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FOOTNOTES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

Ideal Types and Aging Glands: Robert Redfield's Response to Oscar Lewis's Critique of Tepoztlan

In the recent critical "life and letters" of Oscar Lewis by Susan Rigdon (1988) there are reprinted major portions of several letters Lewis wrote to Robert Redfield regarding their differences over the interpretation of the "folk culture" of Tepoztlan (Redfield 1930, Lewis 1951). For understandable reasons, the volume does not include Redfield's side of the correspondence. Since this is one of the classic cases of substantial disagreement over the interpretation of what was putatively the "same" ethnographic entity (cf. Stocking 1989), and since Redfield (unlike Ruth Benedict or Margaret Mead in the other two most important cases) did in fact respond to the critique of his work, both in correspondence and in print (cf. Redfield 1960: 132-48), it seems appropriate to get into the public record some of his side of the private correspondence responding to the Lewis critique.

Lewis had been in touch with Redfield from the time of his first fieldwork in Tepoztlan (OL/RR 11/9/43, reproduced in part in Rigdon 1988:187-88), and Redfield was on several occasions supportive of his work. During the late spring and early summer of 1948, however, Lewis wrote several letters to Redfield from Tepoztlan indicating the nature of his developing disagreements with Redfield's interpretation. In the first of these (RRP: OL/RR 5/7/48), he said that he had originally planned his study as supplementary to Redfield's, and that he had not foreseen the differences in interpretation that had developed. Now that he had become aware of them, he hoped that they might discuss their evidence and methods in order to "work out the fairest possible presentation of the findings." Responding to an account of one family which Lewis forwarded, Redfield sent back a two page critique by his wife, Margaret Park Redfield (who had been with him in Tepoztlan), in which she suggested that "if culture is seen as that which gives some order and significance to life," then Lewis's account had "very little of culture in it" (RRP: RR/OL 6/8/48). In a letter which Rigdon reproduced in major part, Lewis suggested in response that "the idea that folk cultures produce less frustrations than non-folk cultures or that the quality of human relationships is necessarily superior in folk-cultures seems to me to be sheer Rousseauian romanticism and has not been documented to my knowledge" (1988:205). In a letter dated June 22, 1948, Redfield replied as follows:

One of the important results that we may expect from your work will be the investigation of the tensions, conflicts and maladjustments which undoubtedly
exist in Tepoztlán families. You refer to the idea that folk cultures produce less frustrations than non-folk cultures. This is not so much an idea to be embraced as it is a problem to be investigated—would you not agree? That the quality of human relationships is necessarily superior in folk societies you well call "Rousseauian romanticism." It seems to me pretty doubtful, whatever you call it, and certainly not a matter in which personal differences in valuation will enter. But it may be that the quality of human relationships is different in such societies.

You invite me to express myself as to whether or not Tepoztlán is or was a folk society. I can only say that it was some experience with Tepoztlán which caused me to develop the conception. As the concept is an imagined construct, no actual society conforms to it in every particular. In many respects Tepoztlán does conform with that imagined construct: it is or was relatively isolated and homogeneous, with a traditional way of life. The extent to which it has other characteristics of more primitive societies is a matter to be investigated. In general, I suppose Tepoztlán to represent the middle range, of peasant or peasant-like societies. The size of the community does not, in my opinion, make it impossible or improbable that Tepoztlán should have some or many of the characteristics of folk societies. The Baganda are more numerous.

It is surely important that you are making much more intensive studies in a community studied by someone else. But I suppose we must be prepared to admit that it will never be possible to bring your materials and mine into full comparison because the investigators were different, and because time has passed. For example, my impressions of Tepoztlán were not of a suspicious and hostile people. Was this because I found doors that were open to me and people who wanted to talk, and met no unfriendly experience? Or is it that, since developments of the past twenty-two years, the temper of the community has changed?

