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SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

I. Washington Matthews Papers in the Wheelwright Museum

The Wheelwright Museum of the American Indian in Santa Fe has prepared a microfilm edition of the Washington Matthews Papers, with accompanying Guide, which is being published and distributed by the University of New Mexico Press in the spring of 1985. Matthews was an army surgeon and self-taught anthropologist in the American West in the late 19th century. After initial studies in Dakota Territory and California, his major work was in New Mexico. Long recognized as the first serious student of Navajo culture, his publications on Navajo religion and mythology are among the earliest anthropological works to present native religious belief and ritual with sympathetic understanding and scholarly thoroughness. When stationed at the Army Medical Museum in Washington, D.C., he contributed to the development of anthropometric techniques and analyzed the skeletal collections of the first Hemenway Southwestern Expedition. His papers illuminate the relationships among his contemporaries and friends (such as Bandelier, Bourke, Cushing, Powell, Mooney and Stephen) and contribute to our picture of the intellectual climate in which 19th century American anthropology emerged.

The Washington Matthews Collection was transferred from the University of California at Berkeley to the Wheelwright in 1951. It consists primarily of his ethnographic and linguistic notes, notebooks, manuscripts and correspondence. Additional materials were assembled from the National Archives, the Southwest Museum, the Bancroft Library, and other sources, including military records and correspondence with colleagues and friends. The microfilm project was supported by the National Publications and Records Commission. Its staff consisted of: Susan McGreevy, Project Director; Katherine Spencer Halpern, Research Anthropologist; and Mary E. Holt, Archivist. Dr. Halpern authored the 100-page Guide which accompanies the 10-roll microfilm. The Guide contains a detailed descriptive inventory of the papers and a complete bibliography of Matthews’ writings. It serves also as a summary of the sources of our knowledge of Matthews’ life and work.

II. The Arizona State Museum Archives

Elizabeth Gibson

The Arizona State Museum was created in 1893 by an act of the Territorial Legislature. Housed on the campus of the University of Arizona, it was the first anthropology museum in the United States to be located in the region that continues to be inhabited by the peoples being studied. The archives of the Museum were established in 1964, and include material resulting from research conducted by the Museum, as well as work produced through the
University’s Department of Anthropology. In addition to materials relating to Arizona and the greater Southwest, the archives contain a small quantity of material relating to Meso-America and the Philippines. Reflecting all facets of anthropological inquiry, these materials include official business correspondence, minutes of meetings, memos on policy, and annual reports and financial records of the Arizona State Museum and related units of the University of Arizona. Manuscript materials include correspondence, field notes, diaries, proposals, drafts of published reports and unpublished reports of the faculty, staff, students and research associates of the Museum and Department of Anthropology, as well as other scholars doing research on the Southwest.

Archeological materials include work done by Gordon C. Baldwin, Byron Cummings, Paul Ezell, Emil W. Haury, Alfred E. Johnson, Mary Elizabeth King, Donald J. Lehmer, Edwin B. Sayles, Arnold Witmers and Richard B. Woodbury. Information generated by contract archeology conducted in Arizona is also housed in the archives, as well as records resulting from the W.P.A. Statewide Archaeological Project and the complete records of the Gila Pueblo Foundation, a private research foundation that operated between 1928 and 1948. There is also material produced by archeologists associated with other institutions, including J.O. Brew of the Peabody Museum, Edward B. Danson of the Museum of Northern Arizona, Malcolm F. Farmer of the San Diego Museum of Man, Isabel Kelly, Paul S. Martin of the Field Museum of Natural History, Earl Morris of the American Museum of Natural History and James W. Simmons.

Ethnographic and linguistic material on native groups of the region includes a small quantity of field notes by William Y. Adams, N. Ross Crumrine’s 1961 field notes on the Mayo, Henry Dobyns’ 1948-1950 field notes on Papago dance, the 1967 oral history project completed by Robert and Elizabeth Euler on the Yavapai, Thomas Hinton’s field notes on the Yavapai and Apache (1953) and the Opata (1955), William R. Holland’s work (ca. 1950) on the Tzotil of Chiapas, and Muriel T. Painter’s field notes on the Yaqui, plus the work of Edward N. and Rosamond Spicer, compiled largely during the 1930’s, containing extensive notes on the cultures and languages of the Papago, Yaqui, and Seri Indians. There are also transcriptions of taped interviews collected in conjunction with the Doris Duke Oral History Project, directed by Bernard L. Fontana, as well as material compiled by the Bureau of Ethnic Research, including such items as a 1950’s Papago census and correspondence with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Edward P. Dozier collection contains his early observations on the Pueblo groups—although the bulk of his collection, including his later work, is as yet largely unprocessed.

