the stereotypical sign of the desert, the cow skull, this image transforms rich land—which European Americans attacked and displaced hundreds of thousands of indigenous people to claim and cultivate—into a desert of bison skulls and “wallows,” or depressions left by large animals in the dust. Refiguring the landscape in this way enables Linderman to suggest that *no one* occupies vast territories that Native Americans have inexplicably ceded.

The theft of land was crucial for the achievement of the cultural destruction that elegiac folklore collections like Linderman’s both celebrate and mourn. In figuring the “backward” progress of Native Americans in spatial terms, by laying cultural and physical decline over the image of Native Americans ceding the continent “step by step,” Linderman’s epigraph points to a powerful, if unintended,

truth: certainly the cultural, religious, and linguistic persecution that Native Americans faced at the hands of white “settlers,” government agents, missionaries, and business interests could never have been so destructive if native claims to *actual* land had not been repeatedly denied, and if Native Americans had not been violently removed from their home places again and again. But Linderman denies the role of land theft in this destruction, and makes only “progress” (1) and “the wicked hand of fate” (2) the agents responsible for stripping Little Bear of his “greatness and his freedom” (13). Spatial terms and re-figured landscapes are used here to disavow responsibility for the “wrongs inflicted” (7) on Little Bear and the Native Americans he is made to represent. In the end, no agents force Little Bear “step by step and ever backward/ O’er the ground his fathers trod” (9-10). This folklore collection offers only Linderman’s *observation* that the chief’s greatness and freedom are equally “gone” (13). National spaces are made eloquent of the naturalness of Native American absence.

Turning Tribal Lands into American Scenes

Space is made eloquent of Native American absence in a different way in folklore collections that specifically attempt to transform tribal lands into American spaces where a national identity can be constituted. The two collections I examine here, by Herbert Earl Wilson and Marion E. Gridley, differ in scope, with Wilson’s focusing narrowly on the territory that in 1890 became Yosemite National Park, while Gridley’s picks out “American scenes” across the country, from Alabama to Maine to Washington. But both texts use spatial tropes to reclaim the sites of Native

American habitation as romantic, affecting scenes where white Americans can consolidate their national identity.

The necessity of Native American absence to enact white American presence is evident in Herbert Earl Wilson's goals for his explicitly non-scientific volume, *The Lore and Lure of Yosemite*,¹⁰ published by the San Francisco-based Schwabacher-Frey Stationery Company in 1926. His hope for the book is

to create and foster in the Yosemite visitor an interest in that fast dying race the Western Indian; in his mode of life, his customs, his religious beliefs and legends, in the days before the coming of the white man sounded the death knell of his people. (11)

The interest in “that fast dying race” Wilson hopes to provoke among readers serves a particular function in this collection, where Indian death itself is meant to enrich readers' interest in Yosemite as a destination. Wilson uses the folklore collection for the purpose of “instilling in the heart” of his readers (12) not just admiration for the sublime landscape of Yosemite National Park, but more specifically instilling a sense of Yosemite as a *national* site, the experience of which enables American tourists to see themselves as participating in a collectivity. As Gregory Clark argues in *Rhetorical Landscapes in America*, the shared experience of dramatic natural sites, especially national parks, served a rhetorical function in helping American individuals to imagine themselves as part of a collective. Such “rhetorical experiences” of landscapes constituted a national identity for individuals to take part in. Wilson's volume makes it clear that Indian death, *located* within the national park, could further enable that collective identification. *The Lore and Lure of Yosemite*

represents the *removal* of Indians from nationally, collectively-owned “public” lands, in a way that makes both the indigenous bodies and their vacated lands available for incorporation.

Wilson’s volume begins with a narrative that represents the peaceful first encounter between whites and the Native Americans who inhabited the valley and surrounding landscape that became Yosemite National Park, and then traces how things went wrong. In brief, the story explains that this group of Indians worked peacefully as laborers for white miners until the miners became so abundant that they used up and transformed the landscape. In response to this “despoliation” (16), the Indians proposed that the white miners share their gold as compensation, and in return be allowed to remain. But, Wilson explains, “[t]he implied threat in this proposal made the white men very indignant,” so “all of the Indians who had claims of their own were driven from the ground, and the claims taken and worked by white men” (17). Henceforth, the story portrays unreasonable Indians who raid the shops and homes of innocent white people, until the U.S. army is finally forced to destroy them all through a protracted and confusing military engagement. The Indians’ refusal to leave the area for a reservation prepared for them elsewhere, there to “live upon the bounty of an alien race” (21), enjoying the “arrangements made for their comfort” (23), is represented as a remarkable racial stubbornness and as the ultimate reason for their destruction. U.S. military officers, impressed with the fortitude of their enemies, consequently named the sites of these Indians’ destruction in their honor: the valley where the bulk of the population was captured was named

“Yosemite” for the English name for this native group, and the lake where the final members of Chief Tenaya’s band were captured was named Lake Tenaya (22, 26).

What I want to emphasize here is the way that spaces and objects within Yosemite National Park come to stand in for the native presence that the opening narrative removes from the landscape. The narrative of the military removal and the “fitting” (29) death of these indigenous people, whom Wilson describes as “practically exterminated” (29), is followed by an abrupt shift; in the next section of *The Lore and Lure of Yosemite*, Wilson appears to replace absent Native Americans with *sequoias*. Wilson refers to the sequoias in the park as “grim and silent warriors” (59)—language that closely echoes the “characteristic hauteur” of the Indian he has earlier described. Sequoias, these “age-old patriarchs,” Wilson marvels, are “[s]till growing, still reproducing yet linking the prehistoric with the present. Could they but speak, what strange tales would be told... yet they stand erect and defiant” (58). Erect, defiant, grim, and silent: these are the familiar features of the Noble Savage, here transformed into trees. But unlike the “practically exterminated” Indians, these trees continue to live, linking “prehistoric” and “present” in a way that contemporaneous Native Americans could not, according to Wilson. In fact, not only do the sequoias retain their ancient dignity and last longer than the doomed and dying races of Native Americans, they are *more* eloquent than the stubbornly silent Native American. Merely spending time “in their presence” communicates to Anglo-Americans “the message that these trees have” for them (64), and Wilson implores his readers to come to Yosemite in order to experience the presence of these “age-old patriarchs” and “carry away the eloquent lessons they speak” (64).

After enacting Native American absence in these ways, Wilson further dramatizes that absence through the folk stories and legends that make up the bulk of the volume. Wilson's emphatic insistence that the stories are *not* reliable accounts of historical facts is typical of the folklore collection genre; but Wilson also explains the particular purpose of *this* collection: these tales should "serve the purpose of an added fascination in the objects or localities with which they are connected" (67). Wilson's stories are meant to lend romance to Americans' experience of the sites of Yosemite, to enable those sites to create the kind of "rhetorical experiences" Gregory Clark identifies. In fact, a substantial proportion of the stories center around the romantic and picturesque death of Native Americans and attach the romance of those deaths to specific sites within the park. That is, Wilson's book uses dead Indians to vivify landscapes, to better enable those landscapes to function as "rhetorical experiences" in the shaping of national identity.

The longest story in the collection exemplifies Wilson's rhetorical attempt to attach the pathos of Indian death to specific sites within the national park. In this story, a young chief and a beautiful maiden fall in love. Their physical beauty is described in detailed and stereotypical terms: Kos-su-kah was "tall and strong and brave" (73), and no others were "so keen of sight, so swift of foot, or so skilled in the use of the bow and the arts of the chase" (74) as he was; Tee-hee-nay was "tall and slender as the fir, and as graceful and supple as the stem of the azalea" (74), with small hands and feet, "silken" black hair like "a moonless night" that "fell in a cloud to her knees" (74), and with eyes like "luminous pools of light" and a voice "like the musical tinkling of the brook" (74). Their engagement was approved and

preparations begun, but tragedy befell the lovers when a cliff gave way beneath Kos-su-kah, causing him to fall to his death. Tee-hee-nay's wait for her betrothed is described in lengthy detail, until at last "the first rosy fingers of dawn lit up the eastern sky" and Tee-hee-nay arrived at the edge of the cliff where, with "sobbing breath and a heart numb with an awful certainty, she forced herself to look over the edge, and saw lying far below, the blood-stained lifeless body of her lover" (77). The story then lingers over that lifeless body, its recovery from the bottom of the cliff, its heart-breaking unresponsiveness to Tee-hee-nay's kisses, until Tee-hee-nay, overcome with her grief, lies across his body to die, herself, of a broken heart. The narrative concludes by attaching this tale, and its abundant pathos, to a specific geological feature within the park where, "in memory of the beautiful maiden and the noble chief, the slender spire of granite, still standing there near the spot where Kos-su-kah's body was found, has ever since been known to the sons and daughters of Ah-wah-nee, as Hum-mo, or the lost arrow" (78).

This story functions to make a tourist site more romantic, infusing the place with the powerful emotions that the death of beautiful Indians can provoke for white Americans. It also makes the site more uniformly meaningful, marking out what the slender spire of granite is meant to signify. This pattern is repeated throughout the collection of myths and legends: Bridal Veil Fall marks the place where another maiden, entranced by the water and mists, fell to her death (80); a fighting husband and wife become transformed into two peaks, Half Dome and North Dome, and their forgotten "papoose" into the Royal Arches (79-80); a woman who becomes old with waiting for her daughter—also fallen to her death—finally finds herself

transformed into the peak of granite called Sentinel Rock (86-87). Repeatedly the stories represent dead Indians who haunt, in romantic unreality, the picturesque sites of Yosemite National Park.

The picturesque death of Native Americans unites Gridley's book with Wilson's, though her work contains more extensive, and sometimes more accurate, information about the specific indigenous tribes she represents. But the sites she describes as "certainly essentially American" (11) are frequently the sites of massacres or individual Indian deaths. The Grand Canyon represents the spirit trail walked by a grieving chief, unable to recover from his wife's untimely death (16-17); Spring River, in Arkansas, is marked by the deaths, in quick succession, of a young bride, her warrior husband, the group of men thought responsible for their deaths, and the repentant chief, the bride's father, who had rashly ordered the death of the men (19-20); Manitou Springs and Hot Sulphur Springs in Colorado are sites of an inter-tribal murder and a chief's death from a broken heart at the bloodthirstiness of his people (30-32). Again and again the stories cross the country and mark Indian death in picturesque, "essentially American" places. Of the 47 stories in the book, thirty narrate the death of Indians; of another 27 brief introductions to Native American tribes, eight refer to Indian deaths, while several more stories narrate mystical, allegorical deaths—of bear people, buffalo people, and so on. The suicide of lovers or chiefs is frequently represented, as well as death through intertribal warfare. "Indian Deaths in American Scenes" might be a more accurate title for this collection, which repeatedly invites readers to access the "Indian" history of

“American” places primarily by representing Indian *retreat* or removal from those places.

Campfire Contact

If depicting Indian death lends additional power to “essentially American” places, such as the Grand Canyon and Yosemite National Park, another spatial strategy limits Native American presence to a brief, unreal, or illusory moment of encounter. This strategy is particularly evident in the numerous collections of folklore that situate stories around Indian campfires. In this strategy, Indians are not as fully absent from the national landscape as they are in narratives of Indian death. Instead, some texts represent exceptional moments, set apart from normal times and places, during which whites and Native Americans share space and simultaneity. Two types of texts—both the “campfire contact” narratives and accounts of shadowy, misty scenes of encounter—enact a strategy of containment, limiting and controlling the place and time of such simultaneity. These texts reassure readers of the impossibility of encountering Native Americans except in rare moments set apart from everyday reality.

Folklore collection writers repeatedly represent a campfire as the setting where individual myths, legends, and folktales were collected. Two of Frank Bird Linderman’s collections, both subtitled “Sparks from War Eagle’s Lodge Fire,” and John Hubert Cornyn’s 1923 collection *When the Camp Fire Burns*, announce this central motif in their titles, and repeat it as a formula in the setting of their stories. The first story in Linderman’s 1920 *Indian Old-Man Stories* begins: “War Eagle, the

old Medicine Man, sat in his great painted lodge with his grandchildren. The fire had burned low, and his stern face was softened in the dim, yellow light. [...] War Eagle stirred the fire until it burned brightly” (3). Subsequent stories in the collection repeat this spatial motif, and War Eagle several times prepares to begin a tale by asking someone else in the lodge to put more wood on the fire (59, 83, 125). Charles Erskine Scott Wood’s 1929 *A Book of Indian Tales* begins each story with a formula, such as “Toward evening, when the sky was red on the edge of the mountains and while we were roasting antelope ribs on the coals, Debe told me this tale” (91), or, more elaborately,

At the head of what is now known as Icy Bay (but which was then unnamed), lying on the shingle, warming myself by the clear driftwood fire...there Tah-ah-nah-klekh, seal-faced and stolid, ... shrewd bargainer and master of all the mysteries of the archipelago, told me this tale. (20)

Although Wood sometimes locates the moment of storytelling in a different setting, such as “while canoeing” or while “riding under the blazing sun over the dusty sage plains” (51), more frequently (20, 27, 36, 72, 75, and 91) the campfire provides the setting for the tellings “recorded” in his book. Cornyn orients *all* his stories around the campfire, beginning his volume by announcing that “These stories were told around the Wigwam fire in the long Canadian winter nights.... I was there simply as an invited guest” (3). Ultimately, this repetitive use of the campfire as the scene where folktales are told and collected functions to *contain* the scope of possible encounter between whites and Native Americans. Placing storytelling in isolated

moments “around the campfire” separates the tales—and their Indian tellers and white collectors—from normal time and space. The campfire setting amounts to a spatial strategy of containment.

The impulse to limit the moments of encounter between whites and Native Americans also appears in the efforts of many folklore collection writers to lend their settings a patina of unreality by figuring scenes of encounter as “dim” or “misty” or shrouded in haze. Emma-Lindsay Squier, in her 1924 collection *Children of the Twilight*, repeatedly uses tropes of mist and haze to represent the distance and unreality of her encounters with Native American informants. For example, she gathers folk stories from the ancient Twana Tyee, a man so old that he stands on the verge of passing “into the mighty darkness” (2), on a day “soft with clinging mist, gray with fragrant rain” that “drenched the firs with crystal beads and hung a curtain across the sky, a curtain of misty sparkles” (3). Mistiness, dimness, mystery, “shimmering desert air,” “semi-darkness,” “faint outlines,” and the “shadowy” presence of antiquity (55-57) characterize the isolated, unreal moments when Squier collects her stories. Cornyn, too, uses similar terms to represent the space where a story is told: “The misty haze of autumn hung about the forest uplands, dimming and blending them into one almost continuous mass” (80). Fogs, mists, and the “afterglow” of glorious sunsets, as in Harold Bell Wright’s 1929 collection *Long Ago Told*, all recur in these stories. These figurations lend otherworldliness to scenes of encounter that are crucial in these collections as testaments to the authenticity of the stories and the authority of the ethnographer-writer who collected them from the field.

Since ethnographic authority depended on firsthand collection, many writers of folklore collections manage their encounters with Native American informants by figuring these informants as *nearly* dead at the moment of encounter (Squier 2, 36, 211-212), poised, as it were, at the brink of another land, or inhabiting “a hidden world” that “few people enter” and “few of the red men leave” (84). Squier’s informants sometimes disappear after their encounter, “mysteriously and unceremoniously...into the shadows without a word of farewell” (Squier 90). A similar strategy of containment, which Linderman, Cornyn, and Wood all deploy, is to locate encounters with Indians several decades before the publication of their books, and in exceptional contexts (military involvement in the 1870s Indian Wars, or adventurous childhoods in a wilderness that no longer exists) that their readers can neither hope nor fear to experience for themselves.

The cumulative effect of these spatial strategies, in which ethnographic encounters with Indians take place in other times and mysterious places, and occur figuratively on the death bed of the race as a whole, is to create the impossibility of encountering Native Americans in everyday life. At the same time, these texts also argue that those Indians readers *could* encounter are themselves unreal, because real Indians have ceased to exist in this country. Whites might sometimes, through great difficulty, seek out Native Americans and find them in shadowy, mystical moments that lie suspended from the regular progression of time; but these texts suggest they will not otherwise encounter each other in the actual spaces of twentieth century modernity. These spatial strategies of containment respond, I suggest, to the competing impulses of space and time in the genre’s primary chronotopes; I say

“competing,” because, as Fabian has argued (*Time and the Other*), indigenous people are denied coevalness, but the ethnographer must somehow access those people, must share simultaneous space with them while denying that simultaneity in writing. The anthropologist’s problem of simultaneity is managed by these spatial strategies that locate encounters in prior times and otherworldly places.

This analysis suggests that the folklore collection genre primarily served as a site where writers repeatedly represented the United States as a country emptied, naturally, of a prior Native American presence. That presence vivifies American spaces and consolidates their “essential” Americanness. These collections figuratively transform bodies into documents, as a 1939 reviewer of Linderman’s work writes approvingly: “His work is the flesh of a vanished epoch made words” (*Frontier and Midland*, Spring 1939, qtd. in Rivers, viii). The lands from which Native American bodies have been removed, in the translation of flesh into words, are imagined by the folklore collection genre as merely empty. The land itself—not the white “settlers” or governments who have killed for it, claimed it, and farmed it—is represented as having expelled Native Americans, who are like the rock gods, in Squier’s words, “whose day has passed, whose land was in the shadow” (107). The image of a sun setting over a dim landscape is repeated throughout these texts. It is in fact the key image for this genre, where space and time are rhetorical resources that writers use to naturalize what was, in fact, a genocidal historical and political project, enabled by tropes that circulated broadly in texts such as these folklore collections. In part, the historical project of destroying Native American peoples was enabled by the implicit argument of all forms of “salvage” anthropology, including

the folklore collection genre, that preserving *texts* as substitutes for actual Native American bodies and cultures renders other kinds of actions unnecessary. This implicit argument is contradicted by the texts I examine in the next section, which use the folklore collection genre to argue for the necessity of ethical response to a colonial situation.

Ethical Alternatives in the Folklore Collection Genre

Not all folklore collections shaped relations between European Americans and indigenous people in these ways; the rhetors I examine below use the folklore collection genre to generate other rhetorical appeals to space and inscribe in the genre alternate possibilities for knowledge and ethical relations. The primary figures I examine in this section, Mary Austin, Luther Standing Bear, and Frank Applegate, use spatial appeals specifically to (1) locate folk stories in a multiplicity of specific settings, contexts, places and times; (2) locate Native American cultures in regional spaces marked by colonialism and *not* overwritten by the nation; and (3) locate the ethnographer/collector *within* this marked, mixed context, as an ethical agent responsible not only for listening and recording, but also for *acting* in these contexts. Austin, Standing Bear, and Applegate use spatial tropes and terms to locate Native American cultures and ethnographers in complex relationships of mutual influence. In doing this, these writers use the genre to offer possibilities for making knowledge that does not merely mirror relations of domination. My analysis is not meant to suggest that Applegate and Austin were personally more ethical in their relations

with Native American cultures; rather, their rhetorical actions marked *in the genre* possibilities for more ethical forms of knowledge than other writers of folklore collections—and that anthropology in its professionalization efforts—failed to exploit.

“A vast country, diversely peopled”

Four works by Austin, Standing Bear, and Applegate suggest the importance to these writers of inscribing geographical specificity and retaining a sense of regionalism that is not overwritten by the nation. Austin wrote many collections of essays, but her only folklore collection was her 1934 book, *One-Smoke Stories*.¹¹ This was published by Houghton Mifflin and introduced by Austin as a collection of tales in a “form...so admirably contrived for oral telling that all anecdote in the Indian country tends to fall into that shape” (2). Applegate, a well-known artist and sculptor and an amateur anthropologist, published two folklore collections, the 1929 *Indian Stories from the Pueblos* and the posthumous 1934 *Native Tales of New Mexico*.¹² Standing Bear was a high-profile Sioux intellectual during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, who wrote and spoke publicly in a variety of settings, both on- and off-reservation, worked in the early film industry, and was among the first students enrolled in Carlisle Indian Industrial School in 1879.¹³ His *Stories of the Sioux* was published near the end of his public career, and directly challenges many of the typical representations of native and national space I described above.

Although these three writers use the folklore collection genre for a range of reasons,¹⁴ these books represent space in ways that differ markedly from the majority

of popular folklore collections written during the same period. In contrast to the idealized, distant spaces where most folklore collections locate Native Americans, Austin, Standing Bear, and Applegate resist the image of a national landscape inevitably emptied of any living Native American presence in their portrayals of the spaces where indigenous life and ethnographic work take place.¹⁵

Standing Bear foregrounds in several ways his departures from the spatial tropes I analyzed above, especially the trope of “campfire” containment that typified so many folklore collections. For instance, Standing Bear prefaces his *Stories of the Sioux* with counter-assertions about the settings in which storytelling took place and about the communities that sustained storytelling practices. In this preface, Standing Bear locates story-telling practices in multiple ways:

These stories were not always told by the camp-fire during the long winter evenings, but at any time and at any place whenever and wherever the teller and the audience were in the mood. Sometimes it was Grandmother who sat on the ground, perhaps with a small stick or drawing-pencil in her hand, drawing designs on the earth as she told a story that she had known ever since she was a child herself. The children would cluster around her, either lying or squatting on the ground listening. Sometimes Grandfather or Great-Grandfather was the story-teller as he sat and smoked at noonday. Even when on the march, if all were enjoying an afternoon rest and someone felt in the humor, a story would be related and enjoyed. So story-telling was in order with the Sioux at any and all times. (ix-x)

Here Standing Bear simultaneously grounds his account in a specific, rather than abstract, context, while using paired linguistic structures to emphasize the variety of settings and circumstances in which folktales are created and communicated within a community. Affirming that stories are told “at any time and at any place,” “whenever and wherever” both “the teller and the audience” find it appropriate, Standing Bear responds directly to the tendency of other collectors to place folktales primarily in campfire and deathbed contexts. Instead of removing folktales from the communities that give them meaning, Standing Bear emphasizes the role of folktales in ongoing, coherent communities—families who use folktales for instruction and entertainment, and a broader community that engages in story-telling “at any and all times.” Standing Bear also encourages his readers to see folktales as rhetorical, by emphasizing the audiences who participate in constructing folktales’ meaning: both “the teller and the audience” must participate, for example, and Standing Bear calls attention to the presence of an audience of children—not Anglo folklore collectors or anthropologists—who listen to stories as part of their participation in their families and communities. Throughout the collection, Standing Bear repeatedly uses spatial rhetorical techniques, especially figures of mobility and habitation, to redefine story-telling as an activity that is fully integrated into the continuing life of a living people.

Austin and Applegate also place folk stories in much more specific settings than do most folklore collections. They provide a regional boundary to their collections, placing the tales in New Mexico, in the Pueblos, or in the plains, rather than the more encompassing spaces called up by Gridley’s “American Scenes,” for instance. Austin sets even more specific boundaries for the scope of *One-Smoke*

Stories in her introduction, which places the tales “south of Green River and west of the Rio Grande” (1), which she describes in great detail as a territory bounded to the north by the Green River, the largest tributary of the Colorado River, which flows across Utah and drains most of the Colorado Plateau, and to the west by the Rio Grande, a much smaller river, which bisects New Mexico from north to south before turning east toward the Gulf of Mexico and forming the boundary between Mexico and Texas (1).

Within the more limited geographical scope of their collections, Austin and Applegate also position diverse and specific communities. Austin, introducing Applegate’s *Native Tales of New Mexico*, describes Applegate’s New Mexico as “a vast country, diversely peopled.” In fact, both Applegate and Austin represent their regions not so much vast as diverse, and minutely rendered. Applegate, like Austin and Standing Bear, provides significant reference to geophysical variation—rivers that run well here, but not there, and thus provoke the events recorded in the tales. Within their circumscribed regions, these writers situate stories in arid wastes, in minute oases, along named rivers, at the foot of specific peaks, next to a certain mining camp, outside a particular town, between two well-known points, and in general within a region that is far more complexly represented than the broad sweeps of “American” sites found in most folklore collections. By representing a particular region in specificity, diversity, and multiplicity, Austin and Applegate characterize that region as both diverse and complex. They use the folklore collection—especially the genre’s resources for representing multiplicity—to create what I call micro-geographies. In particular, they re-present the *desert*, usually treated as a blank

canvas or an expanse of desolation, as rich, minutely varied, and *not* able to be assimilated into an encompassing vision of what Austin described (and deplored) as “one vast, pale America” (“Regionalism” 98). Instead, Austin and Applegate’s collections represent ethnographic encounters taking place in landscapes that specifically disrupt the singularity of a single America. They inscribe *into* national space a region marked by colonialism, historical change, transculturation, and syncretism. Landscapes are differentiated from that “vast, pale America” and retain the marks of colonialism in these stories.

Locating the Ethical Ethnographer

To make clearer these assertions about the function of space and landscape in the folklore collections of Austin, Applegate, and Standing Bear, I want to focus my analysis on one particularly rich folk story collected in Applegate’s 1934 *Native Tales of New Mexico*. Below, I argue that Applegate repurposes space as a rhetorical resource in the folklore collection genre, in order to locate the ethnographer *within* a marked, colonial context, as an ethical agent responsible not only for listening and recording, but also for *acting*. Applegate makes the scene of the ethnographic encounter include the resentment and anger of Native Americans at governmental abuses, the shame and outrage of honest observers of these abuses, and the ethnographer’s specific responsibility to respond to injustice through action—both rhetorical and material, both within the ethnographic scene and beyond it.

Applegate’s “The Lost Child of Zia” relates how, over a three-day period, a child from the Zia Pueblo was lost and then found. Applegate opens the story with a

couple of pages describing the “domain” (195) allotted to the Zia Pueblo and providing brief cultural data about Zia culture, history, and present economic situation. This information establishes an ethnographic context for the story that follows, but Applegate also suggests that cultures, such as the Zia, must be represented as specific and historical, in contrast to the romanticized representations of Native Americans that predominate in the folklore collection genre.

Applegate uses spatial specificity as a strategy to launch a critique of U.S. policies that pay insufficient attention to the variability of land within a region. The first paragraph of “The Lost Child of Zia” provides geophysical description of the land the Zia people inhabit. Applegate uses this description to support his argument, stated explicitly in the first two sentences of the story, that “Zia is the most poverty stricken of all the pueblos in New Mexico.... not on account of lack of effort put forth on the part of the inhabitants, but because that, of all the pueblos, Zia has the poorest domain” (195). Applegate emphasizes the harshness of the desert, not as a monolithic expanse, but as a region that varies in its richness, with considerable consequences for the groups of people who inhabit its “poorest domain.” Zia “has only a tiny strip” of land that could be farmed, and the “rest of the land assigned to this pueblo is either rocky or sandy wastes” (195). This implicit critique of the 1887 Dawes Act quickly becomes more explicit: “An American farmer of the most industrious sort would be unable to maintain the minimum family, without comfort on all the land that the Government has allotted for the use of this whole pueblo” (195).¹⁶ Applegate provides a more finely detailed description of the Zia Pueblo, which is “situated amidst the ruins of a once very much larger pueblo on a bare

rocky hill which drops abruptly to the little Jemez River which flows past the hill in a waste of fine sand crusted over with white alkali” (197). In addition to representing the pueblo’s territory in its specificity, he also distinguishes Zia Pueblo people from other indigenous groups in the region, telling us, for example, that “The Zia Indians subsist in such a meager manner that the other well-provided-for pueblo Indians call them the ‘hungry ones’” (195), and explaining that people of the Zia pueblo have long traded their pottery to other pueblos in exchange for food they cannot grow on their particular plot of land (196-197).

The geophysical space of the Zia Pueblo is not only specified, but is also historicized, in contrast to the genre’s more typical representation of Native Americans in landscapes that lie outside of time and historical processes of change. Applegate notes, for example, that the Zias’ *use* of their land has changed it: because the “tiny strip” of farmable land is so insufficient for the community’s needs, that strip “has now become so saturated with alkali from the alkali-bearing water which they have to use for irrigation that it is scarcely worth planting” (195). This present state of impoverishment is also historicized by its contrast with an earlier prosperity: “When Zia was not so restricted in territory and there was plenty of game in the near-by mountains, they were not forbidden to hunt by a paternal government, and Zia was one of the largest and strongest of all the pueblos of New Mexico” (196). In addition to underscoring the present poverty of the Zia pueblo,¹⁷ Applegate also historicizes that poverty, and locates its cause simultaneously in the Zias’ impoverished natural environment, in “paternal” government policies that have restricted the Zias’ mobility, and in a broader situation of encroachment that reduces

resources, like game and water, demonstrating that this particular environment is affected by factors beyond it as well.

Applegate also frames the ethnographic data that begins this story as indicating not just poverty but also tenacity and adaptation to changing conditions. He asserts that:

The people of Zia have held onto their old culture and religious customs with great tenacity in the face of advancing civilization and they faithfully and carefully perform all their ancient ceremonies and pay homage to their old tribal deities as they did a thousand years ago. It is undoubtedly this clinging to their tribal culture that has held them together and given them courage to carry on in the face of dire poverty. (196)

Although some of the language here echoes the trope of progress and the emphasis on the past that is so prevalent throughout the genre, the purpose of this passage within a surrounding discussion of Zia poverty seems to me entirely opposed to the genre's typical representation of Native Americans out of space and time. This passage does not insist that Indians remain picturesque—like the prints of Edward Curtis, with cars and cowboy boots removed. The language Applegate uses here, for instance, is *not* picturesque; the ceremonies and deities are not described, but merely referred to. The people of Zia pueblo are linked to their past—a “thousand years” of cultural practices—but not confined to it. By historicizing the present situation of the Zia people, Applegate also admits the possibility of Native American adaptation and change, a possibility fervently resisted in most folklore collections, with their

nostalgic orientation and their insistence on “authenticity” of native cultures. Applegate notes, for example, that “The women now do much toward supporting their families by making and selling pottery” (196), and that they were trading pottery to other tribes even “Before the Americans began buying [it]” (197). In short, Applegate uses a specific and historicized account of Zia Pueblo life to contradict, on one hand, government policies designed to bring about cultural destruction, and on the other hand to counter romanticized images that insisted Indians were naturally incompatible with “advancing civilization” in order to mourn and recuperate vanishing native bodies.

This specific, historicized account of Zia “survivance” (Vizenor) frames the subsequent narrative, which recounts how Applegate learned of a young girl missing from the Zia pueblo, and how the community responded to that loss and to her subsequent recovery. From the concerns that he opened the folk-tale with—poverty, policy, and Zia tenacity—Applegate shifts to the more recent past and uses a shift in *scale* to launch the argument of the rest of the story. He writes:

A few years ago the Government kept a day school at Zia for the Indian children and the Indians were very much pleased, for then their children could be at home with them, but the Government becoming parsimonious, decided that a few dollars could be saved by closing the school and placing all the children over six years old in the government boarding school at Santa Fe, seventy miles away. (197)

Applegate has framed this story, and continues to guide reader reactions, by foregrounding a critique of national-level policies that do not sufficiently account for

community-level variation and needs. In this passage, he shifts the scale of analysis in a way that makes visible the community-level effects of a policy decision, made a thousand miles away in Washington D.C., and made in ignorance of (or disregard for) local consequences. On such a scale, “seventy miles away” becomes visible as a formidable distance; on the other hand, the “few dollars” saved by sending “children over six years old” so far from their homes becomes almost obscenely small in comparison. He also interprets the importance of this new policy from the position of the Zia people who are directly affected by it: “The Zia Indians were all very unhappy at this decision, for it meant that there would no longer be any children in the pueblo and that it would be more forlorn than ever” (197). Saving “a few dollars” has consequences for the community that are both spatial and cultural: the children are moved *out* of the pueblo, *away* from their homes,¹⁸ and this movement has a cultural dimension, which subsequent events in the narrative make clear.

In the main action of the story, Applegate is invited to a celebratory feast, but arrives in the pueblo to find the entire town distressed by the disappearance of a young girl who is the only family and caretaker of her blind, crippled grandmother. The girl had gone to the river for water the day before, and had not been seen since, though her pot was found by the river, broken. Applegate emphasizes the distress this has caused the community by describing the places searched and the time spent in searching: “All the day before everybody who could had looked for her. The men had looked in the river and in the hills and mountains. They had spent all night in the search and were still searching to-day” (199). The whole community is so sick

with worry that all other activities have been postponed until the girl should be found.

In the passages that provide this information, Applegate foregrounds his own presence and activity in the situation to a much greater extent than is typical in the genre, where folk-tales are more usually represented as found objects, rather than elicited through the repeated activity of the collector. In contrast, in “The Lost Child of Zia,” I-statements predominate throughout the section where Applegate relates the story to his readers. Applegate constructs the narrative through strings of sentences that foreground *how* he came to be aware of this story and that emphasize his involvement in the life of the pueblo: “I was invited.... I did not think... but I accepted the invitation and I thought...” (198). Then, “I arrived.... As I walked.... I asked them what the matter could be.... Asking for details I was told....” (198-199). After hearing the story of the girl’s disappearance and the pueblo’s search, Applegate writes: “I stayed about the pueblo for a while, trying to make helpful suggestions” (200), and noting, “I particularly urged the men of Zia to take their trouble to the Indian agent, and ask him to send help” (200) and that “As I went I made inquiries of everybody I met” (200). Applegate narrates his return to the pueblo the following day and his discovery of the rest of the story through another sequence of I-sentences: “I returned to hear what news there might be.... I found everybody I had seen the day before...I saw that they were deeply stirred by anger.... I asked him what news there was.... I asked him.... and so word by word I drew from him...” (200-201).

Through these I-statements, Applegate makes visible his presence in the pueblo, his activity as a seeker of information, his opinions, his efforts to influence the actions of the people of Zia pueblo, and the repeated questioning necessary to *elicit* the story of “The Lost Child of Zia Pueblo.” In all of these ways, Applegate’s positioning of himself *within* the narrative he recounts contrasts significantly with the disembodied presentation of stories in most of the folklore collection genre. Compare, for example, the more typical self-positioning seen in Charles Erskine Scott Wood’s 1929 collection *A Book of Indian Tales*. In Wood’s collection, a short opening paragraph sets the stage for the collection of a folktale: “In the year 1878 the Bannacks, Piutes and Umatillas went on the warpath. In the campaign I was much with the scouts and guides (they were under me); and riding side by side, beneath the pines, John McBean, interpreter and half-breed, told me this tale” (13). Beyond this introduction, the rest of the folk-tale is told as if it poured forth from the mouth of Wood’s informant in one breath, without pause, and was then transcribed, rather than reconstructed by Wood nearly fifty years after its original telling “beneath the pines” in 1878. The structural difference I am pointing out between these two stories does not only affect the individual folk-tale, but influences the arguments of the folklore collection as a whole. Using a genre that typically represents native stories as objects of the past, found intact and preserved as relics, Applegate disrupts the assumed authenticity and separateness of such tales by highlighting his own presence within the tale’s construction. He is present at the moment of its occurrence; he responds to the story as it unfolds, influencing the course it takes, rather than

plucking it out of the distant past through a figure, like John McBean, who provides access to an earlier place and time.