With reference to the questions you raise as to the interpretation of the materials on the Rojas family, I think the point in my mind, and my wife's, was that the person you had collect the materials was probably not experienced in cultures different from that of the town or city of her own upbringing and was perhaps therefore insensitive to aspects of the family life which a more widely experienced person and trained anthropologist might have felt. The materials, as read by us, do indeed give that impression.
You refer to my wife's belief to the existence of a middle class bias on your part. There is no such belief. She supposed such a bias to exist in the woman who lived with the Rojas family, affecting her choice of materials to report.

Unless this misunderstanding be the cause, I am at a loss to account for your finding some of our comments unkind. The comments were made, in response to your invitation that we make them, in an entirely amiable temper. I think you know that I have always appreciated and learned from your work, and have supported it, in general sympathy and in not a few practical acts. I shall continue to learn from what you do. That you will find part of what I recorded in that community twenty-two years ago to require correction is to be expected, and your own success in that direction is to be applauded. We learn not by defending a position taken, but by listening to the other man, with the door of the mind open for the entrance of new understanding.

Even before the emergence of their disagreements, Redfield was somewhat restrained in his evaluation of Lewis at the time of the latter's appointment to the University of Illinois, suggesting in his letter of recommendation that while Lewis was "a good man," he was "probably not a man of first rank" (RRP:RR/J. W. Albig 4/26/48). However, he continued to support other Lewis initiatives (RRP: RR/American Philosophical Society 11/6/50), and when Lewis asked to dedicate his book to Redfield, he acquiesced, sending along a rather ambiguously worded comment for the jacket blurb: "... because, in putting before other students my errors and his own [sic] in a context of intelligent discussion, he has once more shown the power of social science to revise its conclusions and to move toward the truth—for these reasons, I praise and recommend the book" (RRP undated).

In an unpublished document prepared at about this time, Redfield listed six of Lewis's major criticisms, offering a response to each of them:

1) "The folk-urban conceptualization of social change focuses attention primarily on the city as the source of change, to the exclusion or neglect of other factors of an internal or an external nature."

This objection misunderstands the nature of the folk-urban conception. As developed, it proposes a contrast between elements "ideally" identified with the city, and those "ideally" identified with the primitive isolated society. As societies change, whether by contact with the city or by contacts with other peoples or by development from within, urban elements may appear. It is true that in TEPOZTLAN attention was centered on urban
elements coming from town or city. But this was because such elements were, in the very recent history of Tepoztlán, important, and because they had been neglected by many students of primitive and peasant societies. Such societies had often been studied in such a way that city-like, and indeed city-originating elements, had been neglected. There is nothing intrinsic to the folk-urban conception that requires or even persuades one to neglect elements of change that arise from sources other than the city. The conception does direct attention to a kind of element of culture-society, or of changes therein, but it does not restrict the attention to any particular source for the changes. Indeed, in the FCY [The Folk Culture of Yucatan], recognition was given to city-like elements (pecuniary valuations, impersonality), in Guatemalan societies which, it was tentatively asserted, arose in pre-conquest time from the development of trade and money and not, perhaps from the city at all.

2) "It follows that in many instances culture change may not be a matter of folk-urban progression, but rather an increasing or decreasing heterogeneity of culture elements....the incorporation of Spanish rural elements, such as the plow, oxen, plants, and many folk beliefs, did not make Tepoztlán more urban, but rather gave it a more varied rural culture."

This is just the point I tried to make in FCY. There I tried to show that the incorporation of Spanish elements into the life of the QR [Quintana Roo] Indians had not resulted in a more urban culture, but in a more folk-like culture. I characterized the QR people as "ritually bilingual," so to speak: the addition of Spanish ritual made their culture more various--we might, as does Lewis, say it was more heterogeneous; Linton would say there were more alternatives. Of course culture change may not be a matter of folk-urban progression. It may be a matter of urban-folk "retrogression," or of change from loin-cloths to trousers with no relevance for folk-urban change at all, or from Buddhism to Christianity--a matter of interest in itself and with or without interest for those using the folk-urban conception as one among many possible instruments of understanding.