Work completed by people outside the department includes Barbara Aitken’s 1910-1913 field notes on Santa Clara Pueblo, copies of E.F. Castetter and W.H. Bell’s 1938-1939 field notes on Papago botany and agriculture, a collection resulting from
Grenville Goodwin's extensive 1930's study on the Western Apache, copies of A.L. Kroeber's work on Papago linguistics, notes by Edward Palmer (ca.1880) on the Pima and California Indians, Sara Jones Tucker's work on the Hualapai, copies of some of Ruth Underhill's work on the Papago, and the John and Louisa Wetherill Papers pertaining to an early trading family in northern Arizona. The Museum's large photographic collection is housed separately.

The State Museum archives have been indexed by author and subject; most of the materials herein described may be located using this system. Incoming collections are now being arranged and described in accordance with nationally accepted archival standards. Researchers wishing to use the materials should communicate in advance with the archivist, Jeanne Armstrong, since the archive's hours of access are limited and there may be restrictions on certain collections.

III. Manuscripts at the Bibliothèque du Musée de l'Homme

Francoise Weil (Conservateur en Chef), reports that her department has a number of manuscripts currently in the process of classification. The largest series (about 8500 letters, dating from 1901-1958), consists of the incoming correspondence of Paul Rivet, indexed so that researchers may request whether a particular individual is either author of, or cited in, letters in the series. A second, smaller series, includes letters by Rivet himself (which Weil would like to supplement by xeroxes of letters in the hands of other institutions or scholars). There are also some letters received by Marcel Mauss. A fourth series consists of the archives of the Musée de l'Homme for the period 1928 to 1950, which are in the process of reclassification, so as to separate, insofar as practicable, the private correspondence of Rivet and G.H. Riviere from official business correspondence of the museum. Finally, there are various manuscripts which have no relation to the history of the museum.

IV. Blumenbach Correspondence

In June of 1984, Dr. F.W.P. Dougherty, as part of his ongoing work on the manuscripts of J. F. Blumenbach, arranged an exhibition at the Universitätssbibliothek Göttingen, entitled "Commercium Epistolicum J. F. Blumenbach." Dougherty has also compiled a catalogue of the exhibit, with the subtitle "Aus einem Briefwechsel des klassischen Zeitalters der Naturgeschichte." The catalogue contains the full text of some eighty letters to and from Blumenbach (some of them by English correspondents), as well as detailed information on the objects mentioned in them, and several illustrations. Catalogue copies may be obtained for 24 DM (plus postage) from the Niedersächschen Staats- und Universitätssbibliothek, Prinzenstr.1, 3400, Göttingen, Federal Republic of Germany.
FOOTNOTES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Academician Bromley on Soviet Ethnography

[The following text derives from an interview with Yulian Bromley, Director of the Mikhukho-Maklai Institute of Ethnography, on April 26, 1984, during a visit to the Soviet Union. After an initial exchange of greetings, the interview consisted essentially of Academician Bromley talking for an hour and a half on the history and present state of anthropology in the Soviet Union, although I offered occasional queries. Bromley spoke in Russian, with Valentine Paritsky translating; the reliability of the translation was indirectly attested by the fact that Dr. Bromley only had occasion to correct it a few times. It was clear that portions of the ground Dr. Bromley covered had been treated in his published writings—including, for instance, his discussion of "The Object and the Subject-Matter of Ethnography," in the Gellner volume on Soviet and Western Anthropology. On the other hand, the present version does offer for HAN readers a convenient short historical summary of recent Soviet "ethnography" (and an indication also of why that is the rubric for the study that has elsewhere been called "ethnology". Although I took extensive notes at the time, and Dr. Bromley has had the opportunity to offer corrections, the present account must obviously be regarded as at best a summary paraphrase of his lengthy comments. For background on the history of the Soviet Academy of Science, interested readers may consult Alexander Vucinich, Empire of Knowledge (Berkeley, 1984).--G.W.S].