Applegate, by including his activity within the frame of the folk-story, alters the relationships the folk-story establishes between white ethnographers and Native American informants in several ways. First, Applegate interacts with several storytellers: a woman with a small baby and a very old man, who first greet him when he arrives at the pueblo (198); others who “had been [his] good friends” but who are reluctant to tell him how the story turns out (200), and the broader group gathered about the pueblo to take part in the search (200). Applegate also introduces the story-gatherer as a figure into the folklore collection genre; this figure has to perform actions—like arriving, staying, accepting, and especially *asking*, again and again—in order to create the narrative he tells. This emphasis on the role of the story-gatherer as an active participant does not, I think, elevate the ethnographer to a position of heightened importance, as it might seem. Instead, it places him into relation with the other actors in the situation, and makes him subject to the decisions of others (for example, to those who give the ethnographer “hard and resentful looks” [200] rather than explanations) in a way that the disembodied collectors the folklore collection genre more typically imagines are not.

In addition to embedding himself within the situation, as an actor and story-gatherer, Applegate tells a story that differs crucially from the folk-tales usually circulated in the genre. The story of a lost Indian girl, an endangered child, has the makings of tragedy surrounding it, but the nature of the tragedy is relocated in “The Lost Child of Zia.” Earlier in this chapter I described the frequency with which

folklore collections represent the tragic death of Native Americans; Applegate plays off the trope of romantic native death and writes instead an unromantic ending for this story. Before the Zias have found the missing girl, they are sad and afraid of several possible outcomes: they worry that

maybe the little girl had fallen into the quicksand in the river and had gone down under it, or had been stolen by some bad Navajo or other Indian, since they used to steal Indian girls, or that she had become a little mad and wandered away. (199)

These three possibilities include the three most typical threats imagined by folklore collections: Native Americans might be killed by the land itself, or through intertribal warfare, or by the internal mechanism of being Indian, which represents a kind of inherent, internal threat. None of these three possibilities happens in Applegate's story. The girl is discovered a day later at the boarding school in Santa Fe, by chance by a Zia man who had gone to Santa Fe "to sell some belts he had made" (201). When the girl is found, she explains that:

as she stopped with her jar at the river, two men whom she recognized as workers for the Indian bureau, jumped out from behind the rocks, gagged and held her until they could get her across the river and into a Ford car, from which they delivered her to the school authorities. (201)

This is not a very picturesque end to the story of "The Lost Child of Zia." She has not fallen to her death, or been killed through intertribal warfare, but taken away to be educated.

Applegate, however, emphasizes that this ending is no less tragic, even though it is less picturesque. From hearing that the girl has been found, Applegate moves to a lengthy critique that forecasts what *future* possible endings await this girl, now that she has been taken from her home and re-located to a government boarding school:

For the first time I understood something of the deep and hopeless resentment of the Indians, frustrated in every normal instinct and helpless before the violation of their most human feelings. For I knew as well as they did how completely in finding the child in school they had lost her. She would be kept there either until they sent her home infected with tuberculosis to die, or after seven or eight years, by which time her old grandmother would also have died, they let her return to her Indian home with a smattering of American education and so utterly spoiled for pueblo life, that the best she could hope for was to be a servant in some white family, or take to prostitution as an alternative to the aimless ineffectual life with a husband of her own tribe, himself made incompetent as an Indian by an education which could not make him white. (201-202)

This critique of the possible outcomes of a boarding school education—death by tuberculosis, domestic service, prostitution, or marital dissatisfaction—sounds like a brutal antidote to sentimentality. Although a picturesque death has been avoided in this narrative, Applegate mourns potential tragedies that still await ahead, just past

the end of this narrative, driven by a misguided national policy of assimilation that has disastrous consequences for Native American individuals and communities.

Although he forecasts this lamentable end to the narrative, he does not end “The Lost Child of Zia” on these predictions. Instead, his conclusion foregrounds the possibilities for humane relations between Native Americans and European Americans. Throughout the story, Applegate represents himself not only acting within the situation—urging, asking, and so forth—but also establishing, *through* actions, particular relationships between himself and the people of Zia pueblo. Concluding the story with an account of how he responded *after* the lost child is found, Applegate reshapes the folklore collection genre as a site of ethical encounter.

People within the Zia Pueblo establish a human relationship with Applegate when they invite him to their festival; he takes up that relationship when he accepts. A guest-host relation indicates one alternative to the observer-object relation that is more prevalent in the folklore collection genre, and Applegate expands the genre’s available modes of relation in the rest of the story. In his immediate response to the girl’s disappearance, for example, he relates as a parent to other parents: “I was very much moved by their distress, for I had a girl of my own and I could realize something of the desperation of anxiety and grief at the idea of her wandering way into the desert mountains, and what might happen to her there” (200). Additionally, in his suggestion that the men of the pueblo should involve the local Indian agent in the search, Applegate suggests that the Zia people, the Indian agent, and himself could all share a relationship as humans to other humans in distress:

At that time I did not know much about Indians, and very little about Indian agents. And of course I could not realize that there could be any well-meaning persons who would not know what it would mean to everybody concerned to have a child disappear from her home and family in that fashion. (200)

Knowing, as he does at the point of writing this tale, that the Indian agent was in fact responsible for the child's kidnapping, he realizes that his attempt to establish human-to-human relationships between "Indians" and "Indian agents" is naïve. In fact, the difficulty of establishing relationships between Native Americans and European Americans that are simply *human* is highlighted also by the response of the Zia people to Applegate after they have found the girl in the boarding school. The fact of Applegate's whiteness alters his relationship with people who had become his friends. Others' actions—Indian agents kidnapping a Zia child—have consequences for Applegate's ability to continue to inhabit the guest-host or the friend-friend relationships he has relied upon; those actions reposition him within the Zia community as a white person among Indians who have been newly wronged.

Applegate responds to this changed situation by re-imagining the relationship between ethnographers and native subjects. First, he acknowledges that the situation has changed, and that his own understanding of the world has had to shift as well: "I had heard of things like this, but I had never before realized them as facts," he explains (201). After imagining the consequences of a boarding school education for the girl, he abruptly shifts contexts: "I did not say much to the men of Zia. What I had to say was said elsewhere, and in company with scores of other white people

who had also seen these things, and what we did together was not entirely without effect” (202).

Thus at the end of the story, Applegate’s position has altered in several ways, as he has moved from friend, to white person, to learner (realizing the kidnapping of Native American children as “facts”), until he finds himself implicated within an unjust situation and feels himself compelled to *act*. The situation has been re-described to him; his position within it has shifted; consequently, his sense of exigence compels him to shift audiences: he seeks out the people, “elsewhere,” who have the power to change this situation, and joins with others who have been similarly implicated. Applegate inhabits the role of ethnographer—facing facts, describing the indigenous world—but locates that role within situations marked by power, history, and specificity, and demanding collaborative rhetorical response. The consequences of this rhetorical action, as Applegate represents them, are twofold: a changed policy that better fits the necessities of a particular community (in this case, the reopening of a day school inside the pueblo), and the restoration of Applegate’s relationship to the Zia community, who eventually “welcome” him again in their community (202).

The overall trajectory of this story through space and time could not be further from, say, Herbert Earl Wilson’s stories in *The Lore and Lure of Yosemite* that describe romantic native death and encourage American tourists to experience that romance by visiting the sites of the national park. Applegate’s arguments—that Native Americans survive tenaciously, adapt to historical circumstance, and demand ethical response from whites beyond pity or curiosity—are enabled by his use of the

spatial strategies of scale and position. Through these strategies, Applegate enacts relationships that are grounded in a specific place and time; relationships that are mutable, as the situation changes and as individual and collective rhetorical action brings about further change; and relationships that are ethical, that is, marked simultaneously by power and by the responsibility to see, to ask, to be moved by, and to respond to other humans' realities.

Applegate's use of the folklore collection genre, exemplified in "The Lost Child of Zia," marks the distant pole of possibility within the genre; this chapter's analysis consequently ends at a point rather distant from where it began. But I have emphasized "The Lost Child of Zia" because that story's focus on ethical relations and rhetorical actions highlights the way the genre as a whole repeatedly reinforces relations of domination, relations that are enabled by the genre's dominant spatial tropes of natural absence and progress, and its underlying nostalgic, elegiac chronotopes. As Catherine Schryer suggests, we might read the folklore collection genre and ask what is *lost* through its enactment of a particular orientation to space and time. In Schryer's examination of the experimental article, for example, the separation of Methods from Results and Results from Discussion creates a situation in which the "narrative of discovery is lost; the narrative of intervention into phenomena which produces a reaction which leads to other interventions is lost. The complex, reactive, even chaotic relationships between past, present, and future are fixed into a controlled sequence" ("Genre Time/Space" 86). What, then, is lost

in the elegiac and nostalgic orientation to space and time that most folklore collections produce and circulate?

My response is that the folklore collection genre, in naturalizing Native American absence through its rhetorical use of space and time, loses the possibility of taking actions *other than* merely collecting cultural artifacts, and denies the mutual embeddedness in shared spaces that would demand radical changes in policies and patterns of land use during this period. In its use of spaces, landscapes, and figured scenes of encounter, the genre makes knowledge about Native Americans that preserves power hierarchies, ignores a history of active destruction of Native American people and cultures, and denies the ethical responsibility and embeddedness of white writers and readers in this history. The folklore collection genre circulates an implicit argument that *sharing no space* with Native Americans allows collectors, ethnographers, and white readers to *claim no ethical responsibility* for past or future relations.

¹ Funding for Edward Sheriff Curtis's (1868-1952) massive undertaking was provided by J. Pierpont Morgan, and Fowler suggests that, having made important friends mostly by accident, Curtis felt himself encouraged in his ambitions beyond his abilities. The completion of the project took much longer than planned, and the interest aroused by the 1907 publication of the first volumes had waned considerably by the time the final volumes were published in the 1920s, so that Curtis was far less famous by the time he completed the project than he had been at its ambitious outset. Less than three hundred of the planned five hundred copies were produced, and several sets were given to Morgan in gratitude for his support, which over twenty years totaled more than \$400,000. Many recent publications speak to continuing interest in Curtis's life and work; several works attempt to bring Curtis's photography—and his romanticized vision of “the face of the American Indian”—to twenty-first century audiences; see, for instance, Cardozo *Edward S. Curtis and Sacred Legacy*; Gulbrandsen; Upham and Zappia. Other recent examinations of Curtis's life and work speak to continuing critical interest in the political and rhetorical dimensions of Curtis's photographic project; see especially Fowler; Gidley. Native American intellectuals hold a range of positions relative to Curtis's project; for example, N. Scott Momaday's foreword to Cardozo's *Sacred Legacy* reframes Curtis's work not as nostalgia but as a record of a “unique moment” in the long and meaningful history of indigenous people on this continent. On the resistance of European Americans to images of Native Americans that reveal Euro-American influence, see Babcock.

² On the desire to create an indigenous identity for European Americans, see Dippie.

³ In fact, text collection was Boas' primary ethnographic method, and remained important among the first generation of anthropologists trained by him during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Anthropological research as the collection of indigenous oral texts was only supplanted in primacy by participant-observation in the 1920s. Many more popular folklore collections were published during the first decades of the twentieth century than can be discussed in this chapter; additionally, academic folklore collections were published extensively by academic societies, museums, university presses and government programs. These academic collections include: James Mooney's *Myths of the Cherokee* (1900); George Amos Dorsey's *Traditions of the Arikara* (1904), *Traditions of the Osage* (1904), and *Traditions of the Caddo* (1905); Pliny Earle Goddard's *Kato Texts* (1909) and *Chilula Texts* (1914); Natalie Curtis Burlin's *The Indians Book* (1923); Paul Radin's *Wappo Texts* (1924); Erna Gunther's *Klallam Folk Tales* (1925); Melville Jacobs' *Northwest Sahaptin Texts* (1929 and 1934); John Reed Swanton's *Myths and Tales of the Southeastern Indians* (1929); Stith Thompson's *Tales of the North American Indians* (1929); Cora Alice Du Bois' *Wintu Myths* (1931), and still many more. Additionally, the *Anthropological Series* of the Field Columbian Museum in Chicago and the *Memoirs* series of the American Folk-Lore Society published a great many academic folklore collections during these decades, from Washington Mathews' *Navajo Legends* in 1897 to Elsie Clews Parsons' *Taos Tales* and Morris Opler's *Myths and Legends of the Lipan Apache Indians*, both in 1940. Even this partial list suggests how widespread the text-collection phenomenon was between 1900 and 1940, as a pursuit for amateurs as well as a fundamental component of academic anthropology.

⁴ On museum competition and the discovery and excavation of several major ancient sites in the early twentieth century, see Fowler, Krech and Shepard, and Wade. On Indian tourism and the Indian craze, see Dilworth *Imagining and Acts*; Carter Jones Meyer; Wade. For the introduction of the phrases “ethnographic salvage” and “salvage anthropology,” see Gruber; also Wolfe and Grek-Martin for critiques of the concept of “ethnographic salvage.”

⁵ Representations of Native Americans as incompatible with white “civilization,” and consequently as inevitably vanishing, were widespread throughout the nineteenth century as well (Dippie). However, the turn into the twentieth century saw an increasing focus on the need to *preserve* oral and material artifacts as substitutions for vanishing Native American cultures.

⁶ See Dilworth *Acts*; Krech and Hail; Carter Jones Meyer. On appropriation and collecting in relation to folklore and oral poetry, see Bataille; Lape.

⁷ For further discussion of the rhetorical significance of chronotopes, see Jack “Chronotopes.”

⁸ Many of these popular books were issued in expensively-bound gift editions, often with expensive woodblock prints or watercolor illustrations depicting native objects, ceremonials, and scenes. Both their lavish design and their higher price targeted a market of middle-class and wealthy readers, especially in the Eastern United States.

⁹ Lowie’s statement in 1917 vehemently denying any truth- or knowledge-value in Native American legends, histories, or folk stories indicates the complicity of professional anthropologists in this condescending construction of Native American cultural productions. See Lowie “Oral Tradition and History.”

¹⁰ The title itself offers an instance of the rhetorical figure *agnominatio*, created by the repetition of the two syllables of “lore/lure.” In contrast to the famous *agnominatio* “nature/nurture,” a figure whose two terms, as Fahnestock writes, “divide between them the complex factors that produce the observable organism and all his actions” (167), the *agnominatio* in Wilson’s title conflates the *lore* with the *lure* of Yosemite: the *lore* is precisely what Wilson offers to lure visitors to the park.

¹¹ Mary Austin was a very well-known writer and activist of the early twentieth century; between the publication of her classic work of nature writing, *The Land of Little Rain*, in 1903 and her death in 1934, she published dozens of books and hundreds of stories, poems, and essays in periodicals that addressed an incredibly rich range of topics. For an account of Austin as popular anthropologist, see Lape; for a general biography, see Lanigan. Although scholars in rhetoric have not examined Austin’s public career, feminist literary scholarship since the 1980s has brought about Austin’s resurgence, if not canonization, particularly in the fields of nature literature and Western literature. New editions of her works include *A Woman of Genius*, Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press, 1985; first published Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1912; *Earth Horizon*, Santa Fe, N.M.: Sunstone Press (New Facsimile Edition), 2007; first published Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1932; *The Basket Woman*, Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1999; first published New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1904; *The Flock*, Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2001; first published New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1906, in addition to many new editions of *The Land of Little Rain*. New edited collections of her periodical publications include Reuben Ellis, ed. *Beyond Borders: The Selected Essays of Mary Austin*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1996; Esther F. Lanigan, ed. *A Mary Austin Reader*, Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996; Melody Graulich, ed. *Western Trails: A Collection of Short Stories*, Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1999; Chelsea Blackbird and Barney Nelson, eds. *Mary Austin’s Southwest: An Anthology of Her Literary Criticism*, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2005; and Kevin Hearle, ed. *The Essential Mary Austin: A Selection of Mary Austin’s Best Writing*, Berkeley, Calif.: Heydey Books, 2006. New book-length scholarship includes Mark T. Hoyer, *Dancing Ghosts: Native American and Christian Syncretism in Mary Austin’s Work*, Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1998; Deborah Paes de Barros, *Fast Cars and Bad Girls: Nomadic Subjects and Women’s Road Stories*, New York: Peter Lang, 2004; and Heike Schaefer, *Mary Austin’s Regionalism: Reflections on Gender, Genre, and Geography*, Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004; as well as an edited collection of new articles on Austin’s work: Melody Graulich and Elizabeth Klimasmith, eds. *Exploring Lost Borders: Critical Essays on Mary Austin*, Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1999. For critiques of Austin as an appropriator of Indian cultures in *The American Rhythm* and other works, see Maureen Salzer, “Native Presence and Survivance in Early Twentieth-Century Translations by Natalie Curtis Burlin and Mary Austin,” *Western American Literature* 39.1 (Spring 2004): 79-103; and Martha L. Viehmann, “A Rain Song for America: Mary Austin, American Indians, and American Literature and Culture,” *Western American Literature* 39.1 (Spring 2004): 5-35.

¹² Very little scholarship is available on Frank Applegate, a painter, sculptor, neighbor to Mary Austin, and member of the artists' colony that grew up around Santa Fe and Taos between 1916 and the 1930s. The only book-length work is Labinsky and Hieronymous, which includes numerous plates of Applegate's watercolors, which Applegate also used to illustrate his folklore collections; for brief mentions, see also Wiegle and Fiore. Applegate's second folklore collection was prepared for publication by Austin, who reflected that "we had worked together so long and so completely in each other's confidence, with such free interchanges of material that I did not find it at all difficult to do" (qtd. Wiegle and Fiore 36). Elizabeth Shepley Sergeant, in a 1934 essay in *Saturday Review*, characterized Applegate and Austin together as on the fringes of "scientific" writing about the cultures and histories of the southwest: "Science produced the first Southwest classics: Bandelier, Cushing, Lummis were scientists in whom the story telling instinct ran strong. Eugene Manlove Rhodes, now unfortunately dead, like Frank Applegate and Mary Austin, perhaps owed something to science—as certainly the latter two were anxious to make clear that they did." (Rptd. Wiegle and Fiore 131-132)

¹³ See Standing Bear *My People* and *My Indian Boyhood*. For analyses of Standing Bear's writing, see Warrior.

¹⁴ For instance, writing folklore collections allowed these writers to produce popular works in considerable demand by publishers and, especially, by east-coast readers who were persistently interested in picturesque stories that represented the romance of "Indian country" and the American West. Austin, for example, found it relatively easy to produce the short tales collected in *One-Smoke Stories*, and published these stories individually and in the collection as a way to generate income when she did not have a longer manuscript ready for publication (Lape). Applegate understood his folklore collecting activities primarily as an aspect of scientific work. Standing Bear's complex positioning in his autobiographies and public performances is explored fully in Warrior and Fear-Segal.

¹⁵ Although I do not consider her folklore collections in this chapter, Zora Neale Hurston's *Mules and Men* and *Tell My Horse* represent two additional experimental and politicized uses of the folklore collection genre.

¹⁶ The 1887 Dawes Act, establishing allotment, did not force individual allotments on the Pueblo and Hopi people, whose lives were not largely affected by the Dawes Act; however, the federal government's allotment of lands "reserved" for the use of the Pueblo, Hopi, and Navajo people did result in a network of government agents who influenced water and land rights among these groups. See Vine Deloria *Indian Reorganization*; Mitchell.

¹⁷ Even representing Zias as impoverished marks a distinction between Applegate's use of the folklore collection genre and more widespread uses. Charles Lummis, in his 1910 collection, *Pueblo Indian Folk Stories*, idealizes Pueblo culture and ignores the transformation of Pueblo economic systems by Anglo encroachment. Lummis's portrayal of Pueblo people as thoroughly integrated into their environments reflects white preoccupations with industrialization and urbanization, processes that challenged middle class white Americans' sense of themselves in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Because representations of Native Americans so persistently reflected white Americans' desires for their own communities, poverty—as a social and historical phenomenon—was generally not sufficiently picturesque to warrant representation.

¹⁸ Rhetorical scholarship on Indian boarding schools has emphasized, first, that cultural destruction was in fact the primary *objective* of boarding school education, and second, that Native American students and intellectuals resisted cultural destruction and turned educational and rhetorical tools against the government's ends. See especially Malea Powell "Down By the River"; Enoch "Resisting" and *Refiguring*. Of the large body of historical and critical scholarship on Native American boarding schools, see especially Fear-Segal; also Lomawaima; Lyons "Rhetorical Sovereignty" and "Left Side"; Pfister; Warrior 95-142.

Chapter Four

Moving Homes: Indian Education in the Ethnographic Novel

“The system of boarding schools off from reservations, now in successful operation, is slowly but surely accomplishing revolutionary and desirable results. Children from different tribes ... hear and use only the English language, are removed from the contaminating influences of camp life, become accustomed to the usages of civilization, and are trained to habits of industry, thrift, and self-reliance.”

--Thomas J. Morgan, *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1889.

“The most fundamental need in Indian education is a change in point of view.”

--Lewis Meriam et. al., *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 1928.

In the early twentieth century, public discourse surrounding federal Indian education policies hinged on issues of space. Nineteenth-century policy-makers had emphasized the necessity of removing students “from the contaminating influences of camp life” to more “civilized” spaces where, as Commissioner of Indian Affairs Thomas J. Morgan argued, students would be transformed by the English language and “trained” to “habits of thrift and industry.” From the 1880s through the 1910s, boarding school education became the most extensive arm of federal Indian policy, powerfully shaping the experience of thousands of Native Americans. But by the

1920s, debate over Indian education had reopened, and calls for change were frequent and strenuous. Lewis Meriam, a senior researcher at the Institute for Government Research charged with undertaking an exhaustive study of federal Indian policy, crystallized the pervasive public sense that *change* was fundamentally in order—not only in how the government undertook to educate American Indians, but also *where* such education took place. As Meriam explained, “Education for the Indian in the past has proceeded largely on the theory that it is necessary to remove the Indian child as far as possible from his home environment; whereas the modern point of view in education and social work lays stress on upbringing in the natural setting of home and family life” (346). Although the 1880s saw general agreement that off-reservation boarding schools were key to “Americanizing” Indian children, reformers in the 1920s stressed the educational value of “the natural setting of home and family life.” Four decades of policies promoting off-reservation boarding schools had not “Americanized” Native Americans as promised; consequently, in the 1920s and 1930s, while boarding school education came increasingly to be viewed as a failure, new public discourse emerged debating the aims—and the *sites*—of Indian education in the future.

During the same decades, professional anthropology was positioning itself as *the* scientific authority over Native American issues. Anthropologists intervened during the 1920s and 1930s in debates over Indian policy, especially Indian education, throughout what historian Tom Holm has characterized as an “age of confusion” in Indian affairs. In their arguments about Indian policy, anthropologists drew on space, especially the spaces of Native homes and schools, to assert their

authority over Indian issues and to attempt to guide federal policy. The ascendancy of the ethnographic monograph as a privileged and rhetorically scarce site for knowledge production significantly influenced the efforts of anthropologists to participate in debates over Indian education—debates that took place largely *outside* the discipline's boundaries, in congressional contexts, in political magazines, in popular and artistic fora.

This chapter argues that many anthropologists intervened through ethnographic novels, a hybrid genre that was published, reviewed, and read throughout the 1930s but that has seen few readers and scarcely any scholarly attention since. In this chapter, I situate ethnographic novels within parallel contexts in the 1920s and 1930s: anthropology's professionalization and the renewed debate over Indian education. The exigencies that contributed to this genre's formation came from both institutional and popular arenas. Drawing on recent genre theory, I analyze the ethnographic novel as a site for rhetorical action, a site that anthropologists developed to access rhetorical resources and advance arguments that could not be located in ethnographic monographs. By recovering these texts, though fictional, as *rhetorical*, I suggest that anthropologists developed the ethnographic novel to embed arguments and policy critiques within a form more suited for popular consumption than the ethnographic monograph.

Although this genre was fleeting—emerging and then fading from practice within a decade—nevertheless, ethnographic novels were a prominent popular genre during this period. After the high-profile success of ethnologist Oliver La Farge's *Laughing Boy*, which won the Pulitzer Prize in 1929, ethnographic novels were

published nearly every year throughout the 1930s.¹ They were reviewed in prominent periodicals, such as *The New York Times* and *The Nation*, and were published by major presses such as J.J. Augustin and Houghton Mifflin. These books, although connected to the long history of “Indian fiction” written in the United States, diverged from that tradition by advancing knowledge claims. Ethnographic novels, because they were based on the writer’s firsthand experience living within another culture, claimed to create accurate ethnographic knowledge despite being fictional. Although La Farge has remained the most famous of the anthropologists writing fiction during this period, many others wrote ethnographic novels during the 1930s, creating a new genre to achieve their rhetorical goals while finding broad readerships and sympathetic reviewers for their work.

In this chapter I examine roughly ten ethnographic novels written by both amateur and professional anthropologists, including Oliver La Farge’s *Laughing Boy* (1929) and *The Enemy Gods* (1937), Frances Gillmor’s *Windsinger* (1930), Dama Margaret Smith’s *Hopi Girl* (1932), Robert Gessner’s *Broken Arrow* (1933), John Joseph Mathews’ *Sundown* (1934), D’Arcy McNickle’s *The Surrounded* (1936), John Louw Nelson’s *Rhythm for Rain* (1937), Gladys Reichard’s *Dezba, Woman of the Desert* (1939), and Ruth Underhill’s *Hawk Over Whirlpools* (1940).² Of these texts, some were written by practicing, credentialed anthropologists, such as La Farge, Reichard, and Underhill, all of whom earned advanced degrees in anthropology, pursued funded field research, and published other anthropological texts in genres more central to the scientific practices of their discipline. Others were written by amateur anthropologists who emphasized their firsthand access to Indian communities to

legitimate and authorize their texts as knowledge, such as Gillmor, Smith, Gessner, and Nelson, who had semi-official access to Indian communities and completed research within those communities through less formalized arrangements. Mathews and McNickle both legitimated the ethnographic quality of their work through their insider status as members of the Native American communities they represented in fiction.

Attempting to create knowledge in a form that would appeal to non-specialists, these popular ethnographic texts also undertake to influence public opinion concerning Indian education policies by drawing on the particular spatial resources that characterize this hybrid genre. In what follows, I first reconstruct the context of debates over Indian education during the early twentieth century and trace the exigencies that characterize the rhetorical situation of this genre's emergence. The second section analyzes the resources that ethnographic novelists draw from both monographs and novels, especially resources for representing Native American protagonists' individuality, interiority, and movement through space and time. In section three, through longer analyses of Ruth Underhill's *Hawk Over Whirlpools* and Gladys Reichard's *Dezba, Woman of the Desert*, I argue that ethnographic novelists used these hybrid rhetorical resources to shape their accounts of where and how Indian education should take place. Finally, I conclude the chapter by assessing the significance of this genre as enabling ethical alternatives to the production of knowledge in monographs.

Exigencies: Indian Education and Professional Anthropology

Since Carolyn Miller's classic 1984 essay, "Genre as Social Action," integrated genre study with Kenneth Burke's theory of motive and Lloyd Bitzer's work on the rhetorical situation, scholars have understood that genres emerge in response to rhetorical situations. Situations are characterized as rhetorical by the presence of an exigence that can be alleviated through discourse, and genres emerge, in Miller's account, in response to rhetors' perception that rhetorical situations recur. If a particular exigence has been successfully met through a particular response, rhetors are inclined to respond similarly to those future situations that they construe as recurrent. In contending that ethnographic novels developed as a genre in the 1920s, then, what I argue is *not* that one writer created a new textual form that others later adopted; instead, I suggest that a series of rhetors responded in similar ways to an ongoing situation, and that earlier responses to that ongoing situation influenced later rhetors' choices. The ethnographic novel is a particularly short-lived genre, emerging and fading from practice over the course of a decade. What exigencies marked the rhetorical situation that anthropologists responded to, between 1929 and 1940, by developing the ethnographic novel?

Addressing the question of exigence requires me to situate this genre at the intersection between popular and professional discourse. In the 1920s and 1930s, both popular and professional discursive contexts influenced this genre's emergence. First, debates over the sites and aims of Indian education brought Indian issues to the forefront of public discourse in the United States. In particular, the prominent 1928 publication *The Problem of Indian Administration* critiqued federal boarding school

education as unsanitary, ineffective, and outdated, and called for educational practices more in line with the newest social scientific research. Second, during this period, social scientists were increasingly valued as experts, capable of generating the neutral, objective knowledge necessary to solve social problems, and anthropologists had by the 1920s firmly established that Native Americans belonged to their particular disciplinary plot. Yet the increasing professionalization of anthropology seemed to isolate anthropologists from the places where debate over Indian affairs was ongoing. It was this convergence of public debate and professional isolation that anthropologists perceived as an exigence, calling for new strategies for locating anthropological knowledge relative to the broad public audiences that many anthropologists still aimed to influence.

Reforming Indian Education in the Meriam Report

A significant exigence stimulating the emergence of the ethnographic novel was renewed public discussion of Indian policy in the early twentieth century. The Americanization policies of the late nineteenth century—policies that sought through allotment and boarding school education to forcibly civilize, citizenize, individualize, and Americanize Native Americans—have received significant attention from historians and from scholars of rhetoric.³ As these scholars have shown, extensive nineteenth-century reform efforts—through philanthropic and missionary societies, conferences and speaking tours, and magazine and newspaper publications—culminated in the adoption of allotment policies and widespread support for boarding school education during the final decades of the nineteenth

century. Americanization policies were premised upon the belief that separating Indian children from the influences of their home environments as early and as fully as possible would transform Native American children into individuals who abandoned their tribal identities. But by the 1920s, it was clear that allotment had been an almost unprecedented failure and that boarding school education had not succeeded in separating Indians permanently from their homes and dispersing them as assimilated citizens.⁴ Instead, Native American students who had been educated in boarding schools retained strong ties to their home communities, wrote and spoke on behalf of those communities in local and national fora, and put their multilingual and multicultural talents to all sorts of uses not imagined by school officials.⁵

The failure of earlier policies instigated new research and prompted new arguments about the course that future federal Indian policy should take. One major document marking the failure of earlier Americanization policies was *The Problem of Indian Administration*, also known as the Meriam Report, which was published in 1928 after two years of extensive investigation under the auspices of the Institute for Government Research. The expectation during the 1920s that expert intervention and firmly empirical knowledge should guide social policy is reflected in the staff hired to conduct the investigation and write the massive Meriam Report. The survey staff included Henry Roe Cloud, a Winnebago man who had founded the American Indian Institute, an Indian high school in Kansas, edited *Indian Outlook* magazine, and earned several advanced degrees including a Master's in Anthropology from Yale; Fayette Avery McKenzie, a professor of Sociology at Juniata College in Pennsylvania and a founding member of the Society of American Indians; and Mary

Louise Mark, a professor of Sociology at Ohio State University who had worked previously for the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics.⁶ Lewis Meriam, for whom the report came to be called, was a senior staff researcher at the Institute for Government Research, which was charged by the Secretary of the Interior, Hubert Work, with conducting an extensive survey of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and submitting the subsequent, roughly nine-hundred-page report to guide future policy decisions.

The Meriam Report warrants rhetorical attention for the way the document reflects two major characteristics of the 1920s: broad public interest in Indian affairs and the heightened prestige of specialized professional communities. The report reflects both the demand for social science expertise that marked the first decades of the twentieth century and the enormous interest of white Americans in Native American issues during the same period. For example, the Meriam Report stressed “specialization” and “efficiency,” key terms in the Progressive Era search for order and objective knowledge of the social world.⁷ Capturing the general faith of the period in statistical data and social scientific research to solve social problems, the Meriam Report repeatedly suggested that the Bureau of Indian Affairs could effectively administer its duties only when its staff included sufficiently trained “specialized workers” (605) who brought to their work insights from current research in education, psychology, economics, and social work. The report prescribed minimum qualifications for many positions in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), positions which had been previously filled by individuals who, the report charged, had woefully inadequate training. Positions typically held by wives and family

members of other BIA officials, for example, were redefined so that specialized training, rather than familial connection, became the primary requirement.⁸

The conviction in the 1920s that social scientific research could solve social problems strongly influenced the report's critiques and recommendations. In addition to summarizing the numerous failures of allotment and raising strenuous critiques of waste and incompetence among BIA officials, the Meriam Report specifically indicted large federal boarding schools as unsanitary and ineffective in light of current social science research. The entire "philosophy" underlying boarding school education was, by 1928, known to progressive educators and social workers to be fundamentally misguided. The report notes that reprehensible policy of taking

Indian children, even very young children, as completely as possible away from their home and family life, is at variance with modern views of education... which regard home and family as essential social institutions from which it is generally undesirable to uproot children.

(403)

Held to the standards of educational research of the 1920s, the policies of Indian education enacted in the 1880s were shown to be ill-advised and based on erroneous theories. Nearly everything the writers of the Meriam Report observed in boarding schools contradicted the findings of current research in education, psychology, and social welfare: boarding school curricula were regrettably unresponsive to the realities of Native American life (33) and schools' severe regimentation neglected to respond to individual or cultural differences among students (32). The report also forcefully criticized boarding schools for providing students with far too little food,

crowding students into insufficient dormitories, and demanding from students unacceptable hours of industrial labor (314-339). On all of these measures, boarding school practices contradicted the findings of new research on health, sanitation, and child development, and the writers of the Meriam Report argued forcefully to bring the practices of Indian education into closer alignment with scientific and social scientific research.