3) "Some of the criteria used in the definition of the folk society are treated by Redfield as linked or interdependent variables, but might better be treated as independent variables. Sol Tax, in his study of Guatemalan societies, has shown that societies can be both culturally well organized and homogeneous and at the same time highly modular, individualistic, and commercialistic."
This is just what I reported in the last chapter of FCY. I did, in passages earlier in the book than those referring to the Guatemalan facts, propose that these be considered as dependent variables "for the purposes of this investigation." Such a consideration is a hypothesis derived from (suggested by) the polar ideal types. This particular hypothesis was in my own book at once denied, or qualified. Thus, on p. 358 I wrote: "But it may well turn out that the correspondence is limited by special circumstances. Certain Guatemalan societies are homogeneous [and] isolated, [but] nevertheless family organization is low, and individualization and the secular character of the social life is great . . ."

Lewis adds in the paragraph numbered (3) that in Tepoztlan commercialism is combined with strength of family organization. Excellent. We are now in a position to ask: Is the greater strength of the family in Tepoztlán as compared with its strength in Agua Escondida, Guatemala, connected with the lesser power of commercialism there or with some other factors not yet sufficiently identified? Again, Lewis seems to have read the propositions relative to the folk-urban differences as assertions of what is universally (or perhaps only usually) true. Rather, they are propositions derived from the application of the folk-urban conception to a few cases with the expected result that they prove not to be true in some of them, at least without the introduction of qualifying factors. It is just in this way that the folk-urban conception is a creator of questions; it does not provide answers. Only particular societies can do that.

4) "The typology involved in the folk-urban classification of societies tends to obscure one of the significant findings of modern cultural anthropology, namely the wide range in the ways of life and in the value systems among so-called primitive peoples."

A class has members; an ideal type, as "the folk society," has no members. The folk-urban difference is not a classification. It is a mental construction of imagined societies that are only approximated in particular "real" societies.

As such it does indeed obscure the difference among primitive societies. That was what it was designed to do. It arose out of the need to find conceptions which would enable us to describe some of the changes which societies undergo, both in macrohistory and in microhistory, and to allow us to consider the "emergent" features of societies as the history of the human race proceeds. It arose out of the simultaneous consideration of modern urbanized peoples, primitive peoples and
peasant peoples, and was developed to help in the understand-
ing of the resemblances and differences among
these. It is not offered as an exclusive way of think-
ing about societies and of studying them, but as one
way, useful in certain connection only.

Lewis is quite right when at the end of this section he
says "what we need to know is what kind of urban socie-
ty, under what conditions of contact, and a host of
other specific historical data." It is to bring it
about that we look for these data that the conception
was developed. But we would not be looking for these
data at all if we did not first think of urban society
as something distinguishable from folk society.

5) "The folk-urban classification has serious limita-
tions in guiding field research because of the highly
selective implications of the categories themselves and
the rather narrow focus of problem. The emphasis upon
essentially formal aspects of culture leads to neglect
of psychological data and as a rule does not give in-
sight into the character of the people."

I repeat that the folk-urban conception has both the
limitations and the advantages of any preliminary way of
looking at complex phenomena. It does indeed lead to
neglect of psychological characterizations of, say, the
Tepoztecan as contrasted with the Tarascans. It may,
however, lead to psychological characterization of
peasant peoples, or of marginal societies, as compared
with psychological charaterizations of isolated, little-
changing homogeneous societies. (Francis on The Peas-
ant.) Indeed, in one chapter in TEPOZTLAN a single
Tepoztecan was described in psychological terms refer-
ing to his character as a "marginal man." Other con-
ceptions of psychological character may lead to a recog-
nition of anal vs oral types, or Apollonians vs Diony-
sians; this one leads to psychological characterizations
that reference to what happens in human living when the
original conditions of isolated self-containment are
altered, by whatever cause, endogenous or exogenous, in
the direction away from the constructed folk type.
Changes in psychological character may be expected to
correspond with this interest, but not with interests
expressed in alternative conceptions.