In a sense, The Institute is the oldest in the Academy of Sciences, even older than the Academy itself, since it has its origin in the Kunstkammer of Peter the Great. Officially established in 1934, the Institute's coat of arms shows the Leningrad building housing the Ethnographic Museum, where before World War II the Institute itself was largely quartered. The Moscow section, however, is now the larger. Unlike other institutes of the Academy, the focus of the Ethnographic Institute is in principle world wide, although limitations of staff mean that its practical focus is on the U.S.S.R. However, fifteen years ago, the Institute published an eighteen-volume world ethnography, and it is now putting out a popular edition in cooperation with the Geographical Academy, which will include three or four volumes on each continent--eighteen of which have appeared already. The main work of the Institute, however, focuses on ethnographic studies (i.e., of the material, intellectual, and traditional culture) of both primitive societies and historical peoples.
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In addition, the Institute includes a department of physical anthropology (anthropology in the continental European sense), which focuses on problems of anthroposociogenesis and ethnogenesis. The latter represents a unique trend in world science—one which in any case has no parallel elsewhere in scale, although it is also studied in other socialist countries. The focus is on the problem of the origin of peoples, and anthropological (i.e., physical anthropological) materials help to clarify aspects of the problem, notably by the reconstruction of human races on the basis of skeletal remains (skeletal materials are also studied in reference to criminalistics). There is also a large group working on the American continent, including especially the decipherment of Mayan.

The focus has been from the beginning largely on the peoples treated by traditional ethnography. But since there was until the 1960s no concrete (i.e., empirical) sociology in the Soviet Union, ethnographers also were active even in the pre-World War II period in regard to problems of contemporary times, among industrially developed peoples. Thus although the focus in the late 1920s and early 1930s was on archaic survivals, ethnography also treated everything, everywhere, in the manner of cultural anthropology. Indeed, when an "ethnological" department was established at Moscow State University in 1925, it included in its purview the subject matter of all the social disciplines. When the other disciplines protested, however, the ethnological faculty was shut down; and since then, "ethnology" as a word has disappeared from scholarly vocabulary. The aftermath of all this is still felt (as ethnographers, we know that a symbol has feedback on the thing it denotes, and this is true also in regard to attitudes to a particular science held by those outside).

Even so, the broader approach began to revive in the postwar years. There were a number of works devoted to rural settlements, treating all aspects of rural social life, from economy up to religion, survivals, and so on. This approach to modern "everyday culture" was very fruitful. In the 1960s, concrete (empirical) sociology began to develop in the Soviet Union—like a mushroom after a warm rain. We soon realized that our field was being actively invaded by sociologists, and the problem thus arose of delimiting the fields.

In the same period (the late 1950s and early 1960s) our interest was attracted to ethnical process, to the changes among peoples. Before, the task had been to give a description of the traditional culture of a people. The interest was historical, but produced a static picture. But given the rapid change in the contemporary world, the focus on ethnic process is unavoidable. This trend was born spontaneously in opposition to the two main prior foci—on archaic survivals, and the more broadly sociological—because of the necessity to define the purpose of our science so as to delimit it from other disciplines, especially with respect to contemporary phenomena. There was
therefore a need for theory, and the creation of a theoretical model became the main object of our studies of "people-ethnos" (or "narodni-ethnos"-terms which are, of course, problematically polysemantic). In the 1960s a number of works were published on these problems, although the interest can be traced to the 1950s.

After this theoretical liberation, the focus was on concrete manifestations. A book on ethnic processes in the USSR was published in 1977, and will soon be translated into English; there were others on ethnic processes in Asia, Europe, Oceania, and the American continent. The Institute in fact pays much attention to ethnic process in America--not contemporary America, but early and mid-twentieth century United States, and in Canada, Central and South America. Ethnography in the Soviet Union is an historical science.

After having considered so far the object of ethnographic science, we must consider also the subject--what specifically should be studied. On the object, ethnography has been united since before the revolution: ethnography should treat all peoples, small and large, developed, lagging, in antiquity and modern times--though of course different specialists treat different aspects. As to what should be studied, there are different views, as in the United States. Three points of view are still held.