The recommendations of the Meriam Report writers also followed current social scientific research in advocating educational practices that would keep students more closely connected to their home communities. Specifically, boarding schools were to be replaced by day schools so that students could remain both physically and psychologically nearer to their homes. This form of education, the report writers argued, would help to alleviate social and economic conditions among Indian communities that Lewis Meriam characterized publicly as ranging from “highly unsatisfactory to scandalous” (“Asks State Guide” 28). A chief advantage of day schools over boarding schools was that such a day school “leaves the child in the home environment, where he belongs” (412). By keeping students “in the home and community far more than in the school,” day schools could ensure that “some connection is bound to exist between the home and the school, frequently constant and close connection” (412). Replacing separation with “close connection” between home and school spaces, the writers of the Meriam Report suggest that by redirecting Indian education according to contemporary social scientific research, they could help to reverse the destructive consequences of earlier policies and rejuvenate Native American community life.

The recommendations of the Meriam Report reflect not only the reigning faith in social science to solve intractable social problems, but also a broader public interest in Indian affairs. “Interest” here is something of an understatement. Public fascination with Indian art, artifacts, and cultures was frenzied during the 1920s and 1930s. This fascination—also known as the “Indian craze”—was deeply connected to economic motives, racialized notions of art and culture, antagonism toward urbanization and industrialization, and the whims of fashion.⁹ The Indian craze so strongly shaped the recommendations of the Meriam Report that the image of Indian education the report advocates serves commercial as well as scientific interests. The adjustments the report suggests attempt to create ideal conditions for the continued production of the native arts and crafts that had recently become desirable and valuable. The report writers make it clear, however, that artisanal production of native commodities must take place within spaces that accommodate a “minimum standard of health and decency” (vii; 86) by making precise adjustments to middle-class white domestic norms. One major benefit of “constant and close connection” between homes and day schools would be that such connection would enable “ideas of cleanliness, better homekeeping, better standards of living, [to] have their influence almost immediately in the home and community” (412). For the writers of the Meriam Report, students’ constant travel between homes and schools exerts influence in a single direction: toward native adjustment to white norms. So when the Meriam Report advised educators to find a way to maintain a “close connection” between homes and schools, they advocated a form of Indian education that would produce a particular kind of Indian student, one capable of adjusting productively to

encroaching Anglo society, while remaining distinct enough to produce highly valuable and recognizably “Indian” arts and crafts.

The Meriam Report was widely reviewed in scholarly and popular media.¹⁰ Its findings figure prominently in the pages of many periodicals between 1928 and 1930, when a new Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Collier, was appointed and began immediately to make changes to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But the extensive public discussion of the Meriam Report is only part of a wide-ranging body of public discourse over Indian education, in which the merits and drawbacks of many educational aims and practices were debated during the 1920s and 1930s. From the restrained pages of *New York Times* editorials to the boisterous pages of *The Nation* and other progressive journals, many Americans were weighing in.¹¹ The intense public discussion of Indian affairs that animated periodicals throughout the 1920s and 1930s functioned ultimately as an exigence for anthropologists who felt called to contribute the weight of their expertise.

Professionalization and the Exigencies of Expertise

In the early twentieth century, the very fact of public interest in Native Americans served as an exigence for anthropologists who were in the process of constructing themselves as experts over the social scientific study of Native American cultures. As Elsie Clews Parsons indicates in the preface to a collection of ethnographic fiction she edited in 1922, *American Indian Life*, many anthropologists perceived the need to get factual, accurate ethnographic information into the hands of readers whose curiosity about Native Americans would otherwise lead them to more sensationalist

writings. Parsons asked: “Between these forbidding monographs and the legends of Fenimore Cooper, what is there then to read for a girl who is going to spend her life among Indians or, in fact, for anyone who just wants to know more about Indians?”

(1) Parsons suggests here that anthropologists’ expertise creates a responsibility to disseminate accurate information for people “who just want to know more about Indians.” Indeed, Parsons convinced the most prominent anthropologists of her generation to contribute ethnographic fiction for this collection; the book, printed by popular press B. W. Huebsch, includes ethnographic stories written by Alfred Kroeber, Robert Lowie, Clark Wissler, Paul Radin, Truman Michelson, Alexander Goldenweiser, Leslie Spier, Edward Sapir, Pliny Earl Goddard, and even the venerable Franz Boas. In her introduction, Parsons suggests that her fellow anthropologists are bound by their expertise to share accurate knowledge with interested audiences. If they remain too committed to producing the “forbidding monographs” that only professionals read and reward, then they leave many potential readers with only the sensationalism of Fenimore Cooper, and no way to learn accurately about Native American life.

Furthermore, the increasing distance between professional and popular discourse occasioned by professionalization was felt by some anthropologists to exclude them from discussions that dearly concerned them. Anthropologists’ desire to participate in public discussions of Indian affairs was motivated by scholarly self-interest as well as by the need to reach meaningful audiences. For example, Parsons suggests that anthropologists must translate their knowledge into accessible forms or risk losing public support for their research. Parsons notes that “Appearances to the

contrary, anthropologists have no wish to keep their science or any part of it esoteric. They are too well aware, for one thing, that facilities for the pursuit of anthropology are dependent more or less on popular interest” (1). The risk of professional isolation here is clear: it can prevent outsiders from providing critical support for anthropologists’ work. Parsons—who was independently wealthy in addition to holding a Ph.D. from Columbia—herself stepped in numerous times during the 1920s to fund anthropological research and even to pay for the continued publication of the *Journal of American Folklore* while funding decreased in the interwar period.¹² During a period of decreased funding, practicing anthropologists needed to remind the public of the importance of their discipline. Parsons suggests in *American Indian Life* that the increasingly strong boundaries that attended professionalization also isolated anthropologists’ work from audiences that mattered to them. As monographs became more important professionally *and* more remote, discursively, from everyday, non-specialist readers after 1920, the distance between professional norms and public engagement increased. For writers of ethnographic novels, fiction that was both accurate and entertaining offered a means to address these popular and professional exigencies.

Hybrid Resources and Spatial Strategies

Anthropologists responded rhetorically to these exigencies shaping public and professional discourse by creating the ethnographic novel as a hybrid genre to meet their rhetorical and professional goals during the 1930s. This hybrid genre offered

spatial strategies that allowed them to advance arguments concerning Indian education and the practice of anthropology.

Combining Carolyn Miller's and Anis Bawarshi's theories of genre, this section discusses the ethnographic novel as a hybrid location for rhetorical action. Rhetors such as Ruth Underhill, John Joseph Mathews, and Gladys Reichard constructed this genre as a space where they could connect their expertise to broad popular audiences. Through their efforts to hybridize the rhetorical and spatial resources of novels and monographs, ethnographic novelists undertake a whole range of actions not located in the privileged genre of the ethnographic monograph. This genre combines the ethnographic monograph's commitment to descriptive detail that evokes a cultural whole with the resources of the novel for describing individual change and development over time.

Through this combination of rhetorical resources, ethnographic novelists put Indian education in motion in the 1920s. As their protagonists move through multiple spaces (including landscapes, schoolrooms, reservations, and so on) and develop in response to that movement, I contend that ethnographic novelists chart trajectories that complicate the meaning of "Indian education" in the 1930s. Furthermore, ethnographic novels include an emotional register that remained absent from both policy statements and professional academic monographs.

What does this hybrid genre offer to these rhetors that other forms, such as monographs and traditional novels, do not? First, although European travellers and colonists have been writing fiction about indigenous people for at least five centuries,¹³ the ethnographic novels I examine here differ by using ethnographic

description to advance knowledge claims. These rhetors insist that their narratives of Indian life are not merely stories, but accurate cultural accounts. In this way, ethnographic novelists can be seen as constructing *arguments* as well as stories. They assert not only the entertainment value of their texts, but also the validity of their texts as knowledge and the relevance of that knowledge for contemporary Native American and white American life. Ethnographic novelists create this knowledge within a genre designed to reach not only anthropological insiders but a broad public readership as well. Their genre choices positioned their arguments between multiple communities of readers—including the community of practicing scientists, the community of middle-class white readers their novels primarily garnered, and the indigenous communities they represented in print. At this nexus, ethnographic novelists negotiated the line dividing insiders from outsiders within each of these communities.

Knowledge and Narrative: Monographs and Novels

The rhetors who developed the ethnographic novel genre in the 1930s drew rhetorical strategies from novels and from the ethnographic monograph. Before proceeding with my analysis of the ethnographic novel, I pause here to review briefly the rhetorical strategies that the monograph genre offered to the ethnographic novelists of the 1930s. Based in exhaustive, descriptive detail gathered by the author's firsthand observations during an extended period of fieldwork in a foreign culture, the monograph relies particularly upon what recent scholars have called ethnographic realism and ethnographic holism to generate authority and create knowledge. Anthropologists in the early twentieth century relied heavily upon these

rhetorical strategies to create texts that attained high status as valid, rigorous, scientific knowledge of another culture.

Ethnographic realism refers to ethnographers' reliance upon abundant descriptive detail to evoke a convincing reality; holism refers to their use of accumulated detail to construct a more or less coherent cultural whole. Ethnographic writing is "realist," according to contemporary anthropologists George Marcus and Dick Cushman, insofar as ethnographic texts deploy "a mode of writing that seeks to represent the reality of a whole world or form of life" (23). Realist ethnographic writing involves "close attention to detail and redundant demonstrations that the writer shared and experienced this whole other world" (Marcus and Fischer 23). Because realist detail is derived from firsthand experience, realism both constructs the "ethnographer[']s authority" and lends an ethnographic text "a pervasive sense of concrete reality" (Marcus and Cushman 29). Thus ethnographic realism simultaneously asserts that another cultural world exists as represented and that a particular ethnographer has observed that world clearly and accurately at firsthand. Ethnographic holism, a counterpart to realism, aims "not to make universally valid statements, but to represent a particular way of life as fully as possible" (Marcus and Fischer 22). Instead of attempting to encompass and explain the whole human world, ethnographic holism seeks exhaustive detail within narrower bounds: the daily life of a single cultural group. Thus realism and holism function together to make authoritative knowledge that derives legitimacy from abundant detail. Marcus notes that readers of ethnographies tend to critique texts that "fail to sketch vividly enough the boundaries of a cultural unit" (509). Rather

than a sweeping account of multiple cultures across time and space, ethnographic monographs promise readers the fullest possible detail within the boundaries of a specific culture.

The abundant detail demanded by realism and coordinated by holism functions as both *logos* and *ethos* in ethnographic writing. By describing daily life with extreme specificity, the writer of the monograph provides discreet textual evidence of his linguistic competence and actual presence among the people being described. *Being there*—being physically present in a distant place and then affirming that prior presence through textual indications—is of fundamental importance for ethnographic writing. Readers expect the monograph to affirm the writers' presence among members of another culture, to convince through copia and detail, and to represent fully what Malinowski called the “imponderabilia” of everyday life.¹⁴

Drawing on the authority provided by realism and holism, ethnographic novelists in the 1930s constructed cultural descriptions that, they implied, were as reliable and accurate as monographs, even though they were placed within the fictional plot of a novel. Unlike many writers of Indian fiction—such as James Fenimore Cooper, whom Elsie Clews Parsons dismissed as sensationalist—ethnographic novelists insisted upon the validity of detailed, realist cultural descriptions to produce *knowledge*. Like writers of traditional monographs, ethnographic novelists used abundant detail as an *ethos* strategy, to assert their firsthand access as a source of reliability. Ethnographic novelists also included direct attestations of their field experience to reassure readers of their texts' accuracy. For example, John Louw Nelson, introducing his 1937 *Rhythm for Rain*, cites his “ten

years with the Hopi Indians” (viii) as evidence that this novel offers valid and reliable ethnographic knowledge. Frances Gillmor, on the dust jacket of her 1930 ethnographic novel *Windsinger*, asserts she has

spent considerable time on the Navajo reservation, far from railways and travelled roads....I have travelled horseback at the foot of Black Mesa, where in my story *Windsinger* lives, I have seen sand painting in the making, a very rare privilege for a white person, and something which women, either white or Navajo, are seldom allowed to do. (v)

Citing her experiences among the Navajo as a source for her authority, Gillmor emphasizes her rare access to ethnographic information that elevates her fictional story to the status of knowledge. Many writers of ethnographic fiction similarly emphasize firsthand observation and affirm the validity of their descriptions as knowledge. Such assertions of accuracy remind readers that this is entertainment that means to count as educational.

Although the ethnographic monograph offered writers abundant rhetorical resources for the authoritative description of cultural wholes, the genre offered few resources for engaging broad audiences, representing individual characters adapting in response to changing cultural contexts, and narrating an individual’s development over time. The novel, on the other hand, was a baggy genre that provided enormous flexibility for realist representation, for constructing a protagonist’s interiority, and for generating *pathos* to provoke readers’ emotional responses. Thus writers of ethnographic novels benefited from a productive genre-based tension between

describing whole cultural contexts and creating narratives of individual protagonists who change over time.

Individuality, Interiority, and *Pathos*

In relation to both the privileged genre of the ethnographic monograph and the popular genre of Indian fiction, the ethnographic novel emerged during the 1930s by combining ethnography's commitment to descriptive cultural details with the narrative progression of the novel. These texts combine novelistic development of an individual protagonist over time with ethnographic descriptions of the cultural context of rituals, ceremonials, and family life. The tension between representing a coherent cultural whole and a unique individual narrative animates this hybrid genre. Far more than monographs, ethnographic novels offer rhetors a way to represent the *interaction* between individuals and their surrounding cultural contexts. Where writers of monographs abstract the experiences of individual informants—using them merely as representative facts to fill out a portrait of a cultural whole¹⁵—ethnographic novelists create individual protagonists to make ethnographic knowledge vivid to popular audiences.

For reviewers of these works, the individual was crucial. Oliver La Farge, for example, praises Ruth Underhill's ethnographic novel *Hawk Over Whirlpools* as “intensively the story of an individual” (“Return” 10). La Farge likewise praises John Joseph Mathews' novel *Sundown* because that book is above all “a well-written, well-planned, sensitive study of a young man” (“Realistic” 309), capable of compelling readers' interest because it is *not* an academic abstraction. Furthermore,

ethnographic novels tell the story of an individual who changes over time. Nearly all these novels begin at the protagonist's birth and follow his or her travels and trials throughout life. Consequently these texts describe change, adjustment, and processes of negotiation in ways the ethnographic monograph could not.

Access to the *interiority* of a protagonist was also crucial; why read a novel, reviewers asked, if the description remained at the surface as it must in "objective" ethnography? For example, Robert Gessner's 1933 ethnographic novel *Broken Arrow* is criticized by one reviewer for merely "record[ing] events" without "conveying any deep understanding" of his protagonists' thoughts and feelings (Gruening 518). Gessner's novel fails to provide the "intimate or individual revelation" (518) that the reviewer finds crucial to creating sympathy for the protagonist. John Louw Nelson's 1937 novel *Rhythm for Rain*, on the other hand, is praised for providing access to "Indian psychology" (Walton 9). Unlike traditional monographs, which demanded that the ethnographer merely observe behaviors and interpret cultural meaning, ethnographic novels offered readers imaginative access to protagonists' interiority—the motivations, meanings, and emotional attachments that made the behaviors of both Indian and white characters make sense.

The ethnographic novel also offered rhetors access to greater resources for *pathos* than the monograph, which is limited by the detachment required of objective science. As Margaret Smith explains in her introduction to the ethnographic novel *Hopi Girl*, "Indians are human beings, even as you and I, and not biological specimens on the ends of hatpins to be examined under a microscope" (ix). "Learned dissertations" (ix), Smith explains, cannot offer such convincing evidence

of shared humanity as the account of a single Indian individual's triumphs and tragedies. Focusing on a single individual offered rhetors a way to bring the humanity of Indian protagonists into view. Forecasting feminist critiques of scientific writing that would emerge decades later, ethnographic novelists eschewed cultural abstraction as a *denial* of shared humanity, a textual strategy akin to treating humans as mere specimens for study.

As many late twentieth-century scholars would assert, the constraints imposed by scientific and academic genres make some arguments impossible. Although ethnographic novelists' reasons for locating their arguments in this genre varied, all turned to this genre as an alternative site better suited to their particular rhetorical purposes. The flexible resources of this hybrid genre accommodated diverse rhetorical goals, including some more openly political than the monograph. The genre allowed an author to assert her authority and the validity of her cultural descriptions while moving a reader through an openly fictional plot; it answered the needs of rhetors who sought to entertain while educating curious white readers, especially about contemporary conditions of Indian life in the 1930s. The genre also offered improved resources for representing the dynamic between individuals and coherent cultural wholes, which some anthropologists viewed as a central problem within anthropology. Many ethnographic novels even offer up the anthropologist as a figure for mocking self-critique. Finally, this hybrid genre offered greater resources for rhetors who wanted to use *pathos* to provoke white readers to act politically in response to their ethnographic texts. Within the constrained and rhetorically scarce site of the monograph, there was simply no space for many of these rhetorical

practices during the 1920s and 1930s. Below, I focus on how rhetors used ethnographic novels specifically to engage public debates about Indian education and the changing contexts of Native American life during the early twentieth century.

Educational Critiques in Ethnographic Novels

Ethnographic novelists throughout the 1930s critiqued the practices of federal Indian education, especially through novels' resources for generating *pathos* and portraying individual lives. Through narratives of individual children forced to leave their homes to attend federal schools, for example, ethnographic novelists critiqued boarding school education as stupidly regimented, staffed by insensitive educators, and characterized by unhealthy practices that rendered schools too disconnected and too different from the home spaces that students were forced to leave behind.

Several novels represent students being forcibly removed from their homes to schools. Levi Horse-Afraid, the protagonist of Robert Gessner's 1933 novel *Broken Arrow*, is handcuffed by a policeman and dragged from his parents' home by a school official, while his siblings and parents watch helplessly (165-166). Oliver La Farge's later ethnographic novel, *The Enemy Gods*, portrays students who are kept at a reservation boarding school over the summer despite their parents' demands that their children be returned, as the school officials maneuver to retain power over their students against parental influence. Still other novels, such as Gillmor's 1930 novel *Windsinger* and Gladys Reichard's 1939 novel *Dezba, Woman of the Desert*, portray the efforts of families to keep their children out of sight of "recruiters" who will remove to federal schools any school-aged children they find, regardless of family wishes

(Gillmor 66; Reichard *Dezba* 58). In both of these novels, the vast distances of the Navajo reservation make it possible for families who live far from “tale-telling Whites and from roads over which automobiles could travel” (Reichard 58) to keep their children out of federal schools and to provide for their education in their own ways.

Even in such a large territory, families fear that enemies, or uncautious friends, will reveal the existence of school-aged children to school officials who take any students they can uncover—because higher enrollments impress other Indian Service officials and open avenues for raises and promotions. In their portrayals of the efforts of families, successful or unsuccessful, to keep their children out of boarding schools and in their communities, ethnographic novelists countered racist notions that Indians lacked interest in their children and thus were eager to have the federal government house and feed them. These writers also criticize the self-serving practices of school officials who are more devoted to filling their dormitories and trumpeting their school’s accomplishments than to providing meaningful and humane instruction to their students.

Ethnographic novelists further critique school officials who subject students to inhumane practices within schools. School officials are frequently represented as, at worst, racist buffoons, and at best, as well-meaning but ineffectual within a brutal educational system. Gessner, for example, mockingly represents a school official who barks military-style orders at a new group of young students, shouting: “Hey, you fellers, stop talkin’ there! ... You fellers cut out that talkin’ in Sioux. You s’posed to be ‘mericans now. It’s ‘gin th’ reg’lations fur you talk in Sioux” (170).

The dropped vowels and strongly emphasized dialect that this official uses, while demanding that students give up their native language to become “americans” who speak English, registers Gessner’s contempt for ill-educated white people who were charged with undertaking Indian education—and who only have “reg’lations,” rather than sense, to guide their practices.

Critiquing the *system* of education, many ethnographic novels portray a range of school officials to argue that even well-meaning people are unable to counteract the worst tendencies of the present system of Indian education. Gessner’s novel includes two good people trying sincerely to help their Indian students: a German cook, Mrs. Schröder, and a young doctor, neither of whom are able to counteract the inhumanity of the system of boarding school education. Mrs. Schröder invites the protagonist Levi and his young love, Lily, for occasional meals, providing them simultaneously with a place to see each other, a warm and caring domestic atmosphere, and much-needed food to supplement their meager rations at the school. But when the superintendent, Mr. Magley, learns of these visits, he threatens the cook with dismissal, noting her failure once, when working in her garden, to stand at attention while the Star Spangled Banner was being played (200). Faced with this threat, and reminded of her precarious status as a German citizen in the U.S., Mrs. Schröder ends the visits and leaves Levi to his fate. Similarly, the school doctor tries faithfully to treat ill students and keep them from spreading tuberculosis and measles, but cannot stop an epidemic when dormitories are overcrowded and the superintendent is too preoccupied with planning his next promotional speech to the Rotary Club to attend to the doctor’s entreaties. Instead, the superintendent

doggedly insists that clearing out an unused guardhouse to quarantine infected students would be “inhumane”—although he imprisons stubborn students, punishes runaways by public humiliation, and ensures that more students will suffer and die from preventable diseases by ignoring the doctor’s requests. Although Mrs. Schröder and the doctor both try to help Levi, Gessner argues that such individuals are incapable of meaningful intervention within a system so thoroughly saturated with ignorance, inhumanity, and self-interestedness.

John Joseph Mathews levels a similarly pointed critique of school officials in his novel, *Sundown*, published in 1934 and set during the first two decades of the twentieth century on the Osage reservation in Oklahoma. Although Mathews’ protagonist, Chal Windzer, attends a reservation day school rather than a boarding school, he still encounters teachers who fail to provide meaningful education for Indian students. Miss Hoover, Chal’s first teacher, is a white woman from Philadelphia who, having fallen “under the romantic spell of Fenimore Cooper [and] ‘Hiawatha,’” had been motivated by “intense bitter-sweet sentimentalism” to teach:

“Ah, to teach little Indian minds,” she once said. “To see them open like flowers on their own beautiful prairie.” She had dreams of sitting with them in their teepees and helping the women with their babies—bringing to them the gifts of science, like gifts from heaven. (26)

Miss Hoover’s daydreams are not focused on her students but on her own adventure: the romance and freedom she will feel while sitting with Indians “in their teepees” coupled with the religious sense of sanctification that white people could earn by

bringing “gifts of science, like gifts from heaven.” After arriving at her teaching post in Oklahoma, however, her zeal quickly dissipates:

After a month standing before those passive faces in the classroom, she became disillusioned and sank easily into the lethargy which was standard at Indian schools. [...] Finally the standardized conviction that Indians were Indians seeped into her heart. (27)

Although this teacher does not have the same degree of control over Chal’s life that the superintendent has over Levi’s life in a boarding school, Miss Hoover’s “conviction that Indians were Indians” influences the limited instruction that takes place in this school. Mathews’ fictional portrayal of Miss Hoover, who learns to approach her students with the “standard” attitude of disillusionment and apathy, is a critique of broader educational practices on reservation schools, where educators’ belief in students’ *incapacity* for education is a “standardized conviction.”

Apart from the inability of educators to provide meaningful instruction, schools are also critiqued by ethnographic novelists for being “stupidly regimented and unsanitary,” in the words of one reviewer (“An Indian Tragedy” 18). In addition to the frequent portrayal of schools as starving students and crowding them into unhealthy spaces (as in Gessner, Reichard, and McNickle), these novels show students being subjected to meaningless drills and relentless enforcement of mind-numbing similarity. Levi Horse-Afraid, in *Broken Arrow*, is forced to stand in line, “shivering” in the cold with other new students, surrounded by “barrack-like buildings in strict regulation” facing a “drill field” (169). This military welcome to school life forecasts the regimentation and loss of identity that students will be

repeatedly subjected to in this boarding school. Gessner and La Farge both portray the trauma students feel after enforced haircuts, which humiliate students and leave them feeling “alienated from [their] bod[ies]” (Gessner 169). Gillmor’s protagonist, Windsinger, evades school officials because he “knew that they would cut off his hair if they took him to school, and would forbid him to speak the language of the People” (66). Forced haircuts and injunctions against using any language other than English were both typical practices in the project of “Americanizing” students; in ethnographic novels, these practices are portrayed as attacks on student identity—attacks of which students themselves are intensely aware.

Ethnographic novelists also critiqued school officials who, in the name of “individualizing” Indians, stripped them of their identities by forcing them to wear uniforms and follow utterly routinized schedules. La Farge, in *The Enemy Gods*, and Ruth Underhill, in her 1940 novel *Hawk Over Whirlpools*, critique these practices pointedly. Underhill’s novel charts the early family life, education at an off-reservation boarding school, and the eventual return of a young Tohono O’odham boy named successively Hawk Over Whirlpools, Rafael La Cruz, and Ralph Norcross. Students at Ralph’s school

all dressed in blue shirts and blue jean trousers. In winter they had dark-red sweaters. A bell rang in the morning and they rose; another, and they went to breakfast; another, and they marched out, piling their tin dishes at the kitchen window. (59)

Underhill links uniform clothing with the extreme regimentation of school life, as two complementary practices that undermine students’ ability to retain a sense of

identity. Although students at this school come from dozens of tribes and speak diverse languages, at school those differences are effaced. Enforced uniformity of dress is paired with enforced uniformity of behavior, so that within the school, students become merely a collective “they,” subject to rules and regimentation that make it difficult for instructors even to *see* students as individuals. Instead, like Mathews’ portrayal of Miss Hoover, teachers come to see individual children primarily as instantiations of the encompassing, essential category “Indian,” indistinguishable from one another but, as a race, essentially different from white people.

Collectively, ethnographic novelists, through a combination of individual narrative and ethnographic detail, launch a critique of federal Indian education, charging that schooling is too separate from the diverse home communities of Native American students. Mathews, Gessner, Underhill and others argue that students are unjustly pressured or forced to attend federal schools, where they are subjected to a host of practices that undermine their health and their connection to their home communities without offering meaningful instruction in recompense for this dislocation. Although the Meriam Report made some of these critiques in 1928, anthropologists in the 1930s developed a genre at the intersection of popular and professional discourse to launch their arguments about Indian education. Through ethnographic novels, these writers combined social-scientific knowledge claims with vivid and individualized stories. This allowed ethnographic novelists to humanize the “problem of Indian administration” so carefully outlined in the Meriam Report. Gessner’s harrowing account of Levi Horse-Afraid’s capture and removal to school

(165-166) or his description of the first night Levi sneaks out of the dormitory with other boys not to make mischief, but to silently raid the garbage cans outside the kitchen in a perpetual struggle to evade starvation (175-177) addresses readers who might not be moved by official reports that note the prevalence of “compulsory” education or the “insufficiency of funds for students’ nutritional needs.” The ethnographic novel offers rhetors such as Gessner, La Farge, Underhill, and others powerful access to *pathos* to support their calls for educational reforms. By crafting individual narratives, these rhetors work to make both real and *moving* a situation that, in other genres, remained abstract or out of sight.

Habitation, Movement, and Educational Trajectories

If ethnographic novelists reached broader audiences and advanced their critiques of Indian education by drawing on *pathos*, their more substantial departure from mainstream monographs comes from putting characters *in motion*. Because the ethnographic novel provides a location for narratives of individuals who are distinct from but responsive to a whole cultural context, many rhetors used this genre to represent individual Indian protagonists who change and develop as they move through multiple spaces. One of the primary rhetorical actions that ethnographic novelists undertake through this genre is constructing trajectories to re-describe Indian education. A trajectory charts both movement through space and development over time, allowing rhetors to describe individual choices within constrained material and historical circumstances. That is, movement is directed by

individual agents, but is constrained by a network of factors in these novels, including family histories, physical barriers, social prohibitions, and ideological and emotional attachments that limit the range of individual possibility.

Ethnographic novelists draw particularly on two spatial strategies, habitation and movement, to construct trajectories of education. As these rhetors represent individual protagonists, situate their protagonists within a whole cultural context, and then mark protagonists' changes through habitation and movement, they define education as a negotiated process taking place over time. Charting educational trajectories in complex networks of movement, influence, and affect, these rhetors counteract the tendency of contemporary debates to reduce "Indian education" to the question of complete assimilation or mere accommodation to white norms.

I call these concepts—habitation, movement, and trajectory—spatial strategies because they function as tools that ethnographic novelists use to represent education as something inseparable from spatial considerations. *Habitation* refers to ethnographic novelists' placement of characters within space and time, particularly their work to show how inhabiting a particular space, such as a school, prompts changes to individuals who then no longer fit comfortably into the spaces of their earlier homes. These changes direct individuals' subsequent *movement* into further spaces and contexts. Together, habitation and movement are rhetorical strategies that can be used to indicate the power of spaces to provoke both individual and cultural change. Tracing movement and habitation across multiple spaces over time, ethnographic novelists describe *trajectories* that, I argue, treat education as something far more complex than official policies recognized during the period.

In this section I argue that ethnographic novelists in the 1930s use habitation and movement as spatial strategies to imbed education within space as well as to underscore the affective investments that give particular spaces such power. A protagonist's ability or inability to fit into her (material, ideological, or spiritual) context both results from her habitation within competing spaces and motivates her subsequent movement. Thus habitation and movement combine to shape where an individual *desires* to be and where she is headed next. These spatial strategies are not, of course, unique to the ethnographic novel, but gain rhetorical power through the deep discontinuity in this genre between unique individuals and coherent cultural contexts. That is, rhetors use the resources of this hybrid genre to construct detailed cultural environments, to propel individual protagonists through such environments, and to show readers the multiple factors that motivate such movement.

Many ethnographic novels explore the consequences of habitation by portraying students who fail to fit into their homes when they return from school. Gladys Reichard, for example, in her 1939 novel *Dezba, Woman of the Desert*, constructs a trajectory of *mis-fit* through the character of Mary, a returned student. Mary, the daughter of Dezba's friend, faces the typical difficulties encountered by students who must re-habituate themselves to their homes after years away in other spaces. Although Mary did well at her boarding school, she is like most female graduates of boarding schools in being unable to find work even in domestic service after her education, and so finds herself with no options except to return to her mother's home. Mary fails to "fit in with her mother's surroundings" (25) after her years at school, and Reichard suggests this mis-fit results from Mary's inability to

achieve domestic comforts and feminine adornments that her schooling has taught her to desire. Dezba, the protagonist and matriarch of this novel's central family, reflects that returned students like Mary

needed so many things the Navajo could not get to carry out their new ideas that their influence was narrowly limited. They liked to bathe every day under a shower or in a bathtub. The Navajo on the Reservation also liked to bathe, but Dezba, who was more fortunate than most of her friends, had to haul every drop of water she used at least two miles, and in dry seasons six. Similarly, she thought manicured nails, if they were not too red, were all right, but chopping splintery cedar wood, dyeing yarn, butchering sheep, and washing clothes in hard water made a manicure seem futile. (60-61)

Through Dezba's reflections, Reichard wages a critique of educational practices that fail to responsibly prepare students for the circumstances that face them after school. Mary's desires are not portrayed as unreasonable in themselves, but only impracticable in the location where Mary has to make her life. The education Mary has been subject to by spending many years at a boarding school is one that is fundamentally inattentive to the varieties of environments where people live; it has taught her to "like to bathe every day" and to like manicured nails, without attending to the impracticality of these learned preferences within the context of Mary's family's life. Instead, doggedly insisting on a single model of white domestic femininity, educators have taught Mary desires that are utterly disconnected from the desert she returns to. Reichard and other ethnographic novelists suggest that, while

habitation in school spaces alters students' desires in many ways, it is both insensitive and destructive to demand that students from diverse home environments adopt behaviors and desires identical to those of whites.

Habitation as a spatial strategy is used in many different arguments, but is almost always intertwined with representations of movement. Movement between competing spaces can create the trajectory of mis-fit Reichard demonstrates through the character of Mary, when failure to fit one's environment generates further mobility, as an individual's re-ordered desires and emotions direct her future movement. Likewise, ethnographic novels represent both movement and habitation as deeply affective processes, intimately connected through the emotional attachments that tie individuals to specific people and places. A protagonist's movement, for example, is often directed toward places where the protagonist has emotional investments, and movement itself is capable of re-orienting an individual's emotional attachments, forging connections to new places or increasing the range of spaces to which one feels attached.

Frances Gillmor's novel *Windsinger*, for instance, examines the intimacy between movement, habitation, and the affective power of particular spaces. In *Windsinger*, both the Navajo title character and his white friend, the Mender of Windmills, are able to *feel at home* in the entire desert because of their repeated movement through that desert. Windsinger crosses the desert again and again in his duties as a singer; the Mender of Windmills crosses it again and again as his job demands, keeping the windmills turning and drawing water for the flocks. Both

characters understand the desert they move through as an expansive dwelling, safe, comfortable, and deeply imbued with emotion.

To contrast with their ability to *dwell* in the desert, Gillmor constructs the character of Mrs. Davison, a white farmer's wife, whose restricted movement both results from and amplifies her inability to invest the desert landscape with the feelings of home. The desert, Mrs. Davison tells the Mender of Windmills, is "bad enough when you have a house and a place of your own" (45). Her feeling of alienation from the desert keeps her indoors; Gillmor repeatedly positions Mrs. Davison within yards and doorways (45, 51, 60). Alienation from the desert environment also keeps her isolated from others who live there. Windsinger, as a boy, is confused by how upset Mrs. Davison becomes when she sees him carrying a dead heron he has found; she gestures wildly, cries, and offers him payment for the bird, but she cannot make herself understood (59-60). When the Mender of Windmills explains later that she misses the green spaces of the country she comes from, Windsinger "looked out across the desert, seeing it in its color and shadow" and tells his friend "this land is also green after the rains" (62-63). The shared language between Windsinger and the Mender—both speak Navajo—and their shared love for the desert connects them to each other and to the vast expanses they cover in their routine activities. Mrs. Davison, whose restricted movement parallels her inability to see the desert as a place that is "also green after the rains," remains unable to communicate and ultimately, unable to stay. Through the encounters she constructs between these three characters, Gillmor suggests that movement is tied to habitation, enabling the intense affection that causes a space to feel like a home.

Affect and Education in *Hawk Over Whirlpools*

The affective dimension of both habitation and mobility offers ethnographic novelists a way to represent the complexity of educational trajectories. Underhill, Reichard, Mathews, and La Farge all combine habitation and mobility into powerful rhetorical strategies for advancing their arguments for educational reform. In *Hawk Over Whirlpools*, for example, Underhill charts the educational trajectory of a single Tohono O’odham boy to critique the very limited options that a boarding school education makes possible for students. The protagonist of this novel, Rafael, lives in a remote desert village and as a child understands that his grandfather, the tribe’s spiritual leader, will initiate him into secret knowledge when he comes of age. But when a recruiter from a federal boarding school comes to his village for students, Rafael is drawn by the possibility that he could also learn the secrets of white knowledge. When asked by his grandfather what he wants, Rafael asserts that he “want[s] both” (57). Hoping to access white forms of knowledge in addition to the knowledge he expects to learn from his grandfather, Rafael chooses to attend the off-reservation boarding school. This initial movement is directed by Rafael’s sharp desire for knowledge; each of Rafael’s subsequent movements—from school, to a canning factory, to a tuberculosis sanatorium, and finally back to Lizard-in-the-Rocks, his village—is more constrained, and each is directed in part by the disappointments that Rafael learns from this initial move.