6) "Finally, underlying the folk-urban dichotomy as
used by Redfield, is a system of value judgments which
contains the old Rousseauan notion of primitive peoples
as noble savages, and the corollary that with civiliza-
tion has come the fall of man."
The statement as to the value judgements implied by my use of this dichotomy seems to me exaggerated. I do not recall any intention to suggest that everything about savages or about Tepoztecans has my approval nor that with civilization came the fall of man. I think it is true that TEPOTILAN shows my admiration of certain features of Tepoztecan life: the provision the culture gives of a sense of what life is all about, and a rich expressive life in the community. There was much there I did not like.

It is interesting that Lewis does not object to the presence of a value judgement in my work; he thinks I chose the wrong one: He writes (p. 435, note 14): "We are not, of course, objecting to the fact of values, per se, but rather to the failure to make them explicit." They will be found, inter alia, where he writes of how the Tepoztecans could be helped to greater agricultural production and a substitution of science for magic. These are also values. The values stressed by my way of looking at these communities are somewhat less often stressed in the work of modern Western science than are the values of increased production and science-rather-than-magic; perhaps then no great harm is done in bringing them to the fore to complement the usual emphasis. And, as to the degree of attachment to both the ideas and the involved values, for what it is worth I guess that my emotional involvement in mine is no greater than is Lewis's in his. It may even be less, as my glands are older.

The general impression I retain after studying these criticisms that Lewis [has] written is that they pretty much amount to blaming the parlor lamp for not cooking the soup.

The folk/urban continuum was of course the subject of considerable anthropological discussion after the appearance of Lewis's book, and the Redfield papers contain a number of documents relating to this debate. In 1954, Redfield invited Lewis to come to Chicago to participate in a seminar, on which occasion he gave Lewis a copy of a manuscript on "The Little Community," in which he commented on Lewis's critique. In responding to the manuscript, Lewis agreed that "I was asking what makes Tepoztecans unhappy because I thought you had already investigated the other question as to what makes them happy" and went on to defend his own use of models (RRP: OL/RR 4/25/54; cf. Rigdon 1988: 212-13). Two days later, Redfield responded as follows:

Yes, I think you did not quite see the conception of the ideal type as a mental device for asking questions along neglected lines. An ideal type suggests tentative statements about particular facts in particu-
lar places that can, of course, be proved or disproved. But the ideal type itself, as I understand it, makes no assertions.

I agree that a "model" usefully gives way to another. The time comes when the new model suggests questions that the old one failed to suggest -- creates new lines of inquiry. Then the new model needs to be made explicit. I think the ideal type of folk society is an extreme, or limiting case, consciously conceived, of a possible but non-existent real system. An ideal type is thus perhaps not the same kind of model as is the conception of the universe as a machine that developed in Newtonian physics. It is the very fact that the folk society is such an extreme or limiting conception -- inward-facing, all relations personal, etc. -- that gives the conception its power as a problem-raiser. To revise the extreme statement by qualifying it in directions suggested by real societies does not improve the usefulness of the conception it seems to me.

I appreciate your friendly reaction to those pages in the Little Community manuscript about your Tepoztlán and mine. The more I think of it, the more wonderfully complex I see to be the factors that go to explaining the differences between the two accounts -- different questions asked; change in the community itself; great development in the science and art of study; personal differences between the investigators; and no doubt other elements beside. What a difficult business we are engaged in!

References Cited


RRP. Robert Redfield Papers. Special Collections Department, University of Chicago Library [quoted with the permission of James Redfield and the Department of Special Collections]

Alice Bullard (University of California, Berkeley) is doing a doctoral dissertation on the deportation of the Paris Communards to New Caledonia (1874-80).