One holds that we should study folk culture, taken as a whole. This point of view is convincing, but many counter positions arise when a scholar has to view his field in relation to other disciplines (since art critics, historians of art, folklorists may all study the same folk culture). Also the concept of folk culture involves problematic shades of meaning in Russian--narod is too polysemantic.

A second view would define the subject matter in terms of the method of direct observation. This view is held especially by archeologists, who say their method is the spade, ours is observation. But observation is not limited to ethnography. It is also practiced in zoology, sociology, and psychology. Nor is ethnography limited to observation. It uses other methods as well.

The third view would say that the subject matter of ethnography is determined by the range of problems it studies. But this neglects the problem of criteria, which is the cornerstone or cardinal problem in each science. Thus physics studies physical properties, chemistry, chemical properties, and biology, biological properties. All sciences study properties of objective reality. The question, then, is what properties or qualities should ethnography study. The answer is: those traits
of peoples-ethnoses which differentiate such communities from other communities, such as stages, parties, classes and the like.

There are two such properties or qualities. On the one hand there is the ability to unite people from within—the trend leading to ethnic identity, the specific human traits which unite peoples of each ethnos, the specific traits of culture, especially of traditional culture in the broad sense (including language), as well as the traits of psychology entangled with traditional culture. But on the other hand, these same factors also differentiate a people from others outside. In our time, traits are being levelled, except for language. But in private, domestic life, they may still be visible.

So the task of ethnography is the study of the traditional culture of peoples to detect specific traits of each people, of each culture, and to see how they differ. Flowing from this is a new trend of comparative study of cultures in terms of their individual components. Thus, we have published four books on the rites and customs of European peoples, as well as work on house-types in Asia outside the USSR. In progress are works on European dwellings, the traditional dwellings of the USSR, and food habits.

While the theoretical viewpoints indicated above are mainly my own, these ideals are being recognized bit by bit by other ethnographers as well.

We turn now from the theoretical to the concrete. The problem, however, is very involved. On the one hand, we draw attention to ethnic processes, try to create a typology, etc. But contemporary ethnic processes can not be understood without the study of urbanized culture as well, and here we must study a different set of problems, not pertaining to traditional processes. We are therefore creating a new discipline—ethnosociology—by combining ethnography and sociology.

 Everywhere in modern science, the most promising prospects appear on the margins of disciplines (biochemistry, etc.). This border discipline will study the relation between ethnocultural process and social processes. It will therefore treat two aspects: the specific of social processes in different ethnic groups, and the specifics of ethnic processes in different social groups. Many methods are borrowed from the sociologists, including questionnaires (Soviet sociologists have done a number of mass surveys, of up to 10,000 people, in the different republics). There a number of books on ethnosociological processes—-or as we call them in the Soviet Union, "national processes" (our word "nation" focuses on the ethnic aspect, rather than the state aspect).
There are also other border disciplines, including ethnic anthropology (a section of physical anthropology), ethnomodelogy, and the beginnings of ethnolinguistics, as well as ethnoeconomics, ethn ecology, and ethnopedagogies. In short, there is a complex of disciplines that study ethnic processes together with other disciplines.

The key problem is to catch and fix dying traits in the culture of each ethnos—the last relics of traditional culture in the process of quick disappearance. To this end we are preparing ethnic atlases, etc.

As for the organization of ethnography in the Soviet Union, each Soviet Republic (save the Russian, which has the All-Union Academy) has its own Academy of Science, each with an ethnographic unit. The same is true in the autonomous republics. Between these various ethnographic units there are a number of different forms of cooperation.

This expansion began when we started training our specialists before the war. At that time there were few ethnographers on the periphery, although there were specialists in other disciplines on the borderline of ethnography (e.g., the art critic who became interested in ethnic dance). During World War II, many scholars were evacuated to Central Asia, and in this situation ethnography was a spontaneous trend. But after the war we began to train specialists. Some republics are saturated, others do not have enough. In most republics, expeditions are on a joint basis. Every two years there is an all union conference on the previous two years work, at which we exchange views and coordinate future work. In the intervening years, there are conferences on particular problems. The meetings are held at different places outside Moscow—this year in the Ukraine; last year in Kazan.