Specifically, Underhill indicates that Rafael’s trajectory is shaped by the feelings of disillusionment and distrust learned through his years of habitation in

boarding school. The space of the school itself initially represents the object of his desires and later symbolizes his inability to access the forms of knowledge he wants. When Rafael arrives at school, he believes he will learn how to construct such a building in his own village; he moves through the school, touching the walls, imagining how such an impressive structure will look in Lizard-in-the-Rocks. But he learns quickly that this is not knowledge that white people are willing to let him access; Rafael's "frequent experiences of being pushed away and ordered about, brought it home to him. These buildings were not for Indians. These were white men's property which Indians might inhabit on sufferance, never possess" (60). The disappointing distance between "possessing" and "inhabiting on sufferance" is the sharpest lesson of his first year in boarding school.

Rafael's feelings of disappointment and distrust become increasingly keen in his second and third years, as he perpetually lowers his educational goals and still finds, repeatedly, that his teachers are unable or unwilling to provide the instruction that would make his desires possible. Once he sees how narrow the range of possibility really is for him after graduation, Underhill writes, "If Lizard-in-the-Rocks had been within reaching distance, Rafael would have gone home at this point" (63). But after Rafael has spent several years away from his home, not only distance but also time makes Lizard-in-the-Rocks beyond "reaching distance." As Rafael's habitation in school teaches him the inaccessibility of the forms of white knowledge he desires, he also recognizes that the passage of time has rendered him ineligible for other knowledge as well. Staying in school for several years without returning even once, Rafael has been kept from his home during the period of his life

when he could be initiated into his grandfather's knowledge; instead of both, Rafael learns he will get neither. Instead of the powerful access to multiple bodies of knowledge that he sought, Rafael gains only some knowledge of English and a bitter understanding that white people do *not* mean to share their powerful forms of knowledge with the Indian children they educate. Ashamed that he hoped to learn things that he now believes white people will always keep for themselves, and intensely distrustful of his teachers' recommendations that he seek further schooling, Rafael's emotional responses to his education acutely influence his subsequent trajectory. His disillusionment and embarrassment keep him from pursuing further schooling or returning to his village; the only remaining option for him is work, and that path, Underhill emphasizes, is severely constrained for Native American students.

In short, Underhill charts a trajectory for Rafael's education that emphasizes the power of places to guide human desires and to affect human movement. Rafael, like other Tohono O'odham, is powerfully affected by the physical beauty of his desert environment and feels connected to that landscape by the seasonal rituals and migrations that emphasize its power to sustain him and his people. His years of education in other environments dislocate him from his home without offering him any compensating beauties—and, crucially, without expanding the scope of the places he has access to.

In fact, Underhill creates a plot in which Rafael's agency is diminished after each move. Instead of accessing multiple bodies of knowledge, Rafael finds only one job open to him after graduation—working under maddening conditions in a

canning factory—and that is open only because Rafael is one of the best students at his school. After contracting tuberculosis in the city where he works, Rafael makes no further decisions about his movements: he is taken by social service workers to a sanatorium in California because his tuberculosis puts others in danger. When he tells his doctor he has no desire for further schooling, the doctor himself, without consulting Rafael, contacts Rafael's family in Lizard-in-the-Rocks, and Rafael is taken back to his village to convalesce. Underhill's critique of Indian education is embedded in the trajectory she charts for a bright, ambitious student whose schooling only highlights his inability to access powerful spaces and brings about his alienation from the places that once sustained him.

Crucially, however, the trajectory Underhill charts for Rafael is not the only perspective she represents within this ethnographic novel. Underhill, like Reichard below, complicates educational trajectories further by including other characters whose paths intersect with the protagonist's. Rafael, after he returns to his village, is the most vociferous opponent of the changes recommended by the village's newly-appointed governor. Others in the village are more tempered in their reactions to the proposed construction of a well, a school, and a trading post, and they marvel that Rafael, who knows the most English, is yet the most violently opposed to any changes. Although Underhill has charted the path that led Rafael to such ferocious resistance to change in his village, she also complicates Rafael's resistance by contrasting it with the attitudes of two female characters, his step-mother Whispering Leaves and his sister-in-law, Ella, who has also been educated at a government school. These two women criticize Rafael's antagonism toward the well, school, and

trading post because *their* domestic work will be lightened by several changes from the traditional practices Rafael insists upon. Whispering Leaves and Ella find their work of caring for the entire household made much easier when they are able to draw water from a well and buy some foods from a trader. By including multiple responses to the changes taking place in the village, Underhill complicates the educational trajectory her ethnographic novel constructs. Women work to make the home that Rafael has in many ways idealized while he has been away, and the novel uses multiple characters to show us that, although his resistance to change is understandable, so too is the tendency of other Tohono O'odham to welcome it. Thus Underhill, through this hybrid genre, generates complexity in her representation of the Tohono O'odham that monographs during the period could not.¹⁶

Educational Trajectories in *Dezba, Woman of the Desert*

Other ethnographic novelists exploit even further the genre's capacity to inscribe multiple educational trajectories. In her novel *Dezba, Woman of the Desert*, for example, Reichard argues that one cannot characterize the relationship between space, emotion, and education as a straightforward progression, in which one begins feeling perfectly fitted to his home, loses that fit through education elsewhere, and then generates narrative tension through his inability to fit in any place. Instead, Reichard maps several interrelated trajectories by structuring her ethnographic novel to include no fewer than four stories of Indian education. Through these multiple trajectories, Reichard argues that emotional investments in particular spaces can

override the influence of physical mobility; that movement can be circular, through home and back again in various ways; and that movement and education, like Underhill also argues, are gendered. In addition to the educational trajectory of Mary, the returned student who desires comforts her mother's home cannot provide, Reichard also shows the traditional form of education that Dezba's own daughter has been subject to since her childhood, and the contrasting shapes of the educational trajectories of her two sons.

Among other things, Reichard uses gendered trajectories of education to insist that *Navajo* education has its own meaningful shape and structure and is better suited to some purposes than education away from home in schools. After seeing what boarding school education has made possible for her two sons and the daughter of a friend, Dezba recognizes that the possibilities that off-reservation education opens up for female students are significantly different from possibilities for male students. While Dezba sees good reasons for boys' education away from their homes, she also sees that education for girls is systematically different:

The boys learned about building, carpentering, and machinery, and all of these could be useful to him. They also became interpreters, and there were more jobs for Navajo men who could speak English than for those who could not. (61)

Girls, on the other hand, appear more likely to follow a trajectory like Mary's, who has learned only to desire comforts she cannot reproduce in her home. Although Reichard, through Dezba's two sons, offers two examples of male students following divergent but ultimately acceptable trajectories, Mary remains the only example of

what boarding school education produces for female students. While at school, Mary gets no training for work outside the home, so that domestic service in a white home is in fact the very best she can hope for—and is not very likely because of the abundance of similarly-trained young Indian girls competing for positions in wealthy white homes. Mary learns only homemaking, on a white model of domestic happiness, and that form of education specifically creates mis-fit between Mary and her home environment.

In contrast, Gray Girl's education takes place wholly within her Navajo community; Reichard uses Gray Girl to construct a trajectory of indigenous instruction that counteracts the lack of fit and loss of mobility that characterize Mary's education. Gray Girl is, to her mother, the ideal of Navajo domestic achievement; for example, she creates orderly space even in the disorder of the sheep dip (10), finds numerous areas within the community in which to be productive and learn new skills, and contributes her skills to ever-widening circles of influence within her community. Gray Girl has learned all that she knows through Navajo instruction, which is "constant, informal, and persistent" (59). Her trajectory through indigenous instruction keeps Gray Girl close to the family and deeply involved in the spaces where she is attached. This form of instruction offers Gray Girl an education that is perfectly fitted to her desires, her material reality, and her trajectory into Navajo womanhood.

In contrast, both Dezba's sons go away to boarding school, and by tracing where their trajectories converge and diverge, Reichard explores the possibilities that boarding school education affords for male students yet denies to female students.

For Dezba's oldest son, Tuli, Reichard charts a trajectory of recurring integration. Tuli's habitation in and movement through boarding school is unsatisfying in many of the same ways that Levi Horse-Afraid's and Rafael La Cruz's boarding school experiences were, but his trajectory does not lead either to the sanatorium or to social isolation back at home.

Tuli, like Levi, is always hungry, but Tuli's physical deprivations are less severe than the intellectual deprivations he suffers. His "education" consists of endlessly washing dishes, making beds, laboring in the laundry, and planting flowers that use water but supply nothing but decoration (62-63). As contemporary historians of Native American education have pointed out, even the term "vocational training" hardly justifies the enormous amounts of labor most students in U.S. Indian boarding schools were required to perform—labor that kept schools running. But Reichard portrays Tuli as not so much *taught* as *determined* to learn, despite his teachers' exclusions. What he learns he brings back to the community where his affection is still invested. Machinery, for instance, is off-limits to him; yet he gleans enough knowledge from observing the machine-shop to contribute to work in his own community:

Although he had not been able to work in the machine-shop, his eagerness to do so and watching the work there had given him ideas which he put into practice for the convenience of all. He devised an efficient hay-baler, made of boards and an automobile jack. Whenever anyone about the place needed construction of any kind he called on

Tuli who found a way to accomplish it even with crude and scanty materials. (64)

In addition to wresting an education from people determined to refuse him, and putting that knowledge to use to help his people, Tuli's affections and desires remain largely unchanged by his education:

Summer after summer Dezba steeled herself needlessly to meet the change in him which she feared. Tuli was the smiling son she had sent away, anxious to get home, eager to herd sheep or ride the range. He had not forgotten his horsemanship, in fact he became more expert at it every year. He was always willing to hoe corn or haul wood or water, even as in the old days. He was never sulky, ill-tempered, discontented or impatient. (63)

Against his mother's worst fears, in all important matters—his emotional attachments to his people, his religion, his integration into his home—Tuli's education in white schools fails to alter him fundamentally:

Although it had taught him new things, school had not changed Tuli's attitude toward his work or his own people. The innovations he adopted were not so complicated that he could not use them in his mother's environment. Because he had not forgotten the skills he had learned before he went to school. There had been no evidence of a change in Tuli's religious beliefs. (65)

Indeed, Tuli eventually enters into formal Navajo education to become a chanter. Underhill describes Tuli as not so much *taught* as *determined* to learn, despite his

teachers' exclusions, enough to be useful to the community where his affection is still invested. He cycles back home during summers, a movement that keeps him connected to his family and provides opportunities for re-integration, serving as a check on the change that Tuli's time in a different environment is effecting. The novel maps Tuli's desires—to school, back toward home—and critiques the school for failing to teach while also showing readers that, despite the school's ineffectualness, this student was determined to learn. Furthermore, he was determined that his learning take a particular direction—back toward his home community, where his emotional investments remained strong and directed his educational trajectory.

Reichard pairs this narrative with a contrasting one to indicate some of the complexity of the ways in which place, emotion, and education intertwine. John Silversmith, Dezba's younger son, traces a trajectory of roving relation—moving further from his home, yet remaining connected to his community in ongoing ways. Unlike his brother, John *is* a favorite among his teachers, which results in his being kept at school over the summer; it is five years after he leaves for boarding school before he first returns to his family home. Through this longer habitation at school, John's relation to his home community becomes looser. Reichard represents this alteration *spatially*: returning home, he “seemed to sit on the very edge of a sheepskin, hardly touching it. He drank gingerly from a cup, or even used one of his own which he carried with him and lent to no one” (73). John is more easily made physically uncomfortable in his family home, and these slight marks of physical

separation indicate the changes he has undergone through his long habitation elsewhere.

John's trajectory also moves through the widest range of educational institutions: he attends a series of boarding schools, then a state university. Eventually he enrolls in the Hogan School, a school for adult Navajos that offers both practical and academic instruction in a curriculum determined by student interest. His studies include "geology, archaeology and anthropology. His favorite subject was philosophy, but he wanted to work intensively on Indian languages" (141). He has an intellectual passion but also a practical goal: he wants to become a teacher to provide adult education on the reservation (142). At the end of his story, John Silversmith's education includes learning indigenous history and language, conducting research among religious figures on the reservation, and teaching medicine and other adult education courses on the reservation. Although he is not so thoroughly integrated into his home community as his brother Tuli, he still maintains a comfortable—if looser—relationship to that community, a relation he is continually re-negotiating as an adult.

In both of these trajectories, Reichard represents John and Tuli's original movement toward boarding school not as something imported from elsewhere, but emerging from desires rooted in their home communities. Although John desires to pursue scholarship and Tuli seeks useful, practical skills, Reichard assures the reader that both desires are *part of the Navajo world*, not a white importation. John, for instance, chooses to attend an off-reservation boarding school because

[h]e was not satisfied with the answers to the many questions in his mind, and he was sure school would help with them. Besides, there must be many wonderful sights and experiences at the far places to which the children were taken and on the way as well. (69)

The desires that lead John to school—his desire for knowledge, for broader access to the world, and for opportunities to travel—are all familiar desires *within* the Navajo community. Reichard represents John and Tuli's movement toward boarding schools neither as a desire for white culture nor as a chafing against traditional restraints; instead, she insists that these desires are rooted in Navajo community life, that there is nothing non-Navajo about travel, even into an Anglo-American institution.¹⁷

I argue that Reichard's decision to construct these four contrasting educational trajectories suggests she is using the ethnographic novel to address the complex relationship between individual choice and structural forces. By inscribing trajectories, indicating where they converge and diverge, where Mary's, Gray Girl's, John's and Tuli's movement is shaped by emotional attachments and how those attachments are modified over time, Reichard is able to construct a version of Indian education that attends closely both to individual differences and to cultural contexts. In this way, Reichard's ethnographic novel does not *only* create knowledge of the Navajo in a form that popular audiences would find readable. Instead, her ethnographic novel explores the interaction between attachments, desires, and the spaces that shape one's education.

Reichard uses the resources available in this genre to construct detailed cultural environments, to propel individual protagonists through such environments, and to demonstrate to readers the multiple factors that motivate such movement. By situating her protagonists within a whole cultural context and then inscribing change through habitation and movement, Reichard defines education as a negotiated process, a process that takes *place* over *time*. In the context of prevailing public discourse on Indian education—which reduced “Indian education” to a question of total assimilation or mere accommodation to white norms—Reichard uses the ethnographic novel to present multiplicity and complexity. Through the four educational trajectories I’ve outlined above, Reichard demonstrates that the essentialist distinction—between “home-loving” authentic Indians, on the one hand, and their opposites, who desire to adopt white practices—is completely insufficient to capture the complexity of life even within a single family. Instead, accessing rich rhetorical resources through a hybrid genre, Reichard counters powerful, racist conceptions of Indian education. By re-symbolizing the meaning of native home and school spaces and by charting how Native American protagonists adjust to and move through multiple contexts, Reichard argues against the relations of domination that were enabled by prevalent images of Native American homes and schools. Furthermore, this ethnographic novel represents Reichard’s efforts, *against* the isolationist tendency of her discipline, to link her expert knowledge with broader public issues. Instead of seeking objectivity through detachment, Reichard attempted to affect—*rather than merely observe*—an ongoing material situation in which Federal Indian Education policy dramatically shaped the lives of hundreds of thousands of

indigenous students—and shaped the communities they were recruited from and to which they frequently returned.

In conclusion, for anthropologists who wanted to engage with public debates, address broad popular audiences, and shape policy reforms, the ethnographic novel offered a site rich in resources for rhetorical action. In particular, this genre allowed rhetors to put Indian education in motion. Rather than producing the static snapshots or aggregate statistics that characterized monographs and summaries like the Meriam Report, this genre provided a way to chart education as a process taking place over time, through movement across spaces richly imbued with emotion. These narratives of individual protagonists who change as they move through multiple spaces function like moving pictures: both by tracing trajectories of Indian education across space and time, and by generating pathos to *move* white audiences toward greater recognition of the integrity of Native American life.

¹ Before *Laughing Boy*, the only known ethnographic novel is Adolf Bandelier's *The Delight Makers*, first published in 1890 and reprinted in 1917. Bandelier's novel differs from nearly all the ethnographic novels of the 1930s in being set during the prehistory of the Pueblo Indians. Bandelier turned to fiction as an effort to create knowledge about a cultural group that could not be known ethnographically because that group had preceded modern Pueblo people, whereas nearly all the ethnographic novels of the period from 1929 to 1940 were set during the contemporary life of Native American peoples, offering ethnographic novelists a way to address contemporary issues rather than to recreate a prehistoric past.

² Future analyses will also consider Ella Cara Deloria's ethnographic novel *Waterlily*, which Deloria wrote in the early 1940s, encouraged by Boas and Benedict to write something fictional that would allow her to cast her knowledge of Dakota culture and kinship into a living arrangement, and possibly inspired by Parsons' 1922 collection, *American Indian Life*. As a potential rhetorical intervention, *Waterlily* is fascinating, although it was not published until Bison Books issued it in 1987.

³ For a small sample, see Adams; Enoch "Resisting"; Fear-Segal; Hoxie; Lomawaima; Lyons "Left Side"; Pfister; Trafzer, Keller, and Sisquoc.

⁴ On efforts of philanthropic and reform societies to promote allotment and Americanization, see Prucha; Hoxie; Lyons "Left Side." For an account of widespread public support for boarding school education in the late nineteenth-century, see Adams. For evidence of student resistance to boarding school domination, see Lomawaima; Pfister; Malea Powell "Rhetorics"; Stromberg; Trafzer, Keller, and Sisquoc.

⁵ See Malea Powell "Rhetorics"; Stromberg.

⁶ The rest of the survey team included: Ray A. Brown, a law professor at the University of Wisconsin; Edward Everett Dale, a University of Oklahoma faculty member who specialized in economic history; Emma Duke, a public health statistician who had worked extensively with the Census Bureau; Herbert R. Edwards, an M.D. serving as Medical Field Secretary for the National Tuberculosis Association; W. Carson Ryan, Jr., a professor of Education at Swarthmore College who had worked previously for the U.S. Bureau of Education; and William J. Spillman, an agricultural economist educated in Missouri and employed in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

⁷ On the widespread emphasis on efficiency and specialization that made the Progressive Era a "search for order," see Hofstadter; Wiebe.

⁸ Positions held by women were particularly likely to be redefined in the Meriam Report to require more extensive and more specialized training than current employees had received. The generalized Field Matron or social worker role that many women had filled throughout the end of the nineteenth century, for example, was redefined with its duties split between multiple, specially trained individuals. In place of Field Matrons, the Meriam Report suggested substitution of public health nurses, home demonstration workers, vocational advisers, family case workers, and recreation leaders, who all needed to have the following training:

"For the public health nurse: (1) Graduation from a training school of recognized standing; (2) one year's course in public health; (3) at least one year's successful experience under supervision in a regularly organized public health nursing association. For the home demonstration worker, the vocational adviser, the general family case worker, and the recreation leader: (1) The equivalent of a B.A. or a B.S. degree; (2) at least one year's technical training for social administration; (3) two years of successful experience with an organization of recognized standing." (659)

On the Field Matron program of the BIA, see Bannan; Emmerich "Civilization" and "Right in the Midst"; Herring; Simonsen; Wall.

⁹ The fascination of American intellectuals, artists, and art collectors with Native Americans especially during the 1920s and 1930s has been widely commented upon; see Berkhofer 86-111; Dippie 273-292; Carr 206-229; also Bataille; Dilworth *Acts*; Holm; Krech and Hail; Carter Jones Meyer; Mullins. On the pressure for Native American art objects to maintain a desirable degree of difference, see Wade.

¹⁰ Reviews of *The Problem of Indian Administration* appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology*, *Social Forces*, *American Political Science Review*, *Pacific Affairs*, and the *California Law Review*, and the findings of the report were discussed in publications ranging from *School Arts* to *The Survey* and *The American Mercury*.

¹¹ See especially Holm; Pfister.

¹² On Parsons' importance as a benefactor for the work of many individual anthropologists, especially women anthropologists, and her funding for anthropological field research and publication, see Deacon; Hieb; Lamphere "Feminist Anthropology"; Reichard "Elsie Clews Parsons"; Zumwalt.

¹³ On the history of Anglo representations of Native Americans, see Berkhofer; Philip Deloria; Dippie; Shanley.

¹⁴ Contemporary anthropologists have been critical of both realism and holism in ethnography; see, for example, Thornton "Imagine Yourself." In the 1920s, there were also dissenters who were skeptical of the ability of ethnographic description to create accurate and reliable portraits of other cultures. For example, contrast Loomis Havemeyer's confidence, in his 1929 textbook *Ethnography*, that he had at his disposal "all the typical and significant facts" (iii), with Elsie Clews Parsons' skepticism in her 1922 *American Indian Life*, where she writes critically:

For one thing we fail to see the foreign culture as a whole, noting only the aspects which happen to interest us. Commonly, the interesting aspects are those which differ markedly from our own culture or those in which we see relations to the other foreign cultures we have studied. Hence our classified data give the impression that the native life is one unbroken round, let us say, of curing or weather-control ceremonials, of prophylaxis against bad luck, of hunting, or of war. The commonplaces of behavior are overlooked, the amount of 'common sense' is underrated, and the proportion of knowledge to credulity is greatly underestimated. (2)

Criticizing the exotic impression of indigenous life that such practices produce, Parsons remarks that this image of Indian life is roughly as accurate as if "we described our own society in terms of Christmas and the Fourth of July, of beliefs about the new moon or ground hogs in February" (2).

¹⁵ Marcus and Cushman note that "the exclusion of individual characters from the realist ethnography probably accounts, more than any other single factor, for the dry, unreadable tone of such texts" (32).

¹⁶ Underhill's own career, which included academic research as well as government positions, may have provided some of motivation for experimenting with hybrid ethnographic genres. Before joining Columbia's anthropology department, she had already published, in 1920, a feminist novel, *White Moth*, and had been involved with various social work organizations for more than a decade. Her dissertation research, like Reichard's, produced a monograph as well as more experimental forms; in Underhill's case, a recorded oral history of Chona, published in 1936 as *The Autobiography of a Papago Woman*. After earning her Ph.D. in anthropology, Underhill worked with Reichard to develop the experimental Hogan School, an institution of adult education on the Navajo reservation whose curriculum was guided by the interests of the Navajo students who attended. She also taught "applied ethnology" to BIA employees, meant to make government employees more sensitive to the cultural

specificity of the tribes with which they worked, and during the years immediately before writing *Hawk Over Whirlpools* she worked for the BIA in as an educational supervisor, traveling across the U.S. southwest to develop local curricula for Indian schools. For biographical information, see Griffen; Lavender; Underhill "Preface." For an analysis of the experimental qualities of *The Autobiography of a Papago Woman*, see Staub.

¹⁷ Reichard does not flinch from depicting the inhumane and racist practices of such institutions, nevertheless. Both John's and Tuli's trajectories are shaped and constrained by racist practices; John leaves school repeatedly because school officials believe that Indian children should be able to survive on a food allotment of roughly 11 cents per child per day; Tuli is sent home during summers and excluded from the machine shop because his disinclination to mimic his teachers' preferred attitudes and behaviors leads them to label him as an ignorant Indian, unworthy of the education the school is meant to provide.

Chapter Five

Negotiating Space: Rhetorical Recruitment and Disciplinary Critique in Field Autobiographies

“If you read *Digging in Yucatan* young enough, there will be no blinking the future: young archaeologists will be storming every academic door. And if you read it too late to join them, you will spend a delightful day at it, and envy archaeologists all your life.”

–Ruth Benedict, Review of *Digging in Yucatan*, 1931

“Ever since *Digging in Yucatan* came along and with it your story of your early desire to dig and the years at the archaeological school in France which started you out on your career, I have wanted to know more about that school and your experience there. [...] Girls are keen about those kind of stories which have some sort of vocational background and judging from their enthusiasm for you and your archaeological adventures in nonfiction, I am sure they would have just as much interest in anything you wrote that had some basis in actuality.”

–Margaret Lesser, letter to Ann Axtell Morris, 1935

Reviewing Ann Axtell Morris’s popular 1931 field autobiography, *Digging in Yucatan*, Ruth Benedict anticipates a violently enthusiastic response, predicting that the book will attract crowds of young archaeologists to Morris’s discipline. Four years later, noting the enthusiasm the book did indeed garner, Margaret Lesser, Morris’s editor at Doubleday, identifies a more specific group of enthusiasts: young women who were particularly “keen about those kind of stories which have some

sort of vocational background.”¹ The heightened visibility of professional women during the 1920s and 1930s contributed to what Lesser identified as a similarly heightened demand for “vocational” stories, as young women in the U.S. increasingly perceived a variety of careers as newly open to their participation.²

Indeed, one young recruit, Alice Ruth Bruce, writing for the *Washington Post*’s series “I Aim to Be—” in 1937, proclaims archaeology her chosen career and credits Morris’s work with her developing interest in the discipline. Bruce, age fifteen, reports that she decided on archaeology “before I could pronounce the word,” and since then has been reading books on “excavation methods, ‘finds’ and experiences of archaeologists” and amassing a collection of minerals, relics, and equipment for use in her later career. Bruce’s efforts to begin participating in the field of archaeology are impressive for one so young. She reports that she “visit[s] every museum and private collection [she] can” and that she “make[s] notes on the types of relics in each,” even doing “a little surface excavation [her]self while on trips.” In fact, Bruce’s knowledge of her chosen career and her preliminary initiation into the profession are striking. She has been, already for seven years, a member of the New Jersey Archaeological Society, from whose meetings she “learns much.” She has taken steps toward securing the advanced coursework required to earn an archaeology degree, having requested materials from Columbia, “which has fine archaeological courses,” and acquainted herself with the entrance requirements for participating in her chosen field. In all, Bruce shows a remarkable degree of familiarity with the professional practice of anthropology: its apparatus of professional organizations, its assumed background knowledge in geology and

history, and the importance of credentials and higher education for access to membership.

Bruce credits her familiarity with archaeology specifically to Morris's two best-selling autobiographies of archaeological fieldwork, *Digging in Yucatan* (1931) and *Digging in the Southwest* (1933), which are among "the most useful books" for a budding archaeologist (Bruce 2). These books introduced readers like Bruce to anthropology's relatively new professional apparatus, which emphasized credentials and technical training during the interwar period as never before. Morris's books, like many of the texts examined in this dissertation, emerge out of—and respond to—the changing rhetorical contours of this context of increasing professionalization. In this context, popular texts written by highly trained women social scientists demonstrate their rhetorical efforts to find avenues for influence beyond the narrowing boundaries of their disciplines. Morris, along with her friend and colleague Gladys Reichard, was among those women anthropologists who recognized that the emerging system of professional practices simultaneously created opportunities and constructed barriers for women in their field. The field autobiographies that Morris and Reichard published during the 1930s respond to this changing professional context by addressing both insiders and outsiders through a hybrid rhetorical form. Negotiating these two audiences, Morris's and Reichard's field autobiographies aim to remake the field of anthropology in two ways: first, by recruiting young women like Bruce into the profession, enabling their access by guiding them toward avenues for legitimate participation, and second, by embedding

methodological critiques and positing alternative spatial practices in their popular texts.

In the analysis that follows, I suggest that Morris and Reichard constructed the field autobiography as a genre where they could access an array of rhetorical resources, allowing both writers to create innovative arguments regarding the shape of their discipline and the place of women within this professional environment. Through their field autobiographies, Morris and Reichard sought to create rhetorical spaces where they could convert their expertise into influence, both within and outside their discipline.

Professional Positions: Morris, Reichard, and Institutional Status

Although both Reichard and Morris wrote field autobiographies, hybrid texts blending technical detail from their research with lively accounts of their particular field experiences, the two women were in fact positioned quite differently within their discipline. Though neither woman was an amateur—both had discipline-specific technical training—their differential status within emerging professional hierarchies was nevertheless clear.

Very little is known of Morris *apart* from her two published field autobiographies; her career was curtailed by illness and her early death in 1945, and her few surviving papers exist only in scattered form. Born Ann Axtell in 1900, she grew up among the upper-middle-class of Omaha, Nebraska, where her father worked for Union Pacific Railroad. She attended Smith College in Massachusetts to

study history; she reports in *Digging in the Southwest* that at the end of her college career, one of her professors finally explained to her that what she wanted was *prehistory* and that the discipline studying it was archaeology (13). Upon her graduation in 1922, she sailed to France to study at the American School of Prehistoric Archaeology, where she spent what she describes as “a gorgeous year” in archaeological fieldwork and training. Returning to the U.S., she met Earl Halstead Morris, already an established archaeologist, during a visit to New Mexico; they were married in the fall of 1923 and two months later were on their way to the Yucatan Peninsula of Mexico. Through his friend Sylvanus Morley, Director of Middle American Archaeological Research for the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Earl had been appointed director of a massive Carnegie-funded dig at Chichen Itza, where Earl and Ann spent much of the next four years undertaking archaeological research. After 1928, the two excavated a series of sites throughout the U.S. southwest, especially in Canyon del Muerto and Canyon de Chelly in Arizona.³ The Morrisses had two children, Elizabeth Ann in 1932 and Sarah Lane in 1934, and although Ann writes cheerfully in her field autobiographies of herself performing domestic tasks in the midst of her archaeological work, Earl’s biographers suggest that Ann’s struggle to care for their children and her restlessness when away from the field contributed to her depression and ill health (Lister and Lister); periodically ill from 1933 on, she died of undetermined causes in 1945.

During the course of her career, Morris’s status as an archaeologist was something she negotiated through her publications, in a variety of ways, though on the whole, her integration into professional networks was less complete than

Reichard's. The report of the Chichen Itza dig, on which she appears as third author, seems to be her only technical publication, and the two field autobiographies for which she became famous are her only other published writings. She never held a faculty position and was officially employed by the Carnegie Institution only briefly during the Chichen Itza dig; usually she was listed in Sylvanus Morley's official reports only as a "staff artist," assisting painter Jean Charlot in his reproductions of murals. The years of archaeological work she carried out took place primarily in the guise of independent researcher and archaeologist's wife. Her year of field training at the archaeology field school in France formed the whole of her formal post-baccalaureate education. Consequently, although her field autobiographies portray her as happily welcome within the community of archaeologists, and although reviews of *Digging in Yucatan* and *Digging in the Southwest* never questioned her credentials or expertise, nevertheless, she was not sought as an authority to review others' works, nor was she typically paid independently for her research.⁴

Compared with Morris, Gladys Reichard's professional status was firmer and her position as an authority was more visible within the framework of her discipline. Reichard was born in Pennsylvania in 1893, where she was raised in an intellectual, Quaker household. She taught elementary school for six years before entering Swarthmore College, where she graduated with a degree in classics in 1919. Like Morris, she discovered anthropology at the end of her time as an undergraduate. In 1919 Reichard entered Boas's graduate program in anthropology at Columbia University on a Lucretia Mott Fellowship from Swarthmore. She earned her Ph.D.

in 1925 following the successful publication of her dissertation, on Wiyot grammar, which she had researched in California through a University of California Research Fellowship in 1922 and 1923. In 1923 she began as an Instructor in anthropology at Barnard College, where she eventually attained the rank of full professor and where she taught until her death in 1955.⁵

Over the course of her career, Reichard published a dozen books with university and popular presses, published dozens of articles in journals such as *American Anthropologist*, *Journal of American Folklore*, and *International Journal of American Linguistics*, and received a number of research fellowships, such as the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship, which funded a year of study in Germany that resulted in her award-winning book *Melanesian Design*.⁶ She also held positions within anthropology's professional organizations, serving as Secretary of the American Folklore Society from 1924 to 1935, for instance, and as program director for Section H (Anthropology) for the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1945. All of these measures indicate Reichard's integration into the emerging professional apparatus of her discipline.

Reichard's faculty position at Barnard College was particularly notable, for many women with similar credentials and publications were excluded from faculty positions during these decades, just as the training of future generations of anthropologists became particularly important to disciplinary insiders. Although Reichard did not train graduate students at a Ph.D.-granting institution, she still played an important role in directing women undergraduates into anthropology; her students at Barnard who became anthropologists include Nathalie Woodbury, Alice

Kehoe, Kate Peck Kent, Eleanor Leacock, and Frederica de Laguna.⁷ Furthermore, the institutional stability she achieved her through her status as a faculty member was an unusual attainment for a woman, even with a Ph.D., during this period, when, as historian Margaret Rossiter points out, a generation of women anthropologists “did important work and built whole careers on little more than a series of temporary fellowships from the NRC and SSRC” (272). Rossiter finds evidence that women were so successful in earning fellowships from the National Research Council and the Social Science Research Council because of “a tendency [...] to give fellowships to women to ‘tide them over’ while the few [faculty] jobs available went to men” (272). Some male anthropologists, like Edward Sapir, intervened actively to prevent women from gaining faculty positions;⁸ others merely passed over women candidates.⁹ In this context, Reichard’s faculty position, even at a peripheral academic institution, afforded her a rare degree of institutional security.

In examining Morris and Reichard’s field autobiographies, I argue that both anthropologists crafted this hybrid genre in connection to their efforts to convert their expertise into influence. Focusing on Morris’s rhetorical strategies for positioning herself *in the field* and within an appealing professional community, I suggest that Morris used her two popular field autobiographies not only to distribute knowledge but also to actively recruit young women into archaeology. Positioned as a legitimate (if tangential) participant in an archaeological community, Morris crafted arguments that reflected the increasingly professional context of anthropological work and, at the same time, responded to that context by directing young women toward avenues for legitimate participation in the field. By casting the professional

apparatus of her field as learnable, manageable, and welcoming to women, Morris projected into her texts the community of researchers she wanted to be part of, thus endeavoring to shape her discipline through recruitment.