Karl Fink (German Dept., St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota), is doing research on "Storm and Stress Anthropology," which will treat the debates on the races of mankind in Germany in the 1770s and 80s, focussing on the work of Schlözer, Herder, Blumenbach, Lessing, Forster, Kant and Schiller.

Victor Golla (Ethnic Studies, Humboldt State University, Arcata, California) is collaborating with Piero Matthey (University of Turin) in preparing a complete, annotated edition of the correspondence between Edward Sapir and Robert Lowie, which will subsume the incomplete edition of the letters of Sapir to Lowie prepared by Lowie and published after his death.

Tiny van Hal (Anthropology, University of Amsterdam) is writing a dissertation on Mary Edith Durham (1863-1944), English traveller and ethnographer of the Balkans (especially Montenegro and Albania), and would appreciate suggestions about letters, photographs, and other relevant materials, which should be sent to her at Begijnepolderweg 3, 1383 AS Weesp, The Netherlands.

Hans-Juergen Hildebrandt (Institut fur Ethnologie und Afrika-Studien, Universitat Mainz, FRG) is doing research on Albert Hermann Post (1839-1895), the founder of "ethnological jurisprudence" in Germany.

Donald McVicker (North Central College, Naperville, Illinois) has been doing research on the role of the U. S. National Museum in the collection of artifacts for the Louisiana Purchase Esposition of 1904.

Marilyn Norcini (2618 E. Manchester, Tucson, AZ 85716) is writing a doctoral dissertation on the professional and academic career of the Tewa-Anglo anthropologist Edward Dozier, and would appreciate hearing from anyone with relevant information.

Jeffrey Peck (Germanics, University of Washington) is working on a genealogical history of philology in the German university in the nineteenth century, from a perspective influenced by Foucault, Said, and "interpretive" anthropologists, with emphasis on questions about narrative, textuality, and cultural representation.
George W. Stocking, Jr (Anthropology, University of Chicago) is at work on a sequel to Victorian Anthropology, tentatively entitled After Tylor: The Reformation of Anthropology in Post-Victorian Britain, 1888-1938.

Murray Wax (Sociology Dept., Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri) is working on a study of Malinowski's "rebuttal" of Freud's formulation of the Oedipus complex, and on what made so many accept it as valid, "when it was so clearly misdirected."

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANA

I. La antropología en México--Thanks to Luis Vásquez León, we are able to report that during 1988, five more volumes of the multivolume history of Mexican anthropology under the general editorship of Carlos García Mora were published by the Departamento de Etnohistoria of the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (cf. HAN 15:2, for volumes one and two, on the general history of Mexican anthropology). Volume three, Las cuestiones medulares (with the assistance of Arturo España Caballero), contains thirty-one essays on various specific topics in physical anthropology, linguistics, archeology, and ethnohistory. Volume five, Las disciplinas antropológicas y la mexicanística extranjera (edited by M. de la Luz del Valle Berrocal), has five general essays on the major subdisciplines, three on major interdisciplinary projects, and eleven on Mexicanist inquiry in different national anthropological traditions in Europe and the United States. Volume six, El Desarrollo técnico (edited by M. de la Luz del Valle Berrocal), includes twenty-eight essays on technical matters in physical anthropology, archeology, genealogy, dance, film, etc. Volumes nine and ten (edited by Lina Odena Guemes), include more than fifty bio-bibliographical essays on Los protagonistas, from Jorge Acosta to Gerardo Murillo. Still to come are another biographical volume, volumes on the different regions of Mexico, volumes on institutions and on publications, and a volume on specific topics in the history of ethnology and social anthropology.