As for our international relations, I would emphasize that for us, America is New York. Through IREX, we are involved in several programs: one on longevity, one on comparative studies of peoples of the North, one on ethnicity (i.e., ethnic processes).

Our journal Sovjetskaja Ethnografiia has a great number of lively discussions—we are not, as many in the West think, all of the same cut. Discussion is a norm of our scientific life. In my opinion, the exchange of information on the tasks of science is the main problem. I recall the many interesting conferences in Burg Wartenstein, as well as the book edited by Ernest Gellner.
RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

David P. Adams (History, Univ. of Florida), is beginning research on the Princeton University Expedition to Patagonia, 1896-1899, led by J.B. Hatcher.

Elazar Barkan (History, Brandeis) is writing a dissertation on the history of racial theories in British and American anthropology and related sciences during the 1920s and 30s.

Ives Goddard (Smithsonian Institution) is pursuing research on the text-editing practices of Truman Michelson and Leonard Bloomfield (as well as other linguists) and would be interested in receiving information on the principles or guidelines currently accepted today in editing hand-written, dictated and recorded versions of primary linguistic materials.

Melinda Kanner (Anthropology, Ohio State) is pursuing dissertation level research on the life and work of the paleontologist Raymond Dart.

Charles Morrison (Anthropology, Michigan State) has compiled a bibliography of 113 publications of Sir Richard Carnac Temple (1850-1931), including his major works and reports, and all of his contributions to *Man*, and would appreciate receiving further references to obscure notes and reviews. Temple—who is to be distinguished from his father, Sir Richard Temple (1826-1902)—often published under the initials RCT.

Nancy J. Parezo (Arizona State Museum) informs us that the Museum is working on a centennial history for the University of Arizona analyzing the role of anthropologists at the University in the development of anthropology, particularly in the American Southwest.

Valerie Pinsky (Anthropology, University of Cambridge) and Alison Wylie (Philosophy, University of Calgary) are editing a book tentatively titled *Critical Traditions in Contemporary Archaeology* which includes a section on the history of archaeology.

Bertrand Pulman (College International de Philosophie, Paris) is pursuing research for a these d'Etat on the history of fieldwork in modern anthropology ("Aux frontieres de l'anthropologie: la question du 'terrain' a l'épreuve de la modernite") and would appreciate being in touch with other researchers pursuing topics in this area.

H.F. Vermeulen (Groenhovenstraat 14, 2311 BT Leiden) is doing research for a master's thesis on the comparative emergence of ethnography and ethnology.
I. The History of Anthropology in France

The papers of the workshop on "History of Anthropology" held in Sèvres, France in conjunction with the International Conference on "The Practice of Anthropology Today," organized by the Association française des Anthropologues, November 19-21, 1981, have recently been published. Twenty-one papers are included in the volume edited by Britta Rupp-Eisenreich, *Histoires de l'anthropologie (XVIe-XIXe siècles)* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1984)—no. 1 below. Another ten are included in a special number of the journal *L'Ethnographie* (No. 90—91), entitled *L'Anthropologie: Points d'histoire*—no. 2 below. Two others have been separately published—no. 3 below.

1. Histoires de l'anthropologie

**Signes [Part 1]**

Un Genre ethnographique profane au xvié siècle: Les livres d'habita (Essai d'ethno-iconographie)—D. Defert ...25
Discours anthropologique et discours théologique aux vié siècle: "L'Apologie de Raymond de Sebonden de Montaigne
--B. Bucher ...43
La relation de voyage: document anthropologique ou texte littéraire? —F. Weil ...55
Séquences de l'Histoire dans l'anthropologie des Lumières: Problèmes et mythe
--P. Gossiaux ...67

**Figures [Part 2]**

Aux "origines" de la Völkerkunde allemande: de la *Statistik
e à l'Anthropologie de G. Forster—B. Rupp-Eisenreich ...89
Le monde extra-européen dans la formation de deux révolu-
tionnaires (Demeunier & Volney) —E. Lemay ...117
Volney, l'étude des langues dans l'observation de l'homme
--C. Desirat & T. Horde ...133
Les éléments anthropologiques dans l'œuvre de Charles Nodier
--C. Mathon ...143
Deux grand ethnologues pratiquement inconnus de la profession:
les Pères François Callet et Léopold Cadière
--G. Condominas ...161