Reichard, already enmeshed in a variety of professional practices, addressed her field autobiography quite clearly toward others inside the discipline, although the book found popular readers as well.¹⁰ In *Spider-Woman* Reichard offers a methodology of ethnographic research, re-positioning the ethnographer as a participant within a particular community, rather than maintaining the fiction of detached observation adopted by many of the major ethnographic works of her contemporaries. As a consequence, Reichard's field autobiography can be seen as posing a challenge to dominant modes of disciplinary knowledge-making practices and as an effort to shape her professional community by modeling an alternative way of inhabiting space as an ethnographer.

Field Autobiographies as a Genre

Field autobiographies constitute a distinct genre primarily through their relations to their intertexts, that is, to the range of texts with which the field autobiography is "relevantly similar ... and relevantly dissimilar" (Frow 48). The relevant intertexts of the field autobiography include the autobiography and the technical report.¹¹ Drawing on elements of these genres, I suggest that Morris and Reichard constructed the field autobiography in order to access particular rhetorical resources—namely, resources for narrating the self in relation to two communities,

the community of anthropologists and the community under investigation. Combining technical detail, methodological awareness, an individual, first-person narrative, and lively, accessible language, field autobiographies allowed Morris and Reichard to position themselves within a discipline and to shape, rhetorically, the contours of those disciplinary communities.

Intertext 1: Autobiography

Field autobiographies, as *autobiographies*, enable their writers to access a range of rhetorical resources, only a few of which can be glossed here briefly. Autobiographical writing authorizes the self to speak, personally, by grounding knowledge in the lived experience of a single individual; consequently, the autobiographer is able to speak from the position of the body, using that embodied position as a strategy for grounding a range of claims. Autobiographical writing in particular offers resources for constructing a rhetor's *ethos* according to the valued terms of a particular community; telling the story of the self, rhetors can construct that self as good, virtuous, daring, reasoned, knowledgeable, untutored, or in other terms that constitute *authority* for the particular community being addressed. Furthermore, autobiographical writing uses the single case of the self to ground arguments that generally seek broader relevance, constructing the self, for instance, as exemplar, as lesson, as exception or as rule, as cautionary tale, or as call to action.¹²

As a distinct hybrid form, field autobiographies are first-person narratives focused on a period of fieldwork; rather than attempting to tell the story of an

individual's life, as a traditional autobiography does, field autobiographies tell the narrower story of an individual's research undertaking. Furthermore, field autobiographies narrate the self in relation to a particular research *site*—a location *in the field*, such as the Chichen Itza ruins in the Yucatan, Canyon del Muerto in Arizona, or on the Navajo reservation, near Gallup, New Mexico. Because they are narratives of an individual's development in relation to a particular site of research, they also function to account for the writer's position in relation to a research *community*. Both Reichard and Morris use the spatial resources of this genre in such a way that their position in space, in their particular field site, stands in for their position in relation to a broader research community. For example, in her field autobiographies Morris emphasizes her practice as an archaeologist and her participation in ongoing archaeological debates and discussions. In doing so, she uses these two autobiographical texts to construct a position for herself *within the field* of archaeology in two senses, simultaneously: within the material site where archaeological research happens, and within the social, intellectual, and discursive milieu of the academic community through which that material site and the practices engaged in there acquire their meaning and value.

Field autobiographies, then, offer these writers a means for forging a relationship between a narrated self, a specific material location, and a broader academic community: in this case, the newly professionalizing disciplines of archaeology and anthropology. For Reichard and Morris, narrating their activity within the material space of the field supports their claims to legitimacy as participants in a professional academic community. This is a more central function

of the field autobiography for Morris than for Reichard, whose credentials, such as her Ph.D. from Columbia and her faculty position at Barnard, also support her claims to membership. For Morris, whose formal field training in archaeology did not result in a Ph.D. or a faculty post, her field autobiographies do much of the rhetorical work of constructing and confirming her identity as a participant in an intellectual community.

Thus the field autobiography joins other autobiographical innovations that narrate not an isolated self, but a self in relation to particular contexts and communities. For instance, just as an autoethnography offers a story of the self in relation to a particular social or cultural group, the field autobiography offers a story of the self in relation to a discipline or profession and a material context of ongoing research. In this focus on the writer's intellectual and disciplinary context, field autobiographies offered Ann Axtell Morris and Gladys Reichard—both of whom were marginalized through the gendered mechanisms of professionalization—an opportunity to construct their field, and their place within it, rhetorically. Because field autobiographies focus on the self in relation to the 'field'—the discipline as well as the spaces where disciplinary work takes place—this genre was particularly useful for women writing themselves into a discipline. The relation between the self and the context—especially the context of anthropological work—is made vivid as writers position themselves in relation to disciplinary practice.

Intertext 2: Technical Reports and Monographs

As official forms for the creation and presentation of field research, technical reports and monographs also offered substantial rhetorical resources that Morris and

Reichard drew upon in creating their field autobiographies. While technical reports and academic monographs vary by discipline, both genres are characterized by the relatively limited audience they seek to address and by their use as (ostensibly) unadorned containers for unembellished technical knowledge. Indeed, contrasting sharply with autobiographical texts, technical reports and monographs are used primarily as *impersonal* sites for knowledge production, wherein the identity of the researcher is minimized as irrelevant to the production of knowledge. Such texts are authorized by their writer's expertise, which reports and monographs simultaneously establish, through networks of review, circulation, and citation that confirm the text's status as knowledge.

The relation between technical reports and field autobiographies is particularly clear in the case of the Morrises' research in the Yucatan. Ann, Earl and their fellow researchers on the Carnegie Institution Chichen Itza Project, including anthropologists Sylvanus Morley, Karl Ruppert, and O.G. Ricketson, had already written and submitted to the Carnegie Institution of Washington a series of yearly research reports, which were published between 1923 and 1929 in the *Carnegie Institution of Washington Year Book*, when Ann began negotiations to write a popular narrative of their dig. The Carnegie Institution of Washington had also published, in 1931, the complete technical report of their research as Publication No. 406, *Temple of the Warriors at Chichen Itza*, in two volumes, with Earl Morris, Ann Morris, and Jean Charlot, the professional artist who had done much of the copying during the dig, as co-authors. This technical report invoked a narrow, specialized audience of antiquarians, archaeologists, and Middle-America specialists. The Morrises'

rhetorical goals in the report were also relatively narrow: to show that the funds received for the excavation were warranted, insofar as they generated clear data to be used in solving ongoing archaeological problems, and to direct future funding decisions by indicating the kinds of further research that might be in order.

In relation to this technical report, Ann Morris's publication of *Digging in Yucatan* accomplishes several further actions *not* achieved in the earlier, official text. First, the field autobiography recasts the specialized knowledge created in the dig and the report into knowledge with broad relevance and interest. Furthermore, *Digging in Yucatan* allows Morris to craft an identity in relation to that knowledge, as well. By broadening their intended audience, writers of field autobiographies not only could circulate knowledge to other constituencies but at the same time could garner *recognition* more broadly as well: recognition for their research and recognition *of* their research identities. For Morris in particular, her identity as an archaeologist, rather than merely an archaeologist's wife, was constructed and circulated broadly through the publication of *Digging in Yucatan*, especially through her portrayals of herself as an active participant rather than an observer. Whereas her technical writing had been embedded within *others'* publications—particularly, as subsections within Morley's annual reports in the Carnegie *Year Books* and in the co-authored final Carnegie publication—Morris's field autobiographies were singly-authored and widely-circulated, garnering support for her status as an independent researcher.¹³

In relation to this rhetorical action in particular, it must be noted that not every popular account of a research project functions as a field autobiography of the kind I am describing. Earl Morris also published a popular version of the Chichen

Itza dig in 1931, titled *Temple of the Warriors*, after the largest and most impressive structure unearthed at the Chichen Itza site. *Temple of the Warriors*, however, is not autobiographical; its focus, as indicated by its title, remains entirely upon the *find*. Earl Morris's goal in the popular book is to convey to a lay audience the significance and interest of the excavated temple. Ann Morris's title, *Digging in Yucatan*, indicates the difference in focus of her autobiographical text, which does not only portray the temples excavated, but also narrates the *process* of excavation and implies an autobiographical subject who performs the "digging" of the title.

In describing the genres related to the field autobiography, I do not suggest that this genre was already in existence, waiting for Reichard and Morris to simply select this genre from among many as a container for their particular communications. On the contrary, "texts do not simply have uses which are mapped out in advance by the genre: they are themselves *uses of genre*, performances of or allusions to the norms and conventions which form them and which they may, in turn, transform" (Frow 25). What, then, do Reichard and Morris use this genre *for*? Through the detailed analyses below, I argue that Morris uses the genre as a method of rhetorical recruitment, persuading other women of the pleasures of fieldwork and directing them toward avenues for occupying this field. Reichard's use of the field autobiography is similar, as she positions herself in relation to a specific site of research, and uses the specific spatial resources of this genre to position herself strategically as an ethnographer. Furthermore, Reichard positions herself within a particular *family* with whom she shares social and material space; in doing so, she

offers a model for other anthropologists—others who are already disciplinary insiders—to emulate as methodology. Combining first-person narrative with attention to research practices and procedures, Morris and Reichard use the field autobiography to garner ethos through specific “strategies of placement” (Christoph) that locate them within material and discursive environments, to address audiences including disciplinary insiders and potential recruits, and ultimately to create space for themselves and their intellectual projects within a refigured field.

Inhabiting the Field: Ethos and Rhetorical Recruitment in *Digging in Yucatan* and *Digging in the Southwest*

The phenomenal success of Ann Axtell Morris’s two popular books, *Digging in Yucatan* (1931) and *Digging in the Southwest* (1933), made Morris one of the most famous archaeologists of her day. *Digging in Yucatan* dramatically exceeded her editors’ expectations, going into multiple printings and producing boxes of fan mail for Morris. Helen Ferris, the first Editor-in-Chief of the Junior Literary Guild, the Doubleday division that brought out the book, herself wrote to Morris to announce that everyone at Doubleday was “perfectly delighted with the reception” her first book received. Ferris called the early reviews “perfectly grand” and encouraged Morris to proceed immediately with writing whatever book she planned to undertake next.¹⁴ Reviewers of both books repeatedly praised Morris’s “zest and knowledge and humor” as well as her skillful ability to “enable any one new to archaeology to understand what it is all about ... and why archaeology is interesting and important.”¹⁵ That *Digging in the Southwest* was a selection not only of the Junior

Literary Guild but of the Scientific Book Club as well suggests Morris's appeal not just for the high-school-aged readers targeted by her publishers but also for adults.¹⁶

Brisk sales of the books continued through the 1940s.¹⁷

Morris's rhetorical aims included not just circulating accurate information about human prehistory, but also representing the methods, aims, and procedures that characterized the discipline of archaeology itself. As many reviews of her books make clear, Morris was particularly adept at translating technical information concerning not only the content but also the *practice* of archaeology. One *New York Times* review of *Digging in the Southwest* notes that Morris explains "how the archaeologist goes about his work, the fundamental ideas which are always observed and the specific techniques that automatically come into play," including both the "aims" and the "general rules" that guide archaeological research (23). Reviews aimed at high-school aged readers also emphasized the procedural knowledge to be gained from Morris's books. A review of "New Children's Books," also in the *New York Times*, notes that *Digging in the Southwest* will be especially appealing to high-school aged readers with a latent interest in archaeology, for whom the book will not only "stir their enthusiasm" but will also "give them a realization of what it means to follow archaeology as a calling" (16).¹⁸ For both adult and young adult readers, Morris's popular books educated audiences about the *methods* and *practices* of archaeology, not just the dramatic unearthing of rich buried treasures. The procedural focus of Morris's popular texts, in combination with the *ethos* strategies I examine below, suggests that Morris's books can be read as rhetorical recruitment tools. Through the *ethos* she creates to position herself relative to disciplinary

insiders and traditional gender roles, and her representation of archaeologists as a community of specialists ready to welcome all careful, qualified practitioners, Morris's popular texts offer to initiate readers—like the budding archaeologist Alice Ruth Bruce—into her discipline.

Morris creates a persuasive *ethos* as an archaeologist by positioning herself *in the field* in multiple ways. As Nedra Reynolds has pointed out, the rhetorical concept of *ethos* retains not only social but also spatial dimensions, as rhetors often “inscribe *who* they are by showing *where* they are” (“Ethos” 325). Morris's writing emphasizes her presence in field excavations and her independent initiation into the discipline to establish her identity as an archaeologist, not merely an archaeologist's *wife*. Though both books concern digs directed by her husband, archaeologist Earl Halstead Morris—first his Carnegie-funded excavation of Mayan ruins at Chichen Itza in the Yucatan, and then the series of excavations Earl and Ann pursued in Canyon del Muerto in Arizona—Morris highlights her own work digging, painting, interpreting data, and collaborating in all aspects of the projects, not merely observing the archaeological activities of others. She is careful to show that her interest in archaeology preceded, rather than followed, her marriage to an archaeologist (*Southwest* 12-16) and describes in detail the “gorgeous year” she spent receiving formal field training at the American School of Prehistoric Archaeology in France (*Southwest* 13-14). Despite her training, Morris did not initially have a formal role in Earl's Chichen Itza project.¹⁹ Nevertheless, in a chapter in *Digging in Yucatan* titled “I Excavate a Temple Myself,” Morris relates how she located a small temple buried near the larger Chichen Itza excavation, deduced its ceremonial significance, and

quickly secured permission to excavate it herself. Morris convinces Sylvanus Morley, Director of Middle American Archaeological Research for the Carnegie Institution, to give her charge of the temple by demonstrating to Morley and to her audiences how quickly and competently she could direct the excavation. Because she is willing to “throw in the wages of a competent director free” (153)—that is, direct this side project herself without pay—Morris convinces Morley that “the whole thing seems such a bargain we couldn’t afford not to do it” (153). Through this exchange Morris bolsters her authority and positions herself at the head of her own project, “bossing my own gang of workers on my very own mound” (154). Minimizing her secondary role in the Yucatan project, and highlighting in both books the significance of those finds she can claim as her own, Morris generates *ethos* by positioning herself in the field of archaeology as an active, independent researcher, working her “own mound.”²⁰

Occupying the physical space of “the field” is crucial in Morris’s rhetorical efforts to establish her *ethos* in relation to gender norms and to recruit women into archaeology. In emphasizing her field activities, Morris resists (both physical and rhetorical) confinement to domestic spaces and lays claim to a research identity that legitimates her presence in the deserts and jungles where her archaeological work takes place. Furthermore, Morris constructs “the field” as a space outside of traditional gender boundaries, a space where women, as researchers, can find both intellectual stimulation and greater freedom of movement and activity. Frequently Morris represents herself playfully transgressing gender norms. For instance, she quips in *Digging in the Southwest* that if her respectable parents had handed out

marriage announcements, they would have had to acknowledge that the newly married couple could be found “at home (in a tent) [in] Canyon of the Dead, Arizona” (11). She represents herself after her marriage as not saddled with domestic duties, but instead “definitely homeless” (11), likely to use the word “home” to refer to “hotel, house, or apartment, to my birthplace or where my luggage is stored, to a straw-thatched tropical hut, to a Spanish hacienda, to a flapping khaki tent in the desert, or even to a tentless bedroll spread beneath the stars” (11). Evoking distance, mobility, and adventure through this list of the variety of spaces that one *could* call “home,” Morris offers an appealing portrait of the freedom of movement and identity that a woman could find through archaeological fieldwork.

In fact, her portrayal of fieldwork recasts domestic disruption as escape from confinement. She positively delights in the dangers—or adventures—of archaeological fieldwork. On her first professional trip to the southwest, Morris writes,

Almost immediately I was nearly starved and drowned, not once but several times, and thereupon decided that my whole previous existence had been but a grey little soft shadow of the perfectly grand possibilities that life could offer to a person who would take the trouble to investigate. (17)

In a discipline where women’s presumed inability to cope with the discomforts of fieldwork helped to keep many women cataloguing in museums rather than participating in digs (Parezo and Hardin 285), Morris’s portrayal of dangers and

discomforts as “perfectly grand possibilities” has a strongly gendered resonance. She acknowledges that freedom from gender constraints represents a significant portion of the appeal of a profession that “furnishes all the excitement of treasure-seeking decently concealed under the respectable cloak of science” (*Southwest* 12). Regardless of what her gendered identity might circumscribe, Morris dons the “respectable cloak” of her professional identity to access physical spaces that were coded as wild and remote, and to challenge the contention that domestic concerns should hold priority over intellectual pursuits for women.

Morris includes many photographs in the two books that both substantiate her *ethos* as a legitimate archaeologist and extend the appeal of her profession to potential women initiates by constructing the field as a space where gendered considerations are secondary. Many photographs, for instance, visually reinforce Morris’s argument that women and archaeology are well-suited, by showing Morris happily engaged in work while surrounded by vast desert expanses, dramatic ruins, and excavated mummies. She grins at the camera while poised above a Basket Maker grave she has just uncovered (*Southwest* Fig. 11); she displays the results of her small Yucatan excavation in a photograph titled “I Proudly Exhibit the Beautiful and Fragmentary Sculptured Panel from My Temple to Dr. Morley” (*Yucatan* Fig. 25). In other images Morris hangs from a rope against the sheer face of a cliff wall (*Southwest* Fig. 26) and perches atop the domed roof of a house, still under construction (*Yucatan* Fig. 21), representing herself undaunted by the dangers attendant upon archaeological work.

Several photographs show her happily subverting gender norms. To an image of Morris in front of a canvas tent surrounded by rocks and rubble, she attaches the exuberantly ironic caption “Woman’s place is in the home!” (*Southwest* Fig. 30). Another, captioned “Mr. and Mrs. Earl Morris at Home,” shows their small tent, dwarfed by the imposing landscape, with a thin plume of smoke indicating that they are “home” to receive callers. Such photographs assert that the trappings of middle-class domesticity—including confinement indoors and the routine of receiving social calls—lose their claim upon an archaeologist engaged in professional pursuits. The many images Morris includes in these books both register her recognition that women’s archaeological fieldwork could seem an affront to gender conventions and simultaneously offer visual support to her argument that women are suited for archaeological careers.

Representing herself as a legitimate archaeologist and archaeology as an appealing profession is only one strategy Morris deploys in her rhetorical recruitment efforts in her popular books. Morris also constructs the community of professional archaeologists as one in which knowledgeable, trained women are welcome to participate. She makes this argument forcefully, for example, when she recounts in detail her interactions with a large gathering of archaeologists in Gallup, New Mexico. As she moves in and out of their conversations, she translates insider information for her non-insider audience, models the questions and responses likely to excite or irritate professionals, displays her familiarity with the discursive norms that mark one as a legitimate participant, and explains for her readers the significance of the obscure, internal arguments that animate this archaeological

community (*Southwest* 18-20). She makes her own status as a “full-fledged” archaeologist clear while also *sharing* access with her audience, rather than withholding insider information by treating it as too complex for non-specialists.

Although she highlights the variety of knowledge an archaeologist must attain—including knowledge of geology, botany, zoology, chemistry, as well as “the processes of preserving fragile specimens” (*Yucatan* 8)—she does not make acquiring such knowledge seem daunting. Morris in fact summarizes a great deal of complex information in both books, asserting that the “immediate result” of her summaries will be to make “you, my gentle reader, quite as learned in the essentials as myself” (*Southwest* 38). Learning from this book, Morris suggests, is a step toward fuller participation in an archaeological community, and she offers herself as an example of archaeologists’ willingness to share their knowledge with newcomers. For those who would move from knowledgeable outsider to full-fledged insider, the archaeological community has clear entry requirements, which Morris spells out in the opening chapters of both *Yucatan* and *Southwest*. For women and men who are “hard-boiled about facts” but who never “object to ants in the porridge, nor think of Indians as low-down dirty savages” (*Southwest* 22), archaeology offers clear avenues for entry into a warm community of “thoroughbred good sports, witty conversationalists, and loyal friends” (*Southwest* 19) and, for young women especially, enormous payoffs in terms of freedom from gender constraints.

Morris’s emphasis on knowledge, training and expertise reflects the newly professionalized context of archaeology and anthropology between the wars, but it also responds productively to professionalization by alerting potential archaeologists

to the new requirements for participation in this discipline. Morris strongly discourages untrained archaeologists, arguing that

once [anyone] breaks ground in the study of a particular location, that site is ruined beyond all help for anyone else. If he misses a single observation, that fact, and it might be an invaluable one, is lost for all time. Hence, you see, the responsibility is tremendous. (*Yucatan* 6).

Justifying her anti-amateur position by appealing to a researcher's responsibility toward "facts" themselves, Morris reflects the prevailing faith in empiricism and technical expertise. But her position can also be seen as a pragmatic recognition of changing institutional realities. Historians Nancy Parezo and Margaret Hardin have pointed out that some interwar publications such as the *Independent Woman* encouraged women who lacked specialized training to volunteer in museums as a way to gain entry into more demanding archaeological work (Parezo and Hardin 285)—a contention that was mostly misleading, for in the newly professionalized context amateurs were almost never advanced to positions of authority or integrated into professional hierarchies. In contrast, Morris highlights higher education and formal training as necessary precursors for fieldwork. Pragmatically, this emphasis encouraged interested readers like Alice Ruth Bruce to seek the credentials and formal training without which they could be barred from participation.

Evidence from Morris's correspondence suggests that her books did indeed guide young women (and men) toward avenues for professional preparation. In response to a request from Doubleday editor Dorothy Bryan, who asked Morris for fan mail that could be quoted to promote a reprinting of her *Yucatan* book, Morris

returns “a couple of letters from young female archaeologist fans” who “wanted to know where to go to college and what to take after they got there that would make them into full fledged archaeologists.”²¹ Another Doubleday editor, Margaret Lesser, wrote to Morris emphasizing the demand for “vocational” books among young women readers. Lesser asks Morris to write more about her experiences in archaeological field school in France, prompting her to emphasize the “vocational” aspect of her archaeological work: “Are there many such [field schools] in the world, particularly where girls are admitted, and have you ever thought of doing a story for older girls based on your experiences before you became a full fledged archaeologist?” Lesser goes on to explain that

Girls are keen about those kind of stories which have some sort of vocational background and judging from their enthusiasm for you and your archaeological adventures in non-fiction, I am sure they would have just as much interested [sic] in anything you wrote that had some basis in actuality. (Lesser to Morris, 4 Jan. 1935)

Lesser’s correspondence highlights some of the historical factors contributing to Morris’s enormous success as a popular anthropologist during the interwar period, especially the keen interest among young women in “vocational” texts and the burgeoning demand for publications that would prepare women for positions in professional and public life. Emphasizing technical expertise, careful research, and intellectual training as requirements for entry into a discipline that offered women mobility, community, and excitement under a “respectable” scientific cloak, Morris

alerts her “young female archaeologist fans” to the training they will need to participate within a changing professional context.

Whether the requisite training would also be sufficient to ensure *full* professional participation is another matter, one Morris largely elides in her field autobiographies. Neither Morris nor her editors appear to question Morris’s status as a “full-fledged archaeologist” or, indeed, to question whether other young women could achieve similar status simply by pursuing an appropriate sequence of coursework, field training, and professional field experience. Indeed, the professionalization of anthropology—and many other disciplines in the early twentieth-century—seemed to offer many benefits that would *enable* women’s fuller participation. In its professionalized form, anthropology offered clearer standards, recognized avenues for gaining expertise, and an explicit, rationalized system of professional hurdles and incentives. Compared with earlier, more mysterious and idiosyncratic avenues for entry into the field, such a rationalized system seemed able to neutralize gender-based discrimination and clear the way for women, through professional training, to gain access to professional status.

Yet in fact the inclusive group of “thoroughbred good sports, witty conversationalists, and loyal friends” who Morris portrays as her professional community represents an ideal that was unevenly realized in practice, and indeed in Morris’s own experience. For instance, even though Ann had field training as an archaeologist, the first season’s Chichen Itza report from Sylvanus Morley to the Carnegie Institution of Washington states that, in addition to a paid staff of six,

“Mrs. E. H. Morris was of invaluable aid in copying the mural paintings from the Temple of the Warriors and in assisting Mr. Morris in connection with the excavations and repair work” (Carnegie Yearbook 1924: 247). In subsequent yearly reports, Ann is listed among the staff as “Mrs. E. H. Morris, artist” when she begins to be paid a very small monthly stipend for her work copying murals.²² Even when the yearly reports Morley submitted included Ann’s own reports of the excavations she was undertaking in relation to the larger Chichen Itza project, she is identified with designations—assistant and artist—that contest her identifications as a “full-fledged archaeologist.” This discrepancy does not suggest that Morris’s portrayals of her discipline were *inaccurate*; instead, the inclusive disciplinary community, willing to respect and reward all trained, hard-working members, represents the profession that women like Morris and Reichard were working to achieve.

Addressing a Profession: Space and Methodology in *Spider-Woman*

Reichard, like Morris, had reason to wish that her disciplinary community achieved its ideals of inclusiveness more nearly and distributed its rewards for intellectual achievement more evenly than it did. Although Reichard enjoyed a firmer institutional position than her friend and colleague Morris, she, too, found that gender affected her professional opportunities and constrained the influence her work achieved. Reichard, writing to Morris in 1932, thanks Morris for “root[ing] for” her to receive Carnegie funding, but adds skeptically:

I shall believe something comes of it only when it does. Nothing has yet. But it will come about as follows: Kidder will speak of it to Sapir. The latter will answer if not the words at least the spirit, why bother with such a moron as that? Now I, I have lots of students who could do the work and do it well why don't you take this one, or that one, etc. And then he will.

Predicting that she will not receive the Carnegie funds, Reichard constructs a dialogue between two other eminent anthropologists, A. V. Kidder, who had received financial support from Carnegie for a long series of projects in the same geographical area where Reichard worked as well, and Edward Sapir, the most prominent linguist of the period who held faculty positions at Yale and then the University of Chicago. The dialogue, in which men affiliated with powerful institutions privately pass judgment on the work of a woman ("such a moron as that") and collude to share professional rewards amongst themselves, is fabricated; nevertheless, through this imagined scene between Kidder and Sapir, Reichard underscores important realities faced by woman seeking to participate as "full-fledged" members of a professionalized community.

First, Reichard registers that rewards such as research funding are not apportioned strictly according to professional merits, but that informal networks of influence can be exploited to keep qualified women from receiving rewards their work might merit. In this instance, Reichard predicts that the *student* of one of her colleagues will receive the funding, rather than she as an established and widely published scholar; informal relationships, unreasonable dislike, selfish guarding of

resources—all these continue to exert power within professional communities, despite the apparent rationality of professionalization. Second, Reichard grimly recognizes that her own network of informal relationships carries less weight than another's; Morris's support, though kindly extended, exerts less influence than Kidder's or Sapir's would. Women in tenuous institutional positions were less able to exert their influence to benefit others in their network, thus sharing their marginality as much as they shared their support.

Insisting that she is “not cynical for nothing,” Reichard goes on to detail a series of slights and professional snubs:

do I ever get asked to teach the Southwest Laboratory or to talk at the symposium of the A. A. A. or to write for the Social Science Encyclopedia, or any of the things that get advertising. Note the review of my Navajo book, four years after its appearance in the last number of the *Anthropologist*! [...] I am not saying I have not had good opportunities for doing just what I want to do, but it is all on account of Papa Franz and I am sure I would not get a cent if it were not for him.

Again Reichard indicates her awareness that professional resources are neither allocated solely on merit nor shared happily amongst a community of friends. Instead, activities that “get advertising”—ranging from influencing the training of younger anthropologists at the Southwest Laboratory to representing the discipline to other social scientists through the Social Science Encyclopedia—also garner visibility and professional rewards. The recognition that her current professional assets, such

as her faculty position at Barnard, could be credited to the support of her influential advisor seems to offer Reichard little comfort.

Connecting professional insults more explicitly to gender, Reichard muses, “There must be something wrong somewhere but for the life of me I cannot figure it out.” Wondering whether the “something wrong” lies in her personality, as a “temperamental failing,” or elsewhere, Reichard notes the similarity between her professional disappointments and those faced by other women: “I can’t forget too that Carnegie promised Bunny a job and then fell down on it. Things like that hurt one’s faith.” “Bunny” in this incident is Ruth Bunzel, whom Boas called “one of the best among the younger people” (Deacon 269), and who spent years setting up an ambitious, interdisciplinary Carnegie-funded research project in Guatemala that would involve geographers, archaeologists, linguists, historians, and other experts, only to find herself replaced as project director in 1933 by Sol Tax, a new male Ph.D. who lacked her experience and qualifications. Although the anthropologists responsible for the decision, including Kidder and Alfred Tozzer, circulated rumors about “improprieties” that led to her replacement—rumors which Bunzel said were “made up by someone out of whole cloth”²³—a number of women anthropologists countered these rumors in their correspondence with one another and identified Bunzel’s removal from the project as gender discrimination rather than individual failure. In her letter to Morris, Reichard justifies her cynicism through her own history of professional slights and by linking her experiences with those of other talented, qualified, highly-trained women who found that professionalization

complicated, rather than clarified, the workings of gender in the “welcoming science” of anthropology.

In the context of these complexities and professional disappointments, Reichard perpetually sought avenues for influencing her discipline. Like Morris, Reichard experienced firsthand the significant ways in which their professional community failed to welcome equally all talented, qualified practitioners, and attempted in response to shape that community through her writing. While Morris used the resources of the field autobiography genre to influence her discipline by recruiting outsiders, in the rest of this section I argue that Reichard used the genre’s resources—especially resources for narrating the self in relation to a particular community and material context—to influence the practices of other insiders within her discipline. By narrating her research process in her 1934 field autobiography *Spider-Woman*, Reichard offers her particular experience as an example for other ethnographers to follow. Specifically, by deploying a series of spatial concepts, including scale, frame, vantage point, and threshold, she crafts in *Spider-Woman* a narrative argument regarding *how* anthropologists can be, and should be, positioned within the communities they study.

Space in Ethnographic Monographs

In developing this genre to address her fellow professionals, Reichard’s use of space acquires much of its methodological import through its contrast with the spatial features of the prominent academic genre, the monograph. Before

characterizing more closely Reichard's use of scale, frame, threshold, and vantage point to advance a methodological argument in *Spider-Woman*, I briefly review the spatial strategies of Robert Redfield's widely praised 1930 monograph, *Tepoztlán, A Mexican Village*. This monograph, an exemplary text in its time, epitomizes the configurations of distance, knowledge, and power that characterized ethnographic monographs during this period. As such, Redfield's spatial strategies offer an important counterpoint to the innovations—rhetorical and methodological—that Reichard sought, through *Spider-Woman*, to introduce.

From the beginning of *Tepoztlán*, Redfield positions his observer at a great distance from the object of his study, while also portraying that observer as already an expert whose authority is in place from the beginning. Redfield introduces the reader to Tepoztlán, the village where he locates his study, through a scale that initially can only be described as atmospheric. Redfield positions himself at a point high enough above the continent to take in at a glance the entire geophysical space of Mexico, viewing its central plateau “bounded on the north by a tableland which dips down northward into a region where the rainfall is too slight for agriculture” (17) and “on the other three sides ... by steep escarpments which rise three thousand feet above the plateau before falling sharply away to the sea” (17). From this scale he provides a series of frames which focus the viewer closer and closer in to the village, constructing in the process a series of relations that between the sites he glimpses: the continent, the country, the central plateau, the state of Morelos, the ring of mountains that surround the village, and finally, Tepoztlán itself, the subject of his study. Through this series of frames, and especially through a center/periphery

organizational device that he uses repeatedly to situate each frame relative to the next, Redfield constructs the site of his study as a microcosm, with relations at one scale exactly copied onto the scales above and below. The relations of center and periphery Redfield observes at the scale of the continent also inhere at the scale of the state and, finally, in the cultural processes he observes in the village: “The village, like Mexico itself, has a center and a periphery” (17). Redfield’s spatial choices result in a portrayal of Tepoztlán as maintaining an analogous relation to a series of larger-scale environments within which the village is nested. Furthermore, the repeated device of center and periphery creates an impression of necessity surrounding Redfield’s ethnographic data; he initially implies, then later states outright, that he observes identical center/periphery relations in each successive frame because the environment itself shapes the cultural dynamics that play out within it.

Redfield also constructs a particular vantage point for his observer relative to the landscape he has mapped out. That vantage point is one characterized by domination and distance. Even when positioned within the scale of the state, Redfield ascends to the highest point at the northern edge of the state and from *there*, from a great height, he looks down toward the mountains to locate the village below. One important rhetorical consequence of these spatial choices is that Redfield portrays the ethnographer occupying a position of extreme distance and yet possessing, even at the very beginning of the monograph, knowledge so expansive that it borders on omniscience. His vision encompasses a country; it is powerful enough to scan a state and pick out one village for ethnographic attention from

amidst a “maze of slighter mountains that from this eminence are no more than hills” (21). Although located at an extreme of distance, the ethnographer maintains unshakeable authority. The ethnographer also shares his powerful vision with his readers, who are likewise in possession of a vision powerful enough to identify an object of knowledge from such a great height.

The spatial concepts of scale, frame, and vantage point are put to quite different use in Reichard’s *Spider-Woman*. In crafting a field autobiography rather than an academic monograph like Redfield’s, Reichard accesses resources for combining technical knowledge with narrative. She uses those resources ultimately to advance an argument about *how* an anthropologist creates knowledge out of the particular, local context of field research. Reichard’s ethnographer, unlike Redfield’s, is not positioned as *already knowing* from the start. Instead, Reichard uses the narrative resources of an autobiographical genre to describe the process of creating ethnographic knowledge, which, in *Spider-Woman*, is a process of *learning* from others, forming relations, and sharing space. Observation from a distance—particularly from the remote locations of atmosphere and mountaintop that Redfield adopts—would be not only impossible but, according to the method Reichard advocates, also unenlightening. Instead, Reichard uses spatial concepts of scale, framing, and vantage point to *inscribe* the ethnographer within a particular local environment, to portray knowledge-making as an educational process, and to include the ethnographer’s self within the frame of ethnographic study. The observer Reichard portrays in *Spider-Woman* is herself subject to scrutiny and embedded within the kind of ongoing human relations that, in fact, make *knowing* possible.

Scale

The scale of Reichard's observation never moves as far from her subjects as Redfield's; her perspective remains steadfastly local. Reichard begins the narrative already at a degree of closeness to her subjects that contrasts sharply with Redfield's. The opening sentences of *Spider-Woman* begin at a much more intimate scale:

White-Sands lay silent and motionless in the dead light of mid-afternoon. Here and there a soft, capricious wind stirred up a tiny whirl of dust. A muffled lazy cluck came from a contented huddle of feathers where a hen leisurely gave herself a dust bath... (1).

