1-1-1991

Volume 18, Issue 1

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/han/vol18/iss1/1
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.
# History of Anthropology Newsletter

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**CLIO'S FANCY**

"Included in this Classification" .................................. 3

**RESEARCH IN PROGRESS** .......................................................... 11

**BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANA**

I. Recent Journal Numbers .................................................. 12
II. Recent Dissertations ......................................................... 13
III. Work by Subscribers ....................................................... 14
IV. Suggested by Our Readers ............................................... 15

**GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS** ................................ 20
The Editorial Committee

Robert Bieder
Indiana University

Regna Darnell
University of Alberta

Curtis Hinsley
Colgate University

Dell Hymes
University of Pennsylvania

George W. Stocking
University of Chicago

William Sturtevant
Smithsonian Institution

Subscription rates
(Each volume contains two numbers: June and December)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual subscribers (North America)</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student subscribers</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional subscribers</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscribers outside North America</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checks for renewals, new subscriptions or back numbers should be made payable (in United States dollars only) to:

History of Anthropology Newsletter (or to HAN).

Direct all correspondence relating to subscriptions and editorial matters to:

George W. Stocking, HAN
Department of Anthropology
University of Chicago
1126 East 59th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Subscribers and contributors should understand that HAN is carried on with a small budget as a spare-time activity. Correspondence and documentation relating to institutional or subscription service billing must therefore be kept to a minimum.

We depend very much on our readers to send along bibliographic notes, research reports, and items for our other departments. It will not always be possible, however, to acknowledge contributions, or to explain the exclusion of those few items not clearly related to the history of anthropology or for other reasons inappropriate.
"Included in the present classification": Notes toward an Archeology of Ethnographic Categorization

In the 1930s, during the later phases of Boasian diffusionism, when the mainline of American anthropology had moved toward cultural holism, culture and personality, and acculturation, students and colleagues of Alfred Kroeber went into the field armed with the "laundry lists" of the California Culture Element Distribution project (cf. Driver 1962). The results of such studies produced tables in which traits were marked by their presence (x) or their absence (-), from which the following is a less than random selection:

1085. Swimming, breast stroke
1086. Swimming, dog fashion
1087. Swimming, on back
1088. Swimming, crawl (overhead reaching)
1089. Males urinate squatting
1090. First marital intercourse anal
1091. "Toilet chips" [for wiping]
1092. Women sit cross-legged (Turkish)
1093. Women kneel on knees and toes, buttocks on heels
1094. Women sit with 1 foot under, other at side

Reading for the first time the culminating entries from E. W. Gifford's trait list for the various bands of the Pomo (Kroeber et al. 1939), I recalled the category-shattering laughter of Michel Foucault, in the opening lines of The Order of Things, upon his first reading of Borges' imaginary Chinese encyclopedia, which divided animals into:

a) belonging to the Emperor
b) embalmed
c) tame
d) sucking pigs
e) sirens
f) fabulous
g) stray dogs
h) included in the present classification
i) frenzied
j) innumerable
k) drawn with a very fine camelhair brush
l) et cetera
m) having just broken the water pitcher
n) that from a long way off look like flies

What implicit system of cultural or ethnographic categorization could possibly account for this strange juxtaposition of behaviors: swimming, pissing, fucking, shitting, sitting? At the most immediate level, the heading gave a ready answer: "Postures and Actions." But why in a list of over a thousand
items should these ten come last? Were the same or similar items included in all the Kroeberian "laundry lists"? Were there perhaps underlying principles to be found in the ethnographic categories of other anthropologists or schools? Would these be the same at different moments in the history of anthropology? Was there, in effect, a kind of deep categorical structure to the European ethnographic experience generally? My wonderment encouraged a research foray (carried on, I should say, in large part by my research assistant Andrea Lee-Harshbarger, and fortuitously supplemented by the bachelor's thesis of Daniel Turner on the ethnographic categories used by James Cook and Joseph Banks on the voyage of the Endeavour in the years 1768-1771).