**Aires [Part 3]**

L'Américanisme tropical, une frontière fossile de l'ethnologie
--A-C. Taylor ...213
La terre, le don et le sacrifice: la société yakoute dans l'œuvre des juristes russes à la fin du xixe siècle
--J. Kerro ...235
L'ethnographie soviétique est-elle une anthropologie?
--B. Chichlo ...247
Des préfets aux champs: une ethnographie administrative de la France en 1800 --M-N. Bourguet ...259

Sur une anthropologie haïtienne au xixe siècle--L.Hurbon ...273

Cristallisations (Part 4)

Linguistique et anthropologie en France (1600-1900) --S. Auroux ...291

L’anthropologie physique et morale en France et ses implications idéologiques --A. Kremer-Marietti ...319

Le Dictionnaire d’anthropologie de L.F. Jehan: apolégétique et histoire naturelle des races dans la France de 1850 --C. Benichou & C. Blanckaert...353

L’Evolution transformée: Positivistes et matérialistes dans la Société d’Anthropologie de Paris du Second Empire à la Troisième République --J. Harvey ...387

Tératologie et anthropologie: introduction à l’étude du rapport entre la science des monstres et l’histoire naturelle de l’homme dans la seconde moitié du xixe siècle --J-L. Fischer ...411

L’anthropologie criminelle et la Cour d’Assises de Paris à la Belle Epoque --R. Harris ...415

Qu’est-ce qui est en jeu dans un nom?--La Société d’Ethnographie et l’historiographie de l’“anthropologie” en France --G.W.Stocking ...421

2. L’Ethnographie

Ethnologie, anthropologie et sociologie (Powell, Boas, Durkheim) --G. Leclerc ...23

Bronislaw Malinowski: de l’anthropologie linguistique à la linguistique anthropologique --A. Joly ...47

L’École d’ethnologie de Vienne et la situation actuelle de l’ethnohistoire --K. R. Wernhart ...61

Evans-Pritchard et l’histoire de la pensée anthropologique --A. Kuper ...69

Un champ d’étude ethnologique en transformation --P.E. De Josselin de Jong ...75

De l’autorité en ethnographie --J. Clifford ...87

Joseph Nadler. Des peuples-souche à la nation --M. Korinman ...119

Des choses occultes en histoire des sciences humaines: le destin de la “science nouvelle” de Christoph Meiners --B. Rupp-Eisenreich ...131

Bibliographie élémentaire et critique de l’histoire de l’ethnologie --P. Menget ...201
3. Separately Published:


II. Recent Dissertations
(Ph.D. except where M.A. indicated)


III. Recent Work by Subscribers

[Note that we do not list "forthcoming" items. Please wait until your works have actually appeared to send citations or offprints, so that we may be certain of dates and page numbers.]

DeMallie, Raymond, ed. The Sixth Grandfather: Black Elk's Teachings Given to John G. Neihardt (Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska, 1984).


IV. Suggested by our Readers


Ellis, John M. *One Fairy Story Too Many: The Brothers Grimm and Their Tales* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago) [includes material on their ethnographic research--R.E.B.]


Greene, John C. *American Science in the Age of Jefferson* (Ames: Iowa State) [chapters on physical anthropology, archeology, linguistics--R.E.B.]


Smith, Bruce D. "Mississippian Expansion: Tracing the Historical Development of an Explanatory Model". Southeastern Archaeology 3(1) (1984):13-32 [Bartram's Creek migration legend as interpreted by Swanton has provided an "explanatory framework ... float[ing] high above the archaeological data base"; James W. Griffin has been right for 35 years, and Gordon R. Willey wrong--W.C.S.]