Reichard's ethnographer observes the scene, at the opening of this text, with a human rather than an omniscient vision. Although Reichard will move beyond the small community of White-Sands over the course of the book—eventually traveling into neighboring communities, sometimes over long distances as her movements follow the movements of the family and community with whom she lives—these communities are linked laterally rather than vertically, as in Redfield's text. That is, the spaces Reichard moves through are adjacent, laid alongside each other, rather than stacked in a way that suggests the necessary correspondence between large-scale environments and small-scale community and family processes.

Frame

Additionally, rather than creating a series of telescoping frames that imply neat relationships between successive spaces, Reichard uses the concept of framing to

include herself within the activity she observes. As she introduces the reader to the subject of her ethnographic research, she neither removes herself from view nor assumes a disembodied stance like that adopted by Redfield:

Now Old-Mexican's-Son, the trader, who is introducing me, directs a witty greeting to the woman at the loom. She, for the first time, shows awareness of our presence. We enter. The trader, who is at home in this Indian family, after pushing aside several dogs, uncertainly tolerant, and removing a pile of wool set out for the carding, finds himself a place on a soft sheepskin where he half reclines, lighting his pipe. The woman interrupts her weaving long enough to turn on me a gleaming smile and to indicate a strong low box on which I, being a stranger, may sit. As we talk and smoke, the woman weaves, her swiftly moving fingers causing the blanket to grow visibly. As I watch, I am consumed with envy mingled with admiration, for this is what I have come to learn. (3).

In this passage, Reichard simultaneously introduces herself to the reader and to the woman weaving. The reader witnesses Reichard's situation at the onset of her research: she is greeted, but a stranger. She does not begin from a position of knowledge; she has explicitly "come to learn." The physical details of this initial encounter are not erased but registered—the dogs, the smoke, the piles of wool and the box where Reichard sits. Even the influence of Reichard upon the scene is noted; the woman "interrupts her weaving" as Reichard enters; although the interruption is momentary, it affirms that Reichard is present, herself an element in the scene, not

merely a disembodied eye whose observations have no effect. As another reader of *Spider-Woman* has noted, the difference between Reichard's textual technique and that of standard ethnographic writing is striking in this passage, where Reichard manages to "evoke a sense of place while keeping herself fully within the frame of reference though not the center of attention" (Frazier 364).

Not only in this initial encounter, but throughout the field autobiography, Reichard's activities remain visible to her readers, included within the frame of her analysis. She walks, sits, cooks, asks questions, drives herself and other members of the community from place to place, relaxes, reads, engages in community disputes, and, above all else, *weaves*. Learning to weave, as the student of Maria Antonia and her daughter Atlnaba, takes place for Reichard in relation to a much more wide-ranging and ongoing participation in the life of this family and community. Unlike most ethnographic texts, *Spider-Woman* does not relegate that participation to a field diary or a brief statement of method, but includes it within the knowledge-making frame of the book.

Vantage Point

The perspective Reichard adopts for her ethnographic observer keeps her in contact with, rather than separated from, the people whose community she participates in. For instance, at the end of her first day of learning to weave, Reichard sits on top of the home that Red-Point's family has given over to her and observes this setting while she considers what her short time under this family's instruction has already taught her:

I take my bed roll outside my house, lay it on the gentle smooth slope of my housetop, a vantage point from which the whole settlement may be observed. [...] Leaning against my bed roll, I have leisure to enjoy the panorama. [...] My eye roves from the rose-colored sand still covered with gray-green grass because of late rains, to the hoar-green sagebrush and over the somewhat lumpy plain abundantly dotted with pine and juniper. (13)

Quickly, people enter into this panorama: Ninaba, a granddaughter of Maria Antonia, brings a herd of sheep into their corral for the evening; Maria Antonia chops wood; others begin preparations for their evening meal. From her vantage point atop the small mound her cellar-like home is dug from, she observes the family life surrounding her:

Fire gleams through the cracks of the shade made of odds and ends fitted about the piñon tree where Maria Antonia does her summer work. She is out at the woodpile making the chips fly. Her beehive of activity is within calling, but not within talking, distance of me. The smoke of her cedar fire, mingled with the pungent odor of the sage stirred up by the chewing goats, and with the dust of their pawing, is wafted to me on the gentlest and coolest of breezes. (14)

By sounds, sights, and smells, Reichard notes carefully the degree to which these two women share the same space. She articulates their distance precisely: Maria Antonia is “within calling, but not within talking, distance.” That Reichard’s vantage point is an embodied one is emphasized by the smells that connect the elements in this scene:

Maria Antonia cooking, the goats stirring up dust and sage as Ninaba guides them. Reichard's positioning as an ethnographer is specific, embodied, and is not effaced but is located within the text. The *process* by which she comes to understand the practices of weaving, the lives of the women who teach her, and the broader Navajo community that surrounds and enables these activities—a process enacted from Reichard's embodied and embedded positioning—constitutes the narrative told in this field autobiography.

The Ethnographic Threshold

One spatial concept that Reichard exploits with particular richness is the concept of the threshold. Early in her entry into the community where she will study, Reichard positions herself on the threshold of Maria Antonia's home: "We stand respectfully at the doorway for a time, looking in and allowing our eyes to become accustomed to the dimness of the light, a contrast to the harsh glare from which we came" (2). By embedding this moment within an ongoing narrative, Reichard refers here to a specific threshold: that dividing Maria Antonia's private space from the surrounding community. The home on the other side of this threshold is a specific one, filled with the material markers of habitation:

The house bulges with life. Bursting sacks of wool hang from its sides. Long, clean, brightly colored skeins of spun yarn hang from the beams and loom posts. The box on the floor at the woman's side has strands of pink and red, orange and green.... A cat rubs our legs... (3).

The specificity of Reichard's description makes it clear that she stands at the threshold of a particular home, the home of her teacher Maria Antonia whom Reichard is momentarily to meet.

But Reichard's language in this passage also suggests that this moment at the threshold has a figurative importance in Reichard's methodological argument as well. For instance, Reichard's *response* to this threshold is part of her methodology: she observes local customs—the politeness of standing at a threshold before entering a home. She also makes this moment, standing on a threshold, symbolic of a particular attitude toward what she will encounter as an ethnographer: “allowing our eyes to become accustomed” indicates an expectation of adjustment on the part of the ethnographer in coming to inhabit a new space. Becoming accustomed requires time, patience, and an expectant attitude. The passage also indicates Reichard's attitude toward the processes by which an ethnographer comes to know; Reichard poised on this threshold is not passing from a state of all-knowing into utter confusion; nor from a state of utter confusion to one of total knowledge. Although the ethnographer-at-the-threshold recognizes that the circumstances inside are different—dimness, rather than glare—Reichard portrays these as differences of degree rather than absolutes.

In deploying these spatial strategies in her ethnographic novel, Reichard ultimately constructs a methodology for ethnographic fieldwork. In calling Reichard's practices and their representation a “methodology,” I mean that they constitute “a theory of research, methods and representation embodied in ethnographic practice” (Frazier 363).²⁴ Reichard positions the ethnographer within

specific spatial configurations relative to the community she studies. That position is embodied; the body, occupying space, moves and acts and interacts within an ongoing situation. This situation, crucially, involves other specific bodies and personalities and families as well, not simply a series of interchangeable informants. The position Reichard adopts and advocates places her neither as an objective outsider whose distance confers knowledge, nor as an immediate and automatic participant, empowered by “the ethnographer’s magic” to achieve a degree of knowledge denied even to cultural insiders themselves. Instead, the ethnographer is emblemized at the threshold of a specific home, in a specific moment, inhabiting a particular body, and adopting a disposition to learn. Reichard’s methodological statement also encompasses *representation* of the ethnographic process; she inscribes her presence into her text, because how that observing, learning self is positioned bears a crucial relationship to the nature of the knowledge being produced. Including herself within the frame, Reichard both treats the ethnographer as a subject for scrutiny and portrays the ethnographer as embedded within ethical relations, human and familial contexts that demand a degree of accountability and acknowledgement that the monograph does not include.

¹ For generously sharing materials from her ongoing research, I thank Dr. Inga Calvin, archaeologist at the University of Colorado-Boulder, who is currently conducting research for the first biography of Ann Axtell Morris. I also thank Elizabeth Morris and the Morris Family Collections for the use of Ann Axtell Morris's correspondence.

² This perception of new vocational possibilities for women during the 1920s and 1930s is evident in the publication of an enormous number of guides to vocations and professions for women during this period, such as Eli Witwer Weaver's *Profitable Vocations for Girls* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1915); Catherine Filene's *Careers for Women* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1920), which she revised as *Careers for Women: New Ideas, New Methods, New Opportunities to Fit a New World* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1934); Frances Perkins' *Vocations for the Trained Woman; Opportunities Other Than Teaching* (New York: Longman, Green, & Co., 1921); Fanny Dunlap and Alice Sarah Johnson's *Vocations for College Women: A Reading List, for the Bureau of Vocational Information* (New York: American Library Association, 1925); Mattie Lloyd Wooten's *Classified List of Vocations and Professions for Trained Women* (Denton, TX: Texas State College for Women, 1931); and Adah Pierce and Werrett Wallace Charter's *Vocations for Women* (New York: Macmillan, 1933). Studies from the period, which typically examined current conditions in an effort to guide women toward friendly fields and to suggest improvements in unfriendly fields, include Elizabeth Kemper Adams' *Women Professional Workers: A Study Made for the Women's Educational and Industrial Union* (New York: Macmillan, 1921) and Edith Morley's *Women Workers in Seven Professions: A Survey of Their Economic Conditions and Prospects, Edited for the Studies Committee of the Fabian Women's Group* (London: Routledge/ New York: E. P. Dutton, 1914). For scholarly treatments of the rise in women's participation in professional work and belief in the openness of various fields to women's participation, see Barbara Harris, *Beyond Her Sphere: Women and the Professions in American History* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978); Penina Migdal Glazer and Miriam Slater, *Unequal Colleagues: The Entrance of Women Into the Professions, 1890-1940* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1987); Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890-1935* (New York: Oxford UP, 1991); Rosalyn Baxandall and Linda Gordon, eds., *America's Working Women: A Documentary History, 1600 to the Present*, 2nd ed. (New York: Norton, 1995); and Francesca Sawaya, *Modern Women, Modern Work: Domesticity, Professionalism, and American Writing, 1890-1950* (Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P, 2004).

³ See Carnegie Institution of Washington *Year Books*, 1924-1932.

⁴ This situation was unfortunately common among early married anthropologists, archaeologists, and other professional scientists. See Parezo; Rossiter. Lamphere, in "Gladys Reichard Among the Navajo," suggests that Reichard was successful in earning a faculty position in part *because* she was unmarried and thus was perceived as having greater need for an institutional position, at least by her mentor Franz Boas, than other women, such as Ruth Benedict, who earned their Ph.D.s with Boas.

⁵ See Goldfrank; Lamphere, "Gladys Reichard Among the Navajo"; Lavender; Leacock; Lyon.

⁶ *Melanesian Design* won the 1932 A. Cressy Morrison Prize in natural science from the New York Academy of Sciences.

⁷ Lamphere in "Gladys Reichard Among the Navajo" in particular discusses Reichard's importance in training future female anthropologists at Barnard.

⁸ For example, see Deacon p. 268 regarding Sapir's intervention to prevent the University of Michigan from hiring Charlotte Gower, a graduate of his own department at the University of Chicago, in 1928.

⁹ Boas was nearly alone in his determination to find faculty positions for his women graduate students; see Deacon 264, 268-71, and Banner 378-79.

¹⁰ Morris's books were reviewed primarily by popular media, apart from one scholarly review that discusses her book briefly in conjunction with Earl Morris's *Temple of the Warriors*; Reichard's work was reviewed less extensively by popular media than by academic publications. See Becker Rev. of *Digging in Yucatan*; Becker Rev. of *Digging in the Southwest*; Benedict; Eaton Rev. of *Digging in Yucatan* and *Digging in the Southwest*; "Finding America's Past," Owen, Robertson; Shea; Spinden; and additional anonymous reviews listed in the bibliography. For reviews of *Spider-Woman* see Amsden Rev. of *Spider-Woman*; "Brief Notices," Fergusson; Lillian Fisher; Kaufman.

¹¹ For an extended discussion of the concept of intertextuality in genre studies, see Bazerman "Intertextual"; Bazerman and Paradis; Bazerman and Prior.

¹² Recent research on autobiography—as rhetorical, social, literary, ethical, and political practice—is extraordinarily rich. For a brief overview, see Benstock; Brumble; Eakin *American Autobiography, How Our Lives*, and *Ethics of Lifewriting*; Gilmore; Huddart; Huff; Kadar; Kadar et. al.; Sidonie Smith; Smith and Watson.

¹³ The effort to contain Ann Morris's work *within* the work of her husband continued to some degree, despite the independent publication of her field autobiographies. John Meriam, head of the Carnegie Institution that funded Earl and Ann's excavations in the Yucatan, recommends that Ann should be careful that her book is published *after* Earl's book, for instance (John Meriam); and Ann's only reviewer in a scholarly publication treats her book as a "second volume [which] should be read after the first," namely Earl Morris's *Temple of the Warriors*, "into which it dovetails perfectly" (Robertson 349).

¹⁴ Helen Ferris to Ann Axtell Morris, 1 May 1931. MS. Courtesy of Elizabeth Morris and the Morris Family Collections.

¹⁵ "Finding America's Past."

¹⁶ Lister and Lister 143; 161.

¹⁷ "Ann Axtell Morris" in *American Antiquity*; "Woodbridge Club."

¹⁸ *Digging in Yucatan* is also mentioned by Ruth Barnes, writing in the NCTE publication *The English Journal* in 1933, as among the recent books that should be taught to junior high school students to promote "international-mindedness" and "international good will." See Barnes.

¹⁹ In fact, as Inga Calvin points out, Ann's initial involvement in the Chichen Itza project was as a nanny for Sylvanus Morley's daughter and as a chaperone for Morley's unmarried secretary and bookkeeper, Edith Bayles, who was a Smith graduate just a year younger than Ann. Inga Calvin, personal correspondence, 27 July 2008. In *Digging in Yucatan*, Morris notes her boredom at not having a project to work on but omits discussion of her "nanny" and "chaperone" duties.

²⁰ Contemporaneous reviewers consistently represented Morris as an expert in her own right, rather than merely the wife of an archaeologist; see reviews "Books"; "New Children's Books"; and "Story Book Lady," all published in 1933. Later, in their 1968 biography of Earl Morris, Lister and Lister overlook Ann Morris's field training and portray her—contrary to her self-representation in her field autobiographies—as disgusted by field work, repulsed by mummies, and, when she becomes ill, shirking her duties as a mother and thus disrupting her husband's legitimate archaeological work. Lister and Lister 116; 140; 167; 169.

²¹ Ann Axtell Morris to Bryan, 18 March 1933. MS. Courtesy of Elizabeth Ann Morris and the Morris Family Collections.

²² Jean Charlot, the professional artist employed to copy excavated murals, earned \$200/month for his work; Ann earned \$75/month for her work as an artist on the same project. Inga Calvin, lecture, Museum of the University of Colorado – Boulder, 27 July 2008.

²³ Bunzel to Parsons, 16 July 1934, qtd. Deacon 270-71.

²⁴ Frazier calls *Spider-Woman* a dialogic ethnography, that is, as an ethnography in which “the position of the self is assessed in relation to the other’s asserted position” (Page 1988: 165, qtd. in Frazier 368). Frazier notes also that “this ability to relinquish an authoritative position in interactions as well as in representation constitutes a kind of methodological principle” (369).

Conclusion: Spatial Practices, Ethical Possibilities, and Gendered Institutions

“Knowledge is in the end based on acknowledgment.”
--Wittgenstein, *On Certainty*, c. 1950

As this project has indicated, representations of space have significant rhetorical power. Portrayals of landscapes can ground powerful arguments about what is natural and therefore inevitable, as in many early twentieth-century collections of folklore that represented Native American absence from “essentially American” scenes. These texts used portrayals of empty landscapes to erase historical violence and elide ongoing relations of exploitation and domination. Representations of landscapes can also be constructed as symbols of liberation from gendered confinement. Ann Axtell Morris’s depictions of the “field” as a space free from constraints on women’s movement and behavior created an appealing image that persuaded many young women to pursue archaeology for the intellectual and material freedoms it appeared to offer.

Figurations of space in language can have powerful material effects as well. For instance, discursive portrayals of the field of research as a comfortably masculine space created material obstacles for women who wanted to occupy it. Announcing

new graduate student scholarships for summer field training in the Laboratory of Anthropology at Santa Fe in 1929, the scholarship committee explained that “as there are at present open to women relatively few professional positions in anthropology, the number of scholarships granted to women should be limited” (Cole, Dixon and Kidder). In a letter responding to Elsie Clews Parsons, who was outraged that women graduate students were being excluded from this increasingly important professional training, Edward Sapir replied that the role “women are taking in scientific work, particularly in field work, is just a bit more of a problem, it seems to me, than some are willing to admit.”¹ Kidder, too, justified the exclusion to Parsons, explaining that far “fewer professional positions (as field workers) are open to women [...], about one to four or five. Hence, it would seem unsound policy to select for training (in field work) women much in excess of that ratio.”² These arguments depended for their force upon representations of space. First, the field—the sites of archaeological and ethnographic work—is an instructional space where female students are “a bit more of a problem” than male students; second, the discipline of anthropology is an institutional space that can only support women professionals in a ratio of “one to four or five.” That such representations were used to justify the ongoing exclusion of women from important disciplinary spaces demonstrates that the line between discursive representations and material effects is quite permeable.

It was this intersection between represented and real spaces that writers like Ann Axtell Morris tried to exploit in their own counter-portrayals of the space of the field and the discipline of anthropology. Morris’s descriptions of the field as a space

of adventure and the discipline as a welcoming one attempt to recruit into anthropology the practitioners who could help to remake the discipline on the model of her representations. Likewise, the portrayals of Indian boarding schools in Underhill's *Hawk Over Whirlpools* and other ethnographic novels not only attempt to reflect what was then taking place within such schools, but also to influence public opinion and actual practice—to generate outrage that would result in more humane conditions and policies. As other scholars have noted, representations of spaces affect how those spaces are inhabited, policed, and experienced as safe or unsafe, welcoming or unwelcoming for particular bodies. This project has shown that early twentieth-century anthropological writers recognized and exploited the rhetorical power of spatial representations in myriad ways.

In portrayals of Native American communities, both in anthropological and popular discourse, spatial representations and material practices are particularly confounded. Popular portrayals frequently define Native Americans in reference to natural environments. Native Americans are often represented as inherently and uniquely attuned to the natural world, as the “first ecologists,” in one classic formulation.³ Such portrayals conflate Native Americans with natural landscapes, erasing regional, historical, tribal, and individual differences in favor of a single romanticized vision, and in the process participate in a long tradition of evocations of the mythical “noble savage.” Yet many Native American writers also posit a distinctly indigenous relationship with the natural world, locating in that relation a source for identity, collective memory, and political empowerment. Some Native American writers suggest that the importance of landscape as a maker of indigenous

identity has a cultural or racial origin; others argue that land becomes a crucial source of Native American identity and political action in response to the historical fact of land theft.⁴ In either case, the history of indigenous people in relation to the United States government has undeniably been one in which pervasive representations of Native Americans in relation to such spaces as homes, farms, schools, reservations, allotments, and the “wild” have been deployed as rhetorical justifications for repeated acts of cultural, intellectual and physical violence.⁵

The role of specifically *anthropological* representations in enabling—and enacting—colonial practices has been increasingly critiqued over the past three decades. Discourses are “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault 49); anthropology has been practiced as a discourse that creates Others in another place and another time (Fabian *Time and the Other*). Many anthropologists have critiqued the ways in which anthropological discourse creates its objects of knowledge through a mode of ethnography by which an ethnographer authorizes himself as a *knower* representing others who are *known*.⁶ In recognition of such problems, many feminist and critical anthropologists have sought, over the last three decades, for research practices and modes of representation that offer ethical alternatives to knowledge-making as a form of domination.⁷

In relation to these contemporary concerns, my study uncovers alternative knowledge-making and representational practices that emerged in anthropology early in the twentieth century. By developing alternative genres where other forms of knowledge, other spatial relations, and other arguments could be located, the rhetors recovered in this project generated discursive representations in order to influence

material spaces. Spatial strategies in ethnographic novels, for instance, supported counter-arguments to powerful, racist conceptions of Indian education. By re-symbolizing the meaning of native home and school spaces and by charting how Indian protagonists adjust to and move through multiple contexts, rhetors used this genre to argue against the relations of domination—both intellectual and material—that were enabled by images of Indian homes and schools. Through such tactics, many writers deployed the epistemological tools of ethnographic description to support arguments unrecognized inside the discipline of anthropology. These rhetors developed alternative ethnographic genres in order to create discursive locations where ethical considerations excluded from the monograph could be taken up.

Alternative ethnographic genres could include ethnographers themselves as objects of critique, and consequently these alternative genres were used by rhetors to reflect on the role of the anthropologist and the limits of ethnographic knowledge. John Joseph Mathews (Osage), for instance, uses the ethnographic novel to critique the kind of knowledge generated through typical anthropological practices. In his novel *Sundown* Mathews depicts a white teacher-ethnographer in order to critique the value anthropologists place on “fieldwork” and firsthand observation. The teacher, Miss Hoover, eagerly adopts the epistemological authority that can be garnered from a field experience. Having been “in the field,” Mathews writes,

She could talk patronizingly about what this one did or what that one did, or said, from the position of one who had been among the Indians and therefore knew them. She felt the importance of all this when she went back to her merchant father’s home as a poetic relief from the

wild reservation of the Osages, with the delightful position of raconteur. With poetic license, she made the reservation a little wilder than it actually was, and the Osages a little more wild and at the same time more gloriously intriguing. (27)

Through the figure of the white teacher, Mathews critiques the motives and the knowledge practices of anthropologists who, like Miss Hoover, believe they have “been among the Indians and therefore knew them.” He argues that, like many school officials, anthropologists are drawn to the field out of misguided sentimentalism and then use their experiences in Indian communities primarily to elevate their status among their own communities. Mathews also inscribes a deep skepticism about the validity and authority of knowledge generated through “firsthand” experience, which may be compromised not only through deliberate exaggerations, but also because of the shaping influence of racist stereotypes and expectations. Certainly it is possible, Mathews suggests, for ethnographers to “live with Indians” and utterly fail to create accurate knowledge because of the strength of their antipathy, the limits of their understanding, or the shaping force of racism on their observations and interpretations.

Through hybrid and popular ethnographic genres, anthropologists also composed alternative possibilities for the ethical creation of ethnographic knowledge. Frank Applegate, for instance, locates the anthropologist not in an otherworldly moment of encounter, but within shared spaces marked by history and invested with mutual responsibility. This spatial positioning enables Applegate to develop an account of the range of roles an anthropologist must adopt: not only the comfortable

role of distant observer, but also guest, fellow parent, concerned friend, and, finally, public advocate who must acknowledge his own racialized positioning in order to maintain relations with an aggrieved community.

Reichard, Underhill, Parsons and many other anthropological writers from this period argue repeatedly that anthropological knowledge, in Wittgenstein's terms, is based on acknowledgement; it must emerge out of human relations of mutual recognition. In folklore collections that constructed shared spaces of mutual responsibility; in ethnographic novels that linked anthropological knowledge with pressing public concerns; and in field autobiographies that attempted to reshape disciplinary contours and ethnographic methods, the rhetors examined in this project advocated for an alternative set of ethical, spatial, and knowledge-making practices. These rhetors demonstrated that anthropological knowledge could be made to serve many public functions. The early twentieth-century rhetors examined in this project developed hybrid genres where they could locate a range of rhetorical actions and ethical stances for anthropological knowledge. These actions included advancing explicitly political and activist arguments, moving readers' emotions to incite their own political actions, addressing interested laypeople in addition to anthropological insiders, and reforming anthropological knowledge from within. They constructed alternative and popular genres to argue that ethical knowledge must also be put to use, not only circulated amongst disciplinary insiders but enacted in broad public contexts, where policies are shaped that profoundly influence material realities in Native American lives.

In addition to recovering these powerful alternative arguments, this dissertation also demonstrates that professional institutions enact power in gendered and raced ways. This project shows that institutional structures of professionalization can enable participation, if not equal status for all participants. For the Women's Anthropological Society, whose efforts to circulate "real contributions to knowledge" began this dissertation, the apparatus of a professional scientific society provided Zelia Nuttall, Alice Fletcher, Matilda Coxe Stevenson, and scores of other women an important way to frame their activities as scientific inquiry. Later, the professionalization of scientific disciplines established avenues for many white women and people of color to study anthropology in universities and pursue anthropology in the field over the first few decades of the twentieth century: not only Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict, but Reichard, Underhill, Bunzel, Hortense Powdermaker, Ester Goldfrank, Frances Densmore, Viola Garfield, Erna Gunther, Dorothy Keur, Ella Cara Deloria, Ruth Landes, Dorothea Leighton, Cora Du Bois, Clara Tanner, Ruth Sawtell Wallis, and many more. African American anthropologists who pursued Ph.D.s in anthropology during this period—such as Zora Neale Hurston, Manet Fowler, Louis Eugene King, Laurence Foster, W. Montague Cobb, and Allison Davis—as well as many Native American anthropologists, including Francis La Flesche, Ella Cara Deloria, Edward Dozier, D'Arcy McNickle, and others—adapted the professional language of anthropology as a discursive tool to validate their cultural experience as knowledge.

But this project also demonstrates that gender, race, and genre interact in the ostensible rationality of professionalization. Although professionalization—

particularly, the rhetorical scarcity of the monograph genre—prompted a proliferation of alternative forms, powerful mechanisms of marginalization and historical erasure kept these rhetors and their innovations isolated. Rhetors such as Mathews, Reichard, Morris, Applegate, and Underhill proposed alternative ethical possibilities to professional anthropologists, possibilities that ultimately failed to become institutionalized within the discipline. Denying women full-time positions in the departments that were training the next generation of anthropologists; denying amateurs access to awards and recognition and participation in scholarly communities; denying popularizers the legitimacy of publication and circulation; denying Native Americans status as theorizers and innovators rather than simply informants—all these efforts isolated innovations from the mainstream of anthropological practice, and then persistently erased their existence through ritual recitals of anthropology's history.

The anthropologists discussed in this dissertation—women and Native Americans, both amateur and professional—encountered barriers to professional recognition, remuneration, and status that, regrettably, continue to influence the lives and careers of professional women and people of color today. Women and people of color are still judged harshly if their colleagues perceive them as stubborn, over-serious, or “hard and efficient and charmless,” as Alfred Kroeber described Gladys Reichard in a letter to Edward Sapir while Reichard was still a graduate student.⁸ Promising careers can still be dramatically curtailed by unfounded rumors of misconduct, as was Ruth Bunzel's career when she was replaced as principal investigator on a major Carnegie project by Sol Tax, a replacement justified by Tax's

powerful male advocates, Alfred Kidder and Alfred Tozzler, through their circulation of rumors of Bunzel's promiscuity in the field.⁹ And innovative, significant theories, when articulated by people of color and women, are still frequently misread as non-theoretical.¹⁰ In numerous ways, for people of color and women, credentials are not enough. What is lost through gender, race, and genre-based mechanisms of professional marginalization is not only the historical and contemporary presence of these practitioners—which is itself significant—but also a rich array of powerful arguments identifying other grounds of knowledge, based in ethical relations and capable of profoundly shaping the material spaces of the world.

¹ Sapir to Parsons, 27 Mar. 1929. Qtd. in Deacon 263.

² Kidder to Parsons, 30 Mar. 1929. Qtd. in Deacon 263-264.

³ See Udall; also Overholt. For a discussion of portrayals of the “ecological Indian,” see Krech; for a more tempered analysis of Native American self-representations, see Schweninger.

⁴ For one of many instances of the former stance, N. Scott Momaday, “Native American Attitudes toward the Environment.” *Seeing With a Native Eye: Essays on Native American Religion*. Ed. Walter Holden Capps. New York: Harper & Row, 1976. For one instance of the latter stance, see Leslie Marmon Silko, *Almanac of the Dead*. New York: Penguin, 1991. For an excellent analysis of a variety of specific ways that Native American writers of fiction and nonfiction articulate a specific land ethic, see Schweninger.

⁵ See Fear-Segal; also Adams; Vine Deloria *Custer*; Hoxie.

⁶ In addition to Fabian *Time and the Other* and *Time and the Work of Anthropology*, see also Behar *Vulnerable*; Clifford “On Ethnographic” and “Spatial Practices”; Stocking *Colonial Situations*; Wolfe.

⁷ See Behar *Translated* and *Vulnerable*; Behar and Gordon; di Leonardo; Gupta and Fergusson.

⁸ Lamphere “Gladys Reichard Among the Navajo” 85.

⁹ As Bunzel noted wryly in a letter to Elsie Clews Parsons, “you know how men feel towards those whom they have treated unfairly[;] they will not feel any better or more kindly if it is pointed out to them that I am better than Sol Tax.” Deacon 269-271.

¹⁰ See Harrison; McClaurin; Moses; Walters.

References

- Abu-Lughod, Lila. *Writing Women's Worlds: Bedoin Stories*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1993.
- Ackerman, John. "The Space for Rhetoric in Everyday Life." *Towards a Rhetoric of Everyday Life*. Ed. Martin Nystrand and John Duffy. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2003. 84-117.
- Adair, John. Rev. of *Dezba, Woman of the Desert* by Gladys A. Reichard. *American Anthropologist* 42 (1940): 500-501.
- Adams, David Wallace. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence: U of Kansas P, 1995.
- "The Adolescent." Rev. of *Coming of Age in Samoa* by Margaret Mead. *New York Times* New York, N.Y. 4 Nov. 1928.
- "Albert Samuel Gatschet, 1832 – 1907." *American Anthropologist* 9 (1907): 561-570.
- Alic, Margaret. *Hypatia's Heritage: A History of Women in Science from Antiquity through the Late Nineteenth Century*. London: Woman's Press, 1986.
- Amidon, Stevens. "The Learning History: Analyzing an Emerging Genre." *Journal of Business Communication* 45 (2008): 451-482.
- "Among the Navajos." Review of *Windsinger* by Frances Gillmor. *New York Times* 5 Oct. 1930: 7+.
- Amsden, Charles. Review of *Navajo Shepherd and Weaver* by Gladys A. Reichard. *American Anthropologist* 40 (1938): 724-725.
- . Review of *Spider-Woman: A Story of Navajo Weavers and Chanters* by Gladys A. Reichard. *American Anthropologist* 37 (1935): 497.
- "An Archaeological Novel." Review of *The Delight Makers* by Adolf F. Bandelier. *Nation* 104.2694 (15 Feb. 1917): 189-190.
- "An Educated Indian." Review of *Sundown* by John Joseph Mathews. *New York Times* 25 Nov. 1934: 19-20.
- "Ann Axtell Morris." *American Antiquity* 11 (1945): 117.
- "Ann Axtell Morris." *American Anthropologist* 47 (1945): 645.

- Applegate, Frank. *Indian Stories from the Pueblos*. 1929. Glorieta, NM: Rio Grande Press, 1971.
- . *Native Tales of New Mexico*. Philadelphia and London: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1934.
- Artemeva, Natasha. "Approaches to Learning Genres: A Bibliographic Essay." *Rhetorical Genre Studies and Beyond*. Eds. Natasha Artemeva and Aviva Freedman. Winnepeg, Manitoba: Inkshed Publications, 2006. 9-99.
- "Asks State Guide." *New York Times* 16 Dec. 1928: 28.
- Atkinson, Dwight. *Scientific Discourse in Sociohistorical Context: The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 1675-1975*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1999.
- Auerbach, Jerold S. *Explorers in Eden: Pueblo Indians and the Promised Land*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 2006.
- Austin, Mary. "Introduction." *Native Tales of New Mexico* by Frank Applegate. Philadelphia and London: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1934.
- . *One-Smoke Stories*. 1934. Athens, Ohio: Swallow Press/Ohio UP, 2003.
- . "Regionalism in American Fiction." *English Journal* 21 (1932): 97-107.
- Babcock, Barbara. "Pueblo Cultural Bodies." *Journal of American Folklore* 107.423 (1994): 40-54.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.
- . *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.
- Bandelier, Adolf. *The Delight Makers*. 1890. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1917.
- Bannan, Helen. "'True Womanhood' on the Reservation: Field Matrons in the United States Indian Service." Tucson: Southwest Institute for Research on Women, 1984.
- Banner, Lois W. *Intertwined Lives: Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and Their Circle*. New York: Knopf, 2003.
- Barnes, Ruth. "Developing International-Mindedness in Junior High School." *The English Journal* 22.6 (Jun. 1933): 476-481.

- Barrett, S. A. *Pomo Indian Basketry*. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 7, no. 3 (1908): 134-308.
- Barton, Ellen, Jennie Ariail, and Tom Smith. "The Professional in the Personal: The Genre of Personal Statements in Residency Applications." *Issues in Writing* 15.1 (2004): 76-124.
- "Bascom, William R. "Folklore and Anthropology." *Journal of American Folklore* 66.262 (1953): 283-290.
- Bashkow, Ira. "A Neo-Boasian Conception of Cultural Boundaries." *American Anthropologist* 106.3 (Sep. 2004): 443-458.
- Bataille, Gretchen, ed. *Native American Representations: First Encounters, Distorted Images, and Literary Appropriations*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001.
- Bawarshi, Anis. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer: Reconsidering the Place of Invention in Composition*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP, 2003.
- . "The Genre Function." *College English* 62.3 (2000): 335-360.
- Baynham, Mike. "Narratives in Space and Time: Beyond 'Backdrop' Accounts of Narrative Orientation." *Narrative Inquiry* 13.2 (2003): 347-366.
- Bazerman, Charles. "Genre and Identity: Citizenship in the Age of the Internet and the Age of Global Capitalism." Coe, Lingard, and Teslenko 13-37.
- . "Intertextual Self-Fashioning: Gould and Lewontin's Representations of the Literature." Selzer 20 – 41.
- . *The Languages of Edison's Light*. Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 1999.
- . "The Life of Genre, the Life in the Classroom." *Genre and Writing: Issues, Arguments, Alternatives*. Ed. Wendy Bishop and Hans Ostrom. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1997. 19-26.
- . "Scientific Writing as a Social Act: A Review of the Literature of the Sociology of Science." *New Essays in Technical and Scientific Communication: Research, Theory, Practice*. Ed. Paul V. Anderson, R. John Brockmann, and Carolyn R. Miller. Farmingdale, NY: Baywood Publishing Company, Inc., 1983. 156-184.
- . *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison, Wisc.: U of Wisconsin P, 1988.
- . "Singular Utterances: Realizing Local Activities Through Typified Forms in Typified Circumstances." *Analyzing the Discourses of Professional Genres*. Ed. A. Trosberg. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000. 25-40.