A comparison of the other trait listings in volume thirty-seven of the University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology (1939) quickly revealed that the "laundry lists" were not all the same—that for the Yana containing only half as many items. And, as Kroeber suggested, the discrepancy was motivated: "Our element lists are not a 'Notes and Queries,' that is, an unlocalized universal-pattern collection of memoranda and instructions for government officials, missionaries, and ethnographic amateurs or novices. They are derived from a thirty-year accumulation, by many participants, of ethnographic knowledge of one area, obtained by ethnographic fieldwork of orthodox type." Kroeber went on to suggest that "each region studied requires a list of its own based on previously acquired knowledge of its cultures." (72) Discussing the methodology of Stanislaw Klimek's statistical analysis of the distribution material (cf Golbeck 1980), Kroeber specified three criteria that must be met in deciding whether the "elements operated with are justifiable units": "First, the elements must be sharply definable. Second, they must be derived empirically, not logically. And third, they must be accepted for use without bias or selection" (1).

Elsewhere in the volume, Kroeber indicated how the lists evolved. They began with "a list of eight hundred culture traits or elements occurring in native California" which he himself compiled in 1928 (but apparently never published as such) for the study that eventually appeared as Cultural and Natural Areas of Native North America (1939). In preparing a "more accurate list" suitable for statistical study, Klimek "shrank" Kroeber's "rough" list by half--after which "Gifford and others" expanded the list "as a basis for new systematic field inquiry" (123; cf. 72).

Although quite disparate in length, the lists were not, of course, totally lacking in structure. As the "Postures and Actions" heading suggests, specific traits were grouped under headings, which may be compared as follows (and in several instances have been abbreviated):
One striking aspect of these lists is the clear relationship to a museum-based, object-oriented anthropology—in which clothing and basketry have pride of place, and bulk much larger quantitatively (in terms of the number of distinct elements under each heading) than many sociological or ritual aspects of culture. Kroeber, of course, had strong connections to museological anthropology, and was inclined to minimize the more sociological aspects of the discipline. One notes also that, despite Kroeber’s appeal to induction, there is an order in the sequence of categories: from subsistence to life cycle to social organization to religious belief—in general, that is, from the material to the ideal.
Since by implication Kroeber himself referred to other systems of ethnographic classification, one is inclined to make a few brief comparisons, to see what if any commonalities there may be among them. "Notes and Queries," of course, referred to the ethnographic manuals prepared by committees of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. The first edition (1874), in which E. B. Tylor played the major role, was divided into three major sections: The Constitution of Man; Culture; Miscellaneous. The seventy-five headings devoted to "Culture" began with "history," and moved from there to archaeology, etymology, astronomy, arithmetic, medicine, food, cannibalism, narcotics, crimes, morals, covenants, religion, superstitions, magic and witchcraft, mythology, government, laws, customs, taboo, property, trade, money, measures, war, hunting, nomadism, pastoralism, agriculture, domestication of animals, slavery, social relations, marital relations, relationships, widows, infanticide, limitation of population, education, initiatory ceremonies, games, communications, tattooing, clothing, personal ornaments, burials, deformations, tribal marks, circumcision, totems, dyeing, music, language, poetry, writing, drawing, ornamentation, machinery, navigation, habitations, fire, string, weaving, pottery, leatherwork, basketwork, stone implements, metallurgy, arts and manufacturers, memorial structures, engineering, topography, swimming, natural forms, conservatism, variation, invention.

While there is no apparent systematic logic to this listing, the contrast between its sequence and that of Kroeber's "laundry lists" is striking. Already author of a work on Primitive Culture (1871) in its more ideal manifestations—but not yet the Keeper of the University Museum at Oxford--Tylor started with modes of knowledge and belief, moved then to social and economic organization, and relegated the clearly "collectible" manifestations of material culture to the very end.

Interestingly enough, however, this reversal of the material to ideal sequence was not to persist in Notes and Queries. In later editions, the order was changed, and by 1912, the movement was from "physical anthropology" to "technology" to "sociology" to "arts and sciences" (including language, fine art, stories, music, dancing, drama, games and amusements, reckoning and measurement, money and other measurements of value, natural science, religion, and "adopted elements in culture: importation, imitation, teaching"). The sequence was from mankind as physical being to technology to social organization to belief systems—i.e., once again, from the physical and the material to the ideal.

