

Society of Washington from its founding in 1879 to the 1960s includes correspondence, minutes of meetings, and membership information. The ASW, which founded the American Anthropologist in 1888, was particularly significant on a national scale in its first thirty years, and the records for this period are most complete. The Archives also recently acquired the official records of the American Anthropological Association from 1917 to 1967. In addition, the Archives has partial records of the American Ethnological Society (1925 to about 1950), the American Society for Ethnohistory (1955 to 1970) and the Society for Historical Archaeology (1968 to 1972).

In the last two years, under the direction of Dr. Herman J. Viola, the National Anthropological Archives has undertaken a program of reorganization and expansion, with the object of both increasing its collections and making them more accessible to scholars. The result has been a large amount of new accessions as well as some remarkable discoveries within present holdings. Any research planning a project in the history of late nineteenth or twentieth century American anthropology should check the holdings of the Archives. Inquiries should be addressed to: National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

FOOTNOTES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

RADCLIFFE-BROWN AND THE AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST: A RECORD OF THEORETICAL IMPACT IN THE UNITED STATES

Elvin Hatch

When A.R. Radcliffe-Brown died in 1955, he was one of the most prominent anthropologists in the world. Nevertheless, some of the details of his professional trajectory are still somewhat obscure. For example, when did his name become prominent among American anthropologists?

To answer this question, I scanned the American Anthropologist (AA) from 1909, the date of his first publication, through 1950, noting every instance in which his name or his work was mentioned. Some references were undoubtedly missed in this reading, but the pattern which emerged is clear (see the accompanying chart). Citations to his work do not begin until 1928 and then are almost entirely to his data on the Andaman Islanders and the Australians. In 1931 the nature of the references begins to change; increasingly they refer to the theoretical elements of his scheme rather than to the data he gathered in field research.

The lack of citations prior to 1928 reflects in part the strong ethnographic focus of American anthropology before about 1930. American anthropologists devoted virtually all their research energies to the North American Indians prior to that time, and although they may have kept abreast of ethnographic research in other parts of the world, they gave scant attention to such places as Australia or the Andaman Islands in their scholarly works. American anthropologists were also impatient with theory, and consequently unlikely to be stimulated by Radcliffe-Brown's functionalism when it first appeared in the early 1920s. This

KEY

This chart omits articles written by Radcliffe-Brown, reviews of his books, and newsy items concerning such matters as his whereabouts. The chart includes references to him found in articles written by others, as well as citations found in book reviews written by others about books other than his own. This limitation was imposed in order to emphasize the degree to which he had intruded into the normal stream of thought of American anthropology.

- D Data--a brief reference citing data reported by Radcliffe-Brown.
 - T Theory--a brief reference citing some feature of Radcliffe-Brown's theoretical scheme, such as his functionalism or his attempt to locate natural laws behind society.
 - M Miscellaneous--a brief reference to Radcliffe-Brown which does not fall into either of the above categories.
 - X Extended general discussion--each shaded square represents approximately one-half page of discussion devoted to Radcliffe-Brown.
-

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

THE LETTERS OF SIR JAMES FRAZER: A REPORT OF RESEARCH

Robert Ackerman

My interest in Frazer began in my dissertation (Columbia, 1969) on "The Cambridge Ritualists and the Origins of 'Myth Criticism'," a study of the group--Jane Harrison, Gilbert Murray, F.M. Cornford, and A.B. Cook--who first applied certain anthropological ideas to literary criticism, thereby initiating what has come to be known as "myth and ritual" criticism.¹ In the process of writing this multidisciplinary dissertation, which led me into classical scholarship, history of religion, and philosophy, I became absorbed in the so-called British rationalist anthropologists of the turn of the century, and it was a natural step to Frazer, the most considerable among them.

As the first step to an eventual biography, I am preparing an edition of his letters (with fellowship support from the ACLS for 1973-74). In such undertakings one must decide first whether one wishes to present every epistolary scrap (most appropriate for literary figures), or to make a selection. Because (as it turns out) Frazer was not a man who poured out his soul in his letters, and also because of the additional several years that would be required to be sure of having canvassed every possible source, I intend what might be described as a comprehensive selected edition.

I fortunately secured the cooperation of Trinity College, Cambridge, the holders of Frazer's copyrights for both published and unpublished writing. Beyond this, I have been the beneficiary of several happy facts: that Frazer's letters have survived in remarkably large numbers,