- . "Systems of Genre." Freedman and Medway 79-101.
- Bazerman, Charles, Joseph Little, and Teri Chavkin. "The Production of Information for Genred Activity Spaces: Informational Motives and Consequences of the Environmental Impact Statement." *Written Communication* 20.4 (Oct. 2003): 455-477.
- Bazerman, Charles and James G. Paradis. *Textual Dynamics of the Professions: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.
- Bazerman, Charles and Paul Prior. *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2004.
- Becker, M. L. Rev. of *Digging in the Southwest* by Ann Axtell Morris. *New York Herald Tribune* 5 Nov. 1933: 9.
- . Rev. of *Digging in Yucatan* by Ann Axtell Morris. *The Outlook* 158 (10 Jun. 1931): 183.
- Behar, Ruth. *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza's Story*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1993.
- . *The Vulnerable Observer: Anthropology That Breaks Your Heart*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.
- Behar, Ruth and Deborah Gordon, eds. *Women Writing Culture*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995.
- Benedict, Ruth. Review of *Digging in Yucatan* by Ann Axtell Morris. *New York Herald Tribune* 31 May 1931: 8.
- Benstock, Shari. "Authorizing the Autobiographical." Smith and Watson 145-155.
- Berkenkotter, Carol and Thomas N. Huckin. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995.
- . "Rethinking Genre from a Sociocognitive Perspective." *Written Communication* 10.4 (Oct. 1993): 475-509.
- Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- Berman, Judith. "George Hunt and the Kwak'wala Texts." *Anthropological Linguistics* 36.4 (Winter 1994): 482-514.

- Bernstein, Jay H. "First Recipients of Anthropological Doctorates in the United States, 1891-1930." *American Anthropologist* 104.2 (2002): 551-564.
- Bhatia, Vijay K. *Analyzing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. New York: Longman, 1993.
- Biesecker, Barbara. "Coming to Terms With Recent Attempts to Write Women into the History of Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 25.2 (1992): 140-161.
- Biolsi, Thomas and Larry J. Zimmerman. *Indians and Anthropologists: Vine Deloria, Jr. and the Critique of Anthropology*. Tucson: U of Arizona P, 1997.
- Bizzell, Patricia. "Feminist Methods of Research in the History of Rhetoric: What Difference Do They Make?" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30 (2000): 5-18.
- . "Opportunities for Feminist Research in the History of Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 11 (1992): 50-58.
- Bizzell, Patricia and Bruce Herzberg, eds. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. 2nd ed. Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001.
- Blair, Carole. "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality." *Rhetorical Bodies*. Ed. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1999. 16-57.
- Blair, Carole and Neil Michel. "Commemorating in the Theme Park Zone: Reading the Astronauts Memorial." *At the Intersection: Cultural Studies and Rhetorical Studies*. Ed. Thomas Rosteck. New York: Guilford, 1999. 29-83.
- . "Reproducing Civil Rights Tactics: The Rhetorical Performances of the Civil Rights Memorial." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30 (2000): 31-55.
- Blair, Carole, Marsha Jeppeson, and Enrico Pucci. "Public Memorializing in Postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Prototype." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 263-288.
- Boas, Franz. *Bella Bella Tales*. New York: American Folk-Lore Society/G. E. Stechert, 1932.
- . *Bella Bella Texts*. New York: Columbia UP, 1928.
- . *Chinook Texts*. Washington: GPO, 1894.
- . "The Eskimo of Baffin Island and Hudson Bay." *American Museum of Natural History. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* 15 (1901): 1-370.

- , ed. *Folk-Tales of Salishan and Sahaptin Tribes*. Collected by James A. Teit, Marian K. Gould, Livingston Farrand, and Herbert J. Spinden. *Memoirs of the American Folklore Society* Vol. 11. Lancaster, PA and New York: American Folk-Lore Society/G. E. Stechert, 1917.
- . "The Foundation of a National Anthropological Society." *Science* 15 (1902): 804-809.
- . *Kathlamet Texts*. Washington: GPO, 1901.
- . *Kutenai Tales*. Together with Texts Collected by Alexander F. Chamberlain. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 59. Washington: GPO, 1918.
- . *Kwakiutl Tales*. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology Vol. 2. New York: Columbia UP, 1910.
- . "The Methods of Ethnology." *American Anthropologist* 22.4 (1920): 311-321.
- . "Otis Tufton Mason." *Journal of American Folklore* 21.82 (Oct. – Dec. 1908): 362.
- . "Report on the Academic Teaching of Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 21 (1919): 41-48.
- . *The Social Organization and Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl Indians*. Washington: GPO, 1897.
- . *Tsimshian Texts*. Washington: GPO, 1902.
- Boas, Franz and George Hunt. *Kwakiutl Texts*. Memoirs of the American Museum of Natural History Vol. 5. New York: G. E. Stechert, 1905.
- . *Kwakiutl Texts—Second Series*. Memoirs of the American Museum of Natural History Vol. 14. New York: G. E. Stechert, 1906.
- Bogoras, Waldemar. "The Folklore of Northeastern Asia, as Compared with That of Northwestern America." *American Anthropologist* 4.4 (Oct. – Dec. 1902): 577-683.
- Bonta, Marcia. *Women in the Field: America's Pioneering Women Naturalists*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M UP, 1991.
- "Books." *The Washington Post* 4 Nov. 1933: 12.
- Borneman, John and Abdellah Hammoudi, eds. *Being There: The Fieldwork Encounter and the Making of Truth*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2009.

- "Brief Notices." Review of *Spider-Woman: A Story of Navajo Weavers and Chanters* by Gladys A. Reichard. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 10.3 (Sept. 1935): 348.
- Bronner, Simon, ed. *Consuming Visions: Accumulation and Display of Goods in America, 1880-1920*. New York: Norton, 1989.
- Brown, JoAnne and David K. van Keuren, eds. *The Estate of Social Knowledge*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1991.
- Bruce, Alice Ruth. "I Aim to Be – " *The Washington Post* Sept. 19, 1937: PY2.
- Bunzel, Ruth. *The Pueblo Potter: A Study of Creative Imagination in Primitive Art*. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology, vol. 8. New York: Columbia UP, 1929.
- Bunzl, Matti. "Boas, Foucault, and the 'Native Anthropologist': Notes Toward a Neo-Boasian Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 106.3 (Sep. 2004): 435-442.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1950.
- Burton, Henrietta. *The Re-Establishment of the Indians in Their Pueblo Life Through the Revival of Their Traditional Crafts: A Study in Home Extension Education*. Contributions to Education No. 673. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1936.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. *Man Cannot Speak For Her*. 2 vols. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1989.
- Cardozo, Christopher. *Edward S. Curtis: The Women*. New York: Bulfinch, 2005.
- . *Sacred Legacy: Edward S. Curtis and the North American Indian*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- Carnegie Institution of Washington. *Year Book* 24 (July 1924- June 1925). Washington: Carnegie Institution.
- . *Year Book* 25 (July 1925 - June 1926). Washington: Carnegie Institution.
- . *Year Book* 27 (July 1927 - June 1928). Washington: Carnegie Institution.
- . *Year Book* 29 (July 1929 - June 1930). Washington: Carnegie Institution.
- . *Year Book* 31 (July 1931 - June 1932). Washington: Carnegie Institution.
- Carr, Helen. *Inventing the American Primitive: Politics, Gender and the Representation of Native American Literary Traditions, 1789-1936*. New York: New York UP, 1996.

- Ceccarelli, Leah. "A Hard Look at Ourselves: A Reception Study of Rhetoric of Science." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 14.3 (2005): 257-265.
- Ceccarelli, Leah. *Shaping Science with Rhetoric: The Cases of Dobzhansky, Schrodinger, and Wilson*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2001.
- Chamberlain, Alexander F. "The Chilean Folk-Lore Society and Recent Publications on Chilean Folk-Lore, etc." *Journal of American Folklore* 23.89 (Jul. – Sep. 1910): 383-391.
- . "In Memoriam: Daniel Garrison Brinton." *Journal of American Folklore* 12.46 (Jul. – Sep. 1899): 215-225.
- . "Mythology of Indian Stocks North of Mexico." *Journal of American Folklore* 18.69 (Apr. – Jun. 1905): 111-122.
- . "Periodical Literature." *American Anthropologist* 8.4 (Oct. – Dec. 1906): 709-730.
- Christoph, Julie Nelson. "Reconceiving *Ethos* in Relation to the Personal: Strategies of Placement in Pioneer Women's Writing." *College English* 64 (2002): 660-679.
- Cintron, Ralph. *Angels' Town: Chero Ways, Gang Life, and Rhetorics of the Everyday*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1997.
- . "The Timidities of Ethnography: A Response to Bruce Horner." *JAC: Journal of Advanced Communication* 22.4 (2002): 924-943.
- . "Wearing a Pith Helmet at a Sly Angle: Or, Can Writing Researchers Do Ethnography in a Postmodern Era?" *Written Communication* 10.3 (1993): 371-412.
- Clark, Gregory. *Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme from Kenneth Burke*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 2004.
- Clements, William M. *Native American Folklore in Nineteenth-Century Periodicals*. Athens, Ohio: Swallow Press/Ohio UP, 1986.
- Clements, William M. and Frances M. Malpezzi. *Native American Folklore, 1879-1979: An Annotated Bibliography*. Athens, Ohio: Swallow Press/Ohio UP, 1984.
- Clifford, James. "On Ethnographic Authority." *Representations* 1.2 (Spring 1983): 118-146.
- . "Spatial Practices: Fieldwork, Travel, and the Disciplining of Anthropology." *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Eds. Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.

- Clifford, James and George Marcus, eds. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: U of California P, 1986.
- Clifton, James A. *The Invented Indian: Cultural Fictions and Government Policies*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1994.
- Coe, Richard. "'An Arousing and Fulfillment of Desires': The Rhetoric of Genre in the Process Era—and Beyond." *Freedman and Medway* 181-190.
- Coe, Richard, Lorelei Lingard, and Tatiana Teslenko, eds. *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 2002.
- Coffey, Amanda. *The Ethnographic Self: Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity*. London: Sage, 1999.
- Cole, Fay-Cooper, R. B. Dixon, and A. V. Kidder. "Anthropological Scholarships." *Science* 69.1789 (Apr. 12, 1929): 394.
- Cole, Sally. "Introduction." *The City of Women* by Ruth Landes. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1994.
- Cole, Sally. *Ruth Landes: A Life in Anthropology*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2003.
- Collier, Donald and Harry Tschopik, Jr. "The Role of Museums in American Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 56.5 (1954): 768-79.
- Collins, Vicki Tolar. "The Speaker Respoken: Material Rhetoric as Feminist Methodology." *College English* 61 (1999): 545-573.
- Connors, Robert. "Handbooks: History of a Genre." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 13.2 (1983): 87-98.
- Corey, Frederick C. "Performing Sexualities in an Irish Pub." *Text and Performance Quarterly* 16 (1996): 146-160.
- Cornyn, John Hubert. *When the Campfire Burns*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1923.
- Côté, James E. "Was *Coming of Age in Samoa* Based on a 'Fateful Hoaxing'? A Close Look at Freeman's Claim Based on the Mead-Boas Correspondence." *Current Anthropology* 41.4 (2000): 617-620.
- Cotkin, George. *Reluctant Modernism: American Thought and Culture, 1880-1900*. New York: Twayne, 1992.
- Cranny-Francis, Anne. "Gender and Genre: Feminist Subversion of Genre Fiction and Its Implications for Critical Literacy." *The Powers of Literacy: A Genre*

- Approach to Teaching Writing*. Ed. Bill Cope and Mary Kalantzis. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1993. 90-115.
- Crowley, Sharon and Debra Hawhee. *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*. 3rd ed. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2004.
- Cunningham, Caroline. *The Talking Stone*. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1939.
- Darnell, Regna. "American Anthropology and the Development of Folklore Scholarship: 1890-1920." *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 10.1/2 (Jun. 1973): 23-39.
- . *And Along Came Boas: Continuity and Revolution in Americanist Anthropology*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1998.
- . "History of Anthropology in Historical Perspective." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 6 (1977): 399-417.
- . *Invisible Genealogies: A History of Americanist Anthropology*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001.
- . "The Professionalization of American Anthropology: A Case Study in the Sociology of Knowledge." *Social Science Information* 10.2 (1971): 83-103.
- Dauber, Kenneth. "Bureaucratizing the Ethnographer's Magic." *Current Anthropology* 36.1 Special Issue: Ethnographic Authority and Cultural Explanation (Feb. 1995): 75-95.
- Deacon, Desley. *Elsie Clews Parsons: Inventing Modern Life*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997.
- De Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. Steven Randall. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.
- Dellenbaugh, Frederick S. "Memorial to John Wesley Powell." *American Anthropologist* 20.4 (Oct. – Dec. 1918): 432-436.
- Deloria, Ella Cara. *Speaking of Indians*. 1944. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1998.
- . *Waterlily*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1987.
- Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. *Custer Died for Your Sins*. 1969. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1988.
- , ed. *The Indian Reorganization Act: Congresses and Bills*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 2002.

- Detweiler, Jane and Claudia Peyton. "Defining Occupations: A Chronotopic Study of Narrative Genres in a Health Discipline's Emergence." *Written Communication* 16.4 (Oct. 1999): 412-468.
- Devitt, Amy. "Generalizing About Genre: New Conceptions of an Old Concept." *College Composition and Communication* 44.4 (1993): 573-586. Rpt. *Relations, Locations, Positions: Composition Theory for Writing Teachers*. Eds. Peter Vandenberg, Sue Hum, and Jennifer Clary-Lemon. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2006. 84-102.
- . *Writing Genres*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.
- Devitt, Amy, Anis Bawarshi, and Mary Jo Reiff. "Materiality and Genre in the Study of Discourse Communities." *College English* 65.5 (2003): 541-58.
- Dickinson, Greg. "Joe's Rhetoric: Starbucks and the Spatial Rhetoric of Authenticity." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32 (2002): 5-28.
- . "Memories for Sale: Nostalgia and the Construction of Identity in Old Pasadena." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 83 (1997): 1-27.
- Rev. of *Digging in the Southwest*. *Scientific Book Club Review* 4 (Dec. 1933): 1.
- Rev. of *Digging in Yucatan*. *Nation* 134 (20 Jan. 1932): 80.
- Rev. of *Digging in Yucatan*. *Open Shelf* Nov. 1931: 132.
- Di Leonardo, Micaela. *Exotics at Home: Anthropologies, Others, American Modernity*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000.
- Dilworth, Leah, ed. *Acts of Possession: Collecting in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2003.
- . *Imagining Indians in the Southwest: Persistent Visions of a Primitive Past*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1996.
- Dippie, Brian W. *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan UP, 1982.
- Donawerth, Jane. "Nineteenth-Century United States Conduct Book Rhetoric by Women." *Rhetoric Review* 21.1 (2002): 5-21.
- . "Poaching on Men's Philosophies of Rhetoric: Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Rhetorical Theory by Women." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 33.3 (2000): 243-258.
- Dorson, Richard. *Folklore and Fakelore: Essays Toward a Discipline of Folk Studies*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard UP, 1976.

- Dunmire, Patricia L. "Genre as Temporally Situated Social Action: A Study of Temporality and Genre Activity." *Written Communication* 17.1 (2000): 93-138.
- Eakin, Paul John. *American Autobiography: Retrospect and Prospect*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.
- , ed. *The Ethics of Lifewriting*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2004.
- . *How Our Lives Become Stories: Making Selves*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.
- "Earl Halstead Morris, 1889-1956." Obituary. *American Anthropologist* 59.3 (June 1957): 521-3.
- Eaton, Anne T. "New Children's Books." Rev. of *Digging in the Southwest* by Ann Axtell Morris. *New York Times* 10 Dec. 1933: BR16.
- . "New Children's Books." Rev. of *Digging in Yucatan* by Ann Axtell Morris. *New York Times* 14 Jun. 1931: BR10.
- Edbauer, Jenny. "Unframing Models of Public Distribution: From Rhetorical Situation to Rhetorical Ecologies." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 35.4 (2005): 5-24.
- Ehrenhaus, Peter. "The Vietnam Veterans Memorial: An Invitation to Argument." *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 25 (1988): 54-64.
- Eldred, Janet Carey and Peter Mortensen. "'Persuasion Dwelt on her Tongue': Female Civic Rhetoric in Early America." *College English* 60 (1998): 173-188.
- Elliott, Michael. *The Culture Concept: Writing and Difference in the Age of Realism*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 2002.
- Ember, Melvin. "Evidence and Science in Ethnography: Reflections on the Freeman-Mead Controversy." *American Anthropologist* 87 (1985): 906-910.
- Emmerich, Lisa E. "'Civilization' and Transculturation: The Field Matron Program and Cross-Cultural Contact." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 15.4 (1991): 33-47.
- . "'Right in the Midst of My Own People': Native American Women and the Field Matron Program." *American Indian Quarterly* 15 (1991): 201-216.
- Enoch, Jessica. "A Woman's Place Is in the School: Rhetorics of Gendered Space in Nineteenth-Century America." *College English* 70.3 (Jan. 2008): 275-295.
- . *Refiguring Rhetorical Education: Women Teaching African American, Native American, and Chicano/a Students, 1865-1911*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2008.

- . "Resisting the Script of Indian Education: Zitkala-Sa and the Carlisle Indian School." *College English* 65.2 (2002): 117-141.
- Enos, Richard Leo. "The Archaeology of Women in Rhetoric: Rhetorical Sequencing as a Research Method for Historical Scholarship." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32.1 (Winter 2002): 65-79.
- Evans, Brad. *Before Cultures: The Ethnographic Imagination in American Literature, 1865-1920*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2005.
- Eves, Rosalyn Collings. Dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University. In progress.
- Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia UP, 1983.
- . *Time and the Work of Anthropology: Critical Essays, 1971-1991*. Philadelphia: Harwood/Routledge, 1991.
- Fahnestock, Jeanne. *Rhetorical Figures in Science*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.
- Fardon, Richard. "Malinowski's Precedent: The Imagination of Equality." *Man* 25.4 (Dec. 1990): 569-587.
- Farmer, Frank. "Review: Community Intellectuals." *College English* 65 (2002): 202-210.
- Fear-Segal, Jacqueline. *White Man's Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska, 2007.
- Feinberg, Richard. "Margaret Mead and Samoa: *Coming of Age* in Fact and Fiction." *American Anthropologist* 90 (1988): 656-663.
- Fenton, William N. "John Reed Swanton, 1873-1958." *American Anthropologist* 61.4 (Aug. 1959): 663-668.
- Fergusson, Erna. Review of *Spider-Woman: A Story of Navajo Weavers and Chanters* by Gladys A. Reichard. *New York Herald Tribune* 18 Nov. 1934: 24.
- Ferris, H. B. "The Indians of Cuzco and the Apurimac." *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association* Vol. 3 no. 2 (April-June 1916): 59-148.
- Ferris, Helen. Letter to Ann Axtell Morris. 1 May 1931. Courtesy of Elizabeth Ann Morris and the Morris Family Collections.
- "Finding America's Past." Review of *Digging in the Southwest*. *New York Times* 19 Nov. 1933: BR23.

- Fisher, Donald. *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1993.
- . "Rockefeller Philanthropy and the Rise of Social Anthropology." *Anthropology Today* 2.1 (Feb. 1986): 5-8.
- Fisher, Lillian Estelle. Rev. of *Spider-Woman: A Story of Navajo Chanters and Weavers* by Gladys A. Reichard. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 22.2 (Sept. 1935): 312-313.
- Fitzpatrick, Ellen. *Endless Crusade: Women Social Scientists and Progressive Reform*. New York: Oxford UP, 1990.
- Fleming, David. "The Space of Argumentation: Urban Design, Civic Discourse, and the Dream of the Good City." *Argumentation* 12 (1998): 147-166.
- . "The Streets of Thuri: Discourse, Democracy, and Design in the Classical Polis." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 32 (2002): 5-32.
- Fletcher, Alice Cunningham. *The Hako: A Pawnee Ceremony*. Washington: GPO, 1904.
- . *A Study of Omaha Indian Music*. Aided by Francis La Flesche and John C. Fillmore. Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. *Archaeological and Ethnological Papers* 1 (1893): 237-287.
- Flint, Kate. *The Transatlantic Indian, 1776-1930*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2009.
- Flores, Lisa. "Creating Discursive Space Through a Rhetoric of Difference: Chicana Feminists Craft a Homeland." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 82 (1996): 142-156.
- Forde, Darryl. "Obituary: Frans Olbrechts." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 28.3 (Jul. 1958): 193-194.
- Fowler, Don. *A Laboratory for Anthropology: Science and Romanticism in the American Southwest, 1846-1930*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 2000.
- Frank, Gelya. "Jews, Multiculturalism, and Boasian Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 99.4 (Dec. 1997): 731-745.
- Freadman, Anne. "Anyone for Tennis?" *Freedman and Medway* 43-66.
- Freedman, Aviva and Peter Medway, eds. *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. London and Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis, 1994.

- Freeman, Derek. *The Fateful Hoaxing of Margaret Mead: A Historical Analysis of her Samoan Research*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1999.
- . *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of an Anthropological Myth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1983.
- Frow, John. *Genre*. New Critical Idiom Series. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Furner, Mary. *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905*. Lexington, Ky.: Organization of American Historians/UP of Kentucky, 1975.
- Gacs, Ute, et. al., eds. *Women Anthropologists: A Biographical Dictionary*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.
- Gallagher, Victoria J. "Memory as Social Action: Cultural Projection and Generic Form in Civil Rights Memorials." *New Approaches to Rhetoric*. Ed. Patricia A. Sullivan and Steven R. Goldzwig. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004. 149-171.
- Gates, Barbara T. *Kindred Nature: Victorian and Edwardian Women Embrace the Living World*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.
- Gates, Barbara T. and Ann B. Shteir. *Natural Eloquence: Women Reinscribe Science*. Madison, Wis.: U of Wisconsin P, 1997.
- Gatewood, John. B. "A Short Typology of Ethnographic Genres: Or Ways to Write About Other Peoples." *Anthropology and Humanism Quarterly* 9.4 (1984): 5-10.
- Gatschet, Albert S. "The Klamath Indians of Southwestern Oregon." *Contributions to North American Ethnology*, Vol. 1, Parts 1 and 2. Washington: GPO, 1890.
- Geertz, Clifford. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1988.
- Gellner, Ernest. "Malinowski Go Home: Reflections on the Malinowski Centenary Conferences." *Anthropology Today* 1.5 (Oct. 1985): 5-7.
- George, Sam. *Botany, Sexuality, and Women's Writing, 1760-1830: From Modest Shoot to Forward Plant*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2008.
- George, Ann, Elizabeth Weiser, and Janet Zepernick, eds. *Women and Rhetoric Between the Wars*. In progress.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles. *Intimate Practices: Literacy and Cultural Work in Women's Clubs, 1880-1920*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1997.
- Gessner, Robert. *Broken Arrow*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1933.

- Gieryn, Thomas F. *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999.
- Gifford, Edward. Review of *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* by Bronislaw Malinowski. *American Anthropologist* 25.1 (Jan. – Mar. 1923): 101-102.
- Gillmor, Frances. *Windsinger*. New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1930.
- Gilmore, Leigh. *Autobiographics: A Feminist Theory of Women's Self-Representation*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994.
- Glenn, Cheryl. *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1997.
- Goddard, Pliny Earle. "Hupa Texts." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* Vol. 1, Part 2. Berkeley: U California P (1903-1904): 89-378.
- . "Life and Culture of the Hupa." *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* Vol. 1, Part 1. Berkeley: U California P (1903-1904): 1-88.
- . "The Relation of Folklore to Anthropology." *Journal of American Folklore* 28 (1915): 18-23.
- Goldfrank, Esther. S. "Gladys Amanda Reichard, 1893-1955." *Journal of American Folklore* 69. 271 (Jan. – Mar. 1956): 53-54.
- Goodstein, Ethel S. "Southern Belles and Southern Buildings: The Built Environment as Text and Context in *Designing Women*." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 9 (1992): 170-183.
- Gordon, Deborah. "Among Women: Gender and Ethnographic Authority of the Southwest, 1930-1960." *Parezo* 129-145.
- . "The Politics of Ethnographic Authority: Race and Writing in the Ethnography of Margaret Mead and Zora Neale Hurston." *Manganaro* 146-162.
- . "Writing Culture, Writing Feminism: The Poetics and Politics of Experimental Ethnography." *Inscriptions* 3/4 (1988): 7-24.
- Grek-Martin, Jason. "Vanishing the Haida: George Dawson's Ethnographic Vision and the Making of Settler Space on the Queen Charlotte Islands in the Late Nineteenth-Century." *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien* 51.3 (Fall 2007): 373-398.
- Gridley, Marion E. *Indian Legends of American Scenes*. Sponsored by the Indian Council Fire. Chicago and New York: M. A. Donohue and Company, 1939.

- Griffen, Joyce. "Ruth Murray Underhill." *Gacs et. al.* 355-360.
- Grinnell, George Bird. *By Cheyenne Campfires*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1926.
- . "Shall Indian Lore Be Saved?" *American Museum Journal* 13 (1913): 135-37.
- . "Tenure of Land Among the Indians." *American Anthropologist* 9.1 (1907): 1-11.
- Gross, Alan G. *Starring the Text: The Place of Rhetoric in Science Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2006.
- Gross, Alan G., Joseph E. Harmon, and Michael S. Reidy. *Communicating Science: The Scientific Article from the Seventeenth Century to the Present*. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Gruber, Jerome. "Ethnographic Salvage and the Shaping of Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 72.6 (Dec. 1970): 1289-1299.
- Gruening, Martha. "The Indian's Tragedy." Review of *Broken Arrow* by Robert Gessner. *Nation* 137.3565 (Nov. 1933): 518.
- Gulbrandsen, Don. *Edward Sheriff Curtis: Vision of the First Americans*. Edison, NJ: Chartwell/London: Compendium, 2006.
- Gupta, Akhil and James Fergusson, eds. *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1997.
- Haeberlin, H. K. *The Idea of Fertilization in the Culture of the Pueblo Indians*. American Anthropological Association. *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association* 3 (1916): 1-55.
- Haile, Berard, O. F. M. Review of *Social Life of the Navajo Indians* by Gladys A. Reichard. *American Anthropologist* 34.4 (Oct. – Dec. 1932): 711-717.
- Haines, Harry W. "'What Kind of War?': An Analysis of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 3 (1986): 1-20.
- Halasek, Kay. *A Pedagogy of Possibility: Bakhtinian Perspectives on Composition Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999.
- Haller, John. S., Jr. "Race and the Concept of Progress in Nineteenth Century Ethnology." *American Anthropologist* 73.3 (Jun. 1971): 710-724.
- Hallowell, A. Irving. "The Beginnings of American Anthropology." *Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist, 1888-1920*. Ed. Frederica de Laguna, for the Publications Committee of the American Anthropological Association. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson & Co./American Anthropological Association, 1960. 1-90.

- Hammersley, Martyn. "The Rhetorical Turn in Ethnography." *Social Science Information* 32.1 (1993): 23-37.
- Handler, Richard. "Boasian Anthropology and the Critique of American Culture." *American Quarterly* 42.2 (Jun. 1990): 252-273.
- Haraway, Donna. "Situated Knowledges." *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Harrison, Faye V. *Outsider Within: Reworking Anthropology in the Global Age*. Urbana and Chicago: U Illinois P, 2008.
- Harrison, Ira E. and Faye V. Harrison, eds. *African-American Pioneers in Anthropology*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1998.
- Hattenhauer, Darryl. "The Rhetoric of Architecture: A Semiotic Approach." *Communication Quarterly* 32 (1984): 71-77.
- Havemeyer, Loomis. *Ethnography*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1929.
- Hegeman, Susan. *Patterns for America: Modernism and the Concept of Culture*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999.
- Henze, Brent. "Emergent Genres in Young Disciplines: The Case of Ethnological Science." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 13 (2004): 393-422.
- Herring, Rebecca. "The Creation of Indian Farm Women: Field Matrons and Acculturation on the Kiowa-Comanche Reservation, 1895-1906." *At Home on the Range: Essays on the History of Western Social and Domestic Life*. Ed. John Wunder. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985. 47-89.
- Herskovitz, Melville. *Franz Boas: The Science of Man in the Making*. New York: Scribner, 1953.
- Hieb, Louis A. "Elsie Clews Parsons in the Southwest." *Parezo* 63-75.
- Hinsley, Curtis. "Ethnographic Charisma and Scientific Routine: Cushing and Fewkes in the American Southwest, 1879-1893." *Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1983. 53-69.
- . *Savages and Scientists: The Smithsonian Institution and the Development of American Anthropology, 1846-1910*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1981.
- Hodge, F. W. and C. Hart Merriam. "Henry Wetherbee Henshaw." *American Anthropologist* 33.1 (Jan. – Mar. 1931): 98-105.

- Hoefel, Roseanne. "'Different by Degree': Ella Cara Deloria, Zora Neale Hurston, and Franz Boas Contend with Race and Ethnicity." *American Indian Quarterly* 25.2 (Spring 2001): 181-202.
- Hofstadter, Richard M. *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956.
- Holm, Tom. *The Great Confusion in Indian Affairs: Native Americans and Whites in the Progressive Era.* Austin: U of Texas P, 2005.
- Holmes, Lowell D. *Quest for the Real Samoa: The Mead/Freeman Controversy and Beyond.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey, 1987.
- hooks, bell. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics.* Boston: South End Press, 1990.
- Hough, Walter. "Alice Cunningham Fletcher." *American Anthropologist* 25.2 (Apr. – Jun. 1923): 254-258.
- . "Otis Tufton Mason." *American Anthropologist* 10.4 (Oct. – Dec. 1908): 661-667.
- Hoxie, Frederick E. *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920.* Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1984.
- Huddart, David. *Postcolonial Theory and Autobiography.* London: Routledge, 2008.
- Huff, Cynthia, ed. *Women's Life Writing and Imagined Communities.* London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Hurston, Zora Neale. *Mules and Men.* New York: Lippincott/London: Kegan Paul, 1935.
- Hurston, Zora Neale. *Tell My Horse.* New York: Lippincott, 1938.
- Hyatt, Marshall. *Franz Boas, Social Activist: The Dynamics of Ethnicity.* New York: Greenwood, 1990.
- Irwin-Williams, Cynthia. "Women in the Field: The Role of Women in Archaeology Before 1960." Kass-Simon, Farnes, and Nash 1-41.
- Jack, Jordynn. "Chronotopes: Forms of Time in Rhetorical Argument." *College English* 69.1 (2006): 52-73.
- . *Science on the Homefront: Women Scientists in World War II.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2009.
- . "Space, Time, Memory: Gendered Recollections of Wartime Los Alamos." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 37 (2007): 229-250.

- Jacobs, Margaret D. *Engendered Encounters: Feminism and Pueblo Cultures, 1879-1934*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1999.
- James, Allison, Jenny Hockey, and Andrew Dawson, eds. *After Writing Culture: Epistemology and Praxis in Contemporary Anthropology*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Jamieson, Kathleen. "Antecedent Genre as Rhetorical Constraint." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61.4 (1975): 406-415.
- "John Wesley Powell." *American Anthropologist* 4.3 (Jul. – Sep. 1902): 564-565.
- Johnson, Nan. *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866-1910*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002.
- . "Reigning in the Court of Silence: Women and Rhetorical Space in Postbellum America." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 33.3 (2000): 221-242.
- Journet, Debra. "Writing Within (and Between) Disciplinary Genres: The 'Adaptive Landscape' as a Case Study in Interdisciplinary Rhetoric." *Post-Process Theory: Beyond the Writing-Process Paradigm*. Ed. Thomas Kent. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999. 96-115.
- "Junior Books." Display Ad 75. *New York Times* 10 Dec. 1933: BR21.
- Kaberry, Phyllis. "Malinowski's Contribution to Field-Work Methods and the Writing of Ethnography." *Man and Culture: An Evaluation of the Work of Bronislaw Malinowski*. Ed. Raymond Firth. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957. 71-91.
- Kadar, Marlene, ed. *Essays on Life Writing: From Genre to Critical Practice*. Toronto: U Toronto P, 1992.
- Kadar, Marlene, Linda Warley, Jeanne Perreault, and Susanna Egan, eds. *Tracing the Autobiographical*. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2005.
- Kain, Donna J. "Constructing Genre: A Threefold Typology." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 14.4 (Autumn 2005): 375-409.
- Kass-Simon, Gabriele, Patricia Farnes, and Deborah Nash, eds. *Women of Science: Righting the Record*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.
- Katriel, Tamar. "Sites of Memory: Discourses of the Past in Israeli Pioneering Settlement Museums." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994): 1-20.
- Kaufman, K. C. Review of *Spider-Woman: A Story of Navajo Weavers and Chanters* by Gladys A. Reichard. *The Christian Science Monitor* 30 Oct. 1934: 16.

- Keller, Evelyn Fox. *Reflections on Gender and Science*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1985.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. "Bronislaw Malinowski: 1884-1942." *Journal of American Folklore* 56.221 (Jul. – Sept. 1943): 208-219.
- Krech, Shepard, III. *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2000.
- Krech, Shepard, III, and Barbara A. Hail, eds. *Collecting Native America, 1870-1960*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1999.
- Kroeber, A. L. "History and Science in Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 37.4 (Oct. – Dec. 1935): 539-569.
- . "The Place of Anthropology in Universities." *American Anthropologist* 56.5 (Oct. 1954): 764-767.
- Kuper, Adam. *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Labinsky, Daria and Stan Hieronymous. *Frank Applegate of Santa Fe: Artist and Preservationist*. Albuquerque: L.P.D. Press, 2001.
- La Farge, Oliver. *All the Young Men*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1935.
- . *The Enemy Gods*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1937.
- . *Laughing Boy*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1929.
- . "The Realistic Story of an Indian Youth." Rev. of *Sundown* by John Joseph Mathews. *Saturday Review of Literature* 24 Nov. 1934: 309.
- . "Return of the Native." Rev. of *Hawk Over Whirlpools* by Ruth Murray Underhill. *Saturday Review of Literature* 14 Dec. 1940: 10.
- La Flesche, Francis. "Alice C. Fletcher." *Science* 58.1494 (1923): 115.
- Lageman, Ellen Condliffe. *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
- Lamphere, Louise. "Feminist Anthropology: The Legacy of Elsie Clews Parsons." *American Ethnologist* 16.3 (Aug. 1989): 518-533.
- . "Gladys Reichard Among the Navajo." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* 12.3 (1992): 79-115.
- Langness, L. L. and Gelya Frank. "Fact, Fiction and the Ethnographic Novel." *Anthropology and Humanism Quarterly* 3.1/2 (1978):18-22.