The second system of classification to which Kroeber indirectly referred was that of Clark Wissler, who in 1923 had devoted the fifth chapter of his influential book on Man and Culture to "The Universal Pattern." There Wissler
suggested that "students of cultures find that the same
general outline will fit them all: thus, we may say the facts
of culture may be comprehended under nine heads as in the
accompanying table":

The Culture Scheme

1. Speech
   Languages, writing systems, etc.
2. Material Traits
   a. Food Habits
   b. Shelter
   c. Transportation and Travel
   d. Dress
   e. Utensils, tools, etc.
   f. Weapons
   g. Occupations and industries
3. Art. Carving, painting, drawing, music, etc.
4. Mythology and Scientific Knowledge
5. Religious Practices
   a. Ritualistic forms
   b. Treatment of the Sick
   c. Treatment of the dead
6. Family and Social Systems
   a. The forms of marriage
   b. Methods of reckoning relationship
   c. Inheritance
   d. Social control
   e. Sports and games
7. Property
   a. Real and personal
   b. Standards of value and exchange
   c. Trade
8. Government
   a. Political forms
   b. Judicial and legal procedures
9. War

(Wissler 1923:74)

In the aftermath of the Great War, "War" was by implica-
tion given a terminal categorical prominence. Insofar as
Wissler offered explicit justification for the sequence,
however, it would seem to have been in implicitly
evolutionary terms, in which the movement was from the animal
to the individual to the social: the priority of speech was
argued on the grounds that "one can scarcely conceive of an
animal community without some degree of communication" (81);
tools--conceived as "material constructs both to supplant
and protect the individual"--were "so universal that man has
been defined as the tool-using animal" (89); from there
Wissler turned to "relations of individuals within the group
and around these functions, what is spoken of as social
organization"--leaving the rest of the categories unremarked.

Wissler's "universal pattern" was one of three "most
promising" prior classificatory schemes consulted in establishing the one developed by George Murdock and his colleagues at the Yale Institute of Human Relations in the late 1930s to serve as the organizing principle of the "Cross-Cultural Survey" (which in 1949 eventuated in the Human Relations Area Files). In the event, however, Wissler's (along with that of Yale's William Graham Sumner and A. G. Keller, as well as their prior source in Herbert Spencer's Descriptive Sociology) "did not seem adequate or comprehensive enough," and a new "Outline of Cultural Materials" was created (Ford 1971:177-78). Its goal was "to provide a consistent system of classification that would permit the ordering of information on man's various environments—including climate, geography and topography, flora, and fauna as well as the physical, social, and behavioral characteristics of a people, their beliefs, value systems, religion and philosophy" (176).

Although that retrospective comment itself suggests that there were in fact implicit prior assumptions about the proper ordering of ethnographic data, it is worth noting certain moments in the development of the HRAF schema. According to its historian, elaborating "the reproductive cycle" was relatively easy, since "the biological aspects of reproduction provided convenient categories" around which "ethnographers tend to organize their information" (Ford 1971:178). But an attempt to develop a "logical system" for material culture broke down when confronted by the actual content of existing ethnographies. The lesson "that was learned was that for technology and material culture"—and for "nearly every part of the outline that was eventually produced"—the "mode of its construction had to be an inductive process." Rather than developing a priori "a logical scheme," it became necessary to examine comprehensively the way in which "ethnographers and other observers [actually] tended to group descriptive information." Categories "based on contemporary theory had to be abandoned in favor of inductively perceived methods of existing classification." It was only in relation to "social and kin groupings and organization"—the privileged theoretical categories of the Murdockian project—that "a series of analytic distinctions had to be made and defined," due to the "lack of consistent usage on the part of ethnographers and other observers in the field. . . " (181-82).