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


Gaillard, Gerald, "Images d'une génération. Eléments pour servir à la constitution d'une histoire de l'anthropologie français de ces trentes dernières années" (Sorbonne, 1988)--two volumes of text, with eight further volumes of supplementary material (biobibliographical, institutional, documentary, indexical, etc).
Klockmann, Thomas, "Günther Tessman: König im Weissen Fleck. Das ethnologische Werk im Spiegel der Lebenserinnerungen: Ein biographischer Versuch" (University of Hamburg, 1988)


Ogburn, Joyce L., "The Reception of Theories of Biological Evolution among American Physical Anthropologists in the Late Nineteenth Century" (M.A., Indiana University, 1988).

Silverman, Eric Kline, "Theory and Practice in the Archaeological Thought of V. Gordon Childe" (M.A., University of Minnesota, 1988)

Wheeler-Barclay, Marjorie, "The Science of Religion in Britain, 1860-1915" (Northwestern University, 1988)

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 (preferably) sending offprints or (if necessary) citations—in the style used in History of Anthropology and most anthropological journals]


Dexter, Ralph. 1988. Agassiz's lectures on 'The order of the appearance of animals on earth'. Bios 58:3-7.


Jarvie, I. C. 1989. Anthropology comes to terms with its past. Philosophy of the Social Sciences 19 (#2) [a review article].


---

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.]


Baal, J. van. 1986. *Ontglipt verleden: verhaal van mijn jaren in een wereld die voorbij ging* [Escaped past: the story of my years in a world that went by]. Wever: Franeker [P.H.-youth, studies in Leiden under Josselin de Jong, civil service in Indonesia; second volume on academic years to follow]


Kilani, Mondher. 1989. *Introduction à l'anthropologie.* Lausanne: Editions Payot [G.W.S.--the last half of the book is a history of anthropological thought from the Greeks to Lévi-Strauss]


Murray, Stephen. 1986-87. The postmaturity of sociolinguistics: Edward Sapir and personality studies in the Chica
go Department of Sociology. History of Sociology 6-7:75-107 [G.W.S.]


Tabachnik, Stephen, ed. 1987. Explorations in Doughty’s Arabia Deserta. Athens: University of Georgia [B.K.--ten essays with material on ethnography, archeology, etc., with two bibliographic chapters]


B.K.= Bruce Koplin
C.F.F.= Christian F. Feest
E. A. W.= Elizabeth A. Williams
G.W.S.= George W. Stocking
I.B.= Ira Bashkow
J.U.= James Urry

J.V.= Joan Vincent
S. M.= Suzanne Marchand
P.H.= Pieter Hovens
W.Y.A.= William Y. Adams
W.C.S.= William C. Sturtevant
Y.W.= Yves Winkin

V. Gradhiva--the fifth number includes articles on the Mission Dakar-Djibouti (B. Caltagirone), on Orientalism and Négritude (M. Richardson), on the notion of the "field" (B. Pulman), on Heraclitus and French anthropology (J.-L. Jamard), as well as several reprints of documents from the interwar period, and news of the various seminars and conferences on the history of anthropology in France. While we will continue to note the appearance of Gradhiva and of its reprints series, it will not be possible, given our limited editorial abilities, to separately note all items of interest in this very important venture; we encourage interested readers of HAN to subscribe.
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ANNOUNCEMENTS

College Art Association--The 1990 annual meeting in New York City will include a session on "Exoticism, Orientalism, Primitivism: Modes of 'Otherness' in Western Art and Architecture from Antiquity to the Present." Those interested should communicate with Frederick N. Bohrer, 1520 Willard Avenue, Apt. 2, Newington, CT 06111.

Durkheim Studies--Robert A. Jones, Department of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana IL 61801, announces that henceforth this journal (founded in 1977) will be published by the University of Illinois Press, appearing once a year, in October, starting in 1989--at a cost of $10 a year for individual subscriptions.