- Lanigan, Esther F. *Mary Austin: Song of a Maverick*. Tucson: U Arizona P, 1997.
- Lape, Noreen Groover. "Critical Introduction—'Between Art and Knowledge': The Literary and Oral Elements of *One-Smoke Stories*." *One-Smoke Stories* by Mary Austin. Athens, Ohio: Swallow Press/Ohio UP, 2003. i-lxvii.
- Lave, Jean and Etienne Wenger. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Lavender, Catherine J. *Scientists and Storytellers: Feminist Anthropologists and the Construction of the American Southwest*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 2006.
- Lay, Mary M. *The Rhetoric of Midwifery: Gender, Knowledge, Power*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2000.
- Leacock, Eleanor. "Gladys Amanda Reichard." Gacs et. al. 303-309.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1995.
- Leff, Michael. "Tradition and Agency in Humanistic Rhetoric." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 36.2 (2003): 135-147.
- Lepowsky, Maria. "Charlotte Gower and the Subterranean History of Anthropology." *Excluded Ancestors, Inventible Traditions: Essays Toward a More Inclusive History of Anthropology*. Ed. Richard Handler. History of Anthropology vol. 9. Madison: U Wisconsin P, 2000. 123-170.
- Lesser, Margaret. Letter to Ann Axtell Morris. 4 Jan. 1935. Courtesy of Elizabeth Ann Morris and the Morris Family Collections.
- Levy, Robert I. "Mead, Freeman, and Samoa: The Problem of Seeing Things as They Are." *Ethos* 12 (1984): 85-92.
- Lewis, Herbert S. "The Passion of Franz Boas." *American Anthropologist* 103.2 (Jun. 2001): 447-467.
- Linderman, Frank Bird. *Indian Old-Man Stories: More Sparks from War Eagle's Lodge-Fire*. 1920. Lincoln: U Nebraska P, 2001.
- . *Indian Why Stories: Sparks from War Eagle's Lodge-Fire*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.
- Liss, Julia E. "Diasporic Identities: The Science and Politics of Race in the Work of Franz Boas and W. E. B. Du Bois, 1894-1919." *Cultural Anthropology* 13.2 (1998): 127-166.

- Lister, Florence Cline and Robert H. Lister. *Earl Morris and Southwestern Archaeology*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1968.
- Little, Joseph. "Achieving Objectivity Through Genred Activity: A Case Study." *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 37.1 (2007): 75-94.
- Logan, Shirley Wilson. *"We Are Coming": The Persuasive Discourse of Nineteenth-Century Black Women*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1999.
- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. "Domesticity in the Federal Indian Schools: The Power of Authority over Mind and Body." *American Ethnologist* 20.2 (May 1993): 227-240.
- Lowie, Robert. Rev. of *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization* by Margaret Mead. *American Anthropologist* 31.3 (Jul. – Sep. 1929): 532-534.
- . "Oral Tradition and History." *Journal of American Folklore* 30.116 (1917): 161-167.
- Lummis, Charles. *Pueblo Indian Folk-Stories*. New York: The Century Company, 1910.
- Lunsford, Andrea, ed. *Reclaiming Rhetorica: Women in the Rhetorical Tradition*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1995.
- Lurie, Nancy O. "Women in Early Anthropology." *Pioneers of American Anthropology*. Ed. June Helm. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1966. 29-81.
- Lutkehaus, Nancy. *Margaret Mead: The Making of an American Icon*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2008.
- Lyon, William H. "Gladys Reichard at the Frontiers of Navajo Culture." *American Indian Quarterly* 13.2 (Spring 1989): 137-163.
- Lyons, Scott. "The Left Side of the Circle: American Indians and Progressive Politics." *Radical Relevance: Essays Toward a Scholarship of the Whole Left*. Eds. Steven Rosendale and Laura Gray Rosendale. New York: SUNY Press, 2005. 69-84.
- . "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want From Writing?" *College Composition and Communication* 51 (2000): 447-468.
- M., B. Review of *Coming of Age in Samoa* by Margaret Mead. *Pacific Affairs* 2.4 (Apr. 1929): 225-226.

- Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. 1922. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1984.
- . "Baloma: The Spirits of the Dead in the Trobriand Islands." *Magic, Science, and Religion and Other Essays*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1954. 149-274.
- . *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.
- . *The Early Writings of Bronislaw Malinowski*. Ed. Robert J. Thornton and Peter Skalnik. Trans. Ludwik Krzyzanowski. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- . *The Sexual Life of Savages in Northwestern Melanesia*. 3rd edition. London: Kegan Paul, 1932.
- Manganaro, Marc. *Culture, 1922: The Birth of a Concept*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2002.
- , ed. *Modernist Anthropology: From Fieldwork to Text*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1990.
- . "Textual Play, Power, and Cultural Critique: An Orientation to Modernist Anthropology." Manganaro 3-47.
- Marback, Richard. "The Rhetorical Space of Robben Island." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 34.2 (Spring 2004): 7-27.
- Marcus, George E. "Rhetoric and the Ethnographic Genre in Anthropological Research." *Current Anthropology* 21.4 (Aug. 1980): 507-510.
- Marcus, George E. and Dick Cushman. "Ethnographies as Texts." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 11 (1982): 25-69.
- Marcus, George E. and Michael M. J. Fischer. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique: An Experimental Moment in the Human Sciences*. 2nd ed. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999.
- Mark, Joan. *A Stranger in Her Native Land: Alice Fletcher and the American Indians*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988.
- Markel, Mike. "Time and Exigence in Temporal Genres." *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 23.1 (Jan. 2009): 3-27.
- Marshall, Mac. "The Wizard from Oz Meets the Wicked Witch of the East: Freeman, Mead, and Ethnographic Authority." *American Ethnologist* 20 (1993): 604-617.

- Martin, Ronald E. *The Languages of Difference: American Writers and Anthropologists Reconfigure the Primitive, 1878-1940*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2005.
- Mason, Otis T. "What is Anthropology?" *The Saturday Lectures*. Delivered in the Lecture Room of the U.S. National Museum, Under the Auspices of the Anthropological and Biological Societies of Washington. Washington, D.C.: Judd and Detweiler, 1882.
- Massey, Deborah. *Space, Place, and Gender*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994.
- Mastrangelo, Lisa. "Learning from the Past: Rhetoric, Composition, and Debate at Mount Holyoke College." *Rhetoric Review* 18.1 (1999): 46-64.
- Mathews, John Joseph. *Sundown*. 1934. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1988.
- McClaurin, Irma, ed. *Black Feminist Anthropology: Theory, Politics, Praxis, and Poetics*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2001.
- McGee, Anita Newcomb. "Historical Sketch of the Women's Anthropological Society of America. Read at the Annual Reception, February 25, 1889." *Women's Anthropological Society of America* 16-22.
- McGee, Emma R. *Life of W J McGee, Distinguished Geologist, Ethnologist, Anthropologist, Hydrologist, Etc. in Service of United States Government, With Extracts from Addresses and Writings*. Farley, Iowa: Privately Printed, 1915.
- McGee, W J. "Powell as an Anthropologist." *Proceedings of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 5 (1903): 118-127.
- McKeon, Michael. *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987.
- McKerrow, Raymie E. "Space and Time in the Postmodern Polity." *Western Journal of Communication* 63 (1999): 271-290.
- McNickle, D'Arcy. *The Surrounded*. 1936. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1978.
- Mead, Margaret. *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization*. 1928. New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks, 1973.
- Medicine, Beatrice. "Ella Cara Deloria." *Gacs et. al.* 45-50.
- Meriam, John C. Letter to Ann Axtell Morris. 2 Jan. 1930. Courtesy of Elizabeth Ann Morris and the Morris Family Collections.
- Meriam, Lewis et. al. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Institute for Government Research. Studies in Administration. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1928.

- Meyer, Carter Jones. "Saving the Pueblos: Commercialism and Indian Reform in the 1920s." *Selling the Indian: Commercializing and Appropriating American Indian Cultures*. Ed. Carter Jones Meyer and Diana Royer. Tucson: U of Arizona P, 2001. 190-211.
- Meyer, Michaela D. E. "Women Speak(ing): Forty Years of Feminist Contributions to Rhetoric and an Agenda for Feminist Rhetorical Studies." *Communication Quarterly* 55.1 (Feb. 2007): 1-17.
- Michaelsen, Scott. *The Limits of Multiculturalism: Interrogating the Origins of American Anthropology*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1999.
- Miller, Carolyn. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70.2 (1984): 151-167.
- . "Rhetorical Communities: The Cultural Basis of Genre." Freedman and Medway 67-78.
- Mitchell, Pablo. *Coyote Nation: Sexuality, Race, and Conquest in Modernizing New Mexico, 1880-1920*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2005.
- Morgan, Thomas J. U.S. House. Department of the Interior. *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*. 1889. (S. Doc. 11.1:889/v.2; I20.1:889 Serial Set 2725 H.exdoc.1/17.). LexisNexis® *Serial Set Digital Collection*. Accessed 6 July 2008.
- Morris, Ann Axtell. *Digging in the Southwest*. New York: Doubleday/Junior Literary Guild, 1933.
- . *Digging in Yucatan*. New York: Doubleday/Junior Literary Guild, 1931.
- . Letter to Dorothy Bryan. 18 March 1933. Courtesy of Elizabeth Ann Morris and the Morris Family Collections.
- . "Report of Ann Axtell Morris on the Mural Paintings and Painted Reliefs in the Temple of the Chac Mool." *Carnegie Institution of Washington Year Book* 27 (Jul. 1927 – Jun. 1928): 297-300.
- Morris, Earl H. *The Temple of the Warriors: The Adventure of Exploring and Restoring a Masterpiece of Native American Architecture in the Ruined Maya City of Chichen Itza*. New York: Scribner's, 1931.
- Morris, Earl H., Jean Charlot, and Ann Axtell Morris. *The Temple of the Warriors at Chichen Itza, Yucatan*. Carnegie Institution of Washington Publication no. 406. Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1931.

- Moses, Yolanda. "Black Women in Academe: Issues and Strategies." *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils*. Ed. Lois Benjamin. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1997. 23-38.
- Mountford, Roxanne. "On Gender and Rhetorical Space." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 30.1 (Winter 2001): 41-71.
- Mullin, Molly H. "The Patronage of Difference: Making Indian Art 'Art Not Ethnology.'" *Current Anthropology* 7.4 (Nov. 1992): 395-424.
- Murdock, George Peter. "Bronislaw Malinowski." *American Anthropologist* 45.3 (Jul. – Sept. 1943): 441-451.
- Myers, Greg. *Writing Biology: Texts in the Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1990.
- Nelson, Christian K. "Classifying Communibiology's Texts: Implications for Genre Theory." *Communication Theory* 14.2 (May 2004): 142-166.
- Nelson, John Louw. *Rhythm for Rain*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1937.
- Nencel, Lorraine and Peter Pels, eds. *Constructing Knowledge: Authority and Critique in Social Science*. London: Sage, 1991.
- Noggle, Burt. "The Twenties: A New Historiographical Frontier." *Journal of American History* 53.2 (1966): 299-314.
- Noguchi, Judy. *The Science Review Article: An Opportune Genre in the Construction of Science*. Bern and New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Ogilvie, Marilyn and Joy Harvey, eds. *The Biographical Dictionary of Women in Science: Pioneering Lives from Ancient Times to the Mid-Twentieth Century*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Olbrechts, Frans M. Review of *The Pueblo Potter* by Ruth Bunzel. *Journal of American Folklore* 44.173 (Jul. – Sep. 1931): 314-316.
- Orans, Martin. *Not Even Wrong: Margaret Mead, Derek Freeman, and the Samoans*. Novato, CA: Chandler and Sharp, 1996.
- Orians, G. Harrison. *The Cult of the Vanishing American: A Century View, 1834-1934*. Toledo, OH: H. J. Chittenden Co., 1934.
- Orlikowski, Wanda and Joanne Yates. "Genre Repertoire: The Structuring of Communicative Practices in Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39 (1994): 541-74.

- Overholt, Thomas W. "American Indians as Natural Ecologists." *American Indian Journal* 5 (1979): 9-16.
- Owen, H. H. Review of *Digging in Yucatan* by Ann Axtell Morris. *New York Herald Tribune* 12 Apr. 1931: 12.
- Paré, Anthony. "Discourse Regulations and the Production of Knowledge." *Writing in the Workplace: New Research Perspectives*. Ed. Rachel Spilka. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1993. 111-123.
- Paré, Anthony and Graham Smart. "Observing Genres in Action: Towards a Research Methodology." *Freedman and Medway* 146-154.
- Parezo, Nancy. "Anthropology: The Welcoming Science." *Parezo* 3-37.
- , ed. *Hidden Scholars: Women Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest*. Albuquerque: U New Mexico P, 1993.
- Parezo, Nancy J. and Margaret A. Hardin. "In the Realm of the Muses." *Parezo* 270-293.
- Parker, Arthur C. *Skunny Wundy: Seneca Indian Tales*. 1926 [as *Skunny Wundy and Other Indian Tales*] Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1994.
- Parsons, Elsie Clews, ed. *American Indian Life by Several of Its Students*. 1922. Lincoln: U Nebraska P, 1967.
- Patience, Allen and Joseph Wayne Smith. "Derek Freeman and Samoa: The Making and Unmaking of a Biobehavioral Myth." *American Anthropologist* 88 (1986): 157-162.
- Patterson, Thomas C. *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*. Oxford & New York: Berg, 2001.
- Peabody, Charles. "The American School in France of Prehistoric Studies." *Journal of American Folklore* 34.133 (Jul. – Sep. 1921): 316-318.
- Pepper, George H. and Gilbert L. Wilson. "An Hidatsa Shrine and the Beliefs Respecting It." *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association* Vol. 2, Part 4. (Dec. 1908): 275-328.
- Pfister, Joel. *Individuality Incorporated: Indians and the Multicultural Modern*. Durham: Duke UP, 2004.
- Pierce, P. B. "Franklin Austin Seely." *American Anthropologist* 8.2 (Apr. 1895): 177-178.

- Poignant, Rosalyn. *Professional Savages: Captive Lives and Western Spectacle*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2004.
- Porter, James. *Rhetorical Ethics and Internetworked Writing*. Greenwich, CT: Ablex, 1998.
- Powell, John Wesley. "The Lessons of Folklore." *American Anthropologist* 2.1 (Jan. 1900): 1-36.
- Powell, Malea. "Blood and Scholarship: One Mixed-Blood's Story." In *Race, Rhetoric, and Composition*, ed. Keith Gilyard. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1999: 1-16.
- . "Down By the River, or How Susan La Flesche Picotte Can Teach Us about Alliance as a Practice of Survivance." *College English* 67.1 (2004): 38-60.
- . "Rhetorics of Survivance: How American Indians Use Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 53.3 (2002): 396-434.
- Prelli, Lawrence. "The Rhetorical Construction of Scientific Ethos." *Rhetoric in the Human Sciences: Inquiries in Social Construction*. Ed. Herbert W. Simons. London: Sage, 1989. 48-68. Rpt. *Landmark Essays on Rhetoric of Science: Case Studies*. Ed. Randy Allen Harris. Mahwah, NJ: Hermagoras Press, 1997. 87-104.
- Prior, Paul A. *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the Academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998.
- Prucha, Francis Paul, ed. *Americanizing the American Indian: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian" 1880-1900*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1973.
- Rabinow, Paul. *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley: U California P, 1977.
- Raglan, Lord. "Review: 79." Review of *Bella Bella Tales* by Franz Boas. *Man* 34 (1934): 63.
- "Record of American Folk-Lore." *Journal of American Folklore* 18.69 (Apr. – Jun. 1905): 144-155.
- Redfield, Robert. Rev. of *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilization* by Margaret Mead. *American Journal of Sociology* 34.4 (Jan. 1929): 728-730.
- . *Tepoztlán, A Mexican Village: A Study of Folk Life*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1930.
- Redfield, Robert and Sol Tax. *Doing Fieldwork: The Correspondence of Robert Redfield and Sol Tax*. Ed. Robert A. Rubinstein. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002.

- Reichard, Gladys. *Dezba, Woman of the Desert*. New York: J. J. Augustin, 1939.
- . "Elsie Clews Parsons." *Journal of American Folklore* 56.219 Elsie Clews Parsons Memorial Number (Jan.-Mar. 1943): 45-48.
- . Letter to Ann Axtell Morris. 5 Dec. 1932. MS. Courtesy of Elizabeth Ann Morris and the Morris Family Collections.
- . *Melanesian Design: A Study of Style in Wood and Tortoiseshell Carving*. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology No. 18. New York: Columbia UP, 1933.
- . *Spider-Woman*. 1934. Glorieta, NM: Rio Grande Press, 1968.
- Reingold, Ida H. *Science in America: A Documentary History, 1900-1939*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981.
- Reynolds, Nedra. "Composition's Imagined Geographies: The Politics of Space in the Frontier, City, and Cyberspace." *College Composition and Communication* 50.1 (1998): 12-35.
- . "Cultural Geography and Images of Place." *The Locations of Composition*. Eds. Christopher J. Keller and Christian R. Weisser. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2007. 251-266.
- . "Ethos as Location: New Sites for Understanding Discursive Authority." *Rhetoric Review* 11.2 (Spring 1993): 325-38.
- . *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.
- Richardson, Theresa R. and Donald Fisher, eds. *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada: The Role of Philanthropy*. Stamford, CT: Ablex, 1999.
- River, Celeste. "Introduction." *Indian Old-Man Stories: More Sparks from War Eagle's Lodge-Fire*, by Frank Bird Linderman. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2001. vii-xxiii.
- Robertson, James A. Review of *The Temple of the Warriors* by Earl H. Morris and *Digging in Yucatan* by Ann Axtell Morris. *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 14.3 (Aug. 1934): 348-349.
- Rohner, Richard, ed. *The Ethnography of Franz Boas*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1969.
- Rosaldo, Renato. "Where Objectivity Lies: The Rhetoric of Anthropology." *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences: Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public*

- Affairs*. Ed. John S. Nelson, Allan Megill, and Donald N. McCloskey. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1987. 87-110.
- Rose, Gillian. *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1993.
- Rosenfield, Lawrence W. "Central Park and the Celebration of Civic Virtue." *American Rhetoric: Context and Criticism*. Ed. Thomas W. Benson. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1989. 221-266.
- Ross, Dorothy. *The Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Rossiter, Margaret W. *Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1982.
- Royster, Jacqueline Jones. *Traces of a Stream: Literacy and Social Change Among African-American Women*. Pittsburgh: U Pittsburgh P, 2000.
- Rushing, W. Jackson. *Native American Art and the New York Avant Garde: A History of Cultural Primitivism*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1995.
- Russell, David R. "Rethinking Genre in School and Society: An Activity Theory Analysis." *Written Communication* 14 (1997): 504-54.
- Said, Edward. *Beginnings: Intention and Method*. New York: Columbia UP, 1975.
- Sauer, Beverly. "Sexual Dynamics of the Profession: Articulating the *Ecriture Masculine* of Science and Technology." *Technical Communication Quarterly* 3.3 (1994): 309-323.
- Schacker, Jennifer. "Unruly Tales: Ideology, Anxiety, and the Regulation of Genre." *Journal of American Folklore* 120 (2007): 381-400.
- Schiebinger, Londa. *The Mind Has No Sex?: Women in the Origins of Modern Science*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989.
- . *Nature's Body: Gender in the Making of Modern Science*. 2nd ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2004.
- Schryer, Catherine. "Genre and Power: A Chronotopic Analysis." Coe, Lingard, and Teslenko 73-102.
- . "Genre Time/Space: Chronotopic Strategies in the Experimental Article." *JAC: Journal of Advanced Composition* 19.1 (1999): 81-89.
- . "The Lab vs. the Clinic: Sites of Competing Genres." Freedman and Medway 105-124.

- . "Records as Genre." *Written Communication* 10 (1993): 200-34.
- . "Walking a Fine Line: Writing Negative Letters in an Insurance Company." *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 14.4 (Oct. 2000): 445-497.
- Schweninger, Lee. *Listening to the Land: Native American Literary Responses to the Landscape*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 2008.
- Selzer, Jack, ed. *Understanding Scientific Prose*. Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1993.
- Shankman, Paul. "The History of Samoan Sexual Conduct and the Mead-Freeman Controversy." *American Anthropologist* 98 (1996): 555-567.
- Shanley, Kathryn. "The Indians America Loves to Love and Read: American Indian Identity and Cultural Appropriation." In *Native American Representations*, ed. Gretchen Bataille. Lincoln: U Nebraska P, 2001: 29-36.
- Sharer, Wendy. "Genre Work: Expertise and Advocacy in the Early Bulletins of the U.S. Women's Bureau." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 33.1 (Winter 2003): 5-34.
- . *Vote and Voice: Women's Organizations and Political Literacy, 1915-1930*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004.
- Shea, A. L. Review of *Digging in Yucatan* by Ann Axtell Morris. *Chicago Daily Tribune* 4 July 1931: 9.
- Shore, Bradd. "Paradox Regained: Freeman's Margaret Mead and Samoa." *American Anthropologist* 85 (1983): 935-944.
- Sillitoe, Paul. Review of *The Ethnography of Malinowski*, ed. Michael W. Young. *Man* 15.2 (June 1980): 403-404.
- Silverberg, Helene, ed. *Gender and American Social Science: The Formative Years*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1998.
- . "Introduction: Toward a Gendered Social Science History." Silverberg 3-32.
- Silverman, Sydel. "Hortense Powdermaker." Gacs et. al. 291-296.
- , ed. *Totems and Teachers: Key Figures in the History of Anthropology*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press, 2004.
- Simonsen, Jane. *Making Home Work: Domesticity and Native American Assimilation in the American West, 1860-1919*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2006.
- Skinner, Charles. *American Myths and Legends*. Philadelphia and London: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1903.

- Smith, Margaret. *Hopi Girl*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1932.
- Smith, Sherry Lynn. *Reimagining Indians: Native Americans Through Anglo Eyes, 1880-1940*. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Smith, Sidonie. "Autobiographical Manifestos." Smith and Watson 433 – 440.
- Smith, Sidonie and Julia Watson, eds. *Women, Autobiography, Theory: A Reader*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1998.
- Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso, 1989.
- . *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996.
- Solovey, Mark. "Riding Natural Scientists' Coattails Onto the Endless Frontier: The SSRC and the Quest for Scientific Legitimacy." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 40 (2004): 393-422.
- Speck, Frank G. *Ethnology of the Yuchi Indians*. Anthropological Publications of the University Museum, vol. 1, no. 1. Philadelphia: University Museum, 1908. Rpt. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2004.
- Spinden, H. J. Review of *Digging in Yucatan* by Ann Axtell Morris. *Saturday Review of Literature* 8 (19 Sept. 1931): 142.
- Spinuzzi, Clay. *Tracing Genres Through Organizations: A Sociocultural Approach to Information Design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003.
- Squier, Emma-Lindsay. *Children of the Twilight: Folk-Tales of Indian Tribes*. Cleveland, Ohio and New York: The World Syndicate Publishing Company, 1926.
- Standing Bear, Luther. *Land of the Spotted Eagle*. 1933. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2006.
- . *My Indian Boyhood*. 1931. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1988.
- . *My People the Sioux*. 1928. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2006.
- . *Stories of the Sioux*. 1934. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2006.
- Staub, Michael E. *Voices of Persuasion: Politics of Representation in 1930s America*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Stegner, Wallace. *Beyond the Hundredth Meridian: John Wesley Powell and the Second Opening of the West*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1954.

- Stocking, George W., Jr. *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology, 1888-1951*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1995.
- . *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*. History of Anthropology Series, vol. 7. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.
- . Rev. of *The Early Works of Bronislaw Malinowski*, ed. Robert Thornton, Peter Skalnik, and Ludwik Krzyzanowski. *American Anthropologist* 97.1 (Mar. 1995): 184-185.
- . *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1992.
- . "The Ethnographer's Magic: Fieldwork in British Anthropology from Tylor to Malinowski." *Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork*. Ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1983. 70-120. Rpt. Stocking *Ethnographer's Magic* 12-59.
- . "Franz Boas and the Founding of the American Anthropological Association." *American Anthropologist* 62.1 (Feb. 1960): 1-17.
- . "Ideas and Institutions in American Anthropology: Thoughts Toward a History of the Interwar Years." *Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist, 1921-1945*. Ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1976: 1-74.
- . "Maclay, Kubary, Malinowski: Archetypes from the Dreamtime of Anthropology." Stocking *Colonial Situations* 9-74.
- . "Philanthropoids and Vanishing Cultures: Rockefeller Funding and the End of the Museum Era in Anglo-American Anthropology." *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*. Ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1985. 112-145. Rpt. Stocking *Ethnographer's Magic* 178-211.
- . *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. 2nd ed. New York: Free Press, 1982.
- , ed. *The Shaping of American Anthropology, 1883-1911: A Franz Boas Reader*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Stormer, Nathan. "Addressing the Sublime: Space, Mass Representation, and the Unpresentable." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21.3 (Sept. 2004): 212-240.
- "Story Book Lady." *The Washington Post* 31 Dec. 1933: SP3.

- Strathern, Marilyn. "Out of Context: The Persuasive Fictions of Anthropology." Manganaro 80-122.
- Strickland, Donna. "Taking Dictation: The Emergence of Writing Programs and the Cultural Contradictions of Composition Teaching." *College English* 63.4 (2001): 457-479.
- Stromberg, Ernest, ed. *American Indian Rhetorics of Survivance: Word Medicine, Word Magic*. Pittsburgh: U Pittsburgh P, 2006.
- "Suggested Requirements for Professional Employment and Status in the Field of Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 48 (1946): 690-691.
- Sunstein, Bonnie Stone and Elizabeth Chiseri-Strater. *FieldWorking: Reading and Writing Research*. 3rd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007.
- Swales, John. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Swanton, John R. "Dr. Frank Baker." *American Anthropologist* 21.2 (Apr. – Jun. 1919): 186-188.
- Thomas, David Hurst. *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Thornton, Robert J. "'Imagine Yourself Set Down...': Mach, Frazer, Conrad, Malinowski, and the Role of Imagination in Ethnography." *Anthropology Today* 1.5 (Oct. 1985): 7-14.
- . "The Rhetoric of Ethnographic Holism." *Cultural Anthropology* 3.3 (Aug. 1988): 285-303.
- Thornton, Robert J. and Peter Skalnik. "Introduction: Malinowski's Reading, Writing, 1904-1914." *The Early Writings of Bronislaw Malinowski*. Ed. Robert J. Thornton and Peter Skalnik. Trans. Ludwik Krzyzanowski. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 1-64
- Tillery, Denise. "The Plain Style in the Seventeenth Century: Gender and the History of Scientific Discourse." *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 35.3 (2005): 273-289.
- Tisdale, Shelby J. "Women on the Periphery of the Ivory Tower." Parezo 311-333.
- Trafzer, Clifford E., Jean A. Keller, and Lorene Sisquoc, eds. *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2006.

- Traxel, David. *Crusader Nation: The United States in Peace and the Great War, 1898-1920*. New York: Knopf, 2006.
- Udall, Stewart. "First Americans, First Ecologists." *Look to the Mountain Top*. Ed. Charles Jones. San Jose, CA: The H. M. Gousho Co., 1972. 2-12.
- Uhlenbeck, C. C. "Blackfoot Notes." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 2.3/4 (Jan. 1923): 181.
- Underhill, Ruth. *The Autobiography of a Papago Woman*. Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association No. 46. New York: American Anthropological Association, 1936.
- . *Hawk Over Whirlpools*. New York: J. J. Augustin, 1940.
- . Preface. *Papago Woman*. Long Grove, IL.: Waveland Press, 1985.
- Upham, Steadman and Nat Zappia. *The Many Faces of Edward Sheriff Curtis: Portraits and Stories from Native North America*. Tulsa, OK: Gilcrease Museum and the Thomas Gilcrease Association/Seattle: U of Washington P, 2006.
- U.S. House. Department of the Interior. *Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners*. [ARBIC] 1885. (S. Doc. I20.5:885; 2398 H.exdoc.109.). Text in: LexisNexis® *Serial Set Digital Collection*; Accessed 28 April 2008.
- Van Mersbergen, Audrey M. "Rhetorical Prototypes in Architecture: Measuring the Acropolis with a Philosophical Polemic." *Communication Quarterly* 46 (1998): 194-213.
- Varghese, Susheela Abraham and Sunita Anne Abraham. "Book-Length Scholarly Essays as a Hybrid Genre in Science." *Written Communication* 21.2 (Apr. 2004): 201-231.
- Vickery, John B. "Frazer and the Elegiac: The Modernist Connection." Manganaro 51-68.
- Visweswaran, Kamala. *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1994.
- . "'Wild West' Anthropology and the Disciplining of Gender." Silverberg 86-123.
- Vizenor, Gerald. *Manifest Manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance*. Hanover: UP of New England, 1994.
- Wade, Edwin L. "The Ethnic Art Market in the American Southwest, 1880-1980." *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture*, ed. George W. Stocking, Jr. Madison: U Wisconsin P, 1985. 167-191.

- Wall, Wendy. "Gender and the 'Citizen Indian.'" *Writing the Range: Race, Class, and Culture in the Women's West*. Ed. Elizabeth Jameson and Susan Armitage. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1997. 202-229.
- Walters, Keith. "'He Can Read My Writing but He Sho' Can't Read My Mind': Zora Neale Hurston's Revenge in *Mules and Men*." *Journal of American Folklore* 112.445 (1999): 343-371.
- Walton. Review of *Rhythm for Rain* by John Louw Nelson. 1937.
- Warrior, Robert Allen. *The People and the Word: Reading Native Nonfiction*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2005.
- Wells, Susan. "Freud's Rat Man and the Case Study: Genre in Three Keys." *New Literary History* 34.2 (2003): 353-366.
- . *Out of the Dead House: Nineteenth-Century Women Physicians and the Writing of Medicine*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2001.
- . "'Spandrels,' Narration, and Modernity." Selzer 42 – 60.
- Wertheimer, Molly, ed. *Listening to Their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women*. Columbia: U South Carolina P, 1997.
- White, Leslie. *The Ethnography and Ethnology of Franz Boas*. Bulletin of the Texas Memorial Museum. No. 6. Austin, TX: Museum of the University of Texas, 1963.
- White, Nancy Marie, Lynne P. Sullivan, and Rochelle A. Marrinan, eds. *Grit-Tempered: Early Women Archaeologists in the Southeastern United States*. Gainesville: UP Florida, 1999.
- Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order, 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.
- Wiegler, Marta and Kyle Fiore. *Santa Fe and Taos: The Writer's Era, 1916-41*. Santa Fe: Sunstone, 2008.
- Williams, Vernon J. *Rethinking Race: Franz Boas and His Contemporaries*. Lexington, KY: U Kentucky P, 1996.
- Wilson, Herbert Earl. *The Lore and the Lure of Yosemite. The Indians, Their Customs, Legends and Beliefs, Big Trees, Geology, and the Story of Yosemite*. San Francisco: Schwabacher-Frey Stationery Company, 1926.
- Winsor, Dorothy. "Genre and Activity Systems: The Role of Documentation in Maintaining and Changing Engineering Activity Systems." *Written Communication* 16 (1999): 200-24.

- . "Ordering Work: Blue Collar Literacy and the Political Nature of Genre." *Written Communication* 17 (2000): 155-84.
- Wissler, Clark and D. C. Duvall. *Mythology of the Blackfoot Indians*. Sept. 1908. American Museum of Natural History. *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History* 2 (1909): 1-164.
- Wittenberg, David. "Going Out in Public: Visibility and Anonymity in Michael Warner's 'Publics and Counterpublics.'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88.4 (2002): 426-433.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *On Certainty*. Ed. G. E. M. Anscombe and G. H. von Wright. Trans. Denis Paul and G. E. M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell, 1969.
- Wolfe, Patrick. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London/New York: Cassell, 1999.
- Women's Anthropological Society of America. "Organization and Historical Sketch of the Women's Anthropological Society of America." Published by the Society, Washington, D.C., 1889.
- Wood, Charles Erskine Scott. *A Book of Indian Tales: Being Some Myths of the North American Indians*. New York: Vanguard, 1929.
- Wood, Susan E. *The Freedom of the Streets: Work, Citizenship, and Sexuality in a Gilded-Age City*. Chapel Hill, NC: U North Carolina P, 2005.
- "Woodridge Club to Meet Tuesday." *The Washington Post* 8 Dec. 1940: S8.
- Worcester, Kenton W. "Social Science Research Council, 1923-1998." New York: Social Science Research Council, 2001.
- Worster, Donald. *A River Running West: The Life of John Wesley Powell*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001.
- Wright, Harold Bell. *Long Ago Told (Huh-Kew Ah-Kah): Legends of the Papago Indians*. New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1929.
- Wright, Elizabethada. "Rhetorical Spaces in Memorial Places: The Cemetery as a Rhetorical Memory Place/Space." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 35.4 (Fall 2005): 51-81.
- Wyer, Mary, et. al., eds. *Women, Science, and Technology: A Reader in Feminist Science Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Young, Michael. *Malinowski: Odyssey of an Anthropologist, 1884-1920*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2004.

Zelizer, Barbara. "Reading the Past Against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 12 (1995): 214-239.

Zhu, Yunxia. "Rhetorical Moves in Chinese Sales Genres, 1949 to the Present." *Journal of Business Communication* 37.2 (Apr. 2000): 156-172.

Zumwalt, Rosemary Levy. *Wealth and Rebellion: Elsie Clews Parsons, Anthropologist and Folklorist*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1992.