The resulting schema included 88 major headings:

10 Orientation
11 Bibliography
12 Methodology
13 Geography
14 Human Biology
15 Behavior Processes & Personality
16 Demography
17 History & Culture Change
18 Total Culture
19 Language
20 Communication
21 Records
22 Food Quest
Again, one notes certain categorical priorities specific to this particular system of classification. In a somewhat different and more pervasive way than with Wissler's "universal pattern," warfare seems to have been privileged—inasmuch as the whole effort (which was in fact supported by the Department of the Navy) was geared, as the category labels suggest, to the analysis of economically and technologically advanced societies. One notes also the special placement of life cycle phenomena at the end, where by implication they suggest a reiterative circularity to the whole cultural scheme. However, there is enough similarity between this scheme and several others treated so far to suggest an underlying framework of assumption. Insofar as one takes the first as foremost, it would seem that at the level of ethnographic classification, if not that of anthropological theorizing, there is a certain materialist, one might even
say "technoenvironmental determinist," bias built into western anthropological thought.

But if this would seem, at the level of ethnographic classification, to qualify Marvin Harris' critique of The Rise of Anthropological Theory (1968), it seems quite unlikely that there has been a pervasive but unacknowledged debt to Karl Marx. The roots of the priority of the material go back long before Marx—and are linked, one suspects, to a teleological privileging of the ideal (as Marx himself might have argued). A recent look at the categories employed by Joseph Banks and Captain Cook on the first of the latter's three expeditions to Southern Seas between 1768 and 1771 suggests that the bias was already then manifest. Thus, Banks' account of New Zealand moved through the following topics: terrain, soil, timber, minerals, quadrupeds, birds, insects, fish, plants, population, appearance, hygiene, tattoos, clothing, ornaments, shelter, food, drink, health, boats, tools, textiles, fishing, cultivation of land, arms, war song and dance, cannibalism, forts, civil government, women, religion, burial customs, and language. While there is variation between the schemas adopted at Tierra del Fuego, Tahiti, New Zealand and Australia, as well as between the two observers, the general movement would seem to be from the external to the internal, from the material to the ideal, from the physical to the spiritual, from that which is closer to nature to that which is closer to God, from the individual to the social, from the concrete to the abstract—or, one might suggest, from the actually collectible to the merely recountable.

Whether, as Daniel Turner (1991) suggests, the basis for this schema is to be found in "the Great Chain of Being" seems perhaps moot—since the sequence "quadrupeds, birds, insects, fish, plants" does not correlate with that of the chain (cf. Lovejoy 1936). But it does seem likely that there is a kind of deep patterning (if not structuring) of ethnographic classification in the anthropological tradition, a patterning derivative perhaps from traditions of natural historical inquiry, and of cosmological and religious assumption. More systematic investigation of questionnaires and other such instruments, as well as comparative study of travel accounts and ethnographies (from the point of view of their actual structuring, as opposed to their exemplification of a generalized notion of "ethnographic authority" [cf. Clifford 1983]), might prove a fruitful project. [GWS]

References Cited

British Association for the Advancement of Science. 1874. Notes and queries on anthropology, for the use of travellers and residents in uncivilized lands. London.


**RESEARCH IN PROGRESS**

Steve Alter (Department of History, University of Michigan) is starting research for a dissertation on the nineteenth century Yale University linguist William Dwight Whitney.

Penny Lee (Department of Education, University of Western Australia) is doing research on the linguistic work of Benjamin Lee Whorf.

Mary Anne Levine (Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst) is working on a manuscript
entitled "Uncovering a Buried Past: The History of Women in Americanist Archaeology to World War II."

Kit Malagoda (Sociology, University of Auckland) has for some time been carrying on research for a book focussing on the anthropological and archeological work of A. M. Hocart in South Asia.

Ruth Mandel (Department of Anthropology, University College, London) is planning research which will seek to compare the discourses surrounding immigration issues in Germany, Britain, and the United States.

Michael Richardson (Department of Anthropology and Sociology, School of Oriental and African Studies) plans to undertake research for a dissertation on "The Crisis of Objectivity in Anthropology: A Consideration through Romanticism and Surrealism."

Benoit Massin (History of Science, EHESS, Paris) is doing doctoral research on the "History of Racial Theories and their Main Critics in Germany, 1860-1945."

Patrick Wolfe (Department of History, University of Melbourne) is conducting doctoral research on the paradigm shift in British anthropology from evolutionism to structural functionalism in the context of major world events (the decline of European in favor of American power, the rise of international communism, etc.), major industrial and technological developments, and institutional and other factors.