G.W.S. = George W. Stocking
J.V. = James Urry
R.B.W. = Richard B. Woodbury
R.E.B. = Robert E. Bieder
R.D.F. = Raymond D. Fogleson
W.C.S. = William C. Sturtevant
GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS

Research Committee on the History of Sociology

Scheduled papers of anthropological interest at the Munich conference of the RCHS (July, 1984) included: "The 'Psychologie des Peuples': An Anthropological Subdiscipline in Turn of the Century France" (Joseph R. Llobera); "Robertson Smith and James Frazer: Two Traditions in the Anthropological Study of Religion" (Bob Jones); "Toward the History of Social Darwinism: Georges Vacher de Lapouge's Theory of 'Social Selections'" (Andre Bejin).

Western History Association.

The program for the 1984 meetings in St. Paul, Minnesota, included a paper by Katherine Spencer Halpern, Mary E. Holt, and Susan McGreevy (Wheelwright Museum, Santa Fe, New Mexico) entitled: "Washington Matthews: Army Surgeon and Field Anthropologist in the American West, 1843-1905".

Sapir Centennial Symposia

The centenary of the birth of Edward Sapir saw two major symposia discussing various aspects of his life and work. At the annual meetings of the AAA, two sessions were organized by James N. Nyce (Brown). The first, entitled "Edward Sapir's Place in the History of the Social Sciences," was chaired by George W. Stocking (Chicago), and an introductory paper was given by J. David Sapir (Virginia). Other papers included: "Edward Sapir: The Jewish Dimension" (Edgar E. Siskin, Jerusalem Center for Anthropological Research); "Edward Sapir and the Mapping of American Indian Languages and Cultures" (Regna Darnell, Alberta and Dell Hymes, Pennsylvania); "Edward Sapir and the Rockefeller Foundation" (Lawrence C. Kelly, North Texas State); "The Sapir, Sullivan and Laswell Collaborations: Real and Imagined" (Richard J. Preston, McMaster); "Sapir as Psychological Anthropologist" (Philip K. Bock, New Mexico); "Edward Sapir's Thought in American Psychoanalysis" (Eugene B. Brody, Maryland) and "Edward Sapir and the Aesthetics of Language" (Bill Beeman, Brown).

A second session, entitled "Edward Sapir as an Anthropologist", was chaired by Dell Hymes (Pennsylvania) and included the following papers: "Edward Sapir, Ethnologist, at Chicago" (Morris E. Opler, Oklahoma); "Retrospective Ethnography: Field Notes as Myth" (Susan Golla, Columbia); "When the Exotic is Mistaken for Subject: Sapir's Critique of Ethnography" (Howard F. Stein, Oklahoma); "Sapir and Linguistics" (Victoria A. Fromkin, UCLA); "The Classification of American Indian Languages by Radin and Sapir" (Mary Sacharoff, San Francisco State) and "Significant Form: The Influence of Sapir's Poetics on his Phonemic Theory" (Richard Handier, Lake Forest College).
Earlier in the fall, a second symposium was held in Ottawa at the Victoria Memorial Museum Building from October 1 - 3, 1984. Papers were given by Robert J. Allen (SUNY-Albany), Regna Darnell (Alberta), Federica de Laguna (Bryn Mawr), Fred Eggan (Chicago), William N. Fenton (SUNY-Albany), Catherine S. Fowler (Nevada-Reno), Ives Goddard (Smithsonian), Victor Golla (George Washington), Richard Handler (Lake Forest), Dell Hymes (Pennsylvania), Michael E. Krauss (Alaska), Margaret Langdon (San Diego), Wendy Leeds-Hurwitz (Wisconsin), Yakov Malkiel (Berkeley), Stephen D. Murray (San Francisco), Stanley Newman (New Mexico), James N. Nyce (Brown), Eila Oksaar (Hamburg), Richard J. Preston (McMaster), Michael Silverstein (Chicago), and David Weinstein (Bethesda, MD).

In conjunction with the Ottawa symposium was a roundtable discussion which included Fred Eggan, Mary R. Haas, Fang Kuei Li, David G. Mandelbaum, Stanley S. Newman, Kenneth L. Pike, Edgar Siakun, and Charles F. Voegelin.

The Sapir centenary has also been the stimulus for various publications, including a plan to reprint many of Sapir's works. Already available is Victor Golla's addition to The Sapir-Kroeber Correspondence: Letters Between Edward Sapir and A. L. Kroeber 1905-1925, published as Report #6 of The Survey of California and Other American Indian Languages, University of California, Berkeley, 1984.