Forum for History of Human Sciences (FHHS)--An organizational meeting was held at the joint meeting of the History of Science Society in Cincinnati, in December 1988 to establish an "Interest Group" to promote scholarship in the history of the human sciences--defined as encompassing anthropology, economics, geography, history, linguistics, political science, psychiatry, psychology, sociology, and statistics, as well as aspects of the biological and physical sciences, medicine, education, law, and philosophy. A seven member Steering Committee was elected, with Jim Capshew, University of Maryland, serving as chair. Planning for the 1989 HSS meetings is now under way. Membership is open to interested individuals at $10 a year. Checks payable to FHHS should be sent to Laurel Furumoto, Corresponding Secretary FHHS, Department of Psychology, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181. The first number of the FHHS Newsletter (Summer 1989) includes a short bibliography on the history of economics--the first of a series of orienting bibliographies on the history of the various human sciences.

History of the Human Sciences--The editors of the new journal by that title have cooperated in organizing a conference on "The Nature of the Human Sciences in the 17th and 18th Centuries," to be held September 26-28, 1990 at the University of Lancaster, England. The conference will focus on the problem of conceptualizing the subject of the human sciences in the centuries before the differentiation of the modern human science disciplines. Different sessions will address different claims to redraw the map of knowledge and to reconceive the subject of that knowledge. For further details, contact Roger Smith, Department of History, University of Lancaster, Lancaster LA1 4YG, UK.
Cambridge Ritualists--On April 27-30, a conference was held at the University of Illinois, Urbana, at which fifteen papers were scheduled to be given on Francis Cornford, James Frazer, Jane Harrison, William Robertson Smith, and on topics relating to the formation and influence of the Cambridge ritualists. Those interested in the program should write to William M. Calder, III, of the Department of Classics, 707 South Mathews Ave., Urbana IL 61801.

Cheiron--The 21st annual meeting, June 15-18, at Queen's University, included, in addition to many papers on the history of psychology, one by E. F. Konrad Koerner (University of Ottawa) on "Wilhelm von Humboldt and North American Ethnolinguistics, Boas to Hymes."

History of Archeology--Activities in this area are getting quite beyond our meagre typesetting capacities. Jonathan E. Reyman (Anthropology, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois), sent along the list of titles and abstracts for the First Annual Symposium on the History of American Archaeology, held at the A. A. A. meetings last year, and informs us that the Second Annual Symposium is scheduled for the 1989 meeting of the Society of American Archaeology. And before this year is out, we are informed by Donald McVicker (North Central College, Naperville, Illinois), the Third Annual Symposium will be held at the Washington D.C. meetings of the A. A. A. In the meantime, Alice Kehoe (University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee) has sent along the list of papers at the session on the history of archaeology at the First Joint Archaeological Congress, held at Baltimore, Maryland from January 5-9, 1989, and informs us that cassette tapes (numbers 331-333) of the session can be ordered from Chesapeake Audio/Video Communications, 6330 Howard Lane, Elkridge, MD. 21227 for $27, including postage and handling [1]. And at the October 1988 meeting of the Southeast Archaeological Conference in New Orleans, Edwin Lyon (Louisiana State University) organized and chaired a session at which six papers were given on various aspects of "The History and Documentation of Southeastern Prehistory."

International Summer Institute in the Philosophy and History of Science, Berlin, GDR, June 1988--There were papers by Val Pinsky (Archaeology, Cambridge University) on "Archaeology, Politics, and Boundary-Formation: The Boas Censure (1919) and the Development of American Archaeology during the Interwar Years," and by Terri Walton (Anthropology, Brandeis) on "Lévy-Bruhl and Primitive Mentality."

Société d' anthropologie de Paris--On June 16-17, a colloquium was held on "L'histoire de l'anthropologie: Hommes, idées, moments." Fourteen papers were given, mostly on topics in physical anthropology and prehistory in the eighteenth and
nineteenth centuries. For details, contact C. Blanckaert, 80 rue Honoré Daumier, La Rochette, 7700 Melun, France.