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANA

I. Recent Journal Numbers

Bulletin of the History of Archaeology--the first number of this new subdisciplinary publication appeared in May, and includes a number of the categories of HAN: current research, dissertations, recent work by subscribers, reports of academic gatherings, sources and announcements. In addition, BHA includes death notices, and plans in future numbers to include book and journal article reviews, as well as a short substantive articles under the heading "Discourse on the History of Archaeology." Although HAN will occasionally draw on the bibliographic listings of BHA (as they will doubtless draw on ours), we will not attempt to reproduce all the bibliographic material included therein. Readers who wish to subscribe to BHA ($5 US; $8 overseas) should communicate with the General Editor, Douglas R. Givens, Department of Behavioral Sciences, St. Louis Community College-Meremec, 11333 Big Bend Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63122.


Journal of the History of Collections--among "recent articles" in this publication of the Oxford University Press (now in its third volume) is Ezio Bassani and Letizia Tedeschi, "The Image of the Hottentot in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries."

II. Recent Dissertations
(Ph.D. except where otherwise indicated)

Barnhart, Terry A. "Of mounds and men: The early anthropological career of Ephraim George Squier" (Miami University, Department of History, 1989).

Clay, Catherine B., "Ethos and empire: The ethnographic expedition of the Imperial Russian Naval Ministry, 1855-1862" (University of Oregon, 1989).
III. Recent Work by Subscribers

[Except in the case of new subscribers, for whom we will include one or two orienting items, "recent" is taken to mean within the last two years. Please note that we do not list "forthcoming" items. To be certain of dates and page numbers, please wait until your works have actually appeared before sending offprints (preferably), or citations in the style used in History of Anthropology and most anthropological journals]


IV. Suggested by our Readers

[Although the subtitle does not indicate it, the assumption here is the same as in the preceding section: we list "recent" work--i.e., items appearing in the last several years.]


Gerigk, Horst-Jürgen. 1989. Der Mensch als Affe in der deutschen, französischen, russischen, englischen un


Graham, Richard, ed. 1990. The idea of race in Latin America, 1870-1940. Austin: University of Texas [includes Alan Knight on "Racism, revolution and Indigenismo: Mexico, 1910-1940"--G.W.S.]


Roscoe, Will. 1988. We'Wha and Klah: The American Indian hermaphrodite as artist and priest. *American Indian Quarterly* 12:127-50 [numerous references to anthropologists who worked among the Zuni and the Navaho--D.M.S.]


B.N.K. = Bruce N. Koplin  I.J. = Ira Jacknis
D.M.S. = David M. Schneider  M.Z. = Marko Zivkovic
G.W.S. = George W. Stocking  R.D.F. = Raymond D. Fogelson
I. B. = Ira Bashkow  W.C.S. = William C. Sturtevant

GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS.

The Society for American Archaeology's Committee on the History of Archaeology met as an Advanced Seminar on Documenting the History of Archaeology at the School of American Research in Santa Fe, New Mexico, from 14-18 July 1990. The primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Committee's scope, responsibilities, and objectives, and to formulate a detailed and manageable plan of its activities over the next seven years.

The Committee on the History of Archaeology explicitly recognizes the vital importance of the historiography of archaeology for contemporary research practice, viewing it as a means of promoting a critical understanding of its processes, products, and consequences, both within and beyond the profession. The Committee thus seeks to encourage and facilitate all aspects of research into the history of archaeology in the Americas (in accordance with the scope of the SAA), by identifying, preserving, and making accessible all relevant source materials. Because many of these source materials are widely dispersed, difficult to access, and in many cases, as yet unidentified, priority will be given to the ultimate creation of a machine-readable database to be managed by a central coordinating office. The feasibility of extending this project to other anthropological subfields is also being considered.

For further information contact the Committee's Chairperson, Dr. Douglas Givens, c/o Department of Behavioral Science, St. Louis Community College at Meramec, 11333 Big Bend Boulevlard, St. Louis, Missouri 63122, USA.

(edited from an announcement by Valerie Pinsky)